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2. HELLENISM AND THE ROMAN TASTE FOR GREEK ART
Changing art concepts

The artist became the mediator between the infinite divine and the confined artwork. This gap was bridged by the artist’s soul, which, in a mystical way of ecstasy, surpassed human bonds. The ‘eikon’ of the artist had become the equivalent of the Platonic ‘idea’.

_Bernard Schweitzer_\(^{120}\)

Introduction

During the Classic Greek and Hellenistic periods it was certainly not a common practice to make exact copies of statuary. The artists themselves made many variations of the same subject; it could also be done by pupils and followers. Small objects however like votive statuettes and in some cases even jewellery, were made in series from moulds by the coroplast.\(^{121}\) Except for the use of moulding techniques, no means of mechanical reproduction were ever applied for large freestanding sculptures. It were the Romans who introduced the faithful imitation of sculpture with the aid of different copy techniques during the first century B.C.\(^{122}\) Significant in this process is the shift in art criticism and theories on aesthetics among Hellenistic thinkers.

Gradually the Romans adapted these concepts. In a practical sense this meant that the Greek philosophical concepts of love for beauty and knowledge for its own sake was now altered and subjugated to represent Roman ideals. This resulted in a new decorative use of art, new moral values, and especially the copies with their new meaning that transformed Hellenistic art into a truly Roman art.

As today, in antiquity the aesthetic theories varied from period to period. A rather bare definition of aesthetics would be that it is ‘a branch of philosophical inquiry, the object of which is a philosophical theory of the beautiful’, or in more general terms, the appreciation or criticism of the beautiful. An elaboration on this is necessary, for it underlines the evolution that lead to the prominent status that was attributed to copies and casts and also explains why they were sought after by collectors, a fact which is testified by ancient writers like Juvenal.

It is obvious that the way in which these theoretical concepts affected the attitude of artists, patrons and collectors is not always explicit. For there will always be a discrepancy between ‘high’ culture of intellectuals and aristocrats who formulate and reflect on ideas and theories, and ‘low’ culture that exists in common life, the latter will always follow the former. But in the long run philosophical thought does and will have an influence on the ideas and attitudes that people have.

1. Greek concepts

In _De Architectura_, the Roman architect Vitruvius Pollio (late first century B.C.) deals directly with art. Vitruvius’ treatise confirms the existence of a considerable tradition of ancient art criticism. In his preface to the seventh book of the _Architectura_ he provides an extensive list of treati-

\(^{120}\) Schweitzer 1963, Band I, 89.
\(^{121}\) A modeller of small, usually terracotta, figurines.
ses written by practising architects, almost all Greeks, from the 6th-century B.C. onward until the Hellenistic period. These treatises were probably technical rather than theoretical and intended for pupils who studied under the supervision of their master. Workshop manuals of some sort that were in circulation must be considered.

What does exist in regard to criticism of the visual arts can be found in the writings of classic Greek philosophers. A general characteristic is that art is evaluated by the influence it has on human morality and spiritual awareness. Supplementary information is found in the works of rhetoricians and poets. Here the visual arts often function as a source of stylistic analogy with literature. Another group of writers who wrote on art were the compilators of tradition. They give technical judgements, anecdotes, and biographical background on art and artists. A reconstruction of an ancient art theory therefore has to be extracted by combining these different sources.

The Greeks were unaware of an element of inspiration as part of the artistic process. This notion certainly is found in early sources of Greek literature, with Homer and Hesiod, in their appeals to the Muses. But to the classic philosophers inspiration was not considered essential to the nature of the arts or relevant to the question of judging their function and products. The word kalon that can be translated as ‘beauty’ signified everything that pleases, attracts and arouses admiration. It embraced a multitude of things. Not only did it refer to the beauty of shapes, colours and sounds, but also to thoughts, virtues and actions. From very early on beauty included a moral aspect, for it was associated with goodness. It was first Hesiod (c.700 BC.) who connected the good with the useful. Plato, was primarily interested in abstract beauty, beauty in itself as it were. Despite of his extensive knowledge of the visual arts, he did not have a very high regard of them. Although he did not condemn or reject art, his remarks were belittling:

---

123 Vitr., De arch., VII. praef. 11-17.
124 Plin., XXXV, 111. Here he states that the painter Apelles dictated a treatise on the art of painting to his pupil Perseus; There are passages in Vitruvius that suggest that he wrote his treatise on architecture for dilettantes, see: Vit., De arch. VI (praef.) 7.
125 Such treatises are known to have existed on rhetorics. For elaboration see: Urlichs 1887, 16ff.
126 E.g. Quintilian and Cicero.
127 See: Plin., XXXIV, especially 83, here he states that the sculptor Euthycrates wrote books on his art. For older studies on the subject of artists and writings in Antiquity, see: Urlichs 1887, 3, esp.n.1; For more recent studies: Jucker 1950; Schweitzer 1963; Pollitt 1965; Tatarkiewicz 1970; Pollitt 1974, 9ff.
128 The extant sources on Greek art criticism involve Latin translations of critical concepts originally formulated in Greek. The Latin translations do not always reflect the precise original thought, see: Pollitt 1994, 9ff. Another problem is that the concept of beauty, on which Plato had a lot to say, differed equally from our modern interpretation. The words 'beauty', or 'beautiful', when used by Plato have no aesthetic implication. The beauty of anything is, for him, what compels us to admire and desire it. It is associated not with the theory of poetry or any other art, but primarily with the theory of sexual love, secondly with the theory of morals and thirdly with the theory of knowledge, see: Collingwood 1938, 38; Pollitt 1974, 32.
129 Hes., Theog., 38; Hom., Il. II, 484.
130 Pollitt 1974, 33, see especially note 2, p.97f; According to Plato (Soph.233c-236b) the painter, like the sophist, is an imitator of reality, which makes him belong to the class of conjurers. Furthermore they are not capable to recognise the existence of objective beauty, which is detached from the transient world, see: De Bruyne 1952 Gr.Oudh., 111ff. Consequently art produces appearances, not true likeness. Although this does not mean that Plato was blind to the pleasures of the muses, but in his opinion it is just not advisable to indulge in them, see: Resp., 607e. Bernhard Schweitzer argues (1953, 45ff) that in the later thoughts of Plato the creation of art and the knowledge that is derived from nous are given an equal place.
132 De Bruyne 1952, Gr.Oudh. 12, especially n.2.
All imitative arts are merely playthings; they contain nothing serious and are nothing but entertainment.\(^{133}\) (...) Art is a patchwork that has nothing to do with truth and knowledge.\(^{134}\)

It is a subject of discussion whether in essence Plato had an awareness of aesthetics.\(^{135}\) Cassirer is right when he argues that art is associated with sensory perception, and that it is impossible to gain formal knowledge of art because it is conveyed by imagination and empathy (\textit{Meinen und Wählen}).\(^{136}\) Plato's concept of ideas is determined by an objective system of notions where logic (mathematics!) and ethics remain the decisive factor. In essence they are opposed to art. This seems to be confirmed in a passage in Plato's \textit{Republic}:

> ‘But nevertheless let it be declared that, if the mimetic and dulcet poetry can show any reason for her existence in a well-governed state, we would gladly admit her, since we ourselves are very conscious of her spell. But all the same it would be impious to betray what we believe to be the truth’.\(^{137}\)

Whereas Plato condemned art and poetry because it did not fit into his ideology, Aristotle adopted his aesthetics to the established practise.\(^{138}\) As a systematic intellectualist he defined art as ability (not just the production itself) and merged it with science:\(^{139}\)

> ‘It follows that an art is nothing more or less than a productive quality exercised in combination with true reason’.\(^{140}\)

However he regarded art as important and serious and not the plaything Plato took it to be.\(^{141}\) The basis of Aristotle’s concept of beauty is mathematics, this in accordance with the Pythagorean tradition:

> (..) ‘For beauty consists in magnitude and ordered arrangement’.\(^{142}\)

Hellenistic writers were the first to narrow down the traditional theory of beauty that entailed several realms and who extracted from it the concept of aesthetic beauty.\(^{143}\)

---

\(^{133}\) Pl., \textit{Resp}., 288 c (tr.) P. Shorey, also compare Tatarkiewicz 1970, I, 125.

