Classical Others. Anthropologies of antiquity[1]

Johannes Siapkas

Introduction

Classical studies is in many respects a multi-faceted discourse which incorporates many branches. One way to clarify the conceptual landscape of classical studies is to associate its branches with other academic disciplines. Anthropology is, together with archaeology, history, art history and philology, one of the academic disciplines which have influenced classical studies. Anthropological models, such as comparative examples, have been widely used in classical studies since the nineteenth century. Mutual influences between anthropology and classical studies have received some scholarly attention.[2] To the best of my knowledge, however, the redefined lure of anthropology during the cultural turn in classical studies has not attracted much attention thus far. The cultural turn denotes a wide-ranging refiguring of the humanities from the 1980s onwards. This redefinition of the humanities affected most aspects of scholarship; scholars introduced and explored topics such as power structures, discourses and world-views which had been neglected in previous scholarship. The epistemological foundations were redefined, and new methodological tools were adopted as a result of the cultural turn. Several examples of the cultural turn will be mentioned in this article. As we are now witnessing the demise of the cultural turn, it is time to assess the anthropological legacy in classical studies once more. This paper aims to elaborate on the influences of anthropological models in classical studies. I will, in particular, explore which new aspects of anthropology were appropriated during the cultural turn.

Oscillating between the exemplary and the primitive

Studies of the classical world have a long history, which continue to affect us. Antiquarian studies, here used as shorthand for studies preceding the establishment of modern science in the nineteenth century, emphasized the exemplary aspects of classical antiquity.[3] This perspective was incorporated in the academic settings of classical studies. On the whole, classical studies continues to pay more attention to the aspects of the classical ancient cultures which have been cast as ideals in later times, such as philosophy, political structures, drama, architecture or artworks. In addition to classical studies, the classical legacy was also incorporated into the

curriculum of other academic disciplines; ancient philosophy is studied in philosophy and the history of ideas, ancient literature in literature studies and ancient art in art history. These wide-ranging appropriations contribute to sustain the established view of classical antiquity as exemplary.[4]

The idealization of classical antiquity is founded on an analytical decontextualization of the material: cultural phenomena are diachronically related to other examples of the same kind, but not to the social and cultural context in which they were produced, e.g. the sculptures of Polykleitos are related to later post-antique sculptures, but not to the society in which he lived and worked. The idealizing tradition is countered by an intellectual trajectory which pays attention to social, cultural and mundane aspects of ancient cultures. The ancient evidence is contextualized in its original setting to a higher degree in this counter-tradition. The idealizing tradition can, furthermore, be associated with an aesthetic definition of culture, and the counter-tradition with an anthropological definition of culture.[5] These intellectual trajectories should not be viewed as mutually exclusive: rather, they complement each other in many respects. In other words, classical studies oscillate in-between an idealizing and an anthropological extreme.[6]

Primitive customs of the ancients

The customs of the ancients were the subject of analysis even before the establishment of modern scientific classical studies during the nineteenth century.[7] With the crystallization of *Altertumswissenschaft* as the epistemological ideal of classical studies in the early nineteenth century, the analytical scope of classical studies was, at least in theory, widened to include *all* aspects of classical civilizations, including anthropological issues. Friedrich August Wolf, Philipp August Böckh and Karl Otfried Müller published works explicating the customs of the ancient Greeks.[8] They were part of the neohumanistic movement which both elevated the idealization of ancient Greece to unprecedented levels and introduced *Sachsphilologie* which aimed to relate the literary record to the historical reality.

The everyday aspects of antiquity received much attention from scholars who were influenced by evolutionary theories during the second half of the nineteenth century.[9] In these models the emphasis was on the universal history of mankind. Evolutionism is founded on the master-narrative that human history gradually evolves towards higher degrees of social and cultural complexity. Civilizations are compared and categorized according to their perceived degrees of complexity. Evolutionary theories were embedded in and contributed to enforce the colonial world order, since contemporary Western civilization was regarded as the teleological end for all cultures. Western history was read as the blueprint for other civi-

lizations. In this conceptual framework, ancient Greek culture was viewed as a primitive culture which could be compared with other past and present cultures like the Iroquois or the Zulu.[10]

Classical antiquity was a rewarding civilization to draw upon for anthropologists due to the rich and familiar evidence available. Classical education and *Bildung* were common among scholars in other academic disciplines as well. From an evolutionary perspective the effect of the evidence is not restricted to a specific context, but has, at least potentially, universal connotations. A Greek or Roman cult, for instance, could also be regarded as a representation of the primordial primitive conditions shared by all humans. James Frazer's exploration of the annual ritual killing of the priest at the sanctuary of Diana at Lake Nemi in Roman times was viewed both as a trait of Roman religion and as the survival of a primitive annual vegetation cult. The ritual had been moulded in primitive times and preserved for centuries.[11]

James Frazer was attached to the Cambridge ritualists, a group which also included Jane Harrison, Gilbert Murray, Francis Cornford and Arthur Cook. They were influenced by evolutionary theories and primarily analyzed ancient religion. The main argument which united the Cambridge ritualists was the conceptualization of rituals as the essential structure that articulated the world-view of a given culture. A web of myths and narratives were later constructed around these.[12] The primacy of rituals as well as the inclusion of anthropological parallels and models went against the grain in classical studies at that time. Classical studies emphasized the literary record and idealized classical antiquity. For many classicists, a comparison between classical antiquity and other primitive cultures was unthinkable, since it questioned its uniqueness.

Independently of, and preceding, the Cambridge ritualists, the French historian Numa Denis Fustel de Coulanges introduced an evolutionary model for the development of the ancient city in his *La cité antique* from 1864. He argued that the ancient Greek city developed in stages from small family units to successively larger units. Fustel de Coulanges regarded rituals as the core feature which facilitated the cohesion of the family and the city.[13]

Tracing and establishing the origins of a cultural phenomenon were primary analytical strategies in the evolutionary discourses. The meaning and content of cultural features were regarded as having crystallized in an original context and having survived as long as they resonated, in some sense, with later conditions. In conjunction with the renewed interest in anthropology during the 1960s and later, the ritualists' adoption of anthropology came under fire. This criticism questioned the very foundations of evolutionary models. Clyde Kluckhohn had, during the 1940s, shown that the fundamental issue propelling the ritualists, that rituals came first and that myths reflect them, simply is the wrong line of enquiry. The most

devastating critique came from Joseph Fontenrose, who in 1966 shattered the assumption that rituals of classical cultures could be viewed as reflections of primordial cultural conditions.[14]

Psychological and social primitivism

During the interwar years, classical studies turned inwards and premiered specialization. In studies of ancient religion, for instance, anthropological models were often replaced with psychologizing frameworks which emphasized individual experience. These kinds of psychologizing studies were authored by Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Louis Farnell, and Louis Mouliner, to name but a few.[15]

The ritualist perspective was, however, not abandoned completely. The Swedish classicist Martin P:n Nilsson continued to employ ritualist theories in his *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, 1950–1955.[16] Nilsson also published *Primitiv kultur* and *Primitiv religion* during the interwar years. These works are founded on evolutionary theories. *Primitiv Kultur* is, furthermore, steeped in race theories.[17] This can serve as a reminder of the wide permeation of race theories during the early twentieth century.

