theories of art and literature and their parallel means of communication, the distinctions between high and low culture, and the question of how much sculptors and viewers were actively aware of the origins of the models reused in Roman art. A number of these issues have been taken up in subsequent scholarship and the further reading selected by Elsner is a useful addition to the book. Elsner's foreword (xv–xxxi) also provides a useful contextual introduction to the book, providing an overview of the historiography of German scholarship that helps to orientate those readers who are more familiar with the Anglo-American tradition. H.'s book has already become a seminal work in the study of Roman art. This new translation will help to broaden its accessibility, especially for students, while the foreword situates it within the broader study of Ancient art. This sort of enterprise is crucial in facilitating communication between scholars of different traditions and it is to be hoped that further translations of other groundbreaking works will soon follow.

University of Warwick   ZAHRA NEWBY

E. PERRY, *THE AESTHETICS OF EMULATION IN THE VISUAL ARTS OF ANCIENT ROME*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. Pp. xvi + 208, 48 figs. ISBN 0-521-83165-2. £45.00.

Perry's book belongs to a new school of revisionist (or perhaps iconoclastic) thinking about the nature of Roman copies, which has developed gradually since the 1970s and has recently gained momentum with important studies by Bartman, Gazda, Marvin, Mattusch, and others. The range of fresh perspectives is encapsulated in Gazda's edited volume, *The Ancient Art of Emulation: Studies in Artistic Originality and Tradition from the Present to Classical Antiquity* (2002), to which P. herself contributed. But this new study is one of the most impressive for its clarity, intelligence, and polemical assurance.

In essence, the revisionist approach rejects the assumption that copies of lost Greek masterpieces can be detected in Roman *Idealplastik*. It rejects both the premises of *Kopienkritik* (the method of reconstructing the posited originals from Roman 'copies', which has prevailed for over a century), and the very assumption that we should be seeking reflections of classical Greek works rather than studying ideal sculpture in its Roman contexts. P. pursues both aspects of the critique rigorously and systematically.

Central to her argument is the Roman concept of *decorum* — roughly 'appropriateness' — which is analysed in the first two chapters. Building on the work of Otto Brendel and Tonio Hölscher among others, she represents *decorum* as a pervasive aesthetic standard in Roman élite culture. It is best exemplified through discussions of rhetoric and literature by Roman authors like Cicero and Quintilian, but (she argues) it applies equally to the artistic tastes of their readers. P. shows convincingly how the use of different Greek styles and models in Roman art was affected by deeply rooted and authoritative conventions about *decorum*. As a result it responds to factors such as the subject matter of the work, its genre, and its intended architectural setting.

These concerns motivated the Roman use of classical Greek imagery and forms to a far greater extent than any desire to imitate classical masterworks. For example, the choice of 'Praxitelean' style as the appropriate manner for representing languorous figures of Dionysus or satyrs is at best a sort of stylistic *imitatio* rather than an attempt to copy specific originals by Praxiteles. (It should be noted that Hölscher's argument along these lines is now available in English translation as *The Language of Images in Roman Art* (2004).) This sort of retrospection does not preclude innovation, and in some cases (like that of the Leda sarcophagus from Kephisia) one can observe sophisticated attempts at the creative adaptation of classical models.

Ch. 3 tackles the concept of 'free copies' (i.e. loose, 'inferior' copies) which has dominated the interpretation of Roman ideal sculpture. P. demolishes the philological analogy that has informed *Kopienkritik* from the start. According to this, any Roman departure from Greek models represents 'contamination' (as Lippold puts it), akin to the corruption of ancient texts by medieval copyists. A better analogy, P. argues, would be Virgil's or Horace's imitation of Greek authors (a tendentious example this, but not fundamentally wrong). A real strength of this chapter is the care with which P. criticizes Adolf Furtwängler, the pioneer of *Kopienkritik*. She avoids the self-righteousness that tends to intrude into critiques of nineteenth-century German archaeology with a sensitive attention to contemporary sources, including contemporary attacks on Furtwängler's work.

