

does not fear to be spellbound by curse tablets."

Gager's attempt to ascertain the efficacy of *defixiones* is especially provocative. "Did they work?" he asks (p. 22). "In some sense" they had to, he maintains, and they should not be regarded, as is usual, as the products of irrational persons. Their effectiveness has to be seen not in the agency of the *daimones*, but in the "coercive power of words." That is, it can be shown that the belief that one was the target of a curse or spell was enough to engender tensions and anxieties. When Germanicus, the heir apparent to Tiberius' throne, became ill in 19 C.E., he believed that his malady had been brought on by a spell. Dio Cassius relates that following Germanicus' death, his rival Piso was accused of having resorted to curse tablets, and indeed evidence was found on his premises (cf. *Tac. Ann.* 2.69). In the fourth century Libanius blamed his various illnesses on a *defixio* and noted the use of spells by those who wanted to confound orators.

Gager contends that amulets functioned in ways similar to *defixiones*. Their use, he argues, was prompted by a realization that hostile beliefs and feelings—"negative forces"—could lead to inaction and withdrawal. The amulet provided the individual with self-confidence and a "counterstrategy." Gager argues in Freudian terms: "the amulet manifests the countermove of the ego," against the inhibiting superego, "the transition from passivity to activity."

Gager's explanations force us to contemplate the *dynamics* of *defixiones* and amulet usage. One wonders, however, whether a more precise understanding of the *voces mysticae* of the tablets would lead to greater insight into how the *defixiones* "worked." Gager at least makes an effort in this direction when he asserts that the language and symbols of the tablets should not be regarded as gibberish, but rather as the medium through which the mundane and spiritual worlds were bridged.

Readers who find this work fascinating will also benefit from J. Naveh and S. Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity* (Jerusalem, 1985) and L. H. Schiffman and M. D. Swartz, *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts from the Cairo Genizah* (Sheffield, 1992). These works (the latter was unavailable to Gager; the former is frequently alluded to) extend our knowledge beyond the better-known Greek and Latin corpus.

This reviewer would have liked a full bibliography (the notes, however are copious), but this is

a small quibble with a collection of texts that is interspersed with useful and insightful discussions that advance our understanding of ancient religion. The reader cannot help but find Gager's theme and conclusion convincing: "The truth is that it made little difference who you were—man or woman; Greek, Roman, Jew or Christian; commoner or aristocrat; unlettered peasant or wise philosopher. In matters of the heart, as in many other affairs of daily life, anyone could play the role of client or target. For there was no one who did not fear the power of *defixiones*" (p. 245).

Stuart S. Miller
University of Connecticut

Kevin Greene, *ROMAN POTTERY*. ("Interpreting the Past.") University of California Press, 2120 Berkeley Way, Berkeley, CA 94720. 1992. 64 pp. 30 illustrations. Paper (ISBN 0-520-08031-9) \$10.00.

We are now paying the price for the neglect of Roman pottery that has been the practice at too many excavations since the discoveries of Herculaneum and Pompeii ushered in the era of classical archaeology. That era is still in its infancy. Kevin Greene's recent University of California/British Museum publication reflects just how far we still have to go before classical archaeology becomes a mature scientific discipline. Pottery is the chief archaeological find, but too many classical archaeologists are more interested in finding buildings or tombs or sculpture or gold. There are relatively few pottery specialists; so study and publication of pottery finds are too often handed over to persons who know little about what they are analyzing. As a result, "scientific" tests of various kinds have in recent years been developed to help non-specialists with the formidable task of interpreting the mountains of pottery that are being found at Roman sites today and the mountains of pottery still unstudied from earlier digs. Greene enthusiastically espouses such tests, but at the same time he admits that all of them have real limitations. Even petrology, so usefully applied to ceramic studies by David Peacock and others, can be deceptive. Greene also supports short-cut methods for "quantifying" pottery, methods like rim-counting and weighing. He does not seem to be concerned with the fact that scholarship goes out the window with such proce-

dures, which in their way neglect pottery finds almost as much as if they had not been studied at all. The fact is that if Roman archaeology is ever to be scientific, every pottery fragment must be studied, not "quantified." Only in that way will we discover what archaeological sites have to tell us about economic history. Archaeology otherwise becomes educated guesswork, not science. But how handle the masses of pottery finds? The answer surely lies in less excavation, more practice of non-destructive archaeology, and more emphasis on scholarly pottery studies. Digging, though, has a glamor that remote sensing and careful scholarship lack. Books like Greene's indicate that Roman archaeology is at a crossroads. Will it choose scholarship or "quantification"? Glamorous digging or unglamorous sherd analysis?

