

AUGUSTUS AND HIS MAUSOLEUM: ARCHITECTURE AND URBAN IDEOLOGY

1. Introduction

The Mausoleum of Augustus stands today in the Piazzale Augusto Imperatore in Rome, liberated from the cluttering of late Renaissance urban fabric around it by the bulldozing activity after 1934¹. The architects of Mussolini transformed the area to a fascist architectural ensemble, providing a particular visual emphasis on the ancient monument, which would then become “the symbol of the new imperial Rome” and the unrivalled focus of the Augustan bimillennium (Figs. 1-2)². Nevertheless, while Augustus

¹The building has a peculiar architectural history from the medieval period down to 1934. In the twelfth century it was transformed into a fortress of a notable Roman family, the Colonna. It was also used as an amphitheater and a bull ring as evident from the engravings. In the second half of 16th century, it was thoroughly excavated and the statue garden of the Soderini family was installed inside. In the 18th century, being owned by the Portuguese Vincenzo Correa, “it became a popular *plaza de toros*” and continuously used as a place of entertainment until Mussolini wielded his pick over the structure in 1934. In 1907, some archaeological work was carried out during the construction of the concert hall. The work resumed between 1926-1930. The concluding excavations and the restoration of the monument was finished in 1938. The results of this archaeological work were partly published by G. Gatti, along with his reconstructions. See Gatti 1934 & 1938; also most recently Riccomini 1995; Richardson 1992, 247; von Hesberg 1996, 236-37. For a more detailed history of the monument, see references at Riccomini 1995, no.2 and von Hesberg 1996, 237.

²Riccomini 1995, 265-66. The Mausoleum was still functioning as a concert hall in 1934, when the dismantling of the whole area started, so the monument is unfortunately deprived from any real human activity and put to neglect immediately after the celebrations. This area was not the only victim of Mussolini’s thorough demolitions in the historical urban fabric of Rome. See Spiro Kostof, “His Majesty the Pick: The Aesthetics of Demolition”, in Zeynep Çelik, Diane Favro & Richard Ingersoll (eds.), *Streets: Critical Perspectives on Public Space*, (Berkeley, 1996), 9-22. Augustus was Mussolini’s proclaimed archetype.

received some enthusiastic celebration from the early 20th century monarchs, often taking him as an “archetype”, the actual nature of his principate between the Roman republic and empire, and the ideological message conveyed by his monuments has been the subject matter of continuous debate³. Augustus’s monumental tomb which is generally assigned to a rather early phase in his lifetime, present a particularly complicated (art-) historical problem of the initial stages in the formulation of an ideological framework for the urban transformation of Roman city-scape that would follow in his reign.

The death of Caesar (44 BC), who had adopted Octavian as his son, was followed with the respectively uneasy period of the triumvirate which constituted —especially towards its end— much rivalry and struggle for power between Octavian and Marcus Antonius⁴. The short time period from the break of the triumvirate (32 BC) to Octavian’s restoration of the *res publica* (27 BC) is often considered to be a crucial transitional period in young Octavian’s political carrier⁵. After the battle of Actium (31 BC) and his subsequent conquest of Egypt (30 BC), Octavian was not only looking for his new role in the republic but also putting a number of building projects in Rome already under their way⁶. The Forum Romanum was being extensively embellished with the triumph

³On this subject, see esp. various articles in Raaflaub & Toher 1990, that celebrated the 50th anniversary of the publication of the work: R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939). On the same line of thought, for literary treatments of the subject, see the articles in the recent T. Habinek & A. Schiesaro (eds), *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge 1997; esp. that of B. Kellum, “Concealing/revealing: gender and play of meaning in the monuments of Augustan Rome”, *ibid.* 158-181. On the ideology of Augustan monuments, esp. Zanker 1990; Favro 1996. Also significant is the publication after Berlin 1988 exhibition; *Kaiser Augustus und die Vorläuferrepublik*, Antikenmuseum Berlin (Mainz 1988). Most recently, K. Galinsky “Making haste slowly: New books on the Augustan age”, *CJ* 93 (1997) 93-99. I also owe my thanks to Prof. Lothar Haselberger for kindly making me available a draft of his forthcoming review of Favro 1996. There he lists (note 1) a much comprehensive bibliography of the recent discussions of the Augustan rule and its monuments.

⁴The third triumvir was Marcus Lepidus, the governor of Spain and Gallia Narbonensis at the time, but later defeated by Octavian in 36 BC. Goodman 1997, 36. Also see Eder 1990, 89-97; for the first phase of Augustus’s carrier, “from *Vindex Libertatis* to defender of Rome”.

⁵See Eder 1990, 88f; Goodman 1997, 31-46.

⁶Zanker 1990, 79-100; Favro 1996, 79-142; esp. 83-86 for a table of building activity in Rome associated with triumphs, ovations, victories. Otherwise, for a wider chronological table, see

monuments of Octavian, especially with the dedication of the Temple of Divus Iulius, while a temple to Apollo was under construction on the Palatine within the limits of Octavian's own dwelling. Tremendous effort must have been put in the restoration of eighty-two Republican temples in Rome during the year 28 BC⁷. The construction of the Mausoleum on the other hand was marking the beginnings of the transformation of the northern Campus Martius. The multivalent ideology behind the variety of these architectural projects undertaken at this time period are associated with a continuous but ambiguous shift in-between the immediate commemoration of the battle of Actium, glorification of the *Gens Iulia* and the revival of the Republican traditions on the way to the reconstitution of the *res publica*. Only after "the restoration of the full authority to the senate by Augustus" and subsequently "the bestowal of the title of Augustus, which moved his person... into the company of Romulus, the founder of the city, and elevated him beyond mortal limits"⁸, Augustus was ready to *inaugurate* his comprehensive and well-structured program of urban renewal in Rome.

In this historical context, the monumental tomb of Augustus raises a three-fold problem for the architectural historians. In the first place, the title of the monument, viz. "Mausoleum" (Mausileion), after the conspicuous tomb of the pre-Hellenistic Carian dynast Mausolos, appears to be an ideological statement by itself. The contemporaneous textual references to the Augustan monument make it clear that the monument was known specifically with this name, and the word "mausoleum" did not have a general

Frederick W. Shipley, "Chronology of the building operations in Rome from the death of Caesar to the death of Augustus", *MAAR* 9 (1931) 7-60, with textual references, commentary and an index.

