

palinodic fiction intensifies the tragedy of the war by demonstrating its futility, a war fought for the possession of a phantom. Helen—whoever ‘Helen’ may be—is rehabilitated, but the result is to assert even more strongly the meaningless suffering of all those thousands who fought and died for ten long years to bring her home. In the end, the phantom who went to Troy is more real—more symbolically real, above all in her effect upon others—than the palinodic ‘flesh-and-blood’ Helen of the play. (William Arrowsmith in *Euripides: Helen*, trans. J. Michie, C. Leach [New York and Oxford, 1981], p. xii)

I learned a lot from this book; although sometimes frustratingly theory-laden and digressive, *Grafting Helen* does provide many fresh perspectives on old themes.

Boston University

STEPHEN ESPOSITO

GREEK CULTURE(S)

C. DOUGHERTY, L. KURKE (edd.): *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture. Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*. Pp. xx + 289, ills. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Cased, £50/US\$70. ISBN: 0-521-81566-5.

Cambridge University Press reproduce the same side of the Aristonothos crater on both front and back of the dust jacket, but no reader of this important collection of papers should come out at the far end seeing at all the same Greek world. In the face of classicists’ persistent assertions about ‘Greek culture’ and reluctant acknowledgement of regionalism (‘Macedonian culture’, ‘Athenian culture’) or class division (‘aristocratic culture’), the contributors to this book insist that many cultures sustained a competitive or collaborative coexistence under a thinly coherent Greek umbrella culture. They identify patterns where others have seen merely oddity, systematic contrast where others have found only random or arbitrary opposition. There is more structuralism here than deconstructionism, but structuralism in which the polarities are multiple not simple.

Dougherty and Kurke’s *Cultural Poetics* volume of a decade ago lingers in the memory for a small number of classic papers (above all Kurke’s own); in this volume no single paper stands out: the whole is greater than the sum of the parts, and the nine papers gain individually from the frame in which they are set by Kurke and Dougherty’s lucid introduction and Josiah Ober’s dense and compelling postscript. The coherence of the collection owes much to its origin in a conference at Wellesley, but something also to William Sewell’s ‘The Concept(s) of Culture’, published in V. Bonnell and L. Hunt (edd.), *Beyond the Cultural Turn* (Berkeley, 1999) to which Kurke and Dougherty, Ober, and two other contributors explicitly refer and from which the phrase ‘thin coherence’ derives.

D. & K.’s introduction reviews past work on ‘ancient multiculturalism’, succinctly noting the limitations of works which emphasize sources of influence without interest in how cultural contact works or what exactly results. Their concern with how cultures adapt to dissonant phenomena extends to the dissonant that grows up within an umbrella culture as well as to that acquired from outside. They stress the dialectic between culture as system (Geertz) and culture as local or class-specific practice (new historicism). They insist that to locate the ‘rifts and fissures’ in the culture of the Greek *polis* it is necessary to do away with assumptions of neat opposition between ‘private’ and ‘public’, and to allow the politics of cultural choice which ancient authors

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

themselves conceal by separating off politics from ‘culture’ (citing Thucydides 2.37). Brief and deft, the argument well reveals the wholesale revision to our view of the classical polis which allowing for cultural diversity within the polis requires.

The papers are organized in three sections. In the first, Jonathan Hall, Dougherty, and Carla Antonaccio look at archaic and fifth-century Greek encounters with other cultures. Hall rehearses arguments about the creation of ethnicity more or less familiar from his other publications. Dougherty analyses the relationship of the Aristonothos crater to *Odyssey* 9, seeing the juxtaposition of the encounter with Polyphemus and Odysseus’ contrasting experience among the Phaeacians as parallel to the juxtaposition on the crater of a hostile encounter between armed men on ships and the blinding of the Cyclops. Antonaccio introduces Homi Bhabha’s notion of cultural ‘hybridity’. She uses the evidence of Herodotos 5.88 to insist that material cultural differences did reveal distinctions of identity, and offers some brief, and not entirely convincing, examples from the archaeological record from Syracuse, Corinth, and Athens.

The second section has papers by Kurke, Nigel Nicholson, and Richard Neer, arguing for the cultural expression of political conflict. Kurke reads a classical debate about Delphi out of the *Life of Aesop*, but the grounds for attributing the various parodies of Delphi and Apollo to the fifth century seem weak, as do those for thinking that critiques of the oracle were localized at Delphi itself. Nicholson argues that the absence of the charioteer from poems and monuments celebrating victories in chariot races shows that ‘the charioteer must have occasioned considerable anxiety’, linking this to the commodity-exchange relationship between charioteer and chariot owners. Nicholson cites Pythian 5, which does celebrate a charioteer who was a relative of the owner, to support this view, but offers no account of a very prominent sixth-century monument in which a charioteer *is* named (*JG* i³ 1469; out-of-date reference at p. 128 n. 129). Neer analyses the east and north sides of the Siphnian treasury frieze, reading there metaphors for political struggle on Siphnos and elite commitment to ‘old-style combat over against the hoplite phalanx’.

The final section has papers on classical Athens from Richard Martin, Peter Wilson, and Katarzyna Hagemajer Allen. Martin and Wilson argue about the *aulos*, with Martin down-playing the contrast between *aulos* and *kithara* and Wilson insisting, in a paper which squeezes out of the meagre evidence a cultural side to Kritias’ politics, that attitudes to the *aulos* changed over time. Hagemajer Allen’s paper is a fascinating addition to M. C. Miller’s demonstration, in *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century B.C.* (Cambridge, 1997), that Athenians made extensive use of Persian culture. Allen notes parallels between architectural motifs in funerary monuments from Sinope, Naqsh-i-Rustam, etc. and in Attic stelai. Who influenced what when remains very unclear, but the case for Athenians being aware of the parallels is strong. Allen refuses to read the adoption of orientalizing motifs as a political gesture, noting only that it fostered an anxiety over cultural difference that needed to be masked by, for example, assertions of autochthony.

These challenging, if often unconvincing, forays are effectively put into a broader context in Ober’s postscript. Every classicist should read this, not only because it introduces work by cultural and political theorists that few will know, but because it brings out the links between ancient and modern issues of cultural homogenization, and the unavoidable politics of the ways in which scholars formulate their own arguments. That what follows this acutely perceptive account is a rosy idealization of democratic Athens represents a surprise triumph for the thin coherence of western culture.

King’s College, Cambridge

ROBIN OSBORNE