

Niels Hannestad, *Roman Art and Imperial Policy*. Jutland Archaeological Society Publications 19. Aarhus University Press, Aarhus 1986. 485 pages, 203 illustrations in the text, 7 illustrations (including two maps) as plates.

Once not long ago there were very few books on Roman art as a whole. Those in use were the surveys, albeit incisive, by P. Ducati, G. Rodenwaldt, and E. S. Strong. As the full, topical, and most timely, stimulating Bibliography at the end of this book demonstrates (pp. 423–458), there are now considerably more, one or two available in several languages. What has remained a need until the appearance of Niels Hannestad's monumental volume has been a book, in one volume only, in which Roman art, architecture, and the special field of numismatic pictorialism are surveyed against the background of Roman history and literature. This is to say that Roman history is told around Roman art, with illustrations and pertinent references from Roman literature. On a recent visit to the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden in Leiden and the Allard Pierson Museum in Amsterdam, I was most impressed with the illustrated syllabuses with appropriate maps and archaeological or architectural reconstructions which teaching assistants were offering for sale to students (and random visitors like myself) at modest prices. One feels that the present book could have grown out of such useful educational tools. An earlier, smaller version appeared in Danish in 1976. At any rate, the present book, with its excellent illustrations in the text, with its concise encyclopedia of notes (pp. 351–422), and, above all, with its relaxed style of telling good history and archaeological fact under topical headings, all adds up to an excellent, worldwide text for serious students of late Republican and imperial Rome. The span covered extends from the cast bronze coins (*aes grave, signatum*) of the years after 250 B. C. to the Obelisk of Theodosius, raised in the Hippodrome at Constantinople in A. D. 390.

The titles of the seven major chapters of text hardly suggest the treasure trove of historical and visual riches, often spiced with the author's pithy and witty comments and asides. The seven are The Republic, The Augustan Principate, The Julio-Claudians, The Flavians, The Adoptive Emperors, The Severans, and The Dominate, the last chapter taking the story by selected topics from portraits of Maximinus Thrax, past the Ludovisi Battle Sarcophagus, Gallienus, and the Tetrarchy (with sub-sections such as the Arch of Galerius), to Constantine the Great, his arch in Rome and his state portraits, and then almost directly (panegyrics and Julian) to Theodosian affairs and the Obelisk's Base. Chapter IV, The Flavians, can be surveyed further, since it seems to mark the watershed of the book, but these pages (117–142) are really the end of the first half of the story. The 'year of the four emperors' surveys the chaos from the coins and their inscriptions, ending with the 'miserable death' of Vitellius. Then comes 'Vespasian and his sons', all about their origins, rise, and power, culminating in the Silver Age of Latin poets and the 'restored' Julio-Claudian coins of Titus, who had after all been a childhood friend of poor Britannicus and who revived his Lugdunum-issue sestertii in the heavier Flavian style at Rome (see H. M. VON KAENEL, *Schweiz. Num. Rundschau* 63, 1984, pl. 22, 16–20, etc.).

The small section titled 'The Colosseum' talks of the games, the naval battle, the gladiators, and the social effects of the structure, culminating in the effusive lines of Martial about the Baths of Titus and the setting of the Amphitheatrum Flavianum and replete with the view of all this on the sestertius of Titus. 'The Arch of

Titus' comes in for a lengthy essay on the two panels, which begins with Flavius Josephus' description of the triumph of Vespasian and Titus. Similarly, there is a full study of 'The Cancellaria Reliefs', and, finally, the nature of the principate at the hands of the last Flavian, Domitian, centers around the 'Equus Domitiani' or Equus Maximus (Staius) as known from the reverse of a sestertius of the emperor who would be a new Demetrios Poliorcetes, Seleukos Nikator, or Ptolemy Euergetes. Despite all the ancient writers' talk of only gold and silver statues of Domitian on the Capitol (and elsewhere), the sestertius-reverse (fig. 90) showing Victoria crowning the cuirassed, thunderbolt-bearing emperor is really quite prosaic as these things go, in a well-established triumphal tradition.

