enlargements demonstrating the impressive transformations made through various immersions and finished off by a protective coating of dilute Paraloid B72.

The publication concludes with four pages of historical analysis. Entertainingly, we are told, for example, that the coins of hoard II could have bought 250–300 litres of wine and about 180 litres of olive oil, while another calculation suggests a modern value equivalent to 380–530 euros! The findspots of the hoards are considered (I was in a commercial area, 'zone F11'; II was in the vicinity of a small bathhouse, 'zone F18'), as is the composition. Typical for hoards of the period, issues of *D. Silanus*, *L. Titurius Sabinus*, and *L. Piso Frugi* are well represented. The question of why and by whom hoard I should have been abandoned in the 60s B.C. or later is raised, but rightly dismissed as unknowable.

Even the sizeable 1987 find is a fairly average hoard—a glance at M. H. Crawford's *Roman Republican Coin Hoards* shows that Italian hoards of this period typically range from the high tens to the very low thousands (for 78–49 B.C., twenty-nine are listed in this 1969 publication—five are over 1,000 coins). It is perhaps surprising that it should be treated as a stand-alone publication rather than a chapter at the end of an excavation report. Nevertheless, lavishly illustrated and with a great deal of attention paid to the archaeological site itself (thirty-three pages), the Musarna catalogue is a beautifully presented record of two Roman coin hoards of the first century B.C.

*The British Museum* R. ABDY

doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni189

## ANTICLASSICISM

A. AURNHAMMER, T. PITTROF (edd.): *'Mehr Dionysos als Apoll.' Antiklassizistische Antike-Rezeption um 1900.* (Das Abendland, Neue Folge 30.) Pp. viii + 520, ills. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2002. Paper, €49. ISBN: 3-465-03210-1.

The product of a colloquium held in Bad Homburg in 1999, this volume maps what it claims is a broad cultural shift in the reception of antiquity around 1900. This had been signalled by the late Romantic decadence that promoted, for instance, Silver Age Latin authors. (A long article in the middle of the volume by Ulrich Schulz-Buschhaus identifies Dionysian elements in Flaubert.) It was given impetus by the two Germanic godfathers of high modernism, Nietzsche and Freud. The main focus is the literature (primarily poetry) of the first two decades of the twentieth century. The editors' introduction argues that the modernists rejected Winckelmann's irenic model of a classical world of 'noble simplicity and silent grandeur'; Apollo gave way to Dionysus. There is a danger here of forcing a crude historical dialectic onto events, to which the monolithic 'classicistic' of the title certainly contributes. (The German term 'Klassizismus' connotes inauthenticity, whereas the term 'Klassik', for which English has no exact equivalent, is used to refer to Goethe and Schiller.) To be sure, some in the later nineteenth century did see the earlier reception of antiquity in this simplified way, including as sophisticated a scholar as Jacob Burckhardt, who termed Schiller's poem 'The Gods of Greece' ('Die Götter Griechenlands') 'one of the greatest forgeries of historical judgement there has ever been, and one that has been all the more irresistible the more innocently and piously it has been expressed' (p. 118). Yet it is important to recognize that this volume deals

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in the first place not with a historical shift, but with a cultural clash between professional academia and cultural innovators, or, in Burckhardt's case, the former's failure to see the point of the latter.

The contributions to the volume address the reception of antiquity by some of the principal figures of germanophone modernism: Nietzsche, Freud, Gottfried Benn, Stefan George, Gerhart Hauptmann, Karl Wolfskehl. The volume begins with general historical considerations, proceeds to discussions of the relation between classical philology and cultural theory in the work of Nietzsche, Burckhardt, and Erwin Rohde, and concludes with modernist literature. The first section contains a useful discussion of the place of the classics in nineteenth-century education by Carola Groppe. Wilhelm von Humboldt's educational theories were grounded in eighteenth-century classical scholarship and the humanism of Goethe and Schiller, and so too, indirectly, were the classical *Gymnasien* that educated the German administrative élite. This identification of the bureaucracy with classical culture had two unintended effects later in the century. Whilst it increased the social cachet of 'classicistic' humanism, it also exposed humanism to anti-establishment attacks. This accounts for the Janus-faced character of classics in cultural and educational theory around 1900: it stood for humanistic values in the face of the growth of 'soulless' science and commerce, but it also became increasingly prone to anti-rational tendencies itself (p. 44).

