IMT School for Advanced Studies, Lucca
Lucca, Italy

Landscapes before the Landscape in Ancient Etruscan Art

Ph.D. Program Institutions, Markets and Technologies
Track in Analysis and Management
of Cultural Heritage
XXXI Cycle

By
Elena Pontelli
2022

The dissertation of Elena Pontelli is approved.

PhD Program Coordinator:
Prof. Maria Luisa Catoni
IMT School for Advanced Studies Lucca

Advisor:
Prof. Maria Luisa Catoni
IMT School for Advanced Studies Lucca

Co-Advisor:
Prof. Maurizio Harari
Università degli Studi di Pavia

The dissertation of Elena Pontelli has been reviewed by:

Prof. Elisabetta Govi
Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna

Prof. Clemente Marconi
Università degli Studi di Milano Statale
New York University, Institute of Fine Arts

IMT School for Advanced Studies, Lucca
2022

Contents

	Page
Acknowledgments	iii
Vita	v
Publications	vi
Presentations	viii
Abstract	ix
1. *Introduction*. Designing Landscapes that fit (into?) an Image	1
2. Ways of Seeing Landscape: A History of Studies on Landscape Representation in Ancient Art	7
2.1. Back to the roots. From Alexander von Humboldt to Emmanuel Loewy	9
2.2. Serafino Ricci. «Un prodotto naturale […] distintivo di quella città»	15
2.3. Margret Heinemann. *Landschaftliche Elemente in der griechischen Kunst bis Polygnot*	18
2.4. Oreste Mattirolo. «Ho a lungo erborizzato nelle opere artistiche»	22
2.5. Giovanni Patroni and the Etruscan 'Environment' in the Thirties	24
2.6. «Studi Etruschi». Archaeology and «Naturalistica»	31
2.7. Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli: Accessory and Background (with a note on Emilio Sereni)	33
2.8. Trends Over The Last Sixty Years	43
3. Landscape in Context	71
3.1. A Man-Made World. Landscapes for Earthly Human Experience	73
3.1.1. *Man Upon Nature. Hunting, Navigation and Agriculture*	73
3.1.2. *Man in Nature. Music, Dance and Ludi*	101
3.1.3. *Duels, fights, killings*	176
3.1.4. *Landscape for Lovers and Eros*	218

3.2. Elsewhere. Landscapes across the Boundaries 236
3.2.1. *Eschatia, "Where the Wild Things Are": Myths and Heroes at the Confines of the World* 236
3.2.2. *Communicating with gods: Haruspices, Prophecies, Oracles* 248
3.3. Landscapes Beyond Human Life 259
3.3.1. *A Journey to the Afterlife, a Landscape Extending toward the Underworld* 259
3.3.2. *Landscape for Celestial Dwellings* 283

4. Schemes and Structures. Landscape and Visual Space Making 288
4.1. Landscape Weapons 288
4.2. Landscape and Figures, Landscape and Space 295

***5. Conclusions*. Landscapes without Horizons** 319
5.1. Landscape and the Etruscan *Kósmos* 319
5.2. Characterizing and Categorizing Space in Etruscan Art 337

Bibliography 341

Plates 481

Acknowledgements

This thesis and the research behind it have been accompanied from the beginning by Professors Maria Luisa Catoni and Maurizio Harari. They have tenaciously encouraged, patiently supported, and wisely guided me throughout this journey. Their intellectual and human support has made this work possible. I hope that these pages can account at least in small part for the extraordinary value of their teachings.

Professors Elisabetta Govi and Clemente Marconi reviewed the final draft of this thesis. I am grateful for their valuable suggestions, which have allowed me not only to improve the form and content of this text in view of its submission but also to polish my take on the subject in view of future research.

Over the past few years, I have had the opportunity and privilege to learn from many scholars. In particular, I am in debt to Linda Bertelli, Lorenzo Casini, Massimiliano Di Fazio, Maria Elena Gorrini, Emanuele Pellegrini, and Angela Pola.

It was an honor to work alongside Claire Lyons, who with humbling generosity has shared her knowledge and experience with me over the last few years.

All the IMT School Administrative Offices and Library staff have facilitated in every possible way all the activities and projects I undertook over the years. I am particularly grateful to Luisa Lo Duca for having helped me carry out research in the library even in difficult times.

A substantial part of my studies was made possible thanks to my stays at IMT, the University of Pavia, the J. Paul Getty Museum and their libraries, which granted me not only access to an incomparable inheritance of knowledge but also welcoming spaces for study and thought.

Thanks to Carla, Silvia, Valeria, and Sara, who are all dear friends to me. I would not be able to get along without them.

Thanks to my sister Anna and my parents, Claudio and Marisa, whom I owe everything to.

Thanks to Federico, who has brought joy and meaning to every day since we chose each other.

The commitment of these years has been in memory of my beloved grandparents, and for the future of my son Riccardo.

Vita

July 10, 1990	Born, Zevio (Verona), Italy
2009	Baccalaureate. Liceo Classico, Educandato Statale Agli Angeli (VR). 100/100
2012	Bachelor degree. *Antichità Classiche e Orientali*. Università degli Studi di Pavia. 110/110 *cum laude*
2014	Erasmus Exchange Period. École Pratique des Hautes Études (EPHE), Paris
2015	Master degree. *Antichità Classiche e Orientali*. Università degli Studi di Pavia. 110/110 *cum laude*
2015-	Ph.D. Program Institutions, Markets and Technologies Track in *Analysis and Management of Cultural Heritage*. IMT School for Advanced Studies, Lucca
2017	Internship, J. Paul Getty Museum (Los Angeles)
2020-2022	Research Collaborator, *History of Ancient Art*. IMT School for Advanced Studies and Polo Museale della Toscana (Lucca, Musei Nazionali, Museo Nazionale di Villa Guinigi)

Publications

1. C.L. Lyons, E. Pontelli, M. Ganio, D. MacLennan, M. Svoboda, *Lastre etrusche dipinte nella collezione del J. Paul Getty Museum*, in D.F. Maras, L. Bochicchio, a cura di, *Pittura di terracotta. Mito e immagine nelle lastre dipinte di Cerveteri* (Atti del convegno, Santa Marinella, Castello di Santa Severa, 22-23 giugno 2018), 2022.

2. E. Pontelli, *Frammenti di paesaggio nell'arte figurativa etrusca*, in M. Harari, E. Pontelli, a cura di, *Le cose nell'immagine* (Atti del III colloquio dell'Associazione Italiana di Pittura Antica, Pavia 17-18 giugno 2019), Roma 2022.

3. E. Pontelli, *Architecture* [Introduction and Catalogue], in C.L. Lyons, *Etruscan and Italic Art in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, Los Angeles 2022.

4. E. Pontelli, *Bronze Vessels* [Catalogue], in C.L. Lyons, *Etruscan and Italic Art in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, Los Angeles 2022.

5. E. Pontelli, *Implements* [Catalogue], in C.L. Lyons, *Etruscan and Italic Art in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, Los Angeles 2022.

6. E. Pontelli, *Lungo rotte nascoste del collezionismo d'antichità. Carlo Albizzati e l'archeologia in circolo*, in «Bollettino dei Musei Vaticani», 38, 2022, pp. 29-43.

7. R. Wallace, E. Pontelli, *Etruscan mirror in the J. Paul Getty Museum, acc. no. 77.AC.100*, in «Studi Etruschi. Rivista di Epigrafia Etrusca», LXXXIII, 2021, pp. 316-320.

8. E. Pontelli, *Passione antiquaria di un archeologo lombardo. La collezione etrusca del museo archeologico dell'Università di Pavia*, in D. Mantovani, a cura di, *Almum Studium Papiense. Storia dell'Università di Pavia*, III, 2, Milano 2020, pp. 835-836.

9. E. Pontelli, *Archeologia di un discorso espositivo*, in S. Massa, E. Pontelli, a cura di, *«Mostre permanenti». Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti in un secolo di esposizioni*, Lucca 2018, pp. 115-130.

10. E. Pontelli, *Mostra di pittura etrusca (Firenze, Palazzo Davanzati 1951)*, in S. Massa, E. Pontelli, a cura di, *«Mostre permanenti». Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti in un secolo di esposizioni*, Lucca 2018, pp. 187-188.

11. E. Pontelli, *Mostra di scultura etrusca (Firenze, Chiostro delle Oblate 1952)*, in S. Massa, E. Pontelli, a cura di, *«Mostre permanenti». Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti in un secolo di esposizioni*, Lucca 2018, pp. 191-193.

12. E. Pontelli, *Mostra di scultura tardo-etrusca di Volterra (Firenze, Palazzo Strozzi 1964)*, in S. Massa, E. Pontelli, a cura di, *«Mostre permanenti». Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti in un secolo di esposizioni*, Lucca 2018, pp. 245-246.

13. S. Massa, E. Pontelli, *«Un pochino troppo di mostre». Nota metodologica*, in S. Massa, E. Pontelli, a cura di, *«Mostre permanenti». Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti in un secolo di esposizioni*, Lucca 2018, pp. 1-7.

14. E. Pontelli, *«Per benevola concessione». La strategia del dono e le terrecotte etrusche dell'Università di Pavia*, in L. Casini, E. Pellegrini, a cura di, *Donare allo Stato. Mecenatismo e raccolte pubbliche dall'unità d'Italia a oggi*, Bologna 2018, pp. 175-191.

15. E. Pontelli, *La roccia e il sacro. Dal rito al segno*, in *DialArchMed*, I.5, Paestum 2017, pp. 1277-1282.

Presentations

1. 121st Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America (Washington, D.C., January 2-5, 2020).
Etruscan Paintings in the J. Paul Getty Museum (C. Lyons, E. Pontelli).

2. Seminar *Looking at exhibitions. Archives, databases and visualization*. (Lucca, IMT School for Advanced Studies, September 5, 2019.
Presentation of the «*Mostre Permanenti*» Project (S. Massa, E. Pontelli).

3. III Colloquio Nazionale AIRPA (Associazione Italiana Ricerche Pittura Antica), *Le cose nell'immagine* (Pavia, June 17-18, 2019).
«Da lontano era un'isola». Frammenti di paesaggio nell'arte figurativa etrusca (E. Pontelli).

4. Conference *L'arte degli Altri* (Lucca, Fondazione Ragghianti, October 5, 2018).
Gli 'altri' in mostra. I Ragghianti e le culture extraeuropee tra studio e divulgazione (S. Massa, E. Pontelli).

5. Conference *Pittura di Terracotta. Mito e Immagine nelle lastre dipinte di Cerveteri* (Santa Severa, June 22-23, 2018).
Etruscan Architectural Paintings in the J. Paul Getty Museum (C. Lyons, E. Pontelli).

6. *Courts, Power, and Public Law. ICON Society 2017 Conference* (Copenhagen, July 5-7, 2017).
The denial of exportation certificate in Italy and its judicial review: an ancient story (Panel: *Culture Before the Courts*); (E. Pontelli).

7. Conference *Dialoghi sull'Archeologia della Magna Grecia e del Mediterraneo* (Capaccio Paestum, September 7-9, 2016).
La roccia e il sacro. Dal rito al segno (E. Pontelli).

Abstract

This thesis approaches the broad field of landscape study from a specialized standpoint, namely by investigating the different ways in which landscape is represented in Etruscan art.

In particular, this analysis aims to identify the significance of what we might nowadays refer to as "landscape elements" in the production-fruition systems of Etruscan visual culture. The iconographic analysis presented here shows that landscape features are working material which, employed in relation to other image elements, express specific meanings in the construction of the image.

This thesis begins with an historiographical overview of the ways landscape representation has been investigated over time, including by visualizing the relationships and influences between the different disciplines that have approached landscape as a research topic. The core section then considers all kinds of representations of landscape elements (landscape elements that appear isolated within images as well as more structured and coherent ensembles of landscape features) in Etruscan art, from its earliest period to the threshold of Hellenism. The analysis and presentation of images is based on a 'situational' categorization (theme/context-based categories) designed to enable transversal readings. Dealing with the multiple 'landscapes' that existed before the landscape (aesthetically appreciable as a pictorial theme), entails moving along two different but interconnected paths. On the one hand, we can see landscape features performing different functions in different visual occurrences. On the other hand, from the perspective of an unfolding elaboration of figurative structures, these features can be analyzed as individual signifying structures that were only organized into broader uniform configurations over time.

"Amare non è sempre conoscere («non sempre
giovinezza è verità»), lo si impara sul tardi.
Un sasso, ci spiegano,
non è così semplice come pare.
Tanto meno un fiore.
L'uno dirama in sé una cattedrale.
L'altro un paradiso in terra".

Vittorio Sereni, *Un posto di vacanza*

1.
Introduction
Designing Landscapes that fit (into?) an Image

This thesis is the main outcome of the research I carried out for my Ph.D. in Analysis and Management of Cultural Heritage at the IMT School for Advanced Studies Lucca.
My activity as part of the LYNX research unit (*Center for the Interdisciplinary Analysis of Images. Objects, spaces, images. Individual experience and social behaviors*) has encouraged me to integrate my studies on Etruscan iconography into a broader discourse on mechanisms of image production through a transversal reflection on the overall theme of landscape.

Over the past few centuries, distinguished thinkers and scholars have focused extensive research on landscape in an effort to uncover why humans are so fond of and attached to this object. Undeniably, research on the topic of landscape has also contributed to our understanding of the history of human societies by virtue of its being related from a variety of perspectives to the analysis of the spatial context of human activity over time.

In this thesis, I have approached that broad field of study from a specialized standpoint, namely, that of examining how landscape is represented in Etruscan art.

First and foremost, it make sense to clarify the concept of 'landscape' used here. Rather than adhering to ready-made definitions, in my research I have considered all kinds of representations of landscape elements, that is to say landscape elements that appear isolated within images as well as more structured and coherent ensembles of landscape features.

A more general foreword on this research subject seems particularly useful. The choice to take depicted landscape as the core of my investigation reflects a particular focus on the 'object', doubtless inspired in part by the modern debate on object agency (e.g., Actor-

Network Theory; Object-Oriented Ontology)[1]. However, the purposes and methodology of this research are wholly consistent with those of an archaeological or art historical investigation. In particular, the argument developed here is based on the description and analysis of 'archaeological images'[2]. Unsurprisingly, image description fills much of the following pages and collecting materials has constituted a critical component of my study. I selected a body of images, many of which are reviewed in the following sections, by focusing on depictions featuring any type of landscape elements.

The period covered by my investigation extends from the earliest evidence of Etruscan art to the beginnings of the Hellenistic age, the point at which landscape became more widespread, if not yet as a

[1] Regarding the Actor-Network Theory, see LATOUR 1996; VOLONTÉ 2017; regarding Object Oriented Ontology, see HARMAN 2018 and the essays in the edited volumes HARMAN 2019; HARMAN 2020; HARMAN 2021.

[2] The issue of methods for interpreting and analyzing images deserves an in-depth discussion of its own, a discussion this thesis does not intend to provide. In fact, the following introductory chapter focuses on 'landscape' and does not offer any preamble to illustrate the methodological principles of image reading. Likewise, the more specific problem of interpreting Etruscan images is not explored in depth. The Etruscan case is specific because it requires taking into account two aspects: one, the mutual compatibility of Greek and Etruscan systems and two, the need to clarify the mechanisms of communication operating between these two contexts (for a theoretical framework on these topics, see D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 1999, esp. pp. XV-XXXVI; D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 2021, esp. pp. 1-4). Having stated that this specificity makes Etruscan figurative imagery an articulated context with a complex semantics, I believe it particularly important to make a specific point: as with Greek images, the task of interpreting Etruscan images is mainly a problem for the modern viewer. It is modern observers who often find themselves feeling inadequate, even when facing images that were perfectly understandable to their Etruscan audience. «La nostra limitata capacità di interpreti troppo distanti nel tempo» (D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 2021, p. 4) raises difficulties for the interpretation of several Etruscan images, including those considered in this study. This fact makes the thematic organization of the content (see *infra* pp. 5; 71-72) somewhat complex, but not unfeasible. My interpretative effort has focused on placing Etruscan images in their cultural context. By describing Etruscan images and trying to frame their relationship with Greek iconography, from time to time in my analysis I have tried to outline how the meaning of the images functioned in relation to the *local* contexts for which they were conceived, even when interpretation requires recourse to Greek and Roman traditions.

genre then at least as an autonomous figurative subject. This relatively broad chronological frame has represented both a constraint and a necessity at the same time. On the one hand, the task of creating a circumscribed and coherent *corpus* has necessarily been made more difficult by wide variety of media, solutions, subjects, and combinations. Moreover, it proved impossible to derive any definite landscape-based patterns and groupings from the images containing landscape elements I collected in the first research phase. On the other hand, this broad timeline has been instrumental to achieving one of the primary purposes of my survey, namely to enable the Etruscan depicted landscape to be observed 'from afar' in combination with a 'close reading'.

As mentioned above, I granted a great deal of importance to individual image analysis ('close reading', focused on *semantic* analysis), here carried out in terms of contextualization rather than abstraction. Nonetheless, an additional issue (the 'from afar' approach, focused on *morphological* analysis) was also pivotal to my research in that individual examples, taken together, help define the existence of functioning patterns.

Besides the *interpretation* of individual artworks which allows us to determine their specific meaning, the step of providing a comprehensive *explanation* of pieces is primarily suited to reconstructing the structures and relationships underlying the visual existence of images[3].

It goes without saying that these two models are compatible: the concern for explanation by no means precludes interpretation. In particular, structural-morphological analysis does not prevent us from

[3] My investigation of the potential of morphological analysis was indirectly informed by research by Franco Moretti. In particular, the phrase 'from afar' approach deliberately echoes the title of a publication by Moretti, *La letteratura vista da lontano* (MORETTI 2005). Of course, my methodology and purposes are very distinct from those of Moretti, as his research is an extreme expression of abstract structure analysis. Although the method adopted in my study is very different, his attempts to emphasize abstract patterns were instructive for my research in the sense of revealing the need to expand a 'close reading' approach.

assigning of a symbolic value to individual elements. That value should be assessed by considering the specific Etruscan context, but also with broader reference to the findings of anthropological research[4].

Although the distant view cannot help but provide a partial picture of the 'Etruscan landscape', adopting this standpoint has proven revealing in two different senses. On the one hand, it provided background material for analyzing the mechanisms of image composition (see section 4.2 in particular). On the other hand, a long-term focus on landscape rendering contributed to thinking about Etruscans' relationship with the natural world (see section 5.1 in particular).

In addition to the activity of image gathering, the trajectory that led me to these insights began with extensive historiographical research. In fact, the following section – *Ways of Seeing Landscape: A History of Studies on Landscape Representation in Ancient Art* – reflects that historiographical work. Rather than reporting on studies of landscape representation in Etruscan art, I have attempted to reconstruct the as-yet-unexplored history of how scholars have investigated landscape representation over time. In so doing, I have tried to provide my reconstruction with a historical background in order to render visible the relationships and influences between the different disciplines that have approached landscape as a research topic.

Nevertheless, my analysis does foreground Etruscan art and the historical and cultural context of Italy. This foregrounding represents a calculated choice that took into account specific issues. My overview of landscape representation could have developed more in the direction of analyzing research on Greek and Roman art. Indeed, though central to my study, these themes often remain on the margins of the historical reconstruction presented in the first chapter. In fact, I thought it appropriate to emphasize that, while building on the general discourse about landscape in ancient art, the discussion on the Etruscan

[4] See e.g. CHIRASSI 1968, e.g. with reference to her analysis of the spring lawn (pp. 91-124) in which he discusses the sacredness of a number of plant species in relation to Mediterranean area rituals.

landscape stands out as a topic in and of itself. As for historical contextualization, the specificity of the 'Etruscan landscape' and related research is especially evident when considering the close connection between art-historical studies and the Italian context over time.

The third section – *Landscape in Context* – is dedicated to analyzing and presenting the occurrences I examined, organized into three groups with related subgroups. Rather than being focused on the figurative subject, each grouping is based on a 'situational' categorization. The choice to organize images though situation-based categories is not based on the idea that 'situations' reflects careful considerations of the meaning of landscape elements within the image. Indeed, there is no univocal correspondence between an individual 'situation' and the significance of the landscape elements being depicted. I thus adopted this structure not to facilitate the explanation of images through a preordained organization, but rather to enable a transversal reading of my collected material. For instance, situation-based grouping highlights the way landscape elements are used to convey different values (values that emerge in relation to the theme) in keeping with recurrent patterns (which in turn reflect recurrent functions). Moreover, this grouping method allows me to consider different objects/kind of artwork side by side, thereby showing how comparable figurative choices appear on different kind of works in different chronological periods[5].

[5] A preliminary methodological note is necessary here concerning the decision to include not only specifically Etruscan artifacts in my analysis, but also Praenestine and Faliscan artworks. On the one hand, this choice was motivated by the observation that – despite their differences – the material culture produced in Falerii and Praeneste is closely linked to the Etruscan one. On the other hand, the choice is based on the recognition of a *de facto* convention in Etruscan studies. When the *Istituto Internazionale di Studi Etruschi* became the *Istituto Internazionale di Studi Etruschi ed Italici* back in 1951, it became widespread among researchers to include objects from Falerii and Praeneste in discussions of Etruscan art; this practice was consolidated over time, along with a redefinition of the crystallized notion of 'Etruscan'. Regarding Falerii, see BIELLA 2013; BIELLA 2014. HARARI 2010 provides an example of an inclusive/integrated reading of artworks. Regarding Praeneste, see MENICHETTI 1995, pp. 11-14; BONAMICI 2002a, esp. pp. 83-84. With these points in mind, therefore, I have

The fourth section – *Schemes and Structures. Landscape and Visual Space Making* – provides a synthetic transversal reading of the images analyzed in the previous section. Besides offering an interpretative model for reading the landscape in Etruscan art, it seeks to present some arguments to spark discussion on the two issues mentioned above, namely mechanisms of image composition and people's relationship with the natural world.

If I were to foreshadow, using code, one possible result of this research, I would so by taking the 'into' appearing in the title of this introduction and putting it into brackets. There are at least two factors that point to such a bracketing. First, as mentioned above, observing how the landscape is composed enables us not only to map progressive changes in the way it was used on a figurative level (as we will see, I found a progressive shift from 'narration' to 'description'), but also to identify some general features of the way images are structured and how they function. In terms of function and structure, there are a number of clues suggesting the existence of compositional rules based on a reciprocal relationship among *all* the elements of the image. As I will try to show, this is an inclusive balance that calls into question the very existence of a clear boundary between 'inside' and 'outside' the image. Secondly, it is significant that the picture (albeit translated, mediated, and potentially misleading) provided to a viewer by an image makes it possible to extend one's gaze *outside* of the image itself. While it is true, therefore, that image elements enter the image by adapting (in varied ways, depending on the technique) to its structural characteristics, we are more interested in observing how these elements meet the needs of the image: for example, why were they selected, what rules of internal functioning do they adhere to, and whether or to what extent are they entrusted with the task of conveying translated aspects of the real world.

---

systematically included these materials in my analysis. Nonetheless, an attempt will always be made to account for their belonging to their own specific material culture.

2.
Ways of Seeing Landscape:
A History of Studies on Landscape Representation in Ancient Art

«Ogni forma artistica può benissimo essere vista, se non come sostituto della conoscenza scientifica, come *metafora epistemologica*: vale a dire che, in ogni secolo, il modo in cui le forme dell'arte si strutturano riflette – a guisa di similitudine, di metaforizzazione, appunto, risoluzione del concetto di figura – il modo in cui la scienza o comunque la cultura dell'epoca vedono la realtà».

UMBERTO ECO, *Opera aperta. Forma e indeterminazione nelle poetiche contemporanee*, Milano 1962, p. 50.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a broader perspective on the development of research on the representation of landscape in ancient art.

Behind the decision to introduce my dissertation with this kind of analysis is the belief that artistic production and image analysis – as much as art itself – cannot be understood without an overall historical framework.

Even though historiographical studies have been fundamental to much archaeological research since the last century[1], only in recent decades have scholars looked into the history of archaeology as a way of investigating the intellectual and cultural history of archaeological thought and its protagonists[2]. Due to the relative novelty of the

[1] See, for instance, the extensive analysis provided by BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1953.

[2] See e.g. TRIGGER 1989; SETTIS 1993; TRIGGER 1994; BARBANERA 2001; BARBANERA 2004, p. 9; BARBANERA 2015. Pioneering studies are MOMIGLIANO 1950 and FERRI 1962.

historiographical approach to archaeological studies, multiple layers of historiographical reconstruction are still to be explored or deepened.
The survey of landscape-related research is particularly challenging, as each discipline – we might say each archaeology – has looked at the subject from its particular standpoint.
In seeking to explore these issues, in the pages to follow, I present an exploratory attempt at the historical contextualization of research dealing with landscape representation to highlight an untold history.
Record and analysis of research outcomes of scholars who have dealt with themes similar to the subject of my project, which became an essential component of my research, will be presented here in synthetic form through crucial texts.

Due to the close, though underlying, connection between the historical analysis presented here and the chapters to follow, these pages deal mainly with research in the field of Etruscan art, and therefore the Italian cultural and scholarly environment assumes a particular prominence. Nevertheless, it seemed appropriate to show that any considerations of Etruscan art are indebted to broader reflections on the representation of landscape in ancient art in general, with regard to both their premises and their evolution.
Despite its relevance to historical research, the modern fortune of Etruscan landscape imagery has not been treated in this introduction to avoid losing the focus of the discussion[3]. My analysis focuses on scientific contributions related to the academic debate. Nevertheless, the reviewed scholarship also includes texts authored by experts who are not archaeologists.
To briefly present the different approaches without losing contact with the texts, I have selected the most significant contributions that encapsulate the prevailing cultural trends of their time.
In the final section, where the analysis touches on contemporary studies, my examination is less restricted and I prioritize identifying

[3] The subject is broad and has been addressed mostly in relation to Greek art (see, for instance, the 2002-2003 exhibition *Landscape of Myth* at the Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles; curator C.L. Lyons).

general trends over detailed reviews. This seems the appropriate methodology to analyze theories that are still under development and to embrace the complexity of reflections which, from a historical point of view, have the limitation – but also the silver lining – of being still in progress.
None of the sections to follow in this introduction claims to be exhaustive or clarify with outstanding linearity the complexity of a theme that would deserve a work of its own.

2.1. Back to the roots. From Alexander von Humboldt to Emmanuel Loewy[4]

In 1900, the archaeologist Emanuel Loewy published his doctoral thesis *Die Naturwiedergabe in der älteren griechischen Kunst*. Loewy analyzes the phenomena of both perception and artistic rendering of

[4] The choice to focus on Alexander von Humboldt and Emmanuel Loewy is based on the idea that they exemplify the sensibility that took hold at the end of the 19th century and influenced the 20th, as I try to show in the pages to follow. At the end of the 19th century, the publication of essays dealing with landscape is not limited to their contributions. Among others, it is worth mentioning BURCKHARDT 1860 (I have referenced the 1958 Italian edition, with translation by Domenico Valbusa: BURCKHARDT 1958; see in part. pp. 270-280 regarding Burckhardt's remarks on the ancient landscape); WOERMANN 1876 and MICHEL 1884. With regard to the reflection on nature and the artistic representability of the landscape, Loewy and von Humboldt inherited – with different achievements – the experience of the poets of the previous generation. In particular, mention should be made of the role played by John Ruskin – who will be mentioned again in the following pages – and Friedrich Shiller. Although they address the problem of the status of landscape painting (see, in particular, Schiller's *Der Spaziergang* (1794), ed. in SCHILLER 2005, in part. p. 81, with Italian translation by G. Pinna. See GAIGER 2000 regarding an analysis of Schiller's essay), their primary interest is the poetic representation of landscape. Their reflection on the relationship of the ancients to nature is therefore firmly anchored in the reading of *literary* sources, and particularly Homer (see e.g. SCHILLER 1804; reviewd in PINNA 2008).

nature in Greek art through a systematic discussion according to medium[5].

In the first chapter, Loewy briefly lists seven peculiar features characterizing Archaic Greek art. The last point states that «the representation of the environment in which the action takes place is omitted, wholly or for the most part»[6].

In his monograph, Loewy does not offer a survey of images of the natural world. In fact, he is interested in identifying the origin of figurative forms, as well as the rules leading its development. «Mental-image» or «memory-picture» (which alternatively translate the German expressions «Erinnerungsbild», «Gedächtnisbild», «geistiges Bild» and «Bild» used by Loewy) plays a crucial role in Loewy's reconstruction of the processes that lead to figurative art[7]. The mental images' or memory pictures' operating principle would also explain, in Loewy's view, the reason why the environment is nearly absent in ancient Greek art. In fact, Loewy applies the notion of mental-image also to the relationship between the viewer and the environment, observing that «in nature the object and its background combine together in one picture: imagination that is not trained into artistic observation brings

[5] LOEWY 1900. In 1907 it was translated into English by John Fothergill (LOEWY 1907). For an overall introduction to the book, see BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1942; DONATI 1993, pp. 69, 71; DONOHUE 2011. See also the introduction by Carlo Anti to the late Italian edition (LOEWY 1946). Regarding an overview of Loewy's research and methodology, see the essays in the edited volume PICOZZI 2013.

[6] LOEWY 1907, p. 6 (= LOEWY 1900, p. 4: «Von der Wiedergabe des Raumes, in dem der Vorgang sich abspielt, wird in mehr oder weniger weitgehender Weise abgesehen»). Loewy emphasizes that these features «appear in every primitive art of the present as well as of the past», expressing reservationes only on the seventh point («the element of landscape»), which «is given more extensive consideration in Egyptian, and especially in Assyrian art» (LOEWY 1907, p. 7, fn. 4).

[7] See LOEWY 1900, p. 5 = LOEWY 1907, p. 10: «As the result of the visual impression which we have received from numerous examples of the same object, there remains fixed in our mind a memory-picture [«Erinnerungsbild» in the German text], which is no other than the Platonic notion of the object, namely, a typical picture, clear of everything individual or accidental». Regarding Loewy's theory of vision, see BARBANERA 2001, p. 14; GALLI 2013. Regarding the relationship between Loewy's image theory, Sigmund Freud, and Aby Warburg, see ROSE 2001 (cf. *infra*, p. 14).

these into consciousness as separate elements. As a rule, of course […] the attention and, accordingly, the memory are absorbed by the animated and active features of a scene, and the local background as such leaves no impression»[8]. Loewy essentially traces back the «indifference to environment»[9] supposedly characterizing ancient art to a mechanism (namely, a function of human memory) that guide the image-building process.

Research on the relationship between ancient man (mainly, the Greeks) and nature, as well as that on the artistic rendering of the natural world and the transformation in space and time of artistic forms, were not a new subject at the beginning of the twentieth century and dated back at least to Winckelmann and Kant[10].
However, Loewy's debt to thinkers of previous centuries has mainly to do with his methodological principles rather than with the object of his research[11]. In fact, in order to show how the psychological process of image-building works, he takes advantage of both modern psychological theory and ethnographic studies[12]. Thus, his methodology vouches for the possibility of a collaboration between natural, social, and human sciences.

Loewy's approach dates back to Goethe's 'Morphology' ('*Morphologie*') and his interest in analyzing how forms are produced[13]. In fact, modern research on landscape and its representation stems

[8] LOEWY 1907, pp. 15-16 (for the German text, see LOEWY 1900, p. 8).
[9] LOEWY 1907, p. 9 (LOEWY 1900, p. 5: «Gleichgiltigkeit gegen die Localbezeichnung»).
[10] Regarding the relationship between Loewy and Winckelmann, see BARBANERA 2015, pp. 90-92.
[11] Regarding this point, see the discussion in GALLI 2013, p. 170, fn. 115; pp. 184-186.
[12] See GALLI 2013.
[13] In his *Versuch die Metamorphose der Pflanzen zu erklären*, published in 1790, Goethe analyzes the becoming of the form focusing on the origin of plants (I have referenced the 1983 edition: GOETHE 1983). In his essays, Goethe sustains the existence of a unity between art and nature, which allows different methodologies and disciplines to overlap. Regarding these aspects, see ZECCHI 1983. Regarding Goethe's concepts of 'metamorphosis' and 'morphology', see CASSIRER 1999, pp. 83-86.

precisely from the nineteenth-century German assumption that science and art processes of becoming are comparable phenomena[14].

In the field of botany, Alexander von Humboldt, who was deeply influenced by Goethe, was the first to focus on individual organisms and their environments as a whole[15]. His innovative approach was influenced by the idea that scientific knowledge and the aesthetic enjoyment of nature fuel each other. In the second volume of *Kosmos. Entwurf einer physischen Weltbeschreibung*[16], which – as the title states – deals with a survey of the *physical* world, von Humboldt focuses on the relationship between man and nature. His essay pivots on the idea that the sense of seeing and sentimental impression of nature encourage the analytical study of nature[17]. Additionally, in the first chapters of his book, he offers a history of «Natural feelings according to the different epochs and races»[18] and one of «Landscape painting considered in its influence upon the study of nature»[19].

Von Humboldt's thoughts regarding the representation of landscape in classical art are similar to those expressed by Loewy. Von Humboldt observes that «In Grecian and Roman antiquity […] Subordinate to other objects, Landscape Painting served only, for a long time, as the back-ground of historical composition or an accidental ornament of pictures on the walls» […] «before which the actors in the scene are moving»[20]. According to von Humboldt, this feature of Classical representation is due to the Greeks'anthropocentrism («genuine

[14] See CANADELLI 2003; POGGI 2010.

[15] In particular, Alexander von Humboldt's *Essai sur la Géographie des Plantes* (HUMBOLDT 1807), dedicated to Goethe, deals with an analysis of plants that considers their geographical context. For a general introduction, see STEARN 1960; FARINELLI 2018.

[16] HUMBOLDT 1847.

[17] See e.g. HUMBOLDT 1848, p. 74: «Landscape painting, as well as a lively verbal description, is adapted to elevate our love for the study of Nature» (trad. A. Prichard). Regarding the centrality of landscape in von Humboldt's analysis, see FRANZINI TIBALDEO 2015.

[18] HUMBOLDT 1848, pp. 4-73.

[19] HUMBOLDT 1848, pp. 74-92.

[20] HUMBOLDT 1848, pp. 74-75.

description of Nature is only seen as a secondary object, because everything in Grecian art moves only in the circle of which Man himself is the center»), which he saw as limiting human feelings toward nature («Nature appears to affect his intellect more than his moral feeling»)[21]. Besides, an echo of this approach (namely the notion that Greek anthropocentrism explains the absence of landscape representations), though expressed in a less pessimistic way, can also be found in Rainer Maria Rilke's 1902 essay, *Von der Landschaft*[22].

[21] HUMBOLDT 1848, pp. 4-5.

[22] Rilke's essay *Von der Landschaft* was written for his book *Worpswede* (first published in 1903). However, it was only published posthumously in 1932 (RILKE 1932). Decades before translations into other languages becoming customary, in 1949 the text was also published in a miscellany by the editor Enrico Cederna, with an Italian translation by Giorgio Zampa (RILKE 1949, pp. 27-33). Rilke's essay provides an example of his attempt to define the distinction between man and nature. As for his analysis of ancient landscape painting, what is relevant to the present discussion is that the mutual extraneousness between nature and man is paradoxically and poetically expressed through an identity metaphor between man and landscape:

> «Sappiamo tanto poco della pittura degli antichi; ma forse non è troppo azzardato supporre che essi vedevano gli uomini come più tardi i pittori hanno visto il paesaggio. Nelle figure dei vasi […] l'ambiente – casa o strada – è solo nominato, abbreviato quasi, dichiarato quasi con la iniziale; e invece sono tutto gli uomini nudi, sono come alberi che rechino frutta e ghirlande di frutta, come siepi in fiore, come primavere in cui cantino gli uccelli. Allora era il corpo – lo coltivavano come una terra, si adoperavano intorno ad esso come intorno a un raccolto, lo possedevano come si possiede un buon podere – la bellezza da contemplare, l'immagine traverso la quale passavano in ordine ritmico tutte le significazioni […]. L'uomo, sebbene al mondo da secoli, era ancora troppo nuovo a se stesso, troppo entusiasta di sé per guardare oltre il suo corpo o distoglierne lo sguardo. Il paesaggio era il cammino su cui egli procedeva, la posta su cui correva, tutti i luoghi di gioco e di danza nei quali si svolgeva la giornata dei greci; […] questo era il paesaggio in cui si viveva. Ma il mondo, deserto di dèi dalle umane sembianze, era estraneo, i contrafforti su cui non si levava alcuna visibile statua, le pendici sconosciute al pastore non erano neppure degni di menzione. Tutto era come un palcoscenico vuoto fino a quando l'uomo non sopravvenne, animando la scena con l'atteggiamento sereno o tragico del suo corpo. Tutto era in attesa di lui e dove egli giungeva tutto si traeva indietro e gli cedeva spazio» (RILKE 1949, pp. 27-28).

For an overview of this essay, see BESSIÈRE 2007, pp. 44-46.

In summary, von Humboldt and Loewy share what both would consider an undeniable point, namely the secondary role played by the landscape in ancient art.
However, the comparison with von Humboldt's argumentation clarifies the extent to which the rationale advanced by Loewy was innovative. Loewy and von Humboldt ultimately identify two different sources of artistic creation.
Von Humboldt stands for the Romantic tradition in his confidence in the centrality of aesthetic reading of the landscape. According to the German naturalist, the limits of the Greek artist correspond to the limitations imposed on a man who is unable to place himself in a spiritual relationship with the surrounding environment.
Conversely, according to the Austrian scholar, the absence of landscape depends on the human ability for a mental reworking of images. Art and its evolution depend on factors (including innate psycho-physiological influences) essentially unrelated to art itself. Loewy was essentially a positivist, and his position was fueled by Darwinian positivism. In his interpretation, to use De Sanctis' words, «il sentimento diviene sensazione […], l'intelligenza un istinto»[23].

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Loewy was the first to apply to archeology the new tools offered by the novel psychological science, which in Germany had already been applied to the history of art by scholars such as Ernst Kris[24]. Moreover, Loewy's concept of «mental-image» is close to that of *Pathosformel* developed by Aby Warburg[25].
Throughout the century, Loewy's theory of vision exerted limited influence and was not exempt from harsh criticism and misunderstandings. In particular, the 1901 publication of Alois Riegl's

[23] DE SANCTIS 1883, p. 18.
[24] See, in part., KRIS 1967, p. 9. See DONATI 1993 regarding an analysis of Loewy's research interests and methodology in relation to the German and Austrian school.
[25] Regarding the relationship between Loewy and Warburg, see ROSE 2001, pp. 39-73, who focuses mainly on the 'images of movement'; CIERI VIA 2014.

Kunstindustrie nach den Funden in Österreich and his formulation of *Kunstwollen* gave way to the progressive rejection of all positivist approaches[26]. Only a few scholars, including Loewy's student Ernst Gombrich, and Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli, expressed positive views on his theories[27].

2.2. Serafino Ricci. «Un prodotto naturale […] distintivo di quella città»

In 1901 Serafino Ricci published the text of a lecture presented in Pavia on *Il sentimento della natura nella monetazione della Grecia e della Magna Grecia*. Ricci explicitly refers to Loewy's teaching, although his position was extremely distant from his Austrian professor[28].
The issue of landscape representation emerged more clearly in Ricci's presentation than in Loewy's book. Ricci observed that «nei primi periodi della coniazione greca si ammira un tale verismo di riproduzione, una tale perfezione di disegno e di rilievo nella maggior parte dei tipi delle città greche autonome, quando si tratta della

[26] Regarding the initial reception of the *Kunstwollen* concept in archaeology (e.g., Gerhart Rodenwaldt and Guido Kaschnitz-Weinberg), see WEISSL 2015, pp. 389-391. Regarding Riegl in his cultural context, see BARBANERA 2001, esp. pp. 7, 12-13.
[27] See, in particular, GOMBRICH 1960; GOMBRICH 1979. Regarding the appreciation of Bianchi Bandinelli for Loewy's research, see *infra*. See GALLI 2013 , pp. 183-186; WEISSL 2015. Regarding specifically Bianchi Bandinelli and Loewy, see BARBANERA 2011.
[28] RICCI 1901, p. 64: «Molti archeologi e storici dell'arte misero in chiara luce l'amore della natura nell'animo degli artisti greci; chi rilevò le predilezioni del paesaggio nella pittura, chi il verismo con cui l'arte di Pergamo ritraeva e rilevava il Pathos nelle opere sue. Il mio illustre ed ottimo professore di archeologia e storia dell'arte a Roma, Emanuele Loewy, trattò direttamente il tema dell'abilità degli artisti greci nel rendere la natura, quale noi vediamo nei capilavori dell'arte greca, specialmente di quella più antica». The adversion towards the experimental method is expressed by the scholar himself in RICCI 1900. Regarding Serafino Ricci, see CORNO 2000; HARARI 2018, p. 1268.

rappresentazione della flora, della fauna, dell'ornato e della nomenclatura oggettiva»[29].

According to Ricci, the earliest Greek coins testify to a «sentimento vivissimo della natura» which appears only later in artistic objects[30]. In his view, the alleged 'feeling of nature' of the ancients (the same that was denied by von Humboldt and neglected by Loewy) is proven by the occurrence of individual and isolated landscape elements, rather than by representations of landscape settings[31].

A few relevant considerations can be gathered from this. These remarks emerge in relation to the particular category of objects investigated by

[29] RICCI 1901, p. 57.

[30] RICCI 1901, p. 58 («[…] occorre ammettere alcuni elementi estranei, quantunque non contrari al normale svolgimento delle arti, i quali contribuissero a rendere precocemente quella perfezione sui tipi monetari greci che noi troviamo solo più tardi nelle arti belle»). Two passages are particularly helpful to understand Ricci's stance:

> I. «Spontaneo, sorto dalla contemplazione diretta ed ingenua dei prodotti della natura, negazione assoluta di ogni simbolismo e di ogni creazione artefatta della realtà applicata all'araldica o alla epigrafia, questo sentimento della natura ha tutti i caratteri della sincerità nell'arte, dell'idillio campestre, della vita suburbana ed agricola passata all'aria aperta, fra il profumo acre dei campi, in mezzo agli animali domestici, o in riva al mare, fra l'onde salse e nella vita dei pescatori. Foglie, fiori, frutta, spighe, grappoli d'uva, grani d'orzo, acini d'uva; conchiglie tartarughe, granchi, delfini, ecco i distintivi monetari che spesso troviamo sulle monete delle città elleniche autonome» (RICCI 1901, p. 59);
>
> II. «Ma potrebbe anche darsi il caso che la scelta del distintivo, ch'era un prodotto naturale, fosse determinata dall'osservazione diretta e costante di quello, o di quei prodotti locali di cui il territorio circostante alla data città che coniava monete era stato e continuava ad essere ferace, cosicché s'imponeva anche per un riguardo abbastanza ovvio che la moneta […] dovesse avere un distintivo noto, che entrasse nella coscienza del popolo, che fosse riconosciuto dappertutto come distintivo di quella data città, di quel dato territorio anche lungi dal paese in terre lontane. […]. Può darsi allora il caso che il politeismo invadente, determinato, oltreché da ragioni di miti e di culti, anche dall'indole fantastica e plasmatrice dei Greci, rendesse immortale appunto il fenomeno o il prodotto naturale, incarnandolo in una divinità locale, di cui il fenomeno e il prodotto stesso diveniva poi l'indivisibile attributo; oppure che la data divinità, scelta e ormai consacrata alla data regione, portasse seco la tradizione dell'attributo a lei sacro, e tale fosse scelto poi a rappresentare e a onorare la divinità sulle monete fra gli altri prodotti di quel suolo» (RICCI 1901, pp. 62-63).

[31] See above, fn. 30, text I.

Serafino Ricci and show how his essay, though devoted to a specific niche of Greek art, was symptomatic of its times.

Firstly, the lead role reserved for man's action on nature stands out. The isolated landscape elements described by Ricci refer to farming and navigation, that is, to man-made spaces. Therefore, the place of man in Ricci's 'landscape' is implicit, but paramount. The main subject of the images is man's impact on nature. In fact, Ricci's descriptions are significantly close to Panism and Vitalism sensitivities characterizing the aesthetics at the beginning of the century.

Secondly, the link between these landscape elements and the city is also worth highlighting («un prodotto naturale […] riconosciuto dappertutto come distintivo di quella città»)[32]. According to Ricci, landscape elements distinctively represent the native land.

This patriotic spirit can be traced back to John Ruskin, who unsurprisingly was also mentioned by Benedetto Croce in his explanatory memorandum to the bill *Per la tutela delle bellezze naturali e degli immobili di particolare interesse storico*[33]. In his discourse, which shares similarities with Ricci's approach, Croce states that «fuvvi anche chi affermò, con profondo intuito, che anche il patriottismo nasce dalla secolare carezza del suolo agli occhi, ed altro non essere che la rappresentazione materiale e visibile della patria, coi suoi caratteri fisici particolari, con le sue montagne, le sue foreste, le sue pianure, i suoi fiumi, le sue rive, con gli aspetti molteplici e vari del suo suolo, quali si sono formati e son pervenuti a noi attraverso la lenta successione dei secoli»[34].

This trope on landscape («*Il volto amato della Patria*») conditioned the theoretical and parliamentary debate, beginning with the first speeches and essays that promoted the need for legislative intervention in

[32] See above, fn. 30, text II.
[33] CROCE 1920.
[34] CROCE 1920. For an analysis, see SETTIS 2011.

matters of landscape protection[35]. The study of coins is likely to have contributed to the definition of such rhetoric[36].

From this perspective, Ricci's essay highlights a further significant aspect. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, for the first time, research on landscape as an object of representation has found a counterpart not only in contemporary theoretical reflection, but also in legislative practice, as well as in the international promotion of conservation movements and campaigns to defend the landscape[37]. This is particularly true in relation to the Italian context, where the earliest legislation for landscape protection was promulgated in 1905[38]. Debates on the necessity of limiting human intervention on the landscape at normative level were heated and led to the promulgation of the L. 778/1922 (*Per la tutela delle bellezze naturali e degli immobili di particolare interesse storico*)[39].

2.3. Margret Heinemann. *Landschaftliche Elemente in der griechischen Kunst bis Polygnot*

In June 1909, Margret Heinemann presented in Bonn her PhD dissertation on *Landschaftliche Elemente in der griechischen Kunst bis*

[35] See SEVERINI 2019, pp. 8-10. Regarding these aspects, see also PICCIONI 2014.
[36] See also the poem *Vergilia Anceps* by Gabriele D'Annunzio (published in the edited volume ANDREOLI, LORENZINI, ANCESCHI 1984). On D'Annunzio's interest in ancient coins and the numismatic program by Vittorio Emanuele III, see ALONZO 2011.
[37] See PICCIONI 2014, who analyzes the features of the first wave of Italian and international landscape conservation, which spread during the first two decades of the twentieth century.
[38] L. 411/1905 (*Per la conservazione della Pineta di Ravenna*). MALFITANO 2012 provides an overview of this law. For a contemporary perspective, see MARANGONI 1911 (in part. p. 470), who also emphasizes the role played by local artists (and especially of the «paesisti lombarti») in a context of revitalized interest in the landscape (see p. 474).
[39] Regarding the legal aspects, see VENTURA 1987; SEVERINI 2019, with up-to-date bibliography.

Polygnot[40]. Heinemann was a pupil of the German archaeologist Georg Loeschcke and attended Adolf Furtwängler's classes in Berlin.
In her discussion, the scholar addresses examples of Etruscan art in several different artistic genres, including wall and vase painting, scarabs, and mirrors[41]. Undertaking a stylistic analysis of artworks and the rendering of landscape elements, Heinemann ascribed to Etruscan culture a mixed character («Mischcharakter»)[42], in which Attic elements combined with East-Greek and pre-Hellenic influences[43].

[40] HEINEMANN 1910. Margret Heinemann was one of the first and very few women in Germany to be awarded a PhD in archaeology before the First World War. She graduated from the Bonn University under professor Georg Loeschcke (see WEHGARTNER 2001, pp. 271-273; HANSSON 2020, p. 136, fig. 7.3).

[41] Particularly noteworthy is the comparison between Pontic vase painting and archaic tomb painting. Although Heinemann did not consider Pontic vases (which she still referred to as the Dümmler Class - «Die Dümmlerschen Vasen», following DOHRN 1937, p. 33, based on DÜMMLER 1887) to be Etruscan, the parallels identified are valid. See, in particular, HEINEMANN 1910, p. 46: «Doch ist hiermit keineswegs ausgeschlossen, daß der betreffende Fabrikationsort der Dümmlerschen Vasen, wie allein schon durch den starken Import griechischer Exemplare nach Mittelitalien bewiesen wird, rege Beziehungen zu Etrurien unterhalten hat; zwischen den Vasen und etruskischen Wandgemälden fin den sich sogar Übereinstimmungen, die nicht zufällig sein können, und die einen willkommenen Anhaltspunkt bieten für die ungefähre Datierung der etruskischen Malereien».

[42] HEINEMANN 1910, p. 31.

[43] See, in particular, HEINEMANN 1910, p. 32 («Wenn wir langer, als es die immerhin spärlichen landschaftlichen Elemente zu verdienen scheinen, bei der Betrachtung dieser wenig beachteten und noch immer rätselvollen Vasengattung verweilten, so geschah es, weil sie Licht wirft auf das Wesen der etruskischen Kunst, deren eigenartige Bedeutung nicht zum wenigsten darauf beruht, daß sie Spuren vorhellenischer Tradition zäh festgehalten und zahlreiche Elemente ostgriechischer Dekoration in sich aufgenommen hat»). Eastern Greek influence is mainly aknowledged by Heinemann in archaic tomb paintings: see pp. 46-47: «Die Geschichte der etruskischen Wandmalerei ist als Geschichte der Imitation der griechischen aufzufassen, wobei allerdings die Ausbildung eines speziell etruskischen Stils nicht zu leugnen ist. Wenn in der späteren Zeit attische Vorbilder benutzt werden, entsprechend den engen Handelsbeziehungen, die zwischen diesem Land und Italien seit En de des VI. Jahrhunderts bestehen, so werden in der Zeit, als die Phokäer im Westen kolonisierten und eine Reihe ostgriechischer Städte ihre Waren nach Etrurien absetzten, kleinasiatische Vorbilder maßgebend gewesen sein, wie sie uns die Dümmlerschen Vasen veranschaulichen. Finden wir nun in der altetruskischen Wandmalerei ähnliche landschaftliche Elemente, wie sie im Unterschied zu der mutterländisch griechischen der ionischen Keramik eigen sind, so

According to Heinemann, Etruscan style's specificity («die Ausbildung eines speziell etruskischen Stils»)[44] embodies the oscillation between the two models, suggesting from time to time the influence of one or the other. As for landscape representation, in general, Etruscan art displays a «Vorliebe für die üppige Vegetation»[45] (a preference for lush vegetation), namely «den Sinn für das Landschaftliche in hohem Grade»[46] (sensibility for landscape to a high degree).

In her presentation, which is always oriented to stylistic analysis, Heinemann highlights some of the features characterizing the Etruscan preference for landscape. She stressed, for instance, the lack of interest in the realistic rendering of botanical genera and species as opposed to a tendency towards stylization and schematic repetition[47].

The scholar observes an Etruscan penchant for the representation of water, which is considered consistent with the interests of Etruscan society and economy[48]. Referring mainly to the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*, she explains the representation of rocks in colored stripes through Greek literary sources and associates the motif of 'death as a leap into the sea' with Greek culture, thus assigning a metaphorical value to this gesture[49]. According to her analysis, the association

---

wird man geneigt sein, diesen Tatbestand aus der Abhängigkeit der etruskischen Kultur von der ostgriechischen zu erklären».

[44] HEINEMANN 1910, p. 47. See footnote 43 for the entire passage.

[45] HEINEMANN 1910, p. 48.

[46] HEINEMANN 1910, p. 97.

[47] HEINEMANN 1910, p. 47: «Den ‚Gattungen und Arten' der Baume und Sträucher darf man nicht nachforschen; sie entfernen sich, wie der Jagdzug, Mon d I XII, 13, gut zeigt, von der Natur, aber bestimmte Stilisierungen werden fest; so entspricht die Palme des Jagdzuges genau dem Baum des Troilosbildes, AD II, 41».

[48] HEINEMANN 1910, p. 47: «Daß in den Jenseitsvorstellungen der Etrusker, eines seefahrenden Volkes, das große Wasser eine Rolle spielt, kann nicht wundernehmen».

[49] HEINEMANN 1910, pp. 50-51: «Den Tod als Sprung ins Meer aufzufassen, ist eine in vielen griechischen Sagen geläufige Vorstellung, der Sprung von der *Leukàs pétre* nur eine individualisierte Brechung dieser Vorstellung. Solcher ‚weißer Felsen' gab es viele an der griechischen Küste; daß auf dem etruskischen Gemälde der Felsen nicht weiß, sondern in der schon in der mykenischen Kunst üblichen Weise phantastisch buntstreifig bemalt ist, darf uns nicht beirren, vielmehr gewinnt unsre Erklärung eine Stütze durch literarische Nachrichten, die von einem Kult und Heiligtum der

between animals and plants would be an additional feature that links Eastern Greek examples to the Etruscan imagery (in contrast with Attic models)[50]. Finally, she maintains that, in Etruscan iconography, the landscape stands as an 'abstract background' with no relation to reality[51].

Heinemann's research is embedded in the principles of German archaeology of the end of the nineteenth century, which were still being fostered at the beginning of the twentieth century. In particular, she demonstrated her adherence to *Archäologie* as *Anschauung*, developed and advanced by Heinrich Brunn and Adolf Furtwängler[52]. As far as the method is concerned, the attention given to different types of objects was impacted by Alexander Conze's lesson, whereby all objects are significant for the historical reconstruction of the past[53].

Leukothea, die .ja selbst erst durch den Sprung ins Meer in die Göttlichkeit einging, an der Küste Etruriens berichten. Die Vorstellung, daß ein Kahn zur Aufnahme des Springenden nahe bei dem Felsen harrte, um ihn ins Totenreich zu bringen, hat sich in einer rituellen Zeremonie auf Leukas erhalten».

[50] HEINEMANN 1910, p. 84: «Den Gegensatz zu dieser streng attischen Landschaftsbehandlung bezeichnet recht gut ein etruskischer Spiegel, Gerhard, Etrusk. Sp. IV, t. 292 […]. Also auch hier haben wir wieder die Vereinigung von Tier- und Pflanzenbeobachtung, die wir schon früher als Merkmal für die ostgriechische und die von ihr abhängige etruskische Kunst hervorhoben».

[51] HEINEMANN 1910, p. 97: « lm Gegensatz dazu benutzen die etruskischen Grabgemalde, denen wir im Übrigen den Sinn für das Landschaftliche in hohem Grade zuerkennen mußten, ebenso wie die gesamten griechischen Vasen, selbst die so stark landschaftlichen Bilder aus der zweiten Hälfte des VI. Jahrhunderts, die Wandflache als den gegebenen · Hintergrund und abstrahieren somit völlig von der Wirklichkeit».

[52] BRUNN 1885. Regarding Brunn's and Furtwängler's methodology, see FERRI 1962, pp. 3-4; BARBANERA 2015, p. 81.

[53] See CONZE 1902, p. 167. Regarding Conze's approach, see BARBANERA 2015, p. 78.

2.4. Oreste Mattirolo. «Ho a lungo erborizzato nelle opere artistiche»[54]

A sequel to von Humboldt's chapter on «Landscape painting considered in its influence upon the study of nature»[55] is provided by Oreste Mattirolo's speech on the occasion of the opening of the 1910-1911 academic year at the Regia Università di Torino[56]. Mattirolo was a botanist and his long address aimed to underscore a methodological issue, namely the need to investigate nature directly, in both art and botany. As for art, he states that «Finché gli artisti lavorarono nelle botteghe, usando un limitatissimo numero di modelli vegetali, per riempire i vuoti nei loro quadri; finché non cercarono essi la verità nella natura, e non si curarono di rispondere alla legge dell'unità di tempo e di luogo, l'Arte del paesaggio, soffocata dalla artificiosità, dalle ingenuità e dagli anacronismi non poté assurgere a dignità di Arte indipendente»[57]. To prove his point, by explicitly referring to Oscar Montelius's classification[58], Mattirolo outlined an evolutionary process of landscape representation from primitive art to photography. He identified three types of imitation: «naturalistica», «scientifica» and «stilizzatrice»[59]. Having dealt with Greek art, which had «per ideale

[54] MATTIROLO 1901, p. 14 («Per raccogliere i materiali necessari al mio studio, ho a lungo erborizzato nelle opere artistiche; ricercandovi le impressioni che i vegetali e le associazioni vegetali esercitarono sul cervello dei grandi maestri, ho raccolto una somma di osservazioni le quali spesse volte mi rivelarono l'indole degli artefici; la pertinenza o la derivazione loro da scuole determinate. Nell'Arte come nella vita, più che le grandi opere, i particolari svelano il carattere delle persone; perocché essi sono il frutto dell'abitudine, del ragionamento sereno; sono le risposte naturali alle impressioni esterne, che non implicano né ardore, né impeti di passione»).

[55] See above, p. 12.

[56] MATTIROLO 1911.

[57] MATTIROLO 1911, pp. 45-46.

[58] MATTIROLO 1911, p. 10. He refers in particular to Montelius' *Die typologische Methode* (1901).

[59] MATTIROLO 1911, p. 15: «Coll'imitazione *naturalistica* l'artista tende a richiamare all'occhio dell'osservatore la impressione corrispondente a quella che egli dovrebbe risentire davanti al vegetale in natura. […] L'imitazione *scientifica* impone la massima cura dei particolari, la meticolosa ed esatta riproduzione dei contorni e dei colori degli organi delle piante, di cui l'artista deve dare l'immagine fedele senza preoccuparsi

supremo la perfezione fisica, libera da ogni preoccupazione di ambiente»[60], Mattirolo provides an analysis of Etruscan art:

> «Quanto rimane della civiltà etrusca, ce la dimostra figlia immediata della civiltà orientale. Simboli orientali ricorrono ovunque negli Ipogei etruschi, e analogie strettissime si notano fra i monumenti e le varie estrinsecazioni artistiche etrusche (influenzate più tardi dall'Arte greca) e quelle dei Fenicii. Piante africane rozzamente segnate, appena riconoscibili, sono qua e là dipinte sulle pareti degli Ipogei. A Corneto Tarquinia, a Chiusi, è riprodotta la Palma *«Dum» Hiphaene Thebaica* (Mart) del Sudan, dell'Egitto e dell'Abissinia e la Palma del Dattero; scimmie africane animano scene di danze e di banchetti»[61].
>
> «Quanto si ammira nei musei di Roma, di Firenze, di Bologna, di Chiusi, di Orvieto, di Cortona, se ci dà idea della loro florida civiltà, della loro abilità e sopratutto della originalità capricciosa e precisione nel modellare terre cotte e nel trattare il bronzo; se ci dimostra l'influenza tardiva dei modelli dell'arte greca, ci convince della poca importanza botanica della loro arte. Poche sono le piante rappresentate nelle loro pitture murali e negli ipogei, incise sui vasi o sui bronzi, che sieno riconoscibili»[62].

As a botanist, Mattirolo applied the comparative method of natural sciences to art history, following the example of previous botanists such as Felix Rosen[63]. However, compared to earlier botanical studies, Mattirolo's analysis prioritizes figurative details over mere classification[64]. His speech, in fact, reveals a first faint underlying

---

dell'impressione estetica complessiva. Lo *stilizzatore* rinunciando all'imitazione della natura, si vale del vegetale […] mirando egli ad uno scopo puramente decorativo».

[60] MATTIROLO 1911, p. 9. See p. 20: «Botanicamente parlando (giudicando da quanto è rimasto), il fulgidissimo periodo dell'Arte greca non indicò, né progressi, né indirizzi nuovi».

[61] MATTIROLO 1911, p. 21.

[62] MATTIROLO 1911, p. 53, fn. 14.

[63] See, in particular, ROSEN 1903.

[64] See, for instance, the previous attempt by COMES 1879 at a botanical classification of plants in Pompeian frescos.

attempt to provide an iconographic analysis of landscape elements in Etruscan art.
Mattirolo's approach would influence the next generation of scholars. However, it would not be applied to the archaeological field until the late 1920s, when a new generation of botanists interested in archaeology was more receptive to his thinking.

2.5. Giovanni Patroni and the Etruscan 'Environment' in the Thirties

The debate on the artistic rendering of landscape returned to the forefront of research with Giovanni Patroni, a pupil of Loewy's who held the chair of Archaeology in Pavia from 1905 and later in Milan from 1927[65]. In 1930 Patroni published in the periodical «Historia. Studi storici per l'antichità classica» an article entitled *Valori etici del paesaggio nell'arte antica (A proposito d'una recente pubblicazione intorno al Toro Farnese)*[66]. Although hardly clear from the title, his contribution dealt with the rendering of landscape in Etruscan art.
In particular, in his analysis Patroni observed that

> «il paesaggio scarsamente occupa di sé e scarsamente commuove per se stesso Greci e grecizzanti; che invece molto più occupa di sé e molto più commuove per se stesso i popoli dell'Italia antica e poi i Romani, come si vede dalla propensione che gli artefici e principalmente i pittori etruschi mostrarono per l'elemento paesistico, pur derivando molto dai Greci per le figure»[67].

Patroni clearly distinguishes two polar opposites.
On one side, there was the art of the ancient Greeks («Greci e grecizzanti»), which took little interest in landscape, as parallels with

[65] On Giovanni Patroni, see SENA CHIESA 2007, pp. 153-155; BARBANERA 2009, pp. 49-50 ; FRATI 2018; HARARI 2018, part. p. 1267.
[66] PATRONI 1930. For a review, see CESSI 1932, pp. 65-66, which only deals with the aspects related to Greek art.
[67] PATRONI 1930, p. 138.

written sources are likely to show[68]. According to Patroni, in Greek art «sentimenti particolari, accordi tra natura e soggetto non sono né espressi né cercati», although some landscape elements suggest accuracy and liveliness[69].

On the other side he positions Etruscan art, which by contrast shows a major interest in landscape. In fact, Patroni highlights that «Etruschi, Romani, Italiani del pre-Rinascimento, del Rinascimento e dei secoli posteriori lo amarono, lo intesero, attribuirono ad esso una vita e un sentimento, e in pratica lo figurarono correntemente nell'esercizio dell'arte loro»[70].

By contrast with Greek models, according to Patroni, Etruscan art represented an innovation in the depiction of landscape. His reasoning rests on thorny theoretical assumptions and implications and is essentially based on just three examples: the *Tomba dei Tori*, *Tomba dell'Orco*, and the Torre San Severo sarcophagus:

> «Ben altrimenti propensa al paesaggio e anche a dare ad esso espressione o significato è l'arte etrusca. Nella pittura di tomba tarquiniese rappresentante Achille e Troilo, gli alberi e virgulti non riempiono soltanto lo spazio né soltanto ravvivano il soggetto, ma conferendo alla espressione dell'agguato, aggiungono efficacia drammatica. Gli alberelli fioriti dicono che la danza dipinta nella tomba dei Leopardi ha luogo in un giardino (gli Elisi) e le danno un altro tono. Le canne palustri della tomba dell'Orco sono pregnanti di significato e segnano la riva dell'Acheronte; al che si può confrontare il paesaggio della riva d'Oceano con la nave d'Ulisse che vi è approdata, visto di lontano, dalla fossa che Ulisse ha scavato sulla riva acherontea per compiervi il sacrificio agl'inferi: paesaggio di cui un Greco avrebbe fatto a meno, ma che lo scultore del sarcofago di Torre S. Severo, ora in Orvieto, si compiacque di figurare»[71].

[68] See e.g. PATRONI 1930, p. 139: «i Greci antichi non amarono il paesaggio, non se ne interessarono, non lo intesero e non lo rappresentarono».
[69] PATRONI 1930, p. 147.
[70] PATRONI 1930, p. 139.
[71] PATRONI 1930, p. 148.

For Patroni, the innovation accomplished by Etruscan artists consisted of enduing landscape elements with expression and dramatic effectiveness. Patroni describes the characteristics granting this condition through their contrast with two traits of Greek culture.
Firstly, he attributed to Etruscan culture the conceptualization of the idea of 'environment', namely

> « […] il concetto degli elementi paesistici e naturali come puro ambiente della vita umana, e il raffinamento di tale concetto nella ricerca di accordi sentimentali»[72].

In Greece, by contrast, nature was anthropomorphized. Therefore, it was essentially conceived as a person rather than an environment.
Secondly, Patroni pointed out that the federal organization of Etruscan cities implied a regional planning thanks to which «venne favorita l'agricoltura e le relazioni tra città e campagna» and «aumentarono il gusto e l'amore per la natura»[73]. Conversely, the social and economic order based on the *polis* would have posed a further limit to the Greek perception of the natural environment.
Moreover, Patroni claims the existence of a spontaneous impulse («impulso spontaneo»)[74] of Italic people towards landscape representation and asserts that this impulse would demonstrate that they were biologically endowed with a love of nature[75].
As mentioned above, according to Patroni these features would characterize not only people and art of the Etruscan period, but also those of the following centuries. In particular, «forte argomento a riprova dell'appartenenza ad Etruschi e Romani, e non a Greci ed

[72] PATRONI 1930, p. 144.
[73] PATRONI 1930, p. 145.
[74] PATRONI 1930, p. 145: «contrariamente a quanto potevano desumere dai loro modelli greci, e dunque per impulso spontaneo, gli artefici etruschi spesso e volentieri, in pittura e in rilievi, rappresentarono elementi paesistici».
[75] PATRONI 1930, p. 145: «aumentarono il gusto e l'amore per la natura, di cui forse già in certo grado erano dotate le popolazioni della penisola».

orientali grecizzanti, di un indirizzo d'arte in cui il paesaggio è in onore, è il risorgere di tale indirizzo nell'arte italiana del Rinascimento»[76].

The theme of the survival of Etruscan art envisages the idea of cultural and ethnic continuity on the Italian soil, from antiquity to modern times. In Patroni's view, resurgences in the artistic sphere account for the Italianness of the "Etruscan", namely for the relationship between the ancient Etruscan and the Italian Renaissance man. That approach consistently aligns Patroni's intervention with the rhetorical presentation of Etruscan art in the Fascist era, although this topic had already emerged much earlier[77]. This approach matches the publishing destination of the article. «Historia», founded by Ettore Paìs, was edited by the «Il Popolo d'Italia» newspaper, founded by Benito Mussolini, and it was no coincidence that it gave much space to Tuscan archaeology[78].

Patroni's interest in Etruscan art undoubtedly predates the 1930s and dates back to the beginning of his research activity[79]. His 1930 essay, however, provides the portrait of a scholar who is far from the positivist and determinist positions he had strongly expressed at the beginning of the century. Instead, his approach is closer to the ideological positions formulated in his *Preistoria*, published in 1937 for the editorial series *Storia Politica d'Italia*[80].

Patroni's focus on the 'environment' witnesses the prominent role he assigned to human action and its relationship with nature. At the same time, it also reveals a connection with the legal and philosophical debates of the previous years.

---

[76] PATRONI 1930, p. 139.

[77] As has been shown, «il tema è largamente prefascista e interno alla riflessione storiografica» (HARARI 2012a, p. 407). In addition to the comprehensive list of examples mentioned by the Author, see also MARIANI 1900, pp. 31-32.

[78] See, for instance, the review in GRENIER 1928.

[79] See e.g. PATRONI 1901 and PATRONI 1908. A list of publication by Patroni in the field of Etruscology can be found in FRACCARO1951.

[80] PATRONI 1937. Slightly earlier contributions by Patroni also show a resort to the ethnogenetic model and reject migration theories: see e.g. PATRONI 1932.

This concept of environment, anachronistically associated with the Etruscans by Patroni, dates back to previous decades and to the complex debates, the onset of which can also be seen in Ricci's analysis. Discussions of humanity's place in nature had led to the idea that man is both creator and creature of the natural environment. From different perspectives, the subject was addressed by geographers including Otto Schlüter and Carl Ortwin Sauer, who contributed to the development of the concept of 'cultural landscape'[81], by sociologists like Georg Simmel, who theorized the contrast between 'nature' and 'landscape'[82], and by ethnographers like Bronisław Kasper Malinowski, who showed that communities and individuals not only modify the environment in a physical sense but also symbolically shape it through the assignment of cultural meanings[83]. Finally, the issue also emerged in the legal field. In *La difesa delle bellezze naturali d'Italia*, published in 1923, Luigi Parpagliolo comments on the L. 778/1922 and states that «vanno comprese tra le cose da difendere anche quelle che, *essendo espressione non della natura ma dell'uomo, hanno essenziale valore paesistico*: e questo valore ha assunto, nel tempo e per l'inquadratura degli elementi circostanti, carattere tradizionale di ambiente»[84]. This example clarifies that a significant contribution to the formulation of the concept of 'environment' as referred to in Patroni's text was likely to have derived

[81] See e.g. Otto Schlüter's distinction between *Urlandschaft* (original landscape) and the *Kulturlandshcaft* (cultural landscape): MARTIN, JAMES 1981, p. 177. Regarding Sauer's definition of 'cultural landscape', see in particular SAUER 1925.

[82] See, in particular, *Die Philosophie der Landschaft* (SIMMEL 1913). For a comment on the couple nature-landscape in Simmel, including selected texts dealing with landscape by the same author, see SASSATELLI 2006, esp. pp. 14-35. For an analysis of *Die Philosophie der Landschaft* (Italian translation *Filosofia del paesaggio*) considered in light of Simmel's reflections on visual arts, see PERUCCHI 1983, esp. pp. 35-36.

[83] See MALINOWSKI 1922 (I have referenced the 2011 edition: MALINOWSKI 2011). This perspective – namely the assignment to landscape of a symbolic mediation function between a territory and the society that produced and inhabited it – was later adopted and developed by Claude Lévi Strauss: see e.g. LÉVI STRAUSS 1948; LÉVI STRAUSS 1955.

[84] PARPAGLIOLO 1923 [editor's italic]. Regarding Luigi Parpagliolo and a historical overview, see SEVERINI 2019.

from the national debate on the necessity to include the landscape in the conservation of cultural heritage. The concept engaged jurists as well as archaeologists and art historians. It highlighted both the need to safeguard the natural environment from man's action and protect the natural environment affected by man's activity.

As outlined above, this latter theme emerges in Patroni's analysis («elementi paesistici e naturali come puro ambiente della vita umana») and, once again, entirely fits with the cultural panorama of the 1930s.

In Italy, the Thirties ended with the revolutionary principles in matters of cultural heritage protection established by the L. 1089/1939 on the *Tutela delle cose d'interesse Artistico o Storico*[85], which had a substantial impact on the international debate. This legislative decree was followed by the promulgation of the L. 1497/1939 on the *Protezione delle bellezze naturali*, which was based on an aesthetic concept of landscape[86]. The text distinguishes «cose» (art. 1, nn. 1, 2) from «località» (art. 1, nn. 3, 4), namely the real estate heritage characterized by extraordinary beauty, from «bellezze panoramiche considerate come quadri naturali e così pure quei punti di vista o di belvedere, accessibili al pubblico, dai quali si goda lo spettacolo di quelle bellezze». The Ministero dell'Educazione Nazionale was responsible for this law. In the following decades, a number of legal critics strongly affirmed that the text of the L. 1497 «ha di mira unicamente i valori paesistici sotto il profilo dei quadri naturali che essi realizzano»[87], while nature as such does not fall within the scope of the law[88].

[85] For an overview, see CAMMELLI 2003, pp. 14 ss.

[86] An overview of this «dispositivo regolatore» can be found in BONELLI 2001 [1993], pp. 325-327. For an analysis of the concept of landscape beyond the L. 1497/1939, see D'ANGELO 2010, pp. 19-21. For a comparative discussion of the text of the L. 1497/1939 with that of the L. 778/1922, see CASSESE 2001, pp. 391-392.

[87] SANDULLI 1967, p. 72.

[88] Nonetheless, comparable criticism can also be found just after the law's promulgation. See, for instance, the position of the art historian Achille Bertini Calosso, who during the 1938 *Covegno dei Sovrintendenti* stressed the opposing and contrary point that was emphasized by Parpagliolo (PARPAGLIOLO 1923; see above p. 28) less than ten years earlier: «Per ultimo mi permetto esprimere il voto che le finalità della Legge, esposte nell'art. l, vengano allargate, si da tutelare non solo le cose che hanno

An analysis by Marino Lazzari, the Italian Direttore Generale delle Antichità e Belle Arti from 1938 to 1943, aiming to justify the law's intent, provides a picture of its cultural and historical background. Unsurprisingly enough, Lazzari's analysis is very close to Patroni's standpoint. Influenced by the stylistic and linguistic formulas of Benedetto Croce's idealism, the new law focuses on the impact of human action (and human work) on nature, in line with the totalitarian regime approach. Lazzari's summary clarifies why L. 1497 falls within the remit of the Ministero dell'Educazione Nazionale[89] and provides a critique of landscape definitions that were retained in common thinking due to the legacies of Romanticism and Positivism[90]. In essence, in his essay, he maintains that

> «Non è dunque il paesaggio in astratto, scenario immobile del dramma umano perennemente vario, che noi ci proponiamo di tutelare, ma il paesaggio del nostro tempo, quello col quale viviamo in continuo rapporto. […] il paesaggio da tutelare non è soltanto quello che ci offre la natura indomita e vergine nelle solitudini alpestri o negli illimitati orizzonti marini, ma è tutto il paesaggio d'Italia, con i segni del lavoro umano, con le sue reti di strade, con i suoi paesi, le sue opere di bonifica e di sfruttamento agricolo o industriale, con le sue zone apriche o deserte, con la sua montagna e il suo mare. Ogni limitazione in quest'opera di tutela sarebbe, più che un errore, un disconoscimento irrimediabile dell'altissimo valore educativo che la presenza costante della natura assume nella moralità stessa del lavoro umano»[91].

Lazzari does not provide a definition of 'landscape'. However, he specifies what 'landscape to be protected' is. Precisely in terms of protection and, therefore, from a merely practical point of view, Lazzari

---

interesse per la loro bellezza naturale ma quelle eziandio interessanti per la loro importanza naturalistica» (BERTINI CALOSSO 1938-1939, p. 158).

[89] See LAZZARI 1939-1940, pp. 79-80.

[90] See LAZZARI 1939-1940, pp. 81-82.

[91] LAZZARI 1939-1940, pp. 81, 83.

also affirms the centrality of the «piani regolatori paesistici» regulating urban and rural development[92].

By comparison, even the final point of Patroni's analysis – the credit given to Etruscans for having promoted regional planning to foster contacts between cities and rural areas – acquires a political dimension. Moreover, Patroni was no less aligned with contemporary Etruscan scholarship. In 1931, for instance, Arturo Solari published *Vita pubblica e privata degli Etruschi*, with a contribution by Aldo Neppi Modona[93]. The book includes two chapters on «Industrie e commerci» and «Coltura», which significantly portray the Etruscans as a people who refused maritime travel beyond the Italian peninsula and were mainly occupied in agriculture and crafts, as well as land reclamation activities.

2.6. «Studi Etruschi». Archaeology and «Naturalistica»

In the very same years as Patroni's work, the interest of etruscologists in landscape also developed through a different approach. Since its first issue in 1927, the journal «Studi Etruschi» dedicated a section to «Naturalistica». That was a multidisciplinary column, centered on the «idea di costituire in seno al Comitato per gli Studi Etruschi, un gruppo di Naturalisti il quale potesse fornire agli studiosi di etruscologia le indispensabili indicazioni tecniche sulle materie prime utilizzate dagli Etruschi e possibilmente sulle condizioni di ambiente nelle quali si svolse la loro attività»[94]. This section, consequently, was dedicated to essays focusing on object technology and materials, as well as on botany and paleobotany. In the first issue, for instance, the botanist Giovanni Negri (a pupil of Giovanni Mattirolo's) published an essay that aimed at reconstructing the «paesaggio vegetale sullo sfondo del quale gli avvenimenti storici si

[92] See LAZZARI 1939-1940, pp. 84, 87-88.
[93] SOLARI 1931, reviewed in RICCI 1931.
[94] *Atti* 1929, p. 259.

sono svolti»[95]. His research was based on the study of the «residui di vegetazione spontanea conservatisi in mezzo alla vegetazione attuale profondamente umanizzata»[96].

The relationship between natural sciences and archaeology was tangibly boosted in these years by the work of Antonio Minto, the journal's director and coordinator of the *Comitato Permanente per l'Etruria* (later *Istituto di Studi Etruschi*), which promoted the publication of «Studi Etruschi»[97]. The «Naturalistica» section was one of the first outcomes of this approach and collaboration.
The division of the journal matched the dual streams of the *Primo Congresso Internazionale Etrusco*, organized in 1928 by the *Comitato*. Among other duties, the *Comitato* was tasked with publishing monographs on various aspects of ancient Etruria, including issues focused on «ricerche sul paesaggio vegetale toscano»[98].

The publications schedule on this subject was drafted during the Primo Congresso and included a volume on «Le piante nell'ornamentazione etrusca» by the biologist Renato Pampanini[99]. Even though the book never came out, the same author published two articles on that subject in «Studi Etruschi», within the section «Naturalistica»: *Le piante nell'arte decorativa degli Etruschi* in 1930 and *Altri soggetti fitomorfi nell'arte decorativa etrusca* in 1931[100]. In examining different media (e.g. tomb paintings, vases, mirrors and jewelery), Pampanini maintaines that the «ornamentazione fitomorfa è povera di tipi, spesso anche difficilmente identificabili sotto le complicazioni e le deformazioni della stilizzazione» and concludes that «le identificazioni emerse dall'ornato fantastico sono quasi sempre ipotetiche. In generale più che derivazioni sono reminiscenze»[101]. Nonetheless, he mainaines

[95] NEGRI 1927, p. 363.
[96] NEGRI 1927, p. 368. For an analysis, see TARANTINI 2002, pp. 150-151.
[97] Regarding Minto's approach and background, see TARANTINI 2002, pp. 152-154.
[98] *Atti* 1929, p. 265. See also pp. 28-29.
[99] *Atti* 1929, p. 266. For an overview of the activity of the *Comitato* and the journal «Studi Etruschi», see TARANTINI 2002.
[100] Respectively PAMPANINI 1930 and PAMPANINI 1931.
[101] PAMPANINI 1930, pp. 293, 316.

that the imaginative characterization «si rallenta o si arresta quando si tratta di piante simboliche o rituali, oppure di oggetti attinenti al culto»[102].

With regard to the collaboration of Pampanini and Negri with «Studi Etruschi», the two pursued a common objective, namely the reconstruction of the Etruscan plant landscape. Pampanini's research methodology is particularly relevant since he focused on images as sources. Nonetheless, rather than being an object of investigation, iconographic analysis entered into the research on the Etruscan landscape as a tool to support botanical studies[103].

2.7. Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli: Accessory and Background (with a note on Emilio Sereni)

A landmark year for cultural heritage, 1939 not only saw the implementation of the Legge Bottai, it also marked a critical moment

[102] PAMPANINI 1930, p. 309.

[103] A further approach to the same subject was the research by Benedetto Bonacelli, who published in «Studi Etruschi» the essay *La natura e gli Etruschi* (BONACELLI 1928) with a focus on historical sources for landscape reconstruction. Comparable research was conducted by Giovanni Alessio in the epigraphical field. In particular, in 1949 he published in «Studi Etruschi» an article entitled *Vestigia etrusco-mediterranee nella flora toscana* (ALESSIO 1949). This essay, included in the «Lingua – Epigrafia» section of the journal, presented an analysis of the botanical lexicon and phytonames addressed «mettendo in rilievo tutti quegli indizi che possono far pensare che ci troviamo in presenza di relitti del sostrato» (ALESSIO 1949, p. 115). Alessio's aim was to contribute to the creation of a botanical dictionary («riteniamo che questa nostra fatica non sia stata inutile, se essa incoraggerà i linguisti e i botanici a darci una buona volta un dizionario botanico della Toscana prima, e poi di tutta la penisola, che risponda ai requisiti della scienza moderna»; *loc. cit.*).
Pampanini bothanical approach can conversely be compared with the methodology adopted by Vicenzo Baldasseroni in analyzing the representation of animals in Etruscan painting (BALDASSERONI 1929, which was published in «Studi Etruschi» as well). Baldasseroni, in fact, aims at the «identificazione scientifica della forma rappresentata» and at «stabilire gli eventuali rapporti tra le forme identificate e la fauna italica contemporanea degli etruschi» (BALDASSERONI 1929, p. 383).

for art history with the publication of *Studies in Iconology* by Erwin Panofsky[104]. At that time, archaeologists were somewhat reluctant to accept its conclusions and implications[105]. The first Italian translation of the text was, in fact, not published until 1975[106]. However, in 1962, the publishing house Einaudi published Panofsky's essay *Iconography and Iconology. An introduction to the study of Renaissance art* (first ed. 1955) with the Italian title *Il significato nelle arti visive*[107]. Panofsky considered the artistic experience as a cognitive act, going beyond the purely evolutionary interpretation of art which had characterized Loewy and positivist sciences. Precisely the 1946 Italian translation of Loewy's *Die Naturwiedergabe in der älteren griechischen Kunst* (*La natura nell'arte greca. Una teoria sulla genesi della espressione figurativa*) confirms the widespread distrust of the iconological method[108].

In 1942, in the issue of «La Critica d'Arte» which also received his *Palinodia*, Bianchi Bandinelli published a review of Loewy's *Naturwiedergabe*[109]. While reiterating his positive opinion of the

[104] PANOFSKY 1939. Reprinted in 1962 with the title *Studies in Iconology: Humanist Themes in the Art of the Renaissance*.

[105] In 1961 Bianchi Bandinelli could state that the iconological method «non ha trovato applicazione per lo studio dell'arte dell'antichità» (BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1961, p. 84). For an overview of iconology and archaeology, see BARBANERA 2004, pp. 8-9.

[106] PANOFSKY 1975.

[107] PANOFSKY 1955.

[108] LOEWY 1946, with translation by Clelia Vinciguerra and introduction by Carlo Anti. In addition to the text by Anti, for the review of Loewy's theory after the Second World War, see PASQUALI 1953, p. 33.

[109] BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1942. See Bianchi Bandinelli's comments in *Storicità dell'arte classica*: BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1950, p. 10: «Lo stesso tema fu ripreso dall'archeologo viennese Loewy nelle sue *Ricerche sul modo di rendere la natura nell'arte greca più antica*. Già questo titolo mostra che al pregiudizio della natura come mèta dell'arte non si poteva sfuggire in quel tempo, nemmeno da parte di uno studioso di serio valore nel campo archeologico. Nonostante l'errata impostazione del problema, possiamo trovare in questo scritto […] la descrizione di un fenomeno psico-fisiologico, sulla formulazione di immagini nella memoria visiva, la cui osservazione, tuttavia, è più importante per lo psicologo che per lo storico dell'arte, il quale deve interessarsi del come dall'immagine visiva dell'artista sorga l'opera d'arte in quanto tale».

scholar's work, Bianchi Bandinelli pointes out the urgent need for modern studies to abandon the concept of art as imitation.
Bianchi Bandinelli's position cannot be associated with the «tendenze restauratrici affermatesi dopo il conflitto»[110], nor to Panofsky's iconology. Like the latter, however, he proposes a methodology as a reaction to the merely formal analysis of the work of art[111].
Reaffirming arguments already stated in *Storicità dell'arte classica*[112], Bianchi Bandinelli confrontes the iconographic issue in his entry for *Paesaggio*[113], published in 1963 in the *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica*. In his analysis, he distinguishes between «elementi paesistici (alberi, edifici, accanto ad animali oppure a figure umane)» and «paesaggio come tale», namely a «paesaggio come forma artistica autonoma e assoluta». Landscape elements «si trovano raffigurati con mezzi lineari (disegno) anche nelle civiltà artistiche primitive» and their representation «ha sempre un carattere meramente indicativo di un ambiente e acquista talora un valore simbolico».
As for landscape representations in Greek art, Bianchi Bandinelli observes that «suo carattere costante è di essere sempre un paesaggio di invenzione, composito, mai ripreso dal vero, anche se i singoli elementi ostentano realismo». In particular,

> «Nell'arte greca […] rimane costante un particolare impegno alla rappresentazione dell'ambiente paesistico oggettivato, che viene di preferenza limitato, nell'epoca arcaica, a una scelta di elementi singoli indicativi e simbolici con una vivacissima sintesi che ne pone in risalto la fresca ispirazione da elementi di realtà osservata […].
>
> […] Senza poter qui allineare esempî, si può dire che per tutto il periodo arcaico (fino al 480 a.C.) l'elemento paesistico è, di solito, usato

[110] BARBANERA 2004, p. 8.
[111] As for Bianchi Bandinelli, this is true especially after the second edition of his *Storicità dell'arte classica*, published in 1950 (BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1950; see BARBANERA 2015, pp. 145-146).
[112] BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1950.
[113] BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1963. All the quotations to follow by Bianchi Bandinelli are taken from this entry, unless otherwise specified.

> come accessorio, ma sempre sentito con straordinaria vivezza. Solo isolatamente si hanno scene, che potremmo dire 'di genere' […], nelle quali il paesaggio non è soltanto un accessorio, ma partecipa in modo indissolubile a costituire l'immagine artistica. Nel modo più sorprendente una di tali composizioni ci è conservata nella Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca a Tarquinia […], dove la redazione etrusca non esclude, ma anzi richiama, opere consimili che dovettero essere state create nella corrente greca ionica, ma riprese anche in Attica […]»[114].

In Bianchi Bandinelli's analysis, Etruscan art is definitively marginal, and it is only mentioned as ancillary or as a reflection of Greek art. In particular, the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca* would provide an example of the East-Greek – rather than the Etruscan – capability to characterize a scene emotionally through landscape elements («Può dirsi che il fresco sentimento realistico dell'arte arcaica si estendesse spontaneamente anche alla costruzione dell'immagine artistica attraverso la caratterizzazione di scene patetiche»)[115]. This is precisely the meaning that is to be assigned to the formula «valore simbolico» used by Bianchi Bandinelli, which is unrelated to the iconological lexicon. Instead, it indicates figurative elements entrusted to endow the image with emotional content.

A further aspect of Bianchi Bandinelli's analysis merits attention: the dualistic conceptualization counterposing accessories and primary figurative elements. Still not contradicting the idea of organicity of the work of art, this opposition is evident and reflects Benedetto Croce's idealism.

To some extent, this same polarity also emerges in the 1960 analysis provided by Piera Bocci for the Etruscan *Gruppo delle Foglie d'Edera*[116]. Regarding this sixt-century group of black-figure vases, the scholar maintains that «nonostante le influenze di vasi attici, calcidesi e in

[114] BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1963, p. 820.
[115] BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1963, p. 820.
[116] BOCCI 1960.

qualche caso laconici, lo stile è lontano da quello greco […] nell'importanza data all'elemento vegetale che non è più in naturalistico rapporto con la figura umana, ma è sentito come fine a se stesso, per la preponderanza data al valore decorativo, per cui si può con certezza parlare di una produzione etrusca». Bocci's analysis echoes Margret Heinemann's insistence on the landscape as an 'abstract background' considered a specific trait of Etruscan Art[117].

On the contrary, Bianchi Bandinelli does not acknowledge the figurative treatment and prominence of landscape as an indicator of a specifically Etruscan genre.

While Bocci and Bianchi Bandinelli's assessments differ with regard to the appraisal of Etruscan art, their analyses are similarly based on the evaluation of the greater or lesser figurative involvement of landscape features in the image. Bianchi Bandinelli's discussion, however, is by its very nature more comprehensive.

In fact, he refers to Etruscan art again in a later passage of his entry on *Paesaggio*. In particular, he presented a brief analysis of Hellenistic urns. In his words, the topic of landscape merges with that of space:

> «Gli accenni paesistici che troviamo nelle modeste sculture artigianali delle urne cinerarie etrusche, specialmente volterrane, indicano derivazioni da composizioni ellenistiche […]. Si tratta pur sempre, tuttavia, di un paesaggio che serve di sfondo accessorio alla narrazione, anche se esso non si limita più ad un accenno quasi simbolico, ma occupa, con vivaci accenti naturalistici, spesso una parte non trascurabile della composizione»[118].

The landscape is thus no longer perceived as the background of real human action. Instead, it appears to be the background of figurative narration. In other words, despite being possibly only an accessory, the landscape is perceived as fully part of the artwork. This explanation,

[117] See above pp. 18-21.
[118] BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1963, p. 821.

coherent with Bianchi Bandinelli's principle of art unity, informs us of a new conception of artistic monuments.

This is mainly due to the new Italian cultural and political scenario. This approach is the outcome of a process that began after the Second World War and gained momentum during the 1950s in Italy. From the late 1940s, under the influences of both British research on Landscape Archeology[119] and the Italian national debate on reconstruction, renewed attention to topography and urbanization implicated a holistic consideration of the human environment[120]. Alongside several exhibitions that fueled the public debate on topography and landscape[121], for instance, the *Commissione Ministeriale per il piano paesistico della via Appia Antica* was established in 1954. In his introduction to the catalogue of the related *Mostra della Via Appia Antica*[122], Carlo Ceschi noted that «l'ambiente intorno al monumento poteva ampliarsi fino a considerare il monumento come un elemento determinante del paesaggio e il paesaggio come quadro naturale del monumento»[123].

Dating to the 1960s and the 1070s – just to provide a further example of the cultural panorama – are also the first travel books by Cesare Brandi[124], in which he offered a personal «lettura dell'archeologia attraverso il paesaggio»[125]. Brandi's landscapes, which are populated

[119] In particular, Italian archeology was influenced by the research conducted by John Bryan Ward-Perkins (see e.g. WARD-PERKINS 1964), who directed the *South Etruria Survey* project, working on the historical topography of Veii and southern Etruria. He was highly accredited and appreciated in Italy between the 1950s and the 1070s (see BARBANERA 2015, pp. 193-194).

[120] Regarding Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli Direttore Generale delle Antichità e Belle Arti (1945-1948) and his approach to landscape and monument, see BARBANERA 2003, pp. 203-215; RUSSO KRAUSS 2017.

[121] E.g. the catalogue of the *Mostre Topografiche di Roma. Piazza Colonna*, held in Palazzo Braschi from December 1954 to January 1955.

[122] The exhibition was held in Rome, Palazzo Venezia, from April to May 1956.

[123] CESCHI 1956. At that time Ceschi was the *Soprintendente ai Monumenti del Lazio*.

[124] E.g. BRANDI 1954; BRANDI 1958; BRANDI 1960; BRANDI 1963.

[125] I am here quoting the title of an essay by Licia Vlad Borrelli (*Brandi. Una nuova lettura dell'archeologia attraverso il paesaggio*; VLAD BORRELLI 2010).

with man's memories, are center on the so-called «rudero». In his opinion, the *rudero* clearly expresses the «'consustanzialità' di monumento e paesaggio»[126].
Essentially, from the postwar period, the scholarly analysis of ancient landscape is likely to connect to a new approach to reality and real environment which spread in the Italian cultural debate, both at the intellectual and the public level[127].

In broader terms, this same debate also coincided with a direct and specific commitment to studies of the history of the Italian agricultural landscape, in the wake of a discipline inaugurated in France by Marc Bloch as early as the beginning of the 1930s[128]. An analysis of the historical transformations effected by humankind on the natural environment of the countryside is provided, for instance, by Emilio Sereni in his *Storia del paesaggio agrario italiano*[129]. Initially written in 1955, this extended essay was first published in 1961. Significantly enough, Sereni combined the analysis of contemporary agricultural history and policy with examining agricultural techniques and institutions of prehistoric and protohistoric Italy. In particular, the third chapter (*Il sinecismo etrusco, l'invasione gallica e il paesaggio della piantata nell'Italia centro-settentrionale*) deals with an analysis of the Etruscan «sistema di allevamento della vite»[130]. Although his essay does not include reproductions of Etruscan artworks, Sereni's methodology deserves to be highlighted in that it shows a particular interest in images. Even though the final publication does not fully reflect this attention, it is noteworthy. In fact, it emerges at a historical moment characterized by a great reluctance to analyze images, which is also

[126] VLAD BORRELLI 2010, p. 61.
[127] The role of literature (e.g. Vittorio Sereni for the Italian panorama) could also be profitably considered (see JACKOB 2005).
[128] See BLOCH 1931. Agrarian history was a core interest in the 1929 founding of the journal «Annales» by M. Bloch and L. Febvre, and profoundly influenced its editorial policy during the 1930s (see TOUBERT, RAGGIO 1990, pp. 488-493). For the state of research on the agricultural landscape in Italy before the Sixties, see GAMBI 1958.
[129] SERENI 1961 (I have referenced the 1972 edition: SERENI 1972).
[130] SERENI 1972, pp. 40-43.

voiced by the cautiousness of Sereni himself. In his introduction, Sereni maintained that the study of the ancient agricultural landscape mainly benefits from toponymy, historical linguistics and «dati che potranno esserci offerti dallo studio della particolare dislocazione dei reperti archeologici, dal loro concentramento in determinate situazioni altimetriche, o in determinati ambienti fitogeografici e pedologici»[131]. As the author himself explained, however, his study of the agricultural landscape from ancient times to the present day was to a certain degree based on image analysis:

> «Ci è sembrato […] che una rassegna di fonti iconografiche di tutt'altra origine, qual'è quella dell'espressione artistica, potesse – con quella rappresentatività e con quella intuizione del "tipico", che dell'opera d'arte costituisce, appunto, una nota saliente – fornirci un materiale illustrativo non solo più suggestivo per il lettore, ma anche più pertinente al carattere ed ai limiti della nostra indagine. La nostra rassegna di queste fonti iconografiche, condotta su oltre duecentomila riproduzioni di opere d'arte (o di loro dettagli) di ogni età, è stata, crediamo, relativamente esauriente, e si è rivelata per noi, comunque, sotto molti aspetti assai istruttiva. […] ci duole soltanto che il desiderio dell'editore, e nostro, di rendere questo volume accessibile ad un più largo pubblico di lettori, non aggravandone eccessivamente il costo, non ci abbia consentito di riprodurre qui che una parte relativamente piccola di questo materiale illustrativo»[132].

In his essay, Sereni includes eighty plates illustrating works of art. The oldest – an image of which is included in the third chapter on the Etruscans – is a detail of the decoration of the House of the Vetii in Pompeii. Although the author specifies that images have an illustrative rather than documentary function[133], the interest accorded to images is

[131] SERENI 1972, p. 18.
[132] SERENI 1972, pp. 23-24.
[133] See SERENI 1972, pp. 24-25: «Sia chiaro, comunque, che delle illustrazioni abbiamo fatto uso, qui, non già come di un materiale documentario, bensì solo – là dove la sua rappresentatività fosse garantita da altre fonti – come di un materiale illustrativo, appunto, della nostra esposizione. […] Là dove, per una impossibilità obiettiva o

noteworthy. The original book title, which should have been *Illustrazioni per una storia del paesaggio agrario italiano*, confirms this emphasis[134]. On the one hand, Sereni's cautious approach to iconographic sources is a sign of reluctance towards images which was – as mentioned above – widespread in the Italian culture. On the other hand, the use of this kind of instrument was pioneering with regard to the same Italian cultural context. Despite his premises, in fact, Sereni makes use of iconographic analysis and applies the criteria of formal art analysis to the study of the landscape[135].

To return to Bianchi Bandinelli, from the methodological point of view, the attention to iconographic data – by granting the passage of landscape from 'background of actions' to 'background of narration' – reveals a new need. The aim of the analysis was no longer to identify distinctive features of a culture or group of people. Instead, its focus turned to the understanding of material objects through the understanding of their images.
In the first half of the century, botanists had paid more attention to iconographic data than archaeologists. Their research, however, even when freed from the Romantic demands of the nineteenth-century discipline, always had – to get back to «Studi Etruschi» lexicon – a *naturalistic* focus. In the second half of the century, archaeologists made use of the possibilities offered by this interpretative tool, albeit with caution. Bianchi Bandinelli himself, in the pages of the same *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica* (*s.v. Iconografia*) and further instances,

soggettiva, non sia dato ricorrere a uno spoglio sistematico ed integrale delle fonti, una testimonianza "involontaria", in effetti, e particolarmente una testimonianza letteraria od artistica, quando sia suffragata dalla conferma di altre fonti, può – per la sua capacità di espressione del "tipico" – assumere un carattere di rappresentatività, che resta altrimenti affidata solo alla più scarna probabilità del dato statistico».

[134] See PARILLI 2016, pp. 765-766.

[135] For an overview of Sereni's approach and his use of iconographic sources, see PARILLI 2016.

clarified the potential he recognized in iconographical analysis «ogni volta che sia controllabile»[136].

Finally, one of the most relevant merits of Bianchi Bandinelli's analysis is recognizing an evolution in the use of landscape elements in Etruscan handicrafts without implying an evolutionary notion of art. This approach was mainly a consequence of recent developments in Etruscan studies[137]. Looking at the history of art history, however, we should also remember that the interest in the 'birth' of landscape as an artistic genre (namely the «paesaggio come tale» mentioned by Bianchi Bandinelli) had returned to the forefront in 1949 with the publication of *Landscape into Art* by Kenneth Clark. The book was a milestone in its field and was translated into Italian for the first time in 1962[138].

In essence, rather than representing a turning point in the history of landscape representation studies, Bianchi Bandinelli's essay was significant since it summarized most of the trends and innovations of his time. These formed the premises for later studies that emerged during the 1970s and are still in progress.

[136] The quotation is extrapolated from BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1953, p. 103, who deals with Hellenistic Roman painting. In his *Paesaggio* entry Bianchi Bandinelli points out that iconography is «elemento prezioso sia per la ricostruzione di una composizione che ci sia pervenuta frammentaria, sia per la sua interpretazione dal punto di vista del soggetto, sia per la indagine sul percorso storico di una data forma di rappresentazione artistica e pertanto per rintracciare i contatti, le influenze e per la definizione stessa dei caratteri peculiari di una fase di civiltà artistica o di un singolo Maestro, caratteri che si manifestano, appunto, nelle variazioni che l'iconografia trasmessa subisce» (BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1961, p. 85).

[137] For a brief overview of the interest in Etruscan art at the beginning of the Sixties, focusing on the urns from Volterra, see PONTELLI 2018.

[138] CLARK 1962. Clark briefly deals also with the conception of landscape in Antiquity. As MALASPINA 2011, p. 69, fn. 71 noted, Clark's thought can be compared to that of von Humbold. See CLARK 1949, p. 1: «The preceding cycle, that of Mediterranean antiquity, had been so deeply rooted in the Greek sense of human values that this concept of nature had played a subordinate part». For the history of landscape painting, see also MADERUOLO 2005.

2.8. Trends Over The Last Sixty Years

Since the 1970s, the interest of scholars in landscape studies has grown considerably. Even in the present day, research on this topic continues to expand.

Recent and contemporary studies on landscape representation can be categorized on the basis of scholars' research questions rather than on different methodologies. Over the last decades, in fact, these questions have often remained constant over time. For this reason, it is appropriate to conclude this section on the history of studies by focusing on the dominant trends and highlighting recurring research questions[139].

The grounds for analyzing contemporary research in light of post-1970s research lie in the debt of the former to the latter. Despite this link, it is worth noting that between the 1970s and the 1990s, reflections on landscape were strongly characterized by a tendency to shift the emphasis from 'landscape' to 'environment'. As a result, landscape-related debates are concealed within the modern debates on the environment[140].

I) In a broad sense, a primary strand of research focused on the notion of landscape and how the *notion of landscape* was conceived *over time*. Two main questions are hidden behind this leading theme: the extent to which we can speak of landscape in ancient art[141] and the meaning of

[139] Reinforcing this decision was the consideration of a rather recent «fenomeno di convergenza tra diversi filoni dell'archeologia europea che, a partire da tradizioni differenti, sono approdati a prospettive teoriche e metodologiche affini» (CUOZZO 2000, p. 323). *Contra* MALASPINA 2001, p. 46: «la ricerca sul paesaggio si è fissata ormai da qualche decennio in scuole di pensiero che coincidono con i principali paesi europei e che si esprimono spesso solo nella propria lingua, in una rumorosa conversazione fra sordi».

