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Abstract:

At the end of the first century BCE, the Roman Empire was being established, and Augustus Caesar was taking sole power of the Roman world. In order to spread the values and concepts that he wanted to perpetuate in the new political order, he revived an archaistic art style based on that of the archaic period of ancient Greece. This study is focused on works that include depictions of Apollo because one of the first and most studied examples of Augustus’ use of Roman archaism was the decorative program of the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine. Apollo is an especially significant figure to consider in a study on a revival of a Greek style because he was originally a Greek god that was absorbed into the Roman pantheon, just as some of the stylistic elements from archaic Greek works had been appropriated into Roman artwork to create Roman archaism. Augustus also considered Apollo as an ancestor and used Apollo to rally support during the Battle of Actium in 31 BCE. By looking at some of the works of Roman archaism created in the time period of Augustus’s rule that depict Apollo, this paper argues that there is a connection between certain ideals Augustus attempted to promote to the Roman people and the archaistic style. The ideals being emphasized included a restoration of religious piety, a subtle reminder of military power, a grounded history for the royal family, and a new youthful ideal for depictions of Roman people.
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In the field of art history, the time period surrounding the appearance of the first emperor of the Roman Empire is an engaging one in regards to art and artistic development. The political structure of Rome was changing from a republic to an empire, civil wars were rampant as various military generals used the support of their troops to gain power by force, and prominent politicians, such as Julius Caesar, were being assassinated. In terms of political structure, a large group of senators were the primary leaders of the Roman Republic, and every male Roman citizen had a say in politics by electing members of assemblies, which in turn elected magistrates (Mouritsen 2001). On the other hand, a singular figure, Augustus Caesar, dominated the beginning of the Roman Empire and held all the main positions of power in Rome. During this tumultuous time, the ideas that were expressed to the Roman people through art were changing in order to reinforce the new political order. For Paul Zanker (1998), a prominent scholar in the study of Augustan art, the “cultural program” that Augustus was instating “was nothing less than a complete moral revival” that “required a new visual language” (2-3). This “cultural program” makes early imperial art especially suitable for stimulating art historical thought as this art established some of the core values and concepts that the Empire was being built upon, including a restoration of Roman religion and an emphasis on the importance of family. In general, new rulers occasionally use distinctive artistic styles in order to create a new artistic tradition that emphasizes their political message (Kellum 1985, 169). For Augustus, the successful transitioning of Rome from a republic to an empire required artistic and stylistic choices by him and other patrons for art and architecture that reflected some of the values and concepts that he wanted to perpetuate in the new political order that was underway at the end of the first century BCE. This paper will be studying a very specific style—an archaistic style—that was consciously revived at the beginning of the Roman Empire during the lifetime of Augustus.
The archaistic style that will be discussed will be referred to as Roman archaism. This style is based on that of the archaic period of ancient Greece, which is considered by modern art historians to have lasted from 800-480 BCE. The naming of this period is based on the Greek word αρχή, “arche,” meaning origin or beginning. This was not the actual beginning of Greek art, but recognizable figural work began to be common in this period. While there was certainly artistic variety within the time frame of archaic Greece, figural works in sculpture tended to have some defining characteristics, such as a stiff and frontal pose, an “Archaic smile,” plated hair, and dovetail drapery. This is especially true for kouroi and korai figures, which were figures of young men and women that were used as votive figures and grave markers during the archaic period of ancient Greece. One such kore figure from the Athenian Acropolis [Figure 1] shows the typical stylistic features of an archaic Greek work. Her posture is stiff, her pose frontal, her hair is styled in long spiral plaits that reach mid-torso; she has an “Archaic smile”—a slight upturning of the mouth that creates a serene expression on the faces of many figures—and the edges of her clothing create zigzagging dovetail drapery. Artists employed this dovetail drapery mostly on depictions of females; males were depicted nude as per Greek conventions. Archaism refers to the style of any piece created after 480 BCE that still retains elements of the archaic Greek style—stiff postures, dovetail drapery, and an “Archaic smile” among others. It is an archaistic style rather than simply an archaic one because it combined the older archaic elements in new ways to create a unique Roman style. Mark Fullerton (1990), a Professor in the Department of Classics at The Ohio State University, suggests that a Classical era statue of Hekate Epipyrgidia made by Alkamene, a marble sculptor, in the fifth century BCE was one of the first examples of an archaistic work. Copies of this work [Figure 2] were made earlier than Augustus’s time in the Hellenistic period of ancient Rome from 323-31 BCE.
For the Romans, the appropriation of Greek style “implied a self-conscious set of aesthetic choices” (Elsner 2003, 6). For Augustus, an archaistic style was not by itself appealing, but its use as a “form for particular contemporary themes and contents” was (Hölscher 2006, 250). So, aesthetic choices such as Roman archaism were made deliberately with specific uses and themes in mind. While the Romans appropriated Greek artwork in many ways—copying statues, importing artwork and architectural elements, looting Greek sites, etc.—only the archaistic style frequently used under Augustus will be discussed here. He revitalized an archaistic style based on ancient Greek models, raising the question of what his reasons might have been for doing so. For Maria Strazzula (1990), the author of the principle book about the terracotta reliefs at the Temple of Apollo to be discussed later, this Augustan archaism “is a very special phenomenon, extremely limited in time and destined to never happen again” in Roman history; “it is taken up in an original vision, shaping it to [patrons’] needs” (128). While art historians may never know for sure what Augustus’s reasons were for reviving Roman archaism, there does seem to be a connection between the style and Augustus’s politics of the time. As a style, Roman archaism seems to have been used more often in the early Roman Empire than in the Roman Republic perhaps due to some of the ideals that Augustus wanted to convey to the Roman people. By looking at some of the works of Roman archaism created in the time period of Augustus’s rule, this paper suggests that style can be used as a starting point for a focused analysis of the ideals being emphasized in the works, which included a restoration of religious piety, a reminder of military power, a grounded history for the royal family, and a new youthful ideal for depictions of Roman people.
In Defense of Stylistic Analysis

The basis of this research project on Roman archaism is stylistic analysis. Stylistic analysis—that is, studying artworks in groupings based primarily on similar visual characteristics—has been at the center of increased debate within the field of art history in recent years. Most art historians, such as Jaś Elsner (2003), a British art historian and classicist, and Svetlana Alpers (1987), a former professor of History of Art at University of California, Berkeley, acknowledge that style has been a prominent method of analysis, but they also identify various problems that stylistic analysis as a methodology has. One issue is that an inability to universally define “style” prevents all scholars from accepting stylistic analysis as a viable form of study on its own, but this oversimplifies problems that some art historians have with this methodology. Some art historians like Meyer Schapiro (1994), a former Medieval and Modernist art historian at Columbia University, believe that studies in style are disadvantageous when considering artwork as “pure constructions of lines and colors” (59). For ancient art history, this becomes an issue because modern viewers are often unfamiliar with original meanings and contexts of works, and art history becomes simply a study on the improving or deteriorating development of form and style. Some authors (Elsner 2003, Alpers 1987) give Giorgio Vasari and his sixteenth century Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects as an example of how subjective focus on form and style creates a degenerative idea of art history.

