interpretation of the Parthenon and the Acropolis.

Perhaps the many significant insights presented in this article and book would have been more universally attractive and acceptable to the scholarly public had the focus of interpretation been changed from the east frieze to the west cella of the Parthenon. Connelly is not the first to associate the word *parthenon* exclusively with the west cella of the great temple of Athena or with a locative plural case that indicates “the place of the maidens.” She is not the first to suggest that the four columns of the west cella of the Parthenon were Corinthian or that the origins of the Corinthian capital were specifically funerary. She has, however, added the lines of the *Erechtheus* to establish a very reasonable argument that the west cella of the Parthenon preserves and commemorates the spot of the tomb of the daughters of Erechtheus, the counterpart to the tomb of Erechtheus, both administered by the same priestess, just as the historical Erechtheus and Parthenon were administered. And she has cited many examples of tombs of heroes in other Greek sanctuaries. If all of that, in that specific context, had been more explicitly related to (1) the general and specific significance of Mycenaean remains for the character of the Acropolis as a religious sanctuary, (2) the broader significance of Mycenaean remains for the character of early post–Dark Age religion as a whole, and (3) the symbolic connection between the Ionic order and the Athenians’ most ancient history, Connelly might have established a less controversial, more easily accepted focus for her analysis than the sculptural specifics of the east frieze. Through that lens she could have analyzed the complex nature of the Parthenon as equal parts chthonic and Olympian, mythical and historical, ancient and contemporary, and would have all culminated in a remarkable punch line, an intriguing suggestion that need not have been proven, just established through the host of consistencies contained in this book: that the sacrifice that ultimately shaped the form and meaning of the fifth-century Parthenon is represented at the culmination of the Parthenon’s Ionic frieze.

**Note**


Diane Favro, Fikret K. Yegül, John Pinto, and Guy Métraux, eds.

*Paradigm and Progeny: Roman Imperial Architecture and Its Legacy* Portsmouth, R.I.: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 2015, 228 pp., 12 color and 131 b/w illus. $109, ISBN 9780991373055

While time-honored, Festschriften usually turn out to be a very mixed bag, displaying piety rather than qualitative progress. *Paradigm and Progeny* is a glorious exception, with every one of its fourteen chapters making a substantive contribution to scholarship on Roman architecture. The book’s genesis was a 2011 conference in honor of William MacDonald at the American Academy in Rome that featured a first-rate cast of presenters. That, and the time taken to prepare the papers for publication, has resulted in an excellent volume that constitutes a real tribute to the range of MacDonald’s impact on our understanding of Roman architecture and the inspiration he has provided. The chapters have been well edited; there is no proximity anywhere, and the information and analysis they present on a variety of key subjects will be an important resource for anyone working in the field.

The volume is organized into four parts, each reflecting the honoree’s interests and legacy. It starts from the ground up with Part 1, “Construction and Design,” with contributions by Gianni Ponti, Marcello Spanu, and Lothar Haselberger. Using the Severan basilica at Lepcis Magna as a test case, Ponti takes up the basic question of coordination between the marble quarry (in this case Proconnesos) and the architects and builders at the final destination. It was a flexible process that allowed “the architect to design and harmonize architectural orders that were quite different both in their structure and their visual impact” (24). This issue also pertains to Haselberger’s rich analysis of the components of the Pantheon façade with the help of 3-D laser scanning: the height variances of the columns are well known, and therefore the Corinthian capitals were configured individually in situ so as to compensate for these irregularities, which were not new (as in the Temple of Mars Ultor). Haselberger highlights well the interplay of new construction methods and the development of a new aesthetic of “refinements”; this process of adaptivity was carried forward in the incorporation of architectural *spolia* into new structures. Change in building traditions propelled by new technologies of construction is also the main theme of Spanu’s discussion of the introduction and development of *opus caementicium* in Asia Minor, especially at the time of Augustus. Typically, there was no standardization of sizes as bricks were produced on specific demand; the resulting heterogeneity, along with other local adaptations, is a hands-on example and reminder that material “Romanization” was based on both brick and marble.

Part 2, “Shaping the City and Villa,” contains five chapters. The theme of innovation continues in Thomas N. Howe’s discussion of architectural evolution at the *villae maritimae* at Stabiae, where we are again looking at an Augustan revolution: principally, a shift of the villas’ functional cores to panoramic rooms and the alignment of rooms parallel to the sea cliffs; the function of gardens changed along with it. Here as in several of the other chapters, some maps and illustrations are produced in color, greatly enhancing the visual quality of the volume. Similar perspectives inform James Packer’s excellent overview of the evolution of Rome’s premier *lieu de mémoire*, the Roman Forum, from Augustus to Diocletian. His narrative connects with those of Spanu and Howe by emphasizing the changes that took place under Augustus. Instead of casting them in a narrower frame, such as the Forum Romanum becoming a forum of the Julian family (per Paul Zanker) and its control over visual and memorial communication (per Susanne Muth), Packer strikes a more inclusive note that accords well with wider perspectives on Augustan phenomena: Augustus “transformed what had been a provincial Italian piazza into the center of the Roman world” (79). This larger perspective is accompanied, in line with the preceding chapters, by thorough attention to physical details of construction and design.