[140] Regarding the influence of the «nuova coscienza ecologica e la diffusione dei movimenti per la salvaguardia dell'ambiente» see D'ANGELO 2010, pp. 25-30, 105-107; see pp. 177-183 for legislative outcomes in the Italian context (*legge Galasso*).

[141] See e.g. JAKOB 2005, pp. 25-26: «Continua a mancare una linea di indagine che […], muovendo da confronti pertinenti, tenti di rispondere alla domanda fondamentale: nel

individual landscape elements. These are subjects of great importance to art history (Kenneth Clark and Ernst Gombrich in particular)[142] and have been relevant to ancient art, especially since the 1990s.

On this highly topical issue, I begin by presenting the most recent contributions to this field and how they are related to previous scholarly reflections.

In 2004, Agnès Rouveret published her well-known essay *Pictos ediscere mundos. Perception et imaginaire du paysage dans la peinture Hellénistique et romaine*. The first formulation of this essay dates back to 1996, when the scholar gave a talk during the seminar *Jardins, Paysage, territoires* held at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris. Her 2004 paper attemptes to establish the genesis of the concept of 'landscape' from the Hellenistic period to the Roman empire. In

---

mondo classico esisteva il paesaggio?». The question presupposes a definitional problem ('what is meant by a landscape?'), which leads to the problem of the relationship between landscape, landscape representation, and the notion of landscape. At the same time, the issue of different artistic media arises while dealing with the artistic rendering of landscape.

The issue of the status of landscape in ancient art has recently been posed and overturned by DIETRICH 2021. Dealing with the Tomb of the Diver in Paestum, the scholar focuses on the fresco's understanding by modern viewers. In particular, he questiones the possible misunderstanding leading to the aesthetic experience of that fresco as a landscape («Are we right to experience this fresco as a landscape?»; p. 183). Finally, he concludes that the panel's landscape elements do not constitute a landscape («[…] what seemed to be an absolute exception, namely a Greek landscape painting, turned out to be rather clearly differentiated from our modern concept of a landscape painting. […] This far, this presumed exception to the rule that there is no such thing as landscape painting in archaic and classical Greek art turned out to be an exception that confirms the rule»; p. 191) but rather contribute to defining the «*decoration*» of the tomb.

[142] Regarding Clark, see above p. 42, fn. 138. Regarding Gombrich's theory of landscape, see the chapter *Renaissance Artistic Theory and the Development of Landscape Painting* in *Norm and Form* (GOMBRICH 1978; first ed. 1966). In his essay, Gombrich maintains that landscape is «the most revolutionary» «of all the 'genres'», which «might never have developed without the artistic theories of the Italian Renaissance» (*ibid*., pp. 107-108). According to his reconstruction, this revolution «followed a demand that existed in Southern markets» (namely in Flanders), which arose by means of «a more or less consciously aesthetic attitude towards paintings and prints» (*ibid*., p. 110).

particular, Rouveret maintained the hypothesis of a «genèse progressive de la notion de paysage entre la fin du IVe siècle avant J.C. et les débuts de l'Empire» based on the gradual «appropriation romaine d'un savoir géographique et cartographique à ses propres fins hégémoniques»[143].

Rouveret's analysis is expressly at odds with the position of a group of scholars, including Alain Roger and Augustin Berque, who deny the existence of a conception of landscape in antiquity[144]. Berque, who claims that landscape was born in China during the fifth century A.D., lists six distinctive defining criteria, without which «on ne peut […] parler de paysage»[145]. Articulated in 2008, these six empirical indicators represent a reformulation of the four criteria initially identified by the same scholar in 1994[146]. The impossibility of associating them with Classical culture leads the author to cut antiquity *in toto* from the list of 'landscape civilizations'. Denying the legitimacy of these benchmarks, Rouveret advises that «il n'y pas de raison d'exclure le monde gréco-romain des 'sociétés paysagères' telles que les définissent les théoriciens contemporains, même si les représentations de paysages n'apparaissent, en l'état actuel de la documentation, qu'à des périodes

[143] ROUVERET 2004, p. 343.

[144] See in part. ROUVERET 2004, p. 326. Regarding Berque, see references mentioned below in the text. Regarding Roger, see e.g. ROGER 1994, pp. 117-120 (reviewed in DEFFONTAINES 1995); ROGER 1996. *Contra* ROGER 2010, pp. 83 and 87, who expressly diverges from Berque (see below in the text) and affirms that «at the beginning of the Imperial Age at least, Rome was the first landscape society in the history of humankind» (p. 87). Roger's basic idea, emphasized in all the above mentioned contributions, is that artistic models shape human experience of culture. Regarding the 'history' of such a way to conceive landscape, see D'ANGELO 2010, pp. 14-21. Regarding the statement that «per gli antichi non vi era paesaggio», see the position of the German philosopher Joachim Ritter (in particular, RITTER 1962), who «si consegna al paradosso in forza del quale la sensibilità per la natura nascerebbe soltanto con la liberazione da essa» (D'ANGELO 2010, p. 38).

[145] BERQUE 2008, p. 48.

[146] BERQUE 1994, p. 16 (reviewed in DEFFONTAINES 1995); BERQUE 1995, pp. 34-35. For a brief analysis and presentation of opposing positions (e.g. Carchia and Venturi Ferriolo), see D'ANGELO 2010, pp. 39-41.

circonscrites et sous des formes très différentes des genres picturaux qui se développent dans l'art occidental à partir de la Renaissance»[147].

In 2011 the Classical philologist Ermanno Malaspina addressed the same theoretical issue as Agnès Rouveret in *Quando il paesaggio non era stato ancora inventato. Descriptiones locorum e teorie del paesaggio da Roma a oggi*[148]. In fact, Malaspina's essay aims to «definire se e in che modo l'antichità classica (romana soprattutto) possa definirsi anch'essa una *civiltà paesaggistica* o *société paysagiste*»[149]. In his analysis, the author sustains the existance of an Hellenistic «società inconsapevolmente paesaggistica»[150]. Malaspina definitively tempered Berque's drastic assertions and sketched a picture of a society in which «si ritraggono quadri naturali, spesso con profonda sensibilità e straordinario nitore artistico, ma senza cogliere l'essenza del paesaggio quale noi lo percepiamo oggi»[151].

Eugenio La Rocca's analysis, which is focused on figurative rather than on textual sources, also arrived at a comparable 'mediate' conclusion[152]. In his 2008 book *Lo spazio negato. La pittura di paesaggio nella cultura artistica greca e romana*, he maintains that «I Greci in età arcaica e classica conoscevano bene i modi di inserimento della figura umana entro un ambiente; solo che l'ambiente è tipizzato, ed è funzionale alla narrazione, senza conseguire una sua piena autonomia artistica»[153]. He then lists several examples including the Tomb of the Diver in Paestum and the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca* in Tarquinia, observing that «in nessuna di queste immagini trapela il senso di un paesaggio vero e proprio, descritto in tutte le sue caratteristiche e con reale senso di profondità spaziale: si tratta di paesaggi simbolici, atti a definire come contorno, per quanto fondamentale, il senso della

[147] ROUVERET 2004, p. 326. Regarding the same subject, see also ROUVERET 2015. Regarding the concept of *sociétés paysagères/paysagiste*, see DONADIEU 2002.
[148] MALASPINA 2011.
[149] MALASPINA 2011, p. 46.
[150] MALASPINA 2011, pp. 66, 80.
[151] MALASPINA 2011, p. 80.
[152] LA ROCCA 2008.
[153] LA ROCCA 2008, p. 11.

rappresentazione»[154]. La Rocca does not expand specifically on these themes, but points out repeatedly that symbolic references to reality («avvicinamenti simbolici alla realtà») are one of the characteristics of ancient landscape painting. In synthesizing this process, he observes that while in Greek art 'landscape' is a «tema artistico», only in Roman art did it become a partially autonomous genre («solo in ambiente romano giunse a trasformarsi in un genere – parzialmente – autonomo»)[155].

In the same years as the seminar *Jardins, Paysage, territoires* at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, several further colloquia on similar subjects took place, spearheaded primarily by French scholars. In 1996, for instance, the proceedings of a colloquium on *Nature et paysage dans la pensée et l'environnement des civilisations antiques* were published[156]. The conference was held in 1992 in Strasbourg and dealt with the theoretical framework of 'landscape' directly connected with the contents of the Paris workshop[157]. Concerning our purposes, two other characteristics of this seminar deserve attention.

On the one hand, alongside the theoretical framework, the conference's papers also point to another of the most popular research questions of the last decades. As already mentioned, the issue of the 'birth' of landscape raises further questions about the function to be assigned to individual landscape elements over time. During the Strasbourg seminar, two substantial interventions were dedicated to analyzing single landscape elements (namely cave and mountain) to identify their specific functions and values[158]. Their approach can be compared to that adopted during a previous conference, organized by the Centre Jean Bérard. That international symposium, convened in Naples in 1989, was entirely dedicated to *Les bois sacrés*. The focused attention to

[154] LA ROCCA 2008, p. 11.
[155] LA ROCCA 2008, p. 72.
[156] SIEBERT 1996, reviewed in BRUN 1997.
[157] See e.g. Alain Roger talk *Les proto-paysages* (ROGER 1996). Regarding the concept of 'proto-paysage', see previously BERQUE 1994.
[158] SIEBERT 1996; BUXTON 1996.

the 'function' of individual landscape elements is worthy of more exploration and will be discussed in the next section (see § II.).
On the other hand, the publication in the Strasbourg proceedings of an essay by Anne-Marie Adam on *Végétation et paysage dans la peinture funéraire étrusque*[159] shows that the complex meditation on the landscape does not disregard Etruscan art. The focused attention given to Etruscan studies and the interests of this specific archaeological field will be addressed in the last part of this section (see § V.).

From a broader point of view, the structuralist-oriented French archaeological studies on landscape representation adopt the socio-anthropological approach that has characterized French culture in the field of social sciences and humanities since the late 1960s[160]. This methodology, adopted in the wake of Jean-Pierre Vernant's studies, is particularly evident in the contributions of Alain Schnapp. The French scholar addresses the debated issue of the existence of 'landscape' in Classical antiquity from a different perspective than that adopted by the scholars I explored here above. In a number of papers, he definitively affirms that ancient Greeks did not take an interest in 'nature'[161]. Assuming that there is no real notion of 'landscape' in antiquity, he tries to pinpoint the *reasons* behind their lack of interest. According to Schnapp, the explanation for this condition is to be found in the cultural and anthropological distance between modern man and Greek man. He maintains that, in Greek images, nature provides a framework for human actions, namely

> «la natura non è un elemento per sé ma una parte del quadro dell'immagine: alberi, fiori, rocce, grotte, fiumi, mare sono parte di un sistema di raffigurazioni che mira ad illustrare la vita e gli eventi degli

[159] ADAM 1996. The essay was already published in the periodical «KTEMA» in 1990: see ADAM 1990.
[160] For an overview of this subject with regard to archaeological studies, see BARBANERA 2011.
[161] See in part. SCHNAPP 2006. See SCHNAPP 2015, p. 30: «I Greci ignoravano la nozione di paesaggio, che dopotutto nel contesto della cultura europea emerge solo col Rinascimento».

> eroi o dei cittadini. Per arrivare a questo risultato i pittori ricorrono ad abbreviazioni, segni grafici che consentono di definire il quadro dell'azione senza ricorrere a un 'effetto del reale'»[162].

Although Schnapp does not openly address the problem of the representation of landscape in Etruscan art, in some of his pages dedicated to the analysis of hunting scenes in ancient art, he generically expresses himself with respect to the existence of landscape elements, recalling «le décor naturel cher aux peintres d'Etrurie»[163].

While the mere reference to 'sign' and 'abbreviation' clarifies his relation to French tradition, Schnapp owes an outstanding debt to research developed by the American Jeffrey M. Hurwit. His debt is relevant in particular concerning the concept of 'framework'.
The catalogue of the exhibition *Mito e Natura. Dalla Grecia a Pompei*, held in Milan in 2015, includes an essay by Schnapp, in which the author emphasizes the position summarized above. The title of this paper (*La rappresentazione della natura nell'arte greca*) is likely a reference and a kind of homage to Hurwit's article *The representation of Nature in Early Greek Art*, a pioneering attempt to categorize landscape elements according to their 'role'[164].

II) Jeffrey M. Hurwit's essay *The Representation of Nature in Early Greek Art*, published in 1991, deals with an analysis of Greek feeling for nature and, by consequence, of landscape representation in ancient Greek art. The equivalence nature-landscape is based on the assumption that landscape representations somehow testify to a «sense of the natural world»[165] in ancient Greek culture. In his seminal article,

[162] SCHNAPP 2006, p. 80.
[163] SCHNAPP 1997, p. 203. In this case, Schnapp's analysis refers to the tree on a Caeretan *hydria* at the Louvre. Although they are considered Etruscan artworks by the scholar, Caeretan *hydriae* are to be ascribed to Greek immigrant production. Beyond the general consideration, the specific example should therefore be considered unmatched.
[164] SCHNAPP 2015; HURWIT 1991.
[165] HURWIT 1991, p. 35.

Hurwit maintains that, especially in Late Archaic art, landscape elements were used to render a «setting» for human action. This setting conveys the relationships between figures and environments. This is why, in the end, Hurwit makes use of the expression «human-scapes»[166]. His *anthropos*-centered perspective – which finds distant parallels in some Romantic analyses examined in the previous pages[167] – is likely to be partially influenced by the 1987 publication of Robin Osborne's *Classical Landscape with Figures*[168]. The book, which deals with an investigation of the relationship between ancient Greek city and its countryside, argued that «the Greek city was not a town and its territory, it *was* its citizens», who were «dependent upon the production of the countryside»[169].

Before reaching his conclusions, Hurwit considers a number of examples through an analysis relevant to our research. In particular, after introducing a group of ancient and modern texts supposedly showing how the ancients perceived nature, the author analyzes a few figurative sources. While comparing an Attic black-figure amphora by the Priam Painter in Villa Giulia with a wall painting in the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca* in Tarquinia, he maintains that

> « […] it is very difficult to believe that an Athenian vase-painter of the late sixth century could envision and compose a scene like this [amphora by the Priam Painter showing nymphs bathing and swimming] and that contemporary Greek free painters could not. That is, the Etruscans probably had nothing on them after all: their supposedly stronger Naturgefühl is illusory, a matter of medium and evidence»[170].

[166] HURWIT 1991, p. 55.

[167] The parallel is somewhat fleeting, first of all because Hurwit does not accept the Romantic belief in an instinctive and individual reaction to nature. Instead, he supports the idea of a culturally determined response to nature, in line with Robin Osborne's examination (see below).

[168] OSBORNE 1987, reviewed and revisited in OSBORNE 1996. Hurwit briefly refers to Osborne's book in HURWIT 1991, pp. 51-52.

[169] OSBORNE 1987, p. 197.

[170] HURWIT 1991, p. 41.

Following this comment on Etruscan art, he focuses on Greek vase painting and ascribes the low recurrence of landscape elements to technical limitations of a curving surface and reduced color palette[171]. Hurwit affirms that on Greek vases «the requisite of landscape – rocks and other land forms, trees and other vegetation, and water» generally appear «singly and as accessories». He lists four «roles» that any individual «element of the landscape» can play within the image. These roles are 1) «a narrative prop»; 2) «a symbol of sexuality, *arete*, immortality, or victory»; 3) «an attribute or symbol of gods»; 4) «a more blandly topographic device, setting the scene vaguely outdoor»[172]. According to Hurwit's analysis, «in the last decades of the sixth century and the first decades of the fifth, the Archaic artist's interest in landscape elements noticeably increases»[173]. Nevertheless, «landscape per se never becomes the sole object of contemplation: […] isolated landscape elements continue to fulfill their traditional narrative, localizing and symbolic functions down to the Hellenistic period»[174]. Hurwit's interest in the function of landscape elements is fully expressed in this 1991 essay, although some ideas might have been formulated already in the early 1980s, when he published an article dealing with the symbolic value of palm trees[175]. His effort to prove that vase painters depicted trees to display and intensify human feelings was met with criticism[176].

---

[171] See HURWIT 1991, p. 42.
[172] HURWIT 1991, pp. 42-43.
[173] HURWIT 1991, p. 46.
[174] HURWIT 1991, p. 46.
[175] HURWIT 1982, p. 198.
[176] This interpretation and the expressive purpose assigned to palm trees can be somehow compared to the idea expressed by Bianchi Bandinelli about the «caratterizzazione di scene patetiche» (see above, p. 36). *Contra* MADDEN 1983, who responds to Hurwit stating that «The Palms do not Weep»; CHAZALON 1995, pp. 126-127. Regarding landscape details as «estensione del corpo umano», see FRANZONI 2006, pp. 141-143.

While Hurwit's attempt to categorize landscape details according to function considers several different landscape elements with no distinction (with the exception of his article on palm trees), a remarkably structured essay published in 1995 by Ludi Chazalon deals specifically with an analysis of the functions of trees. Her focus is on archaic black- and red-figure vases. One of the major innovations of her contribution was in assigning a structural role to landscape elements. In addition to a possible symbolic purpose, these elements would in fact have the figurative power to convey a kind of «joue visuel»[177], a visual tool used by the painter to guide the view («construction d'image»)[178]. Chazalon maintained that a tree never determines the layout of the scene, rather «sa presence renforce et souligne l'organisation de l'image mais ne la change pas»[179].

Chazalon's approach is significant, among other things, for the centrality she assigns to the object. In fact, the scholar addresses the image in relation to its material support rather than as an isolated entity[180]. Even more, the role played by the gaze stands out in her analysis. The «problema dello sguardo», as Marcello Barbanera defined it, is the theme on which most of the archaeological debate from the 1990s converges, in accordance with a growing interest in ancient visual culture[181]. Once again, it parallels a field cultivated by art historians in previous decades. We can, for instance, highlight the lead role that Ernst Gombrich assigned to the viewer regarding the

[177] CHAZALON 1995, p. 127.
[178] CHAZALON 1995, p. 117.
[179] CHAZALON 1995, p. 117.
[180] The scholar fully expresses the emphasis on the relationship between image and object in CHAZALON 2013.
[181] For a historiographical overview, see BARBANERA 2004, pp. 8-9. Examples of this approach – which has given remarkable results especially in the investigation of Roman art – are provided, for instance, by Paul Zanker and Jaś Elsner (e.g. ELSNER 1995; ELSNER 2007). Regarding applying a recent comparable approach on ancient Greek literature, see KAMPAKOGLOU, NOVOKHATKO 2018, with a chapter dealing with «literary texts meeting other media», which includes examples of image analysis. Regarding the «aesthetic experience» and ancient visual culture see GRETHLEIN 2017, esp. pp. 191-248; DIETRICH, SQUIRE 2018.

revolutionary «discovery»[182] of landscape as a genre (*Renaissance Artistic Theory and the development of landscape painting*, in *Norm and Form*, 1966). Both the idea of the communicative potential of artistic images and the belief that any change in form results from a change in function were emphasized by Gombrich in relation to landscape painting as early as the early 1960s (see e.g the second chapter of *Art and Illusion*)[183].

Also with regard to landscape representation studies, anthropologically-oriented research centered on man's gaze on the object has resulted in quite different reflections. Some of these are closer to Chazalon's analysis, others less so.

In his analysis of how images convey the relationship between gods and nature in Greek vases and reliefs, François Lissarrague points out that rocky landscape «non è pittorico ma caratterizza e qualifica gli dei che ingloba»[184]. This idea is comparable to Chazalon's belief that within the image there is an «échange»-based relationship between tree and man, namely «l'arbre […] est utilisé par l'homme, il rend service»[185]. Rather than dealing with the spatial structuring *of* the image and *within* the image, however, Lissarrague suggests that landscape elements symbolically characterize the space in which the figures ideally act. Both scholars emphasize the link between landscape elements and figures, but from a very different perspective: what for Chazalon is essentially a graphic element that functions to compositionally organize the image, for Lissarrague is an element capable of assigning some symbolic value («forte importanza simbolica»)[186] to the represented space. Essentially, according to Lissarrague, the landscape in the image «fa eco allo spazio reale»[187]. Thus, for instance, a rock

[182] GOMBRICH 1978, p. 157 (first. ed. 1966). Regarding the essay, see above p. 44, fn. 142.
[183] GOMBRICH 1960.
[184] LISSARRAGUE 2015, p. 76.
[185] CHAZALON 1995, p. 123.
[186] LISSARRAGUE 2015, p. 77.
[187] LISSARRAGUE 2015, pp. 76-77.

associated with Pan and Hermes would not be a mere piece of landscape («un semplice elemento del paesaggio»), but rather it «caratterizza le due divinità situandole all'esterno della città, nello spazio della natura selvaggia»[188].

In his research, Nikolaus Dietrich confronts both the problem of space and the issue of the viewer. In his book *Figur ohne Raum? Bäume und Felsen in der attischen Vasenmalerei des 6. und 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, published in 2010, Dietrich affirms that anthropological categories such as 'inside' and 'outside' cannot be applied to ancient Greek pottery[189]. His assumption is based on the idea that there is no depiction of space in vase painting. Granting «the need not to look at trees and rocks as depictions of space, but rather to ask what role they play in the depiction and characterization of the figures and their actions», Dietrich analyzes semantic aspects of trees and rocks. He identifies a trend of progressive autonomy of such landscape elements over time[190]. Nonetheless, rocks and trees, «si aggiungono semplicemente alle figure, a rafforzarne la caratterizzazione»[191]. The relationship between figures and landscape is formulated in a novel manner: the latter, with no figurative autonomy, becomes part of the figures, which have a primary role within the images. Conversely, «the location is linked attributively to each figure»[192].

Dietrich's thoughtful attention to space and spatial qualities has a twofold interest. On the one hand, with regard to the function of landscape details, he examines the spatial properties of landscape

[188] LISSARRAGUE 2015, p. 75. *Contra* DIETRICH 2015a, pp. 69-70: «Certamente l'interpretazione, nella pittura vascolare attica, dello spazio della natura quale assenza di cultura e di civiltà trova un certo riscontro in queste immagini. Ciò nonostante, la rappresentazione della natura non deve necessariamente conformarsi alle leggi dell'antitesi natura-cultura».

[189] DIETRICH 2010.

[190] DIETRICH 2010, p. 551.

[191] DIETRICH 2015a, p. 70. See also DIETRICH 2010, p. 98.

[192] DIETRICH 2010, p. 551. Regarding the relationship between object and figures, see also DIETRICH 2018a. The scholar deals with the notion of 'attribute' and maintains that «attributes […] constitute an integral part of the body, in line with a conception of the body that does not reduce it to merely the physical frame» (p. 265).

elements in Archaic Greek vase painting. Dietrich ascribes a finite extension to them («räumliche Begrenztheit»), with no autonomy with respect to the figures[193]. On the other hand, as there is no fictional pictorial space, he maintains that the location of the image is its material support itself.

The importance given to the concrete support (the object, i.e. the vase) positions the viewer in a new light[194]. According to Dietrich, there is no gap between the image and its support. Instead, the image is 'presentificated'[195] in the vase. This concept necessarily rejects the possibility of a contemplative gaze. Like any other figure, landscape elements are conceived as physical objects standing 'in the space of the object' with no evocative power. Therefore, as for any other figure, their composition is conditioned by the shape of the visual pictorial field. As figures and objects «conform to the spatiality of their material

[193] DIETRICH 2010, pp. 98 ss. See also DIETRICH 2017a, §15: «the landscape elements in Attic images never go beyond the dimensions of the figures». His analysis is slightly different with regard to landscapes in Roman wall-painting, which «go beyond the spatiality of confined objects in space. Indeed, they provide the enclosing space for the objects, architectural structures and figures depicted» (DIETRICH 2017a, §15). See DIETRICH 2015b for an in-depth look at the notion of body's 'extension(s)' and how those formulations apply to the analysis of figurative spatial context.

[194] Regarding the «agency of the viewer» according to Dietrich's analysis, see also DIETRICH 2018b; DIETRICH 2020. Regarding the importance bestowed on the material support in relation to the pictorial space, see DIETRICH 2017a. The attention paid to the viewer and the relationship between the observer, the image and the material support points to Dietrich's debt to the reflections of François Lissarrague, who fostered the approach to vases as functional objects rather than mere supports. In particular, the dynamics were demonstrated in relation to the symposium, sympotic gestures, vessels and vessel images. LISSARRAGUE 1987 (English translation LISSARRAGUE 1990a) and LISSARRAGUE 1990b are especially illustrative for the development of Greek vase painting in relation to the cultural and social phenomenon of the *symposion*. The subject (symposium practice / symposium imagery / symposium images) has been addressed also by WĘCOWSKI 2002, pp. 355-361 and developed by CATONI 2010 (see, in part. pp. 219-287), who focuses on the 'contextual reading' of sympotic vases and the possibility to link them to the *symposion*'s entertainment.

[195] The concept of 'presentification' is more deeply analyzed by the author in DIETRICH 2020, pp. 253-254, fn. 6. ORegarding the «'presenza' delle immagini», see also HÖLSCHER 2004, p. 19.

support, the vase, which is […] an object in (the viewer's) space»[196], it follows that they are depicted in the viewer's space, rather than being dislocated in a «self-contained pictorial time and space»[197].

The reflection on spatial properties addressed by Dietrich shows a connection not only with the discussion on the peculiar configuration of space in vase-painting[198], but also with a long-standing tradition of thought on the physical landscape's quality and physical objects' extension in space and time[199]. Dietrich's idea that the space of representation does not match a represented space (an observation that implies the dependence of landscape elements on figures), in fact, also entails a reflection on 'spatial medium' and 'temporal medium', namely a «temporal medium of narrative»[200].

As outlined above, in Dietrich's reflection on space, flanking the iconographic issue (focusing on the couple 'space of nature' – 'space of man') is an epistemological problem (dealing with the 'space of the vase' – 'space of the image' pair)[201]. The investigation of pictorial space and the 'background' notion – addressed by Dietrich also within the research network *Topoi*[202] – is touched from a double perspective: how the space was perceived and how it was presented and represented. Once more, ancient viewing – that is to say, the «agency of the viewer» – is central in Dietrich's analysis[203]. Thus, the reflection on the 'space of

[196] DIETRICH 2017a, §15. See also DIETRICH 2017a, §15, *infra*: «To put it simple: as decorated Attic vases are *objects in* (the viewer's) *space*, the 'landscapes' on them are depicted as confined objects too».
[197] DIETRICH 2020, p. 254.
[198] See bibliography listed above, p. 52, fn. 181, and especially GRETHLEIN 2017.
[199] See e.g. MALINOWSKI 1973 (first ed. 1922), pp. 286-287; EINSTEIN 1955, p. 122 (fifteenth English edition, with the addition of notes dealing with the relationship between objects and space. Compare with the second Italian edition EINSTEIN 1960, briefly reviewed in SELVAGGI 1961, p. 129. First German edition 1917).
[200] DIETRICH 2020, p. 252. The pictures' narrative character is drawn from GIULIANI 2003.
[201] See, in particular, DIETRICH 2011 and DIETRICH 2017a.
[202] See https://www.topoi.org/, in part. Group (C-4) Pictorial Constructions of Space(s). See e.g. DIETRICH 2019.
[203] For further details on this topic, see in particular DIETRICH 2018b.

the figures' – 'space of the beholder' pair (or, in other words, internal and external «spatio-temporal context»)[204] follows that on the pairs mentioned above.

III) The reflection on the image's organization has led also a debate on the function and the ontological status of *ornament* and *frame*[205]. This issue is clearly summarized by Hurwit, also in relation to the problem of landscape, as a question on «the difference between image and frame, between nature and ornament, between element of landscape and artificial pattern»[206]. Also – I would add – between representation and decoration, between figure and ornament.

The analysis of the ornamental function of plants was dealt with during the 1900s in several studies, which also focused on ancient art by developing a merely stylistic-formal analysis[207]. The first attempts to address the actual dichotomy figure-ornament date back to research by Nikolaus Himmelmann and – as already mentioned – Jeffrey Hurwit[208]. In the wake of these studies, which made the case for a possible figurative dimension of ornament in Greek art[209], a number of more recent studies have investigated the figurative nature of decorative forms[210]. By means of an investigation of the «semantic significance of

[204] See DIETRICH 2020, p. 257 («we may distinguish between the presence *in* the image – referring to the space and time within the pictorial fiction – and the presence *of* the image – referring to the actual space and time of the physical image in the situation of viewing»).
[205] See SQUIRE 2018 for a comprehensive bibliography regarding this subject.
[206] HURWIT 1992, p. 63.
[207] See e.g. MEURER 1909; JACOBSTHAL 1927; MÖBIUS 1929.
[208] See in particular HIMMELMANN 1968: HURWIT 1977; HURWIT 1992.
[209] In particular, Himmelmann maintains that ornamental forms on Geometric and Orientalizing vase painting have a figurative significance (see HIMMELMANN 1968, p. 266). HURWIT 1992 observes that the distinction between ornament and natural forms «was not, in fact, very clear at the beginning of the Archaic vase-painting, and, through properly acknowledged throughout most of the sixth century, it was often intentionally blurred toward and after the century's end» (p. 63). In essence, what Hurwit 'theorizes' is the «divorce of ornament from representation» happened in the sixth century (p. 66).
[210] See, in particular, HÖLSCHER 2004, p. 22-23; PLATT, SQUIRE 2017 (reviewed in SCHULTZ 2017); DIETRICH, SQUIRE 2018.

form», they essentially revers the dichotomy 'constituent' vs 'complement' of Kant's *Critique of Judgment* (1790) pointing out that «ornament, far from being opposed to image, is an aspect of representation that is constitutive to images»[211].
Although these overall theoretical themes have been occasionally addressed with respect to the Etruscan field (as is the case with mirrors floral decoration)[212], the interest in Etruscan art emerged in relation to more specific issues.

IV) While, on the one hand, the analysis of landscape elements' function (§ II.) is addressed both in terms of iconographic analysis and in terms of formal analysis and, on the other hand, the reflection on the ontological status of ornament and frame (§ III.) is mostly set in formal terms, a further object of investigation shifts once again the attention to the iconographic datum. Over the past few decades, in fact, an additional strand of the research on landscape representation has covered the analysis of *naturalistic records*[213]. This fascination with

[211] GRETHLEIN 2018, p. 74. Compare with DIETRICH 2018c, p. 169: «The antithesis between ornamental formalism and figurative meaning does not hold in Archaic art». See also KÉI 2015, p. 157 («si nota una vera e propria interazione tra le […] 'decorazioni floreali' e l''immagine', che porta i motivi floreali ad assumere un ruolo figurativo e persino semantico») and KÉI 2020. Regarding frames see in particular MARCONI 2017a, p. 117: «My argument here is that the borders of pictures on Greek pots, far from being external supplements to the work, are integral constituents of the visual and spatial field to which they belong: so much so that often the ways in which painters articulate the relationship between the pictures and their boundaries have a particular relevance at the semantic level, with those formal solutions significantly contributing to an image's meaning». Regarding the interaction between figures and border in Greek vase painting see CATONI 2021, discussed *infra* p. 330. Kant's *Critique of Judgment* passage on the status of frame is discussed in MARCONI 2017a, p. 117 and SQUIRE 2018, pp. 18-19. A theoretical framework on the 'frame' reviewing the role this conveys in experiencing the image can be found in FERRARI, PINOTTI 2018. The scholars presented some of the most important literature that validated the study of 'frames' during the Nineteens. See HEDREEN 2017 (esp. p. 170) regarding Greek pictorial representations lacking any frame and their meaning.
[212] See e.g. EDLUND 1982, discussed *infra* pp. 326-327, fn. 25.
[213] The attention to the original botanical model characterizes a number of studies that mainly deal with Greek and Roman art. See e.g. the section *Il verde reale e il verde*

plants and greenery mainly developed from research by Pierre Grimal on Roman gardens. In the many re-editions of *Les jardins romains*[214] – as well as of the shorter essay *L'art des jardins*[215] – the scholar provides a reconstruction of the role that ornamental gardens played in the cultural evolution of Rome[216]. One of his fundamental statements is the strong connection between gardening and landscape painting, developed on the concept of the garden as both a source of inspiration and an object of imitation.

The study of the history of gardens, which has become a thriving sub-discipline, has not only benefited from the study of images, but has in turn also influenced the methods and goals of iconographic analysis *per se*. Moreover, the interest in plant life, including both wild and domesticated vegetation, has granted a new phase of collaboration between different disciplines. This multidisciplinary approach is confirmed by conferences such as that organized in 1993 by the Istituto Ortobotanico of the Università degli Studi di Bari on *La flora e la vegetazione spontanea della Puglia nella scienza, nell'arte e nella storia*[217]. In more recent years, the cycle of talks *L'archeologia in verde. Quattordici conversazioni a Milano sulla percezione della natura nel mondo antico*[218], held in Milan on the occasion of the exhibition *Mito e Natura*. *Dalla Grecia a Pompei*[219], has shown the comprehensive application of this approach to

dipinto in the catalogue of the 2015 exhibition *Mito e Natura. Dalla Grecia a Pompei* (SENA CHIESA, PONTRANDOLFO 2015, pp. 255-301).

[214] GRIMAL 1969. Grimal firstly published his research in 1943 with the title *Les jardins romains à la fin de la République et aux deux premiers siècles de l'empire: essai sur le naturalisme romain*. The second edition with the title *Les jardins romains* was published in 1984. Two Italian editions in 1990 and 2000.

[215] GRIMAL 1954 (first French edition). The five Italian editions were published in 1987, 1993, 2000, 2005 and 2014.

[216] Regarding this subject, Settis' analysis of the paintings in the Villa of Livia at Prima Porta is still a crucial one (see SETTIS 2008, esp. pp. 5-47, first published in 1988).

[217] Proceedings MACCHIA 1997.

[218] SENA CHIESA, GIACOBELLO 2016a.

[219] SENA CHIESA, PONTRANDOLFO 2015.

the archaeological domain[220]. Furthermore, the relationship with more strictly iconographic themes is confirmed by the two conferences on *Gli dei in giardino* organized in conjunction with the same exhibition[221].

This cross-disciplinary stance, based on the interest in vegetation, has had different outcomes in the field of Etruscology as well. A Swedish research group has developed a project to evaluate the interaction between nature and man, that is, the management of natural resources in antiquity employing environmental and landscape change analysis. The implementation of their research is based on the collection of geological data to identify vegetal transitions and shifts in vegetation patterns, as well as to estimate metal production over time[222].

The focus on botanical species underlies Paul Fontaine's study of the plants illustrated in the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*[223]. In order to provide an iconographical analysis of the tomb's frescos, the French archaeologist expressly refers to Pampanini's research and the French edition of *Trees and Bushes of Europe* by the botanist Oleg Polunin and the botanical illustrator Barbara Everard, firstly published in 1976[224].

Jean-René Jannot adopts a similar comparative approach between botanical and iconographic data in order to investigate the significance of plants depicted in Etruscan funerary contexts[225]. In particular, the scholar classified plants such as ivy, pomegranate, laurel, lotus, and poppy according to their use.

---

[220] A research group at the Università degli Studi di Milano including historians, historians of religions, archaeologists, philosophers, and philologists has similarly researched these issues. Their first outcome is the publication of a volume dealing with the symbolic value of plants and their relationships with gods in Greece and Southern Italy: see ARRIGONI 2018; reviewed in COLLARD 2020.
[221] SENA CHIESA, GIACOBELLO 2016b.
[222] WIMAN, EKMAN 2000-2001.
[223] FONTAINE 2009, pp. 273-275.
[224] POLUNIN, EVERARD 1976. Regarding Pampanini, see above pp. 32-33.
[225] JANNOT 2009.

The previous discussion shows that over the last decades the interest in Etruscan landscape has mainly focused on tomb paintings. An overview of this aspect will be the subject of the last part of this section.

V) The research topics presented above also arise within the debate on Etruscan art.

As part of the research on the representation of landscape in Etruscan art, a pioneering study was published in 1982 by Nancy Thomson de Grummond on *Some Unusual Landscape Conventions in Etruscan Art*[226]. Focusing on engraved bronze mirrors, the scholar identifies two unusual fifth- and fourth-centuries conventions in Etruscan art, which are unparalleled in Greek art. In particular, she defines them as an «encompassing ground line» and a «stylized atmosphere». The first one is a curving extension of the groundline, taking the form of semicircles. The second is a filling of the figurative space in which «the artists seem to have been trying to indicate above all that we do not exist in a vacuum, but are surrounded by and interact with the air»[227]. These two characteristics are evaluated as similar «in psychological and aesthetic effect»[228], in that they both reveal the moment when «the artist begins to consider what is around the figure» and «to become conscious of the air or atmosphere surrounding the figures»[229]. Furthermore, according to the author, this effect is «paralleled to that obtained elsewhere in Etruscan tomb paintings by showing the figures surrounded by trees and birds and reflects what we know of Etruscan conceptions of the universe: man needed constantly to heed his environments – plants, animals, sky, sea, thunder, lighting – in order to understand the will of the gods and to

[226] DE GRUMMOND 1982a. After a few consideration in BONFANTE 1964, p. 39. On floral motifs in mirrors, see EDLUND 1982 (reviewed *infra*, pp. 326-327, fn. 25).
[227] DE GRUMMOND 1982a, p. 7. In particular, de Grummond distinguishes three different types of stylized atmosphere: wavy contours, wavy vertical pattern in discontinuous and short lines, and dotted area running around the figures (see pp. 6-7).
[228] DE GRUMMOND 1982a, p. 9.
[229] DE GRUMMOND 1982a, p. 12.

live in harmony with them. In Greek art, the human figure is usually either divorced from its surroundings, or else the setting is barely indicated»[230]. This parallel between figurative conventions and the concept of the universe is one of the most noteworthy and original aspects of de Grummond's discussion. In light of this correspondence, artistic figurative norms show a «deep feeling for and interest in the natural surroundings of man that contrast vividly with the attitude of the classical Greeks»[231].

De Grummond focus on landscape depiction in mirrors was strikingly original compared to later research[232]. As for Etruscan art, recent reflections on the representation of landscape primarily concern the limited domain of tomb paintings and funerary space, which de Grummond only marginally addresses.

One trend that can be observed is the attempt to encompass almost all previous research questions within a more 'cohesive and complete' framework combining methodological approaches and interpretative complexity. Nonetheless, such studies reveal the limits of focusing only on a specific material class[233]. A brief overview of the research on this subject area is presented here, as the individual papers will be discussed in detail in the chapters to follow.

Of most significant interest to researches on landscape illustration in Etruscan art are the function of individual landscape elements and the problem of rendering and structuring space. The notion of 'space' refers both to the 'space of the image' and the 'space of the tomb'. Subsequently, the issue of space merges also with the reflection on the image's entire setting and the role played by the frame.

---

[230] DE GRUMMOND 1982a, pp. 9-10.

[231] DE GRUMMOND 1982a, p. 12. Concerning the relationship with Greek artworks, de Grummond considers Etruscan conventions as an «*alternative* to the Greek system» (*loc. cit.*); *contra* BONFANTE 1964, p. 39.

[232] However, the same subject is later also addressed by BRIQUEL 1993.

[233] Francesco Roncalli's research constitutes the most significant effort to overcome this 'monographic' approach. See RONCALLI 2014a for an example of the different media considered by the scholar.

Historically – and before approaching the reflection on landscape – research on the representation of space in Etruscan tomb paintings dates back to the analysis of the relationship between architectural structure and painting. During the 1960s, this topic was remarkably addressed by Guido Achille Mansuelli and Jean-Marie Dentzer[234]. The result has been a strand of more or less connected studies concerning the analysis of the way figurative scenes, friezes and decorative elements are organized on the wall support within the real space of the tomb[235]. A related topic, particularly productive also in recent years, is the pictorial representation of architectural structures[236].

Alongside these strands of research, the interest in the representation of landscape emerges in relation to studies that privilege a rhetorical reading of images to understand the existing relationships between image themes and pictorial spaces, namely the «percezione della camera sepolcrale come supporto d'immagini relazionate a uno spazio simbolico e cogente […]»[237].

---

[234] See MANSUELLI 1967; DENTZER 1968. In *Le sens architectural dans les peintures des tombes tarquiniennes avant l'époque hellénistique*, Mansuelli foregoes figurative and stylistic analysis, privileging the analysis of tomb architecture and the way the paintings adapt to the architecture (see e.g. MANSUELLI 1967, p. 44: «Les peintures des tombes étrusques ne sauraient donc être considérées seulement au point de vue figuratif. Les scènes figurées des frises et des frontons s'intègrent dans un ensemble tirant ses origines et sa raison d'être de l'exigence de la représentation architectonique. Les solutions qu'on a adoptées par rapport à la composition et à la structure des frontons et des frises nous font apercevoir des problèmes qui se sont posés aux peintres, chez lesquels a prévalu tantôt l'intérêt architectonique, tantôt l'intérêt figuratif»).

[235] See e.g. OLESON 1978; COARELLI 1983; LINIGTON, SERRA RIDGWAY 1997; FRANZONI 2012.

[236] See in particular NASO 1996; BENASSAI 2005; RONCALLI 2016; RONCALLI 2017; MARZULLO 2017.

[237] See HARARI 2007, p. 47 («[…] Roncalli e Mario Torelli, più di altri, hanno chiarito la semantica dei percorsi, dei diaframmi, degli ingressi, con acquisizioni direi definitive, quali il carattere liminare delle pareti d'ingresso e di fondo, il contesto oltremondano delle figurazioni comprese nei timpani, la nozione (veramente basilare) dell'ipogeo stesso come *locus medius*, che tuttavia, già nel tardo V secolo, si converte in *locus inferus* dando asilo a un'impressionante popolazione di demoni»; in particular, in this essays Harari aknowledges the rhetorical and literary nature of the *Tomba François*' frescoes – see p. 48). Regarding this topic, in addition to the contributions

As outlined above, since the second half of the twentieth century, socio-anthropologically oriented studies developed archaeological research to interpret the codes of social imagery as conveyed by material culture. In Etruscology since the late 1970s, the main impetus in this direction has come from the work of Bruno d'Agostino and Luca Cerchiai, who adopted a hermeneutical approach to the investigation of Etruscan funerary ideology[238], in line with the methodological premises

discussed below in the text (in particular the analysis conducted by Francesco Roncalli), which are more focused on landscape representation, see also HARARI 2012b (on the *Tomba dell'Orco* III); TORELLI 1983 (on the *Tomba dell'Orco* I and II):TORELLI 1997b; TORELLI 2002c (who deals with «paesaggi della morte in Etruria», although in this case by 'paesaggi' he means 'representation of funerary ideologies'); TORELLI 2007a; TORELLI 2012 (who warns against the idea of continuous progress of formal acquisitions, as well as against reading tomb paintings «senza una chiara visione del carattere sistemico del tessuto sociale sotteso» – p. 11; compare with TORELLI 2002c, p. 45).

Noteworthy with this regard is also analysis by Jean Charles Balty, who published in 1985 the essay *L'espace dans la peinture funéraire étrusque* (BALTY 1985). By transferring the analysis of Tarquinian tomb *imagerie* on the level of sociological analysis, the scholar identifies a number of figurative formulas (in particular, location and distribution of thematic nuclei such as funeral games and banquet) which indicate the desire for self-representation of the families who commissioned the frescos (see e.g. BALTY 1985, p. 166: «Au moment de son apogée, la peinture funéraire étrusque réussit donc à mettre en scène, dans ces mégalographies désormais réalisée à l'échelle humaine, ceux-là mêmes qui participaient en quelque sorte au banquet et aux jeux ; auto-représentation d'une société, relativement limitée, de grandes familles»). Balty describes his approach as «une approche de pure histoire de l'art, envisageant la manière dont s'est faite la prise de conscience de l'espace de la tombe et dont a évolué la notation de cette espace» and compare his endeavor with the investigation conducted a decade earlier by Agnès Rouveret on *L'organisation spatiale des tombes de Paestum* (BALTY 1985, p. 150 ; ROUVERET 1975. Albeit acknowledging an affinity in terms of methodological assumptions, as regards the comparison with the tombs of Paestum, Balty maintains that «Il n'y a […] guère d'einsegnements à tirer de la comparaison des deux séries» – BALTY 1985, p. 150, fn. 19). Regarding the sociological approach adopted by Balty and his reported antecedents (in particular, CRISTOFANI 1969 for the *Tomba del Trifone* and STOPPONI 1983 for the *Tomba della Scrofa Nera*) see BALTY 1985, p. 144.

[238] See e.g. D'AGOSTINO 1977; D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 1999 (esp. pp. XV-XXXVI). For a theoretical overview see also D'AGOSTINO 1991; CERCHIAI 2012.

that inform French studies[239]. As we will see in the chapters to follow, with regard to investigations expressly dedicated to the significance of landscape elements, their focus is mainly on the representation of the sea[240]. In recent years the endeavor («individuare il valore semantico rivestito dal mare nella cultura etrusca»[241]) has been undertaken by Chiara Pizzirani and – mainly with regard to the *stelae* of Felsina – by Giuseppe Sassatelli and Elisabetta Govi[242].

The most remarkable contributions to the study of the representation of landscape in Etruscan art have been made by Agnès Rouveret and Francesco Roncalli. Their contributions will be discussed in more detail also in the chapters to follow.

Markedly structuralist research carried out by Rouveret has its origins, on the one hand, in anthropological interests – specifically related to the study of acculturation mechanisms[243] – and, on the other hand, in the related concern for the analysis of decorative programs[244]. Under Louis Althusser's advice, the figurative decoration of tombs is conceived by Rouveret as an expression of a given culture's funerary ideology[245]. Since the 1970s, her interest in funerary *imagerie*, which is

[239] In addition to the examples mentioned above, see e.g. VERNANT 1986: PONTRANDOLFO, ROUVERET 1990; PONTRANDOLFO, ROUVERET 1992; D'AGOSTINO, SCHNAPP 1990. For possible further results of adopting this socio-anthropological approach see also the others contributions edited in the same volume: GNOLI, VERNANT 1990.

[240] See D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 1999, pp. 53-88.

[241] PIZZIRANI 2005, p. 251.

[242] See e.g. PIZZIRANI 2005; PIZZIRANI 2010; PIZZIRANI 2014; GOVI, SASSATELLI 2004.

[243] See e.g. GRUZINSKI, ROUVERET 1976 (reviewed in CRISTOFANI 1976, pp. 2-3; PONTRANDOLFO 1989, p. 339). For an overview of the contributions concerning the issue of acculturation in the 1960s and the 1070s, see PONTRANDOLFO 1989, p. 347.

[244] See e.g. PONTRANDOLFO, ROUVERET 1990.

[245] In particular, with reference to ALTHUSSER 1970, who maintains that «les idées (d'un sujet) sont ses actes matériels insérés dans des pratiques matérielles, réglées par des rituels matériels eux-mêmes définis par l'appareil idéologique matériel dont relèvent les idées de ce sujet». See PONTRANDOLFO, ROUVERET 1990, fn. 2: «[…] è giusto supporre che dal tentativo di lettura delle pratiche funerarie e del rituale, che si può operare a partire dai dati archeologici, si possono individuare certe componenti dell'ideologia funeraria […]».

mainly reflected in her research on painted tombs from Paestum, has emphasized the analysis of «l'organisation et la representation de l'espace»[246], with steady attention to the analysis of textual sources.
According to Rouveret, Etruscan tomb painting is relevant to these topics since it «offre un terrain privilégié pour l'analyse des phénomènes d'acculturation parce qu'elle permet l'étude des savoir-faire artisanaux impliqués et la mise en évidence de "programmes décoratifs" laissant entrevoir les valeurs et les signes d'autoglorification de l'aristocratie étrusque, commanditaire de tels monuments»[247]. As for Etruscan art, Rouveret focuses on Tarquinian archaic tombs, which she analyzes by investigating both the ideological aspects behind the images and the techniques of space representation[248].
In *Espace sacré/espace pictural: une hypothèse sur quelques peintures archaïques de Tarquinia*[249], Rouveret includes «le motif des petits arbres qui reviennent avec une grande fréquence et une grande régularité dans le décor des tombes» in the list of «éléments figurés destinés à structurer l'espace intérieur de la tombe de manière spécifique»[250]. In particular, the scholar rejects the idea that trees have the «simple valeur anecdotique qu'on leur accorde le plus souvent comme marqueurs d'un espace de plein air». Rather, their function would be related to space delimitation «dans les pratiques et les représentations mentales des Etrusques»[251]. According to Rouveret, the decorative system of Tarquinian archaic tombs is at first based «sur les rapports entre des structures spatiales, sémantiquement marquées»[252]. Subsequently, from the early-fifth century, the system of representation showed a growing disregard for decorative structure due to a major emphasis on human

[246] ROUVERET 1975, p. 597.
[247] ROUVERET 1992, p. 170.
[248] See, in particular, ROUVERET 1988, in which the two topics converge; ROUVERET 1992, who focuses on the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*.
[249] ROUVERET 1988.
[250] ROUVERET 1988, pp. 203-204.
[251] ROUVERET 1988, p. 204.
[252] ROUVERET 1988, p. 207. This semantic relevance comes from the idea that images represent «fragments d'un rituel» (p. 211).

figures. This turning point consisted of the establishment of a novel decorative syntax which «donne […] d'une certaine façon à l'image son autonomie»[253]. That is to say, «l'image gagne en 'réalisme' ce qu'elle perd en pouvoir d'évocation»[254]. In particular, the *Tomba del Cacciatore* and the *Tomba delle Bighe* – which provide examples for «scène unitaire» – demonstrate the nature of the change taking place between the sixth and fifth century B.C.[255].

The research path set by Agnès Rouveret is being followed by Anne-Marie Adam[256]. In the already mentioned essay *Végétation et paysage dans la peinture funéraire étrusque*[257], the scholar deals with the relationship, which is established inside the tomb, between real space and imaginary space. With reference to the *Tomba del Cacciatore*, the *Tomba delle Leonesse* and the *Tomba della Nave*, she maintains that landscape representations aim to render «un espace imaginaire qui gomme les limites imposées par l'univers clos de l'hypogée»[258]. Moreover, widening the analysis to later sixth century tombs (in particular, the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca* and the *Tomba dei Tori*, but also the *Tomba dei Giocolieri*, *Tomba delle Leonesse*, *Tomba del Letto Funebre* and the *Tomba del Triclinio*) would suggests an additional feature of landscape elements. According to Adam, in fact, these played a «rôle important dans la régulation des rapports entre vivants et défunts»[259]. Therefore, according to her analysis, «tout se passe […] comme si la représentation des arbres était réservée […] à une sorte

[253] ROUVERET 1988, p. 211; see also p. 214.
[254] ROUVERET 1988, p. 212.
[255] ROUVERET 1988, pp. 212-213.
[256] Rouveret and Adam' statements have been criticized, with no substantial effectiveness, by ZANONI 1998 (see, in part., pp. 341-351), who stresses the concept of «Naturwille», which he defines as the «volontà di trasporre le scene raffigurate in un'altra sfera con l'ausilio di elementi vegetali» (ZANONI 1998, p. 356). According to his interpretation, in in tomb painting, landscape elements would indicate that the scene takes place in an imaginary setting – which is evoked by landscape elements themselves – where the living and the dead are brought together. 8
[257] ADAM 1990 = ADAM 1996.
[258] ADAM 1996, p. 33.
[259] ADAM 1996, p. 38.

d'antichambre au-delà de laquelle les vivants n'ont pas accès et qui constitue donc le dernier lieu d'échange entre les vivants et les morts […]»[260].

The scholar's reflection on landscape representation has developed in more recent years. At a 2012 conference held in Strasbourg on *Le détail dans les cultures visuelles (Antiquité - XXIe siècle)*, in fact, Adam gave a speech on *'Horror vacuit' et détails inutiles (?) dans la peinture funéraire étrusque*[261]. Adam's text deals with an analysis of late archaic tombs in Tarquinia and is intended to demonstrate that apparently incoherent details contribute to shaping – and further, to understanding – the meaning of pictorial cycles and their funerary message. Among the possible *remplissages*, Adam considers in particular «volatiles divers» (alongside further little animals) and «arbustes ou autres végétaux»[262]. Rather than dealing with the ontological reflection on the ornament's status (as the paper's title might suggest), the author addresses the iconographic analysis of figurative elements fully embedded in the image. In her essay, she aims to demonstrate their relevance for understanding the image's overall meaning («des motif en apparence marginaux par rapport à la thématique principale lui sont en réalité intimement liés au point qu'ils fournissent une bonne partie des clés pour la compréhension de l'ensemble»)[263].

As mentioned above, a decisive impulse toward studies on landscape representation was offered by Francesco Roncalli's research. One of Roncalli's fundamental premises concerns the appreciation for pictorial tomb space, which is conceived as an autonomous and metaphorical space. In spite of this methodological unitary vision, in his numerous essays, Roncalli has shown that tomb paintings provide the viewer with a great variability of situations. By means of their «ambientazioni simboliche», in fact, «talora ci affacciamo al luogo stesso del transito del defunto, talaltra siamo esclusi dalla sua presenza,

[260] ADAM 1996, p. 35.
[261] ADAM 2013.
[262] ADAM 2013, p. 240.
[263] ADAM 2013, p. 253.

talaltra ancora guardiamo con i suoi stessi occhi. E il paesaggio muta di conseguenza»[264].

In his 1990 essay *La definizione pittorica dello spazio tombale nella "età della crisi"* , which is based on his 1987 presentation at the conference *Crise et transformation des sociétés archaïques de l'Italie antique au Ve siècle av. JC.* held at the École française de Rome, Roncalli bestows upon the «elementi fondanti […] l'individuazione architettonico-pittorica del vano tombale» (e.g. the polychrome bands and the painted bases) the ability to define the tomb's «assetto ideologico figurativo»[265]. The scholar analyzes the evolution of these pictorial elements over time and considers their insertion process within the «programma allusivo globale» embodied by tomb painting[266]. In essence, he assigns a «valore significante»[267] to details which are deemed to be exhortative.

In his analysis, Roncalli emphasizes both earthly and other-worldly nature of burial space, defined in this way by the relationship between physical volumetric space and imaginary place «individuato dall'effetto concertato dei dipinti»[268]. His analysis shows that any figurative element is eligible to have a significance in relation to the tomb's ideological content, namely they perform a «funzione rituale, […] globale asservimento ai contenuti e scopi ideologici e cultuali della sepoltura»[269].

In a number of subsequent studies, which stand out for their conceptual clarity and methodological rigor, Roncalli provides more specific analysis of a few painted tombs in Tarquinia. In these studies, the role assigned to landscape elements also emerges. In particular, on the occasion of the conference *Les Étrusques, les plus religieux des Hommes*, held in Paris in 1990, he bestows upon the rock depicted in the

[264] RONCALLI 2014a, p. 60.
[265] RONCALLI 1990 (quot. p. 231). Before this comprehensive essay, the scholar had addressed the subject from a more specific perspective, by analyzing the paintings of the François Tomb (see RONCALLI 1987).
[266] RONCALLI 1990, p. 232.
[267] RONCALLI 1990, p. 235.
[268] RONCALLI 1990, p. 230.
[269] RONCALLI 1990, p. 231.

Tomba dei Demoni Azzurri, which at the time had recently been discovered, the specific symbolic value of spatial discrimination of the environments of the underworld[270]. Roncalli's essay, published in the 1997 conference proceedings, gave rise to one of his central research themes to which also the analyses Marisa Bonamici significantly contributed[271]. In particular, they identify figurative elements employed to describe the infernal topography and structure the itinerary toward the afterlife that the deceased must accomplish after his/her death.

In more recent years, in addition to addressing the theme through comprehensive overviews[272], Roncalli has provided an original reading also of the *Tomba del Barone* and the *Tomba dei Giocolieri*, highlighting the role played by landscape elements in defining the physical and symbolic space of these tombs[273].

Finally, in his most recent essays, Roncalli's analysis relates to broader theoretical themes, such as the validity of the notions of 'ornamental' and 'frame'[274]. In doing this, he links Etruscan iconography to wide-ranging subjects, across a path never thoroughly experienced before. His encouragement of the possibilities offered by iconographic research in Etruscan art has played an important part in stimulating the present investigation.

---

[270] RONCALLI 1997. See also RONCALLI 1994, pp. 113-114.

[271] See, e.g. RONCALLI 1994, esp. pp. 112-117; RONCALLI 1996a; RONCALLI 2014a. As for Marisa Bonamici's contribution to this subject see, in particular, BONAMICI 1998; BONAMICI 2005a; BONAMICI 2005b; BONAMICI 2014. Drawing on RONCALLI 1994, HARARI 1997c, pp. 200-201 and fn. 25 analyzes the krater by the Montebradoni Painter at the Museo Guarnacci in Volterra, inv. MG 4584, ex Viti collection, and suggests the «eventualità di una certa pregnanza semantica per gli stessi intrecci floreali […] che demarcano, di sopra e di sotto, il fregio principale del cratere». On the landscape of the *Tomba dell'Orco*, see also CRISTOFANI 1987b; WEBER LEHMAN 1995; WEBER LEHMAN 1996 (*contra* HARARI 2012b, pp. 289-290).

[272] See e.g. RONCALLI 2001; RONCALLI 2014a.

[273] See, in particular, RONCALLI 2001; RONCALLI 2003; RONCALLI 2005. See *infra* pp. 131-134; 299-300.

[274] See, e.g. RONCALLI 2017.

3.
Landscape in Context

The purpose of this chapter is to present an analytic survey of Etruscan images showing landscape details. The following overview is divided into three sections, each one dealing with a specific reference 'context' for the images. By 'context' I primarily refer to the physical space in which actions ideally take place. However, the suitability of such physical contexts depends on their correspondence with ontological spheres, namely the symbolic significance of each context.
By virtue of the existing correspondence between geographical and symbolic spaces, each section relates to a specific geographic and thematic area. The internal division of sections confirms to what extent the tripartition by spatial contexts implies a categorization of images according to 'situational' nuclei. As mentioned in the introduction[1], although there is no evidence of biunivocal correspondence between a given situation and a particular significance of landscape elements, situation-based categorization has appeared to be the most effective in meeting my research aims.

The first section (*A Man-Made World. Landscapes for Earthly Human Experience*) deals with the earthly space in which human action takes place. The second section (*Elsewhere. Landscapes across the Boundaries*) provides an overview of action spaces external to the human domain that are also suitable for connection with the supernatural and the divine. The third section (*Landscapes for the Afterlife*) includes scenes set in both the Underworld and heavenly dwellings.

The structuring of these categories and the assignation of images to a specific group have been challenging and might be a matter for further discussion. For instance, in the case of the third group, though the infernal setting is usually easily recognizable due to the presence of demons and monsters, the celestial one is less objectively identifiable.

[1] See above p. 5.

According to ancient understanding, gods can easily move between the heavenly dwellings and the earthly space of humankind. Focusing on physical context, therefore, one might argue that it is problematic to determine whether the fishing scene involving Eros and Aphrodite on a mirror in the Metropolitan Museum collection of antiquity (**pl. 17.a**)[2] takes place along an earthly or otherworldly waterway. The problem is less severe than it appears. In fact, rather than focusing on two subjects – the 'migration' of which would prevent any assignment – the distinguishing feature is the type of action specified by the image. In the following overview, examining the kind of action or gesture depicted provides the basis for any association to one of the three contexts. Therefore – to give a concrete example – the 'man-made world' refers to the space in which man imagines his action and the area in which he places the humanized actions of gods.
From this point of view, the distinction has necessarily benefited also from the analysis of the iconographic schemes and their specific connection with humans or gods, through a serial consideration of figurative contexts.

A further remark on the tripartition is essential to note at the outset. Being valid both on the spatial and the semantic level, by showing the existing correspondence between geographical and symbolic spaces, the tripartition provides an overview of the way reality is arranged. The way physical and geographical reality is described shows – more or less directly – how reality is conceived and imagined. Further clarification on this aspect seems to be needed. On the one hand, the access to given reality granted to the viewer through image reading is mediated and influenced by the way reality appears in the image, namely by figurative elements displayed in the image, their arrangement, the visual perspective, and so on forth. On the other hand, based on a conventional system, such elements and features work as reality's 'surrogate'[3]. Therefore, images can be understood as a

[2] New York, Metropolita Museum of Art, inv. inv. 07.260. See *infra* p. 96.
[3] See GIULIANI 2013, pp. ix-xix.

carrier reflecting their audience's perception. For that reason, the tripartition and analysis of the way landscape elements are inserted in each context provide us with an overall picture – although mediated – of how the Etruscans perceived space and environment.

3.1. A Man-Made World. Landscapes for Earthly Human Experience

3.1.1. *Man Upon Nature. Hunting, Navigation, and Agriculture*

The purpose of this section is to present images the subject of which conveys a subordinate relationship between man and nature. Activities resulting in human impact on nature include hunting, navigation, and agriculture. These three themes are all attested, although with different frequencies, in Etruscan art.

HUNTING

Some of the oldest examples of landscape representation in a hunting context are those on seventh-century imported luxury metal vases found in Etruscan tombs of exceptional prestige. They are mainly attributable to Middle Eastern production. Despite being a helpful tool for studying the social and cultural context[4], such artworks provide less data for understanding the Etruscan visual world. In particular, a few vessels from the Barberini and Bernardini tombs in Praeneste and from the Regolini Galassi tomb in Cerveteri show hunting scenes with landscape details[5]. Their production – which was assigned to

[4] MAUSS 1923-1924 (= MAUSS 2000, pp. 155-192 and MAUSS 2002); SCIACCA 2006-2007.

[5] E.g.: lebes Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 61545, from the Bernardini tomb, Palestrina (TORELLI 2006, p. 25, fig. 2; *Karlsruhe* 2017, pp. 97, 136-137, cat. 25c; dating to 680-660 B.C.); patera Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa

immigrant workers[6] or craftsmen working in Phoenicia or Cyprus[7] – shows a figurative style linked to oriental themes and traditions. These cannot coherently fit into a system to analyze the Etruscan specificities of image structuring and treatment.
However, the *imagerie* of seventh-century vase painting is more distinctive.

No longer bound by the constraints of Geometric style – see e.g. the Pittore delle Palme's series of palm trees (**pl. 1**)[8] – at the beginning of the seventh century, the Pittore delle Gru seized the possibilities offered by the new Orientalizing phase, during which an early narrative impetus characterized images[9]. This impetus implies a new role accorded to landscape elements in the painter's works. Formal innovations concerning landscape representation are mainly visible in two amphoras showing a deer hunting scene, attributed to the Pittore delle Gru by Marina Martelli. The two vases are at Villa Giulia (**pl. 2**)[10] and the Museo Arqueológico Nacional in Madrid (**pl. 3**)[11], respectively. In both cases, the animal is represented while being shot by arrows, and the hunter is not visible. Besides the deer, there are large trees on both vases that stand out, covering the vase's body, shoulder, and neck. Through specific consideration of the *trapeza* depicted below the deer

Giulia, inv. 61565, from the Bernardini tomb (NASO 2000, p. 126; NERI 2000, p. 21; TORELLI 2006, p. 25; SCIACCA 2006-2007, p. 286).

[6] See e.g. BOTTO 2004, p. 32.

[7] See e.g. BURANELLI, SANNIBALE 2006, p. 220.

[8] Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, *sine inv.*; from the Monterozzi necropolis. CANCIANI 1974, p. 17, pl. 12.3; CANCIANI 1987, pp. 78; 252-253, no. 23. Regarding the *Pittore delle Palme*, operating in Tarquinia between 700 and 675 B.C., see CANCIANI 1974, pp. 16-17. For an overview of the Painter in the Tarquinian cultural and production context, see BAGNASCO GIANNI 2001a, p. 346.

[9] On the *Pittore delle Gru*, working at Caere at the beginning of the seventh century, see MARTELLI 1987b; MARTELLI 1987c, p. 4; MARTELLI 2001; MARTELLI 2008b, p. 127.

[10] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia. From Veii, tomb 868 Grotta Gramiccia. MARTELLI 1987b, p. 2, figs. 5-9.

[11] Madrid, Museo Arqueológico Nacional; previously on the art market; provenance unknown. MARTELLI 2001, pp. 12, 14, fig. 35; OLMOS 2003; ZUCHTRIEGEL 2011, figs. 1-4.

on the Madrid amphora, the image was interpreted as a unique scene set in «an open-air sanctuary – characterized by the offerings on the table – situated in a grove»[12]. By covering nearly the total height of the vase's surface with trees, the painter builds – both visually[13] and semantically – on what was previously a «motivo accessorio»[14]. In his artworks, trees acquire new space and, therefore, visual impact. This pictorial exercise aims to mark the presence and role played by trees. Plants reach a leading role in characterizing the image, referring by metonymy to a woodland context.

An unsolved problem remains: establishing whether the saplings refer to a generic setting or define a particular action taking place in a specific woodland location through spatial characterization. In other words, one might wonder whether or not the setting helps identify a specific story by showing details that provide «a visual representation of the story to which it refers»[15].

The etched bucchero olla Louvre C 561, dating to the middle of the seventh century B.C. and possibly produced in Cerveteri, features a hunting scene with a hunter kneeling in front of a cervid (**pl. 4**)[16]. A palm-like tree stands between the two figures. It is depicted just behind

[12] ZUCHTRIEGEL 2011. Compare MARTELLI 2001, p. 14: «un culto all'aperto […] rivolto alle proprietà generative della natura, alle potenze sovrannaturali deputate alla fertilità o, in subordinata alternativa, ad un culto di natura totemica. Il che sarebbe, tra l'altro, armonicamente convergente con l'albero che occupa il lato secondario e con le inclinazioni religioso-cultuali […] del nostro pittore, il quale infatti non di radi immette svettanti presenze arboree».

[13] MARTELLI 1987, p. 17 ascribes to the Pittore delle Gru the «creazione di uno stile monumentale» derived from the «ceramografia greca del primo orientalizzante, in particolare da quella delle Cicladi».

[14] MARTELLI 1987d, p. 17.

[15] GIULIANI 2013, p. 56. Regarding the role of setting performed by landscape elements in Greek images featuring episodes of the Trojan saga, see HEDREEN 2001 (reviewed in HURWIT 2002).

[16] Paris, Museée du Louvre, inv. C 561. Ex. Campana collection, inv. 3088; unknown provenance. BONAMICI 1974, pp. 56-57, 115-120, figs. XXXV.c, XXXVI, a-b: CAMPOREALE 1984, p. 35, no. 3, pl. Xa; SCHNAPP 1997, p. 485, no. 70; PRELOŽNIK 2013, p. 24, fig. 5. For the attribution to an atelier in Caere and dating, see pp. BONAMICI 1974, pp. 115, 118-120.

the stag's antlers. Although both the motif of the kneeling hunter and the shape of the sapling date back to near-Eastern models[17], the overall style of this vase allows us to relate it to Caeretan production. The description for this image provided by Marisa Bonamici is worth mentioning. The scholar, in fact, maintains that «un cacciatore appostato dietro un alberello sta per vibrare un colpo d'ascia ad un cervo pascente»[18]. This intriguing interpretation («*sta per*») is likely to reject the hypothesis of the tree's possible purely decorative function. Instead, it is meant to provide a meaningful detail for the 'narrative' construction. It would have the figurative power to qualify the action of hiding performed by the hunter and facilitate the viewer to identify the action's timing[19]. Moreover, this figurative construction would result in establishing a relationship between the individual elements of the image. Instead of representing isolated elements next to one another, the depiction focuses on subjects involved in a situation. This is achieved as much by the gesture of kneeling as by the tree, which contributes to the creation of a certain 'sense of drama'[20].

[17] In particular, the motif of the kneeling hunter finds parallels in the repertoire of the Syro-Hittites and Nimrud ivories (see e.g. BARNETT 1957, p. 68). Another example is represented on a thirteen-century cylinder seal from Assur: see TURK 2005, p. 33, fig. 47. The tree on the Louvre bucchero can be compared to similar plants on vases from the Bernardini tomb. For a discussion, see BONAMICI 1974, pp. 118-119, fns. 131-132, 135.

[18] BONAMICI 1974, p. 57. Compare with the description provided in PREL0ŽNIK 2013, p. 23.

[19] With this, we do not intend to argue that the image structures its reception as a temporal sequence. Instead, we stress that the engraver focuses on the dramatic quality of the scene. Regarding the relationship of images to time, focusing on sixth-century Greek iconography, see GIULIANI 2013, in part. pp. 131-135.

[20] Regarding the emergence of narrative iconography in seventh-century Greek vase painting, see GIULIANI 2013, esp. pp. 53-88; GIULIANI 2017. Giuliani advises that as long as an image – although compatible with a story – does not «*demand* a story (and a very specific one) to be told) […] the iconography we are dealing with is a descriptive and not a narrative one» (GIULIANI 2013, p. 51). As for this analysis, I use the term 'narration' in a broader sense, with reference to images representing particular stories or subjects involved in specific situations. My primary purpose is to analyze the extent to which landscape elements have to do with the specific context of action images.

As outlined above, while metallic vessels from royal Etruscan tombs represent a passive reception of figurative material of near-eastern derivation, Etruscan bucchero tableware inspired by Eastern examples shows a more conscious elaboration of the models. The bucchero olla's image is realized according to eastern iconographic types but is made in 'local' style.

The motif of the hunter crouching in concealment, for instance, dates back to Near-Eastern art[21]. In particular, ancient Mediterranean art broadly depicted kneeling archers aiming at cervids. Examples include, for instance, a Bronze age cylinder seal from Knossos and the imagery of the Situla art[22]. Moreover, the silver gilded plate Villa Giulia 61565 from the Bernardini tomb also shows the same composition[23]. The image's overall conformation confirms that the figurative schema implies the hunter is hidden behind the tree in all these cases. However, the traditional spread motif does not coincide with the one depicted on the Louvre bucchero.

The comparison with the Eastern representations mentioned above, in fact, shows that the distinctiveness of the Etruscan example is not limited to style. In fact, the olla features a local type of hunting, in which a particular axe replaces the bow. The active appropriation in terms of style and subject matter of the oriental motif suggests that the tree itself is a deliberate expedient used to form the narration. This narrative dimension envisages the description of both the spatial and temporal variable embedding the action, as illustrated in the following examples and sections.

Etruscan black-figure vases with hunting subjects, which expand the possible usage examples of landscape elements, also confirm this idea. A Pontic *oinochoe* in Seattle, dating to 550-520 B.C. and attributed

[21] See above p. 76, fn. 17.

[22] See, for instance, the situla from Novo Mesto and the belt buckle from Molnik in TURK 2005, pp. 31-33, figs. 44-46. For further examples of kneeling hunters with arch, see PRELOŽNIK 2013.

[23] See pp. 73-74, fn. 5.

to the Paris Painter (**pl. 5.a-b**)[24] shows five decoration bands. Two of them refer to the hunting context. The widest frieze represents three horse riders and three dogs to the left. Two saplings are on either side of the handle and flank the scene. They take the form of a single straight stem with pointed leaves in pairs on each side. The lower band shows a continuous hare hunt. Two hunters are depicted back to back, flanking the scene. They are both beardless. One wears a white chiton, and the other wears a black one. The first of the two men holds a curved stick (*lagobolon*) in his hand. He runs to the left behind two hounds pursuing a hare. The animal, depicted on a large scale, runs toward a net. A stalk of vegetation stands behind this, flanking another net along which the second hunter stands. He holds a cord to lock the net after the hare has run into it. While, on the upper frieze, the plant works out as a frame, it operates on a more aptly narrative level in the lower band. As in the case of deer hunting on the Louvre bucchero olla, here the hunter appears hidden behind the bush, waiting to ambush his prey.

A matching scene appears on a black figure foot-plate at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. The plate comes from Vulci and was attributed to the Paris Painter (**pl. 6.a**)[25]. Two concentric friezes frame the center of the plate, featuring a large branching tree. The outermost branches overlap with the painted circle delimiting the central pictorial medallion. The inner frieze shows six animals running to the left. Seamlessly, a griffin, a panther, and a lion chase a deer, a doe, and a goat. The outer frieze depicts a hare hunting scene comparable to the Seattle *oinochoe*. In this scene, a hunter runs behind six hounds. The dogs pursue two hares as they run towards a triple curving line representing a net. A sapling stands by the net. On its left, a second hunter is crouching. He elongates his hand behind the tree while

[24] Seattle, Seattle Art Museum, inv. 59.82. AMYX 1962; HANNESTAD 1974, p. 47, no. 24; CAMPOREALE 1984, p. 118, no. 18, pl. L.a-c; ANDERSON 1985, pp. 39-42, figs. 17.a-c; PRELOŽNIK 2013, p. 27, fig. 10 (drawing); PIERACCINI 2014, pp. 149-150, fig. 5.
[25] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, inv. 187. AMYX 1962, p. 125; HANNESTAD 1974, p. 49, no. 38; CAMPOREALE 1984, p. 118, no. 19, pl. LI.a;

holding a thread that extends to the trap the rabbit is moving into. Behind the hunter, another male figure and a dog face right. Turning his back against the first hunter, the latter completes the circle. Two trees are depicted between the dog and the first hunter. The Bibliothèque Nationale plate is likely to exemplify three different functions possibly accomplished by landscape elements within the image: first, an evocative purpose of a natural setting (the central tree); second, a narrative function (the tree next to the net and the hunter crouching behind it); and finally, a function – which I would define paratactic – aimed at structurally organizing the image's elements.

As for the structural organization of the image, this purpose can be awarded to the stalk of vegetation of a lid fragment in Bonn, possibly coming from Tarquinia and dating to 525-490 B.C. (**pl. 6.b**)[26]. In this case, the sapling is likely to split the image into two parts. It contributes to the image arrangement within the pictorial space by performing, on the horizontal bi-dimensional plane, a task that can be compared to that often assigned to ornamental patterns and structural elements (e.g. handles) on the tridimensional level.

The late sixth-century tympanum *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca* (**pl. 38.b**)[27] shows a hunting scene set in a more extensive landscape context. In particular, the return from a hunt with five hunters (two on horseback) and three dogs is depicted on the tympanum of the first room. Lush vegetation covers the entire area that is not occupied by the figures.

Standing out are single high-stemmed saplings with lanceolate leaves on both sides. They are of the same type as those depicted on other sixth- and fifth-century Tarquinian tombs and can be compared to those on the lower frieze of the same *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*'s room. A pomegranate grows at the left angle[28]. Furthermore, at least

[26] Bonn, Akademisches Kunstmuseum, inv. 1012; ex Bourguignon collection. CAMPOREALE 1984, p. 94, no. 19, pl. XXXV.b; see also pp. 100-101; BENTZ 2008, pp. 33-34, no. 22; LYONS 2009, p. 179, no. 88.

[27] CAMPOREALE 1984, pp. 125-126; 131-132; LUBTCHANSKY 1998, pp. 123-124.

[28] See PODDA 2012, pp. 126-127, fig. 5.

three low-stem saplings with five large wedge-shaped leaves are arranged in a fan pattern, and two opposite bunches are falling under the leaves. Pampanini links this specific iconography to the Etruscan palm. He observes that «nell'arte etrusca la Palma è particolarmente interessante, perché mentre nelle raffigurazioni rituali conserva sempre il suo aspetto normale (foglie pennate) quando è considerata come elemento naturalistico del paesaggio viene invece stilizzata […] e sarebbe assolutamente irriconoscibile se non fosse caratterizzata dai regimi». According to his interpretation, «l'aspetto oltremodo fantastico» of the Etruscan palm should be interpreted as a deformation of the dwarf palm, rather than of the date palm[29].

Rather than referring to a specific botanical setting, the vegetation of the tympanum is intended to provide an ideal potential location[30]. The realistic detail of the hare tucked into the foliage on the right end of the tympanum best supports this remark. In the picture, the greenery also provides a hiding place for the prey. The hare lurking with the two dogs on its trail suggests that the image depicts a specific moment of the hunt, namely the final moment of the day, when – according to Xenophon[31] – the hunter has to look for the weary prey by inspecting what grows on the ground.

---

[29] PAMPANINI 1930, pp. 307-308. Pampanini also suggests that a reminiscence of the palm leaf can also be recognized in the three long leaf plants depicted between the two dogs on the right end of the tympanum, which may alternatively refer to acanthus (PAMPANINI 1930, p. 310).

[30] Compare CAMPOREALE 1984, p. 131: «Una ricchezza esuberante di elementi vegetali dà l'idea dell'ambiente in cui la caccia si è svolta». Luca Cerchiai emphasizes that vegetal elements have a linking function with respect to the image below (see D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 1999, p. 67: «La caccia è immersa in un rigoglioso paesaggio vegetale che sembra costituire il tramite verticale con la sottostante scena di *komos*») and bestows erotic implications upon the hare hunting scene.

[31] XEN. *Cyn*. VI.25:

«ἐπειδὰν δὲ μεταθέουσαι αἱ κύνες ἤδη ὑπόκοποι ὦσι καὶ ᾖ ὀψὲ ἤδη τῆς ἡμέρας, τότε δεῖ τὸν κυνηγέτην τὸν λαγῶ ἀπειρηκότα ζητεῖν, **μὴ παραλείποντα μηδὲν ὧν ἡ γῆ ἀνίησιν ἢ ἔχει ἐφ᾽ αὑτῆς**, τὰς ἀναστροφὰς ποιούμενον πυκνάς, ὅπως ἂν μὴ παραλειφθῇ (κατακλίνεται γὰρ ἐν μικρῷ τὸ θηρίον καὶ οὐκ ἀνίσταται ὑπὸ κόπου καὶ φόβου), τὰς κύνας ἐπαγόμενον, ἐγκελεύοντα, παραμυθούμενον τὴν φιλάνθρωπον πολλά, τὴν αὐθάδη ὀλίγα, τὴν μέσην μέτρια, ἕως ἂν ἢ ἀποκτείνῃ

Vegetal elements comparable to the 'palms' on the tympanum of the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca* also appear on a fragmentary «bloc taillé en forme de maison ou de temple» from Chiusi showing a hunting scene (**pl. 7.a**)[32].

As for sixth-century tomb painting, a further case deserves to be mentioned[33]. Even if it does not show a full-fledged hunting scene, the *Tomba del Cacciatore*[34] can be included in this group because of its explicit allusion to hunting. The tomb, dating to 510-500 B.C., depicts a hilly landscape with grazing roe deer. The grave space is conceived as the interior of a hunter's tent, namely a wooden structure covered by a light veil that allows the view of the surrounding landscape. The tomb walls are dematerialized and show the interplay between optical

---

αὐτὸν κατὰ πόδας ἢ εἰς τὰς ἄρκυς ἐμβάλῃ». (English translation E.C. Marchant, G.W. Bowersock, London 1925: «As soon as the hounds are getting tired of pursuing and the day is far advanced, it is time for the huntsman to search for the hare, worn out as she is, passing over nothing growing or lying on the ground, retracing his steps continually for fear of an oversight (since the animal rests in a small space and is too tired and frightened to get up), bringing the hounds along, encouraging and exhorting the gentle frequently, the willful sparingly, the average sort in moderation, until he kills her in a fair run or drives her into the purse-nets»). For a comment, see CAMPOREALE 1984, p. 126.

[32] Chiusi, Museo Nazionale Etrusco, inv. 2260; from Poggio Gaiella. PAMPANINI 1930, p. 306, tab. XXV, fig. 1; PARIBENI 1969, p. 122, no. 174; CAMPOREALE 1984, p. 125, tab. XLVII.b; JANNOT 1984a, pp. 59-61, no. 30, fig. 204 (quot. p. 59). Jannot notes that this fragment does not belong to an urn, contrary to what it might seem. The relief is fragmentary and the prey is not represented. Based on the position of the hunters, the weapons and the overall composition, Camporeale suggests that the urn depicts a hare hunting scene.

[33] We do not include in our list the *Tomba del Morente* (STEINGRÄBER 1985, p. 330; CERCHIAI 2002, pp. 71-72; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 230-233), which is very poorly preserved. While untrustworthy modern watercolors document the other walls, a black and white picture shows the hunting scene depicted on the rear wall (WEEGE 1921, pl. 72). The scene depicts a naked hunter holding a *lagobólon*. He faces left and keeps a horse by a lasso. A tree is depicted at the back of the hunter. The isolation of this image from the overall context hinders any interpretative hypothesis with respect to the use of landscape elements.

[34] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis; STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 301-302; ROUVERET 1988, pp. 212-213; TORELLI 1997a, pp. 131-134; CERCHIAI 2002, pp. 73-74; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 77-80.

illusions and semantic allusions[35]. The compositional structure of these images differs considerably from the conventions which characterize contemporary tombs. Rather than being provided by small trees (as is the case with several contemporary tombs, which will be analyzed in the sections to follow), in the *Tomba del Cacciatore* the objects hanging from the tent provide an overall effect of rhythmic distribution. Their function in the visual structuring of the image is confirmed by the fact that they are not depicted on the entrance wall and only begin at a certain height on the side walls. Therefore, as has been noted, «il ritmo della loro distribuzione focalizza lo sguardo dello spettatore verso il centro della parete di fondo»[36].

The lower frieze of the later *Tomba Querciola I* (**pl. 7.b**) – of which we have partial knowledge based on drawings by Carlo Ruspi[37] – shows a boar hunting scene set in a lush landscape context[38]. With regard to this tomb, Anne-Marie Adam aptly noted that «le cadre naturel où se déroule cette chasse est clairement indiqué par la végétation (herbes et arbustes), qui ne joue pas ici un simple rôle de partition des parois»[39]. This remark is confirmed by the fact – mentioned by Xenophon – that wild boars live in habitats characterized by abundant vegetation[40].
The same statement is likely to be extended to the complex hunting scene in a wild landscape on the entrance wall of the *Tomba dei Demoni*

[35] See TORELLI 2004, pp. 120-121, tab. IX.
[36] CERCHIAI 2002, p. 73.
[37] See SANNIBALE 2019a.
[38] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis; dating to the end of the fifth century B.C. CAMPOREALE 1984, pp. 148-149; STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 342-343; ADAM 1993; JANNOT 1995, pp. 13-14.
[39] ADAM 1993, p. 76.
[40] XEN. *Cyn*. X.6: «ἡ δὲ κύων ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ ἀφίξεται ἐπὶ τόπον ὑλώδη ἰχνεύουσα. κατακλίνεται γὰρ τὸ θηρίον ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ εἰς τοιαῦτα: τοῦ μὲν γὰρ χειμῶνός ἐστιν ἀλεεινά, τοῦ δὲ θέρους ψυχεινά». (English translation E.C. Marchant, G.W. Bowersock, London 1925: «The hound following the track will, as a rule, arrive at a well-wooded spot. For the beast usually lies in such places, since they are warm in winter and cool in summer»).

Azzurri (450-425 B.C.)[41], which was recently recovered thanks to a multispectral campaign[42].

As outlined above, the detailed spatial dimension of hunting scenes does not match vase images, which are more likely to include individual landscape elements. Moreover, in vascular paintings, individual components do not necessarily intend to define a context for hunting. Instead, they are meant to perform several functions. Even when they bestow a spatial contextualization, they appear to be allusive, as they do not provide the set-up of articulated 'landscapes' matching those of the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*, the *Tomba Querciola I*, and the *Tomba dei Demoni Azzurri*.

Hunting is a theme also belonging to the figurative repertoire of a number of other tombs dating to the second half of the fifth century B.C.[43], all centered on the theme of the banquet. In particular, a deer hunting scene is depicted on the *columen* in the middle of the rear wall's tympanum of the *Tomba della Caccia al Cervo* (about 450 B.C.) and the *Tomba Maggi* (450-425 B.C.)[44]. Moreover, a scene of sow hunting is depicted on the tympanum of the rear wall of the *Tomba della Scrofa Nera*, dating to around 460 B.C.[45]. In contrast to the cases examined above, these scenes do not show landscape elements. As has been noted, despite hunting being the main subject, in these fifth-century examples the theme is resolved in a novel way. Rather than refer to the actual aristocratic activity, they are likely to reference heroic hunts

[41] See *infra*, pp. 261-264.
[42] ADINOLFI *et alii* 2018.
[43] We do not include in our list of fifth-century tombs the *Tomba del Biclinio*, in that it is only documented via J. Byres' drawings (see ADAM 1993, p. 82; CERCHIAI 2002, p. 76).
[44] In both cases, two panthers flank the scene, including only the hunter and his prey. In the *Tomba della Caccia al Cervo* there is also a hound.
[45] As for the *Tomba della Scrofa Nera*, a hunting scene, though very poorly preserved (see STOPPONI 1983, pl. 4b), is also depicted on the right end of the right wall. The image includes a hunter and a hound.

(«l'immagine figurate sembra […] rivolta ad esaltare il paradigma della caccia eroica»)[46].

Hunting scenes as part of more structured landscape contexts can be found in bronze engraved artworks – namely, mirrors and cistae – dating to the fifth and fourth century B.C. As is the case with most of the tombs dating to the second half of the fifth century, the core of these images is not the hunter's commitment to hunting (or the aristocratic exaltation of the hunter), unlike the vase and tomb paintings dating to sixth and beginning of the fifth century[47]. The mirrors and cistae's focus is on the symbolic value assigned to hunting, according to a process enhanced by the figurative fourth-century spread of mythological themes related to hunting. For that reason, we might state that these images show a clear mythical benchmark. The nature of the objects (mirrors and cistae), which belong to the muliebral world, confirms this interpretation[48].

The hare or boar hunting scenes were widespread in cistae and mirrors produced in Praeneste. The Ficoroni cista lid (**pl. 8.a**)[49] is the most notable case for the purposes of this analysis. The circular cover shows two circular figural bands. The outer one represents a deer and wild boar hunting scene in which there is ample space for the representation of rocky elevations, saplings, and shrubs.

Boar hunting enters the Hellenistic repertoire filtered through the mythical story of the Calidonian boar hunt, which had success in late relief urns[50]. An Etruscan mirror in Basel shows the animal's killing by

[46] CERCHIAI 2002, p. 75.

[47] Regarding the symbology of hunting imagery in vase painting, see SCHNAPP 1997, pp. 403-424. On hunting in Etruscan tomb painting, see CERCHIAI 2002.

[48] See CAMPOREALE 1984, pp. 151-152; 170-171.

[49] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 24787; dating to 340-320 B.C. BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA, EMILIOZZI 1990, pp. 211-226, no. 68, pls. CCXCVII-CCXIV.

[50] See e.g. alabaster urn from Volterra, Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale (BOARDMAN 1989, p. 17, fig. 17).

Meleager in the presence of Atalanta (**pl. 8.b**)[51]. The scene takes place on the rocky ground filling the exergue area. The figures stand in front of luxuriant vegetation that emerges between and above them. In particular, there is a long trunk and numerous branches, on which some birds rest. In the background of another mirror showing Meleager and Atalanta as they are about to capture the boar (**pl. 9.a**)[52], the lush setting is replaced by a single broken trunk which resembles the iconography spread in urns' reliefs.

The mythological component of fourth-century hunting scenes is also evident in the engraving of a Praenestine mirror in Mariemont (**pl. 9.b**)[53], showing a tripartite tondo. A hunting scene with a panther and a man holding a bunch of grapes and a *lagobolon* is depicted in the center. Dionysus stands in the upper register with a panther and three female figures. The lower register displays a simplified version of hare hunting in which the hunter is absent, and only the prey and three hunting dogs appear. All the images are set in a rocky landscape, as suggested by a few wavy lines and a rock on which a maenad of the upper register is seated. Another landscape detail is fascinating. Above the hare hunting scene, there are two crescents. Camporeale suggests that in this image the moon assumes «il senso di una notazione ambientale o, se si vuole, temporale»[54]. He underlines that, according to Xenophon, hare hunting was done early in the morning, when the moon was still visible in the sky[55]. Furthermore, he points out the association

[51] Basel, Antikenmuseum und Sammlung Ludwig, inv. BS 535. JUCKER 2001, pp. 35-37, no. 15.

[52] GERHARD, KÖRTE 1897, pp. 120-121, pl. 94.

[53] Mariemont, Musée royal de Mariemont, inv. B 205; ex Warocqué collection. Dating to the second half of the fourth century B.C. CAMPOREALE 1984, p. 158, no. 3; p. 160, fig. 24; p. 163, no. 3; LAMBRECHTS 1987, pp. 41-43, no. 24.

[54] CAMPOREALE 1984, p. 167.

[55] See XEN. *Cyn*. VI.4: «ἐξιέναι δὲ πρῴ, ἵνα τῆς ἰχνεύσεως μὴ ἀποστερῶνται, ὡς οἱ ὀψιζόμενοι ἀφαιροῦνται τὰς μὲν κύνας τοῦ εὑρεῖν τὸν λαγῶ, αὐτοὺς δὲ τῆς ὠφελείας: οὐ γὰρ ἐπιμένει τοῦ ἴχνους ἡ φύσις λεπτὴ οὖσα πᾶσαν ὥραν» (English translation E.C. Marchant, G.W. Bowersock, London 1925: «Start early, and so give the hounds a fair chance of following the scent. A late start robs the hounds of the find and the hunters of the prize; for the scent is by its nature too thin to last all day»).

operating in the Latin world between the goddess of hunting, Artemis, and the goddess of the moon, Selene[56]. Based on these conclusions, a comparable 'temporal' interpretation may be made of a pear-shaped Praenestine mirror with a rough engraving featuring a nude man, a dog, a rabbit, eight stars, and a crescent (**pl. 10.a**)[57].

Nevertheless, with its two crescents, the Mariemont mirror suggests that the possible eschatological significance of landscape details should not be overlooked. Although the landscape setting interpretation is suggestive, the location of the hare hunting scene in the lower exergue area (which is often intended for underworld subjects or eschatological and astral symbolism) suggests that the two crescents' significance is instead to be found in the funerary semantics traditionally associated with this motif[58]. The single or twin lunar crescent recurs in association with female figures in Etruscan and Praenestine mirrors that combine the themes of love and death and athletic competitions[59].

---

[56] CAMPOREALE 1984, p. 167. The cult of Luna/Diana is documented also in the area of Chiusi: see STIBBE-TWIEST 1977; COLONNA 1985a, p. 29. On the association between moon and hunting, see also the interpretation provided by De Puma for a mirror at the Cleveland Museum of Art, inv. 16.2012. The mirror represents two standing female figures and a crescent occupying the space between them. Relying on the presence of the moon and a spear held by one of the figures, De Puma suggests that the scene depicts Athena and Artemis conversing (DE PUMA 1987, p. 27, no. 13).

[57] Brussels, Musée Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire, inv. R 1277; ex Ravestein collection; dating to about 300 B.C. LAMBRECHTS 1978, no. 27; CAMPOREALE 1984, p. 163, no. 4, tab. LXVI.b; VAN DER MEER 2016a, p. 118, no. 31 suggests that the nude man is Orion and argues the incision is a fake.

[58] On the Luna-Proserpina equation, see GURY 1994, p. 76; DE GRUMMOND 2004, pp. 364-365. On the recognition of a moon goddess in Pyrgi (Catha), in association with the god Śuri, see DE GRUMMOND 2008. With regard to the Mariemont hunting scene, it might also be observed that in Nemi the same goddess was worshiped under the triple aspect of hunting goddess (Artemis/Diana), protector of births (Lucina) and chthonian goddess (Hecate): see GHINI, DIOSONO 2012, p. 119.

[59] See e.g. Etruscan mirror with Tiur, Lasa and Turan set in the tondo with two crescents: Christie's, Sale 3748, Antiquities, New York, 4 June 2015, Lot 145 (see SANNIBALE 2019b, pp. 180-181, fig. 11); Praenestine mirror with Losna, Amykos and Pollux (Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 24864; possibly found with the Ficoroni cista; see HARARI 1995, pp. 108, 114, n. 23, fig. 3; DE GRUMMOND 2004, pp. 364-365, fig. 18.8; PACETTI 2011, pp. 29-36, no. 1). Both mirrors date to the

An overview of hunting scenes dating from the seventh to the fourth century B.C. enables us to highlight some features in the use of landscape elements. These data will then be compared to what will emerge from the analysis of the groups of images in the sections to follow.

First, the early use of landscape elements serving a narrative function emerged in seventh-century vase painting. In particular, I considered the use of the tree, which encodes a narrative detail within the image.

Second, the wide versatility of landscape elements' use in black-figure vases has been highlighted. In particular, I pointed out three different functions, namely descriptive, narrative and paratactic. The paratactic function consists of the image's arrangement by displaying internal structure and reading direction. In this sense, referring to the physical limits of the image, this function can be associated with the frame function.

Third, in the sixth century, more complex landscapes in relation to hunting images expressing an aristocratic value were documented (*Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*), according to a figurative pattern possibly documented in the following century (*Tomba Querciola I*). These images show attention to the action as a whole, contextualizing the hunting scene employing details evoking the actual realistic setting.

Fourth, the landscape does not appear in the mythical-heroic '*pinakes*' of fifth-century tombs.

Fifth, on the contrary, landscape is depicted on cistae and mirrors, where hunting scenes can be assigned a mythical (and Dionysian) meaning similar to that of late fifth-century tombs. The difference, in this case, also depends on technical factors. The closed steadiness of '*pinakes*' is contrasted by the decorativeness that easily fits the engraved drawing. Finally, we can emphasize a few specificities of images on

---

end of the fourth century B.C. On the association between Luna and the athletic sphere, see DE LUCIA BROLLI 2018, pp. 38-40. On the historical persistence of the cult of Luna and her *paredroi* (including the evidence provided by the *Tomba delle Tassinaie*), see SANNIBALE 2019b, p. 196.

bronze mirrors and cistae. In particular, the hunting landscape is structured as both a rocky and a green landscape, unlike all the other examples, which mostly depict trees. Moreover, further details with a substantial symbolic value are included in the scenes.

NAVIGATION

This section analyzes images in which the sea appears in navigation scenes and scenes showing navigation-related activities, such as trade, fishing, piracy, and war. In many cases, the specific subject cannot be established with certainty[60].

On principle, it can be observed that until the middle of the seventh century B.C. Etruscan seafaring depictions contained boats engaged in simple scenes of sailing or fishing. Later, military ships engaged in martial activities are also depicted[61].

A substantial issue also arises with regard to the significance attached to images of boats', that is, the difficulty of distinguishing real voyages from the imaginary journeys to the Afterlife[62]. The distinction between the two types concerns the sphere of interpretation, which by its very nature is not based on objective and incontrovertible data[63].

[60] Regarding this distinction, see e.g. RIZZO 2016, p. 328: «Non è sempre facile distinguere sulle rappresentazioni dipinte quali navi possano considerarsi da guerra e quali da trasporto, anche perché spesso potevano svolgere entrambe le funzioni; a volte solo alcuni dettagli relativi alla prua, alla poppa o agli scalmi per i remi possono aiutarci nel definire la funzione dell'imbarcazione, e non sempre con sicurezza».

[61] See ARIZZA *et alii* 2013, p. 107.

[62] With regard to Etruscan images, Chiara Pizzirani (PIZZIRANI 2005) distinguishes for instance «dimensione geografica» and «dimensione ontologica» of the sea, with a turning point between the two models detected around 540-530 B.C. On closer inspection, it can be noted that, even considering the oldest examples, there is no shortage of examples that allow multiple interpretations (see e.g. footnote 63).

[63] The huge debate about the so-called 'lastra della Nave' from Bologna is exemplary in relation to this point (see SASSATELLI 2009 – reviewed in CERCHIAI 2012 – for an overview of different interpretations). Also the interpretation of the *Tomba della Nave* in Tarquinia is widely debated, even after the exhaustive interpretation provided by Giovanni Colonna (COLONNA 2003): *contra* e.g. GILOTTA 2007, p. 61: «Il successo della ricerca nella individuazione di un precoce sistema di immagini dalle valenze

Concerning the objectives of this analysis, I am interested in understanding the distinction between representations referring to *earthly human experiences* and these to be placed 'elsewhere', namely in an *ultra-worldly dimension*. In the latter case, the sea would represent the imaginary path toward the afterlife[64]. A possible difference between the two typologies mainly depends on the figurative context rather than the discovery's context. The representation of foodstuffs in the ships' hold, for example, has made us lean towards an earthly interpretation (this is the case, for instance, of the *kantharos* from the via A. D'Avack necropolis). In contrast, the presence of monsters, or demons, suggests an otherworldly location (e.g. the so-called *Stele della Nave* from Bologna, which I interpreted according to the most recent analysis by Giuseppe Sassatelli)[65].

Nevertheless, we should not forget that it is almost impossible to establish a clear boundary between these two types of travel and representation. In navigation scenes, the setting itself has an intrinsically polyvalent nature. That is to say, the very same sea is

catactonie ha però talora indotto a proporre ipotesi di lettura difficilmente sostenibili. È questo il caso della Tomba della nave, datata intorno ai decenni centrali o terzo quarto del V secolo a.C. […]: crediamo infatti che […] si possa […] riconoscere nella scena marinara, anche a causa del suo minuto e marcato realismo, un momento di esistenza reale, una immagine concreta delle occupazioni del defunto». A further and more ancient example is provided by the seventh century *Tomba della Nave* in Caere, for which Colonna has proposed a metaphorical reading with reference to the «periglioso viaggio per mare verso l'Isola dei Beati» (COLONNA 1989, p. 20). For the same image, Chiara Pizzirani has emphasized the reference to the real dangers of the sea in the seventh century Etruscan man's imagination. Nonetheless, the scholar acknowledged that the boat has «un significato ulteriore e metafisico» (PIZZIRANI 2005, p. 256; on this notion, see PIZZIRANI 2014, p. 71: «La metafora che avvicina il mare alla morte nasce dall'esperienza umana nel momento in cui lo spazio marino viene percepito come limite reale e geografico, ambiente che cela nei suoi recessi pericoli tali da mettere a rischio la vita dell'uomo»).

[64] For an overview of the sea journey to the afterlife according to the Etruscan conception, see COLONNA 2014.

[65] SASSATELLI 2009. With regard to the differentiation criteria, the distinction of vessel types does not seem to be a valuable criterion for distinction. I any case, the artist must in fact have been inspired, more or less faithfully, by existing examples.

simultaneously perceived both as the real space of perilous navigation (thus reflecting «la rilevanza e l'attualità della tematica marinara»)[66], and the space of the journey to the afterlife, according to a real «paradigma mediterraneo»[67]. Therefore, a clear distinction is not possible because the sea itself and the very idea of the sea voyage signify both situations. However, recognizing this polysemy must not coincide with the renunciation of any attempt to interpret the image. In this situation, there are times in which specific pieces of evidence allow for the favoring of one reading over another. This is the case, already mentioned, of sea monsters sometimes crowding the space below the boat. In order to propose as reliable reading as possible, in any case, each image should be read by taking into account the figurative, socio-cultural, and archaeological context of discovery as a whole.

This section will define a group of examples dealing with 'earthly human experiences', leaving aside examples that refer more clearly to the underworld. Additionally, further instances in which stylized designs evoke the sea will be analyzed in the chapters to follow.

As we just mentioned, the oldest navigation images date back to the seventh century[68]. Most of these examples do not depict the sea (nonetheless, it is necessarily included in the description involving the boat) nor graphic elements to evoke it expressly[69]. However, in a few

[66] MARTELLI 1987a, p. 267.

[67] RENDELI 2017, p. 5. For the analysis of the relationship between Etruscan and Greek afterlife lore conducted considering the Greek myth as a 'berthing space' and valorizing the «credenze cosmologiche già maturate e sedimentate presso le comunità indigene, rese così atte a recepire il progressivo innesto di influenze esterne, ed elaborarle», see RONCALLI 2014a (quot. p. 55).

[68] For an overview of seafaring representations in Orientalizing Etruscan art, see PAGLIERI 1960; CRISTOFANI 1983, pp. 11-31; CRISTOFANI 1984; MARTELLI 2008b, p. 37, fn. 58; RIZZO 2016.