Instead of viewing style as inherently moving forward or regressing, style can develop in an biological evolutionary sense in that separate species, separate styles, develop in response to changing environments, though stylistic environments are politically, economically, and socially affected rather than climatically or predatorily. In order to resist a subjective view of style, this paper uses Schapiro’s (1994) thoughts on incorporating research of mythology and religion into
a study of style; contextualizing a style historically suggests that it is “not autonomous but is connected with changing attitudes and interests that appear more or less clearly in the subject matter of the art” (59). The notion that “changing attitudes and interests” affect the development of forms and style relates well to the time period of the early Roman Empire for reasons explained earlier. Roman archaism was used frequently because Augustus and other patrons wanted to express the changing ideals and political attitudes in Rome during this time. The use of Greek styles in Roman art, including Roman archaism, is deliberate. Tonio Hölscher (2004), a Professor of Classical Art and Architecture at the University of Heidelberg, argues that this use is not “arbitrary” but “a selection, which is geared towards best expressing [a] message” (86). Rather than older styles simply being associated with direct visual interpretation, “the inherited forms . . . disregard[ed] the boundaries of the historical periods” in favor of values and “ethical models” (95-96). For this paper, “style” is both the combination of formal elements—line, composition, shape, color, space, form—that create an the archaistic style and the connotations and meanings of the studied works that may not be visually expressed within them. By viewing the archaistic style as a deliberate artistic choice based on the changing attitudes of August and other patrons of art, this paper can suggest possible connections between the style and Augustus’s politics.

The works discussed in this paper [see Appendix] have all been dated to the Augustan period by art historians. Unfortunately, while style is often beneficial when narrowing down a time period for ancient or unattributed art, revivals and appropriations such as Roman archaism complicate how a certain period style should be perceived; the inclusion of older stylistic elements may suggest an older date than the work actually has. For example, marble Roman copies such as this Roman copy of the Doryphoros of Polykleitos [Figure 3] of bronze Greek
originals are more difficult to date because of their basis in older Greek forms. Roman appropriation of Greek stylistic elements also brings up the question about what is considered a unique Roman style and what is just a reproduction of earlier Greek work. Elaine K. Gazda (1995), a Professor of Classical Art and Archaeology in the Department of the History of Art at the University of Michigan states referring to such works as “copies” prevents art historians from understanding them as “legitimate Roman cultural products” (122). Classifying an artwork as a “copy” prevents it from communicating ideas from its own culture and time. It is for this reason that this paper will not be attempting to argue the potential origin of any of the pieces discussed. The paper will only focus on possible reasons why elements of the archaic Greek style were appropriated for use in Roman archaism during the Augustan period.

In addition, this paper attempts to use “appropriation” whenever possible when discussing the use of Roman archaism. The distinction between “appropriation” and “influence” is important to make. In the study of style, both terms are often used to denote styles that seem to be based either visually or conceptually on an earlier or coexisting style. While these terms are sometimes used interchangeably, there is a difference between the two. For Elsner (2003), “‘Appropriation’ has very different implications from ‘influence,’ especially in its reversal of the dynamics and motivations of imitation” (5). Appropriation allows the artist to choose elements of a work of art deliberately with specific reasons or uses in mind. On the other hand, influence is much less active on the part of the artist and often results in copies or unoriginal work. In the study of ancient Roman art, the appropriation of Greek art—which will be discussed in greater detail in a later section—encouraged the Romans to reinterpret Greek art and architecture for their own uses (Kousser 2015, 376). “Appropriation” is much more apt a term in a study of
Roman archaism due to how Augustus and other patrons increased its use during the Augustan period in order to showcase aspects of the changing political and social environment.

**The Importance of Apollo as a Figure**

Examining all works that have an archaistic style is too broad a scope for this small study. As Roman archaistic depictions have a variety of subject matter, contexts, and materials, the focus of this paper will be narrowed to include only sculptural works that include a depiction of Apollo. In classical mythology, Apollo was the god of music, archery, prophecy, illness, and healing. These responsibilities originate in oral tradition and literature about Apollo. For example, in Homer’s Hymn to Apollo, Apollo’s origins as son of Leto are described. Instead of nursing, Apollo was given nectar and ambrosia, the drink and food of the gods, immediately growing into an adult and “[speaking] out among the deathless goddesses, ‘The lyre and the curved bow shall ever be dear to me, and I will declare to men the unfailing will of Zeus’” (Homer 1914, 3.123). These literary accounts are the remnants of a vibrant oral tradition in the ancient world. It was this oral tradition that is the origin of Apollo and other gods’ attributes, the symbols of the gods’ powers that art historians can now use to identify gods within an artwork. For Apollo, these attributes include the lyre, a bow and arrow, and his sacred stone, the *omphalos* or betyl, which was housed at his temple at Delphi where the most famous oracle of the ancient world lived. Apollo can also be identified by his involvement in certain mythological stories, such as his fight with Hercules over his tripod, a symbol of his role as god of prophecy, described in the *Fabulae* of Hyginus. In this tale, Hercules has just murdered his wife and children and begs Apollo to give him an oracular reply about how to cleanse himself of his crime. Apollo refuses, Hercules steals Apollo’s tripod, and the two fight over its possession until Jupiter intervenes and ensures the tripod is returned to Apollo (Hyginus 1960, 32).
Iconographical clues such as the tripod have helped to identify the presence of Apollo within the works being discussed in this paper.

Apollo is especially suited to this study due to his absorption into the Roman pantheon of gods. When the Romans conquered other cultures, one of the ways that they prevented uprisings within new provinces was by identifying with the gods of particular regions. This was done by way of a process often referred to as *interpretatio Romana*. This term is used only once in extant Latin literature, in a passage from Tacitus’s *Germania* (43.4) describing a Naharvalian grove where “according to *interpretatio Romana*, Castor and Pollux” are worshipped (Ando 2005, 41).

