of marble held in particular esteem. Such esteem could only flourish if at least some sculpture were once displayed as Winckelmann would have wished – unadorned by paint.

NIGEL SPIVEY
Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge
njs11@cam.ac.uk

DILLON (S.) **Ancient Greek Portrait Sculpture. Contexts, Subjects, and Styles**. Cambridge UP, 2006. Pp. xx + 217. £60. 9780521854986.

Sheila Dillon's book seeks to challenge traditional approaches to the subject in a number of respects. First, she argues that we cannot afford to ignore the large majority of the Greek portraits transmitted to us, which are not the well-known named portraits, but the numerous anonymous portraits. Second, in order to understand the character of Classical and Hellenistic Greek portraiture, we need to understand how the evidence which has reached us today has been filtered through the interests of the Roman viewers for whom the copies, which are the basis of our knowledge of Greek portraits, were originally produced. Such an approach, she suggests, greatly enlarges the range of evidence on which we can draw, permitting new kinds of questions, and challenging both traditional developmental stylistic accounts of portraiture and some of the sharply defined typologies of, for example, philosopher portraits or the citizen image identified in recent scholarship.

An introductory chapter, 'Facing up to anonymity', discusses D.'s interpretive aims and methods, generally developing out of an interest in the corpus of anonymous portraits. The remainder of the book is divided into two parts, 'Facing the past: Greek portraits in Roman contexts' and 'Facing the subject: interpreting identity in Greek portraiture', each part consisting of two chapters.

Ch.2, 'Making portraits of the Greeks', studies Roman portrait-copying practices, in the first place to establish how we can know that any anonymous portrait we find in a Roman villa is of a Classical or Hellenistic Greek rather than a Roman contemporary, especially when beards come into fashion with Hadrian; second, in order to know where we should expect careful reproduction of the original portrait's features, where free variation. Ch.3, 'Displaying portraits of the Greeks', looks at the patterns of subject selection and viewing of portraits of Greeks in Roman villas, arguing against programmatic readings in favour of open meanings. Ch.4, 'The appearance of Greek portraits', is really the core of the book, looking at the anonymous portraits against the background of the heads of Classical Attic funerary reliefs in order to suggest broad age-classifications for such portraits and to provide a base against which to assess the specific stylistic choices and effects of the portraits. Ch.5, 'Greek portraits in practice', looks at the evidence for the social uses of portraits in late Classical and early Hellenistic Athens, which is then used as a framework for interpreting some of the representational features of the unnamed portraits in terms of the projection and negotiation of stylized identities related to the social values and personae presupposed by those contexts: men of action (generals and orators) and men of thought (philosophers and poets).

This is certainly a significant contribution, a book which anyone with an interest in Greek portraiture ought to read and think about. As D. suggests, the picture of the development of portraiture which she presents is, compared with previous approaches, more complex, 'complicated and untidy' (128), and she certainly substantiates her claim that late Classical and early Hellenistic portraiture was more diverse and varied than the limited range of identified portraits illustrated in standard accounts would suggest. But increased complexity in itself does not necessarily represent an advance in understanding, unless that complexity or variation can be explained. In practice, when D. sought to interpret and explain that complexity, I was struck by how well the types established by scholars like Smith and Zanker stood up, since even where D. is able to show their blurring in specific instances, that blurring is normally interpreted as creating meaning precisely by referencing two or more types in a way appropriate to the particular context of the portrait or the image the individual in question wished to project (military leader emulating Hellenistic ruler portrait (81); blurring of philosopher and poet with citizen types, perhaps linked to honouring of philosophers/poets for performing civic services, as ambassadors (112)). Unfortunately, in the absence of names or specific contexts for such images, there is no way of confirming whether such readings are sound or may, in the future, seem as far-fetched as Richter's projection of Pausanias' character, as we know it from Herodotus, onto a portrait which has in fact turned out to be Pindar (discussed by D. on p.5). In this respect D.'s work seems to confirm and complement both established findings (typology) and goals (desirability of being able to identify the individual being represented), rather than as such challenge them. Notwithstanding these qualifications, D. has certainly enriched our vision of Greek portraiture by focusing on a body of unduly neglected material which no one has previously been able to make such fruitful use of.

Appendices include a museum index and a catalogue of the anonymous portraits which form the core of the study. The book is very fully illustrated, offering in particular a good sampling of the anonymous portraits. On the production side, my only complaint would be the placement of the photographs, scattered rather unevenly through the main text, rather than collected together at the end of the text. Since D. often refers forward and back to different figures for purposes of comparison, it is quite inconvenient having to flick forwards and backwards to find the relevant image.

JEREMY TANNER
Institute of Archaeology, University College London
j.tanner@ucl.ac.uk