Transactions of the American Philological Association 108 (1978) 155–174

THE IMPACT OF GREEK ART ON ROME

JEROME J. POLLITT
Yale University

During the sixty-five years from Marcellus's capture of Syracuse in 211 B.C. to the sack of Corinth by Mummius in 146 B.C., the city of Rome was inundated with Greek statues and paintings.[1] The reason for bringing these works of art to Rome in the first place was, as Plutarch says of Marcellus's booty, to make "a visual impression of his triumph and also to be an ornament for the city" (*Marcellus* 21.1). But as they were distributed about the city in public buildings and temple precincts, as well as in private collections, these Greek statues and paintings soon became a major element in the Roman civic environment, and they interacted with the character and taste of the Romans to produce a special cultural atmosphere in much the same way that the fountains and churches of the Baroque period do today. Many of the works that came to Rome were among the finest masterpieces of Greek art, and it was inevitable that, as time went by, the Romans would begin not only to examine their artistic subtleties and differences but also to assess what their value was, if any, to Roman society.

Ancient literary sources contain enough information about how the Romans reacted to the presence of all this plundered art in their midst to enable one to draw a coherent picture of its impact on Roman cultural, and to an extent even political, life during the late Republic and early Empire. It is this picture that I shall attempt to compose in the present article.[2]

[1]Since the time when a version of this paper was read at the annual meeting of the American Philological Association in 1975 I have benefited from helpful suggestions and criticisms offered by a number of colleagues. I wish to express my thanks in particular to Gordon Williams and Robert E. A. Palmer.

[2]I feel I should emphasize that this article deals with a specific and limited chapter in the history of ancient art criticism (for which the evidence is mostly literary rather than monumental) and not with the whole question of how Greek art influenced Roman art. The monumental evidence for such topics as the adaptation of various Greek styles in Roman sculpture and painting, the rise of the Neo-Attic and archaistic styles, the stimulation of the copying industry, and the influx of Greek art and artists to Italy have frequently been dealt with. In addition to most general histories of Hellenistic and Roman art see: G. M. A. Richter, *Ancient Italy* (Oxford 1951) 37-65; Maurizio Borda, *La scuola di Pasiteles* (Bari 1953); Paul

To set the stage for this study it may be useful to sum up briefly what the Greek plunder that reached Rome consisted of and when it arrived. After the fall of Syracuse, Plutarch tells us, Marcellus brought "the most beautiful public monuments" of that city to Rome (*Marcellus* 21.1). These consisted of both statues and paintings (Livy 25.40.1-3) in which Syracuse had abounded. "Prior to this," Plutarch notes, Rome "neither had nor even knew of these exquisite refined things . . . rather it was full of barbaric weapons and bloody spoils," and "there was no sight which was joyful, or even unfearful, to gentle and refined spectators."[3] Two years later, in 209 B.C., Fabius Maximus took from Tarentum a quantity of statues and paintings almost equal to that taken from Syracuse (Livy 27.16.7 ff.). While Fabius won praise from Roman conservatives for leaving most of the images of the Tarentine gods intact, his scruples did not extend to a colossal bronze of Herakles, which was transported to Rome and dedicated on the Capitoline (Pliny, *NH* 34.40). Flamininus's triumph in 194 B.C. after his defeat of Philip of Macedonia lasted three days and included the exhibition of bronze and marble statues taken not only from conquered Greek cities but also from the private collection of the Macedonian kings (Livy 34.52.4-5). In the case of the triumph of M. Fulvius Nobilior in 187 B.C. after his defeat of the Aetolians, Livy seems to give us an official inventory figure when he mentions the number of statues in the procession: 285 of bronze and 230 of marble (Livy 39.5.13-16). The same seems to be true in the case of the triumph of L. Scipio in 186 B.C. following his defeat of Antiochos: in this case we hear of 1,423 pounds of engraved silver vases. Aemilius Paullus's triumph after Pydna in 168 B.C. contained so many statues and paintings that 250 wagons were required to transport them, and a whole day was barely sufficient to see them (Plutarch, *Aemilius Paullus* 32-33). Among these spoils was an Athena by Pheidias, subsequently set up in a shrine of Fortuna huiusce Diei on the Palatine (Pliny, *NH* 34.54). In 148 B.C. Macedonia was plundered for a second time and its conqueror, Quintus Metellus, brought to Rome one of the most famous and, I suspect,

---

Zanker, *Klassizistische Statuen* (Mainz am Rhein 1974), Cornelius C. Vermeule III, *Greek Sculpture and Roman Taste* (Ann Arbor 1977).

The most thorough studies of Greek influence on Roman art criticism and taste are Hans Jucker, *Vom Verhältnis der Römer zur bildenden Kunst der Griechen* (Bamberg 1950), and Giovanni Becatti, *Arte e gusto negli scrittori latini* (Florence 1951). Literary sources on the subject are collected and analyzed in Olof Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik* (Lund 1941).

[3] *οὐδὲν γὰρ εἶχεν οὐδ' ἐγίνωσκε πρότερον τῶν κομψῶν καὶ περιττῶν, οὐδὲ ἦν ἐν αὐτῇ τὸ χάριεν τοῦτο καὶ γλαφυρὸν ἀγαπώμενον, ὅπλων δὲ βαρβαρικῶν καὶ λαφύρων ἐναίμων ἀνάπλεως οὖσα . . . οὐχ ἱλαρὸν οὐδ' ἄφοβον οὐδὲ δειλῶν ἦν θέαμα καὶ τρυφώντων θεατῶν . . .*

influential monuments of Hellenistic art—the "Granikos Monument" of Lysippos. This group consisted of 25 equestrian bronze statues representing Alexander and the Companions and had been set up at Dion by Alexander himself after the battle of Granikos. Metellus installed it in a newly-built temple and portico complex (the Porticus Metelli) facing temples of Juno and Jupiter. One of these temples is said to have been the first marble temple in Rome, and it seems likely that it was built in a purely Greek style. The final major event in the Age of Plunder was Mummius's sack of Corinth in 146 B.C., an event which, as one source puts it, "filled the whole of Italy" with statues and paintings (*De Vir. Illust.* 60). Looking about the city in the time of Augustus, Strabo seems not to have been exaggerating when he observed of the plunder of Mummius: "The greatest number and the best of the public monuments of Rome come from it" (6.381). Among the spoils was a picture of Dionysos by a famous painter of the fourth century B.C., Aristeides of Thebes. Mummius installed this picture in the temple of Ceres on the Aventine; Pliny (*NH* 35.24) cites it as the first foreign picture to have become public property in Rome (. . . *in Cereris delubro posuit, quam primam arbitror picturam externam Romae publicatam*), a significant observation to which I shall return later.