[69] See e.g.: Caeretan amphora, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnbergdating, Antikensammlung; dating to 700-675 B.C. (MARTELLI 2001, p. 5, fig. 11; previously attributed to the Pittore Argivo – Veii – by F. Canciani and P. Kranz: see MARTELLI 2001, p. 17, fn. 15); two white-on-red pyxis, Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, from tomb 1 of the San Paolo necropolis in Cerveteri, dating to 660-650 B.C. (RIZZO 2016); white-on-red amphora, Milan, Civiche Raccolte Archeologiche e Numismatiche, from tomb 17 Banditaccia necropolis, Cerveteri,

cases, we can already detect a reference to the maritime landscape context. The claim that in the seventh century «la dimensione propriamente fisica del mare non viene mai rappresentata, ma è soltanto evocata dall'ambientazione derivante dalla presenza di navi e pesci»[70] must be therefore at least partially revised.

A well-known amphora at the Museum of Art and Archaeology of the University of Missouri (**pl. 10.b**) shows a series of five warships on the body[71]. The vase dates to 700-650 B.C. and has been attributed to the *Pittore delle Palme*[72]. The boats of the Missouri amphora are placed between two groups of horizontal lines. Between the warships, a fish is depicted to the right at sail height. Three fish are represented on the shoulder. Finally, three wavy stripes are on the lower section of the vase. As has been noted, they «sembrano quasi evocare le onde marine», although a purely ornamental function cannot be excluded («esse possono però avere una funzione puramente ornamentale»)[73]. The wavy lines on vases dating to the beginning of the seventh century comprise «una delle prime documentazioni di motivi curvilinei […] orientalizzanti»[74], which also applies to other contemporary examples with no immediate reference to the sea[75]. Likewise, it can be noted that

---

dating to 650-625 B.C. and attributed to the *Pittore della Sirena-Assurattasche* (MARTELLI 1987c, figs. 17-20; MARTELLI 2008b, pp. 127-128; BELLELLI 2019, p. 94, no. 35); impasto *oinochoe* from tomb 1 of the Casalaccio necropolis in Veii (VIGHI 1932; MANDOLESI, CASTELLO 2009, 16, fig. 3); white-on-red amphora, London, British Museum, inv. 1850,0227.49, from the Isis tomb in Vulci; olla from the Olmo Bello necropolis.

[70] PIZZIRANI 2005, p. 255. See also pp. 253-254: «Tra la fine dell'VIII secolo e la metà del successivo […] il mare non è mai rappresentato con le sue onde e i suoi flutti, ma viene semplicemente evocato: le navi, i pesci raffigurati galleggiano in uno spazio neutro e privo di qualsiasi connotazione».

[71] Columbia, University of Missouri, Museum of Art and Archaeology, inv. 71.114. See HUMPHREYS 1977; CANCIANI 1987, p. 253, no. 24; GIULIANO, BUZZI 1992, p. 193 («c'è il vivo senso del mare in questa oinochòe»); BRUNI 2013, p. 770, fig. 40.5.

[72] On the *Pittore delle Palme*, see above p. 74, fn. 8.

[73] CANCIANI 1987, p. 253. *Contra* PIZZIRANI 2005, p. 255 (with seemingly tautological argument).

[74] CANCIANI 1987, p. 251, no. 20.

[75] CANCIANI 1987, pp. 251-252, no. 21.

an amphora at the National Maritime Museum, in Haifa, featuring the same boat decoration as the Missouri amphora, differs in the lower part, where an upward triangular pattern replaces the wavy lines[76].
On the other hand, however, the wave motif associated with the representation of a ship is not unique in the seventh century.

An almost unknown white-on-red sporadic olla from the Mengarelli excavations in the Banditaccia necropolis (**pl. 11**)[77], for instance, shows a schematic boat with irregular vertical undulating lines underneath it.
The *kantharos* from the via A. D'Avack necropolis, in the area of Veii (**pl. 12**)[78], provides an example of a wavy pattern more clearly referring to waves of the sea. The bucchero *kantharos*, dating to 650 B.C., shows a boat decoration with raw engraving on either side. In particular, side A depicts a vessel carrying men and animals (horses and herons). The keel is only partially depicted, since it is intended as half-hidden in the water, which is not represented. Side B is more damaged, but everything suggests that the image was very similar to the one on side A. In this case, however, irregular and sinuous lines evoking the waves of the sea can be recognized alongside the boat. Although it is not a prized piece and essentially imitates valuable bronze-baccellate paterae[79], this *kantharos* represents a piece of outstanding quality and its figurative decoration is noteworthy. The engraving is carefully executed and reveals excellent attention to detail. Inside the engraved vessel (of the hybrid type which combines merchant and military vessel)[80], for example, we can distinguish human figures with precision

[76] Haifa, National Maritime Museum, *sine* inv. See HUMPHREYS 1977, fig. 2; BRUNI 2013, p. 770.
[77] Cerveteri, Museo Nazionale Archeologico Cerite, inv. 115079. RIZZO 2016, pp. 328-329, fig. 9. Regarding the white-on-red production, see MICOZZI 1994.
[78] Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano, Palazzo Massimo, inv. 576093. For a comprehensive analysis of this object, see ARIZZA *et alii* 2013 (with published references); ROSSI 2019, pp. 156-159, no. 95.5; ARIZZA 2020. Unfortunately, the extremely fragmentary state does not allow for the verification of the possible wave's presence on the Faliscan *kantharos* published by BIELLA 2010.
[79] ARIZZA *et alii* 2013, p. 91.
[80] ARIZZA *et alii* 2013, p. 93.

– including one that can be interpreted as the *naukleros* – as well as the animals and the load of wine containers[81]. Therefore, the attention to the sea waves' details is also part of this carefully particularized figurative structure. Nonetheless, its presence on only one side reveals that it is not perceived as necessary to the depiction.
As has been suggested, the entire *kantharos* likely represents «una spedizione marina composta da più imbarcazioni»[82]. Therefore, the subject would be comparable to that of the almost contemporary Aristonothos krater, crafted by a Greek artist for an Etruscan customer, where stylized stars and a zig-zag pattern indicate sea waves[83].

On the basis of these examples, cases in which a simple line appears in association with a boat can also be considered. In the Tragliatella *oinochoe*, a straight engraved line overlaps with the ship by hiding its keel (**pl. 13**)[84]; a single wavy line appears underneath the vessel in the pyx of the Pania I (**pl. 14.a**)[85].

A further example is particularly significant. It confirms the figurative relevance of the 'sea-line' and shows how the description of the sea by means of a line can contribute to defining the subject. A cup on foot with graffiti decoration from Cerveteri and today in Milan shows a ship crossed by a horizontal line (**pl. 14.b**)[86]. This represents the waterline, from which only the ends of the hull and the upper section of the mast emerge. A sailor is depicted underwater, next to the

[81] ARIZZA *et alii* 2013, p. 97.
[82] ARIZZA *et alii* 2013, p. 101.
[83] MASSA PAIRAULT 1992a, p. 19 (see also p. 34 for published references); MARTELLI 2008b, p. 127; BAGNASCO GIANNI 2007.
[84] Rome, Palazzo dei Conservatori, inv. 358; dating to 640-620 B.C. See; D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 1999, pp. 79-80.
[85] Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 73846; ex Castellani collection; dating to 630 B.C. CRISTOFANI 1971; MASSA PAIRAULT 1992a, pp. 20-21.
[86] Milan, Museo Etrusco Fondazione 'Luigi Rovati', inv. P817. See PAOLUCCI 2019, p. 79, no. 14.

ship. The presence of the line is therefore functional, allowing the viewer to identify a shipwreck scene[87].

Finally, sea waves drawn as small snapped lines also appear in the representation of another comparable naval expedition on a white-on-red pyx dating to 630-620 B.C. in the antiquities collection in the Musée du Louvre (**pl. 15**)[88]. The Louvre pyx is relevant to our investigation also because «due alberi fronzuti, che separano la rappresentazione dei due lati»[89] stand at the handles. The impertinence of the trees to the marine environment reveals two characteristics of the use and meaning of these elements. On the one hand, the distinction in two parts of the overall narrative through landscape elements is noteworthy. These are necessarily external to the narration itself and work as structural-paratactic elements within the image. On the other hand, rather than being functional at the narrative level, the association between sea and tree likely maintains its effectiveness at the compositional one.

An almost contemporary white-on-red rectangular-shaped cinerary urn at Fordham University vouches for this last aspect. One side of the urn lid depicts a ship with rowers and warriors. In the panel below, a lion strides to the left toward a small tree. A wave pattern is painted along the top edge of the panel (**pl. 16**)[90]. The waves' placement at the top of the box clarifies the waves' liminal nature, both figuratively and semantically. In fact, they are visually related to the lid on which the boat stands. Moreover, their placement on the panel suggests a link

[87] Paolucci suggest that the scene refers to the Ulysses' shipwreck described in the Fifth book of the Odyssey, although he does not exclude that it might also be the representation of the perilous voyage to the afterlife (PAOLUCCI 2019, p. 79, no. 14).

[88] Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. MNB 1780, attributed to the *Pittore della Sirena-Assurattasche* (MARTELLI 1987a, pp. 95, 267-268, no. 44; MARTELLI 1987c, p. 7; MICOZZI 1994, p. 245, no. 13; PIZZIRANI 2005, p. 255; see RIZZO 2016, p. 328, fn. 26 for up-to-date references).

[89] MARTELLI 1987a, p. 267.

[90] New York, Fordham University, Fordham Museum of Greek, Etruscan and Roman Art, inv. 6.002. Supposedly from Caere. CAVALIERE, UDELL 2012, p. 144, no. 41. Side B, lid: two horses facing left. Side B, box: two winged horses facing left. CAVALIERE, UDELL 2012 errs in describing the lid as decorated with an oared ship on each side. In fact, the ship and the wave patter appear only on the principal side.

with the image below and between the two images on the semantic plane. The Fordham University urn leads us out of the circle of images related to 'earthly human experience'. Rather, it is meant to provide a clear example of the journey to the afterlife. The comparison between this example and the Louvre pyx with naval expedition and trees at the handles is likely to confirm the difficulty in establishing the boundary between the two subjects. The waves depicted on the urn (namely, by extension, the sea area) mark the border between two different spaces, each characterized by its own landscape. Above is the marine navigation surface. Below is the underworld, traditionally populated by beasts, here also characterized by the small tree.
The parallel suggests that the two 'paratactic' trees on the Louvre vessel might also be a reference – which would be significantly placed at the handles, a pivotal transition position revealing a kind of *apò koinoù* construction – to what lies beyond that sea.

The emblem of this interpretive insolvency is represented by the sixth-century images of the second room of the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*. A fishing scene from a boat in a seascape is depicted on the three walls (**pl. 40.a-b**) [91]. These are the most realistic of Etruscan navigation scenes. More than any other, they show a wealth of landscape details and draw on the reality of human experience. Nevertheless, they are likely to require an eschatological interpretation[92].
By comparing the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*'s and the previous boats, it can be noted that the former has an entirely different function from the latter. More generally, the entire sailing scene appears to be wildly dissimilar to the others. On the plane of objective reality, a fishing scene replaces the representation of naval expeditions or battles. On the interpretative level, the images of the tomb enhance a different character of the sea. Rather than being a difficult area to cross, this became a space of death and rebirth, as the diver jumping off a cliff

[91] For the interpretation of the different types of fishing being performed, see LUBTCHANSKY 1998, esp. pp. 114-121.
[92] See, in particular, CERCHIAI 1987 (= D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 1999, pp. 61-71); RONCALLI 1990, p. 238, who interprets the sea as a «diaframma»; D'AGOSTINO 1995.

next to the boat shows. The tomb, then, shows a scene of 'static' navigation, which bears no relation to the journey extending toward afterlife. Instead, the possibility of interpreting the image in an eschatological way is mainly entrusted to the image of the diver. The metaphorical meaning of the all-human scene of fishing is instead to be identified in the connection between fishing and the erotic sphere[93]. Since it also takes place in parallel in the tympanum featuring a symposium, this erotic theme becomes the protagonist of the frescoes.

The Eros-fishing-landscape association also returns in the image engraved on a later bronze mirror, an object traditionally used for funerary purposes. The mirror, held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, depicts Eros and Aphrodite by a stretch of water (**pl. 17.a**)[94]. A palm tree stands in the background in the center of the mirror. Eros stands on the left. Behind him is a flower. On the right, Aphrodite sits on a rock from which a second flower sprouts. A bird rests on the goddess' shoulder. Both figures are slightly stretched forward and hold the fishing rod bitten by a fish. In the water, not far from Aphrodite's feet, there is an octopus, which can be compared to the octopus appearing in the water of the tomb's fishing scene[95].

To return to navigation, it can be noted that the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca* frescoes represent a rare example of this subject in the sixth century B.C. The aristocratic character of this iconography explains why, after the seventh century B.C., the representation of sea voyages was drastically reduced. Meanwhile, the semantic and metaphorical significance of the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*'s images indicates a

[93] For the erotic interpretation of the fishing scene and an analysis of the erotic references in the tomb, see D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 1999, pp. 69-70. See also MASSA PAIRAULT 1992a, p. 86; WARLAND 1996. LUBTCHANSKY 1998, esp. pp. 135-146, stresses the aristocratic nature of fishing in the Italic and Etruscan cultural context.

[94] New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. 07.260; dating to 350 B.C.; unknown provenance. BONFANTE 1997, pp. 43-44, no. 12; DE PUMA 2013, p. 182, no. 6.14.

[95] Regarding the erotic significance of the octopus («immagine emblematica») in the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*, see D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 1999, p. 70, with fn. 16. For a reading of the tomb frescoes under the sign of Aphrodite, see MASSA PAIRAULT 1992a, pp. 85-86.

different use of this subject and its iconography. Namely, sea voyage progressively gets rid of in-life ambitions; it lends itself to depicting the journey to the afterlife, which will be soon structured as a journey in stages through landscapes and seascapes populated by daemons.

The boats of the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*, which still reflect an earthly experience, are nonetheless charged with a new meaning, with allusions both to the saving value of water where navigation takes place and to the 'erotic' fishing. What remains unchanged is the fully aristocratic nature of the representation. In keeping with a Mediterranean motif widespread throughout antiquity, representations of experiences carried out at sea, in all their forms, respond to an aristocratic taste[96].

The Ficoroni cista – showing a ship embedded in a complex figurative structure – and a group of late Hellenistic Volterra urns with Odysseus[97] represent the last Etruscan examples of boats landing on 'earthly' shores. However, they are inevitably transformed by the mythical experience which permeates them.

The examples analyzed above show that representations of the sea – although rare and schematic – come back to the seventh century B.C., namely the period in which navigation scenes were significantly widespread as an aristocratic motif. Looking at the *corpus* of navigation images, we can note a preference for characterization of the sea – mostly realized through the depiction of fish – even in cases where there is no actual representation of the sea. Nevertheless, there is a minimum degree of attention to landscape representation through lines indicating the waves. Our initial *corpus* of sea depictions also suggests

[96] ROUVERET 1992 acknowledges that not only technical and stylistic but also ideological oriental influences can be detected in the second's room seascape of the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*. In particular, the scholar links marine images to the diffusion of a taste for representing the sea spread in Etruria under oriental influences. The frescoes would therefore indicate, rather than the diffusion of a figurative theme, the spread of «thémes idéologiquement dérivés des modèles de souveraineté du monde oriental» (p. 171).

[97] See e.g. Volterra, Museo Etrusco Guarnacci, invs. 278, 280, 283.

that the attention given to the representation of the sea is all the more remarkable, the more the sea itself bears a symbolic significance.

AGRICULTURE

Etruscan images showing figures engaged in agricultural activities are as rare as noteworthy. A fifth-century Etruscan mirror in Boston, in particular, shows on the reverse two satyrs in profile holding sickles. They both face outward and gather grape clusters from a vine which serves as the mirror's frame. In the middle of the scene, a maenad faces right, holding a basket of grapes on her shoulder (**pl. 17.b**)[98]. This interaction between figures and grape border – which has been considered an example of «the liveliness of Etruscan pictorial style»[99] – can be compared to the grape harvest in the lower exergue of a mirror at the British Museum (**pl. 18.a**)[100], where there are a vine shoot and a satyr with one hand raised towards a bunch of grapes. A grape harvest scene is also represented in a mirror from Vulci in the Museo Gregoriano Etrusco (**pl. 18.b**)[101] featuring a satyr clambering over an ivy vine, and in a scarab from Campo della Fiera in Orvieto showing two satyrs (**pl. 19.a**)[102].

The iconography of the Dionysian-flavour grape harvest dates back to Greek and Southern Italian models and is also documented in the Caeretan *hydriae* and Attic examples from Etruria Padana[103]. Moreover,

[98] Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 03.991; dating to about 480 B.C. See COMSTOCK, VERMEULE 1971, p. 267, no. 385; DE GRUMMOND 1982b, pp. 146-147; DE PUMA 1993, pp. 34-36, no. 13; SANNIBALE 2007, p 122.

[99] DE GRUMMOND 1982b, pp. 146-147.

[100] London, British Museum, inv. 1814,0704.915. SWADDLING 2002, pp. 19-21, no. 16. For further details on this mirror, see *infra*, p. 300.

[101] Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. MV 12249; from Vulci. See CAMPOREALE 1997, p. 901, no. 16; DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 154, fig. VII.9.

[102] STOPPONI, GIACOBBI 2017, pp. 131-132, fig. 10.

[103] See e.g. BEAZLEY 1929, p. 6, no. 12, pl. III.2; TRENDALL 1989, p. 56, no. 72. On the Caeretan *hydriae, s*ee BONAUDO 2004, cat. 9 (= Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, *sine inv.*; from Cerveteri, Banditaccia). On the circulation of this subject in Etruria Padana, see PIZZIRANI 2018, p. 130.

all of these examples do not prevent assigning Dionysian symbology to images, even though the representation of grape harvesting has concrete connotations.

The Etruscan black-figure production contemporary to the Boston mirror includes a noteworthy example for this analysis. Although it does not depict any actual grape harvest, an amphora attributed to the Pittore di Gerusalemme («Gruppo Tardo a Silhouettes»)[104] can significantly be compared to the mirror's engraving. The amphora (**pl. 19.b**)[105] shows two male nude pairs on either side. In particular, on side A, two ephebes move towards the right. Another ephebe and a satyr, whose sexual attributes have been added by modern restoration[106], are depicted on the other side. The representation at the handles is quite original and differs from most of the other examples by the same painter, who traditionally allocates this area to large palmettes. Two ivy trees are depicted below the handles on either side. They rise from the ground and grow vertically along a central support. Finally, the shoots' upper ends extend to the area above the figures[107].

The Dionysian subject and visual predominance assumed as a reference to Dionysian presence allow a comparison between this image and the mirror. What is most interesting is the shared strategic placement of landscape elements, combined with a structured cross-reference between the 'inside' and the 'outside' of the image. In both cases,

[104] On the *Pittore di Gerusalemme*, see MARTELLI 2002, esp. p. 346; SCARRONE 2015, pp. 32-33. For an overview of the painter's attributions, see PAOLUCCI 2001, p. 207-210; PAOLUCCI 2007, p. 27; *adde* SCARRONE 2015, p. 56. On the «Gruppo Tardo a Silhouettes», see SCARRONE 2015, pp. 22-56.

[105] Siena, Museo Archeologico Nazionale; ex Mieli collection. See PAOLUCCI 2003, pp. 333-335, figs. 1-3.

[106] See PAOLUCCI 2003, p. 333.

[107] The same decoration appears on an amphora attributed to the *Pittore di Gerusalemme* (see *infra* pp. 175; 177-178, **pl. 79**; PAOLUCCI 2001, p. 210 describes the decoration as «due arbusti di edera che sorgono dal terreno e si sviluppano lungo un sostegno verticale, con grandi corimbi lungo il fusto e un tralcio di foglie cuoriformi alle estremità». *Contra* PAOLUCCI 2003, pp. 334-335: «ambientazione delle scene figurate sotto un rigoglioso tralcio di edera che si intreccia con quello di una vite, combinazione che evidentemente allude all'ambiente dionisiaco».

landscape elements are placed in critical positions. From a visual point of view, those positions are traditionally considered an area of secondary and merely accessory decoration[108]. The Boston mirror and the *Pittore di Gerusalemme*'s amphora, by contrast, show the semantic significance assigned to these elements in relation to the main subject, and reveal their 'open' use. The two images show a similar unhinging of the relationship between frame and image (or between ornament and figures) and suggest that there is no actual distinction between the two. In the mirror, the grapevine – which has a relevant role within the image – is arranged in a circle around the main engraving and structured in the shape of the frame. The satyrs, who stretch their arms towards the branches, are depicted at the moment of harvesting. This confirms the functional relationship between the branch frame and the figures in the medallion. The frame, in fact, contributes to the illustration of the scene's action. As for the amphora, the relationship is expressed in reverse form. In this case, the decoration expands into the image by stretching towards the figures[109].

[108] For an overview of this debate's theoretical framework in relation with landscape representation, see above pp. 332-335.
[109] See *infra*, pp. 332-334 for an in-depth examination of these issues.

3.1.2. *Man in Nature. Music, Dance and Ludi*

The purpose of this section is to present images the subject of which relates to human action within the natural space, without the action *per se* implying any form of control by man over the surrounding environment. As for Etruscan examples, activities expressing human action 'in nature' include music and dance practice, *komoi*, ceremonies, stage performances, *ludi* and sporting activities.

ROCKS AND MUSIC

In Etruscan art, the association between rocks and music essentially relates to a group of fourth-century images featuring seated musicians. As we will see, only some of these can be regarded as representative for this analysis. Moving from a brief presentation of less relevant examples – which is necessary to show the genesis of the iconographic type and to motivate the reasons for our critical judgment – we will then focus on the images that shed more light on the Etruscan specificity.

A well-known laurel-leaf mirror from Corchiano at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston (**pl. 20.a**)[110] from the first half of the fourth century B.C. shows a male player seated on rocky ground. He faces right and wears a *himation* wrapping up his hips and legs. Both his hands rest on the *kithara* on his crossed legs. The animals surrounding the figure have suggested he might be Orpheus, although the laurel garland floating behind him hints that he might be the god Apollo[111]. The rocky soil is rendered by a few dainty wavy lines, which nonetheless result in the overall image of a delicate naturalistic environment, also due to the

[110] Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 13.207; dating to 400-350 B.C. KRAUSKOPF 1984, no. 88; DE PUMA 1993, pp. 36-38, no. 14; VAN DER MEER 1995, p. 210; GILOTTA 2000a, pp. 96-97, fig. 6, who attributes the mirror to a Praenestine workshop.

[111] An overview of Orpheus' iconography can be found in CASCIANELLI 2015; SALVADORI 2002.

presence of the animals. Whether or not this figure is the god Apollo, the *schema* of the male figure seated on a rock playing a stringed instrument (*kithara* or *lyra*) dates back to the Apollo Leucadius type, which became widespread from the fourth century B.C. [112].

In Etruscan art, the same type appears on the body of a red-figures *oinochoe* at Villa Giulia (**pl. 20.b**)[113] dating to the last quarter of the fourth century B.C., which shows the dispute between Apollo and Marsyas. The god is represented as a seated male holding a *kithara*[114]. He faces right, and his left leg is tucked under the right one. The god is about to be crowned by a winged female figure represented behind him, while Marsias stands on the right.

The same motif (Apollo musician seated on a rock) is documented in the initial production phase of Faliscan pottery, between 375 and 350 B.C. In particular, a *skyphos* by the *Pittore dell'Aurora* in Berkeley (**pl. 21.a**)[115] shows the Citharede god crowned by a laurel wreath and sitting on a rock. Two female figures stand by his sides.

On a similar note, the two twins *stamnoi* Civita Castellana 6153 and 6154[116] (**pl. 21.b**)[117], which show yet again the dispute between Apollo

[112] PRÜCKNER 1980, p. 360. See the discussion in D'ANDRIA, RITTI 1985, pp. 46-47. For the diffusion of this type, see also FRANKE 1976.

[113] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 50668. Unknown provenance; ex Castellani collection. See DEL CHIARO 1974a, p. 40, no. 59, pl. 40; SMALL 1982, p. 60, fn. 7; KRAUSKOPF 1984, no. 100; DE LUCIA BROLLI 2000, pp. 110-111, no. 69 (additional published references).

[114] On iconographical analysis and different functions of *kithara* and *lyra*, see JANNOT 1979; SARTI 1992; SARTI 2003. The image of the Villa Giulia *oinochoe* follows a *schema* (seated Apollo and standing Marsyas) which is uncommon in Attic vases (see e.g. the krater by the Pittore di Londra F64 from Spina, tomb 873 Valle Trebbia, at the Museo Nazionale in Ferrara) and widely spread in examples from Southern Italy (see MUGIONE 2000, pp. 92-93).

[115] Berkeley, Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, inv. 8-997. See BONAMICI 1993, p. 13, fig. 19 (pp. 19-20, fn. 49 on provenance information); POLA 2016, p. 250, pl. CCL. For further details on this vase, see POLA forthcoming (the scholar proves the provenance of the vase from the Faliscan area).

[116] *Stamnoi* attributed to the Pittore di Würzburg H4513 (ex 818). Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, invs. 6153-6154. POLA 2016, pls. CCXXIV-CCXXV.

and Marsyas, and refer to the same chronological phase as the Aurora Painter, represent the god seated on a rock in front of his standing rival. The compositional structure of the image on the Villa Giulia *oinochoe* and that of the Berkeley *skyphos*, also appear in a few of Etruscan scarabs (see e.g. **pl. 22.a**)[118] and can be compared to a possible prototype on a South-Italian krater in Naples[119]. This vase shows the god alongside Artemis, a young female figure resting on a pillar and a winged Nike as she is about to crown the god. Although in the Naples krater the god, despite holding his musical instrument, is not represented in the act of playing, the three images reveal a similarity primarily expressed by the female figure located behind Apollo.

Several hypotheses could be suggested on the meaning of the link between the musician Apollo and the rock-seat. In particular, the association might be related with the Leukad origin of this specific iconography[120], and can be sought in Apollo's strong ties with Micro Asiatic regions[121]. However, what is relevant to our purposes is that no particular insight is likely to be gathered from these images for the function of landscape elements in Etruscan art. Despite being documented only in Etruscan art, this *schema* dates back to the well-known Greek type, which spread as a repertory motif[122]. Indeed, the

---

[117] *Stamnos* attributed to the Pittore di Würzburg H4513 (ex 818). Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 6153. POLA 2016, pl. CCXXIV.

[118] Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, inv. 2019.13.11. 'Free Style' cornelian scarab set in a gold ring; dating to 350-325 B.C. ALLEN *forthcoming*.

[119] Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale. See BONAMICI 1993, p. 13, fig. 20.

[120] See e.g. STRAB. *Geog*. 10.3. For an overview of *Leukàs*, see FERRARI 2011, pp. 548-549.

[121] See e.g. what is observed in CARETTONI 1973, pp. 79-80.

[122] The same limit concerns the representations of satyrs and generic musicians seated on a rock. See e.g. the satyr in the Faliscan red figure *oinochoe* Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. 40.08 (ADEMBRI 1988, p. 12, 14, fig. 6, who identifies both Attic and South Italian models for the Painter Wien 40.08); the musician in the mirror GERHARD 1867, no. 297.1; and the satyr in the inner medallion of the red-figure *kylix* from Chiusi in Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. F 2949. Dealing with Caeretan red-figure vases, DEL CHIARO 1974a, p. 116 included figures seated on a rock in the group of «stock poses […] shared in common by Caeretan red-figure and all South Italian fabrics» that are «not to be counted as indicative of specific influence».

connection between Etruscan and South-Italian examples supports the idea of an impact of allogeneic models[123].

The same reasoning can be applied to the representation of the dispute between Apollo and Marsyas on a bronze Praenestine cista (**pl. 22.b**)[124] dating to the last quarter of the fourth century B.C. and featuring Apollo seated on a bench while Marsyas is standing. A laurel tree stands between the two figures. The association between the seated Apollo and the laurel tree dates back to Greek iconographic models and parallels the South-Italian figurative repertoire. A variation of the Apollo Delphinios type, for instance, is documented in a Lucanian krater in Paris[125].

By contrast, the reworking of basic types by Etruscan artists is significant to delineate Etruscan specificities in the use of landscape features.

The aforementioned mirror from Corchiano at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston (**pl. 20.a**) provides an example. Although the god's attitude belongs to the recognizable type analyzed above, the single boulder is replaced by rocky soil, which occupies the entire engraved medallion.

Another example of model adaptation is the Faliscan *kylix* Berkeley 8.935 from Orvieto, attributed to the Nazzano Painter (**pl. 22.c**)[126]. The

[123] As for the aforementioned representation of the dispute between Apollo and Marsyas, a closer parallel can be made with Attic models, where the rather unusual association between the seated Apollo and the standing Marsyas is documented comparatively more often than in South Italian specimens (see BONAMICI 1993, pp. 3, 18, fns. 24-25).

[124] Rome, Museo Nazionale etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 13135. From the Necropoli della Colombella. KRAUSKOPF 1984, no. 102; BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA, EMILIOZZI 1990, pp. 232-236, no. 70; BONAMICI 1992, p. 683, no. 9; BONAMICI 1993, pp. 3, 7, figs. 5-6.

[125] A fragmentary relief depicting Apollo Delphinios at the Miletus Museum shows the god seated on a rock by a laurel tree. Arch and quiver are the god's attributes, like the snake (on a discussion about this type, see GRAF 1979). The Lucanian krater, dating to 380-360 B.C. and attributed to the Brooklyn-Budapest Painter (TRENDALL 1983, p. 114, no. 594), is at the Musée du Louvre (inv. K 519): see SMALL 1982, pp. 60-61, fig. 17.

[126] Berkeley, Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, inv. 8-935: dating to 370-360 B.C. and attributed to the Nazzano Painter (POLA 2016, p. 112, tab. XCII). See also SMALL 1982, p. 59, fig. 15.

vase shows Apollo Kitharodos sitting in front of the silen Marsyas. In this case, a dotted profile indicates the rocky soil on which the god rests his feet and is likely seated and resting his right elbow. This figurative detail adaptation significantly varies the original *schema* and betrays a certain autonomy in using the reference model. Unsurprisingly, in the field of Faliscan painting, this type of enfranchisement appears in a specimen by the Nazzano Painter, who is known for his free use of an exceptionally wide variety of figurative patterns[127].
Therefore, both examples reveal the will and the capacity of the painter/engraver to make free use of figurative elements, the occurrence of which can be traced back to some original compositional structure.

However, as anticipated in the beginning, the difficulties in recognizing a specific 'Etruscan' subject as well as the rather pedantic adherence to the model make it virtually impossible to understand the meaning to be attributed to the painter's (or engraver's) choices. In other words, while the reshaping process can be easily recognized, establishing whether or not there has been a conscious attribution of meaningful value to the landscape element proves more problematic.
A few further examples might be more significant in this respect. The model provided by the Greek iconography of Apollo is in fact also used to represent other musicians. They take on the Apollonian aspect, albeit inserted in a figurative setting which refers to the Etruscan cultural context. On the one hand, the possibility of transferring landscape features from one representative context into another allows recognizing possible formal innovations. On the other hand, their insertion in distinctly Etruscan images allows formulating preliminary hypotheses about the meaning of these formal revisions.

The young fisherman and ferryman Phaon, who is represented as a lyricist in two engraved Etruscan mirrors, is to be counted among the most evidently Apollonian musicians due to his attitude and looks.

[127] POLA 2016, p. 112.

Both mirrors, dating to the second half of the fourth century B.C., show a three-figure composition with Phaon (identified by the Etruscan inscription «Phaun») and two female figures. The first example (**pl. 23.a**), at the British Museum, is likely the prototype for the latter, from the Vatican collection (**pl. 23.b**)[128].

In both images Phaun is seated, facing right, and holds a *lyra*. He wears a laurel wreath and his legs and hips are wrapped by a *himation*. The shared use of semicircular engraved strokes to draw the rocky setting confirms the kinship between the two mirrors[129]. As in the mirror from Corchiano, also in these two examples, the landscape setting is invasive and impacts the entire space surrounding the figures. Some vegetal elements embellish the rocky soil. In the Vatican example, a bird is resting on the rock among the two female figures.

The early Hellenistic mirror production, which these two specimens belong to, is characterized by a certain autonomy in creating figurative representations. It is likely that Etruscan engravers followed established patterns for the leading figures and autonomously added details to create bespoken images[130]. Therefore, the landscape setting elaboration is ascribable to the specific will of the engraver (as well as

[128] **Pl. 23.a**: London, British Museum, inv. 1865,0712.6; from Cerveteri; acquired from the Castellani Collection in 1865; inscriptions: «Phaun», «Eurphia». **Pl. 23.b**: Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. MV 12255; from Palestrine; dating to 325-300 B.C.; the central figure is labeled as «Rutapis»/Rodope. See CRISTOFANI 1985b, pp. 2-4, figs. 1-2; BONAMICI 1993, p. 15, figs. 26, 28; GENTILI 2000, p. 118, fig. 2, p. 116, fig. 1 (see also p. 115, fn. 2 and p. 117, fn. 6 for additional published references; pp. 117-119 for the attribution and relationship between the two mirrors); PIZZIRANI 2011, p. 111, fig. 7.

[129] See GENTILI 2000, p. 119: «Il rapporto stretto tra i due esemplari in esame, oltre che dall'evidente dipendenza di uno specchio dall'altro nella strutturazione della scena, è ribadito con forza anche maggiore da alcuni di quei particolari secondari di cui si diceva. Ad esempio dall'ambientazione paesistica della scena tra rocce e nuvole rese combinando tra loro tratti a semicerchio, secondo una convenzione non nuova nell'arte etrusca, ma ben diversa dal prospetto architettonico o dal fondo neutro che accompagnano la redazione del mito di *Phaun* su specchi etruschi più o meno contemporanei».

[130] See GENTILI 2000, pp. 118-119.

of his customers) rather than to the arguably passive application of a ready-made structure.

With regard to the images of the two mirrors, beyond the issue of identifying the female figures, the erotic connotations of the scene have been stressed by several scholars. That is suggested, for instance, by the gestures and names of the women (either appearing as «compagna amorosa», they are depicted in a dance movement), as well as by the dove («animale erotico per eccellenza»)[131]. Moreover, the representation of Phaun as a musician emphasizes the sensual significance. While the beautiful appearance of the young man refers to his physical transformation by Aphrodite, the stringed instrument is likely to be drawn from the traditional account of Sappho's unrequited love for Phaon[132]. Even though any musical elements do characterize the mythical episodes centered in Phaon, his representation with a *lyre* is not a *unicum*: for instance, it appears on the well-known *hydria* by the Meidias Painter from Populonia today in Florence[133]. Despite the affinity in the subject, however, the figurative construction which appears on the mirrors greatly differs from that of the Greek *hydria*. Nonetheless, the representation of Phaun on the two Etruscan mirrors betrays an influence of the Greek tradition, as confirmed by the Hellenizing inscriptions alongside the figures. Conversely, the inscriptions themselves point out the reception of the boatman's myth within the framework of Etruscan culture.

Phaon's metamorphosis into a musician, which implies erotic connotations, in Etruria entails the set-up of a bursting landscape scenario. A further element is therefore added to the music-love pair. The rocky scenario is not accidental, and one specific argument endorses the examples from Classical tradition evoking a link between

[131] BONAMICI 1994, p. 10; CRISTOFANI 1985b, p. 4.
[132] See e.g. STRAB. X.2.9; OV. *Eroides* XV.
[133] Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 81947; dating to 420-410 B.C.; from Populonia (Livorno), San Cerbone necropolis, 'Tomba delle *hydriai* di Meidias' (SARTI 2011, p. 239, fig. 8; HUERTA SEGOVIA 2019, p. 112, no. 71.1).

rock and love[134]. According to the Greek traditional account, Sappho, out of despair for being rejected by Phaon, died throwing herself down the White Rock of Leukas, which became the symbolic place for death due to love suffering[135]. The *Odyssey* also reports that the cliff is located next to the gates of the Sun and Hades[136]; therefore, it belongs to the infernal landscape, so much so that in the Homeric text *Leukàs* (lit. White Cliff) becomes both synonym and mythical landmark of death. Finally, with regard to the Etruscan area, philological[137] and iconographical[138] studies have hinted at a link between the metaphor of the dive and the concept of love abduction[139].
The rocky landscape in the two Etruscan mirrors with Phaun is likely to complete the overall picture (music-love-rock-death), entirely consistent with the funerary destination that these female objects used to have.

In the Etruscan representations of Phaun the erotic theme coexists and partly overlaps the Dionysian one[140]. Considering the examples reviewed so far, this is for instance emphasized by the satyr depicted in the lower exergue of the British Museum with Phaun[141].

---

[134] For the link between Eros and rocks see, for instance, the tradition about the birth of Eros «duris in cautibus» from «Tmaros aut Rhodope aut extremi Garamantes» in VERG. *Buc*. VIII, 43.
[135] On the figurative level, images of Eros seated on rocks, which especially spread in Roman glyptic, are well documented also in Greek examples (see the sixth-century cornelian scarab inv. 1898,0715.5 at the British Museum).
[136] HOM. *Od*. XXIV.11-14. For the analysis of the Homeric text, see HIGHBARGER 1940, pp. 50 ss.; AMORY 1966, pp. 3 ss.; NAGY 1973.
[137] NAGY 1973.
[138] D'AGOSTINO 1999a, pp. 59-60; CERCHIAI 1999a, p. 71.
[139] D'AGOSTINO 1999a, p. 60. GIULIANI 2021, pp. 224-226 criticizes the traditional hermeneutic reading of diving scenes, according to which this subject has an initiatory value. However, the scholar does not deny that diving scenes have a meaning and can be understood as a «similitudine per il passaggio dalla vita alla morte» (p. 226).
[140] PIZZIRANI 2011, p. 111. On the possible transferal Phaon-Phaun-Faunus, see MAGGIANI 1986, pp. 20-23
[141] London, British Museum, inv. 1865,0712.6 (**pl. 23.a**).

Unsurprisingly, the relevance to the erotic sphere also characterizes a further group of images featuring musicians.

A well-known mirror from Vulci (though possibly produced in Perugia) in Berlin (**pl. 24.a**)[142] shows Fufluns raising his arms to embrace Semla. Aplu stands by them with a laurel branch. On the left-hand side, a young naked satyr plays the double flute sitting on a boulder. The flutist occupies the area of the lyricin in the previous examples and keeps the same peculiar pose with a raised leg. The same image also appears on a number of other mirrors, including both ancient reproductions and modern forgeries[143].

The same compositive structure, including a hug with upturned figure (here involving «*turan*» and «*atunis*»), standing Apollo and a seated figure on the left, appears in a mirror from the Castel Viscardo necropolis, near Orvieto, dating to 375-350 B.C. (**pl. 24.b**)[144]. The small male figure behind Apollo is winged and sits on a boulder. His right leg is resting, while the left one is raised with the foot resting on a protrusion of the rock. Though this scheme can be compared to these of the *lyra* and flute players in the previous examples, the tiny figure depicted in the Castel Viscardo mirror is not a musician. In fact, reaching out his arms, he raises a *iynx*, a magical tool for love spells composed of two stretched wires and a central wheel[145]. The *iynx*

[142] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. Fr. 36. See KRAUSKOPF 1984, p. 342, no. 36; DE ANGELIS 2002, pp. 56-58, fig. 14 (see fn. 53 for comprehensive bibliography); BONAMICI 2002, pp. 442-443 (the scholar convincingly attributes this mirror to a workshop located in Perugia); DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 117, fig. VI.5. The dating of the mirror, which can be generically set in the fourth century B.C., is widely debated (see AMBROSINI 1996, pp. 195-196, fn. 75).

[143] E.g.: Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 08.253; Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 24875; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département des Monnaies, Médailles et Antiques, inv. 1303, without the satyr. For a discussion, see FISCHER-GRAF 1980, pp. 66 ss.; KRAUSKOPF 1984, p. 342, no. 37; BONAMICI 2002b, p. 443.

[144] FERUGLIO 1997; BONAMICI 2002b, pp. 443-444; BINACO 2017, pp. 16-17, fig. 4. The mirror was found during the excavations conducted in the necropolis between 1984 and 1986 (FERUGLIO 1997, p. 299, fn. 1).

[145] See FERUGLIO 1997, p. 309, fn. 18 for further bibliography; pp. 310-312 for iconographic occurrences. See also DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 95, 153.

would produce a sound while spinning[146] and its association with music is confirmed by a mirror showing a seated woman playing the *iynx* with a *kytara* lying by her feet (**pl. 25.a**)[147]. In the Orvieto mirror, an engraved cartouche by the young boy contains the label «*turnu*», which is likely a syncope for **tur(a)nu*, namely 'that of Turan'[148]. Therefore, the inscription suggests an affinity between the figurine and the Etruscan Aphrodite. In this instance, the involvement of the winged figure in the love scene is emphasized by the inscription and the tool in his hands. It is worth noting one further detail. In the mirror, a little bird represented from behind is resting on a small rock sticking out from the exergue line by Apollo's foot. The very same word *iynx* (῾Ιυγξ) which refers to the tool and means 'love charm', also denotes the wryneck (or jynx). According to the myth, the Greek name of this bird dates back to Iynx, the daughter of Pan and Echo tunred by Hera into a stone[149] or a bird[150] since she had instigated Zeus' love towards Io[151].

In addition to the examples mentioned above, unmistakably erotic connotations characterize a mirror in the Musée du Louvre (**pl. 25.b**)[152]

---

[146] See GOW 1934, p. 5.

[147] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. Fr. 54. ZIMMER 1995, p. 38, no. 35.

[148] FERUGLIO 1997, p. 308.

[149] *Suidas* s.v. *Iynx*.

[150] Schol. ad Theocrit. II.17, ad PIND. *Pyth.* IV.380, *Nem.* IV.56; TZETZ. *ad Lycoph.* 310.

[151] It might be worth adding the scene on a red-figure *oinochoe* at the British Museum to the examples showing a couple embracing and a player sitting on a rock (inv. 1836,0224.43; dating to 375-350 B.C. POLA 2016, p. 371, pl. CDVIII). The London *oinochoe* specifically represents a satyr and a maenad in an erotic embrace and Aplu (?) playing the *lyra* seated on a rock. Next to them are Turan (?) and Atunis (?) sitting in a chariot drawn toward the left-hand side by two swans. The attribution of the vase, which is likely to be Faliscan, is somewhat problematic and has also been ascribed to Attic production (for a discussion, see POLA 2016, p. 371). Given the controversial interpretation and the impossibility of identifying Etruscan features in the construction of the image, this example is only marginally relevant to the present discussion.

[152] Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. 1731. Dating to the second half of the fourth century B.C. See GERHARD 1867, pl. CCXCIV; KRAUSKOPF 1984, no. 80; KRAUSKOPF 1998, p. 191, fn. 94 (with additional *LIMC* references); EMMANUEL-REBUFFAT 1997, pp. 39-40, no. 9. On the erotic value of the musical context, see BAGLIONE, GILOTTA 2007, p. 5.

showing Aplu and a female figure holding a musical instrument each. They are seated on a rock, and the woman has her arm around Aplu's neck.

A satyr holding a *kithara* and a Lasa are wrapped in an upturned *symplegma* in an engraved mirror from Perugia (**pl. 26.a**)[153]. In this instance, rocks with stemming plant elements appear in the space near the figures.

Musician satyrs also appear in a beguilement scene engraved on a Praenestine cyste lid (**pl. 26.b**)[154]. In particular, a chytarede and a flute player are represented both seated on boulders. A wavy line sketches a rocky landscape also around the other figures. Similarly, a Praenestine cista in Villa Giulia also represents a satyr sitting on rocky ground. He accompanies the courtship between another satyr and a naked woman with his flute music (**pl. 27.a**)[155].

While Phaun and the musician figures analyzed above are embedded in images related to the sphere of love, a different theme emerges in the representation of Cacu, a further Apollonian player appearing in a well-known bronze mirror from Bolsena at the British Museum (**pl. 27.b**)[156]. The mirror shows a *vaticinium* image. «*Cacu*» is seated in the middle of the scene and plays the *lyra*. The young «*artile*» holding a diptych is by his side. Next to them, two armed men («*caile vipinas*» and «*avle vipinas*») look towards the scene's center, each one

[153] GERHARD, KÖRTE 1897, pl. XXXI. See FRASCARELLI 1995, pp. 41 ss., no. 17; BONAMICI 2002b, p. 444, fn. 37, who associates this mirror with the one from the Castel Viscardo necropolis (FERUGLIO 1997; **pl. 24.b**).

[154] Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. MV 12282. BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA, EMILIOZZI 1990, pp. 317-322, no. 101, pls. CDLXII-CDLXVII; MENICHETTI 1995, pp. 116-117, fig. 84.

[155] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 13141. BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA, EMILIOZZI 1990, pp. 273-277, no. 82, pls. CCCLXXXVI-CCCXCI; MENICHETTI 1995, pp. 56-57, fig. 22; PAIRAULT MASSA 1992, pp. 171-173, figs. 168-169; GILOTTA 2002, p. 61, fig. 1.

[156] London, British Museum, inv. 1873,0820.105. ALBINI 2009 (see p. 141, fn. 1 for comprehensive bibliography); BAGNASCO GIANNI 2009, p. 50, fig. 12; DOMENICI 2009, pp, 175-196. For an analysis of the figurative structure, see KRAUSKOPF 2016, p. 403, 405, fn. 13.

standing by a tree. In addition to the trees, the landscape setting includes a rocky face in the background. A ferine head emerges from behind the rocky edge. Once again, the Apollo Kitharodos type, recurringly applied to the representation of a different musician, is transferred by the Etruscan engraver into a more complex figurative construction. From a structural point of view, this complexity mainly consists of a landscape scenario. In this instance, two graphically detailed large trees appear in addition to the still predominant rocks. From a thematic point of view, beyond the challenging identification of the individual figures, the prophetic theme is undoubtedly dominant in the scene.

Non dissimilarly from the prophet-player Cacu, the prophetic cantor Prucnas is also represented sitting on a rock on an engraved mirror in New York (**pl. 28.a**)[157].

Musicians' representations that spread in Etruria during the fourth century B.C. are the consequence of the circulation of vases produced in Attica since the fifth century B.C.

In Greece, the wide diffusion of myths related to music and musical images had stemmed from an intellectual and political debate about *mousiké*, its origins, and its functions[158].

However, only vague traces of that cultural *coté* are preserved once the images are transferred into a different cultural context. In fact, the Etruscans are likely to embed the musical representations as well as the related myths. Still, they do not embrace (or only partially acknowledge) the Greek cultural controversies from which the images originate. In other words, although the images embedding the Athenian context are appreciated, they are deprived of their meaning, which a not-Attic audience cannot grasp[159]. Nonetheless, Greek artworks work as primary sources and provide formal patterns.

[157] New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. 22.139.61. BONFANTE 2000, p. 20, fig. 4.
[158] For an overview, see BESCHI 1991; MURRAY, WILSON 2004.
[159] Regarding this subject, see GORRINI 2005.

In the fourth century B.C., Greek musical subjects – bared of the motivations that had determined their original diffusion on Attic pottery – are embedded in Etruscan images centered on musical-erotic and musical-prophetic themes. The leading characters of Greek musical agons (Apollo, Museo, Marsyas, Olimpio, Tamiri) leave space to figures with Etruscan or Etruscizing names speaking to an Etruscan audience. The examples in which this kind of cultural transfer is so straightforward prove the rise of new figurative elements.
Precisely in relation to these Etruscanized themes, the artist deliberately creates images in which the landscape gains space, mainly taking the form of a rocky landscape.

PLANTS, MUSIC AND DANCE – BLACK-FIGURE PAINTING

Conversely, a number of images featuring a combination of players and dancers show a steady predominance of plant elements. The brief overview of musicians presented above triggers a discussion on this broad, widespread typology.

While the examples reviewed above are all rather late, the theme of dance was widespread also in the previous centuries. In particular, representations of music and dance performances are well documented in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. Their diffusion is likely to have been linked to banquets and *komoi*, as well as to stage performances and athletic competitions. In many cases, however, these images do not allow for a clear identification of the context. Convivial moments were in fact organized in fluid formats, entailing the intertwining and overlapping of different activities. Rather than endeavoring an unrealistic classification, it is worth acknowledging a certain degree of ceremoniality as a common ground to all these situations.

The issue of interpreting not real action, but its representation (namely, the figurative rendering of the action) is even more complex. Therefore, an additional element to consider in this analysis is the interchangeability of figures: this suggests the inadequacy of classification by subject and vouches instead for classification by

'situation'[160]. In relation to similar meanings, the ancient system of image construction provides for the adoption of the same *schema* for different subjects. This figure swap («affascinante gioco di scambi, sovrapposizioni e allusioni»)[161] includes instances in which some characters mimic actions performed by others, in a way that did not coincide with the representation of theatrical performances[162].

Dance performances, documented in Etruscan black-figures vases, are mainly spread in artworks by the Micali Painter, his followers, and his epigones. Conversely, they are unlikely to be found in more ancient or contemporary black-figures vases representing comparable scenes[163]. The two best-known vases attributed to the Micali Painter show dance-based iconographies involving individuals and plants. The body of the British Museum amphora ex B64 (**pl. 28.b**)[164], from Vulci, shows a continuous frieze representing music and sports scenes. In front of a *carcer* with horses and a dog, six ithyphallic satyrs and six maenads (possibly, men and women dressed up like satyrs and maenads)[165] walk

[160] For further details on this approach, see the discussion in TORELLI 2002a.
[161] CATONI 1998, p. 77.
[162] For a few examples from both Greek and Etruscan repertoires, see SZILÁGYI 1981a; CATONI 1998; TORELLI 2002a; CATONI 2005, pp. 330-333; MASSA PAIRAULT 2008. Selected up-to-date references on the relationship between the visual arts and fifth century theatre can be found in CATONI 2016, p. 10, fn. 8. Conversely, another trait of the *schema* is the suitability to go beyond different functions («alta capacità 'migratoria' degli schemata in termini funzionali»: see CATONI 2005, pp. 161-204; quot. p. 194).
[163] Pontic-vase painting, for instance, shows a number of dance performance representations comparable with the analyzed examples, though differing in the lack of landscape features. Examples include works by the Silen Painter, who «eccelle nei soggetti dionisiaci» (see Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. E 703, dating to about 540 B.C.: RIZZO 1987, pp. 33, 152, 302, no. 105; RIDI 2009, p. 166, fig. 9; **pl. 113.a**) and by the Bibliothèque Nationale 178 Painter (see Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum, inv. 919.5.138; dating to 530-510 B.C.: RIZZO 1987 p. 304, no. 110).
[164] London, British Museum, inv. 1865,0103.25 (ex B64); dating to about 510 B.C. See SZILÁGYI 1981a, pp. 8-10, figs.24-27; THUILLIER 1985, pp. 148-149; SPIVEY 1987, p. 19, no. 102, pl. 18.a-b; BRUNI 2004, pp. 22, 25, no. 29.
[165] SZILÁGYI 1981a, p. 8, who suggests that the representation is related to primitive satiric performances. For an analysis and interpretation of the frieze, see VAN DER MEER 1986, who points out that the frieze depicts a Dionysiac festival; SPIVEY 1987, p. 67,

in pairs towards the gate to the left. Two of the maenads hold a twig. Two different branch-types are represented between satyrs and maenads. Behind these figures, two pairs of young males play *crotala* by a beardless male with a staff. Two branches are represented by the three figures. The following frieze section features an athletic trainer with two confronted boxes facing a central branch, a naked youth, a male aulete, a *brabeus*, two bearded males walking towards a little figure climbing a pole, a *diskobolos*, a naked male with a spear and an armed male facing left.

Four pairs of dancing satyrs are depicted on the shoulder of the Florence *hydria* 4139, from Vulci (**pl. 29.a**)[166]. These satyrs, considered by Spivey «pure Micali work»[167], are separated by three stylized vegetal elements that grow from the groundline. Composed of winding stems with simple dots, they match one of the branch types represented on the London amphora. On the Florence vase neck, an orderly row of male dancers is interposed by the same limb type. On the left-hand side, the row is opened by a figure looking backward and holding a similar branch-like shrub.

Fairly identical vegetal elements made of a simple line and dots are not only documented in the representation of further similar *komoi* (see e.g. **pl. 29.b**, with dotted fronds around the figures)[168], but were also widely spread on black-figures vases showing more generic dance scenes (see

who interprets the vase as a «commission for some games or festival»; JOLIVET 1993; THUILLIER 1997a. BRUNI 2004, pp. 22, 25, no. 29 suggests that the image represents a funeral ceremony (see also SCARRONE 2014, p. 44, fn. 90).

[166] Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 4139. The body shows the apotheosis of Herakles. SPIVEY 1987, p. 21, no. 125; pls. 22a-b; 23a; 40a; p. 57 fig. 12.

[167] SPIVEY 1987, p. 26.

[168] Harrow, Harrow School, Old Speech Room Gallery, inv. 1864.25; dating to the fifth century B.C. attributed to the Orvieto Group. The vase shoes two dancing satyrs positioned by an auletes (GAUNT 2005, p. 34, pl. 38).

e.g. **pl. 30.a** with a frieze of male dancing figures)[169] or very different subjects[170].

Wavy lines between dot lines also separate the dancing satyrs depicted on the Tarquinia amphora RC 6884 (**pl. 30.b**; attributed to the Micali Painter workshop)[171]. The overall dance scheme of this amphora, with a frontal satyr playing the double flute, can be compared to equivalent schemes of tomb paintings and marble reliefs from Chiusi, which will be presented in the following section[172].

An amphora from Vulci in Munich (**pl. 31.a**; dating to 500-490 B.C.)[173] and a fragmentary high-foot *kyathos* in Erlangen (**pl. 31.b**)[174] can be referred to the Micali Painter workshop as well. The amphora, included by Beazley in the Group of Munich 872, shows four young males in silhouette moving towards the left. The open arms and hands position suggests that they are dancing. Between each pair, the space includes a wavy growing branch composed of an undulating stem with small leaves. The high-foot *kyathos* fragment represents a group of ephebes dancing in ivy-like branches.

The inner tondo of a black-figure *kylix* from the Baldelli collection, at the Museo dell'Accademia Etrusca e della città di Cortona (**pl. 32.a**)[175], shows a dancing female figure with a stylized sapling on either side. The two plants are made of a central stem with side dotted lines. This

[169] Art market. Formerly Lugano, E.I. collection. Attributed to the Micali Painter's «fase della piena maturità»: see BRUNI 2010, pp. 20-21, figs. 2-3; MENICHETTI, CERCHIAI 2017, fig. 11.

[170] E.g.: Milan, Civiche Raccolte Archeologiche e Numismatiche, inv. A7199; Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, inv. K 1910-2.11. For other examples, see SPIVEY 1985.

[171] Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. RC 6884: dating to 515-490 B.C. See GINGE 1987, pp. 47-48, no. 20, pls. XXVII-XXIX.

[172] See *infra* pp. 133-134.

[173] Munich, Antikensammlungen, inv. SH 872. See OLIVIER-TROTTENBERG 2014, p. 115, tab. 64.3-4 (with published references).

[174] Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Antikensammlung, inv. I 829. See DRÄGER 2007, tab. 59.5-6; SCARRONE 2014, p. 49, C.24.

[175] Cortona, Museo dell'Accademia Etrusca e della città di Cortona, inv. 2510; dating to the end of the sixth / beginning of the fifth century B.C. PAOLUCCI 2000, pp. 122-123, fig. 14; PAOLUCCI 2011a, pp. 171, 175.

image is especially relevant as its subject is a *unicum* in this type of vases, attributed to an archaic Chiusine workshop producing *kylikes* with athletes or satyrs[176].

The dance motif among vegetal elements relates to the typical scenes of a specific group of black-figure vases, the so-called Ivy Leaf Group (*Gruppo delle Foglie d'Edera*)[177]. Fifteen vases of this group feature a series of male and female figures moving while holding large ivy leaves (see e.g. **pl. 32.b**)[178]. It has been suggested that these images – rather than being «un segno della non-atticità del loro autore il quale, nella sua provinciale insipienza, distorce le immagini dando […] estrema importanza all'elemento vegetale fine a se stesso»[179] – would represent «scenes where probably cult cerimonies in honour of the god [Dionysos] are performed by man and women, dancing or walking in a procession»[180]. This realistic interpretation implies the existence of ritual processions in which men and women carried «oversized ivy leafs, symbols of Dionysos»[181].

Similar themes to these characterizing the early phases of black-figure production also appear in the later Etruscan black-figure painting showing a more profound influence of Attic models and related on different levels to the earlier Etruscan black-figure production.

Drinking and dancing satyrs are represented, for instance, on a fragmentary *kyathos* in Munich and attributed to the Kyknos Painter, who is considered a follower of the Micali Painter. His workshop was active between 500 and 475 B.C. Despite the vase being heavily

[176] PAOLUCCI 2000, pp. 122, 124; PAOLUCCI 2011a, pp. 169-173 (*Pittore di Tolle 126*).
[177] See BOCCI 1960; WERNER 2005.
[178] Leipzig, Karl-Marx-Universität, Antikenmuseum, inv. T 329. *Die Welt der Etrusker* 1988, pp. 142-143, B 5.12.
[179] SERRA RIDGWAY 2005, p. 11.
[180] WERNER 2005, p. 75.
[181] WERNER 2005, p. 77. See also SERRA RIDGWAY 2005, p. 12: «grandi foglie irreali e pur concrete (evidentemente 'modelli', costruiti con canne e tessuto come accessori teatrali, o come i grandi fiori dei nostri carri di carnevale), simbolo dionisiaco per eccellenza»; BONFANTE 2009, p. 151.

damaged, two branched saplings are visible on either side of the scene. A bunch is hanging from one of the branches. Dotted branches are also visible between the figures (**pl. 32.c**)[182]. An *oinochoe* in Bonn attributed to the same Painter (**pl. 33.a**)[183] shows two female dancers separated by a lotus-like flower. A thin shrub with leaves stands on their right.

Although of a very different type, a central motif also appears between two dancing figures on the amphora Tarquinia RC 3216 (**pl. 33.b**)[184]. On one side of the vase, two females stand by a central sapling composed of skewed lines departing from either side of a straight vertical stem.

Among followers of the Micali Painter is also the «Peintre de la danseuse aux crotales», firstly identified by Françoise Gaultier[185], «uno dei maestri più qualificati della pittura vascolare etrusca a figure nere, in stretto rapporto con il Pittore di Jahn del Gruppo di Praxias»[186]. Generally speaking, this Painter rarely represents landscape elements. A number of vases with dancing figures are included in the group of examples attributed to his workshop. One of these, held in Bochum (pl. **34.a**) and attributed to the Painter by Cornelia Weber-Lehmann[187], shows a dancing female figure on either side of the vase. One of the two figures is winged. On either side, a plant stands on the right of the figure. A plant with split branching grows by the winged dancer. Both

[182] Munich, Antikensammlungen, inv. NI 8080 (SH 977); dating to 500-490 B.C. SPIVEY 1987, p. 42, no. 6; OLIVIER-TROTTENBERG 2014, pp. 112-113, tab. 62.4-5. On the *Peintre de la danseuse aux crotales*, see SPIVEY 1987, pp. 41-42; RIZZO 1987, p.38.
[183] Bonn, Akademisches Kunstmuseum, inv. 569; dated to 525-500. See BENTZ 2008, p. 53, no. 56.
[184] Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. RC 3216. Dating 500-475 B.C. GINGE 1987, pp. 74-75, cat. no. 37, pls. LXV.b-LXVI; SCARRONE 2015, p. 49, cat. I.92 (included in the «Gruppo Tardo a Silhouettes»).
[185] GAULTIER 1987; GAULTIER 2003, pp. 59-62. See also SCARRONE 2015, pp. 7-12 (*Pittore della Crotalista*). The Painter's workshop was located in Vulci between 490 and 460 B.C.
[186] SCARRONE 2015, p. 7.
[187] Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität, Antikenmuseum, inv. L 1271. See WEBER-LEHMANN 2009, p. 80, V.33, reviewed in BIELLA 2010, who agrees on the attribution to the *Peintre de la danseuse aux crotales*.

branches end in an elongated acorn-like inflorescence. Alongside the figure on the other side, a shorter sapling with bifurcated branching shows a fan-shaped corolla. The latter type matches the shoot on an amphora in Chiusi depicting a battle scene (**pl. 34.b**)[188], attributed to the Chiusi 577 Painter[189].

Closely related to the *Peintre de la danseuse aux crotales* (as well as to the production of the Painter of the Dancing Satyrs, which I will analyze later on), is the «Gruppo Tardo a Silhouettes». This Group counts several painters (including the Munich 892, Munich 883 and Vatican 265 Groups)[190] and «deriva evidentemente dalla bottega del Pittore di Micali»[191]. Particularly relevant to our purposes is an amphora from the Rosenbaum collection (**pl. 35.a**)[192], «un esemplare molto particolare» showing similarities with the decoration of an amphora attributed to the *Pittore di Gerusalemme*[193]. Satyrs and dancing female figures alternate on the body of the vase. Specifically, four figures (two satyrs and two maenads) are depicted on either side. On one side, two saplings composed of a wavy line and dots separate the two central figures from the lateral ones. Though made of lines and dots as vegetal elements appearing in more ancient black-figure examples, these saplings are slightly more elaborated than the previous ones, in that they show stem and branches. A comparable elaboration of the motif with a line between dotted lines is attested by the

[188] Chiusi, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 577. See GAULTIER 1987, pp. 79-80, no. 9, figs. 15-16; RIZZO 1988, p. 100, no. 76, fig. 195.
[189] RIZZO 1988, p. 100. Maurizio Pistolesi (PISTOLESI 2004, p. 103, fn. 25) associates this amphora with an olpe included in the Munich 892 Group.
[190] See SCARRONE 2015, pp. 22 ss. On the Vatican 265 and Munich 883 Groups, see PAOLUCCI 2011a.
[191] SCARRONE 2015, p. 26.
[192] Ascona, Rosenbaum Collection, inv. 1969. SCARRONE 2015, pp. 29; 50, no. I.129, tab. 6.c-d; dating to 500-475 B.C.
[193] SCARRONE 2015, p. 26. The branch with bunches of grapes depicted on the neck support the comparison. The peculiarity of the vase is not only due to its decoration but rather also to its unusual shape.

continuous frieze of the amphora Tarquinia RC 5310 (**pl. 35.b**)[194], in which six dancing maenads and satyrs alternate. Between the figures, rising from the ground, are wavy lines, only the upper part of which is enclosed by dots. Belonging to the same group is an amphora in Basel with female figures dancing between high, wavy stems (**pl. 36.a**)[195].

A characteristic case study is then provided by the Munich 892 Group (which, as mentioned above, is included in the «Gruppo Tardo a Silhouettes» as well)[196], whose workshops have been alternatively located in Vulci[197], Orvieto[198] , and Chiusi[199]. Black-figure *stamnoi* and amphoras attributed to this Group, in fact, largely lack any landscape details[200]. Repetitive subjects and genre scenes characterize its iconographic repertoire, which is usually enriched by the abundant use of palmettes and floral friezes. There are only a few examples in the Group likely providing an exception[201]. Two of these vases show uncommon mythical scenes, an unusual feature for the Group.

For the purposes of this analysis, one of the two, namely the amphora-ossuary from tomb 812 in Tolle (**pl. 36.b**)[202], deserves

[194] Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. RC 5310; dating to 500-475 B.C. GINGE 1987, pp. 77-78, cat. no. 39, pls. LXIX-LXX; SCARRONE 2015, p. 56.
[195] Basel, Hess collection; from Vulci. HESS 1963, no. 43 (with figure); SCARRONE 2015, p. 50, I.125.
[196] On this Group, see SCHWARZ 1983, pp. 121-127; SCHWARZ 1984, who identifies a unique painter; PISTOLESI 2004, who identifies four different painters. See SCARRONE 2015, pp. 22-27 on the issues related to the definition of this Group (and its relations with the Group Munich 883 and Vatican 265 – all included in the «Gruppo Tardo a Silhouettes»).
[197] SCHWARZ 1983, p. 134; SCHWARZ 1984, p. 72.
[198] MARTELLI 1992, p. 346.
[199] PAOLUCCI 2007, p. 23.
[200] For a few examples see *infra*, p. 124, fn. 218..
[201] Amphora from tomb 812 in Tolle (see *infra*). Amphora Richmond, Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 62.1.8; provenance unknown; dating to about 500-490 B.C; side A: A satyr, Dionysus and a female figure. Vegetal elements stemming from the ground. Side B: Herakles and the Nemean lion (RIZZO 1987, p. 312, no. 135; PISTOLESI 2004, pp. 102-103, pls. 9.d-10.a). Column krater Toledo, Museum of Art, inv. 1912.1240; dating to about 470 B.C. (attributed to the Munich 892 Group by SCHWARZ 1983, p. 125, no. 9).
[202] Chianciano Terme, Museo Civico Archeologico. See PAOLUCCI 2014.

particular attention. The vase shows a continuous frieze (which is another unusual characteristic for this group) with the abduction of Thetis by Peleus. Two saplings with long straight stems and lotus flower-shaped inflorescences stand on either side of the scene. Four dancing female figures wearing chiton and cloak, possibly Nereids, occupy the rest of the frieze. They are alternated with vegetal elements of the same type as those framing the central group of Peleus and Thetis. The shoulder is split into two figurative sections replacing the floral decoration that usually appears on other examples of the Group. Side A shows two naked male figures facing left alternated with two saplings, which are poorly preserved. A forging scene with four blacksmiths and references to phallic iconography is depicted on side B. The destination of the vase, which was used as an ossuary in the tomb[203], suggests an eschatological interpretation of the images related to the imagery of passage[204]. As with the other examples of the Munich 892 Group, the influence of Attic models on this amphora is also evident. The mythical scene, for instance, matches similar representations on Greek vases[205]. Due to its unusual features (shoulder decoration; continuous frieze; mythical subject), which differentiate this amphora from the other examples of the Group, the Tolle vessel is likely to have been a special commission for an Etruscan customer deeply influenced by Greek culture («prodotto su commissione per una committenza colta e fortemente ellenizzata»)[206].

A few additional aspects can be pointed out. In this amphora from Tolle, in fact, not only the subject, but also the image structure can hypothetically be traced back to the function of the vase, which was used as an ossuary. The dance, which extends along the frieze and has

[203] See PAOLUCCI 2014, pp. 351-353.
[204] See PAOLUCCI 2014, p. 358: «Se poi passiamo all'esame funzionale del vaso come contenitore di ceneri comparato alla rappresentazione sul corpo, sembra verosimile intravvedere nella scena del ratto in cui è coinvolta una divinità un collegamento con la morte: la raffigurazione potrebbe pertanto richiamare proprio il momento di passaggio verso il nuovo status del defunto sepolto all'interno dell'anfora».
[205] See PAOLUCCI 2014, pp. 356-357.
[206] PAOLUCCI 2014, p. 356.

its pivot in the mythical image, does not appear to be incidental with regard to the central theme. The female figures do not appear to be an ancillary group of Nereids. Instead, they are primarily characterized as dancers.

While the choice of a Greek mythical theme[207] betrays the Hellenized background of the client, the choice to arrange the dance scene as an introduction and frame to the mythological theme is likely to denote more specifically Etruscan cultural traits. In particular, the structure with figures alternating with small trees is likely typically Etruscan. For instance, it matches the figurative repertoire of a group of contemporary tomb paintings, which will be analyzed later on in this chapter. The possible match of the decoration with tomb paintings seems especially relevant when considering the function of the Tolle amphora, which was used as a funerary container[208].

As outlined above, the Tolle amphora provides an outstanding use of landscape elements which does not recur in the other vases of the Munich 892 Group. A comparable case can be identified within the contemporary Group Munich 883 (included in the «Gruppo Tardo a Silhouettes»)[209]. An amphora with a lid in Viterbo (**pl. 37.a**)[210] stands out within the production due to two large trees depicted under the handles. The trees have long stems and several side branches. Side A shows two satyrs dancing around an amphora placed on a tripod. Their arms and one of the legs are raised. Side B shows two dancing satyrs and two large birds flying above their heads. The images on this

[207] The subject is also widespread in Greek pottery: compare, for instance, the Attic black-figure *kylix* in Munich (Antikensammlungen, inv. 8966, attributed to the C Painter) showing a similar parade of Nereids as the Tolle amphora.

[208] PAOLUCCI 2014, p. 351-353.

[209] On this Group, see SCHWARZ 1983, pp. 127-130; RIZZO 1987, p. 38; PISTOLESI 2004. See SCARRONE 2015, pp. 22-27 on the issues related to the definition of this Group (and its relations with the Munich 892 and Vatican 265 Groups – all belonging to the «Gruppo Tardo a Silhouettes»).

[210] Viterbo, Museo Civico, inv. 337/212; ex Rossi Danielli collection. EMILIOZZI 1974, pp. 155-156, no. 200, pls. CI-CII; SCHWARZ 1983, p. 129, no. 26; PISTOLESI 2004, pp. 106-107.

amphora match the amphora 337/220 at the Viterbo museum. The two examples only differ in the decoration under the handles. The amphora 337/220, in fact, shows a more common palmette decoration in place of the trees[211].

Finally, the Painter of Dancing Satyrs provides further examples of landscape elements within dance images[212]. On either side of a krater on the Swiss art market (**pl. 37.b**)[213], for instance, there is a couple composed of dancing satyrs holding a *thyrsus*-like staff. Wavy dotted lines are painted alongside them. An amphora in Boston attributed to the same Painter (**pl. 38.a**)[214] shows two dancing satyrs on either side. Three vegetal elements grow from the groundline. They are composed of a thin trunk and a large outgrowth in the shape of an acorn. Their shape matches that of the *thyrsi* in the Boston amphora. Despite the stylistic influence of Attic models, these satyrs arguably make «gesti di danza etruschi che, specie nei movimenti della mano, differiscono in modo caratteristico dalle danze conosciute tramite le varie raffigurazioni greche»[215].

[211] For further details on this amphora, see EMILIOZZI 1974, p. 155, no. 199. See also *infra* p. 289, fn. 6.
[212] For an overview on the Painter of Dancing Satyrs and other examples, see SZILÁGYI 1981a; RIZZO 1987, p. 39; MARTELLI 2017.
[213] SZILÁGYI 1981a, p. 5, figs. 6-7; about 480 B.C.
[214] Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 13.158; about 480 B.C. (SZILÁGYI 1981a, p. 5, fig. 5).
[215] SZILÁGYI 1981a, p. 4. Depicted in a similar attitude are also the satyrs represented on a black-figure *stamnos* in Hamburg (Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, inv. 1960.54; dating to about 480 B.C.), possibly to be attributed to the same Painter (see RIZZO 1987, p. 312, no. 137). Here, a stem with inflorescence stands by the satyrs. Although it is strongly influenced by Attic models (see e.g. the hands' rendering), a black-figure *hydria* dating to the end of the sixth century B.C (Copenhagen, National Museum of Denmark, inv. 13437) shows an Etruscan dance. The vase was attributed to the late production of the Micali Painter by Spivey (SPIVEY 1987, pp. 29-30, no. 193, pl. 32b) and subsequently to the Silen Painter (see PALEOTHODOROS 2007, p. 190). The *hydria* shows a dancing female crotaliste between two satyrs. Flanking the scene are two sphinxes resting on pedestals with dotted fronds at their bases.

As the analyzed examples suggest, the «ritmi sovreccitati»[216] of the Micali Painter's artworks and the «vivo interesse verso i problemi della spazialità del corpo»[217] characterizing the Painter of Dancing Satyrs lay out the premises for the definition of action space.
As observed above, although dance scenes were also represented in more ancient or contemporary black-figures vases, these depictions were almost entirely devoid of landscape details[218]. Few exceptions occur in examples that are significantly close in style to the Micali painter's artworks.

Beyond such discrepancy between different production series, some remarks can be formulated about the resorting to landscape elements by the group of black-figure painters presented above. These remarks

[216] RONCALLI 1986, p. 636. See also SPIVEY 1985, p. 13 («energia instancabile della pittura»; «effetto coreografico»).
[217] SZILÁGYI 1981a, p. 3. See also RIZZO 1987, p. 39 («Egli si muove nella generica imitazione delle figure attiche, mostrando comunque un certo interesse verso i nuovi problemi relativi alla rappresentazione nello spazio della figura umana»).
[218] For that matter, the presence of landscape elements in dance images is not even the rule in the production by the Micali Painter workshop, his followers and successors. See, for instance, the dancing women recurring on the neck of vases by the Painter of the Vatican 238 (or Kaineus Painter; see SPIVEY 1987, pp. 42-43; MARTELLI 2018): e.g. Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. 406 IV 1477 (RIZZO 1987, pp. 310-311, no. 129). On a similar note, landscape elements are nearly missing also in the later black-figure *stamnoi* and amphoras attributed to the Munich 892 Group (SCHWARZ 1983; SCHWARZ 1984; PISTOLESI 2004): e.g. amphora Brussels, Brussels, Musée Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire, inv. 270 (PISTOLESI 2004, tab. 15.a); amphora Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 1939 (GINGE 1987, p. 80, no. 41, pls. LXXII-LXXIII; PISTOLESI 2004, tab. 15.c); amphora Orvieto, coll. Alla Querce, inv. 373 (PISTOLESI 2004, pl. 15.c); *stamnos* Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. RC 1760 (GINGE 1987, p. 82, no. 44, pls. LXXV-LXXVI; PISTOLESI 2004, pl. 16.b); amphora Chianciano Terme, Museo Civico Archeologico, from Tolle, tomba 515 (PAOLUCCI 2014, pp. 354, 358, fig. 8). See also the amphora in Florence edited in MAGI 1943, pp. 523-524, pl. XLII.3-4. A group of black-figure high-foot *kyathoi* referring to the same production area (Scarrone 'Gruppo Tardo a Silhouette'; see SCARRONE 2014, p. 37, fn. 15: «in esso confluiscono i tradizionali Gruppi di Monaco 892, Monaco 883 e Vaticano 265»; on the Group, see SCARRONE 2015, pp. 22 ss.) shows dance images characterized by the absence of landscape elements (see e.g. Monaco, Staatliche Antikensammlungen, inv. 960 = SCARRONE 2014, p. 50, cat. D.9; Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 81093 (H 2709) = SCARRONE 2014, p. 50, cat. D.18).

are to be considered preliminary and are exclusively based on the images centered on dance and music performances analyzed here.
First, the 'action space' is described uniquely by minimal and schematic – if not merely evocative – figurative features. This suggests that this 'space' does not convey a descriptive purpose. The recognition that the aforementioned black-figure painters do not describe a *real* landscape is especially unsurprising once this datum is compared to their general aptitude for abstracting.
However, even though this space is not realistic, it is neither generic nor anonymous. In other words, the analyzed examples show an environment well-characterized as a whole, rather than a generic environment. What is vital to these images is not the appearance of landscape elements, but rather their presence and position.
By contrast, individual landscape elements show very generic features from a botanical point of view, so that they can hardly be individually identified. An uncommon bunch of grapes visible in the aforementioned fragmentary Munich *kyathos* NI 8080 (**pl. 32.c**)[219] is clearly to be traced back to imported Attic models (see e.g. Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, inv. PC 23).

The representation of generic plant elements in Dionysian contexts likely hints implicitly at vine or ivy also in other examples[220]. However, assigning them with a sign function is impossible whenever these elements are not represented in a univocally identifiable way. In other words, they do not act as an actual *sign* apt to convey some steady significance[221]. It goes without saying, this does not imply that landscape elements do not bear any symbolic value.
Moreover, graphic elements that are sometimes possible to identify as Dionysian plants also occur in entirely different thematic contexts, in which vine and ivy are unlikely to be represented. That is to say, there

[219] See above p. 118..
[220] See ISLER-KERÉNYI 2015.
[221] Regarding methodological issues, compare with what affirmed in TORELLI 2002b, pp.140-142 about the palm tree iconography.

is no univocal association between a specific plant and a particular graphic rendering.

Finally, friezes and ornaments used by our group of black-figure painters are also worthy of attention. In fact, they show foliage (especially ivy and vine) rendered with botanical expertise. This clarifies that generalization is an intentional choice. Indeed, the versatility in representing trees and *thyrsi* (which leverages both functional and semantic proximity between the two objects) betrays the lack of attention to botanical data. Instead, it is less likely that this versatility reveals the will to picture a conceptual metaphor based on a parallel between tree and *thyrsus*.

Since the first systematic studies on the Micali Painter's work, there has been much debate about the hypothesis to assign some eschatological value and afterlife setting to a group of his images[222]. In particular, it has been suggested that scenes including *Mischwesen* or isolated heads might relate to «contesti topografici che fanno presupporre una loro dislocazione in un mondo ultraterreno»[223].

In essence, scholars have pointed out that the Micali Painter's attempt is pioneering compared to later realistic Underworld representations in tomb paintings. In these articles, the topographic setting is based on the subject. That is to say, fantastic animals or isolated heads influence the interpretation of their action space. Therefore, the exercise they encourage is not to identify figurative data apt to qualify the topographical context within the image. By contrast, the figures themselves hint at the context, which remains nonetheless wholly implicit. In these analyses, the very definition of the environment type contributes to defining the central theme (that is to

[222] While in his monography on the Micali Painter (SPIVEY 1987) Spivey claims that it is not possible to ascribe any specific symbolic meaning to animals and fantastic beasts depicted by the Painter, in an essay published in the following year he contemplates a possible eschatological reading of the same figures (SPIVEY 1988a; for an explanation and 'historicization' of this change, under the influence of Herbert Hoffmann, see SPIVEY 2015, p. 385). See also RENDELI 1996, p. 12 and AMBROSINI 1998, p. 357, both discussed *infra*.

[223] RENDELI 1996, p. 12. For an analysis of the isolated heads, see AMBROSINI 1998.

say, the meaning of the image). In fact, the afterlife location unequivocally charges the image with an eschatological function. It follows that, along with the environment/context, the image also hides its «messaggio allegorico»[224].

Possible interpretations of the black-figure *Mischwesen* will be discussed in the chapters to follow[225]. At this stage, however, it is interesting to observe a methodological issue concerning the possibility of extending the 'topographic' question to the dance and performance images. The suggestion that the painter conceives a specific environment behind what he represents makes one wonder whether this same attempt can also be recognized behind other images of him and whether the use of landscape elements contributed to this type of framing.

Having assumed the hypothesis that the landscape elements analyzed above bear a symbolic value, we need to verify the possible referents behind figurative data. If a landscape detail can act as a signal within the image, one might wonder whether it can also be a signal of a topographically identifiable place, or of any of its features.

Finally, from a structural point of view, the images explored above show a strong vocation for rhythmic articulation. Significantly enough, this rhythm is frequently illustrated through the presence of plant elements. This feature, already observed in other images, clearly emerges in the case of dance images and constitutes a meaningful *trait d'union* between black-figure images and tomb painting. This parallels also leads to a tempting interpretation of isolated figures flanked by vegetal elements black-figure vases. Individual dancers and musicians might be *excerpta* of more elaborated scenes, including landscape elements as a partition pattern[226].

[224] RENDELI 1996, p. 12.
[225] See below pp. 239-240.
[226] SCARRONE 2015, p. 35.

PLANTS, MUSIC AND DANCE – KOMOI AND CEREMONIES IN ARCHAIC TOMB PAINTING AND RELIEF FROM CHIUSI

Plant elements are widely spread also in tomb paintings from the sixth century B.C.[227]. Leaving aside any discussion on the relation between black-figure vases and tomb paintings in terms of production[228], the analysis is now moving from one group onto the other only on the basis of subject affinity.

The well-known *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca* in Tarquinia has been aptly defined a «inno alla vita ritmicamente scandito»[229]. The first chamber's frescoes, dating to about 510 B.C., represent a dance in which dancers alternate with trees with hanging objects. The entrance wall (**pl. 39.a**) shows two trees and dancers on either side of the door. Two pairs of male dancers standing by a central tree are poorly preserved on either side of the rear wall door (**pl. 38.b**). Dancers and musicians are depicted on the side walls (**pl. 39.b-c**). As in the case of the short walls, also on the side ones, the same number of trees is represented on either wall. The dancers have their arms raised and lift their legs in an energetic *saltatio*. While the human figures are rather small, the trees are large and take up all the space on the wall. They have red stems and blue leaves. In some cases, tiny dark spots are visible between the leaves. The ex-voto hanging from the branches (including a mirror and a cista) refer to the *mundus muliebris*.

---

[227] The following analysis does not include the *Tomba del Teschio* (STEINGRÄBER 1985, p. 350), since the poor state of conservation of its paintings does not allow for a reliable reading, and the *Tomba del Morente* (STEINGRÄBER 1985, p. 330), which is mainly known via modern sketches which are not trustworthy (for further details on this tomb, see above p. 81, fn. 33).

[228] On the hypothesis that tomb painters were also ceramographers, see CRISTOFANI 1976; BUCCELLATO, GATTI 1979; VLAD BORRELLI 1985. A substantial overlap has also been maintained for the Hellenistic age in Etruria (MARTELLI 2008a, p. 14; *contra* COLONNA 1994a) and the Hellenic area (HURWUIT 2012).

[229] MASSA PAIRAULT 1992a, p. 85. On this tomb, see STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 299-300; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 69-76.

The majesty, predominance and thickness of the trees, as well as the presence of dancers, have suggested to interpret these images as depiction of a *lucus*. In particular, François-Hélène Massa Pairault argued that they represent a *ludus* in the goddess Aphrodite's *lucus*, while Erika Simon had previously interpreted them as representation of a laurel forest sacred to Apollo[230].

Both etymology and ancient sources suggest that the terms '*lucus*' (*alsos*) originally referred to a «radura rituale, ritagliata nel bosco» rather than to a real wood[231]. In essence, the *lucus* is likely to be a *temenos* created in the wood, whose inauguration equates it to a *templum* (which happened to be often surrounded by a wooded area)[232]. In this sense, it is appropriate to think of a *lucus-temenos* for the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca* images.

The main characteristic of this space can be deduced from a further detail. Rather than being dependent upon the trees' botanical identification, the connotations of the *lucus* can be inferred from an external characteristic of the saplings, namely the fact that they are adorned with objects. In particular, the presence of *anathemata* confirms the sacred dimension of the place in which the action takes place and endorses the interpretative hypothesis[233]. An additional significant

[230] See MASSA PAIRAULT 1992a, p. 86; SIMON 1973, p. 32. Drawing on a suggestion by Romanelli, Massa Pairault's hypothesis is also centered on the interpretation of the saplings as myrtles, which are sacred plants to Venus Mirtea. Although Venus was the goddess most immediately connected to this plant (see e.g. PL. *Hist. Nat.*, XII, 3), Apollo was also revered in ancient times as myrtle's lord (see FERRARI 2011, p. 253).

[231] COARELLI 1989, §22. An overview of the notions of *lucus* and *nemos* can be found in SCHEID 1989.

[232] The first interpretation of the Etruscan tomb as a *templum sub terra* is in ROUVERET 1988, pp. 204-206, providing a comprehensive list of ancient sources (see ROUVERET 1988, pp. 204-206, esp. fns. 5, 9). See also ADAM 1996, p. 34. *Contra* ZANONI 1998, pp. 346-347.

[233] A different interpretation of hanging objects has been advanced by Luca Cerchiai, who emphasizes the mirroring character of those, which would evoke the dimension of alterity of the context. See D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 1999, p. 67: «[…] piante recanti una significative serie di oggetti che proiettano l'immagine in un'atmosfera fortemente allusiva: bende, corone, ciste e soprattutto oggetti in metallo, collane […] e i due grandi

element is related to the practice of hanging objects. As has been noted, in fact, «on n'accroche pas aux arbres du *lucus* des présents de valeur (de valeur marchande), mais les marques corporelles ou vestimentaires d'un statut dont on fait matériellement et symboliquement l'abandon, avant d'en acquérir un nouveau»[234]. After the *manumissio*, for instance, the released slaves would offer to the sanctuary the symbols of their past enslavement by displaying them on trees. Similarly, the Vestals would offer the symbols of their former social and juridical status[235]. Trees are the space of the material display of the objects which symbolize the past life and whose hanging/dedication marks the passage. This space materializes the limit, which can be crossed only once, between the two conditions, preceding and following the object consecration, respectively. Having been offered to the god, the objects cannot be reverted to their previous status of everyday objects and are consecrated to the god forever. As for *anathemata* consecration, the passage is also irreversible, just like every initiation.

The application of such mechanism to the inside of a tomb (or rather its antechamber, as is the case with the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*) is immediately evident. In materializing the natural space of traditional initiation ceremonies[236], the room appears as the physical space of the passage. Here, deceased people left behind the symbols of their life before their irreversible transition to the afterlife.

From a semantic point of view, this function assigned to trees can be compared to folkloristic traditions documenting the motif of hanging robes on a tree (or branch, or bush) and taking them back after having experienced a rite of passage and estrangement. Possible passages also include the path from life to death, that many traditions significantly

specchi […]. La presenza di questi ultimi sembra evocare soprattutto la duplicità dell'immagine dei comasti, lo sdoppiamento di chi "fa il *komos* come Dioniso" […]».

[234] DE CAZANOVE 1989, §26; the scholar convincingly proves that this practice is not connected with tree worship practices.

[235] See DE CAZANOVE 1989.

[236] See COARELLI 1989.

describe as a dive comparable to the one depicted in the second room of the tomb)[237].

The *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca* is an exceptional monument. However, the eschatological conception behind its antechamber frescoes is likely to be in line with that also observed in other tombs spanning the end of the sixth and the beginning of the fifth century B.C., when the tomb room is conceived as a liminal space in between life and death. More specifically, «la tomba non è il luogo del defunto: è un luogo intermedio, tra defunto e sopravvissuto, cui si consegna l'evocazione di eventi, cerimonie o riti, variamente coinvolgenti o celebranti l'assente»[238].

As mentioned above, the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca* represents a dance the rhythm of which is marked by trees. Small-size individual human figures move to the background and, in doing so, they lose their centrality, whereas dance as a whole proves the real protagonist. This arrangement appears to be articulated by the *lucus* trees, which fill the image both pictorially and semantically.

[237] For instance, Plinius (*nat.* 8, 81) recalls an Arcadian tradition recorded by Evander and dealing with werewolves who, before turning into wolves, would hung their robes from an oak tree («*vestituque in quercu suspenso*») and would swim across a stretch of water. After nine years, they would cross the water again, take back their clothes and regain their human appearance. For an analysis of Greek tradition and parallels within folklore, see BORGHINI 1989, pp. 103-104, fn. 9. Further evidence from folkloric tradition is provided by HROBAT 2007, p. 44, who analyzes oral traditions centered on landscape features in the area of the prehistoric and Roman site of Ajdovščina in Slovenia («Women used to tie their kerchief to a tree above the cave and then plunge into the chasm. They left their kerchief to take it back on their way to heaven. The dragon was supposed to redeem them»).

[238] RONCALLI 2005, p. 420. A similar consideration is arguably also valid for Tomb 4780 in Tarquinia, the frieze of which represents tenias, wreaths and a box hanging between small trees. In this case, the relevance of a female figure is also confirmed by the symposium depicted in the tympanum, where a woman takes part in a symposium type usually reserved for men (see STEINGRÄBER 1985, p. 370).

The *Tomba dei Giocolieri* in Tarquinia[239], dating to around the same years as the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*, shows a different kind of dance. The dance image (**pl. 41.a**), depicted on the left end of the right wall, constitutes only one of the thematic nuclei of the frescoes. In order to highlight some peculiarities, we can zoom in onto the scene as an isolated picture, although it can be fully understood only as part of the overall figurative program of the room. Even though several other readings of the overall scene have been proposed[240], the analysis formulated by Francesco Roncalli is the most fitting to the purpose of this discussion[241]. According to his interpretation, the walls show distinct spaces marked by different frieze heights, colors, styles, and figure dimensions and proportions[242]. The two side walls show «due itinerari distinti e contrapposti» leading to the rear wall, which is visually emphasized by reducing the size of the figurative field. In particular, while a music performance is depicted on the right wall, the fear of death and the possibility of a mantic mediation materialize on the left one. These are symbolically represented by a defecating man attacked by two black birds next to a tree and an old blind man (**pl. 41.b**), respectively. Finally, a deceased man eating the fruits of the Underworld and a ritual game signifying the liberation from corporeity are depicted on the rear wall (**pl. 42.a**).
Eleven saplings are depicted on the frescoes, ten of which belong to the same species and look «distinti da quello che appare come un

[239] STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 315-316; D'AGOSTINO 1993; TORELLI 1999, p. 148; ADAM 2012, pp. 249-251; RONCALLI 2005; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 156-158; RONCALLI 2017, pp. 570-571; HAUMESSER 2018, p. 359. The Tomb was attributed by Camporeale to the «Maestro delle Leonesse» (CAMPOREALE 1968, pp. 43-45).
[240] See in particular TORELLI 1997b; D'AGOSTINO 1983; D'AGOSTINO 1993.
[241] RONCALLI 2005.
[242] RONCALLI 2005, pp. 408-409. See also RONCALLI 2017, p. 570: «Un preciso movente, d'ordine semantico e non puramente ornamentale, deve aver comandato quell'ispessimento della fascia a spese del fregio figurato […] e la drastica inversione del naturale rapporto gerarchico tra la pagina centrale e conclusiva del racconto pittorico sulla parete di fondo e le altre che verso quella convergono».

progressivo stadio di fioritura»[243], «quasi a scandire il tempo di una rinascita in atto»[244].

Therefore, the sapling of the dance section belongs to a series ideally linking all different figurative areas. The trees are also integrated with the groups and the figures, and contribute to defining their distribution. More specifically, they mark both the distribution of the groups on the walls and the distribution of individual figures within each group. In essence, what is relevant here is not the mere presence of the tree, but rather their location and distribution, namely the conscious planning of their presence and absence.

Plant elements are tidily located also between figures of the dance group on the right wall. A male playing the *syrinx*, who is likely to be Pan, is depicted in the center of the scene. The fresco is poorly preserved at his head's height, but the position of his arms holding the *syrinx* confirms he is represented frontally[245]. His legs are shown towards the right. By the musician are two symmetric pairs of female figures. The two in the center area are represented in profile, facing towards the *syrinx* player. Their arms are raised in front of their face and they are likely to be accompanying the music with songs. The two side figures are facing outwards. The one on the right has poorly been preserved, and only her arm is visible, while the well-preserved one on the left raises her right leg and arm. Her left arm is lowered along her hip. The only preserved arm belonging to the right figure suggests that she was represented in a specular manner, and her pose matched that

[243] RONCALLI 2010, p. 408 («Il primo, che introduce allo spazio dei due uccelli neri, ha un sottile stelo da cui si staccano coppie di foglie azzurre chiuse in una sorta di bocciolo a forma di tulipano; il successivo, che sorge alle spalle del giovane ignudo sulla sinistra della parete di fondo, è identico, ma ai calici delle foglie ancora chiuse si alternano brevi steli con bacche brune; a partire invece dal prossimo, verso cui l'uomo tende la mano sinistra, quasi a toccarlo […], fino all'ultimo visibile tra parete destra e d'ingresso, tutti gli alberelli hanno le stesse bacche e foglie alternate, ma le foglie sono dischiuse»).

[244] RONCALLI 2005, p. 418.

[245] On the meaning of the frontality, see CERCHIAI 2008, pp. 443-444; RONCALLI 2010, pp. 414-415.

of the other dancer. As has been suggested, the physical divergence of the two dancers «ne esprime probabilmente non già un reciproco allontanarsi (che non avrebbe senso), bensì il muoversi in cerchio»[246].

The entire composition and the position of the figures («il loro quasi liturgico disporsi in gruppi distintamente officianti»)[247] suggest that the image represents a ritual dance with a strong symbolic meaning. The matching attitude of comparable groups confirms that these are schematic and ritual gestures. Examples include a black-figure *stamnos* attributed to the Micali Painter representing a satyr who plays the double flute by two dancing maenads (**pl. 42.b**)[248], and a cylindrical travertine base from Chiusi (**pl. 43.a**)[249]. The base shows a male *syrinx* player and three female dancers and singers whose attitude matches that of the figures in the *Tomba dei Giocolieri*.

From a visual point of view, the trees neatly placed between the figures underline the rigidly symmetrical structure of the image and vouch for its ritual dimension.

In the *Tomba dei Giocolieri*, the three figures by the middle of the rear wall also perform to the sound of music. The flute player, the female dancer, and the male figurine in the basket are framed on either side by two saplings. The dancer, placed in a prominent central position, holds a *thymiaterion* above her head. As has been illustrated by d'Agostino by means of a comparison with textual sources and images, she is performing a *kernophoros*, a dance performed while carrying vases or small altars above the head[250]. According to his analysis, the male figurine in the basket is possibly offering to the dancer a prize consisting of buns (some sort of *kottabia*, as they are called in the

[246] RONCALLI 2005, p. 414.
[247] RONCALLI 2005, p. 416.
[248] Orvieto, Museo 'Claudio Faina', inv. 2703; dating to 510-500 B.C. See RIZZO 1987, p. 309, no. 125; CAPPELLETTI 1992, pp. 80-81, no. 21.
[249] Chiusi, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 2248. From Poggio Gaiella; ex Malaspina collection. See JANNOT 1984a, figs. 348-351.
[250] See D'AGOSTINO 1993, pp. 45-49. A discussion about *kernos*-carrier dance in Classical antiquity can be found in LAWLER 1951, p. 39 and LAWLER 1964, pp. 36-37.

Etymologicum Magnum, or *popana*, according to Pollux in *Onomastikon*, II, 169) which were kept in a basket and were also used in sacrifices[251]. What strikes the attention, once again, is a structural feature of the image. The female character overlaps with the bands limiting the image at the top and bottom, breaking the frame. A contact is established between the central figure of the tomb and another landscape element, namely the sea depicted in the lower band across all the walls. Trespassing the ground line, the dancer rests her feet on the crest of waves and emphasizes the tripartition of the wall space[252].

The musical theme and the use of plant elements to mark symmetry also characterize the *Tomba Cardarelli* in Tarquinia, dating to around 510 B.C.[253]. In this instance, an additional theme appears. The entrance wall shows two boxers by the door (**pl. 43.b**). As has been demonstrated, boxing scenes are not only associated with music on a general level[254]. Instead, they should be functionally associated with dance images, especially when combined with athletic game representations[255]. The

[251] See D'AGOSTINO 1993, p. 49. For a different interpretation, still not rejected by d'Agostino, see WEBER LEHMAN 1987, p. 116, who suggests that the dancer might be the juggler's target, focused on hitting the top of the *thymiaterion*. For an analysis of this image section, see RONCALLI 2005, p. 418.

[252] RONCALLI 2005, p. 418. See also RONCALLI 2017, p. 571: «Essa è la sola, nell'intero fregio, i cui piedi poggino sulla cresta di quelle onde: e al fine di farne meglio risaltare, nella resa a risparmio, il voluto stacco dalla linea di terra che traversano, questa è in quel punto ispessita. Ma non è la sola barriera che la donna ignora: anche l'alta fascia che la sovrasta è traversata per intero dal thymiaterion che regge sulla testa. Qui, per la prima volta, fascia policroma, linea di terra e zoccolo/mare si trovano associati nella loro complementare valenza di definizione spaziale proprio in virtù di quel "giuoco mantico" che rende la protagonista, e lei sola, capace di trasvolarli tutti e tre».

[253] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. MORETTI 1966, pp. 95-99; STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 302-303; D'AGOSTINO 1999b, pp. 27-29; CERCHIAI 2003; STEINGRÄBER 2006, pp. 99-100; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 86-89. Attributed by Camporeale to the Master of the Bacchantes («Maestro dei Baccanti»): see below p. 138, fn 261. *Contra* COLONNA 1970, p. 767, who ascribes the tomb, as well as the *Tomba della Fustigazione*, to the late production phase of the Painter previously identified by BROWN 1960.

[254] THUILLIER 1985, pp. 231-241.

[255] See CERCHIAI 2003. On the meaning of boxers on either side of the door and their link with the *Dioskuroi*, see RONCALLI 1990, pp. 241-242.

rear wall of the tomb shows on either side of a painted central door a *kithara* male player by a volute krater and a male flutist by an amphora, respectively (**pl. 44.a**). Either side wall presents a *komos* with two confronted groups separated by a central tree. In particular, the left wall (**pl. 44.b**) shows, to the left of the tree, a small flute player and a male figure with a loincloth moving towards the right. He raises his arms holding a *kylix*. On the right-hand side of the tree, there is a three-figure group moving towards the tree to the left. This group includes a small naked male holding a *flabellum*, a central woman wearing a long chiton and a cloak and, lagging behind, a small female holding a mirror and a *kyathos*. The figure in the middle is raising her right leg, and her outstretched arms hold the cloak open at hip-high. The right wall (**pl. 44.c**) shows two groups of male figures separated by a central tree. A figure dancing while turning her gaze backward and a small *barbiton* player stand on the left-hand side. A cupbearer and a man raising a *kylix* are depicted on the opposite side. The painter has described with great accuracy the gesture of the latter figure. The cup's foot rests on his forearm, and he holds the handle with his finger. He is twirling the kylix for the *kottabos*. Finally, four trees are depicted on each corner of the room.

The relation between the *komos* and symposium practice is underlined by the two vases on either side of the false door materializing the ultimate threshold between life and death[256]. This meaning is best supported by comparing a third-century Chiusine urn in Palermo from the Casuccini collection (**pl. 45.a**)[257]. The urn shows a

[256] D'AGOSTINO 1983, pp. 9-10 («confine tra il mondo dei vivi e quello dei morti»). Regarding the symbolic and ritual meaning of the false door («the *locus sepulturae* and the point of passage toward the Underworld») in Etruscan tombs, see TORELLI 1999, p. 150-153. The interpretation provided by d'Agostino is also accepted by COLONNA 1986, p. 459 and ROUVERET 1988. See BALTY 1985, p. 155: «porte qui constitue le seul passage entre le monde des vivants et celui des morts». *Contra* JANNOT 1984b; JANNOT 1988a, pp. 324-325 («Il s'agit de la porte de la tombe et non de celle de l'au-delà» ; quot. p. 324, fn. 40). For an overview of further interpretations and published references, see NASO 1996, p. 420, fn. 712. *Adde* VACCARO 2011; TASSO 2013.
[257] JANNOT 1988a, pp. 324-325, fig. 6.

central door framed by a *kithara* player and a flute player, which confirms the great success of this iconographic motif. At the center of the door, a winged female demon is sitting on a rock, according to an iconography used to represent the gateway to the afterlife also in other Etruscan tombs.
Therefore, on the visual level three different themes merge – and ultimately coincide – in the Tomba Cardarelli: *ludi*, *komos* (music and dance performed before drinking), and *symposium* (the actual drinking moment).

In the *Tomba Cardarelli*, the trees have a pivotal function with regard to the groups on the side walls. Conversely, by marking the corners, they delimit and hold the entire scene together. On closer inspection, however, their function does not have so much to do with the space within the image, but rather with the actual space of the tomb. The choice to place trees in the corners dates once again back to the inauguration of the sacred space of the *temenos* and highlights the sacredness of the place[258]. Although, in this case, they are not configured as a real fence (as is the case, for instance, with the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*), their strategic placement in the corners seems to enhance their frame function. This function is fulfilled in relation to the physical space rather than the figurative area. In other words, by establishing some sort of dialogue between representation and reality, trees provide a pictorial frame to the human action space.