Manfred Landfester's article on Nietzsche shows, however, that the historical model needs careful handling. The opposition that Nietzsche constructed between Apollo and Dionysus was already present in German Romantic aesthetics of the 1790s. Hence, Nietzsche's attack on classicism in *The Birth of Tragedy* was made using the 'romantic weapon of the Dionysian' (p. 104). Despite his awareness of this non-linearity of intellectual history, Landfester still subscribes to the model of a 'classicistic' eighteenth century, according to which classical philology was only freed from its tendency to idealize antiquity by the historicism of Humboldt, F. A. Wolf and August Boeckh (p. 89). This neglects the important work of Humboldt's own teacher C. G. Heyne, as well as ignoring other important developments such as the (proto-Nietzschean) celebration of orgiastic rituals by Wilhelm Heinse and the (proto-Freudian) identification of figures from Greek myth with deep psychological drives by Goethe and C. G. Carus. Erwin Rohde's immensely influential *Psyche* proves the point. For, as Gregor Vogt-Spira shows, Rohde's project of making antiquity accessible had more in common with the pre-historicist classicism of a Winckelmann than with Rohde's scholarly contemporaries. Rohde appeals not to the canons of classical scholarship but to contemporary theories of psychology. Wilamowitz for one found Rohde's work appealing but hard to accept.

The high modernists, on the other hand, reacted against a certain type of German bourgeois culture—the culture of the *Gymnasien* that simplified and popularized Goethe and Schiller yet still enjoyed unassailed dominance for the modernist generation. An awareness of the functions of antiquity in cultural–political polemics comes out at several points in the volume. It was Nietzsche who saw most clearly how antiquity could be used to taunt priggish bourgeois Christian moralists, as Goethe had done in his (unpublished) erotica. Especially fascinating is the case of Wagner's circle in Bayreuth, which found in Greece a focus for its hazy, bizarre, and often contradictory notions of cultural reform, as Wolf-Daniel Hartwich's sceptical analysis shows (pp. 59–60). Renate Schlesier argues that Freud came to identify with Dionysus as the very opposite of the Jewish and Christian conceptions of God (pp. 203–4). In this sense 'anti-classicistic' classicism offered liberation. One conventional nineteenth-century attitude to myth, exemplified by Max Müller, was to dismiss it as

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

childish fiction. Freud rose to the challenge, as did the modernists in Stefan George's circle, who set out to reclaim myth for reality (p. 55).

Aside from an unfortunate tendency to appeal to overly schematic historical models, this volume is to be recommended to readers of German who are interested in the cultural reception of antiquity around 1900. It has less to say to the professional classicist, for it contains nothing on mainstream German classical scholarship. Since one of the volume's themes is the tensions between the German professoriate and cultural innovators—for which the antagonism between Wilamowitz and Nietzsche may stand as a symbol—this is perhaps a shame.

*King's College, London* MATTHEW BELL
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni190

## A TRIBUTE TO UGO BIANCHI

G. CASADIO (ed.): *Ugo Bianchi. Una vita per la storia delle religioni*. (Biblioteca di Storia delle Religioni 3.) Pp. 525, pls. Rome: Il Calamo, 2002. Paper, €37. ISBN: 88-88039-24-4.

'È stato una delle persone di animo più nobile da me finora incontrate.' Ugo Bianchi (1922–95), the occupant of the chair of the History of Religions at La Sapienza in Rome from 1979 until his retirement in 1992, was a learned, sober, articulate, and endlessly curious scholar capable of evoking warm feelings of respect and gratitude from his pupils ('senza superbia accademica'). A conventional Festschrift, *Ἀγαθὴ ἐλπίς*, edited by the first and most eminent of these, Giulia Sfameni Gasparro, appeared in 1994; the book under review presents an extended retrospect of his intellectual *Werdegang* in the form of essays by different hands, many of which were first presented at a conference organized by Casadio at the University of Salerno in April 1997. Despite having published on a wide variety of topics in Greek, Roman, and Graeco-Roman religion, and edited nine volumes of international conference proceedings, Bianchi is less well known among classicists than he perhaps deserves to be, not merely because his main relevant contribution was in the field of mystery cults and Gnosticism, but also because he was fiercely concerned to defend the cause of comparativism, a mode at odds with the immanent particularism of classical studies. It is instructive that, in a personal letter to the editor cited on p. 189, Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones, born in the selfsame year as Bianchi, writes, 'I did not know *Διὸς αἶσα* [1953] when I wrote *The Justice of Zeus* [1971], or I should certainly have quoted it'. Bianchi's preferred international forum was the International Association for the History of Religions (IAHR), a body familiar to few students of classical religion.

As a student of the history of religions at the Royal University of Rome during the Second World War, Bianchi received an education which would nowadays be considered impossibly demanding, in classical philology, ancient history, epigraphy (Margherita Guarducci), Etruscology (Massimo Pallottino), Italian philology, Assyriology, and Old Persian. His early qualifying work, directed by R. Pettazzoni, was devoted to classical topics: Artemis of Ephesus (1944); the formation of the Capitoline Triad (1947); the archaic Greek notion of destiny (1953). Before his appointment to his first chair, at Messina, however, while he was earning his living as a schoolteacher, he worked mainly on the problems of dualism, especially in

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni190 Published online by Cambridge University Press