3

Traders and artisans in archaic central Italy

Christopher Smith

Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the role of traders and artisans in central Italy from the ninth to the end of the sixth century BC.[1] I hope to be able to indicate the central importance of these figures in and for the society and economy of this region at this time, and through two particular crafts, pottery and terracotta decoration of buildings, to show the originality of central Italian artisans, and the sources of the ideas which they transform. In the course of this discussion I hope also to show how these creative arts serve the purposes of the ruling elite.

In this chapter, I wish to draw particular attention to the role of artisans in the emerging urban communities of central Italy. It is striking how little attention the artisan receives; creator, initiator, servant, supplier, the artisan's role is indispensable, and yet much of the focus in discussions of the ancient economy is given to a class which, although it may overlap significantly with that of the artisan, is nevertheless functionally distinct from it: the class of the trader or merchant.

[1] I am grateful for comments from the conference participants; I remain responsible for any errors. This article is dedicated in gratitude to †Mr J. Creed, and to Mr T. Rhodes.

Whilst it is undoubtedly the case that the movement of goods is a great stimulus to social, political and economic development, there is a serious problem with omitting the artisan from our accounts of such developments. In the first place, artisans are not necessarily static individuals, constrained to remain forever in their workshops. Quite the opposite; certain crafts are necessary in any community, and therefore the great colonising movement from the eighth century in the Mediterranean requires the movement of artisans. At Pithecusa, we have indisputable evidence for metal-workers and potters (Ridgway 1992, 83–103).

There is clearly a problem here, for it is equally true that artisans do not have to move in order for their products to move. La Rocca believed that he had identified a group of itinerant Greek potters from a hoard in Rome; an idea not only unlikely since much of the pottery has since been shown to be local imitation, but also unnecessary, since from other evidence we can show quite clearly that there was a considerable movement of goods around the Mediterranean at precisely the time that this pottery was being produced, and that the end-point of some of this production was in central Italy (Smith 1996, 80; La Rocca, in Vallet ed. 1982; Bartoloni 1987, 45). It is largely impossible to distinguish between the movement of goods and the movement of artisans since archaeologically there is no difference to be discerned. Nevertheless, on occasions we can prove the movement of artisans, and on occasion we can hope to be able to spot the difference between imitation and original, a particular issue for Etruscan painted pottery. A rigid principle in favour of the movement of artisans only or the movement of goods only is certain to be misplaced, given the diversity and energy of the ancient Mediterranean at this time.

The economy of central Italy in the archaic period

The economic structure of central Italy may be briefly sketched; thanks to the archaeological discoveries of the past century or so, we are now relatively well-informed about the position of the region in the larger Mediterranean context and can fit this pattern into a methodological framework (cf. Cornell 1995; Smith 1996).

In essence we find throughout central Italy an elite which was engaged in conspicuous consumption of wealth on a grand scale, in funerary behaviour and daily life. Hence we find that Etruria and Campania boast significant finds of jewellery and other expensive imports, some of which are found in burials, and others (the more scarce because of the more difficult conditions of survival) in settlements. The wealth required to support this activity presumably came from the extraction of a surplus from a dependent labour force; the point at which slavery replaced tied free labour is unknown, though there have been suggestions that slavery was being introduced to Etruria as early as the fifth century, and the Roman practice of *nexum*, known from the Twelve Tables, indicates a form of debt-bondage (Cornell 1995, 280–3).

The sources of these luxuries were in southern Italy and the east, and thus the process whereby the elite of central Italy demonstrated their social status is indissociable from the great colonisation movement that brought Phoenicians and Greeks to Pithecusa and then to other parts of Italy. Whether the elites pre-existed the arrival of these new opportunities for display is somewhat disputed, but I personally believe that social stratification may be identified in Italian society from the tenth century BC (Smith 1996, 106–25), and that the elite were perfectly situated to exploit the new opportunities which trade and colonisation brought, and moreover, that this was one factor in the success of the Greek colonisation process.

Specifically, we can identify two major areas of influence. One is the Levantine culture of Phoenicia and Syria, which both directly and indirectly (through the orientalising culture of the Greek world) had a major impact; the other is the Hellenic civilisation of mainland Greece and its offshoot in southern Italy. In art and in life, there were models here which the Italians followed. On occasion we can be quite specific about the origin of a certain artistic motif or cultural practice, but on the whole the influence is diffuse and pervasive. For instance, the cults of Hercules and Demeter and Persephone seem at present to have stronger roots in southern Italy than in mainland Greece (Bayet 1926; Zuntz 1971; Cazenove 1990), whilst Etruscan pottery owes much if not all to the influence of orientalising Euboean, Corinthian and later Attic pottery (Brendel 1995), but practices like the banquet have too broad a range of predecessors in mainland Greece, Magna

Graecia and the east to permit any conclusive attribution of origin (Murray 1990; Murray and Tecusan eds 1995).