Trees in the corners with the same function also appear on another contemporary tomb, attributed to the same atelier as the *Tomba Cardarelli*[259]. The *Tomba dei Baccanti*[260] is one of the smallest tombs in

[258] See e.g. FESTUS 146L; SERV. *ad Aen*. IV.20 (for a discussion, see ROUVERET 1988, pp. 204-205, fn. 5: TORELLI 1995, pp. 102-104).
[259] CAMPOREALE 1968.
[260] STEINGRÄBER 1985, p. 290; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 35-39. Attributed to the Master of the Bacchantes («Maestro dei Baccanti») by Camporeale. *Contra* BROWN 1960, p. 79, who ascribes the tomb to the same painter as the tombs *del Morto*, *del Vecchio* and *delle Iscrizioni*; D'AGOSTINO 1983, p. 11, fn. 14.

Tarquinia, and its style is very close to that of the tomb we have just analyzed. The overall image composition is similar, with trees that stand in the corners and the middle of the two side walls. Furthermore, this tomb shows a tree in the middle of the rear wall in place of the false door and on either side of the entrance door, in the area occupied by boxers in the previous example. The saplings are all the same and match these of the *Tomba Cardarelli*, with a red stem, four symmetric branches curving outward and blue leaves. Also in this instance, the frescoes are filled with a *komos*. In particular, the rear wall (**pl. 45.b**) shows a dancing *lyra* player to the left of the tree and a dancing couple at its right. The male partner holds a *kylix*. The left section of the right wall shows a dressed male flutist to the left, while a naked dancer holding a *kylix* is depicted on the right side (**pl. 46.a**). Two pairs stand on either side of the tree on the left wall. A dancer and a small flutist are on the left, and two dancers are on the right (**pl. 46.b**).

In addition to these of the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*, the *Tomba Cardarelli* and the *Tomba dei Baccanti*, a further example of *komos* is provided by Tomb 5591 (*Tomba Moretti*)[261], which shows stylistic similarities in particular with the *Tomba Cardarelli* and the *Tomba dei Baccanti*. The tomb walls are filled with a pictorial sequence of male dancers. The only female figure is depicted on the right end of the rear wall. She wears a chiton, a cloak, and a hat and is represented in profile, looking to the left. A flutist and a figure holding a *kylix* are depicted on the left end and in the middle of the same wall, respectively (**pl. 47.a**). A naked dancer, a youth holding a *kylix*, a *barbiton* player, and a man holding a basked are depicted on the left

[261] STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 373-374; MARZULLO 2016, pp, 234-236. Weber-Lehman ascribes Tomb 5591 (= *Tomba Moretti*) and Tomb 4255 to a group of tombs attributed to the Master of the Bacchantes («Maestro dei Baccanti»), active in Tarquinia from 510 to 480 B.C. The group, firstly identified by Camporeale (CAMPOREALE 1968, p. 35), also includes the *Tomba dei Baccanti*, *Tomba Cardarelli*, *Tomba del Teschio* and *Tomba della Fustigazione* (for an overview of archaic tomb painting workshops, with related references, see STEINGRÄBER 2006b, p. 71). See p. 135, fn. 253.

wall (**pl. 47.b**). Three naked dancers and a youth holding a *kylix* above his head are represented on the right wall (**pl. 47.c**). All figures are alternated with saplings. Four additional trees are depicted on each corner.

Dating to around 510 B.C. is also the *Tomba del Morto* in Tarquinia, showing a *komos* unusually combined with a *prothesis* scene, depicted on the left wall (**pl. 48.a**)[262]. A naked male dancer stands by the mourning scene gathered around the *kline* on which the dead lies. The back (**pl. 48.b**) and the right walls show the actual *komos*, including four naked males. A flute player stands opposite a bearded figure with a *kylix* on his back. A krater is resting on the ground in between the two characters. On the right wall, two figures dance towards the left. One of them brings the *kylix* to his mouth. A sapling with hanging wreaths stands between the two dancers.

Significantly, a polychrome vessel (**pl. 49.a**)[263] from the Monte Abatone 454 tomb (Cerveteri), dating to the end of the sixth / beginning of the fifth century B.C., shows a decoration with dancers that matches the arrangement of Tarquinian frescoes. In fact, individual dancing satyrs alternate with saplings along the entire vase, while wraps hang from above and dotted flowers fill the space between the figures. A wall-painting model for this container has been aptly suggested on a comparative basis. The matching subject («il soggetto della danza tra elementi 'paesaggistici'») and the rich polychromy, visible through macro X-ray fluorescence (MA-XRF) scanning[264], best support this hypothesis.

The tombs analyzed here above (first room of the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*; *Tomba Cardarelli*; *Tomba dei Baccanti*; Tomb 5591; *Tomba del Morto*) are the main instances of the archaic tombs depicting a *komos*.

[262] See D'AGOSTINO 1983, p. 4; STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 330-331; CERCHIAI 2008, p. 445; MARULLO 2016, pp. 237-242.
[263] GILOTTA 2019 (with published references).
[264] GILOTTA 2019, p. 108.

Few further examples will be analyzed *infra* and, as it will be shown, they arguably contribute to the construction of the same interpretative system.

As outlined above, music and dance appear to be a central theme on the right wall of the *Tomba dei Giocolieri*, where the Dionysian flavor rituality of *komos* is replaced by a dance directed by the musician Pan.
In all these examples, the predominant subject (music and dance) is more or less explicitly and in different ways linked to other related themes, namely athletic agons or *ludi* (e.g. *Tomba dei Giocolieri*; *Tomba Cardarelli*), symposia, and evocation of death. Among them, from a figurative point of view, the representation of the drinking moment always appears to be a marginal subject, relegated to confined spaces (or adjacent rooms), or evoked by symposium vases and practices such as the *kottabos* (e.g. *Tomba Cardarelli*; *Tomba dei Baccanti*; Tomb 5591), as it is common in archaic tombs[265]. The evocation of the dead *ex absentia* relies on *prothesis* scenes (*Tomba del Morto*) or symbolic false doors (*Tomba Cardarelli*)[266].

As we have seen, all these examples are characterized by the presence of plant elements. They essentially include saplings with monopodial ramifications consisting of four side branches and elongated strobilus-like plants with sporiferous leaves. A few tomb paintings alternate both types, while others show either one or the other.
Plant elements are always inserted in the image according to recurrent, if not standard, formulas, which provide a rigidly symmetrical layout for the images.
In all the tombs depicting a *komos*, trees frame the physical space of the tomb, and, in doing so, they provide the room with a pictorial structure. Their predominant arrangement in the corners confirms their liminal function. Even when the trees do not fill the entire wall, their presence in the corner appears to be a compendium, serving as a

[265] On the marginal arrangement of symposium images in Archaic tombs, see D'AGOSTINO 1983, p. 8; TORELLI 2004, p. 157.
[266] See D'AGOSTINO 1999b, p. 28; CERCHIAI 2003.

virtual *temenos* to the room space. In both cases (condensed form or whole fenced area), this mimetic representation mode calls for a mutual relationship between the image and the room. The painting contributes to cutting down the marked-off space of the tomb, which is sacred and where «nothing is accidental» and «everything […] demands attention»[267]. In other words, trees – mainly when situated in the corners – appear to be a visual tool to underline the room function. It goes without saying that paintings perform this task in tandem with the actual walls. Walls and frescos, however, do not have a matching role. On the one hand, the walls configure the static nature of the tomb, that is, they define its tangible spatial configuration. On the other hand, the decoration defines the cultic settings[268]. In delimiting the space, plant elements also contribute to qualifying it. Plants *participate* in ritual performances: they characterize dances as comastic dances ritually positioned in a funerary context.

Francesco Roncalli has convincingly shown that, since the end of the sixth century B.C., tomb painting must be conceived as «un'arte nella quale si è ormai realizzato un pieno adeguamento delle peculiari risorse del mezzo pittorico alla funzione rituale, il loro globale asservimento ai contenuti e scopi ideologici e cultuali»[269]. The sacredness assigned to the place by the presence of a fence, in fact, matches the image content, which focus on funeral celebrations and ceremonies.

The different themes identified in the images analyzed above merge into a single theme, namely funerary rituality. Within the sacred and liminal space of the grave, archaic tomb paintings stage the solemn ceremonial rituals that would accompany the deceased in the moment

[267] On the meaning of ritual settings, based on the idea of an intertwined relationship between place and ritual, see SMITH 1987 (quot. p. 104). On ritual space planning in Etruria, see WARDEN 2016.
[268] The sea-base of the *Tomba dei Giocolieri* and a number of other tomb paintings confirm the symbolic nature of frameworks.
[269] RONCALLI 1990, p. 231.

of their passage to the afterlife[270]. As has been shown, in Etruscan tomb paintings, funeral *komos* sits at an intermediate stage between the human and the supernatural, as opposed to Greek vase painting conventions where its more varied use traditionally does not refer to funeral contexts. In other words, it belongs to the ritual level laying in between the spheres of life and the afterlife[271].

In addition to providing a frame for the room, plant elements also impact the images internally, marking the separation between figures and between groups of figures involved in the ceremonies. Plant elements visually mark a structural peculiarity shared by all of these images: symmetrical and specular arrangement. Alongside landscape features, this balanced set-up employs additional figurative elements, such as false doors and wine containers. Moreover, as has been aptly illustrated in recent years, the multicolored stripes running on the upper section of the walls, which are likely to be a conscious tool to convey equilibrium and regularity, confirm that such effect is not accidental[272].

This structural feature matches the «repertorio definito di gesti»[273] appearing in the images. The repetitiveness of gestures and dance steps is consistent with the ritual context. Each condensed, crystallized, and repeated moment conveys the ceremonial nature of the represented gesture[274]. *Mutatis mutandis*, the entire schematized composition confers an aura of ritual to the image. Rather than being an innovation, the taste for a symmetrical construction of dance and music scenes is a stylistic preference, which finds further ancient and contemporary parallels in Italic and Greek figurative repertoires. For instance, examples can be found in the pioneering dance images by the

[270] D'AGOSTINO 1983; RONCALLI 2005, p. 420.
[271] TORELLI 1999, p. 156. On the *komos* in Etruscan tomb paintings, see D'AGOSTINO 1999b; CERCHIAI 2008. For an overview of *komos* in Greek vase painting, see ISLER-KERÉNYI 2007, pp. 107-158; OSBORNE 2018, pp. 171-175 (both providing a comprehensive bibliography on this subject).
[272] RONCALLI 2017.
[273] D'AGOSTINO 1983, p. 2.
[274] CATONI 2008.

Francavilla Painter showing dancing silhouettes interposed with geometric floral decorations[275], and in several geometric vases featuring comparable funeral dances, the ritual nature of which can be inferred by the fact they include *prothesis* scenes [276].

However, landscape details, which in Etruscan tombs are functional to symmetrical structuring, are not *necessary* for symmetry in absolute terms. In this sense, they prove to be a peculiar tool. The comparison with contemporary Attic black-figure pottery is likely to endorse this point. Greek black-figure production, in fact, provides a close parallel in terms of iconography, although it is not the primary stylistic reference for these Etruscan tombs. In particular, some painters, such as the Amasis Painter, show related subjects and a comparable «fastidious, symmetrical arrangement»[277] of the figures[278]. However, while looking to create a similar visual effect, these Attic examples lack entirely any landscape details.

A further comparison can be drawn with the Chiusine cinerary urns. In this instance, a few examples show saplings between performers (see e.g. **pls. 49.b** and **50.a**)[279], making it look as though they have been extracted from more complex tomb scenes. However, no

[275] Basel, Antikenmuseum und Sammlung Ludwig; Basel, art market (both edited in MARTELLI 2008a, p. 10, figs. 39-41).

[276] See e.g. Athen, National Archaeological Museum, inv. 806; Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1916.55 (for images and a discussion, see CATONI 2005, pp. 182-194, esp. 193-194; see also p. 182, fn. 81 for a comprehensive bibliography on funerary representations in geometric pottery).

[277] HENRICHS 1987, p. 102.

[278] For instance, the Amasis Painter production documents not only isolated images of boxers (e.g. shoulder of the amphora Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, acc. n. 76.AE.48 and Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, acc. n. 86.616; BOTHMER 1985, p. 118, no. 20) or *komoi* (e.g. amphoras Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. F 36: BOTHMER 1985, pp. 81-82, no. 5; and Basel, Antikenmuseum und Sammlung Ludwig, inv. Ka 420), but also the association between the two themes (e.g. amphora with satyrs and female figures flanking Dionysus; formerly Berlin, Antikensammlung inv. 3210, now lost: HENRICHS 1987, p. 101, fig. 2).

[279] **Pl. 49.b**: Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. 1237 (JANNOT 1984a, pp. 35-36, no. 3, figs. 143-145); **pl. 50.a**: Siena, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 49 (JANNOT 1984a, p. 35, no. 2, fig. 142).

landscape elements are represented in most dance scenes, which constitute a widespread subject in this category of monuments[280]. Moreover, tomb paintings and the urns from Chiusi share an additional feature. A specific characteristic of the urns featuring dance scenes is in fact the presence of trees carved in relief in the corners («le rameau angulaire feuillu qui deviant le décor habituel de la plupart de nos monuments») in light of which Jannot maintains that «il nous semble donc certain que ces danses sont des rites de plein air, mais qu'elles se déroulent en des lieux consacrés»[281].
Finally, it can also be noted that the same motif appears in a distinctive («sinora isolate nell'artigianato artistico dell'Etruria meridionale»)[282] terracotta painted urn in Tarquinia (**pl. 50.b**)[283], whose relationship with the *Tomba del Barone* frescoes has already been discussed[284].

The system defined so far is apparently contradicted by three tombs, which complete the list of tombs dating to the Archaic period featuring dance and *komoi*[285]. These tombs are the *Tomba delle Iscrizioni*, the *Tomba*

[280] A discussion of dancing scenes in Chiusine reliefs can be found in JANNOT 1984a, pp. 314-340.
[281] JANNOT 1984a, p. 318. The comparison between Chiusine urns and tomb paintings is not a novelty. For some remarks on their matching *imagerie*, see e.g. *ibid*. p. 387: «La nature des reliefs qui s'y développe éclaire la function des cippes et des bases : l'identité de répertoire les assimile de quelque manière à des tombes, et par contre-coup, l'étude de ces reliefs vient préciser la connaissance que nous avons des peintures pariétales».
[282] WEBER-LEHMAN 2019, p. 183.
[283] Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 1417. GASSER 1969, p. 54, no. 63; CIAGHI 1986, pp. 297-298, no. 759, figs. 305-308; WEBER-LEHMAN 2019 (with published references).
[284] GASSER 1969, p. 54, nos. 62-63. S.C. 1986, p. 298 (with further references); *contra* WEBER-LEHMAN 2019, p. 186.
[285] For the aforementioned reasons (see above, p. 128, fn. 227), the list does not include the *Tomba del Teschio* and the *Tomba del Morente*. LUBTCHANSKY 2006, p. 222 includes also the *Tomba del Barone* in the group of tombs featuring a *komos*. I would rather follow a different interpretation of the rear wall, based on AMANN 2001 and RONCALLI 2003. TORELLI 1999, pp. 154-155 qualifies also the image on the right wall of Tomb 1999 in Tarquinia, featuring two confronted dancing satyrs, as the representation of a *komos*. I will include this last example in the section to follow

della Fustigazione, and the *Tomba delle Leonesse*. Finally, the *Tomba del Topolino* provides an inverse and contrasting argument to prove the interpretative system of these images.

The *Tomba delle Iscrizioni*, dating to about 520 B.C., shows a rather articulated figurative decoration, which is only documented via photographs and drawings on tracing papers[286]. Three false doors stand out in the middle of the back and side walls, respectively. The rear door represents the endpoint of two marches starting each on one of the side walls, just after the doors. In particular, the right end of the left wall shows a parade of men on horseback (**pl. 51.a**), while the left section of the right wall depicts a *komos* including a male flute player and male dancers carrying symposia vases towards the left (**pl. 51.b**). The wall sections by the entrance door show games and fight scenes.

The overall figurative system of this tomb matches the features of the other contemporary graves. In fact, both the themes and the symmetrical arrangement are consistent with the other examples. In this instance, the split by thematic groups is entrusted to the false doors, which occupy the entire wall height and distinctly mark the subject-based classification.

The unusual arrangement of the *komos* requires further analysis. In the *Tomba delle Iscrizioni*, the revelers are represented in a row, without any landscape elements between them. This singularity is likely due to the different nature of this dance, which belongs to a different moment of the ritual. The revelers' arrangement suggests that they form a procession towards the central door. Therefore, this formula lacking any internal articulation arguably expresses the dancers moving from

(*Plants, Music and Dance – Archaic Tomb Painting, Athletic Competitions and Symposia*; see pp. 150-151), dealing with tomb paintings that combine the representation of dance performances with other leading themes.

[286] STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 319-320; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 166-172. BROWN 1960, p. 79 and D'AGOSTINO 1983, p. 11, fn. 14 ascribe the tomb to the same painter as the *Tomba del Morto* and *Tomba del Vecchio*. *Contra* CAMPOREALE 1968, p. 35; STEINGRÄBER 2006b, p. 71.

one place to another instead of dances popular in contemporary tomb paintings.
On closer inspection, the frescos of the *Tomba delle Iscrizioni* do not entirely lack any landscape elements. Two small saplings, in fact, stand to the left of the left false door and to the right of the right false door, respectively. Since only one sapling is depicted on just one side of each door, the two plants create symmetry between the two side walls and highlight the asymmetry between either side of the two doors. Therefore, the presence of the saplings is not likely to be directly related to the doors, as is the case with trees flanking doors in other tomb paintings. Instead, they are meant to connect the two walls through a visual link that materializes the split of the tomb into two sections. One would be the grave area by the entrance, characterized by an autonomous figurative decoration and delimited by the double tree-door threshold. The other would be the inner part of the room, including the *komos* and the parade on horseback towards the back door. However, this use of plant elements is not related to representations of dance and music performances and will be discussed in more detail in the following sections[287].

Like the *Tomba delle Iscrizioni*, the *Tomba della Fustigazione*[288] essentially lacks any landscape representations. The paintings are well visible after the restoration[289]. This tomb can be compared to the *Tomba Cardarelli* as for the boxers depicted on either side of the entrance wall (**pl. 52.a**) and for the two male figures flanking the false door on the rear wall (**pl. 52.b**). In particular, a *kithara* player stands to the left and a dancer with a *kylix* to the right[290]. The *kithara* player turns back towards

[287] See below pp. 301-302.
[288] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis; dating to 520-510 B.C. STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 312-313; D'AGOSTINO 1999b, p. 27; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 143-145. See p. 135, fn. 253; p. 138, fn. 261 for its attribution.
[289] See CECCHINI 2012.
[290] The fresco is poorly preserved, especially with regard to the right section of the wall. D'AGOSTINO 1999, p. 27 interprets the figure as a flute player. Following its restoration, it has been possible to recognize him as a dancer holding a *kylix* (see CECCHINI 2012).

a figure depicted in the side wall. On either side of the door, a vase rests on the ground between the male figure and the door. Two additional large false doors occupy the central area of the two side walls. On the right wall, two erotic groups are depicted on either side of the door (**pl. 53.a**). On the left wall, two dancing revelers wearing a breechcloth dance on either side of the opposite door (**pl. 53.b**).
Despite its similarity to other contemporary tombs, the abridged *komos* of the *Tomba della Fustigazione* shows a characteristic that is only apparently banal. The four doors (the real one on the entrance wall and these painted in the middle of the other three walls) play a prominent role. The few and sparse figures taking part in the *komos* are thus separately set between a door and a corner. They are not required to build a unitary whole, that is, to represent an overall ceremony *in progress*. The painter seems instead to resort to these figures as individual snapshots that are disconnected from each other, though referring to a shared thematic context.

The rear wall of the contemporary *Tomba delle Leonesse* shows a further scene of music and dance (**pl. 54.a**)[291]. Standing in the middle is a large krater flanked by a man playing the *lyra* and a double-pipe player. To the left, a female dancer moves towards the left. To the right, a couple composed of a male and a female figure performs a lively dance holding an *oinochoe* and a *simpulum*[292]. Near the corner, another

---

His attitude, with the left arm stretched out in front of his head and the right one raised above his head, matches that of a number of other male dancers holding *kylikes* in contemporary tombs.

[291] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis; dating to around 520 B.C. STEINGRÄBER 1985, p. 322; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 178-182. Attributed by Camporeale to the «Maestro delle Leonesse», who would have worked also on the *Tomba dei Giocolieri* (CAMPOREALE 1968, pp. 43-45). On this tomb, see D'AGOSTINO 1983, pp. 8, 12, fns. 27, 36; ROUVERET 1988, pp. 209-210 (who suggests that the tomb represents «la tente provisoire qui abritait le lit lors de l'exposition du cadavre»); MASSA PIRAULT 1992, p. 87; RONCALLI 2014a, p. 60.

[292] Drawing on a suggestion by Roncalli, Massa Pairault (MASSA PIRAULT 1992, p. 87) suggests interpreting the scene as a representation of the *kraterismos* practice and connecting this tomb painting to the cult of Dionysus.

oinochoe is on the floor behind the male dancer. Given its central position, the krater appears as the critical element of the image. It represents the pivotal element – bespoken to the scene – around which the symmetrical image system is arranged. The lower register shows blue waves with dolphins jumping in and out of the water while birds fly above it. This painting is interrupted behind the krater, where there is a niche in the wall. The left and the right walls, the principal register of which displays large reclining banqueters, show the same wave decoration in the lower register. With regard to this analysis, the columns depicted in each of the four corners are the outstanding feature of this tomb. Two other columns are depicted in the middle of each side walls. Their meaning can be inferred from comparing the frescos showing trees in the corners. Therefore, the columns appear to be linked to the persistent (though implicit) theme of the *temenos* that *angulos adfixos habeat ad terram*[293]. The significance of the virtual visual space defined by the columns is evident in the fact that they take up the entire wall height. Irrespective of the different register division and thematic changes, they impose themselves on the lower section occupied by waves, dolphins, and birds, where no architectonic structure would appear consistent with the figurative repertoire[294].

Finally, the *Tomba del Topolino*[295] represents a «caso limite»[296] and shows that, even though plant elements are not necessary to describe *komoi*, the opposite is also true. In other words, just like trees can be replaced by other figurative elements with a similar function, the *komos*

[293] CIC. *nat. deor.* 2.125. See above p. 129.
[294] The motif widely spread across the Mediterranean area from the Archaic to the Hellenistic period. Regarding the allusive function of column representation («colonnato come allusione al passaggio da una dimensione all'altra») on Archaic Greek and Sicilian terracotta sarcophagi (decorated with columns in the interior) and on Hellenistic Campanian painted tomb featuring columns, see BENASSAI 2005, pp. 145-147.
[295] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis; dating to 490 B.C. STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 352-353; CERCHIAI 2001; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 375-378.
[296] CERCHIAI 2008, p. 441.

can also be replaced by other figurative elements, without the overall iconographic and semantic content being distorted.
This tomb, in fact, presents all the thematic elements detected in the other tombs representing *komoi*. However, these elements are all sorted with different figurative solutions to what we have observed so far. The two gables show banqueters and *Mischwesen.* Furthermore, two male dancers are depicted on the entrance gable (**pl. 54.b**). They raise their legs and arms and their attitude matches these of other revelers in Archaic tombs. On the rear wall, two large trees stand by a central false door (**pl. 55.a**). A little mouse climbs up the branches of the left tree (**pl. 55.b**). While the entrance wall is deeply damaged and its fresco is no longer preserved, two trees clearly stand on either side wall (**pl. 56.a**). On the left one, a winged phallus is depicted to the left[297]. The themes appearing in these images are the symbolic celebration of the deceased or death (false door on the rear wall), the symposium (gables), as well as additional references to the world of Dionysus (e.g. panther; *anaskelos*; winged phallus; little mouse)[298]. Dionysian symbolism thus figuratively replaces the narration of the *komos*, that is the Dionysian event. The visual space is emptied of the explicit representation of a ceremonial dance. By contrast, it is enhanced with symbols alluding to the same cultural sphere, «quasi elementi animati di un *kottabos* immaginario»[299]. Therefore, while the reference to the symposium is preferably made through the *komos* moment, the same ritual can also be referred to by selecting other moments and making condensed allusions. On the visual level, the different formulas share a structural feature. The delimitation of the pictorial space remains unchanged and still ascribed to the arrangement of the trees along the walls.

[297] The iconography matches the amphora from tomb 812 in Tolle (see above p. 120).
[298] As for the winged phallus, not only the erotic connotations, but also the bird is likely to be strictly connected with the Dionysian sphere (onbirds and *komoi*, see BONAUDO 2006; BONAUDO 2007).
[299] CERCHIAI 2008, p. 441.

PLANTS, MUSIC AND DANCE – ARCHAIC TOMB PAINTING AND SYMPOSIA

The extrapolation of visual segments depicting *komoi* from tomb paintings has made it possible to identify a system regulating the image configuration. Even remaining within the thematic scope of this section dedicated to music and dance performances, it is also possible to verify the existence of this system in other instances. In particular, we will consider the immediate successors in terms of chronological and thematic development of the pictorial compositions examined above. In terms of chronology, we will consider examples spanning from the end of the sixth to the very beginning of the fifth century B.C. At the end of the Archaic period, dance performance is no longer the tomb painting's main subject. The focus shifts to a different moment of the symposium: the actual communitarian drinking itself. After having played a relatively marginal role in the oldest frescoes, this subject becomes definitively more critical in tomb paintings imagery[300].

Some evidence of this trend is already visible at the end of the sixth century. The *Tomba dei Vasi Dipinti*, dating to the end of the sixth century B.C., shows a banquet scene with dancers (**pl. 56.b-c**)[301]. Trees with hanging wreaths and wrappings are depicted in the corners and between the dancers.

A symposium scene is a crucial feature also of the almost contemporary Tomb 1999's back wall, which is poorly preserved[302]. A small tree from which a *kithara* hangs is depicted on the left of the scene, involving two dancers and a flute player (**pl. 57.a**). Two satyrs dancing towards each other, separated by a small tree, are depicted on the right wall. The motif of the musical instrument hanging from the tree is worth of interest but hardly readable in context, as the paintings

[300] See TORELLI 1997b; TORELLI 2004, p. 157.
[301] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 357-358; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 406-411. TORELLI 2004, p. 120 assigns the tomb to the workshop of the *Tomba degli Auguri*, on which see MARZULLO 2016, pp. 29-34.
[302] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. Dating to 510-500 B.C. STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 363-364; STEINGRÄBER 2006a, p. 103.

of Tomb 1999 are very damaged[303]. In the Latin literary tradition, the motif seems to refer to a certain constancy to the renouncement of music[304]. This interpretation can hardly be advanced in the case of this tomb. Instead, with its banquet scene, Tomb 1999 emphasizes the musical theme. Nonetheless, a visual evocation of the theme of absence and abandonment – entrusted to the image of the hanging instrument – cannot be excluded[305].

Symposium and dance scenes are depicted in the major frieze of the *Tomba delle Bighe*, dating to 490 B.C. and deeply influenced by Attic technique (**pl. 57.b-c**)[306]. This tomb serves as a model for many late-archaic tombs, characterized by the emphatic placement of the three-*klinai* symposium. Dancers spaced by saplings are depicted on the side walls (although only the frescos on the right are still clearly legible). In the tomb, the theme is combined with the athletic one, starring in the smaller frieze above, where no landscape details can be detected.

The *Tomba del Citaredo* paintings, dating to 490-480 B.C. and characterized by Attic influence, are no longer preserved[307]. On the entrance wall, two boxers facing toward the center were depicted on either side of the door. Both stand between two trees. The outer trees stood along the corners. Two false doors stand on the rear wall and are flanked by saplings. Two dancers were depicted on the marginal areas of the wall, while two trees stood in the corners. A male flute player

[303] A hanging lyre also appears on the back wall of the *Tomba della Pulcella* in Tarquinia, dating to 510 B.C. (STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 341-342; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 301-306).

[304] See e.g. VERG. e*cl*. 7.24; HOR. *carm*. III 19.20; CLAUD. *Rapt*. II.31; *pr. Eutr*. II.59; *Epith*. 12; NEMES. *ecl*. 1.13-14

[305] A similar value can perhaps be attributed to the double flute case hanging from the tree-like shaft of *thymaterion* at the Metropolitan Museum of Arts, inv. 1972.118.87 (see *infra* p. 205).

[306] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 295-296; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 58-63. See also TORELLI 2004, p. 157. On the minor frieze with sporting scenes see *infra* p. 165.

[307] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 306-307; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 100-102. As for the Attic influence, Steingräber mentions parallels with the Brygos, Kleophrades and Panaitios Painters.

and four nude dancers – one of which holding a *kylix* – were depicted on the right wall. Between the figures, there were little trees with hanging garlands and wrappings. Comparable trees were also depicted between the figures on the right wall. These included a male *lyra* player standing in the middle of the scene, two female dancers, a female *crotala* player and a female flute player.
In these examples, the Archaic convention of representing dancers interspersed with trees persists and reveals it has become an established feature.

PLANTS, MUSIC AND DANCE – TOMB PAINTING OF THE FIFTH AND FOURTH CENTURIES

Around 470 B.C., the *Tomba del Triclinio* and the *Tomba dei Leopardi* show that the symposium – which entirely dominates the tomb's back wall – finally has a prominent role in Etruscan tombs. Dancers and musicians spaced out by saplings are depicted on the side walls of the *Tomba del Triclinio* (**pl. 58.a**)[308]. Their poses are more composed than those of the participants in the *komos* of sixth-century tombs. The trees are more slender. At the figurative level, their relationship with the figures is more pronounced. The outstretched arms of the dancers, in fact, extend over the plants, creating an effect of increased organicity.
Nonetheless, the scanning effect between the figures is clear. Birds, cats, and hares populate the wall space along with the dancers. The birds, particularly numerous, are depicted in flight or leaning against the trees' branches. There are a small ivy-shoot frieze on the top and a sea-wave frieze at the bottom in all four walls.

The dance scene on the right wall of the *Tomba dei Leopardi* (**pl. 58.b**)[309], which is slightly earlier than the *Tomba del Triclinio*, is characterized by an even greater dynamism. However, it lacks any naturalistic effect due to the absence of little animals. Also, in the *Tomba*

[308] STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 355-356; TORELLI 2004, pp. 157-158; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 388-393.
[309] STEINGRÄBER 1985, p. 324; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 190-194.

dei Leopardi, the dancers' arms overlap with the trees rising beside them. Furthermore, the particularly sinuous trees follow the profile of dancers and players. The winding nature of this dance image contrasts with the composed rhythm of the procession depicted on the left wall of the tomb (**pl. 58.c**). Six young men move to the right. Trees are represented at the sides and between the figures. Compared to the plants on the opposite wall, these appear more rigid and stiffly inserted between the figures.

The same layout (banquet on the rear wall and dancers alternating with saplings on the side walls) also appears in the *Tomba dei Fiorellini* (**pl. 59.a**)[310]. Two additional trees are depicted on either side of this tomb's entrance.

This arrangement is documented at least until the end of the fifth century, as shown by the central frieze of the *Tomba della Querciola I* (**pl. 59.b**)[311], which is characterized by rather conservative design and style than the minor friezes.

However, during the fifth century, there is no shortage of alternative organizations in which the symposium, while remaining the main subject, is developed in several figurative forms. The analysis of these cases contributes to tracking changes in the use of landscape elements.

The paintings of Tomb 4021 (**pl. 60.a**)[312], dating to 475-450 B.C., seem to lead back to the figurative arrangements of the Archaic frescoes, in which groups of dancers dominated the walls. A *komos* is depicted on the side and the rear walls, depicting a flute player standing in the middle of the scene. Two recumbent banquets are represented on the tympanum of the entrance wall. The re-codification of the relation *komos*-symposium is all the more relevant if we consider that the dancers of this tomb are separated by small trees sinuously moving

[310] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. Dating to 475-450 B.C. STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 309-310; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 134-136.
[311] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. Dating between the end of the fifth and the beginning of the fourth century B.C. STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 342-343.
[312] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. STEINGRÄBER 1985, p. 369.

between the figures, in an ensemble that has lost the rigidity of the previous century's corteges. A comparable organization is also documented in Chiusi in the back chamber of the contemporary *Tomba del Colle Casuccini*, which features dancers and musicians alongside swaying plants winding between the figures[313].

The appearance of schematic organization of the figures also diminishes on the side walls of Tomb 5513 (*Tomba Bettini*), dating to the middle of the fifth century (**pl. 61.a**)[314].

At the end of the century, the *Tomba del Gallo* (**pls. 61.b-62.a**)[315] shows a rather innovative layout and relatively original use of the tree motive. A banquet scene occupies the right wall of the tomb. A three-figure group with a male flutist, a female crotalist, and a masked dancer (Phersu) is depicted on the left half of the left wall. A loculus is dug into the other part of the same wall. To the left of the entrance wall, there is a *chitara* player, while on the right there is a flutist. A single tree is painted on the corner between the flutist and the group with Phersu. This is the only one of the four corners which shows a tree[316]. Conversely, in the second half of the fifth century, the *Tomba della Pulcella* (**pl. 62.b**)[317], today poorly preserved, shows the canonical arrangement of trees on the four corners.

Tomb 3713 (*Tomba Pallottino*; **pl. 63.a**)[318], dating to the beginning of the fourth century, shows a comparable loosening of the rigid angular

[313] The *Tomba del Colle Casuccini* dates to 475-450 B.C. MASSA PAIRAULT 1993, p. 253; MAGGIANI 2015.
[314] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 372-373.
[315] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 313-314; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 147-149 (with published references). See also MORETTI 1966, pp. 205-211 (where it is called Tomb 3226).
[316] For corner trees in tombs dating to the end of the fifth century, see the *Tomba Bertazzoni* (MARZULLO 2016, pp. 49-52). The poor state of conservation of this tomb does not allow for specific iconographic considerations.
[317] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 59, 340-341; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 301-306 (with published references).
[318] Tarquinia, Monterozzi Necropolis. STEINGRÄBER 1985, p. 368; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 273-275.

shafts' arrangement. The tomb frescoes depict dancers and musicians alternating with saplings, with no banquet image. They occupy the rear and the two side walls. On the entrance wall, which is poorly preserved, there are two trees on either side of the door. The rear wall – arranged «secondo uno schema geometrico»[319] – is characterized by remarkable symmetry. Two trees with curved branches and leaves stand by a central dancer with her legs in a chiastic position. A *chitara* player and a dancer are represented on the right and left sides of the wall, respectively. Next to them are two trees depicted along the corners. The trees' placement only on these two corners[320] suggests that their arrangement mainly provides a symmetrical framing for the rear wall and set a *trait d'union* between the rear and the side walls.

The *Tomba del Guerriero* (375-350 B.C.)[321] and the *Tomba del Gorgoneion* (400-375 B.C.)[322] show two different outcomes of what seems to be a transformation process entailing the use of trees in tomb paintings from the Archaic period up to the fourth century. Though presenting similar architectural layouts, these two tombs display very different figurative settings.

The *Tomba del Guerriero* combines thematic conservatism with more innovative stylistic solutions. On the one hand, symposium representation dates back to the previous century. On the other hand, adopted perspective solutions are firm references to the fourth century. The left wall of the entrance aisle represents a double flute player towards the left[323]. On the entrance wall (**pl. 63.b; 64.a**), to the right of

[319] STEINGRÄBER 1985, p. 368.
[320] Although the entrance wall is poorly preserved, the residual fresco does not provide evidence for a tree on the corner.
[321] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 318-319. MARZULLO 2016, pp. 161-165 (with published references).
[322] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. STEINGRÄBER 1985, p. 317; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 159-160 (with published references).
[323] On the double flute's value, see LECLERCQ-NEVEU 1989, pp. 263-264, who attributed chthonic properties to that instrument, as it was used during sacrifices and funerals.

the door, a naked warrior stands to the left by a sapling. Two horses dragging a chariot are depicted on the other side of the entrance wall. A tree is depicted behind the horses. On the left end of the left wall, a male double flute player steps toward the left. A tree stands just behind him, positioned by two boxers facing each other. A small flute player stands between the two boxers while a sapling closes the scene by standing behind the second fighter. On the right end of the left wall is the first part of the symposium scene which continues on the rear wall. The left section of the right wall is lost, while the right one is poorly preserved.

The *Tomba del Gorgoneion*'s walls feature trees with wavy branches. A number of little birds fly through the branches. Two male figures standing by a central tree face each other on the rear wall (**pl. 64.b**). Two saplings are also depicted on either side of the entrance corridor. The trees' placement does not comply with the criteria of rigid symmetry. This is proved by their placement on the entrance wall, where two trees are depicted to the right of the door, while a single one stands to its left. No trees are represented in the corners, but the branches of the last tree on the right of the right wall occupy the corner and extend over the entrance wall.

In these fourth-century examples, trees still have a paratactic function: they split different thematic nuclei and coordinate the walls and their parts. However, the trees no longer respond to the priority need to divide space and images according to criteria of rigid symmetry, as the *Tomba del Gorgoneion* entrance wall proves.

In other words, trees are not arranged in a layout that schematically defines the space *a priori*. On the contrary, they provide a stronger characterization of the space itself by creating a relationship between landscape elements and figures. We might state that landscape elements intervene in the image by acting from inside of the image itself. From a visual perspective, this effect is carried out both through drawings of more detailed trees (although always lacking in botanical precision) and through the mutual overlapping between trees and figures. Moreover, while an intention of creating symmetries and

correspondences remains strong, the arrangement of the trees on the wall seems to depend – *a posteriori* – on the placement of the figures. This latter aspect is mainly visible in the entrance area and on the left wall of the *Tomba del Guerriero*.

The *Tomba del Gorgoneion* – which completes our overview on tombs featuring music and dance scenes – represents a sharp break in fourth-century iconographic schemes. At this point, the symposium is, in fact, completely absent, as is any dance or music scene. Unlike the *Tomba del Topolino*[324], where the choice to represent only trees matched the inclusion of a symbolic repertoire consistent with the mainstream figurative trends, the *Tomba del Gorgoneion* bears witness to novel models, which signal a new way of drawing on Greek culture[325].

PLANTS, MUSIC AND DANCE – BRONZE MIRRORS

Since the early fifth century, scenes with dancers and players appeared on several bronze mirrors.

Three engraved mirrors in Berlin attributed to the «Maestro di Cathesan» by Mansuelli[326] show groups of three musicians. Two of them depict two crotalistas by a central flutist, while the third one shows two male dancers flanking a female chitariste. The exergue of the three mirrors is decorated with a sea motif (waves and fish). In the mirrors with flutist and crotalistas (**pls. 65.a and 65.b**)[327], two wavy ivy shoots arise from the exergue line following the mirror's edge. The drawing of the shoot is interrupted by the female arm and reappears over the musicians' head, where the shoots link up, closing the frame.

[324] See above pp. 148-149.
[325] See TORELLI 2004, p. 160.
[326] MANSUELLI 1948, p. 49.
[327] **Pl. 65.a**: Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. Fr. 18, dating to around 490 B.C. (GERHARD 1843, tab. XCVIII, with inaccurate drawing which not includes the flute recognizable in the mirror; BAGLIONE 1976, pp. 114-115, no. 3, tab. LXIX; ZIMMER 1995, p. 17, no. 5); **pl. 65.b**: Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. Fr 19, dating to around 490 B.C. (BAGLIONE 1976, p. 116, no. 4, tab. LXX).

Two tall flowers with curving leaves and fan-shaped corolla space out the three figures.
The third mirror, showing a female kithara player and two dancers (**pl. 66.a**)[328], shows a thinner ivy branch frame. Two saplings stand in between the figures.

These images can be compared to those on another engraved mirror (**pl. 66.b**)[329] showing a female flutist and a female dancer. They stand on either side of a central tree. In this instance, the frame takes the form of two wavy ivy shoots arising from the exergue's line.
The style of these mirrors can be compared to the Attic vase production of the end of the sixth and the beginning of the fifth century B.C. In particular, the draperies match some examples of the Leagros Group[330]. The stylistic affinity is augmented by thematic consistency. The large black-figure *kylix* from Falerii Veteres produced by the ateliers of the Leagros Group, for instance, shows two crotalists dancing in between ivy leaves before the god Dionysus[331].

Although the subject is definitively not innovative, the way in which it is treated on Etruscan mirrors emphasizes some peculiarities in relation to the Etruscan use of landscape elements. First, the attention is drawn to the persistent representation of the sea in the lower exergue, which is not uncommon in Etruscan mirrors and will be discussed more extensively in the following chapters. Secondly, the compositional structure highlights the systematic use of plant elements to mark intervals between human figures.

A comparable – although specular – use of saplings is visible on a mirror in Berlin (**pl. 67.a**)[332], which depicts two female dancers represented in a specular manner and facing the center. On either side

[328] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. Fr. 20; dating to around 480 B.C. (ZIMMER 1995, pp. 17-18, no. 6).
[329] Bern, private collection. JUCKER 2001, pp. 68-70, no. 33. Formerly on the art market: see REUSSER 1986, pp. 28-29, no. 6.4.
[330] See BAGLIONE 1976, p. 115.
[331] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia; from the Celle necropolis.
[332] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. Fr. 17; dating to 510-490 B.C. (ZIMMER 1995, pp. 16-17, no. 4).

of the scene, there is a palmette. This plant is of the same type as the plants in the other examples.

An additional observation about the group of analyzed mirrors relates to the frame. The interaction between plants and figures, which we have highlighted, grants the frame a dual-status and a double function. On the one hand, the plants rising from the ground line take the form of a frame. On the other hand, the frame itself enters the image and plays an active role.
This last connection is further reinforced by analyzing a Praenestine mirror showing a draped female figure playing the flute between two dancing, draped women (**pl. 67.b**)[333]. The medallion shows a regular laurel-leaf border and there is no landscape background. The two dancers, whose feet overlap with the exergue area and the leaf outline, stretch their arms towards the laurel branches. The figure on the right hand side grabs the frame, holding it like a branch.
The fluid frame, simultaneously characterizing and delimiting the figurative space, also distinguishes a number of mirrors representing single male or female dancers. The scene on a late Praenestine mirror in Boston, for instance, presents a dancing satyr and a large krater, both encircled by a wavy ivy wreath (**pl. 68**)[334]. The plant stems from the ground line and is drawn with thin lines and few leaves.
This frame can be paralleled with a late mirror at the Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, that shows a dancing maenad[335].

One additional mirror can complete our list of examples. A mirror in Viterbo (**pl. 69.a**)[336], dating to the early fourth century B.C., shows

[333] GERHARD, KÖRTE 1897, pl. 48; VAN DER MEER 2016a, p. 123, no. 161. Dating to the last decades of the fourth century B.C.
[334] Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 01.7525, dating to 300 B.C. See ELDRIDGE 1917, pp. 381-383, no. 5, fig. 5; DE PUMA 1993, p. 34, no. 12; VAN DER MEER 2016a, p. 118, no. 23.
[335] Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. MV 12239; dating to the third century B.C.

two dancing females facing the center while raising their arms. They are nearly naked, wearing only a *nebris*, suggesting that they are maenads. The two figures stand on a rocky landscape populated by plants. Between the two dancers, a large bell-shaped flower grows from the ground in the middle. A similar, though smaller, flower stands to the rear of the left figure. On the right side of the medallion, behind the maenad's shoulders, there is a tree with a tall trunk and branches with leaves. This plant grows from the wavy lines surrounding the scene. As in the previous examples, in this mirror, the symmetrical arrangement of the scene is highlighted by plant elements. In particular, the central blossom marks the specularity of the two dancing figures. Nevertheless, more than in the other cases, the use of landscape elements in the Viterbo mirror likely contextualizes the scene, as is also shown by the coexistence of rocks and plants. This same feature suggests that there is no question of interpreting wavy lines as clouds, as has been proposed[337].

Wavy lines surrounding the figures often appear on Etruscan mirrors, cistae, sarcophagi and tomb paintings[338]. In many examples, it is hard to detect whether such lines represent the atmosphere (de Grummond refers to «stylized atmosphere»)[339] or the ground. In a few instances – such as the mirror with Phaun from Cerveteri at the British Museum analyzed above – tiny plants grow from the scalloped profiles.

The Viterbo mirror represents an interesting case due to the abundance of plants, which are consistently represented in relation to the lines. The presence of both such elements along the entire outline could suggest that the scene is set inside a cave. Ancient sources, for that matter, make several references to the rocky caverns as a

[336] Viterbo, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 121.009. BARBIERI 1999, pp. 42-43, no. 36.
[337] BARBIERI 1999, p. 42.
[338] A discussion of a number of examples can be found in DE GRUMMOND 1982a.
[339] DE GRUMMOND 1982a, *passim*.

temporary refuge for the maenads[340]. The interruptions in the lines of rocks – while it might recall the maenads' ἀνόροφοσ πέτρα described by Euripides[341] – and the presence of a tree, make the cave interpretation unconvincing[342].

As has been noted, sketched lines appear behind the figures «breaking up the emphasis on their contours and indicating that they are immersed in and inseparable from the surroundings»[343]. Rather than referring to a specific landscape setting, the image on the mirror likely endorses this purpose.

Nevertheless, placing the scene in a rocky setting may be related to the specific subject. The maenads' dance, in fact, directly evokes the Dionysian conceptual and spatial context, which is traditionally referenced in opposition to the regulated and regulatory space of the *polis*. Dionysus is a god in everlasting movement, a wandering god of the wilderness, «qui n'est nulle part chez lui»[344]. Literary sources and iconographic traditions agree in describing Dionysian feasts as courtships leaving the city to indulge in wine and celebrations in the countryside, hills, and forests. Dionysus himself, in fact, celebrates the Bacchic rites on a mountain outside the city of Thebes, the Cithaeron[345]. Although intimately connected with the city sphere, the god's world

[340] See e.g. PLUT. *de Is. et Os,* I. An analysis of Dyonisus' relationship with caves can be found in LAVAGNE 1988.

[341] EUR. *bacc.* 38. Il testo riporta la forma del dativo, «ἴνορόφοισ πέτραισ».

[342] Nonetheless, it is worth pointing out that in a number of Greek Hellenistic mirrors women grooming themselves by a water basin are depicted in a cave setting. Analyzing those scenes, HEINEMANN 2019, pp. 345-346 observed that «The rustic setting of untouched nature is in stark contrast with the refined make of the *louterion* featuring frequently in these scenes, strongly suggesting that these divergent elements, rather than depicting an actual space, serve as signifiers adding up to a wider notional complex: both water and grottoes are intrinsically linked to the habitat of nymphs, but their semantic potential goes well beyond that of simply pointing to a mythical identity. […] the grotto, in ancient Greek imagination, is the place *par excellence* for lustful encounters, especially illicit ones, taking place outside the normative framework of the *polis*».

[343] DE GRUMMOND 1982.

[344] JEANMAIRE 1951, p. 193.

[345] EUR. *bacc.* 661-662.

has a different nature than the city itself, and is accessible to humans only in particular moments. The connection with Dionysus can in fact be realized only through rituals (which include theater) or death. Dyonisius acts in the «monde sauvage de l'exaltation des forces brutes de la vie»[346]. In fact, he «n'est vraiment chez lui que dans les antres rocheux»[347]. The landscape elements depicted on the Viterbo mirror, which are structured around the image in the form of a frame, are likely to suggest that the maenads and their dance take place in a space that is geographically and conceptually located outside the city.

Finally, in the Viterbo mirror the figurative delineation of a separated space, closed in itself beyond the city and characterized by rocks and plants, is all the more relevant if we consider that the mutual relationship between landscape details and the mirror frame also stands out in this example. Rather than providing a general setting, the landscape takes the specific form of an outline. Thus, it is a liminal space marker. This example is well suited to conveying the liminal vocation of landscape elements, that is especially evident in mirrors.

PLANTS, MUSIC AND DANCE – RED-FIGURE VASES

After its wide diffusion during the Archaic period, which mainly affected black-figure vases and tomb paintings, dance- and music-based representations did not spread in Etruscan red-figure vase production[348]. For the purpose of this analysis, we should first observe that, although dance images are not entirely missing in red-figure vases, their actual subject matter appears to be rather different compared to that dating to the sixth and fifth century B.C. As we will see in detail, rather than being focused on public ceremonies the fourth-century repertoire is likely centered on the initiation dimension.

[346] LAVAGNE 1988, p. 50.
[347] BERARD, BRON 1984, p. 127.
[348] With regard to red-figure painting, I did not consider the *stamnos* of the Funnel Group at the Museo 'Claudio Faina' in Orvieto, inv. 2653 because it is heavily overpainted (CAPPELLETTI 1992, pp. 164-164, no. 56).

During the second half of the fourth century, red-figure column kraters produced in Northern Etruria workshops provide examples that are especially significant for the purposes of this discussion. In particular, a *kelebe* from Perugia (**pl. 69.b**)[349] – one of the few examples including landscape elements in the scene – is significantly close to the *imagerie* of the previous centuries. On one side, the vase shows a silen-like double flute player standing in the middle of the scene by an incense-burner and a growing upward vegetal-like element. The shoot, conformed in a somewhat unconventional manner, is composed of seven heart-shaped bulbs laying one on the top of the other. In 1922, the first editor of this vase noted that «È facile peraltro capire che questo peculiare festone tiene qui luogo di una colonna o pilastro, che indicava l'edifizio in cui il Sileno sta compiendo un sacro rito»[350]. Side B of the *kelebe* depicts a dancing female figure. Her torso is uncovered. She holds her robe with her hand at shoulder height. Two large wavy shoots with heart-shaped leaves grows on either side of the dancer. Generally speaking, the Perugia *kelebe* shows a rather unusual figurative formula, which finds no parallel in contemporary examples. Conversely, the arrangement of the figures significantly dates back to Archaic images, where wavy branches growing by dancing characters and saplings standing by flute players were widely spread. However, the *anakalypsis*, which clearly evokes the initiatic and Dionysian context of this image[351], shows that there is a thematic gap between the Perugia *kelebe* and the more ancient iconography. With regard to this analysis, this example is relevant because it shows a long-lasting resort to 'landscape patterns' in partially different figurative and cultural contexts. On closer inspection, the passage of corresponding patterns from one context to the other is fascinating, especially if we consider that ceremony and initiation

[349] Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 88160; from località Monteluce; dating to about 330-310 B.C. GALLI 1922, pp. 24-25, figs. 2-3; MONTAGNA PASQUINUCCI 1968, p. 90, no. LXXXV, figs. 112-113; MANGANI 1993, p. 138. See CRISTOFANI 1995, p. 11 = CRISTOFANI 1997, p. 187 for the neck decoration.
[350] GALLI 1922, p. 27.
[351] See CRISTOFANI 1997, pp. 180-182.

representations both hint at a shared ritual dimension, which is the *fil rouge* – in addition to landscape details – of these images. In other words, it can be noted that landscape elements that articulate Archaic *komoi* are subsequently (though only occasionally) entrusted with the arrangements of *bakchoi*, in light of their shared ritual nature.

ATHLETIC COMPETITIONS AND SPORTING SCENES

Athletic competitions and sporting games appear in a number of figurative contexts analyzed in previous sections. In particular, the depiction of sporting events spreads in sixth- and fifth-century frescoes from Tarquinia and Chiusi. These examples display a specific element of Etruscan sporting practice, namely funeral games, in which the preeminence of horseracing and pugilism stands out. The funerary (and ritual) vocation of these games accounts, at least in part, for their strong link with dance. In fact, dance and sport are not only two distinct decisive moments of the burial ceremony, but are often intertwined in a single ritual dimension in which music plays a key role[352].

Although representation of funeral games «favors a realistic rather than a metaphorical reading», «it also illuminates the splendor of these ceremonies, the expense involved, and so the social status of the families in question»[353]. Consequently, it also has value as a status-symbol.

Despite their possible realistic references, sporting scenes are drawn according to some abstract patterns which follow these analyzed in dance images, where landscape elements have a key structural

[352] A discussion of religious aspects of athletic contests can be found in THUILLIER 2017, pp. 229-231. On choreographic dimension of boxing scenes with relation to funerary contexts, see JANNOT 1985, pp. 72-75; THUILLIER 1993, pp. 38-42. For a discussion, see SZILÁGYI 1981a; JANNOT 1984a, pp. 340-357; CERCHIAI 2003; CERCHIAI, BONAUDO, IBELLI 2011, pp. 83-92. On armed dances in Etruria, see CAMPOREALE 1987 and SPIVEY 1988; on its aristocratic value, see ADAM, ROUVERET 1990. For an overview of chariot racing in Etruria, see BRONSON 1965.

[353] THUILLIER 2017, p. 230.

function. In turn, in tomb frescoes sporting images themselves are often arranged in a choice spot, as shown by boxers flanking entrance doors in many frescoes from Tarquinia.

Generally speaking, landscape elements appear in sports scenes with a lower frequency than dance scenes. For instance, the minor frieze of the *Tomba delle Bighe* – «il più ampio ciclo etrusco con raffigurazione di gare atletiche» – apparently showed no vegetal details. However, some plant details were depicted in the main frieze featuring a dance scene[354].

There are, however, significant examples of the conscious use of vegetal features. An example can be found in the *Tomba del Letto Funebre*[355]. While *prothesis* and banquet scenes of the back wall extend into the rear half of side walls, the front portion of the side walls shows a sequence of funeral games. The left wall shows an armed dance alongside athletic performances (**pl. 70.a**), while the right one depicts a male boxer (he has the *cestus* on the right hand) and a chariot racing (**pl. 70.b-c**). A row of thin high trees stands in the background, behind one of the horses. These trees have been variously interpreted as a *spina* comparable to that of the Roman circus, or as indicators of an outdoor setting[356]. Although Jean-Paul Thuillier has shown the unsuitability of the first explanation[357], a certain recurrence of trees in the

[354] STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 363-364. See also STEINGRÄBER 2006a, p. 103. On the main frieze with dance scene, see above p. 151.

[355] Tarquinia, Monterozzi Necropolis. Today the frescos are preserved in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Tarquinia. See STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 325-326; JANNOT 1988b; ROUVERET 1988, pp. 213-214; RONCALLI 1990, pp. 239-241; COLONNA 1996; STEINGRÄBER 2006b, pp. 139-141; FRÈRE 2006, pp. 168-169; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 195-200.

[356] On the *spina* interpretation, see e.g. STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 325-326. *Contra* THUILLIER 1993, p. 29.

[357] See THUILLIER 1993, p. 29 : «On ne peut pas dire que ces végétaux servent ici de repères, de bornes, de *metae* pour indiquer, signaler l'endroit où les chevaux devraient passer et surtout tourner, et que nous aurions là encore une course se déroulant dans le sens des aiguilles d'une montre, ce qui est contraire à l'habitude. Et on parlera encore moins, comme on l'a fait parfois pour la Tombe du Lit Funèbre […], de prototype étrusque de la spina du cirque romain, puisque, comme J. Humphrey l'a bien montré, cette barrière longitudinale, située dans l'axe du cirque - qui n'a d'ailleurs jamais porté

representations of races must be highlighted. Their association – which will be analyzed in greater depth in the following pages – is likely to avoid vagueness in the environment characterization.

Regarding the side frescoes of the *Tomba del Letto Funebre*, the two blue trees depicted in the middle of either wall are most relevant to our purpose. In fact, the athletic scenes are separated from the adjacent sections with banquets by a double flute player facing the entrance whose image overlaps that of a high tree with single small lanceolate foliage. In both trees, the top is significantly superimposed on the upper frieze. The shape of the tree has suggested its association with the cypress and, therefore, with the *metas imitata cupressus* mentioned by Ovid[358]. While the suggestive botanical interpretation remains uncertain, the tree's color, arrangement, and layout are clear. The figure exiting from its two-dimensional borders and the resultant overlapping of the frieze, in particular, represent a formula which is well established in the painted panels from Caere, but is rather uncommon in the frescoes from Tarquinia[359]. It recurs in some isolated outstanding examples, such as the rear wall of the *Tomba dei Giocolieri* discussed above[360] and in the ambush scene on the *Tomba dei Tori*, where Troilos's head goes out of the figurative field.

Within the figurative field, the trees, located on the center of the side walls, visually mark the thematic partition between the two halves of each wall. Since the two thematic nuclei correspond to two different moments of the funeral ritual, namely the banquet and the funeral contests (or, alternatively, to the two moments of the passage to the Afterlife, presented from an earthly – funeral contests – and otherworldly – banquets – perspective), the trees likely also represent

le nom de spina ! – n'a été constituée que progressivement et tardivement, au IIe siècle de l'Empire. Contrairement à que l'on croit encore trop souvent, la spina n'est en rien une caractéristique originelle de cet édifice, qu'on serait alors légitimement tenté de chercher auprès des Étrusques».

[358] See ROUVERET 1988, p. 214, with ref. to OV. *met*. 10, 106.

[359] See RONCALLI 2018, p. 108.

[360] See above pp. 134-135.

the limit of the ritual area («la limite extérieure de l'aire rituelle»[361]). In other words, the trees are suggestive of distinct symbolic zones within the tomb itself.
Moreover, the outflow from the figurative field's boundaries indicates a further element. As has been observed, this formula appears to be in connection with the «volontà di attualizzazione degli eventi rappresentati», by means of a graphic expedient which «espande lo spazio simbolico e lo salda e assimila a quello reale occupato dallo spettatore»[362].

There is another feature of the side walls of the *Tomba del Letto Funebre* we should note. On both walls, another element can be equated with the two trees. Towards the back wall, on each wall, the banquet scene begins with a couple on a *kline*. In both instances, a blue post starting from the *kline* rises towards the ceiling and crosses the line of the upper frieze, the decoration of which is interrupted by the stick itself. While above the sports scenes there is an ivy vine, the banquet scene is surmounted by a festoon frieze. In the final part of the side walls, the *parapetasma* is framed by a frieze, while in the back wall the frieze opens up so that the drapes are drawn over the scene in the gable area. In the central area of the rear wall, behind the funerary bed, two more blue poles support the tent (**pl. 71.a**)[363]. Steingräber noted that the four posts are «entwined with foliage», as likely suggested by the blue color and pattern (**pl. 71.b**)[364]. As a result of the placement of the two trees and two posts on the side walls, on either side, three figures are framed by these two blue elements, which stand out cutting through the upper frieze. The 'framed' groups include a double flute player facing the entrance wall, whose musical instruments cross the tree's

[361] See ROUVERET 1988, p. 214.
[362] RONCALLI 2018, p. 108.
[363] STEINGRÄBER 2006b, p. 140 (with figure).
[364] STEINGRÄBER 2006b, p. 144 (with figure). The motif is reminiscent of the vegetalisation of columns, which was to become a widespread phenomenon in Roman painting (SBROLLI forthcoming) and is also documented in engraved Praenestine cistae.

trunk, a central male figure facing the rear wall, and a third figure moving towards the banquet scene and facing backward.

In general, as in the case of dance scenes, the use of landscape elements in athletic scenes consistently meets the need to emphasize the principles of symmetry and rhythm beneath the images. Examples include the saplings often growing alongside chariots, and plants standing by the boxers who flank tomb doors or false doors (e.g. in the *Tomba del Citaredo*).

Regarding representations of chariots, the row of trees in the *Tomba del Letto Funebre* which we have just described can be compared to similar trees depicted behind the chariot on the *Tomba del Guerriero*'s entrance wall (**pl. 63.b**) and to these of the first room of the *Tomba del Colle Casuccini* in Chiusi (**pl. 60.b**).

Vegetal elements under horses and chariots represent a partially different, as shown by the *Tomba delle Olimpiadi*[365] and the *Tomba delle Iscrizioni* (pl. **51.a**)[366]. These examples can be easily associated, on the one hand, with images of the same type in which hares or hounds appear under the horses[367] and, on the other hand, more generally, to figurative schemes involving the insertion of objects or animals between the legs of a number of figures arranged in a row[368]. The motif seems to date back to Greek models (see e.g. the Leagros and the Perizoma Group's *imagerie*)[369] and appears both in Etruscan scenes with a series of figures and images with isolated figures[370]. In the latter case,

[365] STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 333-334; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 250-252.
[366] See above pp. 145-146.
[367] A list of Etruscan examples is discussed in BRONSON 1965, pp. 95-96, who considers the animals depicted beneath the chariots as a «facile filling devices».
[368] See e.g. Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. E 704 (HANNESTAD 1974, p. 48, no. 29, pl. 21.a).
[369] For the Leagros Group, see e.g. Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. CA 4716 (COHEN 2006, pp. 201-202, no. 53) and Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, acc. n. 96.AE.95 (with rocks under the horses). For the Perizoma Group, see e.g. Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum, inv. L327 (STASSLER 2009).
[370] See e.g. the engraved mirror Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 12984 (BAGLIONE, GILOTTA 2007, pp. 64-66, no. 21).

the compositional scheme is likely to be taken from examples with several figures in series.

It can be noted that the principles which we have highlighted (symmetry and rhythm) are also documented by further examples complementing these provided by tomb painting.
Trees standing out behind running chariots, for example, recur in the reliefs of the urns from Chiusi (see e.g. **pls. 72.a-e**)[371]. Incidentally, relief monuments from Chiusi also provide two additional related examples that are likely to endorse the opinion held by Thuillier. As I mentioned above, the scholar denies that these trees represent Roman-like *spinae*[372]. Two urns in Berlin (**pl. 73.a**)[373] and in Perugia (**pl. 73.b**)[374] show the same trees: in the first example, the tree is behind a horse held by the bridle; in the second, it appears between human figures involved in a procession.

Confronted boxers (and dancers in a boxer's attitude performing a «combat mimé»)[375] arranged in a specular manner appear in black-figure paintings[376]. The amphora British Museum B64 (**pl. 28.b**)[377], the

[371] **Pl. 72.a**: Chiusi, Museo Nazionale Etrusco, inv. 823; ex Paolozzi collection (JANNOT 1984a, pp. 76-77, no. 8, fig. 268); **pl. 72.b**: Palermo, Museo Archeologico Regionale 'Antonio Salinas', inv. NI 8392; ex Casuccini collection (JANNOT 1984a, pp. 75-76, no. 22, fig. 265); **pl. 72.c**: Palermo, Museo Archeologico Regionale 'Antonio Salinas', inv. NI 8385; ex Casuccini collection (JANNOT 1984a, pp. 48-49, no. 8, fig. 172; THUILLIER 1993, p. 28, fig. 7); **pl. 72.d**: Palermo, Museo Archeologico Regionale 'Antonio Salinas', inv. NI 8386; ex Casuccini collection (JANNOT 1984a, pp. 80-81, no. 33, fig. 286); **pl. 72.e**: art market (see THUILLIER 1997b, p. 247, fig. 4). On occurrences of running chariots in the Chiusi relief's iconography see THUILLIER 1997b, p. 246, fn. 5.
[372] See THUILLIER 1993, p. 29, quoted above p. 165, fn. 357.
[373] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. 1237. JANNOT 1984a, pp. 35-36, no. 3, fig. 144.
[374] Perugia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale dell'Umbria, inv. 340. JANNOT 1984a, pp. 42-44, no. 1, fig. 159.
[375] THUILLIER 1993, p. 38.
[376] As for this group, I was not able to see the entire frieze of the *kantharos* British Museum 1865,1214.80, reportedly featuring a branch by the wrestlers (SCARRONE 2015, p. 53, cat. I.194bis).
[377] See above p. 114. For an analysis of the sports scene, see VAN DER MEER 1986.

hydria Budapest T.765 (**pl. 73.c**)[378], and the shoulder of the amphora Würzburg HA18 (**pl. 74**)[379], all attributed to the Micali Painter, show plant elements inserted in the space to arrange their place in the pictorial space. In the latter, rather than appearing between the figures, plants are under the legs of the two boxing satyrs, depicted among smaller satyrs, one of whom plays the *aulos*. The *hydria* 172 from the Poggiali collection in Florence (**pl. 75.a**)[380] – attributed to the Micali Painter's late production – can also be added to this group. The *hydria*'s main frieze shows boxers performing in a space with numerous shrubs with heart-shaped leaves comparable to that on the Würzburg amphora. In the Florence amphora, the wavy branches are depicted in both the foreground and the background to give an idea of depth[381].
On several occasions, a reinterpretation has been convincingly proposed for all these images, highlighing the choreographic dimension of the action being depicted[382]. They would clearly show, in fact, the «triple alliance, bien attestée en Étrurie, entre la danse, la musique et le pugilat»[383].

Unsurprisingly, the evolution in the treatment of landscape elements (that is to say, the progressive reduction of schematicity), which we have highlighted, can be compared to that observed in tomb paintings' dance scenes. Like in the case of dance scenes, in general, the choral and choreographic dimension of the image is associated with the

[378] Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. T. 765; dating to 520-510 B.C. SZILÁGYI 1981b, pp. 53-56; THUILLIER 1993, pp. 34-40, figs. 12-15; CERCHIAI, BONAUDO, IBELLI 2011, pp. 87-88, fig. 12; MENICHETTI, CERCHIAI 2017, fig. 8.
[379] Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum, inv. HA18. WEHGARTNER 1983, pp. 59-61; CERCHIAI, BONAUDO, IBELLI 2011, pp. 85-89, figs. 9-10, 14.
[380] Florence, Poggiali collection, inv. 172. CHERICI 1988, pp. 155-159, pls. LXXIX.c and LXXX.a-b; THUILLIER 1993, pp. 40-42; CERCHIAI, BONAUDO, IBELLI 2011, p. 87, fig. 13.
[381] In the Budapest amphora (T.765) some of the plants also overlap with the figures limbs, but overall the individual elements alternate in the figurative space with greater schematicity.
[382] See SZILÁGYI 1981a; JANNOT 1984a; JANNOT 1985; THUILLIER 1993; CERCHIAI 2003; CERCHIAI, BONAUDO, IBELLI 2011.
[383] THUILLIER 1993, p. 38.

use of landscape elements to arrange the image's components. The association is fascinating, especially if we consider the role played by music in the two contexts and the ritual value assigned to music and its connection with the concept of *rhythmos*[384].

Despite this clear datum, we should not forget that, as with dance scenes, the representation of plant elements in boxing scenes does not reflect crystallized figurative norms. Compared to dance-themed images, their presence in boxing images is even further away from being defined as canonical. If we broaden our analysis, we note that plants are often absent and that, in some cases, their presence is likely due to different reasons.

With regard to their absence, we should not only consider isolated examples by the Micali Painter (e.g. *hydria* Orvieto, Museo 'Claudio Faina', inv. 2700, in which boxers are depicted on a plain field)[385], but also take into account the case of entire classes of monuments in which the motif does not appear. The funeral steles from Felsina provide the most evident example: in these monuments, boxing scenes appear as crucial moments of funeral ceremonies, as is the case with vases and tomb paintings. On the figurative level, the steles' images are marked by a very strong symmetry, although there is no evidence of landscape elements to keep this feature[386].

Regarding different possible reasons leading to the use of landscape details, we should consider primarily the fourth- and third-century production of Praenestine cistae, where we can note a semantic extension of the value assigned to boxing occasion. As observed above about boar hunting scenes[387], the iconographic repertoire of mirrors and cistae shows a preference for mythological themes and subjects that, already widespread as generic themes, are selected as identifiers of a particular myth. In particular, rather than referring to generic social

[384] On these themes, see *infra* p. 309.
[385] See CERCHIAI, BONAUDO, IBELLI 2011, p. 87, fig. 11.
[386] Regarding the representation of athletic games in the steles from Felsina, see SASSATELLI 1993.
[387] See above p. 84.

events, boxing images on cistae are to be regarded as episodes of the vicissitude of Amykos, «Βεβρύκων βασιλῆος ἀγήνορος»[388], whose most famous figurative occurrence is the Ficoroni cista's engraving[389]. Therefore, rather than being considered athletic boxing scenes, these images are intended to be fight scenes[390] (and, as such, they will be analyzed in more detail in the following section)[391]. Pollux's athletic triumph over Amykos is, in fact, a warrior triumph, a celebrative formula of ethical aspirations and, therefore, a moral *exemplum*. Rather than being concerned with the dancing rituality of funeral ceremonies, the Argonautical combat is related with initiatic and Dionysian rituality, in which the celebration of aristocratic virtues relies on the plot of the myth[392].

The frieze of a cista at the Museo Archeologico in Milan (**pl. 75.b**)[393] combines «una generica scene di toilette presso una fontana» with «personaggi ripresi da raffigurazioni del mito di Amykos»[394]. The massive, knotty trunk which stands by the boxers is a well-documented motif in Praenestine production. There is no lack of cases in which an equally massive trunk replaces the even more widespread sinuous

[388] APOLLON. RHOD. II.1 ss.
[389] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 24787.
[390] See MENICHETTI 1995, p. 97, who considers the «mondo della palestra» of bronze cistae as an «elemento complementare alla preparazione alle armi in riferimento alla *paideia* maschile».
[391] See *infra* pp. 176 ss.
[392] Regarding the value granted to Amykos in the cistae from Praeneste, see SAPELLI 1975, pp. 241-250; GILOTTA 2002, p. 74.
[393] Milan, Civico Museo Archeologico, inv. A 0.9.1310. BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA 1979, pp. 133-134, pls. CLXI-CLXIV; CASTOLDI 1995, pp. 62-63, no. 68; MENICHETTI 1995, no. 38, fig. 16; GILOTTA 2002, pp. 74-75, fig. 18; LAMBRUGO 2011, pp. 70-72, no. 44.
[394] CASTOLDI 1995, p. 62. The scholar affirms that the two scenes are combined with no mutual relationship. Cf. BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA 1979, p. 134. *Contra* MENICHETTI 1995, p. 65, who identifies in the frieze a thematic polarity between female *pulchritudo* and male *virtus*; GILOTTA 2002, p. 74, who acknowledges in Dionysism «il vero elemento unificante delle due sezioni».

saplings or the slender columns that often fit between the figures[395]. In the case of the Milan boxing scene, however, the trunk echoes common images depicting the conclusion of the fight between Pollux and Amykos, with the former tying the latter to a trunk. In addition to the Ficoroni cista, examples include more coarse Praenestine monuments (see e.g. **pl. 75.c**)[396], Faliscan vase painting (see e.g. **pl. 76.a**)[397], bronze mirrors (see e.g. **pls. 76.b**; **77.a**)[398], and scarabs[399].
Therefore, as well as the fountain which often appears in these images, the trunk can perform a narrative or symbolic function within the image[400].

Within this context, there are some significant cases in relation to this analysis. Two examples, in particular, show that even in complex friezes such as these of cistae – where «una fitta vegetazione di tipo 'dionisiaco' avvolge [le] rappresentazioni»[401] and rocky backgrounds abound – the structural motif already recognized in painting seems to emerge. Just like in tomb and vascular painting, some engraved boxing scenes make use of vegetal elements to organize the image and symmetrically mark its sections. Examples include the tree standing in between two fighting boxers in a cista in the Vatican Collection (**pl.**

[395] See e.g. London, British Museum, inv. 1847,1101.15; see GILOTTA 2002, pp. 67-68, fig. 10.
[396] Palestrina, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 1493; see BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA 1979, pl. CCXV; GILOTTA 2002, pp. 74-75, fig. 19.
[397] Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 07.862; dating to 400-350 B.C.; attributed to the *Pittore del Ganimede di Oxford*. See HARARI 1983, p. 148, tab. 24.1; JURGEIT 2006, p. 603, fig. 4.
[398] **Pl. 76.b**: Toledo, Museum of Arts, inv. 1980.1340; dating to about 300 B.C. (MACCABRUNI 1977; CARPINO 2003, p. 24, pl. 32; see *infra* p. 203); **pl. 77.a**: Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale; dating to 325-300 B.C. (GERHARD, KÖRTE 1897, pl. 91.2; DE GRUMMOND 2006, fig. VIII.23).
[399] Oxford, Ashmoleam Museum, inv. 1953.137 (219); dating between the end of the fifth and the beginning of the fourth century B.C. AMBROSINI 2011b, p. 34, no. 35.
[400] For a more detailed analysis of fountains and trees in Amykos' images, see *infra* pp. 202-205.
[401] GILOTTA 2002, p. 68.

77.b)[402], and a cista in Berlin (**pl. 78.a**)[403] depicting two logs by Pollux and Amykos who are fighting. Confirming the semantic and structural dual reference of the trunk, the latter example shows Amykos with his arms behind his back as he is about to be tied to one of the two trees.
All such figurative constructions, based on recurring patterns, are partly affected by the use of 'stock-figures', which would be recurringly applied in the creation of cistae. Additionally, we should note that they are also influenced by the 'rhetorical' composition techniques governing the friezes. Comparing these elements with what has been analyzed in previous sections, we can note that it is no coincidence that narrative conceptions and iconographic choices of Praenestine cistae have been compared to those of some tomb paintings from Tarquinia. That choice was based on the idea that, in both cases, «il mondo e le sfere di competenza del defunto vengono […] rappresentati in maniera simbolica e rituale, attraverso schemi cadenzati e raddoppi speculari»[404].

In reference to the ritual arrangement of athletic competition, we can finally note that the system of superimposed friezes that recurs in bronze cistae has an Archaic parallel in the *Tomba del Maestro delle Olimpiadi* (**pl. 78.b-c**)[405]. This single-room tomb shows two superimposed unified friezes depicting athletic competitions and a row of trees, respectively.

In this section, I observed how boxing and chariot racing – the favorite athletic contests of the Etruscans – proliferated in several

[402] Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. 12244. BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA, EMILIOZZI1990, pp. 322-326, no. 102, tabs. CDLXVIII-CDLXXIII; MENICHETTI 1995, fig. 47.
[403] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. Fr. 541. BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA 1979, pp. 62-63, no. 8, pl. LXXI-LXXII; SAPELLI 1975, pp. 242-243, fig. 10; MENICHETTI 1995, fig. 50; GILOTTA 2002, pp. 70-71, fig. 14.
[404] Regarding the «retoricità» of the Praenestine repertoire, also in comparison with tomb paintings, see GILOTTA 2002, esp. pp. 68-73 (quot. p. 70).
[405] Tarquinia, Monterozzi Necropolis; dating to 530-500 B.C. STEINGRÄBER 1985, p. 326; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 204-209.

representations dating to the sixth and fifth centuries. As vase and tomb paintings bear witness, several images of athletic contests are characterized by landscape elements; by echoing the musical accompaniment, their arrangement provides a figurative rhythm for the athletes' races and blows. This pattern, well established in the Archaic period, likely also survives in some late examples by outlasting the semantic evolution of the athletic theme.

As far as the athletic topic is concerned, the specificity in the use of landscape details which characterizes black-figure vases is finally confirmed by another case that once again moves the focus on the frame.

The treatment of the theme is distinctive in an amphora – which served as an ossuary – attributed to the *Pittore di Gerusalemme* («Gruppo Tardo a Silhouettes») and coming from Tomb 155 of the Tolle necropolis, in the area of Chianciano Terme (**pl. 79**)[406]. Side A shows three youths[407], while side B represents two naked athletes and an athletic trainer. The decoration at the handles matches another amphora attributed to the same painter we have analyzed before in the 'Agriculture' section[408]. In particular, on either side, an ivy tree rises from the ground and grows vertically along a central support. As is the case with the other example by the same Painter, the shoots' upper ends extend to the area above the figures, showing a further example of an interaction between border and figures. Finally, due to the related subject, the athletic scene on the Chianciano Terme vessel can be associated with two lost vases representing two youths holding a halter and a disk[409]. One of them, in

[406] Chianciano Terme, Museo Civico Archeologico; dating to 500-480 B.C. See PAOLUCCI 2001, pp. 210-218, figs. 6-10; PAOLUCCI 2007, pp. 77-78, no. 1. On the Painter, see above p. 99, fn. 104. On the «Gruppo Tardo a Silhouettes», see SCARRONE 2015, pp. 22-56.

[407] See *infra* p. 178.

[408] The same decoration appears, in fact, in the amphora showing nude youths and a satyr by the same *Pittore di Gerusalemme*. The vase is at the Museo Archeologico Nazionale in Siena (see above p. 99; PAOLUCCI 2003).

[409] See SCARRONE 2015, p. 51, I.134 (pl. 9.a); I.138 (pl. 9.b).

particular (**pl. 80.a**)[410] shows a plant with a double inflorescence growing between the two figures.

3.1.3. *Duels, Fights, Killings*

The purpose of this section is to present images showing figures involved in fights, battles, and duels. In the following analysis, warriors' combats are examined alongside Amazonomachy, Centauromachy, and Gigantomachy.
While depictions of fights involving fantastic mythical creatures are included, examples of battles against monsters populating the path to the Afterlife are excluded. These examples will be presented in more detail in the following section.
Our analysis of landscape elements in fight images can be developed by examining individual thematic groups related to the general subject matter.

A first cluster includes examples that can be identified as armed dances or, more generally, as **fights figuratively related to dance or athletic performance**. This group is strictly related to previous sections' discussion. In several instances, the distinction between real fights, armed dances, and theatrical performances is not simple or even possible to distinguish[411]. In general, however, we can argue that – as is the case with Greek art – the distinction can depend on the context, i.e. by considering the involvement of other visual details and figures, such as weapons, musicians and musical instruments.

The amphora Würzburg HA18 by the Micali Painter (**pl. 74**)[412] – whose shoulder's decoration is analyzed above[413] – features a

[410] Lost. SCARRONE 2015, p. 51, I.134, pl. 9.a.
[411] See SZILÁGYI 1981a; LESKY 2000.
[412] Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum, inv. HA18. WEHGARTNER 1983, pp. 59-61; CERCHIAI, BONAUDO, IBELLI 2011, pp. 85-89, figs. 9-10, 14.
[413] See above p. 170

continuous frieze with Herakles fighting against a warrior. They stand by four other pairs of confronted warriors. Ibelli highlighted some iconographic peculiarities (e.g. the presence of armor, but not weapons; the arms' position) characterizing that fight as a boxing-like combat. The scholar also observed that the entire figurative program of the Würzburg amphora develops as mimesis of athletic practice[414]. In examining the landscape details of the main frieze, we can note that small plant elements with spherical inflorescences grow between the legs of the figures, while tall wavy filiform plants appear in the background between the warriors.

Similarly, dancers and warriors alternate in the frieze of a recently published *kyathos* in Erlangen (**pl. 80.d**)[415]. In this instance, simple wavy lines are depicted between the figures replacing plant elements.

In a black-figure *kyathos* on the American art market, which belongs to the *Gruppo tardo a Silhouettes*, two dancing warriors are depicted in a mirror-like arrangement while moving in wavy dotted branches (**pl. 80.b**)[416].

A black-figure *kyathos* in Frankfurt[417] starkly shows a relationship between armed fights and athletics, as well as a link between these performances and dance and music. In the Frankfurt *kyathos*, the wavy stem enclosed by dots which grows by the male flute player dates back to possible models from wall panting, where – as outlined above – the association between figures and plants matching these in the *kyathos* widely spread[418].

---

[414] See CERCHIAI, BONAUDO, IBELLI 2011, pp. 88-89.

[415] Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Antikensammlung, inv. MF 1340 (SCARRONE 2015, p. 53, I.199, pl. 10.d).

[416] *Günter Puhze* 1985, p. 18, no. 188 (with figure); SCARRONE 2015, p. 53, no. I.195.

[417] Frankfurt, Archäologischen Museums Frankfurt, Antikensammlung, inv. x 34; dating to about 450 B.C. STUTZINGER 2012, p. 70, fig. 57.

[418] Armed dances (and especially pyrrich dances) are well documented in the fifth-century black-figure vase production: see e.g. the amphora Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, inv. ZV 1653; from Camporsevoli, showing a flute player and a dancing warrior (SPIVEY 1988b, pp. 592-593, fig. 1; MARTELLI 1992; COLONNA 1997; PAOLUCCI 2011a, pp. 160, 167, fig. 8; CERCHIAI 2014, fig. 1 [fig. 2, erroneously labeled as the Dresden amphora, is the amphora Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv.

The two sides of the amphora-ossuary by the *Pittore di Gerusalemme* (from the Tolle necropolis in Chianciano Terme), which I have analyzed above (**pl. 79**)[419], confirm the relationship between athletics and the military sphere. While side B features an athletic scene, side A represents three male figures – two are armed – framed by branches and grapes growing from the plant depicted under the handles.
Unsurprisingly, as far as the treatment of landscape elements is concerned, these examples correspond with dance images unrelated to military meaning.

A further group of images is likely to confirm how this visual correspondence depends not only on a thematic affinity – namely, the intrinsic link between armed dance scenes and generic dance scenes – but also on a shared (and, therefore, recurrent) technique of image structuring.

This group – the second to be identified in this analysis – includes **duels**' images, namely, fight between two individual confronted warriors. Since the Archaic period, the motif spread in black-figure vases and subsequently in bronze mirrors as one of the themes of two-figured compositions.
Confronted soldiers standing by a central plant recur on several almost contemporary scenes. Examples include the amphora Orvieto 2736 + 2816 (**pl. 80.c**)[420] showing a lotus flower growing between two of the

V 464]; SCARRONE 2015, pp. 33-34; 47, I.42; STEINER, NEILS 2018, fig. 13). For an overview of this iconography in the *Gruppo Tardo a Silhouettes,* see SCARRONE 2015, pp. 34-35. On the pyrrich and its functional values, also in relation to funeral context, see CECCARELLI 1998 (on the relationship between Greek and Etruscan *imagerie* of the funerary pyrrich, see in part. pp. 53-57).

[419] Chianciano Terme, Museo Civico Archeologico; dating to 500-480 B.C. See PAOLUCCI 2001, pp. 210-218; PAOLUCCI 2007, pp. 77-78, no. 1. See above p. 175.

[420] Orvieto, Museo 'Claudio Faina', inv. 2736 + 2816; from Crocefisso del Tufo; dating to the end of the sixth century; differently attributed to one of the followers of the Micali Painter (see SPIVEY 1988b, pp. 593-594, fig. 4; CAPPELLETTI 1992, pp. 86-87, no. 24) and to the Micali Painter (BRUNI 2010, pp. 26-28, fig. 8).

fighting warriors; the amphora Tarquinia 965 (**pl. 81.a**)[421] which depicts two warriors standing by a central plant composed of two elongated leaves growing from a short stem; the *oinochoe* Louvre E772 (**pl. 81.b**)[422]; and a slightly later amphora in Florence (**pl. 82.a**)[423] showing a triple-inflorescence plant. Additionally, a black-figure *hydria* at the Hermitage in Saint Petersburg (**pl. 82.b**)[424] depicts the combat between Herakles and the giant Kyknos. The two opponents are separated by a lotus flower rising from the ground and wavy lines – perhaps representing some lightning – high up between their heads. Another vegetal element extends to the right by Kyknos. The quiver of Heracles' bow and the sheath of the giant's weapon appear between their legs.
In all these examples, the central flower provides the pivotal visual element around which the two parts of the image are arranged.

The compositional scheme including two facing warriors also appears in engraved mirrors, where the representation of two confronted half-seated warriors, each one arranged along the edge of the mirror, spread since the late fifth century B.C. In all these cases, the figurative scheme does not convey a narrative situation of combat between the two warriors. The motif distinguishes the so-called 'San Francisco Group', firstly labeled by Del Chiaro[425]. An engraved mirror in Basel (**pl. 82.c**)[426], which can be associated with this group, features two warriors identified as Achilles and Ajax by their inscriptions. A

[421] Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 965; dating to about 500-480 B.C.; attributed to one of the followers of the Micali Painter. See GINGE 1987, pp. 58-59, no. 26, pl. XLV (see also p. 57 for parallels and attribution).
[422] Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. E 772; from Cerveteri; dating to 500-480 B.C. See GAULTIER 2003, pp. 83-84, pl. 53.
[423] Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. V 21. SCARRONE 2015, p. 9, pl. 2.
[424] Saint Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum, inv. B 3146; dating to 500-475 B.C. See *Die Welt der Etrusker* 1988, pp. 148-149, B.5.28; ANANICH *et alii* 2008, pp. 78-79.
[425] See DEL CHIARO 1955, in part. p. 281; who follows a first assembly of specimens by Mansuelli (MANSUELLI 1948). On the 'San Francisco' group, see DE GRUMMOND 1982b, pp. 160-162; MANGANI 2005; ZANONI 2009, p. 73, fn. 10, with further bibliographical references
[426] Basel, Antikenmuseum und Sammlung Ludwig, inv. Zü 5; dating to the second half of the fifth century B.C. JUCKER 2001, pp. 23-24, no. 6; ZANONI 2009, p. 74, fig. 4.

lotus-like blossom grows between the two heroes. In reality, this is not a widespread motif. Nevertheless, an example from Tarquinia shows a comparable scene with two confronted half-seated warriors. Although the image is poorly preserved, some vegetal elements are visible between the two figures[427]. In particular, a palmette-like plant and an opium poppy grow in the central area. An allusive function suggesting the underworld has been assigned to these, in particular, to the poppy[428].

In the case of mirrors, in other words, the motif does not specifically recur in confronted warriors' images. Therefore, there is no direct link between central plant elements and the military subject. Instead, we can note how a vegetal element often appears to be a central visual pivot in the larger group of two-figured engraved scenes.

In relation to this point, we can note that this layout (two figures standing by a central vegetal element or blossom) dates back to a specific composition motif that spread during fifth and fourth centuries B.C. That is to say, the representation of the Dioscuri, concerning whose production Mansuelli identified a «Maestro dei Dioscuri affrontati»[429]. There is a central element in many mirrors depicting the Dioscuri, interpreted as a sylph plant. According to Greek literary tradition, that medicinal plant was related to the cult of the divine twins[430].

Therefore, the analyzed examples likely illustrate two different scenarios, which can be visualized considering the two *corpora* (black-

[427] Zanoni notes that the presence of a third character in the middle cannot be excluded. The middle area, in fact, cannot be easily read due to its poor state of conservation (ZANONI 2009, pp. 72-73).

[428] ZANONI 2009, p. 75. On the relationship between the poppy and funerary contexts, see JANNOT 2009, p. 85; for an overview on ancient sources, see ZANONI 2009, p. 75, fn. 23.

[429] MANSUELLI 1948, p. 55. *Contra* the existence of a unique common workshop, see DEL CHIARO 1955, p. 281.

[430] PAUS. III.16.2-3. For further Etruscan examples, see e.g. PACETTI, p. 19. On the tradition at the base of the connection between the Dioscuri and this plant, see also VAGLIO 2000, p. 228; FERRARI 2011, p. 856.

figure vases and bronze mirrors) featuring pairs of confronted warriors.
On the one hand, scenes from black-figure vases – which are mainly focused on the ongoing fight – are likely to be a kind of *excerpta* from more composite representations.
On the other hand, images on mirrors representing resting warriors are arranged as symmetrically structured autonomous constructions. According to a compositional characteristic recurring in two-figure constructions, in these images, there is a central element which «fa da catalizzatore 'logico-spaziale' del gruppo, attraendo le attenzioni dei protagonisti». This arrangement also has parallels in Greek mirrors[431].
With this distinction in mind, we might nonetheless note that examples of ongoing duels possibly taken from articulated compositions are also documented in bronze mirror production. For instance, a bronze mirror in Florence (**pl. 83.a**)[432] shows a warrior about to pierce a naked man in the back. The two figures are placed on either side of the medallion, and a flower grows in the middle beneath the warrior's outstretched arm.

On closer inspection, a pattern comparable to mirrors occasionally occurs in the oldest Etruscan red-figure pottery. The krater Leipzig T 952 (**pl. 84.a**)[433] depicts two warriors on two rampant confronted horses. A shrub with leaves is represented under the crossroads of the animals. In this example, two distinct motifs are combined. On the one hand, the image echoes the conventional motive of landscape elements growing under the rampant horse's legs. On the other hand, the sapling

[431] BAGLIONE, GILOTTA 2007, p. 51.
[432] Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 640. A comparable *excerptum* can be found in a mirror in Rome: Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 51103. Although this scene lacks any plant element, the fight significantly takes place on rocky ground.
[433] Leipzig, Karl-Marx-Universität, Antikenmuseum, inv. T 952; dating to the beginning of the fourth century B.C. Beazley attributed the vase to the Painter of Vatican G 111 (BEAZLEY 1947, pp. 48-49). See GILOTTA 1986, p. 5; *Die Welt der Etrusker* 1988, pp. 251-252, D 1.15; MELLI 2009, p. 596. Especially focusing on the armor are GILOTTA 1984, p. 48 and LEJARS 2014, p. 408, fig. 2.

provides a visual pivot on which the image's symmetry is hinged. Closely akin to this group of mounted warriors is the scene in an Apulian volute krater in Budapest, dating to the decades at the turn of the fourth and third century B.C., which was likely made in Canosa[434]. Both the arrangement of the figures and the presence of a central plant match these of the Leipzig krater.

Another example that can be included in our second group is noteworthy. It shows a different way to set the image and confirms the great versatility and awareness in using landscape elements in archaic black-figure vases. A Pontic amphora in Basel (**pl. 84.b**)[435], which depicts the departure of Amphiaraos, shows in the shoulder the brawl between Tydeus and Polynices. Consistent with the compositional systems already highlighted, a vegetal-like element with five stems grows from the ground between the two warriors. To the left of this scene, two flanked female figures – the two daughters of Adrastus, Argeia, and Deipyle – observe the fight[436]. Significantly, a shrub with branches and lanceolate leaves is represented between the women and the exiled princes. The bush inserted between the figures, in this instance, does not seem only to arrange the individual figures within the image symmetrically. Rather, it is meant to characterize the action of the young girls as they are lurking to observe the clash. Conversely, the actual inclusion of the two women deserves attention. It provides a focus on a marginal element to the central theme. Namely, it represents the addition of an extra-scenic detail, separated from the primary theme matter by the shrub. The relevance to the image of an off-screen component is indicative of the painter's interest in the assemblage of single comprehensive scenes. In the Basel amphora case, these are combined through a figurative pin, the bush marking the boundary between internal and external field. Therefore, in this example, the

[434] Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 2008.3.A; dating 320-280 B.C.
[435] Basel, Antikenmuseum und Sammlung Ludwig, inv. Zü 209; attributed to the Tityos Painter. See HANNESTAD 1974, p. 46, no. 15 and *passim*; REUSSER 1988, pp. 54-56; KRAUSKOPF 2002, pp. 500-501, fig. 5.
[436] See EUR. *supp*. 132 ss. on the nocturnal fight between Tydeus and Polynices.

image's setting seems to imply a sort of montage writing. This system guarantees the image the details it needs for its identification and provides a frame with the power to synthesize (and signify) the broader narrative picture.

A comparable technique has been proposed in analyzing an engraved mirror in a Swiss private collection (**pl. 85.a**)[437], which features the fight between Tydeus and Melanippus in the presence of Menrva. In this instance, a wavy strip suspended in mid-air is depicted between the goddess and the two heroes. According to Jucker, this central element represents « […] ein Wellenband […], das die Sphäre der Göttin vom Gemetzel der Heroen trennt»[438]. The scholar bestowed upon the lightning bolt the function of marking the boundary between the human and divine spheres, each corresponding to one of the two flanked parts of the image.

By comparing this scene with that of the Basel amphora, we can note that, like Adrastus' daughters, Menrva belongs to the image, although her figure is not directly manifested. The lightning, like the bush, spells out the existing relationship between the figures and the parts of the image. Therefore, the image is entrusted with showing the 'invisible', that is, what is outside the field and whose inclusion in the scene is concerned with elements signifying the ontological and physical boundary between the scene's sections.

Finally, Etruscan mirrors' *imagerie* shows a further figure arrangement, which entails a different involvement of landscape elements. As we will see, in these examples, the two-figure groups likely date back to multiple figure groups. Several engraved mirrors feature duels in which rock elements are included. In particular, an example at the British Museum (**pl. 85.b**)[439] shows «Aivas» (Ajax) as he is throwing a stone against «Ectur» (Hector). They stand in a frame of ivy trails,

[437] Bern, private collection. JUCKER 1997, pp. 84-85, fig. 2; JUCKER 2001, pp. 70-72, no. 34; KRAUSKOPF 2002, pp. 507-508, fn. 48, fig. 11 (with the correct orientation).
[438] JUCKER 1997, p. 84.
[439] London, British Museum, inv. 1847,0909.5; from Vulci; dating to 400-350 B.C. SWADDLING 2002, no. 25.

while three boulders are depicted in the space between their legs. In a mirror in Bologna (**pl. 86.a**)[440], a rock grows from the ground line and stands between the legs of one of the two male figures involved in a duel. In both cases, images follow patterns that occur in more complex figurative systems and will be discussed in the following pages.

The third group includes images of struggle more complex than these analyzed so far. In Etruscan art, images depicting major fights mainly refer to Amazonomachy, Gigantomachias, and Centauromachies. All of these examples, as anticipated, may have offered a model from which the duel scenes were taken. An analysis of this group enables us to highlight different ways of inclusion of landscape elements – both rocks and plants – within the image[441].
Although absent in tomb paintings, **Amazonomachy** was a prevalent theme in Etruria. In particular, it appears prominently in Hellenistic sarcophagi and urns. Nonetheless, some examples are also documented in earlier times[442].

A late archaic Chiusine relief in Berlin (**pl. 86.b**)[443], for instance, shows Amazons fighting against warriors on horseback and on foot. Under each of the horses and one of the soldiers they face, «on voit un curieux arbuste ayant vaguement la forme d'une palmette, et dont

[440] Bologna, Museo Civico Archeologico, inv. It. 1070; ex Palagi collection; from Vulci; dating to 450-400 B.C. SASSATELLI 1981, pp. 55-56, no. 40. Attributed to the *Maestro di Achille e Pentesilea* by Mansuelli (MANSUELLI 1948, pp. 17-19).
[441] From this point of view, a potentially significant example, but one that must be treated with caution, is a back-figure amphora – which has been greatly repainted – in Orvieto (Orvieto, Museo 'Claudio Faina', s.n. – **pl. 87.b**) showing two armies separated by a tree. See CAPPELLETTI 1992, pp. 134-137, no. 43. In this case, the tree would seem to have a paratactical reading support function similar to that found in other images. However, the heavy modern interventions on the image suggest a high degree of caution in reading the overall scene.
[442] See e.g. the architecture decoration from Satricum (DE LUIGI 2000). For an overview on the fortune of this topic in Etruscan art, see VLAD BORRELLI 1958; CAMPOREALE 1959; STEINGRÄBER 2006b, p. 192, 242.
[443] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. 1221; from Chiusi; ex Mazetti collection; dating to 500-450 B.C. JANNOT 1984, pp. 173-174, no. 2; *Die Welt der Etrusker* 1988, pp. 215, 281, B 10.7.

l'exécution est extrêmement fruste»[444]. According to Jannot's analysis, the urn belongs to a group of «ouvres décadentes» and its vegetal details are «encore marqués par une raideur provenant d'une sclérose de modèls orientalisants» which «continuent de jouer un rôle de remplissage»[445].

After the late archaic phase, a second wave in the subject's diffusion is registered during the fourth century B.C., when it spread in red-figure vase production. A completely different approach to both the theme and the figures' arrangement can be noticed in these examples.
Side A of red-figure calyx-krater in Richmond attributed to the Nazzano Painter (**pl. 87.a**)[446] shows an Amazonomachy with figures arranged on several levels. Under some of the figures, a dotted profile indicates the ground they walk on[447]. In the foreground, a dotted profile also represents the irregular soil on which a warrior has fallen. While holding his shield, he protects himself from the attack of a horse on which an Amazon is riding. Behind the animal, there is a trunk with branches and leaves. The Amazon is facing backward and is about to hit another warrior, who rests his right foot on a rocky rise. In this instance, the area delimited by the dotted profile is painted to render the rocky nature of the bulge with greater precision. A resting bird is depicted next to the male figure raising his right foot. Side B of the Richmond krater represents two satyrs and a female figure moving on rocky ground, which is rendered in a completely different way. There is no dotted outline and the rocks are made using red color with black internal details.

The subject also spread in the following decades, as shown by a red-figure *stamnos* in Viterbo, in which an archer is about to hit a female

[444] JANNOT 1984, p. 173.
[445] JANNOT 1984, p. 171.
[446] Richmond, Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 82.137; dating to about 370 B.C. MAYO 1998, pp. 74-75; POLA 2016, p. 125, pl. CDXXXV.
[447] The same pattern appears in the *kylix* Berkeley 8-935, attributed to the same painter and analyzed above, p. 104.

figure on horseback moving to the left on a rocky ground (**pl. 88.a**)[448], and by a number of vases assigned to the Funnel Group[449]. The mutual comparison of the Funnel Group's examples confirms the relationship between multiple- and two-figure scenes. A krater in St. Petersburg (**pl. 88.b**)[450] shows a continuous frieze with Amazonomachy, including a duel on a raised rocky soil. Although restored and repainted, a neck-amphora in Orvieto (**pl. 88.c**)[451] showing a continuous frieze with warriors and Amazons should also be considered. One of the Amazons, on horseback, is about to throw a stone against her opponent. Her attitude matches that of the Amazon depicted on another heavily repainted amphora c in the same museum (**pl. 89.a**)[452]. The friezes of the Orvieto vases can be compared to the scene on one side of a krater from Vulci at the Cabinet des Médailles (**pl. 89.b**)[453]. The scene depicts a warrior fallen on rocks who shelters himself with his shield as a female figure lifts a boulder above her head[454]. The same group, including an Amazon about to hit a fallen warrior, can also be found on a krater

[448] Viterbo, Museo Nazionale Etrusco Rocca Albornoz (formerly in Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 27134): CULTRERA 1916, pl. 26; ADEMBRI 1981, pp. 14, 19, figs. 17-18. The Viterbo *stamnos*, dating to about 350-300 B.C., might be assigned to Orvietan production mastered by Faliscan immigrated craftsmen. I thank Angela Pola for her help with the interpretation of this vase.

[449] On the Funnel Group, see especially DEL CHIARO 1974b; BOCCI 1976; HARARI 1990; HARARI 2000, p. 450; POLA 2018, p. 276, fn. 22 (with further published references); JOLIVET 2018.

[450] Saint Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum, inv. B 1841; dating about 330 B.C. GATALINA 1988; HARARI 1990, p. 40, no. 9.

[451] Orvieto, Museo 'Claudio Faina', inv. 2649; dating to about 330 B.C. HARARI 1990, p. 39, no. 7; CAPPELLETTI 1992, pp. 170-173, no. 59. On the restoration, see CRISTOFANI 1993, p. 95.

[452] Orvieto, Museo 'Claudio Faina', inv. 2650 (1955: VG 24); dating to about 330 B.C. HARARI 1990, p. 40, no. 8; CAPPELLETTI 1992, pp. 174178, no. 60. On the restoration, see CRISTOFANI 1993, p. 96.

[453] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département des Monnaies, Médailles et Antiques, inv. 921; dating to about 330 B.C. MARTELLI 1987a, p. 328; HARARI 1990, p. 39, no. 6; CRISTOFANI 1993, pls. XXXIV-XXXV.

[454] The motif (a single Amazon fighting against a single warrior) also spreads in fourth-century bronze mirrors (see e.g. *ES* CCCLXVI; CCCXCVII).

from Vulci in Mainz (**pl. 89.c**)[455]. Alongside the Amazon and warrior group, that frieze also shows the inverted pattern, with a fallen Amazon assaulted by a male warrior. For our purposes, it is worth noting that the first scene is framed by two trees with a solid trunk and high foliage[456].

While this frame-like composition is not common in contemporary scenes of Amazonomachy, the analysis of these red-figure vases shows that a few patterns of landscape elements recur. In particular, we can note two recurring motifs. First, the rocky ground or environment around fallen figures as they are about to be struck. Second, the use of landscape elements as weapons.

Both motifs appear in another monument, which is almost contemporary to the Funnel Group production and combines all the functions we have identified. The *Sarcofago del Magnate* (**pl. 90.a**)[457], from Tarquinia, represents the fight between warriors and Amazons. The scene shows figures armed with boulders and two characters (an Amazon and a warrior) fallen on rises of rocky ground. Figures are gathered in two-figured groups arranged according to the *'Treter' Gruppe* scheme. Another figurative detail is worth noting. In addition to the rocky ground, four trees are depicted among combatants. According to Camporeale, these trees «conseguono un effetto del tutto

[455] Mainz, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, inv. 38835; dating to about 330 B.C. BÜSING-KOLBE 1978, pp. 11-14, pls. 1-2; CRISTOFANI 1987a, p. 325, no. 172; CRISTOFANI 1993, p. 94, pls. XXIII.c; XXIV; XXVI.a-b; HARARI 1995, p. 107. For further details on this vase, see *infra* p. 209.

