

education from the priests, who have acted for ages as their protectors from annihilation and barbarism, to the Government schools; in Turkey, as we have seen, they provide for the better education of the clergy, and, if this can be effected, the priesthood will continue as the natural instructors of their flocks' (p. 182).

Did the Bents actually enjoy themselves on their travels? If they did, they certainly did not make a point of it in their writings. With the exception of their accounts on Patmos (p. 74–86; 152–156) and especially Astypalaia (p. 94–104; 160–163), which they both seem to be very fond of, the rest of their journey is full of complaints; the food, lodging, people, etc. Travelling within the islands on mule or donkey-back, especially in Karpathos, was very hard on Mabel. And navigating the unpredictable waters of the Aegean in what must have been not so comfortable sailing ships, was quite trying. The very fact that they embarked on such a journey is of itself quite admirable! The modern reader of Theodore's and Mabel's travels in the Dodecanese is surely to find something of interest to him or her. One needs to acknowledge that many of the personal biases and prejudices reflected through the Bents' writings are part of a broader socio-historical context; their feelings certainly would have not been considered unusual at that time. Their sentiments as reflected in this collection of writings surely rested well with their intended audience, and thus their candid accounts provide quite an informative, as well as entertaining, vestige of the 19th-century British imperial mindset and its approaches to the antiquities and local people they encountered.

LITA TZORTZOPOULOU-GREGORY
THE AUSTRALIAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE AT
ATHENS
lita.gregory@sydney.edu.au.

Multiperiod

Pablo Aparicio Resco. *Entre Aidós Y Peitho. La iconografía del gesto del velo en la Antigua Grecia*. pp. 179, illus. 2015. Madrid: JAS Arquelogía Editorial. ISBN 978-8-494-21104-1 €15.

The subject of Pablo Resco's neat and useful study is the artistic development and cultural meaning of the 'veil-gesture' in Greek art. The 'veil-gesture', as I named it back in 2003 in my monograph *Aphrodite's Tortoise: the veiled woman of ancient Greece* (Swansea: Classical Press of Wales), is one of the most frequently encountered motifs in Greek art. In fact, there are so many examples that a close study of the motif was well beyond the limits of my work at that time. Resco, drawing closely on *Aphrodite's Tortoise*, has taken the opportunity to expand the investigation of the repertoire of the motif.

To give a brief overview of my original findings: the veil-gesture is usually (but not exclusively) performed by women. The motif is first properly encountered in the early seventh century BCE; and from there on in it becomes a standard part of the artistic repertoire well into the Roman era. Moreover, the motif can be found throughout the Greek world from Sparta to Asia Minor, and from the Aegean islands to North Africa; in fact, Spartan examples are some of the earliest available which suggests that not only was the veil a facet of archaic Lakonian society, but also that the artistic motif may have had its origins in Spartan (or at least Peloponnesian) tradition. The motif always incorporates the gesture whereby a woman raises part of her veil with one arm which she apparently extends in front of her so that the veil forms a large and distinctive flap of cloth which frames her face, although sometimes the gesture is reduced to a mere delicate touching of the veil, particularly in later classical examples. It is clear that painters and sculptors relished the opportunity that the gesture gave them to experiment with the depiction of the hands and fingers and the range of effects that could be created by the veil falling in a variety of folds around the face, head, and shoulders. Furthermore, there are frequent variations on a theme and the veil-gesture is found in many images where the veil is not worn on the head, but instead it can be performed with another article of clothing such as the sleeve of a *chitōn*, a section of the *kolpos* of a *chitōn* or *peplos*, the back or front folds of a *himation* or *pharos* when worn off the head or else it might be performed with an indistinct and ambiguous item of dress—perhaps a veil, a sleeve, an overhang

REVIEWS

or something else entirely. The ambiguity of the gesture is its most striking and interesting feature, so that the woman adopting the pose could be seen as *either* covering her face, *or* preparing to uncover it. The gesture is a frozen moment and the viewers of a vase painting or a sculpture are allowed to decide for themselves whether the gesture is about covering or divesting.