\(^{134}\) Pl., \textit{Resp}., 597 a-c (tr.) P. Shorey.

\(^{135}\) Broos believed he didn’t (1948, 58), De Bruyne 1952, 67) mentions Cassirer (1922) and Schaerer (1938, 260) who were of the same opinion; For discussion, see: Schweitzer 1953, 45; Keuls (1974, 100ff;) points out a discrepancy in Plato’s attitude, also see Keuls 1978, 118.

\(^{136}\) Cassirer 1922, 3ff.

\(^{137}\) Pl., \textit{Resp}., 607 c ff. (tr.) P. Shorey.

\(^{138}\) Tatarkiewicz 1970, 139; De Bruyne (1952, \textit{Gr. Oudh}. 126): In his numerous definitions Aristotle's main concern is beauty in deeds, nowhere or never abstract beauty as with Plato.

\(^{139}\) Arist., \textit{Eth.Nic.}, 1140 a, 9 (tr.) J.A.K. Thomson; For discussion see: De Bruyne 1952 \textit{Gr.Oudh.}, 131.

\(^{140}\) Arist, \textit{Eth.Nic.}, 1140a 9 (tr.) J.A.K. Thomson.

\(^{141}\) Tatarkiewicz 1970 I, 148.

\(^{142}\) Arist., \textit{Poet.}, 1450b 38 (tr.) W.H. Fyfe.

2. Individualism and new ways of evaluating art

During the Hellenistic period, under the influence of evolving philosophical concepts, a new interpretation of art was developed. Indirectly this opened the way for copies and casts and the status they had in the hierarchy of art. What was new is that a work of art was regarded as a spiritual product of the artist rather than merely a handicraft produced by an artisan. Parallel to this the individual gained more importance, for rational thought lead to a new understanding of the relationship between the subject and the world, which decreased the importance of the metaphysical; it became simply one of many concepts.

Early signs of a growing sense of individualism is that as early as the 6th century B.C. artists inscribed their names and even expressions that denote competition with other artists on decorated vases. This should be regarded as a conscious effort to win public favour. Another clue is that at the same period a trade in art evolved. Special art shops emerged in the harbour of Piraeus (near Athens) and Olbia (Greek colony at the Black Sea coast) that sold both fine and applied art, like statuettes which served no purpose other than that of pleasing the beholder now had a regular place in the home. A 4th-century example in this context concerns a picture gallery for the work of native painters in the town of Sicyon (situated in the northern Peloponnesus between Corinth and Achaea).

Another indication that reveals a tendency towards individualism is a new phenomenon, namely the erection of honorary statues. Such statues had been awarded occasionally in the Classical period, but became regular only in the Hellenistic period. An honorary statue no longer had to be dedicated to a military strategist, philosopher or a poet, but also civilians who made themselves particularly useful for the city could earn the approval of the council and the people by having a statue erected in their memory. This is also apparent in the individual fulfilment within the family and in the home where we find portraits of private citizens, home decorations and mosaics. During the Hellenistic period votive- and hero statues were a well-known phenomenon. Formerly they only existed in a religious context; they were not a 'gift' from the artist to the people, but from the people to the gods. We know that hero statues were presented with offerings. One could therefore say that honorary statues signify a shift from cult to fact. The honorary statue stimulated viewing man as a person, rather than the representation of a stereotype, although the ideal element in Greek portraiture was never completely lost. Realistic portraits have existed from the second half of the 3rd-century B.C., but the problem is that we only know them as Roman copies. The new interest during the Hellenistic period in genre scenes, everyday people and their pursuits, is commonly understood

144. The term 'Hellenism' is relatively new and was first used by Johann-Gustav Droysen in his Geschichte des Hellenismus published in 1836. Politically, the Hellenistic period begins with the conquest of the Achaemenid Empire by Alexander in 334-330 B.C. The traditional terminal date is 31 B.C., when Octavian Augustus defeated Cleopatra VII at the Battle of Actium and brought the Ptolemaic kingdom to an end. Though it has to be noted that from the art historical perspective that is intended here, the period has a wider span. Smith (1991, 9) points out that Hellenistic sculpture cannot easily be defined or analysed in terms of chronology – ‘not even its beginning and end’.


147. see: Schweitzer 1963, Bd II, 178; Smith (1991, 10) points out that the increasing number of honorary statues in the Hellenistic period were a symptom of the cities' growing dependence on prominent individuals to cope with needs beyond the state's collective resources. Statues became the highest currency of 'honour'.

148. For elaboration see: Zanker 1995, 251ff.

149. Diog.Laërt.,10,18; Plin., HN., XXXV, 5.


to be the result of the decline of the city state. Fowler (1989) remarks that when people, deprived of a common purpose, turned to individualistic philosophies of Stoicism and Epicurean, so artists turned to the portrayal of personal passions, the particulars of life. Literature became romantic rather than classical.\(^\text{152}\)

The increase of realism and subjectivism that became more prominent during the Hellenistic period also had consequences for the status that was attributed to art. From tradition Greek art evolved from the school of religion: mythos was her eternal theme, and logos her understanding of the world.\(^\text{153}\) But from the 3rd century onward art was more or less adapted to the sociological make up of Roman society and Late Antiquity.\(^\text{154}\) It is indeed true that the art of the Romans liberated the Greek composition from its strict and inaccessible objectivity and related it to man himself.\(^\text{155}\)

That subjectivism led to an upgrading of the role of sensory perception is reflected by Cicero (106-43 B.C.), when he postulated an active element not only in creators of art but also in its recipients, not only in the psychology of the artist, but also in the psychology of the beholder.\(^\text{156}\) He stated that man possessed a special sense (sensus) of beauty and art:

(\(\ldots\)) ‘For everybody is able to discriminate between what is right and what is wrong in matters of art and proportion by a sort of subconscious instinct, having any theory of art or proportion of their own; and while they can do this in the case of pictures and statues and other works to understand which nature has given them less equipment, at the same time they display this much more in judging the rhythms and pronunciations of word, because these are rooted deep in the general sensibility, and nature has decreed that nobody shall be entirely devoid of these faculties’.\(^\text{157}\)

This view embodies new thoughts and concepts. By means of this ‘sense’ the understanding of the beholder is increased and one is better qualified to determine what is proper and false in art, or in other words: man is now fully capable to evaluate art and beauty.\(^\text{158}\) The significance of this concept becomes apparent in later sources that deal with art evaluation. In one passage Dio Chrysostom (ca.40-120) comments on the statue of Zeus made by Pheidias in Olympia. In praise of Pheidias he attributes a 'divine inspiration' to him:

(\(\ldots\)) ‘Pheidias, that wise and divinely inspired creator of his awe-inspiring masterpiece of surpassing beauty’.\(^\text{159}\)

\(^{152}\) Fowler 1989, 4ff. Graham Zanker studied of the relationship between Hellenistic poetry and visual art. He also found an individual streak, namely a reader or viewer integration in terms of emotions. That is: the experience of a spectator of a drama when the historical reader is integrated into the dialogue between the fictive speaker and the fictive reader, making him into an active participant in dialogues, descriptions, scenes, and narratives. The same is found in funerary and dedicational epigrams. New methods of expressing the innerman by the Hellenistic epigrammatists (like Callimachus) were in analogy with contemporay art. Pollit (1986, 59-78) explored this inner essence in visual art and called it the ‘psychological portrait’. ‘Character portraits’ were clearly in vogue for the Hellenistic poets, they liked the way artists saw. In fact this meant a departure in Hellenistic art from the traditional manner of representation (Zanker 2004, 103ff.).

\(^{153}\) Godin 1997. Religion has to do with tradition, to pass on a tradition dogma’s are a necessity, the latter are constructed and taught by priests or theologians.

\(^{154}\) Schweitzer 1963, Bd I, 203.


\(^{156}\) Tatarkiewicz 1970, 205.

\(^{157}\) Cic., De or., III 50, 195 (tr.) H. Rackham.

\(^{158}\) Cic., Off. I 4, 14.

\(^{159}\) Dio Chrys., Olymp.Disc., 49 (tr.) J.W. Cohoon.
It has been argued that the quintessence of Dio's *Olympic discourse* is the emphasis on the theoretical meaning of art. Art is no longer subordinated and perceived as merely an analogy for the creation of the world, or as an explanation of the relationship between spirit and matter. Here visual art is given a central place and its relation to a higher spiritual realm is validated. In the introduction of Philostratus’ *Imagines* (second / third cent. A.D.), the painter is put on an equal plain as the poet. This is in contrast to the classical concept where only poets were regarded as an instrument of a higher revelation. In the same period Callistratus -the sophist- remarks in his description of the Bacchante by Scopas and the Eros by Praxiteles (ill.1+2) that:

‘It is not the art of poets and writers of prose alone that is inspired when divine power from the gods falls on their tongues, nay, the hands of sculptors also, when they are seized by the gift of a more divine inspiration give utterance to creations that are possessed and full of madness’.

It is quite clear from this that art is granted a higher status, and its products are regarded as sacred.

Cicero is an important witness of the taste of his time. He commented on art and beauty summarising the aesthetics of the early Stoics, enriched with Platonic thought. What is essential in an artwork, according to Cicero, is not the imitation of reality as such, but of a picture in the mind, a perfect revelation of beauty which Plato called *Idea*. The term *Idea* itself and its original meaning were Platonic, but Hellenistic writers altered its meaning while retaining the term. According to Plato, *Idea* was a reality existing outside man and the world, an external immutable reality beyond the reach of the senses but apprehended conceptually. In the eyes of Cicero, or Dio, it was transformed from being the object of a metaphysical entity to being the object itself and from a transcendent idea to an image in the artists mind. Or in other words, it was transformed from an abstract concept into the kind of image that the artist employs.

Seneca (4 B.C. –A.D. 65) rejected painting to be included in the *artes liberalis* because in his opinion it does not promote virtue and it is no preparation for education. To him painters, like sculptors and marble workers, are nothing but servants of sumptuousness (*luxuriae ministros*). Already in the works of Pliny we notice a stoic influence for instance in his tirades against *luxuria,* and against the passion for works of art. He even states that there is little purpose in

---

161 Phil., *Imagines*, I, 1-10: 'Whosoever scorns painting is unjust to truth; and he is also unjust to all the wisdom that has been bestowed upon poets -for poets and painters make equal contribution to our knowledge of the deeds and the looks of heroes. (..) For one who wishes a clever theory, the invention of painting belongs to the gods'.
162 Callistratus, *Descr.*, II,III; Pl., *Pha.*, 245A: On the madness which inspires the poet: 'And a third kind of possession and madness comes from the Muses. This takes hold upon a gentle and pure soul, arouses it and inspires it to songs and other poetry, and thus by adorning countless deeds of the ancients educates later generations'.
163 Callistratus, *Descr.*, III.
169 Plin., *HN*, XXXIII, 149: ‘Rich luxurious booty of war dealt a serious blow to our morals’.
gaining any knowledge of art. The nudity of many figures in different artworks would probably have offended someone like Cato Censorius (234-149 B.C.), considering his promotion of sobriety and logic.

In his treatise on architecture, Vitruvius describes the qualities an architect should comply with. His recommendations not only speak of intellectual capacities but also of a skill for drawing:

‘He [the architect] should be a man of letters, a skilful draughtsman, instructed in geometry, know much history, have followed the philosophers with attention, understand music (..).’

It is obvious that in fact Vitruvius pleads for a wide knowledge of the Greek-Hellenistic art and civilisation.

That the Hellenistic perception of art as a spiritual product rather than merely a handicraft was maintained, is confirmed by a statement of Lucian (c.120-c.A.D.180). He observed that the Cnidian Venus (ill.3) was only a stone until the artists mind transferred it into a goddess. Philostatus held that when Pheidias sculpted Jove, his mind, or imagination, was wiser than his hand.

All this had consequences for the position of the artist: he became the mediator between the infinite divine and the confined artwork. This gap was bridged by the artist’s soul, which, in a mystical way of ecstasy, surpassed human bonds. Or, in the words of Schweitzer: 'The eikon of the artist had become the equivalent of the Platonic Idea. This notion also influenced the way in which copies were perceived. They were accepted, if not as equals, at least as equivalents of originals.

To what extend such conceptions influenced the general attitude of the Romans towards art is hard to lay ones finger on. In the end art was governed by the concept of res (reality, fact). Overall the Romans did not think much of theoria (reflection); sobriety and reality were their main objectives. It is therefore no coincidence that the prevailing art form of the Romans was architecture: the most practical and utilitarian of all art forms.