⁷Aug. *RG* 20.4: "In my sixth consulship I restored eighty-two temples of the gods in the city on the authority of the senate, neglecting none that required restoration at that time"

⁸Eder 1990, 88, 105. See also Aug. *RG* 34; Zanker 98-100; Goodman 39.

meaning of “monumental tomb” in this specific context⁹. The problem is even more complicated if one considers that in contrast to the tomb of Mausolos, Augustus’ mausoleum was a family/clan tomb in the line of the Republican funerary monuments; not only for the members of the *Gens Iulia*, but also Augustus’s most notable friends. The first burial of Marcellus, Augustus’ nephew in 23 BC was followed by his son-in-law Marcus Agrippa in 12 BC. Before Augustus’ own ashes took their own prominent place in the burial chambers of the Mausoleum in 14 AD, Drusus the Elder (9 BC) and, Lucius and Gaius Caesar (2 and 4 AD) were also deposited here¹⁰.

Secondly, the innovative architectural form of the monument attracted the curiosity of several scholars, who showed glamorous efforts to figure out its sources of derivation¹¹. The variety of references of its supposed tumulus form occupied the center of attention, since this could very well bring references to Alexander and his archaeologically unknown tomb at Alexandria. However, the unique architectural design and constructional intricacies of the Mausoleum received little interest so far. Henner von Hesberg’s recent and careful investigations and publications on the architecture of the Mausoleum seem to have resolved at least some of the problems in this issue including a more precise dating¹².

⁹Strabo 5.3.8; Seut. *Aug.* 100.4. Herzberg (1988, 248) confirms the reference to the Mausoleum of Halikarnassos. This is esp. advocated by J.-C. Richard 1970, 370-75. See also Pedersen 1994, 19. See the discussion below in the next section.

¹⁰Burials continued after Augustus’ death and the last emperor buried in the Mausoleum was Nerva in 96 BC, and it was a special case since the Flavians had their own clan tomb. In the interim, Drusus the Younger, Livia, Tiberius, Agrippina, mother of Caligula, Nero and Drusus (brothers of Caligula) and Poppaea (wife of Nero) were deposited in the Mausoleum. Richardson 1992, 248-49; Claridge 1998, 183.

¹¹Recently J.C. Reeder discussed the various hypotheses for the architectural background of the monument with extensive bibliography, as an introduction to his long and verbose Samothrace and tholos-type argumentation; see Reeder 1992, 265-278.

¹²In addition to von Hesberg’s contributions to *Kaise Augustus* (1988) and *LTUR* (1996), his major publication *Das Mausoleum des Augustus: Der Bau und seine Inschriften* (München 1994) is co-authored by Silvio Panciera, who studied the building inscriptions.

Less emphasized however is the urban context of the monument, that was built within a formal urban landscape and marked the northern limits of Campus Martius. The aim of this paper is therefore to concentrate upon the last problem after reviewing some of the discussions on the monument's architectural form and the appropriate textual references to it, in order to be able to suggest a new insight to the urbanistic character of the monument. It will be mainly argued below that the Mausoleum was not an isolated funerary monument in the Republican tomb tradition, but it was built as the first and probably most important piece of an architectural ensemble, possibly with the *Horologium Augusti*, the *Ustrinum Domus Augustae* and the *Ara Pacis Augustae*, all of which were conceived within the formal layout of a royal publicized funerary *horti*.

2. Strabo and Vitruvius: Augustan Mausoleum in the literary context

Augustus located his monumental tomb in the northern limits of Campus Martius between the Via Flaminia and the Tiber. After running parallel to Via Flaminia and the Pincian hill to the east and creating a fairly narrow entry to Rome, Tiber makes a sharp westward bend here, opening the space for the wide marshland of the Campus. The Mausoleum marks the mouth of this isthmus, and with its colossal dimensions, it dominates the entry to the city. The symbolic significance of Via Flaminia to the generals including essentially Augustus himself, in their victorious returns from Gaul, Spain, Dalmatia and North Italy should be obvious¹³. Along with the erection of his Mausoleum, Augustus built a monumental arch over the Pons Mulvius to the north and restored this imperial and military highway extensively in 27 BC¹⁴.

¹³Favro 1996, 209-211; Richardson 1992, 415-416,

¹⁴Aug. RG 20.5: "In my seventh consulship I restored the Via Flaminia from the city as far as Rimini, together with all bridges except the Mulvian and the Minucian". For the urban significance of the Via Flaminia, see Favro 1996, 209-210. The reconstruction of the Mulvian bridge must have been much earlier, since in 27 BC the bridge seems to be in good condition. A coin minted in Spain most probably depicts the Mulvian bridge with Augustus on a chariot drawn by elephants. See Favro 1996, fig. 102.

Strabo's famous account of Rome (*Geo.* 5.3.8), written some time before 7 BC is concentrated predominantly on the urban image of Campus Martius and its monuments, in contrast to the almost neglected city within the walls. He seems to be particularly fascinated with the overall vivid picture of the public life within the integrated space of landscape and townscape, "which present[ed] the eye the appearance of a stage-painting... a spectacle that one could hardly draw away from". Towards the end of his account, Strabo brings the word to the Mausoleum, which he counts as the most prominent among the funerary monuments in the Campus;

... in the belief that this place was the holiest of all, the Romans have erected in it the tombs [mnēmata] of most illustrious men and women. The most noteworthy is what is called the Mausoleum [tū Mausoleion kalōmenon], a great mound [xōma mōga] near the river on a lofty foundation of white marble, thickly covered with ever-green trees to the very summit. Now on top is a bronze image of Augustus Caesar; beneath the mound are the tombs of himself and his kinsmen and intimates; behind the mound is a large sacred precinct [mōga êlsow, more literally "large sacred grove" (Ö.H.)] with wonderful promenades; and in the center of the Campus is the wall (this too of white marble) round his crematorium; the wall is surrounded by a circular iron fence and the space within the wall is planted with black poplars. Strabo 5.3.8.

Strabo's text is not only the earliest reference to a monumental tomb with the title "mausoleum" other than that of Mausolos, but it also offers the most detailed account of its architectural form¹⁵. A careful observation of the original text reveals that the monument was "called the Mausoleum" at this time rather than the term referring to a generic tomb type. Suetonius (*Aug.* 100.4) addressed the tomb also as "Mausoleo", and added that in 28 BC, Augustus had "opened to the public the groves and walks [*silvas et ambulationes*] by which [the Mausoleum] was surrounded".