The comments which follow are keyed to the pages of this splendid pictorial history. Each reviewer rides his special concerns, his own Bucephalus, into the permanency of print, particularly in a great annual like *Bonner Jahrbücher* which goes back to the rise of Napoleon, the reign of King George III, and the Presidency of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, but I will try to offer a few comments which echo my respect for what Niels Hannestad has brought to scholars (including students) across the world's dimensions from Vancouver to Dunedin, from Oslo to Cape Town.

pp. 38, 362, note 155. Why cannot the Ahenobarbus base stay where it has always been in the chronology of Roman historical art, even if the events referred to are earlier? Roman Republican coins exhibit the same ancestral types and family relationships.

p. 55. The hound beside 'Tiberius' in the centre of the breastplate of the Primaporta Augustus could be an allusion to Alexander the Great, whose mighty canine accompanied him on his early campaigns in the East and had a town named after him (?), just like the steed Bucephalus. We know how conscious were the Romans from Lucullus and Pompey to Nero and even Vespasian (his first denarius in the East) concerning the iconographic inheritances of Alexander the Great in the East, where Octavian achieved lasting success.

p. 75. In the section, 'The provinces', the term *swaggering* (not the garlands) seems an unusual epithet for the Augustan monument near La Turbie, north of Monaco. The Augustan to Julio-Claudian sculptures at Pisidian Antioch might be adduced also to show Hellenistic-Roman triumphal art in remote regions, a colony and therefore trying to be like Rome itself but firmly grounded in the ethos of Attalid-Seleucid Asia Minor.

p. 77. The planners-sculptors for the 'Cenotaph' of Gaius Caesar at Limyra on the Lycian coast need not have come from Rome, only from Aphrodisias in Caria (Sebasteion and similar urban proliferations), Ephesus (the Memmius Monument), or Athens, in the tradition of the head of Agrippa in profile against the same neutral backgrounds seen in the fragments from Limyra (fragment in Boston). But, we remember, Lycia had a tradition of 'state', 'historical' sculpture almost greater than anywhere else in the Greek world, including the Italo-Etruscan forebears of the Roman. And the brief flowering of urban medallion bronze coins under Augustus in Lycia (Tlos) showed what the locals could produce in the Pergamene or Ionian traditions, completely apart from Rome.

p. 106. The story of Claudius' end and Nero's accession, much told in books and on BBC-sponsored television (*I Claudius*, *Claudius the God*) is rephrased here with all of the author's wit and humour. For example: 'For all Claudius got out of his last marriage . . . was deification.'

p. 111. Since this book is history perhaps a modern explanation can be added. Nero's transformation from handsome youth to bloated image of self-indulgence can be paralleled in our times by the iconographic career (coins, stamps, press photographs) of the late King Farouk of Egypt.

p. 113. While Augustus had used the Skopasian Apollo with the Lyre as an Actian symbol, it was surely as Leader of the Muses (fig. 72) that the statue, then in Rome, appeared on dupondii of Nero.

p. 120. In the realm of pure history, based visually on the canonical *JUDAEA CAPTA* sestertius of Vespasian (fig. 75), the story of the Jewish Revolt seems too simplistic, especially as regards overseas Jewry. The literature on all this has proliferated in recent years: *inter alia*, the reviewer's *Jewish Relations with the Art of Ancient Greece and Rome* (1981). Basically, E. SCHÜRER, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ 1*, Revised by G. Vermes, F. Millar (1973), Chapter 20, *The Great War with Rome A.D. 66-74* (?), 484-513; T. RAJAK, *Contrasting Worlds in First-Century Palestine*. *Journal Rom.Stud.* 72, 1982, 170-174, a review article of the revised Schürer, vol. 2 (1978).

p. 209, fig. 130. If, indeed, the head from the Canopus of Villa Adriana is 'Hadrianus Renatus' as suggested by the cistophori of Ephesus (?), then the type is also known in marble from Asia Minor, as the head at Wellesley College indicates: *Archaeology* 25, 1972, 282, fig. (with no beard). The man, or men, must be part of Hadrian's entourage, in the manner of the companions seen in the Hadrianic tondi on the Arch of Constantine.