3. Roman statuary practises: Greek spoils of war

The Roman admiration for Hellenic culture revealed itself in all realms of cultural life. It was the result of an acculturation process that already began during the earliest phase of Roman

---

170 Plin., HN., XXXIV, 37: ‘What mortal man could recapitulate them all [3000 statues at Rhodos], or what value can be felt in such information’.
172 Vitruvius, De arch., I, 3 (tr.) F. Granger.
173 Phil., Vit.Apoll., VI-19; Lucian, Essays in portraiture defended., IV, 23-24; The interpretation of these passages is by Tatarkiewicz 1971 (Vol.I), 292.
174 Schweitzer 1963, Bd I, 60.
175 Schweitzer 1963, Bd I, 89; Germain Bazin was of the same opinion, see: Bazin 1967, 18.
176 Bazin 1967, 18.
177 E.g. From the late 4th century BC. a few Roman nobiles elected to attach Greek cognomen to their family names. Even some consular houses took them on. Roman chief magistrates appear on the fasti with the cognomens Philo (consul 339), Sophus (consul 304), Philippus (consul 281), and Philus (consul 223). Though it did not catch on as a general phenomenon, see: Gruen 1993, 227; Solin 1971, 86-91. For the receptivity of Rome to Hellenic cults as early as the 5th- and 4th-century , see: Gruen 1993, 228ff.; In the 2nd century it became increasingly common to honour prominent Romans with
history: directly, through contacts with the Greek colonies in Southern Italy and, indirectly, through the Etruscans who lived up in the North.\textsuperscript{178}

Since the late 3\textsuperscript{rd}-century B.C. political and military contacts between Rome and the Hellenistic world increased. This urged Rome to come to grips with the structure of Greek culture. Rome's attitude was characterised by participation but at the same time it wanted to exercise her own supremacy. The approach to Hellas was ambivalent and characterised by two separate tendencies, Phil-Hellene and anti-Hellenic; each encouraged by influential leaders and contended in Rome.\textsuperscript{179}

The impetus for Roman collectors of Greek works of art and artefacts was not only a matter of taste and fashion but was also ruled by envy and excess of competition. It was these emotions that prompted prominent citizens like Mummius, Sulla, Julius Caesar, and in particular the notorious Caius Verres, to pillage and plunder Greece and its colonies. Livy records an example of the Roman admiration for Greek sculpture.\textsuperscript{180} When the consul Aemilius Paullus came to Olympia after 168 B.C. he ordered to bring lavish sacrifices for the statue of Zeus as if it was the Capitoline Jupiter. Supposedly because this statue, which was made by Pheidias, had moved to his soul, as if he had witnessed the god in person.\textsuperscript{181}

Not that the Romans were lacking a tradition of their own, because there was an established tradition of portraits, historical reliefs and different statuary practices. The oldest had its origin in ancient Etruscan/Italic aristocratic funerary rituals. In this context commemorative wax busts of ancestors were kept on display in the family house and at funerals they were carried round in a procession. Details on extant portraits of deceased persons on funerary steles or sculpted heads indicate that they were made from wax death masks (ill.4, 5a+b). It is peculiar though that this did not result in a local art of portraiture.

The Greek influence on Roman sculpture can be demonstrated by many examples, like a clay head found in Rome (ill.6) and relief altars (arulae) that depend on Greek models and some of them on Greek moulds.\textsuperscript{182} (ill.7+8) Although John Boardman pointed out that the emphasis that different scholars put on nuances of style, whether Greek or non-Greek, has been highly subjective and contradictory.\textsuperscript{183}

The large majority of known artists working in Italy during the Republic were Greeks or at least of Greek extraction. Little is known about these copyist sculptors, for they are hardly ever referred to in ancient literature; but the occasional signatures testify to Greek names and places of origin. The fact that these Greek artists worked in Italy could be an indication of a low level of indigenous artistic talent or lack of experience among the Romans.\textsuperscript{184}

\textsuperscript{178} E.g. From very early on Etruscans started to copy Greek vase-painting styles. On some of them mythological scenes were painted. Though figure scenes are not the dominant feature of Hellenistic pottery of 7\textsuperscript{th} century Etruria, they are strongly indicative of a form of intellectual contact with the Greeks. see: Boardman 1994, 230ff.
\textsuperscript{179} For elaboration, see: Gruen 1992, 223ff; \textit{Loquax otiosum} (and) \textit{ineptum} (longwinded, idle and foolish). This was the official opinion in conservative Roman circles concerning the true being of the Greeks, see: Cic., \textit{De or.}, I,102; II, 18.
\textsuperscript{180} For general reading see: Peter Stewart (2003, 2008).
\textsuperscript{181} Plut., \textit{Vit.}, VI.
\textsuperscript{182} Boardman 1994, 282; Smith 1988, 125: ‘In the 2nd century as a whole, portraits of Roman dynasts were modelled on those of Hellenistic kings, although the documentation is poor’. He also emphasises (p.125) that extant 2nd century sculpted portraits can only generally be placed as late Republic.
\textsuperscript{183} Boardman 1994, 282.
\textsuperscript{184} Gruen 1992, 139ff. He points out that most of the preserved names, e.g. presented by Pliny, were probably derived from Greek treatises which would give a distorted view, like the \textit{opera nobilia} by the Italian Greek sculptor and scholar Pasiteles recorded in: Plin., \textit{HN.}, XXXVI, 39-40. Yet Gruen
The Romans adopted from the Greeks the practise of publicly displayed commemorative statues. Already under the kings (616 B.C.) commemorative statues of famous men existed. There are records of the first statues placed on columns and equestrian statues as early as 338 B.C., although Livy says that this was rare.

Pliny reports one of the earliest cases of Greek statues in Rome. He refers to the statues of the Greeks Pythagoras and Alcibiades as examples of the wisest and bravest men of the Greek race. They were erected at the comitium in Rome during the Samnite War (c.343 B.C.). This was supposedly done on suggestion of the Delphic oracle. Most likely they were Greek portrait statues, with heads that have a strong effect of apparent realism. Shortly after 285 B.C. the Greeks of Thurii in the South of Italy erected a statue in Rome for the magistrate (tribune) C. Aelius, who had helped them in passing laws against their enemies.

Representational art functioned as a means to dramatise military accomplishments in the service of the state. Not only military heroes got honoured with statues, but also private individuals. An example of the latter is L. Caecilius Metellus of whom it is recorded that he courageously rescued the Palladium from the burning temple of Vesta in 241 B.C. This earned him a statue on the Capitol in Rome. The honorary statue held a notable place in the public life of mid-republican Rome. It was to commemorate military accomplishments, advertise civic services, display personal virtues, or promote political objectives. Through time the number of statues at the forum in Rome grew so great that in 158 B.C. two censors, Publicus Cornelius Scipio and Marcus Popilus had all the statues that had no consent of the state cleared out.

Romans became acquainted with Greek art through spoils. Art objects as the fruits of war became increasingly familiar in Rome during the fourth and third centuries B.C. Religious statues taken as booty were deconsecrated and placed in Roman shrines and temples as spoils.

concludes that the Roman decision to encourage Hellenic craftsman was deliberate and meaningful. Hellenistic skills would serve to decorate the city, provide structures for its public activities, commemorate its accomplishments, and solidify its relations with the gods. The Romans put on display not only their taste in Greek art, but their management of that art.

