entwined. Christians developed an approach to dreams that reflected a new interaction between Greek and Hebrew traditions. The political significance of many dreams in the pagan world disappeared. Dreams no longer predicted the future, but were transformed into utopias describing the ideal society. Dream interpreters, so common in the pagan world, were rejected and banned from baptism. Since most dreams were regarded as being sent by demons or by Satan himself, significant and legitimate dreams were reserved for the so-called religious virtuosi, i.e. monks, nuns, and saints. Thus the early Christian discourse on dreams represents the passage from Artemidorus' predictive interpretation of dreams to Freud's introspective approach.

In sum, *Dream Cultures* offers titbits from various cultures and serves as a perfect appetizer to read more about dreams in antiquity: *inter folia fructus.*

Augsburg VEIT ROSENBERGER

WHO FOUND TROY?

S. H. ALLEN: *Finding the Walls of Troy: Frank Calvert and Heinrich Schliemann at Hisarlik*. Pp. xiii + 409, 53 figs, 4 maps. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1999. Cased, £27.50. ISBN: 0-520-20868-4.

Few (if any) archaeological discoveries have aroused more interest and controversy than those made by Schliemann at Hissarlick, the site identified with Homeric Troy. Schliemann's work immediately captured the attention of both scholars and general public, and, since then, fascination with this site has never waned. Allen's book thus covers well-known ground: the novelty of her story is that it adds fresh information on and is viewed from the perspective of the 'self-effacing' archaeologist Frank Calvert, whose crucial rôle in the discovery of Troy was obscured by the ungrateful, unscrupulous, and self-aggrandizing Schliemann.

For several years, well before Schliemann had shown even a remote interest in archaeology, Calvert had conducted pioneering topographical work in the Troad, identifying a number of sites mentioned in classical authors, assembling a remarkable collection of antiquities, and conducting a number of small excavations at various sites, including Hissarlick, part of which had become his own property. By the mid-1860s, following the publication of Maclaren's *The Plain of Troy Described* (Edinburgh, 1863) as well as the results of his own excavations, Calvert had come to the conclusion that Hissarlick was the most likely candidate for Homeric Troy.

Calvert was not a professional archaeologist, but a gentleman scholar with a particular interest in archaeology. He belonged to a prominent English Levantine family whose members combined diplomatic careers with trade. A. describes him as one of the 'unpropertied younger offspring who, despite possessing the lineage of a "gentleman", were forced to find a living in the world of commerce'. Calvert, however, unlike Schliemann, had not accumulated sufficient wealth to enable him freely to pursue his archaeological interests: more excavations were required to clinch his identification of Hissarlick with the Homeric citadel, but for this he needed the financial backing of some institution or liberal patron. Unfortunately, family circum-

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stances first and, subsequently, his association with the unscrupulous Schliemann thwarted Calvert's aspirations.

Calvert initially sought the backing of the British Museum, but this famous institution was unwilling to see its name associated with that of a family fallen from grace, for not long before Calvert's brother Frederick had become implicated in a notorious financial scandal and Calvert himself had been involved in a slander case. Then, in 1868, Calvert met Schliemann and sought another opportunity to fulfil his dream. Calvert persuaded him to excavate at Hissarlick, inviting him to dig in the part of the site which was his own property. He also provided Schliemann with scholarly advice and endless help in practical matters. But Calvert, instead of fulfilling his own dream, ended up being utterly exploited by the ungrateful German businessman turned archaeologist. Schliemann not only refused to share any of the glory with Calvert, but tried to minimize his contribution and tricked him financially to boot (e.g. by buying Calvert's share of some finds at ridiculously low prices). A rift between the two men ensued, further fuelled by disagreement concerning archaeological matters, such as the interpretation of the citadel's strata and chronology. (As is well known, Schliemann erroneously identified his second stratum at Troy with Priam's citadel. Calvert believed this stratum to be much earlier, and suggested that the stratigraphy discovered by Schliemann presented a thousand-year gap—1800–800 B.C.) In the interest of scholarly research the two men eventually 'buried the hatchet' and resumed their odd collaboration. It was probably only a small consolation for Calvert to see his own observations vindicated by Schliemann's final excavations, and by the work subsequently carried out by Dörpfeld.