The *alsos* of Strabo's description can thus be easily equated with what Suetonius called *silva*. The opening of such a wooded park to the Roman people immediately

¹⁵Suetonius also calls it "Mausoleo", *Suet. Aug.* 100.4; the same name appears on a number of inscriptions: *CIL* 9.5290 (*fasti Cuprensis*), *CIL* 6.8686 (*purocurator m.*). Other notable references to the monument were *Tumulus* (*Verg. Aen.* 6.873), *Tumulus Augusti* (*Tac. ann.* 3.4.1), *Tumulus Iuliorum* (*Tac. ann.* 16.6.2), *Mnemeion* (*Cass.Dio* 53.30.5, 54.28.5). For other references, see Richard 1970, 370-75; von Hesberg 1996, 234.

reminds us J. Caesar's bequethal of his *horti* in the *Trans Tiberim* and its contents to the Roman people (Suet. *Iul.* 83.2). Augustus' gigantic Naumachia also in the Trans Tiber was surrounded by a sacred grove called the *Nemus Caesarum*, which was subsequently renamed by Augustus himself after his grandsons Gaius and Lucius¹⁶. This apparent and immediate reference by the *divi filius* Augustus to his "deified father-in-law" Julius Caesar is well complemented by his dedication of the Temple of *Divus Iulius* in the *Forum Romanum* (29 BC) as part of his triumph after the battle of Actium¹⁷. It is also of significant note that this section of the northern Campus used to be Pompey the Great's *horti*, and it was eventually handed over to Marcus Antonius. After Augustus' defeat of Antonius at Actium, the property fell into the hands of Augustus¹⁸. By building his own memorial monument on the prior land of his rival and immediately opening it up as a large public park to the Roman people, Augustus was clearly making an important statement of power, as well as a statement of his faithfulness to the Roman people, in contrast to Antonius, who was accused to have planned to establish a Hellenistic dynasty and move the capital to Alexandria¹⁹.

However, the word "mausoleum" still remains to be explored. Diane Favro (1993, 247) already brought to attention the significance of the naming of the monuments in the Augustan urban ideology. Since the architectural form of Augustus' tomb did not have much in common with the famous tomb of Mausolos at Halikarnassos (as it will be

¹⁶Aug. RG 23; Suet. *Aug.* 43.1; Dio 66.25.3. See J. H. D'Arms, "Between public and private: the *epulum publicum* and Caesar's *Horti Trans Tiberim*", in M. Cima & E. La Rocca (eds.) *Horti Romani* (Rome 1998) 33-44. Also R. E. Palmer, "The topography and social history of Rome's Trastevere (southern sector)" *ProcPhilSoc* 125 (1981) 368-397. R. Taylor, "Torrent or Trickle? The Aqua Alsietina, the naumachia Augusti, and the Transtiberim", *AJA* 101 (1997) 465-492.

¹⁷Zanker 1990, 79f.; Haeckl 1996, 11-25; Favro (1996, 95): "After the peace of Brundisium in 40 BC, Octavian began to call himself *Divi filius*"

¹⁸Favro 1996, 260, also 328 no.4

¹⁹For a detailed historical account of the rivalry between Octavian and Antonius, see Eder 1990, 98-101. It is often claimed that Augustus' early project of a temple of Apollo on the Palatine was a reaction to Antonius' self-association with Dionysus, as "New Dionysus". See also Galinsky 1996, 223-24.

discussed in the next section), one needs to look for literary evidence. The most important ancient source for the possible Augustan reference to the Carian dynast comes from Vitruvius' *De Architectura*, which was written ca. 27-20 BC and dedicated to Augustus²⁰. Having introduced the brick walls with Proconassian marble and polished stucco revetment at the royal residence of "the most potent king Mausolos" in Book II of *De Architectura*, Vitruvius interrupts his elaborate discussion of wall techniques, sparing six long paragraphs to introduce Mausolos and his dynastic building activity at Halikarnassos²¹. Vitruvius presents him as an ingenious and skillful builder of his dynasty and his capital at Halikarnassos. He gives a detailed description of the urban context for the Mausoleum:

...the [site] had a curvature like that of the seats in a theater. On the lowest tier, along the harbor, was built the forum. About half-way up the curving slope, at the point where the curved cross-aisle is in a theater, a *broad wide street* was laid out, *in the middle of which was built the Mausoleum*... At the top of the hill in the center [*In summa arce media*] is the [temple] of Mars, containing a *colossal acrolithic statue* by the famous hand of Leochares... (Vitr. 2.8.11) [emphasis mine. Ö.H.]

The urban relation of the tomb of Mausolos to the major street and the harbour at Halicarnassos has striking similarities with the urban location of the Mausoleum of Augustus with respect to Via Flaminia and the Tiber (Figs 3-4). Recent archaeological work at Halikarnassos which heavily concentrated on the Mausoleum itself, proved the impressive accuracy of Vitruvius' descriptions²². It is also tempting to consider the architectural parallels that Pedersen has drawn between the palace of Mausolos on an eminence right by the harbor of Halikarnassos and the *domus* of Augustus on the Palatine

²⁰Anderson 1997, 40-44 is the most updated evidence about Vitruvius, his life and work. See also the extensively used translation by M.H. Morgan, *Vitruvius: The Ten Books on Architecture*, (Harvard University Press 1914; new. ed. New York, 1960).

²¹Vitr. 2.8.11-16. For the building program in pre-hellenistic Hekatomnid Caria, see various articles in Isager (ed) 1994 and Linders & Hellström 1989.

²²See Pedersen 1994, esp. fig.2; also Birte Poulsen, "The new excavations in Halikarnassos" in Isager (ed) 1994, 115-131. Vitruvius' account is discussed earlier by Jeppesen (1981-83) and later more comprehensively in Jeppesen et al (1986): Vol. II. Written Sources.

in Rome, both of which were supplied with a temple of Apollo²³. A comparison of the Mars Ultor temple in the Forum Augustum and the the sanctuary of Ares at Halikarnassos was also brought. Most important is however, is the fact that excavators of the Mausoleum of Halikarnassos reconstructed the immediate layout of the monument within an enclosure identified as a “garden” which certainly contained a funeral “pyre” of Mausolos (Fig.5).

Jeppesen proposed that it is not very unlikely that Vitruvius might have visited Halikarnassos as he accompanied Julius Caesar’s campaign in Pontos and that his writings on Halikarnassos were most possibly a firsthand knowledge of its topography²⁴. J.-C. Richard hypothesized that it might have been L. Munatius Plancus, the proconsul of Asia in 40-38 BC, who was responsible for the naming of Augustus’ monumental tomb²⁵. Being an important political figure in the Post-Actium Rome, M. Plancus had also built a mausoleum for his family in Gaeta, Campania, which shared striking similarities in its architecture with the Mausoleum of Augustus (fig. 5)²⁶. In any case, it is clear that much detailed first hand information about Mausolos and his building projects was available to the Roman emperor. It is also highly probable that Augustus’ interest in Halikarnassos lies in the fact that Alexander the Great has been to Halikarnassos, immediately after the completion of Mausolos’s monumental tomb, and that many of the famous craftsmen of the city, like the Athenian sculptor *Leochares*, later served for the projects of the Macedonian royal family²⁷.

²³Pedersen 1994, 19, although he admits that this might be a mere coincidence.