Anthropological perspectives were also adopted in accounts which focused on the beliefs of ordinary ancient Greeks. In the influential *The Greeks and the irrational*, E. R. Dodds aimed to answer the question whether the Greeks were "blind to the importance of nonrational factors".[18] The irrational aspects of ancient Greek culture were, in effect, everyday practices and beliefs which were examined through the extensive use of anthropological parallels. Dodds related the religious experience in the Homeric epics, the gradual change from a shame to a guilt culture, and the rationalism of Plato, to anthropological models in order to illuminate the Greek miracle. In contrast to the evolutionary perspectives, Dodds did not turn to anthropology in order to shed light on a primordial universal past, but to further our understanding of the Greeks by charting the irrational, primitive aspects of Greek culture. An interesting parallel to Dodds is G. E. R. Lloyd: he was primarily concerned with the development of the rational aspects of ancient Greek thought, philosophy and science, but this domain was contrasted with the irrationality of the ancient Greeks, not least in order to anchor the Greek miracle in a cultural context.[19] Dodds's emphasis on the notion of the irrational went against the grain of the idealizing trajectory in classical studies.[20] The initial marginalization of Dodds's publication indicates that the anthropological intellectual trajectory in classical studies continued, and continues to be the underdog.

Primitive social institutions

Conceptual developments in anthropology also contributed to widen the gap between anthropology and classical studies. The evolutionary paradigm encapsulated a comparative dimension which facilitated a place for classical antiquity. During the interwar years, however, anthropology moved towards functionalistic models which emphasized synchronic explanations. As a result of this, to a large extent, anthropologists lost interest in the past.[21]

With the introduction of theories of functionalism, and the emphasis on synchronic explanations, classicists once again turned to anthropology.[22] Anthropological parallels were legitimate once again, since the universal aspects of antiquity were foregrounded. Moses Finley turned, for instance, to examples from modern anthropology in order to illuminate the world of the Homeric epics. The perceived veracity of the myths among the Greeks was explicated by reference to Malinowski's study of the Trobriand Islands.[23] The institution of the travelling ritual player or artist in the Homeric epics was related to the Arioi of the Society Islands (e.g. Tahiti) and the Hula of Hawaii.[24] Once again, examples from anthropological fieldwork were used to inform classical studies.

Finley was also a leading scholar in a trajectory in which anthropological economic theories were at the centre of the debate. In short, this debate was concerned with whether ancient economies could and should be understood as modern or primitive. The controversy began in the 1890s, when Karl Bücher argued that ancient economies were primitive. The ancient economies were characterized by self-sufficiency. The core structure, or unit, around which economic activities were organized was the *oikos*. In contrast to Bücher, Meyer and Julius Beloch argued that ancient economies were, in essence, modern. This was because it was the state, and not the *oikos*, which was the central structure that determined economic activities, even during antiquity.[25] Eduard Meyer argued against the notion that the *oikos* had preceded the state in a long and highly critical overview of contemporary anthropology in the 1907 edition of his *Geschichte des Altertums*.[26] The Bücher-Meyer controversy set the agenda for studies of ancient economies for a long time. Finley, and before him Max Weber and Karl Polanyi, discussed different aspects of the premodern character of ancient economies. In these accounts anthropological parallels were used to illustrate models and institutions of ancient economies.[27]

Classical pasts and Mediterranean presences

Anthropological theories and models have also been utilized in order to elaborate the vexed issue of cultural and social continuity between classical antiquity and the present in the Mediterranean area. This discursive

field oscillates between notions of continuity and disruption. While Jakob Fallmerayer, who questioned the biological continuity of the Greeks, represents one side, Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos, who argued for the spiritual continuity of the Greeks, is on the opposing side.[28] This debate originated at the turn of the nineteenth century and is related to the emergence of modern nationalism. Hellenism, the ideology of Greek nationalism, rests on two foundations: firstly, the idealization of classical Greek culture, cast as the origin of modern Greek culture, and, secondly, a continuity between ancient and modern Greece. For Greek anthropology, a foundational issue was to furnish evidence for the cultural continuity of the Greek people.[29]

This discourse was rejuvenated with the social turn during the 1970s and 1980s. In classical archaeology, the social turn is associated with regional archaeological projects. These projects have explicit research agendas which bring to the fore issues such as the interaction between man and the environment, and different aspects of the social and economic organization of society. They often included ethnographic studies which analyzed contemporary behaviours, structures and practices, with the aim of furthering our understanding of antiquity. The preferred analytical entity was a remote region in the Mediterranean area, which, ideally, had remained in a pristine condition untouched by modernity. These accounts ignored the profound effects of social and cultural structures from post-antique times such as the modern nation-state. Features such as regional economic support, modern agricultural machines, intra-regional transportations, effects of higher education (e.g. social mobility), and even the monetary economic system were obscured in these ethnographic accounts in order to support the argument for continuity.[30] These ethnographic studies rested on an environmental determinism which holds the Mediterranean landscape as a constant, dictating the socio-cultural organization.[31]

The essentialist discourse mentioned in the last paragraph is challenged by ethnographic accounts which emphasize the dynamic and mutable character of culture. The ethnographic project conducted by the Nemea Valley Archaeological Project embraced a dynamic view of culture: "Far from being untouched repositories of ancient custom, the contemporary villages of the Nemea Valley thus owe their very existence to the new systems set in motion by the creation of the modern Greek state."[32] Differences between the ancient and the modern countryside are inevitable, but "this fact does not remove these villages from comparison with the valley's earlier development. Indeed, it identifies exactly what about the present is most relevant for understanding the past, and vice versa."[33] The establishment of the modern nation-state and the minute control of its territory are perceived as having the greatest effect on the countryside and thus they have also contributed to the differences between antiquity and modernity.

The emphasis on nationalism mirrors a wider concern with nationalism during the cultural turn. The relationship between archaeology and nationalism received much attention during the 1990s.[34] The scholarly interest in nationalism, in tangent with the redefinition of culture, was crucial for the emergence of archaeological ethnographies. This discursive field views the chasm between professional archaeological fieldwork and the local populations' indifference to archaeology, despite the official obsession with the past, as its foundational issue. A lot of effort is put into the dissemination of archaeology to local populations. The local communities are engaged in the archaeological projects, and their narratives concerning the archaeological sites are incorporated in the official archaeological narratives. The archaeologists do not silence the local, non-academic voices but acknowledge them. Ethnographic methods are used in order to achieve this.[35] The ethnographic gaze, however, is directed towards both the local community and the archaeologists. Another strand in archaeological ethnographies is to turn the gaze on the archaeologists and interpret archaeological fieldwork as a culturally encoded setting.[36]

Ancient structures and mentalities

Another branch of classical studies which was informed by anthropological perspectives was the Paris school, advocated by Louis Gernet, Jean-Pierre Vernant, Pierre Vidal-Naquet, Nicole Loraux, Marcel Detienne, and their followers who developed their own version of structuralism. An assumption which informed the Paris school was the distinction between a rational strand of classical Greek culture which was associated with the emergence of philosophy and the Greek miracle, and an irrational strand which incorporated ordinary practices in Greek culture.[37] Particular attention was paid to the mental structures in classical Greek culture. These were explicated through elaborations on the notion of *métis* (cunning intelligence), mythological narratives such as Hesiod's narration of the Prometheus myth, religious structures such as the hero, and social structures like hunting and killing.[38]

