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From the outset of *The Power of Images*, Zanker states that he is concerned with the totality of Augustan imagery, and how this would have been experienced by the contemporary Roman, rather than an interpretation of each individual piece of ancient artistic evidence.¹ Indeed, throughout the book, Zanker investigates imagery in a variety of guises, including sculpture, coinage, portraiture and architecture, and as a conduit for moral, political and social ideals. Zanker is explicit that he is not exploring visual culture in isolation, but rather how this area of classical scholarship also impacts upon social and political concerns in the Augustan period. Andrew Wallace-Hadrill notes in his 1989 review that Zanker’s approach is concerned with how Augustan art underlines the historical events of the period, therefore emphasising how appropriate *The Power of Images* is for an exploration of the relationship between Roman visual culture and Roman history.² By the nature of its title, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* would suggest that Zanker’s focus will be limited to the visual culture of the Augustan age, raising concerns that the book will not have the same applicability when used to understand the relationship between Roman art and history in its entirety. Zanker, however, begins his work by exploring the appropriation of Greek art in Roman visual culture and the cultural atmosphere of Rome as a city before Octavian. By providing this background, Zanker widens his discussion beyond the Augustan period and contributes more to the understanding of the relationship between Roman art and history.

The first chapter of *Power of Images*, ‘Conflict and Contradiction in the Imagery of the Dying Republic’, opens with an investigation into the problematic nature of nude portrait statuary, exploring how this particularly Greek art form was appropriated and made palatable for Roman tastes. Zanker acknowledges from the outset that honorific statuary of Hellenistic kings intended to reflect the ‘power and prestige’ of such rulers, by emulating depictions of gods and heroes, suggesting that use of the same by a Roman individual intended to appropriate such positive traits in their own honorific imagery.³ By using the example of a bronze Roman general statue (Fig. 1 – for Figures 1-17 please see the Appendix), Zanker clearly highlights the Hellenistic style in the pose and nudity, believing it to be derived from

---

Lysippus’ *Alexander with the Spear*, and emphasising the similarities in beard, hair and expression to that of Macedonian royal portraiture.\(^4\) He notes, however, that the nudity of the statue would have been offensive to Roman sensibilities, and confronts the problematic questions that the statue raises. Zanker states that this is an early example of contradiction in the Roman appropriation of Greek art, and proposes that the statue was actually set up by the Greeks themselves in commemoration of their new rulers.\(^5\) Zanker’s strength here is that he accepts that the statue would still have had to be consented to by the Roman general depicted, and therefore does not ignore problematic evidence.\(^6\)

Zanker furthers this discussion on contradiction in the appropriation of Greek art by exploring the portraiture types of Caesar, Pompey and Crassus (Figs. 2, 3 and 4). Here he recognises that the rendering of realistic Roman portraits as favoured by the aristocracy still have Hellenistic undertones, most notably in the Alexander-style *anastole* of the otherwise rather plain rendering of Pompey.\(^7\) This amalgamation of Roman art with its Greek counterpart to cater to specific Roman tastes points towards a lack of a ‘standard’ model of art prior to the principate.\(^8\) Roman art at this time did not have a set identity, but then neither did its politics, society or morality.\(^9\) Zanker underlines here the relationship between visual art and the cultural atmosphere of Rome at the time.

The chapter also explores the city of Rome itself and its connections to political concerns. Zanker argues that the poor condition of the city came not only from neglect, but also due to the senate shunning the immorality of grand public works.\(^10\) He uses the example of the Temple of Concord, showing how the Hellenistic marble columns and plan could not be amalgamated into the design correctly due to the original ground plan and the podium having to remain due to religious concerns.\(^11\) The ‘conflict and contradiction’ pre-principate is clearly illustrated again here, and whilst the recognition of Greek art appropriation by the Romans is not a novel academic viewpoint, connecting the state of the city to the ‘state’ of society certainly is.\(^12\)
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\(^12\) Zanker, *The Power of Images*, p. 5.
Zanker continues by linking the literal and figurative ‘battle’ between Octavian and Marc Antony to their visual representations in his second chapter, ‘Rival Images: Octavian, Antony and the Struggle for Sole Power’. After discussing early types of Octavian portraiture on coins and statuary, Zanker explores the role of divinity in the representations of the two men. Here he finds a reciprocal relationship between how both Octavian and Antony use mythological representation as propaganda, and how this ultimately moulds their behaviour.\(^\text{13}\) Zanker opines that Octavian was represented in the manner of Apollo, using the examples of coinage depicting Octavian with an olive wreath on the obverse (Fig. 5), and a cameo showing Apollo in the form of a snake entwined with imagery of Octavian’s priesthoods (Fig. 6).\(^\text{14}\) Zanker does not limit his point to a surface reading of the imagery, but links this concept to propaganda to show how coinage clearly illustrated a political message which could be understood by all.\(^\text{15}\) Furthermore, Zanker notes that by locating his residence close to the Temple of Apollo, Octavian was aligning himself with the positive moral characteristics of the god, and was therefore sending a message to his people in a similar manner to the propagandistic coinage.\(^\text{16}\)

