

a re-orientation of the building by Constantine, a view which has become commonplace in modern scholarship since Nibby. Likewise, the north, or so-called ‘Constantinian’, apse is understood as a later modification of the original project (57–60, 70 n. 16), but one performed to consolidate and reinforce the original design where the north wall had deteriorated: when it was resumed, presumably under Constantine, after the interruption of Maxentius’ death, the wall decoration was left unfinished. Yet there remain some inconsistencies, as Samuelli Ferretti accepts the traditional interpretation of the apse as an addition by Constantine, while at the same time retaining the inverted commas (168).

The book is intended for scientists and researchers, and its uneven texture does not facilitate its presentation to a more general audience. Intriguing details about the building’s materials and later uses are buried in endnotes. There is a wealth of supporting illustrations, photogrammetric images, and axonometric, virtual drawings. But the book lacks an overall evaluation of the building in its historical context. Archaeological details such as the building’s brick facing and travertine corbels — strikingly similar to those of the Curia Julia rebuilt by Diocletian and Diocletian’s Baths — help to place it in the context of the urban re-organization of Rome begun under the Tetrarchy. But the initial historical section is very concise in comparison with the later technical parts, with almost no discussion of the actual functions of the basilica, for example its possible use by the city prefect as a ceremonial meeting hall and courtroom (cf. H. Brandt, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit von Diokletian bis zum Ende der konstantinischen Dynastie* (1998), 69–72). Conceptually, the historical interpretation lacks the sophistication of the geological and structural analyses: the section on euergetism ‘as a means of political propaganda’ is very short and does scant justice to the theme (12). While it is good for an Anglo-American readership to see an important contribution published in English, the translation is convenient, rather than elegant, and the style generally wooden and sometimes repetitive (e.g. 23, 25: ‘...took an entirely different approach ... had entirely different characteristics...’, more tolerable in Italian than English).

That this book is little more than the sum of its parts is also reflected in the absence of a bibliography and index. There are some unfortunate errors: for example, the architect Viollet-le-Duc comes out as ‘Voilet-le-Duc’ (13), and it is an inconvenience to the reader that the numbering of notes in the main text of ch. 2 does not match that in the endnotes — due to the omission of note 1 in the text (21). This book is undoubtedly an important contribution to the recent increased understanding of the materials, structural qualities, and construction processes of Roman architecture. But its lack of overall homogeneity and direction means that the search for a full-length monograph on this important building is not yet complete.

Durham University

EDMUND V. THOMAS

P. REHAK, *IMPERIUM AND COSMOS: AUGUSTUS AND THE NORTHERN CAMPUS MARTIUS* (ed. J. G. Younger). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006. Pp. xxvii + 222. ISBN 0-299-22010-9. US\$60.00.

The Augustan regime left a deep imprint on the urban fabric of Rome, nowhere to more spectacular effect than the Campus Martius, which reduced the rest of the city, in the rhetoric of the contemporary Strabo, to a mere appendage (5.3.8). Focusing on a cluster of monuments in the northern Campus Martius, all much discussed and freighted with lengthy bibliographies, Rehak investigates the relationship between architecture and political authority and argues that this area stood apart from the rest of the city as an emphatic declaration of monarchy and cosmic power. Despite some flaws in its central thesis, *Imperium and Cosmos* offers several novel and arresting observations that will be of interest to scholars of Augustan Rome.

Following an overview of the monumental development of the Campus Martius during the Republic (ch. 2), three chapters on the Mausoleum and ‘Ustrinum’ of Augustus (ch. 3), the ‘Horologium-Solarium’ (ch. 4), and the Ara Pacis (ch. 5) form the core of the book. The chapter on the Mausoleum and ‘Ustrinum’ is the least successful. Most of the discussion is unexceptionable (it is, however, somewhat deflating to read through a lengthy survey of possible influences on the form of the Mausoleum (43–52), only to be told that the tomb of Augustus was ‘eclectic’ in design (61)), but the location of the Mausoleum had nothing to do with the ‘tomb of Romulus’, as R. suggests (36). The treatment of the ‘Horologium-Solarium’ is better. In addition to providing a clear account of how the sundial actually worked (68–9, 81–3), R. is very good on astrology and catasterism (69–74), the logistics of obelisk transport (90–1), and the complex monarchic,