None of this is challenged by Resco who, instead, opts to follow and support my original findings, expanding, however, on the evidence I was originally constrained from using. Many of the 92 figures which usefully pepper the text are taken from the line-drawings I had prepared for *Aphrodite's Tortoise* (with my permission, I should add). Resco carefully traces the development of the veil-gesture in Greek art, referencing my previous study frequently and quoting passages (in Spanish translation). He agrees with my reading of the *anakalypteria* as a series of wedding unveilings and in a brief chapter on the veil in society he employs, as I did, anthropological models in trying to understand the meaning of the veil in Greek life. He follows too my ideas on the inherent eroticism of the veil and emphasizes, as I formerly did, the ambiguity of the veil in concealing and revealing the body.

How much, then, is fresh about this work? Enough, I am happy to confirm, to make this short study a useful addition to my longer work. Resco's aforementioned chapter on the anthropological material contains much useful discussion and cites important work published since 2003, while his chapter on the use of the veil-gesture in the iconography of death is very good and fills a gap in our knowledge. Appropriately he links the death-imagery to marriage scenes where, of course, the veil-gesture takes centre stage. A very useful epilogue explores the subsequent use of the veil-gesture in Etruscan and Roman art (although further work is needed here; we cannot assume that the gesture was understood in the same way as in Greece) and Resco briefly explores the motif in Renaissance and Baroque art (this could form a major study in itself).

Resco's monograph is a short, well-written, clear and focused overview of a long-standing artistic motif which clearly had important cultural resonances. It is self-consciously deferential to *Aphrodite's Tortoise* (perhaps too much to be called 'original'), but when used alongside my 2003 work it will provide a useful companion to the earlier work and will present new evidence for the reader's consideration.

LLOYD LLEWELLYN-JONES
CARDIFF UNIVERSITY
Llewellyn-JonesL@cardiff.ac.uk

Ancient textiles in their economic context

Kerstin Droß-Krüpe (ed.). *Textile trade and distribution in antiquity/Textilhandel und -distribution in der Antike* (Philippika 73). pp. xii + 228, 61 b/w figures. 2014. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. ISBN 978-3-447-10220-9 hardback €48.00.

New scientific techniques, increasingly precise excavation strategies, and an upsurge in interest in the ancient economy—and in particular in identifying new datasets that might contribute to our understanding of it—mean that ancient textiles are finally receiving the attention they deserve. While research on ancient dress and textile production has a long history, it has tended to be something of a lonely one. Only in the past ten years have economic historians begun to appreciate the potential of this area, and only over the same period have textile specialists begun to explore how their work can inform debates in economic history. Demand for textiles in antiquity must have been enormous. As Jongman notes, 'in most pre-industrial economies, the production and consumption of clothing is the most important non-agrarian economic activity after building.'¹ However, the evidence for textile production is problematic. Textiles perish over time and are only preserved in particular conditions—the dry soil of Egypt and the Levant or the water-logged ground of more northerly climes. Literary evidence is also skewed towards discussions of domestic spinning and weaving, mainly undertaken by women. The epigraphic record is varied and patchy, and tends to provide glimpses of information about specific individuals or groups involved in textile manufacture or trade but without much context. The different stages of work involved in textile production also often necessitated multiple groups of people doing very different things: sourcing different types of raw materials (from plants and animals), spinning, weaving, tanning, fulling, trading, selling. Each of these tasks leaves behind different traces which have often been examined by researchers in entirely separate disciplines, a point made by Mary Harlow and Marie-Louise Nosch, the editors of another recent volume on ancient dress and textile production.²

This volume, like Harlow and Nosch's, seeks to overcome this fragmentation of the scholarship on textile production and trade by pulling together scholars from various backgrounds: archaeologists, historians, scientists, and textile researchers. Its focus is also multi-period: there are five papers on evidence

¹ Jongman 2007: 609.

² Harlow and Nosch 2014. See review, this Volume.