²⁴Vitruvius is known to have served for both Caesar and Augustus as a military engineer and joined a majority of their campaigns. See Jeppesen 1981-83, esp. 85 and 97.

²⁵Without doubt, M. Plancus had good knowledge of Caria at that time, since the inhabitants of Mylasa, a city in Caria, where mausolos was born, rendered a cult after him. Richard 1970, 382-83.

²⁶See Colvin 1991, 67, fig. 55.

²⁷See “Alexander and the Hekatomnids” in Pedersen 1994, pp. 13-18.

Another important reference to Alexander's interest in the tomb of a major eastern dynast comes from Strabo (*Geo.* 15.3.7). According to the text, entering Pasargadae in the Achaemenid heartland, Alexander visited the tomb of Cyrus the Great, which was built "in a park [*ἡν παραδείσῳ*] ... [it was] a small tower and was concealed within the dense growth of trees". While the tomb of Cyrus, that was built by imported Lydian-Ionian craftsmen, had great impact in the architecture of tower type tombs in Caria and elsewhere, the Persian royal gardens, viz. *paradeisos*, with formal landscape designs and extensive waterworks, would also become a widespread element in the satrapal residences of Persian Asia Minor²⁸. Such formal gardens were well known in Hellenistic Mediterranean, especially Alexandria, and particularly in the funerary contexts²⁹ and it is tempting to think that the formal landscape designs within *horti* and funerary gardens of the late Republican and early Imperial Rome, should be considered within the same tradition³⁰.

All of this textual and architectural evidence suggest a meaningful historical context for and an alternative reading of Augustan Mausoleum, which was conceived within a formal landscape design, and topped by "evergreen trees". Both Alexanderian and Augustan references to the eastern dynasts in the shaping of their rulership ideology becomes evident, particularly in their "wish to express their power by altering the face of nature"³¹. Mausolos who presented himself as the *ktistes*, the new founder of his dynasty

²⁸See for instance Xen. *An.* 1.2.20 for a detailed description of the satrapal palace with *paradeisos* at Kelainai, in southern Phrygia. See C. Nylander, *Ionians in Pasargadae* (Uppsala 1970), for the architecture of the tomb of Cyrus and its Anatolian workmen. For the excavated *paradeisos* at Pasargadae, see D. Stronach, "Parterres and stone watercourses at Pasargadae: notes on the Achaemenid contribution to garden design", *Journal of Garden History* 14 (1994) 3-12.

²⁹See Farrar 1998, 1-11; Purcell 1987, 29-30; P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford 1972), 5-37.

³⁰Farrar 1998, 21-26; see especially and most recently articles in M. Cima & E. La Rocca (eds), *Horti Romani* (Roma, 1998), esp. A. Wallace-Hadrill, "Horti and Hellenization", *ibid.* 1-13. Also various articles appeared in E.B. Macdougall (ed), *Ancient Roman Villa Gardens* (Washington 1984). Special reference should be made to N. Purcell, "Town in country and country in town", *ibid.* 187-203.

³¹Purcell (*supra* no.31), 190.

and Halikarnassos, must have been a good model for both Alexander—who is known to have founded several cities—and Augustus—who changed the face of the city of Rome with his extensive urban transformation program³².

3. Architectural Typology: A Lofty Tumulus

Strabo's description of the Mausoleum was the primary inspiration for the various reconstructions, along with the extant architectural remains (Figs. 7-12)³³. The peculiar infra-structure of the monument comprises five concentric rings of concrete walls, faced with *opus reticulatum*, squared-stone masonry³⁴. The outer three rings were structurally connected with heavy radial and semicircular buttressing, which was only interrupted by a vaulted dromos entrance to the south. Vitruvius wrote about such substructural buttressings to bear the load of the massive earth structures³⁵. Around the central column, which presumably held the bronze statue of Augustus at the summit of the tomb, was the burial chamber with niches on its walls to receive the *cineraria*, the funerary urns. The funerary procession or the later visitor was obliged to circumambulate the burial chamber twice by means of walking through the two annular corridors around the chamber, following a route imposed by the architecture. Some scholars have attributed a funerary ritual function for these annular corridors³⁶. Similar circumambulatory spaces appear in several mausolea in or outside Rome in Italy, as studied by H. Winfried-

³²See K. Jeppesen, "Founder Cult and Mausoleion" in J. Isager (ed) 1994: 73-83. Jeppesen argued the Mausolos's tomb should also be seen as a *heroon*.

³³See von Hesberg & Panciera 1994, 46f. for the most thorough discussion of the architecture of the monument.

³⁴For the construction technique in its historical context, see Blake 1947, 171-172; 264-65

³⁵Vitr. 6.8.7. Similar substructures occur in two separate mausolea, one in West Mersea, Essex, England and the other in Canosa, South Italy. See Colvin 1991, 47 fig.39.

³⁶See especially H. Winfield-Hansen, "Les couloirs annulaires dans l'architecture funéraire antique" *ActaAArtHist* 2 (1965) 35-63. Reeder 1992, followed the hypothesis by suggesting some ritual connections with the Samothracian mysteries.

Hansen (1965). As it is evident in the case of the tomb of M. Plancus in Gaete (Fig. 6), most of these mausolea must have been modelled upon the Mausoleum of Augustus.

On the exterior, both Gatti's and von Hersberg's reconstructions agree that a lofty travertine socle formed a monumental base (*krepis*) for the monument, while the distinctively heavy concentric wall around the burial chamber second from the core, was raised as a cylindrical travertine tower to hold a second mound and the statue of the emperor at its summit. Von Hesberg has carefully reconstructed a luna marble doric entablature with ionic mouldings on this upper wall, that was punctuated with shield plates³⁷ (fig. 13). Gatti's earlier proposal for a doric colonnade or attached pilasters around this upper drum was rejected by von Hesberg³⁸. In its overall form, the monument appears to be an "architecturalized" tumulus tomb culminated with a cylindrical tower and topped by earth mounds on two different levels. Although in his architectural reconstruction, von Hesberg avoids the "evergreen trees" on the mound that Strabo mentioned (5.3.8), the plantations must have altered the image of the monument to a great extent. Again according to von Hesberg (1996, 235), the frontal southern façade of the lower socle was revetted with marble, extending 40 m. on each side of the doorway, for inscriptions. Most significant however, according to the literary sources, is the fact that the *Res Gestae* of Augustus was posthumously inscribed on two bronze tablets and either "installed at the entrance of the Mausoleum" [*in aeneis tabulis, quae ante Mausoleum statuerentur*]³⁹ or "engraved on two bronze pillars" [*incisarum in duabus aeneis pilis*]⁴⁰.

³⁷Von Hesberg 1988, 249-250; von Hesberg & Panciera 1994, 41f.

