pose that in the late period, that is from the third century onward, amphoras continued to be produced in Baetica and exported as empty vessels to be used in the fish-sauce industries of Lusitania. This is an interesting suggestion, but its acceptance would depend on a better understanding of Baetica and the dynamics of exchange in the Late Empire.

The general conclusions of the volume touch upon three main issues. The first refers to the typology of so-called Lusitanian amphoras, as the authors are keen to emphasize that they are not necessarily copies of amphoras produced elsewhere, notably in Baetica. The authors warn against typological classification grounded solely on criteria relating to shape, as they can be misleading, and reject the use of the adjective "Lusitanian" to describe these amphoras (194). The common use of provincial names as adjectives applied to these vessels should not be discarded, however, as it is a useful way of indicating areas of production, although the possible proviso could be made that such names add a specific reference to the precise region such as, in this case, the Sado valley.

The second issue is also a terminological one, as the authors do not accept the use of "kiln" as a reference to the place of production, preferring to call it *atelier* (workshop) in its general meaning of "producing place" (195). Such a strategy may be appropriate to amphora-producing areas that lack stamps, but it should not be used when dealing with those areas where epigraphic evidence is available. When there are stamps, it is possible to study the exchange between consuming and producing areas, from specific kilns to specific consumer sites, producing social, economic, and cultural data with which to interpret Roman society as a whole. José Remesal's *La annona militaris y la exportación de aceite bético a Germania* (Madrid 1986) led to the adoption of this approach, and such studies are now used as primary sources for discussing the character of Roman society and economy. The third issue refers to the development of the area of the Sado valley.

In summary, this book provides useful and accessible data on the settlement of the Sado valley, thus serving an invaluable purpose since the publication of archaeological evidence is an important task in itself. The reader might perhaps have gained from a more anthropological stress on the overall context of fish-sauce production, as there are several issues relating to social habits (fishing, workshop activities, consumption of sauces, and so on) that would also interest a general reader. As it is, this book, as with most archaeological reports, is probably too descriptive to be read by nonspecialists. But the purpose of the book was first and foremost the publication of the evidence and it is successful in this, furnishing data to be used by scholars interested in Roman economy and society.

PEDRO PAULO A. FUNARI

DEPARTAMENTO DE HISTÓRIA
INSTITUTO DE FILOSOFIA E CIÊNCIAS HUMANAS
UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL DE CAMPINAS
C. POSTAL 6110, CAMPINAS 13081-970, SP
SÃO PAULO, BRAZIL
PEDROFUNARI@STI.COM.BR

ALEXANDRIA AND ALEXANDRIANISM: PAPERS DELIVERED AT A SYMPOSIUM ORGANIZED BY THE J. PAUL GETTY MUSEUM AND BY THE GETTY CENTER FOR THE HISTORY OF ART AND THE HUMANITIES AND HELD AT THE MUSEUM, APRIL 22–25, 1993, edited by *Kenneth Hamma*. Pp. x + 302, figs. 191, fold-out map 1. J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu 1996. $50. ISBN 0-89236-292-8.

ALEXANDRIA IN LATE ANTIQUITY: TOPOGRAPHY AND SOCIAL CONFLICT, by *Christopher Haas*. Pp. xviii + 494, figs. 16, maps 3, plans 2. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore 1997. $45. ISBN 0-8018-5377-X.

After suffering decades of scholarly indifference, particularly in the United States, Alexandria "ad Aegyptum" is again firing the imagination of scholars and public alike. The multiculturalism of late first-millennium B.C./early first-millennium A.D. Egypt finds resonance within the current political climate; French undersea excavations in Alexandria itself have captured international attention; and recent exhibitions spotlighting Graeco-Roman Egypt (and another scheduled for the Petit Palais devoted specifically to Alexandria) have reawakened interest in the ancient city. The symposium at the J. Paul Getty Museum was instrumental in bringing Alexandria "near Egypt" to the United States, and the two volumes reviewed here should do much to nurture this revival of interest.

Peter Green's exhilarating essay that introduces *Alexandria and Alexandrianism*, gloriously capturing the romantic nostalgia the polyvalent site has historically evoked, is sure to make Alexandria-enthusiasts of all who read it. It also encapsulates the peculiar configuration of the symposium. Since the aims of the conference form the framework for the volume, it seems relevant to address this focus here, and it is the myth and the image of Alexandria—"the modern conception and re-creations of [the] city, which is as legendary as its founder" (ix)—that is one of the emphases of its organizers. Perhaps for this reason, internationally respected scholars currently elucidating the *reality* of Alexandria are conspicuous by their absence: those of the Polish Archaeological Mission (who have been excavating in the city center since the early 1960s) are greatly underrepresented; those of the French Centre d'études alexandrines (which was formally established in 1990, but whose personnel formed a strong earlier presence and made significant additions to the topographical plan of the city) are completely ignored; Italian scholars (heirs to the giants of Alexandrian archaeology, Botti, Breccia, and Adriani, and to their archives) are overlooked; and the few Egyptians actively excavating and interpreting Alexandrian materials are also absent. In short, the physical reality of Alexandria gained from recent excavation and publication of site-specific materials is largely ignored.