p. 213. Roman coins never, and Roman medallions only under Hadrian and the Antonines, show the pure mythology seen so often on the great Greek imperial bronzes, coins and large 'medallions', of Asia Minor, as Bellerophon and the Chimaera at Thyatira in Lydia under Severus Alexander (218–222), a composition going back to Archaic Greek times: M. L. SCHMITT, Bellerophon and the Chimaera in Archaic Greek Art. *Am. Journal Arch.* 70, 1966, 341–347. See further, H. VOEGTLI, *Weitere Sagenbilder auf Kolonialprägungen. Numismatics – Witness to History. IAPN Publications No. 8 (1986) 19–29.*

p. 214, fig. 132. The sestertius of Antoninus Pius, dated 140–143, surely shows Antoninus Pius and Faustina I holding the statuette of Concordia, with Marcus Aurelius Caesar and the imperial daughter Faustina II as the small figures in front, making the reverse a dynastic statement (despite the vagueness in the British Museum description, 'two small figures': *BMCCRE IV*, 198–199, nos. 1236; 1237).

p. 237. Was the Column of Marcus Aurelius in Rome really surmounted by statues of both Marcus Aurelius and Faustina II? Since the Column was mostly the work of their son Commodus (177–192) this is very possible, whereas Trajan put up his own Column, and he and Plotina of course left no children, only cousin Hadrian (Plotina's pet!).

p. 245. The author makes a good point about the short hair and beard in the medallionic portraits of 191 to 192 showing Commodus as Hercules (fig. 154), an iconographic style not seen in the very florid hair of the bust of Commodus as Hercules in the Palazzo dei Conservatori (fig. 155) but certainly a feature of the head and fragments of the statue of Caracalla as Hercules (Karl Lehmann's suggestion to Gisela Richter and to me in 1954), lionskin over the arm, not on the head, in the Metropolitan Museum, New York. This factor, Herculean hair, may not make the statue as late as the reign of Severus Alexander, but then again Caracalla's Herculean toughness was well remembered by the boys of his Mother's family who aspired to continue his dynasty: H. B. WIGGERS, *Caracalla. Das röm. Herrscherbild III 1 (1971) 71.* This Emperor-as-the-tough-Hercules iconography may have hastened and may explain, very slightly, the 'cubism' of the Tetrarch era.

p. 303. The very last Greek imperial coin of Asia Minor, the Emperor Tacitus (275–276) at Perge in Pamphylia, disappeared nearly a generation before the new monetary system of the Tetrarchs. The debased tetradrachms of Alexandria in Egypt staggered on to 295–296. Coinage in Greece, from Macedonia to the Peloponnesus, had been terminated under Gallienus and Salonina (260–268), perhaps while Valerian was still ruler (253–260) and when the Herulians came. D. R. SEAR's most useful *Greek Imperial Coins and Their Values. The Local Coinages of the Roman Empire (1982)* makes this all very easy to grasp at a glance.

p. 305. The point about the shoulder-brooches on the cloaks of the Seniores Augusti having been chiselled away (the porphyry Tetrarchs in Venice from Constantinople) is well taken, a special *damnatio memoriae* says the author. Probably these ornaments were offensive to Byzantine Christians, one being an image of Jupiter and the other of Hercules as on the reverses of the aurei. Which Augustus was which has been the subject of a mighty literature, surely Diocletian being on the viewer's extreme left which is the extreme right and senior position of the group and Maximianus Hercules being on the viewer's left of the pair on the viewer's right: see *Iconographic Studies (1980) 60–62.*