³⁸See various reconstructions in Gatti 1934. Only the pilastered version was favored by scholars. Reeder (1992) has recently preferred Gatti's reconstruction to von Hesberg's, to be able to draw parallels to the Hellenistic tholos architectural type.

³⁹Seut. *Aug.* 101.4.

⁴⁰*Aug. RG. praef.* See Suna Güven, "Displaying the *Res Gestae* of Augustus" *JSAH* 57 (1998) 30-45, esp. 31. Güven wrote "Augustus deliberately chose an architectural context that had solely personal, yet grandiose and dynastic associations".

Most of the discussions on the Augustan Mausoleum concentrated on architectural typology of the monument and the quest for its sources of derivation, with the unspoken assumption that its architectural form was the most powerful ideological tool on the behalf of its owner(s). Coarelli and Thébert (1988) pointed out to the essential link between the ideology of political power and the erection of funerary monuments. The dominant character of the Mausoleum as an earthen mound on a stone socle, with an accessible burial chamber immediately brought the associations with a certain type of *tumulus* tomb. The type is known from a variety of archaic to hellenistic contexts in the Mediterranean, but much credit was given to the tomb of Alexander⁴¹. Three such tumuli are known from Pergamum, to the south of the city, where the Pergamene kings buried themselves⁴². Two important hellenistic examples from the North African Numidian dynasty, studied by Coarelli and Thébert, illustrate how the tumulus form could incorporate different construction techniques (figs. 14-15)⁴³. The two Numidian tombs carry important similarities with the Tomb of Kleoboulos at Lindos on the island of Rhodes⁴⁴.

The archaeologically unknown tomb of Alexander in Alexandria was built in the Macedonian royal tomb traditions, and it was *atumulus*, or *sêma* [literally “a highly

⁴¹See e.g. Holloway 1966; emphasized the Trojan origins of the Julii, so he saw the tumulus reference to the burial customs of Trojan princes. Also D. Boschung “Tumulus Iuliorum-Mausoleum augusti: Ein Beitrag zu seinen Sinnbezügen”, *Hefte des Archäologischen Seminars der Universität Bern* 6 (1980) 38-41. For the connection between the mausolea of Alexander and Augustus, see Bernhard 1956; Richard 1970; Eisner 1979. Reeder (1992, 274 no.52 provided extensive bibliography on *imitatio Alexandri*. See esp. D. Kienast, “Augustus und Alexander”, *Gymnasium* 76 (1968) 430-456.

⁴²Pausanias (8.4.9) describes one of these tumuli as “a mound of earth enclosed by a stone basement and surmounted by a bronze figure of a naked woman”. One of them at least was excavated, but the dating remains to be controversial. Hansen gives a early 2nd c. BC date. See E.V. Hansen, *Attalids of Pergamon* (Ithaca 1971) 283.

⁴³Medracen, north of Aures, eastern Algeria (dated to end of 3rd, early 2nd c. BC) and the “tombeaux de la chrétienne” (Kbour-er-Roumia) near Tipasa, modern Algiers (dated to the end of 2nd c., first decades of 1st c. BC). These tumuli were constructed in the structural way that a pyramid was constructed. Coarelli & Thébert 1988, 764f.

⁴⁴See Fedak 1990, fig.55.

visible marker or *signum*“], with a vaulted burial chamber inside⁴⁵. According to Suetonius (*Aug.* 18), Augustus visited this tomb at the time of his conquest of Egypt in 30 BC. Alexander’s tomb must have influenced Augustus’s ideas for his own monument, but the discussions on this interrelation remains *argumentum ex silentio*, at the absence of any archaeological evidence⁴⁶. Suetonius (*Aug.* 17.4-5) also tells us that in the same campaign following the death of Antonius and Cleopatra, Augustus ordered their incomplete tomb [*tumulus*] to be finished and both would be buried together. K. Kraft argued that Augustus’s Mausoleum in Campus Martius was a propagandistic response to Antonius’s burial in Alexandria⁴⁷. Nevertheless, all these hypotheses build upon the assumption that Augustus planned and started the construction of his tomb after his arrival to Rome in the summer of 29 BC. Suetonius (*Aug.* 100.4) implies that the construction was finished in his sixth consulship (28 BC), while in contrast, Dio Cassius (53.30.5) mentioned that at the time of the burial of Marcellus (23 BC), the tomb was still unfinished [“*kodome*to]. Von Hesberg recently revised the dating of the monument based on his analysis of architectural details and sculptural decoration. He suggested that the construction must have started even before 31 BC⁴⁸. Traces of the insignia that was granted to Augustus in 27 BC —fragments of a marble copy of *clipeus virtutis*, and laurel decoration— were found in the building, suggesting the completion of the major architectural features at this date, but smaller additions continued to be made at least until 4 BC.

⁴⁵Reeder 1992, 276; Zenobius 3.94. Alexander shared his tomb with the Ptolemies. Suet. *Aug.* 18.

⁴⁶Bernhard (1956) tried to identify the tomb in the depictions of Alexandria on a number of Roman lamps, and concludes that the Alexander’s tomb was a mound with a massive stone socle at its base and it was accompanied by a temple dedicated to the hero cult of Alexander.

⁴⁷Kraft 1967, esp. 200-201: “Das Grabmonument auf dem Marsfeld mußte in Rom jedermann vor Augen stellen, daß Octavian im Gegensatz zu M. Anton bis zu seinem Tod an die Stadt am Tiber gebunden bleibe, daß er hier seinen Standort und den Mittelpunkt des Reiches sehe”. Also Zanker 1990, 72-73; “While his rival lay beside the Ptolemaic kings and queens, there rose in Rome the gigantic tomb of the victor”

⁴⁸Hesberg 1996, 235; 1994, 54-55. Based on the stylistic criteria on the form of the Doric entablature.

In the late Republican Rome, burials of the notables in the *tumuli* were not uncommon⁴⁹. The *Sepulchrum Sullae* was built for Sulla by the *senatus consultum*, and according to Lucan (2.222), it was a *tumulus medio campo*, viz. in the middle of Campus Martius⁵⁰. Julia, the daughter of J. Caesar and J. Caesar himself were also buried in the Campus Martius and their tomb is known as *Tumulus Iuliae*⁵¹. A pyre was erected for Caesar's funeral near this family tomb⁵². The *Sepulchrum Horatii* on the 5th mile of the Via Appia *in extremis Esquiliis* was built not far from the *Tumulus Maecenatis*, with similar form, and dated some time between 80-44 BC⁵³. Although none of these tombs are archaeologically known, Richardson (1992, 352) convincingly argued that "Augustus's choice of the *tumulus* form with modifications must be allusive rather to Caesar than to the Etruscans". The well-known monumental non-imperial tombs like that of Caecilia Metella on the Via Appia, tomb of Munatius Plancus at Gaeta, tomb of M. Lucilius Paetus outside Porta Salaria and others which follow the architectural type of a high circular socle topped with a mound are either contemporaneous or slightly later than the Mausoleum of Augustus; therefore they can be seen as examples of the same architectural trend that followed the innovative scheme of Augustus' Mausoleum⁵⁴.