What this little book makes us think about, then, is more important than what it actually says. What does it say? In part, it is an updating of another British Museum booklet, Catherine Johns's excellent *Arretine and Samian Pottery* (1971). Johns summarizes, and fully illustrates, the Roman clay dishes in the collection of the British Museum. Greene's book, however, is more theoretical than practical. It concerns itself with general discussions of how various types of pottery were produced and distributed, and how they are studied. Clay shipping amphoras and their fragments are the chief finds on Roman sites, on land and under water, but Greene considers amphoras "specialized" (p. 8) and is more interested in dishes and kitchen ware. He does not illustrate a single amphora, except for one very small picture showing modern amphoras for sale in Tunisia. Only about half of the illustrations, in fact, show pottery at all, and most of what is shown is quite superficially identified. Charts, graphs, diagrams, and maps make up the other illustrations, and there are three pictures showing excavations of pottery kilns. As with most British Museum publications, the subject is seen through a very British lens. The focus is on British scholars and on finds in Britain or finds from sites excavated or surveyed by British archaeologists (Sutri in Italy, the Etruria Survey in Italy, the Avenue Bourguiba site in Carthage). Greene himself excavated the legionary fortress of Usk (Wales), from which we are given a page of pottery profiles and graphs. Perhaps his connection with Usk leads him to refer to military sites as particularly useful chronologically. "Non-military sites" other than Pompeii and Herculaneum

he finds "notoriously difficult to date" (p. 27). Although he mentions them once briefly, he does not seem to be aware of how the meticulous excavations of the Athenian Agora by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens have revolutionized pottery dating for most archaeological periods, including the Roman.

There are some other problems with this book. The reader should not look for much objective help with bibliography, though there is a "Further Reading" appendix. But, to give just two examples, the American Howard Comfort, who is the greatest living Arretine specialist, and Clementina Panella, the noted Italian amphora scholar, are referred to only incidentally. The book is also quite repetitious. One sometimes feels that the author has forgotten what was said on previous pages; for example, Heinrich Dressel is introduced to us on p. 17 and fully introduced again on p. 19. John Hayes, the British ceramics specialist, is introduced on p. 21 and again on p. 31, as if he had not been mentioned previously. Topics like dating, classification, and production keep popping up in a repetitious fashion. Greene says in the Acknowledgements that he spent "less than eighteen months" on the booklet, thanks to "hounding" by his editor. A few more months might have permitted him to organize topics for the reader's benefit, to extend his geographical range, and to address the enormous importance of underwater archaeology to ceramic studies. The book does, though, succeed in giving the layman an impression of the importance and complexity of Roman pottery studies. The topic is a massive one. Greene is to be complimented for having undertaken it. And the colored cover photo of pottery sherds from Corbridge is exceptionally fine. Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema's painting of the emperor Hadrian's visit to a Romano-British pottery also makes a nice frontispiece, but Greene's amused statement in the caption that a Roman emperor would not "concern himself with arts and crafts" is unfortunately incorrect. As stamped trademarks prove, Hadrian was a manufacturer of amphoras, and throughout the second century A.D. the emperors and their relatives (especially their female relatives) were active manufacturers of bricks. Domitia Lucilla the Younger, the mother of Marcus Aurelius, was the most productive manufacturer of bricks during the Roman period. Throughout antiquity, ceramic products were a way to wealth, for private individuals and for public officials. For us today, careful study of Roman ceramic products offers a

"wealth" of historical information. Will classical archaeologists accept the offer?

