

historical overview while the remaining chapters are categorised thematically. The historical chapters underline the significance of the official and imperial actions regarding the implementation of iconoclasm and the transformation of the Byzantine Empire. A reader might think that the authors somewhat neglect the unofficial aspects of iconoclasm, but the authors' view that imperial politics had a major role in both sides of iconoclasm is argued in detail and mostly convincingly. The discussion of Leo III is exceptionally interesting, as he is shown to have been less of an iconoclast than what is normally thought. The thematic chapters emphasise especially the socio-economic, political and administrative contexts of iconoclasm. Indeed, the book is actually at least as much about Byzantium in the iconoclast era as it is about iconoclasm itself (hence the title). In the final chapter, the representational aspects of iconoclasm are discussed together with the seminal issues of what iconoclasm was about, and why the phenomenon existed at all.

From relatively minor issues such as the dating of individual sources to wider challenges such as the influence of the rise of Islam on iconoclasm, the authors' different fields of expertise successfully complement each other. However, as the authors freely admit (p. 7), some topics are granted more limited attention. For example, the authors do not really focus on literature. Despite the complexity of the subject matter, the authors manage to write in an academically uncompromising yet notably reader-friendly style. The book does demand a decent amount of previous knowledge of the subject, but does not exclude readers who are not specialised in the iconoclastic era of Byzantium. Another laudable feature of the book is the substantial and most useful bibliography (pp. 815–906). Some points of criticism regarding editorial choices can, however, be mentioned. As a very minor annoyance, the footnotes are not always justified. A more unfortunate aspect of the book is the decision to quote the original texts of the written sources very sparingly. The praiseworthy critical reading of the sources would have been even more praiseworthy had the Greek more often been made visible in order to further convince the reader. Another slight weakness of the book is the relatively frequent use of hedges. Nevertheless, the merits of the volume easily transcend the rare points of complaint. *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era* is a genuinely major contribution to the field of Byzantine studies and an absolutely must-read. Whether a reader agrees with all of the presented arguments is questionable, but scholars and students interested in iconoclasm and Byzantine history cannot afford to ignore this volume. Thus, the book is likely to encourage future contributions to the field.

Kalle Knaapi

PAGE DUBOIS: *Out of Athens. The New Ancient Greeks*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass. – London 2010. ISBN 978-0674035584. X, 236 pp. EUR 25, GBP 20.

Page duBois has already established herself as one of the most nimble appliers of new theoretical frameworks into the study of classics, operating with a wide and stimulating selection of interpretative paradigms from postcolonial studies and Butlerian feminism to globalization theory and Vernantian comparative anthropology. Her *Out of Athens*, a wide-ranging, open-ended exploration of classical and post-classical modalities in nine case studies, is bound together by duBois' carefully chosen but cleverly oblique viewpoints and her uncompromising drive to jettison scholarly myths wherever they are encountered. Likewise, duBois is remark-

ably deft in regulating her interdisciplinary theoretical tools: no cover-all explanations are entertained, and critical voices are almost always taken into account and used to modulate the argument. Occasionally, the writer's self-conscious preoccupation with unearthing elements declared 'strange' (57), 'subversive/transgressive' (70) or 'weird' (28) may, however, be counterproductive to the overall effect of her study, as they are likely to project modern dispositions into the ancient context.

The Prologue of the book is a treat in itself – only rarely does one encounter as stimulatingly multi-faceted and theoretically daring an introduction in a classicist's contribution – and it all gets even better. Chapter 2 ("Spartacus") explores the legendary rebel's polysemic reception history. Covered are such intriguing themes as the connection between slave revolts and Dionysiac elements, possible feelings in such rebels of moving into a 'new present' by creating their own exempla, and Hollywood representations of authoritarian rulership. Alain Badiou, Homi Bhabha and Brent Shaw provide the scholarly underpinnings of the chapter, though the overall effect is closer to an essay than an actual case study. Chapter 3, "Sappho between Africa and Asia", presents a more conventional motif-study of some of the fragments of the poetess, augmented by Indo-Iranian and Egyptian parallels. Although the declared aim of exploring heterotologies is carried through, and the stratified, constantly renegotiated nature of Sappho's reception is well brought across, occasionally the reasoning borders on forced. Even so, the vistas no longer simply extend from Lesbos to modernity and the West, but also into the past and the East - or, in other words, to M. L. West.