186. E.g. Plin., HN., XXXIV, 34,20: 'The custom of erecting (..) statues on pillars is of earlier date'. (ca.493 B.C.); Plin., HN., XXXIV, 23: ('..) 'in front of the temple of the Castors an equestrian statue of Quintus Marcius Tremulus'. (ca. 305 BC.); Plin., HN., XXXIV, 27: 'The purpose of placing statues of men on columns was to elevate them above all other mortals (..) At Rome also the tribes set up statues to Marius Gratidianus (..) and threw them down at the entrance of Sulla'; Liv., VIII, 13-9 (..) 'equestrian statues put on the Forum'. (ca.338 BC); also see; Jucker 1950, 53ff.
187. Plin., HN., XXXIV, 26; Plut., Vit., VIII, 10. Though it is doubtful whether Romans really consulted the Delphic oracle this early in their history.
189. Plin., HN., XXXIV, 32: The first statue publicly erected at Rome by foreigners was that in honour of the tribune of the people Gaius Aelius (26-24 B.C.)
190. E.g. P. Scipio Aemilianus, the conqueror of Carthage. After his triumph he used the vast bulk of the spoils he gathered from Carthage (which originally came from the cities of Greek Sicily) to restore to the Sicilians all those precious items that could be identified as taken from shrines and cities. But he made sure though that his name was inscribed on the bases of restored statues to advertise his magnanimity. This has to be explained as not only a display of personal virtue but also as a cultivation of his image as promoter of the fine arts, see: Gruen 1992, 117ff.
191. A guardian statue common in ancient cities; in Rome kept as a pledge of Rome's fate.
192. Dion.Hal., II.66.3-4; For more examples of statues which honoured prominent Romans, see: Gruen 1992, 118ff.
194. Plin., HN., XXXIV, 30; One has to realise that most statues were spoils of war that were considered property of the state. It has been argued (Muensterberger 1994, 52) that such measures in effect initiated private ownership.
During the second Punic War (218-201 B.C.), Fabius Maximus captured and sacked Tarentum, the old Lacedaemonian colony in the foot of Italy. He treated the temples with due reverence, but carried off for his triumph a Colossus of Heracles, the work of Lysippos. Syracuse, the Greek Capital of Sicily and one of the wealthiest cities of the Greek world, was sacked in 212 B.C. According to Plutarch, the great commander M. Claudius Marcellus,

(...) ‘carried back with him the greater part and most beautiful of the dedicatory offerings in Syracuse, that they might grace his triumph and adorn his city. For before this time Rome neither had or knew about such elegant and exquisite productions, nor was there any love there for such graceful and subtle art: but filled full of barbaric arms and bloody spoils, and crowned round about with memorials and trophies of triumphs, she was not a gladdening or reassuring sight, nor one for un-warlike and luxurious spectators (..) it was from these that one can trace the beginning of the craze for works of Greek art and, arising from that the licentiousness to which all places be they sacred or profane were despoiled’.196

With the Roman admiration for Hellenic culture also grew the influence of Greek philosophy. The canon of Greek aesthetics was redefined. Plutarch tells us that since the fall of Syracuse the Romans began to spend the greater part of the day on disputes about the arts and artists. This process did not evolve in a homogeneous context. The Roman nobiles projected themselves as custodians of the nation's principles, the champions of its characteristic values. Yet these very same nobiles were the persons most drawn to Greek literary achievements, religion, and visual arts. To them it was both a challenge as well as an intimidation. Plutarch refers to this when he describes the twofold reaction to the Hellenistic artworks that Marcellus brought to Rome:

(...) ‘With the common people Marcellus won more favour because he adorned the city with objects that had Hellenistic grace and charm and fidelity; but with the elder citizens Fabius Maximus was more popular. For he either disturbed nor brought away anything of this from Tarentum when that city was taken, but while he carried off the money and the other valuables he suffered the statues to remain in their places, adding the well known saying: ‘Let us leave these gods in their anger for the Tarentines’. And they blamed Marcellus, first, because he made the city odious, in that not only men, but also even gods were led about in her triumphal processions like captives’.199

The spoils of Syracuse heralded a Hellenization of Rome. The ancient texts suggest that this was the beginning of a shift in Roman aesthetics and moral sensibilities. In fact this was the result of a more gradual process that evolved to some extend from Roman traditions.

Taking spoils was a well-established tradition, only half a century earlier (264 B.C.) Rome had allegedly taken two thousand statues from the Etruscan town Volsinii. But this seemed to be no reason for contemporary criticism. By then the populus Romanus was hardly getting its first glimpse of statues and paintings, even of Greek statues and paintings. It must

195 Plut., Vit., Fab., 22; Strabo, Geo., VI, iii, i.
196 Plut., Vit., Marc., 21 (tr.) B. Perrin; Livy regarded the conquer of Syracuse as the beginning of the admiration by the Romans for Greek artworks, but also the beginning of licentiousness, Liv., 25, 40, 2.
198 Gruen 1992, 1. For the impact of Greek art on Rome also see: Zanker 1974 and Pollit 1978.
199 Plut., Vit., Marc., 21 (tr.) B. Perrin.
200 Plin., HN., XXXIV, 34; Jucker 1950, 49, esp. note 4. For other examples of acquisition of artworks by the Romans from the defeated enemy during the Republic, see: Gruen 1992, 86ff.
have been the scale of Syracuse's artistic booty that made it especially memorable to the ancients.  

Paintings seem to be less appreciated than statues, in case of murals most likely for practical reasons: they can only be transported with great difficulty. Polybius records that amidst the ruins of Corinth the soldiers of Mummius threw famous panel paintings, among which were the Dionysos and Heracles by Aristides, on the ground and used them as tables to play dice on. As works of art the paintings had no value for them.  

The attitude of the Romans was first and foremost pragmatic. Morality was not so much the issue nor was aesthetics. The real reason for criticism of Marcellus was determined by strategic motives. The expropriation of items useless to the establishment of power or to its expansion, do nothing but incite envy among victims and hatred among others. It constitutes an unforgivable error and an obvious transgression against self-interest. Statues were also taken as spoils for their material value. This could be an artistic value or the value of the metal they were made of. It is for this reason that Fulvius Nobilior did not take the terracotta statues of Zeuxis in the capital of Pyrrhos as booty, for terracotta’s were nothing extraordinary in Italy.  

In other cases the artistic value in relation to the esteem some artworks had for Greek connoisseurs was the decisive factor. For example when Mummius at the sale of booty was made an offer of 600,000 denarii by Attalos II, the king of Pergamon (159-138 B.C.), for a panel painting of Dionysos made by Aristides. Mummius, unaware of the value of it, had the picture called back and placed it on the Shrine of Ceres. Pliny states that it was the first 'foreign' artwork that was publicly displayed in Rome.  

The taking of spoils from conquered Greek cities in Italy and Sicily was only the beginning. Next the focus was on Greece itself and the Hellenistic kingdoms of Asia Minor. It seems that the triumphantores attempted to outdo one another in the quality and quantity of the objects seized and transported to Rome. For the triumphal procession following a victory in West Greece (Aetolia 189 B.C.), 285 bronze statues and 230 marble ones were carried around. For another, after victory in Macedonia (Pydna, 168 B.C.), 250 wagons were needed for the duration of two days to carry all the paintings, statues, vessels and armour. The import of Greek statuary really got on its way after 146 B.C. when Greece was subjugated and eleven years later Pergamon became a Roman province. The first Roman generals in Greece showed Greece less consideration than Marcellus showed Syracuse. Mummnius destroyed Corinth entirely, he had shiploads of artworks taken to Rome as spoils, realising that they would make a visual impres-