Clifford Ando (2005), a Professor of Classics, History, and Law at the University of Chicago, describes this term as “enigmatic,” just like “many of the other mechanisms with which Romans and their subjects negotiated cultural difference” (50). According to William Hansen (2004), a Professor Emeritus of Classical Studies and Professor Emeritus of Folklore at Indiana University, *interpretatio Romana* was the specific appropriation of Greek mythology by the Romans, creating the modern expression “*classical mythology,*” and had three components, the first two of which will be explained now. The first component was that the Romans adopted and adapted the origin stories and heroic myths from Greek narrative tradition. The second was how they then identified their own deities “with the Greek deities to whom they appeared most closely to correspond.” In this way, Jupiter was affiliated with Zeus, Venus with Aphrodite, and Mars with Ares as well as others. Ando (2005) complicates the simplicity of Hansen’s explanation, discussing the inherent difficulty in coming up with an accurate explanation of how *interpretatio romana* worked due to translation problems and the etymology of some of the gods’ names by themselves. Some names have roots in both Latin and Greek even though the Romans and Greeks have separate names for the “same” god. Despite Ando’s misgivings, the model
supplied by Hansen for *interpretatio romana* is still useful to understand the integration of Apollo into the Roman pantheon.

During the identification process, there was sometimes no corresponding deity from the Roman pantheon to link with a Greek deity. This is the case for Apollo. Instead of affiliating the Greek god Apollon with an existing Roman deity, the Romans adopted him and Latinized his name, creating “Apollo” (Hansen 2004, 12). All of the myths originally associated with Apollon were absorbed as well, though “Apollo” was used in the Roman retellings. This absorption of Apollo into the Roman pantheon is a main reason for a focus on depictions of him. The archaic style employed under Augustus was primarily a Greek one, just as Apollo is primarily a Greek god. This absorption would have occurred as early as the 6th century BCE, perhaps even before the rise of the Roman Republic. Even so, many of the depictions of Apollo in the Roman culture, as well as other Italic cultures such as the Etruscans to Rome’s north, would have first been based on Greek ideas about how Apollo should appear since his mythology was borrowed into these cultures. These depictions were then adapted to make them specifically Roman depending on their contexts or symbolic meanings. These earlier depictions of Apollo could have some connection to Augustus’s revival of Roman archaism as will be discussed in a later section.

After the processes of adopting and adapting myths and identifying deities, the third and final component of *interpretatio Romana* is another justification for using Apollo as the focus of this paper. The final step in the process of creating classical mythology is how the Romans “elaborated and codified their own connection to the system” (Hansen 2004, 12). The Romans began connecting their own traditional stories about early Italic history to the Greek myths that had been adopted about gods and heroes. The origin of Rome itself was connected to stories about the Trojan War and the journeys of Aeneas, a Trojan War hero and refugee, who
supposedly founded a new settlement near the eventual location of Rome. One of his
descendants, Romulus, founded Rome a few centuries later. In the epic poem *Aeneid*, the Roman
poet Virgil reinforced the backstory of Aeneas and reflected Julius Caesar’s claim of ancestry in
Venus through Aeneas and his son Iulus (Hansen 2004, 12). So, the Romans did not only
connect their cultural origin stories to Greek myths, but individual Romans used the mythology
to identify with certain ancestral lines.

As Julius Caesar’s adoptive son, Augustus would have also considered himself a
descendant of Venus. Additionally, he considered himself a descendant of Apollo, and used this
association during his military campaigns (Kellum 1985, 170). According to Zanker (1998),
Augustus was not the only political figure to grant himself “divine protection and favor.” He
states, “During the struggle for power that followed Caesar’s murder, the contestants tried to
outdo one another in such identification with gods and heroes” (44). Although it was not the first
time Augustus associated himself with Apollo, the Battle of Actium and its historical context
lends itself well to study of how political figures in Rome identified with gods and heroes. Both
the main opponents in this battle—Mark Antony and Augustus, then Octavian—identified
themselves with a more powerful figure than themselves in order to gain support from their
troops. Antony and his family traced their lineage to Anton, a son of Hercules (Zanker 1998, 45).
The association of these two political rivals with different figures lent itself well to depictions of
fights between Apollo and Hercules, particularly the fight over Apollo’s tripod. Although one
example of such a depiction will be examined in greater detail in the next section, according to
Barbara Kellum (1985), a Professor of Art History at Smith College in Massachusetts, these
depictions show “Apollo appearing in exactly the role Octavian found most suited to himself—
that of defender and righteous protector, devoted to maintaining Roman power at Rome – and
not Alexandria” (171). This deep association with Apollo and the nature of Apollo’s protection over Augustus applies well to the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine, a building with archaistic elements that commemorated Octavian’s victory over Antony at the Battle of Actium.

**Battle of Actium and Temple of Apollo on the Palatine**

The Battle of Actium in 31 BCE is often considered the turning point in the history of Rome from a republic to an empire. The Temple of Apollo on the Palatine commemorated this victory and employed an archaizing style in its decoration. Before discussing this temple at length, some of the history surrounding the Battle of Actium should be reviewed. Thirteen years earlier, Julius Caesar had declared himself *dictator perpetuo*, “dictator for life,” and moved to take political and military power over the Roman people. Roman society, which believed in the equal power of all citizen men, had found this attempt at sole power unacceptable and the Senate conspired his assassination on March 15, 44 BCE (Southern 1998). The ensuing years between Julius Caesar’s assassination and the Battle of Actium were fraught with civil wars as major military leaders and government officials vied for power over the Roman people. Gaius Iulius Caesar Octavianus—Octavian, later Augustus—was one of the major military leaders. In addition to his support by the military, he was the great-nephew and adopted son of Julius Caesar himself, and had taken the Caesar name and its accompanying authority upon Julius’s assassination.

Octavian did not immediately fight for sole power of Rome but created the Second Triumvirate in 43 BCE with Marcus Aemilius Lepidus and Marcus Antonius—Mark Antony—in order for the three of them to share power in Rome for two terms of five years. This political alliance between three of the most prominent military leaders of the time was meant to bring much of the civil warring to an end, but it did not last. By 36 BCE, Lepidus had gathered an
army to challenge Octavian’s power in Sicily, which had been gained through a victory over Sextus Pompeius in the same year (Southern 1998). Through monetary compensation and casting doubts among Lepidus’s ranks of soldiers, Octavian managed to convince most of Lepidus’s army to desert. Subsequently, Lepidus was dissociated from the Triumvirate and exiled, only retaining his role as pontifex maximus, head priest of Rome, until his death in 12 BCE (Clark 2010). Meanwhile, Mark Antony had been living in Alexandria, Egypt with Cleopatra VII in spite of his marriage to Octavian’s sister Octavia. Octavian revealed to the Roman public that Antony was planning to have Alexandria as his burial place—unheard of for a Roman politician—and the animosity between the two culminated in the 31 BCE Battle of Actium in Greece (Southern 1998). This naval battle between the forces of Octavian and those of Antony and Cleopatra ended with Antony and Cleopatra’s suicide, and Octavian gaining full control of Rome.

