

Evans took part in the excavations at Fengate and appears in one of the many photographs that illuminate the volume. As befits such a complex landscape the volume contains numerous insets that cover all sorts of asides about recording practice, sampling and redundant information, Neolithic houses, etc. But perhaps the most enjoyable of these asides is the concluding section which presents interviews with Pryor, Fleming and Bradley who were all pioneers in the interpretation of early field systems. This is a delight and an important historical document that contributes a significant lesson on the serendipity of archaeological field-work.

Paul Rehak (ed. John G. Younger) 2007. *Imperium and Cosmos: Augustus and the Northern Campus Martius*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press. ISBN 978-0-29922-014-3.

Reviewed by **Patrick Murray**

In a famous passage in his life of Augustus, Suetonius reflects on the extent of the transformation of Rome's cityscape under the *princeps*: in Suetonius' estimation, Augustus had 'so beautified [Rome]... that he could justly boast that he had found it built of brick and left it in marble'. Much has been written about the Augustan program of building and refurbishment in the area of the Fora, and in the Southern Campus Martius. In *Imperium and Cosmos*, Paul Rehak briefly discusses the process by which Augustus and other members of his family remodelled these public areas into Julian family monuments, excluding the great Senatorial families who had traditionally used them for competitive displays of power and wealth.

But Rehak's focus is on the Northern Campus Martius, and the complex of four monuments built by Augustus in the decades after Actium. These monuments – the Ustrinum (site of Augustus' cremation); the Mausoleum; the Horologium-Solarium (an enormous sundial); and the Ara Pacis Augustae (the Altar of Augustan Peace) – form a distinct part of Augustus' building program. Unlike the buildings of the Southern Campus Martius and the Fora, the Northern Campus Martius complex possesses none of the 'political, military, commercial or social functions' ordinarily associated with Roman public buildings. Rather, as Rehak argues, they were intended as expressions of monarchical and divine power, and stand in marked contrast to Augustus' preferred image of himself as first among senatorial equals.

Imperium and Cosmos provides a meticulous discussion of the monuments' structure and the imagery of their sculpture, contextualising Rehak's analysis of the overall ideological program behind the complex. Rehak mounts a compelling case for the complex as a 'cognitive map of cosmic imperium', intended to commemorate Augustus' life and achievements, to serve as the ground for his apotheosis and deification after his death, and as a 'declaration and definition of' the imperial role Augustus had come to play, a yardstick against which his successors would be measured. The complex resembles the monuments of Hellenistic ruler cults – and, as Rehak points out, this resemblance is no coincidence, given Augustus' veneration of Alexander the Great, and exposure to the royal sites of the East.

Far from emphasising continuity with the Republic, each of the monuments that make up the complex 'convey specific monarchical messages' to the viewer. The Ustrinum facilitated Augustus' apotheosis as his mortal body was destroyed by fire, while the Mausoleum – unmistakably a dynastic tomb – provided a resting place for the new Roman Imperial family, and was surmounted by Augustus' deified figure, looking out over Rome from what must have seemed a heavenly height. The Horologium-Solarium 'elevat[e] Aug[us]tan time and the birth of the princeps to a cosmic level', stamping Augustus' conception, birth and life as events of immense astrological significance – the beginning of a new 'Golden Age' – and placing Augustus at the centre of the cosmos. Finally, the Ara Pacis served as a memorial to the peace Augustus had won, but also as a symbol of the new 'Golden Age', and a means by which Augustus could align his achievements with those of Rome's first kings, Romulus and Numa.

In *Imperium and Cosmos*, Rehak has comprehensively detailed the ideological underpinnings of these monuments, and their place as reflections of the evolution of Augustus' own conception of his role and achievements, not only in Roman politics, but in history. Like the *Res Gestae* – set up in bronze in front of the Mausoleum – the complex was a conscious attempt to define his place in world history, and enforce his self-assessment on generations to come; as Rehak puts it, a 'justification of apotheosis'.

Pamela Jane Smith 2009. *A "Splendid Idiosyncrasy": Prehistory at Cambridge 1915–50*. Oxford: Archaeopress BAR British Series 485. vi + 220 pp. Illustrated with figures, maps, plans, drawings and photographs. ISBN 978-1-40730-430-4.

Reviewed by **Richard Tattersall**

Pamela Jane Smith takes the title of her work from Anthony Quinton's description of archaeology and anthropology at Cambridge University in the interwar period; a time when 'Archaeology was a comparatively marginal subject in Cambridge ... and many of its exponents were amateurish or odd or both' (quoted by Smith 2009: 1) – a comment that could be applied to many British archaeologists of that era, not just those of Cambridge.

The study, based on her 2004 doctoral thesis, is offered as 'a block for the building of a broader informed history of British academic archaeology' (Smith 2009: 1), and its author sets out to chart how archaeology was institutionalised as a university degree subject at Cambridge between the early and the middle years of the twentieth century.

The theoretical approach is threefold. Firstly, the research schools model taken from history of science studies. This suggests that the success of a research school is likely to be associated with a charismatic leader with a research reputation, combined with a 'focused research programme, a pool of recruits, new exploitable techniques, new fields of research and a publication outlet' (Smith 2009: 6).

Secondly, geography of knowledge insights in relation to the spread of Cambridge archaeology, and finally a gender-based analysis. A methodology section is followed by chapters containing biographical sketches of three key figures (and many more minor ones) seen as protagonists in successive decades of Cambridge archaeology – for the twenties, Miles Burkitt, for the thirties, Grahame Clark, and for the forties, Dorothy Garrod. The conclusion is that whilst archaeology under the influence of Grahame Clark fits the research schools model, the case is less than clear in respect of Burkitt and Garrod. Smith suggests the research schools model needs to be modified to take account of 'strong emotions, motivations and belief systems' in the case of Burkitt (Smith 2009: 105), and to highlight gender issues – an important dimension during Dorothy Garrod's tenure as Disney Professor at Cambridge. In addition, the top-down, charismatic leader model is found wanting, requiring to be augmented by a more nuanced faculty-wide corporate knowledge approach. The model also needs modification to account for the agency of the student population – self-starting and creative students were a key factor in disseminating Cambridge archaeology throughout the world. Much importance is also attributed to the museum tea-room, as a place where informal discussion of academic ideas could take place, and a climate of trust nurtured. Attached to the study is a lengthy appendix comprising of transcripts of taped interviews with a number of distinguished ex-Cambridge students.

The most successful and absorbing parts of the work are the three central chapters of biographical information, painting a wonderfully rich picture of archaeology as practised at Cambridge in the study period, supplemented by some fascinating interviews in the appendix. The theoretical arguments are less convincing. Smith is clearly critical of the 'stage-oriented archaeological history of the world in 300 pages' seeking 'to recover intentions, reconstruct conventions and restore context in a fine grained analysis' (Smith 2009: 13) and fortunately for her readers, she mostly escapes from her theoretical shackles. It should be remembered that the monograph represents Smith's thinking of five years ago when submitted as her doctoral thesis. It seems she came late in her research upon Richard