---

201. The Syracuse accusers of Marcellus claimed that he had left nothing portable in the city, see: Livy, 25.31, 26.30.9; Plut., Vit., Marc., 19.3; cf Liv., 25.40.1.  
202. Historic sources testify that during the sack of Ambrakia panel paintings were taken "into account". But they were not listed in the official index in which all the spoils were recorded. Livy records the booty in every detail: gold and silver objects, coins, bronze and marble statues, but paintings are not mentioned (Polyb., XXI, 3,9 = Liv., XXVIII, 9,13; Stab., 7.501; Polyb., XXXIV, 5,15); Jucker 1950, 61, 114ff.  
203. Polyb., IX.10.  
205. Plin., HN., XXXV, 24; for details see: Jucker 1950, 115. But there is doubt to the truth of this remark.  
206. Plut., Vit., Aem.P., 32; Diod.Sic., XXXI, 8,9, states that 500 wagons were needed. Also see: Vell., 1,9,3ff; Val.Max., V,10,2; Macrobr., 19; Liv., XXXXV, 33ff; 45,39,5ff. Also see: Boardman 1994, 284.  
207. According to Polybius, "The soldiers (who served under Mummius) cared nothing for the works of art and consecrated statues (..) I saw with my own eyes pictures thrown down on the ground and the soldiers playing dice upon them" (Polyb., XXXIX, 1.8-2.3). Though later Mummius appears to have altered his ways (Polyb., XXXIX, 4.4-6).
sion not only of his triumph but also were an adornment for the city.208 At the time of Caesar, colonists in Capua and Corinth searched through all the graves for old pottery and bronze objects in order to sell them for financial gain. Strabo (c. 60 B.C.-A.D. 20) remarked that in these days Rome was flooded with necrocorinthia.209

4. Public art collections in Rome

In ancient Rome numerous collections with all kinds of works of art existed, for the larger part Greek spoils of war; most of these collections were more or less publicly admissible.210 Art objects were (re) consecrated to the gods and given to the people to be displayed in sanctuaries, theatres, porticoes, basilicas, baths, villas and public gardens of the emperors and those from the upper classes.

Despite the very existence of these public collections, there was no special institution to manage them. Although the places where art was on display resemble the modern museum the context was very different.211 The Roman word museum referred to villas, to designate a place of philosophical discussion or a scholar's study. The word was never applied to a collection of art. It was only during the Italian Renaissance that this meaning was acquired.

In Rome some of the wealthiest citizens even had their own private 'museums'. Vitruvius states that a picture gallery, known as a pinakotheka, was a common feature in the Roman house of the higher social classes.212 Cicero speaks of:

‘Country houses (..) crammed with Delian and Corinthian vessels (..) embossed silver coverlets, pictures, statues, marble.213 Villas crowded with statues and paintings, which were partly public property and partly sacred objects belonging to the gods.214 (..) I had entered a richly restored mansion, wherein the draperies were not unrolled, nor the plate set forth, nor the pictures and statuary displayed to view’.215

That the monopolizing of art was not without criticism becomes clear from a speech by Marcus Agrippa, the minister and son-in-law of Augustus about the advisability of rendering public all paintings and statues which would be of more value than exiling them to country houses.216

An example of a famous statue that was housed in the Baths of Caracalla in Rome is the Rhodian group now known as the Farnese bull.217 The majority of the artworks were displayed under porticoes. Pliny relates that:

‘The public porticoes were covered with paintings (..) containing life-like portraits of all the gladiator and assistants’.218

208 Boardman 1994, 284.
209 For Capua, see: Suet., 81; for Corinth, see: Strabo, 8, 381.
210 Cicero states that in Rome Greek artworks could be seen in three places. a) in public buildings, b) at the country houses of the rich, c) at art exhibitions of the Aediles (Cic., Verr., II, iv, 57, 126).
211 In Greek the word museum, (mouseion) applies to sanctuaries dedicated to the muses, to philosophical academies or to institutions of advanced learning or scientific research, over which the muses -quite naturally- presided.
212 Vitr., De arch., I, 2, 7; VI, 3, 8; cf. VII, 3.
214 Cic., Leg., III, 13.
215 Cic., De or., I, 35.
217 Now in the Museo Nazionale in Napels; Also see: Plin., HN., XXXVI, 34.
The Portico of Octavia, built by Metellus to house his collection of art, was made up from the spoils of war that were carried in his triumphal procession in 212 B.C. The Loggia was rebuilt under Augustus in 27 B.C., since then it was known as Porticus Octavia. The structure was quadrangular enclosed by four open galleries, the interior housed two temples dedicated to Jupiter and Juno a schola which served as an auditorium for certain Senate meetings, as a library and an art gallery. The artworks were exhibited under the portico, but also in the two temples and in the schola. In front of the temple the famous equestrian group by Lysippos was found, which represented Alexander the Great and his companions, 34 bronze equestrian statues in all. Previously the group had been exhibited under the portico of Metellus, who had bought it in Dion, a city in southern Greece.

Other works of art that are known to have been displayed in the Porticus Octavia were: paintings of Hesione, an Alexander and Philippus with Athena all by the artist Antiphilus. Or a bronze statue of Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi and the daughter of Scipio Africanus the Elder that was first exhibited at public porticoes, but later in the Porticus of Octavia. Paintings of famous masters like Antiphilus, Nikias, Pausias and Polygnotos could be seen in Rome in the Portico of Pompey. Other well-known porticos with artworks on display were the Portico of Marcius Philippus, the Portico of the Argonauts, the Portico of Apollo and the Portico of Vipsania. The latter was a sort of geographical 'museum' where a great map of the world erected under Agrippa's supervision was kept. The Portico of Apollo -two porticoes- the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine, later Regio IX- was decorated with fifty statues of the Danaids, to which corresponded on the esplanade, fifty statues of their ill-fated husbands and four bronze oxen, originals by Myron.

5. A boost of copies and copy-workshops

The domination by the Romans of Greece coincided with a period when leading Greek artists tended towards a classical revival in their work. This eclectic grand style, that among others involved copies of works by great Greek artist like Polykleitos or Pasiteles, had a great appeal. It was perceived as a revival of art. This is confirmed by remarks by Pliny the Elder (23/4-79 A.D.). After having mentioned the pupils of Lysippos in the 121st Olympiad (between 296 and 293 B.C.), he continues with the statement:

‘After that art languished and it revived in the 156th Olympiad’ [that is between 156 and 153 B.C.].

---

218 Plin., HN., XXXV, 52.
219 Plin., HN., XXXV, 114, XXXVI, 15, 24, 25.
221 Plin., HN., XXXV, 114: ‘Pictures of Antiphilus in Octavia’s Porticoes, and [other works of art] in Philippus Portico and Pompey’s Portico.
222 Plin., HN., XXXV, 66.
224 The revived classical Greek style became exemplary for Roman art. This lead Niels von Holst (1967, 28) to conclude that: ‘The Romans must have found it comparatively easy to approach works which, by reason of a certain harshness and discipline, had some affinity with their own character, like for example the works of Polykleitos and Myron’.
225 Plin., HN., XXXIV, 52.
This passage involves a polemical judgement that Pliny borrowed from a Greek critic. It implies that no work of art worth the name was produced in that period. It represented the opinion about Hellenistic art among educated Romans.\textsuperscript{226} Because of this prejudice against Hellenistic art, Hellenistic statues were little copied in the Roman period.\textsuperscript{227} But there is also another explanation of Pliny’s Hellenistic ‘lacuna’, namely that he had no later literary sources available.