The Temple of Apollo at the Palatine, dedicated in 28 BCE to thank Apollo for his assistance in Octavian’s military victories, includes elements of Roman archaism. Its building began in 36 BCE after the victory over Sextus Pompeius in Sicily, but the subsequent coups by both Lepidus and Antony delayed its completion. Rather than planning a new project to commemorate the Actium victory, Octavian reconceived the existing building project on the Palatine to memorialize both victories (Wiseman 2014, 330). Many reliefs that show the archaistic style as well as archaic Greek work were used in the building and decoration of this temple. After introducing the sculptors Bupalus and Athenis as masters in terracotta, Pliny the Elder discusses the Temple of Apollo in his *Natural Histories*. He states, “At Rome, there are some statues by these artists on the summit of the Temple of the Palatine Apollo, and, indeed, in most of the buildings that were erected by the late Emperor Augustus” (Pliny the Elder 1855,
This means that the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine was not the only example of Augustan architecture that used archaic and archaistic elements, though it does seem to be one of the most studied as evidenced by passages in research by Zanker (1988), Hölscher (2006), Hallett (2012), Touchette (2015).

The Temple of Apollo on the Palatine was built with a variety of styles and materials. It was made mostly of marble, but the roof ornaments were of terracotta. Gold and ivory figured reliefs decorated the doors, and the surrounding portico had sculptures of Danaid figures [Figure 4] (Hallett 2012, 87). Some of the archaistic decorative works in the Temple of Apollo included terracotta relief plaques that were possibly originally a part of this portico [Figure 5, 6, 7]. Though all three reliefs have elements of Roman archaism, only Figures 6 and 7 will be discussed in detail because they depict Apollo. Figure 7 will be discussed in the next section in terms of religious piety. Figure 6 depicts the fight between Apollo and Hercules over the tripod mentioned earlier; Apollo is on the right on the center tripod with his bow and arrows, and Hercules is on the left wearing his lion-skin cape and holding his knobbed club. Although this depiction does not have the characteristic dovetail drapery that is employed in many other works of Roman archaism, it does stylistically conform to Roman archaism with the stiff postures of the figures—as if they were posing rather than moving. The “tiptoe stance” of the figures is also associated with archaistic works of Roman art (Kellum 1985, 170). Iconographically, this battle is between Apollo and Hercules, but symbolically the battle is between Octavian and Augustus (Zanker 1983). Kellum (1985) argues, “The archaic composition places the two protagonists on an equal footing, but the conclusion of the contest – the ultimate vindication of the rightful possessorship of Apollo – is a foregone one” (170). The archaistic style allows the viewer to
interpret this image as a reference to both mythology and history, placing it contextually within the events of the Augustan time period.

In addition to the style of the plaques being an example of Roman archaism, the material of the plaques and other architectural elements has an archaistic element as well. The building’s plan relates back to older Tuscan temple types in Italy. In Vitruvius’s *De Architectura*, he classifies five types of temples. For the fourth type, he states, “The construction will be diastyle when we can insert the thickness of three columns in an intercolumniation, as in the case of the temple of Apollo and Diana” (Vitruvius 1914, 3.3.4). Timothy Wiseman (2014), a classical scholar and professor emeritus at the University of Exeter, argues convincingly that the Temple of Apollo and Diana is the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine based on evidence on ancient texts and coins. According to Kellum (1985), this diastylic temple plan was “as close as possible to the ancient Tuscan style of temples as was achievable in marble” (169). In addition, although much of Roman archaism has a basis in works from archaic Greece, the terracotta material used at the Temple of Apollo actually relates back to the archaic period of Rome itself.

Early in their history, the Romans had much contact with the Etruscans to their north in modern-day Tuscany. The Etruscans had many temples with terracotta decoration and architecture. In particular, one site, Veii, is known for the Portonaccio Sanctuary of Minerva that had its roof decorated with terracotta figures like this one of Apollo [Figure 8]. The contact between the Etruscans and the Romans encouraged Romans to incorporate terracotta into their own temples, even going so far as to commission work from Etruscan artists to use in temples. One such temple was the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, or Jupiter Capitolinus, on Capitoline Hill, one of the most important temples of ancient Rome. This was one of the first monuments in Rome: “The first diamonded pavement at Tome was laid in the Temple of Jupiter
Capitolinus, after the commencement of the Third Punic War” (Pliny the Elder 1855, 36.61).

According to Lori-Ann Touchette (2015), a classical archaeologist and art historian, “The reliefs [at the Temple of Apollo] . . . recall the multitude of painted terracottas that symbolized continuity with the Italic past of the city and in particular those of the original Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus (burned in 83 BC), the archetypal Tuscan temple that the Temple of Apollo imitated in marble” (304). Augustus was considered in ancient times by writers such as to have given dignity to Rome by “[finding] it built of brick and [leaving] it in marble (Suetonius 1914, 28.3). Indeed, he built many monuments and temples in marble, but his architecture of terracotta was just as important, perhaps more so due to how one such temple was dedicated after the battle that gave Augustus his power. The Temple of Apollo on the Palatine not only used an archaistic style based on elements of an archaic Greek one, but it was built with a material connected to the archaic period in Italy as well. At the very basis, though, the Palatine Temple of Apollo was a religious structure. Temples in ancient Rome were centers of religious practice as well as dedication sites, so any style used on a temple, including Roman archaism, took on a religious aspect.

