

2007

Greeks Make It; Etruscans Fecit: the Stigma of Plagiarism in the Reception of Etruscan Art

Vedia Izzet

University of Southampton, UK

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/etruscan_studies

Recommended Citation

Izzet, Vedia (2007) "Greeks Make It; Etruscans Fecit: the Stigma of Plagiarism in the Reception of Etruscan Art," *Etruscan Studies*: Vol. 10, Article 18.

Available at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/etruscan_studies/vol10/iss1/18

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Etruscan Studies by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

*Greeks make it; Etruscans fecit:
the stigma of plagiarism
in the reception of Etruscan Art*

BY VEDIA IZZET

I
—

*“The Etruscans were a rich but artistically immature and impoverished people, and they became ready and receptive customers for anything exotic that the Euboeans could bring them ...”*¹

Such is the damning opinion of Etruscan culture in Sir John Boardman’s treatment of archaic Mediterranean interaction. The purpose of this paper is to explore the treatment of Etruscan art by three prominent British Classical archaeologists of the mid-20th century, and to examine the origins of such treatment. The importance of this lies in exposing the negative opinion in which the Etruscans are held in the wider discipline of Classical archaeology. Etruscologists are, of course, aware of the importance and originality of the Etruscan achievement. However, in the parallel discipline of Classical archaeology this is not the case, and it is often through the narratives of Classical archaeology, such as Boardman’s *The Greeks Overseas*, that students are first introduced to the Etruscans. The Hellenocentric bias in such accounts is obvious, but if we are to eliminate such bias, we must be aware of its penetration, and of its origins. To do this, it is necessary to go back to the origins of the intersecting disciplines of Etruscology and Classical Archaeology. It is possible to discern and outline the early debates, led by J. J. Winckelmann, which set the course, however indirectly, for subsequent analyses of the Etruscans. Beginning with the earliest interest in Etruscan culture, it is possible to trace their vacillating popularity, and to show how the Etruscans have been drawn into debates over cultural authenticity and legitimacy, debates which are deeply embedded in the discipline of Classical Archaeology.

11
—

First, we must explore the tone of discussions of the Etruscans in British Classical Archaeology after the second World War. Drawing on the work of three prominent writers, John Beazley, Robert Cook and John Boardman, this section examines the ways in which the Etruscans, and in particular their art, has been considered.² To begin, I turn to an often-quoted section of John Boardman’s *The Greeks Overseas*:

“The difference in the reactions of the two peoples is a measure of the difference in their quality and originality. The Greeks chose, adapted, and assimilated until they produced a material culture which was wholly Greek, despite all the superficial inspiration which the east provided. The Etruscans accepted all they were offered, without discrimination. They copied ... with little understanding of the forms and subjects which served as models. They had their gold worked into extravagant pastiches of eastern jewellery, and gave the Greeks the metal they wanted in return for what was often hardly more than the bright beads with which to dazzle natives”³

From Boardman’s account it would seem that in the face of Eastern contact, Greeks produced something that was truly their own, of a high quality, original, and distinctive; the Etruscans on the other hand, when faced with the same influences, copied without discrimination or understanding in order to produce nothing but pastiche. The reasons for this lie in a distinct absence of artistic flair in the Etruscans:

“... the Etruscans had no strong existing artistic tradition,” which meant that when they did come into contact with “real” art they were immediately impressed by it. They adopted it uncritically because they did not have the innate ability to transform what they saw into something original.⁴

The obvious structure which underlies these discussions of Etruscan and Greek contact is the comparison drawn between the two cultures. Boardman’s use of the Etruscans as a foil for the Greeks is made explicit in the beginning to another chapter on the Etruscans in a volume which has received less attention than *The Greeks Overseas*, that is *Pre-Classical*:

“The art of Etruria has attracted far more attention than it deserves, and it earns a place in this book ... for the revealing contrast it affords to the achievements of the Greeks, and for the way it shows what the effect of Greek art could be on a relatively primitive people.”⁵

For Boardman then, Etruscan art is only instructive as a way of highlighting the Greek artistic achievement. The sophistication and historical importance of Greek art can be defined against the more primitive Etruscan art, highlighting the superiority of the former. The creativity, originality and simplicity of Greek Art is contrasted with the flamboyance and vulgarity of Etruscan material culture.⁶ In addition, the comparison is useful in demonstrating the effect of a superior culture on an inferior one; this recalls the mention of “natives” above, and with it, the importance of the role of the Greeks as the cultural missionaries of the ancient Mediterranean.

In a significant early essay on the subject John Beazley used the same comparative device for examining Etruscan mirrors. Cutting across media, he compares the field of the bronze mirror to the tondo of a Greek cup.⁷ Later, the comparison between the

two cultures is taken further: concerning the qualities of Classical Etruscan mirrors, Beazley says that “it varies greatly in quality: but at its best it is very Greek,”⁸ thus setting the Greek model as the standard by which all others are judged.