By contrast, Zanker is less than complimentary regarding Marc Antony’s self-representation, arguing that ‘he did not care what kind of impact the images and symbols he made use of would have in Rome and Italy’.\(^\text{17}\) He uses the example of an Arretine clay bowl (Fig. 7), which alludes to Antony as the mythological Heracles and Cleopatra as Omphale, Zanker arguing that Antony was aligning himself with the masculinity and strength of the hero.\(^\text{18}\) Antony, however, replaced the imagery of Heracles with that of Dionysus, and as a scholar chiefly concerned with the power of images, it is apparent why Zanker is less than enamoured of Antony, describing him as ‘corrupt, godless and soft’.\(^\text{19}\) Perhaps a weakness of Zanker’s argument here is his tendency to allow his disdain for Antony to surface in his writing. He is highly critical of Antony using letters and speeches to denigrate Octavian, yet is less critical of Octavian and his supporters using Dionysian imagery around Rome to denigrate Antony’s character. Zanker’s assertion that ‘to whip up emotions Octavian claimed that [Cleopatra’s doryphoroi guards shown on the Arretine bowl] were Roman soldiers reduced to serving the queen’ is less complimentary of Augustus, and therefore more balanced. The point, however, is not strengthened by ancient evidence.\(^\text{20}\) Zanker could
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\(^\text{13}\) Zanker, *The Power of Images*, p. 44.
\(^\text{15}\) Zanker, *The Power of Images*, p. 54.
have emphasised Octavian’s use of more effective visual imagery than Antony’s, with coins minted to depict Antony as Heracles, and the changing of his self-representation to that of Dionysus whilst Octavian remained faithful to the imagery of Apollo.\textsuperscript{21} Zanker, however, does note the strong relationship between artistic imagery and the social atmosphere of Rome, stating that the opposing representations of Octavian and Antony caused two opposing factions to form in society, which challenged the moral and political atmosphere of the time.\textsuperscript{22} Furthermore, Richard Brilliant in his review of \textit{The Power of Images}, notes that prior discussions did not focus upon Octavian/Augustus’ use of propaganda and, therefore, Zanker’s contribution to this area is valuable.\textsuperscript{23}

A further strength of this chapter, recognised by Wallace-Hadrill, can be found in Zanker’s inherent ability to raise the questions which he believes his audience wish to have answered.\textsuperscript{24} Zanker focuses on the problematic nature of Octavian building such a large mausoleum before becoming Emperor (Fig. 8), and even prior to defeating Antony at the Battle of Actium.\textsuperscript{25} This would have been considered immoral, as discussed in the previous chapter, however Zanker skilfully links this to a propagandistic angle. He notes that Antony was said to have wished to have been buried in Alexandria, alienating the Roman people. The mausoleum, therefore, exemplified Octavian’s attempts to prove himself loyal to Rome in life and in death.\textsuperscript{26} Zanker also claims that the building actually became a victory monument of sorts, and therefore even more political, by being completed after Antony’s defeat at Actium.\textsuperscript{27} By addressing the artistic imagery of the mausoleum, and then linking the same to social and political concerns, Zanker is again emphasising his skill at exploring the relationship between Roman art and history. Wallace-Hadrill agrees, noting that Zanker thinks outside of his experience as a classical archaeologist to present a more nuanced discussion on the propaganda of the time.\textsuperscript{28}