Although works of Greek art continued to be brought to Rome from time to time after the sack of Corinth (notably by Sulla in 81 B.C., by Lucullus in 63 B.C., and by Pompey in 61 B.C.), the stage was essentially set by 146 B.C. Following the triumphal processions just noted, some of the works of art that had adorned them may have gone into private collections, but it is clear that others, like the Dionysos by Aristeides, were eventually offered as ex-votos in public sanctuaries, where they continued to be seen and admired for centuries. Through this process Rome became a museum of Greek art, and while a certain amount of bric-a-brac was undoubtedly mixed up with the masterpieces, it is clear that the overall level of the works on public display was very high. In the first century A.D. a visitor to the Capitoline, for example, could see sculptures by Myron, Praxiteles, Euphranor, Lysippos, Chares, and paintings by Parrhasios, Nikomachos, and Aristeides. On the Palatine he could see statues by Pheidias, Myron, Skopas, Timotheus, the sons of Praxiteles, and by the archaic sculptors of Chios. For the most part the list of artists whose works are mentioned by Pliny and others reads like an honor rôle of Greek art; there were very few prominent artists of the Classical and Hellenistic periods whose works could not be seen in the city. My unofficial count of Rome's holdings lists, among sculptors: 14 works by Praxiteles, 8 by Skopas, 4 by Lysippos, 3 each by Euphranor, Myron, and Sthennis, 2 each by Pheidias, Polykleitos, and Strongylion, and single works by many others; and among the painters: 4 each by Aristeides and Nikias, 3 each by Apelles and

Nikomachos, 2 each by Zeuxis, Parrhasios, and Antiphilos, and also works by Polygnotos, Timanthes, Pausias, and others.[4] And this is a conservative count. It includes only works which are specifically mentioned as being in the city (Pliny sometimes implies that particular works were in Rome without directly saying so), and it counts groups like the Granikos Monument as one work.

Once this astonishingly rich collection of Greek masterpieces became part of their urban scene, the Romans were never able simply to ignore it. They were driven to clarify their own relation to it, and in the process of doing so, they devoted a considerable amount of energy to denouncing it, praising it, evaluating it, trying to figure out a proper rôle for it, and finally to using it for their own purposes. As they struggled with, and eventually absorbed, the impact of Greek art, two fundamental attitudes toward it emerged—one of which I will call the "Catonian attitude" and the other the "Connoisseur's attitude"—and a conflict between these two points of view can be seen to run from the end of the third century B.C. until at least as late as the reign of Vespasian.

The essence of the "Catonian attitude" was that the arrival of Greek art in Rome marked the beginning of a slow decay in the moral standards of Roman society. Livy, probably expressing the point of view of Augustus, who adopted the Catonian theme for his own uses, puts it this way: "They [the statues and paintings from Syracuse] were no doubt the spoils of the enemy and were no doubt taken by right of war; all the same it was from these that one can trace the beginning of the craze for works of Greek art and, arising from that, the licentiousness with which all places everywhere, be they sacred or profane, were despoiled" (25.40.1-3).[5] Prior to the sack of Syracuse, adds Plutarch, "the Roman people . . . had been accustomed to fighting or farming and had no experience with a life of softness and ease." Afterwards, they developed "a taste for leisure and idle talk, affecting urbane opinions about the arts and about artists, even to the point of wasting the better part of the day on such things" (*Marcellus* 21.5).[6] The

[4]See the Appendix to this article (a topographical index of Greek statues and paintings in Rome).

[5]. . . *hostium quidem illa spolia et parta belli iure; ceterum inde primum initium mirandi Graecarum artium opera licentiaeque huius sacra profanaque omnia vulgo spoliandi factum est* . . .

It might be noted here that Livy was not the first historian to assume the Catonian attitude with regard to Greek art. See, for example, Sallust, *Cat.* 11.6, where the exposure of Sulla's army to Greek art in the East is said to have contributed to a general degeneracy among the Roman people.

[6]. . .σχολῆς ἐνέπλησε καὶ λαλιᾶς περὶ τεχνῶν καὶ τεχνιτῶν, ἀστεϊζόμενον καὶ διατρίβοντα πρὸς τούτῳ πολὺ μέρος τῆς ἡμέρας.

most fervent spokesman for this attitude was, of course, the man after whom I have named it, the elder Cato, and one of the most revealing expressions of it comes in a speech which Livy ascribed to Cato. After castigating the "diverse vices, avarice, and luxury" and "every sort of libidinous temptation" that were infecting Rome from Greece and the East, Cato calls to mind what may have been a common scene in his time: "They are dangers, believe me, those statues which have been brought into the city from Syracuse. For now I hear far too many people praising and marveling at the ornaments of Corinth and Athens and laughing at the terracotta antefixes of our Roman gods" (34.4.4).[7]

The terracotta antefixes in question were probably those in Rome's older temples, those influenced by the Etruscan archaic or post-archaic style. It is easy to understand how such ornaments may have elicited a few embarrassed snickers among Romans who were struggling passionately to keep up with the latest developments in Greek art. And it is also easy to understand how such snickers would have infuriated a Roman like Cato.