In *Etruscan Vase-Painting*, Beazley takes the comparative device a step further by comparing actual Greek and Etruscan objects.⁹ On the first page of the first chapter he singles out two vases, an Etruscan black figure amphora from the Vatican, and “the *original* from which it was *imitated*, an Attic vase picture of about 560 BC.”¹⁰

The unique relationship between Etruscans and Greeks, and the indebtedness of the former to the latter is also central to Robert Cook’s view of Etruscan art. He says, “if one subtracts its Greek constituent, what remains is a jumble of mostly incompetent deviations without any positive stylistic unity.”¹¹ In the area of pottery, he claims Greek influence “improved” both the shapes and technique of Etruscan *bucchero*, which he concedes was “their one area of excellence.”¹² Etruscan art is judged in terms of how well it lives up to what Cook calls its “Attic parent.”¹³ Sadly, the resulting “deviations from the Attic standards have no common quality except incompetence”¹⁴ as the local artists showed “no sensitivity to the conventions of the Greek model.”¹⁵

When the Etruscans and Greeks are drawn into comparison with each other the Etruscans can only emerge the inferior. The qualities which characterise fine Greek art are sought in the Etruscan material, and unsurprisingly, can never be found. However, the treatment of Etruscan artefacts is not simply a case of the imposition of an alien set of aesthetic values. The undeniable contact between the two cultures has made comparison almost inevitable. Equally inevitable for the Classical archaeologist are the Greece-tinted spectacles through which the comparison is scrutinised. What emerges is the derivative nature of Etruscan art. The terminology of this particular instance of cultural interaction is that of the copy and the fake, which is in stark contrast to the well-established language of Greek genius. Beazley puts it thus: “if this is Greek, it is Greek spoken with a strong accent.”¹⁶

From these remarks it would seem that the crux of the problem with Etruscan art is not simply that it is bad, but that it is bad because it lacks originality. The best that Etruscan artists could manage was to reproduce Greek forms; they were copyists, who could, sometimes, make a fair job at reproducing Greek originals.

Once Etruscan art is seen in these terms, it becomes imperative to differentiate between Etruscan and Greek workmanship. There must surely be a danger that a “good” copy might get through the scrutiny, masquerading as original Greek production. Such doubts are raised, and then calmed, by Robert Cook: “Etruscan painters sometimes catch the spirit of their models... [but] ...with a little practice it is easy to distinguish by style between genuine Corinthian and most Italocorinthian.”¹⁷ The language used in these considerations of Etruscan art is that used by the art historian in trying to “rumble” a copy or a fake. Several elements of the preceding examination of writing on Etruscan art resonate with the art historian’s description and analysis of copying and faking. The ubiquitous device of comparing Etruscan art with Greek to show the superiority of the latter has direct parallels with Max Friedländer’s discussion of copies. Friedländer says: “The notion of quality is brought out by a comparison between the original and a copy better than by the best definition.”¹⁸ He articulates the difference between a copyist’s skill

and an artist's spontaneity. He points out that no matter how skilful the copyist, he "cannot avoid misunderstandings" and makes mistakes in details of clothing, landscape or narrative.¹⁹ Similarly, for tomb painting, the Etruscan artists are "betrayed by their naïve misunderstanding of Greek subjects"²⁰ and "odd distortions" of forms,²¹ and in gem engraving the Etruscans developed a "distinct Etruscan manner, which shows itself most obviously in clumsiness of proportions and misunderstandings of Greek myth."²² With Greek superiority taken for granted, the Etruscans try to emulate the Greek originals. This results in failure on the part of the Etruscans because, lacking the creative spirit of the Greeks, all they can do is copy. It then becomes the task of the archaeologist to uncover and expose the precise points of influence, copying and forgery.

In response to the criticisms levelled at *The Greeks Overseas*, Boardman suggests that "we would do well to withhold instinctive and highly subjective judgements, at least until the manner in which [Etruscan art] was created and developed has been explored."²³ Boardman is surely right that a careful re-examination of the nature of Greek-Etruscan interaction is essential for a better understanding of Etruscan art; given the importance of cultural contacts at this period, analysis of the fluidity of objects and peoples would, indeed, allow a more nuanced understanding, and this is illustrated in work already undertaken to this end.²⁴ However, this should not be the sole approach; instead, a concurrent examination of the origins of the "instinctive and highly subjective judgements" which have impregnated assessments of Etruscan art in Classical scholarship is necessary. An understanding of the intellectual background of Etruscan studies must form the starting point of such an examination. We must turn to the changing histories of the Etruscans if we are to understand how the Etruscans acquired the label of copyists.

III

Three major strands emerge from the negative view of the Etruscans noted above. The first is the drawing together of Etruscan and Greek art for comparison; the second is the poor quality of Etruscan art; and the third is the view that Etruscans merely copied the Greeks in their art. In the history of the reception of the Etruscans, such views were not, however, always the dominant ones. This is demonstrated by the popularity of the Etruscans in the 16th and 17th century court of Florence, and in the wave of "Etruscomania" which swept European elite circles in the 18th century, testified by the many "Etruscan" rooms in British country houses, and the production of ceramic imitations of "Etruscan vases" in Staffordshire and Naples.²⁵ None the less, despite this popularity, the Etruscans were to fall from their position of high regard to one of marginality. The origins of this marginalisation date to roughly the same time as Etruscomania, and to the origins of Classical archaeology as a discipline, and to the work of J. J. Winckelmann in particular. Although Winckelmann's *History of the Art of Antiquity* was mainly concerned with Greek art, he devotes one book to the Etruscans. In this book, he lays the foundation for the three strands identified above in later writings on the Etruscans.

