and shallow travesty of Aeschines 1 in a desperate effort to prove that 'the ancients did conceive of homosexuality as an identity' (p. 147) and hated homos. Anachronisms abound—'gay', 'cruising'—while the Greek terms significantly never appear. Active/passive, citizen/slave, etc. are ignored when convenient. Most of her statements are flatly contradicted by the text. I recommend two exercises to the reader. One, set S.'s paraphrases next to the Greek (e.g. p. 158 vs. Aesch. 1.37). Two, think of President Clinton and use her arguments to prove that Americans hate 'heterosexuality'.

Potter and Barton make random observations on smells and blushing.

Richlin gives a subtle meditation on the meaning of heads and head-hunting in Rome, covering *diminutio capitis*, *capite censi*, capital punishment, and the special meaning of the silencing of 'Cicero's Head'. It is engaged and rooted in the texts.

Downing's 'Anti-Pygmalion' goes over ground far better covered by Myerowitz, whom he dislikes and misunderstands.

Edwards in 'The Suffering Body' eschews crude generalizations to examine the particular case of the body in Seneca's *Letters* and the specifically Roman imagery of these literary *ludi*. Seneca obsesses about pain and torture. He achieves intellectual control—so he thinks—by facing up to his fears. But S. is always the *editor* of his own spectacles. Unfortunately, the translations (taken from the Loeb) do the author and reader disservice.

Gleason's 'Truth Contests and Talking Corpses' gathers various stories involving resurrections and trials (*Golden Ass*, *Acts of Peter*) to arrive at the idea that truth is power (including rhetorical power) over the body. G. read Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* only after writing this essay and Barton's *Sorrows of the Ancient Romans* would also have appealed. Two objections: (1) 'body' is stretching it a bit; rather power over the material, since the bodies in question include dogs, statues, inflated bladders, and a smoked herring. (2) In fact, the Christian narratives show quite the opposite: Peter has power over the material world because he has the truth. Add Perkins, 'Social World of the *Acts of Peter*', in J. Tatum (ed.), *Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore, 1994), pp. 296–307.

Lamerton claims that Plotinus' shame at his embodiment is 'something new in cosmology and psychology' (p. 316), and offers a biographical and psychoanalytic explanation: Plotinus was weaned too late and had a breast fixation (p. 323).

Hexter, in 'Ovid's Body', after some po-mo punning around, reveals himself as an old-fashioned positivist ('some of the tidbits in the ancient lives of Virgil . . . offer authentic or at least creditable information', p. 329). He then gets down to his unstated topic: medieval pseudepigrapha and speculations on Ovid's exile.

Wyke's 'Herculean Muscle!: The Classicizing Rhetoric of Bodybuilding' is fun, with a refreshing insistence on presenting facts and interpretations clearly.

*University of Cincinnati* HOLT N. PARKER

## IN YOUR DREAMS

D. SHULMAN, G. G. STROUMSA (edd.): *Dream Cultures. Explorations in the Comparative History of Dreaming*. Pp. x + 325, figs. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Cased, £42. ISBN: 0-19-512336-0.

This book is the fruit of a workshop held in 1995, exactly 100 years after Freud had

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.139 Published online by Cambridge University Press

finished the redaction of his *Traumdeutung*. But unlike Freud, who was searching for universal elements throughout various cultures, the authors treat dreaming as a cultural act: the place and rôle of dreams as well as the very status of dreaming are regarded as being heavily influenced by cultural traditions and religious attitudes. Thus encoding and decoding dreams by different ways of interpretation can be a highly communicative act within the cultural space. Wisely avoiding the claim to present an exhaustive view of dream cultures, this book exemplifies sixteen specific cases ranging from Early China and India to Milton and Freud.

In Section III four articles trace questions on dreams in antiquity. Christine Walde's 'Dream Interpretation in a Prosperous Age? Artemidorus, the Greek Interpreter of Dreams' gives an introduction to Artemidorus and compares him with Freud. Although there are significant differences—e.g. Artemidorus regards dreams as messages from the gods, whereas for the Viennese psychologist dreams are messages from the unconscious—Walde shows many parallels in method. Both introduce the communicative situation into their deliberations and both vary in their interpretations from client to client. Although Artemidorus and Freud seem to be only of historical interest in modern dream research, trench wars between different psychoanalytic schools do still overshadow even the evaluation of Artemidorus, as Walde points out.

Cristiano Grottanelli's 'On the Mantic Meaning of Incestuous Dreams' discusses the differing interpretations of men dreaming about sexual intercourse with their mother. Artemidorus, for example, takes into account the type of intercourse, the social status of the dreamer, and whether the mother is dead or still living. The meaning of such dreams can range very widely. They can promise power (control of the *polis* or return to the mother country—not entirely positive, since tyrants like Hippias or Caesar have such dreams) and they can predict death. Although incest is a highly taboo topic throughout antiquity (except from Ptolemaic Egypt), dreaming of incest with the mother can be favourable because of a complex system ruled by the logic of symbolic discourse. Grottanelli states a strong analogy of mother and earth, unfolded in four aspects: the mother country, the earth as primal matter, landed property, or agriculture. This essay closes with an intriguing appendix on incest in modern dream books.

In 'Idolum and Imago: Roman Dreams and Dream Theories', Hubert Cancik deals with dreams in the Roman republic and the early empire. There are only very few instances of dreams in state religion during the republic. Cancik sees analogies to the suppression of dreams in three areas: in the general limitation of inspirational divination; in the repression of the Dionysian cults after 186 B.C.; and in the restrictions of the Magna Mater cult. I think dreams were simply too personal to fit into the divination systems of the Roman republic, which required signs for the entire *res publica*. Generals like Marius, Sulla, or Caesar, the grave-diggers of the republic, were the first to claim to receive messages from the gods by dreams, a typically monarchical way of divination consequently used in imperial times. It is somewhat puzzling that Cancik still regards Cicero's treatise *On Divination* as 'a notable contribution to religious enlightenment in ancient Rome' (p. 173)—Mary Beard's article about 'Cicero and Divination: the Formation of a Latin Discourse', *JRS* 76 (1986), 33–46 (listed in the bibliography, but not to be found in the notes), clearly shows otherwise. Cancik's essay is brilliant where he interprets Roman poets, who in spite of the state religion frequently narrate dreams.

Finally, Guy G. Stroumsa's 'Dreams and Visions in Early Christian Discourse' convincingly argues that for early Christian writers dreams and visions are inseparably

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.139 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/51.1.139 Published online by Cambridge University Press