There are three major regions in the central Italy of this chapter: Etruria, Latium and Campania. Less is known of the Sabina, or of Umbria. The developments of the three major regions which I have mentioned depended on their exposure to influxes of foreign populations and foreign goods, and also on their own resources. Campania was most nearly affected by the presence of the Greeks with the trading post of Pithecusa on the island of Ischia, and the colony of Cumae in the eighth century, together with the later colonies in the south. At the same time however, Campania was for a while subjected to the Etruscans, and maintained its own regional identity, so that artistically and culturally Campania was a complex hybrid. Its great asset was its agricultural wealth, as in later times (Frederiksen 1984).

Etruria developed more quickly than either of the other two regions, and became a major political power as well as an artistic centre of cultural excellence, whose goods were found across the Mediterranean and more particularly in southern Gaul (Ridgway 1988). Why this should be so is unanswerable; in terms of language, religion, and possibly ethnic origin, the Etruscans were different from all other Italian peoples. In addition, their region possessed considerable mineral resources, which were exploited from the very beginning of the colonisation period, as iron ore from Elba found on the island of Ischia attests (Ridgway 1992, 105, 108).

Latium, sandwiched between the two, had neither the great agricultural resources nor the mineral wealth of its neighbours, and is in general the least wealthy, to judge by the patchy and fragmentary archaeological record, though its political development, first under the Etruscans and then Rome as an independent power, was remarkable.

Although there are clear regional identities and different trajectories of development, it still makes sense to see this as some sort of unit. One can see that certain areas were favoured as the places where contact with non-Italians was closest. For instance, the ports of Pyrgi and Gravisca in Etruria, and the towns of Cales and Capua in Campania, and Rome in Latium, are particularly significant.[2] There are a number of centres or cores, and a number of

[2] See Ciaghi 1993 for an account of the terracotta production of Cales.

peripheries, and they overlap with each other, so that Rome for instance may have received some foreign visitors but must also have relied heavily on trade with Etruscan cities to provide the imports which were then redistributed through Latium, thus enhancing Rome's own position within the region. Trade between Campania and Etruria was probably quite intense in both directions. This kind of system has been described as 'dendritic', and is typical of a society with an elite but also some sense of the market (Smith 1996, 114–22; Smith forthcoming). As we shall see, the conditions of archaic Italian trade were by no means primitive, and although it is easy to see that the economy remained firmly embedded in the social relations of competitive hierarchies, both supplier and consumer had quite accurate and clear ideas of the sorts of goods which were needed to fulfil the attendant requirements. Recently, the strikingly limited range of iconography preferred in central Italian imports of Greek pottery has led some to suspect the identification of favoured mythological scenes and their production to order (Arafat and Morgan 1994). Without pursuing this too far, such attention to detail rather gives the lie, in my opinion, to the idea that even in the foreign markets Greek pottery had a strictly limited value (Gill 1994; Small 1995).

On one thing we are not and will never be clear. There is no satisfactory archaeological indicator in any non-colonial site for the numbers of immigrants from outside Italy at any one time. The number of imported pots gives no indication whatsoever, nor does the depth of artistic influence of one region on another. The literary sources are notoriously silent on issues of population and proportion. The few inscriptions which we have are not a representative sample, and are too few in number. Short of expensive petrographic analysis, only the eye can spot the difference in style of painting between an imported Corinthian pot, and a pot painted by an Etruscan imitating a Corinthian pot (which is what we mean by an Etrusco-Corinthian pot), and the stylistic ascriptions do not necessarily map directly onto ethnic distinctions; if a Corinthian potter settles in Etruria and marries an Etruscan woman will his son paint in the Corinthian or the Etruscan style, and what will his identity be? If in this chapter I have tried to say something about artisans and the movement of craftsmen between regions, it is in response to the indications of the sources, which I shall

discuss in the next section, and to some current thinking on artisan activity and ancient workshops, which I shall turn to in the section after that.

Roman accounts of traders and artisans

When one begins to consider the issue of the artisan in early Italy, it is surprising to discover how many records there are in the sources. Together with priests, warriors and kings, the artisans loom large both in the historians, and also in the invaluable chapters of Pliny the Elder. How much weight can we place on such frail evidence?

I suspect that we should not be surprised to discover a kernel of truth behind the stories, so even if the man who made the terracotta *quadriga* for the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitol was not called Vulca, he may yet have come from Veii (Pliny, *HN* 35. 157). What the sources preserve is either real names and facts, or a structural pattern of events which was familiar to the writer, and which he could therefore extrapolate backwards – and there is of course a good deal of possibility for a bit of both. If we are dealing with a structural pattern, is it a pattern that makes sense in the time of the author, or one that might make sense at the time of the events recorded? Let us swiftly review the evidence.

The evidence refers to statues, painting and architectural terracotta. Pliny the Elder is in two minds about the earliest Roman statuary and painting, for there was clearly a strong tradition that the Romans did not engage in such activities during the earliest period, and that it was only the arrival of the Greeks that brought them to work in clay and paint. He gives the palm in bronzework to the Romans in one passage, however (Pliny, *HN* 34. 33, 35. 152, 35. 6–8; Pollitt 1983, 6–8).