The first of these strands is the drawing together of Greek and Etruscan art, and

by extension, culture, into comparison. In his first chapter, on reflections on the character of the people, he says that the Greeks, “not content with having civilised the barbarian Etruscans [by having taught them the alphabet], taught them their mythology, and their history until the Trojan war, and inspired in them a love of the arts.”²⁶ That he believes that the Greeks were the civilizing force, teaching their uncultured Etruscan neighbours, is evident in his treatment of Etruscan art: it was the Greeks who “gave them the regular forms characteristic of works of art.”

Similarly, at the end of his discussion of Etruscan art, in order to illustrate his case, he reverts to a comparison between Etruscan and Greek art:

“in general, this style of the Etruscans, set side by side with that of the Greeks, could be compared to a youth, deprived of the benefits of a good education, abandoned to the ardour of his passions, and the whims of his spirit, which lead him to violent acts, while the Greek style would resemble a fine young man, for whom the passion of youth has been moderated by sound principles and a reasoned humanity, and whose favourable person would join a modest bearing to a grand and imposing air.”²⁷

The comparison between the two cultures, and the resulting positive light in which the Greeks are seen is the genesis of the comparisons we find in the 20th century passages examined above. In addition, we see articulated here the notion implied in Boardman, that the Etruscans were incapable of taking the opportunity which they had been presented of learning from the Greeks.

The setting together of Greek and Etruscan art is made all the more striking in the first book of *History of the Art of Antiquity*, the first chapter of which is devoted to the essence of art in general. The consideration of Greek and Etruscan art together is highlighted by the difference he constructs between these and Egyptian art. For Winckelmann, the art of the Egyptians is like a tree whose growth is interrupted, and so remains the same forever. By contrast, the arts of Etruria and Greece are both compared to water: Etruscan art is like a torrent, flowing impetuously from rock to rock; in contrast Greek art resembles a river with limpid water, watering fertile valleys, and not causing inundation or excess.²⁸ From the very beginning of his history then, Winckelmann draws Greek and Etruscan art together for comparison, so that even when he does not explicitly invite this, the reader is already familiar with the framework. It is this element of comparison between the two cultures which so dominates modern British writing on Etruscan art. The Greeks and the Etruscans are extremes of the same spectrum: Etruscan art is “skolios,” whereas Greek art is “orthos.”²⁹

In this way Winckelmann implicitly comments on Etruscan art even when discussing Greek art. In his preface he states that the principal object of the work is Greek art, reiterated in the second chapter of his treatment of Greek art, when he states that the preceding examinations of Egyptian and Etruscan art were only the prelude to the proper subject of the book.³⁰ Etruscan (and Egyptian) art is placed in a secondary position to Greek art. The hierarchy which is echoed so clearly in modern writers has its genesis in this construc-

tion. Greek art is qualitatively better than Etruscan art because the Greeks attain perfect beauty, and create the sublime, whereas the Etruscans created only the imperfect.

This disdain for Etruscan art is the second strand of the 20th century British criticisms which can be traced back to Winckelmann. Throughout his discussion of Etruscan art, Winckelmann is guarded at best. Towards the end of the second chapter of his book on the Etruscans, Winckelmann gives a general stylistic account of Etruscan art, consisting of three different stages: the first, simple and primitive phase, the second period of their perfection, and the third phase of degeneration under Roman rule.³¹ The first, Archaic, style has two characteristics: that it is forced and rigid, and that it was based in an imperfect idea of beauty. The first is manifest in the thin, emaciated spindle-like figures, with no musculature, which leads him to conclude that the archaic style lacked variety. Imperfect beauty is evident in the oval heads, the pointed chins, the sloping eyes, and upturned corners of the mouth.³² With regard to the poses of figures in the archaic style, the figures have their arms attached to their sides and their feet placed parallel to each other. These characteristics led to Archaic Etruscan art being rather heavy, largely due to an inability to draw from nature. With increasing knowledge, Etruscan art was able to abandon the archaic style, and move forward to the second style of its history.³³

The second style of Etruscan art is, according to Winckelmann, characterised by an extreme articulation of musculature, the depiction of hair arranged in bands, and affected movements and poses, which appear forced or awkward. Muscles are extremely full and too strongly pronounced, and give too strong an impression of strain. In sum the style is forced and *outré*, as opposed to natural, soft, and gracious.³⁴ As proof of Etruscan excess, he cites a Mercury with the (inappropriate) muscles of a Hercules, and describes in minute anatomical detail the musculature and underlying skeleton visible in figures on a gem.³⁵

However, it is in the discussion of the third phase of Etruscan art that Winckelmann introduces the third of the strands echoed by later writers, that the Etruscans copied the Greeks, while simultaneously corroborating the points about the crudity of Etruscan workmanship. The third style in Etruscan art saw the increased influence of the Greeks, who, having taken possession of Etruria and built cities, started to cultivate the arts; here they were able to enlighten the Etruscans. The result was an influx of Greek scenes and craftsmen, and the gradual decline of Etruscan art. Proof of this is found in medals and coins, where, eventually, one finds that the heads of divinities perfectly resemble the heads of Greek statues.³⁶ According to Winckelmann the third and decadent style is marked by the absence of recognisably Etruscan art, in favour of the reproduction of Greek models. In other words, the loss of the distinct and original character of Etruscan art resulted in the decline of Etruscan art, as artists increasingly copied and imitated Greek art.