The Paris school was informed by anthropological reasoning and theory. The analytical aim of these scholars was not to explain the particularities of analytical objects, as in the mainstream positivism of classical studies, but to map deep-seated mental structures of the ancient Greeks. The influences of structuralist theories were articulated in the search for associative and oppositional patterns in the employment of symbols and mythical elements in ancient Greek culture.[39] The mapping of homologous patterns in classical culture was another indication of anthropological influences. The opposing relationship between a pair of structures was often viewed as a reflection of another pair of structures. For instance, the relationship between Hermes and Hestia in Pausanias' account of the Zeus

statue at Olympia is interpreted by Vernant as a reflection of the relationship between men and women in Greek culture.[40] The influences of the structuralist paradigm in anthropology were profound in the publications of the Paris school. The emphasis on bipolar opposing pairs, synchronic features and the holistic approach testify to this. Foundational features of Saussure's and Lévi-Strauss's structuralism were, however, lost in the process of appropriation by the Paris school. The Paris school focused on universal mental structures which were also found in ancient Greek culture, but in contrast to structuralism, the Paris school stressed that meaning is constructed in, and valid only within, a specific cultural context. The redefinition of structuralism by the Paris school meant that psychological and comparative theories and methods were adopted. The comparative method has, in particular, been championed by Marcel Detienne, who recently argued for the benefits of a micro-analytical comparative perspective. This differs from nineteenth century comparativism in the sense that Detienne argues for the need to delimit the compared contexts more narrowly.[41] Cross-cultural comparisons of similar structures, for instance between classical Athens and proto-democratic institutions (1) during the French Revolution, 2) in communities in Italy during the Middle Ages, (3) the Cossacks, or (4) the Ochollo in Ethiopia, facilitate, according to Detienne, a better understanding of which factors in classical Athens led to the Western trajectory of democracy.[42] Detienne's micro-analytical adoption of the comparative method corresponds with the focus on micro-history during the cultural turn.

The French structuralists, through their emphasis of meaning as mutable and contextually determined, in some respects preceded the cultural turn. The Paris school is occasionally regarded as a branch of the Annales school.[43] A fair amount of French publications authored by post-structuralist philosophers, scholars in the Annales school and scholars in the Paris school were translated into English. These translations contributed to the emergence and wide impact of the cultural turn.

Cultural anthropology

Anthropology became interesting for historians when functionalism was replaced by a hermeneutical, interpretive framework. During the cultural turn, anthropology was not only rewarding to historians because it provided them with comparative examples, but also because of the ethnographic method which was cast as an epistemological master-narrative for the humanities.[44] Clifford Geertz's notions of *thick description* and *deep play* were crucial in this respect since they were elevated to the status of paradigmatic methodological examples.[45] Geertz's interpretive framework widened the ethnographic method through an emphasis on the self-reflective constructive dimensions of interpretation. Geertz paid particular

attention to the active practices of the anthropologist. In Geertz's framework we find the origins of the constructivism which was further developed into one of the epistemological foundations of the cultural turn by anthropologists such as James Clifford, George Marcus and Michael Fischer.[46]

Ethnographic fieldwork was foundational for anthropology during the twentieth century. In its early definition, which originated in the works of Malinowski, however, there was no place for either constructivism or the influence of diachronic historical features. With the cultural turn, the epistemology of anthropology was placed under the looking-glass, and the inability of anthropology to account for historical aspects emerged as a major issue. As a consequence of this, anthropological studies which were influenced by the cultural turn often aimed to incorporate and account for the influences of history. Culture was, however, redefined as mutable, which meant that the diachronic shifts were foregrounded. This contrasts with earlier accounts which traced survivals on the assumption that the meaning of cultural phenomena is fixed.

From the opposing side, historians began to pay more attention to anthropological models. This followed on from the increasing attention paid to the everyday life of ordinary people in former times. Historians aimed to understand the world-view of agents who lived in the past and turned to anthropology as a discursive key to unlock the mental landscape of people in the past. Anthropology was perceived as an established conceptual framework for the understanding of unfamiliar Others.[47] In various branches of the cultural turn, e.g. new historicism, cultural poetics, reader-response criticism, post-processual archaeology, *Alltagsgeschichte*, micro-history, cultural history, history of mentalities, post-colonial studies and gender studies, analytical objects of all sorts were conceptualized as culturally encoded messages which should be deciphered and interpreted. Cultures and identities were viewed as dynamic, shaped in a dialectical interplay with surrounding structures. Culture was regarded as an arena in which power relations were negotiated. The cultural turn encompassed a variety of perspectives with internal differences, but the common denominator was an anti-essentialist sentiment.

Negotiated antiquity

In classical studies, especially with regard to both topics and models, the cultural turn was informed by anthropology. A topic which had a wide impact on classical studies was the dialectical dynamic between agent and the surrounding cultural context. When Astrid Lindenlauf, for instance, elaborated on the notions of dirt and cleanliness in ancient Greece, she viewed them as mental structures integrated in the fabric of everyday life. In her contribution, these structures articulate social distinctions, but dirt

also had different meanings due to the social standing of the agent and different chronological periods. In other words, culture is dynamic and the shifts in meaning are caused by the practices of agents. Meaning shifts for different groups and agents but also over time in Lindenlauf's elaboration.[48] In James Davidson's exploration of the social attitudes and practices concerning food, drink and sex in ancient Greece, he similarly stresses the shifting meanings and practices.[49] Both Lindenlauf and Davidson ground their elaborations in a dynamic view of culture, use anthropological models, and integrate seemingly mundane domains with politics and power. Food, cleanliness and sex are not only everyday necessities; they also articulate social distinctions and power relations.

The negotiated and contested nature of culture was also a central tenet in *Archaeology as cultural history* by Ian Morris. He developed a conceptual model for Iron Age Greece, and in particular Athens, which was based on a distinction between a middling discourse and a discourse of the wealthy. The middling discourse was associated with a wide-spread ideology which emphasized the self-restraint adopted by Athenian men. Men championing the middling discourse also supported democracy. This ideology was contested by a discourse of wealth. Wealthy citizens displayed their luxury, not least through the import of prestige goods from the East and through hosting symposia. The wealthy discourse was associated with an oligarchic political ideology.[50] Morris's model shows that ancient Greek culture was not monolithic, but rather incorporated tensions. This model illustrates how our understanding of ancient Greek culture can be informed by the cultural turn. W. R. Connor's study from 1987 of rituals in archaic Athens is an early example of a study which was informed by the cultural turn. He views rituals and festivals as integrated parts of the cultural and social order. These ritual practices are regarded as generating cohesion between participants, but are also seen to articulate power relations.[51] Robin Osborne similarly illustrates how notions of death are articulated through visual imagery, and are grounded in the cultural context.[52]

The edited volume *Cultural poetics in ancient Greece*, and to a lesser extent its follow-up *The cultures within ancient Greek culture*, contributed to the introduction of the cultural turn in classical studies.[53] Morris articulated the constructivism of the cultural turn and demonstrated the effects of different epistemic perspectives on our understanding of ancient Greece.[54] Hero cults were a favoured topic during the cultural turn, and several contributions in *Cultural poetics* elaborate on this theme. It was a suitable topic since it was a phenomenon with a high degree of variability. There are many aspects of hero cults which can be viewed as the result of the active articulation of identities, and of negotiations between different social groups. Anthropological models of ancestor-worship and socio-functional theories emphasizing the social cohesion and functions of cultic

activities are used in order to shed light on hero cults.[55] On a general epistemological level, *Cultural poetics* was united by two important influences: Geertz's interpretive framework and the agenda of new historicism which was introduced and established by Stephen Greenblatt and Harold Veeser, amongst others.[56] New historicism is a branch of the cultural turn which pays particular attention to how reality is represented, constructed and imagined in literature. Literary texts articulate the anxieties, concerns and identities of an author or of parts of a society. *Cultures within* also draws on new historicism, but is informed by post-colonial theories as well. The emphasis has shifted from the dynamic effects of cultural phenomena to the mapping of conflicting (sub-)cultures within ancient Greek culture. Particular attention is given to the space in-between, to different sub-cultural fields and to the negotiations between them through the deployment of the notions of hybridity and the subaltern.[57]