[456] It is worthwhile to mention that the presence of trees with a comparable framing function is uncommon also in Greek examples featuring an Amazonomachy. A single tree appears in two red-figure vases dating to about 440 B.C. The former example is a kalyx-krater from Valle Trebbia (tomb 1052), in which «il particolare paesistico che consiste in quell'unico albarello che separa l'inizio dalla fine della scena (che è molto raro nelle rappresentazioni figurate sui vasi)» (ARIAS 1953, p. 18, fig. 2) can be noted. This motif matches that on the latter example, an Attic *dinos* from Agrigento at the British Museum (inv. 1899,0721.5) and attributed to the Group of Polygnotos.

[457] Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 9873; from the Partunus tomb, Monterozzi necropolis; dating to about 330 B.C. HERBIG 1952, pp. 62-63, no. 120, tabs. 18-20; CAMPOREALE 1959, pp. 107, 109, 129-130; GASSER 1969, p. 54, no. 68; MORANDI TARABELLA 2004, p. 356.

diverso da quello voluto». The scholar maintained that, due to the brittle nature of the material which imposes a technical limit to the expressive intention, «gli alberi anziché da elementi di sfondo fungono da elementi di separazione fra i vari gruppi e anche all'interno di uno stesso gruppo»[458]. On closer inspection, the trees' placement (both at the edge of the scene and between individual figures colliding in pairs) is likely functional to grant a certain degree of symmetry in the figurative syntax. This attention to the overall order characterizes a number of early-Hellenistic sarcophagi and is emphasized in silver ceramic's relief [459]. Between the end of the fourth and third century B.C., the friezes of silver clay vases from Volsinii – which count the Amazonomachy among their favorite subjects – are mainly based «sulla sequenza ripetitiva di schemi fissi, costituiti da gruppi di due o tre combattenti»[460]. According to Menichetti'a analysis, «Il modello che ha ispirato questo tipo di rappresentazione è certamente da individuare nelle lastre del Mausoleo di Alicarnasso che raffigurano scene di amazzonomachia secondo una scansione per gruppi, rielaborate e diffuse attraverso la mediazione di cartoni tanto in area etrusca quanto in ambito italiota»[461]. The same model, dating to the middle of the fourth century, also influenced the *Sarcofago del Magnate*[462]. Nonetheless, the Etruscan sarcophagus differs from the Halicarnassus model and the other mentioned Etruscan examples with trees, rocky soil, and boulders used as weapons.

It can be noted that the groups that appear in the examples mentioned above – particularly the *'Treter'*, *'Helfer'* and *'Hauptgruppe'* groups – spread with a certain constancy along with landscape

[458] CAMPOREALE 1959, p. 107.
[459] On this type of composition, see BORBEIN 1976. See amphora Orvieto, Museo 'Claudio Faina' (MICHETTI 2003, pl. XXXVI; MICHETTI 2005, p. 100, fig. 1) for an example of Amazonomachy in a silver clay example.
[460] MENICHETTI 2005, p. 99.
[461] MENICHETTI 2005, p. 99. For an example from architecture and a brief discussion on the spread of the motif during the Hellenistic period, see MORETTI SGUBINI 2008, p. 235.
[462] As has been already noted by CAMPOREALE 1959, p. 109, fn. 4.

elements, as is the case with the *Sarcofago del Magnate*. In addition to the Mainz amphora mentioned above, a drawing of an amphora from Canino of the Torlonia collection shows two warriors attacking a central Amazon. She has fallen on the ground by a large tree standing in the background (**pl. 90.b**)[463].

On the one hand, therefore, it can be noted that, to some extent, landscape elements affect the figurative space during the reworking phases of the model. As suggested by comparing the Amazonomachies in Faliscan and Etruscan red-figure examples, such landscape elements' assortment likely dates back to local models or earlier motifs fully integrated into the local repertoire. On the other hand, if we accept this assessment, we can also assume that the *Sarcofago del Magnate*'s trees voluntarily interrupt the continuity of the frieze. While underling the paratactic structure to the frieze, they would also represent the integration between an external model and pre-existing ways of structuring the sequence of battle schemes composing the image.

Motifs comparable to these identified in the representations of Amazonomachy also characterize Etruscan images of **Gigantomachy**[464].

In the shoulder of a black-figure *hydria* on the Swiss art market, analyzed above with regard to its body's frieze (**pl. 30.a**)[465], Herakles is depicted while fighting against six Giants. As has been noted, they «sembrano usare i massi come strumenti da palestra per compiere esercizi»[466]. In this instance, the motif of the 'landscape weapons' combines with a characteristic figurative and semantic structure of Gigantomachy representations in use at the end of the sixth century B.C. Around that time, the theme had a particular success by virtue of a «manipolazione semantica» which led to the establishment of a

[463] Rome, Torlonia collection; from Canino. BEAZLEY 1947, pl. XI.8; GREIFENHAGEN 1978, pls. 37.1; 38-39; HARARI 1990, p. 40, no. 10.
[464] On the appropriation of this theme by the Etruscans, see COLONNA 2005.
[465] Art market. Formerly Lugano, E.I. collection. BRUNI 2010, pp. 20-21, figs. 2-3; MENICHETTI, CERCHIAI 2017, fig. 11. See above p. 116.
[466] MENICHETTI, CERCHIAI 2017.

relationship between the images of struggle and the sphere of the agons[467].

A black-figure neck-amphora in Minneapolis (**pl. 91.a**)[468], which can be associated with the Micali Painter's school, is noteworthy for this analysis. The vase features a continuous frieze with two male figures carrying rocks and armed Menrva advancing on Herakles. The hero moves towards the right while looking back over his shoulder. Despite the scene being uninterrupted under the handles, the goddess and the hero virtually occupy side A. The other two figures – who can be interpreted as two giants – are on the opposite side. Four wavy dotted lines grow from the ground among the four figures and between their legs. A stylized date palm identifiable by the dangling bunches stands in the middle of the scene with the two giants[469]. Three plants of the same type grow from the boulders held by one of the giants. Olsen Carlucci, who first published this vase, noted that the «tripartite, pillow-shaped rocks» in the Minneapolis amphora «do not occur in Attic art» and that «they survive only in a few Etruscan works». However, the parallels that the scholar presents are taken from toreutic and glyptic, where the characteristic rocks' shape is likely due to technical and stylistic reasons[470]. More convincingly, the scholar maintains that the palmettes «might be mere filling ornament, or they might indicate that the rocks are intended to be clods of earth, in this case pulled up with plants still attached and a possible reference to the Poseidon-Nisyros episode of the Gigantomachy»[471].

The four characters who appear in this amphora and a comparable conformation of rocks can also be found in a black-figure *hydria* in

[467] See MENICHETTI, CERCHIAI 2017.
[468] Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Art Gallery (T.B. Walker Collection), inv. WF 7. OLSEN CARLUCCI 1978; HARARI 1988b, pp. 36-37, fig. 2; VIAN 1988, p. 237, no. 411; SCHAWARZ 1989, p. 180, no. 6, who attributed the vase to the Lotus Bud Group.
[469] On the identification of this plant, see PAMPANINI 1930, p. 306. See also our discussion above, p. 80.
[470] However, see the discussion in VIAN 1988, p. 236, who lists a number of examples of «volumineux rochers souvent formés de trois globules».
[471] OLSEN CARLUCCI 1978, p. 546.

Marseille, which has been assigned to the Micali Painter (**pl. 91.b**)[472]. In this example, the boulders held by the giants do not show plant growths. The figures are arranged in two overlapping two-figure groups. On the left-hand side, Herakles holding a club and a bow, is about to hit a giant fallen on a boulder. On the right-hand side, Menrva holds the torn limb of her opponent, who raises a boulder over his head. This motif dates back to the *schema* of the confrontation between Menrva and the giant Akrathe, which is documented in a few Etruscan representations of Gigantomachy[473]. In these examples, Akrathe is regularly about to hit the goddess with a boulder, following a motif (rocky weapons) the meaning of which will be analyzed in more detail in the following chapter[474]. An Etruscan red-figure *stamnos* from Vulci, belonging to the Funnel group, provides a slightly different example. It shows Menrva holding an arm and chasing an unarmed, armless warrior who is about to fall on a rocky elevation (**pl. 92.a**)[475].

The overall *schema*, including Menrva holding the torn arm of her rival, finds a parallel in a group of archaic bronze bands with stamped relief decoration dating to 500-490 B.C.[476]. These bands show the battle of the giants and the gods. Two examples, reportedly from Bomarzo, are at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston[477]. Other examples are in Wien and Berlin, respectively[478]. Other comparable bands are preserved

[472] Marseille, Musée d'Archéologie Borély, inv. 3098. VIAN 1949; OLSEN CARLUCCI 1978, fig. 5; CAMPOREALE 1981, pp. 447-448, no. 1; VIAN 1988, p. 237, no. 410; CERCHIAI, BONAUDO, IBELLI 2011, pp. 85-86.

[473] CAMPOREALE 1981. On this group and *schema*, see the discussion in VIAN 1988, p. 268.

[474] See *infra* pp. 287 ss.

[475] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. F 2957; dating to 350-300 B.C. CAMPOREALE 1981, p. 448, no. 3; DEL CHIARO 1985, pl. 58.1-2; *Die Welt der Etrusker* 1988, pp. 258, 283, no. D 1.35.

[476] See HANFMANN 1937; VIAN 1988, p. 237, nos. 414-416; COLONNA 2005.

[477] Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, invs. 01.7528 and 01.7529. Although the pieces were found in Bomarzo according to museum records, Colonna suggested they are from Tarquinia: see COLONNA 1982, pp. 36 ss.

[478] Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. AM 123 (three bands; reportedly from Monte Romano); Munich, Antikensammlungen, inv. 3225 (band fragment).

at the Vatican Museums[479]. Many of these bands show corresponding scenes. Giants are armed with boulders, and blooms grow from the ground. In particular, a flower takes up the area under the horses' legs in one of the Vienna examples[480] and the space between Menrva and Akrathe in one of the Boston bands (**pl. 92.b**)[481]. Both the motifs match those analyzed above. Beyond the corresponding schema with Menrva and Akrathe, we can note that the band scenes and these in black-figure vases date back to a unique prototype shared by most of the representations dating to the Archaic phase[482]. Colonna aptly suggested a circulation of the theme from architecture decoration[483] to toreutics and, finally, from metalworking to vase decoration[484]. Despite these correspondences, bronze bands show different stylistic backgrounds from vase production. The bands are not stylistically affected by the ionic influence that impacted black-figure vase production at the end of the sixth century. Instead, they likely show the influence of artisan traditions that originated in Veii, Rome, and inner Lazio. This shows not only the durability of the schemes without being subject to stylistic changes but also – striking for the purpose of this analysis – the relationship between *schemata* and landscape elements and the latter's place in compositional patterns.

Unsurprisingly, the same motifs described here above (rocky weapons and characters falling on rocky ground) also appear in later representations of Amazonomachy, as shown by the friezes of many Praenestine cistae (see e.g. **pl. 93.a-c**)[485]. In these images, characterized

[479] Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco; from Pianmiano, Bomarzo. See DONATI, RAFANELLI 2004, nos. 129-131; MENICHETTI, CERCHIAI 2017, fig. 2. For further details on this group of bands, see HAUMESSER 2011.
[480] See COLONNA 2005, p. 1366, fig. 7.
[481] Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, invs. 01.7528. COLONNA 2005, p. 1366, fig. 6.
[482] See, for instance, the terracotta fragments from Orvieto analyzed in COLONNA 2005.
[483] See e.g. terracotta fragment with warrior from Orvieto: Rome, neg. Istituto Archeologico Germanico 1935.433 (COLONNA 2005, p. 1362, fig. 1).
[484] COLONNA 2005, p. 1367.
[485] **Pl. 93.a**: Munich, Antikensammlung, inv. SL 36; from Palestrina; dating to the third century B.C. (COLONNA 1984a, p. 1070, no. 228; MENICHETTI 1995, fig. 77); **pl. 93.b**: Copenhagen, National Museum of Denmark, inv. 778 (BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA 1979,

by figurative features that find no parallel in Greek images, such as the anguiped giant, the tree's presence also stands out. Saplings regularly appear in the middle of two-figure groups in which one character has fallen to the ground as the other is about to hit him.

On a similar note, the presence of matching *schemata* in **Centauromachy** scenes is worth nothing. As was the case for Amazonomachy and Gigantomachy, Centauromachy was only partially acknowledged by the Etruscan audience. These themes, in fact, «vengono accolti in quanto rappresentazione di antichi miti, ma privi dei significati etici di cui si erano arricchiti»[486]. Subsequently, we often find «un insieme di scene giustapposte, non più riconducibili ad un contesto preciso»[487] in which different Greek traditions are combined[488]. In terms of literary tradition, we can highlight a recurring feature consistent with the Etruscan figurative repertoire. According to ancient sources, centaurs would live in wild and primordial places. The *Iliad* informs us that centaurs were residing in the Pelion[489], a mountain of Magnesia in Thessaly, known in ancient times to be, among other things, rich in forests[490]. Specifically, we are informed that they were living in caverns of the mountain. The cave of Chiron, for instance, is a «domus ardua» which «montem perforat et longo suspendit Pelion arcu»[491]. Conversely, the same places are also where peaceful meetings

pp. 80-82, no. 16, tabs. XCIV-XCVII; MENICHETTI 1995, p. 109, fig. 67.b); **pl. 93.c**: Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 42223 (BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA, EMILIOZZI 1990, pp. 265-273, no. 81, tabs. CCCLXXVI-CCCLXXXV; MENICHETTI 1995, fig. 78).

[486] ADEMBRI 1981, p. 14. See also the discussion in SCARRONE 2015, pp. 13; 156-157.

[487] ADEMBRI 1981, p. 14.

[488] Ancient literary tradition records at least three cases of Centauromachy. *Iliad* (I.262 ss.) and *Odyssey* (XXI.295 ss.) mention the clash between Centaurs and Lapiths in Thessaly, on the occasion of the wedding of Piritoo with Hippodamia. Another fight took place following Herakles' visit to the Centaur Pholus (on which see *infra* p. 194). Finally, Hesiod reports that also Peleus was involved in a fight against the Centaurs (HES. *Fr*. 78-79).

[489] HOM. *Il*. II.472-474.

[490] HES. *Cat.* I.27.

[491] STAT. *Achil.* I.106-108. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the cave of Chiron was identified on Mount Pelion by Arvanitopoullos, who identified a sanctuary

between centaurs and men took place. Although they always remain «du côté de la sauvuagerie»[492], centaurs often perform the role of tutor. On Mount Pelion, for instance, Chiron accompanies Achilles and raises the young Jason[493]. Additionally, the encounter between the centaur Pholus and Herakles was initially peaceful. The mythical event is a well-known one. As he goes to the mount Erymanthus to capture the wild boar, Herakles is hosted by the centaur Pholus in his cave. Here, the hero imprudently opens the wine container, a common property of Centaurs' entire community. Attracted by the smell of wine, they reach the cave and begin a clash, leading to the death of a group of Centaurs, including Chiron and Pholus himself. This episode is documented in Etruscan art, as the so-called *Cratere dei Gobbi* proves[494]. Although these images are largely lacking in landscape detail, a few examples provide exceptions that are relevant to our purposes. An impasto brazier rim fragment with cylinder-stamped decoration (**pl. 94.a-b**)[495] and two engraved gems[496] are relevant since they are likely to set the encounter between Herakles and Pholus in a cave.

In the case of the Etruscan figurative tradition on Centauromachy, its semantic affinity with fights against Amazons and giants is ultimately proved by the juxtaposition of their respective representations. For instance, a Pontic neck-amphora at the Fitzwilliam

dedicated to Zeus Akraios and the centaur Chiron (on archaeological aspects and the cult of Chiron in Thessaly cf. GORRINI 2006).

[492] CAMASSA 2005, p. 35.

[493] OnAchilles, see HES. *Cat.* V.96 b. On Jason, see HES. *Cat.* I.27.

[494] On Herakles and Pholus in Etruria, see BANTI 1966; PIERACCINI 2003, pp. 104-105. Regarding the *cratere dei Gobbi*, see MARTELLI 1987, p. 289, no. 85; SZILÁGYI 1992, p. 387, no. 1; D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 1999, pp. 160 ss.

[495] **Pl. 94.a**: private collection (see BANTI 1966, p. 371, no. 2, fig. 1.a; PIERACCINI 2003, pp. 104-105, fig. 62); **Pl. 94.b**: from the votive deposit of the altar area in the sanctuary of Portonaccio (MICHETTI 2017, p. 184, fig. 9.a-b). Although there are only a few fragments preserved, the existence of local manufacture for these pieces, as hinted at by Michetti (MICHETTI 2017, p. 184; *contra* PIERACCINI 2003, pp. 151-153) would be indicative of the actual spread of the friezes and related themes.

[496] ZAZOFF 1968, no. 677 and no. 678

Museum (**pl. 95**)[497] combines centauromachy and gigantomachy. Side A shows a centaur holding a boulder over his head. He stands in the middle of the scene by two warriors as they are about to stab him with their spears. On the other side, two warriors attack a bearded giant sitting (or having fallen) on the ground as he is about to raise a rock over his head. The rocky weapons held by Amazons and giants can be compared to a number of stones used by centaurs, as a few black-figure vase fragments preserved in Heidelberg prove (**pl. 96.a-c**)[498]. Moreover, in the shoulder of a black-figure *hydria* in Naples (**pl. 96.d**)[499], centaurs struggle, holding shrubs and rocks the shape of which can specifically be compared to that of the boulders in the Minneapolis amphora featuring a Gigantomachy. In reference to the Naples examples, Lista observes that the rocks are «stranamente rese a forma di pesi usati nelle gare ginniche»[500]. Though not entirely convincingly, the comparison to *halteres* hints at the association of some centauromachy representations with the group of 'agonistic Gigantomachies' reviewed by Cerchiai and Menichetti.

As a general rule, Centauromachy constitutes a relatively widespread subject in the Archaic period[501]. Its success seems to have suffered a setback at the end of the fifth century[502]. Some examples, however, also date to that period and can finally be found in later red-figure images dating to the following century. A red-figure column-krater at Villa Giulia (**pl. 97.a**)[503] dating to the end of the fifth century

[497] Cambridge, The Fitzwilliam Museum, inv. GR.23.1864.
[498] Heidelberg, Institut für Klassische Archäologie und Byzantinische Archäologie, Antikensammlung, invs. E40; E43; E44 (HERBIG 1933, pp. 356-358, pls. XV.6; XVI.5-6).
[499] Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 81095; from Canino; dating to about 490 B.C. LISTA 2009, pp. 18-19.
[500] LISTA 2009, p. 18.
[501] The subject especially spread during the late Archaic period: see SCARRONE 2015, p. 13, discussing recurring *schemata*. *Contra*, ADEMBRI 1981, p. 14, and BONAUDO 2004, pp. 161-162 tend to affirm the rareness of the subject in the Archaic period.
[502] ADEMBRI 1981, p. 14; GILOTTA 2001, p. 140.
[503] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 56111. GILOTTA 2001, pp. 139-140, pl. XXV, who assigns the krater to the *Bottega dello stamnos di Bologna 824*

B.C. shows the fight between a centaur and a naked warrior. He holds his opponent by his beard. A boulder is resting on the ground between the hooves of the centaur. Although Attic models deeply influence this image[504], the rock on the ground matches these recurring in Etruscan examples (see e.g. the *stamnos* in Viterbo analyzed above)[505]. In reference to later red-figure production, examples show both single episodes (specifically, two-figure groups including a warrior and a centaur; see e.g. **pl. 97.b**)[506] and full frieze Centauromachies (see e.g. **pl. 98.a**)[507].

Generally speaking, it can be noted that these examples largely lack any comprehensive landscape setting. A few examples – from different figurative and cultural backgrounds – are likely to provide exceptions which are relevant to our purposes.

A black-figure Pontic amphora in Munich[508] shows the fight between centaurs and Herakles. Multiple-spiral motifs are depicted between the legs of both the hero and the centaurs. Moreover, some vegetal elements appear behind and between the figures. A small palmette stands on the spot where the feet of Heracles and these of the centaur touch. The plant type and their function within the image can be compared to the plants in the Pontic amphora Basel Zü 209 analyzed above (**pl. 84.b**)[509], with which it also shares the central theme. Both vases, in fact, show the departure of Amphiaraus on their body.

A different landscape setting characterizes the scene on a red-figure amphora from the *Tomba Golini* I, Settecamini necropolis, near Orvieto

(on which see GILOTTA 1986, pp. 5-9; SCARRONE 155-159); SCARRONE 2015, pp. 155-157, no. IV.6.

[504] See the discussion in GILOTTA 2001, p. 140, and SCARRONE 2015, pp. 156-157.

[505] See above pp. 185-186.

[506] Red-figure volute krater, Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 70527 (see ADEMBRI 1981, pp. 18-20, figs. 19-21).

[507] Red-figure *stamnos*, Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 4031 (see ADEMBRI 1981, pp. 14, 18-19 figs. 9-16).

[508] Munich, Antikensammlungen, inv. SH 838; dating to about 520 B.C.; attributed to the Amphiaraos Painter.

[509] Basel, Antikenmuseum und Sammlung Ludwig, inv. Zü 209; attributed to the Tityos Painter. See above p. 182 for description and references.

(**pl. 98.b**)[510]. This vase, dating to the last decades of the fourth century, shows a continuous frieze featuring a generic fight between centaurs and warriors. Six centaurs and two naked youths are depicted in the scene. One of the two male figures moves towards the left, looking backward and holding his cloak with his hand. The other sleeps on a rock and has an axe lying on his chest. A centaur is about to pierce him. Two centaurs are holding a stick chase after the young man who remains upright. To the right, a centaur moving towards the left on a rocky ground receives a branch from a centaur who has just torn it from a tree. A centaur advances on the other side of the sapling, holding a large rock on his shoulders. In addition to the rocky soil we have mentioned, other vegetation and rocky details also appear in the scene, protruding from the upper and bottom frames. The vegetation and the tree evoke the coniferous forests of Thessaly, where the Centaurs would live and whose branches they use as weapons. The analysis of rocky elements is more compelling, especially because a head appears in three of them. In actuality, their identification as rocks is not unanimous. Cristofani, for instance, describes them as ««'nuvole' entro le quali si trovano profili maschili»[511]. However, their shape and the fact that they grow from the ground suggest they are rocks. Their presence is especially relevant in light of the meaning of the heads. Cristofani aptly suggest identifying the male profiles as «una sorta di 'doppi' dei personaggi rappresentati [...] o evocazioni di guerrieri già uccisi». In other words, they would be «immagini che, attraverso le teste, simboleggiano gli spiriti dei morti»[512]. Therefore, in the Orvieto

[510] Orvieto, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 70529; dating to 330-310 B.C. ADEMBRI 1972, pp. 85-87; CRISTOFANI 1987a, p. 327, no. 175; MASSA PAIRAULT 1992a, pp. 136-137, figs. 121-122; COARELLI, FRATINI 2001, p. 22.
[511] CRISTOFANI 1987a, p. 327.
[512] CRISTOFANI 1987a, p. 327. *Contra* MASSA PAIRAULT 1992a, p. 137. Massa Pairault associates one of the heads (the one in the rock under the tree) with Orpheus and suggests that the other heads represent an «oracolo per incubazione». According to the scholar, the association between struggling centaurs and orphic heads dates back to the myth of Caeneus. With regard to the funerary interpretation of the Orvieto amphora, we should not forget the funerary purpose of the vase.

amphora, the savage and rural landscape in which the centaurs act gains a specific significance, based on a link between rocks and the underworld. As we will see in more detail in the following sections, the conceptualization of the 'rocky nature' of the underworld follows a novel idea of the afterlife which spread in Etruria from the fifth century B.C. onwards, one of the earliest pieces of evidence of which is found in tomb paintings from Orvieto.

Another example of landscape setting is the lower frieze of the so-called Napoléon cista (**pl. 99.a**)[513], which stands out thanks to their peculiar «carattere 'paesistico'»[514]. The fight, involving naked warriors and centaurs armed with boulders, set on a rocky ground with saplings and trees standing between the characters and between groups of figures. As is the case with some Praenestine cistae, the trees' arrangement is likely not unplanned. In reference to Centauromachy representation, the frieze of a cista in Lyon is especially relevant (**pl. 99.b**)[515]. Three trees appear in the scene. Two of them frame a scene with two centaurs and a central warrior. They stand on rocky ground, and the centaurs hold stones with their hands. On the other section of the frieze, a centaur hits a warrior in the chest. He has fallen by the third tree. An archer lurking behind the tree is about to shoot an arrow. With other cistae showing similar patterns (see e.g. **pls. 99.c-d**)[516], this example completes the picture on Etruscan Centauromachies[517]. Significantly, its frieze represents a compendium of many functions that I have observed and shows the widespread, recurring, and long-lasting repetition of the same patterns, from the Archaic to the Hellenistic period.

[513] Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. Cp 6759. BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA, EMILIOZZI 1990, pp. 181-186, no. 59, pls. CCLVII-CCLXVI; MASSA PAIRAULT 1992a, pp. 160-162; MENICHETTI 1995, p. 122, fig. 89; MENICHETTI 1999, pp. 503-504, fig. 13.
[514] MASSA PAIRAULT 1992a, p. 162.
[515] Lyon, Musée des Beaux-Arts, inv. E 154; ex Castellani collection. BOUCHER 1970, pp. 144-148; MENICHETTI 1995, fig. 72.
[516] MENICHETTI 1995, figs. 73.a-b.
[517] The analysis of standing individual centaurs and pairs of centaurs depicted as they hold their weapons will be addressed in the following section. See *infra* pp. 287 ss.

Among killing scenes belonging to the tradition of Amazonomachy, Centauromachy, and Gigantomachy, a group of images plays a prominent role regarding their specific mythical background. Several examples represent single episodes taken from myth and referring to particular lore. Therefore, the third group of this analysis includes examples of mythical **single fighting and killing episodes**. In particular, our research will focus on Talos and Amykos.

Talos was a bronze giant automaton, guardian of Crete, and was killed by the Argonauts during their journey[518]. The few literary sources, quite late, report two traditions on Talos. According to the former, the giant was killed by Medea[519], while the latter blames his killing on Peante[520]. Iconography documents a different traditional account, reporting that Castor and Pollux were also involved in the killing. A volute krater by the Talos Painter of Talos in Ruvo di Puglia, for instance, represents the capture of the giant by the Argonauts[521]. In the scene, the island's guardian is depicted as he is dying in the arms of Dioscuri. Their presence, in fact, also characterizes a number of Etruscan images, one of which identifies the giant by the Etruscan name «Chaluchasu»[522].

Three widely debated mirrors, preserved in Paris and Berlin respectively, are especially relevant to our purposes.

A mirror at the Cabinet des Médailles (**pl. 100.a**)[523], dating to the end of the fifth century, shows two young men walking on rocky ground as they attack another male figure, who raises his arms holding a stone that he uses as a weapon. An inscription alongside his figure identifies

[518] For Talos, see PLAT. *Min*. 320 c; APOLL. *bib*. I.26. An overview of this character can be found in MONTE 2006.
[519] APOLL. RH. *Arg*. IV.1677-1688.
[520] APOLL. *bib*. I.9.26.
[521] Ruvo di Puglia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale Jatta, inv. J 1501 (see RICCARDI 2005).
[522] See London, British Museum, inv. 1859,0301.30.
[523] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département des Monnaies, Médailles et Antiques, inv. 1312 (CARPINO 1996, p. 77, fig. 12).

him as «Itás». According to a convincing interpretation[524], he is the giant Talos, who fended off foreigners from Crete by throwing stones at them[525]. Indeed, despite their systematic association with the funerary sphere, we should not forget that many mythical traditions in which the Dioscuri were involved as active characters circulated in Etruria[526].

The image in the Paris mirror can be compared to two mirrors in Berlin. A relief mirror dating to the last quarter of the fifth century (**pl. 100.b**)[527] shows a fighting scene on rocky ground. In the middle of the scene, a naked male figure holds his arms around the neck of two winged male figures at his sides. This scene matches that in an engraved mirror dating to the late fourth century B.C. (**pl. 100.c**)[528]. As in the previous one, also in this example, the fight takes place on rocky ground. Furthermore, a blossom is engraved in the fourth-century example. Finally, there are a star and a crescent above the three figures. Although some scholars identified the two side figures as the Boreads, Calai and Zete (the two sons of the north wind Boreas')[529], the comparison with the examples reviewed above suggests they are the Dioscuri. Their representation as winged twins is not unknown within Etruscan figurative repertoire[530].

---

[524] CARPINO 1996, p. 77; CARPINO 2003, pp. 40-41.

[525] APOLL. *Bib*. I.141; APOLL. RH. *Arg*. IV.2503-2505.

[526] See STRAZZULLA 1994, pp. 42-43: «A partire dal V secolo a.C., e con maggiore frequenza nel IV, fanno la loro comparsa, nel repertorio iconografico etrusco, episodi specifici del mito, nei quali i Dioscuri si presentano nel ruolo di protagonisti o di comprimari».

[527] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. 30480; unknown provenance. CARPINO 1996, pp. 66-67, 72, fig. 3; CARPINO 2003, pp. 35 ss., pls. 47-48 (with published references).

[528] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. Fr. 150; from Tuscania. CARPINO 1996, p. 78, fig. 13; CARPINO 2003, pp. 37, 41, pl. 51 (with published references).

[529] See e.g. BRENDEL 1978, pp. 370-373; CARPINO 1996, p. 66. For Kalai and Zete as winged figures, see Ov. *met*. 6, 713-717.

[530] The winged Dioscuri appear, for instance, in a mirror in Florence (see DE PUMA 1986, p. 600, no. 27) and, drawing on a suggestion by Sassatelli, in the stele n. 138 from Bologna (SASSATELLI 1993, p. 50).

With regard to the purpose of this analysis, it can be noted that the persistent representation of rocks in images featuring the giant Talos might be linked to its mythical tradition, which is explicitly set in the rocky environment of Crete. In particular, literary sources dealing with the myth of Talos bestow a vital role in the setting of the giant's murder. The most reliable information we have about this event is primarily drawn from Apollonius from Rhodes. The Greek poet reports that Talos fought with stones and blames the moment when he «πεταίῳ στόνυχι χρίμψε σφυρόν»[531] for the giant's death. Immediately after the collision with the rock, in fact, «οὐδ᾽ ἔτι δηρὸν εἱστήκει προβλῆτος ἐπεμβεβαὼς σκοπέλοιο» and «ὣς ὅγε ποσσὶν ἀκαμάτοις τείως μὲν ἐπισταδὸν ἠωρεῖτο, ὕστερον αὖτ᾽ ἀμενηνὸς ἀπείρονι κάππεσε δούπῳ»[532].

The entire saga of the Argonauts, actually, represents par excellence the journey to mysterious and uncharted lands, far from civilization. As has been noted, «un récit comme celui que suppose la geste des Argonautes repose naturellement sur une opposition classique entre l'ici et l'ailleurs, le propre et l'étranger, le Grec et le non-Grec, le civilisé et le sauvage»[533].

In Etruria, one of the most famous episodes of the Argonautical saga is the victory of Pollux on **Amykos** in boxing, which we have already discussed in the previous pages[534]. As we will see, although not all literary sources agree that Amykos was killed after having been defeated[535], some figurative features hint at the inclusion of Amykos' episode into this section of our analysis. The Ficoroni cista is one of the

[531] APOLL. RH. *Arg.* IV.1679.
[532] APOLL. RH. *Arg.* IV.1680-1681; 1687-1689.
[533] CUSSET 2004, p. 31.
[534] See above pp. 172-174. An overview of Amykos' images in Etruscan art can be found in MARCHESE 1944
[535] See HYG. *Fab.* XVII; APOLL. RH. *Arg.* II.98: «[...] Ὁ δ'ἀμφ' ὀδύνῃ γνὺξ ἤριπην. [...] / [...] τοῦ δ'ἀθρόος ἔκχυτο θυμός». See SAPELLI 1975, pp. 247-249 for an overview of literary tradition about Amykos in relation to Etruscan figurative sources. On the relationship between figurative sources and Greek literary tradition, see DEL CORNO 1975.

most relevant sources on that episode (**pl. 101**)[536]. The scene takes place on rocky ground and by a fountain. The comparison with literary sources shows that the rocky setting is relevant to the mythical event being depicted. According to Valerius Flaccus, for instance, as soon as Jason and his comrades reach the cost of Amykos' land, «*spelunca apparuit ingens, arboribus super et dorso contecta minanti, non quae dona deum, non quae trahat aetheris ignem, infelix domus et sonitu tremibunda profundi*»[537]. On a similar note, Theocritus describes Amykos as the rocky-muscled guardian of a fountain made of rock from which water flows[538].

A fountain also appears in the scene depicted in a red-figure *stamnos* in Boston, dating to 340-320 B.C. (**pl. 76.a**)[539]. The vase represents Pollux as he is about to bind Amykos to a tree trunk. A small plant grows from the ground below Pollux's raised leg. The fountain, made of rocks covered by vegetal elements, is depicted on the scene's side and emerges from the palmette decoration.

---

[536] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 24787; dating to 330-310 B.C. See MASSA PAIRAULT 1992b.

[537] VAL. FL. IV.177-180.

[538] See THEOC. *Id.* XXII.34-52: «Κάστωρ δ' αἰολόπωλος ὅ τ' οἰνωπὸς Πολυδεύκης / ἄμφω ἐρημάζεσκον ἀποπλαγχθέντες ἑταίρων, / παντοίην ἐν ὄρει θηεύμενοι ἄγριον ὕλην. / εὗρον δ' ἀέναον κρήνην ὑπὸ λισσάδι πέτρῃ / ὕδατι πεπληθυῖαν ἀκηράτῳ: αἱ δ' ὑπένερθεν / λάλλαι κρυστάλλῳ ἠδ' ἀργύρῳ ἰνδάλλοντο / ἐκ βυθοῦ: ὑψηλαὶ δὲ πεφύκεσαν ἀγχόθι πεῦκαι / λεῦκαί τε πλάτανοί τε καὶ ἀκρόκομοι κυπάρισσοι, / ἄνθεά τ' εὐώδη, λασίαις φίλα ἔργα μελίσσαις, / ὅσσ' ἔαρος λήγοντος ἐπιβρύει ἀν λειμῶνας. / ἔνθα δ' ἀνὴρ ὑπέροπλος ἐνήμενος ἐνδιάασκε, / δεινὸς ἰδεῖν, σκληραῖσι τεθλασμένος οὔατα πυγμαῖς: / στήθεα δ' ἐσφαίρωτο πελώρια καὶ πλατὺ νῶτον / σαρκὶ σιδηρείῃ, σφυρήλατος οἷα κολοσσός. / ἐν δὲ μύες στερεοῖσι βραχίοσιν ἄκρον ὑπ' ὦμον / ἔστασαν ἠύτε πέτροι ὁλοίτροχοι, οὔστε κυλίνδων / χειμάρρους ποταμὸς μεγάλαις περιέξεσε δίναις: / αὐτὰρ ὑπὲρ νώτοιο καὶ αὐχένος ἠωρεῖτο / ἄκρων δέρμα λέοντος ἀφημμένον ἐκ ποδεώνων».

[539] Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 07.862; dating to 400-350 B.C.; attributed to the *Pittore del Ganimede di Oxford*. See DEL CORNO 1974, pp. 209-210, HARARI 1983, p. 148, tab. 24.1; JURGEIT 2006, p. 603, fig. 4. See also above p. 173.

A Praenestine mirror in Toledo, dating to about 300 B.C. (**pl. 76.b**)[540] features the same episode. Castor and Pollux stand on a rocky ground by Amykos, bound to the trunk after being defeated in the boxing match. On the right-hand side, there is a silen-headed fountain from which water flows[541].

In general, both the fountain and the rocky environment provide a context for the story. All the images reviewed above encapsulate the episode by representing the moment in which Amykos is bound to the tree[542]. As Dario Del Corno noted, the focus on this crystallized scene that obliterates the killing likely matches the final scene of Sophocles' satire drama dedicated to Amykos, only a few fragments of which are preserved[543]. This outcome, in fact, «incruenta e nello stesso tempo spettacolare», likley was «la più appropriata per un dramma satiresco»[544]. With regard to the tree, Del Corno noted that «nella tradizione letteraria il motivo dell'albero ritorna con singolare insistenza sotto svariate motivazioni»[545]. Conversely, with regard to the spring, the scholar observed that «il suo rilievo risulta alquanto ridotto nella tradizione letteraria»[546]. According to Del Corno, this discordance

[540] Toledo, Museum of Arts, inv. 1980.1340; dating to about 300 B.C. See GERHARD, KÖRTE 1897, no. 90; MACCABRUNI 1977; CARPINO 1996, pp. 72-73, fig. 8; CARPINO 2003, p. 24, pl. 32).

[541] MACCABRUNI 1977, p. 65 describes the fountain as a «roccia scolpita a forma di testa di leone». With regard to the rocky environment, Maccabruni observes that «come nella cista Ficoroni, i pochi tratti indicanti le asperità del terreno, oltre ad ambientare la scena in un paesaggio roccioso, suggeriscono l'esistenza di una serie di piani collocati in profondità rispetto al primo piano in cui agiscono i personaggi. Questo tentativo di resa spaziale è particolarmente evidente nell'indicazione delle rocce al di sopra della fonte» (MACCABRUNI 1977, pp. 65-66).

[542] WEIS 1982 suggested that the *adligatus* motif (namely, the motif including a figure bound to a tree) dates back to a painting of Amykos possibly located in central Italy. The scholar also suggested that the presence of the tree, uncommon in Greek art, was inspired by the Italic tradition of the *arbor infelix*. Regarding the *adligatus* motif in Etruscan art, see AMBROSINI 2015.

[543] DEL CORNO 1975, pp. 213-214.

[544] DEL CORNO 1975, p. 213.

[545] DEL CORNO 1975, p. 214, fn. 21.

[546] DEL CORNO 1975, p. 219.

supports the idea that Amykos' iconography «riflette il mito nella particolare versione che ne diede Sofocle»[547].
These figurative features likely evoke the tradition according to which Amykos was the guardian of a spring. In Etruscan imagerie, in fact, non-monumetalized springs «rimandano a un paesaggio selvaggio e non civilizzato»[548], consistenlty with the «frequente predilezione del dramma satiresco per il tema della fonte»[549].

Beyond the issue of models and sources, the repetition of visual details suggests that they might have a specific meaning at the figurative level. In particular, two aspects can be pointed out. On the one hand, it can be noted that water is key to Amykos' episode. The king's punishment, in fact, «stigmatizza l'atto di un Barbaro che rifiuta l'acqua, cioè l'ospitalità»[550]. On the other hand, we should not forget that water had a substantial functional and symbolic value in the Etruscan definition of sacred and ritual spaces[551]. Moreover, in a number of Etruscan images, the presence of a fountain evokes that of an altar. Subsequently, it is entrusted with chthonian connotations[552]. As we will see in more detail in the following sections, fountain and

[547] DEL CORNO 1975, pp. 220-221.
[548] MAGGIANI 2012, p. 282. Concerning the representation of sources, the scholar identifies three different types. In the first one, the source is left in the primitive state (p. 280, no. 1); the second type includes sources which are given an elementary arrangement, consisting of a jet mouth (p. 280, no. 2); the third one comprises sources with a leonine protome mouth.
[549] DEL CORNO 1975, p. 220.
[550] MASSA PAIRAULT 1992b, p. 124. Moreover, as also Del Corno noted, «il divieto di attingere ad essa era la causa diretta della sfida pugilistica» (DEL CORNO 1975, p. 220). On the «centralità del 'fare acqua'» in Amykos' mythical account, see MARRONI 2017, pp. 263-266.
[551] See COMELLA 2005; FACCHINETTI 2010.
[552] See e.g. BANTI 1956, p. 148, fn. 14. Regarding the silen-headed fountain represented in the Toledo mirror, Brendel suggests that the head is an original Etruscan motif associated with the chthonian sphere (see BRENDEL 1978, p. 373). See also BÉRARD 1983, pp. 20-27 for a few remarks on the figurative relationship between fountain and violence scenes.

altar can be considered «segni iconici rispettivamente dell'agguato e del sacrificio», and often «si fondono in un'architettura mista»[553].

On a wider inspection, considering other figurative occurrences of the *adligatus* motif, we can note that as well as having an etiological value and – perhaps – anticipating Amykos' destiny of death, the fountain account for the identification of Amykos' episode compared to other figures bound to a tree. While the most immediate reference is to Marsyas[554] or Pyritoo (**pl. 102.a**)[555], it is worth considering that the motif is also attested in Etruria in relation to more generic subjects[556]. In all these instances, there is no indication of the fountain.

After examining full fights involving Amazons, giants, and centaurs, the analysis should finally consider full scenes featuring **confrontations between human/humanized armies**. In particular, several examples dealing with generic clashes are provided by Faliscan pottery. A Faliscan *stamnos* of unknown provenance in Bonn (**pl. 102.b**)[557] shows a fighting scene on foot and on horseback, taking place on rocky ground. A calyx-krater in Civita Castellana (**pl. 102.c**)[558] and attributed to the same painter as the Bonn *stamnos* shows a comparable scene on rocky soil. Both images represent warriors as they are about to be struck to death. Two iconographic details reinforced the theme in both instances: rocky ground and birds (possibly swans) resting by or

[553] UCCHINO 2009, p. 189.
[554] Red-figure krater: Aléria, Musée J. Carcopino; from Aléria, tomb 33. AMBROSINI 2015, tab. I.
[555] *Thymiaterion*, New York, Metropolitan Museum, inv. 1972.118.87; dating to the end of the fourth century B.C. (AMBROSINI 2015, pp. 179-181, tab. II.a). See the Praenestine mirror from Monterotondo (AMBROSINI 2015, pp. 180-181, fig. 2).
[556] See AMBROSINI 2015, pp. 186-189.
[557] Bonn, Akademisches Kunstmuseum, inv. 1569; attributed to the Pittore di Civita Castellana 43969 (BENTZ 2008, pp. 32-33, no. 21; POLA 2016, p. 179, pls. CLXXIV-CLXXV).
[558] Civita Castellana, Museo Archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 2420. See POLA 2016, p. 178, pls. CLXVIII-CLXIX.

advancing on the dying warrior[559]. Generally speaking, it can be noted that in Faliscan vases a rocky ground is recurrently depicted in correspondence with dying figures.

A *stamnos* in Berlin (**pl. 103.a**)[560] provides an example relevant to our purposes. The vase shows the sacrifice of the Trojan prisoners on the tomb of Patroclus. In the scene, a naked warrior sitting on a rock is about to be killed by Achilles. On the right-hand side, a bird is resting on a stone extending from the palmette decoration below the handle.
Corresponding iconographies can also be found in the Etruscan area. One side of a red-figure krater from Vulci in Paris (**pl. 103.b**)[561], for instance, shows the moment when Ajax Telamonius (name inscribed) pierces a Trojan prisoner who is kneeling on rocky ground. Behind the dying man is Charun, who evokes imminent death and performs the same function as the birds in the previous examples.

On closer inspection, the last two examples allow for a broader review of killing images, as they show a specific type of murder, namely **human sacrifice and ritual murder**. In the mythical plot, this type of killing often represents the conclusion of attacks or ambushes. As a general rule, the moment directly preceding death is at the very core of the depiction[562].

---

[559] The bird of prey as a premonition of death dates back to Greek literary tradition (see e.g. HOM. *Od*. II.146-155). On the symbolic meaning of birds of prey, see the discussion in D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 1999, pp. 55-56 and MARTELLI 2017, p. 370. The traditional account of the swan as an omen of death can be traced back to the myth (referenced in CIC. *Tuscul*. 1.30) according to which Apollo donated to this bird the ability to predict its death. Regarding the scheme of the «fighting warriors with a bird», see MARAS 2016, pp. 95-101.

[560] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. V.I.5825; from Sovana. MASSA PAIRAULT 1992, pp. 133-134, fig. 115; DE ANGELIS 1999, pp. 53 ss.; POLA 2016, p. 259, pl. CCLIV.

[561] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département des Monnaies, Médailles et Antiques, inv. 920; dating to 330-330 B.C. CRISTOFANI 1987a, pp. 226-226; 327, no. 174; BONNECHERE 2000, p. 255, fn. 1.

[562] On human sacrifice and bloodshed in the ancient world, see VERNANT 1981; BURKERT 1983; VERNANT 1991; BREMMER 2007a; BREMMER 2007b; BONNECHERE, GAGNÉ 2013; NAGY, PRESCENDI 2013. On representations of human sacrifice in mythological contexts, see ALROTH 1992. On human sacrifices and ritual murders in

The same subject matters appear in a number of Etruscan images characterized by a similar arrangement of figures.
The Torre San Severo sarcophagus (**pl. 104**)[563], dating to the fourth century B.C., shows a frieze that is entirely centered on the theme of sacrifice. One of the long sides is especially relevant to this analysis. The relief shows the sacrifice of Polyxena at Achilles' tomb. In front of the burial monument, Neoptolemus is about to kill the young daughter of Priam. The scene takes place alongside a rocky polygonal structure, on the top of which a male figure rests his foot. The form of the rock evokes an altar. Considering the different altar typologies documented for the Etruscan area, the shape of this rocky-altar can be compared to that used for victims to be slaughtered. The same type is also possibly depicted in a sardonic scarab with a figure named «Uthuze», ripping a quadruped apart[564]. This altar type usually lacked any decoration and was consecrated to chthonian deities[565]. In the Torre San Severo sarcophagus, the sacrifice scheme is the same already reviewed for other killing scenes (e.g., the Torlonia amphora). With his left leg bent and the right outstretched, Achilles rushes over Polyxena holding her hair as she falls to the ground[566].

Since the fifth century B.C., the same characters' attitude recurs on similar images of male figures threatening females. Significantly enough, similar ambush scenes in mirrors systematically take place in

---

Etruscan culture, see BONNECHERE 2000; DI FAZIO 2001; BONFANTE 2014; DI FAZIO 2017. Drawing on DI FAZIO 2001, our distinction between human sacrifice and ritual murder is based on BRELICH 1966, p. 12.

563 Orvieto, Museo 'Claudio Faina'. GALLI 1916; CAGIANO DE AZEVEDO 1970; COLONNA 1985b, p. 121, figs. 7-10; CAMPOREALE 1992, no. 82; MASSA PAIRAULT 1992, pp. 126-130, figs. 109-111; RONCALLI 1994, p. 114; MASSA PAIRAULT 1996, pp. 182 ss. Regarding the events related to the discovery of the sarcophagus, see BRANDA 2012. For further details on this sarcophagus, see *infra* p. 271.

564 Mario I. Pozzesi private collection (Argentina), inv. RC 6603; from Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis; dating to fourth century B.C. AMBROSINI 2011b, p. 45, no. 62.

565 COLONNA 1985a, p. 23.

566 The male figure threatening a woman while resting his foot on a rock in the engraved mirror Edinburgh, Royal Scottish Museum, inv. A.1907.694 (JOHNSTONE 1937, pp. 393-394, pl. V.2), possibly a forgery, performs a comparable gesture.

rocky settings. Two engraved examples dating to 475-450 B.C., for instance, show Menelaus threatening Helen, who clings to the statue of Menrva. In the first example (**pl. 105.a**)[567], the king of Sparta stands on a «rocher oblique qui descend vers le centre du miroir»[568]. The second, more cursory mirror (**pl. 105.b**)[569] shows two cone-shaped projections rising from the ground and the medallion's upper edge, respectively. A two-leave plant grows from a wavy line representing the soil. A column stands in the background[570].

The comparison with a mirror in Berlin suggests that these projections belong to the rocky soil. A mythical subject is also at the base of the Berlin mirror (**pl. 106.b**)[571], which features Orestes who is slaying Clytemnestra. He holds her hair and wields his sword. On his back, there is a snake-bearing female daemon. On the right-hand side, Clytemnestra has fallen to the ground. On her back, a pointed projection rising from the ground is partially covered by her figure. Its profile is made of a double line. As she falls, Clytemnestra rests her right hand on this element, which is likely a rocky bulge. Its shape matches the rocky protrusion depicted in the mirror's inferior exergue, where a naked young man faces a snake-shaped monster. Significantly enough, the scene in the medallion finds a specific parallel in a fourth-century Paestan red-figure neck-amphora at the J. Paul Getty Museum

[567] Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. 1744. EMMANUEL-REBUFFAT 1988, pp. 48-50, no. 11.
[568] EMMANUEL-REBUFFAT 1988, p. 48.
[569] Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. 1745. EMMANUEL-REBUFFAT 1988, pp. 50-52, no. 12.
[570] According to EMMANUEL-REBUFFAT 1988, p. 51, «la colonne qui figure sur ce dessin est probablement un reste du temple qu'on trouve sur le miroir Gerhard 398, ou de l'édicule qui abrite le Palladion […]». However, the comparison with other mirrors featuring a male figure who intimidates a woman suggests that the presence of the pillar relies on the entire image structure rather than being related to the specific myth's setting. See e.g. London, British Museum, inv. 1824,0489.82, that shows a warrior fighting an Amazon next to a column standing in the background (**pl. 106.a**).
[571] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. Fr. 148. RENDELI 1996, pp. 20-21, fig. 25; DE ANGELIS 2002, p. 61, fig. 20, who suggests that the «etrusca Erinni» is ment to «sottolineare l'empietà dell'atto di Oreste». A comparable image is engraved in the mirror Tübingen, Tübingen, Eberhard Karls Universität, Instituts für Klassische Archäologie, inv. 88 (CARPINO 2003, pl. 101).

in Malibu[572]. The vase depicts Clytemnestra falling to her knees on rocky ground as Orestes attacks her with his sword. As in the Berlin mirror, also in this instance, the scene takes place above a Fury or Erinys holding snakes.

Considering the repertoire of Etruscan mirrors, Orestes and Clytemnestra also appear in another example (**pl. 106.c**)[573] , showing an aggression scene on a rocky ground from which two large blossoms grow. Additionally, an engraved mirror in Toulouse shows a rocky environment in which a warrior is caught in the act of sacrificing two maidens at an altar[574]. Moving to vase painting, we can include in this group the scene depicted in a red-figure *stamnos* at the Museo Greogriano Etrusco with a naked man caught in the act of killing a woman on a rocky ground (**pl. 107.a**)[575].

A protofaliscan calyx-krater in Boston by the Nazzano Painter (**pl. 107.b**)[576] shows Telephus seated on an altar and holding the infant Orestes. On the left-hand side, Agamemnon is rushing towards the altar as another male figure is restraining him. They both stand on a low rocky ground adjacent to the altar.

The same scheme appears in a red-figure volute krater from Vulci in Mainz analyzed above (**pl. 89.c**)[577]. In this image, Eros holds Menelaus

[572] Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, acc. n. 80.AE.155.1; dating to 340-330 B.C.; attributed to the Painter of Würzburg. See TAPLIN 2013, p. 16, fig. 8.

[573] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. Fr. 31; dating tot he end oft he fifth century B.C. DE ANGELIS 2002, pp. 60-61, fig. 19.

[574] Toulouse, Musée Saint-Raymond.

[575] Vatican City, Museo Greogriano Etrusco, inv. 18218; dating to 330-320 B.C. (After TRENDALL 1955, pp. 240-241, Z 95, tab. LXIII.a, e.

[576] Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 1970.487; dating 380-360 B.C. HARARI 1983, p. 148, pl. 24.3.

[577] Mainz, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, inv. 38835; dating to about 330 B.C.; belonging to the Funnel Group. See BÜSING-KOLBE 1978, pp. 11-14, pls. 1-2; CRISTOFANI 1987a, p. 325, no. 172; CRISTOFANI 1993, p. 94, pls. XXIII.c; XXIV; XXVI.a-b. For further details on this scene and interpretation of Menelaus and Helen, see especially the discussion in HARARI 1995, pp. 107; 124, pl. 5. For further details on this vase, see above p. 187.

as he is about to ambush with his sword Helen, kneeling on rocky ground and embracing a Palladium.

The images described here above are especially relevant when considering the scene depicted in a Faliscan *stamnos* from Corchiano in Civita Castellana (**pl. 108**)[578]. This vase, which is likely strictly related to the Nazzano Painter[579], shows Telephus threatening the young Orestes by an altar in the presence of Agamemnon, Apollon, and Clytemnestra. The mother of Orestes is depicted in the foreground, as she falls on her knees on a large stone resting on the ground. In light of the mirror engraved scenes analyzed above – which emphasize the specific falling scheme and the boulder – we can suggest that the fall of Clytemnestra by her little son bears a peculiar value. Her attitude, matching that of images centered on her murder, is likely to prefigure her destiny of death by the hand of Orestes himself.

The oblique rocky ground which characterizes one of the Paris mirrors analyzed above also appears in another Louvre mirror, dating to 375-350 B.C. (**pl. 109.a**)[580]. In this instance, the medallion represents a scene from an unknown local myth involving «luqorcos» who intimidates «pilonicos taseio filios» as «taseos» rushes to defend him. The entire iconographic *schema* allows for a comparison with the myth of Telephus, which was relatively widespread in the Etruscan area. Although the scheme of this mirror matches these of the previous examples, the roles of the characters are somewhat different. Nonetheless, these images date back to a shared prototype.

Another local myth is possibly engraved in a Praenestine mirror at The Cleveland Museum of Art, dating to 325-300 B.C. (**pl. 109.b**)[581]. In the middle of the scene, a bearded man, naked apart from the *balteus*,

[578] Civita Castellana, Museo Archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 6208; from Corchiano, second cemetery of Vallone, tomb 15. KRAUSKOPF 1981, no. 19; STRAUSS 1994, no. 65; POLA 2016, pp. 110, 131, pls. CVII-CVIII.
[579] See POLA 2016, p. 110.
[580] Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. 1729. EMMANUEL-REBUFFAT 1997, pp. 36-39, no. 8; GAULTIER, HAUMESSER, CHATZIEFREMIDOU 2014, p. 153.
[581] Cleveland, The Cleveland Museum of Art, inv. 1920.170. *Accessions* 1920, p. 109; DE PUMA 1983, pp. 296-301, figs. 17-21 DE ANGELIS 2002, p. 71, fig. 27.

moves to the right, threatening a small-size male figure with his sword. A standing naked woman on the left holds back the armed figure by his arm, while an old women, wearing a sleeved chiton, kneels on the right margin and raises the right arm bent at the elbow. The scene takes place on irregular soil from which some plants grow.

In reference to the subject matter, the reviewed images refer to different mythical accounts. Considering the Greek mythical plot, not all the investigated ambush or attack episodes automatically relate to the sphere of sacrifice. We can note for instance that, from the Classic Greek perspective, «non è sacrificio la morte pretesa dai potenti, come quella di Polissena e Cassandra reclamate a diverso titolo dai signori della guerra in contesti del tutto stravolti sul piano religioso, e in atmosfere che […] alternano allucinazione e blasfemia»[582]. As far as Etruscan images are concerned, it is quite challenging to establish with precision the nature of the crime on the basis of the analysis of the Greek background. As a general rule, we can focus on the acquisition and transformation of figurative models without providing any definitive answer regarding how the Etruscan audience receives the mythical and cultural content conveyed by the models.

Figurative patterns frequently recur in the images examined above regardless of the distinction between cases in which the tragic ending is more evident and those in which it is less obvious. Moreover, in the case of Etruscan mirrors, establishing whether or not (and to what extent) the Etruscan audience may have identified these images as sacrificial killings is most likely genuinely incidental. The material medium, which primarily relates to the female sphere, shows that images are not centered on the murder/sacrifice intended as an offer to the god. Instead, their focus is on human and gender relationships rotating around the sacrifice. The specific success of Clytemnestra (expressly identified by inscriptions) and Orestes' matricide confirms this feature. This episode, which refers to the most shameful of crimes,

[582] BELTRAMETTI 2008, p. 68. Nevertheless, it can be noted that the religious and cultural nature of the setting grants for the characterization of the gesture as an impious one on a figurative level.

calls into play multiple family and social ties, which are the real protagonists[583].
In relation to this point, the scheme's repetition corresponds to the recurrence of a general theme (common to all individual stories) and an ever-present identifiable meaning identifiable beneath the individual scenes. For this reason, an analysis of these images as a unitary group seems correct.

For the purposes of this analysis, an overview of this group allows for general consideration. We can note that the group shows rocky elements as a recurrent figurative feature. Murders and sacrifices are regularly set by an altar and on stony ground. The warrior depicted by the altar with its victim stands on rocky ground. The altar itself stands on the same floor. While the altar grants a certain degree of ritualization to the action being depicted, no other feature conveys the ritual nature of the murders. The absence of trees, which regularly appear by the altar in images of 'standard sacrifices' (see e.g. **pl. 110.a**)[584], reveals the unconventional nature of the murders reviewed above.

By acknowledging the blasphemous nature of the murder set in a rocky environment[585] we can best support Maria Donatella Gentili's interpretation of the so-called *Sarcofago delle Danaidi*[586]. While one of the long sides shows an episode of the Danaid's myth, the other (**pl. 110.b**)

[583] See BELTRAMETTI 2008, p. 62: «Oreste, il più giovane fratello di Ifigenia, è stato chiamato da Apollo a uccidere sua madre, a compiere quel matricidio su cui è stato fondato il nuovo ordine della città, ma anche a spargere il sangue più consanguineo, quello che la terra non assorbe».
[584] Terracotta relief plaque with the sacrifice of a ram: Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 88.364; reportedly from Cerveteri, Vignaccia sanctuary; dating to fourth/third century B.C. (NAGY 2013, pp. 1001, 1003, fig. 54.20). See also Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 646.
[585] See also *infra*.
[586] Tuscania, Museo Archeologico Nazionaleinv. 15531; dating to the end of the fourth century B.C. GENTILI 2009. See also DE LUCIA BROLLI 1981; HERBIG 1952, pp. 48-49, no. 85, pls. 31-32.a-b.

shows an «oscuro mito indigeno»[587] that has been variously interpreted[588]. Through the comparison with a number of other sarcophagi attributed to the same workshop, Gentili noted that the *Sarcofago delle Danaidi* «si mostra fedele a canoni stilistici di un certo rigore, ancora alieni da alcune tendenze che si fanno strada negli altri sarcofagi della bottega, quali […] il ricorso a notazioni paesaggistiche»[589]. Significantly enough, despite the lack of any vegetal elements, in the 'Etruscan side', the two figures who are about to be killed are seated on rocks. In particular, the female figure is seated on a polygonal block while the male figure is seated on the ground. As Gentili noted, these characters' positions and gestures hint at their being supplicants[590]. The attitude of the two effigies above the altar confirms the unholy status of the murder perpetrated against supplicants. They look in the opposite direction to the killing scene (κατάμυσις). Therefore, the rocky setting is consistent with the leading theme of the sarcophagus, which is meant to be a «monito morale nei confronti dell'empietà»[591]. Unlike standard sacrifice, the blasphemous murder cannot occur in the standard ritual setting, usually marked and framed by trees.

Similarly, another sarcophagus dating to the end of the fourth century, from Tuscania, shows Artemis and Apollo slaying Niobe's sons, who fall dying on rocky ground[592].

A contrasting example completes our overview, as it shows a preference for plant elements instead of rocky ones.

---

[587] GENTILI 2009, p. 657.
[588] On the mythological interpretation, see SIMON 1984 and DI FAZIO 2001. On the historical interpretation, see VAN DER MEER 1993, pp. 382-386.
[589] GENTILI 2009, p. 654.
[590] GENTILI 2009, p. 656-657.
[591] GENTILI 2009, p. 657.
[592] Vatican City, Museo Greogriano Etrusco, inv. MV 14947.2.1; from Tuscania, Carcarello necropolis, Vipinana's tomb, Veltur Vipinana's sarcophagus; dating to 310-300 B.C.

The ambush of the Trojan Prince Troilos by Achilles was a favorite motif in Etruscan art from the end of the seventh century B.C. onwards[593]. The Fould *stamnos* attributed to the *Pittore dell'Aja*, Louvre CA 6529 (**pl. 111**)[594], and the British Museum mirror inv. 1873,0820.108[595] document the fortune of the subject until the fourth and the third century B.C. The *stamnos* and the mirror respectively significantly illustrate the two crucial motifs covered by Etruscan images: the ambush and the killing. The two events occur in association with each other on the two sides of a Pontic amphora by the Tytios Painter (**pl. 112.a**)[596].

In many Etruscan images (see e.g. **pls. 112.a-c; 113.a**)[597], including the Fould *stamnos* and the Pontic amphora, a recurring motif is the presence of a tree or shrub. In some instances (e.g. the Paris *stamnos*) the fountain also takes a rocky conformation. According to a scheme widely documented in Greek images[598], these vegetal elements usually

[593] List of examples in MARTELLI 2017, p. 365, fn. 2. For a seventh-century example from the Calabresi Tomb (bucchero amphora with relief decoration), see PRAYON 1977.
[594] Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. CA 6529. HARARI 1996, pp. 119-120, figs. 4-5; GILOTTA 2012. For further details on this vase, see *infra* p. 310.
[595] The representation of Achilles holding the severed head of Troilos, as it appears in this mirror, dates back to Greek models (see e.g. the black-figure hydria of the Leagros Group, London, British Museum, inv. 1837,0609.69, dating to the end of the sixth century B.C.; for further details on this scheme, see DURAND, LISSARRAGUE 1999, pp. 91-102), and widely spread in Etruscan art: see DI FAZIO 2001, p. 458.
[596] Reading, Ure Museum of Greek Archaeology, inv. Ure 47.6.1; dating to about 550 B.C. (SCHAUENBURG 1970, pp. 66-67, figs. 33-34; RIDI 2009, p. 165, fig. 8).
[597] **Pl. 112.a**: Pontic amphora by the Tytios Painter, Reading, The Ure Museum of Greek Archaeology, inv. Ure 47.6.1; dating to about 550 B.C. (SCHAUENBURG 1970, pp. 66-67, figs. 33-34; RIDI 2009, p. 165, fig. 8); **pl. 113.a**: Pontic amphora by the Silen Painter, Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. E 703; dating to about 540 B.C. (RIZZO 1987, pp. 33, 152, 302, no. 105; BÉRARD 1983, pp. 26-27; RIDI 2009, p. 166, fig. 9); **pl. 112.b**: black-figure amphora from Narce (necropoli di Covone di Monte Li Santi, tomb 2 [LXXII]), Civita Castellana, Museo Archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 5200 (SCHAUENBURG 1970, pp. 62, figs. 29-30; CAMPOREALE 1984, p. 119, no. 28; MICHETTI 2016, pp. 172, 179-180, fig. 3; see p. 172 for attribution); **pl. 112.c**: Genève, Benoit de Gorski collection; attributed to the pittore del Vaticano 238 (MICHETTI 2016, pp. 172, 181, fig. 4; MARTELLI 2017, figs. 1-3).
[598] For a list of examples, see MARTELLI 2017, p. 369, fn. 22.

appear associated with the fountain or altar by which the ambush occurs.

However, in ambush scenes, plants do not only appear when Achilles is hiding, waiting for Troilus to come close, as is the case with an amphora in Genève (**pl. 112.c**)[599]. They also occur at the ambush scene when it is happening, and Achilles, having come out of his hiding place, is attacking Troilus, still alive. That is the case of the Pontic amphora by the Tytios Painter (**pl. 112.a**)[600]. Side A shows Achilles on horseback and Troilos lying on the ground. Side B shows Achilles carrying Troilos toward an altar made of bricks. A bush grows in the middle of the scene, between the two men and the altar.

The use of plants, which generally refers to the ambush setting in the shrine of Apollo Timbreo, would therefore have a multifaceted meaning. On the one hand, the function of plants in identifying the action of a hiding figure is consistent with other examples analyzed in previous sections[601]. On the other hand, as plants appear by the altar or fountain even when the ambush is in progress, there may be something more.

In the Pontic amphora in Paris (**pl. 113.a**)[602], Achilles is grabbing Troilus by his hair. The hero is moving to the left. His arm and leg are superimposed on the tree behind him, next to the fountain. The act of 'crossing' reveals the painter's interest in rendering the ambush in progress: Achilles is coming out of his hiding place and is about to pull Troilus off his horse. Conversely, in the Tytios Painter's amphora, there is no evidence of this kind of relationship between the figures and the tree. Instead, standing in the center, the plant acts as a separating pivot between the two sections of the scene (the altar and Achilles and

[599] Genève, Benoit de Gorski collection; attributed to the pittore del Vaticano 238 (MICHETTI 2016, pp. 172, 181, fig. 4; MARTELLI 2017, figs. 1-3).

[600] Reading, The Ure Museum of Greek Archaeology, inv. Ure 47.6.1; dating to about 550 B.C. (SCHAUENBURG 1970, pp. 66-67, figs. 33-34; RIDI 2009, p. 165, fig. 8).

[601] See above, p. 76.On this subject, see *infra* pp. 303 ss.

[602] Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. E 703; dating to about 540 B.C.; attributed to the Silen Painter (RIZZO 1987, pp. 33, 152, 302, no. 105; BÉRARD 1983, pp. 26-27; RIDI 2009, p. 166, fig. 9).

Troilus). The possibility of identifying this kind of drawing with a palm tree hints at a link with the sanctuary setting[603].

Seeking a parallel, we can see that a large palm tree also stands next to the altar in the ambush-scene fresco of the *Tomba dei Tori* in Tarquinia (**pl. 113.b**)[604], one of the most relevant examples for the purposes of this analysis. In addition to the high palm by the fountain and the shrubs between the horse's paws, this fresco shows many other plants around the figures. On the left-hand side, Achille stands between high bushes hiding him from Troilos, who is approaching[605]. A row of seven different saplings is depicted over the altar. Another row of nine trees differing in shape is displayed in the lower band at the bottom of the scene.

Moreover, two large trees stand on either side of the wall, beyond the doors enclosing the scene, between the doors and the room's corners. The well-ordered rows of trees represented near the fountain and under the frieze, arranged as a frame to the upper fresco, evoke figurative constructions recurring in other archaic tombs, where rows of trees are placed all along the walls. For comparable instances, we have identified a specific value and suggested that trees frame the tomb's space as a ritual space. In the *Tomba dei Tori*, the trees likely convey the same function. In fact, they are arranged as a fenced area surrounding the fountain and the scene, respectively. In other words, the space of the ambush is framed by trees. Once compared with tomb paintings featuring ritual scenes analyzed in previous sections, this

[603] PAMPANINI 1930, pp. 307-308.

[604] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis. STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 353-355; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 379-387 (with published references; *adde* MARTELLI 2017, pp. 367-368, with a critique of the interpretation of Achille's knife as a *machaira* having the figurative power to reveal the sacrificial nature of the killing. This interpretation was first proposed by CERCHIAI 1980. Cerchiai's argument is accepted in HEDREEN 2012, p. 137).

[605] A Tyrrhenian amphora in Philadelphia (Penn Museum, inv. MS2522) shows Achilles who waits for Troilos (who is approaching on horseback) next to a column-fountain from which a ivy shoot grows. The motif widely spread in Thyrrenian vases (see e.g. the example in the art market SCHAUENBURG 1970, p. 54, fig. 21).

vegetal frame grants the image a ritual value. Subsequently, in this fresco, the killing of Troilos appears to be highly formalized as the setting in a physically marked space shows.

The fresco of the *Tomba dei Tori* shows that when the murder of Troilos moves to the Etruscan background – or the specific background of the tomb's owner – the episode betrays its institutional function. Within the figurative context of the *Tomba dei Tori*, the ambush of Troilus stands in fact as a representative episode, which is officialized as part of the death's passage towards the afterlife.

The vegetal features in archaic representations of murders is not a *unicum*. For instance, shrubs are used in preference to rocks in the threatening scene by an altar (most likely Neoptolemus attacking Polyxena) of the amphora Louvre E 703 by the Silen Painter (**pl. 113.a**)[606]. In previous sections, I have noted that Pontic vases feature dance performance without resorting to landscape features, in contrast to the Micali Painter's production[607]. Conversely, two shrubs grow between the figures in the Louvre amphora – the body of which depicts a row of dancing figures lacking any landscape detail. The setting of the scene in a space marked by trees and the depiction of plants by the altar, in the area of the killing, likely grants some sort of official character to the scene. On closer inspection, it can be noted that this perspective appears consistent with the Greek perception of Polyxena's death. The sacrifice of the young women is decoded as a libation, an offering that is requested[608].

[606] Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. E 703; dating to about 540 B.C. HANNESTAD 1974, pl. 29; BÉRARD 1983, pp. 26-27; RIZZO 1987, pp. 33, 152, 302, no. 105; RIDI 2009, p. 166, fig. 9. For further details on this scene, see MUGIONE 2014, who describes a «tomba sormontata da un altare».

[607] See below pp. 113 ss.

[608] On juridical aspects of Polyxena's sacrifice, see BATTEZZATO 2010.

3.1.4. *Landscape for Lovers and Eros*

The purpose of this section is to present images featuring love-based subjects whose arrangement makes use of landscape features.
Since their schemes match, this section includes examples featuring both humans and gods as long as they are depicted in a humanized attitude. On the contrary, examples analyzed in the following section (*Landscape for Celestial Dwellings*) show – we might say – mere 'divine actions'. That is to say, their figurative structure starkly differs from these of human/humanized scenes since it is strictly related to the divine subject. This is the case, for instance, of Herakles entering the Olympus, whose representation is based on specific schemes, which are unlikely to be generalized to human contexts. Conversely, in love-themed images, divine and human subjects alternate with a certain regularity without altering the image's meaning and scheme. This distinction between humanized and divine scenes also explains why generic pursuing scenes (which normally include men pursuing women) are included in this section, while images of Thesan pursuing Tithonos or Kephalos are postponed to the following one. As Robin Osborne noted in his analysis of pursuing scenes in Athenian pottery, the transgression represented by the 'woman pursuing man' scheme can only come about through divine action[609].

In reference to Etruscan erotic images, we can distinguish three pictorial themes. The first group refers to chase, ambush and kidnap scenes. The second group encompasses images featuring erotically oriented conversations and encounters, while the third one includes scenes with female figures grooming themselves by a *louterion*.

Compared with satyrs depicted in archaic black-figure vessels, where erotic strain is not a dominant theme[610], Dionysian characters of

[609] See OSBORNE 1994.
[610] Although erotic connotations apply also to Archaic Dionysiac iconography, it can be noted that in black-figure painting «sexual scene are rare and seem to derive from Attic

Faliscan and Etruscan red-figure vases are most often engaged in sexually oriented scenes. Many of them take place in a landscape setting with rocks and plants with lanceolate leaves. These images, which account for the most significant part of the pursuit scenes group, typically show satyrs pursuing maenads/winged figures or men attacking/raping female figures. The model for all of these scenes is likely provided by Greek fifth-century images featuring heroes, gods, or ephebes pursuing mortal or immortal women[611]. In the Praenestine repertoire, examples of satyrs threatening male figures are also documented. A mirror in Villa Giulia (**pl. 114.b**)[612] features a satyr

prototype» (PALEOTHODOROS 2007, p. 190). Although erotic groups of ithyphallic satyrs and nude females are documented in Etruscan black-figure vases, their overall subject is very different from the red-figure vases repertoire. Despite the erotic context, in fact, in archaic black-figure pottery the central theme is the celebration of Dionysian performances. In other words, images mainly refer to the Dionysiac *thiasus*, in which characters are equally linked to dance, wine, music, and sex. This remark is best supported by the relevant role played by music, which is conveyed by the involvement of musicians (see e.g. the cortège of the amphora Louvre E 703 by the Silen Painter [**pl. 113.a**]). Moreover, even when arranged in a fugue scheme as a whole, the position of individual figures usually is consistent with dance schemes (see e.g. the double-handed olla from Tolle, tomb 969; PAOLUCCI 2011a, p. 173, fig. 22). A properly erotic aggression scene is depicted in an amphora in Tarquinia (Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. RC 947 [**pl. 114.a**]; see GINGE 1987, pp. 45-46, no. 18, pls. XXIII-XXV). Either of the two sides of the vase shows a satyr chasing a female figure. On side A, a central long wavy stem with a row of dots on either side is depicted next to the satyr, while a floral element with heart-shaped bud grows between his legs. On side B, there are two heart-shaped flowers between the legs of the figures and high palmette-like blossom (GINGE 1987, p. 46 describes it as an «element floreale […] complesso, consistente in un bocciolo semi aperto su uno stelo con due grappoli d'uva attaccati ad esso». On the identification of this motif as a palm, see PAMPANINI 1930, p. 306 and my discussion above, p. 80).

[611] For an overview of the Greek repertoire, see STANSBURY-O'DONNELL 2009. Pursuit scenes are widely documented in Polygnotos and his followers' production, and widely spread in Southern-Italian production (TODISCO, SISTO 1998, p. 594, fn. 92). For the diffusion of Polygnotos' and other Greek painters' artworks in Etruria, see SCARRONE 2015, pp. 184-185.

[612] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 12999; dating to the end of the fourth century B.C. MANSUELLI 1943, pp. 513-517, no. 12; BAGLIONE, GILOTTA 2007, pp. 83-85, no. 31. On the gender of the right figure, see MANSUELLI 1943, p. 516 (*contra* DELLA SETA 1918, p. 440, who interpreted the figure as a maenad).

sitting on a rock and holding a young man by his arm as he flees to the right.

As a calyx-krater by Sommavilla Painter in Dunedin (**pl. 114.c**)[613] shows, plant elements characterize pursuing scenes on Etruscan red-figure vases since the end of the fifth century B.C. Both Attic and Southern-Italian models (the latter being similarly elaborated from Greek examples)[614] influenced early red-figure production. However, in the Dunedin krater, only the subject and its visual arrangement (that is to say, the scheme, but not the flower) can be traced back to these archetypes. Instead, the insertion of an object between the legs dates back to patterns previously spread in Etruscan black-figure vases and later documented in red-figure vases.

In Faliscan pottery, pursuits of satyrs and maenads typically occur on irregular rocky soil indicated by undulating profiles (see e.g. **pls. 115-117**)[615]. A few examples lack any rock features and show only

[613] Dunedin, Otago Museum, inv. E.48.225; dating to the end of the fifth / beginning of the fourth century B.C. In one of the two sides of the vase, a large bloom grows between the legs of a satyr who runs toward the left chasing a young girl. To the right, another woman is running away from the satyr. SCARRONE 2015, p. 203, no. IX.11bis, pl. 57. Regarding the Sommavilla Painter, see SCARRONE 2015, pp. 203-213.

[614] See SCARRONE 2015, p. 171, 178-187.

[615] In general, pursuing scenes especially spread in the first phases of the Faliscan red-figure production (see POLA 2017, p. 204). **Pl. 115.a**: Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 8359 (HARARI 1997b, no. 18; POLA 2016, p. 64, pls. XVIII-XIX); **pl. 115.b**: Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 8236; from Fabrica di Roma, loc. Poggio delle Monache (MASSA PAIRAULT 2008, fig. 5 [indicated as inv. 8326]; POLA 2017, p. 199, fn. 19, p. 205, fig. 10); **pl. 116.a**: New York, Metropolitan Museum, inv. 96.18.61 (DE PUMA 2013, pp. 216-217, no. 6.57; POLA 2016, p. 259, pls. CCLV-CCLVI); **pl. 116.b**: Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 4046 (POLA 2016, p. 260, pl CCLIX); **pl. 116.c**: *stamnos*, Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 61975 (POLA 2016, p. 260, pl. CCLXIII); **pl. 117.a**: Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. RC 7689 (POLA 2016, pl. CCCXI); **pl. 117.b**: Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 18246 (PIANU 1980, no. 52; POLA 2016, p. 211, pl. CCCXX). See also Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 1660 (POLA 2016, p. 311, pl. CCCXXII- CCCXXXIII). Nonetheless, the same subject is also documented in the later production: **pl. 117.c**: Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. MV 18235; dating to 330-300 B.C.; attributed to the Fluid Group (MASCI 2008, p. 405, no. 149). On

plants, which generally grow between the legs of the figures (e.g. **pl. 118**)[616].

Erotic connotations of these Faliscan images contributes to the creation of Dionysian scenes pivoting on the notion of 'initiation' and the resultant idea of salvific function of initiation[617]. As a general rule, as has been noted, the eroticized tone of pursuing suggests the «reinterpretazione in chiave funeraria della scena, non priva di un significato di eroizzazione del mortale qualora esso sia oggetto di desiderio da parte di una divinità. Ed è probabilmente consentito, in comunità fortemente integrate con il mondo greco […] intravedere in tale processo di eroizzazione una qualche forma di credenza circa il superamento della morte, un'escatologia di natura salvifica»[618].
This interpretation is even reinforced as the eroticized tone of pursuing combines with both Dionysiac context and funeral significance, as is the case with Faliscan pottery[619].

---

pursuing scene taking place on rocks, see also the Etruscan kalyx krater Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. MV 39569; dating to 360-340 B.C.

[616] **Pl. 118**: Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 50667 (POLA 2016, p. 70, pls. XXX-XXXI). See also Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 2291 (POLA 2016, p. 222, pl. CCXIII).

[617] On mystery-based Dionysian rites in Etruria and surrounding areas from 460 B.C., see CRISTOFANI, MARTELLI 1978; COLONNA 1991; PIZZIRANI 2009. On the contrary, in the archaic Etruscan *imagerie*, «l'adesione a Dioniso traduce l'ideologia di una ristretta aristocrazia urbana che, mediante la celebrazione del simposio e del *komos*, sottolinea la sperimentazione di un'identità più alta che, nel segno della comunione con il dio, unisce una *élite* di privilegiati: in questa prospettiva, l'esperienza religiosa non traduce la proiezione verso una dimensione trascendente, ma serve a garantire la condizione di supremazia di un ceto dominante» (CERCHIAI 2011, pp. 118-119).

[618] MARTELLI 2006a, p. 14. In the instance of Faliscan vases, this reading is best supported by the entire friezes, when pursuing scenes combine with Underworld scenes (see e.g. Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 1660: POLA 2016, pl. CCCXII).

[619] POLA 2017, pp. 205-206 observes that, in a number of Faliscan images, the «enfasi sull'aspetto matrimoniale» is related to the «esito eroizzante dell'azione», showing that «in un ambito funerario come quello che faceva da contesto alla maggior parte degli esemplari falisci, risulta […] immediato declinare il rapimento perpetrato da un amante divino quale metafora del desiderio di superamento della morte e di conseguente acquisizione di uno statuto di beatitudine».

Some myth-based images stand out for their relevance in the Faliscan repertoire of pursuing/ambush/abduction scenes[620]. A special role is assigned to the representation of the nymph Thetis's abduction by the mortal Peleus and the events preceding his ambush. Although this episode is represented only in two Faliscan examples (**pls. 119.a; 122.a**), these images are noteworthy for their emphasis on the aggressive erotic content. This stance links them to images of maenads being pursued by satyrs. It differentiates them from other Faliscan abduction images, which conversely emphasize the amorous exchange and the marriage dimension[621]. On closer inspection, the two motifs indicate two different ways of approaching the funeral theme. While the marriage background accentuates the salvific topic, the abduction combines the theme of transcending death with that of sudden death, which «trova una metafora efficace nel tema del rapimento»[622].

In the Faliscan repertoire, Theti's abduction is depicted in a well-known volute krater by the *Pittore dell'Aurora* (**pl. 119.a**)[623]. One side of the vase shows Peleus attacking Thetis in a fight scene taking place on a rock in a space surmounted by a rocky ledge indicating the fountain at which the nymph was bathing. The other side shows the kidnap of Kephalos by Thesan.

As outlined in the previous section, the abduction of Thetis was previously depicted in a black-figure amphora from Tomb 812 in Tolle (Chianciano Terme), where the representation of Thetis' capture by Peleus combines with a dance scene (**pl. 36.b**)[624].

As noted in previous sections, the archaic image's arrangement matches other sixth- and fifth-century cortege scenes with trees

[620] See POLA 2017, pp. 204-205.
[621] See POLA 2017, pp. 205-206.
[622] SPERTI 2008, p. 21.
[623] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 2491; from Civita Castellana, necropoli delle Colonnette, tomb 115; dating to 360-340 B.C. (BEAZLEY 1947, p. 80, no. 1; CRISTOFANI 1987a, no. 147, POLA 2016, pl. CCXLV-CCXLVII; POLA 2017, p. 202, fig. 5).
[624] Chianciano Terme, Museo Civico Archeologico. See PAOLUCCI 2014. See above pp. 120-121.

growing between figures. Beyond the value assigned to the abduction scene, the unique frieze of the vase-cinerary from Tolle is designed according to the criteria (which pivot on the notion of rhythm) governing contemporary tomb paintings' imagery. On the contrary, when the abduction takes place *over* the landscape (as the presence of rocks below the figures in the krater by the *Pittore dell'Aurora* suggests), landscape features clearly play a different role.

This function of the setting is not a novelty first appearing on Faliscan images, as it characterizes a few archaic images. Two engraved mirrors dating to the end of the sixth and the first quarter of the fifth century B.C. show Peleus pursuing Thetis by a monumental fountain (**pl. 119.b-c**)[625]. In both examples, plants grow between the figures, while there is no trace of rocks. Compared to the later Faliscan krater, these two images represent an antecedent in the erotic-aggressive treatment of the episode. Nonetheless, mirrors show marked differences in developing the myth as compared to the same krater [626]. In reference to the landscape setting of mirrors' images, we can note that the fountain's association with abundant vegetal elements endorses a comparison with aggression/murder scenes analyzed in the previous section.

Conversely, landscape and setting features (rock and rocky fountain) of the krater by the *Pittore dell'Aurora* appear in a further scene of abduction of a nymph-like woman. The kidnapping of Amymone by Poseidon is depicted on a late fourth-century engraved mirror at the Museo Gregoriano Etrusco (**pl. 120.a**)[627]. The scene takes place by a rocky fountain with leonine protome. In the background, the head of a satyr emerges from the same rock wall into which the

[625] **Pl. 119.b**: Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum; from Città della Pieve (Perugia); **pl. 119.c**: Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale; from Follonica (Grosseto). See DE GRUMMOND 2000, pp. 72-74, figs. 4-5, with published references.

[626] See, in particular, the bearded serpents of the Follonica mirror in Florence.

[627] Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. MV 5339; unknown provenance; dating to the late fourth century B.C. LAMBRECHTS 1995, pp. 20-22, no. 5; DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 143, fig. VI.37.

fountain's mouth is inserted. The rock also extends at the bottom, below the figures' feet, and to the right side of the medallion. To the right, there are two fish by the legs of the figures. They are suspended in the figurative space that is not occupied by the rock and is engraved with a stippling-like technique indicating water.

Satyrs spying on erotic groups are widely spread in Etruscan figurative repertoire[628]. Moreover, the background depiction of a rocky wall from which satyrs and other peeping figures protrude is also common in mirrors depicting different scenes. This is the case, for instance, of a fifth-century mirror from Cerveteri with the children Aplu and Artumes attacking a serpent at the presence of their mother (**pl. 120.b**)[629], of a Praenestine mirror at the Museo Gregoriano Etrusco (**pl. 121**)[630], and of the British Museum mirror with Cacu reviewed in the previous section (**pl. 27.b**)[631].

To return to the Amymone mirror of the Vatican Museum, which represents a *unicum* in Etruscan art[632], we can note that the figurative setting is consistent with both the narrative plot and the nature of the characters. The image's structuring betrays a particular awareness of the use of figurative elements specifically related to the myth. Amymone was one of the fifty daughters of Danaus, king of Libya, who, having come to grips with his brother Egypt, left his homeland and traveled to Argos. According to Strabo, who quotes a verse of the *Catalogue of Women*, the Danaids made Argos rich in water[633]. Strabo

[628] With regard to mirrors, see e.g. London, British Museum, inv. 1873,0820.105 (**pl. 27.b**), on which see above p. 111.
[629] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia; from Cerveteri; dating to 450-400 B.C. DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 105, fig. V.36.
[630] Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. MV 12646; dating to the end of the fourth / third century B.C. GERHARD 1867, pl. 350; VAN DER MEER 2016b, p. 72, fig. 1.
[631] London, British Museum, inv. 1873,0820.105. ALBINI 2009 (see p. 141, fn. 1 for comprehensive bibliography); BAGNASCO GIANNI 2009, p. 50, fig. 12; DOMENICI 2009, pp, 175-196. For an analysis of the figurative structure, see KRAUSKOPF 2016, p. 403, 405, fn. 13.
[632] Nonetheless, the myth was known in Etruria since the fifth century B.C. via Attic pottery. See SIMON 1981, p. 746, n. 55.
[633] STR. VIII.6.8 = Hes. *Fr.* 128 Merkelbach /West.

also mentions the Amymone spring in the area of Lerna, thereby revealing the civilizing function specifically assigned to this character. The relationship between Amymone and the fountain is in its turn linked to the episode of Poseidon's ambush. The myth, to which Aeschylus dedicated a lost satyr play, is reported by Apollodorus[634]. While searching for water, Amymone shot an arrow at a deer but hit a sleeping satyr, who woke up and tried to attack her. Poseidon appeared, and the satyr fled. After their union, the god showed Amymone the springs of Lerna, thanks to which Argos was then irrigated. Greek and Southern-Italian iconography document both Amymone attacked by satyrs and the attack by Poseidon[635]. Although these examples show that the amphora is a recurring attribute of Amymone, there are relatively few comparisons of the importance assigned to the fountain[636].

With regard to the Vatican mirror, it can be observed that the image has the exceptional power to encapsulate the mythical event and emphasize specific aspects of it thanks to the selection of specific figurative details (the fountain, the opposition rock vs. water, but also the presence of the satyr)

As mentioned above, the Faliscan repertoire provides another example taken from Peleus and Theti's episode. One side of a *stamnos* at the archeological museum in Grosseto (**pl. 122.a**)[637] shows a different

[634] APOLL. *Bib*. II.1.4-5.

[635] See e.g. Amymone attacked by satyrs: Attic krater, Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. 4.1011, dating to 420-410 B.C.; Attic amphora, Athens, Kerameikos Archaeological Museum, inv. AA 1972, 808, dating to about 420 B.C. Amymone approached by Poseidon: Attic krater, Saint Pietersburg, The State Hermitage Museum, inv. 767 (St. 1535), dating to 460 B.C.; Attic *pelike*, Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 20847, dating to 450 B.C.

[636] See e.g. the Attic *kylix* with Poseidon about to strike with his trident a high rock rising between him and a female figure in Ruvo di Puglia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale Jatta, inv. 1346; dating to 410-400 B.C. See also New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. 06.1021.184.

[637] Grosseto, Museo Archeologico e d'Arte della Maremma, inv. 363; dating to 370-360 B.C.; attributed to the *Pittore di Civita Castellana* 8238. POLA 2017, figs. 1-2 (see pp. 199-201 for attribution).

segment of the story, that is to say, the moment which precedes the ambush. Peleus and the centaur Chiron are hidden behind a tree caught in the act of spying on Thetis bathing. The man reaches out his hands beyond the tree to grasp his future bride. In these instances, the sapling allows viewers to identify the mythical tale and the specific depicted moment. Apollodorus reports that Chiron suggested to Peleus that he hide to spy on the goddess before catching her[638]. At the same time, however, we can note that the tree also contributes to the figures' arrangement through the visual space's bipartition, which underlines the polarity between the divine world of the goddess's toilet and the human world of the mortal Peleus. If the status passage (which refers to the passage from life to death) is the main subject of the funerary vase, the centrality given to Peleus' gesture is not surprising, nor is the physical demarcation of the threshold left entirely to the evocative potential of a liminal tree.

The tree marks the physical and symbolic boundary between the two spheres of pertinence. On the narrative level, it allows viewers to identify the moment being depicted, as I have already suggested. Moreover, it also materializes it by displaying its central role. If the main subject of the *stamnos*' image is the passage of status (as indicated by Peleus' passage from the mortal to the divine background – with a specific reference to the passage from life to afterlife), the physical act of crossing the threshold is understandably destined for the central space of the image. The centrality of the traversing moment is visually entrusted to the central liminal tree.

As Angela Pola observed[639], the depiction of Peleus spying on Thetis as she bathes is also attested in two Praenestine cistae[640]. One of them is especially relevant for this analysis (**pl. 122.b**)[641]. The engraved frieze

[638] APOLLOD. 3.170.

[639] POLA 2017, pp. 202-203.

[640] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, invs. 13147 and 13148.

[641] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 13148. BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA, EMILIOZZI 1990, pp. 246-250, no. 74, pl. CCCXLV; GILOTTA 2002, p. 61, fig. 3; POLA 2017, p. 203, fig. 6.a.

shows two groups of figures (one with Peleus and Chiron, and the other with Thetis at the fountain accompanied by other female figures) divided by a column the visual function of which can be compared to that of the tree in the Faliscan *stamnos*.

Accepting the interchangeability between the natural (tree) and the architectural (column) element, which is appropriate considering cistae' imagery[642], we can also see under a new light the image of the calyx-krater Civita Castellana 8236 (**pl. 115.b**)[643], attributed to the same painter as the Grosseto *stamnos*[644]. One of the krater's sides shows an *anodos* scene with a column depicted in the middle of the visual area. In particular, the pillar stands in correspondence with the female figure and between the two side satyrs. Massa Pairault, who interpreted the image as the «*anodos* de Sémélè», observed that the scene «advient au milieu des danses des Satyres du thiase qui se déroule en vue d'un sanctuaire symbolisé par une colonne»[645]. Rather than validating the hypothesis of an architectonic setting, however, the comparison with the Grosseto *stamnos* suggests that also the column conveys a liminal value.

This section has reviewed several images featuring pursuing, ambush and kidnap scenes. I have observed that Etruscan red-figure and especially Faliscan pottery typically use landscape features to arrange these scenes.

However, on a broader level, it can be noted that landscape features (and mostly rocky details) also appear on many other erotic images. It is the case of erotically oriented conversations and encounters, mainly spread in mirrors and red-figure vase painting.

---

642 See e.g. the arboreal column of the cista MENICHETTI 1995, fig. 12.
643 Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 8236; from Fabrica di Roma, loc. Poggio delle Monache (MASSA PAIRAULT 2008, fig. 5 [indicated as inv. 8326]; POLA 2017, p. 199, fn. 19, p. 205, fig. 10). On the iconography, see POLA 2016, pp. 460-463, who suggests the scene is a possible representation of Semele's *anodos*.
644 See POLA 2017, p. 199.
645 MASSA PAIRAULT 2008.

In contrast to the group of images analyzed above, courtship scenes follow patterns already widespread in Attic and Apulian vase paintings. In particular, in these images, the two schemes of (1.) the offeror/suitor resting his foot on the rock and that (sometimes coexisting) of (2.) the figure sitting on a boulder prevail.

Figurative compositions with two figures converging towards the center are «tra i preferiti della *kleinkunst* (ma non solo) tardo-classica e proto-ellenistica»[646]. The usual subjects of these groups are Dionysus and Ariadne, Aphrodite and Adonis, satyrs and maenads, anonymous youths and maidens[647]. The erotic theme is therefore strongly linked to that compositions, as the recurrence of special couples like Turan and Eros confirms. This is the case of a relief mirror from Tarquinia in London (**pl. 123.a**)[648]. On the right side, the goddess, who leans forward as she hands a container to Eros, is standing on rocky ground and has her right foot resting on a ledge. Similarly, Turan and Atunis appear in a mirror in Tarquinia (**pl. 123.b**)[649], where the goddess is seated, and the male figure is standing with his feet on the rock.

In Etruscan red-figure and Faliscan vase painting, offerors who echo these attitudes are widely spread throughout the fourth century (see e.g. **pls. 124-126**)[650]. Among them, an Etruscan red-figure kylix-krater in

[646] BAGLIONE, GILOTTA 2007, p. 51.

[647] See also the libation scene with Aplu and a Muse in a red-figure *stamnos* in Florence (Museo Archeologico Nazionale) attributed to the Akrate Painter by Del Chiaro (BONAMICI 1992, pp. 3, 8, fig. 8).

[648] London, British Museum, inv. 1873,0820.112; ex Castellani collection.

[649] Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale; dating to the second half of the fourth century B.C. GENTILI 2000, p. 134, fig. 15.

[650] Etruscan: **pl. 124.a**: New York, Fordham University, Fordham Museum of Greek, Etruscan and Roman Art, inv. 4.016; dating to about 350 B.C.; attributed to the Fluid Group; **pl. 124.b**: Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. MV 18190; dating to 350-320 B.C. (TRENDALL 1955, p. 261, Z 63, tab. LXVII.c-d); **pl. 124.c**: Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. MV 18233; dating to 350-300 B.C. (DEL CHIARO 1985, pl. 54); **pl. 125.a**: Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 4128; dating to 350-300 B.C. (ADEMBRI 1981, p. 21, figs. 27-29; DEL CHIARO 1985, pl. 61.1-3); **pl. 125.b**: red-figure *stamnos*, Brunswick, Bowdoin College Museum of Art, inv. 1913.9; dating to the late fourth century B.C. (BURKE 1981, p. 28).

Orvieto (**pl. 127.a**)[651] shows a rocky environment enriched by a «delicata e ricca infiorescenza sovradipinta» that «copre i vuoti del fondo»[652].

With regard to the Faliscan *imagerie*, we can point out a few observations. Firstly, an almost constant feature in these depictions is that male figures (youths, satyrs, or male winged figures) holding their foot (variably the left or the right one) on rocks also rest their elbow or forearm on their knee. Secondly, it can be noted that, in many instances, individual male figures resting their feet on a rock are depicted in more complex scenes, in no direct opposition with a

---

Faliscan: **pl. 125.c**: Orvieto, Museo 'Claudio Faina', inv. 2512 (CAPPELLETTI 1992, pp. 152-153; POLA 2016, p. 83, pl. XLII); **pl. 126.a**: Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, acc. n. 83.AE.368.12.1-5 + 83.AE.343.9 + 83.AE.368.113 + 83.AE.368.116 + 83.AE.368.119 + 86.AE.390.2 (cup 9; POLA 2016, pl. LXVII.a; **pl. 126.b**: Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, acc. n. 83.AE.368.18.1 (cup 86; POLA 2016, pl. LXVIII.a). See also: Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum, inv. APM 00479 (POLA 2016, p. 128, pls. XCVI-XCVII); Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 1472 (POLA 2016, p. 160, pl. CXLVII); Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 1058 (POLA 2016, p. 161, pl. CXLVIII); Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 6433 (POLA 2016, p. 160, pl. CXLI-CXLII); New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. 96.18.26 (with dotted rock; POLA 2016, p. 161, pl. CLIII); Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 26017 (POLA 2016, p. 163, pl. CLXIV); Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, inv. H. 159 (POLA 2016, p. 250, pl. CCLI); Princeton, University Art Museum, inv. Y1950-28 (POLA 2016, p. 266, pl. CCLXXIII); Lawrence, University of Kansas, Wilcox Classical Museum, inv. A0231 (POLA 2016, p. 287, pl. CCLXXIV); Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 3625 (POLA 2016, p. 288, pl. CCLXXXII); Tübingen, Eberhard Karls Universität, Instituts für Klassische Archäologie, inv. 1223 (POLA 2016, p. 290, pl. CCXCIV A); Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. F 2946 (POLA 2016, p. 318, pl. CCCXXIV B). The same scene as in Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, invs. 3596-3597; Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 2264. The scheme is also documented in bronze cistae, as shown by an example in Berlin, Antikensammlung, dating to 340-310 B.C. (WISEMAN 2000, p. 284, fig. 29; VAN DER MEER 2016b, pp. 78-79, fig. 8).

[651] Orvieto, Museo 'Claudio Faina', inv. 2630; ex Valentini Bonaparte collection; dating to about 330 B.C. GILOTTA 1985, p. 33; CAPPELLETTI 1992, pp. 162-163, no. 55.

[652] CAPPELLETTI 1992, p. 163.

confronted figure (see e.g. **pl. 127.b-c**)[653]. These examples must be considered *excerpta* taken from original courtship scenes and inserted in articulated scenes by virtue of using the same *cartoni*.
In reference to this group of Faliscan images, we can also note that the offering figures, whether engaged in a libation or an offering of wine, likely refer to the initiatory sphere (as the affiliation of many depicted characters to the Dionysian sphere confirms). This subject is subsequently used as a metaphor for the passage from life to death[654].

A different scheme, which is also documented in Faliscan pottery (**pl. 128.a-b**)[655] but mainly spread in fourth-century bronze mirrors, includes one or two seated figures by another standing figure. Two examples in Villa Giulia (**pls. 128.c-d)**[656], both dating to the second half of the fourth century B.C., show a male figure sitting on a rock on the left-hand side by two other figures. This type of composition continued into the third century B.C., typically as part of more complex, multi-figure groups engraved on more sketched mirrors, and are related to the depictions of the Judgement of Paris[657].

Finally, in both red-figure vase painting and mirrors, there are erotic scenes with two figures sitting on a boulder. This is the case, for instance, of the two neck-amphoras in Orvieto, which depict a Lasa and

---

653 **Pl. 127.b**: Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 43968 (POLA 2016, p. 179, pl. CLXXVI); **pl. 127.c**: Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 8237 (POLA 2016, p. 102, pl. LIX).
654 POLA 2016, pp. 604-605.
655 **Pl. 128.a**: Göttingen, Georg-August-Universität, Wissenschaftliche Sammlungen, inv. J52 (POLA 2016, p. 355, pl. CCCLXXXIV.B); **pl. 128.b**: Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. F 2947; from Chiusi (GILOTTA 1987, p. 53, figs. 1-3; POLA 2016, p. 81, pl. XXXV).
656 Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, invs. 12975 (**pl. 128.c**) and 12989 (**pl. 128.d**). BAGLIONE, GILOTTA 2007, pp. 50-52, no. 15; pp. 72-74, no. 25. With regard to inv. 12989, showing the encounter between Paris and Helen while Turan stands on and watches, BAGLIONE, GILOTTA 2007, p. 74 noted that the star depicted at the top appear in «contesti di cui si voglia sottolineare il carattere eccezionale o l'ambientazione sovrumana […], con possible riferimento, in qualche caso, al'ambientazione 'astronomica' o comunque in spazi aperti».
657 See e.g. the left group of the mirror BAGLIONE 1976, pp. 131-132, no. 16, pl. LXXX.1; ex Borghese collection; dating to the beginning of the third century B.C.

a young man embracing (**pl. 129.a-b**)[658], and of a Praenestine mirror in the Villa Giulia (**pl. 129.c**)[659] showing an embracing couple. The Louvre mirror with Aplu analyzed in the previous section (**pl. 25.b**)[660] can also be included in this group.

Following the review of courtship scenes is the analysis of bath scenes. These images mainly spread in cistae and (both Praenestine and Etruscan) bronze mirrors[661], although a few examples depicted in vases and scarabs are known.

In his analysis of Etruscan scarabs' *imagerie*, Mario Torelli noted that *louterion* scenes «vanno collocate accanto a quelle più propriamente di carattere atletico, sia pur con una connotazione diversa dal ben preciso sapore iniziatico»[662]. This interpretation implies the idea that, in some instances, ancient images were overburden «di più di un referente, per rafforzarne il messaggio ideologico»[663]. In other words, ancient perception and representation of individual subject matters, such as youth initiation, cross several semantic fields. When applied to mirrors' and cistae' repertoire, this approach enables appreciating the semantic depth of that type of image. With particular regard to cistae, it also provides a background for combining different subjects (see e.g. the discussion about the Milan cista reviewed in the previous section, **pl. 75.b**)[664].