While there is no reason to doubt that Livy's portrait of the outraged Cato is historically accurate and that the Catonian attitude was a major element in the intellectual history of the second century B.C., let me emphasize again that it was not confined only to this century. Livy, writing in the time of Augustus, seems as committed to it as Cato was, and the same may be said of the elder Pliny, writing in the time of Vespasian. In view of all the other fascinating information that Pliny preserves for us, it is easy to lose sight of this moralistic strain in his work, but it is, in fact, one of the few continuous themes in books 33-37 of the *Natural History*. In speaking of the arrival of the spoils from Corinth and the concurrent fall of Carthage, for example, he reflects that these events "gave immense impetus to the overthrow of our morals" since they created a climate in which "there was freedom to enjoy vices and the enjoyment of them became possible" (*NH* 33.150). He laments the luxurious nature of the theatre built by the aedile Scaurus in 58 B.C. because it created a public channel through which "vice" could make inroads on private life (*NH* 36.6) and *maxime prostraverit mores* (*NH* 36.113). The real meaning of a portrait of Pompey made of pearls and carried in his triumph of 61 B.C. was, in Pliny's view, "the triumph of luxury and the conquest of *severitas*" (*NH* 37.14).

It seems to me most probable that Livy and Pliny promoted the Catonian attitude because it was favored by the emperors who were their patrons. Before going into the question of why Augustus and Vespasian, as

[7] *Infesta, mihi credite, signa ab Syracusis illata sunt huic urbi. Iam nimis multos audio Corinthi et Athenarum ornamenta laudantes mirantesque et anteflxa fictilia deorum Romanorum ridentes.*

well as others, endorsed this point of view, let us look for a moment at the views of the opposition party, that is, those who favored what I call the "Connoisseur's attitude." What was it about these connoisseurs that particularly annoyed the Catonians?

There were, I suggest, two factors: first their affectation of foreign manners and tastes and, second, their intense interest in forming private art collections. The affectation of foreign manners and taste was particularly galling to conservative Romans because it was often accompanied by a "more sophisticated than thou" attitude and by disdain, even contempt, for Roman traditions. We have already noted how some of the new connoisseurs, entranced with the novel elegance of Greek art, would ridicule the terracotta ornaments of early Roman temples. The contrast between the sensible old Roman and the new philhellene apparently first became crystallized around the personalities of Fabius Maximus and Marcellus. Fabius, as already noted, had refused to carry off sculptures of the gods of Tarentum because to have done so would have been an impiety. But Marcellus brushed such considerations aside and "proclaimed proudly even before the Greeks that [by bringing the spoils of Syracuse to Rome] he had taught the Romans, who had previously understood nothing, to respect and marvel at the beautiful and wondrous works of Greece"[8] (Plutarch, *Marcellus* 21.5). This flaunting of the superiority of Greek institutions over Roman apparently continued to irritate Roman conservatives for generations. Even in Cicero's time a statue of Lucius Scipio, set up after his defeat of Antiochos in 189 B.C., was a cause for comment because it represented him in sandals and a *chlamys*, that is to say, in the dress of a Greek (*Pro Rab. Post.* 10.27).

Even when they were not specifically challenging things Roman, the pretensions of the new connoisseurs could be exasperating. Pliny, for example, testily accused those who were always praising Corinthian bronzes of being ignorant poseurs: ". . . it seems to me that the majority of these collectors more often simply pretend to have real knowledge about this bronze so that they may set themselves off from the common run of men; and that less often do they really have a subtle understanding of the subject" (*NH* 34.6).[9] Even later, Quintilian seems to show the same impatience when he observes that some critics praise the rather primitive works of painters like Polygnotos "their private motive being, in my

[8] οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ τούτοις ἐσεμνύνετο καὶ πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ὡς τὰ καλὰ καὶ θαυμαστὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος οὐκ ἐπισταμένους τιμᾶν καὶ θαυμάζειν Ῥωμαίους διδάξας.

[9] *ac mihi maior pars eorum simulare eam scientiam videtur ad segregandos sese a ceteris magis quam intellegere aliquid ibi suptilius.*

opinion, a desire to make a display of connoisseurship" (. . . *proprio quodam intellegendi, ut mea opinio est, ambitu* . . .) (*Inst. Or.* 12.10.3).

In spite of such continuing criticism and resistance, however, it became respectable as the years went by to have some knowledge of and discrimination about Greek art. In fact, by the end of the first century B.C. it was clearly expected, as the introductory books of Vitruvius's *De architectura* make clear, that every educated man be able to demonstrate some connoisseurship. Pliny's occasional ruminations about the disputed authorship of a particular work (*NH* 36.27-29) or how much better one Greek work is than another (*NH* 34.44) must reflect typical topics of discussion among the educated.

The slow changes in taste and education through which Greek art in Rome ceased to be looked upon as exotic booty and came to be valued as a cultural resource were clearly active through-out the period when most of the plundering took place. Marcellus, as we have seen, was an unabashed admirer of the artistic achievements of the Greeks, and Aemilius Paullus, although a renowned plunderer himself, looked after his children's education with a philhellenic zeal which included, according to Plutarch (*Aemilius Paullus* 6.5), training in sculpture and drawing.[10] That this education had its proper effect is attested by the fact that one of Paullus's sons, Scipio Aemilianus, later undertook to return a number of works of art plundered by the Carthaginians to their original Sicilian Greek owners at Thermae, near Himera (Cicero, *Verr.* 2.2.86).

A landmark of sorts in the development of philhellenic connoisseurship was reached in 99 B.C., when the aedile C. Claudius, wishing to undertake a temporary but magnificent embellishment of the Forum, *borrowed* (rather than expropriated) an Eros by Praxiteles from its Sicilian owner. Claudius was sophisticated enough to know the value and importance of Praxiteles' work and also clearly felt that to steal such a thing would be crude and boorish. Cicero then reflects: "It is only recently that men of noble rank have behaved this way . . . it has only been for the briefest time that we have seen those who decorate the Forum and the basilicas do so not with spoils from the provinces but with the art objects of their friends, loaned by their hosts . . ." (*Verr.* 2.4.6).