The 19 essays, which represent all but four read at the symposium, consider the art and life of the city from Ptolemaic until modern times, but decidedly privilege the Hel-

lenistic period. The participants were asked to address general themes, and the inevitable repetition permits the reader to gain a comfortable familiarity with the subject, while the format allows for a good overview of the scholarly issues that Alexandria has historically raised. In the latter case, the contribution by Andrew Stewart assessing the history of scholarship on Alexandrian art is most welcome. Stewart reminds us that Theodor Schreiber constructed the Alexandrian style that has become our—albeit discredited—definition, and suggests new avenues of inquiry that might provide more productive results. This essay might well have introduced the section on Alexandrian art in which Robert Bianchi, the late Bernard Bothmer, W.A. Daszewski, Arielle Kozloff, Michael Pfrommer, and R.R.R. Smith discuss the relation between Egyptian and Greek style in Ptolemaic art (another focus of the symposium) and permit us to enjoy some of the (good-natured) "feisty nationalism" infusing current scholarship identified by Stewart. Bianchi argues for a "conscious compartmentalization" between classical and Egyptian styles; conversely, Smith sees the Egyptian clergy embracing both a Hellenistic and a pharaonic idiom in representations of the Ptolemaic ruler as a "visual counterpart of [their] accommodation with the Macedonian rulers" (210); Bothmer points to distinctive elements in specific Egyptian portraits that originate in the classical world, while emphasizing elements once thought to be so derived that are now dismissed; Kozloff and Pfrommer both identify Achaemenid memories in Ptolemaic art, but Pfrommer also isolates Macedonian influences and Kozloff faint Egyptianizing ones. Daszewski notes that mosaics (the technique imported from Greece), while primarily retaining their Greek style, nevertheless admit Egyptian stylistic elements, and he argues that this mixed style influences Ptolemaic sculpted portraits. Klaus Parlasca, discussing a Late Roman painted sarcophagus at the Getty, further extends the conceptual interrelationships: he interprets the young symposiast named Ammon (after the Egyptian god), who reclines in an image that recalls classical Totenmahl reliefs, as a Christian.

Henri Riad provides a general view of life in Hellenistic Alexandria. Diana Delia treats its ethnic composition in Early Ptolemaic times, concluding that despite the intelligentsia who migrated mostly from Greek centers, a large part of the population of Alexandria were mercenaries comprising foreigners from much of the Mediterranean world (she might have credited Enklaar not only with establishing a chronology of Hadra hydrias, but with many of the same conclusions that she reaches). Heinrich von Staden argues that medicine (especially dissection), engineering, and philosophy interact in Alexandria, creating points of intersection in the rich intellectual life of the city. Religion, which provides one of the great intersections of Egyptian and Greek thought in Alexandria, is considered by Lilly Kahil.

Günter Grimm and Judith McKenzie both address the topography of Hellenistic Alexandria, each independently resuscitating the reputation of Mahmoud Bey, the engineer (el Falaki) who drew a plan of the ancient city in the mid-19th century. Grimm, acknowledging the grid surveyed by Mahmoud Bey, nevertheless dramatically reduces el Falaki's eastward extension of the city for the Early Hellenistic period by adducing red-figure vases, dated to the fourth century B.C., that locate the earliest eastern city wall. McKenzie continues her assessment of the architectural innovations assignable to Alexandria and their importance for both the Baroque style and Second Style Roman wall painting (some of which were earlier noted by Margaret Lyttleton and Achille Adriani). With their careful evaluation, McKenzie and other architectural historians form the vanguard of scholars restoring to Hellenistic Alexandria some of its glory as the adventurous and influential center imagined by Schreiber. John Onians's contribution to the architectural achievements of Alexandria, while novel, is marred by indigestible theoretical connections and incorrect contentions. In his attempt to show that Roman Alexandria directly adopted Egyptian architectural forms, he identifies, for example, the Anfushy tombs as those of local Egyptians and ignores the segmental pediment on a terracotta figurine from a Ptolemaic period tomb noted over 20 years ago by Lyttleton. His thesis does not prove unpalatable from any "pride [of our] being heirs to a distinctly Greek tradition" (127), but rather because he dismisses the Greek filter operating between the Egyptian and Roman worlds.

Glen Bowersock, Abraham Udovitch, and Mohammed Ghoneim are responsible for Late Antique through modern Alexandria, a daunting charge. Bowersock elegantly interprets Alexandria's wavering political importance and rich social history before the Muslim conquest, using Cavafy's imagery as his leitmotif and providing a perfect complement to Green's introductory essay. Udovitch explores the reasons for Alexandria's diminished status after the conquest, tracing the city's peripheral status to the "ambivalence and wariness with regard to the sea . . . [that] characterized pre-Ottoman Muslim polities of the Mediterranean basin" (275), but concludes that Alexandria *ad* Aegyptum under Muslim rule was more closely tied to Egypt than ever before. In the final essay, Ghoneim seeks to wrest the image of modern Alexandria from the one engendered in the west by Cavafy's nostalgically constructed paradigmatic past and Durrell's philhellenic bias and to return Cavafy's πανελλήνια κορυφή to Egyptians.

In the second book under review, Christopher Haas treats one of the periods underplayed in the Getty symposium, providing a readable, balanced vision of the social history of Alexandria in the Late Antique period. His focus is the interplay between the physical organization of the city, its social and political structures, and the competition among its factions for cultural hegemony. After a brief overview of the topography and its relationship to the city's social life, he considers the three communities—Jews, Pagans, and Christians—that comprise the population of Late Antique Alexandria. On the one hand, Haas's stated reliance on urban topography as a method to elucidate the interaction between these communities appears more cogent in some circumstances than in others; on the other, the book is decidedly much richer than its subtitle implies. Certainly, the significance Haas affords topography effects a tangible sense of place, but the other sources he adduces add considerable weight to his discussion. Two examples: marshaling many sources, he computes (42) that the amount of grain exported from Alexandria during the Late Em-

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