Winckelmann's treatment of Etruscan art, and the role he gives the Etruscans in the history of art in general, was to influence profoundly the ways in which the Etruscans were characterised by later scholars. In addition, the wider notions expressed in, and resulting from, Winckelmann's ideas about beauty and its creation, were to affect perceptions of Etruscan culture in a much broader sense. For Winckelmann, beauty is the essential of art, and beauty is impossible to imitate. When describing what constitutes good or beautiful art, Winckelmann first attacks Baroque art as vulgar and "utterly corrupted." The elaboration and flamboyance of the work of Bernini is condemned as lacking harmony.³⁷ For Winckelmann, true beauty lies

in simplicity, unity and harmony.³⁸ This is found in ideal beauty, which is the sum of the beautiful parts of many individual examples of beauty.³⁹ The age of man most associated with beauty is youth: “here more than in manhood, the artist found the cause of beauty, in unity, variety and harmony.”⁴⁰ It is Winckelmann’s discussion of youth as the greatest age of true beauty which gives a hint at the way in which his ideas were to affect the Etruscans so dramatically. In order to sustain his point that youth is the true representation of beauty, he argues that

“in the engraved gems, and the copies from them, by which it is seen that aged heads are imitated by modern artists better and more accurately than beautiful young heads. A connoisseur might probably doubt, at first glance, as to the antiquity of an aged head upon an engraved gem; but he will be able to decide with more confidence upon the copy of a youthful ideal head.”⁴¹

According to Winckelmann, then, it is easier to tell the forged head of a youth than that of an aged figure. This is because the youth possesses the essence of beauty which is not copiable. According to such an argument, then, copies cannot be beautiful. The simplicity and purity of Greek art lies not just in its lines and form but in the nature of its production. Greek art is produced by artists who make original, essentially beautiful objects, free from the artifice and deceit of copying.

Winckelmann’s influence was immense. Editions of the *History* were produced in French and Italian, each of which ran to several editions. However, an (excerpted) English edition was not to appear until 1850. Until then Winckelmann’s ideas were transmitted to an English-reading audience through the work of Pierre d’Hancarville in his catalogue of Sir William Hamilton’s vases, the first volume of which was published in 1766. The importance of the Catalogue in determining British tastes cannot be underestimated. D’Hancarville drew heavily on Winckelmann in the catalogue, to the extent that some sections are paraphrases or loose translations of Winckelmann’s words (most pertinently here for instance, his section on the Etruscans).⁴² More importantly, d’Hancarville adopted Winckelmann’s notions of beauty and the importance of originality. Here the freedom of the artist is emphasised.⁴³ In both the first two volumes, d’Hancarville stresses that good art can only be produced with the independence and freedom of the artist. However this means more than political freedom. What concerns d’Hancarville most is the freedom from previous models and schools.⁴⁴ In other words, good art is art which is original, and does not slavishly copy the work of others.

IV

In an aesthetic environment which valued originality, the Etruscans fell from favour. The different strands of the reception of Etruscan culture outlined above are of importance beyond the 18th century. The characterisation of the Etruscans as lacking originality which was established in the later part of the 18th century formed the kernel of attitudes developed in the 20th century.

The importance of originality and creativity in the perception of art is at the very

basis of our own culture's production of art objects. During the 20th century, artists from Duchamp to Emin have experimented with the possibilities of mechanical reproduction, and challenged the limits of what constitutes "the art world." The precarious status of the art object has been questioned and highlighted, and at the same time reaffirmed by the mechanism of the gallery context. Recent debates, such as that between Rosalind Krauss and Albert Elsen, over the "authenticity" of posthumous bronze and marble casts of Rodins, or unauthorised sculptures made from waxes made by Degas, serve to highlight the importance of establishing authorship in the production of art.⁴⁵ At the same time, an obsession with authentication (both through so-called scientific methods, and through the eye of the connoisseur), and the discovery of forgeries and fakes has reaffirmed the importance of originality in perceptions of art. In turn, forgers such as Han van Meegeren and Eric Hebborn insist that it is the art market and critic who is the fake, by not being able to spot the difference between an original or fake Vermeer.⁴⁶ Both artistic production, and the study and perception of art have revolved around the establishment of the authentic and the original.

Classical studies have not been immune to debates surrounding authenticity and originality. In order to illustrate the ways in which concern over authenticity has infused the discipline of Classical archaeology two examples will suffice: ancient sculpture and painting. The Romans were the first to acknowledge their debt to Greece (Horace *Epistles* 2. 1. 156), and as a result, areas of Roman culture where Greek precedent can be found became seen as derivative. This was particularly true during the 19th century, no doubt partly due to the increasing importance of specifically Hellenic (as opposed to Classical) studies after the installation of the Elgin marbles in the British Museum.⁴⁷ Since then, Romanists have implemented two main lines of argument in attempting to redeem the Romans.