The novel design of the Mausoleum should then be acknowledged. It was not following the earlier simple schemes of *tumuli* with a lofty *krepis*, but introducing a considerable sense of verticality with the towering drum and the statue of the emperor on its summit, in the way that the pre-Hellenistic Lycian-Carian tower tombs incorporated monumental sculpture on top of their pyramidal roofs, like the famous lion tomb of

⁴⁹On the dating of earliest *tumulus* tombs in the late Republican Rome, see Eisner 1979.

⁵⁰Richardson 1992, s.v. "*Sep. Sullae*", 360-61.

⁵¹For textual references, Richardson 1992, s.v. "*Tumulus Iuliae*", 402.

⁵²pyre: Suet. *Iul.* 84.1. family tomb: Cass.Dio 44.51.1. Julia was buried by the Roman people despite oppositions, while Caesar was cremated.

⁵³Reeder 1992, 266, no 8; Richardson 1992, s.v. "*Sep. Horatii*", 356-57.

⁵⁴For a survey of these monumental circular tombs, see Toynbee 1971, 143-164; Colvin 1991, 67-72.

Knidos, the Belevi Mausoleum and the Mausoleum of Halikarnassos⁵⁵. Moreover, the intricate infrastructure for the giant dimensions of its mound presented a unique structural solution, providing the necessary labyrinthian annular corridors for the circumambulatory rites and enough space for the burials of the Julian family for more than a century. Planned and constructed with such size and grandiosity when Octavian was in his mid-thirties, the monument must have been on the one hand a good representation of his quest for sole power after the death of J. Caesar, and on the other hand an architectural statement of self-exaltation and boast in the early years of his career. However, a reconsideration of the urban context of the Mausoleum will take us a step forward in understanding its significance as a continuation yet transformation of the late Republican funerary traditions in Rome.

4. The urban context: Mausoleum, Horologium and Ara Pacis

One of the most significant late Republican building traditions that has developed in the *suburbia* of Rome is the agglomeration of the funerary monuments of the noble families alongside the major arteries that led into the city⁵⁶. Impressive streets of linear burial-grounds, *Gräberstraßen*, were formed with the ever increasing architectural competition among the Roman nobilities towards the end of the Republic. The introduction of the Hellenistic architectural vocabulary, the emulation of foreign architectural traditions of the conquered lands and the respective aesthetic freedom and individuality in these private projects opened the door to enormous architectural variety in the funerary monuments, which then became an undeniable part of the urban/suburban image. Oftentimes, the tombs were built in large funerary gardens, which had formal

⁵⁵See Fedak 1990, 65-101.

⁵⁶Burial in the *pomerium* of Rome was only reserved for notable civic heroes. See various articles in H. von Hesberg & P. Zanker, *Römische Gräberstraßen* (München 1987). Also Anderson 1997, 321f.; Favro 1996, 166f.; Dyson 1992, 147f.

designs and sculpture, and they served for occasional feasts for the honor of the deceased⁵⁷. Inscriptions as *epitaphs* and the narrative scenes of sculpture on the tomb structures conveyed biographical and even propagandistic/ideological messages about the tomb owner, often presented as detailed as a complete narration of his life and career. Practical instruments like a sundial would occupy the passer-by and attract his interest to the tomb. A paragraph from Petronius's *Satyricon* will be helpful to extent and nature of these compounds:

Now tell me, my dear friend: you will erect a monument as I have directed? I beg you earnestly to put around the feet of my statue my little dog, and some wreaths, and bottles of perfume, and all the fights of Peraites, so that your kindness may bring me a life after death; and I want the monument to have a frontage of 100 feet and to be 200 feet in depth. For I should like to have all kinds of fruit growing round my ashes, and plenty of vines... So above all things I want added to the inscription, 'This monument is not descend to my heir'... I beg you put ships in full sail on the monument, and me sitting in official robes on my official seat, wearing five gold rings and distributing coin publicly out of a bag; you remember that I gave a free diner worth two denarii a head... On my right hand put a statue of dear Fortunata holding a dove, and let her be leading a little dog with a waist-band on; and my dear little boy, and big jars sealed with gypsum, so that the wine may not run out... And a sundial in the middle [*horologium in medio*], so that anyone who looks at the time will read my name whether he likes it or not. And again, please think carefully whether this inscription seems to you quite appropriate; 'Here lieth caius Pompeius Trimalchio, freedman of Maecenas... (Petr. *Saty.* 71)

Therefore, this flourishing tendency among the Roman nobilitas of the late Republican and early imperial period, to erect tomb monuments that "combined architecture, sculpture and the written word to convey complex messages about the deceased" should be acknowledged⁵⁸. If it can be argued that the Augustan monuments of the northern Campus Martius, including the Mausoleum of Augustus, the Ara Pacis, the Ustrinum and the Horologium, were the components of a coherent urban ensemble within a unifying "park" and that they complemented each other with their particular (architectural/urban/ideological) function, it can probably be hypothesized as well that this entire complex was a monumentalized version of such a tomb complex. The location

⁵⁷For funerary gardens, see Toynbee 1971, 94-100; Farrar 1998, 177-179. Such a formal design of a funerary garden with a mausoleum in the middle of it is depicted on a marble plan by a rich freedman from Perugia. For an illustration of the plan see Toynbee 1971, figs 7 and 8. Also recently Verzár-Bass 1998.

⁵⁸Dyson 1992, 148.

of the complex along Via Flaminia, one of the major arteries of Rome, and outside the *pomerium*, follows the Republican tradition carefully.

Both Strabo's text on Rome (5.3.8) and Augustus's *Res Gestae* (19-21) are helpful enough to act as witnesses for the massive urban transformation in Rome with particular emphasis in the Campus Martius at the time of Augustus⁵⁹. The development of the northern Campus Martius in particular appears to be a careful appropriative transformation of a previously private *horti* (discussed above) into an urbanized public park under the auspices of Augustus⁶⁰. The area under concern here was delimited by the ancient locations of the Mausoleum of Augustus, Ara Pacis Augustae and the Horologium Solarium Augusti, bounded by the Via Flaminia to the east and the Tiber to the west. The construction of the Mausoleum (31-27 BC) and the opening of Augustus's grove with walkways (public park) to the Roman people (28 BC) was followed by the erection of the Horologium obelisks (10 BC) and the inauguration of the Augustan Horologium and the Ara Pacis together (9 BC)⁶¹.