There are two different things going on here. First, Pliny is engaging in the endless debate about the impact of the Greeks on the Romans that is so heavily immersed in a moral discourse. Plutarch says that Numa prohibited the making of images of the divine: 'during the first 170 years of their history, though they built temples and established holy shrines, they did not undertake to make a holy image, since it was not holy to liken exalted

things to baser things nor to come into contact with the divine by any other means than the intellect' (Plut. *Numa* 8). This philosophical objection is wholly anachronistic, but it can be explained by the other issue which Pliny is having difficulty with here and elsewhere, and that is dating the objects which he can see or has report of. If we consider the issue of painting, Pliny reports that a Corinthian named Ekphantos was said to have invented painting, but that he himself had seen paintings at Ardea, Lanuvium and Caere which were much older. These were found in the first two cases in temples. Since the advent of stone-built temples does not precede the sixth century, and few of these survived without serious refurbishment, it looks as if Pliny's claim to have seen paintings which predated the middle of the seventh century is implausible. Presumably, however, Pliny is making a case for an indigenous tradition here, as he does for bronzeworking, and one must wonder whether Pliny felt he could spot the difference between Greek artistry and Italian artistry.

Central to the debate is the figure of Demaratus of Corinth, apparently one of the casualties of the collapse of the Bacchiad reign at Corinth (Ampolo 1976/7; Ridgway and Ridgway 1994). He was a trader, and it appears a successful one, for he brought with him from Corinth, according to some traditions, both Ekphantos the founder of painting and Eucheir, Diopos, and Eugrammos who brought the art of clay modelling into Rome. The names are suspicious, and so is the story; Demaratus of course was the father or grandfather of Tarquinius Priscus, first Etruscan king of Rome. Yet when the great terracotta roof decoration for Capitoline Jupiter is required, it is the Etruscans who provide the skill, as we have seen.

All in all, the sources seem to give a slightly confused picture, on the one hand proclaiming the significance of the Greeks and on the other the flourishing native tradition. When speaking of the Greeks, we hear only of the first founders of a skill or technique (a tradition of reporting which is of course a favourite in antiquity), and there is a close association with one man, a trader. If one were to take the story of Demaratus seriously, we would be thinking of a man wealthy enough to engage in the movement not only of goods but also of workshops, or sufficiently desperate, and sufficiently optimistic about the market that he paid for at least three

craftsmen to accompany him out of the tumultuous days of Cypselid Corinth into the new horizons of Etruria.

Is the tradition acceptable? In terms of the first-founder rhetoric it is not, and in a recent article, David and Francesca Serra Ridgway (1994) have shown that by the time Demaratus and his *fictores* had arrived in Italy, there was already a developed knowledge of stone statuary, and terracotta roof decoration which included at least head antefixes and possibly larger-scale seated or standing statues as well. Of course dating is difficult in this early and unrecorded period, but we shall discuss this in more detail later. Crucially however, the arrival of Greeks does not fit archaeologically with the invention of central Italian art, and if the Roman artistic development is later, it is not the Greeks but the Etruscans who are making the difference.

What though of the association between Demaratus the trader and his three *fictores*? We know enough of later Roman practices to realise that workshops could be alienated with their staff attached, so that what really changes hands is the skilled labour. Supposing that we are looking at something similar here, does it still make sense to see the movement of artisans as part of the complex economic exchanges of the time? We need to look closer at current thinking about workshops in the archaic period.

Artisans and workshops

Much work has been done recently on the nature of artisan activity, largely as a result of the ever increasing amount of evidence (Bonghi Jovino 1989, 1990, 1993; Carafa 1995). Although this is necessarily speculative, certain general trends can be identified. First, it is clear that no branch of artistic activity in central Italy was happening in complete isolation from the others. We shall see later evidence for the influences of one art form on another; here I wish merely to point out that the use of the mould is common to both terracotta decoration and to bronzeworking through the lost wax method which was prevalent at this time. We should not be surprised therefore to see parallels between the two. There is, I believe, even more reason to assume these sorts of connections if one begins to move away from any conception of ornamentation as being idle and devoid of ideological message.

Second, we have begun to see more and more instances of the movement of decorative motifs, particularly in terracotta reliefs, which require explanation other than simple imitation. Ever since Andren the clear similarities between friezes at Rome and Velletri have been explained by the re-use of the same mould with some alterations, and such examples are multiplying. How can we explain this in terms of what actually occurred (Rystedt *et al.* 1993)?

