

coinage late, indeed mostly posthumous) Martin rightly questions.

In Chapters 8, 9, and the conclusion, Martin reviews the evidence on coining and autonomy from Greek states other than Thessaly, and the literary and epigraphical evidence that might in any way be thought relevant. The treatment is necessarily fairly brief, but clear and convincing; nothing of major importance seems to be omitted. Puzzling is, however, the arrangement of these chapters in relation to the rest of the work. Chapter 9, on the epigraphical and literary evidence for Greek ideas about coinage, would fit more naturally at the beginning of the work, after Chapter 1; and the conclusion is in large part not properly a conclusion at all, but rather introduces major new evidence which ought to have been discussed in either Chapter 8 or 9. These oddities of organization aside, the book is well written and well produced, with relatively few of the typographical errors and little factual slips inevitable in a work of such length (I do note that on p. 90 Philip II's older brother Alexander II is accidentally referred to as his grandfather).

In a work largely based on numismatic evidence, the question of numismatic method is important; here again Martin deserves great credit for the thorough and meticulous analysis to which he subjects the numismatic evidence, being careful to indicate just what such evidence can prove, and how. Nevertheless, my only major criticism bears precisely on numismatic method, in regard to the chronological evidence provided by coin hoards. Martin rightly distinguishes between savings hoards and currency hoards, which is to say hoards collected over a long period by putting away a few coins at a time, usually ones in excellent condition, and hoards gathered quickly in an emergency from whatever coinage was in current circulation. If we are to interpret these hoards for chronological purposes, however, the circumstances of their loss also need to be taken into account. Though this is in an exact sense unknowable, it is important and can in a general way be hypothesized. For the salient fact about all coin hoards we discover is that their original owners failed to recover them. Such failure can only be due to death, flight, or exile, the owner being unable to return or instruct his friends or heir to recover the hoards. While it is easy to imagine that sometimes the owner of a savings hoard might die accidentally before he could tell his heir of the hoard's whereabouts, this sort of thing must have been relatively uncommon; clearly the most frequent causes of failure to recover hoards must have been wars and political upheavals resulting in the owner's death or permanent removal from the scene in some other way.

This is not taken into account by Martin, yet it may explain why, e.g., coins of Philip II and Alexander III only appear in Thessalian hoards around 320 (pp. 47-50). As Martin notes, we have a number of Thessalian hoards dating from the 350s and then none until the late 320s. Since the latter are the first to contain coins of Philip and Alexander, he concludes that these coins only began to circulate in Thessaly at that time. In fact the hoards only prove that these coins began to circulate in Thessaly between ca. 350 and 323: the absence of hoards from the intervening period is doubtless due to the fact that, unlike the unstable and dan-

gerous 350s and late 320s, there was a period of peace in the intervening years when few or no hoards were lost.

RICHARD A. BILLOWS

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
FAYERWEATHER HALL
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10027

EGYPT AFTER THE PHARAOHS, 332 B.C.—A.D. 642:
FROM ALEXANDER TO THE ARAB CONQUEST, by
Alan K. Bowman. Pp. 264, pls. 144, figs. 4. The
University of California Press, Berkeley/Los Angeles
1986. \$25

This attractive book aims "to exploit both the written and the archaeological evidence in order to see the impact of the presence of the Greeks and Romans in Egypt against the backdrop of the Egyptian tradition." It does this in seven chapters and a one-page epilogue, accompanied by two appendices (chronology, money and measures), notes, bibliography, and index—and a remarkable richness of illustration. A frontispiece and 144 illustrations sprinkled through the text depict places, buildings, coins, papyri, inscriptions, sketches by travelers in the previous century, everyday implements, skulls, paintings, sculpture, and more. Many of them are splendid color shots of sites, in large part apparently Bowman's own work (though this seems nowhere to be said).

The scope of the book is wide, its structure systematic. First, the country, which means most of all the Nile. Next, a capsule political history. Chapter 3 deals with the state and its relationship to the people; Chapter 4 with the economy; Chapter 5 with the people themselves, focusing on Greek-Egyptian relations. Then comes a chapter on religion and one on Alexandria. The notes mainly refer to ancient documents or literary works quoted or cited in the body of the text, but for each chapter they are preceded by a list of most pertinent items from the bibliography. The latter is no lightweight, occupying nearly 10 pages, and it should be more than ample for further exploration by scholars and laymen alike; it is happily not limited to works in English.

The book aims to introduce the educated but nonspecialist reader to a vast body of material, furnished in large part by the Greek papyri found in Egypt but also by papyri in other languages, inscriptions, and archaeological remains. Despite the illustrations and the avowed purpose, the Greek papyri dominate the book. For the reader who wants to discover what sorts of things scholars find out from documentary papyri, this is an ideal beginning point. There are enough documents quoted directly to give something of the flavor of the discipline, not only the essence. Bowman's positions on major issues are so well balanced and judicious that the novice is in no danger of being led astray by idiosyncratic views; that this has been accomplished without resorting to nonstop generalizations and banality is an achievement of great merit. The wealth of illustration adds to these virtues to make this the best introduction to the life of Hellenistic and Roman Egypt.