Several scholars have already pointed out the coherence of urban design and architectural references among these monuments. Diane Favro (1996, 170) wrote that "the Mausoleum Augusti with its *ustrinum* (crematorium) formed an ensemble based upon related function, adjacency, and a blanket of unifying landscaping" and added that the two monuments "were visually and programmatically linked with the Horologium Augusti, Ara Pacis and Agrippan Pantheon". Among the recent scholars of Roman archaeology, the actual site of the Augustan *ustrinum* is highly debated, and the

⁵⁹See especially various articles in C. Pietri *L'Urbs: Espace Urbain et Histoire*, (Rome 1987). Zanker 1990, esp. 101-166; Recent works of D. Favro, 1992; 1993; 1996, esp. 143-216. For a long review of Favro 1996, see Haselberger, forthcoming.

⁶⁰See esp. Rakob 1987; Coarelli & Thébert 1988, 790; Favro 1996, 255f.; Also most recently F. Coarelli, *Il Campo Marzio* (Rome 1998).

⁶¹For a chronologically wider scope of building activity in northern Campus, see Rakob 1987, esp. 707f.

traditional location of the monument immediately to the east of the Mausoleum is highly challenged⁶². Still there is no reason to consider that the *ustrinum* was topographically not a part of Augustus's funerary complex.

The comprehensive study of the Horologium of Augustus by Edmund Büchner has shown that the Horologium had apparently astrological-physical links not only to the Ara Pacis, but also to the birth of Augustus⁶³: "Es bleibt bestehen, daß die Äquinoktienlinie, die Linie des 23. September, des Geburtstages des Augustus, in die Mitte der *ara Pacis* weist und daß *horologium Augusti* und *ara Pacis* zusammen eine Geburtstagsanlage sind."⁶⁴ The gnomon of the Horologium was an obelisque (still standing to the north the Piazza di Parlamento), which was brought from Heliopolis in 10 BC at the twentieth anniversary of the conquest of Egypt⁶⁵. This again historically ties the Augustan sundial to the immediate historical context of the erection of the Mausoleum. The inscription on the obelisque reads; "Imperial Caesar, son of Divus (Julius): Augustus: chief priest: in 10 BC: Egypt under the will of the Roman people having been brought: gave this as a gift to Sol"⁶⁶. Therefore the monumental Horologium of Augustus not only provided the function, that is implied in Petronius's passage, in a much more urbanistic and publicized way but also clearly ideologically refers to the life and accomplishments of Augustus.

Ara Pacis, the altar of Augustan Peace, was a commemorative monument to Augustus's victorious return from Gaul and Spain in 13 BC (Aug. *RG* 12.2). As a

⁶²Haselberger (forthcoming, 11, note 35) criticised Favro's assumption that the monument is firmly located, and pointed out that the archaeological evidence favored a more southerly location from the Mausoleum. See esp. V. Jolivet, "Les Cendres d'Auguste: Note sur la topographie monumentale du Champs de Mars Septentrional", *Archeologia Laziale* 9 (1988) 90-96.

⁶³See esp. E. Büchner, "Solarium Augusti und Ara Pacis", *RM-EH* 83 (1976) 319-365.

⁶⁴E. Büchner, "Horologium Augusti" s.v., in *LTUR* 3 (1996) 35-37.

⁶⁵The obelisque was actually erected for Psammetichus II in the early 6th c. BC in Heliopolis, the major cultic center for the worship of the sun god.

⁶⁶From Claridge 1998, 192.

memorial monument, the altar is perhaps comparable to *thearae honoris virtutisque causa*, the memorial monuments as altars erected for Roman civic heroes, most prolifically in the late Republican-early imperial period and especially in the Campus Martius, as noted by Strabo in the quotation cited above⁶⁷. The primary subject matter of the famous relief panels of this much celebrated Augustan monument is all about Augustus and the Julian family, their divine approbation, the mythical foundations of Rome, and the Augustan-Julian rule of “the *imperium Romanum*”, which secured its peace “on land and sea”⁶⁸. The “multiple meanings of associations” that this sculptural narrative of the Julian family thus well served for the political-historical narrative component of the funerary complex, along with the *Res Gestae*, which was exhibited at the entrance of the Mausoleum.

The *Res Gestae* was *thererarum gestarum divi Augusti*, “the achievements of Divine Augustus”, *quibus orbem terrarum imperio populi Romani subiecit*, “by which he brought the world under the empire of the Roman people” (*RG*, praef.). In terms of its literary genre, P. A. Brunt and J. M. Moore argued that the text should be seen in the tradition of the *elogia*, an oration “commemorating the dead man’s virtues and achievements”, which were often exhibited on “permanent monuments in the form of inscriptions recording their careers and deeds”⁶⁹.

The Mausoleum of Augustus was thus not an isolated monument in the urban historical topography of Rome, and the entire northern Campus Martius was gradually converted into a funerary complex of the Julian family through the lifetime of Augustus in a grand scale, and completed with the erection of the bronze inscriptions of *Res Gestae*

⁶⁷See Frischer (1982-83), esp. 66-67.

⁶⁸Galinsky 1996, 141.

⁶⁹P. A. Brunt & J. M. Moore, “The Literary Genre” as introduction to *Augustus, Res Gestae divi Augusti* [*The Achievements of the Divine Augustus*, Oxford 1967.], 2-3.

posthumously. The innovative character of the complex in its design and conception should be acknowledged. The private and smaller scale of the Republican family/clan tomb type was elaborately aggrandized to an urban or rather imperial scale, and in contrast to the rather private character of its predecessors, it was prodigally opened to the Roman people by Augustus. The same innovative character is also obvious in the architecture of each of the Augustan monuments of northern Campus, particularly in the Mausoleum. The multivalent symbolic associations and meanings of the Mausoleum not only linked Augustus to the Republican traditions and heritage, especially with the origins of his Julian clan, but also memorialized him as a civic hero, the new founder of the Roman *imperium*.

Bibliography*

Ancient Texts

Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 2.8.10-17. Strabo, *Geography* 5.3.8.

Augustus, *Res Gestae divi Augusti* [*The Achievements of the Divine Augustus*, P.A. Brunt & J.M. Moore (eds), Oxford 1967.]

Modern Sources

ANDERSON, JAMES C. (1997) *Roman Architecture and Society*, Baltimore and London.

BERNHARD, MARIE-LOUISE (1956) "Topographie d'Alexandrie: Le Tombeau d'Alexandre et le Mausolée d'Auguste" *RA* 47: 129-156.

BLAKE, M. ELIZABETH (1947) *Ancient Roman Construction in Italy from the Prehistoric Period to Augustus*, Washington.