It is in chapter four, on the topic of the ‘Augustan Program of Cultural Renewal’, whereupon Zanker’s contribution to our understanding of the relationship between Roman visual imagery and history becomes obvious, with his noting that ‘a completely new pictorial vocabulary was established over the course of the next twenty years’.\textsuperscript{29} Zanker views this

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21} Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 45.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 62.
\item \textsuperscript{23} R. Brilliant, ‘\textit{Augustus. Kunst und Leben in Rom um die Zeitewende} by Erika Simon; \textit{Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik} by Mathias Hoffer et al.; \textit{The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus} by Paul Zanker’, \textit{Art Bulletin}, 72/2, (1990), p. 329.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Wallace-Hadrill, \textit{Rome’s Cultural Revolution}, p. 157.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 72.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 73.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 72.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Wallace-Hadrill, \textit{Rome’s Cultural Revolution}, p. 158.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 101.
\end{itemize}
programme as not only creating a new visual culture, but also repairing the turbulent aftermath of civil war. He does not associate this change with a propagandistic agenda, unlike Octavian’s previous link to Apollo, but rather a result of cultural renewal in a wide range of areas, including religion and even fashion.\textsuperscript{30} An interesting facet of this section is that Zanker not only explores religious buildings, but also studies the relationship between them and the festivals and rituals which took place inside. This connects neatly with his original view that imagery is not just about describing artistic evidence, but understanding how the contemporary Roman interacted with visual culture: ‘the monuments came alive in the festivals connected with them’.\textsuperscript{31} By highlighting religious renewal during the Augustan period, Zanker links his imagery to the wider themes of piety, noting that the rebuilding and renewal of sanctuaries and temples were an ‘important leitmotif of the Augustan era’.\textsuperscript{32} He argues that Augustus’ key plans as emperor to renew Rome centred on religion, custom and the morality of the Roman people. He also introduces an alternative viewpoint, however, noting that the building of a specific temple, the Temple of Jupiter Tonans (shown on denarii in Fig. 9), was not a case of Augustus being wholly altruistic.\textsuperscript{33} After a lightning bolt bypassed Augustus and struck his slave, Zanker proposes that Augustus believed himself to be chosen by Jupiter, and further drew attention to the temple by continually visiting it.\textsuperscript{34} Zanker therefore explores the emperor’s possible hubris, another important contribution. Brilliant agrees here, finding Augustus sanctimonious, and using art as a means to conceal this facet of his character, noting that discussion prior to Zanker had not investigated the behaviour or character of Augustus himself.\textsuperscript{35}

A surprising element of this chapter is Zanker’s linking of Augustan legislation on morality to Roman clothing. Zanker was particularly original in this regard, with the research of Alexandra Croom, Judith Lynn Sebesta & Larissa Bonfante as well as Kelly Olson on ancient clothing and its relationship with societal values coming much later.\textsuperscript{36} Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones notes that ‘the study of dress in the ancient world has been shamefully undervalued’, and therefore this is an important contribution by Zanker to our understanding of the relationship between Roman art, including representations of clothing, and Roman society.\textsuperscript{37} Zanker views Augustus as establishing the Imperial toga, with its draped \textit{sinus} and \textit{balteus} (see

\textsuperscript{31} Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 114.
\textsuperscript{32} Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 102.
\textsuperscript{34} Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 108.
\textsuperscript{36} A. Croom, \textit{Roman Clothing and Fashion} (Stroud, 2010); J. L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante (Eds.), \textit{The World of Roman Costume} (Madison, WI., 2001); K. Olson, \textit{Dress and the Roman Woman: Self-Representation and Society} (London, 2008).
Figs. 10 and 11) as a symbol of his people belonging to the Augustan age, and of being true Roman citizens.\footnote{Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 162.} He uses Virgil’s writing on Romans as the \textit{gens togata} as further evidence.\footnote{The \textit{Aeneid}. \textit{Publius Vergilius Maro}, C. Day Lewis (Trans.), (Oxford, 2008), p. 1.282.} Zanker links Augustus’ moral reforms, or \textit{mores maiorum}, to the clothing worn by Roman citizens and therefore the imagery of the people themselves.