Chapter 4, "The Tattoos of Epimenides", examines characters who might have purposefully sought unnaturalness or transgression – essentially a corporeal aspect of Foucaultian heterotology. DuBois is probably quite correct in focusing on the sense of numinosity that in antiquity seems to have been linked with the teratological or the freakish; the difference in sentiment from the Early Modern parallels would appear quite consistent, and accordingly duBois treads with some care around the 'magical freaks' (60). Epimenides, the ostensibly 'marginal' tattooed Cretan who nonetheless was regarded as a great purifier of cities and a founder of temples, is an apt figure to structure this chapter around – though the repetitive stressing of his freakishness (cf. 70) is in danger, ironically enough, of alienating the reader. This will only last until the next chapter "Slaves in the Tragic City" (Chapter 5), however, as duBois deftly negotiates the half-written margins of the 'dramatic' *polis*. She discusses very well the modes through which drama in its original context modulated the individualistic 'tragic hero' – an interpretation she quite correctly (drawing from J.-P. Vernant) derives from Aristotle, the first of the culturally detached manipulators of the image of classical drama – whereas via its modern reception 'Greek drama' has largely emerged as an empty signifier or cliché of representation. DuBois seems to envision a remedy that borrows from the Nietzschean conception of the 'Dionysiac' (75), although she finds more congenial help from Judith Butler.

Slaves are also met in Chapter 6, "Alexandrias", devoted to the multicultural Hellenistic foundations and the effect such an environment had on distinctions between ethnic and social groups. In particular, duBois' point about the dichotomy slave/free becoming a possible 'displaced sign' for all difference is worthwhile. On the other hand, the Hellenistic popularity of physiognomic treatises would point to the possibility of outward categorisations and even ethnic slurs having a prominent place, too – much as happened in the Roman Empire during the second and third centuries, when physiognomic handbooks were ostensibly quite popular among orators. It is certainly useful to bring nuances to the familiar refrain of Hellenistic 'uni-

versalism' and a Momigliano-inspired perception of a post-Alexander appreciation of 'alien wisdom'. DuBois convincingly interprets Herondean and Theocritean *ekphraseis* as examples of a very colonialist-sounding preoccupation with describing and regulating difference. In both these cases and in the Alexandrian mimes there is also incorporated a clear aim of describing the low to the members of the elite – an elite that may have become not only empowered by the monarchic systems, but also more self-conscious when engaged in defending the new mixed communities from clear outsiders, such as the Galatians. The other, less famous Alexandrias constitute something of an afterthought in the chapter, but the treatment does enrich the whole, with the more precarious but less hegemonistic Greeks of the eastern communities providing a welcome counterpoint to the epistemically dominating Egyptian cosmopolis.

From cosmopolis to doulopolis, "Histories of the Impossible" (Chapter 7) is linked with the utopianism of slave revolts already examined briefly in Chapter 2; the focus is upon Hellenistic Asia Minor, where the previously oxymoronic concept of 'city of slaves' seemed on occasion closer to reality than Aristotle, for instance, would ever have countenanced. Here, as so often, the search for heterotologies is faced with challenges posed by the narratives of hegemonic historiography, though both share a desire to alter reality by manipulation of language (cf. 117). 20th-century scholarship is engaged with to great heuristic benefit, as it is throughout the work, though duBois' own remarkable expertise regarding perceptions of slavery (see *Slaves and Other Objects*, 2003) get perhaps slightly mired in the process. The next chapter (8, "Jesus and Other Jews"), on the other hand, endeavours to remedy a perceived lack of scholarly engagement – or to be more precise, an artificially maintained and theoretically unjustifiable division between classical and Christian subjects. This is, of course, a long overdue correction, and one which duBois approaches from the relatively untrodden direction of bodily markings, physical punishment, and slavery. The cross-fertilisation yields very worthwhile results in this case, too. The following comparative treatment of the topical similarities between Jesus, itinerant holy men and magicians, Dionysus, and Socrates are rather more familiar from modern scholarship, but engagingly and stimulatingly presented.

