sometimes mechanical. Was the Three Age system inevitable? To what resources (experiences, metaphors) did the antiquaries resort in imagining the past, and how did those resources change from one century to the next? Such questions do not come into sharp focus. But it may be ungrateful to complain about so rich a book, a *Wunderkammer* of stories, images, little known facts, and keen observations.

MICHAEL FOTIADIS

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48109-1003
MFOTIADI@UMICH.EDU

THE CULTURAL LIFE OF IMAGES: VISUAL REPRESENTATION IN ARCHAEOLOGY, edited by *Brian Leigh Molyneaux*. Pp. xvii + 274, figs. 99, table 1. Routledge, London and New York 1997. $69.95. ISBN 0-415-10675-3.

Despite the portentous title suggesting a synthetic interdisciplinary exploration, the contents of this volume are more adequately indicated by the subtitle. Twelve authors deal with aspects of the use of images of the past in the disciplinary practices, and to some extent the history, of archaeology. Most of them concentrate on this topic as such, although three chapters deal with the interpretation of images actually produced in the past—by pharaonic Egyptian, classical Greek, and Plains Indian artists—as an indirect way of introducing the theme of the archaeological use, and abuse, of images. Although several essays are quite slight, others take up complex and weighty theoretical problems, with varying success.

It is not always clear to whom this volume is addressed or who will find it useful. The chief target of the anthology's general polemic would appear to be a working archaeologist who unhesitatingly accepts pictures of the past—for example, excavation photographs, reconstructions of artifacts or sites, or museum displays—as unmediated, neutral representations of the depicted ancient reality; he or she allegedly treats the depiction as wholly "transparent" to its intended object. Although a few references are made to archaeologists who might have done this, especially several generations ago, it is unclear how many today would really do so. And if they do, I doubt that they would be convinced by the arguments in this volume, which typically assume relativist and culturalist premises and rarely—at a theoretical level—take up the reasons for one's rationally assuming the nonarbitrary connectedness of an image with its object, at least sometimes or in some relevant respects. Among working archaeologists, most practitioners probably know themselves fairly self-consciously to be facing the situations well described by Simon James (ch. 2) in his straightforward reflections on reconstruction drawings or by Michael Shanks (ch. 5) in his more labored consideration of archaeology and photography: they know an image of the past—like any depiction—to be a mixture of resemblances and representations, responding as much to contemporary disciplinary, ideological, and even financial pressures as to archaeological knowledge of the past. Still, it would be salutary for any working archaeologist to read through the volume as a whole, for it does serve to suggest the range of problems that one must keep in mind in "representing the past" visually and gives some feel for the techniques and discussions that are likely to occupy the near-term future of archaeology, especially as computer-generated image-making begins to influence excavation and publication.

Most other readers—museum curators, anthropologists, art historians, philosophers—have long assumed the culturally constructed and "noninnocent" nature of depiction. Many of them will probably find the "theoretical" arguments in these essays to be largely familiar; they will already have reviewed the material presented in Alan Costall's brief survey (ch. 3) of theories of depiction, though they might or might not share his preference for a modified resemblance theory of pictorial communication—and probably will be most interested in the more particular and substantive discussions of specific archaeological illustrations or images of the past, as in Stephanie Moser and Clive Gamble's fine essay (ch. 9) on different styles, iconographies, or genres of representing human antiquity (offering an intriguing juxtaposition of the "Romantic," "archaeological," and "comic" traditions) or Timothy Champion's useful charting (ch. 10) of the representation of ancient Gauls in the 19th century. These studies fit well into the growing interdisciplinary consideration of visual representations of the past, which has included major international exhibitions and full-length monographs on the representation of the past, or of chronological and geographic "otherness" generally, in the contexts of modern rationalism, nationalism, imperialism, and racism.

In his contribution, Brian Molyneaux (ch. 6) examines expressive variation in 18th-Dynasty tomb painting in Egypt; his overall point seems to be that an archaeological perspective on image making would examine their "situational" dimension—the way in which highly traditional styles and motifs were specifically "shaped" in each context of use, including what might be the extremely local needs and interests of the artist or patron himself or herself. Although this is indeed an archaeological question—whether it is addressed by archaeologists or by art historians and others—Molyneaux's example does not wholly convince; variation in the height of depicted figures in Theban tomb painting might reflect changes in the social and ideological relations between the tomb's patron and the reigning pharaoh, as Molyneaux suggests, but the material causality could equally be the other way around (for images, as other essays take pains to point out, are not merely passive reflections of social conditions) and other scenarios equally account for the reported measurements. In general, Molyneaux's faith that metric study of images will reveal relative visibilities of depiction and hence the patterns of significance or meaning in narrative and metaphorical visual communications seems overly optimistic.