**Religious Piety**

One of Augustus’s main reasons for reviving an archaistic style was to restore the religious piety of the Romans that he saw as lacking during the end of the Roman Republic. According to Karl Galinsky (1996), a Professor of Classics at the University of Texas, “Fundamentally, religion is a response and alternative to chaos; it is an attempt to provide structure, order, and meaning, the very efforts that lay at the heart of the Augustan reconstruction of the *res publica* [the republic]” (288). This was not a new idea, either. Zanker (1988) states, “Ever since Cato the Elder, the dissolution of tradition and of the state, the self-destructiveness
that threatened to destroy Rome, had all been ascribed to a neglect of the gods” (102). This would have been one to two centuries before Augustus had taken power. For Augustus, reinforcing religious piety was a way to overcome the chaos that prevailed through civil wars in Rome after the assassination of Julius Caesar. This chaos had caused both the priesthods to be “filled intermittently or not at all” and the general neglect of many of the temples and other sacred buildings in Rome (Galinsky 1996, 289). This importance on revitalizing piety was present in literary works of the Augustan period as well. Commissioned by Augustus, Horace’s Odes reads, “Your fathers’ guilt you still must pay, / Till, Roman, you restore each shrine, / Each temple, ’mouldering in decay, / And smoke-grimed statue, scarce divine” (Horace 1882, 3.6). In chapter 20 of his funerary inscription, the Res Gestae Divi Augusti, Augustus placed an emphasis on how he rebuilt temples that had been neglected. He states, “In my sixth consulship, in accordance with a decree of the senate, I rebuilt in the city eighty-two temples of the gods, omitting none which at that time stood in need of repair” (Augustus 1924, 20). This emphasis on restoring temples and other sacred sites shows Augustus’s political emphasis on religious piety.

Many scholars have connected Roman archaism to this idea of restoration of religious piety. Christopher Hallett (2012), a Professor of Roman Art at University of California, Berkeley, states, “It has always been recognized that Archaic images are deployed in Augustan Rome in specifically religious or sacred contexts” (91). The revival of Roman archaism may also coincide with the revival of religious piety that Augustus meant to bring about in his artistic program through restoring sacred spaces. By using an archaistic style on the temple commemorating the victory that led to his taking control of Rome, the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine, Augustus certainly shows how important both religion and a return to older styles was. Roman archaism “reflects not only an aesthetic fashion, but the element of pietas in the
Augustan cultural agenda” (Zanker 1988, 245). Augustus was not the first patron of art to believe that works with archaic elements were intrinsically religious. Touchette (2015) argues, “Archaism had lost its novelty long before its appropriation in the Roman world . . . instead, its significance was religious, conferring greater venerability on images of the gods and their followers” (294). This venerability would have appealed to Augustus, who was just establishing the foundations of his new reign. This idea of Augustus’s creating a grounded history for himself will be discussed later.

The archaistic elements of the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine have also been connected to Augustus’s revitalization of Roman piety. In fact, “Augustus may have commissioned the Palatine terracotta gods for the . . . sanctuary on the Palatine, presenting himself as the restorer of the Republic and paralleling his restoration of traditional cults and temples associated with the origins of Rome” (Touchette 2015, 304). The Temple of Apollo on the Palatine was so important to his commemorating his victory over Mark Antony that it serves as a starting point for the rest of his artistic program. The decorative program of the temple is greatly connected to his restoration of religious piety that he began early in his reign. This is especially true for Figure 7. On this relief plaque, two maidens flank an aniconic, non-figural image of Apollo Agyieus identified by his lyre, bow, and arrows. Aniconic imagery was often considered more sacred than figural due to its connection to an ancient past. Even in later works, “aniconic monuments affirm the survival of a very deep past, attest an indigenous history, and proclaim religious ideology” (Gaifman 2010, 82). The combination of aniconic imagery and archaistic style are particularly impactful, both representing a time when Rome was better than it became at the end of the Republic.
In addition to the decorative program of the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine, other works [Figures 9 and 10] show a deep connection to religious piety as well. Both the reliefs in the Louvre and the Cleveland Museum of Art show basically the same scene, the Louvre’s is just slightly older than the Cleveland Museum’s. Nike on the right is pouring a libation into a bowl held by Apollo. Libations are gifts of food or wine to the gods and can be done at public temples or worship spaces or in private homes. Larger libations of animal sacrifices were reserved for communal worship, rites of passage, and the fulfillment of vows, but smaller libations of only wine were common as well (Goodman 2012). These libations were also used in thanks for military victories, which is probably what these two reliefs were used for due to the inclusion of Nike in the scene. This will be further discussed in the next section. For Touchette (2015), “Rather than divesting the works of their religious character, archaistic style reinforced their sacrality by rendering them timeless” (296). These two reliefs are strong examples for this point as their images are almost identical and yet they were created one hundred years apart. The imagery that was important in the Roman Republic remained important in the Empire because Augustus’s success relied on his assertion that he was restoring the greatness of the republic, which included fixing the lack of religious piety that he thought brought about the downfall of the Republic in the first place.

Military Agenda

At the same time that he was working on restoring religious piety, Augustus was building Rome’s military power and trying to change his reputation. Although many scholars like Zanker (1988) and Touchette (2015) often cite a religious sanctity in many archaistic works, some of the same works that show this religious subject matter, such as the libation scenes with Nike that are discussed briefly in this section, also have a military agenda. One of the more subtle suggestions
that Roman archaism allowed Augustus to make was one of military might. The Temple of Apollo on the Palatine is a more obvious example as it was built to commemorate two separate battles, a victory at Sicily and the Battle of Actium. The temple had clear archaistic elements in the decorative program and the terracotta material used for many of the reliefs and rooftop figures. These elements were certainly employed in a religious context as parts of a religious center, but the historical context of the temple in regard to the Battle of Actium connects the same archaistic elements to a reminder of Augustus’s military prowess. Augustus gained his power in Rome through military victories both at Actium and earlier, and the environment in which his power originated would have influenced his visual language choices (Zanker 1988, 240). The origin environment was full of struggles that Augustus had to overcome in order to become a successful leader of Rome, and triumph over these struggles is implied within works of Roman archaism.

As the basis for some of the elements of Roman archaism, the archaic period style from Greece grounds the discussion of military agenda and violent imagery. In archaic works, violent scenes of bloody conflict were common. Common subjects included, but were not limited to the following: the twelve labors of Heracles; Theseus and his battle with the Minotaur; the Centauromachy, a great war between centaurs and Lapiths; the Amazonomachy, a great war between Greeks and Amazons; and the Gigantomachy, the great war between the giants and the Olympians for the control of Earth (Hallett 2012, 93). Each of these events involved extremely violent conflict, and the conflict was readily observed on a variety of artistic forms, including Greek vase painting of the time. One example of violent imagery on archaic relief is one from Temple C at Selinous on the island of Sicily [Figure 11]. The fight is violent with Perseus grasping Medusa by the hair to keep her still. Perseus’s sword cuts deep into the neck of Medusa,
severing her head as she grimaces in pain. Sculptors of the archaic period “regularly produced powerful and memorable images of violence—especially in architectural reliefs” (Hallett 2012, 93). This violence in imagery during the archaic period was not continued in the archaistic images under Augustus.