As Cicero's remark suggests, the plundering of the second century had slowly put on a new face and by the first century had become respectable. It became "art collecting," the second of the developments that, as I have said, the Catonian Romans disapproved of. What we would call an "art market"

[10]On the philhellenism of Aemilianus and the "Scipionic Circle" see A. Astin, *Scipio Aemilianus* (Oxford 1967). I am grateful to Robert Palmer for bringing the importance of Aemilianus' rôle in the development of connoisseurship to my attention.

appeared for the first time in Western history, and perhaps in world history, in late Republican Rome, and there is probably no aspect of this period that has a more modern ring to it. All the familiar features of today's art market were there: passionate collectors, dealers (some unscrupulous, some reliable), smugglers, forgers, restorers, appraisers, fads and fashions, and inflated prices. All of this emanated from the fact that upper class Romans who had once been free to seize Greek art were now content to buy it in order to adorn their townhouses and villas. The great private collections of the time apparently drew not only upon the limited reservoir of earlier Greek masterpieces that happened to be available but also on works by contemporary artists, all apparently also Greeks, whose styles recaptured something of the quality of classical Greek art. The sculpture collection of Gaius Asinius Pollio (76 B.C.–A.D. 5), for example, contained not only works by Praxiteles and Skopas but also works by the contemporary classicistic sculptors Stephanos, the pupil of the Neo-Attic master Pasiteles, and Arkesilaos (Pliny, *NH* 36.23-34). It is not known what Asinius paid for his collection, but Pliny records that Lucullus was prepared to pay a fabulous sum, one manuscript reading makes it as much as a million sesterces, for a statue of "Felicitas" by Arkesilaos. If that much could be offered for the work of a contemporary, one wonders what the price tag would have been for a Praxiteles. In any case there is no doubt that cash flowed freely. Crassus paid 100,000 sesterces for some cups by the Greek engraver Mentor (fifth or early fourth century B.C.); Gaius Gracchus is said to have bought some figures of Dolphins for 5,000 sesterces a pound (Pliny, *NH* 33.147); the orator Hortensius paid 144,000 sesterces for a painting of the Argonauts by the fourth century painter Kydias (*NH* 35.130). Cicero, who collected on a much more modest scale, admits that he paid 20,400 sesterces for some Megarian statues (*Att.* 1.8.2).

We get a realistic picture of the day to day state of mind of an average collector in Cicero's letters to Atticus—his excitement about a new work of art that has been shipped to him, his impatience at the delay in its arrival, his daydreams about how it will look in his villa, and so on.[11] All this seems civilized and innocent enough. What was it about such collecting that could possibly disturb Catonian Romans? There can be no doubt that, even though collecting gradually became socially acceptable, it still carried the stigma of being a somewhat frivolous, pretentious pastime. Some of the disclaimers which Cicero felt compelled to slip into the *Verrines* to assure the jurors that, in spite of his own collecting, he was a serious person, are

[11] Some of the more typical passages are collected in my *The Art of Rome ca. 776 B.C.–A.D. 337: Sources and Documents* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1966) 76-78. For the texts see Vessberg (above, note 2) 59-61.

revealing. On one occasion he expresses enthusiasm for a statue of Herakles in Agrigentum and then hastens to "cover himself" by assuring the jury that he really does not have much expertise in such matters (2.4.94). Again, in castigating Verres for forcing the Sicilians to accept shockingly low prices for their works, he hastens to note that he does not judge these prices on the basis of his own knowledge but follows the judgement of those who are *studiosi harum rerum* (2.4.12–13).

Some of the old xenophobia, particularly doubts about the integrity and seriousness of Greeks, may also have contributed to the continuation of the Catonian attitude. In one revealing passage in the *Verrines* Cicero is describing how piteously the Sicilian Greeks lamented the loss of the statues taken by Verres when suddenly he apparently begins to feel that he is losing his audience. One can just see some of the sterner Romans shifting in their seats and wondering skeptically: "You mean all this fuss is about statues?" To win them back Cicero takes pains to explain that Greeks really are different from Romans when it comes to things like art and that the jurors really should try to understand them: ". . . Greeks delight in this kind of ornamentation, in works of art and in artistry, in statues and paintings, more than anything else. And consequently, from their mournful complaints we are able to understand how these things seem so terribly bitter to them which to us might seem less serious and hardly so worrisome" (2.4.132).[12] It also seems that most of the art dealers and appraisers of the first century B.C. were Greeks and that some of them had shabby reputations. Cicero paints a vivid picture of two Greek artists named Tlepolemos and Hieron from Cibyra in Lycia who, after being expelled from their hometown for having plundered a sanctuary of Apollo, become rapacious and dreaded agents for Verres in Sicily (*Verr.* 2.4.30-31; 2.4.96). Not only did they assist Verres in locating and evaluating works for his "collection" but, if Cicero can be trusted, resorted to extortion and outright theft in order to acquire what pleased their employer. Even when not so obviously disreputable, dealers could create difficulties. In a letter written to Fadius Gallus in 61 B.C., when his enthusiasm for collecting seems to have been cooling, Cicero grumbles about his dealings with two dealers who were giving him money problems (*Fam.* 7.23.1-3). One of them, Damasippos, seems to have been a specialist in designing gardens tastefully adorned with sculptures (*Att.* 12.29.33). Apparently he had promised to buy some unwanted sculptures from Cicero but had failed to carry through his intention, perhaps because he was bankrupt, a

[12] *. . . deinde hic ornatus, haec opera atque artificia, signa, tabulae pictae, Graecos homines nimio opere delectant. Itaque ex illorum querimoniis intellegere possumus haec illis acerbissima videri quae forsitan nobis levia et contemnenda esse videantur.*

misfortune for which Horace later satirized him (*Sat.* 2.3.16 and 64). The other dealer, Avianius Evander, was an artist and restorer (Pliny, *NH* 36.32) who apparently was charging Cicero inflated prices.[13]