Andren believed at one stage in wandering craftsmen, but found the idea less attractive later in his life. The idea of artisans wandering through central Italy hawking their terracotta friezes is implausible, since there is a considerable amount of material and equipment which was essential to any such activity. The story of Vulca's difficulty with the kiln in which he created the great *quadriga* for the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter may reflect an understanding of the sheer technical complexity of moulding and firing large-scale statues (Plut. *Popl.* 13). What seems to be clearer now is that the decoration of public and domestic architecture was a large-scale and programmatic affair; that one did not simply add bits and pieces, but rather built up a relatively coherent order of decoration. A roof for instance requires the gables, simas and ridgepoles to be planned, especially if standing or seated figures are to be added on the top. So a single man, carrying a couple of decorative moulds, will not go far to explain both the inventiveness and the complexity of Italian architectural decoration.

Bonghi Jovino (1990) has therefore suggested a different approach. She introduces the concept of a small and rather monofunctional workshop for the earlier period, tracing the move to a polyfunctional workshop which produces more standardised material in larger quantities to some time in the sixth century.[3] Certainly we shall see reasons to accept a major change in architectural terracotta decoration in the sixth century. I wish here to focus on the idea of workshops built around a master-craftsman, at first serving a very specific and limited set of needs, perhaps at the top end of the market, and later broadening their production.

[3] Carafa 1995, in a detailed study of the pottery found in the Palatine excavations at Rome, comes to similar sorts of conclusions about the development of workshops from domestic adjuncts to diverse polyfunctional workshops, and this was accompanied by a greater standardisation of forms again.

Bonghi Jovino suggests at one point that we could imagine the master-craftsman moving between different workshops, given temporary hospitality in a different city, or actually owning or running operations across a wide area. This fits well with the account in the sources of Vulca being called from Veii to participate in the construction of the Temple of Jupiter, and it also seems to me to fit well with another feature of early Latin society which Carmine Ampolo has described as its horizontal mobility – that is, the movement of members of the elite into different areas, most clearly seen in the arrival of Tarquinius Priscus in Rome (Ampolo 1970/1). Other examples are less easy to pinpoint, though inscriptions suggest Latins in Etruria (Smith 1996, 238), and the very precise material parallels between the grave-goods found in Cerveteri and Praeneste, if they do not indicate the movement of an aristocrat from the one place to the other, do indicate close links between the areas (Smith 1996, 93–7). The goods may have moved as part of gift exchange.

Latin society at the upper level at least seems open; the elite is a permeable structure. If patronage operated in the sixth century, as would seem plausible if not readily demonstrable, then it makes sense for artisans to follow their patrons' movements around central Italy, and this is perhaps the most significant aspect of the Etruscans' domination down to Campania.

Thus Bonghi Jovino's intuition would seem valuable, not simply on the grounds of the practicalities but also in terms of the political and economic relationships of the time. She is also correct, I think, in identifying two different kinds of activity: that of the master-craftsmen engaged in specific tasks for specific patrons, and that of the more general and standardised production which will have required more labour. Thus the production of roof-tiles demands a single pattern to be followed repeatedly, whilst the crafting of the statues that adorned the ridgepole requires the hand of the master.

One aspect of this division is that the more basic operations are relatively value-free, for whilst one does not expect all roofs to be tiled so that possession of such a durable roof is a mark of status for building or owner, there is little else of ideological value in the tiles themselves. It is the other parts of the roof, the painting and particularly the statuary, or the friezes, or the decoration of

pottery, which carried the loaded messages of superiority or difference. Hence the master craftsman was not simply an artist; he was also the conveyor of a political message (Colonna 1988). In this he inherited some of the roles which his predecessors as far back as the ninth century BC had fulfilled, and it is to this that I now turn.

Pottery

Pottery is ubiquitous in central Italian archaeology, since the focus on burial grounds has left us with a huge collection of ceramic pieces from the whole area. Whilst the arguments rage about the value of Greek pottery, Italian archaeology indicates some rather precise functions for the different styles of pottery, and suggests that pottery and its decoration were not idly undertaken, but produced for specific markets.

Let us take first the instance of Osteria dell'Osa, a burial ground in Latium which was in use from the end of the tenth century to the early sixth century (Bietti-Sestieri 1992b for full publication). The excavator, Anna Maria Bietti-Sestieri, has identified two ninth-century groups in this burial population at its outset; they surround a group of four or five cremations. Each group has a consistent set of burial characteristics and there are clear differences between the two groups. One group has pottery with particular forms of incised and/or moulded decoration that remains constant for a period much longer than the life of any individual (Bietti-Sestieri 1992a, 141–98).

This is the clearest example of a more general feature of Latin life, the presence of a set of objects which are thought suitable for burial with a deceased person for a period of some centuries. Although the goods change in material and the technique becomes more elaborate, the major features remain much the same. In the early period in particular, the decorative traditions are relatively standard across the region – it is this standardisation that permits us to speak of a Latin culture.

The place of the artisan in this culture is therefore not merely that of a craft specialist, for in fact pottery may have been a task which many people could have participated in. Since the early incised decoration has been likened to the sorts of patterns which

one might find on textiles, clearly a major feature of Latin production as the amount of weaving equipment in female burials in particular shows, it may even have been a task which was not confined to men. The standardisation does however suggest that there was a tradition for burial goods at least, and that this tradition was carefully preserved for a considerable length of time. The evidence from Osteria dell'Osa shows that local differences may have had considerable significance as a means of differentiating between groups. The potters then are preservers of a tradition with specific local and perhaps religious connotations.