solar and Apolline symbolism of the horologium obelisk (91–5). But the jewel of the book comes in the chapter on the Ara Pacis. R.'s iconographic analysis of the monument's sculptural decoration is consistently excellent. Especially impressive is R.'s reinterpretation of the south-west panel relief, normally thought to depict Aeneas sacrificing upon his arrival to Latium. Building on work first published in *Art Bulletin* 83 (2001), 190–208, R. argues that the panel instead depicts Numa sacrificing in accordance with Fetial law, which he himself had instituted, to guarantee peace with a foreign community (115–20). Iconography (the age of the sacrificant and the nature of the deities shown in the small temple), ritual practice (a single sow being sacrificed, as prescribed by Fetial law), and the historical associations of the Campus Martius (Numa's sacrifice to Mars to guarantee *concordia* between Romans and Sabines), all support R.'s argument; the resulting symmetry of the monument seems to clinch it (135): on the east side of the monument, the panel depicting Roma (war) is balanced by that depicting Tellus/Italia/Pax (peace), and on the west side the Romulus and Remus panel (war) is balanced by Numa (peace), the two pacific panels (on the south-west and south-east corners) facing towards the city, and the two martial panels (north-west and north-east) facing away from the city and into the sphere of *imperium militiae*. Subsequent discussion of the monument will have to take this compelling argument into account.

R.'s interpretations of individual monuments are all in the service of his central thesis, which is articulated in the preface (xiii), developed in ch. 1, and further elaborated in the concluding chapter (ch. 6). The thesis, in brief, is that Augustus himself masterminded a carefully-orchestrated series of personal monuments in the northern Campus Martius, designed not only to publicize his monarchic power, in a setting imbued with cosmic significance, but also to stake his claim to deification. R. acknowledges that the argument depends heavily on the validity of Buchner's calculations for the functioning of the horologium (*Die Sonnenuhr des Augustus* (1982)) — criticized by several scholars, including, most recently, P. Heslin (*JRS* 97 (2007), 1–20) — and in part on Jolivet's proposed location for the crematorium of Augustus on the Montecitorio hill (*ArchLaz* 9 (1988), 90–6), but does not sufficiently emphasize how crucial for his case is Bosworth's persuasive reading of the *Res Gestae* as a justification for apotheosis (*JRS* 89 (1999), 1–18). More problematic is the absence of adequate topographic contextualization. R.'s isolation of the monuments chosen for analysis, though convenient for a monograph, prevents a full understanding of their urban texture and ideological resonance. R. does draw some comparisons with other parts of the city, in particular the Forum Romanum and Forum of Augustus, but he does not pay enough attention to the larger Campus Martius in which his monuments were embedded. There is too little here on the Pantheon, too little on other Egyptian monuments in the area (e.g., the temple of 'Isis Campensis'), and far too little on Agrippa's large-scale building programme in adjacent sectors of the Campus Martius (on which see now L. Haselberger, *Urben Adornare*, *JRA* suppl. 64 (2007), 100–28). In order to comprehend the monuments of the northern Campus Martius — a label of convenience for modern topographers — they must be properly situated within the Campus Martius as a whole. And the Augustan Campus Martius belonged as much to Agrippa as it did to Augustus.

Imperium and Cosmos is, nevertheless, a useful addition to the literature on Augustan Rome. Paul Rehak, as some readers will know, died in 2004, before completing work on the book. We therefore owe deep thanks to John Younger, R.'s colleague at the University of Kansas, for seeing the manuscript through to publication and bringing R.'s fruitful ideas to the community of scholars.

University of California, Berkeley

CARLOS F. NOREÑA

K. J. HARTSWICK, *THE GARDENS OF SALLUST: A CHANGING LANDSCAPE*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004. Pp. 233, 115 figs. ISBN 978-0-292-70547-0. US\$55.00.

This valuable book on the *horti Sallustiani* examines the disparate physical remains of the gardens (architectural and sculptural) and the history of scholarship on them in an effort to uncover the 'development of the present obfuscation' and to provide a salutary corrective to many of the views of the gardens and their artifacts (147). Ultimately many of the conclusions of this work are negative, but Hartswick's aim is to provide a suitably cautionary starting-point for future research. The centuries have not been kind to the physical memory of this once-important garden estate. Obviously, as the author warns (xi), there can be little discussion about the actual horticulture. Originally created by the historian C. Sallustius Crispus in the late Republic at the end of the first century B.C.E., the gardens were enlarged by his heirs and by the time of Nero had become