A growing number of publications in classical studies adopt post-colonial perspectives. Notions such as creolization, hybridity, third space and middle ground are introduced in order to conceptualize the emergence of new mixed cultures which result from the cross-fertilization of native and colonizing cultures. In a hybrid culture features from the "original" cultures are appropriated and mixed. The post-colonial outlook challenges older views of colonialism which often regarded cultural processes as unidirectional. The notion of Romanization, for instance, has been questioned during the last few decades by the adoption of post-colonial theories which emphasize the contribution of local native cultures in the Roman provinces.[58] In classical studies, post-colonial investigations tend to focus on situations in which the Greeks or the Romans encounter Others.[59] Post-colonial discourses were introduced during the cultural turn, but they articulate concerns which are fundamental in the current relational turn – a wide refiguring in the human and social sciences which is grounded in various network theories. Irad Malkin has, for instance, also incorporated the notion of the middle ground, which stresses the fact that colonial encounters are characterized by the creative misunderstanding of each Other(s), in publications informed by network theories.[60]

An interpretive aim of the cultural turn was to understand the worldviews of agents. In order to do so, scholars argued that it was necessary to utilize different categories of evidence. There was an acute awareness of the limitations and constraints of different sorts of evidence, and as a result, frequent calls were made to blur the conceptual boundaries. In classical studies, these calls have been particularly concerned with the divide between archaeological, material-based studies and historical text-based studies. This is often achieved by way of adopting a hermeneutical perspective. From this perspective, material culture is *read* and conceptualized as a symbolic system.[61]

The lure of anthropology in classical studies in the cultural turn resides

in the interpretive framework, and not in the concrete comparison of cultural phenomena in antiquity with other cultures. When John Winkler, in his study of sexuality in ancient Greece, reflects on his own anthropological method he excludes the possibility of making "a true anthropological description of an ancient Greek community" due to the fragmentary nature of the data.[62] He argues nevertheless for the relevance of anthropological insights, which facilitate the development of "particular techniques of reading, of supplying implied meanings, and with specific interpretive stances".[63] Winkler explicitly articulates a widespread research strategy in the cultural turn. Classicists, historians and others looked for interpretive guidance from anthropology in general and the ethnographic method in particular.[64]

Encountering the Other, encountering the Self

During the cultural turn, anthropological practices were compared metaphorically with notions of travel, routes and encounters.[65] These metaphors were cultivated by Clifford in *The predicament of culture* and *Routes*, amongst others.[66] The metaphors highlight (1) the dynamic view of culture, (2) that a scholar's conceptualization of a culture changes due to his or her accumulated experience and (3) that cultures and identities crystallize through encounters with unfamiliar Others. In other words, both the position of the scholar and the cultural phenomena studied are relativized through these metaphors. Travel accounts emerged as an important genre which was studied primarily as articulations of the concerns of the authors, and not as accurate representations of reality.

The discourse of travel has informed elaborations, particularly in relation to two ancient travel narratives; Homer's *Odyssey* and Pausanias' *Perigiesis*. Anthropological insights were also used prior to the cultural turn to illuminate Homer's world, for instance in the works of Finley (see above). Another connection between the Homeric epics and anthropology can be noted in the debate concerning Homer's original contribution to the poems. Milman Parry's thesis that the Homeric epics are structured around formulaic expressions was based on ethnographic observations of bards in the Balkans during the 1930s.[67]

Anthropology, however, acquired another position during the cultural turn. In *The returns of Odysseus* Malkin read the *Odyssey*, and other accounts of ancient hero travels, as tales of Greek encounters with Others around the shores of the Mediterranean. Accounts of travels generated a sense of self-reflexivity among the Greeks, which in turn contributed to the crystallization of identity. The factual aspects of the *Odyssey* are not the focus of Malkin's attentions: rather, he views the *Odyssey* as an account in which the Greeks charted imagined spaces in which fantasies concerning Others were played out. Here, the *Odyssey* articulated the

challenges the Greeks faced in their endeavour to secure a place of their own in the world.[68] In a similar vein, Carol Dougherty, relying explicitly on Geertz's notion of thick description, read the *Odyssey* as an ethnographic account which articulates issues pertaining to early archaic Greek culture. The notion of travel is associated with the search for knowledge on a metaphorical level. In Dougherty's account, the *Odyssey* is a narrative which should be interpreted as an expression of the Greek culture, not a verbatim account of real life encounters with Others. The imagined unfamiliar Other was constructed by the Greeks, and thus should be interpreted as an expression of Greek desires.[69] Similarly, François Hartog in *The mirror of Herodotus* read Herodotus' representation of the Scythian Other as a narrative which reflects the concerns of Herodotus.[70] In the *Memories of Odysseus* Hartog turns to the *Odyssey*: "The *Odyssey*, with its poetic anthropology, provides the basis for the Greek's vision of themselves and of others."[71] In the *Odyssey*, Hartog identifies a template for the ancient Greek search for an identity. It maps the limits of the Greek experience, and through the travels Greeks encountered Others. These encounters contributed to the crystallization of an identity, which in the cultural turn was always constructed in relation to an Other. In *Memories of Odysseus*, Hartog added a diachronic dimension. The *Odyssey* is also a blueprint for later travel accounts, both ancient, e.g. Pausanias, and post-antique, e.g. Dante's *Divine Comedy*. The construction of identities through travels and encounters with Others is portrayed by Hartog as a structure which permeates Western culture.[72] Travel is a discursive metaphor in Hartog's investigation, which reminds us of Clifford's concept. In Malkin's, Dougherty's and Hartog's treatises, anthropological parallels are occasionally mentioned in order to illustrate some of their arguments. The agenda of the cultural turn is, however, primarily articulated by interpretations of ancient texts as negotiations of identities and the construction of cultures.

The *Perigiesis* by Pausanias is a travel account of mainland Greece. It holds a special place in classical archaeology since it contains accurate descriptions of many important archaeological sites, primarily of sanctuaries. It has therefore been used extensively to secure the identification of archaeological remains.[73] In contrast, during the cultural turn, the *Perigiesis* was read as a narrative which articulated the concerns of Pausanias and his intellectual context. The topics and narrative structure of the *Perigiesis* were the main focus of the analysis; Pausanias is, for instance, notorious in not mentioning post-classical buildings. There is a hiatus of about 500 years between the classical period and the period in which he wrote. Pausanias' concern with Greek identity is also reflected by his endorsement of actions which united the Greeks and the condemnation of actions which divided them.[74] The interpretations of Pausanias which are influenced by the cultural turn foreground the representation

of reality as an issue. The *Perigiesis* is viewed as contributing to the charting of a cultural identity.

The notion of ethnography has recently been picked up by Greg Woolf in *Tales of the barbarians*. He views the Roman discourses of the western parts of the Roman Empire as discourses concerning unfamiliar Others.[75] Woolf pays particular attention to how Roman narratives were informed by the encounters with local cultures, but also to how the narratives contribute to shape the perception of reality. Primarily, Woolf does not seek anthropological comparisons, but finds the ethnographic method a rewarding approach that contributes to further our understanding of classical antiquity.