If we turn to another major burial ground in central Italy, Pontecagnano in Campania, we can find evidence of the politicisation of this tradition (D'Agostino 1977; D'Agostino and Gastaldi 1989; Cerchiai 1990; de Natale 1992 for reports). In a recent article Cuozzo has speculated on the impact of the Etruscan domination of the area as indicated by the bucchero production of the seventh and early sixth centuries (Cuozzo 1993). Cerchiai had already noted two different traditions in the Etrusco-Corinthian production of this site. One tradition is strongly related to the workshops of Vulci, the other to the workshops of Caere and Veii. Bucchero and impasto production also shows two different traditions, one of which is close in terms of size and shape to the Caere/Veii group. The other tradition is represented by some rare large bucchero pieces, which follow examples in metal rather than any ceramic pattern.

What is significant about this evidence is that the major bucchero pieces come from a site called the Scarico Granozio off the Via Sicilia, an area which had not been used for burials before the end of the seventh century, and were in a necropolis which also produced Etrusco-Corinthian ware. So the emergence of important new forms of pottery coincides with the reshaping of the necropolis area and the arrival of the Etruscans in force in the area, and there seems no doubt that one should connect all these features. The new elite of Pontecagnano brought with them the goods, the skills and quite possibly the artisans of their homeland, and in at least one instance it would appear that they commissioned a special set of bucchero pieces for use in a new burial ground which has a high proportion of infant burials. Once again, we can see the use of artisan skills in the context of political and social display.[4]

Terracotta roof decoration and friezes

The study of terracotta architectural decoration has become of immense importance for the study of central Italian society as more fragments have been unearthed, and attention revived after the pioneering work of Andren (see Rystedt *et al.* 1993, 306–10 for a bibliography). We are beginning to be able to make tentative steps towards a history of the craft and to identify areas of production and innovation.[5]

Of all the crafts of the period, this is the one which most readily lends itself to the idea of travelling artisans, as we have seen, in particular because of the presence of friezes which seem to come from the same mould though found in quite different areas. In this section I wish to focus on the iconography of the friezes and the ideology which seems to underlie them, and as we shall see in the following section, this iconography draws in a number of other crafts as well.

The purpose of terracotta coverings of wooden roofs is to provide protection against the rain, and a more durable covering than natural material would permit. It has been suggested that it may have originated from a simple clay covering to wooden beams which the sun would naturally bake dry, though this might have cracked more easily. Once in use, certain features of the roof can be highlighted. Around the ends antefixes can conceal the runoffs from the guttering, and channel water away from the walls and the revetment friezes beneath. Simas can be added which project above the roof, and these have a clear development in the sixth century, as has recently been shown, from the lateral and raking simas to the torus sima, which eschews figural decoration for floral

[4] Carafa 1995, 259 speculates on the possibility that there may have been a workshop attached to one of the high-status houses on the slopes of the Palatine; there was a kiln there from the second quarter of the fourth century BC, and the suggestion is that it may have had a predecessor. Given the high status of these buildings (which await full publication), the link between potter and patron is here suggestive, though not proven.

[5] Downey 1995, for instance, observes that the architectural decoration of the third Regia (first half of the sixth century) is uniquely Roman, but that by the time of the fourth Regia (second half of the sixth century), 'Rome is no longer isolated . . . but is part of a central Italian unit' (1995, 71). This again suggests polyfunctional workshops, and exchange of ideas.

decoration and achieves greater height. The torus sima develops under influence from southern Italy in response to the increased size of the buildings of the sixth century, and requires greater elevation in order to fit the new proportions (Wikander 1994). The provision of a strong and stable roof allows for acroterial decoration and figures along the ridgepole; one of the important aspects of the Etrusco-Italic temple is the attention to sculptural decoration on top of the roof, not just in friezes around the pediments. The effects are quite different.

The ridgepole *acroteria* are so important because they come early, and reveal similarities with depictions of Villanovan period housing in hut urns from the tenth century onwards. There is in fact no need to posit a Greek origin for the *acroteria*, though in the course of time Greek influence on both the *acroteria* and the nature of roof decoration as a whole increases, with the south Italian colonies being crucial.

One of the elements of the acroterial sculpture is seated figures. We now know that the so-called Murlo cowboy was seated, and we find other such figures at an early period (later on they stand, under the influence perhaps of Greek kouros sculpture) (Edlund-Berry 1993). Colonna and von Hase have attempted to demonstrate that the true predecessor of the seated statue was not Greek but Syrian (Colonna and von Hase 1984). The context for their assertion was the discussion of a seated stone statue in an early seventh-century tumulus tomb just outside Cerveteri. The parallels they sought to draw were with seated rulers in Alalakh and Carchemish, several centuries earlier. There are missing links in the argument, especially since not all of the Syrian examples which are given were intended to be seen, but one can perhaps accept a generalised influence from the east.

