pire would have necessitated 647 average-sized grain ships annually; that is, during the sailing season, 32 fully loaded grain ships would have sailed from Alexandria's harbors each week! Secondly, a passage (60) quoted from John the Almsgiver, via Leontius, on the urban poor (although this is by no means Haas's point) evokes our contemporary homeless and adds an unexpected immediacy to our experience of Late Antique Alexandria. Since Haas's book will surely become a major history of the city at this period, the lack of a separate bibliography (despite copious illuminating endnotes) reflects a poor editorial decision.

In conclusion, each of these volumes provides a rich source for the study of ancient Alexandria. Each is a welcome addition to the literature on this "most eminent of all Greek cities."

MARJORIE SUSAN VENIT

DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND 20742-1335
MV4@UMAIL.UMD.EDU

THE ICONS OF THEIR BODIES: SAINTS AND THEIR IMAGES IN BYZANTIUM, by *Henry Maguire*. Pp. xviii + 222, figs. 167. Princeton University Press, Princeton 1996. $59.50. ISBN 0-691-02581-9.

Henry Maguire's study of saints' images in Byzantine art is a timely contribution to the study of Byzantine saints, which, in terms of its scope and methodology, still lags behind the study of saints in the medieval West. The merits of Maguire's book, however, go even further. By focusing very closely on the formal qualities of Byzantine sacred portraiture, Maguire demonstrates how Byzantine artists modulated these qualities in order to emphasize the physical and spiritual characteristics of different saints. This study provides ample evidence that medieval artists were able to employ a varied register of different visual "languages" and contradicts the still widespread notion that medieval artists were caught up in a particular "style."

The profound effects of the Iconoclast Controversy on Byzantine art and society are a thread that runs through the entire book. The first two chapters examine in detail the manner in which saints were customarily depicted in Byzantine art after Iconoclasm. Central to these chapters is the Byzantine conception of portraiture, which, as Maguire shows with the aid of textual sources, differed substantially from post-medieval notions of portraiture. Even though illusionism did have a place in Byzantine sacred portraiture, lifelikeness, central to portraiture in western Europe from the Renaissance onward, was not what Byzantine viewers expected of portraits. In Byzantine art a premium was placed on the careful definition of the saint depicted in order to facilitate the viewer's recognition of the saint. Accuracy was fundamental to the careful definition of a saint, but not in the modern sense of optical illusionism. Accuracy in Byzantine sacred portraiture was understood to mean that an image of a saint was faithful to its prototype and, at the same time, carefully distinguished from portraits of other saints. Visions and dreams often enabled the Byzantines to check and confirm the veracity of sacred portraits.

A first step in Byzantine sacred portraiture was to represent the category to which a saint belonged. Military saints were shown in a different way from holy bishops, who in turn were carefully distinguished from Evangelists. Physical characteristics, such as facial features, clothing, hairstyles, and, in some instances, attributes—even though less commonly used in Byzantine than in western medieval art—served to reinforce distinctions between these categories of saints, and link saints belonging to the same category.

Different degrees of corporality and immateriality that Byzantine artists employed to distinguish between various classes of saints after Iconoclasm are explored in chapter 2. Military saints, for instance, were carefully modeled and depicted in a more three-dimensional fashion than holy monks, whose mode of portrayal emphasized insubstantiality and immobility. Whereas holy monks were shown to be barely of this world, military saints appeared physically active, strong, and solid. It is no coincidence, as Maguire points out, that many of the surviving relief icons show military saints vigorously jutting out toward the viewer, whereas there are only a few relief icons of monks. Similar formal distinctions, reflecting different degrees of corporality, also apply to angels and apostles, the latter being shown in a more substantial, solid manner. As Maguire argues, there is a rationale between these different degrees of corporality. Those saints who had borne witness to the human nature of Christ are often shown in a more corporeal fashion than those who, like holy monks and nuns, were otherworldly.

In post-Iconoclast art, saints are easily identifiable: they are meticulously differentiated from one another by formal means and by being accompanied by an inscription, a feature often absent in pre-Iconoclast depictions of saints. The differences between pre- and post-Iconoclast sacred portraiture are more fully elaborated upon in chapter 3. Whereas, for instance, a particular saint may be depicted several times in a pre-Iconoclast church, such repetition cannot be found in the post-Iconoclast period. Multiple depictions of, usually, anonymous saints also occur on pre-Iconoclast fabrics where, by their very multiplication, they take on an amuletic function. Such depictions were not revived after the Iconoclast controversy because ecclesiastical authorities exerted much tighter control over the cult of saints and closely regulated their portrayal in art. Saints were no longer associated with the magical practices of the domestic sphere, so pervasive during the Early Byzantine period. Post-Iconoclast image theory, according to which icons were intermediaries between the worshipper and the saint, made it unnecessary and indeed impossible to have multiple images. The carefully defined relationship between image and prototype is also at the root of the attempt to distinguish between individual saints in post-Iconoclast art. Recognition became an important part of the worshipper's engagement with saints' images, leading to a far greater standardization of their portrayal. The need to define, name, and control was central to post-Iconoclast sacred portraiture.