As a result, not only works of art but also Greek artists themselves were called to Rome where they were to make cult statues and decorative sculpture under Roman patronage. Moreover it gave a particularly strong impulse to the copy industry. In Rome a Greco-Roman style developed, the artists blended Greek types with Roman portraits and accessories and adopted them to Roman buildings as a purely decorative element. In decorative reliefs, Greek artists combined older with contemporary styles.\textsuperscript{228} We know of Pasitiles, a Sicilian who had gained Roman citizenship (probably in 88 B.C. with other Sicilians)\textsuperscript{229}, of Arkesilaos and others. They made groups and figures of Greek mythological and historical subjects, but also cult statues for Roman temples.\textsuperscript{230} Most works were purchased at the open art market or, selected in the storage places of the copy workshops.\textsuperscript{231}

Copies, usually made in workshops outside Italy, more and more fulfilled the increasing demand for artworks.\textsuperscript{232} This had also practical reasons because the large marble-quarries were in Greece. The accuracy with which copies were made varied. Copies of Classical statues were copied more closely, those of Hellenistic statues more loosely. Roland Smith argued that at a given level of ability, the relative formal economy of Classical versus Hellenistic sculpture would encourage this. Hellenistic statues, generally, would be harder to copy. The specialists in the copy workshops however were fully capable of reproducing the formal intricacies of the most advanced Hellenistic statues. The accuracy and quality would also depend on how much the customer could afford to pay.\textsuperscript{233} We know of a Zenodoros who, at the time of Nero, made copies of a chalice by Kalamis\textsuperscript{234} and Octavianus who bought a plaster copy of a crater from Arkesilaos.\textsuperscript{235} Cicero had Greek slaves employed from time to time in his villa in Tusculum in making copies of Greek pieces of sculpture that were not to be readily purchased.

One of the most celebrated and successful sculptors was Praxiteles (4th century B.C.). According to Pliny he mainly worked in marble, but also in bronze.\textsuperscript{236}

‘and (..) he was unrivalled in his work in marble’.\textsuperscript{237}

One of the most renowned sculptures of antiquity was the Cnidian Venus by Praxiteles. No one questioned the fact that she was an embodiment of physical desire. There is an account of a man who fell that much in love with the statue that he had himself locked into her shrine to make love

\textsuperscript{226} Smith 1991, 7.
\textsuperscript{227} Smith 1991, 8. However this does not mean that there was no admiration whatsoever for Hellenistic works, what is now referred to as 'Greek Baroque'. Caesar was especially fond of these works in this style and Augustus had the same inclinations, for examples see: Holst 1967, 27.
\textsuperscript{228} Bieber 1977, 16.
\textsuperscript{230} Boardman 1994, 286.
\textsuperscript{231} Jucker 1950, 68.
\textsuperscript{232} Jucker 1950, 68.
\textsuperscript{233} Smith 1991, 15.
\textsuperscript{234} Plin., \textit{HN}, XXXIV, 45-47.
\textsuperscript{235} Plin., \textit{HN}, XXXV, 156. compare XXXIV, 47: it was common practise for sculptors to work from clay models. Sketch models of clay used to sell for more, among artists themselves, than the finished works, see: Plin., \textit{HN}, XXXV, 155.
\textsuperscript{236} Plin., \textit{HN}, XXXIV, 69.
\textsuperscript{237} Plin., \textit{HN}, XXXVI, 20.
to her at night.\textsuperscript{238} This anecdote illustrates the transition that took place of the cult-statue to the plain human figure. It is doubtful whether these statues were ever worshipped, for they were all too human to be godly.\textsuperscript{239} Evidence of Praxiteles’ popularity is found in a passage of the \textit{Satyricon} by Petronius (first century A.D.) where the prime of female beauty is compared with Praxitelean ideal of beauty:

‘Her little mouth was as Praxiteles imagined Diana’s’.\textsuperscript{240}

Works by Praxiteles could be found in Rome in the gardens of Servilius, on the Capitol and some pieces were part of the collection of an Asinius Pollio (first century B.C.). The latter owned the first library that was publicly admissible in Rome.\textsuperscript{241} Further evidence of Praxiteles’ fame is a shipload that included a copy of the Cnidian Venus together with other copies and new creations, which sank around 50 B.C. near Antikythera.\textsuperscript{242}

Contrary to Greek custom, the interest for works of art shifted to the private realm. The rise of prosperity during the late Republic increased the need for leading families to represent themselves. To assemble works of art at great expense constituted an element of prestige associated with power and wealth. This was expressed in luxurious palaces and villas of which the interiors and gardens were decorated with classical statues (in most cases copies of Greek originals) in marble and bronze.\textsuperscript{243} Pliny mentions the habit of placing bronze portrait busts in private libraries:

‘We must not pass over a novelty that has also been invented, in that likeness made, if not of gold or silver, yet at all events of bronze are set up in libraries in honour of those whose immortal spirits speak to us in the same places (..) At Rome this practise originated with Asinius Pollio, who first by founding a library made works of genius the property of the public (After 39 B.C.)’.\textsuperscript{244}

Those who were less wealthy would content themselves with plaster casts (see the chapter on moulding and casting techniques). As has been mentioned before, the architect Vitruvius considered picture galleries a common feature in the houses of the Roman rich.\textsuperscript{245}

\textsuperscript{238} Plin., \textit{HN}., XXXVI, 21. Also see Antonio Corso (2007).

\textsuperscript{239} Examples of the practise of worship of cult-statues are numerous, e.g. the bronze Colossus of Heracles in his temple at Agrigentum. Since hundreds of years the statue was worshipped, the chin and mouth were worn off because of the many kisses of the pious (Cic., \textit{Verr}.IV, 94). Lucretius (Lucr., DRN.I, 316) mentions bronze statues at city gates. It was the practise to greet them by a touch of the hand, which caused them to be severely worn down.

\textsuperscript{240} Petron., \textit{Sat}. 126, 16.

\textsuperscript{241} Plin., \textit{HN}., XXXVI, 23.

\textsuperscript{242} Several of such ships were found that wrecked on their way to the Roman market. This particular shipwreck is dated in 80-50 B.C. and was found near the Greek island of Antikythera in 1900. The wreck contained a bronze youth, a bearded philosopher and several other bronzes plus thirty-six badly preserved marble statues including a Cnidian Venus, see: Svoronos 1908, Taf.XVI, 2, description p.74; Also see: Weinberg 1965; Gelsdorf 1994 for ancient shipwrecks containing art transports in the Mediterranean.

\textsuperscript{243} E.g. Plin., \textit{HN}., XXXIV, 55 mentions a statue of a young boy playing with knuckle-bones by Polycleitus that was on display in the atrium of the emperors’ palace of Titus, A statue of a man using a Body-scraper (\textit{Apoxymenous}) by Lysippus that Marcus Agrippa gave to be set up in front of his Baths (Plin., \textit{HN}., XXXIV, 62), and statues of Praxiteles that could be found in front of the Temple of Felicitas (Plin., \textit{HN}., XXXIV, 69).

\textsuperscript{244} Plin., \textit{HN}., XXXV, 9.