---

[658] Orvieto, Museo 'Claudio Faina', invs. 2643; 2644; attributed to the Vanth Group; dating to 325-300 B.C. CAPPELLETTI 1992, pp. 194-199, nos. 64-65.
[659] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 15700; ex Gagliardi collection; dating to the second half of the fourth century B.C. BAGLIONE, GILOTTA 2007, pp. 93-95, no. 37. For further details on this mirror, see *infra* p. 234.
[660] Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. 1731. See KRAUSKOPF 1984, no. 80; KRAUSKOPF 1998, p. 191, fn. 94 (with further *LIMC* references); EMMANUEL REBUFFAT 1997, no. 9. See also above p. 110.
[661] On this subject matter, see especially WISEMAN 2000; GILOTTA 2000a; GILOTTA 2002; MENICHETTI 2006.
[662] TORELLI 2002a, p. 117.
[663] TORELLI 2002a, p. 154.
[664] Milan, Civico Museo Archeologico, inv. A 0.9.1310. See above, p. 172.

The polysemic vocation of that group of images accounts for the versatility in the use of landscape elements. In most bath scenes, different landscape features alternate and are variously combined.
In addition to pure landscape detail, the reference to water is typically indicated by the depiction of fish (see e.g. **pl. 130.a**)[665], similarly to the Vatican mirror with Amymone, analyzed above (**pl. 120.a**)[666].
As in the case of cistae, in several bath scenes engraved in mirrors vegetal and rocky details are combined with simple architectural structures such as individual columns and small pilasters (see e.g. **pls. 131.a**)[667].

As a general role, I observed that cistae typically account for semantic complexity through thematic combination. This applies to a lesser extent in mirrors, the execution of which requires selecting a more specific subject due to their smaller figurative area. Conversely, bath scenes engraved in mirrors provide a piece of evidence for the distinctive manner of structuring the scene which characterizes this type of monument.
While, in some instances, the definition of a landscape space neglects the presence of the frame (as is the case with the Praenestine mirror in Berlin with rocky setting following the medallion's profile: **pl. 131.b**)[668], in some examples, a significant relationship between frame and image is established (see e.g. the rocky fountain projecting from the vegetal frame in a mirror in Basel: **pl. 131.c**)[669]. In particular, service objects are

[665] Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum; dating to the end of the sixth century B.C. JURGEIT 2017, p. 249. Another example of marine representations with visual substitutes for the sea is provided by a group of gems featuring Herakles or a Silenus on a raft of amphoras, where vases are depicted in place of water (see TORELLI 2002a, pp. 127-129).
[666] See above p. 223. See also the mirror Berlin Staatliche Museen, Antikensammlung, inv. Fr. 23 (**pl. 130.b**; KRAUSKOPF 2005, pp. 615-616, fig. 4).
[667] **Pl. 131.a**: Detroit, Detroit Institute of Art, inv. 47.399; dating to 300-275 B.C. CACCIOLI 2009, pp. 39-43. See also Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Skulpturensammlung, inv. ZV 1209 (HERES 1987, pp. 27-28, no. 17).
[668] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. Misc. 6240; dating to about 350 B.C.
[669] Basel, Antikenmuseum und Sammlung Ludwig, inv. BS 1906.764; dating to 325-300 B.C. JUCKER 2001, pp. 17-18, no. 1.

depicted hanging from the vegetal frame so that the frame itself offers a landscape context to the scene (see e.g. **pls. 132.a-b; 130.a**)[670]. A comparable pattern appears in a fifth-century Campanian amphora which features two female figures bathing at the *louterion*. They stand in the middle of a scene flanked by two side saplings bent by the weight of hanging garments[671].

As we have seen in the previous section, in the Archaic period, the motif of objects hanging from the tree has a specific meaning related to the passage[672]. Rather than appearing in various ritual contexts, during the fifth and fourth century B.C. the same motif is strictly related to bath scenes. This is illustrated in the mirrors reviewed here above and confirmed by a fourth-century *kylix* at the Vatican Museums[673].
This thematic specificity suggests that, in later images, the motif is at least partially disconnected from its original ritual value. Instead, the

[670] Praenestine: **pl. 132.a**: Brussels, Musées Royaux d'art et d'histoire, inv. R 1256 (LAMBRECHTS 1978, pp. 43-48; ADAM 1980, p. 46, no. 32; GILOTTA 2000b, p. 155, fig. 11); **pl. 132.b**: Cambridge, The Fitzwilliam Museum, inv. GR.2.1976, dating to about 300 B.C. GILL 1990, p. 291, no. 10; NICHOLLS 1993, pp. 33-34, no. 12. Etruscan: **pl. 130.a**: Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum; dating to the end of the sixth century (JURGEIT 2017, p. 249). Another example is in Paris, Musée des Arts Décoratifs (? - I saw a reproduction of this mirror in the Del Chiaro photographic archive at the Getty Research Institute, but could not verify its actual location and inventory number).
[671] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. F 2129; dating tot he beginning of the fifth century.
[672] See above pp. 129-130.
[673] Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. MV 14962.0.0; dating to 350-300 a.C; from Chiusi. In addition to these examples, it can be noted that a number of mirrors dating to the same centuries show scenes of a different kind in which objects related to the female world hang from the frame. Some of the most ancient examples are a mirror in Rome (Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 51164, dating to 500-475 B.C.; see BAGLIONE 2002, pp. 111-112, fig. 17) and a mirror from Vulci in Berlin (**pl. 133.a** = Antikensammlung, inv. Fr. 22; dating about 470 B.C.; ZIMMER 1995, pp. 18-19, no. 7; DE GRUMMOND 2006, fig. V.35) with Aplu and Artumes facing each other. In the Berlin example a cist is hanging from a phytoform element that protrudes from the contour line of the medallion. See also the banquet scenes of a mirror in Göttingen (Georg-August-Universität, Wissenschaftliche Sammlungen, inv. M57): LIEPMANN 1988, pp. 23-25, no. 4 (**pl. 133.b**) and Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. MV 12232 (**pl. 134.a**); dating 490-480 B.C. (NOGARA 1934, pp. 129-130, pl. XXXI).

relationship between scene objects and trees suggests an attempt to incorporate the landscape into the image. This is all the more evident in the case of mirrors, where the landscape abstractly evoked by the frame is materialized as an actual setting through the figurative relationship between the objects and the trellis.

That such a naturalistic trend is expressed in connection with the erotic sphere rather than with the mere ritual one is confirmed by the fact that the relationship between vegetal frame and scene is mainly established in love-based images[674]. Particularly relevant in this regard is the already mentioned Praenestine mirror in the Villa Giulia (**pl. 129.c**)[675] with embracing scene. The frame of this mirror, which has been stylistically traced back to Hellenistic models from southern Italy[676], is a kind of 'peopled scroll', with birds and insects inserted between the flowering shoots[677]. Another significant element in this instance is the combination of landscape details with small animals. Although already occasionally observed in tomb paintings dating to the end of the fifth and fourth century B.C., this motif mainly occurs in connection with images of deities[678].

[674] See pp. 218 ss.

[675] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 15700; dating to 350-300 B.C. BAGLIONE, GILOTTA 2007, pp. 93-95, no. 37. On this mirror, see also above p. 231.

[676] See BAGLIONE, GILOTTA 2007, p. 95.

[677] On 'peopled scrolls' see TOYNBEE, PERKINS 1950.

[678] A recurring motif is, for instance, the depiction of Minerva's owl resting on the branch of a tree. See e.g. Etruscan mirrors: Bologna, Museo Civico Archeologico, inv. It. 1073, from Arezzo, dating to 330-320 B.C. (SASSATELLI 1981, pp. 32-35, no. 13); **pl. 134.c**: Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. Fr. 29, from Vulci, dating 425-400 B.C. (ZIMMER 1995, pp. 22-23, no. 14; DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 68, fig. IV.16); London, British Museum (?), dating to the beginning of the third century B.C. (COLONNA 1984, p. 1071, no. 246). Praenestine mirrors: **pl. 135.a**: Madrid, Museo Arqueológico Nacional, dating to the second half of the fourth century B.C. (COLONNA 1984, p. 1066, no. 188). See also the tiny bird resting on rock in the mirror from Talamone in Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 597; and a red-figure *kylix* in Berlin, Antikensammlung, dating to 350-300 B.C. (DE GRUMMOND 2006, fig. VI.9).

A mirror in Basel (**pl. 134.b**)[679] which features the embrace between two naked figures provides another notable example. The scene, located in a rocky landscape with plants, is framed by an engraved circle. A shoot-like frame is engraved on the outside of the circle. In this instance, the relationship between the image and the frame is reinforced by the position of the inscriptions, which refer to the figures and are engraved near the shoot.

A fourth-century red-figure *stamnos* from Orvieto in Florence (**pl. 125.a**)[680] finally completes the catalogue of bath scenes. Side A shows three female figures next to a large central vessel resting on the ground. On either side of the container, a plant with lanceolate leaves grows from the ground. Although the scene clearly depicts the underworld damnation of the Danaids[681], the arrangements of the figures «farebbe pensare ad una contaminazione del mito con una scena di toletta, come suggerirebbe la nudità della figura centrale in connessione con l'atto del versare l'acqua»[682].

It is difficult to establish with certainty whether these plant elements are to be referred to the model scheme or the underworld context. Certainly, however, it can be noted that it is rather rocks that recur as a characteristic feature in the underworld iconography. This aspect will be discussed in more detail in the section to follow.

[679] Basel, Antikenmuseum und Sammlung Ludwig, inv. Zü 4; dating to 350-325 B.C. JUCKER 2001, pp. 21-23, no. 5.

[680] Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 4128; dating to 350-300 B.C. ADEMBRI 1981, pp. 20-21, figs. 27-29.

[681] In keeping with the traditional account referenced, among the others, by PS. PL. Ax. 371 d-e. With regard to other comparable depictions of the same episode, two saplings flanking a central vessel appear in the *hydria* Policoro, Museo Nazionale, inv. 38462, dating to about 350 B.C.

[682] ADEMBRI 1981, p. 21.

3.2. Elsewhere. Landscapes across the Boundaries

The purpose of this section is to present images the subject of which relates to both physical and conceptual liminal areas beyond the space in which human and humanized actions occur.
This section is subdivided into two parts. The first one (Eschatia, *"Where the Wild Things Are": Myths and Heroes at the Confines of the World*) deals with myths the actions and characters of which are located outside the standard domain of human experience, at the imaginative confines of the world. The second (*Communicating with gods: Haruspices, Prophecies, Oracles*) focuses on images featuring interaction between humans and gods.

3.2.1. *Eschatia, "Where the Wild Things Are": Myths and Heroes at the Confines of the World*

In the ancient world, the personality of the hero as protagonist of ancient myth is defined through a series of exploits that take place in a number of geographically defined settings. More specifically, the hero's existential itinerary unfolds alternately inside and outside of urban space. On the one hand, he embarks on adventures and defeats monsters in distant regions, tackling the wildland (*eschatia*) that endangers the *polis*. On the other hand, he is the founder and ruler of urban centers. This attention to the setting of the myth is not surprising. As the chronological-narrative criterion, also the geographical-spatial one meets the ancients' need to conceive myth as history[683]. In other words, the setting is functional to the myth's narrative consistency. This spatial dichotomy (*intra moenia* vs *extra moenia*) characterizes the hero's activity in Etruria and Greece.

As a general rule, the features of setting in Etruscan art are described in an abridged form, as some pictures of Oedipus and the

[683] GRAF 2007, pp. 92-108, esp. p. 107.

Sphinx show. In Etruscan images, the winged monster who the literary tradition describes as «ἐπὶ τὸ Φίκειον ὄρος ἐκαθέζετο»[684] is typically depicted on a small rocky outcropping (see e.g. **pl. 135.b**)[685] or set in a more generic stony environment, as is the case with a fourth-century mirror in Brussels (**pl. 135.c**)[686]. The «importuna crepido»[687] on which the Sphinx rests while waiting for her victims, according to literary tradition, is figuratively expressed by a more generic *importunum* environment. This type of framing is more a matter of identifying the scene than setting it.

Similarly, in several examples, abridged landscape serves to meet narrative needs. This is the case, for instance, with landscape details provided below Europa in-flight astride the bull in two fourth-century examples. The internal tondo of a Faliscan *kylix* (**pl. 136.a**)[688] shows the young woman and animal above a hill-shaped elevation with blades. An engraved mirror from Tarquinia (**pl. 136.b**)[689] shows the same characters as they fly above the sea rendered by waves and a dolphin. The waves refer to the traditional account of the woman's journey by sea and chronologically place the image before her arrival on the island[690]. The figurative detail reveals that the focus here is on her voyage. This motif systematically occurs in iconography of Europa on the bull beginning in seventh century B.C., in Greece and Etruria.

---

[684] APOLLOD. 3.5.8. See also PAUS. 9.26.2: «Προελθόντων δὲ τὸ ὄρος ἐστὶν ὅθεν τὴν Σφίγγα λέγουσιν ὁρμᾶσθαι ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ τῶ ἁρπαζομένων αἴνιγμα ᾄδουσαν» (for further details on this passage, see MOGGI, OSANNA 2010, pp. 364-365).

[685] Cornelian scarab. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, inv. 1936.5; dating to fifth/fourth century B.C. RICHTER 1968, p. 211, no. 864; ZAZOFF 1968, p. 107, no. 201.

[686] Brussels, Musées Royaux d'art et d'histoire, inv. A 1265; dating to about 300 B.C. LAMBRECHTS 1978, pp. 361 ss., no. 69.

[687] STAT. *Theb*. 2.504.

[688] Tivoli, Magazzini SAL, inv. 16323; from the Poggio Somma Villa necropolis, tomb 32. Attributed to the *Pittore Berlino* F 2947 by POLA 2016, p. 81, pl. XXXVIII. See also SCARRONE 2015, pp. 273-274, fn. 57.

[689] Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 70801; from Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis; dating to 320-300 B.C. See ROBERTSON 1988, p. 83, no. 120; BRUNI 1991, p. 57, fn. 11; VAN DER MEER 1995, pp. 46-47, fig. 17, cat. 5.4.1.

[690] On different figurative traditions, see ROBERTSON 1988.

However, the depiction of the rocky rise below or next to the flying bull as it appears in the Faliscan kylix is much rarer[691]. For the Etruscan context, the inclusion of such a detail dates back to the same model that also lies behind the Caeretan *hydria* Louvre E696[692], in which Europa flies astride Zeus, with the god having taken a bovine form to subdue her. In front of her is a mountainous rise with three trees on top and a hare climbing the cliffside. This rise can easily be identified as an island, thanks in part to the dolphin depicted between the bull and the extreme right edge of the island. Literary sources – especially Apollodorus and Moschus[693] – inform us that this is probably the island of Crete, the destination towards which the two figures are heading and where their union takes place. The painter's intention here was not to describe a landscape context; rather, the three trees and the hare are attributes used to indicate that the rocky elevation is an island. The artist pursued this aim by endowing the peak with some terrestrial elements, in contrast with the other natural element in the image, namely the sea, referred to by the dolphin included in the image. While the individual attributes show how the island is assembled, the way in which the island as a whole is constructed illustrates a significant characteristic of its attributes. It can be noted that, despite their characterizing function, the attributes are not sufficient for the observer to identify any specific island. As was also illustrated in relation to several archaic and classical Greek examples[694], in the Louvre *hydria* identification of the island is entrusted to viewers and their ability to use their existing knowledge of the myth. It can also be noted that, while the trees perform an attributive-denotative function in relation to

[691] A possible comparison can be found in an Attic black-figure *lekythos* in Naples (Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. RC 218; see ROBERTSON 1988, no. 35), the interpretation of which is debated.
[692] BONAUDO 2004, cat. 10; regarding an iconographic discussion and presentation of sources related to the mythical episode, see PONTRANDOLFO 2015, pp. 45-47.
[693] APOLLOD. 3.1.4; MOSCH. 2.194-204.
[694] Regarding this subject matter, see in particular GIULIANI 2017; DIETRICH 2018b. See also HEDREEN 2007. On visual perception in ancient Greek culture, see the essays edited in SQUIRE 2016.

the island, the island as a whole likely has a narrative function in that it contributes to the construction of the narrative.
The rocky elevation is likely a reference to Crete in the case of the Faliscan vessel as well. Therefore, the landscape details are a narrative tool used to include 'historical' information about the myth.

To return to the wild setting of myths, as already mentioned in previous sections, the Sphynx and a number of other fantastic figures (such as Centaurs) likewise relate to a setting «di confine, marginale, in bilico tra il regno della *sauvagerie* e il regno della socialità»[695].
This peculiarity is reflected mainly in archaic black-figure painting, a genre in which *Mischwesen* and beasts features among the favorite subjects. With regard to this category of monuments, in a recent essay Spivey has cleverly sketched a portrait of an archaic Etruria characterized by a taste for paradoxography that was distinctly Ionian in character[696]. The scholar finds that the artworks of the North Ionian workshops established in Etruria sought to «dare verosimiglianza all'esotico»[697]. He argues that these images, filled with Ionian fairytale culture («cultura favolistica ionica»), launched a «sfida […] alla concorrenza artistica locale». Spivey reconstructs a frame in which the local audience was indifferent to Greek philosophy's ontological problems regarding the non-being of monsters and painters were concerned with the graphic effect of monsters (i.e. the «effetto di 'realizzare' una creatura 'esotica'») and interested in providing «vivacità al meraviglioso», in a way that did not coincide with any narrative connotations[698]. According to the scholar, rather than being motivated by an intention to populate images with symbols, the painter «con l'astuta consapevolezza di produrre immagini gradite alla committenza locale – committenza con una predilezione forte per

[695] CAMASSA 2005, p. 43.
[696] SPIVEY 2015, p. 387. Spivey's analysis is especially influenced by Alessandro Giannini's research on Greek archaic paradoxography (GIANNINI 1963).
[697] SPIVEY 2015, p. 388.
[698] SPIVEY 2015, p. 388-389.

l'antica mitografia ionica – […] crea lo spettacolo del suo *Wunderwelt*», the symbolic value of which «si trova soprattutto nello spirito della paradossografia»[699]. Spivey does not reject the connection between fantastic beasts and the funerary sphere; he also accepts their functioning as liminal creatures in a semiotic sense. Above all, he emphasizes that there existed at that time background cultural attitude of willingness to accept fantastic beasts and seek to match their image to actual zoological reality. In many black-figure vases, the plant elements standing among fantastic figures can be ascribed to this kind of effort to make figures 'actual'[700].

One further aspect to consider is the arrangement of figures and landscape elements in the 'space' of the vase, that is to say, in the different figurative areas of the object. Significantly enough, a neck-amphora in New York attributed to the Paris Painter (**pl. 137.a**)[701] shows a series of superimposed friezes. The neck decoration involves a large tree with long branches that occupy the entire figurative area. The shoulder features a procession of centaurs. The prominence granted to the tree by the Paris Painter matches the point I highlighted earlier in relation to the Vulci plate at the Bibliothèque Nationale with concentric friezes depicting hunting scenes and framing a large tree in the center of the vessel (**pl. 6.a**)[702]. In both examples, the relationship between the images and the tectonics of the vase grants landscape elements a particularly notable position. In the case of the Vulci plate, I argued that the large sapling might have evoked the natural setting. The same interpretation can also be advanced in the case of the New York

[699] SPIVEY 2015, p. 389.
[700] Regarding the historicization of *incredibilia* in ancient Greek culture, see SANTONI 2000. The comparison of the analysis of Palephatus's *On Incredible Tales* provided by Santoni with Spivey's remarks reveals how visual art meets, with its own tools, a widely diffused need. That is to say, images likely account for a way of thinking about myths that, as far as Greek culture is concerned, is clearly described by literary sources (SANTONI 2000, esp. pp. 30-31, 42).
[701] New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. 55.11.1; dating to 575-550 B.C. HANNESTAD 1974, no. 9.
[702] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, inv. 187. See above, p. 78.

amphora, where superimposed friezes replace the concentric figurate rings. This system of image assemblage, the same kind that also characterizes tomb paintings (see e.g. the *Tomba del Maestro delle Olimpiadi* analyzed above, **pl. 78.b**)[703] was typically used during the Archaic period to convey the relationship/detachment between figures and their landscape context.

Among heroes, Herakles is primarily perceived as a «mediatore tra natura e cultura» and «al confine tra questi due mondi»[704]. There are only a few instances, however, in which the representation of his labors is characterized by landscape features. In two examples the capture of the Nemean lion is set in a cave, in keeping with the traditional account according to wich the beast chased by the hero took refuge in a cave[705]. A cornelian scarab in Berlin (**pl. 137.b**)[706] shows the naked hero leaning forward and holding the lion by its head, caught in the act of pulling him out of the cave; the mouth of the cave in this case takes the form of a vertical strip along the edge of the gem. A red-figure krater from Tarquinia (**pl. 138.a**)[707] shows the fight between the hero and the lion. On the top left corner, a strip with four projections along the ridge cuts up the figurative space and suggests a cave setting[708]. As we will see in detail, Heracles' status as mediator is instead and primarily expressed by his weapons. As suggested by the hero's iconography (he is naked,

[703] See above, p. 174..

[704] D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 1999, p. 152, who follow BURKERT 1992, p. 125: «Per la trasformazione della 'natura' nella 'cultura', si ha bisogno di un mediatore, che agisca con intelligenza ed astuzia, o con magia oppure con la forza bruta».

[705] APOLLOD. 2.5.1.

[706] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. 386; dating to the end of the fifth/fourth century B.C. FURTWÄNGLER 1900, pl. XVII.59; ZAZOFF 1968, p. 164, no. 673; SCHWARZ 1990, p. 220, no. 191.

[707] Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 102148. RONCALLI 1994, p. 110; CRISTOFANI 1997, p. 179, pl. II.a.

[708] RONCALLI 1994, p. 110 suggests that the motif indicates the «ciglio roccioso, reso in forma compendiaria in alto e in basso, dell'apertura della tana della belva». *Contra* CAVAGNARO VANONI, SERRA RIDGWAY 1989, p. 52, fn. 30, who describe it as a «motivo a festoni risparmiato».

draped in the *leonte*, and armed with his non-military weapons) shows, in order to tame the beasts Herakles must use the animal's own armaments, thereby defining him as «anti-oplita» and «ladrone»[709].

We have seen that several examples lack any landscape features and the wild status of the scene derives from the wild characterization of the main character rather than the wilderness-like setting. Conversely, there are also a few examples showing that landscape elements are not necessarily or uniquely related to the setting. A well-known Pontic plate attributed to the Tityos Painter, at Villa Giulia and featuring Herakles, Dayanara, and the centaur Nessus (**pl. 138.b**)[710] provides a clear example of this opposite tendency. In contrast to what the circularity of the plate might suggest, the pursuit depicted here is not circular. Cerchiai emphasized that the compositional scheme, with Deianira and Nessus running towards the hero, highlights the «solidarietà» with each other and shared opposition to Herakles. The hero is figuratively surrounded by the «rete di sguardi» of these two conspiring pursuers who go on to condemn him to death, the one by devising the plan for the poisoned tunic and the other by making him wear the garment [711]. I believe this interpretation to be quite valid and, if we do accept it, it becomes clear that, rather than being a decorative element which is merely accessory and external to the image, the tree

[709] D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 1999, pp. 151-152. The iconography of Heracles, who is naked but at the same time armed, is meaningful. A comparable combination of the same signs (nudity and weapons) also characterizes the Greek iconography of the ephebes. In hunting scenes, in fact, they re-functionalize attributes and behaviors belonging to the oplitic sphere (LISSARRAGUE 1990c, pp. 163-164). As Cerchiai observes, «l'ambiguità della loro immagine è finalizzata a valorizzare l'interferenza che può attuarsi tra mondo della caccia e della guerra: una commistione tra i valori dell'*areté* militare e un comportamento legato all'astuzia e all'inganno» (CERCHIAI 1999b, p. 359). Moreover, with regard to the Etruscan background, we should remember that Heracles' liminal vocation is also conveyed in a funerary sense, as he is «quanto mai atto, in un contest funerario, a significare ingressi non meno trionfali nell'Oltretomba che nell'Olimpo» (RONCALLI 1994, p. 110, fn. 45).

[710] Rome, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Villa Giulia, inv. 84444. GIULIANO, BUZZI 1992, p. 208, CERCHIAI 1998; CERCHIAI 2000, p. 226 (with published references).

[711] CERCHIAI 1998, pp. 39-40.

indicates both the direction in which the image is to be read and the role of the figures involved. The tree interrupts the circularity and is inserted between the woman and the centaur. Starting from the tree, which is the pivotal element to the observer's eye, the scene opens out into a radius in the direction indicated by the gazes of Nessus and Dayanara and, in so doing, underlines how they encircled Heracles.

In addition to mythical feats generically located in remote regions outside of the human-made and civilized space, there are several mythical episodes expressly set at the world's boundaries. Although imaginary, this is a topographically identifiable space the identification of which is relevant to the plot of the myth.
A scarab in Boston (**pl. 139.a**)[712] shows Herakles standing naked on rocky ground and holding up the sky, indicated by the moon and stars. On the left-hand side is a stylized tree with fruits. On the right-hand side, there is a club resting on a rock and the engraving «Hercle». As the tree suggests, the scene depicted here is the conquest of the golden apples in the Garden of the Hesperides[713]. According to one version of the myth, the garden and apples were located on the shores of the Ocean, in the extreme west[714]. Another traditional account has them located in the land of the Hyperboreans by Atlas[715]. Another scarab in Boston (**pl. 139.b**)[716] confirms that the Etruscans were familiar with this tradition.

[712] Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 27.724; ex E.P. Warren collection; dating to the end of the fifth/fourth century B.C. RICHTER 1968, p. 197, no. 792.
[713] A relief from the Barberini collection possibly refers to the same context. The bronze foil relief, dating to the end of the fourth/beginning of the third century B.C., shows Herakles wearing a lion skin and sitting on a boulder. He faces right and holds his club, which is lying on the boulder as well. Behind the hero's head there are the «rami franzati di un albero», which hinted that the scene is set in the Garden of the Hesperides (see DELLA SETA 1918, p. 451).
[714] See PHERECYD. *FGrHist* 3 F 16 b. On the geographical location of the region of the Hesperides in the myth of Herakles, see ANTONELLI 1997, pp. 169 ss.
[715] APOLLOD. 2.5.11.
[716] Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 98.736; ex E.P. Warren collection; dating 460-400 B.C. See DE GRIÑO, OLMOS 1986, pp. 6-7, no. 17.

According to the ancient world's mythical geography, the Land of the Atlantes was a region of Libya. Its name dated back to mount Atlas, the most legendary mountain in Africa[717]. Mount Atlas represents the transformed shape of the Titan Atlas, the one Zeus charged with supporting the heavens on his shoulders. The relationship between Atlas and the garden where the apples (a wedding gift from the goddess of the Earth to Hera) are kept is significant. According to Apollodorus[718], Prometheus advises Heracles not to go and pick the fruit himself; instead, he suggested asking the Titan Atlas to do it. Herakles offers to take the Titan's place in supporting the sky, but he uses a trick to return this burden to Atlas once the Titan's task is completed. Therefore, the scene depicted in the Boston scarab likely represents the moment when the hero replaces the Titan. Accommodating the need to synthesize the entire story in a single image, the club and inscription guarantee that the viewers are able to identify the hero while the tree and rocky elements identify the episode and the figure's posture makes it possible to pinpoint the specific moment in the story.

A mirror at the Vatican Museums (**pl. 140.a**)[719] shows the moment of the plot directly subsequent to the one depicted in the Boston scarab. Herakles («Calanice») is taking his leave of Atlas, and the Titan has resumed his place supporting the firmament. This fact is indicated by a hemispherical-like lump protruding from the frame and filled with tiny engraved tridents. A high plant with inflorescences grows to the right of the figures[720]. A spear whose point crosses the mirror frame near the lump is thrust into the ground between Atlas and the plant. The same

[717] PLIN. *Nat. Hist.* 5.5.
[718] APOLLOD. 2.5.11.
[719] Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. MV 12242; dating to about 450 B.C. MASSA PAIRAULT 2000, pp. 190-191, fig. 5; DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 179, fig. VIII.7.
[720] PAMPANINI 1930, p. 302 maintains that «in questa pianta fantastica convergono reminiscenze di una Ombrellifera (foglie e forse ombrelle), della Vite (viticci), dell'Edera (fusto e forse ombrelle […]), e forse anche di una Composta (capolino?)». DE GRUMMOND 2006 describes «exotic plants in the surrounding landscape».

scene appears in an almost contemporary red-figure Campanian neck-amphora in London attributed to the Owl-Pillar Group[721].

In Etruscan art, the scheme of the figure supporting weight on his shoulders can be compared to images featuring Prometheus chained on the Caucasus mountains with an eagle incessantly gouging out his liver. Three examples depict this episode. An agate scarab dating to the fifth century held at the British Museum (**pl. 139.c**)[722] shows Prometheus seated on a rock by an eagle that is feeding on his liver; in this case, Prometheus has his hands tied above his head.

An engraved mirror held in Berlin (**pl. 140.b**)[723] shows the liberation of Prometheus by Heracles while Apollo stands on and watches. The identification of the characters derives from the inscriptions, still legible despite the object's poor condition. In the mirror, Prometheus is depicted still chained, with his hands tied to a rocky spur protruding from the edge. The tradition according to which Heracles liberates Prometheus, already referenced in Hesiod, is documented in the Etruscan area by a relief mirror from Vulci in Krakow (**pl. 141.a**)[724] the dating of which is debated[725]. In the middle of the medallion, Prometheus («Prumathe») seats on a rock near the eagle who is responsible for his punishment. On either side, Herakles («Calanice») and Castor («Castur») hold Prometheus by his arms. They both have a small spherical object in their hands. The interpretation identifying these three figures is based on three inscriptions in the upper area, in the space defined by three arches framing the heads of the figures at

[721] London, British Museum, inv. 1772,0320.432; dating to 470-425 B.C.

[722] London, British Museum. inv. 1966,0727.1, dating to 500-475 B.C. FURTWÄNGLER 1900, p. 73; RICHTER 1968, p. 211, no. 865.

[723] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. Fr. 134; dating to fourth century B.C. (*contra* BAYET 1926, p. 97 who dates it to the second century B.C.); GERHARD 1845, no. 139; SCHWARZ 1990, p. 230, no. 317; GISLER 1994, no. 74.

[724] Krakow, Muzeum Czartoryskich, inv. MNK XI-759. GERHARD 1845, no. 138; DE PUMA 1986, p. 601, no. 47; DOBROWOLSKI 1991, pp. 1231 ss.; DOBROWOLSKI 1994, pp. 177-179; CARPINO 2003, pp. 48 ss., pl. 68 (with published references).

[725] The mirror is variously dated to the middle of the fifth century B.C. (STRAZZULLA 1994), to the second half of the fifth (DOBROWOLSKI 1994), and the fourth century B.C. (CARPINO 2003).

the top. The nature of both the spherical objects and the arch structure is unclear. The first one likely dates back to a tradition reported in a few fragments of *Prometheus Bound* by Aeschylus: Zeus wanted a crown and a ring to be made from Prometheus' chains, to remain as a reminder of his punishment and a symbol of Prometheus' submission[726]. The structure at the top of the mirror is more directly relevant to the purposes of my investigation. It has been suggestively interpreted as a representation of the rocky outcrops of the Caucasus[727]. The most critical analysis of both the tale of Prometheus and its presence in Etruscan art has been provided by Witold Dobrowolski, and he addresses this issue in two different papers published a few years apart[728]. Dobrowolski's analysis is based on an observation about the twofold nature of Prometheus. On the one hand, in fact, the mythical figure brought about the separation between the world of men and that of the gods; on the other hand, he was the word's first priest and soothsayer. By teaching men divination and knowledge of the stars, he «ha anche stabilito le basi per i futuri contatti e il futuro intendimento tra i due mondi»[729]. Thus, Dobrowolski relates Prometheus' ambiguous nature to the ambiguity – or, rather, the two-fold value – of the location where his torture takes place. Significantly enough, the place of his punishment is the point where the world of mortals and that of the immortals come together, in that it indicates the borderland where the door dividing the two worlds is located[730]. Accordingly, the scholar compares Prometheus to Atlas: one in the East and the other in the West, the two «dividevano, ma nello stesso tempo

[726] See BRELICH 1970, pp. 236 ss.
[727] See e.g. DOBROWOLSKI 1994, pp. 178-179.
[728] DOBROWOLSKI 1991; DOBROWOLSKI 1994. The first paper is a specific discussion on the myth of Prometheus in Etruscan art, while the second one is a more general examination of iconography and the symbolic value of Dioscuri in Etruscan mirrors.
[729] DOBROWOLSKI 1994, p. 178. See also BRELICH 1970.
[730] See DOBROWOLSKI 1994, p. 178: «Possiamo dunque immaginare che anche la porta del mondo sotterraneo non fosse distante, la porta attraverso la quale doveva passare Prometeo per essere condotto, su ordine di Zeus, dal Tartaro sulla cima del monte».

univano, terra e cielo»[731]. The Caucasus and Atlas mountains stand at the edges of the cosmos and hold it up, simultaneously dividing and connecting heaven and earth. In reference to the Krakow mirror, Dobrowolski interprets the three irregular arches as delimitation between the two worlds[732]. He explains Heracles and Castor's juxtaposition with the door separating the two worlds through the observation that they evoke «la possibilità di vincere la morte e passare dalle scure regioni del mondo sotterraneo al cielo»[733].

As a result, it can be noted that the Caucasus peaks are not only perceived as a place of punishment: at the same time, they are also the setting that encapsulates the metaphorical value of the story of Prometheus as figure who, acting as a hinge between the terrestrial and otherworldly worlds, met his fate in the balance between the two realities. The rock is the mark or iconographic seal of this condition of balance and boundary.

The rocky environment is purely natural. However, unlike other domains such as the garden, rock characterizes settings that are not merely unihabited. Instead, it refers *par excellence* to areas that *cannot* be inhabited. In other words, a rocky region is not generally defined as a space outside the city but, more specifically, as the antithesis of the city. Furthermore, it can be noted that rocks are sterile and, unlike plants, neither alive nor productive. Such barrenness accounts for the conflict between urban and rocky environments. While the former is a place of life, the latter is a 'non-place' where the nameless and unknown lurk and into which only heroes can venture. On the one hand, therefore, there is the city, the world of civilized man who has tamed surrounding space to suit his needs. On the other hand there is wild and rugged nature, the land of the unknown and world of the barbarian.

The hero who ventures into the unknown world crosses a border that is both physical and metaphorical and, in doing so, exposes himself to

[731] DOBROWOLSKI 1991, p. 1222.
[732] DOBROWOLSKI 1991, p. 1223.
[733] DOBROWOLSKI 1994, p. 178.

danger. This theme is cultural even before it is iconographic. The recurrence of rocky elements in the images analyzed here shows that, for their part, images meet the need to represent complex themes using their own structure, with individual figurative elements standing for concepts.

3.2.2. Communicating with gods: Haruspices, Prophecies, Oracles

Drawing on Alessandro della Seta, the role of religion in Etruscan culture can be defined as «una grandiosa impalcatura che ingombrava ogni atto della vita con la divinazione»[734]. This image accounts for the fundamental relationship between the two spheres of religion and divination. Indeed, examining the gods' will dominated Etruscans' daily activities and they made their religion («formalistica, magica, priva della grazia del mito»)[735] into a complex set of rituals and rules. Attempts to reconstruct this kind of apparatus must inevitably involve a critical comparison of textual, archaeological, and iconographic sources, considering that different data intertwine and form a coherent framework. Evaluating the variety of sources, the purpose of this section is to investigate the iconographic relationship between landscape features and other image elements in scenes depicting occasions of institutionalized contact between man and deity.

The ideological foundation of Etruscan divination was the idea that reality is ruled by divine forces guaranteeing order and rationality. Consequently, according to Etruscan perception, everything happens for a reason. To the Etruscan mind, in fact, «ogni avvenimento trova una precisa collocazione, e quindi anche una sua relativa prevedibilità, all'interno di una struttura unitaria che coinvolge tutto il cosmo»[736].

[734] DELLA SETA 1922, p. 163.
[735] DELLA SETA 1922, p. 163.
[736] MAGGIANI, SIMON 1984, p. 139.

In Etruria, the societal figures who held knowledge about all ritual and divinatory practices were the haruspices. This term is used in ancient sources to designate experts in the Etruscan discipline more generally. In an etymological sense, however, it indicates experts in a particular field of divinatory practices, namely the practice of inspecting victims' entrails. On the figurative level, the haruspices' activity is illustrated by a small number of well-known pieces, the celebrity of which is tied to the fertile debate on their exegesis that has developed over the decades. Some of the most interesting examples of such pieces are the bronze mirror featuring Chalchas from Vulci held in Rome and the bronze mirror with an extispicy scene from Tuscania preserved in Florence. The mirror representing Chalchas (**pl. 141.b**)[737] – the soothsayer mentioned at the beginning of the *Iliad* – dates to the end of the fifth century B.C. and clearly shows how Etruscan culture «si muove con autonomia nell'ambito della cultura greca»[738]. The mirror shows an haruspicina scene with the soothsayer, winged and with one foot on the rock, bent over a table holding an animal's liver. For the purposes of this analysis, a few remarks concerning this practice are warranted. First of all, we should consider that liver-reading in Etruria had the function of consulting divine will[739]; in fact, this organ was considered «particulièrement approprié à reproduire ce qu'est le monde dans son ensemble, et porter le marques que veulent y imprimer les dieux qui président à sa marche»[740]. The assumption that made hepatoscopy one of the main pillars of Etruscan divination is that the entrails of the sacrificed animal reproduced, as if in a miniature form, the cosmic system. Therefore, the entrails were thought to reflect both this system and the divine will engendering it. Sacrifice thus acquired a specific

[737] Vatican City, Museo Greogriano Etrusco, inv. 12240; dating to the end of the fifth century B.C. BRIQUEL 1990, pp. 30-31, fn. 40 (with published references); CAMPOREALE 2004, p. 41, no. 15; AMBROSINI 2006, p. 206, fig. 15; RONCALLI 2010, pp. 122-123, fig. 12.
[738] BIANCHI BANDINELLI, GIULIANO 1973, p. 262.
[739] See BRIQUEL 1997.
[740] BRIQUEL 1997, p. 419.

value. As Briquel has aptly shown, «[…]. Le foie, centre de la victime, devient un véritable centre du monde, les hommes et les dieux s'y rencontrent et les premiers y reçoivent des seconds les indications, les signes, que ceux-ci veulent leur communiquer. Il se produit donc, dans le sacrifice étrusque, défini comme « consultatoire », un échange entre hommes et dieux. [...] Ce n'est plus le clivage entre les deux mondes que met en valeur le sacrifice : c'est au contraire le rapport qui s'établit, par le rituel, entre mortels et immortels»[741]. In relation to this point, the mirror with Chalchas shows one of the key moments in the relationship between humans (in the person of the haruspex) and gods. In the mirror, the figurative rendering of this moment shows the haruspex resting his left foot on a rock, according to a model also documented by other examples (see e.g. **pl. 142.a**)[742]. As has been noted in relation to a haruspex statuette posed in the same position, «l'aruspice è colto in un momento e "atto" preciso, a conferma del fatto che, mentre il costume (che può variare) individua il sacerdote in quanto tale, il masso sotto i suoi piedi ne segnala – a quanto pare invariabilmente – l'azione rituale in corso, indipendentemente dalla classe sacerdotale cui egli appartiene, e forse anche dalla particolare natura dell'azione stessa cui attende»[743]. In other words, the ongoing ritual action being depicted is figuratively characterized in the form of contact between the ritual officiant and a rock protruding from the ground.

A preliminary clarification is necessary to understand why connection with the deity is made by physically thouching a rock. In Etruscan perception, the world was organized according to a rational system entailing not only the division of the sky and the underworld into sectors (as the Piacenza liver shows)[744] but also «vertical links

[741] BRIQUEL 1997, p. 419.

[742] Lower attachment of a bronze Schnabelkanne handle; dating to 400-375 B.C. Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum, inv. 1481. See TORELLI 2000, p. 592, no. 151; RONCALLI 2010, p. 153. Despite the absence of the wings, the attitude of the haruspex in the Amsterdam attachment matches that of Chalcas in the mirror from Vulci.

[743] RONCALLI 1996b, p. 49.

[744] As Maggiani has shown, the Piacenza liver suggests that «l'immagine cosmologica [...] fosse concepita come un sistema discendente dalle sedi di Tin a quelle sotterranee

between heaven and earth, and between earth and the Underworld»[745]. These links maintained and guaranteed equilibrium and interaction between heaven, earth, and the underworld, realms that were distinct but never conceptualized as independent. In this system, «l'*orbis terrarum* viene articolato secondo un sistema di coordinate astronomiche basate […] sui punti cardinali»[746]. The delimited and inaugurated sacred space of the *templum* was the primary site in which these forms of correspondences manifested, and illustrated the sense in which sense «l'éspace céleste se reflète dans le monde des vivants»[747]. Moreover, the city-making process also took place through a series of astronomically oriented ritual acts[748].

---

degli dei inferi, di Vetis e Cilens; e che pertanto la divisione del cielo in sedici regioni rappresentasse esclusivamente l'aspetto tecnico della dottrina, lo strumento con il quale fosse possibile leggere, nello schermo concavo della volta celeste (equivalente al *templum* naturale di Varrone) la proiezione dei segni divini» (MAGGIANI 1984, p. 69). Regarding the Piacenza liver and related issues about divination, see also WEINSTOCK 1946; TORELLI 1966; COLONNA 1976-1977; VAN DER MEER 1979; VAN DER MEER 1987; COLONNA 1994b.

[745] EDLUND-BERRY 2006, p. 118.

[746] MAGGIANI, SIMON 1984, p. 149.

[747] Regarding the orientation of temples and buildings, see PRAYON 1991; PRAYON 1997 (quot. p. 366). On the relationship between eartly *templum* and celestial *templum* in Etruria, see also GUARINO 2011; PERNIGOTTI 2019.

[748] Starting with the foundation rites, the layout of the Etruscan city is subject to practices and arrangements of religious nature (on the Etruscan public ritual for city-foundation, see BRIQUEL 1987a; BRIQUEL 2008; VAN DER MEER 2011, pp. 82-104. For an overview of the relationship between spatial, ritual and political dimensions in Etruscan cities, see the essays edited in GOVI 2017). As a general role, «anche i rapporti tra la città e il suo territorio sono subordinati a questo criterio in quanto, oltre a essere regolati da un ordinamento istituzionale, sono permeati da quel concetto di sacralità e di inviolabilità, illustrato nel testo della così detta "profezia di Vegoia", secondo cui l'ordine politico e sociale, espresso in questo caso dai cippi di confine, riflette l'ordine cosmico stabilito da Tinia quando pose il confine tra cielo e terra» (MANESCHI 2011, p. 2). For an archaeological perspective on these subjects, see MICHETTI 2013. Some archaeological evidence, in fact, shows the function of rock as *memorandum* of the cosmic system. A cylindrical trachyte structure from San Cassiano (Crespino) intentionally outcropping from the ground provides an example. The construction, which from a planimetric point of view fits in with the walls' orientation, has a piece of red Verona marble in the center and a clay concoction in the northern area. It has been suggested that it is a «pro memoria pietrificato della posizione del Nord, riferimento

The Chalcas mirror and the mirror from Tuscania featuring an extispicy scene (**pl. 142.b**)[749] can be compared on the basis of their similar subjects. Although analysis of the Tuscania mirror remains quite problematic, one of the few clear points is the significance of the medaillon's tripartite structure. The middle area containing the main engraving is complemented by the upper space, where Thesan is represented in a quadriga, and the lower exergue where a winged demon appears. Although consistent with the structural arrangement common to mirrors of this period, such a tripartition is likely «indicativa di una distinzione di spazi geografico-simbolici»[750]. In such a system, the central area is intended to represent the space of human beings. The rocks, plants, and sun in the background were thus likely meant to set the central scene in an earthly context. This image shows five characters. On either side are two male figures whose nudity probably denotes their divine status. A young man («Pava Tarchies») wearing a pointed headdress («il tipico copricapo dell'ordine sacerdotale allacciato sotto il mento»)[751] stands by the right-hand naked figure. Pava Tarchies holds a liver in his hands, and rests his left foot on a high rocky prominence rising from the ground. A bearded man wearing a similar hat («Avl Tarchunus») and a female figure («ucernei») attend the scene. Apart from the debate over who exactly the individual characters are[752], what is especially relevant for the purposes of my analysis is Pava Tarchies' posture. In addition to the pose, his placement in relation to the sun is particularly noteworthy. In

topografico fondamentale» (HARARI, PALTINERI 2010, p. 71). On the *etrusco ritu* city-foundation, see also the case of Marzabotto (SASSATELLI 2014, p. 103). On the use of stones to delimit sacred space, see also the example of the Lucus Feroniae: BENEDETTINI, MORETTI SGUBINI 2019, pp. 181-182.

[749] Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 77759; dating to the fourth century B.C. TORELLI 1988; AMBROSINI 2006, p. 207, fig. 17; HARARI 2009 (with additional published references); DOMENICI 2009, p. 107; RONCALLI 2009, pp. 246 ss.

[750] HARARI 2009, p. 476.

[751] MAGGIANI 2005, p. 55. The proper interpretation of the sacred vestments is firstly provided by PALLOTTINO 1979.

[752] See the overview in HARARI 2009, p. 476.

fact, he is standing so as to turn both his shoulders and his left heel towards the sun. Although it is impossible to determine whether the sun is rising or setting, reducing its presence to a mere landscape note appears simplistic when considering how important cosmic orientation was for the haruspex. It can be observed that the image displays a close relationship between foot position (and, subsequently, the position of the rock) and astronomical orientation. In other words, the stone and the foot resting on it are oriented with extreme precision. This is confirmed by the position of the right foot, which rests on the ground in a precisely orthogonal position («collocazione rigorosamente ortogonale»)[753] in the same way as with Chalcas. However, the two images do not show two identical bodily positions. In particular, there is a difference worth nothing: whereas in the mirror with Chalcas the foot is positioned on the ground in a natural, physiological way, Pava Tarchies has to assume a very unnatural posture to place his right foot in that way. Indeed, his right leg is disarticulated from his body as if the engraver's primary intention was to show the correct position of the foot.

Following the idea that the terrestrial system of orientation corresponds to the cosmic and lower order, Cristofani has suggested that the spear held by the naked young man on the right and the laurel branch held by the figure on the left are the symbolic coordinates of the heaven vs. earth opposition («contrapposizione cielo/terra»)[754]. Similarly, as has been noted, the «lunga canna»[755] held by Avl Tarchunus «trapassa visibilmente la fascia di terra tra la scena e l'esergo, fino a toccare la testa del demone alato che la sorregge, la cui qualità ctonia è evidenziata dalla netta contrapposizione con la natura "urania" della quadriga dell'Aurora nel timpano dello specchio»[756].

Therefore, Avl Tarchunus' posture and Pava Tarchies' gesture bear a matching value. Despite their differences, both of the representational

[753] HARARI 2009, p. 476 (see also fn. 7).
[754] CRISTOFANI 1985a, p. 5.
[755] PALLOTTINO 1979, p. 682.
[756] RONCALLI 1996b, p. 49.

schemes emphasize the two figures' involvement in the divinatory moment («the two partners are thus operating in full accordance with one another, achieving the same 'communicating' condition with the chthonian world through diverse means: the reading youngster leaning his foot on the rock, his assisting elder partner pressing his staff deep into earth»)[757]. The rock thus guarantees that the action taking place belongs to the domain of the sacred. The figurative strength of this sign lies in the fact that it also indicates *what* grants such belonging: the figure's foot on the stone indicates that the action being depicted is sacred. The action represented in this image is sacred insofar as it complies with the requirements that the ritual be performed according to a precise orientation, i.e., the orientation that ensures contact with divinity. By placing his foot on the rock, the haruspex sets and orients himself in space as indicated by the stone, and the stone is a reminder of the order and *modus* that enables contact with the divine[758].

The typical haruspex bodily positioning described here above is also documented by a mirror from Castelgiorgio (Terni) showing Umaele consulting a liver (**pl. 142.c**)[759]. As in the other examples, Umaele rests his left foot on a rock protruding from the ground. The figure's haruspex-like attitude sets the scene in a divination context that also involves Turms, Aplu, and Alpnu. As with the Tuscania mirror, the Castelgiorgio mirror likewise shows Thesan in the upper exergue.

Significantly enough, a group of three other mirrors (**pl. 143**)[760] depicting prophecy scenes involving Umaele also depict a male figure

[757] RONCALLI 2010, p. 121.

[758] For further details on this subject, see PONTELLI 2017, with some related remarks about the *per iovem lapidem* oath (*adde* BAGNASCO GIANNI 2001b to published references).

[759] London, British Museum, inv. 1873,0820.109; dating to about 300 B.C. DE GRUMMOND 2000, p. 43, fig. 13; DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 39, fig. II.17; BAGNASCO GIANNI 2009, p. 55, fig. 8.

[760] **Pl. 143.a**: Siena, Museo Archeologico, inv. 176; from Chiusi; ex Bonci Casuccini collection; dating to about 300 B.C. (BONAMICI 1993, pp. 8, 14, fig. 21; DE GRUMMOND 2000, p. 41, fig. 11; AMBROSINI 2006, p. 231, fig. 19; DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 33, fig. II.10; BAGNASCO GIANNI 2009, p. 54, fig. 2); **pl. 143.b**: Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. 1724; from Castelgiorgio, Terni (DE GRUMMOND 2000, p. 42, fig. 12; AMBROSINI 2006,

resting his left foot on a rock on the left-hand side of the engraved medallion. As scholars have suggested, in divinatory practice this figure «fulfils the inspired function of the poet» as opposed to the figure on the other side, who «fulfils the function of recording the prophecy»[761]. These examples show that the motif of the foot resting on a rock, figuratively emphasizing the consulting nature of liver-reading, also appeared in other prophecy scenes, thus suggesting an extension of the meaning of the bodily gesture. In fact, although both the compositional scheme of these mirrors and the arrangement of their figures (based on the use of mythical characters not relying on a specific mythical narrative) can be compared to mass-produced conversation scenes, the bodily positioning of the side figure is not a repertory motif disconnected from the overall meaning of the image.

The widespread appearance of this gesture in images depicting isolated vaticinating heads confirms that it is relevant for prophecy contexts[762]. Examples include an engraved mirror in Brussels showing Pherse and Menrva (**pl. 144.a**)[763] and a relief mirror showing Odysseus and Penelope (**pl. 144.b**)[764]. In both of these images, the figure's left foot raised to rest on a rock is combined with the elbow resting on the knee and the index finger raised. This iconography dates back to fifth-century Attic images[765] and can be found in some Etruscan gems (**pl. 145.a**)[766]. For this particular type of object, an example from Chiusi held

p. 231, fig. 20; BAGNASCO GIANNI 2009, p. 54, fig. 3); **pl. 143.c**: Princeton, Princeton University Art Museum, inv. 1998.46 (AMBROSINI 2006, p. 231, fig. 21; BAGNASCO GIANNI 2009, p. 54, fig. 4).

[761] BAGNASCO GIANNI 2009, p. 50.

[762] Regarding this subject and identification with Orpheus, see AMBROSINI 1998 (with published references).

[763] Brussels, Musée Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire; dating to third century B.C. DE GRUMMOND 2000, p. 52, fig. 22; DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 36, fig. II.14.

[764] Duke, Nasher Museum of Art, inv. DCC1969.1; dating to third century B.C. DE GRUMMOND 2000, p. 53, fig. 23; DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 37, fig. II.15.

[765] See e.g. red-figure *hydria* Basel, Antikenmuseum und Sammlung Ludwig, inv. BS 481; dating to 440-430 B.C.

[766] AMBROSINI 1998, pp. 352-353, fig. 10.

in London is especially relevant (**pl. 145.b**)[767]. This banded agate scarab dating to fourth century B.C. shows Turms stooping over a vase from which a male head emerges. The god has his right foot resting on the same rock on which the vase is placed. Gisela Richter has suggested that the stone indicates that «the scene is taking place out-of-doors»[768]. I would instead argue that its presence is related to the specific gesture performed by Turms and the necromantic connotation of the image, possibly associated with the episode of the liberation of Ares/Laran enclosed by the Aloadai in a bronze *pithos*[769].

In addition to oracular scenes, it can be noted that the same gesture also appears in relation to images of libation and prayer, that is, other channels through which to make contact with the gods. In a mirror from Cantolle (**pl. 145.c**)[770], for instance, the connection takes place in a different direction for Herakles, depicted in the act of performing a libation. The hero stands in the middle of the medallion, below the exergue with Thesan, and rests his left foot on a rock. Herakles' attitude and the «umanizzazione aneddotica»[771] of his gesture indicate both his immortality and the foundations of his cult[772]. A male figure making an offering next to an altar with his foot raised is depicted on a fourth-century cornelian scarab (**pl. 146.a**)[773] at the J. Paul Getty Museum. This

[767] London, British Museum, inv. 1872,0604.1238; ex Castellani collection. RICHTER 1968, p. 194, who dated the scarab to 460-380 B.C. ('middle period'); TORELLI 2002a, pp. 149-150.
[768] RICHTER 1968, p. 194.
[769] HARARI 1997b, p. 108, no. 117. On the orphic-eschatological connotations of this image, see TORELLI 2002a, pp. 149-150.
[770] Private collection, place of conservation unknown; dating to about 300 B.C. DOBROWOLSKI 1999; MASSA PAIRAULT 2000, pp. 203-206, fig. 12; DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 140, fig. VI.34; AMBROSINI 2011a. See also SANNIBALE 2007, p. 144, fn. 167 with published references on divine libations.
[771] SANNIBALE 2007, p. 144.
[772] See MASSA PAIRAULT 2000, p. 203.
[773] Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, inv. 81.AN.76.132. ALLEN forthcoming.

scheme can be compared to a later scarab which shows a man standing before an altar with his foot resting on a rock[774].
Similarly, the satyr praying in front of an erm in an engraved mirror at the Vatican Museums (**pl. 146.b**)[775] also bends his left leg, resting it on a protruding part of the ground.
In light of all the examples examined above, other more complex and controversial images can also be framed as belonging to an oracular context.

Different kinds of prophecy scenes appear in the Paris mirror featuring Urphen and Lunc (Orpheus and Lynceus) dating to the end of sixth century B.C. (**pl. 147.a**)[776] and a fourth-century red-figure krater from Montediano (**pl. 147.b**)[777] showing the weighing of the oracular *responsum* by Palmithe (Palamedes). Attending the scene is a naked youth with one foot resting on a boulder and the other held at a right angle to the first. He is leaning on a pole that is stuck into the ground behind Palamedes' foot[778].

These examples complete the portrait I have sketched here about forms of communication between humans and gods. On the figurative level, they confirm that a distinguished prophetic stance with the left leg raised to rest on a rock was quite widespread.
Generally speaking, the sacred nature of the rock (a sacredness conferred on this natural element by several different cultures) can be investigated from a primarily anthropological perspective[779].

---

[774] New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. 41.160.679; dating to third century B.C.
[775] Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. MV 5340; dating to fourth century B.C. LAMBRECHTS 1995, pp. 22-23, no. 6.
[776] Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. 1726 ; dating to 325-300 B.C. EMMANUEL-REBUFFAT 1997, pp. 30-32, , no. 5; DE GRUMMOND 2000, p. 50, fig. 20.
[777] Lost. Formerly Patrizi collection. Dating to 350-325 B.C. MASSA PAIRAULT 1992, p. 138; HARARI 2003, pp. 504-510 (with published references).
[778] MASSA PAIRAULT 1992, p. 138 suggests that the youth is Hermes or Diomedes; HARARI 2003, p. 507 interpreted him as Hermes.
[779] On the sacred nature of stones from the perspective of the history of religions, see ELIADE 2008, pp. 195-213 (first edition 1949). On the metaphorical use of rocks in Greek and Latin literary tradition, see MACRÌ 2009.

Nonetheless, the group of Etruscan images reviewed above contributes to highlighting a specific role played by the rock. Of particular interest is the evidence that rocks appear also as figurative features in prophetic music scenes, as shown by the examples presented in the earlier section[780].

Rather than suggesting a generic symbolic value, all of these examples suggest tat the rock played a specific function as a bridging element between different levels of reality. This function is primarily based on the evidence that, by virtue of its very nature, rock physically bisects the ground. Therefore, it is connected equally to what is above and what is below, namely *ge*/*gaia* and *chthon*. These two polarized elements represent «due aspetti della terra […] geologicamente antitetici» both in terms of stratigraphy («*chton* è la faccia esterna del mondo infero, la terra dalla superficie in giù, *ge* è la terra dalla superficie in su, la faccia che la terra volge verso il cielo») and in terms of function («*chton* non è coltivabile né se ne può trarre nutrimento, sfugge all'opposizione città/campagna e non è un bene che possa essere posseduto; *ge*, per converso, […] produce i raccolti e i beni che arricchiscono gli uomini»)[781]. As we will see in more detail in the following sections, images suggest that the potential of rock to encroach vertically into these two realities was felt keenly in Etruscan perception.

[780] See above pp. 112-113.
[781] AGAMBEN 2020.

3.3. Landscapes Beyond Human Life

The purpose of this section is to present images featuring scenes set in both the Afterlife and in heavenly dwellings inhabited by immortal heroes and gods. These two domains represent the two dimensions in which the Etruscans visualized the afterlife. Although not subject to death, the gods live in an otherworldly dimension. From an eschatological perspective, heavenly abodes are antithetical to the underworld[782].

3.3.1. *A Journey to the Afterlife, a Landscape Extending toward the Underworld*

In the previous section, I reviewed images showing the intermediary function of rocks in prophecy scenes. Jean-Pierre Vernant anthropologically-based research about the *kolossos* has aptly shown the extent to which rock ensures contact between the earthly world and the afterlife while simultaneously embodying death. According to Vernant, the *kolossos* embodies visible-invisible and life-death oppositions. The relationship between stone and death is based on the coldness, inertia, insensitivity and immobility shared by both elements. Therefore, stone is a metaphor for death (with death understood as petrification of life) and a medium through which it is possible to make contact with life (through the *kolossos*, in fact, the deceased manifests himself to the living). In other words, the *kolossos* is a double of the dead who manifests himself to the living while standing in opposition to them[783].

The analysis of Etruscan images dating from the end of the fifth century B.C. shows that the affinity between rock and death is not limited to a metaphorical association based on common characteristics.

[782] On the Etruscan belief about the Underworld and the destination of the deceased, see HARARI 1988a; JANNOT 2000.
[783] See VERNANT 1976, p. 221.

Instead, the rock appears to be a distinguishing topographic feature of monstrous nether world scenes.

Etruscans conceived of the afterlife journey as taking place in stages and these stages recur with a certain degree of consistency, albeit not without some variation. A similar geographical structuring of the afterlife also appears in Greek sources[784]. Mauro Cristofani[785] was the first to highlight the link between images of the *Tomba dell'Orco II* and Aristophanes' *Frogs*, in which the transition from life to death is described as the progression of sequential phases. According to Aristophanes' text, the itinerary traveled by Dionysus and his servant Xanthia begins (1) on the beaches of the lake through which Charon's boat passes. When Dionysus and Xanthia arrive, the ferryman refuses to board picking up the servant «εἰ μὴ νεναυμάχηκε τὴν περὶ τῶν κρεῶν»[786]. Charon then orders Xanthia to walk around the lake, and wait « παρὰ τὸν Αὐαίνου λίθον / ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀναπαύλαις»[787]. We can observe that this rock stands as a novel threshold and «nuovo punto di partenza»[788], in that it represents the physical boundary between the first and second part of the journey. The second phase begins once the god and his servant have left Charon and are about to cross (2) the dark moor inhabited by monstrous beasts. Finally, there is (3) the flowery meadow in which Hades and Persephone's palace is located, and it is here that Dionysus and Xanthia's journey ends.

According to the Etruscan perspective, the general notion of a journey divided into stages takes on the more specific nuance of a two-part journey, with an initial transitional phase leading through the swamp of monsters, and a second phase in which the encounter with the gods of Hades takes place[789].

---

[784] See e.g. PAUS. 10.28.4.
[785] CRISTOFANI 1987b.
[786] AR. *ra.* 190.
[787] AR. *ra.* 194-195.
[788] BONAMICI 1998, p. 4.
[789] See BONAMICI 2005a, p. 526.

On the iconographic level, this argument that the rock holds a specific value as a boundary between two distinct spaces of the Underworld dates back to Francesco Roncalli's research[790]. The scholar's observations are based on his analysis of the paintings on the *Tomba dei Demoni Azzurri* walls in Tarquinia (**pl. 148**)[791], discovered in 1987 and dating to the third quarter of the fifth century B.C. The entrance wall shows a scene of earthly games and is symmetrically offset by the rear wall, which features an afterlife symposium. The side walls show the images of the journey, arranged according to sophisticated points of mutual correspondence. On the left-hand side is the journey of the man, shown triumphantly stepping up into the chariot. On the right-hand side is the woman's journey and she is depicted preparing to board Charon's boat[792]. The discrepancies between the two side scenes, revealing two differing ceremonial statutes, show that Etruscans conceptualized the journey to the afterlife in an allegorical form that was far from monolithic or constant[793].

---

[790] See RONCALLI 1997.

[791] Tarquinia, Monterozzi Necropolis. TORELLI 1983; CRISTOFANI 1987b; HARARI 2012b; ADINOLFI *et alii* 2018.

[792] See RONCALLI 1997, p. 41 : «Il est alors clair que la scène "traditionnelle" de symposion figurée sur la paroi du fond représente la destination ultime du voyage, et que l'itinéraire décrit sur la paroi de droite et appartenant au "nouveau" répertoire constitue un parallèle au cortège du dignitaire figuré sur la paroi de gauche, et aboutit comme lui à la scène de symposion». The proposal to read the scene in the opposite direction, identifying in the image of the woman a depiction preceding the moment of her death, and considering the two figures by Charun as already deceased characters (SACCHETTI 2000) is not tenable, as aptly shown by RONCALLI 1997.

[793] With regard to the *Tomba dei Demoni Azzurri*, the two different allegorical forms of the journey are abridged in the two different vehicles (namely the chariot and the boat) used by the man and the woman respectively. DOMENICI 2012, p. 99 observed that the two vehicles refer to two different semantic nuclei, one relating to the symbolism of the diurnal sun (Usil), and the other to the nocturnal sun (Śuri). In 2018, at a conference presentation the proceedings of which have not yet been published (University of Cambridge, Craven Seminar 2018, Ancient Mediterranean Painting between "Classical" and "Non-Classical"), Maurizio Harari highlighted the Attic connotations of the right wall of the *Tomba dei Demoni Azzurri*. That is especially evident when we compare it to the *imagerie* of Attic white-ground *lekythoi* (GIUDICE 2015, esp. pp. 57-82). Besides revealing two different statutes – rather than two paths –

Following Roncalli's analysis, we can identify the female figure on the right-hand wall as the deceased. She is walking towards the infernal boat, where a female figure and young boy, probably two ancestors, are waiting for her. Two infernal demons accompany the dead woman. One, who precedes her, has blue flesh; the other, who follows her, has wings and brown flesh[794]. Close to the entrance wall, behind the deceased and the blue and brown demons, two other demons open the scene. The first, also with blue skin, has two bearded serpents wrapped around his arms and seats on a rock. The second is winged, with blackish skin, and walks to the left with his arms outstretched towards the rock. Roncalli suggests the whole scene be read right-to-left and points out that the woman is depicted in the middle of a journey «dont la première étape est marquée par le rocher figuré prés de la paroi d'entrée»[795]. In contrast to the itinerary described by Aristophanes, the deceased's journey in the *Tomba dei Demoni Azzurri* places the monsters' area earlier, before the lake passage. The sequence suggested by the tomb images is nonetheless paralleled in an excerpt from the *Aeneid* in which the area of the monsters precedes the river[796].

More specifically, with regard to the identification of the demons, Roncalli associates the two winged figures with a blackish/brown color. According to the scholar's interpretation, these are two transporter demons, who perform the function of psychopomps[797]. The reason why two demons are required to perform this function is conveyed by Marisa Bonamici when she states that, looking at these images, «sembra

---

the two walls would therefore be representative of two different cultural backgrounds. On one side, an Etruscan man. On the other, an Attic woman. She would be involved in commissioning an Attic-like image, assembled in an Etruscan conception of limits. Other examples of the Attic character of Etruscan culture in Tarquinia in the fifth century B.C. are the *Tomba dei Pigmei* (HARARI 2005) and the *Tomba della Scrofa Nera* (STOPPONI 1983).

[794] On the skin color of daemons, see MARCATTILI 2012.

[795] RONCALLI 1997, p. 41.

[796] VIRG. *Aen.* 6.258 ss.

[797] This function was firstly entrusted to the Etruscan Charon by De Ruyt in his monography on the hell's ferryman. See DE RUYT 1934, p. 224: «le rôle de Charun […] commence au moment de la mort et finit à l'entrée des Enfers».

trasparire una concezione secondo la quale alla struttura binaria dell'itinerario possa corrispondere una parallela bipartizione della figura psicopompa, insomma una regolamentazione, in virtù della quale a una determinata guida spetti la tutela della prima parte del viaggio e ad una diversa guida competa la cura della seconda parte, senza che in questo possano darsi confusione di ruoli, sovrapposizioni e vuoti di presenza»[798].

In brief, in the case of the *Tomba dei Demoni Azzurri*, it can be argued that the first threshold, one marking the actual distinction between the world of the dead and that of the living, is the door of the tomb itself. The second threshold is «*marquée par le rocher*» beyond which only these

[798] BONAMICI 2005a, p. 526. See also MAGGIANI 1992, p. 195: drawing on VAN GENNEP 1909, the scholar adopts an anthrophological perspective and underlies the existence of a «struttura soggiacente di tipo tripartito, che prevede un percorso perfettamente analizzabile nei termini a suo tempo messi a punto dall'antropologia: è infatti riconoscibile una fase preliminare, nella quale il defunto è appannaggio di Charun e Vanth, che gli notificano il destino di morte e lo accompagnano alla porta dell'Aldilà, una fase liminare, rappresentata dalla porta stessa, alla quale presiede la dea che dalla porta prende il nome, Culsu, e una fase postiliminare, l'Aldilà vero e proprio, nel quale dimorano Eita (Ades) e Phersipnai (Persephone), ma anche demoni come Tuchulcha, retaggio di arcaiche concezioni indigene». Drawing on Johann Rasmus Brandt's analysis – which is based on van Gennep's three stage *rites-de-passage* model – we might also divide the journey in three parts including «the space of the living, i.e. this world, in which death occurred and in which the funerary rituals and practices were performed», «the liminal space beyond this world, i.e. the space in which the deceased travelled to reach the Underworld», «the space of the dead, i.e. the Underworld in which Aita and Phersipnai reigned» (BRANDT 2015, p. 149).
It can be noted that the structure of the Etruscan underworld, based on the presence of positive guides, might be anachronistically compared with Dante's *Divina Commedia*. However, we should note the very same opera, as a result of a Christian conception, fed a widespread misunderstanding in the interpretation of the Etruscan underworld, repeatedly received in modern time as a demonic universe of damnation. In his work on the representations of the Etruscan hell, for instance, Körte mentions the «tormenti che soffrono i peccatori nell'inferno» (KÖRTE 1879, p. 306). See also MASSA PAIRAULT 1975, p. 199, who assumes an image of torture in one amphora of the Torlonia collection. On the contrary, we should remember that according to the Etruscan perception, the confrontation with monsters is always a moment of trial and never the ultimate damnation and that demons are not necessarily hostile.

who have been buried can go. Finally, the third threshold is the infernal river, «*que seuls franchissent les élus et les initiés*»[799].

What is especially significant for the purposes of this discussion is the fact that the rock functions as a physical demarcation. One might wonder why the two sections need to be indicated so severely. The explanation most likely lies in the fact that the stone does not indicate a generic crossing point; instead, the rock is an actual barrier beyond which not everyone is allowed to pass. In fact, as Roncalli highlights, the snake-bearing daemon by the rock «interrompt le voyage des morts sans statut et met un terme à celui des morts sans sépulture dont les os sont destinés à blanchir au soleil là même où il les abandonne»[800]. The idea that unburied dead were not allowed to access Hades and remained wandering restlessly in the underworld was common in religious belief in ancient Greece and Rome. Literary sources confirm this idea, as shown by Elphenor in the *Odyssey* and Palinurus in the *Aeneid*[801]. The events related to the refusal to bury the Carthaginians stoned to death after the battle of Alalia show that this sensibility was also common to the Etruscan mindset[802].

However, most revealing episode in relation to this point, especially with regard to the specific value of the rock, is that of Sisyphus. As illustrated by several gems, the François Tomb paintings in Vulci, and the *Tomba dell'Orco II* in Tarquinia, this myth was undoubtedly known to Etruscans[803]. The figure of Sisyphus is related to the debated

[799] RONCALLI 1997, p. 41. In the pictorial reconstruction of this journey, an area characterized as the land of monsters is lacking. This absence is probably related to the value of defeating monsters in ancient funerary concepts. The overcoming of the trial represented by the monsters to be defeated is in fact a feature of the aristocratic funerary conception, imitative of the heroic model. This model was *par excellence* masculine and it likely didn't match funerary concepts of the female sphere.

[800] RONCALLI 1997, p. 41.

[801] See HOM. *Od.* X.55 ss.; VIRG. *Aen.* 5.835 ss.

[802] See HDT. *Hist.* 1.167. The episode is analyzed in DI FAZIO 2001, pp. 439 ss.; DI FAZIO 2017, pp. 449-450. The guilt of not burying the deceased turns the place of martyrdom into a cursed place and stains the Etruscans with sin.

[803] According to Roncalli (see RONCALLI 1996a), the figure kneeling beside a rock on one of the sides of the sarcophagus of Laris Pulenas (Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico

translation of the Etruscan «tupi», a term that appears in association with the name of Sisyphus and has been hypothesized to be the Etruscan word for 'rock' or 'stone'[804]. The story of the cunning man who mocks the gods and is punished in the Underworld, as already referenced in the Homeric *nekyia*[805], is well known. Although Sisyphus is definitively damned, he is not condemned to reside in Hades itself: he instead inhabits a borderland from which he can plan to return to life as long as no funeral honors are celebrated for him on earth. Before dying, Sisyphus asks his wife Merope not to perform his funeral rites[806]. According to the myth, the boulder involved in Sisyphus's punishment continually rolls back down to the bottom of the hill from which he must then push it again to the top, thereby indicating his ongoing attempt to climb back to life. More than the grueling physical effort, the heart of Sisyphus' condemnation lies in the torture of his being trapped in the Underworld. Given that he seeks to cross the threshold in the opposite direction (from death to life), the hindrance imposed on his efforts constitutes the very meaning of his punishment. Ferecides reports that Sisyphus was condemned to roll the boulder «πρὸς τὸ μὴ πάλιν ἀποδρᾶναι»[807], not to escape. Besides being the instrument of his punishment, Sisyphus' rock is also the symbol, or memory, of the threshold that he incessantly and unsuccessfully tries to cross. This value seems to be entirely consistent with the one assigned to the rock in the analysis of the *Tomba dei Demoni Azzurri* paintings. In particular, the rock can be seen to represent both a boundary marker and a specific link with death. Because of the combination of these two aspects, in the

Nazionale; dating around the middle of the third century B.C.) should be interpreted as Sisyphus.

[804] *CIE* 5373: «*tupi sispes*». The translation of the term with 'rock' («roccia») is accepted in PALLOTTINO 1984, p. 516 and BREYER 1993, p. 322 (to whom we refer for further bibliography and an overview on the discussion); similarly PITTAU 1997 accepts 'stone' («pietra»). CAFFARELLO 1975, p. 148 translates 'punishment' («punizione») and MORANDI 1991, p. 233 suggests 'fatigue («fatica»).

[805] HOM. *Od.* IX.593 ss.

[806] Cf. PHERECYD *FGrHist* 3 F 119.

[807] PHERECYD *FGrHist* 3 F 119.

Tomb of the Blue Demons as in the story of Sisyphus the rock becomes «le lieu et le symbole de la mort comme passage inéluctable»[808].

Despite their uniqueness, the *Tomba dei Demoni Azzurri* frescoes are not the only evidence of this kind of conception[809]. Marisa Bonamici has fruitfully applied Roncalli's proposed interpretative approach in her studies to successfully highlight similar instances.

In particular, Bonamici has interpeted the frieze of a Faliscan *stamnos* in Wien (**pl. 149.a**)[810] as «un vero e proprio ciclo figurato, relativo al cruciale tema del viaggio e soggiorno nell'Aldilà, dal suo inizio, alla fase delle lotte – travagliate ma vittoriose – contro le terrificanti creature infernali, fino al felice approdo alle dimore dei Beati»[811]. In the center of side A scene, there is a nude female figure wearing only footwear and jewelry[812]. This woman, represented seated on her cloak playing the lyre, is facing to the left. The cape lies on a structure that is not depicted, while the figure rests her feet on a rock. A bearded male figure wearing a long robe, interpreted as Charun, stands by the female lyre player. He holds a mallet in one hand and a serpent in the other. On the left-hand side, a female snake-bearing figure wearing long attire steps toward the central woman. Bonamici suggests that this snake-bearing woman can be interpreted as a «creatura maligna che abita stabilmente nell'Aldilà»[813], while the female player is the deceased[814].

The scholar also suggests that the rock at the dead woman's feet is the «soglia dove si saldano due spezzoni del tragitto che la defunta in parte ha già percorso, in parte si appresta a percorrere: l'itinerario "terrestre"

[808] RONCALLI 1997, p. 49.

[809] In more recent years, Roncalli has used the reading model proposed for the *Tomba dei Demoni Azzurri* to interpret a number of images carved on sarcophagi (see RONCALLI 2001).

[810] Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. 448; attributed to the Pittore di Villa Giulia 1660.

[811] BONAMICI 1998, p. 2.

[812] On the identification of the gender of this figure, see BONAMICI 1998, p. 4.

[813] BONAMICI 1998, p. 4.

[814] According to Bonamici, the deceased is depicted as a lyre player as she is supposed to be an initiate into the Orphic mysteries who faces the journey to the Afterlife in the wake of Orpheus (see BONAMICI 1998, p. 6).

gestito da Caronte, o meglio dal "Caronte di qua" e l'itinerario infero che attende la defunta al di là del fatidico ingresso, attraverso un orrido paesaggio abitato dalle potenze malevole, che si preannunciano con il demone anguiforo»[815]. In fact, the meaning of the scene that emerges from a right-to-left reading is consistent with the position of the female figure, as she turns her back on the male demon while facing the female one. Like Roncalli, Bonamici also interprets the rock as the dividing line between two parts of the Underworld. As in the *Tomba dei Demoni Azzurri*, in the Faliscan *imagerie* several demonic figures correspond to the different phases of the journey. However, there is a difference: while in the paintings of the Tarquinian tomb the two daemons are psychopompes, in the *stamnos* scene this is not the case. Rather, on one side there is Charun (who appears here in his traditional Etruscan guise and not as the Greek ferryman) and, on the other side, his counterpart is an aggressive demon who prefigures the land of monsters lying beyond the rocky threshold. On side B, the Wien vase shows a naked young man with petasos, cloak, and *bipennis* in his right hand. He faces towards the center of the scene where there is a bearded dragon with spotted skin. On the right hand side, a young man wearing a chiton, cloak and petasos is stabbing the serpent with a javelin. He is standing on a rock under which the snake's tail is also partially tucked. The figure holding the *bipennis* «altri non può essere che Turms Aitas», who «svolge la sua funzione di guida amichevole dei defunti, soccorrendoli nelle loro traversie»[816]. Assisting him in the fight against the monster, Turms Aitas waits for the deceased, i.e. the other young man, beyond the threshold (the rock) which he is about to cross by striking the infernal snake. In brief, therefore, «lo *stamnos* di Vienna rappresenta il momento dell'arrivo al paese dei mostri, saldando sapientemente un tratto dell'itinerario terrestre e un segmento del percorso infero (Lato A), il quale è riproposto ancora sul Lato B, in modo più disteso, nella scena della lotta contro il drago»[817].

[815] BONAMICI 1998, p. 4.
[816] BONAMICI 1998, p. 7. On Turms Aitas, see *infra*, p. 282.
[817] BONAMICI 1998, p. 8.

In addition to these considerations, the association between rock and snake is not among the elements addressed in Bonamici's analysis. Significantly enough, it has been suggested that, in ancient perspective, snakes are to be considered «mostri guardiani ai margini dell'*oikoumene*»[818]. As a general rule, the association between rock and snake dates back to fight scenes between monsters and heroes. By imitating the hero, the deceased of high social status experiences the fight against monsters during his afterlife journey[819].
In terms of the focus of my analysis here, the migration of the very same scheme – rock included – from one background to the other can be interpreted as demonstrating the rock's belonging to the basic figurative unit and suggests continuity in its meaning.

Two twin amphorae from the Vanth Group (**pl. 149.b**)[820] dating to the last quarter of the fourth century show Persephone's chariot followed by Hades. The gods move to the left towards the deceased, a cloaked woman accompanied by a demon guide, clearly identifiable as Charun[821]. Behind the dead woman there are another Charon and Cerberus, while between them and the woman sits a rock on which a serpent-dragon rests. In the two amphoras, the link between rock and snake is reinforced by a difference between the two images rather than a matching feature: in one instance a rock is depicted between Hades' legs, while in the other a snake occupies that position.

A number of other examples show rocks characterizing the topography of the underworld. A red-figure fourth-century amphora from the Torlonia collection (**pl. 150.a**)[822] provides a case in point, although it is only documented via a drawing. According to this

[818] BOTTINI 2004, p. 28. On the iconography of snakes in Etruscan art, see HOSTETLER 2007; HARRISON 2013, p. 913.
[819] HARARI 2011, p. 389.
[820] Orvieto, Museo 'Claudio Faina', inv. 2645. MANINO 1980, pp. 61 ss., pls. I-III; KRAUSKOPF 1987, pl. XI; BONAMICI 1998, p. 13; BONAMICI 2005, p. 35, fig. 2.
[821] *Contra* SPINOLA 1987, p. 57, who suggests that the figure wearing the cloack is the «vecchio defunto appoggiato ad un bastone».
[822] Rome, Torlonia collection; from Canino. GREIFENHAGEN 1978, pls. 37.2; 40; HARARI 1988a, p. 172, fig. 3; HARARI 1990, p. 40, no. 11; BONAMICI 1998, p. 8, fig. 13

source, the vase's pictorial decoration involves two scenes that form a continuous frieze. On one side, there is a Dionysian scene of bliss; on the other side, a female figure is depicted as she falls onto a rock and is approached by an armed Charun. As has been noted, the relationship between the two scenes is not one of mutual opposition. That is, the vase does not show an antithetical confrontation between a scene of bliss and one of torment. Instead, it shows the path taken by the deceased, as she carries out a tortuous journey before reaching final bliss[823]. According to Bonamici, the amphora shows the dead woman as she falls onto the «roccia di ingresso»[824] and is rescued by the demon who will guide her along her journey. With this hypothesis, Bonamici overturns previous readings and suggests a new interpretation of the demon's gesture, casting it instead as an act of offering aid. This new reading is based on the idea that Charun's gesture «denota inequivocabilmente un atteggiamento benevolo di invito, allo stesso modo dell'atto di prendere per il polso»[825]. Conversely, the apparently aggressive posture of Charun wielding the mallet is read by Bonamici as a «cifra iconografica costante di Caronte adottata evidentemente per rendere la figura immediatamente riconoscibile»[826]. This understanding of Charun's stance is best supported, among other examples, by the scene featured in the Bologna stele from San Michele in Bosco (**pl. 150.b**)[827] showing the ferryman holding the oar in his right hand and grasping the wrist the deceased person standing beside him.

Adopting Bonamici's proposed reading, the gesture of the daemon depicted in a *stamnos* in London attributed to the Funnel Group can be interpreted as a gesture of assistance. The vase (**pl. 151.a**)[828], dating to 350-325 B.C., shows a naked man who has fallen onto a rock in the

[823] See BONAMICI 1998, p. 10.
[824] BONAMICI 1998, p. 10.
[825] BONAMICI 1998, p. 14, fn. 80.
[826] BONAMICI 1998, pp. 14-15, fn. 80.
[827] SASSATELLI 1984; SASSATELLI, TAGLIENTE 2014, cat. 13.
[828] London, British Museum, inv. 1839,1025.10; reportedly from Orbetello; attributed to the workshop of the Aleria Painter. DEL CHIARO 1974b, pp. 41-42, no. 3, pls. 46-47; BONAMICI 1998, pp. 10-11.

same manner as the woman of the Torlonia amphora. Standing in front of the male figure is Charun, and the daemon brandishes the mallet and grasps the fallen man's wrist. This 'assistance' interpretation is best supported by the image on the other side of the same *stamnos*, an image showing a naked young man sitting on a rock. The man wears only shoes and has the sheath of a sword across his legs. To the left, a winged female figure holding a torch in her right hand rests her left hand on the man's shoulder. Despite the presence of shoes and a sword, , there is not much evidence to support Beazley's suggestion that the male figure be identified as Theseus[829]. Rather, the image should be read as related to the scene on the other side of the vase, thus suggesting that the *stamnos* as a whole represents two *excerpta* from the infernal journey.

I have reviewed a group of images in which the scene is set in a specific area of the underworld through the visual reference to a rock (often in association with a serpent). Specifically, this rock is the passageway between the various stages of the infernal journey imagined by the Etruscans. In other words, in these images, the rock points to a genuine border point[830].

In addition to the examples in which such a precise location can be identified, some scenes set in the underworld involve a more generic use of rocks. In other words, the rock-underground association in some images is influential in the sense of providing a generic topographical characterization of the underworld. Along these lines, Aristophanes' *Frogs* – already reviewed in the previous section – describes the underworld's very depths as a dark place made up of rocks. According

[829] BEAZLEY 1947, p. 142 no. 8.

[830] GILOTTA 2010, p. 107 and fn. 17 assigns a similar function to the architectural structure (tomb) on which Turms sits in a red-figure column krater (Chiusi, Museo Archeologico Nazionale) dating to 430-410 B.C. On the separator function of architectural structure, see HARARI 1997c, p. 202 (regarding the krater by the Montebradoni Painter at the Museo Guarnacci in Volterra [**pl. 151.c**]) and BELLELLI 2011 (on Campanian black-figure vase painting, i.e. the *Gruppo della Festa Campestre*).

to the text, in fact, «τοία Στυγός σε μελανοκάρδιος πέτρα / Ἀχερόντιός τε σκόπελος αίματοσταγὴς»[831] hold damned people in the bowels of the underworld.

As mentioned above, the underworld's connotation as a rock-filled space stems primarily from the rock-death association. This was likely based on concrete, everyday observation of the real-life relationship between rock and the earth. Stone, generated by the earth, maintains physical contact with it and, embedded in the earth, functions as a physical interface between above and below.

With regard to Etruscan art, the generic characterization of the underworld as a rocky area can be found, for instance, in images of individual demons standing on boulders[832]. A carnelian scarab at the British Museum (**pl. 151.b**)[833] showing a winged male daemon with his right foot resting on a rocky ledge provides an example.
Similarly, in the third-century sarcophagus from Torre San Severo (**pl. 104**)[834] there is a rock between the legs of each of the two daemons standing on either side of the scene of Polyxena's sacrifice. In these instances – as in another nephron sarcophagus from Tarquinia held in Copenhagen (**pl. 152.a**)[835] – the boulders likely act as an attribute with the figurative power to project the demons into the imaginary geography of their underworld space.

It is by acknowledging a specific value underlying the demon-rock association that we can best understand the Berlin cista 6238 from

[831] AR. *ra.* 470-471.
[832] On the rocky «environnement» in which Charun Etruscan representations are set, see JANNOT 1993, pp. 70-71; on the relationship between Etruscan daemons and rocks, see RONCALLI 2001.
[833] London, British Museum, inv. 1865,0712.92; dating to the late fifth-century B.C.; ex Castellani collection. RICHTER 1968, p. 187, no. 748.
[834] Orvieto, Museo 'Claudio Faina'. GALLI 1916; CAGIANO DE AZEVEDO 1970; COLONNA 1985b, p. 121, figs. 7-10; CAMPOREALE 1992, no. 82; MASSA PAIRAULT 1992, pp. 126-130, figs. 109-111; RONCALLI 1994, p. 114; MASSA PAIRAULT 1996, pp. 182 ss. On the events related to the discovery of the sarcophagus, see BRANDA 2012. See also above p. 207.
[835] Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, inv. H. 278. HERBIG 1952, p. 32, no. 50, pls. 11-12; RONCALLI 1996a, pp. 51-52, fig. 6.

Praeneste (**pl. 152.b**)[836], a piece for which scholarly analysis has already proposed an interpretation combining triumph and death[837]. A rock grows between the legs of the figure located behind the horse-drawn chariot. Seeing as this scene evokes the triumphal moment of the deceased's entry into Hades, the rock likely indicates the actual boundaries of that land.

It can be seen that this relationship between daemons and rocks was even stronger during the third century B.C. At that time, in fact, representations of daemons sitting on rocks by the gateway to the underworld appear frequently in different categories of monuments, as indicated by the frescos of tomb 5637 and a number of urns from Chiusi[838].

And yet it was not only demons that were depicted standing on rocky ground. As shown, for instance, by the scene in a Faliscan *oinochoe* in Civita Castellana (**pl. 153.a**)[839], the entire confrontation with monsters took place on stony terrain. In a number of comparable images rocks appear in the confrontation scene (see e.g. **pl. 153.b**)[840].
In the previous section, I analyzed the calyx-krater from Vulci at the Cabinet des Médailles showing a Trojan prisoner being slain by Ajax Telamonius (**pl. 103.b**)[841]. Side B of that krater shows a *nekyia* scene with four standing figures. On the left-hand side, a woman wearing a long chiton stands with her hands clasped in front of her body. She is depicted frontally but she turns her neck and gaze towards the left in

[836] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. 6238 (BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA 1979, pl. LXX; GILOTTA 1994).
[837] See GILOTTA 1994.
[838] See e.g. COLONNA 1984b, pp. 14-15, and the urn in Palermo (ex Casuccini collection) in JANNOT 1988a, p. 325, fig. 6. See also RONCALLI 1994, p. 113: «[…] il valore simbolico di queste rocce […] diverrà, in età ellenistica, perfettamente familiare al lessico figurativo dei decoratori sia di sarcofagi che di urne».
[839] Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 2351. POLA 2016, pls. CCCXLII-CCCXLIII.
[840] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. F 2951. SCHAUENBURG 1982, pp. 254-256, figs. 4-5.
[841] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département des Monnaies, Médailles et Antiques, inv. 920; dating to 330-330 B.C.; attributed to the *Pittore di Turmuca*. CRISTOFANI 1987a, pp. 226-226; 327, no. 174; BONNECHERE 2000, p. 255, fn. 1.

the opposite direction of that in which Charun is moving. Beside this figure, Charun has just been moving to the right and is caught in the moment when he stops at a precise limen. He leans on his hammer, having just rested it on a rock rising from the ground in the middle of the scene. On the right-hand side, two veiled and cloaked female figures are standing on rocky ground. An inscription indicates that they are «hinθi Aturmucas» («l'ombra di Aturmuca»)[842] and «Pentasila», namely the Greek Penthesilea, the queen of the Amazons killed by Achilles. Side B is therefore consistent with side A, as they both depict «personaggi del mito, ma di origini non greche (un Troiano, e le Amazzoni, alleate dei Troiani) che soccombono di fronte agli eroi greci, verso i quali esiste, in questo periodo, un processo di identificazione genealogica da parte degli Etruschi»[843].

What is relevant to the present discussion is the bipartition of the *nekyia* scene. It shows two separated groups, but only the one on the right is depicted on rocky ground. Unlike the Amazons, the female figure to the left (who is likely the deceased, as her backward gaze and the placement of her hands suggests timid and Charun do not step on the rocky soil. This difference suggests that Charun is leading the female figure towards the Amazons, and these latter «are already in that realm of Hades that she is destined to join; this realm is expressed, once more, by the rocky height on which they are stepping as if on a pedestal»[844]. The rock, emphasized in the right-hand section of the image, defines the afterlife landscape in contrast to the other group's environment with its lack of any landscape detail.

The topographical characterization of the underworld can be further documented thanks to the black, stalactite-like rock depicted near Charun in the well-known krater at the Cabinet des Médailles showing

[842] Transl. CRISTOFANI 1987a, p. 327.
[843] STEINGRÄBER 1985, p. 374.
[844] RONCALLI 1996a, p. 59. *Contra* CRISTOFANI 1987a, p. 327, who maintains that in the scene «tre fanciulle, una anonima, le altre due più famose, attendono sulla riva dell'Acheronte di essere traghettate da Caronte».

the 'encounter' between Alcestis and Admetus (**pl. 153.c**)[845]. According to Roncalli, the wild landscape of the scene indicates that their meeting is located «next to (and immediately out of) the land depicted in the Tomb of the Blue Demons». Roncalli's argument in this case is based on the idea that wild elements constitute a general «allusion» to the specific setting[846].

Significantly enough, the black shading of the rock suggests the relevance of colors in the structuring of the Etruscan rocky, infernal landscape[847]. While the black-rock motif relates to the long-standing scholarly issue of identifying the black god Śuri[848], on the iconographic

[845] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département des Monnaies, Médailles et Antiques, inv. 918; from Vulci; dating to 350-325 B.C.; attributed to the *Pittore di Alcesti*. CRISTOFANI 1987a, pp. 324-325, no. 170; RONCALLI 1996a, pp. 56-58, fig. 11 (the scholar suggests that the vase is «an appropriate offering from a man on the occasion of his wife's untimely death»); HARARI 1997a, pp. 97-98, no. 2; HARARI 2000, p. 452; PIERACCINI, DEL CHIARO 2014.

[846] RONCALLI 1996a, p. 58.

[847] The black coloring is consistent with Greek perception, as literary sources record. See e.g. EUR. *Alc*. 439; *Op*. 154 ss.

[848] On the Etruscan **śur-* and its possible link with the Latin *niger* (with an additional remark in COLONNA 2018), see in part. COLONNA 2009 and COLONNA 2012 (*contra* THUILLIER 2012). Colonna's remarks are based on linguistic and epigraphic research by Emil Vetter. The Austrian scholar proposes to translate the Latin family name Nigidius with the Etruscan Surte (a surname documented in Etruria in the first century B.C. and resulting from the variant Śur of the theonym Śur/Śuri; the Latin transliteration of the surname is the family name Sortes, from which Vetter's interpretation developed). Subsequently, Colonna maintains that the Etruscan form **s/śur-* can be associated with the semantic field of the Latin **nigo-* (from which we get **nigus* > Nigidus and niger). According to Colonna, the relationship between Surte (the Etruscan family name) / Sortes (the Latin transliteration of the Etruscan family name) / Nigidius (the Latin translation of the Etruscan family name) leads to «guadagnare al lessico etrusco un aggettivo /šur/ sigificante "nero" (verosimilmente nero opaco), di cui il teonimo S/Śur non è che la sostantivazione conseguente al suo impiego come epiteto ("il dio Nero"), generatrice di molti derivati onomastici» (COLONNA 2009, p. 112). In other words, the theonym would be a speaking name referring to the color of the 'black god', identified by Torelli as Apollo of Pyrgi. With regard to the god, Torelli also mentions the ovoid or parallelepiped shaped black pebbles, partly carved, which were found in sacred areas and necropolises, mainly in Volsinii and Orvieto, and observes that they «si distinguono nettamente dai comuni cippi sepolcrali per essere di durissima pietra effusiva di colore nero, bigio o bluastro (basalto, lidite, trachite), oppure di colore verde

level the recognition of chromatic symbolism derives primarily from a reading of tomb paintings. Researchers' exploration of the semantic value of colors, a topic pursued by multiple studies in recent years[849], is facilitated by the results of multispectral reflectometry and ultraviolet (UV) fluorescence analyses of tomb frescoes[850].
This field of analysis would then benefit from being supplemented by some insights into the problem of light[851].

In the underworld images reviewed here, the rocky setting is not only a feature of the bumpy journey undertaken by deceased people; it also characterizes their final destination. Taking as reliable the drawing thanks to which we know the Torlonia amphora analyzed above (**pl. 150.a**), the rocky environment can be argued to have a more generalized use. Beside the fallen woman rescued by Charun, the amphora shows two naked figures crowned with leaves sitting on a rock, facing each other in a mirror-like position. A rivulet of water gushes from the rock and the stone outcropping shows a dot and flowers pattern. A bird, most probably a swan, is resting on the leg of the figure on the right. On each side of the scene are a tree and an archer. The two archers extend their bows towards the central couple. This scene should be interpreted in an Orphic perspective as one of the few documents to provide evidence of the diffusion of this doctrine in

cupo e di accertata provenienza non locale (serpentina, diorite)» (COLONNA 2009, p. 117). According to the scholar, those stones allegedly are aniconic signs of the black god, Śur/Śuri.

849 Regarding the colors of the Etruscan Underworld, see BRIQUEL 1993, p. 354; HARARI 2011, pp. 394-395, fn. 62; MARCATTILI 2012 (on rocks' rendering, see in part. p. 74).

850 See ADINOLFI *et alii* 2018. A paper on *Rediscovered Landscapes. Recovering Iconography through Multispectral Imaging in Etruscan Painting*, which I could not attend, has been presented by G. Adinolfi, R. Carmagnola, L. Marras, V. Palleschi, and A. Russo at the 2021 Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America.

851 The topic of light was dealt with extensively at a recent conference held at the Università degli Studi di Urbino Carlo Bo (*IV Colloquio Internazionale dell'Associazione Italiana Ricerche Pittura Antica – AIRPA. Pittura, Luce, Colore*, 17th-19th June 2021).

Etruria[852]. In particular, the two naked figures have been interpreted as «deux défunts glorifiés par les insignes de Bacchus assis près de la source de Mnèmosynè (la Reminescence), qui est défendue par deux archers en costume "oriental", deux habitants de la région hyperboréenne où les anciens imaginaient le siège de l'Elysium»[853].
In the Torlonia vase, both water and vegetal elements are involved in converting the rock in a 'positive' sense, that is, rendering it more pleasant. In this scene of alleged beatification black rocks are replaced by a kind of garden with a flowery rock out of which water flows. It should be noted that water also characterizes the space of this beatitude *per differentiam* as compared to infernal topography. This polarity is indicated most clearly in the Orphic laminette of Petelia where initiates are invited to seek the waters of Mnemosyne's lake. Conversely, Hades' spring represents the threat of oblivion[854]. Most likely, not only water but also rock contributes to establishing the memory-oblivion pairing. For instance, we can cite the rocks of Lethe ('chair of forgetfulness') mentioned by Apollodorus[855] around which snakes coiled. Hypothetically, the rock depicted in the red-figure oinochoe Tarquinia RC 1645 (**pl. 154.a**)[856] can be interpreted as a chair of forgetfulness if we accept the identification of the three figures as Pirithous Theseus, and Persephones[857].

As outlined above, although there are few examples that can be interpreted as representing the afterlife itself, Etruscan imagery

[852] See MASSA PAIRAULT 1975, p. 201; HARARI 1988a, p. 172.
[853] HARARI 1988a, p. 172.
[854] *F 32a Kern*; see PUGLIESE CARRATELLI 1993, I A 2.
[855] APOLLOD. *epit.* 1.24.
[856] Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. RC 1645; from Vulci; dating to 360-340 B.C.; attributed to the workshop of the *Pittore di Alcesti*; PIANU 1980, pp. 7-8, no. 1, pl. I. .The frieze is traditionally considered to be an unidentifiable conversation scene (in addition to PIANU 1980, p. 8, see e.g. IACOPI 1956, IVB, p. 4, pl. 5; CRISTOFANI 1987a, p. 324).
[857] MINGAZZINI 1971, p. 264 recognized the episode of Theseus' liberation in the image of a silver-plated ceramic patera (MICHETTI 2003, pl. LXVIII); *contra* MICHETTI 2005, p. 105.

indicates that was *the* preferred theme was representations of the journey extending *towards* the world of the dead.

As the *Tomba dei Demoni Azzurri* frescoes suggest, rock is not the only landscape feature connected to representations of the route towards the afterlife. In Etruscan *imagerie*, efforts to depict the topography of death also relied on the visual role of water in that the act of crossing water was considered part of the journey to the underworld.

In addition to actual representations of the sea, a long series of pictorial elements allude to marine water. In his 1911 catalogue of funerary stelae from Felsina[858], Pericle Ducati acknowledged that the «spirale ad onda» alternatively appears as «element meramente decorativo» or «rappresentazione stilizzata del mare». According to Ducati, therefore, some stelae «di contenuto essenzialmente marino» used this pattern as a symbol of the sea («starebbe […] a simboleggiare il mare»)[859]. There has been extensive research on this topic in recent years that also considers the recurrence of this pattern on mirrors, cistae, and tomb paintings, has been extensively deepened in recent years. Most scholars agree that the wave pattern was assigned precise semantic values and indeed consider it a «richiamo al tema del viaggio oltremarino e oltremondano»[860]. What is especially significant is the resultant account according to which the use of this motif testifies to «una particolare

[858] DUCATI 1911.

[859] DUCATI 1911, pp. 501-503.

[860] RONCALLI 2014b, p. 222. According to GOVI, SASSATELLI 2004, p. 232, wave frames are documented in 67 stelae. On an analysis of this pattern which considers also other types of monument, see GOVI, SASSATELLI 2004, pp. 243-248. *Contra* VITALI 2014, reviewed in CERCHIAI, SASSATELLI 2014, pp. 204-205. Drawing on BRENDEL 1978, p. 374, PIZZIRANI 2005, p. 264 observes that «Il mare raffigurato così frequentemente come cornice delle stele felsinee non è uno spazio geografico da attraversare, non è la dimensione in cui il defunto compie il viaggio verso l'aldilà: nelle stele questo viaggio è infatti sempre concepito come viaggio per terra. Come già nella documentazione di età arcaica, il mare delle stele è invece una condizione ontologica, simbolo dell'alterità della morte».

Likewise, the semantic value of phytomorphic frames has also been investigated (see esp. PIZZIRANI 2005, p. 264: GOVI 2009; GOVI 2010).

percezione della morte», «intesa […] metaforicamente come un'immersione»[861].

Considering both schematic/symbolic and explicit representations of the sea, Chiara Pizzirani has identified two movements – horizontal and vertical – that illustrate the Etruscans' relationship with this figurative element[862]. On the one hand, «alla prospettiva verticale dell'immaginario marino rimanda la percezione dionisiaca del mare, già implicita nell'esperienza del tuffo» that had been developed in Etruria since the end of the sixth century B.C.[863]. The initiatic connotations underlying the connection between sea and death is clarified in particular by the sea scene depicted in the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca* (**pl. 40.b**) and the almost contemporary *hydria* from Vulci featuring humanized dolphins diving into the waves (**pl. 154.b**)[864]. On the other hand, following the horizontal perspective, «il mare etrusco rappresenta la dimensione del viaggio» and «evoca […] la buona meta cui [il viaggio stesso] conduce»[865] in keeping with the idea analyzed above, of death as a journey to the afterlife[866]. Evidence shows that this liminal space was though to be populated by creatures, often hostile, that the deceased had to face or fight. The dangerous nature of the sea accounts for both the presence of monstrous creatures beneath the waves (including non-marine ones, as in the case of the terracotta urn at Fordham University (**pl. 16**)[867] and the black color used to depict the

[861] GOVI, SASSATELLI 2004, p. 248.
[862] PIZZIRANI 2014.
[863] PIZZIRANI 2014, p. 74.
[864] Rome, Palazzo Barberini, Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Antica (?); dating to 510-500 B.C.; attributed to the Pittore Vaticano 238. Formerly in Toledo, Museum of Art (HARARI 1988b, fig. 1; GIULIANO, BUZZI 1992, p. 214; PIZZIRANI 2014, p. 74, fig. 67; D'ERCOLE 2017; HEINEMANN 2021, pp 248-249, fig. 9). On the metaphoric value of diving, see also D'AGOSTINO 1999a; D'AGOSTINO 1999c; CERCHIAI 1999a; HEINEMANN 2021. GIULIANI 2021, pp. 224-226 has strongly criticized the hermeneutic/mysteric interpretation of the diving scenes.
[865] PIZZIRANI 2014, p. 76.
[866] See the discussion above pp. 259 ss.
[867] New York, Fordham University, Fordham Museum of Greek, Etruscan and Roman Art, inv. 6.002. See above, p. 94.

sea in almost all Etruscan representations. In contrast, the tympanum's scene of the *Tomba dei Tori* (**pl. 113.b**) shows a figure on a hippocampus flying toward a rock-outcropping island above a crystalline sea surface, a *unicum* in Etruscan repertoire. Unlike the usual somber chromatic connotations, the surface of the sea in the *Tomba dei Tori* is likely «evocativa non dei pericoli del viaggio verso l'Aldilà, ma dell'ambiente idilliaco della meta». That is to say, it is meant to represent the Homeric *áls* rather than the *póntos*[868].