The final chapter of the book explores narrative depictions of saints from the post-Iconoclast period. Some of

these, as Maguire shows, are full of detail and incident, whereas others are schematic and abbreviated, and may even lack elements vital to the hagiography of the saint. A particularly illustrative example is the depiction of St. Nicholas giving a dowry to the poor man's daughters, an event central to the hagiography of the saint. In many visual renderings of this story the daughters are not shown. The image is stripped of much of its content, but by deemphasizing the specifics of the narrative, the scene becomes a generalized image likely to appeal to a wide range of viewers. Depictions of the Virgin also throw light on Byzantine conceptions of narrative imagery and highlight the different narrative registers Byzantine artists employed. In the illustrated sermons of James Kokkinobaphos, for instance, scenes of the early life of the Virgin are full of detail, whereas events from the early life of Christ are devoid of incident and almost repetitive in nature. The detailed scenes are the less important ones because they focus on human beings, whereas the scenes relating to Christ's infancy deal with the mystery of the divine, and thus carry a much higher status.

This is a lavishly illustrated book containing a profusion of examples to support the author's argument. Maguire's avowed aim in his exploration of Byzantine sacred portraiture is to address the role that society had in the design of icons. It is a book, as he states, that is "not about art in society but about society in art" (196). It remains debatable, however, to what extent the role of art in society and the effect of society on art are separable.

BARBARA ZEITLER

DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES
BOX 951417
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90095-1417
ZEITLER@HUMNET.UCLA.EDU

A CATALOGUE OF THE LAMPS IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM IV: LAMPS OF METAL AND STONE, AND LAMPSTANDS, by *Donald M. Bailey*. Pp. xii + 192, pls. 192, figs. 10. British Museum Press, London 1996. £70. ISBN 0-7141-2206-8.

LAMPES ANTIQUES DU DÉPARTEMENT DES MONNAIES, MÉDAILLES ET ANTIQUES 3. FONDS GÉNÉRAL: LAMPES CHRÉTIENNES, by *Catherine Trost* and *Marie-Christine Hellmann*. Pp. 163, pls. 40, fig. 1, maps 2. Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris 1996. 490 FF. ISBN 2-7177-1956-3.

One of the more encouraging developments in lamp studies in recent years has been the undertaking by a number of major European museums to publish, or in some cases republish, extensive collections of Greek and Roman lamps, some of which, one suspects, have been gathering dust in museum storerooms for more than a century. The scale of such projects should not be underestimated. The work involved may take many years and the resulting publications are likely to run to several volumes. Such is the case here. Each of these lamp catalogues forms a new addition to an established multivolume series that began to appear more than a decade ago. In each case the new volume succeeds well in maintaining the high standards set by the previous volumes in the series.

Bailey's volume forms the fourth and final installment of his monumental catalogue of lamps in the British Museum. The study of metal lamps, as Bailey himself has pointed out (*JRA* 4 [1991] 51–62), has until recently been a relatively neglected field of lamp study, and the current volume goes a long way toward providing a solid anchor for future studies. For those more familiar with the study of pottery lamps, this new volume serves as an impressive reminder of the great variety of alternative lighting apparatus that existed in the Graeco-Roman world. Collected together here is a great assortment of metal objects: lamps, lampstands, lanterns, lamp glass holders, lamp lids, candlesticks, and other such items, all presented and discussed with unerring precision and with superb bibliographic documentation. The high quality of the text is matched by that of the illustrations, mostly drawings, the clarity of which does much to enhance the volume. There is, wisely, no attempt to establish a typology of the metal objects discussed. As the author points out, the extraordinary variety of shapes and forms renders such a task quite impossible.

The material is arranged broadly according to function and, as far as possible, according to date. However, the author repeatedly emphasizes the difficulty of assigning accurate dates to objects that, for the most part, lack archaeological contexts and, even where these are known, are of very uncertain longevity. Thus, while many of the objects are known to be from the cities destroyed by Vesuvius, the date of their actual manufacture can often only be guessed. In some cases findspots are given—as, for example, the bronze lantern Q3943, said to be from one of the excavated villas at Boscoreale. By way of comparison, the author notes the discovery of two similar lanterns in the press-room of another Boscoreale villa. This reminds us that the use of these sophisticated, and no doubt expensive, lighting devices was not restricted to the luxury apartments of rich *oppidani*. Other objects, notably the series of fine Late Antique "polycandela" or metal lamp-glass holders, are identified as probable church furnishings. Such items appear repeatedly in the lists of papal donations to the Early Christian basilicas of Rome (see, e.g., R. Davis, *The Book of Pontiffs (Liber Pontificalis)* [Liverpool 1989] 39, §48: *fara canthara qui pendent ante altare*). Bailey catalogues several ornate examples, including one in silver with a control mark dating to the reign of Justin II. It would perhaps have been helpful to add an illustration of the kind of lamp glasses that these elaborate devices were designed to hold.

One of the more difficult questions that arises when discussing metal lamps is that of the relationship between these metal objects and their ceramic counterparts. This question is touched upon several times here but, perhaps not surprisingly, no simple answer emerges. Bailey argues, for instance, that clay *Firmalampen* were derived from bronze models (37), but elsewhere he suggests that the copying process went the other way: that the metal versions of a Broneer type XXI lamp (45) and of North African Hayes