R. has done: his functional analysis of monumental fountains illuminates the limitations of architectural typologies and reinforces the importance of contextual analysis.

University of Iowa Brenda Longfellow
brenda-longfellow@uiowa.edu
doi:10.1017/S0075435814000318

S. BUSSELS, *THE ANIMATED IMAGE: ROMAN THEORY ON NATURALISM, VIVIDNESS AND DIVINE POWER* (Studien aus dem Warburg-Haus 11. Reihe, Kunst und Wirkmacht). Munich: Akademie Verlag/Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2012. Pp. 222, illus. ISBN 9783050059495 (Munich)/9789087281786 (Leiden). €79.80.

Although *The Animated Image* addresses images and texts which are well worn staples of much recent work in the history of ancient art, Stijn Bussels' book brings a new perspective to these materials through the breadth of its focus. The fundamental thesis of the book is that image animation is a feature not just of Greco-Roman art and literature, but needs to be seen in the context of a wider range of cultural practices — in particular rhetoric, pantomime, theatre and even such para-theatrical institutions as élite funerals and public executions.

An introduction — grounded in an analysis of Lucian's *Lover of Lies*, with its animated statue of a Corinthian general, heard singing in the bath at night — sketches the key themes of the book, and the theoretical perspectives which inform it, notably Jas Elsner's analysis of Roman visualities, and the anthropologist Alfred Gell's account of art as agency.

The first chapter looks at anecdotes in Pliny's art history with a focus on the issue of image animation. It then explores these in a broader context of concepts and practices of image animation in late Republican and early Imperial Rome, with a particular emphasis on the distinction between popular identifications of image with reality and a repeated insistence on the 'as if' of élite writers discussing their own social group's participation in equivalent practices of animation, such as the impersonation of ancestors by their wax-mask-clad descendants in élite funerary commemorations.

Ch. 2 is concerned with animated images in rhetoric, in particular with *enargeia* and *energeia*. It traces these concepts back to fourth-century Greek philosophy and rhetorical theory, and shows how the epistemological issues concerning the status of vivid visual representations — as well as the practical issues of how to engender them by means of words alone — is explored in Hellenistic and Roman rhetorical and literary texts from Cicero to Philostratus.

The third chapter starts from Callistratus' (late third/early fourth-century A.D.) ekphrasis of Lysippus' Bacchante. B. explores the concept of image-making implicit in Callistratus' description of Lysippus as both a *prophetes*, inspired by a divine *pneuma*, and the master of rational *techne*. As B. points out, this is a rather unusual account of the rôle of the sculptor, and he traces the two components of this rôle definition back through Horace, Aristotle, Plato, Pindar and so on — though with the emphasis very much on poets, rather than visual artists, with the consequence that the context and significance of Callistratus' quite striking innovations are rather lost.

Ch. 4, in many ways the most original and stimulating, at least from the perspective of an art historian, explores the broader ramifications of ideas concerning truth, imitation and animation in the context of a broader range of performative practices. B. explores the rôle of actors and orators in bringing to life events or characters, exploring the different degrees to which the performer 'conceal[s] the representational aspect of their own performance' (112) and masks their own identity in trying to present a living scene in the very different contexts of a murder trial or a tragic drama. Pantomime raises similar issues of literal and 'as if' responses on the part of audiences, but also the intriguing concept of a kind of inverse ekphrasis, where the audience might claim even to be able to hear the words of the characters, if the gestural language of the mime artists was sufficiently articulate. The chapter concludes with an interesting discussion of Martial's account of the public executions staged as enactments of famous scenes from mythology (Pasiphae and the Dictaean Bull, Meleager and the Caledonian boar) participating in the same cultural logic as ekphrastic image animation, but taken to the level of hyper-reality.

The last substantive chapter explores the issue of the animation of cult images, discussing examples already largely familiar to most art historians from the discussions of Richard Gordon and Verity Platt, and without very much new to contribute, though it is good to see Lucian's

https://doi.org/10.1017/S007543581400032X Published online by Cambridge University Press

criticism of image worship in *On Sacrifices* being discussed alongside that of his contemporary, the Christian Clement, in his *Protrepticus*. An Epilogue, discussing responses to Praxiteles' Aphrodite of Cnidus, resumes some of the key themes of the book.