\textsuperscript{245} Vitr., De arch.,VI, 3, 8 (for the Roman house); VI, 4,2; VI, 5,2 (for the Greek house).
The connoisseur and public speaker Hortentius owned a painting by Kydias for which he had a special hall erected near his villa in Tusculum. \(^{246}\) Cicero was a keen collector and connoisseur of Greek art. \(^{247}\) He admitted that for him collecting created the utmost pleasure. \(^{248}\) In his correspondence with his friends Fadius Gallus and Atticus -the latter was his agent in Athens- there are many requests and assignments to buy Greek statues and other decorative objects for the interior- and garden decoration of his villas in Tusculum and Formiae. \(^{249}\) In public however he promoted puritanism and referred sneering to those who had for relaxation a beautifully furnished suburban villa and funs. \(^{250}\)

The anti-Greek attitude that Cicero advocates in this context is also found with Varro (116-27 B.C.). In his *De re rustica* Varro states that for him, the wax portraits of the ancestors had more value than the finest Greek statues. \(^{251}\) When Horace exalts poetry over sculpture he speaks of ‘rich people who could think no better present to give each other than some original work of Scopas or Parrhasius’. \(^{252}\) Petronius refers with disdain to Apelles and Pheidias as ‘poor crazy Greeks’. \(^{253}\)

Most Romans of wealth and taste collected Greek works of art, Corinthian bronzes, Attalic tapestries, Coan silks, Sicilian pictures, of gold, silver and marbles. \(^{254}\) In some cases this lead to excesses. Such was the case with C. Verres who was *propraetor* in charge of jurisdiction in Sicily in the first century B.C. Cicero pictured this civil servant as notorious for his debaucheries with women and his appetite for personal gain at the cost of bribery and rapacity. According to Cicero this avid collector would not refrain from murder in order to obtain any object that struck his fancy. For this purpose he employed two bloodhounds, a modeller in wax and a painter who had to trace artworks for him. He did not desist from appropriating art objects from private houses or even temples to augment his private collection. \(^{255}\) At some point he was able to acquire the gold and ivory doors of the temple of Minerva in Syracuse which he displayed at his villa in Rome. Another striking account is given by Cicero who relates that in front of the temple of Ceres at Henna stood two life-size statues, of Ceres and of Triptolemus. ‘Their beauty brought them in danger, but their weight saved them’. In the hand of the Ceres statue was a delightfully finished Victory. Verres had the small statue knocked off and

\(^{246}\) Plin., *HN.*, XXXV, 130.

\(^{247}\) In *Brutus* 261, Cicero talks about skilfully executed paintings exhibited in the proper light, which suggests first hand experience.

\(^{248}\) Cic., *Att.*, I, 9: (…) this is how my fancy takes me.

\(^{249}\) About art objects obtained for Cicero by Atticus, see: Cic., *Att.*, I-5; II-2; IV-2; V-2; VI-3; IX-3; X-5. By Fadius Gallus, see: Cic., *Fam.*, VII, 23. For general reading on sculptures in Roman villas, see: Neudecker 1988.

\(^{250}\) In this context one has to consider that in any public speech it was 'bad form' for a *vir gravis* (a Roman gentleman) to profess, or even to imply, any knowledge of art, or to assume such knowledge on the part of his hearers, see: Greenwood, (Loeb) 1935, note on *Verr.*, IV, 4. This is also why Verres called Cicero an idiot when his knowledge on art is concerned. For elaboration on the concept of *vir gravis* see: Oppermann 1983, 402ff. Elsewhere Cicero remarks that people should not led a statue by Polycleitus cause them to loose all self-control. This Roman ideal of dignity contains elements of Stoic thought, see: Holst 1967, 27.

\(^{251}\) Varro, *Rust.*, III, 2.

\(^{252}\) Horace, *Carm.*, IV.8.6.

\(^{253}\) Petron., *Sat.*, 88, 10.

\(^{254}\) Chambers 1928, 65; Marcus Licinius Crassus (ca.112-53 BC.) whose fame was based on his wealth, owned vases and embossed metal ware that was so precious that he did not dare to use it. Marcus Aemilius Scaurus, son in Law of Sulla, set up a dactyliotheca and ordered several statues of the famous Pausanias (4th century BC.) from Sikyon to Rome.

\(^{255}\) Cic., *Verr.*, II, XIII, 30.
confiscated it.\textsuperscript{256} In the end Verres was prosecuted but escaped from Rome, only to commit suicide.

During the first century B.C., antique works of art were collected more than ever for their economic value. By this time traders from all over the empire gathered in Rome. Art dealers occupied entire city blocks. They were clustered along the Via Sacra and in the Saepta Julia where under the colonnades all kinds of shops could be found. In Greece and Asia not only statues and vases, but even whole columns were bought and packed off to Rome. Some art collections also contained natural curiosities. Suetonius recorded that in the villa of Emperor Augustus at Capri a collection of unidentified stone weapons and bones could be found.\textsuperscript{257}

In Rome, public art sales were publicly announced and preceded by exhibitions which attracted crowds of people, art dealers as well as amateurs. Roman satirists such as Statius, Suetonius, Juvenal, Seneca and Martial caricature these collectors. The latter ridicules such a treasure hunter at the Saepta Julia, an art-market in Rome:

\begin{quote}
(\ldots)’Wandering long and often in the enclosure where golden Rome rummages her wealth, Mamurra (\ldots) stripped the coverings from round table tops and called for ivory exhibited aloft, and after four times measuring a tortoise shell couch for six, lamented that it was not large enough for his citrus. He enquired of his nostrils whether the bronze smelt of Corinth and was critical of Polykleitos statues’.\textsuperscript{258}
\end{quote}

Already during the Augustan period it was fashionable to collect archaic Greek works of art, who were called ‘primitives’.\textsuperscript{259} Horace tells us of a collector by the name of Damasippus who, if a marble were awkwardly sculpted or a bronze worked in a dry, hard fashion, would be eager to quickly offer 100.000 sesterces for it.\textsuperscript{260}

The predominant taste for Greek sculpture spurred on the demand for copies, which were traded for high prices. However this did not prevent forgers from providing them with spurious signatures and passing them off as originals.\textsuperscript{261} When these turned into a flood, expertise soon evolved into a regular profession, which marks the difference between connoisseurship and mere accumulation. Art for Art’s sake had arrived: meaning art for the self-esteem of collectors and the financial profit of dealers and artists.

The developments in the art-theoretical enphilosophical realm brought new aesthetic concepts and explain how exact copies, in marble as well as in plaster, gained a status in the hierarchy of art. Ancient writers like Juvenal, Pausanias and Lucian talk about collecting plaster copies as an established custom, testify to this fact. And although the archaeological evidence of plasterworkshops is rare (e.g. Baiae and Pompeii) one must assume that many have existed. The same goes for copying in marble, the measuring points on unfinished pieces sculpture are an indication of an established copy industry.

\* * *

\textsuperscript{256} Cic., \textit{Verr.}, II, XLIX, 110.
\textsuperscript{257} Suet., \textit{Aug.}, 72.
\textsuperscript{258} Mart., Spect., IX, 59.
\textsuperscript{259} Augustus had archaic sculpture from the 6\textsuperscript{th} century placed on top of the roof of the temple of Apollo on the Palatine hill. It was then believed to be the work of Bupalos and Athenis, two semilegendarry artists from the Ionian islands, see: Plin., \textit{NH.}, XXXVI, 11-4.
\textsuperscript{260} Hor., \textit{Sat.}, II, 3, 20.
\textsuperscript{261} Phaedrus, \textit{Fables}, III, 5; Tac., \textit{Dial.}, XVIII, 16; Tac., \textit{Ann.}, 2, 88, 17. It seems that during the Claudian-Neronian period there was little awareness of the difference between original works and copies, see: Jucker 1950, 67.