I am inclined to doubt, however, that the pretentiousness of connoisseurs or xenophobia in any of its varied forms were the principal reasons for the Catonians' uneasiness about private collections of Greek art. Rather, in view of the steps which Augustus subsequently took to curb it, I would suggest that the most serious objection to collecting was that it constituted a form of private extravagance which had dangerous political implications. To surround one's personal estate with the external trappings of power and wealth—and statues and paintings, whether they had been obtained by plunder or by huge amounts of money, were part of such trappings—was one of the symptoms of an ambitious strongman. By making their wealth conspicuous, men like Lucullus, Pompey, and Crassus had been able, with the help of the patron-client system, to attract large retinues of opportunistic followers and thus set themselves up as independent forces in Roman politics in the first century B.C. They came to be more like the potentates of the Hellenistic east, each holding court in his own splendid domain, than like the farmer-soldier heroes of the early Republic. The fabulous villas of Lucullus, filled, as Plutarch tells us, with "paintings and statues . . . which he collected with great outlays of money" (*Lucullus* 39) were clearly only the most notorious example of a general movement (cf. Pliny, *NH* 36.109-10), and when the Stoic philosopher Tuberon referred to Lucullus as "Xerxes in a toga" he may have been only half joking.

By the time of Actium the jostling for power among these strongmen had given Rome more than half a century of Civil wars and left the Republic in a shambles. In the new order which Augustus sought to establish after he came to power the cultivation of personal grandeur had no place, and steps had to be taken to eradicate it. Reverence for tradition and for institutions of government, piety, and restraint were the officially approved virtues of the day, not extravagance. Yet, by Augustus's time, it had become a social grace to have refined taste in the arts. Unlike Cato, Augustus could not simply dismiss a love of Greek art as frivolous nonsense. He himself, if we

[13]Damasippos was the owner of substantial gardens along the Tiber. Presumably they were filled with sculptures on the model of, but no doubt inferior to, those in the Horti Serviliani. On these and similar gardens in Rome see Pierre Grimal, *Les Jardins Romains* (Paris 1969²), particularly pp. 101-96.

Avianius Evander was a freedman connected with a Campanian family, one of whose members may have emigrated from Italy to Greece in the second century B.C. On the background of the Avianii see J. H. D'Arms, "CIL X 1792: A Municipal Notable of the Augustan Age," *HSCP* 76 (1972) 207-16.

can believe Suetonius, had a passion for Corinthian bronzes (*Div. Aug.* 70.2). On the other hand, he had to discourage the use of art collections as advertisements for the politically ambitious. The Augustan solution to this problem was apparently to let it be known that Greek art should henceforth be considered *public property* and that it should be *used in the service of the state.*

In his efforts to convert private collections into public exhibitions Augustus probably used persuasion rather than force. Pliny mentions "a magnificent oration by Marcus Agrippa, worthy of the greatest of citizens, on the subject of making all statues and paintings public property . . ." (*NH* 35.26). This oration must have been the official signal from the Emperor, and those who had any sense must have gotten the message. Even staunch republicans and dedicated critics of Augustus and his principate, like Asinius Pollio, seem to have been influenced by it. Asinius had undertaken the restoration of the building known as the Atrium Libertatis where the offices and records of the censors were kept (Suet. *Div. Aug.* 29). To enhance this restoration he added a public library to the building, and it was apparently in this library that his famous collection of sculpture was exhibited. Although Pliny notes with approval that Asinius wanted his collection to be seen because he was a man of great enthusiasm (. . . *fuit acris vehementiae*) (*NH* 36.33), enthusiasm for art may not have been Asinius's only motive for putting his collection on public display. He may have been trying to assure Augustus that *real* republicans were as concerned for the general welfare of Rome as Augustus himself claimed to be. If this was the case, Asinius's sculpture gallery can be understood as a public compliment, however unintentional, to the policies of Augustus.

Augustus himself seems to have practiced what he prescribed for others. His own country villas, in contrast to those of Lucullus, were adorned, Suetonius tells us, "not so much with statues and paintings as with open walks and woods" (*Aug.* 72.3). In doing so he was clearly attempting to revive what was considered a virtue of the heroes of the past. In the *Verrines*, probably appealing to the conservative taste of his audience rather than expressing his own view, Cicero professes that while all the great conquerors from Marcellus to Mummius had adorned public areas of Rome with gifts and monuments, "the homes of these men, when they flourished with virtue and honor, were devoid of statues and paintings" (*Verr.* 2.1.55). Whether or not the remark is true, it is clear that there were Romans in the first century B.C. who were prepared to believe it.

Mummius, it will be remembered, had dedicated a famous painting by Aristeides of Thebes in the temple of Ceres on the Aventine, and in doing so had won recognition from Pliny as the first Roman to have donated a work of Greek art to the people. Augustus was apparently influenced by this

model too. On those occasions when he did spend money for works of art it was for the public good. Suetonius records, for example, that he used money donated to him on his birthday to buy Greek, or imitation Greek, images—for example an Apollo Sandalarius and a Zeus (Jupiter) Tragoedus—which he dedicated in various wards of the city (*Div. Aug.* 57.1).

In restoring Greek art to public prominence and making it a community possession, however, Augustus seems not to have been content simply to let it be decorative. Rather, it looks as if he tried to use Greek art to convey Roman messages whenever possible. In his forum, for example, he dedicated two paintings by Apelles, one representing Castor and Pollux with Victory and Alexander the Great; the other Alexander riding on a triumphal chariot along with a figure of War (Polemos) whose hands were bound (Pliny, *NH* 35.93). It is unlikely that any perceptive Roman who saw these paintings in the forum would have failed to perceive their significance: by his victories over Antony and the assassins of Caesar, Augustus had been supported by the old gods, like Castor, whose reign he reestablished (the temple of Castor in the Forum Romanum dated back, it will be remembered, to 484 B.C.); and thanks to a great general's triumph, war was no longer a threat. Alexander, incidentally, seems to have become a symbol in the Roman mind for any great ruler,[14] and no one would have had difficulty in making the equation between him and Augustus in these paintings. Suetonius tells us, in fact, that Augustus for a time used Alexander's portrait as his own personal seal (*Div. Aug.* 50). Just to make the political message of these paintings obvious beyond a doubt, however, Claudius later had the faces of Alexander cut out of these paintings and inserted portraits of Augustus (Pliny, *NH* 35.94).

