

BOOK REVIEW

The Pantheon: From Antiquity to the Present. By TOD A. MARDER AND MARK WILSON JONES. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015. Pp. xx + 476. Hardcover, \$99.99. ISBN 978-0-521-80932-0.

Few monuments from antiquity have engaged scholarship to such an extent as the Pantheon, a fact clearly illustrated by the thirteen contributions assembled here which address the building's fabric and history from antiquity to the present. This volume consolidates recent progress regarding the technical and historical questions that continue to linger, while setting out the current state of research for a wider public (3). In achieving these goals, the editors have also integrated the individual contributions into a coherent whole. *The Pantheon* does not mask its indebtedness to previous works, most notably William L. MacDonald's classic study,¹ but instead offers a significant update through the application of decades of new research and new digital modelling technologies.

A lengthy opening chapter by the editors sets the stage for the volume as a whole. Summaries of each contribution are interwoven into a thematic and diachronic narrative that provides orientation for the more narrowly-focused chapters to come. The remainder of the volume is essentially divided into two parts, with the first group of contributions (Chapters 2–7) thematically focused on the physical structure of the Pantheon and the second group (Chapters 8–13) diachronically focused on the history of the building's reception from the Middle Ages to the 20th century.

In Chapter 2, Eugenio La Rocca reviews the evidence for Agrippa's original Pantheon and concludes that there was a direct, physical relationship between the earlier building and the one constructed in the 2nd century, emphasizing the importance of the site within the context of Roman history and its axial relationship with Augustus' mausoleum. In the following chapter, Lise M. Hetland revisits an earlier study of the brickstamps² to offer a convincing argument for re-

¹ MacDonald, William L. *The Pantheon: Design, Meaning, and Progeny*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976 (repr. 1981, 2002).

² Hetland, Lise. "Dating the Pantheon." *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 20, 2007, pp. 95-112.

dating the Pantheon's design and initial phases of construction to the end of Trajan's reign, calling into question previous tendencies to associate such dramatic architectural advancements to the Hadrianic period.

In Chapters 4 and 5, respectively, Giangiacomo Martines engages in a technical exploration of the Pantheon's architecture, focusing on the dome and rotunda, while Gene Waddell innovatively examines clusters of features, such as other instances of freestanding buildings with attached porticoes, or domes with coffers and an oculus, in order to determine the Pantheon's most probable prototypes, concluding that although it had numerous sources of inspiration it drew most heavily from Trajanic projects.

In Chapter 6, Janet DeLaine employs her method of reverse quantity surveying, originally developed for her work on the Baths of Caracalla,³ to calculate a rough estimate of the minimum manpower and construction time required to build the Pantheon. She concludes, in accord with earlier chapters, that the minimum estimate of nine years places it within the corpus of final projects commissioned under Trajan. Mark Wilson Jones closes this group of thematically-based contributions with a survey of how close, architecturally-speaking, the Pantheon came to failure, and how its completion relied heavily on compromise, a fact clearly illustrated in the awkward joining of the portico, transitional block, and rotunda.

The group of diachronically-arranged chapters begins with Erik Thunø's survey of the Pantheon's history from its completion to the period before the Renaissance, focusing on the building's use as a church after the early 7th century and its role within the liturgical life of medieval Rome. In Chapter 9, Arnold Nesselrath provides an overview of how various personalities engaged with the Pantheon during the Renaissance and how those engagements produced new visions, whether idealized re-imaginings of the building or inspiration for new projects.

The chapters by Tod A. Marder and Susanna Pasquali focus on the 17th and 18th (to early 19th) centuries, respectively, the centuries that left the most permanent physical alterations, whether by the 17th-century popes or the conflicting antiquarian and Christian interests of the 18th century. Chapter 12 by Robin B. Williams offers a fascinating exploration of the role that the Pantheon, tied closely together with (the body of) Vittorio Emanuele II, played in the construction of

³ DeLaine, Janet. *The Baths of Caracalla in Rome: A Study in the Design, Construction, and Economics of Large-Scale Building Projects in Imperial Rome* (*Journal of Roman Archaeology*, Supplement 25), Portsmouth, 1997.

a new political legitimacy for modern Italy at the end of the 19th century. In the final chapter, Richard A. Etlin complements the final chapter of MacDonald's volume by approaching the Pantheon's reception through an examination of the ways in which its design was repeatedly favored to house new institutions or reflect the redefinition of traditional institutions during the Neoclassical movements of the late 18th to early 19th and 20th centuries.

Given the diversity of the contributors' backgrounds, this volume should appeal to many disciplines, including, but not limited to, classical studies, archaeology, art history, history, architecture, and landscape architecture. Several chapters also lend themselves to undergraduate and graduate discussion readings, although instructors should be advised that images in one chapter are often referenced by multiple chapters. Typographic errors are few (though note that on pp. 2 and 24, Ammianus Marcellinus is 4th century AD., not BC.). The editors have successfully brought the Pantheon's scholarship up-to-date with this volume, but they make no declaration that this is the final word on the subject. As the reader is repeatedly reminded, there are always avenues for new research and even the most traditionally-held views are susceptible to future reassessment.

MARK D. HAMMOND

Independent scholar; mdhammond1204@gmail.com