Chapter 9 ("The Persistence of Oedipus") is again firmly engaged with reception studies, with duBois emphasising the layers of meaning that have accrued to the figure of a tragic king so favoured (indeed, reinvented) by psychoanalytic theories. Heavy on modern theorists of several fields – with the novelist Simenon thrown in for good measure – the chapter nonetheless makes very instructive reading to any classicists. Even more so is the last chapter, "Twenty-first-Century High Theory and the Classics", an impressive closure to the book. Some of the disparate strains from the previous chapters are brought together, among them the reception of drama, psychoanalysts' mining of the classical past; furthermore, much of the modern scholarship taken up is already familiar from the preceding treatment.

*Out of Athens* is possibly the most articulate contribution since *Classics in Progress* (ed. T. P. Wiseman, 2002) concerning the possibilities and challenges faced by Classical Studies as the field enters the 21st century. Apart from what has been singled out above, of particular heuristic value are duBois' rejection of the 'arboreal' model of classicist scholarship in favour of a 'rhizomic' one, and her emphasis on comparison between cultures and societies as a valid tool when used judiciously. She appreciates 'contamination' of texts, ideas and social *staseis* for the new perspectives that they engender, and there can hardly be found a better illustration of the value of studying these 'contaminations' than this book. What duBois achieves in *Out of Athens* is the demonstration that the fragmentary and the implied, when drawn from cleverly reading

the margins of antiquity and diagonal or tangential to the hegemonic narratives of the time, can provide insights that could never be obtained by rehearsing the established viewpoints of classical studies. Indeed, one might observe that the (only ephemerally) spotless white dust jacket of the hardback edition under review seems almost designed to act as parable for the inevitable, instructive, and highly beneficent 'contamination' of any lingering notions of 'white antiquity'. Carried along for a prolonged period of time, both the dust jacket and the classical reception have become adorned by fascinating tints.

*Antti Lampinen*

HYUN JIN KIM: *Ethnicity and Foreigners in Ancient Greece and China*. Duckworth, London 2009. ISBN 978-0-7156-3807-1. VI, 217 pp. EUR 60.

It is in no way surprising that Sino-Hellenic studies have exhibited a notable surge in recent years: no doubt this reflects a combination of real-life circumstances with the increasing openness of classical studies to methodological cross-fertilisation. Indeed, the recent review article by Tanner (*JHS* 129 [2009]) demonstrates well the advantages of a properly conducted comparative approach in the study of China and Greece, even as it shows how little favour the method in general has enjoyed among the classicists. One likely reason is the extensive knowledge of two entirely independent traditions that is required from a scholar embarking on such a study. It is, then, quite understandable that this contribution by Kim, focusing upon historiography and ethnography, makes no assumptions about the readers' background knowledge about the early Chinese dynasties and literature. Another explanation for the dearth of comparative studies may derive from the notional exceptionalism of classical antiquity (in the West), which may have appeared to many previous generations as barely conducive to comparisons with other traditions. A similar mentality may have held sway among students of Chinese classics.

In terms of original cultural particularism – in opposition to its inherited forms – however, the epistemic appeal of comparing the Sinocentric and Hellenocentric worldviews is quite obvious: both Chinese and Greco-Roman cultures entertained strong and theoretically buttressed notions of both moral and spatial centrality, and in both cultural traditions the formal constraints of literary traditionalism tended to create an 'ethnographic stasis' with very little testing against the anthropological realities in the field. During the classical period in Greece, Kim's primary chronological focus, writers' stylistic dependency from and reverence towards their predecessors was perhaps less pronounced than during later periods, and hence might be argued to contrast quite strongly with the mellow quality of any criticism directed at their precursors by the Chinese litterati. Antiquarianism, though subsequently a strong formative influence within both Chinese and Greco-Roman ethnographic and historiographic traditions, is treated only in passing by Kim; even so, texts such as the *Huainanzi* and the *Shanhaijing* clearly formed an already established pool of quasi-ethnographic knowledge which Sima Qian had to negotiate with (88–94).

The sections dealing with Greeks and their ethnocentricity in Chapters 1 to 3 are dependable but rather predictable, and are mainly designed to contextualise Herodotus' worldview; one supposes that a specialist in Sima Qian might say the same regarding the Chinese sections of the same chapters. But even if both writers are eminently 'classical' in terms of their