One can probably also attach a Roman message to two paintings placed in the Curia Julia, the new Senate House which had been begun by Julius Caesar and finished by Augustus (Pliny, *NH* 35.28). One of these, by Philochares, depicted an old father and his vigorous son, above whom flew an eagle with a snake in its claws. It seems likely that this picture was intended to remind the Senate of the virtue of filial piety, the virtue so strongly emphasized in the *Aeneid* and reinforced by Augustus through his vengeance (symbolized by the eagle and the snake) against the assassins of Caesar. The other picture, by Nikias, showed a personification of Nemea contemplated by an old man leaning on a stick above whose head was

[14]There were other notable paintings of Alexander on display in Rome: one by Nikias in the Porticus Pompei (Pliny, *NH* 35.130); and two by Antiphilos, a group scene in the Porticus Octaviae depicting him in the company of Philip and Athena (*NH* 35.114) and a portrait of him as a boy in the Porticus Philippi (*NH* 35.114).

depicted a victorious chariot. This must have been, of course, some sort of triumphal prize connected with the Nemean Games, just as Panathenaic amphorae were connected with the Panathenaic Games. In its place in the Curia Julia, however, it was perhaps taken to mean that the Senate (that is, the old man) should contemplate the victory (i.e., Augustus's) which had restored it to a place of influence in Roman affairs.

If we knew more about the circumstances in which particular works of Greek art were exhibited we could probably find many more reinterpretations. When Augustus placed Apelles' Aphrodite Anadyomene in the Temple of Divus Julius, for example (Pliny, *NH* 35.91), he was probably reminding the Roman public of the divine lineage, descending from Venus through Caesar, that he had inherited. More speculatively it might be suggested that when Livia dedicated a statue of Eros in honor of one of the deceased children of Germanicus in the temple of Venus Capitolina (Suet. *Caligula* 7) she expected it to be understood as a symbolic statement of her continuing allegiance to the Julian line.

After Augustus's death, his struggle to preserve Greek art in Rome as a public possession took a strange turn, and the rôles of the Emperor and the public were reversed: Tiberius and the later Julio-Claudians apparently attempted to reconvert it to private use, and they were resisted by an irate public. At first Tiberius seems to have followed Augustus's example in his disposition of Greek art. When he installed a picture of Hyakinthos by Nikias in the Temple of the Divine Augustus, for example, he seems to have been using the painting in much the same way that Augustus had used the Aphrodite of Apelles. The picture was probably taken to express the idea that Augustus, like Hyakinthos, had died only to be reborn in a new form, his deified form, and that he continued to be a presence in the Roman state. After he began to build the Domus Tiberiana and gradually withdrew from public affairs into a more secluded life, however, Tiberius's outlook changed, and he apparently became tempted to do just what the collectors of the first century B.C. had done, i.e., to adorn his personal dwelling with works of Greek art. To many in the Senate this may have seemed to signal an abandonment of the constitutional scruples so carefully observed by Augustus and a reversion to the arbitrary use of power of a military chieftain. Such a controversy probably was at the root of the strange story of Tiberius's passion for the Apoxyomenos of Lysippos (Pliny, *NH* 34.62). The Emperor is said to have been so overwhelmed with a sexual passion for this statue that he removed it from the Baths of Agrippa and put it in his own bedroom. This act created a public outrage and a demonstration of such vehemence, however, that he was forced to restore the statue to the baths. Pliny also hints that something similar occurred in connection with a painting by Parrhasius (*NH* 35.70). We can leave the lurid and gossipy

aspects of these stories aside. What they seem to tell us is that Tiberius, in the manner of one of the great aristocrats of the Republic, tried to collect famous works of Greek art to adorn his private palace and that the public, probably led by the followers of Augustus in the Senate, resisted.

Although the evidence on the question is limited it appears that the later Julio-Claudians were even more high-handed in adapting public monuments to their own purposes. Caligula, for example, wanted to bring the Zeus of Pheidias from Olympia to Rome and replace its head with his own portrait (Suet. *Caligula* 22.2, Dio Cassius 59.28.3); and he is also said to have converted the temple of Castor in the Forum, including its two images, into a vestibule for his palace on the Palatine (Dio Cassius 59.28.5). But it was, of course, Nero who carried this anti-Augustan drift in the behavior of emperors to its farthest limit. Nero, with his acquisitiveness, his implied disdain for Roman taste, and his extravagance can be considered the last great apostle of what I have called the "connoisseur's attitude." His Domus Aurea, which usurped a great part of the center of Rome, went beyond even the most ambitious dreams of the strongmen of the first century B.C. It represented seemingly unlimited power, seemingly unlimited wealth, and unlimited opportunity for self-indulgence. To be true to its tradition it had to be packed with works of Greek art, and Pliny assures us that it was, citing a long list of works *violentia in urbem convecta* (*NH* 34.84).