All of this is devoted to a survey of almost 1000 years in the life of Egypt. Writing about a millennium without either ignoring development or becoming mired at great length in detail is a hard job. Only Chapter 2 is really narrative in any sense, and it moves rapidly. In Chapters 3 and 6, Bowman takes care to bring out the important changes in the government's methods of ruling and in religion over these years; elsewhere he avoids banality and makes distinctions by variety in his choice of texts and illustrations. The chapter on the economy perhaps has less sense of chronological development than the others, but that may be realistic. The style is in general smooth and painless, and with a generous mix of illustrations, the pages flow quickly by. One complaint: the specific illustrations in this book are never (so far as I noticed) referred to in the text, so that pictures (with their captions) and text run parallel but are not closely tied together. Rostovtzeff said (in the introduction to his *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*) that his "illustrations are not intended to amuse the reader and to console him for the dryness of the text and notes. They form an important constituent part of my work." The illustrations here too are an important constituent part (even if often a diverting one), and it is a pity that the author did not go a bit further in integrating them.

Covering so much ground does make it difficult to impose any unifying theme on the book. In the Epilogue, Bowman argues that "no stark and rigid division between 'Greek' and 'Egyptian' can be useful in describing the development of this society after Alexander the Great." He concludes with the hope that he has made a case for believing that Greek and Roman elements in Egypt "both contributed to and benefited from the development of Egyptian civilization." This theme in fact comes out at various points in the book. For example, Bowman argues that the Ptolemies and Romans produced in Egypt an economy with a higher level of sophistication than is found elsewhere in the ancient Mediterranean (Ch. 3) and at the same time considerably more developed than that of Egypt before the coming of the Greeks (Ch. 4). A similar point of view turns up in the discussion of public administration, and the reciprocal influences of Greek and Egyptian culture are brought out. The point of view is rather more positive about the effects of foreign rule than what one often encounters, though it is hardly the naive enthusiasm of past generations in the heyday of European colonialism. It deserves careful discussion.

It is worth singling out the chapter on religion for attention. The Greeks and Romans mostly thought Egyptian cults exotic (though some of the Greeks in Egypt certainly embraced them), and modern scholars in general have not done well at understanding the internal realities of a pagan's religion. Bowman's account is deliberately written from the point of view of the Greeks, not the Egyptians, but it is sympathetic and realistic; the reader gets a good sense of what it was that the Greeks encountered.

The readers of this journal will want to know how well the aim to use archaeological material along with the written has been fulfilled. As indicated above, the illustrations contribute greatly to the book even with less than total integration. Archaeology plays a substantial role in some discus-

sions, such as that of the crops grown in Egypt, or that of the character of towns and villages, not to speak of Alexandria. Elsewhere it is illustrative more than integral. I do not underestimate the difficulty of the enterprise; it may be impossible without more preliminary studies. What we have here is much more than we generally find.

No book with the range of this one can be free from faults of various sorts. But this one has comparatively few, and its merits are great. It deserves a wide readership.

ROGER S. BAGNALL

DEPARTMENTS OF CLASSICS AND HISTORY
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10027

KOPIEN UND NACHAHMUNGEN IM HELLENISMUS. EIN BEITRAG ZUM KLASSIZISMUS DES 2. UND FRÜHEN 1. JHS. V. CHR., by Jörg-Peter Niemeier. (Habelt Dissertationsdrucke, Reihe Klassische Archäologie 20.) Pp. 246, figs. 38. Dr. Rudolf Habelt GMBH, Bonn 1985.

In recent years, a great deal of interest has focused on the issue of copies, of all periods and forms; note for instance the 1985 Symposium at the National Gallery in Washington, D.C., on "Retaining the Original," of forthcoming publication in the History of Art Series. In terms of ancient art, this interest is leading to ever greater differentiation between Roman creations imitating Classical styles and works reproducing Classical prototypes with varying degrees of faithfulness to the original, primary among such studies being P. Zanker's *Klassizistische Statuen* (1974). The work here under review, originally a dissertation presented to Bonn University in 1983/84, has the specific purpose of testing a theory advocated since the time of Furtwängler: that Hellenistic copies, obtained without mechanical means, represent approximations rather than true replicas of a given prototype; as such, they are merely the forerunners of exact copies, which start only in the Roman period, and no earlier than the first century B.C. A definite progression would therefore be traceable, from the less to the more exact reproduction, according to the time when the sculpture was made. The copying phenomenon itself is seen as a by-product of Classicizing tendencies, the onset of which is placed within the second century B.C.

Niemeier does not attempt a complete listing of all Hellenistic works that could be considered copies of a Classical prototype; he selects (primarily from Pergamon, but also from Delos and other eastern—that is, east of Italy—sources) 21 sculptures traditionally dated within the second and the first century B.C. He then examines them stylistically, typologically, and structurally; he determines their approximate date on whatever evidence may be available (mostly through comparisons with other more or less datable works and largely on stylistic grounds); he finally analyzes them in terms of their relationship to the alleged prototypes. The 21 examples are thus seen to belong to three different categories. True copies are the Meleager head and the Athe-