Elizabeth Lyding Will
Amherst College

William M. Calder III (ed.), *WERNER JAEGER RECONSIDERED*. (*Illinois Classical Studies*, Supplement 3: "Illinois Studies in the History of Classical Scholarship," Volume 2 = Proceedings of the Second Oldfather Conference, held on the campus of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, April 26-28, 1990.) Scholars Press, P. O. Box 15399, Atlanta, GA 30333-0399. 1992. xiv + 325 pp. Paper (ISBN 1-55540-729-3) \$44.95 (\$29.95 to members of APA).

This study of Werner Jaeger (hereafter J), one of the best-known classicists to leave Germany for America in the 1930s, sometimes becomes a feeding frenzy as the contributors, catching the scent of personal ideology and professional ambition, "deconstruct" his scholarly idiom, lapses, and biases. E. Badian's article (poorly proofed) attacks J's *Demosthenes* (English ed., 1938; German, 1939) for its historical "creativity." Heinrich von Staden, disputing J's view (Berlin, 1938) that Diocles of Carystos was dependent upon Aristotle, speaks of the "irresistible" influence of his "powerful combination of philological skills, philosophical knowledge, and rhetorical efficacy." Other specialists in J's subjects include Mortimer Chambers on Thucydides (berating J's "elitist approach to the classics," p. 33), Charles H. Kahn on J's concept of an undeveloping Plato, Paul T. Keyser on J's overstatement of the continuity of the Greek tradition in Christianity, Eckart Schuextrumpf on Aristotle (arguing that J owed more than he admitted to earlier scholarship, but commending him for his superior ability to see larger issues) and Robert Renehan, who speaks with unambiguous admiration of J's textual acumen in his review of the OCT *Aristotelis Metaphysica* (1957).

Beat Naef on the genesis of *Paideia*, Ernst A. Schmidt on the friendship of J and the conservative poet Rudolf Borchardt, and Donald White on the role of Wilamowitz and others in the development of J's educational ideology contribute to the cultural history of the Weimar Republic. Despite the resonance in J's rhetoric with some of the politically "charged" vocabulary of the period, more caution should be used by some of the con-

tributors in making inferences about J's political position.

Focusing more particularly on J's *intentions* are the articles by Judith P. Hallett (her explanation of why J never became President of the APA perhaps overrates how significant he considered the office), Alessandra Bertini Malgarini (a comparison of J with other scholarly emigrants) and William M. Calder III, whose too-intimate narrative of J's appointment to the chair of Wilamowitz in Berlin paints an unattractive portrait of the man, unfortunately coloring, as the keynote article, most of the others. Is it so odd or immoral to try to influence the choice of one's colleagues? Making much of J's attempt to do so, Calder writes, p. 11: "He could not bear a rival and needed a colleague whom he could bully but who was not too obviously inferior." Among the contributors at least Renehan, p. 151, n. 14, has a contrary view: "In my experience φθόρος [envy] was foreign to Jaeger's nature." This in regard to W. D. Ross's *Metaphysics* (Oxford, 1924), appearing just before his own edition for Teubner, planned for the next year but never published.

Calder's copious work on the history of more recent classical scholarship can be enlightening. In "How did Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff Read a Text?" (*CJ* 86 [1991], 344-352), Calder shows how J's great teacher combined Welcker's reconstruction of lost tragedy with Hermann's knowledge of Greek language and literature into a broader philological historicism whose aim was to bring antiquity to life. There, the presentation of aspects of Wilamowitz's private life does not blur the main point, his reshaping of classical scholarship. The present volume is not so successful in this distinction. More useful than inferences about J's personal motives would have been a reassessment, or better yet, a revision of his central aim: to make the study of classics contribute to a better world. If J's ideas were imperfect or contained elements friendly to totalitarianism, we should say exactly how they could be modified. In these critical times for Classics, we should, as he and Wilamowitz did, ask again what philology is and what it is for. Can we trust philology to help us read the evidence from antiquity without the distortion of our known and unknown biases? Can philology make us virtuous as a political community (state), as a community of scholars (profession), and as individuals?

While compromises have been made by most thinking scholars and teachers in any age and especially prior to and during the Nazi period, it