Conclusion

Anthropological theories and perspectives have played a significant role in classical studies since the nineteenth century. The relationship between anthropology and classical studies has been characterized by a mutual cross-fertilization. Scholars from both academic traditions have occasionally appropriated examples or models from the other discipline. My impression is, however, that during the last few decades classicists have been influenced by anthropologists to a greater extent than anthropologists by classicists. This article has aimed to foreground the different ways that anthropological results, models, and theories, have been appropriated in classical studies.

Anthropological parallels are often used in order to shed light on an ancient example. Finley draws, for instance, parallels between the bards in antiquity and the Hula of Hawaii in order to further understand Homer's world. He is, however, not using anthropological methods or interpretive frameworks to shape his methodology. In contrast, when Malkin, Dougherty and Hartog discuss the *Odyssey*, the notion of travel is appropriated as a methodological metaphor which guides their reading. In other words, during the cultural turn, it was the interpretive framework of anthropology which attracted the attention of scholars in classical studies. In this respect, classical studies have adopted a common research strategy characteristic of the cultural turn. The ethnographic method, with its sensitive and self-reflexive encounter with an unfamiliar Other, proved to be a fruitful template for classicists trying to understand the world-views of agents in the past.

Another important trait of the cultural turn was the redefinition of culture. Culture is conceptualized as mutable, and as an arena in which power relations are negotiated. Emphasis is placed on the individual perception of a culture, and meaning is viewed as bounded in time and place. The redefinition of culture did not take place only in anthropology, but should be viewed as a trait which united the various branches of the cul-

tural turn. Nevertheless, the consequences of the redefinition of culture are profound. It is, for instance, due to the adoption of a dynamic view of culture that archaeological ethnographies question the often assumed continuity between the cultures of classical antiquity and the contemporary Mediterranean.

It seems that we need to conceptualize classical antiquity as an Other, which often entails influences from anthropology, in order to be able to appreciate classical cultures in their own right and not as universal ideals.

Summary

Classical Others. Anthropologies of antiquity. By Johannes Siapkas. Anthropology is, together with archaeology, history and art history, one of the academic disciplines that exercise most influence on classical studies. The mutual influences between anthropology and classical studies have previously received scholarly attention, but, to the best of my knowledge, these assessments have not incorporated the cultural turn from the 1980s onwards. In this article, a critical assessment of anthropological influences on classical studies with particular focus on studies from the cultural turn is offered. In order to appreciate the various traits of anthropological influences in the cultural turn earlier appropriations of anthropological models in classical studies will be discussed. This account is by no means intended to be exhaustive, rather it is selective. The aim of the paper is to identify different themes, discourses, and even trajectories which have originated in anthropological reasoning and then been appropriated by classical studies. An example of the widespread practice of appropriation, dating back to at least the nineteenth century, is the use of anthropological examples from other cultures to shed light on ancient phenomena. The examples used range from minute isolated cultural phenomena to institutions and social systems. During the cultural turn, scholars turned to anthropology both for comparative insights and for theoretical guidance. Widespread notions such as the negotiated and mutable nature of culture and the permeation of power in all segments of culture have also been appropriated in classical studies. Crucially, with the cultural turn came an epistemological shift which designated a hermeneutical interpretive framework, founded in Clifford Geertz's anthropological method, as a heuristic ideal for the humanities.

Notes

2. See Robert Ranulph Marrett (ed.): *An-

thropology and the classics. Six lectures at Oxford. By Arthur J. Evans, Andrew Lang, Gilbert Murray, F. B. Jevons, J. L. Myres, and W. Warde Fowler (Oxford, 1908); Eduard Meyer: Geschichte des Altertums (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1907); Clyde Kluckhohn: Anthropology and the classics (Providence, 1961); Moses I. Finley: "Anthropology and the classics" in The use and abuse of history (London, 1975); Sally C. Humphreys: Anthropology and the Greeks (London, 1978); Louis Gernet: The anthropology of ancient Greece (Baltimore, 1981 [1968]); Paul Cartledge: "The Greeks and anthropology" in Classics Ireland 2 (1995); James M. Redfield: "Classics and anthropology" in Arion, 3rd ser 1:2 (1991); Wilfried Nippel: "Sozialantropologie und Alte Geschichte" in Christian Meier & Jörn Rüsen (eds.): Historische Methode (München, 1988); Wilfried Nippel: Griechen, Barbaren und 'Wilde'. Alte Geschichte und Sozialanthropologie (Frankfurt am Main, 1990); Renate Schlesier: Kulte, Mythen, Gelehrte. Anthropologie der Antike seit 1800 (Frankfurt am Main, 1994).

3. See Peter N. Miller (ed.): Momigliano and antiquarianism. Foundations of the modern cultural sciences (Toronto, 2007), for the relation between antiquarianism and modern scientific classical studies.

4. François Hartog: "The double fate of the classics" in Critical inquiry 35:4 (2009).

5. Associated with Matthew Arnold: Culture and anarchy (Cambridge, 1963 [1869]) and Edward Burnett Tylor: Primitive culture. Researches into the development of mythology, philosophy, religion, language, art, and custom (London, 1871) in Anglo-American literature. The anthropological notion of culture has been explicated repeatedly: for a sophisticated recent exploration, which also includes further references, see Michael M. Fischer: "Culture and cultural analysis as experimental systems" in Cultural anthropology 22:1 (2007).

6. See Koenraad Geldof: "The dialectic of modernity and beyond. Adorno, Foucault, Certeau and Greenblatt in comparison" in Jürgen Pieters (ed.): Critical self-fashioning. Stephen Greenblatt and the new historicism (Frankfurt am Main, 1999); James Clifford: The predicament of culture. Twentieth-century ethnography, literature, and art (Cambridge, Mass., 1988); James Clifford: Routes. Travel and translation in the late twentieth century (Cambridge, Mass., 1997); Stephen Greenblatt: Renaissance self-fashioning. From More to Shakespeare (Chicago, 1980) for the notions of in-betweenness and oscillation in the cultural turn.

7. Peter Burke: "Images as evidence in seventeenth-century Europe" in Journal of the history of ideas 64:2 (2003), 276–277; Peter Burke: "Exemplary and anti-exemplary in early modern Europe" in Alexandra Lianeri (ed.): The western time of ancient history. Historiographical encounters with the Greek and Roman pasts (Cambridge, 2011).

8. Friedrich August Wolf: Prolegomena ad Homerum (Halis Saxonum, 1795); August Böckh: Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener (Berlin, 1817); Karl Otfried Müller: Geschichten hellenischer Stämme und Städte: II. Die Dorier (Breslau, 1824); Karl Otfried Müller: Prolegomena zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie (Göttingen, 1825); see also Suzanne L. Marchand: Down from Olympus. Archaeology and philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970 (Princeton, 1996).

9. See Marvin Harris: The rise of anthropological theory. A history of theories of culture (London, 1968), 108–216; Derek Freeman, Carl Jay Bajema, John Blacking, Robert L. Carneiro, U. M. Cowgill, Santiago Genovés, Charles C. Gillispie, Michael T. Ghiselin, John C. Greene, Marvin Harris, Daniel Heyduk, Kinji Imanishi, Nevin P. Lamb, Ernst Mayr, Johannes W. Raum, & G. G. Simpson: "The evolutionary theories of Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer [and comments and replies]" in Current anthropology 15:3 (1974); Robert L. Carneiro: Evolutionism in cultural anthropology. A critical history (Cambridge, Mass., 2003).