Calvert's decisive rôle in the discovery of Homeric Troy, and his valuable archaeological investigations at Hissarlick and other sites in the Troad, were not entirely unknown to the scholarly world and even to the general public before the appearance of this book. The very first biography of Schliemann by Emil Ludwig (1931) mentioned that it was Calvert who persuaded Schliemann to dig at Hissarlick; Michael Wood's BBC programme and book *In Search of the Trojan War* (London, 1985) even suggested that Schliemann appropriated Calvert's childhood dream of finding Troy; and recently David Traill's *Schliemann of Troy: Treasure And Deceit* (New York, 1995) devoted several pages to Calvert's crucial rôle in the story (and was generous in his praise). A.'s, however, is the most determined attempt fully to restore Calvert's claim 'to the honour of actually having found the site of Troy'.

A.'s treatment of Calvert is humane and sympathetic. It is impossible not to feel sympathy for Calvert's unassuming, scholarly, and gentlemanly manners, and distaste for Schliemann's duplicity, bad faith, and relentless attempts to 'write out of history' his less fortunate 'rival'. At the same time one cannot fail to notice Calvert's hesitation, lack of persistence and his 'latching like an antiquarian onto assorted projects rather than focusing on a larger goal', to use A.'s own words. All this contrasts greatly with Schliemann's single-mindedness and determination, and, indeed, partly explains Schliemann's success and Calvert's failure. In a sense, Calvert found Hissarlick, but it was Schliemann who found Troy.

A., nevertheless, has given us new insights into the intriguing relationship between Schliemann and Calvert and the history of research on Troy. In particular, she provides much new information on the social and intellectual background of a relatively little-known English archaeologist. This is perhaps the most original contribution of this book. Calvert offers an interesting example of an archaeologist still working in an antiquarian mould but 'on the cusp of both the transition of archaeology from a

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

gentleman's avocation to a scientific discipline and its absorption into the institutions and practices of the academy'.

University of Bristol NICOLETTA MOMIGLIANO

LIVIAS

E. BARTMAN: *Portraits of Livia: Imaging the Imperial Woman in Augustan Rome*. Pp. xxiv + 242, 194 figs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Cased, £65. ISBN: 0521-58394-2.

The portrait images of Livia constitute a difficult but rewarding body of archaeological and visual material, and Bartman's book in its wide-ranging inclusiveness both lays bare the problems and brings out many of the points of interest.

The preface describes the focus of the work clearly—'the visual evidence for Livia's portrait appearance', in all media, seen as 'a tool for promulgation of the Augustan ideology of dynasty and social order' (pp. xxii–xxiii). The book is divided into three parts. The first, 'Patterns of Response', is mostly synchronic. The second, 'The Politics of Portraits', is a detailed diachronic handling of Livia's images over nearly a century of continuous manufacture, lifetime and posthumous. The third part is a catalogue of images and inscriptions.

Chapter I, 'Identifying Livia', discusses the difficult question of the relationship of Livia's official portrait types, their surviving versions, and their identification. B. stays within the current methods of typological study, but with some reluctance, and, as suits the fluid reception of Livia's images, she proposes a more flexible classification. Most of the surviving images are not tidy instances of easily reconstituted types (as they often are for other imperial figures, especially later) but for the most part more or less 'mongrelized variants'. Chapter II, '(Gendered) Modes of Portrait Production and Reception', looks at the mechanics of making and setting up the images from the points of view of sculptors and buyers, and their possible uses and transformations of central types. Chapter III, 'Facial Signs/Body Language', is in some ways the most original and attempts a global reading of all the signifying components of Livia's statues—hair, face, dress, gesture.

Chapters IV–VII reconstruct a continuous (and often frankly hypothetical) history of Livia's images correlated with the major phases of her life as wife of Octavian (Chapter IV), as wife of Augustus (Chapter V), as widow Julia Augusta and mother of Tiberius (Chapter VI), and finally as Diva Augusta following her promotion to Diva status by Claudius in A.D. 42 (Chapter VII). Very broadly, B. places the origin of the Marbury Hall type, with complex fashion hairstyle and known in fewer (nine) versions, in the earliest period and that of the Fayum type, which has a much simplified fashion hairstyle and is known in some thirty versions, in the main period of Augustus' reign. This reverses the usually accepted chronological sequence of these two clear and distinct types. The remaining ideal type(s?), with plain, centrally parted hairstyle and highly variable physiognomies, are found, as usual, to correspond to the Tiberian and Claudian images of Julia Augusta and Diva Augusta.

The catalogue presents *c*. 90 sculptured portraits in the round arranged geographically (Rome, Italy, and the provinces, west and east) and *c*. 20 gems and cameos. The epigraphic catalogue gives texts and translations for seventy-six statue honours for Livia, arranged in broad chronological groups.

The full archaeology of Livia's imperial image is treated even-handedly, and B.

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.141 Published online by Cambridge University Press