Having established the context of Augustus’ \textit{leges Iuliae} on the punishment for adultery and being unmarried, whilst rewarding those who bore several children, Zanker links this to the dignified \textit{matrona} wearing her honourable \textit{stola} (Fig. 12) to denote her marital status and therefore ‘worth’ in society.\footnote{Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, pp. 157-165.} Zanker, however, does not raise the problematic nature of clothing in artistic representations. Whilst he does highlight Suetonius’ account of Augustus having to issue an edict that the toga, and not a cloak, should be worn in the vicinity of the Forum, he does not develop this point further.\footnote{The \textit{Caesars}. \textit{Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus}, D.W. Hurley (Trans.) (Indianapolis, IN., 2011), p. 40.} There is a missed opportunity here to discuss the problem of how the public were expected to present themselves, and therefore how statuary representations depicting clothing contrasted with what people \textit{actually} wore in the everyday, and therefore the reality of Roman clothing and its relationship with society.

The largest section of \textit{The Power of Images} concerns Zanker’s discussion on ‘The Mythical Foundations of the New Rome’ in chapter five, detailing the culmination of Greek appropriation, cultural renewal, mythology and artistic representation as discussed previously. Zanker uses the ‘Tellus’ relief (Fig. 13) from the Ara Pacis as an example, stating that the previous moral legislations of Augustus had failed, and a new method of visual imagery was required, this time focussing on fertility and abundance.\footnote{Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 173.} Zanker finds the whole scene iconic to the Augustan age, and therefore an exploration of this particular monument is important to our understanding of Zanker’s contribution to the relationship between Roman art and history.\footnote{Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 174.}

Zanker argues that the goddess depicted on the relief is Pax Augusta, to be viewed comparatively with the relief of Roma seated on the mound of armour on the opposite side of the Ara Pacis. These images suggest victory through Roman arms (Roma) resulting in peace (Pax Augusta).\footnote{Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 175.} Zanker also explores the concepts of fertility in the bucolic landscape, the grazing sheep and grain stalks behind Pax as symbolic of Augustan
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\textsuperscript{38} Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 162.
\textsuperscript{40} Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, pp. 157-165.
\textsuperscript{42} Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 173.
\textsuperscript{43} Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 174.
\textsuperscript{44} Zanker, \textit{The Power of Images}, p. 175.
abundance, and the cowed sea-monster symbolising peace after the unrest of civil war.\(^{45}\) By comparing the ‘Tellus’ relief to Horace’s commissioned ode the *Carmen Saeculare*, ‘may our earth, abundant in fruits and cattle, yield the headed grain as a crown for Ceres’, Zanker’s contribution is that he is able to link literary and artistic imagery so that his audience can also understand the symbolism.\(^{46}\) When Zanker states that ‘the princep’s political program is translated into an image of affecting beauty to which every viewer could respond’ he could equally be describing his own ability to express the power of symbolism to his reader.\(^{47}\) Wallace-Hadrill concurs, viewing Zanker as stressing the symbolic, rather than narrative, function of Augustan imagery on the Ara Pacis.\(^{48}\) Zanker furthers his discussion on mythological imagery by investigating how representations of Venus and Mars were used to portray a new Roman mythology. The gods were considered ancestors of the Romans due to Mars fathering Romulus and Remus by Rhea Silvia (who herself belonged to the Trojan family of Aeneas). The adulterous nature of the god’s relationship, however, was ignored to fit a preferred ideology.\(^{49}\) Here, Zanker returns to his discussion on Greek art appropriation, noting that Augustan artists adapted classical sculpture models for their new gods, and using the example of the Venus in Brescia (Fig. 14) which was itself an adaptation of the fourth century Venus of Capua (Fig. 15).\(^{50}\) In the Augustan representation, Venus is recording Roman victories on a shield, with her upper torso covered. Zanker here equates the classical Greek art form with moral value, but notes again that the imagery had to be adapted, with the Venus in Brescia having her breasts covered so as not to offend. Similarly, the Ares depicted on the Ara Pacis wears a breastplate, helmet, spear and shield in the guise of a ‘dignified father figure’, with Zanker noting that the helmet was derived from Phidias’ Athena Parthenos, the beard and face being in the high classical style, and the breastplate and shield typical of the Augustan period.\(^{51}\) By exploring the meaning behind Augustus’ symbolic use of mythological imagery, Zanker again links visual evidence to wider Roman history, and the concepts of combining the high moral values of classical Greek society with the new mythological foundations of Augustan Rome.