The first has been to insist on the originality of Roman culture. In 1907, in the Introduction to *Roman Sculpture*, Eugenie Strong outlined contemporary attitudes: "most people nowadays conceive of the Romans as aliens within the sphere of the formative arts, confining achievement there to imitation, or at most to adaption of Greek models."⁴⁸ Strong's efforts to breathe life back into Roman sculpture for an English-speaking audience takes the form of denying the imitation and lack of originality. With Winckhoff, she insists that instead of simply producing bland copies in "an insignificant and imitative episode," Roman sculptors did make a contribution to the development of sculpture.⁴⁹ The "aesthetic advance" which was the Roman sculptor's achievement was in freeing sculptural compositions from the "trammels of "frontality."⁵⁰ The "individuality and independence"⁵¹ of Roman sculpture in the history of art is thus established by its "profoundly original character."⁵² Strong uses a specific, original artistic element which the Romans contributed to the development of sculpture in order to prove her case.

In recent studies of Roman poetry, Borges' story "Pierre Menard, author of the *Quixote*"⁵³ has been used as an illustration of the originality of texts which allude heavily to previous authors.⁵⁴ Menard's exact replication of Cervantes' 17th-century words evoke entirely new resonances in the 19th.⁵⁵ The same story illustrates the second way in which Roman art regained legitimacy during the 20th century: the use of Greek art in a Roman context leads the copy to be just as original as the Greek originals themselves. The

re-use and manipulation of existing forms is seen as original in itself.⁵⁶ Such an approach is evident in the work of modern scholars, where the originality of the re-use in a Roman context over-rides the fact of being a copy.⁵⁷

For Romanists these two approaches (finding something original, and the originality of re-use) have reinstated some sense of Roman authenticity. However, the importance of Roman authenticity, or lack of it, is not restricted to Romanists. For Hellenists, lack of Roman originality is crucial. Without Roman copies there would be very little for the students of Greek sculpture to contemplate. In the absence of many Greek originals, Roman copies are drawn into discussions of Greek sculpture, as valuable “sources.”⁵⁸

Similarly, in discussions of ancient painting, Hellenists argue for very close copies of Greek originals by Roman painters. For example, in a discussion of *Theseus Triumphant* from Herculaneum, Martin Robertson argues:

“the hero is so close to Greek sculptural creations of the fourth century B.C. that it is natural to think it copied from a painting of that time. Nothing in the fine composition seems to me to contradict the idea that the whole work is of such derivation”⁵⁹

Given that so few Greek paintings survive, for the Hellenist it is essential that the Romans copied faithfully and accurately if a history of Greek painting is to be possible.

For the Romanist, by contrast, such a derivative view of Roman painting is intolerable. Roger Ling argues that during the Augustan principate “a new Roman cultural identity emerged, incorporating major contributions from Greek literature, art and thought, but with indigenous elements too, and expressing an essentially Roman outlook.”⁶⁰ For Ling, the same *Theseus Triumphant* is included in a list of “the finest and best know-known examples of the genre” of the Fourth Style of Roman wall painting.⁶¹

The verity of Roman copies to Greek originals, their value as sources, or the unique contributions they make, in either sculpture or painting, is not my concern here. Rather, the preceding examples demonstrate the ways in which, in the writing of Classical archaeology, creativity and originality are bound up with the perceived worth of an ancient culture. What is important here is the premium placed on originality, or lack of it, in the different discourses on ancient art.

V

To return to the question of the value of Etruscan art, it is obvious that the scorn which characterises writing on the subject is part of a much broader discourse about art in general. We have seen the importance of ridding the Romans of the taint of copying, and so, by extension, forgery. It seems appropriate then to do the same for the Etruscans: to shake the stigma of forgery from the Etruscans too. I have not argued for the ways in which Etruscan culture made a unique contribution to ancient art, or to the development of Western art in general. This is already underway: the influence of Etruscan ceramic

forms on the repertoire of the Athenian potter has been well established,⁶² and aspects of specifically Etruscan art have been outlined.⁶³ My interest has been in why the label of copyists adhered so strongly to the Etruscans.

By the later 18th century, through the work of Winckelmann among others, originality had become exclusively associated with ancient Greece; by contrast, the Etruscans were shown to have been masquerading as Greeks — especially as, by this time, the highly prized painted vases thought to have been Etruscan were now known to have been of Greek manufacture.⁶⁴ In an intellectual environment which increasingly favoured the unique and original, in combination with the preference for simplicity and purity of line, it is not surprising that the Etruscans fell out of favour in the tasteful circles of the European intellectual classes. According to Robert Cook, “the students of the eighteenth century did two services to vase-painting; they discovered it and recognised it as Greek.”⁶⁵ The result was that the Etruscans became increasingly marginalised in the inquiry into antiquity, and became nothing more than copyists of Greek genius.

The 20th-century analyses of the ancient Mediterranean must be seen within this framework. When scholars such as Beazley, Boardman and Cook began their pioneering studies of Greek vases and culture, originality and homogeneity formed the foundation of understandings of the ancient world. The distaste for the Etruscans which was felt in British academic circles at this time should thus be seen as an unease with “falsity” that has its origins in the artistic discourse developed by Winckelmann, at a time that was crucial for the development of the discipline of Etruscology.

