The Hellenistic period saw an increasingly wide variety of locations for sculpture, such as column drums and shafts, capitals, pedestals, and ceiling coffers, and these are treated effectively. The chapter on "Motifs" seems all too brief, but more discussion of individual monuments is provided with those discussed in part II. Nonnarrative motifs used as pattern more than statement—such as bull's heads and bucrania, rosettes, tripods, phialai, and garlands—are considered first. Following this are griffins, heads and masks, erotes, akanthos figures and caryatids, shields, and *imagines clipeatae*. The use of narrative themes is then analyzed, first human figures, then the traditional mythological themes of Gigantomachy (Pergamon, Ilion, Lagina), Amazonomachy (Ephesos, Magnesia, Alabanda), Centauromachy (Belevi, Limyra, Samothrace), and other battles. The Telephos frieze receives its due, and Webb's agreement with lowering the date of the Pergamon Altar to ca. 165 B.C. (see part II) supports the view that this frieze is one of the earliest extant examples of continuous narrative in sculpture.

Part II, "The Sites," contains the meat of the book, but is somewhat harder to assess, given the fine line taken by the catalogue between exhaustiveness and conciseness. In addition to the basic background and descriptive information about the sculptures from each site, Webb discusses problems in dating and identifying the monuments. For example, the Mausoleum at Belevi in Ionia, patterned after that at Halicarnassos, is attributed to Lysimachos (died 281 B.C.), despite Pausanias's description of the death and burial of Lysimachos near the Chersonese. Webb concludes that the Belevi Mausoleum was planned for that successor of Alexander, but left unfinished upon his sudden death, and her analysis of the ceiling coffer sculptures places them stylistically in the early third century B.C.

Webb includes many little-known monuments, such as that of Caius Memmius, a grandson of Sulla, in Ephesos, with its caryatids and attic reliefs, along with much-discussed monuments such as the Altar of Athena at Priene, with its now-lost sculptures of Apollo and the Muses. A particular strength of the work is Webb's competent overall discussion of each monument, covering architectural elements and pottery deposits as well as the sculptural finds. Additional references might reinforce and expand the descriptions. For example, in the discussion of the Temple of Apollo Smintheus at Chryse, dated to the mid-second century B.C., there is no mention of the fact that the temple held a famous statue of Apollo by Skopas. The reference given is only to Strabo 13.604 (cited by A.F. Stewart, *Skopas of Paros* [Park Ridge 1977] 128); surely this conflict in dating (Skopas being a mid-fourth-century sculptor, or even a first-century one) deserves some explanation?

There is little that could be improved here, but one can always make a few suggestions for ease of use. First, there is no overall list of the monuments discussed, and not only is there a large selection, but many are little known. They deserve more notice. The monuments can be ascertained, however, from the very useful lists by building types in tables 1–6. Second, notes are placed at the end of each site rather than at the end of each monument, where one would most naturally expect them, given that the bibliographies are placed with each monument. Finally, the bibliographies could be arranged chronologically for a more useful sequence of excavation and publication events, rather than alphabetically.

Altogether, this volume is a most useful and informative work, and we eagerly await the promised companion volume on architectural sculptures from the Greek mainland.

LINDA JONES ROCCOS

THE COLLEGE OF STATEN ISLAND
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
2800 VICTORY BOULEVARD
STATEN ISLAND, NEW YORK 10314
ROCCOS@POSTBOX.CSI.CUNY.EDU

THE ALEXANDER MOSAIC: STORIES OF VICTORY AND DEFEAT, by *Ada Cohen*. (Cambridge Studies in Classical Art and Iconography.) Pp. xiv + 279, color pls. 8, figs. 81. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1997. $60. ISBN 0-521-56339-9.

Cohen's monograph, originally a Harvard University dissertation, is less concerned with the classic problems of the Alexander Mosaic's authorship, identification, date, and so on, than with its "richness, its openness to discussion and interpretation, the multiple contexts that it evokes" (1). In true *fin-de-siècle* fashion, the author guides us discursively and undogmatically through a maze of contexts, effectively mobilizing contemporary critical theory and visual comparanda ranging from Altdorfer to the Iwo Jima Memorial.

In chapter 1, Cohen begins with a description (which omits several figures, and could have benefited from numbering them all), then turns to methodology, deftly reviewing the main problems and the central issue of the relationship between image and history-as-text. Chapters 2 and 3 then establish the mosaic's general accuracy as a copy and its model's inaugurative status within the genre.

Chapters 4–6 are the heart of the book, investigating the work's "first level of existence" as a Graeco-Macedonian painting. Chapter 4 addresses content, narrative structure, general historicity, and author. Chapter 5 examines narrative technique, relating it to tragedy and Hellenistic "tragic history," and chapter 6 takes up Alpers's classic opposition between description and narration, focusing upon such showstoppers as the shield-mirror and costumes, postures, gestures, and facial expressions.

In chapter 7, Cohen shifts to "the second level of existence"—the Roman. She examines the Casa del Fauno and its owners, then the plunder of Greek works and the beginnings of copying, and finally the mosaic's possible meaning(s) to the Roman viewer. A brief epilogue concludes the book.

This is a rich, subtle, well-researched, fair, and often

convincing study whose wide implications cannot be adequately addressed here. Instead, I will focus on some of the author's more controversial views regarding the original's date, subject, background, narrativity, and ideology.