Inevitably, given the range of the materials covered in the book, and its rather short length, readers may come away with the feeling that the analysis of many of the specific examples is perhaps too superficial. And Gell's analytical framework, much trumpeted on the book jacket and in the introduction, actually plays rather a marginal rôle, if any, in informing by far the majority of the analysis; this is a shame, since a more systematic resort to Gell could have helped to bring out in an analytically much sharper way the continuities and differences between the various modes of image animation which B. discusses, and in particular their sociological underpinnings. That said, B.'s contribution should help to broaden the range of the debate about image animation in the classical world, and should be welcomed for that.

The book is well produced, apart from a rather too generous sprinkling of typos and other errata. There is, however, one perverse choice made by the publishers and editors, which one might wish not to see repeated: namely a bibliography in alphabetical order by surname but with first-names, rather than surnames, placed first (for example Jas Elsner, rather than Elsner, Jas), which is extremely tiresome when one is scanning though the bibliography to find a reference.

Institute of Archaeology, University College London JEREMY J. TANNER
j.tanner@ucl.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S007543581400032X

R. SINISGALLI, *PERSPECTIVE IN THE VISUAL CULTURE OF CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. xii + 195, illus. ISBN 9781107025905. £60.00/US$99.00.

The origins of Western linear perspective are once again being hotly debated. Particularly important among art historians has been the work of James Elkins and (most recently) Hans Belting, whose *Florenz und Bagdad. Eine westöstliche Geschichte des Blicks* (2008) charted Western perspective's 'invention' in relation to the social, cultural and theological debts of Arabic geometry. Where Belting somewhat played down the Graeco-Roman archaeology, Classicists have been re-examining ancient 'perspective systems' in their own right, and with particular reference to Campanian wall-painting: alongside the recent contributions by Pierre Gros and Rolf A. Tybout, one thinks of Philip Stinson's 2011 article in the *American Journal of Archaeology* (115, 403–26), situating itself against Erwin Panofsky's classic 1927 essay, *Die Perspektive als 'symbolische Form'*.

Such is the intellectual backdrop of Sinisgalli's own intervention. Turning to both literary and archaeological evidence, S. sets out to prove (*pace* Panofsky and co.) a fundamental continuity between Classical and Renaissance theories of linear perspective: ancient writers, S. contends, 'reveal and confirm thoughts and ideas that, in Greece and Rome, were at the origin of the science of images, that is, of modern representation' (41). Central to this thesis is an argument about mirrors. In line with S.'s earlier research into Renaissance perspective (the work of, *inter alios*, Alberti, Borromini, Brunelleschi, Commandino and Leonardo), S. argues that it is '"catoptrics", or the science of mirrors, that makes the concept of linear perspective comprehensible' (1). After a short introduction, the first chapter lays out the approach with reference to the *De speculis* of Euclid: Euclid's explanation for 'the capturing of images upon the flat surface of the mirror suggests the possibility of painting, upon a surface, images that can be mistaken for real objects' (14). The following chapters on Lucretius, Vitruvius and Ptolemy explore how these authors adopted and adapted Euclid's theories, sometimes with explicit reference to *scaenographia* ('that is, the perspectival representation of a three-dimensional structure on a surface' (70)); sandwiched between these chapters are two brief forays into the material evidence, surveying in turn 'perspective at the center of power', and 'perspective in the area of Vesuvius'. Bar a few short paragraphs on 'Socrates and Plato' (9–11), there is no analysis of Euclid's predecessors, nor any discussion of extant Greek imagery before the first century B.C.

Although S.'s interest in catoptrics offers some new and interesting perspectival perspectives, above all with reference to Euclid, the volume is beset by major problems of structure, argument and presentation. There is little attempt to bridge the transition from one chapter to the next, and a conspicuous lack of overarching conclusion (the final chapter abruptly ends with an

https://doi.org/10.1017/S007543581400032X Published online by Cambridge University Press