In addition to the black color and presence of fantastic beings, rock also gives the Etruscan sea its dangerous character. In contrast to both the rock of the *Tomba dei Tori*'s tympanum that indicates the island as the journey's destination and the diving board-rock of the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca* that conveys a liminal value (as indicated by the relationship with the diver), the rock of the *Tomba della Nave* in Tarquinia (**pl. 155**)[869] actively contributes to characterizing the seascape as a fearsome one. According to Giovanni Colonna[870], the rocks of the shipwreck scene on the left wall (as opposed to the symposium scene on the right-hand side) indicate the *Planktai pétra* or wandering rocks, mentioned earlier by Homer[871]: only the Argonauts, with the help of Hera, managed to safely overcome these obstacles. Apollonius from Rhodes informs us that these towering rocks were capable of catching fire and thereby unleashing storms that blackened the air and obscured the sun's rays[872]. This image is well suited to conveying the grim context of death and the specific case of the *Tomba della Nave* frescoes with their powerful tragic connotations. This mythical interpretation is also compatible with a recognition that the rock – which is the cause of the shipwreck – contributes to visually constructing the dark and

[868] PIZZIRANI 2014, p. 76.
[869] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis; dating to about 450 B.C. COLONNA 2003 (*contra* GILOTTA 2007, p. 61). See above pp. 88-89, fn. 63.
[870] COLONNA 2003.
[871] HOM. *Od.* XII.59-72.
[872] APOLL. RH. *Arg.* IV.785-788; 924-928.

frightening space of death, according to the rules of imaginative geography.

As Pizzirani has noted, horizontal and vertical movements were combined in specifically Etruscan iconographies including the gods Usil and Thesan[873]. Indeed, the solar metaphor of death «partecipa di entrambi i movimenti: il movimento verticale della levata del sole da Oceano e del suo tramonto tra le sue acque, il movimento orizzontale del percorso quotidiano che il sole compie nel cielo, al di sopra del mare»[874].

In relation to landscape features, an overview of these images shows that there was a close figurative relationship between astral elements and water. In general, mirrors that both feature subjects related to Usil and have a wave frame evocating the sea provide an example of this relationship (see e.g. **pl. 156.a**)[875]. Wave patterns suggesting flight over the sea appear in the early fifth-century feet of a cista, each one shaped in the form of a winged male figure in *Knielauf* position (**pls. 156.b-c**)[876]. The best support for the argument that these figures were connected to the god Usil is to compare these feet to a group of similar cista feet without waves that instead feature figures holding a rayed disk (see e.g. **pl. 157.a**)[877]. The sea pattern is more clearly related to the journey motif in the case of images that show Thesan in the act of abducting Cephalus (see e.g. **pl. 157.b**)[878]. With regard to the latter subject, however, it is worth noting that that the abduction of the

[873] On the iconography of Usil, see TIRELLI 1981 and KRAUSKOPF 1992.
[874] PIZZIRANI 2014, p. 73.
[875] Minneapolis, Minneapolis Institute of Arts, inv. 57.14; dating to third century B.C. (DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 8, fig. I.10). On the wave frame of Etruscan mirrors, see DE GRUMMOND 1982a. Regarding the relationship with sun-based subjects, see KRAUSKOPF 1991.
[876] **Pl. 156.b**: Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, inv. 96.AC.127; **pl. 156.c**: Chicago, Art Institute, inv. 1999.559; See also: private collection (*Christie's* 2006, lot 218). For a discussion about *Knielauf* position, see MARTELLI 2006b, p. 369.
[877] Stuttgart, Landesmuseum Württemberg, inv. 3.36.
[878] Terracotta acroterion, Berlin, Antikensammlung; from Cerveteri (PIZZIRANI 2014, p. 73, fig. 64).

handsome young man who made the goddess fall in love is also rendered with no reference to the sea, following the scheme of other abduction scenes taking place on rocky ground (**pl. 158.a**)[879].

As with sea-related details, from the end of the sixth century B.C. onwards sun-related landscape elements reduced to a schematic form appear with significant frequency in Etruscan images. For the group reviewed here (Thesan and Usil), an example of such imagery can be found in both male and female heads surrounded by rays, like those engraved in several bronze bowls and mirrors. For example, a male head encircled by a zig-zag line and three large wings is engraved at the center of a fifth-century basin in the Getty collection and the same basin also bears an engraved wave pattern on the outside (**pl. 158.b**)[880]. Both rays and waves frame a head in profile on a mirror in Boston (**pl. 159.a**)[881]. A male head encircled by rays also appears on a terracotta pilgrim flask from a private collection dating to the beginning of the fifth century B.C.[882]. The head of Thesan wearing winged headgear is framed by a radiant pattern in a bronze mirror at the Museum Folkwang in Essen (**pl. 159.b**)[883] and the same figure appears on a bronze bowl that used to be part of the Aichmeir collection (Austria).
The sea crossing theme as a metaphor for the life-death transition also appears in a fifth-century banded agate scarab with Turms Aitas (**pl.**

[879] Brussels, Musée Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire, inv. R 1271. LAMBRECHTS 1978, pp. 133-140, no. 21 (see esp. pp. 139-140 for the identification of the subject. With regard to the two stars engraved in the medaillon, Lambrechts noted that «les deux étoiles figures près d'Éos, bien que la céramique ait fait un fréquent usage de ce motif à titre purement décoratif, bien que sur les miroirs prénestins aussi il soit très commun, ces étoiles ici pourraient bien devoir être prises dans leur sens propre: elles contribuent de manière précise à l'identification de la figure principale»).
[880] Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, inv. 80.AC.84 (PONTELLI forthcoming). A head comparable to the Getty example appears on a basil in the art market auctioned by Sotheby's (*Sotheby's* 1984, lot 30).
[881] Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 95.72. DE PUMA 1993, no. 4.
[882] ARIAS 1969.
[883] Essen, Museum Folkwang, inv. K 1021/177; dating to 325300 B.C. HÖCKMANN 1987, pp. 33–34, no. 13; DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 108, fig. V.39.

160.a)[884]. Here, the god stands above a row of waves that evoke the journey and his role as an accompanying god.

At the beginning of this section, I noted that Etruscan images rarely focus on representing the afterworld, instead preferring images of the journey towards or passage to death. Concerning the representation of the sea, there is an example that features an unusual occurrence of the ultramundane sea and completes the analysis of this subject. In this example, a fourth-century cornelian scarab at the J. Paul Getty Museum (**pl. 160.b**)[885], Tantalus is depicted in the Underworld, forced to stand before unreachable waves that splash at his feet and towards which he stretches his arms in vain. The representation of water in relation to the punishment of Tantalus[886] is an example of 'infernal' water, namely the water flowing in the underworld. Although the waves in this case are rendered in the same way as examples of the sea in other gems (see e.g. the British Museum example with Turms Aitas, analyzed just above), the waves before Tantalus definitively relate to a freshwater body of water.

Rather than being equated to representations of the sea, these waves should be compared to the rock pushed by Sisyphus in other Etruscan images analyzed above[887]. Just like the rock, the waves in this case

[884] London, British Museum, inv. 1772,0315.344. Turms Aitas literally indicates 'Turms of Aita'. That is to say, in this guise, Turms is the messenger of the god of the underworld Aita, and to a large extent his figure matches that of Hermes Psychopompos. The god appears with his inscribed name in a fourth-century mirror in which he leads the soul of Tiresias before Odysseus. In Etruscan *imagerie*, Turms and Turms Aitas are two distinct figures, even though sometimes it is impossible to distinguish one from the other. For instance, Turms of Aitas and Turms of Tinia are depicted together in an early fourth century bronze *stamnos* from tomb 169 at Spina (MASSA PAIRAULT 1994, pp. 150 ss.). On Turms and Turms Aitas, see KRAUSKOPF 1987, pp. 45-60; DE RUYT 1989, p. 216; HARARI 1997b; GILOTTA 2010. On the Greek god Hermes as god of passage, see MAJOREL 2003.

[885] Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, inv. 81.AN.76.129; dating to about 400-350 B.C. ALLEN *forthcoming*.

[886] HOM. *Od.* XI.582-584. On a brief overview of literary tradition on Tantalus, see PETTENÒ 2004, pp. 32-34.

[887] See above pp. 264-266.

enable viewers to identify the action and mythical episode; indeed, the two elements are necessary to the narration in the same way.

3.3.2. *Landscape for Celestial Dwellings*

The purpose of this section is to provide a brief overview of images featuring gods in their divine 'settlements'. As mentioned above, the act of putting together such a group of images does not rely on an *a priori* categorization of depicted 'environments'. Rather, the distinction is based on the analysis of the subject. That is to say, we define as 'celestial dwellings' the environments surrounding the iconographies specifically related to deities.

As a result of his subject-based categorization, the depiction of mythical episodes involving only groups of gods merges into this section.

For instance, *anodos*-like scenes depicting female figures emerging from water or rocks in keeping with a typically divine narrative and figurative motif (see e.g. **pls. 160.c-d**)[888] is an example of this genre. Rather than providing data to support a definition of the *imagerie* of celestial dwellings, however, these examples are useful for thinking about the image in ontological terms.

The central (wholly divine) theme of these images – apparition – implies an entrance, that is, an entryway into the world of the image. The border crossed by the figure in question coincides with both the landscape element and the frame of the figurative space. In other words, by moving through the landscape, the figure enters the actual representational space surrounded by the frame. The enactment of this transitional moment emphasizes the distance between 'inside' and

[888] **Pl. 160.c**: Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 24872 (ex inv. 5541); dating to the second half of the fourth century B.C.; PACETTI 2011, pp. 46-49, no. 7; **pl. 160.d**: Saint Pietersburg, The State Hermitage Museum, inv. B 314; AMBROSINI 2012, pp. 37-38, figs. 16-18. Drawing on MICALI 1844, p. 240, and supported by the comparison with VERG. *Aen*. 10.210-260, 307-347, 375-399, Ambrosini suggested that the figure is Circe rising from rocks.

'outside'. On the visual level, the graphic border around the figurative area marks the boundary between different areas of the object; on the ontological level, it indicates the boundary between the object and whatever is outside the object[889].

The Etruscan repertoire also includes some examples featuring a consortium of gods and heroes, typically gathered around their sovereign Tinia to celebrate specific 'divine' occasions such as Herakles' introduction on Olympus (**pl. 161.a**)[890], and the birth of Menrva (**pls. 161.b**)[891]. These images of crowds of gods occurred mainly in fourth-century mirrors, that went on to influence more roughly made exemplars involving 'holy conversation pieces' in the following centuries. The 'divine occasions' group also includes the Cabinet des Médailles mirror with two figurated registers (**pl. 162.a**)[892]. The top scene shows Herakles introducing the puer «Epiur» to Tinia in the presence of Turan and Thalna. Tinia is seated on a chair-like throne, and the only natural element in the scene is a plant protruding from the left border. The bottom scene shows Helen («Elinai») as sovereign of Leuke[893]. On either side of the scene, a male and female figure each rest their feet on a rock from which a plant grows («Aevas»/Ajax and «Lasa Thimrae» respectively).

These images derive from the combination of pre-existing schemes and figurative groups that spread widely in mirrors of that period. One example that is especially relevant to our purposes is the figure of

[889] On ontological interpretations of *anodos* scenes, see QUANTIN 1992, in part. pp. 187-188.
[890] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 12988; dating to 350-300 B.C. (BAGLIONE, GILOTTA 2007, pp. 70-72, no. 24).
[891] Bologna, Museo Civico Archeologico, inv. It. 1073; from Arezzo; dating to 340-320 B.C. (SASSATELLI 1981, pp. 32-35, no. 13; DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 65, fig. IV.13; KRAUSKOPF 2017, pp. 214-215).
[892] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département des Monnaies, Médailles et Antiques, inv. 1287; from Vulci ; dating to about 325 B.C. MASSA PAIRAULT 1992, pp. 149-150, figs. 139-140; MAGGIANI 2002, pp. 9-10, fig. 2; DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 66, fig. IV.14.
[893] See FERRARI 2011, pp. 550-551 for an overview of literary tradition about the island of Leuke.

Aevas, depicted in a motion of *aposkopein*[894] and resting his foot on a rock. Aevas' posture matches that of «Sethlans» in the above-mentioned Bologna mirror showing the birth of Menrva. Moreover, Turms performs the same gesture in an almost contemporary mirror from Vulci in Philadelphia (**pl. 162.b**)[895]. In these three images, it is worth nothing that the gesture used to show that a god has been sighted is associated with the foot-on-the-rock pose[896].

The representation of Tinia sitting on a rock-shaped throne dates back to more simple schemes (which I defined 'conversation scenes' in the previous section) with a seated and a standing figure. Compositions of this type involving gods sitting on rocks are documented beginning in the late archaic period, as shown by the Louvre antefix from Cerveteri (**pl. 163.a**)[897], featuring Herakles and Menrva. While the same underlying composition continues to appear in fourth- and third-century mirrors (see e.g. **pls. 163.b**)[898], this type of monument is also associated with the spread of more complex group scenes characterized by the move to supplement the basic scheme with plant elements. The earliest representations (together with the later ones which adhere to the model without integrating it into more complex scenes) follow the model set out by the more generic conversation/offering scenes analyzed above, in the previous section[899]; in contrast, the figurative

[894] On the *aposkopein* scheme and its meaning, see CATONI 2005, pp. 162-170.
[895] Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology; dating to 325-300 B.C.; from Vulci. DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 116, fig. VI.4.
[896] See *infra* pp. 254; 296-298.
[897] Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. CA 4504; dating to about 480 B.C. GAULTIER, HAUMESSER, CHATZIEFREMIDOU 2014, pp. 90-91 (with published references).
[898] Mirror showing Menrva and Lasa Vecu: Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 24884; dating to the end of the fourth/beginning of the third century B.C. (DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 30, fig. II.7; PACETTI 2011, pp. 65-69, no. 18). See also mirror Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. MV 12645; dating to 325-300 B.C.: mirror ex Borghese collection, with Hebe serving Herakles while Menrva stands on and watches; from Bomarzo; dating to the beginning of the third century B.C. (BAGLIONE 1976, p. 133, pl. LXXXI.1).
[899] See above pp. 227 ss.

solutions adopted in fourth-century mirrors show that there was a tendency to enrich the scene with botanical elements in the transition from two- or three-figure groups to more complex divine scenes.

In other words, images of divine congregations with enthroned figures from the fourth century B.C. onwards make use of schemes that had already been employed in previous centuries. Nonetheless, they are distinguished by the novel inclusion of plant elements. Therefore, vegetal details are the characteristic feature of the space belonging to the gods, as depicted in these examples.

The association between deities on thrones and plants went on to enjoy great success not only in vase painting (see e.g. **pl. 164**)[900] but also in Hellenistic coroplastic work. In particular, a group of well-known votive terracottas from the Vignaccia temple in Cerveteri shows deities on a throne next to a palm tree[901].

[900] Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, H.I.N. 242 (POLA 2016, p. 367, pl. CCCXCVIII).

[901] On the antefix typology and value of the recurring tree, see CRISTOFANI, GREGORI 1987, pp. 9-11.

4.
Schemes and Structures.
Landscape and Visual Space Making

4.1. Landscape Weapons

The previous section demonstrated how the monster-slaying, civilizing hero operates between the two contrasting spaces of inside and outside the city. In heroic nudity or wearing his armor, the hero holds the weapons that define his *virtus*. Conversely, savage beasts, unable to employ the weapons of human civilization, make use of what nature has made available to them, namely rocks and trees. The incivility of beast-like creatures is coupled with a physical limitation characterizing humans: that is, men are excluded from using these tools of nature due primarily to the fact that human strength is not sufficient to lift and hurl them. In literary tradition, the heroic value of protagonists in ancient myths is exalted and evoked by their association with weapons and unsurprisingly, these arms often acquire divine connotations[1]. I have also mentioned that Theseus' heroic career began when he found his father's sword, the object which symbolizes his legacy. Similar to other weapons, the blade takes on a somewhat special status; indeed, it is so special that death caused by this weapon appears honorable, as illustrated by multiple images of Ajax's suicide[2]. This kind of symbiotic relationship between the hero and his weapons takes on an even greater iconography value[3]. The use of weapons is functional identifying not only heroes as such but, more specifically, individual heroes. For example, there are numerous cases in which the identification of Herakles is made possible by the inclusion of his club in the image, sometimes apparently accessory but unequivocally

[1] This is the case with Achilles' weapons, made by Hephaestus at the request of his mother Thetis (HOM. *Il.* XVIII.478-617).
[2] On the suicide of Ajax, see *infra* pp. 312 ss..
[3] On the relationship between heroes and weapons in sixth- and fifth-century Greek vase painting, see DIETRICH 2010, pp. 311 ss.

necessary for recognizing the hero. In these instances, the representation of the weapon is as valuable as an inscription. As a general role, it can be stated that the representation of weapons is functional to both identifying heroes and constructing the narrative plot. Moreover, from a socio-historical perspective the visual display of weapons also conveys a symbolic value partly related to the myth's narrative[4].

Just as representations of mythical characters with their weapons serves to define their heroic status, a similar function (albeit with an opposite value) is likely performed by the non-heroic weapons of uncivilized beings. In previous sections, I reviewed several examples showing monsters fighting with rocks and trees. In particular, boulders and trees are Centaurs' traditional weapons in Greek, Magna Graecia, and Etruscan tradition[5]. The ancient tradition according to which Centaurs fought with stones was first documented in iconography and then followed by pseudo-Apollodorus. Reporting the events immediately following Herakles' act of opening the container of wine held by Pholus, the Greek author states that, drawn by the smell of wine, the Centaurs broke into the cavern armed with stones and fir trees.

In the Etruscan repertoire, several images show individual Centaurs holding stones (**pl. 165**)[6] or plants (**pl. 166**)[7]. Similarly, previous sections

[4] This is the case with Roman gems from the Imperial age, in which the figures of Achilles with helmet and spear and Theseus with sword lose their mythical depth and narrative dimension and become «oggetto di venerazione e sprone all'eroismo per i soldati delle armate romane» (TOSO 2007, p. 236, with published references about this subject matter).

[5] CAMASSA 2005, pp. 37-38, fn. 26 noted that in both literary and figurative tradition, stones and boulders used as weapons by Centuars appear later than branches and trees. According to his analysis, in fact, the oldest attestations of rock weapons date back to the beginning of the sixth century B.C. Moreover, the scholar noted that literary sources mentioning boulders are later than the figurative occurrences. Nevertheless, the scholar urges caution and does not exclude the existence of an earlier traditional account according to which rocks were used as weapons.

[6] **Pl. 165.a**: black-figure amphora, Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 57186; dating to the end of the sixth century B.C., attributed to the Micali Painter

reviewed a group of images featuring Centaurs involved in large-scale combat and fighting with these weapons (**pls. 94-99**)[8].
Similarly to Greek tradition[9], Etruscan *imagerie* also includes examples of Giants fighting with rocks (see e.g. **pl. 167**)[10].

Etruscan iconography preferred anguipeds among the types of giants. This figure was related to Typhon, a primordial demon that Zeus threw into Tartarus[11]. Francis Vian has divided images of this

followers (SPIVEY 1987, p. 40; RIZZO 1988, p. 86, no. 45, fig. 153); **pl. 165.b**: carnelian scarab, London, British Museum, inv. 1772,0315.341; dating to the second half of the fifth century B.C. (FURTWÄNGLER 1900, pl. XVII, 69; WALTERS 1926, no. 661, pl. XI; RICHTER 1968, p. 289, no. 755); **pl. 165.c-d**: black-figure amphoras Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, invv. V 19 and V 20; ex Vagnoville collection (MAGI 1943, pl. XLIII.1; 4). See also: Viterbo, Museo Civico, inv. 337/220; ex. Rossi Danielli collection (EMILIOZZI 1974, p. 155, no. 199; on further details on this amphora, see above p. 122).

[7] **Pl. 166.a**: black-figure *lekythos* Paris, Musée du Petit Palais, inv. 431 (PLAOUTINE 1941, pl. 3.1, 4.3-6; SCHWARZ 1989, p. 180, no. 11; PALEOTHODOROS 2010, p. 2, fn. 17); dating to 500-475 B.C.; **pl. 166.b**: Pontic amphora Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, inv. 3326; from Vulci; ex Durand collection; dating to 530-510; attributed to the Tityos Painter (CHAMPION 1928, pls. 28.6; 29.1; 30.1, 4; HANNESTAD 1974, p. 57, no. 25); See also: red-figure *stamnos* Hamburg, Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, inv. 1917.661; dating 350-300 B.C. (*Kunst der Etrusker* 1980, p. 86, no. 103; CRISTOFANI 1993, p. 94).

[8] See above pp. 193-198.

[9] See VIAN 1952, pp. 23-24.

[10] **Pl. 167.a**: cornelian scarab, Munich, Antikensammlungen, inv. 1630; dating to fourth century B.C. (ZAZOFF 1968, p. 128, no. 256); **pl. 167.b**: cornelian scarab from Colle del Forno; dating to about 450 B.C. (GIOVANELLI 2010); **pl. 167.c**: cornelian scarab. Genève, Musée d'Art et d'Histoire, inv. 2673; dating to fourth century B.C. (ZAZOFF 1968, p. 127, no. 254); **pl. 167.d**: Praenestine bronze cista, Cambridge, The Fitzwilliam Museum, inv. GR.3.1965; dating to the end of the fourth century B.C. (BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA 1979, pp. 73-75, pls. LXXXIII-LXXXV [erroneously indicated as inv. GR.3.1165]; VASSILIKA 1998, p. 86; DE GRUMMOND, SERRA RIDGWAY 2000, p. 260, fig. 107); **pl. 167.e**: Praenestine bronze cista, Munich, Antikensammlungen, inv. SL 36; dating to the end of the fourth century B.C. (BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA 1979, pp. 137-138, pls. CLXVII-CLXVIII; DE GRUMMOND, SERRA RIDGWAY 2000, p. 260, fig. 108).

[11] Typhon is depicted in Etruscan images as an anguiped giant from the sixth until the third century B.C. (VIAN 1951, pp. 9-11), with a certain originality compared to Greek representations, where the type of Typhon with human torso and snake legs disappears very soon, and then reappears during the fourth century B.C. due to direct Etruscan influence. Another difference is the fact that in Greek iconography Typhon does not

monster into two groups, dating to the end of the sixth and fourth century B.C., respectively. Typhon, armed with rocks, appears recurrently in the former, older, group. Later images instead lack such a feature for the most part[12]. «The earliest known instance in the ancient art of what seems to be a general Gigantomachy with a winged anguiped Giant»[13] is a *hydria* in London dating to the end of the sixth century B.C. (**pl. 168.a**)[14].
Comparable images depicting anguiped monsters (Typhon, Nereus, or Triton)[15] span the archaic period[16] and have been found to appear in the following decades and centuries[17].

Just as rocks are associated with anguiped giants, they also appear as weapons wielded by marine monsters such as the Scylla. In literary tradition, this beast, the ultimate icon of danger from the sea, has a special connection with rocks. For instance, Homer defines the creature

---

appear in fight scenes with more than one opponent until the fourth century (VIAN 1988, p. 253).

[12] See e.g. the two fourth-century stelae from Felsen where Typhon appears unarmed in a scene of confrontation with a warrior (VIAN 1951, pp. 10-11, nos. 9-10).

[13] DE GRUMMOND, SERRA RIDGWAY 2000, p. 259.

[14] London, British Museum, inv. 1842,0407.18; from Vulci; attributed to the Micali Painter (DE GRUMMOND, SERRA RIDGWAY 2000, p. 259; HÖPFLINGER 2010, p. 108).

[15] In Etruscan iconography, these figures are often paired; see TRAFICANTE 2006, p. 83.

[16] See e.g.: black-figure amphora from Falerii Veteres, Civita Castellana, Museo Archeologico dell'Agro Falisco (ex Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 18597); dating to the end of the sixth century B.C.; attributed to the Micali Painter (BOOSEN 1986, p. 256; SCHWARZ 1989, p. 180; BONAMICI 2005b, p. 39). Sardonic scarab, Copenhagen, National Museum of Denmark; from Tarquinia; dating to the second half of the sixth century B.C. (FURTWÄNGLER 1900, pl. LXIV.28; VIAN 1951, p. 10, no. 5). Praenestine bronze cista, Munich, Antikensammlungen, inv. SL 36 (see **pl. 167.d**); dating to the end of the fourth century B.C. (BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA 1979, pp. 137-138; DE GRUMMOND, SERRA RIDGWAY 2000, p. 260, fig. 108).

[17] See, e.g.: Cornelian scarab, unknown location; dating to fifth century B.C. (FURTWÄNGLER 1900, pl. XVIII.51). Bone handle mirror, Hannover, August Kestner Museum, inv. 1550; dating to about 350 B.C. (LIEPMANN 1988, pp. 54-55, no. 23; DE GRUMMOND, SERRA RIDGWAY 2000, p. 259, fig. 105). Red-figure *kylix*, Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, inv. MV 34625; dating to 350-325 B.C. (MARTELLI 1987a, pp. 47, 218, 323). Red-figure *stamnos*, Brunswick, Bowdoin College Museum of Art, inv. 1913.9; dating to the late fourth century B.C. (BURKE 1981, p. 28).

as «πετραίην»[18] and informs readers that it lives hidden in a deep cave[19]. In one of the two sides of a funerary stele from Bologna dating to 420-390 B.C., the monster appears in the act of shaking a large rock (**pl. 168.b**)[20].

Etruscan images show that natural, irregular weapons were disconnected from the civic sphere while regular metal weapons clearly belonged to this arena. On an iconographic level, the contrast between different types of weapons is emphasized in images depicting a struggle among two or more adversaries, each displaying their own distinctive weapon[21]. One example of this contrast is the Funnel Group krater at the Cabinet des Médailles described above (**pl. 89.b**)[22]. The vase shows an Amazon who is about to hurl a boulder at a fallen warrior. Just like bestial figures, the Amazon – as a member of a female warrior population perceived as existing on the edge of the civilized world – wields a stone rather than using civilized weapons. Like centaurs, Amazons symbolically represent a threat to the civilized world and, as such, they are consistently endowed with bestial attributes. The same applies to other figures positioned in opposition to

[18] HOM. *Od*. XII.231.
[19] HOM. *Od*. XII.93.
[20] Bologna, Museo Civico Archeologico, stele 169; from the Sepolcreto della Certosa (BOOSEN 1986, pp. 16-17, pl. 3; DE GRUMMOND, SERRA RIDGWAY 2000, p. 263. fig. 112; GOVI 2016, pp. 165-166, fig. 1). On the diffusion of the subject in the *stelae* from Felsina, see GOVI 2016.
[21] Evidence shows that the 'rock vs sword' opposition was also trendy in Greek iconography. With regard to Attic examples excavated in Italy, see e.g. the black-figure amphora from Vulci at the Metropolitan Museum (inv. 47.11.5; dating to 540-530 B.C.; attributed to the Taleides Painter; HOLLIDAY 1993, p. 94, fig. 37a), and the almost contemporary black-figured amphora at the Museo Nazionale Etrusco in Tarquinia (IACOPI 1956, III.H.6-7, pl. 29.1,4), both emphasizing the opposition between Theseus holding his sword and the minotaur armed with rocks. See also the kolumn-krater from the fondo De Luca in Bologna (Bologna, Museo Civico Archeologico, inv. D.L. 15; Laurinsich 1929, pl. 28), and the late-sixth-century *kylix* Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 20760.
[22] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département des Monnaies, Médailles et Antiques, inv. 921; dating to about 330 B.C. MARTELLI 1987a, p. 328; HARARI 1990, p. 39, no. 6; CRISTOFANI 1993, pls. XXXIV-XXXV. See above p. 186.

the heroes of civilization, such as Itás in the engraved mirror in Paris (**pl. 100.a**)[23] and Celsclan in a mirror from Populonia in Florence (**pl. 169.a**)[24].

On closer inspection, there are also several Etruscan images that differ from this described model. On the one hand, rather than being armed with trees or rocks, a number of images show Centaurs with a sword[25]. On the other hand, there are a few humans who appear armed with stones.

A column-krater from Chiusi in Siena (**pl. 169.b**)[26], dating to about 450 B.C., depicts two young men using sword to attack a third warrior who is defending himself with a stone-like object. The third figure has been interpreted as Ida, son of Aphareus (brother of Tyndareus, the father of the Dioscuri). According to the myth, Ida mortally wounded Castor with a spear. Therefore, the image might possibly represent the clash between the two divine twins and Ida.

This iconography is somewhat bizarre considering that, according to a current of tradition that appears in Etruscan images as well, Castor was killed with a spear. Nonetheless, this possible anomaly is consistent

[23] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département des Monnaies, Médailles et Antiques, inv. 1312 (CARPINO 1996, p. 77, fig. 12).

[24] Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 79283; dating to the second half of the fifth century B.C. (MANSUELLI 1949, p. 91; DE GRUMMOND, SERRA RIDGWAY 2000, p. 259; DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 107, fig. V.38). In this mirror, Celscan is depicted next to Laran and is armed with a large boulder. In Etruscan images, Laran is a male figure typically wearing full armor. Alternatively, he is naked and holds a helmet and sword or spear. He is the Etruscan god of war, corresponding to the Greek Ares. However, he appears in only one action scene: the clash with Celsclan. Elsewhere, he is a spectator at the birth of Minerva or is depicted with other principal divinities such as Hercules, Menrva, Turan, or Aplu (see DE GRUMMOND 1982b, p. 114 with a list of examples). There is little data to interpret the second figure, the 'son of Cel'. Otherwise unknown, he is only depicted in this mirror. Following the suggestion that Cel is an earth goddess (FISHER-GRAF 1980, pp. 41-42), Celsclan can be interpeted as a Giant (DE GRUMMOND 1982b, p. 109).

[25] See WEBER-LEHMAN 1997 for a list of examples. DI FAZIO 2012 e SMOQUINA 2012 provide evidence for understanding this anomaly in the central-Italic area.

[26] Siena, Museo Archeologico Nazionale; ex Casuccini collection (LAVIOSA 1958, pp. 294-300, figs. 1-9; DE PUMA 1986, p. 605, no. 84).

with a distinctive trait emphasized in ancient sources. Homer describes Idas as the strongest man on earth, so powerful he is capable of to defeating Apollo himself[27]. Therefore, Idas' rocky weapon in the Siena krater might be a reference to his supra-natural strength. Similarly, we can consider the scene on a volute krater from Orvieto in Florence, the same vase analyzed in the previous section (**pl. 97.c**)[28]. Employing a rock, this scene encapsulates the motif of the hero's regression to pre-oplitic form, in keeping with the model of Herakles fighting against centaurs[29].

In light of these anomalies, images of isolated warriors holding a stone should be treated with caution (see e.g. **pl. 169.c**)[30]. Rather than a specific interpretation of these images, what is relevant to our purposes is the notion that the rock held by a warrior signals his physical strength.

On the basis of Greek texts, it can be see that rocks used as weapons are associated with human warriors in specific instances. Firstly, rocks replace traditional iron weapons when the warrior finds himself unarmed[31]. This was the case of Heracles, trained by the Titan Prometheus to fight against the Ligurians. According to Aeschylus, Strabo reported, the hero fought with stones provided by Zeus since he had run out of arrows[32]. Secondly, the rock is the weapon of heroes

[27] HOM. *Od*. IX.558-560.

[28] Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 70527. ADEMBRI 1981, pp. 18-20, figs. 19-21. See above p. 196.

[29] See the discussion above, pp. 241-242. On the theme of warriors' 'regression', in relation with the Greek notion of ἀλκή («l'animosità primeva affidata ad armi irregolari», see CAMASSA 2005, esp. p. 39. Hercle throwing a boulder also appears in an early-fourth-century Cornelian scarab at the J. Paul Getty Museum, inv. 81.AN.76.138 (ALLEN forthcoming).

[30] Cornelian scarab dating to the fifth/fourth century B.C. FURTWÄNGLER 1900, XVI.50; ZAZOFF 1968, p. 174, no. 845.

[31] With regard to the Etruscan repertoire, the situation of the man who finds himself unarmed is likely applicable to the exergue underworld scene depicted in a mirror in Palestrina (Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 1514; ex Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 15697) showing a naked man lying on rocky ground about to hurl a boulder at a serpent.

[32] STR. IV.1.7 = *Prom*. Fr. 326 M.

described in the grip of a bestial, superhuman fury (see e.g. the case of Hector in HOM. *Il.* XII.459-466). This association between anger and stone is expressed by the notion that stone is «ἀναιδὴς»[33]. Conversely, the enraged hero is compared to an «ὀλοοίτροχος ὡς ἀπὸ πέτρης»[34]. Moreover, once again addressing with Hector's fury, Homer informs us that after the god had intervened to make the material weigh less, the hero succeeded in lifting the boulder that could hardly have been shifted even by two strong men[35]. Gods are the only ones apart from monsters who can easily make use of weapons as heavy as rocks. In the clash between Athena and Ares in the *Iliad*'s twenty-first book, the goddess uses a large black boulder to strike her opponent[36].

In summary, rocks are the weapon of monsters, heroes relegated to a primitive stage (out of necessity or due to a feral instinct), and gods. This framework is also reflected in Etruscan repertoire. Concerning divine strength, consider for instance a late Praenestine mirror at Villa Giulia (**pl. 170.a**)[37] that shows ten Amorini attacking a lion: one of them is raising a stone over his head.

In the examples examined here, landscape weapons recur with an *attributive* function, associated with subjects who are characterized by their bestiality or superhuman power by means of this special type of weapon. The element underlying this association is the nature-culture binomial in which attributive landscape features stand as the mark of nature.

[33] HOM. *Il.* IV.521.
[34] HOM. *Il.* XIII.137.
[35] HOM. *Il.* XII.450.
[36] HOM. *Il.* XXI.404-405.
[37] Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 12987; dating to fourth century B.C. (KRAUSKOPF 1988, p. 8, no. 79).

4.2. Landscape and Figures, Landscape and Space

The attributive nature of landscape weapons highlighted in the previous section (*Landscape Weapons*) represents a rather singular way of using landscape elements. On one hand, it has quite a precise parallel in Greek art[38]. On the other hand, however, in the context of Etruscan art, this specific attributive function is properly identifiable in relation to this particular subject, namely landscape elements used as weapons. I use the notion of 'attribute' to indicate an element of the image that constitutes an «intrinsic part of the visualization»[39] of the figures in question, an element whose absence or presence serves to emphasize specific qualities of the figures themselves[40].
This formulation applies to features that fit into the image inseparably from other figurative elements to form an overall assemblage.
The overview of images presented in the previous sections includes several examples showing a close association between landscape elements and figures, and this raises the question of the nature of their relationship.

However, as we will see, the extension of the *corpus* confirms that the identification of landscape-weapons and the relationship between these elements and the figures follow a different criterion of use than in the other cases where landscape elements are closely connected to figures. The rock-weapon case can be seen to involve *attributes that qualify a figurative element* of the image; in many other cases, it is instead a matter of *elements characterizing (or denoting) a performed gesture or action*.

Indeed, many Etruscan images show a preference for referencing gestures or actions through landscape features.

[38] See e.g. CAMASSA 2005; DIETRICH 2010, pp. 311-327.
[39] DIETRICH 2015b. On the notion of 'attribute', see also DIETRICH 2018a.
[40] Regarding the meaning of attributes' absence, see the example of Herakles in DIETRICH 2010, pp. 327-334.

In the corpus reviewed in previous sections, such a preference can be seen in examples of the 'foot-on-the-rock' and 'figure seated on the rock' schemes.

As we have seen, the gesture of the haruspex– or figures praying, or on the verge of making a sacrifice – implies that the rock has been included in the image to indicate a situation that allows and guarantees contact with gods[41]. In other words, the rock denotes the significance of the gesture and its sacredness. Conversely, by characterizing the gesture, the rock element allows viewers to identify the action. The fact of the scene's belonging to the prophetic sphere is based on the particular relationship established between different figurative elements.

In these examples, since landscape elements characterize the action, we can say that they act at the *narrative* level[42].

Broadening the analysis, let us consider examples – found mainly in fourth-century *imagerie* (e.g. red-figure vase painting and engraved bronze cistae) – in which the same schemes are combined in more complex, multi-part compositions. It is evident that these images reveal the influence of Attic and Apulian models depicting figures seating or raising their feet. Nonetheless, the importance granted to landscape details here is different than in the model repertoires: in many instances, the model images lack any rocky prop. The emphasis on landscape features that characterizes Etruscan (and Etruscan-related) images relies upon a pre-existing meaning having been allocated to the visual object, such as that shown by the group of 'prophetic images'.

Love-based images of encounters, conversations, and offers belong to a different sphere of competence than prophetic images. However,

[41] When considering the schemes' tendency to 'migration' which we have highlighted in the introduction and other sections, we should assume that images in which the gesture is performed by gods do not hinder the proposed interpretation (see e.g. «Artume» in the mirror Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 84806; and the male «Thalna» in the mirror New York, Metropolitan Museum, inv. 22.139.61 [**pl. 170.b**]).

[42] On 'narrative function' as used in this research with regard to Giuliani's remarks on that notion, see above p. 76, fn. 20.

two remarks show that love images also contain prophetic nuances and support the hypothesis that there is a relationship underlying the use of the same landscape-scheme patterns in both sphere.

Firstly, considering Etruscan fourth-century music-based images influenced by Greek models (e.g. the Apollo Leucadius type), I highlighted the way images addressing the musical subject in association with erotic and prophetic themes grants considerable importance to landscape features. The best interpretation of such an instance is that it shows an interplay between the different semantic domains.

Secondly, the analysis of delivery scenes is especially relevant. The archetypal delivery scene that provides a model for the large group of offering images reviewed above is the delivery of Helen's egg, where the delivering figures often rest one foot on a rock (see e.g. **pl. 171.a**)[43]. These scenes, highly popular in Etruria during fourth century B.C., were based on Etruscan variants of Greek prototypes[44]. As scholars have noted, the connection between these images and «rebirth, fertility, and the continuity of life»[45] may lie in the prominent visual role of certain features such as the large size of the egg and water-related details. Therefore, it can be suggested that Etruscan archetypes for delivery scenes were designed to convey a strong significance related to the Etruscan notion of fate and destiny.

In fourth-century red-figure vases and cistae, the figures are typically set in an 'overall' landscape. In this figurative context, the initial relationship between gesture and landscape has become less intense. Freed from the rigid scheme, landscape details are inserted into the image more freely to compose a more generic setting for the figures.

On the visual level, elements that serve to characterize not the action but the environment framing the action can be seen to perform a

[43] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. Misc. 7770: dating to the late fourth century B.C. CARPINO 2003, pl. 61.
[44] CARPINO 2003, p. 46.
[45] CARPINO 2003, p. 48.

descriptive function – as opposed to the narrative function defined above.

In previous sections, analyzing landscape 'in context', I reviewed a number of examples in which the narrative function of landscape details that stands out. Just as in the case of attributive landscape elements, we can see that in these 'narrative examples' as well «the landscape remains within the spatial range and dimension of the figure»[46]. As N. Dietrich also suggests, the «functional economy of the landscape element» and its role in staging figures thus stands out[47].
Conversely, in a number of other examples, the landscape has a descriptive function and provides a context for the story as a whole, leading the viewer's attention to the setting rather than the individual action.
As we will see, the distinction between the different typologies is not rigid. Rather, it is possible to recognize a kind of non-fluid process that leads artists to prefer the second type over the first, always considering that the second, descriptive function is not found on its own, independent of or separate from the first, narrative function.

To clarify the extent to which it is appropriate to refer to the narrative function of landscape elements, let us consider some examples and in particular instances of (1.) encounters at the tree and (2.) hiding figures.
The previous sections analyzed many examples of **encounters taking place at a tree**. This subject appears mainly in tomb paintings, although there are also other examples significantly enrich the group supporting the analysis.

[46] DIETRICH 2015b.
[47] DIETRICH 2015b.

The *Tomba del Barone* (**pl. 172**)[48] shows three encounter scenes, each depicted on one of the walls (right, left, and rear wall). The arrangement of the trees and their gradual thickening guide the viewer's eye towards the middle of the back wall. Here we see a meeting between one female and two male figures, respectively placed to the right and left of a single-stemmed sapling growing in the center. Accompanied by the sound of the flute played by one of the two male figures, the other man extends his arm over the small tree and hands a *kylix* to the woman. Based on this offering gesture and the positioning of the female figure's hands, the best interpretation of this image is that it is an encounter scene.

According to Roncalli, the placement on the walls follows a «squilibrio […] programmato»[49]. The scholar notes that this segmented arrangement of the fictional setting has implications for the organization of the tomb's physical space. The alternating absence and presence of trees, more or less densely positioned, makes it possible to identify two distinct areas: «un'area più interna riservata alle deposizioni [...] e uno spazio più intimo, tra quella e la soglia: spazio, almeno sul piano ideale, più aperto e deputato ad accogliere la frequentazione dei vivi sopravvisuti e i gesti della loro *pietas*»[50].

In the previous section, I have assumed that other graves (e.g. the *Tomba delle Iscrizioni* [**pl. 51.a**], dating to about 520 B.C.)[51] also display a comparable division of space marked by trees. Assuming that this reading applies to the *Tomba del Barone* as well, it is noteworthy that, if we follow the visual progression created by the rhythm of the trees' positioning, the encounter scene and the act of moving beyond or 'crossing' the sapling become the apex of the dead peoples area. At the same time, however, by virtue of being symmetrically opposed to the

[48] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis; dating to 520-500 B.C. STEINGRÄBER 1985, p. 291; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 39-44. On the interpretation of the frescoes, see in particular RONCALLI 2003; MASSA PAIRAULT 1992, pp. 84-85, figs. 70-72.
[49] RONCALLI 2003, p. 54.
[50] RONCALLI 2003, pp. 56-57.
[51] See above pp. 145-146.

entrance door, the tree in the middle of the encounter scene serves as the pivot point of the entire figurative cycle.

It can be noted that the same three components (female figure/deceased; flute player; male figure offering a *kylix*) in the *Tomba del Barone* images appear in at least two other tombs dating to the late sixth century B.C. analyzed in previous sections. The left wall of the *Tomba Cardarelli* (**pls. 43.b; 44**)[52] shows a male cupbearer and a flute player moving to the right towards a tree. The sapling separates the male group from a female figure standing on the right-hand side, next to two servants. Tomb 5591 (*Tomba Moretti*; **pl. 47**)[53] brings the subject to the rear wall, where the three figures are divided by two trees.
In these images, repetition of the same gestures and motifs is so suggestive of their ritual content that Massa Pairault has defined these frescoes as a «coerente trasposizione in immagini delle *laudes* pronunciate dai banchettanti all'indirizzo delle divinità»[54].

In addition to Chiusine reliefs matching tomb *imagerie* (see e.g. **pl. 43.a**)[55], similar three-figures schemes appear in bronze mirrors as well. An engraved example from Tarquinia (**pl. 18.a**)[56] shows two men on either side of a central woman. A tree grows on the medallion's left-hand side. The type of plant in this image fits into the palm tree-typology identified by Pampanini[57]. Natacha Lubtchansky interpreted this scene, repeatedly compared to the almost contemporary Tomba del Barone's images[58], as a «rituel d'initiation amoureuse, la compétition de

[52] See above pp. 135-137.
[53] See above p. 138.
[54] MASSA PAIRAULT 1992, p. 85 (with particular reference to the *Tomba del Barone* frescoes).
[55] Chiusi, Museo Archeologico, inv. 2248. RONCALLI 2005, pp. 418-419, fig. 13. On the relationship between this relief and the *Tomba dei Giocolieri* as highlighted by Roncalli, see above pp. 133-134.
[56] London, British Museum, inv. 1814,0704.915; dating 525-475 B.C. SWADDLING 2002, pp. 19-21, no. 16; LUBTCHANSKY 2006, pp. 227-231, fig. 12. On the exergue scene, see above p. 98.
[57] PAMPANINI 1930, pp. 307-308.
[58] MAYER-PROKOP 1967, p. 32.

deux prétendants pour la main d'une femme»[59]. In particular, the scholar identified the female figure as Marpessa standing between Aplu («qu'un arbuste – le palmier de Délos? – et un oiseau permettent d'identifier»[60]) and Idas. Beyond the possibility of identifying a mythical background, these images illustrate the actual relationships between the themes of death and initiation. The initiation passage as marked by a tree is therefore found not only in tomb paintings. If we accept Lubtchansky's reading, it could be argued that the Tarquinia mirror's tree is related to the god Aplu[61]. However, even accepting the palm's symbolic value, we can see that the same palm-type tree also appears in an engraved mirror in Paris depicting Menrva leading Athanasia (**pl. 173.a**)[62]. The chance to achieve immortality, a chance rejected by Tydeus and personified by Athanasia, is encapsulated in the two female figures' movement in an apparently backward direction, towards the plant.

A female figure in a mirror from the *Tomba del Triclinio* in Tarquinia (**pl. 173.b**)[63] makes the same gesture as that performed by the *Tomba del Barone* cupbearer. The mirror shows the encounter between two

[59] LUBTCHANSKY 2006, p. 231.
[60] LUBTCHANSKY 2006, p. 230.
[61] Regarding the «riferimento delio che possono assumere le piante», see also CRISTOFANI, GREGORI 1987 (quot. p. 11). Nonetheless, in his analysis of the wall decoration of a third-century underground complex in Caere, Cristofani suggested that the plant has multiple meanings: «il raddoppiamento della palma e la decorazione del fondo non richiamano però solo l'albero sacro alla triade delia, simbolica di purificazione, ma anche un ambiente in cui vegetazione esotica e acque si combinavano: una sorta di boschetto […]» (p. 11).
[62] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département des Monnaies, Médailles et Antiques, inv. 1289; dating to about 450 B.C.; possibly from Vulci. COLONNA 1984a, pp. 1070-1071, no. 237; JUCKER 1997, p. 83, fig. 1; KRAUSKOPF 2002, p. 507, fig. 12; DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 75, fig. V.4.
[63] Berlin, Antikensammlung, inv. Fr. 62; from Tarquinia; dating to 510-500 B.C. GERHARD 1867, pl. CDXXI; MAYER PROKOP 1967, p. 43, pl. 38; BONFANTE 1986, p. 238, fig. VIII.6; RONCALLI 1990, p. 240, fn. 23; MASSA PAIRAULT 1992, pp. 88-89, fig. 75 (who unconvincingly interpreted the scene as a «ierogamia con Afrodite o Leucotea-Aurora» and a male figure identified as Adon, Titono or Paris); ZIMMER 1995, p. 25, no. 16; RONCALLI 2005, p. 418.

counterposed female figures standing on either side of a central, single-stemmed sapling. The left figure extends her hand beyond the tree, offering a twig to the other woman, who for her part is flanked by two additional and smaller plants.

The act of holding a plant or flower, often included in an offering scene, matches the gestures of the other scenes already reviewed. For instance, in the Paris mirror with Menerva and Athanasia the goddess holds a flower in her hand. On the rear wall of the *Tomba dei Giocolieri* (**pl. 42.a**) a standing figure is depicted in the act of reaching to pick a flower or fruit from one of the plants; interestingly, this tomb also includes the «diaframma»[64] represented by an underlying sea, in keeping with the repertoire seen in the Tarquinia mirror.

Therefore, encounter scenes like these analyzed here likely refer to the ritual dimension of initiatory funeral ceremonies, and the plants contribute to marking the salient moments of such ceremonies.
It is not surprising that the scene showcased in the mirror's 'condensed' depictions, selected from more extensive tomb frescoes, is the culminating moment of the encounter/offering. We might add that the plants emphasize the centrality of this moment. In addition to the *Tomba del Barone* where plants become progressively thicker, leading the viewer's attention to the back wall, there is also the gradual flowering of the saplings of the *Tomba dei Giocolieri*. The Freis II from the Archaic Temple in Metaponto might constitute a comparable example of progressive flowering in a funeral context: this scene shows a women's procession with a chariot pulled by mules. Carlo Rescigno has observed that «i fiori che le tre figure femminili del corteo e quella principale sul carro sorreggono sono chiaramente coordinati: dalla gemma si passa al bocciolo della seconda figura, quindi al fiore dischiuso della terza, infine a quello pienamente aperto della figura sulcarro»[65]. Rescigno associated this motif with the initiatory theme of

[64] RONCALLI 1990, p. 238.
[65] RESCIGNO 2014, p. 49 (with fig. 6).

the progressive maturation of the young woman preparing for marriage[66].

The examples analyzed here show that landscape contributes to marking the moments of ceremony in space. Moreover, the metamorphosis of landscape in terms of progressive maturation indicates the direction in which the image is to be read, thus emphasizing its temporal evolution. We can claim that landscape features play a 'narrative' role in that they structure the action (in this case, the encounter in which the narrative culminates) and characterize it as a ritualized event. Moreover, plants are located on an intermediate plane between image and reality. While paratactically organizing the image's content and highlighting the characteristics of the action, they also show viewers the correct direction for reading the representation.
Additionally, as Roncalli suggests, in some Etruscan images rocks convey a similar liminal pivotal function. For instance, this is the case of a sarcophagus in Copenhagen (**pl. 174.a**)[67]. The frieze shows two processions converging toward the middle of the scene, and in the middle there is a boulder that Roncalli has identified as the «*primo* passaggio» toward the underworld[68]. Similarly, a late sarcophagus in Chiusi (**pl. 174.b**)[69] shows a journey to the Underworld with the deceased on horseback moving to the left toward a tree growing out of the middle of the sea. On the left-hand side there is a sea monster facing the tree, waiting for the deceased.

Images depicting **figures hiding behind landscape features** provide another significant example of the narrative function in the sense of the term outlined above.

---

[66] However, see the cautions regarding image reading problems in RESCIGNO 2014, p. 49, fn. 46.
[67] Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, inv. H.I.N. 57; dating to 350-300 B.C. See RONCALLI 2001; VAN DER MEER 2001, p. 85, cat. *H49*.
[68] RONCALLI 2001, p. 249.
[69] Chiusi, Museo Archeologico Nazionale; dating to second century B.C. KRAUSKOPF 2006, pp. 67, 70, fig. V.5; DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 212, fig. X.3.

There is evidence to show that the hiding places of lurking or spying figures are often shrubs or rock faces expressly outlined in the image.
As outlined above, the seventh-century bucchero olla C 561 (**pl. 4**)[70] includes a hiding scheme derived from Eastern images (the hunter lurking behind a small tree) in a composition that shows, on the whole, an Etruscan reworking of models.

Hidden characters, including both lurking and spying figures, are widespread in later Etruscan images.
Lurking figures first occur in chase scenes. For instance, they appear in mythological hunting scenes dating from very different periods, from the *Cratere "dei Gobbi"* (**pl. 175.a**)[71] to Praenestine cistae (see e.g. Lyon E 154 [**pl. 99.b**][72]), the patterns of which date back to figurative models of aristocratic hunts. Secondly, lurking figures are depicted in images showing the moment before a sacrifice. In this instance, images featuring Achilles' ambush of Troilus provide the model of reference. The fact that the hiding motif is already present in Greek models (see e.g. the Penn amphora MS2522)[73] should not make us to overlook the stealth-enabling function of plants in Etruscan images, especially the *Tomba dei Tori* (**pl. 113.b**)[74].

Although spying subjects appear in images involving different themed (see e.g. **pls. 27.b; 120.b**)[75], they are most common in erotic scenes. Not surprisingly, in mirror engravings, a number of satyrs are depicted in the act of spying on female figures (see e.g. **pl. 121**)[76]. One

[70] See above pp. 75-76.
[71] Cerveteri, Museo Nazionale Archeologico Cerite; from the Tumulo I of the Banditaccia necropolis; dating to 590-570 B.C.
[72] See above p. 199.
[73] See above p. 216, fn. 605.
[74] See above p. 216.
[75] **Pl. 27.b**: London, The British Museum, inv. 1873,0820.105; from Bolsena; dating to about 300 B.C. (DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 28, fig. II.5). **Pl. 120.b**: Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia; from Cerveteri; dating to 450-400 B.C. A satyr and a maenad look over a hill spying Artumes and Aplu attacking a serpent. The satyr participates in the action by hitting the snake with a thyrsus (DE GRUMMOND 2006, fig. V.36).
[76] See above pp. 224-225.

image that features similar content but a more complex composition is that of the Faliscan *stamnos* at the Museo Archeologico in Grosseto with its depiction of the ambush of Peleus and Chiron on Thetis (**pl. 122.a**)[77].

On closer inspection, therefore, it appears that landscape features are used not only to depict hiding figures, but also to hide figures. This implies an active intervention on the part of the image-maker in terms of categorizing the spaces involved in the image. A Swiss mirror analyzed in previous sections provides the most significant example: in this piece, Tydeus and Melanippus fight before Menerva and a lightning bolt between them splits the invisible space of the goddess from the human area (**pl. 85.a**)[78].

In summary, the group of images with hiding figures reviewed here illustrates the extent to which the narrative purpose of landscape elements in Etruscan images was combined with other roles performed by the same features. Besides characterizing the hiding action and allowing viewers to recognize of *the* narrative moment, landscape details also perform a paratactic function by arranging the image and its semantic content. In other words, landscape elements allow for an internal partitioning of the image. This scanning technique operates on both the spatial and temporal levels. In fact, even though the narrative is encapsulated in the photographic synthesis of the image, its structuring requires both the categorization of space and the organization of time.

On the spatial level, landscape elements show the existing boundary between 'here' and 'there' while also focusing on different ontological fields. By using landscape features, the artist emphasizes the distinction (and, subsequently, the relationship) between the image and off-screen subjects.

Considering our *corpus*, we might argue that the distinction between on-screen and off-screen space typically lies in a semantic

[77] See above p. 226.

[78] See above p. 183. Nonetheless, we have to acknowledge that the lighting is a common attribute that identifies Capaneus in Etruscan images (see KRAUSKOPF 2002, p. 508).

differentiation. In some cases this polarisation is more concrete (female vs. warrior sphere) while in others it is more abstract (human vs. divine world).

On the temporal level, landscape features serve to shape the narration in that they render material the boundary between 'before' and 'after'. This is especially evident in ambush scenes. The subject of these images is not a crystallized vision of the moment before the ambush; rather, the emphasis on the tree/threshold – the crossing of which marks the evolution and outcome of the story – suggests that the thematic center of the image is *that* moment and *that* threshold.

As for the corpus reviewed in the previous section, **dance and music images** deserve special attention in relation to my analysis here. Indeed, examining these images and employing the notion of 'narrative' function, these images even more than others illustrate a progressive change in the use of landscape elements.
In a continuous interplay between the fictional space of the image and the real space of the tomb[79], the trees of Archaic tomb paintings take a religious place-making process and make it material. In such a space, all the motifs are deliberately arranged into a complex configuration.
Both human agency and its transposition into pictorial, fictional space adhere to the typically Etruscan approach of «fedeltà ad un rituale, metodica, fredda e pedantesca». The act of reading the image matches the actual «formalismo della liturgia» from a perspective that takes both of these acts as a tool for responding to the frightening «incertezza dell'ignoto»[80].

In other words, images of dance between trees can be seen as the visual expression of a significant configuration of individual elements in space and time, in which 'space' and 'time' combine in the rhythmic

[79] Drawing on Rouveret and Roncalli, we have repeatedly noted that the architecture of Etruscan tombs typically match with the «luoghi ideali lungo i quali si dispiega il "paesaggio"» (RONCALLI 2001, p. 262).
[80] MANSUELLI 1949, p. 98, who describes the Etruscan mindset as a «mentalità oscillante tra il formalismo della liturgia e l'incertezza dell'ignoto».

rendering of human agency. The notion of *rhythmos* is key to understanding the relationship between space and time in these images. More generally, it is also key to bringing into focus the relationship between static images and movement[81]. The link between the notion of *rhythmos* and the visual arts was already pivotal in ancient times[82]; indeed, *rhythmos* can be conceived as the illustration of how individual parts are arranged according to temporal and spatial structures, just as they are in dramaturgy[83]. Figurative *schemata* rely on different communication systems being mutually integrated and developing phenomenologically on the basis of spatial and temporal criteria. These two variants of time and space underlie the tidy display of *schemata* (as well as beneath the notions of 'movement' and 'narration').

If we take it as true (as we should) that the image which visually freezes the action codifies the movement rather than summarizing it[84], then we can argue that landscape features are fully embedded in that codification system. In summary, archaic ritual-based dance images can be argued to display the rhythmic/rational nature of human agency.
Figures are «bound»[85] in rhythm and *schemata* as they take on a distinctive shape. This form is a normative constrain involving both physical and ethical attitudes. Therefore, since landscape features imbue figures with a rhythmic disposition, they are set *inside* the scheme. Finally, it can be noted that, even as rhythm is granted

[81] On the notion of *rhythmos,* see PETERSEN 1917; MESTURINI 2001; FRANZONI 2006, pp. 214-216; 246-247; MICHON 2018. On the history of rhythm as a philosophical concept, see CRESPI, MANGHANI 2020. Regarding the investigation of devices and rules to represent movement in ancient art, see PUCCI 2005; CATONI 2013; CATONI, GIULIANI 2016 (substantial bibliography on the topic, included scholarly publication focusing on modern figurative contexts, are provided in CATONI 2021, §1).
[82] See the discussion in CATONI 2008.
[83] HODGE 2010, p. 30.
[84] See CATONI 2008.
[85] I take the notion of being 'bound in rhythm' from Aeschylus' *Prometheus* (see AESCH. *Pr*. 241).

significance through landscape features, at the same time those same elements are also used to highlight arrhythmia.

This pattern is most evident in dance scenes of archaic tomb and vase paintings dealing with canonized and ritualized dances. If we follow the evolution of this subject matter in later tomb paintings, we see that landscape details gradually detach from the rigid figure-framing system. In many instances, from a visual point of view, this coincides with a rapprochement between figures and the landscape to such an extent that they end up overlapping.

Tomb paintings featuring a fluid interplay between trees and figures illustrate the 'descriptive' function of landscape features. That is to say, rather than being used to define actions, these landscape elements refer to the setting of action(s).

The Etruscans definitely had a «vision pour ainsi dire géographiquement définie de l'au-delà, ou l'éloignement est transcrit par la succession des plans sur un axe horizontal et non plus par leur étagement sur un axe vertical»[86] from at least the fifth century onwards. However, it must also be acknowledged that the way in which such space was conceptualized and perceived evolved over time.

Evidence shows that the tomb was initially perceived as a *temenos*, a rigidly organized space in which canonical and ritualistic actions were performed[87]. In this context, setting features function to emphasize the normative nature of human agency. Later, representative schemes became progressively detached and the landscape freed from this function.

Before the grave came to be identified with the underworld landscape (as in the case with the *Tomba dei Demoni Azzurri*), there were a number of examples in which landscapes appear in tombs as reminiscent of the *temenos* but freed from their original normative

[86] RONCALLI 1997, p. 44.
[87] See above p. 129.

function. In these cases, they instead serve to provide dance scenes with a more fluid context.
Although the tombs' tree-lined landscapes never shift to the extent of becoming generic settings, tomb paintings featuring dance scenes account for this process of detaching landscape from its former function.

In the case of tombs, this tendency towards a new perception (and description) of space was likely reflected in the move to include visual components other than the frescos, components that contributed to creating a diffuse setting. This is the case of late-Classic and Hellenistic tree-shaped *thymiateria* that seem to have been placed alongside the tomb walls in a dialectical relationship with the walls[88].

In reference to the paired 'narrative'-'descriptive' function, another group of Etruscan images illustrates the multiple values of landscape features. As observed above, the metaphorical association between rock and death is based on the experience of observing a natural element embedded in the earth[89]. Rather than being merely figurative, this is a primarily cultural-anthropological theme that is also attested to in Greek literature[90].

In Etruscan *imagerie*, this theme gives rise to a number of noteworthy figurative solutions.
On one hand, drawing on Roncalli and Bonamici, we have examined images in which the rock becomes an ambiguous spatial marker in the topography of the underworld[91].

[88] Information about *thymiateria* location in the grave is taken from tomb 11 of the second cemetery of Vallone (AMBROSINI 2002, pp. 319-320; MICHETTI 2019, pp. 110-111). On the symbolic meaning of Etruscan Hellenistic *thymiateria*, see AMBROSINI 2002, pp. 313-322. With regard to the tree-like shape, considering the *thymiateria*'s connection with the female sphere, Ambrosini suggested their fertility-related symbolism.
[89] See above p. 260.
[90] See e.g. the evocative wordplay between *petros* and *nekròs* in EUR. *Or*. 1520-1521 (reviewed in DI BENEDETTO 1965, p. 279).
[91] See above pp. 266-271 for the discussion about this subject matter.

On the other hand, I reviewed several images showing dying figures sitting or slumped on rocks. This motif is found mainly in red-figure vase paintings and Praenestine cistae. Significantly enough, it also appears in relation to figures carrying a corpse. This is the case of the *stamnos* Fould at the Musée du Louvre, for instance, showing the ambush of Troilos and Ajax carrying the corpse of Achilles (**pl. 111**)[92]. The frieze's reading direction is indicated by Menerva's hand gesture, and its «consequenzialità fatale»[93] leads towards the *mise en scene* of the hero's death. It is not accident that the element following the Ajax and Achilles group is a column that interrupts the frieze and likely marks the beginning and end of the narrative. Significantly, while moving towards the column, Ajax rests his foot on a rock rising from the ground.

An archaic fetid stone base in Palermo (**pl. 175.b**)[94] confirms that rock or plant elements were used in varying ways, a point made above when analyzing the way these the two elements perform a comparable pivotal function in encounter scenes. One of the sides of this stone base shows a warrior striding along carrying a corpse on his back. A large plant grows between his legs. The warrior moves towards the edge of the parallelepiped. The absence of decorative elements along the corner, elements which are otherwise common in similar monuments, suggests a continuity with the scene on the adjacent side, showing an assembly[95]. Rather than interpreting this as an «assemblea di una famiglia di rango sociale piuttosto elevato in occasione della morte di un congiunto»[96], we should grant importance to the warrior's act of crossing the life-death threshold. Also, considering that the leftmost

[92] Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. CA 6529; from Vulci; ex Fould coolection. GAULTIER, VILLARD 1985, p. 3, figs. 2, 20-25, pl. 1; HARARI 1995, pp. 108-109; 119-120, figs. 4-5; GILOTTA 2012.
[93] HARARI 1995, p. 109.
[94] Palermo, Museo Archeologico Regionale 'Antonio Salinas', inv. N.I. 8382; from Chiusi; dating to the end of the sixth century B.C. JANNOT 1984a, figs. 108-110; CAMPOREALE 2007.
[95] These are the only two sides of the monument that have been preserved.
[96] CAMPOREALE 2007.

figure in the crowd is facing to his left (that is to say, ideally, towards the warrior), we might suggest that the scene takes place in the underworld, beyond the threshold that the deceased is crossing.
Two additional subjects account for the significance of the association between rock and death in Etruscan repertoire, namely, the death of Actaeon and Ajax's suicide.

An engraved mirror in Brussels (**pl. 176.a**)[97] shows Actaeon being attacked by three hounds. They stand on rocky soil that occupies the entire lower section of the medallion. A large vine shoot surrounding the figures is depicted in keeping with the botanical representational scheme usually used for frames. Emphasizing the prominent role of landscape elements in this image, Roger Lambrechts has observed that «la scene se déroule […] dans le cadre d'une nature exubérante»[98]. However, without delving into a deeper consideration of the rock,ock's analysis, his detailed analysis focuses on the dual nature of the vine shoot and subsequent relationship between «cadre» and «espace matériel dans lequel l'action se joue» / «motif décoratif» and «scène»[99].
The neck of a Faliscan *oinochoe* (**pl. 176.b**)[100] depicts Actaeon being torn apart by dogs before Artemis and a satyr. The satyr spies on this scene from a hiding place from which only his torso emerges, thereby echoing comparable patterns that were widespread in Apulian vases featuring the same myth[101]. Actaeon is depicted standing on an irregular rocky ledge characterized by black streaks. Similarly, Acteon also rests his foot on a rock in a Faliscan krater in Civita Castellana (**pl. 177.a**)[102].

[97] Brussels, Musées Royaux d'art et d'histoire, inv. R 1278; dating to 420-400 B.C. LAMBRECHTS 1978, pp. 177-180, no. 28.
[98] LAMBRECHTS 1978, p. 180.
[99] LAMBRECHTS 1978, p. 180.
[100] Civita Castellana, Museo Archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 1601. POLA 2016, pl. VII.
[101] See e.g. the proto-Apulian volute krater from Gravina dating to about 350 B.C. in MUGIONE 2000, p. 83, fig. 32.
[102] Civita Castellana, Museo Archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 6360. POLA 2016, p. 131, pl. CIX-CXI.

The best evidence to support this idea that the rock plays a characterizing function in relation to Actaeon's death, confirmed by the visual significance of this element, is the fact that it is almost continuous association with the subject. A terracotta fragment from a high relief pediment provides an example of the late popularity of this motif. The fragment, possibly dating to about 250 B.C., was confiscated in Campione d'Italia (Como) in 2017. It preserves the lower part of Actaeon's body devoured by two dogs. The hunter rests his right knee on a tall, shapeless boulder (**pl. 177.b**)[103].

Possibly due to its affinity with the Etruscan aristocratic ideal[104], the myth of Ajax's suicide was particularly popular in Etruria[105]. There are numerous images, not all of which can be traced back to a unique model, but some examples of such images deserve attention here due to the fact that they include rock elements. A London red-figure krater from Vulci (**pl. 178.a**)[106], dating to the first half of the fourth century B.C., shows Ajax leaning over his sword after the blade has already pierced him. Significantly, side B of the krater depicts Actaeon being attacked by his hounds. On side A, below Ajax there is a dotted rocky ground that is also represented vertically behind him[107]. A shield and piece of armor hang in front of the dying figure. Ancient sources report that Ajax's suicide took place in an outdoor area. This traditional account, accepted by Ovid in the *Metamorphoses*[108], had already been attested to in the work of the Greek tragedians. In particular, Sophocles relates in *Ajax* that, to prepare to commit suicide, the hero planted his sword in the bushes[109]. Therefore, the detail in the London krater likely

[103] MARAS 2018, p. 199, no. 101.
[104] See SPIVEY, STODDART 1990, pp. 55-56, who suggested that «The message of the suicide of Ajax is, 'Ajax brought shame upon himself and killed himself: in such circumstances, I would do the same'» (p. 56).
[105] See DAVIES 1971; CAMIZ, FERRAZZA 2006.
[106] London, British Museum, inv. 1867,0508.1328.
[107] On the identification of the latter object, see BEAZLEY 1947, p. 137: «It is evidently of the same nature as the rocky ground below».
[108] OV. *met*. 12.
[109] S. *Aj.*

reflects an intention to stage the episode in an outdoor space. Additionally, it can be noted that Ajax's special relationship with the ground goes far beyond the setting of his suicide in an open space. The *Little Iliad* reports that, to express contempt, Ajax's body was not cremated as befitting heroes, but buried instead[110]. Sophocles' own tragedy ends with a debate as to whether or not the hero should be buried[111]. Beyond providing a setting, therefore, the rock characterizes the status of the suicidal hero, distinguishing him from other heroes. The rock visually prefigures the outcome of the hero's tale in that he was destined to be buried under the ground on which he died. As a *pendant*, the weapons depicted in front of Ajax likely encapsulate the story's antecedent by conveying the cause of the suicide[112]. Therefore, this stone element might be defined as a 'talking' rock, like the iris that often accompanies the iconography of Ajax's suicide has been defined[113]. To be more precise, we might define it as a «'pointer-object'» understood as a visual «key able to orient the narration»[114]. These premises might well explain the emphasis on the rocky soil in the figurative scheme traditionally adopted in Etruscan gems (**pl. 178.b-c**)[115].

These rocks, as evocative detail of the *post mortem*, echo the image of a *stamnos* from the Casuccini collection (**pl. 179.a**)[116]. The vase in question shows Ajax, naked, standing in front of a sword vertically

[110] EUST. 285, 34-35 (see HOLT 1992).
[111] For further details on this motif in literary tradition, see BRILLANTE 2012.
[112] Cfr. CATONI 2015, p. 28. The scholar defines the hanging sward in the Ajax's suicide scene that is depicted in a Greek *kylix* (Leiden, Rijksmuseum, inv. PC 75) as a «figurative pointer» to orient the viewer towards possible narrative directions.
[113] See HARARI 1995, p. 139, with reference to a *stamnos* by the *Pittore di Settecamini* at the Cabinet des Médailles.
[114] CATONI 2015, pp. 27-28.
[115] **Pl. 178.b**: Cornelian scarab, London, British Museum, inv. 1872,0604.1159; reportedly from Chiusi; dating to fifth century B.C. (CATONI 2015, pp. 17, 331, fig. 2). **Pl. 178.c**: Cornelian scarab, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. 41.160.489; dating to the beginning of the fourth century B.C. (CATONI 2015, pp. 17, 332, fig. 4).
[116] Palermo, Museo Archeologico Regionale 'Antonio Salinas', inv. 5529; ex Casuccini collection. HARARI 1995, pls. 11-12; GILOTTA 2005.

fixed to the ground in front of him. Behind the hero is a winged male demon who approaches the hero, reaching out his arms. This demon is Thanatos, waiting «presso la colonnina che segnala, in anticipo sull'evento, il luogo della sepoltura»[117]. To the left-hand side of the primary scene, Minerva appears holding a spear in her arms. While resting her foot on the carcass of a ram, the goddess points at the sword with her finger. The animal's corpse, indicating the hero's madness[118], lies on a rock next to which Ajax's sword is thrust into the ground. In the Casuccini *stamnos*, the rock thus plays a pivotal role connected to the carcass, the sword serving as the means of suicide, and the chthonic Minerva, who «sembra quasi identificarsi con Persefone»[119].

As a final remark on the episodes of Actaeon and Ajax, it should be acknowledged that there is the possibility of assigning a specific value to the rock in a solid relationship with these two episodes. As has been noted, in fact, images referring to the two subjects show «analogie compositive» implying that they «sembrano discendere […] da una comune concezione di fondo, basata sull'imminenza di un evento tragico (o comunque straordinario) che condurrà il protagonista in una dimensione sconosciuta»[120]. We might say that these images, as leave-taking scenes, are the counterpart of the encounter scenes analyzed in the previous section. The insistence on depicting the rock in

[117] HARARI 1996, p. 139.

[118] The 'personification' of madness evokes a motif of the Euripides' *Herakles Mainomenoswinged*, where Lyssa triggers Herakles' madness. The female daemon appears in an Apulian amphora by the Pittore di Dario in Berlin, (Antikensammlung, inv. Fr. 3239; 340-330 B.C.), and a Krater by the *Pittore di Licaone* in Boston (inv. 00.346; about 440 B.C.). See VARRIALE 2010, pp. 560-561.

[119] GILOTTA 2005, p. 73. Besides the specific chthonian connotations of Menrva in the Casuccini *stamnos*, in Etruscan art we can underline a certain diffusion of images of the goddess resting on a rock: see e.g. Faliscan skyphos, Civita Castellana, Museo Archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, from the cemetery of Vallone (GILOTTA 2000b, p. 147, fig. 4).

[120] GILOTTA 2005, p. 74. Those analogies are highlighted by Gilotta comparing a group of Greek and Etruscan images. According to the scholar, representations of the two episodes share 'theatrical features', that is to say, in both instances the figures' attitude and gestures would prove their «origine teatrale» (quot. p. 74).

representations of Actaeon's and Ajax's death, derived from Attic and Apulian models, meets the scenic needs guiding the composition of the image. However, rather than constituting an example of the image passively adhering to a text (or, more generally, a tradition), I think we should emphasize the coherence underlying the recurrent relationship between figurative element (the rock) and subject (the «evento tragico […] che condurrà il protagonista in una dimensione sconosciuta»). According to this perspective, the rock does not provide context for the moment of death; rather, in accordance with a proleptic strategy that was widespread in vase painting, it *prefigures* the destiny of death. This value as an element anticipating the story's content confirms that landscape elements were assigned a narrative rather than a generically descriptive function.

On a more general level, in both of the instances reviewed here (rocks as a benchmark of the underworld and death on stones), it can be argued that stones convey a narrative function in that they embody specific actions and steps to be undertaken in specific places and moments.

Conversely, I reviewed examples in which the underworld topography is more generically characterized by rocky ground. In these instances, landscape features can be seen as performing a descriptive function upon. In fact, they contribute to defining the scene's setting rather than characterizing it in a univocal way[121].

Above I mentioned that generic contexts cannot be divorced from the (pre)existence of related narrative landscape features. This is evident from the persisten recurrence of the same landscape features, and is best confirmed by the fact that even most 'generic' landscapes typically contain 'iconic signs' evocative of the narrative value of landscape elements. Examples are the tree trunks and fountains

[121] See GIULIANI 2013, esp. pp. 51-88; GIULIANI 2017, esp. p. 200.

depicted in some mythical scenes engraved on mirrors, as in the case of Amykos and Amymone[122].

Following the analysis developed in previous sections, this section has summarized different values conveyed by landscape features in Etruscan art. Subsequently, I have suggested that there was a progressive tendency for landscape elements to perform a descriptive function, as a prelude to the more comprehensive landscape representations of the Hellenistic and Roman period.

On a final note, we can venture to generalize these insights into a more overarching relationship with cultural process development. Analyzing 'frame', George Simmel has observed that the evolution of this element over time «integrates the frame into a far-reaching principle of cultural development»[123]. According to Simmel, this development «by no means always leads the individual elements from a mechanistic-external form to an organically animated and autonomously more meaningful form. On the contrary, whenever the spirit organizes the material of existence into ever more extensive and ever higher designs, then innumerable objects, that had previously led a self-enclosed life representing an idea of their own, are degraded to merely mechanically effective, specific elements of larger constellations; only the latter are now bearers of the idea, whereas the former have become mere means, whose autonomous existence is meaningless»[124].

Although evidence shows it would be inappropriate to suggest that Etruscans were concerned with aesthetic appreciation, it does make sense to look on the Etruscan imaginary in light of Simmel's aesthetic-oriented analysis. The metaphor devised by Simmel illustrates the process leading to 'broad contexts'. Defined in philosophical terms, therefore, such contexts can be investigated in sociological, historical, social, or even historical-artistic terms, as is the case with the analysis of

[122] See above pp. 172-174; 202-205; 224-225.
[123] SIMMEL 1994, p. 16 (first edition 1902 = G. Simmel, *The picture frame: An aesthetic study*, in FERRARI, PINOTTI 2018, pp. 71-76).
[124] SIMMEL 1994, p. 16.

the frame. Generally speaking, Simmel has observed that «from out of the coexisting, mutually independent and self-sufficient entities there grows an all-embracing structure to which, as it were, each gives up their soul, their existence for themselves, in order to regain a meaning for their existence only as mechanically functioning elements of that structure»[125].

Simmel thus asserts that the frame becomes ontologically a frame (i.e. a structure 'at the service' of the work of art) when its components lose their own identity.

Likewise, we might argue that the landscape becomes landscape (aesthetically appreciable as a pictorial theme in Hellenistic and Roman art) when its components lose their original signification. Of course, this detachment does not occur in the form of a sudden break, giving rise to the abrupt appearance of landscape. Rather, it is the result of a meditated and mediated exercise in which artists begin to reflect on space even as technology develops and evolves.

Before landscape, many 'landscapes' existed. The plural form not only refers to the multiple functions performed by landscape features: it also accounts for the existence of individual signifying structures progressively organized into broader uniform configurations. While only the whole entity bears the actual idea of landscape, only the founding 'narrative' units serve as carriers of significance.

[125] SIMMEL 1994, p. 16.

5.
Conclusions
Landscapes without Horizons

5.1. Landscape and the Etruscan *Kósmos*

Before moving on to the conclusions proper, considering the analysis conducted so far a generically conclusive section can provide a broader perspective on landscape representation and its position/location in Etruscan art, sufficient to provide insight into Etruscan perceptions of the *kósmos*.

The assumption at the heart of this approach is that images represent the conceptual order of the world[1]. In essence, addressing the immense issue of the relationship between 'image' and 'reality', I embrace the notion that there is a profound interplay (but not coincidence) «between an image, conveying significance to reality, and reality, stylized into a significant image»[2].

By transposing this topic onto the more defined sphere of landscape images, we can take this reasoning eve further to affirm, affirming that a 'significant (landscape) image' encapsulates a 'significance' that pre-exists in reality. Since depicted landscape is the visual translation of a meaning that is already in reality, it – like any art – «does not supply neutral reality with additional meaning but translates and transforms meaning into meaning»[3].

According to this perspective, I am not suggesting that Etruscan images account for how the landscape looks 'in reality'. Instead, as products of individualized expressive action, such images convey a meaning

[1] In methodological terms, a similar attempt to the one being presented here has been made by BAGNANSCO GIANNI 2008, who proposed that some epigraphic signs from the Orientalizing period have an «eloquenza visiva» as to be suitable for a graphic representation of sacred space (quot. p. 267).

[2] HÖLSCHER 2016, p. 265.

[3] HÖLSCHER 2016, p. 268.

'translated' from reality, regardless of how convincing and faithful the rendering might be[4].

Considering the collected *corpus*, reviewed in previous sections, I propose three levels of interpretation for images featuring landscape details. By employing these levels, we can acquire elements that contribute to our understanding of how the Etruscans regarded reality. The different levels are concurrent, as each image seems to have multiple degrees of reading, layered one on top of another. As can be gathered from the overview of the history of the literature presented in the first section, research on landscape representation has largely overlooked these aspects. The three main focuses can be described as follows: **I)** The position of landscape in relation to the image; **II)** The position of landscape in relation to the object; **III)** The location of the image containing landscape elements.

I) Research on the **placement of landscape features within the image** primarily relies on analyses of the spatial articulation of the pictorial field.

This type of investigation is particularly profitable when dealing with the tree-lined landscape of Archaic and Late Archaic tomb paintings. In these instances, the pictorial elements are used as a tool poised between the two connected plans of reality and visual fiction. As this relationship is particularly evident, what follows is a straightforward reading of the landscape's 'debt' to reality.

The visual rendering of the sacred nature of both location and action is achieved by setting these elements in the sacred space of the *temenos*. This visual expedient relies on a well-established significance granted to boundaries. The importance assigned to boundaries in the Etruscan world is expressed, for instance, in the prophecy of Vegoia: as this prophecy recounts, the sentence inflicted by the gods on these who

[4] Drawing the lexicon from the language of modern art, we could call this approach a 'modernist' one, as opposed to the 'classicist' one (see SHIFF 1991, pp. 129-131).

remove or move boundary markers ranges from death to misfortune and disease[5]. The complexity of the Etruscan notion of *tular*[6] shows that this issue of boundaries was fundamental to the identity of Etruscan cities. The problem of defining space is thus linked to the problem of defining identity.

Since the 1960s, research on the value of boundary construction – a body of literature that was involved in defining the notion of 'symbolic boundaries'[7] – has come to play a crucial role in anthropological and social studies[8]. The act of establishing symbols demarcating boundaries – understood as 'lines' that define groups of people – is key to the arguments of Mary Douglas. In *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology* (first edition 1970)[9], the anthropologist explores relationships between symbolic systems and the social order. Her discussion of the role of rituals represents the development of a line of inquiry already initiated during the 1960s[10]. Drawing on Douglas, we can assume that there is a relationship between normative concerns with preserving boundaries and ritualistic religion[11].

As we have seen, the Etruscan concern for boundaries was articulated at different levels, all of which are connected in some way with identity issues. In some Etruscan images, the landscape pictorial arrangement hints at the use of landscape elements as a tool to convey ritual content. On a more general note, the iconographic analysis of Etruscan images indicates two phenomena: one, the use of landscape to

[5] See LACHMANN 1848, pp. 350, 17; 351, 11.
[6] On the notion of *tular*, see MAZZARINO 1957, pp. 101-107; LAMBRECHTS 1970; MAZZARINO 1980, pp. 263-286. See HARARI 2017 (esp. pp. 572-574) for the analysis of the «ideologia del confine, strutturale e identitaria […] nella mentalità di più genti della prima Italia» (quot. p. 572).
[7] See LAMONT, PENDERGRASS, PACHUCKI 2015 for a brief discussion of the history and modern research on symbolic boundaries.
[8] See LAMONT, MOLNÁR 2002 for a survey of some of the main developments of research around the concept of boundaries.
[9] My knowledge of *Natural Symbols* is based on the 1979 Italian translation by Primo Levi (DOUGLAS 1979).
[10] DOUGLAS 1979, pp. 13-36; DOUGLAS 1968a; DOUGLAS 1968b.
[11] See DOUGLAS 1979, p. 29.

construct spaces with a strong symbolic meaning and two, the use of landscape to define semantically distinct spaces.
Based on the observation of these features, I would suggest that insights from the analysis of the pictorial rendering of the ritual definition of space might help us understand cultural practices that symbolically translate the need for identity affirmation. In fact, the suggestion that landscape serves to construct symbols (at least in their pictorial rendering) is consistent with the idea that landscape is instrumental in creating *schemata*, as was first suggested to explain the narrative function of landscape features.
In Etruscan tombs, the painters also used the *temenos* as a sort of framework to insert the subjects. Even while relegated to his own field, each figure contributes to the formation of a whole complex scene. Nonetheless, for the most part, these scenes are devoid of any occasion for interaction.

Moreover, following the formal and semantic evolution of the tree line framing the space of the tomb leads to further considerations. The overlapping of landscape elements and figures – which, as we have seen, points to the progressive tendency towards assigning a descriptive function – enlivens the composition and suggests a displacement of the perspective planes. While analyzing dance images in black-figure vases, we saw that the works of the Micali Painter and the Painter of the Dancing Satyrs display a distinctive choreographic effect in their treatment of the human figure[12]. At the same time, these are also the two painters who most frequently depict landscape elements.
Therefore, at the end of the sixth and over the course of the fifth century B.C., we can appreciate different pictorial solutions with a common inclusion of landscape that presuppose a certain degree of reflection – albeit preliminary – on the problem of space.

In her analysis of still life paintings in the Vesuvian area, Silvana Costa observed that «la grammatica compositiva meccanicamente

[12] See above pp. 113-117.

applicata dai pittori pompeiani per la costruzione di scene di progressiva complessità affonda le proprie radici nella riflessione ellenistica a proposito della resa della spazialità, i cui riflessi rimangono in alcuni degli artifici applicati per l'individuazione dei piani»[13]. We can therefore argue that, on the one hand, Pompeian still life images are an effect – if not an outcome – of Hellenistic pictorial experimentation. On the other hand, some Etruscan images show a particular use of landscape elements, which is a prelude to this same phase of experimentation.

An analysis of the position of landscape elements in relation to figures – described above in terms of a progressive shift from a narrative to a descriptive function – suggests that landscape became increasing important in relation to the context, at the expense of patterns involving figures. Examining the rules guiding the composition of images and the different ways landscape elements were inserted into the picture, it appears that a need for harmony progressively replaced the need for rhythm.

While the examples analyzed here account for the Etruscan perception of the cosmos in a more intelligible form (which does not, however, necessarily mean more truthful), the remaining repertoire is more elusive.

Mirrors showing tripartite images and medallions deserve particular attention in relation to our purposes (see e.g. **pl. 179.b**)[14]. This visual device typically identifies a celestial space (the upper exergue, intended for astral themes in which Thesan is often depicted) and an underworld space (the lower exergue where demons or marine-themed representations appear) framing the main scene in the central area[15].

[13] COSTA 2014, p. 563.

[14] Bloomington, Indiana University, Sidney and Lois Eskenazi Art Museum, inv. 74.23; dating to 325-300 B.C. (DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 88, fig. V.18).

[15] AMBROSINI 2018, p. 106 notes that the tripartite division widely spread «negli specchi più antichi e fino alle metà circa del IV secolo a.C.».

Although part of a single unique image (as suggested by the elements that often cross the horizontal dividing lines), three subjects are inserted into a figurative space divided into three different sections by means of a caesura between the planes. This type of image, designed around the rendering of 'three-dimensional' space, presupposes that the engravers had a particular awareness in their approach to the 'cosmic' problem. From an anthropocentric perspective, this approach involves an orderly placement of heaven and the underworld arranged so as to surround earthly reality.

With respect to landscape, the division into three ontological domains matches a division between superimposed topographical areas.

The picture of a tripartite reality as rendered by mirrors reveals a way of organizing the universe that is easily understandable in relation to modern man's intellectual experience. In other instances, however, the arrangement of landscape elements in the image illustrates more complex aspects of Etruscan thought.

One illustrative example is that of the sea, to be analyzed in relation to what is located above and below.

A cinerary urn at Fordham University analyzed in the previous section (**pl. 16**)[16] shows a wave pattern along the top edge of the box. A ship is depicted on the urn lid, ideally sailing on the waters represented by the wave pattern. The panel below the waves displays a lion and a tree. The overall image shows the afterlife journey, in which the beast evokes the hurdles the deceased will face in the course of the journey. Significantly enough, the underwater space is not filled with sea monsters; rather, it shows a land-based topography with terrestrial flora and fauna. In the Etruscan topographical rendering of the Afterlife, sea and land alternate. The afterlife journey was most likely supposed to be undertaken in phases, possibly «combining a sea route

[16] New York, Fordham University, Fordham Museum of Greek, Etruscan and Roman Art, inv. 6.002. See above, p. 94.

and a land route»[17]. The urn's figurative sections thus likely refer to successive stages of the same journey, but we should not overlook their stratigraphic arrangement.

In general, images like that of the New York urn supply scattered information which does not fit effectively into an Etruscan logically constant conception of the Underworld. The Etruscan concepts of life after death are not uniform and do not result in constant figurative constructions[18]. However, if we assume there was a connection between funerary concepts and funerary imagery, it is possible that systematic observation of spatial displacement can account for the complex nature of divergent beliefs.

On a general note, it is worth examining another aspect of the sea placement in the image with regard to the possible relationship between reality and figurative rendering.

Once again, mirrors displays various peculiarities becuase they are morphologically structured to have a limited and comprehensive rounded figurative space that is alluring to the eye. The frame, when it appears, emphasizes the separateness and synthesizing capacity of the tondo scene[19] in such a way that the image functions as a depiction of a self-contained reality. In other words, to quote Nancy de Grummond, the medallion is a «contained word, in which the actions take place on a cosmic stage»[20].

[17] KRAUSKOPF 2006, p. 67. On the hypothesis that the journey to the Afterlife was to be taken in stages, see my discussion above, pp. 260-261, with published references.

[18] Theoretical overview of the Etruscan concepts on the Afterlife are provided in BRIQUEL 1987b; JANNOT 1987; SIMON 1997.

[19] See FERRARI, PINOTTI 2018 on the frame as a «dispositivo insularizzante» (quot. p. 53) and an overview of the theoretical debate on that 'object'. On the modern interest in the frame, see my discussion above, pp. 57-58.

[20] DE GRUMMOND 2009, p. 290. The contribution is part of an established line of research that considers the mirror as a possible reflection of the universe (see e.g. DOBROWOLSKI 1994; CRISTOFANI 1985b; TORELLI 1988).

A fourth-century mirror belonging to the Vatican antiquities collection (**pl. 180.a**)[21] shows «Marsisturns» (?) and «Alpan» standing on either side of a central romantic couple. In the lower exergue, a female figure plays a stringed instrument while the bust of a demon-like figure appears in the upper exergue. What is most relevant for our purposes is the frame-like engraving flanking the central section. On both sides, in fact, there is a frieze with wavy motifs, fish, and sea monsters. This motif, which echoes a marine version of the 'peopled scroll'[22], evokes the idea of a sea encircling the universe. Similarly, a mirror at the Cabinet des Médailles (**pl. 180.b**)[23] shows a male head inside a beam suspended in the area between two standing figures (likely Aplu and Artemis), with dolphins depicted at each side. As outlined above, fish are typically used in mirrors as a substitute for the sea[24]. In the Paris mirror, this pattern surrounding the sun motif accounts for the close relationship between astral elements and water[25],

[21] Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco; from Vulci; dating 325-300 B.C. DE GRUMMOND 1982b, p. 107; BONAMICI 1992, pp. 7, 10, fig. 13; DE GRUMMOND 2006, p. 141, fig. VI.35.

[22] See above pp. 234-235.

[23] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Département des Monnaies, Médailles et Antiques, inv. 1300. KRAUSKOPF 1984, p. 341, no. 29; PIZZIRANI 2005, p. 259, fig. 10.

[24] See above p. 97.

[25] On the relationship between astral- and water-based themes, see above pp. 280-281. See also PIZZIRANI 2005, p. 259, who noted that «L'iconografia solare nel mondo etrusco sembra […] caratterizzata da un'ambientazione precisa, il paesaggio marino, e da una connotazione infera». On the methodological level, several publications of mirrors have attempted to establish stylistic classification by analyzing a possible thematic correlation between the exergues or frame and the main scene. That also applied to floral ornaments and subjects. For instance, the distinctive floral frieze of overlapping leaves fastened by rings encircling a large group of mirrors was once considered a hallmark of the *Kranzspiegelgruppe* or 'Spiky Garland Group' (see HERBIG 1955-1956; BONFANTE 1980). However, the coherence of the group based on the typology of the frame is no longer accepted (see SZILÁGYI 1994; LAMBRECHTS 2000; DELLA FINA 2002). Based on the idea that «there are a few examples of a unified theme, in which the border, main scene, and exergue focus on a specific scene or context», EDLUND 1982, pp. 138-139 maintains that mirror's floral designs are typically «casually disposed». Generally speaking, the scholar observed that «trees, bushes, and plant do not always appear when and where we expect them, but serve to illustrate

as most clearly conveyed by the Minneapolis mirror with Usil arising from the sea (**pl. 156.a**)[26]. Significantly enough, the Cabinet des Médailles example presents a sort of duplicated frame, although neither of these two fraiming elements is technically structured in the form of an actual frame. In fact, there are two tall undulating vines growing between the figures and the dolphins.

On a more general note, analyzing a small group of Etruscan Hellenistic mirrors with figured border surrounding mythological scenes, Laura Ambrosini has suggested that «la cornice […] va probabilmente intesa come rappresentazione di uno 'spazio' altro, una sorta di sintetica cosmologia o immagine compendiaria dell'universo»[27]. Building on B. van der Meer's remarks on the «cosmic program» of the fifth-century bronze chandelier from Cortona[28], Ambrosini has argued that «la cornice costituisce quasi il limite del mondo e segna una demarcazione spazio-temporale»[29].

Representing the cosmos with concentric bands indicates a different visual rendering system than the stratigraphic tripartition presented above. The question remains as to whether these are two distinct renderings of the same concept (perhaps due to various technical influences) or whether the descriptive distinction derives from an evolution in the understanding of the universe itself[30].

It is worth noting that, in both instances, the orderly structuring of the spheres is articulated through the use of landscape elements. In the first

'nature' on the one hand, and are used as a filling of space on the other. When the plants are more or less realistic representations of actual vegetation […] the plants should probably be seen as the work of an artist who was interested in these particular details». From that follows that «floral representations on Etruscan mirror may serve as evidence of artistic traditions which reflect deep-roted beliefs about life and nature».

[26] Minneapolis, Minneapolis Institute of Arts, inv. 57.14; dating to third century B.C. See above p. 281.

[27] AMBROSINI 2018, p. 101. By the definition of 'figured border' the author referred to mirrors showing a «cornice *completamente* decorate da figure umane o animali» (p. 102).

[28] VAN DER MEER 2014, esp. p. 297.

[29] AMBROSINI 2018, p. 105.

[30] Compared with what observed in AMBROSINI 2018, pp. 106-109.

group, landscape intervenes is primarily on a symbolic level, through signs that allow the artist to assign each of the three sections to one of the three distinct metaphysical spheres. In the second group, landscape acquires liminal importance and its main function becomes that of meeting framing requirements. As such, these examples might also be described as landscape performing a mediating role.

In addition to providing useful insights into the arrangement of the 'Etruscans universe', the images we have analyzed in previous sections also offer clues for evaluating the formulas involved in sorting space.
As I have shown, the articulation of pictorial space through landscape features not only meet the representational need to structure distinct topographical areas suggestive of different metaphysical zones. In many instances, landscape elements are included in images to play a specific paratextual function, that is, to inform the viewer of the proper direction in which the image is to be read[31].
The most intriguing and significant example of this use of landscape is the Pontic plate by the Tityos Painter at Villa Giulia (**pl. 138.b**)[32], and indeed my earlier discussion of the piece emphasizing how the trees play a pivotal role in guiding the viewer's eye.
A similar function can be found in other media, as well as in different chronological and cultural contexts. For instance, the same thing occurs in some Praenestine cistae in which a tree indicates the place to start reading the scene (see e.g. **pl. 167.d**)[33]. The small tree on the entrance wall of the *Tomba dei Pigmei*[34], that opens onto the procession of men on horseback extending onto the side wall might similarly be associated with this group.

[31] Observations on the direction Etruscan images are to be read, although developed from a different perspective than the one adopted here, are provided by PENNY SMALL 1987.
[32] Rome, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Villa Giulia, inv. 84444. See my discussion above p. 243.
[33] Cambridge, The Fitzwilliam Museum, inv. GR.3.1965.
[34] Tarquinia, Monterozzi necropolis; dating to 425-400 B.C. STEINGRÄBER 1985, pp. 338-339; HARARI 2005; MARZULLO 2016, pp. 285-288.

In general, these images illustrate the liminal value of trees. This value, which I highlighted earlier when dealing with 'encounter scenes', is also evident in painted tombs featuring trees on either side of a door (for instance, the *Tomba dei Tori*, *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*, and *Tomba Cardarelli*) in keeping with a motif that also appears in later relief urns.

Analyzing the position of landscape features within the images shows that, rather than contributing to the convincing rendering of spatiality, landscape elements serve the quest for a compositional syntax that lends coherent organization to pictorial space. On the one hand, this raises the question of the extent to which such coherence can account for the way the universe and reality are spatially structured. Some of the examples presented here suggest we should not overlook possible cases in which the organization of the fictional space reflects the ways in which real space is structured. On the other hand, it is important to note that, although the Etruscan concern for the organization of pictorial space did not result in proper landscape pictures, it did entail artists' increasing involvement in the problem of spatiality and its rendering. This concern might have constituted the prelude to the most advanced reflections on the pictorial rendering of the environment.

II) The potential insights to be gained by analyzing the **position of landscape in relation to objects** have been partly illustrated in the discussion of tomb painting and mirrors. For instance, the study of the trees' placement on the sides of the door can also be carried out considering tomb walls as an 'object' (i.e. as the support for the image). The 'horizontal' reading that Roncalli proposes for the *Tomba dei Giocolieri* and *Tomba del Barone*[35] is based on the assumption that they use an overall compositional syntax. This structure is based not only on the relationship between individual scenes; it also takes advantage of

[35] See above pp. 131-134; 299-300.

the objective nature of the wall as a material space in which pictorial elements are rationally arranged.

Similarly, the frames of engraved bronze medallions should be analyzed by emphasizing their relationship with the tondo image, but also in terms of their 'dislocation' along the edge of the medallion. The same applies to upper and lower exergues. In the analysis presented here, I have shown that, in many mirrors, a significant relationship between frame and image is established on multiple levels. In a recent essay, Maria Luisa Catoni reviewed a few examples of Greek vase paintings (four red-figure cups) featuring direct interaction between the represented subject and borders[36]. In her analysis, Catoni shows that there are two different «patterns of interaction between the tondo's border and the represented scene»[37] in late-sixth- / early-fifth-century vases. In these instances, the frame functions as an element belonging to the object or, alternatively, as a visual device entering and impacting the pictorial field. As the scholar notes, examples in which the unsurpassable frame barrier is violated – regardless of its function – are significant in that they reveal the frame to be a «pivotal narrative element of the visual representation»[38].

Considering this corpus of Etruscan images, I similarly reckon that instances in which (a.) the frame invades the space of the figures (i.e. the 'pictorial' field), and (b.) the frame imposes itself on the image as a device related mainly to the space of the support (and, in doing this, more intrusively encroaches on the space of the viewer; e.g. *anodos*-like scenes, **pls. 115.b; 160.c-d; 181.a**)[39] are revealing and provide visual

[36] CATONI 2021. On the treatment of frame in ancient Greek painting, see MARCONI 2017a. See my discussion above pp. 57-58 for a brief historiographical overview of the subject, with list of published references.
[37] CATONI 2021, §3.
[38] CATONI 2021, §3.
[39] **Pl. 115.b**: Civita Castellana, Museo archeologico dell'Agro Falisco, inv. 8236 (see above pp. 227-228). **Pl. 160.c**: Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, inv. 24872 (see above p. 284). **Pl. 160.d**: Saint Pietersburg, The State Hermitage Museum, inv. B 314 (see above p. 179). **Pl. 181.b**: Basel, Antikenmuseum und Sammlung Ludwig, inv. BS 539. Dating to 425-400 a.C. JUCKER 2001, pp. 37-38, no. 16.

evidence of the 'active' nature of borders in Etruscan art. Both instances show what we might describe – to build on Clemente Marconi's statement[40] – as the contribution of the border to the image's meaning. Nonetheless, there is also another element worth emphasizing and that remains constant in both groups, namely the *barrier*-like nature of the frame. Indeed, we see a potential for a relationship between 'inside' and 'outside' where and when there is a boundary line. As shown above, such a relationship is conveyed in terms of (a.) invasion or (b.) imposition.

On closer inspection, we might note that the two patterns in which the presence of the frame is expressed account for a mutual relationship network between figures and frame.

The frame's *invasion* of the figurative field matches the figures' invasion of the space of the frame. This is evident not only in these instances in which the figures make use of the frame (such as satyrs using the vine to pick grapes), but also when the frame serves as a support for figurative elements (as in the case with hanging objects).

The frame's *imposition* on the scene is expressed in the cut produced by the frame, i.e. the materialization of the aforementioned distinction between 'inside' and 'outside'. At the same time, however, the border is a tool that the image actively uses to show or hide something. Moreover, while the frame imposes itself on the image, to define it as an autonomous and closed entity, the depiction of figures crossing the frame evokes an external space and referencing this external space within the image delimits the pictorial space as a self-contained area.

In the former scenario, the relationship between the scene and the frame results in the *deconstruction* of the frame with the result that the actual establishment of a boundary between 'inside' and 'outside' is ultimately compromised. Conversely, in the latter situation, makes sense to refer to a *violation* understood as a device for creating illusionistic cuts.

[40] See MARCONI 2017a, p. 117 (the entire passage is quoted above, p. 58, fn. 211).

Focusing on the function of landscape features, it can be noted that both patterns use such features as visual tools to compose the image. On a general level, it can be argued that, when shaped in the form of an interactive frame capable of both impacting the composition of the inner image and staging the image in the viewer's space, landscape provides evidence for theoretical reflection on does and does not belong to the image[41]. In the introduction to this section, I affirmed that images take meanings which pre-exist in reality and encapsulate them through a translation process. Given the original question of the relationship between reality and representation, reflecting on the frame raises the need to further define the question in a direction previously left undeveloped. Is an image suitably described merely in terms of pre-existing physical objects? Or is it defined by the visual material that falls within its frame? If we accept the latter scenario, then we assume that the relationship between figurative elements and medium can reveal a meaning, a meaning that is produced when the viewer approaches the object through some 'discursive' mode.