The iconography of the seated individual is of tremendous significance in the Etruscan world. There are in fact a number of instances in tombs. They also exist as we have seen in *acroteria* such as that at Murlo (Poggio Le Civitate), and in the so-called canopic urns, cremation urns with a figure of the deceased on the top (Nielsen 1994; Damgaard Andersen 1993). Finally we may note their presence on numerous frieze plaques, together with scenes such as hunting or banqueting or procession (Sinos 1994 for Murlo; Bruun 1993 for Velletri; Downey 1995 for Rome (Regia); Rystedt *et al.* 1993 for further examples).

For Colonna and von Hase (1984), and Ridgway and Ridgway more recently (1994), these seated statues represent the impact of Syrian craftsmen on the Etruscan world, possibly coming through the northern Adriatic rather than through southern Italy as the Greeks were to do; the Mediterranean may be too much of a cultural melange to permit such close national identifications. The development of clay examples of a sculpture, executed either in free-standing or relief form in stone in Syria, adapts the new ideas to a new material, and one which was easier to use in a variety of contexts, and closer to bronzeworking in which the Etruscans were pre-eminent.

What the figures actually represent is of course rather harder to define. Interpretations move uneasily between political elites and gods, and in some cases try to combine the two by suggesting a deliberate blurring of the boundaries, an idea which I think is particularly attractive given the religious authority of, say, the king at Rome.

Let us return for a moment to the story of Demaratus' three *fictores*. If it is true that they contributed to terracotta work, they cannot have been the initiators since the dates do not match up, and we have seen other influences at work. Ridgway and Ridgway suggest that the Greeks contributed to the standardisation of the decoration, so that we find roof tiles on a number of the buildings at Acquarossa which cannot all have been elite dwellings (Ridgway and Ridgway 1994, 7). The pattern which they propose is of an entrepreneur importing and maintaining artisans who can exploit the needs of the communities of central Italy. There are other possibilities; the floral decoration of the seventh- and sixth-century simas does reflect the patterns found on Corinthian pottery, and the tradition may be a more generic connection between central Italy and Corinth, if it has any validity at all. The parallel that they draw, which is a very significant one, is of two Corinthian workshops or single artisans producing *aryballoi* on the island of Pithecusa. It has been observed that the clear reason for the presence of Potters/Painters X, Y and Z is to exploit the market – 'immigrant potters were needed to supplement supplies'.[6] Although Ridgway and Ridgway make a very good case for the development of central Italian art without the Greeks (a

[6] Ridgway and Ridgway 1994, 12, quoting Williams 1986.

case which, as we have seen, has roots in ancient debates), by the mid-seventh century the Greek impact is already enormous. That Demaratus importing Greek artisans might be compared to his grandson Tarquinius Priscus asking for Vulca from Veii to assist with the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter is an intriguing instance of the variety of political and social experience in the archaic period.

Crossover between crafts

I wish to end this summary of artisan activity with a brief consideration of the concept of ideas crossing over between different metiers. Let us consider the example of the antefix with a head surrounded by a kind of cloak or halo. The image can be found on antefixes, but also on sixth-century bronzes and ceramic ware; there are good examples from Capua. The origin may lie in Laconian bronzes of the seventh and sixth centuries (Minoja 1993).

Similarly, the seated figure appears in stone in tumuli, in terracotta on roofs, and in terracotta reliefs. The scene of the banquet is to be located in terracotta reliefs, in tomb paintings and in vase painting. The hunt occurs in the reliefs and in the imported Syrian gilded bowls found in Cerveteri and Praeneste. The figure of the lion can be spotted on everything from large-scale transverse *acroteria* to tiny *aryballoi*, and again has an eastern origin.

There are other examples, and many have been exhaustively documented, and occasionally tentatively dated. What does this suggest about central Italian art? It seems to me to suggest that the relationships between the crafts became quite close from the seventh century on. It may be that the specialist traditions of the ninth century that we saw operating in the necropolis at Osteria dell'Osa have given way to a different form of artisan activity, one not so particularist, but still at the service of an elite. These motifs are not empty ciphers; the hunt and the banquet are classic elite practices, and even the lion may have more than a decorative function in the visual shorthand of the time. Necessarily, the skills of the artisan have had to become attuned to a broader market, a wider variety of skills, and a different artistic repertoire, removed from familial or gentilicial control, and seated in a different environment. This brings me to the theme of the city, which is part of this volume's concern.

The artisan and the city

Power and ideology go hand in hand. As the nature of a society changes the status and importance of its ideologues also change. In better-documented periods, it is interesting to note that some of the major artistic figures come to the fore in the sources in periods where propaganda is of great significance. So Pheidias is a central character in the history of Athens as a democratic and imperial power; Lysippus and Apelles rank in the history of Hellenistic art through their connection with Alexander. The Roman imperial context is slightly different perhaps, since the major artists were still Greek it appears, but perhaps often in a subservient position.