Having explored certain aspects of *The Power of Images*, and the contribution of Zanker to our understanding of the relationship between Roman art and history, his work will now be compared and contrasted with other academic research to assess the extent of this


\(^{50}\) Zanker, *The Power of Images*, p. 197.
contribution. In *Roman Sculpture from Augustus to Constantine* Eugénie Strong also uses the ‘Tellus’ relief from the Ara Pacis as an example. Whilst Zanker finds a classical Greek influence in the *aurae* to either side of Pax Augusta (in his identification) on the ‘Tellus’ relief, and the ‘classicismizing drapery’ of her gown, Strong believes that the goddess is depicted in a much different style to the Greek Ḡē(Earth Mother).\(^52\) She argues that this representation was Augustan art distancing itself from Greek counterparts, in direct contrast to the earlier chapters of *The Power of Images*, where Zanker explores the amalgamation of classical Greek sculpture and portraiture to appropriate its high moral value. Furthermore, Zanker notes the Hellenistic style in the ‘moving’ vines on the exterior of the altar, and suggests this became a motif throughout Augustan art as it could be easily reproduced, rather than a move away from Greek connotations.\(^53\) There is, however, a similarity between *The Power of Images* and *Roman Sculpture* in that both Zanker and Strong link the imagery of nature to the symbolism of abundance. Zanker discusses the vines growing from the calyces on the exterior walls of the Ara Pacis as symbolising the fertility of the Augustan era (Fig. 16), with the leaves and creatures representing further imagery of growth.\(^54\) Strong also investigates the uses of vine imagery, and reaches the same conclusion to that of Zanker.\(^55\) Zanker, however, looks deeper, and notes that whilst appearing random, each ‘symbol’ of nature has its particular place, which may be an allegory for Augustan order.\(^56\) This is a conclusion which Strong does not reach, and is further evidence of Zanker’s unique contribution to our understanding of the relationship between Roman art and history.

The most obvious difference between the work of Strong and Zanker is the former’s derision of the Ara Pacis, unimpressed with its composition and believing that it has no visual motive or structure. She writes that the symbolism of the Ara Pacis was overpowered by the sheer amount of Hellenistic art which the sculptor was attempting to be derivative of, whilst not being adequately skilled to condense this effectively. Strong steadfastly argues that Augustan imagery displayed Roman art at an ‘embryonic’ stage, with the peak occurring during the Flavian period.\(^57\) Furthermore, she opines that Roman sculpture was a form in and of itself, rather than being derivative of its Greek counterpart. Her viewpoint suggests that Greek art flourished in Rome because the Romans themselves nurtured and appreciated it.\(^58\) Zanker’s view is therefore in direct contrast to that of Strong. He sees Augustan visual art as ‘powering’ historical events through symbolism and not as Roman art


\(^54\) Zanker, *The Power of Images*, p. 179.

\(^55\) Strong, *Roman Sculpture from Augustus to Constantine*, p. 67.


\(^57\) Strong, *Roman Sculpture from Augustus to Constantine*, p. 55.

\(^58\) Strong, *Roman Sculpture from Augustus to Constantine*, p. 29.
in its earliest stages. Zanker also uses a wider range of evidence than Strong, including coinage, sculpture, painting, monuments and literary source. Rather than a surface reading of their imagery, Zanker continually emphasises the link between art, politics, society and religion.

Tonio Hölscher’s *The Language of Images in Roman Art* was published contemporaneously to Zanker’s original work, yet whilst *The Power of Images* was translated the following year, Hölscher’s work was not published in English until 2004. Hölscher proposes a semantic system in his book, the titular ‘language of images’, and explores the art of the Roman Empire as a means of visual communication, and how contemporary society developed and used this system. Hölscher’s work parallels that of Zanker when investigating the example of the Augustan Altar in Arezzo (Fig. 17), depicting a she-wolf, twins and shepherds. Hölscher believes that this belongs to the Hellenistic tradition of mythological landscapes, also acknowledged by Zanker in his chapter on the mythological representation of Augustus’ new Rome and examples of Pax Augusta, Venus and Mars. Hölscher also suggests that the two neo-Attic victory figures on the Altar in Arezzo are the product of symbolism rather than the stylistic choice of a client, mirroring Zanker’s examples of the bronze general (Fig. 1) and Republican portraiture (Figs. 2, 3 and 4). Hölscher’s argument also compares to that of Zanker in his discussion on the Venus of Capua (Fig. 15) as appropriated in the Venus in Brescia (Fig. 14), believing this to be a nuanced, selective approach which reworked classical statue types for their stylistic meaning, rather than appropriation simply due to aesthetic tastes.