In fact, archaistic works rarely show blatant violent imagery. Hallett (2012) states that “instead, where conflict is shown . . . it is reduced to . . . a symbolic image of struggle rather than a credible enactment of one” (93). A marble relief “Apollo and Herakles Fighting Over the Tripod” [Figure 12] demonstrates this concept. In mythology, Apollo and Herakles’s fight was so violent that Zeus eventually had to step in and resolve the issue of the tripod’s possession. In terms of iconography, this fight is closely connected to other images of Apollo and Hercules as well as Augustus and Mark Antony’s violent clash at the Battle of Actium. In spite of the inherent violence in the confrontation between the two figures, this relief showcases the serenity of Roman archaism. Both figures use a slight tip-toe stance and appear posed rather than active. Hercules casually looks backward to a pursuing Apollo, but neither figure seems to be moving very rapidly. The lack of violent confrontation suggests a more contextual meaning where the figures have to be symbolically interpreted, as Hallett (2012) points out. Even though the violence is not explicit, Roman viewers would have known the mythological contexts surrounding the imagery on an archaistic work, easily connecting the less-violent archaistic style to the violent myths it portrayed. During the time that Augustus was taking power, this lack of violent imagery in archaistic works was important, as will be discussed shortly.

For archaistic works depicting Apollo, Nike is a common companion and suggestion of Augustus’s military agenda. Nike was a Greek victory goddess, and any depictions that involve her would have immediately had a military connotation. The libations scenes discussed in the
previous section would have been allusions to military victories separate from their religious connotations in the act of pouring libations. Another relief [Figure 13] from the Augustan time shows not only a meeting between Apollo and Nike, but an Apollonian triad procession that includes his mother Leto and his sister Artemis as well. The destination of these three figures is the winged Nike on the right, suggesting that the procession itself is a triumphal one. Peter Holliday (2002), a Professor of Art History at California State University, asserts that the ceremony surrounding Roman triumph had three purposes: (1) purification and acknowledgement of military success, (2) appeasement and honoring of the gods, and (3) justification of military campaigns to the Senate and Roman people (23). Triumphal imagery such as that in the relief was clearly connected to both the success and justification of military actions. The use of Roman archaism for Figure 12 strongly suggests that the style had not only a religious meaning, but also a military one. The less violent imagery in the archaistic style would also have been appropriate for triumphal interactions with Nike as the interaction would have taken place after the battle violence had ceased. The presence of a libation in three archaistic reliefs also connects back to the notion of restoring religious piety from the last section.

Having Roman archaism as a less-violent style than its archaic Greek precursor would have connected more generally to how Augustus wanted to be viewed by the Roman people. He had gained much of his political power through military force, including assassinating those who went against his views while he was a part of the Second Triumvirate. These assassinations happened under a proscription process, a process “whereby Roman leaders who acquired power by force” published a list of their enemies as well as the bounties on their heads in the Roman Forum, a very public place (Lobur 2008, 64). The famous orator Cicero was among the victims of the proscription. After his victory at the Battle of Actium, “Octavian altered his political
style,” claiming to have restored the Republic. For this claim, he received Augustus, “the illustrious one” as a title in 27 BCE and distanced himself from his actions as Octavian (Zanker 1988, 33). Augustus then altered imagery and artwork to promote a more peaceful view of his rule since his more violent actions before he was titled had to be forgotten, or at least repressed, to become a successful ruler. According to Zanker (1988), “Before the change, symbols and images operated entirely within the framework of the ambivalent and contradictory pictorial vocabulary of the Late Republic . . . determined by the struggle for power” (33-34). The artworks of Augustus, including those in an archaistic style, had a serenity and calmness that Octavian’s work lacked. This helped reassure the Roman people that Augustus was not as harsh as Octavian was. Still, public memory of Augustus’s more violent actions would have ensured that even in a serene style like Roman archaism, the military agenda and implications could be understood.

**Lineage for Family**

As mentioned earlier, Roman archaism gave works a timeless quality. For this reason, Augustus could have commissioned many works of Roman archaism to emphasize his and his family’s right to rule Rome and its provinces by giving his family a visual lineage that seemed older than it actually was. As Roman archaism was a retrospective style, visual elements on monuments, reliefs, and statues would remind the public of an older time period because by Augustus’s time, the Romans’ love of Greek art would have been well established. When Greece had been conquered by the Roman Republic in the mid-second century BCE, many Roman generals and their soldiers looted Greek cities for captives, supplies, art, and other war booty. The art looted took the form of paintings, statues, architectural elements, and even design plans for buildings. For the Romans, the most effective images were ones with “overall visual magnificence” that could be displayed prominently in triumphal processions (Kousser 2015,
Many of the more portable pieces of artwork made their way into the private homes of wealthier Romans to be enjoyed during leisure time. A century and a half later, Augustus is capitalizing on that fascination with Greek art to promote his political agenda. In the case of archaism, he is drawing on material from the archaic period in Greece, a time period from before Greece was even conquered. The Temple of Apollo showed this emphasis on a connection to history as well. Kellum (1985) states, “Clothed in its eclectic, archaistic splendor, the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine . . . linked the Augustan present to the remote heroic past, celebrating Octavian’s Actian victory in the guise of the deeds of Apollo” (176). This implies that he wanted the public to associate him and his family with a long heroic history while giving credence to his bid for complete power. By giving his family a long history, Augustus ensured that the public would be more likely to accept a hereditary line of power, and by showing his own history as lengthy within the narrative of his god-like ancestry, Augustus could be viewed as the rightful ruler of Rome.