10. Lewis Henry Morgan: Ancient society (Chicago, 1877); Henri Jeanmarie: "La cryptie lacédémonienne" in Revue des études grecques 26 (1913). The relationship between time and geographic distance in anthropological conceptualizations of the primitive is investigated by Johannes Fabian: Time and the Other. How anthropology makes its object (New York, 1983).

11. James George Frazer: The golden bough. A study in comparative religion (London, 1890). Frazer has received considerable attention, see Robert Ackerman: J. G. Frazer. His life and work (Cambridge, 1987); Robert Ackerman: The myth and ritual school.

J. G. Frazer and the Cambridge ritualists (New York, 1991); Mary Beard: "Frazer, Leach, and Virgil. The popularity (and unpopularity) of the golden bough" in *Comparative studies in society and history* 34:2 (1992); Shelley Arlen: *The Cambridge ritualists. An annotated bibliography of the works by and about Jane Ellen Harrison, Gilbert Murray, Francis M. Cornford and Arthur Bernard Cook* (London, 1990). George W. Stocking: "Outcast from the islands. Frazer, *The golden bough*, and modern anthropology" in George W. Stocking: *Delimiting anthropology. Occasional essays and reflections* (Madison, Wisc., 2001), illuminates the ostracizing of Frazer from mainstream anthropology.

12. See Gilbert Murray: *Five stages of Greek religion* (Oxford, 1925); Francis Macdonald Cornford: *The origin of Attic comedy* (London, 1914); Arthur Bernard Cook: *Zeus. A study in ancient religion* (Cambridge, 1914); Jane E. Harrison: *Themis. A study of the social origins of Greek religion* (Cambridge, 1912); Jane E. Harrison: *Prolegomena to the study of Greek religion* (Cambridge, 1992 [1903]).

13. Fustel de Coulanges has received considerable attention, Moses I. Finley: "The ancient city. From Fustel de Coulanges to Max Weber and beyond" in *Comparative studies in society and history* 19:3 (1977), 310–314; Arnaldo Momigliano & Sally C. Humphreys: "Introduction", in N. D. Fustel de Coulanges: *The ancient city. A study on the religion, laws, and institutions of Greece and Rome. With a new foreword by A. Momigliano and S. C. Humphreys* (Baltimore, 1980); François Hartog: *Le XIXe siècle et l'histoire. Le cas de Fustel de Coulanges* (Paris, 1988).

14. Joseph Fontenrose: *The ritual theory of myth* (Berkeley, 1966); Clyde Kluckhohn: "Myths and rituals. A general theory" in *Harvard theological review* 35 (1942), 54–55; Finley: "Anthropology and the classics", 102–104.

15. E.g. Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: *Glaube der Hellenen* (1932); Louis Farnell: *The higher aspect of Greek religion* (Oxford, 1912); Louis Moulinier: *Le pur et l'impure dans la pensée des Grecs d'Homère à Aristote* (Paris, 1952). A late, Swedish, example is Birgitta Bergquist: *Herakles on Thasos. The archaeological, literary and epigraphic evidence for his sanctuary, status and cult reconsidered* (Uppsala, 1973). See also Ian Morris: "Poetics of power. The interpretation of ritual action in archaic Greece" in Carol Dougherty & Leslie Kurke (eds.): *Cultural poetics in archaic Greece. Cult, performance, politics* (Cambridge, 1993).

16. Martin P. Nilsson: *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* (München, 1950), was influenced by the German ritualist Albrecht Dieterich: *Mutter Erde. Ein Versuch über Volksreligion* (Leipzig, 1935). There is a German parallel to the Cambridge ritualists, e.g. Herman Usener, Albrecht Dieterich, Erwin Rohde, which is omitted here due to limitations of space, see Schlesier: *Kulte, Mythen*.

17. Martin P. Nilsson: *Primitiv religion* (Stockholm, 1934 [1911]), spec. 9–11; Martin P. Nilsson: *Primitiv kultur* (Stockholm, 1926), 16–23, for an argument for race theories. See, however, Jesper Svenbro: "Tre seminarier om Martin P:n Nilsson" in *Glänta* 1–2 (2005), concerning Nilsson's racism.

18. E. R. Dodds: *The Greeks and the irrational* (Berkeley, 1951), 1. See also Kluckhohn: *Anthropology and the classics*, 17–19.

19. G. E. R. Lloyd: *Polarity and analogy. Two types of argumentation in early Greek thought* (London, 1966); G. E. R. Lloyd: *Magic, reason and experience* (Cambridge, 1979).

20. See Cartledge: *The Greeks and anthropology*. The anti-irrational sentiments also had other victims. In Germany, Herman Usener and Erwin Rohde had difficult times due to the disproval of Wilamowitz, see Schlesier: *Kulte, Mythen*, 195–213, 314–315. Jane Harrison had been ostracized from Cambridge after World War I.

21. M. G. Smith: "History and social anthropology" in *The journal of the Royal anthropological institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 92:1 (1962), emphasizes the differences between anthropology and history.

22. See e.g. Moses I. Finley: "Sparta and spartan society" in *Economy and society in ancient Greece* (New York, 1981 [1968]), 24.

23. Moses I. Finley: *The world of Odysseus* (London, 1977 [1954]), 23.

24. Finley: *The world of Odysseus*, 37.

25. Karl Bücher: *Die Enstehung der Volkswirtsschaft* (Tübingen, 1893); Meyer: *Geschichte des Altertums*; Karl Julius Beloch: *Griechische Geschichte* (Strassburg, 1893);

Schlesier: *Kulte, Mythen*, 65–99; Moses I. Finley (ed.): *The Bücher-Meyer controversy* (New York, 1979).

26. Meyer: *Geschichte des Altertums*; Sally C. Humphreys: "Anthropology and the classics" in *Anthropology and the Greeks* (London, 1978), 18. Meyer and Weber were students of Theodor Mommsen, who introduced a broader, social, view on Roman history, see Mark Humphries: "In Mommsen's shade. Roman historiography, past and present" in *Classics Ireland* 9 (2002).

27. Mohammad Nafissi: *Ancient Athens and modern ideology. Value, theory and evidence in historical sciences. Max Weber, Karl Polanyi and Moses Finley* (London, 2005); Sally C. Humphreys: "History, economics and anthropology. The work of Karl Polanyi" in *Anthropology and the Greeks* (London, 1978), 31–75. See also Hans Derks: "'The ancient economy'. The problem and the fraud" in *The European legacy* 7:5 (2002), who offers a critical assessment of the Finley paradigm.

28. Jakob P. Fallmerayer: *Geschichte der Halbinsel Morea während des Mittelalters* (1830); Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos: *Istoria tou Ellinikou ethnous* (Athina, 1860–1874); Elle Skopetea: *Phalmerayer. Technasmata tou antipalou deous* (Athina, 1997); Yannis Hamilakis: *The nation and its ruins. Antiquity, archaeology, and national imagination in Greece* (Oxford, 2007); Michael Herzfeld: *Ours once more. Folklore, ideology, and the making of modern Greece* (Austin, 1982), 75–96.