As I have mentioned, we do have the putative names of some artisans from archaic central Italy. I am personally very struck by one; the man who, according to Plutarch, created eleven shields to copy the one that fell from heaven and was placed in the Temple of Mars in the time of Numa was one Mamurius Veturius (Plut. *Numa* 13. 3). The name is a patrician one. It may be another piece of the jigsaw of evidence that indicates the gentilicial basis of early Roman religion; is it also an indication of a higher prestige for craftsmanship, reflecting perhaps the long-felt awe for the artistic genius, and the worker of metal and fire (Delcourt 1957, 204–22)?

As ideas become replaced by standardisation, the position of the artisan decreases. In the archaic period, some figures seem to have held the keys to the iconography of elite behaviour, and access to their skills was a part of the nature of power as much as access to the traders who brought in prestigious imports like jewellery and perfume.

During the seventh and particularly the sixth century, the shape of the community in central Italy evolved in the direction of urban form. This change is of the utmost significance, and is still, I believe, poorly understood in both the Italian and the Greek contexts. There is no doubt that trade has something to do with this change, in that it helps to provide the goods which are the markers of status. In this context, it encourages the production of a surplus and the increased exploitation of an agricultural labour-force. The arrival of traders from different countries, as well as the possession of easily removable wealth, may have sharpened a sense of identity, which is the basis of an early concept of citizenship.

In sixth-century Latium, the boundaries were being erected haphazardly through the sixth century. We hear of trading arrangements between Rome and the Carthaginians. We see the formation of *jura* or rules of co-operation between Rome and the Latins after the Battle of Lake Regillus at the beginning of the fifth century. At roughly the same time we see more control over the public display of wealth by an elite, and the basis of that elite beginning to broaden – a picture which fits well with Etruscan evidence too (Smith 1996, 130ff.).

The artisan in this context purveys the images of authority that serve the elite in the sixth century. The sources tend to suggest that this period also sees the rise of representative sculpture of individuals like kings. The creation of hierarchical images by craftsmen of recognised and respected skill sets them at the centre of the move away from power as something localised in chieftainship to something at the heart of civic community. It is perhaps no coincidence that early Rome provides evidence for the creation of artisans' *collegia* and a potters' quarter known as the Vicus Tuscus.[7]

The development of an urban settlement requires people to be located and respected for their constructive occupations, and it requires an iconography of authority and community. I do not mean to suggest that artisans held positions of enormous authority or that they invented the city, but rather that they were instrumental in its creation, at least as much as the army for instance. What gave them this potential was first their skill, and second, especially at a time of enormous cultural variety and international contact, their ability to adapt and adopt ideas from elsewhere. One of the most important items of trade in this period was knowledge; it is not only the movement of goods but also the movement of artisans which provides the vehicle.

Bibliography

Ampolo, C. (1970/1), 'Su alcuni mutamenti sociali nel Lazio tra l'VIII sec. e il IV sec.', *DdA* 4–5: 37–99.

[7] Carafa's suggestion of a kiln attached to an elite house (see n. 4 above) fits in well in this context.

—— (1976/7), 'Demarato: Osservazioni sulla mobilità sociale arcaica', *DdA* 9–10: 333–45.

Arafat, K. and Morgan, C. (1994), 'Athens, Etruria and the Heuneburg: mutual misconceptions in the study of Greek–barbarian relations', in I. Morris (ed.), *Classical Greece: Ancient Histories and Modern Archaeologies* (Cambridge), 108–33.

Bartoloni, G. (1987), 'Le comunità dell'Italia centrale tirrenica e la colonizzazione greca in Campania', in M. Cristofani (ed.), *Etruria e Lazio Arcaico* (Rome), 37–54.

Bayet, J. (1926), *Les Origines de l'Hercule Romain* (Paris).

Bietti-Sestieri, A. M. (1992a), *The Iron Age Community of Osteria dell'Osa: A Study of Socio-Political Development in Central Tyrrhenian Italy* (Rome).

—— (1992b), *La Necropoli Laziale di Osteria dell'Osa* (Rome).

Bonghi Jovino, M. (1989), 'La produzione fittile in Etruria ed i suoi riflessi nell'Italia antica', in *Secondo Congresso Internazionale Etrusco* (Rome): 667–82.

—— (ed.) (1990), *Artigiani e Botteghe nell'Italia Preromana: Studi sulla Coroplastica di Area Etrusco-Laziale-Camapana* (Rome).

—— (ed.) (1993), *Produzione Artigianale ed Esportazione nel Mondo Antico: Il Bucchero Etrusco* (Milan).

Brendel, O. (1995), *Etruscan Art* (Yale).

Bruun, C. (1993), 'Herakles and the tyrants: an archaic frieze from Velletri', in E. Rystedt *et al.* (eds 1993), 267–78.

Carafa, P. (1995), *Officine Ceramiche di Età Regia* (Rome).