BOËTHIUS, AXEL (1970) *Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture*, New Haven and London, (new ed.1994).

BUCHNER, EDMUND (1976) "Solarium Augusti und Ara Pacis" *RM-EH* 83: 319-365.

CLARIDGE, AMANDA (1998) *Rome: An Oxford Archaeological Guide*, Oxford.

COARELLI, FILIPPO & YVON THÉBERT (1988) "Architecture funéraire et pouvoir: Réflexions sur l'Hellénisme Numide", *MEFRA* 100: 761-818.

COLVIN, HOWARD (1991) *Architecture and the After-Life*, New Haven and London.

DYSON, STEPHEN L. (1992) *Community and Society in Roman Italy*, Baltimore and London.

EDER, W. (1990) "Augustus and the power of tradition: The Augustan Principate as binding link between republic and empire" in K.A. Raaflaub & M. Toher (eds), *Between Republic and Empire*, Berkeley: 71-122.

Eisner, Michael (1979). "Zur typologie der Mausoleen des Augustus und des Hadrian", *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts Roemische Abteilung* 86: 319-324.

FARRAR, LINDA (1998) *Ancient Roman Gardens*, Gloucestershire.

FAVRO, DIANE (1992) "Pater Urbis: Augustus as city father of Rome", *JSAH* 51: 61-84.

– (1993) "Reading the Augustan city" in P. J. Holliday (ed.), *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art*, Cambridge University Press: 230-257.

– (1996) *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*, Cambridge University Press.

* The abbreviations are according to AJA 95 (1991) 1-16.

- FEDAK, JANOS (1990) *Monumental Tombs of the Hellenistic Age*, Toronto.
- FRISCHER, BERNARD (1982) "Monumenta et Arae Honoris Virtutisque Causa: Evidence of memorials for Roman civic heroes", *BullCom* 88: 51-86.
- GALINSKY, KARL (1996) *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*, Princeton.
- GATTI, GUGLIELMO (1934) "Il Mausoleo di Augusto", *Capitolium* 10: 457-464.
- (1938) "Nuove Osservazioni sul Mausoleo di Augusto", *L'Urbe* 3-8: 1-17.
- GOODMAN, MARTIN (1997) *The Roman World: 44 BC - AD 180*, London and New York.
- HAECKL, ANNE E. (1996) "Dynasty, Cult, Topography, Architecture" in E. K. Gazda & Anne E. Haackl, *Images of Empire: Flavian Fragments in Rome and Ann Arbor Rejoined*, Rome: 11-25.
- HASELBERGER, LOTHAR (forthcoming) "Rethinking the urban image of Augustan Rome" [review of Favro 1996], *JRA*.
- Hesberg, Henner von (1988). "Das Mausoleum des Augustus" in *Kaiser Augustus und die Verlorene Republik*, Antikemuseum Berlin: 245-249.
- (1996) "Mausoleum Augusti" in E. M. Steinby (ed.) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae III*, Rome: 234-237.
- Hesberg, Henner von & PAUL ZANKER (eds) (1987) *Römische Gräberstraßen: Selbstdarstellung - Status - Standard*. München.
- Hesberg, Henner von & SILVIO PANCIERA (1994) *Das Mausoleum des Augustus: Der Bau und seine Inschriften*, München.
- HOLLOWAY, ROSS (1966) "The tomb of Augustus and the princes of Troy" *AJA* 70: 171-173.
- Hornblower Simon (1982). *Mausollos*. Clarendon Press: New York.
- Isager, jacob (ed) (1994). *Hecatomnid Caria and the Ionian Renaissance*, Odense University Press.
- Jeppesen, Kristian (1981-83). "Did Vitruvius ever visit Halikarnassos?", *Anadolu* 22: 85-98.
- (1994a). "What did the Maussolleion look like?" in *Architecture and Society in Hecatomnid Caria*. , T. Linders & P. Hellstrom (eds), Uppsalas: 15-22.
- (1994b). "Founder cult and Maussolleion" in *Hecatomnid Caria and the Ionian Renaissance*, I.Jacob (ed), Odense University Press: 73-82.
- Jeppesen, Kristian et. al (1986). *The Maussolleion at Halikarnassos*, 3 vols., Aarhus University Press.
- KLEINER, DIANE E. E. (1992) *Roman Sculpture*, New Haven.
- KRAFT, KONRAD (1967) "Der Sinn des Mausoleum des Augustus", *Historia* 16: 189-206.
- LINDERS, TULLIA & PONTUS HELLSTRÖM (1989). *Architecture and Society in Hecatomnid Caria*, Uppsala.

- MACCIOCCA, M. (1996) "Mausoleum Augusti: Le Sepulture" in E. M. Steinby (ed.) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae III*, Rome: 237-39.
- NICOLET, CLAUDE (1991) *Space, Geography and Politics in the Early Roman Empire*, Ann Arbor.
- Pedersen, Poul (1994). "The Ionian Renaissance and some aspects of its origin within the field of architecture and planning" in *Hekatomnid Caria and the Ionian Renaissance*, I.Jacob (ed), Odense University Press: 11-35.
- PURCELL, NICHOLAS (1987) "Tomb and suburb" in H .von Hesberg & P. Zanker (eds.), *Römische Gräberstraßen: Selbstdarstellung - Status - Standard*, München: 25-42.
- RAAFLAUB, KURT A. & MARK TOHER (eds.) (1990) *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, Berkeley.
- RAKOB, FRIEDRICH (1987) "Die Urbanisierung des Nördlichen Marsfeldes: Neue Forschungen im Areal des Horologium Augusti", in C. Pietri (ed), *L'Urbs: Espace Urbain et Histoire*, Rome: 687-712.
- Reeder, Jane Clarke (1992). "Typology and ideology in the Mausoleum of Augustus: tumulus and tholos", *ClAnt* 11/2: 265-307.
- Riccomini, Anna Marie (1995). "A garden of statues and marbles: the Soderini Collection in the Mausoleum of Augustus", *Journal of Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 58: 265-283.
- Richard, Jean-Claude (1970). "Mausoleum: d'Halicarnasse à Rome, puis à Alexandrie", *Latomus* 29: 370-388.
- Richardson, L. jr. (1992). *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Baltimore and London; s.v. "Mausoleum Augusti": 247-249.
- TOYNBEE, JOCELYN M.C. (1971) *Death and Burial in the Roman World*, Baltimore and London.
- VERZÁR-BASS, MONIKA (1998) "A Proposito dei Mausolei negli Horti e nelle Villae" in M. Cima & E. La Rocca (eds.), *Horti Romani*, Roma:33-44.
- Zanker. Paul (1990). *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Trans. A. Shapiro; Ann Arbor.

ENDNOTES