29. Herzfeld: *Ours once more*, 97–122; Michael Herzfeld: *Anthropology through the looking-glass. Critical ethnography in the margins of Europe* (Cambridge, 1987); Eythimios Papataxiarchis: "To parelthon sto paron. Anthropologia, istoria kai i meleti tis neoellinikis koinonias" in Eythimios Papataxiarchis & Theodoros Papadellis (eds.): *Anthropologia kai Parelthon. Simboules stin koinoniki istoria tis neoteris Elladas* (Athina, 1993); Hamilakis: *The nation and its ruins.*

30. Michael Fotiadis: "Modernity and the past-still-present. Politics of time in the birth of regional archaeological projects in Greece" in *American journal of archaeology* 99:1 (1995), for a succinct critique, and for numerous examples. See also Susan Buck Sutton: "Introduction. Past and present in rural Greece" in Susan Buck Sutton (ed.): *Contingent countryside. Settlement, economy, and land use in the southern Argolid since 1700* (Stanford, 2000), 7–8, for the different ideological underpinnings that come together to enforce the view of an eternal rural Greece. Thomas W. Jacobsen: "Another modest proposal. Ethnoarchaeology in Greece" in Nancy C. Wilkie & William D. E. Coulson (eds.): *Contributions to Aegean archaeology. Studies in honor of William A. McDonald* (Dubuque, Ind., 1985) for an uncritical evaluation.

31. Michael Herzfeld: "Practical Mediterraneanism. Excuses for everything, from epistemology to eating" in William Vernon Harris (ed.): *Rethinking the Mediterranean* (Oxford, 2005).

32. James C. Wright, John F. Cherry, Jack L. Davis, Eleni Mantzourani, Susan B. Sutton, & Robert F. Sutton Jr.: "The Nemea Valley archaeological project. A preliminary report" in *Hesperia. The journal of the American school of classical studies at Athens* 59:4 (1990), 602.

33. Wright, et al.: "The Nemea Valley", 602. The mutable aspects of the history of rural Greece are emphasized in Sutton (ed.): *Contingent countryside.*

34. Margarita Diaz-Andreu & Timothy Champion (eds.): *Nationalism and archaeology in Europe* (London, 1995); John A. Atkinson, Iain Banks & Jerry O'Sullivan (eds.): *Nationalism and archaeology* (Glasgow, 1996); Philip L. Kohl & Clare Fawcett (eds.): *Nationalism, politics, and the practice of archaeology* (Cambridge, 1995); Paul Graves-Brown, Sian Jones & Clive Gamble (eds.): *Cultural identity and archaeology. The construction of European communities* (London, 1996). The history of anthropology, not the least its implications and associations with nationalism, was also scrutinized during the cultural turn, see Sutton: "Introduction. Past and present", 11–12; Herzfeld: *Ours once more*; Herzfeld: *Anthropology through the looking-glass.*

35. Anna Stroulia & Susan Buck Sutton (eds.): *Archaeology in situ. Sites, archaeology, and communities in Greece* (Lanham, 2010); Yannis Hamilakis & Aris Anagnostopoulos (eds.): *Archaeological ethnographies* (Leeds, 2009). Compare also e.g. Eleana Yalouri: *The Acropolis. Global fame, local claim. The Athenian Acropolis as an objec-*

tification of Greek identity (London, 2001); Roxane Caftanzoglou: "The shadow of the sacred rock. Contrasting discourses of place under the Acropolis of Athens" in Barbara Bender & Margot Winer (eds.): *Contested landscapes. Movement, exile and place* (Oxford, 2001); Philip G. Duke: *The tourists gaze, the Cretans glance. Archaeology and tourism on a Greek island* (Walnut Creek, 2007).

36. Matt Edgeworth (ed.): *Ethnographies of archaeological practice. Cultural encounters, material transformations* (Lanham, 2006).

37. The *irrational* replaces, in some sense, the *primitive* in earlier discourses. Both concepts aim to capture the everyday practices and beliefs of the ordinary ancient Greeks, which are contrasted with the rational intellectual achievements of the ancient Greeks. Although the Paris school and Dodds (see above) shared an interest in similar issues, there were also differences in their approaches. A major difference is that the Paris school formulated an explicit theoretical agenda based on structuralism, which Dodds did not.

38. Jean-Pierre Vernant: *Myth and thought among the Greeks* (New York, 2006 [1983]), 25–51, for Hesiod's adaptation of the myth of the human races. Vernant's essay "At man's table. Hesiod's foundation myth of sacrifice", in *Myth and society in ancient Greece* (New York, 1990 [1974]) is widely considered as the best illustration of his approach to myths. Other publications by the Paris school are M. Detienne & J.-P. Vernant (eds.): *The cuisine of sacrifice among the Greeks* (Chicago, 1989 [1979]); Pierre Vidal-Naquet: *The black hunter. Forms of thought and forms of society in the Greek world* (Baltimore, 1986 [1981]); Jean-Pierre Vernant & Pierre Vidal-Naquet: *Tragedy and myth in ancient Greece* (Brighton, 1981 [1972]); Marcel Detienne: *The gardens of Adonis. Spices in Greek mythology* (Princeton, 1993 [1977]); Nicole Loraux: *The invention of Athens. The funeral oration in the classical city* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986 [1981]); Richard L. Gordon (ed.): *Myth, religion & society. Structuralist essays by M. Detienne, L. Gernet, J.-P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet* (Cambridge, 1981). See also Herbert Hoffmann & Edmund Leach: *Sexual and asexual pursuit. A structuralist approach to Greek vase painting* (London, 1977).

39. Humphreys: "Anthropology and the classics," 27–28.

40. Vernant: *Myth and thought*, 157–196; R. G. A. Buxton: "Introduction" in R. L. Gordon (ed.): *Myth, religion*, xii.

41. Marcel Detienne: *Comparing the incomparable* (Stanford, 2008), 73. Another recent example which adopts a comparativist approach is Marshall David Sahlins: *Apologies to Thucydides. Understanding history as culture and vice versa* (Chicago, 2004) who illuminates the nineteenth century history of the Fiji Islands through comparisons to Thucydides' account of the Peloponnesian War.

42. Detienne: *Comparing the incomparable*, 79–99.

43. See Jean-Pierre V. M. Herubel: "The 'Annales movement' and its historiography. A selective bibliography" in *French historical studies* 18:1 (1993). See also Peter Burke: *The French historical revolution. The Annales school, 1929–89* (Cambridge, 1990), 98–99.

44. Tim Whitmarsh: "Thinking local" in Tim Whitmarsh (ed.): *Local knowledge and microidentities in the imperial Greek world* (New York, 2010), 13; James Clifford: "On ethnographic allegory" in James Clifford & George E. Marcus (eds.): *Writing culture. The poetics and politics of ethnography* (Berkeley, 1986); Clifford: *The predicament of culture*.

45. Clifford Geertz: "Thick description. Toward an interpretive theory of culture" in Clifford Geertz: *The interpretation of cultures* (New York, 1973); Clifford Geertz: "Deep play. Notes on the Balinese cockfight" in Geertz: *The interpretation of cultures*. Geertz did not precede the cultural turn in all aspects; he emphasized, for instance, the coherence of a culture, which he viewed as a static system. William Sewell Jr.: "Geertz, cultural systems, and history. From synchrony to transformation" in *Representations* 59, Special issue: *The fate of "culture". Geertz and beyond* (1997); William Sewell Jr.: "The concept(s) of culture" in Victoria E. Bonnell & Lynn Hunt (eds.): *Beyond the cultural turn. New directions in the study of society and culture* (Berkeley, 1999); Richard Biernacki: "Method and metaphor after the new cultural history" in Bonnell & Hunt

(eds.): *Beyond the cultural turn*; Sherry B. Ortner: "Introduction" in *Representations* 59 (1997), discuss Geertz's notion of culture.

