walls. In others, they had instead the function of highlighting contact points between the growing city and the external world, typically located at some distance from the fortified area. The archaic sanctuary published in this volume evidently belongs to this second group.

A masterful concluding essay by M. Torelli places the Fosso dell'Incastro complex within the context of its peer coastal sanctuaries, at the same time building an argument for their similarity also in terms of religious ideas. What Torelli also reconstructs is the subtle criss-crossing of cultic connections between the gods worshipped at these temples. A fascinating, if slightly disquieting, new divine character emerges from these musings — a chthonic, black sun god who would appear in various forms in sanctuaries of this kind, creating a religious coastscape that undoubtedly influenced the movement of Tyrrhenian travellers. In this sense it is also significant that at some point the notion that Aeneas had landed at this sanctuary becomes part of his saga; with the mediation of the ambiguous figure of Indiges, the cult of the deified Aeneas (which was of course also thriving at Lavinium) probably became institutionalised at Castrum Inui as well.

The recurrence of connected religious presences along coastlines and other communication routes, even across ethnic boundaries, is a phenomenon that characterises the Mediterranean in the archaic period. It is enough to recall the case of Hercules (syncretised as Melkart in Punic sites), perhaps the most common harbour-related cult of the period (H. R. Neilson, *Class. Bull.* 82 (2006), 5–26). The functional benefit of these chains of cults is clearly to facilitate long-distance commerce, migration and contact by providing a religious middle ground to a disparate variety of travellers. In the absence of any kind of international or commercial law, common worship of similar deities was one of the few forces that could foster collaborative behaviours, which were essential, among other things, for the diffusion of those exotic prestige items that elites everywhere craved.

Budding cities, significantly, invested in these outward-looking sanctuaries very early in the urbanisation process. At Rome, the Sant'Omobono temple predates the Capitoline Temple of Jupiter by a generation or two. At many other major urban centres, the resources devoted to harbour cult places were at least equivalent to what was done in the centre of the city. The Fosso dell'Incastro complex now adds a significant and well-legible piece to this fascinating picture, while at the same time greatly enriching our understanding of the religious worldview that tied these manifestations together. Evidently, they represented an irreplaceable part of the process that led the western coast of central Italy to become one of the most vibrant urban systems of the entire Mediterranean.

University of Michigan NICOLA TERRENATO
terrenat@umich.edu
doi:10.1017/S007543582000043X

MICHAEL ANDERSON and DAMIAN ROBINSON (EDS), *HOUSE OF THE SURGEON, POMPEII: EXCAVATIONS IN THE CASA DEL CHIRURGO (VI 1, 9–10.23)*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2018. Pp. xv + 647; illus., maps, plans, forms. ISBN 9781785707285. £70.00.

Despite their massive contribution to the field of Classical archaeology, large-scale excavations centred on major ancient urban sites are often criticised for being too empirical in nature. Perhaps one of the most common complaints in this regard is that backlogs, accumulated over decades of continued fieldwork, create bottlenecks in the pipeline from recording to publication, eventually requiring extensive retrofitting. Confronting the challenges of publishing interpretations based on large and often messy data sets, the authors of the first major final report from the Anglo-American Project in Pompeii (AAPP) prompt readers to reflect on the research benefits of the 'big dig' model for Pompeian archaeology.

Shifting focus from the individual house to the broader topographic unit, between 1994 and 2006 the AAPP carried out systematic architectural survey coupled with sub-surface excavation to investigate in detail the structural development of a Pompeian city block known as Insula VI.1. The specific aim was to address overarching issues of 'intensification' (occupation density), 'differentiation' (functional variation) and 'inequality' (social stratification with reference to access to urban land) within Pompeii's urban fabric (vi). Weaving these research threads together throughout the book, the authors sketch a much more complex history of occupation for the Casa

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435820000519 Published online by Cambridge University Press

del Chirurgo (VI.1.10) than previously assumed, emphasising especially its importance for our understanding of the diffusion of the canonical Roman atrium house design (50–4, 541–3).