In a rare display of dogmatism, Cohen "insists" on a date after Gaugamela, for she thinks it "inherently improbable that works of art referring to Alexander's expedition would be commissioned while the expedition was at its height" (84). Yet two sentences later she admits that Lysippos's Granikos monument was indeed commissioned then, directly after the battle. So why not this one?

Cohen opts for a palimpsest of Alexander battles, arguing that by ca. 320 B.C., when she dates the original, events would have become clouded and conflated. Yet even if the picture were painted this late, her comparanda—the Iwo Jima Memorial and Manet's "Execution of Emperor Maximilian"—actually undercut her case. For both *do* portray a single, unique, historical event; though the Iwo Jima flag-raising was soon repeated, this was a Hollywood-style restaging in situ, not a new flag-raising during a different battle on another island. In Greece the genre of monumental battle-painting was long established (131), and there is no evidence either that any of these huge works depicted anything other than specific, unique events (e.g., Marathon and Mantineia), or that, confronted with yet another example, the Greek viewer would not *expect* such specificity. How the artist edited his battle is another matter.

Although bare trees dot the new Vergina hunt fresco, the Alexander Mosaic's tree is both bare and truncated, with two branches cut off. It is also—a fact Cohen overlooks—crossed by the leftmost lance in the background, which is enormously elongated for the purpose. So it cannot simply be dismissed as a topos (117). Nor can it lament "the desolation of human lives" on both sides (118)—a misconception based on Cohen's detection of a "community of interests" between them in the painting (164). For not only would this triumphalist genre, like Kallisthenes' and Kleitarchos's histories, lament only the deaths of the *victors*, but since the stricken tree echoes the gestures of Darius and his charioteer, and the spear crossing it mirrors the skewered Persian below, it must refer specifically to the desolation of the *Persians*. The background spears should therefore be Macedonian, not those of Darius's Greek mercenaries, as Cohen, following Nylander, believes (124). The picture's composition is thus broadly chiastic, Macedonian-Persian in front and Persian-Macedonian behind.

Cohen's discussion is good on narrative and its problems, but she concludes that the mosaic's temporal and causal emplotment is overshadowed by the "frozen drama" of the tragedies of the two Persians in the foreground, and of Alexander and Darius (e.g., 103, 147). This seems overstated, and her narrative-drama dichotomy invites the objection that Greek drama was a selection from and intensification of a broader narrative ("slices from Homer's banquet"), not a substitute for it (contra 145). To my eye, the nub is the confrontation between an Alexander with a now-useless sarissa and a Darius with no arrows, and I fail to see how this "does not . . . adhere to the requirements of *peripeteia*, the sudden reversal of fortunes and circumstances" (145, cf. 155) of dramatic narrative. As I argued some years ago (*Faces of Power* [Berkeley 1993] 146–47), fourth-century viewers would see it as a double *peripeteia* orchestrated by Tyche—who appears only when Cohen reaches the picture's afterlife in Pompeii (188–89).

All this hardly indicates that "Alexander and Darius seem to be suffering the same sense of ultimate loss and to be sharing a common tragedy" (120), creating a "subtext of community of interests between Greeks and Persians" (164). Although the artist certainly respects Persian valor, this humanistic reading strains the pictorial evidence and seems perilously modern. In support, Cohen points, i.a., to Alexander's pro-Persian sympathies that culminated in his "fusion" policy of 324—all of which increasingly annoyed the Macedonians and did not outlive his death, so are unlikely to have loomed large in this picture. Indeed, if, as I have argued elsewhere (*Faces of Power* [Berkeley 1993] 143–44), the picture's assimilation of Darius to a rape victim (compare, e.g., the *Abduction of Helen* mosaic at Pella) and other clues covertly feminize the Persians, then this reveals less an ideology of tragic equality than one of natural dominance and submission. Believing that the king "has eyes only for his soldier's predicament" (118; but he looks and gestures at *Alexander*), Cohen merely footnotes this view (105 n. 71); she does return to it later (173–74), but without reconciling the contradictions.

Cohen writes lucidly, though better editing would have caught such infelicities as "looked entirely differently" (38) and "enlisting them to" (51). The pictures are adequate, several in color excepted. And despite the reservations expressed above, this thoughtful book is essential reading for any serious student of Greek art in general and the Alexander Mosaic in particular.

ANDREW STEWART

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY OF ART
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720-6020
ASTEWART@SOCRATES.BERKELEY.EDU

ANCESTOR MASKS AND ARISTOCRATIC POWER IN ROMAN CULTURE, by *Harriet I. Flower*. Pp. xvii + 410. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1996. £50. ISBN 0-19-815018-0.

Ancient historians have devoted much attention to the issue of whether the Roman aristocracy was hereditary. Even though the aristocracy was surely not hereditary in a technical constitutional sense during the Republic—sons did not inherit their father's magisterial offices or senatorial seats—a limited group of families dominated the highest offices of state over generations and even centuries. Leading historians such as Ronald Syme have described not only rank but also certain character traits as "inherited" within noble families, even though this cannot have been true in any literal, genetic sense.

Harriet Flower's valuable book, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, illuminates some of these issues with an examination of a central aspect of Roman