Ch. 4 demonstrates that the 'eclecticism' of Roman sculpture, often regarded as a negative characteristic, has parallels in literary and rhetorical theory. Once again, writers like Quintilian positively advocate the use of multiple models as a desirable part of the process of *imitatio*, and they resort to artistic analogies to make their point. In practice sculptural types like that of the Venus of Capua/Victory of Brescia and its variations show that the typological heritage of Greek art could be manipulated with some subtlety and with regard to the connotations of the various iconographic models used. Yet, in the process, it is likely that the specific classical prototypes for such figures, if they were ever known or esteemed, were often forgotten.

Ch. 5 is a rather less successful, less obviously relevant, discussion of various conceptions of *phantasia* — artistic 'visualization' of non-visible subjects like gods. There is no sustained or compelling argument for linking this to ideal sculpture, though the observations made are fascinating in themselves. Finally, ch. 6 acknowledges the Roman respect for famous Greek artists of the past, but shows that, except perhaps in the religiously motivated replication of specific cult images, there is no consistent link between the most celebrated artists and the works that are believed to have been copied by the Romans. Rather, literary theory again suggests that there was a preference among artists as among writers and orators for seeking to internalize the qualities of different old masters in order to improve one's own work. There was a canon of old masters, but no expectation that they should be slavishly imitated. A comment by Quintilian is indicative, and sums up much of what P. is trying to argue. He disapproves of those painters who desire only to be able 'to copy pictures with measuring rods and plumb-lines' (10.11.6–7).

The use of literary *aemulatio* as an analogy for Roman art is perhaps not fully justified (we are not in fact dealing with Virgils and Horaces here). P. does not particularly seek to elevate the creative status of Roman artists or to make claims for their distinctive cultural identity (though she does employ the fashionable but misleading near-neologism 'romanitas' throughout). What she does illustrate powerfully is the skill of Roman artists in meeting the requirements of their customers. P. succeeds in arguing that certain works of art long assumed to be copies of some kind are better understood as Roman creations by artists well versed in the language of classical Greek art, and her claims for the basic value of literary sources in interpreting the aesthetics of emulation are satisfying.

Where, then, does this leave the study of 'real' copies? A significant aspect of P.'s approach is that she repeatedly accepts the possibility of such 'true' copies — both works that more or less accurately reflect the form of a Greek original, and works that are specifically *intended* to do so. Even while she (rightly) condemns the 'laziness or sheer obstinacy' (16) of authors and museums that continue to label ideal sculptures as copies without any question, she acknowledges that some 'exact' copies appear to exist (91). In view of this concession, it seems inappropriate to reject the claims of those like C. Hallett (13) who have proposed a revised use of *Kopienkritik*. Ultimately a fuller understanding of Roman art will require a fairer attention to all kinds of imitation, and is surely bound to retain a role for copy-criticism, even if the arguments of P. and others restrict the material to which it can reasonably be applied.

Courtauld Institute of Art PETER STEWART

J. W. STAMPER, *THE ARCHITECTURE OF ROMAN TEMPLES*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. Pp. xvi + 287, 162 illus. ISBN 0-521-81068. £50.00.

An encyclopedic monograph on Roman temples would be invaluable, but John Stamper's slim volume is no such study. It is focused on basic architectural features of a few dozen conventional temples in or near Rome, excluding the rest of the Roman Empire and all unconventional designs. The best features of the book are the fine drawings by S. and his students at Notre Dame University and a solid compendium of existing scholarship, which make the book a useful reference.

S. focuses primarily on his thesis that the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus (hereafter TJC) was so important that its architectural design was an authoritative precedent, influencing all subsequent temple designs. It is a valid thesis, i.e., one that can be proved or disproved, with readily specifiable information. First, we must know the definitive, unique features of the TJC. These must be pioneered by this temple, not merely conforming to a conventional existing type. Second, we must find those features specifically copied in subsequent examples. Third, other sources of information — literary, archaeological, etc. — should confirm that the emulation was intentional.