If Nero was the last apostle of the connoisseur's attitude, Vespasian should be seen as the last major spokesman for the Catonian attitude. Pliny's running diatribe against extravagant houses in Book 36 of the *Natural History* (*NH* 36.4-8, 48-50, and 109-11) must reflect the sentiments of Vespasian and have the example of Nero in mind. The same is probably true of Pliny's other passing pronouncements, some of which were cited earlier, about the evil effects of luxury on morals. But in practice Vespasian was an Augustan type of Catonian and clearly wanted to revive the principles of Augustus with regard to Greek art. When the Domus Aurea was dismantled at his orders, he took all the Greek statues that had been looted by Nero and placed them in a splendid new public sanctuary, the Templum Pacis, where the public could again admire them (*NH* 34.84). He also retained and handsomely rewarded an artist who restored the "Venus of Kos" (Suet. *Vesp.* 18). The work referred to by Suetonius was probably the Aphrodite Anadyomene of Apelles which, it will be remembered, Augustus himself had dedicated in the temple of the Divine Julius.[15]

[15]*nec non et artifices, Coae Veneris, item Colossi refectorem insigni congiario magnaque mercede donavit.* (*Coae Veneris*, it might be noted, is a restoration based on *coevenerit* in the

According to Pliny this painting had decayed so badly that Nero had had it replaced with another work. In having the painting restored Vespasian was thus pitting Catonian *pietas* against the purely aesthetic considerations of a connoisseur.

After the time of Vespasian we do not hear much more about the importance or the function of Greek art in Rome; nor do we hear anything more about the related controversy as to whether it should be public or private property. By the second century A.D., Rome had become cosmopolitan to such an extent that the old tension between Greek and Roman traditions was no longer felt. To a sophisticated emperor like Hadrian the great works of art of the past belonged to a single cultural tradition. There is no evidence that Hadrian, unlike the connoisseurs of the previous two centuries, was interested in collecting. In fact he spent almost as much time restoring and replenishing the artistic heritage of Greece as others had spent in exploiting it. His villa at Tivoli seems to have been characterized by nostalgic caprices which recreated his travels in Greece rather than by looted objects.

By Hadrian's time the plunder of Marcellus and Mummius had been absorbed into the Roman psyche. The ambitions and fears which it had generated were largely forgotten. It was, in fact, increasingly difficult to distinguish between what was Greek and what was Roman.

manuscripts.) Suetonius's wording is ambiguous. He could mean that there was a single *refector* for both the Venus of Kos and the Colossus of Nero, in which case the *refector* in question was most probably a sculptor. He could also mean, however, that there was a separate *refector* for each work. The other famous Venus of Kos, besides Apelles' painting, was a statue by Praxiteles (Pliny, *NH* 36.20). There is no evidence, however, that Praxiteles' statue was ever brought to Rome. J. C. Rolfe, in a note in the Loeb edition of Suetonius (vol. 2, p. 310) suggests that the Venus of Kos was identical with the statue of Aphrodite mentioned by Pliny *NH* 36.27 as having been dedicated in the Templum Pacis by Vespasian. But Pliny does not connect this figure with Kos, nor does he know who its sculptor was. These would be astounding lapses of memory if the statue in question were the very Aphrodite of Kos that he had mentioned only a few sections earlier in Book 36.

In the case of the painting of Apelles, we know for a fact that it was in Rome and that it was badly in need of restoration in the time of Nero (Pliny, *NH* 35.91). Furthermore, Cicero, *Orator* 5, suggests to me that when educated Romans encountered the phrase *Coae Venus* they naturally thought of the painting by Apelles. (Cicero's pairing of the Coae Venus with the Ialysos of Protogenes in this passage makes it clear that he is referring to a painting.)

APPENDIX

Topographical Index of Greek Statues and Paintings in Rome.
(*NH*=Pliny, *Naturalis Historia*)

Sculpture

Apollo Sosianus, aedes

1. Niobids, by either Skopas or Praxiteles, *NH* 36.28
2. Apollo, by Timarchides, *NH* 36.35
3. Apollo, by Philiskos, *NH* 36.34
4. Leto, Artemis, Apollo, *NH* 36.35
5. Muses, *NH* 36.35

Bibliotheca Asinii Pollionis

1. Sileni, by Praxiteles, *NH* 36.23
2. Thyiads, by Praxiteles, *NH* 36.23
3. Caryatids, by Praxiteles, *NH* 36.23
4. Maenads, by Praxiteles, *NH* 36.23
5. Dionysos, by Eutychides, *NH* 36.34
6. Kanephoros, by Skopas, *NH* 36.25
7. Aphrodite, by the sons of Praxiteles, *NH* 36.24
8. Zeus, by Papylos, *NH* 36.33
9. Hermerotes, by Tauriskos, *NH* 36.34
10. Centaurs and Nymphs, by Arkesilaos, *NH* 36.33
11. Thespiades (Muses?), by Kleomenes, *NH* 36.33
12. Oceanus and Zeus, by Heniochos, *NH* 36.33
13. Appiades, by Stephanos, *NH* 36.33
14. Zethos, Amphion, Dirke and bull, by Apollonios and Tauriskos, *NH* 36.34

Capitoline

1. Apollo, by Kalamis, *NH* 34.39; Strabo 6.319; Appian, *Illyrica* 30
2. Zeus by Myron, Strabo 14.637b
3. Bonus Eventus and Bona Fortuna (Tyche? Agathe Tyche? Agathos Daimon?), by Praxiteles, *NH* 36.23
4. Athena by Euphranor, ded. by Q. Lutatius Catulus, *NH* 34.77
5. Herakles from Tarentum, by Lysippos, *NH* 36.34; Strabo 6.278
6. Colossal head, by Chares of Lindos, *NH* 34.44

Circus Flaminius

1. Marine Thiasos, by Skopas, including figures of Poseidon, Thetis, Achilles, Nereids, Dolphins, Triton, sea deities, sea creatures, *NH* 36.26

Circus Maximus

1. Herakles, by Myron (in the *aedes* of Pompey), *NH* 34.58

Concordia, Aedes, templum

1. Leto with Artemis and Apollo, by Euphranor, *NH* 34.77
2. Asklepios and Hygieia, by Nikeratos, *NH* 34.80
3. Works by Sthennis: Demeter, *NH* 34.90
   Zeus, *NH* 34.90
   Athena, *NH* 34.90
4. Apollo and Hera, by Baton, *NH* 34.73
5. Ares and Hermes, by Piston, *NH* 34.89
6. Hestia, from Rhodes, Dio Cassius 55.9.6

