Hall discuss their material within such frameworks, the former explicitly; as a result, these are two of the more thought-provoking contributions. Nevertheless, Lomas has brought together an astonishing range of material. The fact that art, archaeology, numismatics, and literature can be used to explore multi-cultural interactions reminds us of the vibrancy of this field of scholarship and echoes the breadth of expertise of the volume's honorand. As such, no more fitting a tribute to Professor Shefton could have been conceived.

*University of Bristol* TAMAR HODOS
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni112

## GREEKNESS

J. M. HALL: *Hellenicity. Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Pp. xx + 312, maps, figs. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2002. Cased, US$50, £35. ISBN: 0-226-31329-8.

*Hellenicity*, H.'s second book, is less of a sequel to his *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1997; reviewed by myself in *CR* 50 [2000], 210–11) than a fleshing out of the thesis delineated in the earlier book. Thus, *Hellenicity* spells out H.'s earlier suggestion of how an 'aggregative' model of Greekness by descent—the process of peoples progressively counting themselves in, and being counted in, to a fictive family-tree descended from Hellen—increasingly gave way, from the fifth century, to an essentially Athenian remaking of Greekness as dependent on cultural criteria. The different models are viewed as qualitatively different: Greekness based on cultural criteria is less profoundly meaningful than that based on descent. This sense of a qualitative difference is reinforced by H.'s sketch of a more or less linear decline of perceptions of primarily descent-based Greekness through into the Hellenistic and Roman imperial periods.

Somewhat surprisingly, given the apparently broader focus of *Hellenicity*, the majority of its chapters are concerned with the archaic period, the focus of *Ethnic Identity*. Following an introductory chapter, which includes a more succinct theoretical discussion of ethnicity than that given in *Ethnic Identity* Chapter 2, Chapters 2–5 set up a thesis of the comparatively late emergence of claims of descent-based common Greekness. H.'s thesis of comparative lateness is set up primarily in opposition to much older modern views of the 'arrival' or 'formation' of 'the Greeks' based on 'objective' cultural assessments and/or racial theory. In Chapter 2, then, H. discusses ancient, retrospective perceptions of early, 'prehellenic', local and supraregional populations, accounts characterized above all with change, whether in the form of migrations or name-changing. These are contrasted with the fixity of modern (early twentieth-century) assessments of the Bronze Age, including the 'arrival of the Indo-Europeans' or 'racial' analysis of the 'mongrel' nature of Greeks. Chapter 3 is concerned to plot the emergence of perceptions of 'intrahellenic' identities (some of which are the major concern of *Ethnic Identity*)—Achaeans, Ionians, Aeolians, and Dorians—from the eighth century, especially at the geographical 'margins' of the Greek world, and as both pre-existing and a prerequisite for the assertion of Greekness on the basis of common descent from Hellen. Chapter 4 is largely a negative argument: a sense of Greekness is not the result of archaic colonial encounters. In Chapter 5, we finally encounter the assertion of common Greekness through descent: the geographical broadening of the concepts of Hellas and Hellenes from the region south of Thessaly

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni113 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to central Greece and beyond in the late sixth century, with an emphasis on the rôle of Olympia and the Hellenodikai as arbitrators of claims of Greekness based on genealogy.

After all this emphasis on the archaic period, H. leaves himself just fifty pages, a single chapter, Chapter 6, to adumbrate developments in the classical and Hellenistic periods in support of his thesis of a shift 'From Ethnicity to Culture', the title of the chapter. This compression carries with it certain advantages, not least that evidence and arguments can be used selectively to fit the shape of the overall thesis of a decline in appeal to descent as the primary marker of Greekness in relation to appeal to cultural criteria. The most convincing part of his argument here is, to my mind, the delineation of fifth-century Athenian notions of 'Greek' and 'barbarian' that are in many cases not so much mutually exclusive opposites as ends of a sliding-scale.