46. George E. Marcus & Michael M. Fischer: *Anthropology as cultural critique. An experimental moment in the human sciences* (Chicago, 1999); Clifford & Marcus (eds.): *Writing culture*; Clifford: *The predicament of culture*.

47. Peter Burke: "Historians, anthropologists and symbols" in Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney (ed.): *Culture through time. Anthropological approaches* (Stanford, 1990); Peter Burke: *What is cultural history?* (Oxford, 2004); Bernard S. Cohn: "History and anthropology. The state of play" in *Comparative studies in society and history* 22:2 (1980); Bernard S. Cohn: "Anthropology and history in the 1980s. Toward a rapprochement" in *The journal of interdisciplinary history* 12:2 (1981); Robert Darnton: "History and anthropology" in *The kiss of Lamourette. Reflections in cultural history* (New York, 1990); Dominick La Capra: "Chartier, Darnton, and the great symbol massacre" in *The journal of modern history* 60:1 (1988); Roger Chartier: "Texts, symbols and Frenchness" in *The journal of modern history* 57:4 (1985); Natalie Zemon Davis: "Anthropology and history. The possibilities of the past" in *Journal of interdisciplinary history* 12 (1981); James D. Faubion: "History in anthropology" in *Annual review of anthropology* 22:1 (1993); Lynn Hunt: *Politics, culture, and class in the French revolution* (London, 1986); Lynn Hunt (ed.): *The new cultural history* (Berkeley, 1989); Bonnell & Hunt (eds.): *Beyond the cultural turn*.

48. Astrid Lindenlauf: "Dirt, cleanliness, and social structure in ancient Greece" in Andrew Gardner (ed.): *Agency uncovered. Archaeological perspectives on social agency, power, and being human* (London, 2004).

49. James N. Davidson: *Courtesans and fishcakes. The consuming passions of classical Athens* (London, 1997).

50. Ian Morris: *Archaeology as cultural history. Words and things in iron age Greece* (Malden, 2000), 109–191.

51. W. R. Connor: "Tribes, festivals and processions. Civic ceremonial and political manipulation in archaic Greece" in *The journal of Hellenic studies* 107 (1987).

52. Robin Osborne: "Death revisited, death revised. The death of the artist in archaic and classical Greece" in *Art history* 11 (1988).

53. Carol Dougherty & Leslie Kurke (eds.): *Cultural poetics in ancient Greece. Cult, performance, politics* (Cambridge, 1993); Carol Dougherty & Leslie Kurke (eds.): *The cultures within ancient Greek culture* (Cambridge, 2003).

54. Morris: "Poetics of power".

55. Carla Antonaccio: "The archaeology of ancestors" in Dougherty & Kurke (eds.): *Cultural poetics*; Deborah Boedeker: "Hero cult and politics in Herodotus. The bones of Orestes" in Dougherty & Kurke (eds.): *Cultural poetics*; Carol Dougherty: "It's murder to found a colony" in Dougherty & Kurke (eds.): *Cultural poetics*.

56. Greenblatt: *Renaissance self-fashioning*; Stephen Greenblatt: *Marvelous possessions. The wonder of the new world* (Oxford, 1991); Harold Veeser (ed.): *The new historicism* (New York, 1989).

57. Carol Dougherty, & Leslie Kurke: "Introduction. The cultures within Greek culture" in Dougherty & Kurke (eds.): *Cultures within*.

58. Greg Woolf: *Becoming Roman. The origins of provincial civilization in Gaul* (Cambridge, 1998); Greg Woolf: *Tales of the barbarians. Ethnography and empire in the Roman west* (Malden, 2011); Francis John Haverfield & George Macdonald: *The Romanization of Roman Britain* (Oxford, 1923); Andrew Wallace-Hadrill: *Rome's cultural revolution* (Cambridge, 2008), 9–14, offers a summary of the debate about Romanization.

59. See the contributions in Claire L. Lyons & John K. Papadopoulos (eds.): *The archaeology of colonialism* (Los Angeles, 2002).

60. Irad Malkin: "A colonial middle ground. Greek, Etruscan, and local elites in the Bay of Naples" in Lyons & Papadopoulos (eds.): *The archaeology of colonialism*; Irad Malkin: "Postcolonial concepts and ancient Greek colonization" in *Modern language quarterly* 65:3 (2004); Irad Malkin: *A small Greek world. Networks in the ancient Mediterranean* (New York, 2011).

61. Carol Dougherty & Leslie Kurke: "Introduction" in Dougherty & Kurke (eds.): *Cultural poetics*, 2. This issue is also important in Simon Goldhill & Robin Osbourne

(eds.): *Art and text in ancient Greek culture* (Cambridge, 1994). See also Eberhard W. Sauer: "The disunited subject. Human history's split into 'history' and 'archaeology'" in Eberhard W. Sauer (ed.): *Archaeology and ancient history. Breaking down the boundaries* (London & New York, 2004).

62. John J. Winkler: *Constraints of desire. The anthropology of sex and gender in ancient Greece* (New York, 1990), 10.

63. Winkler: *Constraints of desire*, 10.

64. This does not rule out that scholars were influenced also by other perspectives. The whole field concerning the history of sexuality in antiquity emerged in response to Michel Foucault: *The history of sexuality* (New York, 1980 [1976]).

65. See also J. Wolff: "On the road again. Metaphors of travel in cultural criticism" in *Cultural studies* 7 (1993) for an explication of the notion of travel in postmodern, poststructural and postcolonial studies.

66. Clifford: *The predicament of culture*; Clifford: *Routes*.

67. Milman Parry & Adam Parry: *The making of Homeric verse. The collected papers of Milman Parry* (Oxford, 1971); J. P. Holoka: "Homer, oral poetry theory, and comparative literature. Major trends and controversies in twentieth-century criticism" in Joachim Latacz (ed.): *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung. Rückblick und Ausblick* (Stuttgart, 1991), for a summary of the debates concerning the Homeric question.

68. Irad Malkin: *The returns of Odysseus.*

Colonization and ethnicity (Berkeley, 1998).

69. Carol Dougherty: *The raft of Odysseus. The ethnographic imagination of Homer's Odyssey* (Oxford, 2001), 7–11, for the ethnographic approach.

70. François Hartog: *The mirror of Herodotus. The representation of the Other in the writing of history* (Berkeley, 1988 [1980]).

71. François Hartog: *Memories of Odysseus. Frontier tales from ancient Greece (*Edinburgh, 2001 [1996]), 25.

72. Hartog: *Memories of Odysseus*, 38–39. Hartog draws parallels between ancient accounts and modern accounts with similar structures. For instance, Abbé Barthélemy's story (Jean Jacques Barthélemy: *Voyage du jeune Anacharsis en Grèce, vers le milieu du quatrième siècle avant l'ère vulgaire* (Paris, 1790)) is compared/contrasted with Herodotos account, Hartog: *Memories of Odysseus*, 108–116.

73. Christian Habicht: *Pausanias' guide to ancient Greece* (Berkeley, 1985), defends the accuracy of Pausanias.

74. Jas Elsner: "Pausanias. A Greek pilgrim in the Roman world" in *Past & Present* 135 (1992); Jas Elsner: "Structuring "Greece". Pausanias's *Periegesis* as a literary construct" in Susan Alcock, John F. Cherry & Jas Elsner (eds.): *Pausanias. Travel and memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford, 2001); See also the other contributions in Alcock, Cherry & Elsner (eds.): *Pausanias*.

75. Woolf: *Tales of the barbarians*, 17.