Cazenove, O. de (1990), 'Les sanctuaires de Cérès jusqu'à la deuxième sécession de la plèbe', in *Crise et Transformation des sociétés archaïques de l'Italie antique au Ve siècle av. J.C.* (Rome), 373–99.

Cerchiai, L. (1990), *Le Officine Etrusco-Corinzie di Pontecagnano* (Naples).

Ciaghi, S. (1993), *Le terrecotte figurate da Cales del Museo Nazionale di Napoli* (Rome).

Colonna, G. (1988), 'La produzione artigianale', in A. Momigliano and A. Schiavone (eds), *Storia di Roma I* (Turin), 292–316.

Colonna, G. and Von Hase, F. W. (1984), 'Alle origini della statuaria Etrusca: La tomba delle statue presso Ceri', *St. Etr.* 52: 13–59.

Cornell, T. J. (1995), *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Beginnings of the Punic Wars (c. 1000 to 264 BC)* (London).

Cuozzo, M. (1993), 'Produzione di lusso, produzione corrente nel bucchero di Pontecagnano: alcune considerazioni', in M. Bonghi Jovino (ed. 1993), 147–65.

D'Agostino, B. (1977), *Tombe 'Principesche' dell'Orientalizzante Antico da Pontecagnano* (Rome).

Damgaard Andersen, H. (1993) 'Archaic architectural terracottas and their relation to building identification', in E. Rystedt *et al.* (eds 1993), 71–86.

D'Agostino, B. and Gastaldi, P. (1989), *Pontecagnano II. La Necropoli del Picentino. 1 Le Tombe della Prima Età del Ferro* (Naples).
De Natale, S. (1992), *Pontecagnano II. La necropoli di S. Antonio: Propr. ECI 2. Tombe della Prima Età del Ferro* (Naples).
Delcourt, M. (1957), *Héphaistos ou la Légende du Magicien* (Paris).
Downey, S. (1995), *Architectural Terracottas from the Regia* (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, 30; Michigan).
Edlund-Berry, I. (1993), 'The Murlo cowboy: problems of reconstruction and interpretation', in E. Rystedt *et al.* (eds 1993), 117–22.
Frederiksen, M. (1984), *Campania* (Rome).
Gill, D. W. (1994), 'Positivism, pots and long-distance trade', in I. Morris (ed.), *Classical Greece: Ancient Histories and Modern Archaeologies* (Cambridge), 99–107.
Minoja, M. (1993), 'Breve note sui rapporti tra produzione vascolare in bucchero, bronzistica e coroplastica nell'artigianato capuano del VI secolo', in M. Bonghi Jovino (ed. 1993), 167–70.
Murray, O. (ed. 1990), *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion* (Oxford).
Murray, O. and Tecusan, M. (eds 1995), *In Vino Veritas* (Rome).
Nielsen, E. (1994), 'Interpreting the lateral sima at Poggio Civitate', in R. D. de Puma and J. P. Small (eds), *Murlo and the Etruscans: Art and Society in Ancient Etruria* (Wisconsin), 67–74.
Pollitt, J. J. (1983), *The Art of Rome c. 753 BC–AD 337* (Cambridge).
Ridgway, D. (1988), 'The Etruscans', in *Cambridge Ancient History*, iv (2nd edn, Cambridge), 634–75.
—— (1992) *The First Western Greeks* (Cambridge).
Ridgway, D. and Serra Ridgway, F. (1994), 'Demaratus and the archaeologists', in R. D. de Puma and J. P. Small (eds), *Murlo and the Etruscans: Art and Society in Ancient Etruria* (Wisconsin), 6–15.
Rystedt, E., Wikander, C. and Wikander, O. (eds 1993), *Deliciae Fictiles: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Etruscan Terracottas* (Stockholm).
Sinos, R. H. (1994), 'Godlike men: a discussion of the Murlo procession frieze', in R. D. de Puma and J. P. Small (eds), *Murlo and the Etruscans: Art and Society in Ancient Etruria* (Wisconsin), 100–17.
Small, J. P. (1995), 'New views on Greek artifacts found in Etruria', *JRA* 8: 317–19.
Smith, C. J. (1996), *Early Rome and Latium: Economy and Society c. 1000 to 500 BC* (Oxford).
—— forthcoming, 'Medea in Italy: barter and exchange in the archaic Mediterranean', in G. Tsetskhladze (ed.), *East and West.*
Vallet, G. (ed. 1982), *La Céramique Grecque ou de Tradition Grecque .1au VIIIe siècle en Italie Centrale* (Naples).
Wikander, O. (1994), 'The archaic Etruscan sima', in R. D. de Puma and J. P. Small (eds), *Murlo and the Etruscans: Art and Society in Ancient Etruria* (Wisconsin), 47–63.

Williams, D. (1986), 'Greek potters and their descendants in Campania and southern Etruria', in J. Swaddling (ed.), *Italian Iron Age Artefacts in the British Museum* (London), 295–304.
Zuntz, G. (1971), *Persephone: Three Essays on Religion and Thought in Magna Graecia* (Oxford).