To connect this idea of lengthy familial history to Roman archaism in depictions of Apollo in the same time period, one can look at “Archaistic relief showing five divinities” [Figure 14] housed at Yale University. This relief depicts a procession of deities. Zeus, the rightmost figure, leads the procession and is directly followed by Hera, his wife. Athena is the center figure followed by Aphrodite. Apollo, the focus of this study, brings up the rear. On the surface, this relief could simply be a procession of gods and goddesses, but it can also be connected with Augustus’s want to promote his own family as the future leaders of Rome. As mentioned previously Augustus identified himself closely with Apollo during the Battle of Actium against Mark Antony. Just like Apollo can be seen as a placeholder for Augustus in the reliefs in the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine, Apollo could be seen as a placeholder in Figure 14. Augustus
placed himself as part of a godly family procession, taking the place of one of the second-
generation family members within the procession. This would not be too far off from his position
in life. Augustus began as the great-nephew and adopted son of Julius Caesar. Augustus, then
Octavian, inherited the Caesar name and became head of the family when Julius Caesar was
assassinated after a failed attempt to become *dictator perpetuo*, or “dictator for life.” Despite his
assassination, Julius Caesar was deified two years later and granted the title of *Divus Julius*. At
this point, Octavian begins calling himself *divi filius*, “son of a god,” in this case the god Julius
himself. Augustus’s apparent ancestry in Venus through Julius Caesar would also lend itself well
to this familial interpretation of the relief. So, not only did Augustus have ancestry in Apollo—
used during the Battle of Actium to gain support—but his adoptive father Julius Caesar was also
descended from Venus and a god himself, giving him a divine right to rule Rome.

The Yale University relief was not the only time that Augustus used a procession of
family members to emphasize his family’s right to rule Rome. One of the most famous
monuments erected in the Augustan period is the *Ara Pacis Augustae*, the Altar of Augustan
Peace (Zanker 1988, Southern 1998). The south frieze [Figure 15] on this monument is an
imperial procession featuring many members of the imperial family, including Augustus himself,
his son-in-law Agrippa [front right-most figure in Figure 15], and his wife Livia [second adult
figure from right in Figure 15]. The next generation is also represented through Gaius, the child
between Agrippa and Livia, who was Augustus’s adopted son. This monument, meant to
celebrate the time of peace that Augustus had brought to the Roman people by ending decades of
civil war, clearly showed Augustus’s family as an integral part of his continued reign. This
emphasis on family was certainly a part of his political legislation. During his reign, Augustus
enforced new marriage laws in order to boost the birth rate of children. He believed that
“marriage was a duty incumbent on all Roman men between 25 and 60 years of age, and on all Roman women between 20 and 50. Widowed and divorced persons within these age limits were expected to remarry. Exemptions were granted to free-born persons who had procreated at least three children, and to freed persons who had procreated four” (Frank 1975, 44-45). Punishments were also enacted on those who did not comply. To go so far as dictate the number of children that a typical Roman should help create shows that Augustus was very concerned about the Roman family. A political preference for those who had three children was a basic feature of the laws as well, ensuring that all those in positions of power had heirs to take their place when they died or retired (Frank 1975). Augustus’s revival of retrospective styles, including this study’s focus of archaism, was meant to imply that his family was clearly not in violation of these new laws. With archaistic works, his family could be seen to go back for many generations. In the words of Fullerton (1990),“Certainly the Romans liked things old for oldness’ sake; they were by nature conservative, respected tradition, and equated venerability with legitimacy” (205). The venerability that Augustus created for himself by using an archaistic style rooted in more ancient times than the classical period ensured that he and his family could retain power after he was gone.

**New Youthful Ideal**

In addition to promoting family and lineage, a final ideal that was emphasized particularly well with the Roman archaism of the Augustan period was a change to a new youthful ideal for prominent Roman men. In the late Roman Republic, a typical portrait was commissioned in a veristic style, an artistic style that emphasized what modern society might now see as “flaws.” This meant “warts, moles, creases, and wrinkles appear as though facial texture was the artist’s sole concern” (Jackson 1987, 32). Although this verism is not associated
with portraits of Augustus, it was still used predominantly just before his rise to power. Julius Caesar’s portraits [Figure 16] often show verism; the deep wrinkles in the forehead, the indentations surrounding the nose and lips, and the heavy-lidded eyes are typical of a veristic portrait. Verism may seem like a style that is based in realism, “show[ing] the person portrayed as he really is, without idealizing tendencies” (Richter 1955, 39); however, verism showcases a different type of idealism—not the idealization of youth, but of age and wisdom. An aged appearance of a portrait not only showed a person as he was, but it also showed that he was someone to be respected due to his age. Highlighted worry lines and wrinkles particularly emphasized that a political figure spent much of his time dealing with important matters that were worth worrying over. In contrast to Julius Caesar’s portraiture, many of Augustus’s portraits show him as a youthful leader [Figure 17], even though he lived until age 76. . The want for more youthful depictions may have originated in his young age when he took power. He was only 20 when he became a member of the Second Triumvirate, and in Roman culture, this age would have been seen as inexperienced and unqualified for the power that Augustus held (Zanker 1988). Changing the type of idealism once he gained complete power in Rome would have legitimized his rule to the Roman people.

The youthful ideal that Augustus perpetuated in his portraiture in particular is often linked to sculpture from the classical period of ancient Greece, rather than the archaic. This paper is not arguing against that link, but it should add complication to viewing classical styles as the only influence for this youthfulness by connecting the ideas of ambiguity and eclecticism. Hölscher (2004) explains that a cursory study of Roman art may suggest that each period of Roman history incorporated and embraced elements of a different period of Greek art, and that Augustan art in particular returns to “orderly ‘Classical’ language of the fifth century BC—
especially that of Polykleitos” (11). Polykleitos is considered the quintessential high classical sculptor of ancient Greece. Though he worked mainly in bronze, his Doryphoros, “spear-bearer,” [Figure 3] is often cited (Pollitt 1995, Frel 1981) to greater or lesser degrees as the basis for Augustus’s “Prima Porta” type exemplified in the Augustus of Prima Porta statue [Figure 18]. Jiří Frel (1981), a former curator of antiquities at the J.Paul Getty Museum, suggests that the “standard, so-called Prima Porta type” could have been used as Augustus was aging to present him as a classical Greek young man, “elevated above incidents of mood, age, and even actual likeness.” Frel gives Polykleitos's canon as the “basis of the proportions, the art, and the elevation of the individual” (28). Clearly, the connection to classical Greece would have helped ensure that Augustus would have a consistent portrait type that would not age as he did. By being eternally youthful in his depictions, Augustus could retain the faith of the Roman people, seeming assured, strong, and young even as he grew elderly. While Augustus’s artists could certainly have been using Polykleitos’s work as a basis for his new youthful ideal, the actual reality of Augustus’s statuary may not be quite so clear-cut.