While Zanker, however, views Augustan visual art as having the most powerful imagery, Hölscher regards the late Hellenistic period as its genesis, with Roman art not being differentiated by time but rather by form and execution. Furthermore, Hölscher explores Roman art and history in the longer term. Zanker does explore how the contemporary Roman interacted with visual art, and the imagery borne from this, which is not dissimilar to Hölscher’s semantic system approach. However, *The Language of Images* was not as well-received at the time of its publication. One possibility for this difference is that Zanker’s writing focuses less on a system for imagery and more on the visual arts themselves, a more accessible approach which therefore reached a wider audience not limited to academia.
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60 Hölscher, *The Language of Images in Roman Art*, p. 2.
61 Hölscher, *The Language of Images in Roman Art*, p. 10.
62 Hölscher, *The Language of Images in Roman Art*, p. 58.
63 Hölscher, *The Language of Images in Roman Art*, p. 59.
64 Hölscher, *The Language of Images in Roman Art*, p. 11.
When assessing *The Power of Images* and its contribution to understanding the relationship between Roman art and history, it should be appreciated that Zanker’s arguments are still relevant today. In the more recent *Augustus: Introduction to the Life of an Emperor*, Karl Galinsky is clearly influenced by the work of Zanker, even though his research focus is firmly on Augustan history rather than visual art. Zanker’s influence can first be found in Galinsky’s chapter on ‘Power Struggles and Civil War’, with his discussion on the representations of Antony and Octavian mirroring Zanker’s chapter on *Rival Images*. Galinsky too looks at the use of propaganda during Antony and Octavian’s power struggle as ‘a concentrated campaign of visuals and images’, and notes, like Zanker, that the imagery could be understood where literacy was lacking.\(^{65}\) However, Galinsky is less derogatory of Antony, noting that he may have been unfairly represented and cannot have been wholly incapable due to Caesar’s trust in him.\(^{66}\) The parallels with *The Power of Images* continue with a discussion on the ‘Tellus’ relief from the Ara Pacis as a symbol of abundance and noting the message of victory in the Roma seated on the mound of arms.\(^{67}\) Marriage, family and loyalty are also explored alongside religion. Here Galinsky employs Horace’s *Carmen Saeculare* to the same effect as Zanker.\(^{68}\) Perhaps the most noticeable influence of Zanker on Galinsky’s discussion can be seen in the sixth chapter, ‘Cultural Vitality’, which strongly parallels Zanker’s chapter on cultural renewal. Galinsky reaches the same conclusion as Zanker on Augustan art as appropriating the past, whilst it also evolved with ‘experimentation and innovation’. Furthermore, Galinsky views the return to classical art as ‘conveying order and stability after the excesses of the Republic’, much like Zanker and Hölscher.\(^{69}\) Galinsky notes that Augustus represented Rome’s values by way of restoration, a point taken up by Zanker in his section on religious renewal.\(^{70}\) Galinsky furthermore believes that it was Augustus’ vision for Rome’s cultural renewal which spurred creativity, an obvious parallel with the overall theory behind *The Power of Images*.\(^{71}\) Both Riggs Alden Smith and Philip Hardie recognise extensive comparisons between the work of Zanker and Galinsky when discussing the manner in which the Augustan age utilised imagery to communicate ideas on morality, religion, politics and society.\(^{72}\) Both argue, however, that Galinsky incorporates more literal evidence in his analysis. Whilst both Hardie’s review and Alden Smith’s

\(^{65}\) Galinsky, *Introduction to the Life of an Emperor*, p. 21.
\(^{66}\) Galinsky, *Introduction to the Life of an Emperor*, p. 21.
\(^{67}\) Galinsky, *Introduction to the Life of an Emperor*, p. 95.
\(^{68}\) Galinsky, *Introduction to the Life of an Emperor*, p. 99.
\(^{69}\) Galinsky, *Introduction to the Life of an Emperor*, p. 147.
\(^{71}\) Galinsky, *Introduction to the Life of an Emperor*, p. 151.
comments refer to Galinsky’s ‘Augustan Culture’, the very notion that the influence of Zanker can still be seen in a book not based on visual art, reinforces the extent of Zanker’s contribution both to Galinsky and to this area of Roman classical scholarship.