The volume has had a long and complicated gestation. The post-excavation supervisors describe it as a form of 'rescue archaeology' (36), due to both the variable quality of the record (aspects of the organisation of the AAPP field-school model are partly to blame here) and the lack of consistent plans for digital data-archiving and curation from the start. Most notable is the absence of any comprehensive analysis of the associated ceramic assemblages, which inevitably affects the accuracy of the site chronology. Rough dates are derived primarily from diagnostic glass vessels, other small finds and coins (58), drawing from the results of insula-wide studies published separately (the relevant materials are discussed in chs 6–7). Additional dating elements are provided by the stylistic analysis of wall decoration (ch. 8 offers an assessment of the overall quality and layout of the largely vanished final phase of wall decoration in the house) and floors (ch. 9). To contextualise the main construction episodes, the authors refer in passing to key moments in the structural development of neighbouring property plots, especially the Casa delle Vestali to the north (but matter relevant to the whole insula is introduced only briefly on 5–7).

The structure of the book moves from a general overview of the phasing (ch. 4) to the particulars of the stratigraphy (ch. 5). The layered text was designed to enable readers to dig down to the desired level of resolution while minimising the need to re-synthesise from the bottom up (58). Yet the omission of stratigraphic unit numbers from the overview and the lack of any coding to distinguish SUs by activity in the general phase plans presented there make it more difficult to connect from the top layer to the more detailed discussion of key features and finds. A list of SUs in the Appendix provides links to the corresponding sections in ch. 5, whose room-by-room description is mapped onto the final stage of the house, limiting the reader's ability to interrogate the conclusions about the phase-by-phase transformations.

The proposed sequencing fits with — and further enriches — the current thinking about urban process in Pompeii. A 'Pre-Surgeon Structure' can be generically assigned to the third and early second centuries B.C.E. (Phase 2). The traces of terracing conform to the main alignment of the Samnite-era master plan (they are at a right angle with the Vicolo di Narciso), but the fragmented state of the evidence does not really allow us to extrapolate the size and layout of the building (the 'Oscan' module reconstructed on 73, fig. 4.10 is based on the hypothetical extent of the 'impluvium-like feature' under Room 23 and the assumption that the property lot had the same limits as those of the subsequent phase). The finds from the levelling layers that obliterated these remains possibly relate to the early occupation, suggesting high status. The construction of the Casa del Chirurgo (Phase 3) can be placed within a very broad chronological range (200–130 B.C.E.), but a date later in the second century B.C.E. is more plausible (456; the fills from below the house even contain late second-century material, 441). This makes the Casa del Chirurgo roughly contemporary with the Casa di Sallustio (VI.2.4, 140–130 B.C.E.), which indeed shares many design similarities in spite of the different building technique. Disregarding much of the pre-existing architecture, the core of the building was reoriented toward Via Consolare. The atrium house, which we now know featured an impluvium at this stage, was inserted within a larger plot occupied by a garden framed by porticoes on two sides (the idea of an emphasis on the exterior vista from the area of the hortus at the back, which the excavators reconstruct as completely open on the east and south sides, seems problematic given that contemporary houses at VI.2 faced onto the Vicolo di Narciso). The replacement of the façades on the back of the house seems to have been dictated by the southward expansion of the Casa delle Vestali, dated by pottery to *c.* 100 B.C.E. (83; but this probably represents a terminus post quem).

The investigation into later changes to the house offers other valuable insights. Phase 4 is tentatively placed in the first half of the first century B.C.E. The thorny issue of whether ownership of the house changed with the arrival of the colonists is left aside, even though this stage is characterised by a short and well-defined redecoration phase in the Second Style (just after 80 B.C.E.?), which is generally rarely attested. This look was retained into the subsequent and more extended renovations (Phase 5: later first century B.C.E. to Augustan period), perhaps indicating a desire to preserve memory. The addition of workshops on the Via Consolare front in the Augustan phase flies in the face of the old notion that the repurposing of urban dwellings for commercial and craft activities postdated the 62 C.E. earthquake. Two further phases can be recognised between 42 and 79 C.E.: a final period of redecoration and modifications to the upper stories, whose Fourth Style paintings are dated to shortly before 62 C.E., and a period of repairs that were still ongoing when the eruption occurred (Phases 6–7, 99–110; the alternative

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435820000519 Published online by Cambridge University Press

explanation that Phase 6 followed the 62 C.E. earthquake and that Phase 7 may have been a response to later seismic aftershocks is explored briefly on 110).

