Rosetta

Samuels, T. (2014); Rebecca F. Kennedy, C. Syndor Roy, and Max L. Goldman (eds.) *Race and Ethnicity in the Classical World: An Anthology of Primary Sources in Translation*. Indiana 2013

Rosetta **16**: 60 – 65

http://www.rosetta.bham.ac.uk/issue16/samuels.pdf

Rebecca F. Kennedy, C. Syndor Roy, and Max L. Goldman (eds.) *Race and Ethnicity in the Classical World: An Anthology of Primary Sources in Translation*. Indiana: Hackett Publishing, 2013. Pp. xviii & 405. ISBN 978-1-60384-994-4 (pbk.)

Tristan Samuels

University of Toronto

There has been a recent increase in critical discussions concerning issues of race in Classical scholarship.[1] This anthology shows the progress in the discussion by acknowledging race alongside ethnicity. The editors observe that Greek and Roman theories of human difference 'while not the same as our concepts of race and ethnicity, suggest that they considered similar causes' (xiii). The sourcebook has an 'Introduction', which includes a maps section, and the collection of documents, divided into two parts. In addition, there is an 'About the Sources' section followed by a 'Selected Bibliography' section and an 'Index'. As the first of its kind, this sourcebook signifies an important methodological shift in Classical Studies. This anthology is an ambitious gathering and translation of sources, but problems are evident in the interpretation of race and the collection overlooks a key aspect of Greco-Roman racial thought.

In the introduction, the editors acknowledge race as a social construct, but define it as pertaining to pseudo-biological characteristics and distinct from ethnicity which is defined according to cultural traits (xiii). This clear cut distinction is highly questionable. Culture often functions as a racial marker which makes race no less cultural than ethnicity.[2] In addition, race and ethnicity often overlap and so ethnicity cannot be so easily separated from race.[3] There should be some discussion on the debate regarding race/ethnicity distinctions. In the absence of such a discussion, it would be better if the editors had left the race/ethnicity distinction open to interpretation.

[1] For example see Isaac 2004, Lape 2010, McCoskey 2012.
[2] Lipsitz 1995: 370, Sheridan 2003: 207-09.
[3] Curry 2010: 552, Lipsitz 1995: 370-71.

‘Theories’, the first section of the book, covers the different theories of human difference in Greco-Roman texts, but black racial groups are underrepresented. The chapter ‘Early Theories of Foreignness’ (p. 3-13) contains excerpts from Homer and Hesiod. Hesiod’s reference to the ‘land of black men’ (*Op*. 527: κυανέων ἀνδρῶν δῆμόν), likely referring to Egyptians and Ethiopians, is not included. Hesiod locates the ‘land of black men’ near the sun which makes this passage the earliest record of Greek environmental theory. In addition, the invisibility of black women in the text reveals a gender bias in racial representation in early Greek thought. Furthermore, this passage is the earliest evidence of ‘black’ being used as a collective racial category in a Western context. Thus, the chapter misses a very important source for early Greek racial thought.

The ‘Genealogies and Origins’ chapter is a good collection, but Kennedy’s translation of Apollodorus 2.1.4 is problematic. Kennedy translates τὴν Μελαμπόδων χώραν as ’the land of the Melapods’ (p. 33), referring to the land of Aegyptus. The literal translation is ‘the land of the black-footed ones’. This is consistent with the Athenian portrayal of Aegyptus and Egyptians in general. Aeschylus describes Epaphus, the mythical progenitor of the Egyptians, as black (*Prom.* 851) and he described the Aegyptiads as having ‘black limbs’ (*Supp.* 719). Kennedy’s transliteration of Μελαμπόδων overlooks the significance of blackness as a Greek racial marker for Egyptians.

The ‘Environmental Theories’ chapter does not adequately represent the diversity of Black racial groups in Greco-Roman sources. The two sources on blackness provided in the chapter only bring attention to Ethiopian blackness (pp. 47-48). There are several texts that emphasise Egyptian blackness through environmental theories. Aeschylus, for example, describes the Danaids as a ‘sun blackened race’ (*Supp*. 154-55: μελανθὲς ἡλιόκτυπον γένος). Lucretius (6.722) also describes Egyptian blackness as a consequence of the sun. The sources in this chapter do not show the various black racial groups in the Greco-Roman worldview.

The ‘Genetic Theories’ chapter makes the same mistake as the previous chapter. There is only one text on blackness, referring specifically to Indian and Ethiopian blackness (p. 54: Hdt. 3.101.2). Pseudo-Aristolean *Physiognomics* 812a should be included in this chapter. The text describes black racial groups, Egyptians and Ethiopians, and White (Greek) women as cowards based on skin color. The text also shows how skin colour could simultaneously enforce racial and gender boundaries. Furthermore, it shows that Greek normative identity was a medium-toned male, not white as often assumed.[4] The absence of this important passage hinders the quality of this chapter.

Part Two, ‘The Peoples of the Ancient World’, is divided into nine chapters delineating different geographic regions. Again, the diversity of black racial groups is overlooked. The absence of texts on blackness in the Egyptian chapter is perplexing considering the centrality of blackness as a Greco-Roman racial marker for ‘Egyptianness’. The selection from Herodotus’ discussion of Egypt (pp. 111-20), for example, does not include his references to Egyptian blackness in 2.57 and, most notable, 2.104.[5] Egyptian blackness was frequently referenced in Greek literature, as previously noted. There are also Roman writers, like Diogenes Laertius (7.1.1), who saw the Egyptians as a black racial group. This chapter overlooks a crucial aspect of the Greek and Roman perception of ‘Egyptianness’.