Seeing only Polykleitos’s work as the basis for the Augustan youthful ideal minimizes the eclectic nature of Roman art. The eclectic nature of Roman art is seen in the variety of styles and forms present at any time period in Roman history. This eclecticism that dominated much of Roman art was due to the looting and purchasing of Greek art in many styles by the Romans, which, in turn, influenced Greek artists to form a unique image language for their Roman buyers (Touchette 2015, 293). Hölscher (2004) qualifies his earlier thoughts on how surface study of Roman art suggests a single predominant style in each period of Roman art history: “Close inspection of Roman art reveals a picture of bewildering diversity. In every period of Roman history, the most varied stylistic phases of Greek art – from Late Archaic to late Hellenistic – are
picked up and exploited” (11). Indeed, closely studying Roman art shows a variety of styles and materials that artists are using. Although the common thread in art history is that much of Augustus’s artwork is based on classical style and artists, this classicism is not the only style that portrays a youthful ideal. Works from the archaic period of Greece do so just as well. The diversity of styles present in all periods of Roman art presents a deliberate lack of clarity in imagery; origins and meanings should be difficult to articulate. For Michael Squire (2013), a reader of Classical Art at King’s College in London, this idea of ambiguity lies at the center of the success of Augustus’s visual program. He states, “the ‘power’ of Augustan images [was not in] excising ambiguity, but rather [in] embracing ambivalence and harnessing it to the new political cause” (246). This ambiguity of imagery suggests that a focus on the classical style of many of Augustus’s works as the only basis for ideals being expressed during this time period would be a hasty argument. In fact, Augustus’s characteristic head tilt is often attributed to portraiture of Alexander the Great [Figure 19] from early Hellenistic art. This is why Roman archaism can certainly express a youthful ideal just as a classical style can.

Unlike the classical style, Roman archaism is not a style well suited to portraiture. Its basis is in the archaic period of ancient Greece, a time period of Greek history when individualism in portraiture was not nearly as common as it was in the classical period. Archaic works from Greece tended to depict generalized figures with similar body types and facial features. The kouroi and korai figures mentioned earlier in this paper show this generalization and were very typical of archaic Greece art. Figure 20 shows the generalized musculature, facial features, and typical striding forward stance of a kouros figure. Though these types of statues were generic in appearance with no individualized features, their common use as votive offerings in temples offers an additional connection to Augustus’s restoration of religious piety mentioned
above. They also make up a large portion of the only extant works of the archaic period of Greece, emphasizing how valuable these figures of youths were during that time. Thus, Roman archaism with its archaic Greek basis does ensure that works using this style show youthful figures and emphasize a youthful ideal.

Interestingly, in early art history, these same *kouroi* figures were thought to be depictions of Apollo due to their youthful appearance and their dedication in a number of temples of Apollo. One such example is the “Piraeus Apollo” [Figure 21]. Though it is known now that most of these figures were not Apollo, this connection does suggest that Apollo as a figure is suited well to this youthful ideal that is present in archaistic works. He is a member of the younger generation of gods in the Roman pantheon, and in most of his representations, he is seen as a clean-shaven younger man. The lack of a beard was a conscious choice in the portraiture of Augustus as well. On coins from his days as Octavian, he is shown with “a military beard to highlight his role as Caesar’s avenger” (Pollini 2012, 168). When he became Augustus, this depiction changed to be clean-shaven so that the public did not associate him so much with his actions as Octavian. The physical ideal of youthfulness is certainly existent in works of Roman archaism as well. The “Marble head of Apollo” [Figure 22] housed in the Metropolitan Museum of Art is in an archaistic style to show this youthful appearance. The “Archaic smile” represents the archaistic nature of this sculpture, but his dimpled cheeks and lack of brow lines are clear indications that of his youth. Though not completely archaistic, another head [Figure 23] from the Palatine Hill shows depicts Apollo as youthful as well. This head actually supports the ideas of ambiguity and eclecticism involved in the youthful ideal as it incorporates elements of a classical style—the hairstyle and heavier, rounder face—in addition to an archaistic “Archaic smile.” The suitability of Apollo to a youthful ideal in addition to the ambiguous nature and
eclectic use of style in Roman artwork imply that while Augustus’s shift to a youthful ideal is often connected with his classical-style portraiture, Roman archaism should also be considered as a basis for youthful depictions.

Conclusion

Because of the new authority in Rome, political ideologies were changing and the art of the period had to change as well. In order to promote the ideals that he wanted to, Augustus Caesar encouraged the use of Roman archaism, an archaistic style that drew upon formal elements of works from archaic Greece. While historians may never know the actual reasons that this style was revived in the early Empire of ancient Rome, there are connections between this style and the political and ideological ideas that were being dispersed during the time. Examining depictions of Apollo that are archaistic in style show these connections well. The first is a connection to religious piety. Augustus wanted to restore order to the Roman world by restoring religious piety. He did so by restoring many temples and sacred spaces. Roman archaism as a style was often used on monuments and buildings that had a religious context and showed depictions of gods and goddesses. The connection that the style had to ancient times bestowed a type of respect on these images that Augustus wanted to perpetuate.

In addition to a restoration of religious piety, the Roman archaism used under Augustus had a military agenda. Unlike archaic predecessors, archaistic works did not often depict blatant shows of violence. Instead, the imagery was seen as serene and peaceful. This connects to how Augustus was changing his public image after the Battle of Actium and distancing himself from his previous actions that even he would not support under his own rule. Still, by often showing imagery with a military or victorious subject matter, archaistic works suggest that Augustus still wanted the public to see him as a strong figure who had the strength of the military to back up
his decisions. A third reason that Roman archaism might have been more frequently used in the
Augustan period was to show the history of his family. As Augustus was creating a new political
structure based on inherited power rather than popular vote, he would have needed to make sure
that he and his family were seen as venerable and legitimate enough to retain control of the
government. In addition, his emphasis on the importance of family could have been seen in the
legislation that he passed while in power. His marriage laws hoped to ensure propagation of
children, and the archaistic style ensured that he and his family were qualified to put that
pressure on other Roman families. After all, their family could be traced back to generations into
the heroic past.

The final suggestion that Roman archaism makes in regard to the connection between
Augustus and Apollo was one of youth. When Augustus took power, he changed the portrait
ideal to that of youth instead of age. Though this change is often linked to the classical styles that
he encouraged under his rule, the connection to archaism cannot be denied. The archaic period of
Greece was full of depictions of youths, the kouroi and korai figures, and Apollo as a second
generation Olympian is well suited to youthful depictions. Augustus’s connections to Apollo as
an ancestor and protector suggest that this close affinity with a god often depicted as youthful
may have had an impact on the revitalization of Roman archaism in the Augustan period. Of
course, this study is in no way comprehensive, but it does attempt to give insight on the
ramifications of Roman archaism as a particular style choice in the early Roman Empire.
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