Specialist reports analysing the ecofacts demonstrate the multiplicity of research agendas fruitfully pursued by the AAPP (chs 10–12, synthesised in ch. 13). In the conclusions, the environmental evidence is linked to wealthier or more humble periods within the house as suggested by its architecture (540–1). The study of the larger assemblages from Phases 3, 5 and 6, however, informs us more about city-wide trends than the single house context, since it appears that the material was sourced from midden thrown away elsewhere and reintroduced during major backfilling and levelling episodes (502 on the level of fragmentation of faunal remains; 518 on the general background noise characterising the archaeobotanical record; 517 on the occurrence of the 'normal' fuel signature known for Pompeii). These taphonomic biases probably affected the ceramic assemblages too, and it is hoped that the final publication of the finds from the house will examine the problem more systematically.

University of Missouri MARCELLO MOGETTA
mogettam@missouri.edu
doi:10.1017/S0075435820000519

T. P. WISEMAN, *THE HOUSE OF AUGUSTUS: A HISTORICAL DETECTIVE STORY*. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2019. Pp. xvi + 245, illus., maps, plans. ISBN 9780691180076. £27.00.

This book is the culmination of a series of arguments on Augustus, early Rome and the Palatine hill which Peter Wiseman has been developing for many years. For most readers, its title will evoke the house at the south-west corner of the Palatine first excavated by Gianfilippo Carettoni in the early 1960s. W.'s core argument is that this cannot have been where Augustus lived as *princeps*, not merely because it was demolished when the temple of Apollo was built, but for three additional reasons: 1) the summit of the hill offered stronger associations with Romulus; 2) the archaeological and literary evidence suggests a different topography for the Augustan Palatine; and 3) its opulence was out of keeping with Augustus' political position.

Paul Zanker claimed that the Carettoni house and the temple of Apollo were connected by a ramp, but Irene Iacopi and Giovanna Tedone's recent re-investigation has overturned this case. The ramp could not have reached the level of the temple in the horizontal space available, and in any case the upper floors of the house were demolished and its basement buried when the temple was built. Despite this, many still argue that part or all of it continued to be used by Augustus; for Andrea Carandini, the palatial character of the house makes it self-evidently his. It is to answer those who remain unconvinced by the archaeology that W.'s other three arguments come into play.

Firstly, W. works carefully through multiple stories about Rome's origins in order to demonstrate the greater attraction of the Palatine summit. Here, Varro's late republican account is key. W. argues that Augustus and his contemporaries could not have believed that the hut from which Romulus emerged to take the 'august augury' at Rome's foundation was the one at the top of the *Scalae Caci*, because Varro placed both him and the hut on the summit of the hill, allowing a clear view to the east. Secondly, he seeks to reconstruct the topography of the Augustan Palatine. The fire of A.D. 64 left scanty remains of this phase, but W. puts what we do know into dialogue with passing references in Augustan writers. The resultant hypothetical reconstruction places Augustus' house beneath the later *domus Augustana*, facing out onto a square *area Palatina*.

But in W.'s opinion, the most important argument against the Carettoni house is that it is too grand; indeed, that it was the sort of house Augustus preferred to demolish and replace with public buildings. This policy is well attested. Velleius (2.81.3) gives us Augustus buying up private houses for public use, while Suetonius (*Aug*. 72.1) gives us Augustus himself choosing to live in a modest house. But W. goes further on the politics behind it. His argument is that Augustus was the champion of the Roman people against an oppressive oligarchy, and that this is why he demolished their luxury properties and returned the space to the public. For W., this is 'the premise of the whole argument' (167), because he believes the alternative habit of viewing Augustus as an autocrat underpins the persistent identification of the Carettoni house as his.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435820000519 Published online by Cambridge University Press