The claim that cultural criteria for Greekness replace ethnic (in H.'s strict sense of descent-based) criteria is, however, far more questionable, and the sheer energy expended in downgrading some of the more notorious classical and Hellenistic appeals to common Greekness on the basis of 'blood' or 'nature' may increase our suspicions that he protests too much. For example, H. rightly states that when, notoriously, Herodotus puts into the mouth of the Athenians a definition of *to hellenikon* as being based on 'common blood' as well as 'common culture' (8.144. 2), he makes them cite a criterion of common identity that receives far less emphasis than cultural criteria in the *Histories* as a whole. One may well suspect that Herodotus is 'up to something' here, but it is far from clear that he is making the Athenians play down 'common blood' by placing it at the beginning of a list that rises in value (pp. 189–94), especially when other criteria cited, notably common language, are equally problematic given Herodotus' attribution elsewhere to Athens of an originally Pelasgian—barbarian—language as well as *ethnos* (1.57). And whatever Herodotus may be 'up to' here, Rosalind Thomas's highly stimulating *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge, 2000) has very ably illustrated the benefits—and indeed the necessity—of seeing Herodotus' arguments about, for example, the relative significance of *nomos* and *physis* as part of a large and fervent debate that extends way beyond this individual text, and with which this text engages.

In contrast, H.'s stern periodization encourages him to organize a history of thought into misleadingly clear and straight lines that are at odds with the situational nature of ethnic identities. In addition, this fosters some inconsistency in his own argumentation. It is, for example, strange that, while seeking to discredit any apparent fifth- and fourth-century references to Greekness based on blood and nature, he should not be more circumspect about, say, Isocrates' claim at *Panegyric* 50 that Greekness is henceforth based not on *genos* but on *dianoia*, on *paideusis* rather than *physis*. While H. is good on the Athenocentrism of such a definition of Greekness, as well as on the question of whether Greekness was an area of primary concern on a day to day level, he does not ask whether Isocrates, in his downgrading of *genos* and *physis*, is engaging in an active argument (as his rhetorical energy might well suggest), or merely stating a commonly held opinion (pp. 208–10).

H. has space only to glimpse the Hellenistic and Roman imperial period. The process of decline that he has begun to map duly proceeds, eliminating obstacles. One is the striking emphasis on asserting connections of kin, mapped very clearly in Christopher Jones's *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA, 1999). H. is moved by his thesis on the decline in significance of such descent-based claims to make a questionable value judgement: 'if its diplomatic employment in the fifth century already betrayed a certain artificiality and formulaic quality, the genealogical

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni113 Published online by Cambridge University Press

routes by which Hellenistic cities established political relationships are now far more tortuous and preposterous' (p. 223). H.'s goes on to claim support for his overall thesis in the Augustan writer Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Roman Antiquities* 1.89.4 which he claims in support of 'the Hellenistic culturally-based definition of Hellenic identity' that 'endured well into the period of Roman rule'. H. is struck by Dionysius' omission of 'common blood' from a definition of Greekness 'that is in other respects remarkably similar to Herodotos' (8.144.2)' (p. 224). But this is actually to misunderstand seriously Dionysius' argument, which is far more complicated and which does not sit at all comfortably with many key aspects of H.'s thesis. Dionysius has, after all, spent most of a whole, long book 'proving' that the Romans are Greek by descent through an exhaustive investigation of the roots of the original settlers of the city's site. At 1.89, where he is summing up his findings and their implications, his concern is with the degree to which the Romans have 'forgotten' this essential Greekness by their subsequent reception of and admixtures with barbarians. What H. reads as the cultural criteria of Greekness—common language, customs, gods, and equitable laws—are no more and no less than Dionysius' 'memories' of a primordial Greekness based on descent.

H. is capable of considerable subtlety, as shown in his attempts to work out how, where and why 'intrahellenic' identities arose within the archaic period. I am not clear that this attempt to think and write bigger shows him at his best. This process of writing and thinking bigger is signalled in part by his appeals to issues of contemporary relevance and importance, notably the question of how far 'national' identities are being reshaped in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. H.'s initial attempt to catch the reader's attention through a discussion of recent political and media debates on Britishness and Englishness is somewhat limply connected to the subject in hand (pp. 4–5). On the other hand, where reflections on modern experience are more closely connected to arguments about antiquity different kinds of problems emerge. A highly debatable view of modern nationalism is applied to antiquity without properly testing its applicability, and in turn, with some circularity, antiquity is used to reassure a sector of the modern audience concerned about the loss of 'national consciousness . . . .in a more integrated Europe' (p. 228). It is this view of modern nationalism that seems to have informed a view that 'nations'—or what are assumed to be their ancient equivalents—have an optimum size for fostering a meaningful, that is descent-based identity, one that is a 'stimulus for altruism and self-sacrifice' (p. 228). Thus, by implication, Achaean identity, or Greekness in the late archaic period, qualifies, whereas culturally based Greekness does not. It is also, perhaps, a preoccupation with the foundation-myths of modern nations that has led H. to the apparent assumption that common ethnicity requires a (fictive) basis in a single descent group: Roman-ness is thus disqualified on the grounds of the 'ethnic heterogeneity between Latin, Sabine and Etruscan populations' (p. 23). This assumption has the bizarre effect of excluding a major way of conceptualizing ethnogenesis and identity in the classical world: a variegated people born of a mixing or mingling of the divine and human, of two or more peoples, often imagined as a rape.