Vedia Izzet

Archeology, University of Southampton

e-mail: vi@soton.ac.uk

NOTES

1. Boardman 1964, 210; 1999, 199
2. Of course such an enquiry cannot be comprehensive. The authors I have selected are particularly prominent in the field. In some instances their remarks have been particularly outspoken, yet this does not, in itself, undermine the representativeness of their writing when examining 20th century Classical Archaeology. Discussions of Etruscan archaeology by non-Classical archaeologists is part of a different tradition, beyond the scope of this article. It is one in which the specificity of Etruscan culture is almost lost within in the wider category of Iron Age European cultures: see for example, Kristiansen 1998.
3. Boardman 1964, 210-211.
4. Boardman 1967, 157; see also 1967, 168; 1993, 349. Similarly Beazley 1947, v; Cook 1960, 148
5. Boardman 1967, 155.

6. Boardman 1967, 157.
7. Beazley 1949, 1.
8. Beazley 1949, 4.
9. A book which begins with the word “Greek” with a very big capital ‘G’.
10. Beazley 1947, 1, my italics. For further examples see Beazley 1947, 3 and 4.
11. Cook 1981, 8.
12. Cook 1960, 148; Cook 1981, 50. This is a type of pottery which the Greeks did not produce, so perhaps it is not surprising that the Etruscans excelled here. Similarly, there is a grudging recognition of Etruscan skill in bronze working: ‘the ready availability of metals encouraged the bronze-smiths to produce works which in size and occasionally in quality can compare well with those of the Greeks themselves’ though they contain a characteristically Etruscan ‘coarse vigour’ (Boardman 1967, 164; see also Cook 1981, 164).
13. Cook 1960, 149.
14. Cook 1960, 191.
15. Cook 1960, 151.
16. Beazley 1947, 4
17. Cook 1960, 150.
18. Friedländer 1942, 232.
19. Friedländer 1942, 235, 240, 259. Interestingly M. Bieber’s method for discriminating between Roman copies and Greek originals works on the same principle, using the “mistakes” in the details of clothing in order to spot the copies: Bieber 1977, 10-19).
20. Boardman 1967, 158, my italics.
21. Boardman 1967, 156.
22. Cook 1960, 169; see also Beazley 1947, 2.
23. Boardman 1994, 226.
24. For example, Rasmussen 1985; Small 1994; Spivey 1997; Haynes 2005.
25. Beard 1978; Borsi 1985; Cipriani 1980; Cockrane 1961; Cook 1960, 290; Cristofani 1978; 1979; De Grummond 1986, 29-39; Govi 1992; Haynes 1992; Leighton and Castellino 1990; Martelli 1977; Pallottino 1977; Rykwert 1980; Tait 1993;
26. Winckelmann 1802, 222. This and the following translations from Winckelmann are my own, from the 1802 Paris edition.
27. Winckelmann 1802, 270.
28. Winckelmann 1802, 1
29. Winckelmann 1802, 22.
30. Winckelmann 1850, 27.
31. Winckelmann 1802, 262.
32. Winckelmann 1802, 263.
33. Winckelmann 1802, 264-5.
34. Winckelmann 1802, 266-268.
35. Winckelmann 1802, 269.
36. Winckelmann 1802, 272-3.
37. Winckelmann 1850, 35, 36, 49, 51.
38. Winckelmann 1850, 43.

- 39 Winckelmann 1850, 45.
- 40 Winckelmann 1850, 47.
- 41 Winckelmann 1850, 49-50.
- 42 D'Hancarville 1766, 26-51.
43. Again drawing on Winckelmann: d'Hancarville 1766, ii-xxv, esp. xiv.
44. See especially d'Hancarville 1766, xiv; xvi.
45. See Hughes and Ranfft 1997, 3 and associated bibliography.
46. Hebborn 1997, 11-12; Werness 1983. I am grateful to Michael Rainey for many discussions about Eric Hebborn.
47. Jenkyns 1991, 1-39.
48. Strong 1907, 1.
49. Strong 1907, 8.
50. Strong 1907. 20.
51. Strong 1907, 10.
52. Strong 1907, 8.
53. Borges 1964.
54. Witnessed, for example, by the resurgence of interest in Ovid by 20th century Classicists. On allusion in Roman literature see Hinds 1998.
55. "Cervante's text and Menard's are verbally identical, but the second is almost infinitely richer." (Borges 1964, 42).
56. "Imitation is never *just* imitation." (Finley 1972, 106).
57. Beard and Henderson 2001; Gazda 1991; Marvin 1997; Richter 1955; Vermeule 1977.
58. Boardman 1985, 15-18; Ridgeway 1984, 1-11; Stewart 1990, 24-7).
59. Robertson 1959, 179.
60. Ling 1991, 3. See also his chapter 6.
61. Ling 1991, 124-5.
62. Rasmussen 1985.
63. Spivey 1997.
64. see Sparkes 1996 for a readily accessible account.
65. Cook 1960, 292.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beard, G. 1978. *The Work of Robert Adam*. Edinburgh.
- Beard, M. and J. Henderson. 2001. *Classical Art: from Greece to Rome*. Oxford.
- Bieber, M. 1977. *Ancient Copies: Contributions to the History of Greek and Roman Art*. New York.
- Black, J. 1992. *The British Abroad. The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century*. Stroud.
- Boardman, J. 1964. *The Greeks Overseas*. Harmondsworth.
- Boardman, J. 1967. *Pre-Classical. From Crete to Archaic Greece*. Harmondsworth.
- Boardman, J. 1985. *Greek Sculpture. The Classical Period*. London.