**ROBIN F. RHODES**

*University of Notre Dame*
Eugenio La Rocca’s perceptive discussion in his chapter titled “The Perception of Space in Ancient Rome” introduces the second sequence of essays in this part of the volume. It also connects with Packer’s chapter: the cityscape of late Republican Rome was a jungle that could not be redesigned ex nunc, and new monuments were generally grafted onto that fabric without regard for a larger plan. Augustus, as Diane Favro has demonstrated, tried to (literally) rectify the situation within existing constraints, but even that result is not enough for us to use a modern, Renaissance-based viewpoint with the laws of linear perspective and a single vanishing point. Instead, paratactical arrangements prevailed, even if they could take on the form of ensembles, as is the case with the temples at Largo Argentina. Mainly, however, the experience for the viewers was kinetic, and it was left to them to put this bricolage together in their own way—here, of course, memory comes into play.

Favro follows up on these topics with reference to MacDonald’s concept of “armatures” and using Nysa in Caria as a case study. She notes that, influenced by Robert Venturi’s departure from the dogma of the International Style and its substitution with a more experiential model and reality (hence Learning from Las Vegas), MacDonald’s approach was toward “a more embodied, evolutionary, and operational assessment of ancient cities” (107). In MacDonald’s definition, “Roman armatures are sophisticated responses to the universal urban need for an architecture of connection and passage—for unimpeded movement and casual assembly appropriately channeled and tellingly measured out for ready access to public places effectively marked.” Armature, in current terminology, is the operating system of a city, which now can be holistically reconstructed with digital models; Nysa provides a good illustration. The application continues in the next chapter, “The Importance of the Sea for the Urban Armature in Roman Carthage,” by T.J. Morton, where the focus is on the Antonine Baths.

The book’s third section, as one might expect, deals with Hadrian. In a stimulating essay, Guy Métraux explores the connection between memory and architecture by way of Hadrian’s use of “rather outdated” opus reticulatum at his Villa at Tivoli. He argues that it harks back to Agrippa, whose Pantheon Hadrian was rebuilding at the time; similar connections have been made for the caryatids. The larger panorama of associative architectural memories, resulting from Hadrian’s travels, includes the palace at Upper Herodium; here Métraux elaborates more specifically on a suggestion made by MacDonald.

Amid the focus on the Villa at Tivoli, Hadrian’s other villas have been almost totally ignored. In their contribution, Elizabeth Fentress and Sandra Gatti remedy that deficit with a detailed analysis of the Villa at Palestrina-Praeneste and Villa Magna at Anagni. Unsurprisingly, neither shows the inventiveness of the Tivoli Villa, which is truly unique. In the following chapter, “Hadrianopolis and Hadrian’s Fame as a Builder of Cities,” Corey Brennan enlarges the perspective by surveying, in their ancient context, both the traditions of the cities bearing Hadrian’s name and the gayerly use of Hadrian and his empire-wide roamings by the Mussolini regime. Alexander was the great model for the former; Plutarch ascribes some seventy emulous and other foundations to him, while Hadrian’s number about a dozen, most of them renamed. That was not enough to project him as a model for the “misione pacificatrice e civilizzatrice del’Impero.” What obtruded, mainly, was that intellectual curiosity, and not the expansion of Roman power, was the driving force for this peripatetic emperor.

The section concludes with an excellent chapter (in French) by Pierre Gros on the architectural and sculptural citations in the provinces of the temples of the divine emperors in the city of Rome. This is an important contribution, from the side of architectural history, to two subjects that have been discussed much of late: the so-called imperial cult and the imitatio urbis. Gros combines his typically sound control of architectural and other details with an acute perspective on the cosmopolitanism of the phenomenon, which accords well with the outlook of both Hadrian and MacDonald.

Part 4, “The Nature and Legacy of Classicism,” provides a fitting finale. Returning to the Pantheon, John Pinto discusses Piranesi’s evolving attitudes and, in particular, his departure from Vitruvian classicism toward ornamental license. The resulting vision was inclusive, acknowledging the authority of antiquity but also finding merit in noncanonical examples and searching for new forms. As Pinto, citing John Wilton-Ely, notes, this eclecticism of design reflected the cultural diversity of the Roman Empire; it also resonates, for example, in the articulation of modern classicism by architects like Robert M. Stern. The concluding chapter is a stimulating and almost philosophical reflection by Fikret Yegül on the classical column, showing its symbolic and even metaphorical dimensions beyond structural necessity. With examples ranging widely from Palmyra to a cartoon about the ratification of the U.S. Constitution, and including Hadrian’s Library at Athens and the Pantheon, Yegül meditates on the multiple meanings columns can take on, easy anthropomorphization among them.

As the discussion above suggests, many of the chapters in this outstanding volume take on topics that connect with one another and also with larger themes. In this, and in their sophistication and substance, they reflect and are a fitting tribute to William MacDonald’s interests and vision.