While Wallace-Hadrill is critical of Zanker’s limited focus on the Augustan era in The Power of Images, and therefore of his separation of this period from cultural renewal in the longer term, Zanker’s later book Roman Art (2008) broadens the temporal scope of his exploration of the relationship between Roman visual culture and Roman history. Notably, Zanker still holds similar opinions to those found in The Power of Images, insisting that the principate was a time when official art in particular became a coherent set of images, and continues to explore the themes of new art based upon Greek forms and conflicting imagery.

In conclusion, it is clear that The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus, and the work of Paul Zanker on this topic, contributed greatly to the understanding of the relationship between Roman art and Roman history. By using a broad range of evidence including coinage, statuary, relief, paintings and monuments, Zanker produces a clear argument for the audience, as his exploration of Roman history can be understood in visual terms rather than as an abstract concept. Whilst Wallace-Hadrill laments that the English translation loses some of Zanker’s original German nuances, the writing combined with a series of good quality images to illustrate key points, ensures that the style is still engaging and informative. No other work prior to Zanker continually linked visual culture to political, social and religious concerns in such depth, and whilst later writing has attempted to, Zanker’s influence still remains clear, in the work of Galinsky most notably. For an understanding of how Roman imagery powered cultural, religious, moral and political renewal, The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus is without doubt an excellent example of classical art history scholarship.

73 Wallace-Hadrill, Rome’s Cultural Revolution, p. 163.
74 Zanker, The Power of Images, pp. 67; 1; 13.
75 Wallace-Hadrill, Rome’s Cultural Revolution, p. 158.
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Figure 1: Honorific Statue of a Roman General, Bronze [height 2.44m, ca. 180-150 BC], from Rome, Terme Museum, invoice number 1049, Photograph: Hirmer.
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Figure 3: Pompeius Magnus [height 26cm, (106-48 BC)], Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek.
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Figure 4: M. Crassus [height 24.5cm], Paris, Louvre inv. Ma975.
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Figure 5: Denarius of Octavian [before 31 BC], Niggeler no. 1015.

Source: Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Fig. 32, p. 42.
Figure 6: Glass Cameo Showing Appolonian Snake [height 3.7cm] Cologne, Römisch-Germanisches Museum, inv. 72.153.

Source: Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Fig. 39, p. 51.
Figure 7: Mould for Arretine Clay Bowl [ca. 30 BC, height 9.9cm], New York Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. 19.192.21.

Source: Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Fig. 45, p. 58.
Figure 8: Mausoleum of Augustus [Rome, 1987, Fototeca Unione].

Source: Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Fig. 57, p. 73.

Figure 9: Temple of Jupiter Tonans, Depicted on Left Denarius [Spain, 19/18 BC] MuM Auction 38 (1968) no. 328.

Source: Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Fig. 89, p. 109.
Figures 10 & 11: Statues of Men Wearing Voluminous Imperial Toga [Rome, Palazzo dei Conservatori], inv. 2392.

Figure 12: Statue of Matron Wearing Stola [height 88cm], Parma, Museo Nazionale inv. 404.

Source: Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Fig. 131, p. 165.
Figure 13: Tellus Relief from the Ara Pacis [photograph by the Capitoline Museum].

Source: Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Fig. 136, p. 174.
Figure 14: Venus in Brescia, Bronze [height 1.95m], Brescia, Museum Civico.

Source: Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Fig. 152, p. 198.
Figure 15: Venus of Capua [Roman Copy, height 2.10m], Naples, Museo Nazionale, INR 83.2259.

Source: Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Fig. 153, p. 98.
Figure 16: Ara Pacis Vine Clusters [Photograph G. Fittschen-Badura].

Source: Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Fig. 140, p. 181.
Figure 17: Altar in Arezzo.