- Boardman, J. 1994. *The Diffusion of Classical Art in Antiquity*. London.
- Boardman, J. 1996. *Greek Art*. (Fourth edition) London.
- Boardman, J. 1999. *The Greeks Overseas*. (Fourth edition) London.
- Borsi, G.F., ed. 1985. *Fortuna degli Etruschi*. Milan.
- Budd, M. 1995. *Values of Art. Pictures, Poetry and Music*. Harmondsworth.
- Cipriani, G. 1980. *Il mito etrusco del rinascimento fiorentino*. Florence.
- Cockrane, E.W. 1961. "Tradition and Enlightenment in the Tuscan Academies 1690-1800." *Storia e Letteratura* 85: 1-268.
- Cook, R.M. 1960. *Greek Painted Pottery*. London.
- Cook, R.M. 1981. *Greek Art. Its Development, Character and Influence*. Harmondsworth. First published 1972.
- Cristofani, M. 1976. "Winckelmann, Heyne, Lanzi e l'arte Etrusca." *Prospettiva* 4: 16-20.
- Cristofani, M. 1978. "Sugli inizi dell' 'Etruscheria': la pubblicazione del *de Etruria Regali* di Thomas Dempster." *MÉFRA*: 90: 577-625.
- Cristofani, M. 1979. "Per una storia del collezionismo archeologico nella Toscana granducale." *Prospettiva* 17: 4-15.
- Cristofani, M. 1983. *La Scoperta degli Etruschi. Archeologia e Antiquaria nel 700*. Rome.
- De Grummond, N.T. 1982. "The history of the study of Etruscan mirrors." In *A Guide to Etruscan Mirrors*. Edited by N.T. de Grummond, 1-7. Tallahassee.
- De Grummond, N. 1986. "Rediscovery." In *Etruscan Life and Afterlife. A Handbook of Etruscan Studies*. Edited by L. Bonfante, 18-46. Warminster.
- d'Hancarville, Baron (P.-F. Hugues). 1766-76. *Collection of Etruscan, Greek and Roman Antiquities from the Cabinet of the Hon.ble W.m Hamilton His Britannick Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary at the Court of Naples*. Naples. In four volumes.
- d'Hancarville, Baron (P.-F. Hugues). 1785. *Recherches sur l'Origine, L'Esprit et les Progrès des Arts de la Grèce; sur leurs connections avec les arts et la Religion des plus anciens peuples connus; sur les monuments antiques de l'Inde, de la Perse, du reste de l'Asie, de l'Europe et de l'Égypte*. London.
- Dutton, D., ed. 1983. *The Forger's Art. Forgery and the Philosophy of Art*. Berkeley & Los Angeles.
- Finley, M.I. 1972. "Etruscheria." In M.I. Finley, *Aspects of Antiquity. Discoveries and Controversies*, 99-109. Harmondsworth. First published in 1964 in *The New York Review*.
- Gazda, E. 1991. *Roman Art in the Private Sphere: New Perspectives on the Architecture and décor of the Domus, Villa and Insula*, Ann Arbor.
- Girouard, M. 1978. *Life in the English Country House*. Harmondsworth.
- Govi, C.M. 1992. "Le 'style étrusque.'" In *Les Etrusques et l'Europe*. Edited by P. Parlavacchia, 300-309. Paris.
- Greenhalgh, M. 1978. *The Classical Tradition in Art*. London.
- Harris, J. 1994. *The Palladian Revival. Lord Burlington, his Villa and Garden at Chiswick*. New Haven & London.
- Haskell, F. 1984. "The Baron d'Hancarville: an adventurer and art historian in eighteenth century Europe." In *Oxford China and Italy. Writings in Honour of Sir Harold*

