
This book represents a revised version of the author’s dissertation, written under the direction of Harald Mielisch at the University of Bonn and submitted in the winter semester of 2002/2003. The study examines Greek portraiture of the 4th century BCE, an important period in the history and development of the genre. Rather than focusing on the handful of securely identified fourth-century portraits, which have been the subject of most previous scholarship on Greek portraits of this period, P. concentrates on those portraits preserved in later Roman versions that are now unidentified. He limits his sample to unnamed bearded males without helmets, thereby avoiding having to deal with athletes, Hellenistic rulers, and the so-called Strategenköpfe. This is a sensible approach, since portraits of these subjects tend to employ a somewhat different set of conventions from the bearded heads P. has selected; it also gives his sample internal coherence. P.’s main thesis is that the ‘good citizen’ style of representation one finds on Greek gravestones, which has been identified by Paul Zanker and others as the main category of male citizen self-representation available in the fourth century, was in fact only one possible portrait option. If you consider the unnamed portraits, P. argues, you find that a much wider range of portrait styles was available, particularly in the second half of the fourth century, than has previously been recognized. This is an important observation with which I fully agree.

P. collects and analyzes 47 different portraits, 21 of which are preserved in more than one example. 20 of the 47 portraits are illustrated in large, good quality black and white photographs, usually in all four views. 9 of the 20 portraits illustrated are types preserved in multiple versions; images of only one example of each type are included. While it is welcome to have 20 of the 47 portraits so fully illustrated, it may in fact have been more useful to illustrate as many of the 47 portraits discussed in the text as possible. That is, since there is no attempt to provide complete photographic documentation of those portraits preserved in multiple versions so that the reader might follow and verify P.’s copy recension (Kopienkritik) in the catalogue – a process that requires at best all four views and at least three – it would have been more helpful to include images of every portrait, even if only from the front, so that one could see the complete range of styles represented by the portraits the author has chosen to include in his study.

The book is divided into ten chapters, including a catalogue, an English summary, and a museum index; there is no separate bibliography, which is unfortunate, or general index, although there are page references in the catalogue to indicate where each portrait is discussed in the text. In the first three chapters P. sets out the problems and aims of the study, gives a brief review of past scholarship (Ch. I, pp. 1–10), defines the criteria by which he selected the material for inclusion (Ch. II, pp. 11–14), and provides a short summary of the evidence for the subject (Ch. III, pp. 15–18). These chapters are very cursory, and take little account of any Anglo-American scholarship on Greek portraits, beyond Gisela Richter’s ‘The Portraits of the Greeks’. While German scholars have certainly done much of the work on Greek portraiture, it would have been profitable for the author to take into account the important contributions that have been made
to the study of Greek portraits by such scholars as A. F. Stewart, J. J. Pollitt, R. Brilliant, R. R. R. Smith, and J. Tanner, to name just a few.

The main focus of the book is a detailed study of the chronology (Ch. IV, pp. 19–51) and typology of the anonymous portraits (Ch. V, pp. 53–160). First chronology. Despite the book’s title, P. has been somewhat flexible in setting the precise chronological boundaries for his study, taking what might be called a ‘long view’ of the fourth century in order to include portraits that probably date from the end of the 5th century as well as those that likely belong in the beginning of the 3rd. This is a very useful strategy because of the real difficulties in dating much of this material, and because of the chronological grey areas that exist particularly between the portraits of the late Classical and early Hellenistic periods. The thousands of Attic gravestones, the large corpus of mostly Attic votive and document reliefs, and the named portraits preserved in later Roman versions provide an important body of comparative material for interpreting the appearance of the later marble portrait heads – their sculptural style, hairstyle, physiognomy, facial expression – and for determining the possible date of the portraits from which they were derived. While P. seems to be well aware of the difficulties involved in dating this material according to a stylistic developmental model, he proceeds to arrange the portraits in a relative chronological sequence organized by decades based on the dates of the named portrait copies as well as the chronology for fourth century sculpture established by German scholars in a series of important and influential studies.1 The results are clearly presented in a table on page 49. The kind of precise dating of Greek portrait copies that P. practices here, while perhaps a necessary, even useful, exercise for a dissertation, has, however, been so seriously undermined by the recent work of Klaus Fittschen and R. R. R. Smith that I found the developmental scheme laid out in this section less than convincing.2 In any case such a decade-by-decade framework is not really necessary. Based on comparisons with bearded heads from Greek grave reliefs, it seems quite clear that most if not all of the unnamed portraits P. includes here are likely to belong in this period. Written evidence, both epigraphic and literary, suggests that during the second half of the fourth century and the beginning of the third there was an increase in the number of portrait statues being set up, particularly in Athens; such historical evidence provides more compelling support for P.’s hypothesis than the formal stylistic analysis on which he relies. Unfortunately P. does not consider in any detail the broader historical context for the development of Greek portraiture in the fourth century.