The Notes can be praised again for their completeness, their organization, and their cross-referencing by topics to the Bibliography, already mentioned for its amazing value to veterans and novices in the world of Roman art, architecture and history. Lest it be overlooked at the end, the Abbreviations serve as a handbook for students going deeper into the field, and the List of Illustrations (pp. 461–464) includes the negative numbers of most of the pictures, Alinari, Anderson, Hirmer, DAI-Rome, Fot. Un., and the like. There is a complete Index, and a Danish summary (pp. 475–478), not to forget a Chronological table of emperors (pp. 479–482) before the three plans of Rome which conclude this beautifully-formatted (design and type) book. All those involved in the publication, for which the author received his Doctorate of Philosophy



from Aarhus University, can be justly proud. One or two comments drawn from the notes must come as an anti-climax.

p. 351, note 11. Finding political messages in Greek art of the Peisistratid to late Persian royal period in Greek vase-painting is a fashionable contemporary discipline.

pp. 353–354, note 25. Virtues and personifications as statues in Rome will be surveyed by the reviewer in: *The Cult Images of Imperial Rome* (1987), part of the *Archaeologica* series of Giorgio Bretschneider.

p. 365, note 35. Asia Minor was flooded with Roman (as opposed to Greek imperial) coins in the third century A. D., both before and after Gallienus, as a jeweller's collection of several thousand worn and inferior-grade specimens brought from Antalya with the Christian exodus of the 1920's demonstrates. These coins are as much a part of the spread of Roman art as are the enrichments of the routine Roman imperial cuirassed statues.

p. 368, note 50. Is it wrong to continue feeling that the exceptional Roman imperial cuirassed statue in Cherchel is Hadrianus Augustus, with references to the iconography and art of the first Augustus similar to what we see on Hadrian's Roman coins, including a revived emphasis on the cult statue of Mars Ultor? After all, when Hadrian came to power he had some avenging to do, particularly as regards the African provinces.

p. 369, note 75. The author is correct in having doubts about the spandrel with flying Victoria in Copenhagen belonging to the Arch of Augustus in its original form. It was found at the *Castra Praetoria*, at a moment when R. Lanciani was away from Rome. The possible connections, as the author states in such lucid fashion, suggest 'a very late restoration made by some emperor who wanted to commemorate Augustus or a Persian victory'. Not Septimius Severus, whose big arch was rising nearby, but perhaps Lucius Verus, for there are fragments of a small arch in the classicizing style from his 'victories' scattered about the museums and churches of Rome. But, more likely this speaks of a small arch in the Forum area, not a rehabilitated or modified Arch of Augustus?

p. 403, note 364. Was Commodus as a child portrayed as Hercules strangling the snakes, or did he have retrospective statues of himself created as Baby Laocoon in 191–192 to show Rome that he had been Hercules from the cradle onwards?

p. 418, note 165. The wonderful bronze Augustus on horseback (horse lost), found in the sea off the coast of Lemnos, seems to me to be a work from an early Greek imperial workshop, say Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamon, or even Mytilene (?), and need not have been lost as late as the creation of the second Rome on the Bosphorus, after 325. Dr. Evi Touloupa will settle much of this in her full publication. The statue recalls the equestrian marble (horse and) lower half of a military rider from Melos (found on the beach) and long on display behind the row of tour-busses in front of the National Museum at Athens rather than the squadron of riders in Leeds and London from Lanuvium, all Antonine. The Lemnian Augustus is, of course, as Mrs. Touloupa has so astutely observed, a creation of the years after 12 B. C. when the first princeps was consolidating his powers as chief religious as well as political magistrate. See now, E. TOULOUPA, *Das bronzene Reiterstandbild des Augustus aus dem nordägäischen Meer*. *Athen. Mitt.* 101, 1986, 185–205, pls. 36–45. In this vein, Richard A. Gergel reminds me that the bronze Hadrian from near Scythopolis in the Holy Land may have once formed part of an equestrian statue.

Would Niels Hannestad or one of his colleagues at Aarhus University please give us a comparable, companion book on Hellenistic Art and Royal Policy, covering the years from Philip of Macedon to Cleopatra in Southern Italy, Sicily, Greece, and the East? J. J. POLLITT's *Art in the Hellenistic Age* (1986) has given us much to think about in these respects and many splendid points of reference.