One may suspect that H.'s heart really lies in the archaic material, but it is something of a pity that his summary treatment of the classical and Hellenistic world does not allow him to convey more of a sense of the complexity and indeed fraughtness of ethnic identities during these periods. Finally, H.'s orthographic system (pp. xvii–xviii for the rationale) not only encourages such bizarre usage as attributing a Latin title, *Moralia*, to an author called 'Ploutarkh' (*passim*), but, more profoundly, suggests a bid

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni113 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for a dubious sense of 'authenticity' and essentialism that is strangely at odds with a consciousness of the complex processes of making and remaking of identities.

*Birkbeck College, London* EMMA DENCH
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni113

## GREEK FREEDOM

K. RAAFLAUB: *The Discovery of Freedom in Ancient Greece*. First English edition, revised and updated from the German. Translation by R. Franciscono, revised by the author. Pp. xii + 420. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2004 (first published as *Die Entdeckung der Freiheit. Zur historischen Semantik und Gesellschaftsgeschichte eines politischen Grundbegriffes der Griechen*, 1985). Cased, US$55, £38.50. ISBN: 0-226-70101-8.

This is a revised and translated edition of Raaflaub's path-breaking *Entdeckung der Freiheit* (1985). In the present version, R. has strengthened his arguments (p. xii), updated the bibliography, responded to critics, and located arguments within current debates. The major questions confronted by such an edition are whether the ideas have stood the test of time, whether they usefully contribute to current discussions, and whether the effort to reach a wider audience is justified. The answer to all three questions is resoundingly affirmative.

R. focuses on freedom, not as a philosophical concept, but as a genuine part of social and political history. Building on Koselleck's theory of *Begriffsgeschichte*, he shows that the word *eleutheria* fossilized a diverse history of events, behavior, attitudes, and ideology. Beyond this single term, R. also examines the conceptual field of freedom, which, he argues, was defined by complementary ideas such as power and contrasting concepts such as slavery. He takes the textual record, including its gaps, seriously: without tangible signs of particular concepts, he infers that the concepts in question were unavailable or unimportant at the time. This approach is more plausible than the rather elaborate recent Marxist interpretations of literary silence (e.g. Rose, *Sons of the Gods, Children of Earth* [Ithaca, 1992]). R. tends, however, to represent ideas chiefly as responsive to events and circumstances, rather than as enabling or motivating political behavior (e.g. 143–4). Other intellectual historians, by contrast, have viewed ideas as action-inspiring—for example, in arguments that French revolutionaries put Enlightenment ideas into action (cf. Baker, *Inventing the French Revolution* [Cambridge, 1990]). Sophistic ideas of freedom and justice may similarly have motivated Athens's oligarchic revolutionaries.

Since the concept of political freedom was foreign to the Bronze Age palace cultures (pp. 19–22), R. begins with Homeric society. Homeric society valued freedom and abhorred slavery without originating an independent concept of political freedom, because the 'crucial dividing line' (p. 31) within communities was between nobles and the masses, whether free or unfree. Advancement came not through winning political freedom but through attaining proximity to the master of the *oikos*; thus the master/servant opposition had more weight than the free/slave opposition. Until those with power, i.e. the élite, began to view freedom as a central concern, freedom remained a 'low-priority value' (p. 43). This insight enables R. to raise substantial doubts about Orlando Patterson's thesis that the concept of freedom as an independent value

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni113 Published online by Cambridge University Press