1 E.g., A. H. Borbein, T. Lygkopoulos, J. Bergemann, K. A. I. Braun, M. Meyer, A. Scholl, E. Voutiras. These names and their studies will be familiar to anyone who works on this material; here again P. seems to have been unaffected by anything other than German language scholarship on fourth century sculpture.

Chapter five focuses on portrait typology and is by far the longest section of the book. P. analyzes the unnamed portraits according to the framework of male head types established for Attic gravestones by Johannes Bergemann. This is undoubtedly the best way in which to deal with these anonymous portraits, and P. should be commended for resisting the desire to identify these images more precisely. He discusses the various names that have been given to many of these portraits in the past, and is correctly skeptical of most of the hypothetical identifications. P. organizes the material into four main groups: 1) portraits with short hairstyles; 2) portraits with long hairstyles; 3) portraits with balding hairstyles; and 4) the remaining portraits that do not fit into these three basic styles. He also considers the cut and style of the hair and beard, physiognomy, and facial expression. P. deals first with the identified portraits, and then inserts the anonymous portraits into this interpretive framework. He clearly demonstrates that while there are similarities between the images of bearded males on Greek gravestones and the bearded males represented in portraiture, the portraits consistently employ a much richer and more varied visual vocabulary than has previously been recognized. That is, while most portraits probably take as their point of departure the exemplary image of the ‘good citizen’ that one sees on grave monuments, it was only that – a starting point. The aim of most portrait sculptors would have been to lift the portrait image off this normalizing background continuum of representation by introducing individualizing features, an unusual hairstyle, and/or a more expressive or animated expression. P.’s study clearly shows that while the figural sculpture of Greek grave reliefs is an important source of information for reconstructing the appearance of fourth-century portraiture, as are the named portrait copies, they alone cannot tell the whole story.

Because this study is focused mainly on a detailed analysis of the chronology and typology of the anonymous portraits, it is not easily accessible to non-portrait specialists. Since P. does not attempt to place the portraits within their broader historical context, and does not offer much in the way of synthetic interpretations, it undoubtedly will have little appeal to classicists. This is too bad, as the material collected and presented here deserves to be more widely known.
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Verf. widmet sich einem bekannten Thema, den Bildnissen der Ptolemäer – die Königinnen sind stillschweigend mit eingeschlossen –, aber unter einem bisher nur wenig systematisch behandelten, dabei ausgesprochen interessanten wie auch schwierigen Aspekt, nämlich den Darstellungen der Ptolemäer als ägyptische Könige. Insofern bezeichnet der Untertitel den eigentlichen Schwerpunkt der Untersuchung. Das knappe und nicht kleinteilig aufgeblasene Inhaltsverzeichnis läßt mit seinen Überschriften erkennen, daß der Verf. bereit ist, neue Ansatzpunkte und andere Sichtweisen zu gebrauchen; dem entspricht auch die durchaus lebhafte und nicht konventionelle Darstellung im Text. Der maßvoll mit Fußnoten versehene Text wird von einem umfangreichen Katalog der Bildwerke er-