Domus Titi

1. Laocoon, by Agesandros, Polydoros, and Athenodoros of Rhodes, *NH* 36.37
2. Astragalizontes, by Polykleitos, *NH* 34.55

Felicitas, aedes

1. Aphrodite, by Praxiteles, *NH* 34.69
2. Bronze statues, by Praxiteles, *NH* 34.69, perhaps Muses (see *NH* 36.36)

Fortuna huiusce Diei, aedes (Campus Martius or Palatine)

1. Eight bronze statues, by Pythagoras of Rhegion, *NH* 34.60
2. Athena, by Pheidias, *NH* 34.54

Horti Serviliani

1. "Flora" (=Persephone?), Triptolemos, and Demeter, by Praxiteles, *NH* 36.23
2. Hestia, by Skopas, *NH* 36.25
3. Apollo, by Kalamis, *NH* 36.36
4. Boxers, by Derkylides, *NH* 36.36
5. Portrait of Kallisthenes, by Amphistratos, *NH* 36.36

Mars, aedes (built for Brutus Callaecus in the Circus Flaminius)

1. Colossal Ares, by Skopas, *NH* 36.26
2. Aphrodite, by Skopas, *NH* 36.26

Palatine: Temple of Apollo

1. Leto, by Kephisodotos son of Praxiteles, *NH* 36.24
2. Apollo from Rhamnous, by Skopas, *NH* 36.25
3. Archaic statues from Chios, *NH* 36.13
4. Artemis, by Timotheus, *NH* 36.32
5. Oxen, by Myron, Propertius 2.31.5-8

Porticus Metelli

1. Granikos Monument, by Lysippos, *NH* 34.64
2. Jupiter (Zeus) in temple of Jupiter Stator, by Pasiteles, *NH* 36.40

Porticus Octaviae

1. Eros of Thespiae, by Praxiteles, *NH* 36.22
2. Artemis, by Kephisodotos son of Praxiteles, *NH* 36.23
3. Asklepios, by Kephisodotos son of Praxiteles, *NH* 36.23
4. Juno (Hera), in Juno Temple, by Dionysios, *NH* 36.35
5. Jupiter (Zeus), in Jupiter Temple, by Polykles and Dionysios, *NH* 36.35
6. Aphrodite, by Philiskos, *NH* 36.35
7. Pan and Olympos, by Heliodoros, *NH* 36.35
8. Aphrodite bathing, by Doidalsas (? reading uncertain), *NH* 36.35
9. Aphrodite standing, by Polycharmos, *NH* 36.35

Templum Pacis

1. Portrait of the athlete Cheimon, by Naukydes, Pausanias 6.9.3

Thermae Agrippae

1. Apoxymenos, by Lysippos, *NH* 34.62

Location Uncertain

1. Apollo, by Praxiteles, *NH* 36.23
2. Poseidon, by Praxiteles, *NH* 36.23
3. Bonus Eventus (=Triptolemos?), by Euphranor, *NH* 34.77
4. Herakles, by Polykleitos, *NH* 34.56
5. Muses, brought to Rome by Fulvius Nobilior from Ambracia, *NH* 35.66
6. Odysseus, by Onatas, Pausanias 5.25.8
7. Amazon, by Strongylion, *NH* 34.82

Painting

Apollo Sosianus, aedes

1. Tragic actor and a boy, by Aristeides, *NH* 35.99

Augustus, Divus, Templum

1. Hyakinthos, by Nikias, *NH* 35.131

Capitoline

1. Theseus, by Parrhasios, *NH* 35.69
2. Rape of Persephone, by Nikomachos (near chapel of Iuventas), *NH* 35.108
3. Victory in a quadriga, by Nikomachos, *NH* 35.108
4. Old man with a lyre teaching a boy, by Aristeides, in the temple of Fides, *NH* 35.100

Ceres, templum (Aventine)

1. Dionysos and Ariadne, by Aristeides, *NH* 35.24 and 99

Concordia, aedes et templum

1. Dionysos, by Nikias, *NH* 35.131
2. Marsyas bound, by Zeuxis, *NH* 35.66

Curia Julia

1. Nemea, by Nikias, *NH* 35.131

Domus Tiberiana (?)

1. Archigallos, by Parrhasios, *NH* 35.70

Forum Augusti

1. Castor and Pollux with Nike and Alexander, by Apelles, *NH* 35.93 (cf. *NH* 35.27)
2. Alexander and Polemos, by Apelles, *NH* 35.94 (cf. *NH* 35.27)

Forum Iulium (temple of Venus Genetrix)

1. Ajax, by Timomachos, *NH* 35.136
2. Medea, by Timomachos, *NH* 35.136

Iulius, Divus, aedes

1. Aphrodite Anadyomene, by Apelles, *NH* 35.91

Porticus Octaviae

1. Hesione, by Antiphilos, *NH* 35.114
2. Alexander, Philip, and Athena, by Antiphilos, *NH* 35.114

Porticus Philippi

1. Dionysos, by Antiphilos, *NH* 35.114
2. Hippolytos, by Antiphilos, *NH* 35.114
3. Helen, by Zeuxis, *NH* 35.66
4. Alexander as a boy, by Antiphilos, 34.114

Porticus Pompei

1. Alexander, by Nikias, *NH* 35.132
2. Kalypso, by Nikias, *NH* 35.132
3. Figure with a shield, by Polygnotos, *NH* 35.59
4. Sacrifice of Oxen, by Pausias, *NH* 35.126
5. Kadmos and Europa, by Antiphilos, *NH* 35.114

Templum Pacis

1. Skylla, by Nikomachos, *NH* 35.109
2. Hero, by Timanthes, *NH* 35.74

Location Uncertain

1. Paintings by Pausias, *NH* 35.127
2. Centaur Family, by Zeuxis (sent to Rome by Sulla, perhaps destroyed before arrival), Lucian, *Zeuxis* 3.