- Acton on his Eightieth Birthday*. Edited by E. Chaney and N. Ritchie, 177-191. Florence. (Reprinted in Haskell, F. 1987. *Past and Present in Art and Taste. Selected Essays*: 30-45. New Haven & London.)
- Haskell, F., and N. Penny, eds. 1981. *Taste and the Antique. The Lure of Classical Sculpture 1500-1900*. New Haven & London.
- Haynes, S. 1992. "La Grand Bretagne et les Etrusques." In *Les Etrusques et l'Europe*. Edited by P. Parlavecchia, 310-315. Paris.
- Haynes, S. 2005. *Kulturgeschichte der Etrusker*. Mainz.
- Hebborn, E. 1997. *Art Forger's Handbook*. Overlook.
- Hibbert, C. 1987. *The Grand Tour*. London.
- Hinds, S. 1997. *Allusion and Intertext: the dynamics of appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge.
- Hoffmann, H. 1979. "In the wake of Beazley. Prologomena to an anthropological study of Greek vase-painting." *Hephaistos* 1: 61-70.
- Hughes, A. 1997. "Authority, authenticity and aura: Walter Benjamin and the case of Michaelangelo." In *Sculpture and its Reproductions*. Edited by A. Hughes and E. Ranfft, 29-45 London.
- Hughes, A. and E. Ranfft, 1997. "Introduction." In *Sculpture and its Reproductions*. Edited by A. Hughes, and E. Ranfft: 1-6. London.
- Hughes, A., and E. Ranfft, eds. 1997. *Sculpture and its Reproductions*. London.
- Jenkins, I. 1983. "Frederic Lord Leighton and Greek vases." *BurlMag* 125: 597-605.
- Jenkins, I. 1988. "Adam Buck and the vogue for Greek vases." *BurlMag* 130: 448-457.
- Jenkyns, R. 1991. *Dignity and Decadence. Victorian Art and the Classical Inheritance*. London.
- Leighton, R., and C. Castelino. 1990. "Thomas Dempster and Ancient Etruria: a review of the autobiography and *de Etruria Regali*." *PBSR* 58: 337-52.
- Lyons, C. L. 1992. "The Museo Mastrilli and the culture of collecting in Naples, 1700-1755." *Journal of the History of Collections* 4: 1-26.
- Martelli, M. 1977. "Un disegno attributo a Leonardo e una scoperta archeologica degli inizi del Cinquecento." *Prospettiva* 10: 58-61.
- Marvin, M. 1997. "Roman sculptural reproductions, or Polykleitos: the sequel." In *Sculpture and its Reproductions*. Edited by A. Hughes, and E. Ranfft: 7-28. London.
- Pallottino, M. 1977. "Vasari e la Chimera." *Prospettiva* 8: 4-6.
- Potts, A. 1994. *Flesh and the Ideal. Winckelmann and the Origins of Art History*. New Haven and London.
- Ramage, N. 1990. "Sir William Hamilton as collector, exporter and dealer: the acquisition and dispersal of his collections." *AJA* 94: 469-480.
- Ramage, N. 1992. "Goods, graves and Scholars: 18th-Century archaeologists in Britain and Italy." *AJA* 96: 653-661.
- Richter, G.M.A. 1955. *Ancient Italy. A Study of the Interrelations of its People as shown in their Arts*. Ann Arbor.
- Ridgway, B.S. 1984. *Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture: the Problem of the Originals*. Ann Arbor.

- Rykwert, J. 1980. *The First Moderns. The Architects of the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge (MA) & London.
- Schnapp, A. 1996. *The Discovery of the Past*. London.
- Schwartz, H. 1996. *The Culture of the Copy. Striking Likeness, Unreasonable Facsimiles*. New York.
- Small, J.P. 1994. 'Eat, drink and be merry: Etruscan banquets.' In *Murlo and the Etruscans. Art and Society in Ancient Etruria*. Edited by R.D. De Puma and J.P. Small: 85-94. Madison, Wisconsin.
- Sparkes, B.A. 1996. "Commonly called Etruscan vases." In B. Sparkes *The Red and the Black. Studies in Greek Pottery*, 34-63 London.
- Spivey, N. J. 1991. "Greek vases in Etruria." In *Looking at Greek Vases*. Edited by T. Rasmussen and N. J. Spivey, 131-150. Cambridge.
- Spivey, N. J. 1997. *Etruscan Art*. London.
- Stewart, A. 1990. *Greek Sculpture. An Exploration*. New Haven and London.
- Strong, E. 1907. *Roman Sculpture. From Augustus to Constantine*. London.
- Tait, A.A. 1993. *Robert Adam. Drawings and Imagination*. Cambridge.
- Vickers, M. 1985-6. "Imaginary Etruscans: changing perceptions of Etruria since the fifteenth century." *Hephaistos* 7-8: 153-67.
- Vickers, M., and D. Gill. 1994, *Artful Crafts. Ancient Greek Silverware and Pottery*. Oxford.
- Vermeule, C. 1977. *Greek Sculpture and Roman Taste: the Purpose and Setting of Graeco-Roman Art in Italy and the Greek Imperial East*. Ann Arbor.
- von Bothmer, D. 1987. "Greek vase painting. Two hundred years of connoisseurship." In *Papers on the Amasis Painter and His World*. Edited by M. True, 184-204. Malibu.
- Werness, H.B. 1983. "Hans van Meegeren fecit." In *The Forger's Art. Forgery and the Philosophy of Art*. Edited by D. Dutton, 1-58. Berkley and Los Angeles.
- Wilton, A., and I. Bignamini, eds. 1996. *Grand Tour. The Lure of Italy in the Eighteenth Century*. London.
- Winckelmann, J.J. 1802. *Histoire de l'Art chez Anciens*. Paris. First published in 1764 as *Geschichte der Kunst der Alterthums* at Dresden.
- Winckelmann, J.J. 1821. *Monumenti Antichi Inediti*. (2nd edition) Rome. First published in 1767 in Rome.
- Winckelmann, J.J. 1850. *History of Ancient Art among the Greeks* (trans. H. Lodge). London.