The chapter for North Africa (Carthage, Libya and Numidia) has similar issues. The introductory text (p. 141) assumes that Greeks and Romans thought of Egyptians, North Africans, as physically distinct from sub-Saharan (black) Africans. The black/non-black division of Africa is a modern ideological division – not Greco-Roman.[6] Furthermore, there are texts describing North African populations as black racial groups (i.e. Hes. *CW.* 40A, Pl. *Poen*. 1112). Black North Africans in visual portrayals are, therefore, not ’Ethiopian’ in style as the editors assume. Rather, it is clear that the Greeks and Romans perceived the various African peoples that they encountered as black racial groups.

[4] For a discussion on the problem of applying racial whiteness to the Greeks see Dee 2004 and for Romans see Haley 2009: 30-33.
[5] For an excellent discussion on the controversy of Herodotus 2.104 see Martin 1984: 299-306.
[6] Keita 1997: 41.

The ‘Ethiopia and beyond’ chapter has textual references to various stereotypes which make it the most complete of the chapters on African regions. However, the physical description of Scybale, the African woman in *Moretum* 27-35 (pp. 193-94), is misinterpreted by Kennedy. There is no evidence that Scybale was a slave as Kennedy assumes. Moreover, the translation anachronistically applies modern stereotypical imagery of the black woman’s body (i.e. pendulous breasts, thick lips) onto the text.[7] Furthermore, Scybale was *Afra genus* – not Ethiopian. The text should be in the North African chapter. This erroneous placement of the text and, in addition, the greater emphasis on blackness in this chapter reveals a presumption that ‘Ethiopia and beyond’ is the Greco-Roman equivalent to ‘Black Africa’. However, as previously discussed, the Greeks and Romans had no ‘Black Africa’ concept and blackness was not exclusive to Ethiopians in the Greco-Roman worldview.

The ‘Select Bibliography’ is limited in scope. The nuanced and recent discussion on race by Denise Eileen McCoskey is included which is the one good record in the bibliography.[8] Frank Snowden and Lloyd Thompson focus on black people in the Greco-Roman experience, but their methodology is outdated and Eurocentric. The work of Shelley P. Haley is not present in the bibliography. The absence of Haley’s work is a major disappointment because her discussions on race in antiquity are the most progressive.[9] The selected bibliography does not have the necessary diversity in sources for this issue.

There are two main problems with this anthology. The editors are correct to acknowledge race alongside ethnicity, but the difference between these concepts needs further discussion. The complex interplay between race and ethnicity in relation to culture is overlooked. Also, blackness is not contextualised within Greco-Roman racial thought which is a frequent problem in Classical studies.[10] The diversity of black racial groups is not reflected in this collection. In addition, the ‘Black Africa’ concept is anachronistically

[7] For further commentary see Haley 2009: 41-46.
[8] See McCoskey 2012. For the reviewer’s reservations on McCoskey’s discussion see Samuels 2013.
[9] See Halley 1993, 2009.
[10] For further discussion see Haley 2005, Lambert 2005.

applied to the Greco-Roman worldview. The anthology is important for its acknowledgement of race in the Greco-Roman experience, but it is hindered by the absence of critical race theory methodologies and an inadequate representation of blackness.

Bibliography

Curry, Tommy J. 2010. 'Race', in Richard A. Couto (ed.). *Political and Civic Leadership: A Reference Handbook*. Los Angeles: SAGE Reference, 550-59.

Dee, James H. 2003/2004. 'Black Odysseus, White Caesar: When Did "White People" Become "White"?', *Classical Journal* 99 (2), 157-67.

Haley, Shelley P. 2009. 'Be Not Afraid of the Dark: Critical Race Theory and Classical Studies', in Laura Salah Nasrallah and Fiorenza Elisabeth Schüssler (eds.). *Prejudice and Christian Beginnings: Investigating Race, Gender, and Ethnicity in Early Christian Studies*. Minneapolis: Fortress,27-50.

_____. 1993. 'Black Feminist Thought and Classics: Re-membering, Re-claiming, Re-empowering', in Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz and Amy Richlin (eds.). *Feminist Theory and the Classics*. New York: Routledge, 23-43.

_____. 2005. 'Rev. of *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*, by Benjamin Isaac', *The American Journal of Philology* 126 (3), 451-54.

Isaac, Benjamin H. 2004. *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*. NJ: Princeton UP.

Keita, S.O.Y. 1997. 'Is Studying Egypt in Its African Context "Afrocentric"?', in Anna Lea and Andrea Ross (eds.).*Were the Achievements of Ancient Greece Borrowed from Africa?: Proceedings from a Seminar Sponsored by the Society for the Preservation of the Greek Heritage and Co-sponsored by Georgetown University and Held at the Intercultural Center, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. on November 16, 1996*. Washington, D.C.: Society,35-46. Print.

Lambert, M. 2005. 'Rev. of *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*', *The Classical Review* 55 (2), 658-62.

Lape, Susan. 2010. *Race and Citizen Identity in the Classical Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Lipsitz, George. 1995. 'The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: Racialized Social Democracy and the "White" Problem in American Studies', *American Quarterly* 47 (3), 369-87.

Martin, Frank. 1984. 'The Egyptian Ethnicity Controversy and the Sociology of Knowledge', *Journal of Black Studies* 14 (3), 295-325.

McCoskey, Denise Eileen. 2012. *Race: Antiquity and Its Legacy*. London/New York: I.B. Tauris.

Samuels, Tristan. 2013. 'Rev. of *Race: Antiquity and Its Legacy*, by Denise Eileen McCoskey', *Electryone* 1 (2) http://www.electryone.gr/?p=486 (accessed July 2013).

Sheridan, Clare. 2003. 'Cultural Racism and the Construction of Identity', *Law and History Review* 21 (1), 207-09.