

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 Knidos, 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 through the bibliography to find a reference.

Institute of Archaeology, University College London
j.tanner@ucl.ac.uk

JEREMY J. TANNER

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

incomprehensible diagram of ‘Ptolemy’s analemma 2’ on 158). If S. is prone to glib generalization (‘the objective representation of reality ... was a distinctive sign of all classical civilization’ (87)), he also imposes back onto antiquity his own Alberti-derived definitions of what ‘perspective’ is or might be. So it is, for example, that the two chapters on Roman wall-painting neglect to ask basic questions about the different sorts of (‘convergence’ and ‘parallel’) ‘perspective’ employed. The discussion reaches its low-point in the attempt to explain the Palatine ‘Room of the Masks’ in light of Suetonian biography: for S., at least, the room’s rationale can best be explained with reference to the historical height of Augustus (‘between 154 and 156 centimeters’, but with due allowance made for the ‘slippers’ purportedly worn by the Princeps in his *cubiculum* (110; cf. 172–3, n. 8)). Confusing diagrams only exacerbate such problems. The choice of pictures is often puzzling — not least the decision to start the book with a picture of Narcissus (not an ancient image, but a bestialized line-drawing after a late sixteenth-century painting by Caravaggio). At other times, diagrams are introduced without any meaningful explanation (e.g. fig. 58 on p. 97 — apparently ‘a spatial projection of the inherent problems in “*scenographia*” of the ancient world’).

No less problematic is the book’s production, which sets a new nadir for the New York division of Cambridge University Press. English is not the author’s native language, and due allowance should be made. But the standard of copy-editing is so dismal that one wonders whether anyone at the Press actually read the book before or during production (e.g. Rome as ‘capitol’ city (36); mirrors ‘associated ... to’ wall paintings (90); ‘the principal reason ... is especially because’, (120) etc.). Had more care been expended on such corrections, perhaps we might have been spared the references to, for example, Aristoteles, Horatius and Platon (185–6). It is not only the English that is garbled: there are also errors in French and German (especially unfortunate that Panofsky’s ‘Perspective als symbolische Form’ is attributed to the ‘Vortrage der Bibliothek Warburg’ on 168): here, as elsewhere, some word-processing ‘autocorrect’ function seems to have mangled S.’s text (cf. fur for für on 179; ‘the Latin title of the [Vitruvian] work is *De Architecture Libri Decem*’ on 168; ‘le text est obscur’ — and likewise Ptolemée on 178, etc.). Similar errors can be found in the Latin, which at times offer light relief (‘*Graecia capta ferum victorem coepit* ... “Greece conquered, overthrew the proud victor”’ (163)). Thanks to the use of transliterations, the ancient Greek is spared. Unfortunately, however, the transcriptions also appear to have gone unchecked — hence the reference to e.g. Ptolemy’s ‘*katoptrikē tekne*’ (14).

The author has evidently been let down by the Press. But other oversights lie squarely at his door: numerous citations, especially to Renaissance theorists, are given without reference (e.g. 174–5 n. 5); quotations are at times garbled (e.g. 179 n. 19 — crucially, Lejeune refers here to the twelfth, not first, paragraph of Ptolemy’s third book); and basic errors have been allowed to slip through (‘Titus Lucretius Caro’ (40)). Most crippling of all are the omissions in bibliography: with the exception of Panofsky, there is no reference to the scholars mentioned in my opening paragraph. This is not the standard expected of a serious academic press.

King’s College London
 michael.squire@kcl.ac.uk
 doi:10.1017/S0075435814000331

MICHAEL SQUIRE

J. H. RICHARDSON, *THE FABII AND THE GAULS. STUDIES IN HISTORICAL THOUGHT AND HISTORIOGRAPHY IN REPUBLICAN ROME* (Historia Einzelschriften 222). Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2012. Pp. 186. ISBN 9783515100403. €52.00.

This book is a revision of the author’s 2004 Exeter thesis, written under the clearly discernible supervision of T. P. Wiseman. As the subtitle suggests, it is as much an examination of the historiography of Republican Rome as it is of the broader mentality of the culture and society that produced and consumed these accounts. Throughout, Richardson offers salutary reminders to the reader that this Roman mentality, especially with regard to conceptions of the nature of human behaviour and the methodology of plausibly reconstructing the past, differs in fundamental and often overlooked respects from that of the modern age. This attention to the underpinnings of Roman historical thought, and to the ways in which they have shaped our extant narratives, is one of the more important contributions made by this work.

Two related phenomena observed across historiography of the Republican period form the basis of this study: ‘the Roman tendency to believe that members of the same *gens* behave in the same way