Two chapters (7 and 8) by Brian A. Sparkes and Richard A. Fox, Jr., are nicely paired. Sparkes considers Greek images of non-Greeks; the topic is extremely familiar to

classical archaeologists, and Sparkes's conclusion (the images depict foreigners according to Greek norms and prejudices) is not novel, but it is useful to have some of the relevant material surveyed in one frame. Fox offers a provocative study of Sioux and Cheyenne depictions of General George Custer's "last stand" on the Little Big Horn River, triangulating the mythologizing images of the event produced by U.S. artists, ledger-book and other Plains Indian drawings of the conflict, and archaeological investigations of the battlefield sites. Fox does not suppose that the "truth" of the conflict can be retrieved from any one of the traditions of its representation; moreover, simply combining the traditions is impossible for they conflict on crucial points. Nonetheless, Fox suggests convincingly that the U.S. vision of the battle can be shown to be considerably further away from a reasonable reconstruction of the historical event derived from the Plains Indian and archaeological representations. In the general context of the volume, Fox's chapter is a powerful reminder that the partial arbitrariness and the culturally constructed and ideologically loaded nature of images is not inherently incompatible with their status as historical documents. Indeed, it is not altogether obvious why most of the authors' insistence that there is "no innocent eye" in representing the past cannot be handled by Fox's precise application of the standard professional historian's methods of source criticism, cross-checking of evidence, and critical evaluation of documents—as several authors seem to be suggesting.

The most "theoretical" essay in the volume—the one that argues for the greatest and gravest consequences from the discovery of nontransparency in depiction—is Michael Shanks's essay (ch. 5) on archaeology and photography, but perhaps because of its ambitiousness it is disappointing in its sketchiness. Shanks approaches topics that would seem to be at the heart of the problem of images of the past (especially those, like photographs, that claim some nonarbitrary connection to the object), tangentially touching on some issues, for example, the role of voyeurism and of archaeological melancholy or even necrophilia, that remain taboo within polite disciplinary discussions; above all, and properly, he highlights discourses of temporality in archaeology. He does not quite focus on the structural paradox of "archaeological photography"—the most instantaneous, contemporary, and nonarbitrary image is used to represent what might be the most long-term, long-dead, and entirely reconstructed reality—in the context of the wider theories of history and representation he swiftly surveys; unfortunately, he too often bogs down in banal points about photographic conventionality. One senses in this and other essays in the volume that theoretical, or what Shanks calls critical or interpretive, archaeology is laboring to import perspectives derived from other fields, such as rhetoric or art history, at the same time somewhat oversimplifying them, rather than focusing on the philosophical status of the discipline's claims—both epistemological and ontological—about its own most widely circulated or conventionally intelligible representations, whether verbal or visual. Still, as a manifesto for a broader intellectual purview and for what he calls a more humanistic and dialectical use of images in archaeology, Shanks's essay sets a worthwhile conceptual agenda for what otherwise seems to be a disparate, and somewhat desultory, congeries of substantive, historiographic, technical, and self-critical enterprises.

WHITNEY DAVIS

DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS 60208

NAKED TRUTHS: WOMEN, SEXUALITY, AND GENDER IN CLASSICAL ART AND ARCHAEOLOGY, edited by *Ann Olga Koloski-Ostrow* and *Claire L. Lyons*. Pp. xv + 315, figs. 60, tables 2. Routledge, New York 1997. $74.95. ISBN 0-415-15995-4.

Women and gender as focal points of research have only recently been admitted into the ranks of classical art and archaeology. While there is a good deal of discussion on the reticence of these disciplines to welcome such newcomers, the number of books devoted exclusively to actual reinterpretations of classical material culture from a gendered perspective is limited. *Naked Truths: Women, Sexuality, and Gender in Classical Art and Archaeology* represents one of the few recent books on the topic. Exploring ways "gendered bodies and sexual differences are communicated visually and symbolically in the art and artifacts" of the Graeco-Roman world, this volume is the result of two panels presented at consecutive annual meetings of the American Philological Association (1993) and the Archaeological Institute of America (1994). Eleven papers from the original panels were selected for this anthology, bracketed by a thoughtful introduction by the editors and an epilogue by Natalie Kampen, who focuses on the concepts of desire and desirability in ancient art. At the heart of these papers are explorations into issues rarely addressed by classical archaeologists and art historians. As delineated by Lyons and Koloski-Ostrow, the contributors investigate the sexuality of images in ancient art; the kinds of gendered social meanings embedded in the iconographical attributes of dress and bodily adornment; and the roles that the viewer plays in constructions of gender. Although some of the authors adopt an explicitly feminist stance, most of the essays do not engage in recent feminist debates. No discussion, for example, is given to scholars such as Haraway, Kristeva, or Butler—seminal individuals in feminist theory. Indeed, my major criticism of this otherwise fine book is its lack of informed or sophisticated theoretical frameworks. While *Naked Truths* takes an important step forward by providing us with gender-conscious papers on the art and archaeology of the Graeco-Roman world, it does not successfully alloy data and theory.

The initial essay by Shelby Brown provides a mise-en-scène for the volume. She paints with a broad brush, outlining the differences between feminism and gender studies, the female nude as a male aesthetic ideal, and the recent history of feminist intersections with ancient art history and classical archaeology.

John Robb supplies the first case study, an insightful examination of the symbolic expressions of male and female identity in Italic prehistory (Neolithic through Iron Age). On the basis of skeletal remains, other mortuary data,