Alongside mirrors, the monumental typology in which it has proven most fruitful to analyze the relationship between object tectonics and decoration is vases. This is not surprising when considering the «alto apprezzamento estetico per la tettonica dei vasi»[42] in antiquity. In reference to our corpus of images, it is clear that red-figure vase painting testifies to a highly thoughtful arrangement of landscape elements in the object.
For instance, satyrs and other figures sitting on rocks often appear under the handles of Faliscan vases. A krater from the Fienga collection (**pl. 181.b**)[43], attributed with some hesitation to a late Faliscan

[41] The subject matter is developed with reference to archaic Greek sculpture by DIETRICH 2017b.
[42] MARCONI 2017b.
[43] Salerno, Fienga Collection; from Falerii, Valsiarosa necropolis, tomb 7; dating to the late fourth century B.C. PESCE 1939; GILOTTA 2000b, pp. 160-161, fig. 15; DE LUCIA BROLLI, MICHETTI 2005, pp. 150-151, fig. 9; GILOTTA 2012, p. 124.

workshop and known today only through a drawing, seems particularly attractive in this respect. The coronation of Herakles and contest between Marsyas and Aplu, respectively, decorate the two sides of the vase. According to the traditional scheme, the player sits on a rock[44]. Rather than constituting simply a support for the musician, the stone depicted, significantly, right at the handle acts as a pivot between the two sides that show different content but are linked by a semantic relationship. This formula, already documented *in nuce* in some Archaic vases (see e.g. the Louvre white-on-red pyx reviewed in previous sections; **pl. 15**)[45], demonstrates particular expertise in mounting scenes expressing a riveting «polarità narrativa»[46].

As a general note, the hypothesis that scenes might have an internal orientation in relation to the object is based on associating images according to the syntax generated by their positioning[47]. My proposal to examine the arrangement of individual figurative elements within the image is intended to further develop this approach, an approach that has already given rise to valuable results[48].

III) A further development of this approach involves analyzing the location of the image containing landscape elements.
One particular group that deserves attention for the purposes of my argumentation here is the use of landscape features in roof decoration. Up to this point, I have made sparing use of the notion of symbol. However, an analysis of 'rooftop landscapes' suggests that it would

[44] On the dispute between Marsyas and Aplu and related *schemata*, see my discussion above pp. 102-105.
[45] Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. MNB 1780 (D 150), attributed to the *Pittore della Sirena-Assurattasche* (MARTELLI 1987a, pp. 95, 267-268, no. 44; MARTELLI 1987c, p. 7; MICOZZI 1994, p. 245, no. 13; PIZZIRANI 2005, p. 255; see RIZZO 2016, p. 328, fn. 26 for up-to-date references). See above p. 94.
[46] Regarding the notion of «polarità narrativa» see HARARI 1995, pp. 109-110.
[47] See in particular the methodology outlined in HARARI 2008.
[48] See in particular TORELLI 2007b on the François vase, and SCARRONE 2014 on Etruscan tall *kyathoi*.

make sense to refer to 'symbolic landscapes' when speaking of a specific architectural decoration group.

In her review of Silen antefixes between Etruria and Greece, Cornelia Isler-Kerényi maintaines that «decorazioni di tetti di edifici sacri fatti di satiri, ninfe, maschere acheloiche in combinazione con piante e fiori rimandano […] alle forze vitali e feconde della natura», as the «edificio che la comunità erige in onore delle proprie divinità viene assimilato a quanto vive e cresce nella natura»[49]. Moreover, Isler-Kerényi has noted that «per chi immagina il mondo come cosmo, cioè in termini mitici, il tetto del tempio diventa la zona di raccordo tra quelle forze [vitali] e il cielo che manda l'acqua benefica»[50], in keeping with a way of conceiving the temple that was particularly widespread in Italic and southern Italian.

Taking the scholar's observations as a reference, we can see that floral features do indeed characterize some Etruscan antefixes. On the one hand, heads framed by leaf decorations as documented in certain Etruscan antefixes resemble the Campanian craft production[51]. On the other hand, they are influenced by the heads inside lotus blooms that were a well-documented part in the fourth-century B.C. Apulian figurative tradition. From the end of the fourth century onwards, this motif spread further in pottery and mirrors in Etruria and Latium. Subsequently, from the third century B.C. it also affected plastic decorations[52]. Indeed, this subject adorned antefixes and other architectural elements such as the capitals of the *Tomba Camapanari* in Vulci and *Tomba Ildebranda* in Sovana, and various Hellenistic urns from Volterra and Perugia.

[49] ISLER-KERÉNYI 2009, p. 59.
[50] ISLER-KERÉNYI 2009, p. 59.
[51] Most likely, semicircular antefixes developed in Campania around the middle of the sixth century B.C. and decorated with a leaves pattern largely influenced the Etruscan production (see RESCIGNO 1998, pp. 54-85; WINTER 1978, p. 35). Subsequently, Veii had a prominent role in this process of diffusion through Sicily, Latium and Etruria of shell frames originated from Campanian examples (CARLUCCI 2007, pp. 41-43; PALLONETTI 2019).
[52] MAETZKE 1955, p. 259.

Marine-themed motifs are all the more significant when they appear in roof decorations. Generally speaking, the choice to depict water-based themes in physically elevated positions is not straightforward and deserves attention.

In addition to images of Acheloo[53] and sea monsters[54], the water-related imagery of Etruscan roof systems included various architectural elements featuring dolphins diving into the waves. For instance, we see this theme in some terracotta plaque revetments (**pl. 182.a-b**)[55] and a group of bases from the Portonaccio shrine[56].

In the case of Portonaccio in particular these images are consistent with the sanctuary's strong connection to water[57], and in general they should

[53] Roof decorations representing Acheloo would be widely employed in Etruria. For instance, antefixes are documented in Caere (CRISTOFANI 1991, tab. IX.a), Tarquinia (ANDRÉN 1940, pp. 67-68, I:5; WINTER 2006, p. 135), Gravisca (CATALDI 1993, p. 214, fig. 38), Populonia (see BRUNI 1985), Chiusi (ANDRÉN 1940, p. 251, I:1), Vulci (BURANELLI 1991, p. 201), Veii (see CARLUCCI 2007), Rome (Museo Archeologico, Auditorium Parco della Musica, inv. 473809) and Pyrgi (sacello β, acroterion in the form of a rampant Acheloos: MICHETTI *et alii* 2015, p. 236, fig. 12.4).

[54] The representation of sea monsters in Etruria was common on architecture decorations from the late archaic period and is documented in various centers throughout the following centuries. For instance, evidences come from Perugia (Viale Indipendenza; ANDRÉN 1940, p. 263, III:1), Cerveteri (terminal tile dating to third century B.C.: ANDRÉN 1940, pp. 53-54, IV:1, fig. 21), Bolsena (friezes with Erotes reading sea monsters dating to second century B.C.: Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, invv. 80486/b; 80487), Praeneste (frieze dating to second century B.C.: GATTI, DEMNA 2012, pp. 353-354, fig. 19), Alife (Caserta; eaves tile with painted sea horse at the base: FISHER-HANSEN 1992, pp.) and Talamone (frieze dating to 150-90 B.C.: VON VACANO 1982, pp. 71 ss., n. 26, fig. 81). Sea monsters also adorn simas and plaques from Orvieto. In particular, findings come from Campo della Fiera (ANDRÉN 1940, p. 192, I:4), Vigna Grande (ANDRÉN 1940, p. 187, no. 3; STOPPONI 2002, p. 261, fig. 11) and Via San Leonardo (ANDRÉN 1940, p. 162, I:8; STOPPONI 2002, p. 262, fig. 12).

[55] **Pl. 182.a**: pediment panel from Portonaccio. Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia (MICHETTI 2010, p. 102, fig. 19); **pl. 182.b**: Chiusi, Museo Nazionale Etrusco, fragmented panel from località Badiola, Chiusi. (PAOLUCCI 2011b, p. 357, fig. 23).

[56] *Base di falda* and *base di colmo* from Portonaccio, Veii. Rome, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia. MICHETTI 2010, pp. 101-102, figs. 15-18.

[57] COLONNA 1987, p. 441; FUSCO 2011, pp. 397-398.

certainly be interpreted in relation to their specific subject. Hybrid creatures, for instance, likely point to a more peculiar liminal significance for the image[58]. Darting dolphins, found in both vase painting and Tarquinian tomb frescoes (e.g. the *Tomba delle Leonesse*) evokes initiatory iconography deriving from a Dionysian background[59].

However, there are a few general remarks we might make. The placement of sea subjects on roof decoration echoes the heraldic composition of some Etruscan tombs. For instance, aquatic creatures flank the *columen* support in the *Tomba dei Tori*, *Tomba dei Tritoni*, and *Tomba del Mare*, the latter of which is known to us only via drawings. There are pieces of evidence hinting at the possibility that those figures in the grave's tympanum were arranged according to a strict logic of composition[60]. In fact, some 'landscape data' indicate that those figures were quite specific. As Pizzirani has noted, the sea scene in the tympanum of the *Tomba dei Tori* entrance wall clearly depicts water, «evocativa non dei pericoli del viaggio verso l'Aldilà, ma dell'ambiente idilliaco della meta»[61].

In keeping with this observation, several studies have also emphasized the benevolent nature of sea monsters in Etruscan imagery[62]. Most likely, the appearance of water-themed scenes in roofs points to 'positive' perceptions of the marine landscape as opposed to a more somber ones (those evoking the voyage towards the afterlife).
It is also quite probable that this distinction between different degrees of positive vs. negative associations in landscape also applies to floral landscapes. The mutual relationship and opposition between a 'benevolent' and 'hostile' landscape might be encapsulated in the two trees – one dried-out and the other green – occupying the back wall of

[58] See RONCALLI 1986, p. 617. On the meaning underlying Acheloos iconography, see CIUCCARELLI 2006; ISLER-KERÉNYI 2009.
[59] HARARI 1988b; CERCHIAI 1999a, pp. 68-71.
[60] The hypothesis follows the analysis of BONAUDO 2016 (see p. 376 for a few remarks on sea beasts), developed on the wave of Roncalli's methodology (RONCALLI 1990), deeply addressed in RONCALLI 2017.
[61] PIZZIRANI 2014, p. 76.
[62] See e.g. MARTELLI 2005, p. 403.

the first room of the *Tomba della Caccia e della Pesca*. This suggestion evokes the opposition between *arbor felix* and *arbor infelix*[63], but in the end it is still wholly open to debate.
At any rate, however, it seems clear that such a debate cannot be divorced from an analysis of the spatial placement of images.

5.2. Characterizing and Categorizing Space in Etruscan Art

The analysis conducted here has identifies the significance of what we currently refer to as landscape elements in the production-fruition systems and contexts of Etruscan visual culture.
Analyzing landscape features in Etruscan art, I have shown that these elements were working materials artists could use to express specific meanings and arrange in relation to other image elements. Given that images are a medium which conveys meaning, all the components of the image must be involved in order to figuratively shape the signifying phenomena in question.
We have seen that landscape elements in Etruscan art adhere to rules which are in turn applied in different figurative 'situations'. Although common conventions is not the same thing as automatic formulas, there is one general factor we can identify: depictions of landscape features did not reflect an effort on the part of artists to render or convey nature as found in reality.
In dealing with multiple 'landscapes' existing before the landscape, I pursued two different but interconnected paths. On the one hand, I outlined the different functions performed by landscape features while, on the other hand, I pointed out the existence of individual signifying structures which were only progressively organized into broader uniform configurations. In looking at the functional and semantic evolution of these structures, I posited that they progressively shifted from performing a role of 'narration' to one of 'description'.

[63] See ANDRÉ 1964.

We have seen that the arrangement of figurative landscape elements produces a *characterization* of the image and its components. For instance, I claimed that landscape features play a 'narrative' role in that they structure some actions by characterizing them as specific events with a particular meaning (e.g. marking salient moments of a ritual).
Subsequently, I noted that the arrangement of landscape features also accounts for the *categorization* of space. For instance, I analyzed landscapes that are suggestive of distinct zones within the image and within the space in which the image is set (e.g. the tomb). Landscape as a figurative tool often remains on an intermediate plane between image and reality.

This relationship with reality is expressed in terms of spatiality and temporality. Both space and time are visually encoded in the image. As we have seen, landscape details not only characterize an action and enable viewers to recognize the specific narrative moment bound to *that* action; they also perform a paratactic function in the arrangement of the image. It is this arrangement (spatial categorization and temporal organization) that accounts for the internal articulation of the image and its semantic content.
Finally, we can also pose a more general consideration that helps focus attention on the Etruscan specificities underlying the Etruscan treatment of landscape. In the specific case of Etruscan culture, it must be stressed that the representation of landscape likely provides evidence that Etruscans were concerned with the relationship between humans and the environment and among the individual elements of natural space. This idea is consistent with a basic principle: in the Etruscan mindset, space is always and necessarily delimited. Therefore, crossing a border always leads to apparent disorder and such disorder must be counteracted by a formulistic act.
The religious integralism of Etruscans permeated and was imposed on everything, including images. Indeed, Etruscan images bear witness to a religious 'sense of space' that gives rise to a veritable 'spatial doctrine' governing the meaning of individual elements and their placement, even within the image itself. Certainly, other pieces of Etruscan culture

prove that this society believed in the significance of the space-making process. The mention of the prophecy of Vegoia is enough to confirm this. In order to analyze the mechanisms regulating the construction of the image, it would be fruitful to insist on and further develop the importance of this notion.

This overview of the Etruscan landscape(s) has required us to come to grips with the fragments of an ensemble that has since been irremediably lost. Significantly, however, dealing with fragments has enabled us to verify the consubstantial semantic significance of these pieces. Landscape elements as they appear in Etruscan images are not simply traces of a whole landscape the completeness of which was variously implicit or denied. Instead, they are substantial plot threads, detectable entities that serve to reveal the Etruscan approach to life.

The analysis of the mechanisms governing the functioning of individual landscape elements shows that we have before us a set of fragments that are, to a lesser or greater degree, revealing projections of various human beliefs.

Bibliography

Accessions 1920
The Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art. Accessions, 7, 1920, pp 109-110.

ADAM 1980
R. ADAM, *Recherches sur les miroirs prénestins*, Paris 1980.

ADAM 1990
A.-M. ADAM, *Végétation et Paysage dans la peinture funéraire étrusque*, in «KTEMA», 15, 1990, pp. 143-150.

ADAM 1993
A-M. ADAM, *Les jeux, la chasse et la guerre: la Tombe Querciola I de Tarquinia*, in *Spectacles sportifs et scéniques dans le monde étrusco-italique*. Conference Proceedings (Roma 1991), Roma 1993, pp. 69-95.

ADAM 1996
A-M. ADAM, *Végétation et Paysage dans la peinture funéraire étrusque*, in G. SIEBART, ed. by, *Nature et Paysage dans la pensée et l'environnement des civilisations antiques*, Paris 1996, pp. 31-38.

ADAM 2013
A.-M. ADAM, "*Horror vacui*" *et détails inutiles (?) dans la peinture funéraire étrusque*, in *Le détail dans les cultures visuelles (Antiquité-XXIe siècle)*, (Strasbourg, 16-17 mars 2012), «Ktèma» 37, 2013, pp. 239-254.

ADAM, ROUVERET 1990
A-M. ADAM, A. ROUVERET, *Les cités étrusques et la guerre au Ve siècle avant notre ère*, in *Crise et transformation des sociétés archaïques de l'Italie antique au Ve siècle av. J.-C.* Actes de la table ronde organisée par l'Ecole

française de Rome et l'Unité de recherches étrusco-italiques associée au CNRS (Rome, 19-21 novembre 1987), Rome 1990, p. 327-356.

ADEMBRI 1972
B. ADEMBRI, *Schede*, in *Pittura etrusca a Orvieto, Le tombe di Settecamini e degli Hescanas a un secolo dalla scoperta. Documenti e materiali*, Roma 1982, pp. 75-103.

ADEMBRI 1981
B. ADEMBRI, *Due nuovi gruppi di vasi orvietani a figure rosse*, in «Prospettiva», 27, 1981, pp. 14-26.

ADEMBRI 1988
B. ADEMBRI, *Earlies Faliscan red-figured Workshops and their relationship with Attic and South Italian Vase Painting*, in J. CHRISTIANSEN, T. MELANDER, ed. by, *Ancient Greek and Related Pottery*. Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium (Copenhagen, 1987), Copenhagen 1988, pp. 7-16.

ADINOLFI *et alii* 2018
G. ADINOLFI, R. CARMAGNOLA, M. CATALDI, L. MARRAS, V. PALLESCHI, *Recovery of a lost Wall Painting at the Etruscan Tomb of the Blue Demons in Tarquinia (Viterbo, Italy) by Multispectral Reflectometry and UV Fluorescence Imaging*, in «Archaeometry», 2018, pp. 1-9.

ADINOLFI, CARMAGNOLA, CATALDI 2020
G. ADINOLFI, R. CARMAGNOLA, M. CATALDI, *"Istantanee" dal passato. Pittura etrusca a Tarquinia*, Pisa 2020.

AGAMBEN 2020
G. AGAMBEN, *Gaia e Ctonia*, in «Una voce. Rubrica di Giorgio Agamben (Quodilibet)», 28 dicembre 2020 (https://www.quodlibet.it/giorgio-agamben-gaia-e-ctonia).

ALBINI 2009
M. ALBINI, *Lo specchio di Bolsena e la figura di Caco*, in M. HARARI, S. PALTINERI, M. ROBINO, ed. by, *Icone del mondo antico. Un seminario di storia delle immagini*, Roma 2009, pp. 141-158.

ALESSIO 1949
G. ALESSIO, *Vestigia etrusco-mediterranee nella flora toscana*, in «Studi Etruschi», XX, 1949, pp. 109-149.

ALLEN forthcoming
R. ALLEN, [*Etruscan and Italic Engraved Gemstones*], in C.L. LYONS, *Etruscan and Italic Art in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, Los Angeles [forthcoming].

ALONZO 2011
G. ALONZO, *Dall'iconografia delle monete antiche all'ideologia della Nazione futura. Proiezioni della numismatica grecistica di D'Annunzio sulla nuova monetazione sabauda*, in N. HOLMES, ed. by, *Proceedings of the XIV^th^ International Numismatic Congress* (Glasgow 2009), II, Glasgow 2011, pp. 1985-1991.

ALROTH 1992
B. ALROTH, *Changing Modes in the Representation of Cult Images*, in R. HÄGG, ed. by, *The iconography of Greek cult in the Archaic and Classical periods*, Liége 1992, pp. 9-46.

ALTHUSSER 1970
L. ALTHUSSER, *Idéologie et appareils idéologiques d'Etat*, «La Pensée», 51, 1970.

AMANN 2001
P. AMANN, *Die Tomba del Barone. Uberlegungen zu einem neuen ikonologischen Verständnid*, in «Studi Etruschi», 64, 2001, pp. 71-93.

AMBROSINI 1996
L. AMBROSINI, Sethlans *con la ruota di Issione su uno specchio inciso da Corchiano*, in «Studi Etruschi», 61, 1996, pp. 181-203.

AMBROSINI 1998
L. AMBROSINI, *Il Pittore di Micali: nota iconografica sulla raffigurazione di due teste isolate*, in «Archeologia Classica», 50, 1998, pp. 343-361.

AMBROSINI 2002
L. Ambrosini, *I* Thymiateria *etruschi in bronzo di età tardo classica, alto medio ellenistica*, Roma 2002.

AMBROSINI 2006
L. AMBROSINI, *Le raffigurazioni di operatori di culto sugli specchi etruschi*, in M. ROCCHI, P. XELLA, J.A. ZAMORA, ed. by, *Gli operatori cultuali* (= *SEL* 23), Verona 2006, pp. 197-233.

AMBROSINI 2011a
L. Ambrosini, *Nuovi dati sul rinvenimento del noto specchio con mar(i)ś hercles da Lubriano – Cantolle*, in «Studi Etruschi», 74, 2011, pp. 137-145.

AMBROSINI 2011b
L. AMBROSINI, *Le gemme etrusche con iscrizioni*, Pisa-Roma 2011.

AMBROSINI 2012
L. AMBROSINI, *La corsa di quadrighe in Etruria. Riflessioni sulla ceramica etrusca a figure rosse prodotta a Vulci*, in «Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte», 35, pp. 29-50.

AMBROSINI 2015
L. AMBROSINI, *Nuovi dati sul tema dell'*adligatus *in Etruria e il cratere del Funnel Group dalla tomba 33 di Aléria*, in *La Corsica e Populonia*. Conference Proceedings (Bastia, Aléria, Piombino, Populonia, 2011), Roma 2015, pp. 177-197.

AMBROSINI 2018
L. AMBROSINI, *Gli specchi etruschi con cornice figurata. Riflessione sulla struttura e raffigurazione del 'cosmo' in Etruria*, in «Studi Etruschi», 80, 2018, pp. 101-113.

AMORY 1966
A. AMORY, *The gates of horn and ivory*, in «Yale Classical Studies», 20, 1966, pp. 3-57.

AMYX 1962
D.A. AMYX, *A 'Pontic' Oenochoe in Seattle*, in M. RENARD, ed. by, *Hommages à Albert Grenier*, Brussels-Berchem 1962, pp. 121-134.

ANANICH *et alii* 2008
E. ANANICH, P. GIULIERINI, P. BRUSCHETTI, ed. by, *Capolavori Etruschi dall'Ermitage*. Catalogo della mostra (Cortona, 6 settembre 2008-11 gennaio 2009), Milano 2008.

ANDERSON 1985
J.K. ANDERSON, *Hunting in the Ancient World*, Berkeley, Los Angeles-London 1985.

ANDRE 1964
J. ANDRE, *Arbor felix, arbor infelix*, in *Hommages a Jean Bayet*, Brussels 1964, pp. 35-46.

ANDREN 1940
A. ANDREN, *Architectural Terracottas from Etrusco-Italic Temples*, Lund-Leipzig 1940.

ANDREOLI, LORENZINI, ANCESCHI 1984
A. ANDREOLI, N. LORENZINI, L. ANCESCHI, ed. by, Gabriele D'Annunzio. *Versi d'amore e di gloria*, Milano 1984.

ANTONELLI 1997
L. ANTONELLI, *I Greci oltre Gibilterra. Rappresentazioni mitiche dell'estremo Occidente e navigazioni commerciali nello spazio atlantico fra VIII e IV secolo a.C.*, Roma 1997.

ARIAS 1969
P.E. ARIAS, *Una nuova 'fiasca da pellegrino'*, in «Studi Etruschi», 37, 1969, pp. 27-37.

ARIAS 1953
P.E. ARIAS, *Cratere con Amazzonomachia nel Museo di Ferrara*, in «Rivista dell'Istituto di Archeologia e Storia», 2, 1953, pp. 15-25.

ARIZZA 2020
M. ARIZZA, *Un porto di mare! Il* kantharos *di via d'Avack, il commercio di cavalli e la navigazione veiente*, in «Mediterranea. Quaderni annuali dell'Istituto di studi sulle civiltà italiche e del Mediterraneo antico del Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche», XVII, 2020, pp. 133-146.

ARIZZA *et alii* 2013
M. ARIZZA, A. DE CRISTOFARO, A. PIERGROSSI, D. ROSSI, *La tomba di un aristocratico* naukleros *dall'agro veientano. Il* kantharos *con scena di navigazione di via a. D'avack*, in «Archeologia Classica», 64, 2013, pp. 51-132.

ARRIGONI 2018
G. ARRIGONI, ed. by, *Dei e Piante nell'antica Grecia*, Bergamo 2018.

Atti 1929
Atti del primo Congresso internazionale etrusco (Firenze-Bologna, 27 aprile-5 maggio 1928), Firenze 1929.

BAGLIONE 1976
M.P. BAGLIONE, *Il territorio di Bomarzo*, Roma 1976

BAGLIONE 2002
M.P. BAGLIONE, *Nuove osservazioni sui contesti funerari di Praeneste*, in A. EMILIOZZI, A. MAGGIANI, ed. by, *Caelatores. Incisori di specchi e ciste tra Lazio ed Etruria*, Roma 2002, pp. 95-116.

BAGLIONE, GILOTTA 2007
M.P. BAGLIONE, F. GILOTTA, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Italia 6. Villa Giulia 1*, Roma 2007.

BAGNASCO GIANNI 2001a
G. BAGNASCO GIANNI, *Ceramica etrusco-geometrica*, in M. BONGHI JOVINO, ed. by, *Tarquinia. Scavi sistematici nell'abitato. Campagne 1982-1988. Vol. 2: I materiali*, Roma 2001.

BAGNASCO GIANNI 2001b
G. BAGNASCO GIANNI, *Le* sortes *etrusche*, in F. CARDANO, C. GROTTANELLI, ed. by, *Sorteggio Pubblico e Cleromanzia dall'Antichità all'Età Moderna*, Milano 2001, pp. 197-220.

BAGNASCO GIANNI 2007
G. BAGNASCO GIANNI, Aristonothos. *Il vaso*, in Aristonothos. *Scritti per il Mediterraneo antico*, 1, 2007, pp. V-XV.

BAGNASCO GIANNI 2009
G. BAGNASCO GIANNI, *The importance of Being Umaele*, in J. SWADDLING, P. PERKINS, ed. by, *Etruscan by Definition: Papers in Honour of Sybille Haynes*, London 2009, pp. 48-56.

BALDASSERONI 1929
V. BALDASSERONI, *Gli animali nella pittura etrusca*, in «Studi Etruschi», 3, 1929, pp. 383-385.

BALTY 1985
J.C. BALTY, *L'espace dans la peinture funéraire étrusque*, in «Bulletin de la classe des Beaux-arts», 67, 1985, pp. 142-168.

BANTI 1956
L. BANTI, *Problemi della pittura arcaica etrusca. La tomba dei Tori a Tarquinia*, in «Studi Etruschi», 24, 1956, pp. 143-180.

BANTI 1966
L. BANTI, *Eracle e Pholos in Etruria*, in «Studi Etruschi», 34, 1966, pp. 371-379.

BARBANERA 2001
M. BARBANERA, *Principali metodi di ricerca nell'archeologia classica come storia dell'arte antica dall'inizio dell'800 ad oggi*, in *Archeologia teorica. X Ciclo di Lezioni sulla ricerca applicata in Archeologia* (Certosa di Pontignano, 1999), Firenze 2001, pp. 149-164.

BARBANERA 2003
M. BARBANERA, *Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli. Biografia ed epistolario di un grande archeologo*, Milano 2003.

BARBANERA 2004
M. BARBANERA, ed. by, *Storie dell'arte antica. Atti del convegno "Storia dell'arte antica nell'ultima generazione: tendenze e prospettive" (Roma, 19-20 febbraio 2001),* Roma 2004.

BARBANERA 2009
M. BARBANERA, *Contributo a una genealogia degli archeologi italiani tra Ottocento e novecento: il caso di Pavia*, in G. MAZZOLI, ed. by, *Anniversari dell'antichistica pavese. L'antichistica pavese nel XX secolo*, Pavia 2009, pp. 41-59.

BARBANERA 2011
M. BARBANERA, *Lo sguardo di Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli verso la cultura francese*, in «Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Antiquité», 123, 2, pp. 417-422.

BARBANERA 2015
M. BARBANERA, *Storia dell'archeologia classica in Italia*, Roma-Bari 2015.

BARBIERI 1999
G. BARBIERI, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Italia 5. Viterbo, Museo archeologico nazionale*, Roma 1999.

BARNETT 1957
R.D. BARNETT, *A catalogue of the Nimrud ivories with other examples of Ancient Near Eastern ivories in the British Museum*, London 1957.

BATTEZZATO 2010
L. BATTEZZATO, *Le convenzioni della Giustizia*, Introduzione a EURIPIDE, *Ecuba*, ed. L. Battezzato, Milano 2005, pp. 5-10.

BAYET 1926
J. BAYET, *Herclé. Etude Critique des principaux monuments relatifs à l'Hercule Étrusque*, Paris 1926.

BEAZLEY 1929
J.D. BEAZLEY, *Notes on the Vases in Castle Ashby*, in «Papers of the British School at Rome», 11, pp. 1-29.

BEAZLEY 1947
J.D. BEAZLEY, *Etruscan Vase-painting*, Oxford 1947.

BECKEL 1981
G. BECKEL, s.v. Amykos, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, I, Zürich-München 1981, pp. 738-742.

BELLELLI 2010
V. BELLELLI, *L'impatto del mito greco nell'Etruria orientalizzante: la documentazione ceramica*, in «Bollettino di Archeologia Online», I, 2010, Special Issue: *Meetings Between Cultures in the Ancient Mediterranean*, pp. 27-40.

BELLELLI 2011
V. BELLELLI, *Al di qua e al di là della stele: una nuova lettura dell'anfora eponima del gruppo campano della Festa Campestre*, in «Mediterranea. Quaderni annuali dell'Istituto di Studi sulle Civiltà Italiche e del Mediterraneo antico del Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche», VIII, 2011, pp. 11-31.

BELLELLI 2019
V. BELLELLI, *Anfora*, in L. BENTINI, M. MARCHESI, L. MINARINI, G. SASSATELLI, ed. by, *Etruschi. Viaggio nelle terre dei Rasna*. Exhibition catalogue (Bologna 2019-2020), Milano 2019, p. 94.

BELTRAMETTI 2008
A. BELTRAMETTI, *Ifigenia e le altre: archetipi greci del sacrificio ... eroica e crimine politico nella cultura ateniese del V secolo*, in «Storia delle donne», 4, 2008, pp. 47-69.

BENASSAI 2005
R. BENASSAI, *Oltre le colonne. Riflessioni sulla dimensione ultraterrena e il passaggio all'aldilà nella pittura funeraria campana*, in F. GILOTTA, ed. by, *Pittura parietali, pittura vascolari. Ricerche in corso tra Etruria e Campania*. Atti della giornata di studio (Santa Maria Capua Vetere, 28 maggio 2003), Napoli, 2005, pp. 143-150.

BENEDETTINI, MORETTI SGUBINI 2019
M.G. BENEDETTINI, A.M. MORETTI SGUBINI, *Il regime delle offerte del santuario*, in M.G. BENEDETTINI, A.M. MORETTI SGUBINI, ed. by, *Un*

grande santuario interetnico: Lucus Feroniae. *Scavi 2000-2010*, Pisa 2019, pp. 177-195.

BENTZ 2008
M. BENTZ, ed. by, *Rasna. Die Etrusker: Eine Ausstellung im Akademischen Kunstmuseum Antikensammlung der Univeersität Bonn*, Petersberg 2008.

BERARD 1983
C. BERARD, *Iconographie, Iconologie, Iconologique*, in «Etudes des lettres», 4, 1983, pp. 5-37.

BERARD, BRON 1984
C. BERARD, C. BRON, *Le jeu du satyre*, in C. BERARD, J.P. VERNANT, ed. by, *La cité des Images: Religion et societé en Gréce Antique*, Lausanne-Paris 1984, pp. 127-145.

BERQUE 1994
A. BERQUE, ed. by, *Cinq propositions pour une théorie du paysage*, Seyssel 1994.

BERQUE 1995
A. BERQUE, *Les raisons du paysage. De la Chine antique aux environnements de synthèse*, Paris 1995.

BERQUE 2008
A. BERQUE, *La pensée paysagère*, Paris 2008.

BERTINI CALOSSO 1938-1939
A. BERTINI CALOSSO, *La tutela delle bellezze naturali e del paesaggio*, in «Le Arti», II, 1938-1939, pp. 155-160.

BESCHI 1991
L. BESCHI, *La prospettiva mitica della musica greca*, in «Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome. Antiquité», 103, 1, 1991, pp. 35-50.

BESSIÈRE 2007
J. BESSIÈRE, *Deux fois du paysage: de la "pathetic fallacy" à "Von der Landschaft" de Rilke*, in M. SCHMELING, M. SCHMITZ-EMANS, ed. by, *Das Paradigma Der Landschaft in Moderne und Postmoderne. (Post-)Modernist Terrains: Landscapes – Settings – Spaces*, Würzburg 2007, pp. 39-48.

BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1942
R. BIANCHI BANDINELLI, *Letture di Archeologia. "Naturwiedergabe"*, in «La Critica d'Arte», VII, 1942, pp. 54-56.

BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1950
R. BIANCHI BANDINELLI, *Storicità dell'arte classica*, Firenze 1950.

BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1953
R. BIANCHI BANDINELLI, *Continuità ellenistica nella pittura di età medio- e tardo-romana*, in «Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte», 2, 1953, pp. 77-161.

BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1961
R. BIANCHI BANDINELLI, s.v. *Iconografia*, in *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica*, 1961, pp. 84-85.

BIANCHI BANDINELLI 1963
R. BIANCHI BANDINELLI, *Paesaggio*, in *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica*, 1963, pp. 816-828.

BIANCHI BANDINELLI, GIULIANO 1973
R. BIANCHI BANDINELLI, A. GIULIANO, *Etruschi e Italici prima del dominio di Roma*, Milano 1973.

BIELLA 2010
M.C. BIELLA, *Su di un vaso falisco di età orientalizzante con scena di navigazione*, in «Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung», 116, 2010, pp. 141-158.

BIELLA 2013
M.C. BIELLA, *La polifonia dell'artigianato ceramico, Alcune considerazioni sulla specificità culturale della regione falisca in età orientalizzante*, in G. CIFANI, ed. by, *Tra Roma e l'Etruria. Cultura, identità e territorio dei Falisci*, Roma 2013, pp. 99-125.

BIELLA 2014
M.C. BIELLA, *I Falisci e i Capenati: prospettiva archeologica*, in M. ABERSON, M.C. BIELLA, M. DI FAZIO, M. WULLSCHLEGER, ed. by, *Entre archéologie et histoire: dialogues sur divers peuples de l'Italie préromaine. E pluribus unum?* Conference Proceedings (Genève, 2013), Bern 2014, pp. 65-81.

BINACO 2017
P. BINACO, *Gli Etruschi fra l'Alfina ed il Paglia. Un contributo per la storia del territorio di Castel Viscardo*, in «Quaderni Monaldeschi», 5, 2017, pp. 11-19.

BLOCH 1931
M. BLOCH, *Les caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française*, Paris 1931.

BOARDMAN 1989
J. BOARDMAN, *Atalanta*, in «Art Institute of Chicago Museum Studies», 10, 1983, pp. 2-19.

BOCCI 1960
P. BOCCI, s.v. *Foglie d'Edera, Gruppo delle*, in *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica*, 1960, pp. 717-718.

BOCCI 1976
P. BOCCI, *Recensione a* M. Del Chiaro, *The Etruscan Funnel Group*, in «Prospettiva», 4, 1976, pp. 36-37.

BONACELLI 1928
A. BONACELLI, *La natura e gli Etruschi*, in «Studi Etruschi», 2, 1928, pp. 427-570.

BONAMICI 1974
M. BONAMICI, *I buccheri con figurazioni graffite*, Firenze 1974.

BONAMICI 1992
M. BONAMICI, *Mousa, Mousai (in Etruria)*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, VI, Zürich-München 1992, pp. 681-685.

BONAMICI 1993
M. BONAMICI 1993, *Le Muse in Etruria*, in «Prospettiva», 70, 1993, pp. 2-21.

BONAMICI 1998
M. BONAMICI, *Lo* stamnos *di Vienna 448. Una proposta di lettura*, in «Prospettiva», 89-90, 1998, pp. 2-15.

BONAMICI 2002a
M. BONAMICI, *Diaspora prenestina*, in A. EMILIOZZI, A. MAGGIANI, ed. by, *Caelatores. Incisori di specchi e ciste tra Lazio ed Etruria*, Roma 2002, pp. 83-94.

BONAMICI 2002b
M. BONAMICI, *Contributo agli specchi perugini*, in G.M. DELLA FINA, ed. by, *Perugia Etrusca. Atti del IX Convegno Internazionale di Studi sulla Storia e l'Archeologia dell'Etruria*, Roma 2002, pp. 475-474.

BONAMICI 2005a
M. BONAMICI, *Dalla vita alla morte tra Vanth e Turms Aitas*, in B. ADEMBRI, ed. by, ΑΕΙΜΝΗΣΤΟΣ. *Miscellanea di Studi per Mauro Cristofani*, Firenze 2005, pp. 522-538.

BONAMICI 2005b
M. BONAMICI, *Scene di viaggio all'aldilà nella ceramografia chiusina*, in F. GILOTTA, ed. by, *Pittura parietale, pittura vascolare. Ricerche in corso tra Etruria e Campania.* Conference Proceedings (Santa Maria Capua Vetere, 28 Maggio 2003), Napoli 2005, pp. 33-44.

BONAMICI 2014
M. BONAMICI, *Il 'viaggio' verso l'Aldilà*, in G. SASSATELLI, A. RUSSO TAGLIENTE, ed. by, *Il viaggio oltre la vita. Gli Etruschi e l'Aldilà tra capolavori e realtà virtuale*, Bologna 2014, pp. 45-51.

BONAUDO 2006
R. BONAUDO, *I gesti degli animali. Schemi iconografici e dispositivi di permutazione su alcune immagini etrusche*, in I. COLPO, I. FAVARETTO, F. GHEDINI, ed. by, *Iconografia 2005. Immagini e immaginari dall'antichità classica al mondo moderno*. Conference Proceedings (Venezia 26-28 gennaio 2005), Roma 2006, pp. 385-390.

BONAUDO 2007
R. BONAUDO, *Dalla ceramica a figure nere alla Tomba del Triclinio: un immaginario visuale delle rappresentazioni degli uccelli su alcuni monumenti figurati etruschi*, in «Annali di archeologia e storia antica», 13-14, 2006-2007, pp. 157-172.

BONAUDO 2016
R. BONAUDO, *Selezione e composizione del bestiario nei timpani delle tombe dipinte tarquiniesi*, in M.C. BIELLA, E. GIOVANELLI, ed. by, *Nuovi studi sul bestiario fantastico di età orientalizzante nella penisola italiana*, Trento 2016, pp. 371-383.

BONELLI 2001
R. BONELLI, *Il Convegno dei Soprintendenti, le due leggi del 1939 e i rapporti con la teoria del restauro*, in V. CAZZATO, ed. by, *Istituzioni e politiche culturali in Italia negli anni Trenta*, Roma 2001, pp. 323-328.

BONFANTE 1964
L. BONFANTE, *A Latin Triumph on a Praenestine Cista*, in «American Journal of Archaeology», 68, 1, 1964, pp. 35-42.

BONFANTE 1980
L. BONFANTE, *An Etruscan Mirror with 'Spiky Garland' in the Getty Museum*, in «The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal», 8, pp. 147-54.

BONFANTE 1986
L. BONFANTE, *Etruscan Life and Afterlife. A Handbook of Etruscan Studies*, Liverpool 1986.

BONFANTE 1997
L. BONFANTE, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. U.S.A. 3. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art*. Roma 1997.

BONFANTE 2000
L. BONFANTE, *Alcuni specchi etruschi nel Metropolitan Museum of Art*, in M.D. GENTILI, ed. by, *Aspetti e problemi della produzione degli specchi etruschi figurati*. Conference Proceedings (Roma 1997), Roma 2000, pp. 13-26.

BONFANTE 2009
L. BONFANTE, *Manici di specchi dionisiaci*, in S. BRUNI, ed. by, *Etruria e Italia Preromana. Studi in Onore di Giovannangelo Camporeale*, Pisa-Roma 2009, pp. 151-155.

BONFANTE 2014
L. BONFANTE, *Conversando con Francesca del tabu del sacrificio umano*, in «Mediterranea. Quaderni annuali dell'Istituto di Studi sulle Civiltà Italiche e del Mediterraneo antico del Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche», XI, 2004, pp. 153-162.

BONNECHERE 2000
P. BONNECHERE, *Mythes grecs de sacrifice humain en Étrurie. Problèmes iconographiques et socio-historiques*, in «Kernos», 13, 2000, pp. 253-264.

BONNECHERE, GAGNE 2013
P. BONNECHERE, R. GAGNE, ed. by, *Sacrifices humains. Perspectives croisees et representations. Human Sacrifice. Cross-cultural perspectives and representations*, Liege 2013.

BOOSEN 1986
M. BOOSEN, *Etruskische Mceresmischwesen Untersuchungen Zu Typologie und hedeutung*, Roma 1986.

BORBEIN 1976
A.H. BORBEIN, *Zur Bedeutung symmetrischer Kompositionen in der hellenistisch-italischen und Spätrepublikanisch-römischen Reliefplastik*, in *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien*, Gottinga 1976, pp. 502-538.

BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA 1979
G . BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA, *Le ciste prenestine I . 1*, Roma 1979.

BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA, EMILIOZZI 1990
G . BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA, A. EMILIOZZI, *Le ciste prenestine I . 2*, Roma 1990.

BORGHINI 1989
A. BORGHINI, *Tradizioni antiche sul lupo mannaro: a proposito delle vesti appese alla quercia*, in «Lares», 55, 1, 1989, pp. 101-108.

BOTHMER 1985
D. VON BOTHMER, *The Amasis Painter and his World*, Malibu 1985.

BOTTO 2004
M. BOTTO, *Artigiani al seguito di mercanti: considerazioni su un aspetto del commercio fenicio nel Mediterraneo*, in S. BRUNI, M. MASSA, T, CARUSO, ed. by, *Archeologica Pisana. Scritti per Orlanda Pancrazzi*, Pisa 2004, pp. 31-38.

BOUCHER 1970
S. BOUCHER, *Bronzes grecs, hellénistiques et étrusques (sardes, ibériques et celtiques) des musée de Lyon*, Lyon 1970.

BRANDA 2012
S. BRANDA, *Il sarcofago di Torre S. Severo. Un caso di conflitto istituzionale tra Umbria e Toscana*, in «Bollettino di Archeologia online», III, 2012, pp. 17-23.

BRANDI 1954
C. BRANDI, *Viaggio nella Grecia antica*, Firenze 1954.

BRANDI 1958
C. BRANDI, *Città del deserto*, Milano 1958.

BRANDI 1960
C. BRANDI, *Pellegrino di Puglia*, Bari 1960.

BRANDI 1963
C. BRANDI, *Verde Nilo*, Bari 1960.

BRANDT 2015
J.R. BRANDT, *Passage to the Underworld. Continuity or Change in Etruscan Funerary Ideology and Practices (6th-2nd Century BC)?*, in J.R. BRANDT, M. PRUSAC, H. ROLAND, ed. by, *Death and Chancing Rituals. Function and meaning in ancient funerary practices*, Oxford 2015, pp. 105-184.

BRELICH 1966
A. BRELICH, *Presupposti del sacrificio umano*, Roma 1966.

BRELICH 1970
A. BRELICH, *La corona di Prometheus*, in «Collection Latomus», 114 (*Hommages à Marie Delcourt*), 1970, pp. 234-242.

BREMMER 2007a
J. BREMMER, ed. by, *The strange world of human sacrifice*, Leuven 2007.

BREMMER 2007b
J. BREMMER, *Greek Normative Sacrifice*, in D. OGDEN, *A Companion to Greek Religion*, Malden 2007, pp. 132-144.

BRENDEL 1978
O. BRENDEL, *Etruscan Art*, Harmondsworth 1978.

BREYER 1993
G. BREYER, *Etruskische Sprachgut im Lateinischen Unter Ausschluss Des Spezifisch Onomastischen Bereiches*, Leuven 1993.

BRIQUEL 1987a
D. BRIQUEL, *I riti di fondazione*, in M. BONGHI JOVINO, C. CHIARAMONTE TRERÈ, ed. by, *Tarquinia, ricerche, scavi e prospettive*. Conference Proceedings (Milano, 24-25 giugno 1986), Milano 1987, pp. 171-190.

BRIQUEL 1987b
D. BRIQUEL, *Regards étrusques sur l'au-delà*, in F. HINARD, ed. by, *La mort, les morts et l'au-delà dans le monde romain*. Conference Proceedings (Caen, 20-22 novembre 1985), Caen 1987, pp. 263-277.

BRIQUEL 1990
D. BRIQUEL, *Divination étrusque et mantique grecque*, in «Latomus», 49, 1990, pp. 321-342.

BRIQUEL 1993
D. BRIQUEL, no. 58 [*Uno specchio etrusco inedito con scena del ritorno della caccia al cinghiale di Calidone con didascalie*], in «REE», LXIX, 2003, pp. 351-355.

BRIQUEL 1997
D. BRIQUEL, *La religiosité etrusque ou le regard de l'autre*, in F. GAULTIER, D. BRIQUEL, ed. by, *Les Etrusques, les plus religieux des hommes*. Conference Proceedings (Paris, 1992), Paris 1997, pp. 415-429.

BRIQUEL 2008
D. BRIQUEL, *L'espace consacré chez les. Etrusques: réflexions sur le rituel étrusco-romain de fondation des cités*, in X. Duprè Raventós, S. Ribichini, S. Verger, ed. by, Saturnia tellus. *Definizioni dello spazio consacrato in ambiente etrusco, italico, fenicio-punico, iberico e celtico*. Conference Proceedings (Roma, 10-12 novembre 2004), Roma 2008, pp. 27-47.

BRILLANTE 2012
C. BRILLANTE, *La sepoltura di Aiace nella tragedia di Sofocle*, in G. BASTIANINI, W. LAPINI, M. TULLI, ed. by, Harmonia. *Scritti di filologia classica in onore di Angelo Casanova*, Firenze 2012, pp. 123-136.

BRONSON 1965
R.C. BRONSON, *Chariot racing in Etruria*, in *Studi in onore di Luisa Banti*, Roma 1965, pp. 89-106.

BROWN 1960
W.L. BROWN, *The Etruscan Lion*, Oxford 1960.

BRUN 1997
P. BRUN, *Compte-rendu* (*Nature et paysage dans la pensée et l'environnement des civilisations antiques. Actes du colloque de Strasbourg 11-12 juin 1992 édités par G. Siebert, 1996. Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg:*

Travaux du Centre de Recherches sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce Antiques 14), in «Revue des Études Anciennes», 99, 3-4, p. 567.

BRUNI 1985
S. BRUNI, *Antefisse inedite da Populonia*, in «Rassegna di Archeologia», 5, pp. 119-130.

BRUNI 1991
S. BRUNI, *Materiali tarquiniesi al Museo Archeologico di Firenze: i lastroni a scala*, in «Studi e Materiali. Scienze dell'Antichità in Toscana», 6, PP. 41-63.

BRUNI 2004
S. BRUNI, *Le processioni in Etruria*, in *ThesCRA*, 1, pp. 21–32.

BRUNI 2010
S. BRUNI, *Note micaliane: contributi per il catalogo del Pittore di Micali*, in «Mediterranea. Quaderni annuali dell'Istituto di studi sulle civiltà italiche e del Mediterraneo antico del Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche», VII, 2010, pp. 17-47.

BRUNI 2013
S. BRUNI, *Seafaring: shipbuilding, harbors, the issue of piracy*, in J.M. TURFA, ed. by, *The Etruscan World*, New York 2013, pp. 759-777.

BRUNN 1885
H. BRUNN, *Archäologie und Anschauung*. München 1885.

BUCCELLATO, GATTI 1978
A. BUCCELLATO, S. GATTI, *Gruppo dei Vasi 'Pontici': Alcune osservazioni sul problema dei rapporti con la coeva pittura tombale tarquiniese*, in «Archeologia Classica», 30, 1978, pp. 193-200.

BURANELLI, SANNIBALE 2006
F. BURANELLI, M. SANNIBALE, *Non più solo "Larthia". Undocumento epigrafico inedito dalla TombaRegolini-Galassi di Caere*, in B. ADEMBRI, ed. by, ΑΕΙΜΝΗΣΤΟΣ. *Miscellanea di Studi per Mauro Cristofani*, Firenze 2005, pp. 220-231.

BURCKHARDT 1860
J. BURCKHARDT, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien*, Basel 1860.

BURCKHARDT 1958
J. BURCKHARDT, *La civiltà del Rinascimento in Italia*, Firenze 1958.

BURKE 1981
M.R. BURKE, *Bowdoin College Museum of Art. The Handbook of the Collection*, Bowdoin 1981.

BURKERT 1983
W. BURKERT, Homo Necans: *The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1983.

BURKERT 1992
W. BURKERT, *Eracle e gli altri eroi culturali del Vicino Oriente*, in C. BONNET, C. JOURDAIN-ANNEQUIN, ed. by, *Heraklès – D'une rive à l'autre de la Méditerranée – Bilan et Perspectives*. Conference Proceedings (Roma, 15-16 septembre 1989), Bruxelles-Roma 1992, pp. 111-127.

BÜSING-KOLBE 1978
A. BÜSING-KOLBE, *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Mainz, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum* 2, Munich 1978.

CACCIOLI 2009
D.A. CACCIOLI, *The Villanovan, Etruscan and Hellenistic Collections in the Detroit Institute of Arts*, Leuven-Boston 2009.

CAFFARELLO 1975
N. CAFFARELLO, *Avviamento allo studio della lingua etrusca*, Verona 1975.

CIAGHI 1986
S. CIAGHI, *Urne*, in M. BONGHI JOVINO, ed. by, *Gli Etruschi di Tarquinia*, Modena 1986, pp. 297-298.

CAGIANO DE AZEVEDO 1970
CAGIANO DE AZEVEDO, *L'autenticità del sarcofago da Orvieto di Torre San Severo*, in «Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung», 77, 1970, pp. 10-18.

CAMASSA 2005
G. CAMASSA, *Le armi dei Centauri*, in G. CAMASSA, *La Sibilla Giudaica di Alessandra*, Milano 2005.

CAMIZ, FERRAZZA 2006
S. CAMIZ , E. FERRAZZA, *Studio sull'iconografia di Aiace Telamonio con metodi di analisi esplorative dei dati*, in «Archeologia e Calcolatori», 17, 2006.

CAMMELLI 2003
M. CAMMELLI, *Il quadro*, in C. BARBATI, M. CAMMELLI, L. CASINI, G. PIPERATA, G. SCIULLO, *Diritto del patrimonio culturale*, Bologna 2003, pp. 11-25.

CAMPOREALE 1959
G. CAMPOREALE, *L'amazzonomachia in Etruria*, «Studi Etruschi», XXVII, 1959, pp. 107-137.

CAMPOREALE 1968
G. CAMPOREALE, *Pittori arcaici a Tarquinia*, in «Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung», 75, 1968, pp. 34-53.

CAMPOREALE 1981
G. CAMPOREALE, s.v. *Akrathe*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, I, Zürich-München 1981, pp. 447-449.

CAMPOREALE 1984
G. CAMPOREALE, *La caccia in Etruria*, Roma 1984.

CAMPOREALE 1987
G. CAMPOREALE, *La danza armata in Etruria*, in «Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome. Antiquité», 99, 1, 1987, pp. 11-42.

CAMPOREALE 1992
G. CAMPOREALE, s.v. *Odysseus/Uthuze*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, VI, Zürich-München 1992, pp. 976-983.

CAMPOREALE 1997
G. CAMPOREALE, s.v. *Thalna*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, VIII, Zürich-München 1997, pp. 900-902.

CAMPOREALE 2004
G. CAMPOREALE, *Purificazione in Etruria*, in *ThesCRA*, II, pp. 36-62.

CAMPOREALE 2007
G. CAMPOREALE, *Base parallelepipeda in pietra fetida*, in D. BARBAGLI, M. IOZZO, ed. by, *Etruschi. Chiusi, Siena, Palermo. La collezione Bonci Casuccini*, Siena 2007, p. 338

CAMPOREALE 2012
G. CAMPOREALE, *Sulla sacralità delle porte urbiche in Etruria*, in *Annali della Fondazione per il Museo 'Claudio Faina'*, XIX, 2012, pp. 327-340.

CANADELLI 2003
E. CANADELLI, *Forme artistiche della natura. Ernst Haeckel e Karl Blossfeldt*, in «Itinera. Rivista di Filosofia e di Teoria delle Arti e della Letteratura», aprile 2003.

CANCIANI 1974
F. CANCIANI, *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, Italia IV. Tarquinia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale III*, Roma 1974.

CANCIANI 1987
F. CANCIANI, *La ceramica geometrica*, in M. MARTELLI, ed. by, *La ceramica degli Etruschi. La pittura vascolare*, Novara 1987, pp. 9-15, 242-254.

CAPPELLETTI 1992
M. CAPPELLETTI, ed. by, *Museo Claudio Faina di Orvieto. Ceramica etrusca figurata*, Perugia 1992.

CARETTONI 1973
G. CARETTONI, *Nuova serie di grandi lastre fittili 'Campana'*, in «Bollettino d'Arte», 63, 2, pp. 75-87.

CARLUCCI 2007
C. CARLUCCI, *Gli apparati decorativi tardoarcaici del tempio di Portonaccio a* Veio, in «Studi Etruschi», LXXI, 2007, pp. 33-46.

CARPINO 1996
A.A. CARPINO, *Greek Mythology in Etruria: An Iconographic Analysis of Three Etruscan Relief Mirrors*, in J.F. HALL, ed. by, *Etruscan Italy. Etruscan Influences on the Civilizations of Italy from Antiquity to the Modern Era*, Provo (Utah) 1996, pp. 65-91.

CARPINO 2003
A.A. CARPINO, *Discs of Splendor. The Relief Mirrors of the Etruscans*, Madison 2003.

CASCIANELLI 2018
D. CASCIANELLI, *Orfeo citaredo incantatore di animali. Il mito, l'iconografia, i significati, la fortuna*, in F. BISCONTI, M. BRACONI, ed. by, *Le catacombe di San Callisto. Storia, contesti, scavi, restauri, scoperte. A proposito del cubicolo di Orfeo e del Museo della Torretta*, Todi 2015, pp. 144-155.

CASSESE 2001
S. CASSESE, *I beni culturali da Bottai a Spadolini*, in V. CAZZATO, ed. by, *Istituzioni e politiche culturali in Italia negli anni Trenta*, Roma 2001, pp. 391-394.

CASSIRER 1999
E. CASSIRER, *Rousseau, Kant, Goethe*, Roma 1999.

CASTOLDI 1995
M. CASTOLDI, *Recipienti in bronzo greci, magnogreci ed etrusco-italici delle Civiche Raccolte Archeologiche di Milano* (Rassegna di Studi del Civico Museo Archeologico e del Civico Gabinetto Numismatico di Milano, Suppl. XV), Milano 1995.

CATENI 1995
G. CATENI, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Italia 3. Volterra, Museo Guarnacci 1*, Roma 1995.

CATONI 1998
M.L. CATONI, *Quando il ragazzo si fa satiro*, in «Prospettiva», 89-90, 1998, pp. 74-84.

CATONI 2005
M.L. CATONI, Schemata. *Comunicazione non verbale nella Grecia antica*, Pisa 2005.

CATONI 2008
M.L. CATONI, *La comunicazione non verbale nella Grecia antica*, Torino 2008.

CATONI 2010
M.L. CATONI, *Bere vino puro. Immagini del Simposio*, Milano 2010.

CATONI 2013
M.L. CATONI, *Mimesis and Motion in Classical Antiquity*, in S. LEYSSEN, P. RATHGEBER, ed. by, *Bilder animierter Bewegung. Imagesof Animate Movement*, München 2013, pp. 198-219.

CATONI 2015
M.L. CATONI, *The Iconographic Tradition of the Suicide of Ajax: Some Questions*, in G.W. MOST, L. OZBEK, ed. by, *Staging Ajax's Suicide*, Pisa 2015, pp. 15-28, 331-340.

CATONI 2016
M.L. CATONI, *Stylization of the body and embodied values in Classical Antiquity*, in «Predella», 39-40, 2016, pp. 3-11.

CATONI 2021
M.L. CATONI, *Cut as a device. An example from Classical Antiquity*, in «Engramma», 179, 2021.

CATONI, GIULIANI 2016
M.L. CATONI, L. GIULIANI, *Myron und die Kunst des Diskuswrfens*, in «Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung», 122, 2016, pp. 13-44.

CATONI, OSANNA 2018
M.L. CATONI, M. OSANNA, *Arianna a Nasso. Un nuovo affresco dalla Regio V di Pompei*, in «Bollettino d'Arte», 39-40, 2018, pp. 5-46.

CAVAGNARO VANONI, SERRA RIDGWAY 1989
L. CAVAGNARO VANONI, F.R. SERRA RIDGWAY, *Vasi etruschi a figure rosse dagli scavi della Fondazione Lerici nella necropoli dei Monterozzi a Tarquinia*, Roma 1989.

CAVALIERE, UDELL 2012
B. CAVALIERE, J. UDELL, ed. by, *Ancient Mediterranean Art. The William D. and Jane Walsh Collection at Fordham University*, New York 2012.

CECCARELLI 1998
P. CECCARELLI, *La pirrica nell'antichità greco romana. Studi sulla danza armata*, Pisa-Roma 1998.

CECCHINI 2012
A. CECCHINI, *Le tombe dipinte di Tarquinia. Vicenda conservativa, restauri, tecnica di esecuzione*, Firenze 2012.

CERCHIAI 1980
L. CERCHIAI, *La* machaira *di Achille. Alcune osservazioni a proposito della Tomba dei Tori*, in «AION. Annali di Archeologia e Storia Antica», 2, 1980, pp. 25-39.

CERCHIAI 1987
L. CERCHIAI, *Sulle tombe del Tuffatore e della Caccia e della Pesca. Proposta per una lettura iconologica*, in «Dialoghi di Archeologia», V, 1987, pp. 113-123.

CERCHIAI 1998
L. CERCHIAI, *Eracle, un lupo mannaro e una camicia rossa*, in «Ostraka», VII, 1998, pp. 39-44.

CERCHIAI 1999a
L. CERCHIAI, *Sulle Tombe del Tuffatore e della Caccia e della Pesca. Proposta di lettura iconologica,* in B. D'AGOSTINO, L. CERCHIAI, *Il mare, la morte, l'amore. Gli Etruschi, i Greci e l'immagine*, Roma 1999, pp. 61-71.

CERCHIAI 1999b
L. CERCHIAI, *La rappresentazione di Teseo sulle stele felsinee*, in F.H. MASSA PAIRAULT, ed. by, *Le mythe grec dans l'Italie Antique. Fonction et Image*. Conference Proceedings (Roma, 14-16 novembre 1996), Roma 1999, pp. 353-365.

CERCHIAI 2000
L. CERCHIAI, *Piatto pontico con demone a testa di lupo*, in A. CARANDINI, R. CAPPELLI, ed. by, *Roma. Romolo, Remo e la fondazione della città*, Milano 2000, p. 226.

CERCHIAI 2001
L. CERCHIAI, *La tomba del Topolino*, in «AION. Annali di Archeologia e Storia Antica», 8, 2001, pp. 99-104.

CERCHIAI 2002
L. CERCHIAI, *L'iconografia della caccia nella pittura tombale di VI e V sec. a.C.*, in I. COLPO, I. FAVERETTO, F. GHEDINI, ed. by, *Iconografia 2001. Studi sull'immagine*, Roma 2002, pp. 71-78.

CERCHIAI 2003
L. CERCHIAI, *I pugili ai lati della porta*, in A. MINETTI, ed. by, *Pittura etrusca: problemi e prospettive*. Conference Proceedings (Sarteano-Chiusi, 26 ottobre 2001), Siena 2003, pp. 79-86

CERCHIAI 2008
L. CERCHIAI, *Riflessioni sull'immaginario dionisiaco nella pittura tombale etrusca di età arcaica,* in S. ESTIENNE, D. JAILLARD, N. LUBTCHANSKY, C.

POUZADOUX, ed. by, *Image et Religion*. Conference Proceedings (Roma, 11-13 décembre 2003), Napoli 2008, pp. 439-447.

CERCHIAI 2011
L. CERCHIAI, *Le regole del gioco, anche in Etruria*, in *L'histoire comme impératif ou la "Volonté de comprendre". Hommage à Jean-Pierre Vernant et Pierre Vidal-Naquet*, Napoli 2011, pp. 111-122.

CERCHIAI 2012
L. CERCHIAI, *Questioni di metodo*, in «Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome. Antiquité», 124, 2, 2012, pp. 407-414.

CERCHIAI 2014
L. CERCHIAI, *Una festa etrusca per Dioniso?*, in F. FONTANA, E. MURGIA, ed. by, Sacrum facere. *Atti del II Seminario di Archeologia del Sacro. Contaminazioni: forme di contatto, traduzione e mediazione nei sacra del mondo greco e romano*. Conference Proceedings (Trieste, 19-20 aprile 2013), Trieste 2014, pp. 95-107.

CERCHIAI, SASSATELLI 2014
L. CERCHIAI, G. SASSATELLI, *Le stele felsinee: invenzione e uso dell'immaginario tra artigiani e committenza*, in *Annali della Fondazione per il Museo 'Claudio Faina'*, XXI, 2014, pp. 187-219.

CESCHI 1956
C. CESCHI, *Introduzione, in Mostra della via Appia antica*. Exhibition Catalogue (Roma 1956), Roma 1956.

CESSI 1932
C. CESSI, *Letteratura Greca (1926-1930)*, in «Aevum», 6, 1, 1932, pp. 31-171.

CHAMPION 1928
H. CHAMPION, *CVA France 7. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Médailles I*, Paris 1928.

CHAZALON 1995
L. CHAZALON, *L'arbre et le paysage dans la céramique attique archaïque à figures noires et à figures rouges*, in «AION. Annali di Archeologia e Storia Antica», 2, 1995, pp. 103-131.

CHAZALON 2013
L. CHAZALON, *Image du corps, corps de l'image, miroir du corps, remarques sur la céramique figurée attique*, in *Thème IV: images, thèmes société. La peur des images*, Paris 2013, pp. 47-53.

CHERICI 1988
A. CHERICI, *Ceramica etrusca dalla collezione Poggiali di Firenze*, Rome 1988.

CHIRASSI 1968
I. CHIRASSI, *Elementi di culture precereali nei miti e riti greci*, Roma 1968.

CHRISTIE'S 2006
Antiquities. Christie's New York, Sale Catalogue, June 16, 2006.

CIERI VIA 2014
C. CIERI VIA, *Archäologie der Kunst e Kulturwissenschaft a confronto: Emanuel Löwy e Aby Warburg*, in M.G. PICOZZI, ed. by, *Ripensare Emanuel Löwy*, Roma 2014, pp. 189-204.

CIUCCARELLI 2006
M.R. CIUCCARELLI, *Acheloo ctonio dalla Magna Grecia all'Etruria?*, in «Mediterranea. Quaderni annuali dell'Istituto di studi sulle civiltà italiche e del Mediterraneo antico del Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche», III, 2006, pp. 121-140.

CLARK 1962
K. CLARK, *Il paesaggio nell'arte*, Milano 1962.

COARELLI 1983
F. COARELLI, *Le pitture della tomba François a Vulci: una proposta di lettura*, in «Dialoghi di archeologia», III, 1-2, 1983, p. 43-69.

COARELLI 1993
F. COARELLI, *I luci del Lazio: la documentazione archeologica*, in *Les bois sacrés.* Conference Proceedings (Napoli, 1989), Napoli 1993, pp. 45-52.

COARELLI, FRATINI 2001
F. COARELLI, C. FRATINI, *Archeologia e arte in Umbria e nei suoi Musei*, Milano 2001.

COHEN 2006
B. COHEN, *The Colors of Clay: Special Techniques in Athenian Vases*. Los Angeles 2006.

COLLARD 2020
H. COLLARD, *Compte-rendu* (*Dei e piante nell' antica Grecia* 1. *Riflessioni metodologiche, Efesto, Demetra in Grecia, Magna Grecia e Sicilia, Kore Persefone, Ecate, Apollo, Afrodite*, Bergamo 2018), in «Kernos», 33, 2020, pp. 342-344.

COLONNA 1976-1977
G. COLONNA, *La dea etrusca CEL e i santuari del Trasimeno*, in «Rivista Storica dell'Antichità», 6-7, 1976-1977, pp. 45-62.

COLONNA 1982
G. COLONNA, *Di Augusto Castellani e del cosiddetto Calice a cariatidi Prenestino*, in H. BLANCK, S. STEINGRÄBER, ed. by, *Miscellanea archeologica Tobias Dohrn dedicata*, Roma 1982, pp. 33-44.

COLONNA 1984a
G. COLONNA, s.v. Menerva, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, II, Zürich-München 1984, pp. 1050-1074.

COLONNA 1984b
G. COLONNA, *Per una cronologia della pittura etrusca di età ellenistica*, in «Dialoghi di Archeologia», 1, 1984, pp. 1-24.

COLONNA 1985a
G. COLONNA, ed. by, *Santuari d'Etruria*. Exhibition Catalogue (Arezzo 1985), Milano 1985.

COLONNA 1985b
G. COLONNA, *Società e Cultura a Volsinii*, in *Volsinii e la Dodecapoli Etrusca. Annali della Fondazione per il Museo 'Claudio Faina'*, II, 1985, pp. 101-131.

COLONNA 1986
G. COLONNA, *Urbanistica e architettura,* in *Rasenna. Storia e civiltà degli Etruschi,* Milano 1986, pp. 371-532.

COLONNA 1987
G. COLONNA, *Note preliminari sui culti del santuario di Portonaccio a Veio*, in «Scienze dell'Antichità», 1, 1987, pp. 419-446.

COLONNA 1989
G. COLONNA, *Gli Etruschi e l'invenzione della pittura*, in *Pittura Etrusca al Museo di Villa Giulia,* Roma 1989, pp. 19-25.

COLONNA 1991
G. COLONNA, *Riflessioni sul dionisismo in Etruria*, in F. BERTI, ed. by, *Dionysos. Mito e mistero*. Conference Proceedings (Comacchio 1989), Bologna 1991, pp. 117-155.

COLONNA 1994
G. COLONNA, s.v. *Etrusca, arte*, in *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica*, II suppl., II, 1994.

COLONNA 1994b
G. COLONNA, *A proposito degli dei del fegato di Piacenza*, in «Studi Etruschi», LIX, 1994, pp. 123-136.

COLONNA 1996
G. COLONNA, *Il* dokanon, *il culto dei Dioscuri e gli aspetti ellenizzanti della religione dei morti nell'Etruria tardo-arcaica*, in *Scritti di Antichità in memorie di S. Stucchi*, Studi Miscellanei 29, II, Rome, 1996, pp. 165-184.

COLONNA 1997
G. COLONNA, *L'anfora etrusca di Dresda con sacrificio di Larth Vipe*, in *Amico Amici. Studi in onore di Gad Rausing*, Kristianstad 1997, pp. 195-216.

COLONNA 2003
G. COLONNA, *Osservazioni sulla tomba tarquiniese della nave*, in A. MINETTI, ed. by, *Pittura etrusca: problemi e prospettive*. Conference Proceedings (Sarteano-Chiusi, 26 ottobre 2001), Siena 2003, pp. 63-77.

COLONNA 2005
G. COLONNA, *Brandelli di una gigantomachiachia tardo-arcaica da un tempio etrusco*, in G. COLONNA, *Italia ante Romanum Imperium. Scritti di antichità etrusche, italiche e romane (1958-1998)*, II, 2, Pisa-Roma, 2005, p. 1361-1368.

COLONNA 2009
G. COLONNA, *L'Apollo di Pyrgi, Śur/Śuri (il "Nero") e l'Apollo Surios*, in «Studi Etruschi», LXXII-2007, 2009, pp. 101-134.

COLONNA 2012
G. COLONNA, *Ancora su Śur/Śuri*, in «Studi Etruschi», LXXIV-2009, 2012, pp. 9-31.

COLONNA 2014
G. COLONNA, *L'Aldilà degli Etruschi: caratteri generali,* in G. SASSATELLI, A. RUSSO TAGLIENTE, ed. by, *Il viaggio oltre la vita. Gli Etruschi e l'aldilà tra capolavori e realtà virtuale*. Exhibition Catalogue (Bologna 2014-2015), Bologna 2014, pp. 25-35.

COLONNA 2018
G. COLONNA, *Śuri, non *Śuris*, in «Studi Etruschi», LXXX-2017, 2018, pp. 149-150.

COMELLA 2005
A. COMELLA, *Fons (Etruria e mondo italico)*, in *ThesCRA*, 2005.

COMES 1879
O. COMES, *Illustrazione delle piante rappresentate nei dipinti Pompeiani*, Napoli 1879.

COMSTOCK, VERMEULE 1971
M. COMSTOCK, C. VERMEULE, *Greek, Etruscan, & Roman Bronzes in the Museum of Fine Arts. Boston*, New York 1971.

CORNO 2000
C. CORNO, *Il numismatico Serafino Ricci*, in «Rivista italiana di numismatica e scienze affini», 101, 2000, pp. 261-308.

COSTA 2014
S. COSTA, *Forme, colori, sapori: funzione e produzione delle pitture di natura morta in area vesuviana*, in «Atti dell'Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Memorie», IX, XXIV, 4, 2014, pp. 445-678.

CRESPI, MANGHANI
P. CRESPI, S. MANGHANI, *A genealogy of Rhythm*, in P. CRESPI, S. MANGHANI, ed. by, *Rythm and Critique. Technics, Modalities, Practices*, Edinburgh 2020, pp. 30-51.

CRISTOFANI 1969
M. CRISTOFANI, *La tomba del Tifone: cultura e società di Tarquinia in età tardo-etrusca*, «Atti dell'Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Memorie», XIV, pp. 213-256.

CRISTOFANI 1971
M. CRISTOFANI, *Per una nuova lettura della pisside della Pania*, in «Studi Etruschi», XXXIX, 1971, pp. 64-89.

CRISTOFANI 1976
M. CRISTOFANI, *Storia dell'arte e acculturazione. Le pitture tombali arcaiche di Tarquinia*, in «Prospettiva», 7, 1976, pp. 2-10.

CRISTOFANI 1983
M. CRISTOFANI, *Gli Etruschi del mare*, Milano 1983.

CRISTOFANI 1984
M. CRISTOFANI, *Nuovi spunti sul tema della talassocrazia etrusca*, in «Xenia», 8, 1984, pp. 3-20.

CRISTOFANI 1985a
M. CRISTOFANI, *Il cosiddetto specchio di Tarchon: un recupero e una nuova lettura*, in «Prospettiva», 41, 1986, pp. 4-20.

CRISTOFANI 1985b
M. CRISTOFANI, *Faone, la testa di Orfeo e l'immaginario femminile*, in «Prospettiva», 42, 1985, pp. 2-12.

CRISTOFANI 1987a
M. CRISTOFANI, *La ceramica a figure rosse*, in M. MARTELLI, ed. by, *La ceramica degli Etruschi. La pittura vascolare*, Novara 1987, pp. 43-53; 313-331.

CRISTOFANI 1987b
M. CRISTOFANI, *Pittura funeraria e celebrazione della morte: il caso della Tomba dell'Orco,* in M. BONGHI JOVINO, C. CHIARAMONTE TRERÉ, ed. by, *Tarquinia: ricerche, scavi e prospettive.* Conference Proceedings (Milano, 1986), Roma 1988, pp. 191-202.

CRISTOFANI 1987c
M. CRISTOFANI, *Di un complesso sotterraneo scoperto nell'area urbana di Caere*, in «Prospettiva», 49, 1987, pp. 2-14.

CRISTOFANI 1991
M. CRISTOFANI, *Scavi nell'area urbana di Caere: le terrecotte decorative*, in «Studi Etruschi», LVI-1989-1990, 1991, pp. 69-84.

CRISTOFANI 1993
M. CRISTOFANI, *La ceramografia etrusca fra età tardo-classica ed ellenismo*, in «Studi Etruschi», LVIII-1992, 1993, pp. 89-114.

CRISTOFANI 1995
M. CRISTOFANI, 'Mystai kai bakchoi'. *Riti di passaggio nei crateri volterrani,* in «Prospettiva», 49, 1987, pp. 2-14.

CRISTOFANI 1997
M. CRISTOFANI, *Itinerari iconografici nella ceramografia Volterrana*, in G. MAETZKE, ed. by, *Aspetti della cultura di Volterra etrusca fra l'età del ferro e l'età ellenistica e contributi alla ricerca antropologica alla conoscenza del popolo etrusco*. Atti del XIX Congresso di Studi Etruschi ed Italici. Firenze 1997, pp. 175-192.

CRISTOFANI, MARTELLI 1978
M. CRISTOFANI, M. MARTELLI, *Fufluns/Paxies*, in «Studi Etruschi», XLVI, 1978, pp. 119-173.

CRISTOFANI, GREGORI 1987
M. CRISTOFANI, G.L. GREGORI, *Di un complesso sotterraneo scoperto nell'area urbana di Caere*, in «Prospettiva», 49, 1987, pp. 2-14.

CROCE 1920
B. CROCE, *Per la tutela delle bellezze naturali e degli immobili di particolare interesse storico*, in *Atti Parlamentari. Senato del Regno. Legislatura XXV. Prima sessione 1919-1920. Discussioni. Tornata del 25 settembre 1920*, Roma 1920, pp. 1667 ss.

CULTRERA 1916
G. CULTRERA, *Vasi dipinti del Museo di Villa Giulia*, in «Monumenti Antichi», XXIV, 1916, cc. 345-500.

CUOZZO 2000
M.A. CUOZZO, *Orizzonti teorici e interpretativi, tra percorsi di matrice francese, archeologia post-processuale e tendenze italiane: considerazioni e indirizzi di ricerca per lo studio delle necropoli*, in N. TERRENATO, ed. by, *Archeologia teorica*, Firenze 2000, pp. 323-360.

CUSSET 2004
C. CUSSET, *Les Argonautiques d'Apollonios de Rhodes comme itinéraire à travers la sauvagerie: d'Homère à Alexandrie, en passant par Hérodote et Xénophon, ou comment l'addresse au lecteur supplée à l'insouciance de Jason*, in M.C. CHARPENTIER, ed. by, *Les espaces du sauvage dans le monde antique*. Conference Proceedings (Besançon, 2000), Besançon 2004, pp. 31-52.

D'AGOSTINO 1977
B. D'AGOSTINO, *Grecs et «indigènes» sur la côte tyrrhénienne au VII siècle: la transmission des idéologies entre élites sociales*, in «Annales ESC», 32, 1977, pp. 3-20.

D'AGOSTINO 1983
B. D'AGOSTINO, *L'immagine, la pittura e la tomba nell'Etruria arcaica*, in «Prospettiva», 32, 1983, pp. 2-12

D'AGOSTINO 1991
B. D'AGOSTINO, *The Italian Perspective on theoretical Archaeology*, in I. HODDER, ed. by, *Archaeological Theory in Europe*, London-New York 1991, pp. 52-64.

D'AGOSTINO 1993
B. D'AGOSTINO, *La Tomba della Scimmia. Per una lettura iconografica delle immagini etrusche*, in *La civiltà di Chiusi e il suo territorio*. Conference Proceedings (Chianciano Terme, 1989), Firenze 1993, pp. 193-202.

D'AGOSTINO 1995
B. D'AGOSTINO, *I pericoli del mare. Spunti per una grammatica dell'immaginario visuale*, in *Modi e funzioni del racconto mitico nella ceramica greca, italiota ed etrusca dal VI al IV secolo a.C.* Conference Proceedings (Raito di Vietri sul Mare, 1994), Salerno 1995, pp. 201-213.

D'AGOSTINO 1999a
B. D'AGOSTINO, *Le Sirene, il tuffatore e le porte dell'Ade*, in B. D'AGOSTINO, L. CERCHIAI, *Il mare, la morte, l'amore. Gli Etruschi, i Greci e l'immagine*, Roma 1999, pp. 53-60.

D'AGOSTINO 1999b
B. D'AGOSTINO, *L'immagine, la pittura e la tomba*, in B. D'AGOSTINO, L. CERCHIAI, *Il mare, la morte, l'amore. Gli Etruschi, i Greci e l'immagine*, Roma 1999, pp. 13-30.

D'AGOSTINO 1999c
B. D'AGOSTINO, Oinops Pontos. *Il mare come alterità nella percezione arcaica*, in B. D'AGOSTINO, L. CERCHIAI, *Il mare, la morte, l'amore. Gli Etruschi, i Greci e l'immagine*, Roma 1999, pp. 13-30.

D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 1999
B. D'AGOSTINO, L. CERCHIAI, *Il mare, la morte, l'amore. Gli Etruschi, i Greci e l'immagine*, Roma 1999.

D'AGOSTINO, CERCHIAI 2021
B. D'AGOSTINO, L. CERCHIAI, *Il leone sogna la preda. Iconografia e immaginari tra Greci ed Etruschi*, Roma 2021.

D'AGOSTINO, SCHNAPP 1990
B. D'AGOSTINO, A. SCHNAPP, *Les morts entre l'objet et l'image*, in G. GNOLI, J.-P. VERNANT, ed. by, *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*, Paris 1990, pp. 17-25.

D'ANDRIA, RITTI 1985
F. D'ANDRIA, T. RITTI, *Hierapolis II. Le sculture del teatro. I rilievi con i cicli di Apollo e Artemide*, Roma 1985.

D'ANGELO 2010
P. D'ANGELO, *Filosofia del paesaggio*, Roma 2010.

DAVIES 1971
M.I. DAVIES, *The Suicide of Ajax. A Bronze Etruscan Statuette from the Käppeli Collection*, in «Antike Kunst», 14, 1971, pp. 148-157.

DE ANGELIS 1999
F. DE ANGELIS, *Tragedie familiari. Miti greci nell'arte sepolcrale etrusca*, in F. DE ANGELIS, S. MUTH, ed. by, *Im Spiegel des Mythos. Bilderwelt und Lebenswelt*, Palilia 6, Wiesbaden 1999, pp. 53-66.

DE ANGELIS 2002
F. DE ANGELIS, *Specchi e miti. Sulla ricezione della mitologia greca in Etruria*, in «Ostraka», 11, 2002, pp. 37-73.

DE CAZANOVE 1989
O. DE CAZANOVE, *Suspension d'ex-voto dans les bois sacrés*, in O. DE CAZANOVE, J. SCHEID, ed. by, *Les bois sacrés*. Conference Proceedings (Napoli, 1989), Napoli 1989, pp. 111-126.

DEFFONTAINES 1995
J.-P. DEFFONTAINES, *"Cinq propositions pour une théorie du paysage". Réactions d'un agronome*, in «Natures Sciences Sociétés», 3, 1995, pp. 354-356.

DE GRINO, OLMOS 1986
B. DE GRINO, R. OLMOS, s.v. *Atlas*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, III, Zürich-München 1986, pp. 2-16.

DE GRUMMOND 1982a
N.T. DE GRUMMOND, *Some Unusual Landscape Conventions in Etruscan Art*, in «Antike Kunst», 25, 1982, pp. 3-14.

DE GRUMMOND 1982b
N.T. DE GRUMMOND, ed. by, *A Guide To Etruscan Mirrors*, Tallahassee 1982.

DE GRUMMOND 2000
N.T. DE GRUMMOND, *Mirrors and* Manteia*: Themes of Prophecy on Etruscan and Prenestine Mirrors*, in M.D. GENTILI, ed. by, *Aspetti e problemi della produzione degli specchi etruschi figurati*. Conference Proceedings (Roma, 1997), Roma 2000, pp. 27-67.

DE GRUMMOND 2004
N.T. DE GRUMMOND, *For the Mother and for the Daughter: Some Thoughts on Dedications from Etruria and Praeneste*, in «Hesperia Supplements», 33, 2004, pp. 351-370.

DE GRUMMOND 2006
N.T. DE GRUMMOND, *Etruscan Myth, Sacred History, and Legend*, Philadelphia 2006.

DE GRUMMOND 2008
N.T. DE GRUMMOND, *Moon over Pyrgi: Catha, an Etruscan Lunar Goddess?*, in «American Journal of Archaeology», 112, 2008, pp. 419-428.

DE GRUMMOND 2009
N.T. DE GRUMMOND, *The sacred day on Etruscan Mirrors*, in S. BRUNI, ed. by, *Etruria e Italia preromana. Studi in onore di Giovannangelo Camporeale*, Pisa 2009, pp. 285-294.

DE GRUMMOND, SERRA RIDGWAY 2000
N.T. DE GRUMMOND, B.S. RIDGWAY, *From Pergamon to Sperlonga: Sculpture and Context,* Oakland 2000.

DEL CHIARO 1955
M. DEL CHIARO, *Two Etruscan Mirrors in San Francisco*, in «American Journal of Archaeology», 59, 1955, pp. 277-286.

DEL CHIARO 1966
M. DEL CHIARO, *The Caeretan Figured Group*, in «American Journal of Archaeology», 70, 1966, pp. 31-36.

DEL CHIARO 1974a
M. DEL CHIARO, *Etruscan Red-Figured Vase-Painting at Caere,* Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1974.

DEL CHIARO 1974b
M. DEL CHIARO, *The Etruscan Funnel Group. A Tarquinian Red-figured Fabric*, Firenze 1974.

DEL CHIARO 1985
M. DEL CHIARO, *The Akrate Painter*, in «Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung», 92, 1985, pp. 65-75.

DEL CORNO 1974
D. DEL CORNO, *Il satiro e la fonte: l'Amicos di Sofocle*, in «Dioniso», 45, 1974, pp. 207-223.

DELLA FINA 2002
G.M. DELLA FINA, *La* 'Kranzspiegelgruppe'. *Criteri per la definizione delle officine*, in A. EMILIOZZI, A. MAGGIANI, ed. by, *Caelatores. Incisori di specchi e ciste tra Lazio ed Etruria*, Roma 2002, pp. 51-58.

DELLA SETA 1918
A. DELLA SETA, *Museo di Villa Giulia*, Roma 1918.

DELLA SETA 1922
A. DELLA SETA, *Italia Antica*, Bergamo 1922.

DE LUCIA BROLLI 1981
A.M. DE LUCIA BROLLI, *Sarcofago in nefro*, in *Prima Italia. L'arte italica del I millennio a.C.*, Roma 1981, pp. 209-210.

DE LUCIA BROLLI 2000
A.M. DE LUCIA BROLLI, *La ceramica etrusca a figure rosse*, in *La collezione Augusto Castellani*, Roma 2000, pp. 109-112.

DE LUCIA BROLLI 2018
M.A. DE LUCIA BROLLI, *Riti e cerimonie per le dee nel santuario di Monte Li Santi-Le Rote a Narce*, Pisa 2018.

DE LUCIA BROLLI, MICHETTI 2005
M.A. DE LUCIA BROLLI, L.M. MICHETTI, *La ceramica a rilievo di produzione falisca*, in «Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome. Antiquité», 117, 1, pp. 137-171.

DE LUIGI 2000
A. DE LUIGI, *Camilla, le Amazzoni e i Volsci*, in «Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome», 58, 2000, pp. 221-245.

DENTZER 1968
J.-M. DENTZER, *Les systèmes décoratifs dans la peinture murale italique*, in «Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome. Antiquité», 80, 1968, pp. 85-141.

DE PUMA 1983
R.D. DE PUMA, *Greek Myths on Three Etruscan Mirrors in Cleveland*, in «The Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art», 70, 7, 1983, pp. 290-302.

DE PUMA 1986
R.D. DE PUMA, s.v. *Dioskouroi/Tinas Cliniar*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, III, Zürich-München 1986, pp. 597-608.

DE PUMA 1987
R.D. DE PUMA, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. USA 1, Midwestern Collections*, Omaha 1987.

DE PUMA 1993
R.D. DE PUMA, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. USA 2*, Boston, Museum of Fine Arts. Cambridge, Harvard University Museums, Ames 1993.

DE PUMA 2013
R.D. DE PUMA, *Etruscan Art in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, New Haven-London 2013.

D'ERCOLE 2017
V. D'ERCOLE, Hydria *etrusca a figure nere*, in V. DE MARTINI, ed. by, *La Bellezza ritrovata*
arte negata e riconquistata in mostra, Roma 2017, pp. 38-40.

DE RUYT 1934
F. DE RUYT, *Charun. Démon étrusque de la mort*, Roma 1934.

DE RUYT 1989
F. DE RUYT, *Démonologie étrusque* (review of I. Krauskopf, *Todesdämonen und Totengötter im Vorhellenistischen Etrurien. Kontinuität und Wandel*, Firenze 1987), in «L'Antiquité classique», 58, 1989, pp. 211-220.

DE SANCTIS 1883
F. DE SANCTIS, *Il Darwinismo nell'arte*, Napoli 1883.

DI BENEDETTO 1965
V. DI BENEDETTO, ed. by, Euripides. *Orestes*. Introduzione, testo critico, commento e appendice metrica, Firenze 1965.

DIETRICH 2010
N. DIETRICH, *Figur ohne Raum? Bäume und Felsen in der attischen Vasenmalerei des 6. und 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Berlin 2010.

DIETRICH 2011
N. DIETRICH, *Anthropologie et espace en céramique grecque : du difficile passage de 'Hestia – Hermès' aux images*, in «Mètis», 9, pp. 279-308.

DIETRICH 2015a
N. DIETRICH, *Lo spazio della natura e lo spazio dell'uomo*, in G. SENA CHIESA, A. PONTRANDOLFO, ed. by, *Mito e Natura. Dalla Grecia a Pompei*, Milano 2015, pp. 64-71.

DIETRICH 2015b
N. DIETRICH, *Figure and Space in Vase Painting and in Architectural Sculpture: On the (Ir-)Relevance of the Medium*, in «Tempo», 21, 38, 2015.

DIETRICH 2017a
N. DIETRICH, *Pictorial space as a media phenomenon: the case of 'Landscape' in Romano-Campanian wall-painting*, in E. VALETTE, S. WYLER, ed. by, *Le spectacle de la nature: regards grecs et romains.* (Cahiers des Mondes Anciens 9), 2017.

DIETRICH 2017b
N. DIETRICH, *Framing Archaic Greek Sculpture: Figure, Ornament and Script*, in V. PLATT, M. SQUIRE, ed. by, *The Frame in Classical Art: A Cultural History*, Cambridge 2017, pp. 270-316.

DIETRICH 2018a
N. DIETRICH, *Das Attribut als Problem. Eine bildwissenschaftliche Untersuchung zur griechischen Kunst*, Berlin-Boston 2015.

DIETRICH 2018b
N. DIETRICH, *Viewing and Identification: The Agency of the Viewer in Archaic and Early Classical Greek Visual Culture*, in KAMPAKOGLOU, NOVOKHATKO, ed. by, *Gaze, Vision and Visuality in Ancient Greek Literature. Trends in Classics Supplement*, Berlin-Boston 2018, pp. 464-492.

DIETRICH 2018c
N. DIETRICH, *Order and contingency in Archaic Greek ornament and figure*, in N. DIETRICH, M. SQUIRE, ed. by, *Ornament and figure in Graeco-Roman Art. Rethinking Visual Ontologies in Classical Antiquity*, Berlin-Boston 2018, pp. 167-201.

DIETRICH 2019
N. DIETRICH, *Spatial Dimensions in Roman Wall Painting and the Interplay of Enclosing and Enclosed Space: A New Perspective on Second Style*, in R.

GEE, V. ROUSSEAU, ed. by, *Ancient Mediterranean Painting*, II (special issue of «Arts»).

DIETRICH 2020
N. DIETRICH, *Narrative, Experience, and the Image. Incomplete Copies in Imperial Age Sculpture*, in J. GRETHLEIN, L. HUITINK, A. TAGLIABUE, ed. by, *Experience, Narrative, and Criticism in Ancient Greece: Under the Spell of Stories*, Oxford 2002, pp. 252-282.

DIETRICH 2021
N. DIETRICH, *The Tuffatore Fresco as a Greek Landscape Painting? An Essay on the Methodological Problem of how to deal with Exceptions in the Archaeological Record*, in A. MERIANI, G. ZUCHTRIEGEL, ed. by, *La tomba del Tuffatore. Rito, arte e poesia a Paestum e nel Mediterraneo d'epoca tardo-arcaica*. Conference Proceedings (Paestum, 4-6 ottobre 2018), Pisa 2021, pp. 175-195.

DIETRICH, SQUIRE 2018
N. DIETRICH, M. SQUIRE, ed. by, *Ornament and figure in Graeco-Roman Art. Rethinking Visual Ontologies in Classical Antiquity*, Berlin-Boston 2018.

Die Welt der Etrusker 1988
Die Welt der Etrusker. Archäologische Denkmäler aus Museen der sozialistischen Länder. Exhibition Catalogue (Berlin 1988), Berlin 1988.

DI FAZIO 2001
M. DI FAZIO, *Sacrifici umani e uccisioni rituali nel mondo etrusco*, in «Rendiconti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe Di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche», XII, 3, 2001, pp. 435-505.

DI FAZIO 2012
M. DI FAZIO, *Il problema dei Centauri*, in M.C. BIELLA, E. GIOVANELLI, ed. by, *Il bestiario fantastico di età orientalizzante nella penisola italiana*, Trento 2012, pp. 315-336.

DI FAZIO 2017
M. DI FAZIO, *Nuove riflessioni su sacrifici umani e omicidi religiosi nel mondo etrusco*, in «Scienze dell'Antichità», 23, 3, 2017, pp. 449-464.

DOBROWOLSKI 1991
N. DOBROWOLSKI, *Il mito di Prometeo. Il limite tra il cielo e la terra nell'arte etrusca*, in «Archeologia Classica», 43, 1991, pp. 1213-1230.

DOBROWOLSKI 1994
N. DOBROWOLSKI, *I Dioscuri sugli specchi etruschi*, in M. MARTELLI, ed. by, *Tyrrhenoi Philotechnoi.* Conference Proceedings (Viterbo 1990), Ghezzano, pp. 173-181.

DOBROWOLSKI 1999
N. DOBROWOLSKI, *Libacja Hercle na Etruskim Lustrze w Warszawie*, in «Ikonotheka prace Instytutu Historii Sztuki Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego», 12-13, 1999, pp. 37-47.

DOHRN 1937
T. DOHRN, *Schwarzfigurige etruskische Vasenmalerei*, Berlin 1937.

DOMENICI 2009
I. DOMENICI, Etruscae Fabulae. *Mito e Rappresentazione*, Rome 2009.

DOMENICI 2012
I. DOMENICI, *Andare in barca nel regno dei morti*, in M. HARARI, S. PALTINERI, M. ROBINO, ed. by, *Segni e Colore. Dialoghi sulla pittura tardoclassica ed ellenistica*. Conference Proceedings (Pavia 2012), Roma 2012, pp. 95-100.DONADIEU 2002

P. DONADIEU, *La société paysagiste*, Arles 2002.

DONATI, RAFANELLI 2004
L. DONATI, S. RAFANELLI, s.v. *Il sacrificio nel mondo etrusco*, in *ThesCRA*, I, 2004, pp. 135-182.

DONATO 1993
M.M. DONATO, *"Archeologia dell'arte". Emanuel Löwy all'Università di Roma (1889-1915)*, in S. SETTIS, ed. by, *L'Archeologia italiana dall'Unità al Novecento* (*Ricerche di Storia dell'Arte*, 50), Roma 1993.
pp. 62-75.

DONOHUE 2011
A.A. DONOHUE, *New looks at old books: Emanuel Löwy, Die Naturwiedergabe in der älteren griechischen Kunst*, in «Journal of Art Historiography», 5, 2011, pp. 1-16.

DOUGLAS 1968a
M. DOUGLAS, *The Contempt of Ritual I*, in «New Blackfriars», 49, 577, pp. 475-482.

DOUGLAS 1968b
M. DOUGLAS, *The Contempt of Ritual II*, in «New Blackfriars», 49, 578, pp. 528-525.

DOUGLAS 1979
M. DOUGLAS, *I simboli naturali*, Torino 1979.

DRÄGER 2007
O. DRÄGER, *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Deutschland 84. Erlangen 2. Antikensammlung der Friedrich-Alexander-Universität,* München 2007.

DUCATI 1911
P. DUCATI, *Le pietre funerarie felsinee*, in «Monumenti Antichi», XX, pp. 23-727.

DUCATI 1911
P. DUCATI, *Le pietre funerarie felsinee*, in «Monumenti Antichi», XX, cc. 357-728.

DÜMMLER 1887
E. DÜMMLER, *Ueber eine Classe griechischer Vasen mit schwarzen Figuren*, in «Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung», II, 1887, pp. 171-192.

DURAND, LISSARRAGUE 1999.
J.-L. DURAND, F. LISSARRAGUE, *Mourir à l'autel. Remarques sur l'imagérie du "sacrifice humain" dans la céramique attique*, in «Archiv für Religionsgeschichte», 1, 1999, p. 83-106.

EDLUND 1982
I.E.M. EDLUND, *Floral and Faunal Motif on Etruscan mirrors*, in N.T. DE GRUMMOND, ed. by, *A Guide To Etruscan Mirrors*, Tallahassee 1982, pp. 128-139.

EDLUND-BERRY 2006
I.E.M. EDLUND-BERRY, *Ritual Space and Boundaries in Etruscan Religion*, in N.T. DE GRUMMOND, E. SIMON, ed. by, *The religion of the Etruscans*, Austin 2006, pp. 116-131.

EINSTEIN 1955
A. EINSTEIN, *Relativity: The Special and General Theory. A popular exposition*, London 1955.

EINSTEIN 1960
A. EINSTEIN, *Relatività. Esposizione divulgativa*, Torino 1960.

ELDRIDGE 1917
L.G. ELDRIDGE, *Six Etruscan Mirrors*, in «American Journal of Archaeology», 21, 4, 1917, pp. 365-386.

ELIADE 2008
M. ELIADE, *Trattato di storia delle religioni*, Torino 2008.

ELSNER 1995
J. ELSNER, *Art and the Roman viewer. The transformation of art from the pagan world to Christianity*, Cambridge 1995.

ELSNER 2007
J. ELSNER, *Roman Eyes: Visuality & Subjectivity in Art & Text*, Princeton 2007.

EMMANUEL-REBUFFAT 1988
D. EMMANUEL-REBUFFAT, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. France 1. Paris, Musée du Louvre 1,* Roma 1988.

EMMANUEL-REBUFFAT 1997
D. EMMANUEL-REBUFFAT, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. France 1. Paris, Musée du Louvre 3,* Roma 1997.

EMILIOZZI 1974
A. EMILIOZZI, *La Collezione Rossi Danielli nel Museo Civico di Viterbo*, Roma 1974.

FACCHINETTI 2010
G. FACCHINETTI, *Offrire nelle acque: bacini e altre strutture sacrificali*, in H. DI GIUSEPPE, M. SERLORENZI, ed. by, *I riti del costruire nelle acque violate*, Roma 2010, pp. 43-68.

FARINELLI 2018
F. FARINELLI, *La natura del paesaggio*, in L. RICCA, ed. by, *Conversazioni Naturali* («I quaderni di PsicoArt», 8, 2018), pp. 73-83.

FERRARI 2011
A. FERRARI, *Dizionario dei luoghi del mito. Geografia reale e immaginaria del mondo classico*, Milano 2011.

FERRARI, PINOTTI 2018
D. FERRARI, A. PINOTTI, *La Cornice. Storie, teorie, testi*, Monza 2018.

FERRI 1962
S. FERRI, *L'archeologia come disciplina*, in «Studi Classici e Orientali», 11, *Opuscola. Scritti vari di metodologia storico-artistica*, 1962, pp. 3-12.

FERUGLIO 1997
A. E. FERUGLIO, *Uno specchio della necropoli di Castel Viscardo, presso Orvieto, con Apollo, Turan e Atunis*, in *Etrusca et Italica. Scritti in ricordo di Massimo Pallottino*, Pisa-Roma 1997, pp. 299-314.

FISCHER-GRAF 1980
U. FISHER-GRAF, *Spiegelwerkstätten in Vulci*, Berlin 1980.

FONTAINE 2009
P. FONTAINE, *Plantes et nature dans la peinture funéraire étrusque. Observations à propos de la Tombe de la Chasse et de la Pêche à Tarquinia*, in S. BRUNI, ed. by, *Etruria e Italia Preromana. Studi in Onore di Giovannangelo Camporeale*, Pisa-Roma 2009, pp. 373-378.

FRACCARO 1951
P. FRACCARO, *Giovanni Patroni*, in «Studi Etruschi», XXI, pp. 498-500.

FRANKE 1976
P.R. FRANKE, *Apollo Leucadius und Octavianus?*, in «Chiron», 6, 1976, pp. 159-163.

FRANZINI TIBALDEO 2015
R. FRANZINI TIBALDEO, *La conoscibilità del mondo secondo Alexander von Humboldt: l'esperienza del paesaggio*, in «Rivista Geografica Italiana», 122, 2015, pp. 1-15.

FRANZONI 2006
C. FRANZONI, *Tirannia sguardo. Corpo, gesto, espressione dell'arte greca*, Torino 2007.

FRANZONI 2012
F. FRANZONI, *Pittura parietale e architettura nelle tombe tarquiniesi più recenti*, in M. HARARI, S. PALTINERI, M. ROBINO, ed. by, *Segni e Colore. Dialoghi sulla pittura tardoclassica ed ellenistica*. Conference Proceedings (Pavia 2012), Roma 2012, pp. 87-93.

FRASCARELLI 1995
A. FRASCARELLI, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Italia 2. Perugia, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 1*, Roma 1995.

FRATI 2018
M. FRATI, *Un metodo appena sfiorato: Giovanni Patroni e i prodromi dell'archeologia stratigrafica in Italia*, in F. SOGLIANI, B. GARGIULO, E. ANNUNZIATA, V. VITALE, ed. by, *VIII Congresso Nazionale di Archeologia Medievale I*, Firenze 2018, pp. 11-15.

FRERE 2006
D. FRERE, *Gestes et sons dans les mondes italique et étrusque*, in M. T. SCHETTINO, S. PITTIA, ed. by, *Les sons du pouvoir dans les mondes anciens*, Besançon 2012, pp. 265-273.

FURTWÄNGLER 1900
A. FURTWÄNGLER, *Die antiken Gemmen*, Leipzig-Berlin 1900.

FUSCO 2011
U. FUSCO, *Il culto di Ercole presso il complesso archeologico di Campetti, area S-O, a Veio: testimonianze dall'età etrusca a quella romana*, in «Archeologia Classica», 62, 2011, pp. 379-412.

GAIGER 2000
J. GAIGER, *Schiller's Theory of Landscape Depiction*, in «Journal of the History of Ideas», 61, 1, 2000, pp. 115-132.

GALLI 1916
E. GALLI, *Il sarcofago etrusco di Torre San Severo con quattro scene del mito troiano*, in «Monumenti Antichi», 24, 1916, cc. 5-116.

GALLI 1922
E. GALLI, *Vasi di Monteluce presso Perugia*, in «Bollettino d'Arte», 1, 1922, pp. 21-37.

GALLI 2013
M. GALLI, *'Immagini della memoria'. Teoria della visione in Emanuel Löwy*, in M.G. PICOZZI, ed. by, *Ripensare Emanuel Löwy*, Roma 2013, pp. 141-188.

GAMBI 1958
L. GAMBI, *In margine al primo Convegno internazionale di storia e geografia rurali*, in «Rivista Geografica Italiana», 65, 1, 1958, pp. 52-60.

GASSER 1969
M. GASSER, *Tarquinia und sein Territorium*, in M. MORETTI, G. MAETZKE, M. GASSER, ed. by, *Kunst und Land der Etrusker*, Zurich-Würzburg 1969.

GATALINA 1988
L. I. GATALINA, *Krater*, in *Die Welt der Etrusker. Archäologische Denkmäler aus Museen der sozialistischen Länder*. Exhibition catalogue (Berlin 1988), Berlin 1988, p. 253.

GAULTIER 1987
F. GAULTIER, *Le "peintre de la danseuse aux crotales". Recherches sur les ateliers de céramique de Vulci dans la première moitié du Ve siècle av. J.-C.*, in «Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome. Antiquité», 99, 1987, pp. 63-93.

GAULTIER 2003
F. GAULTIER, *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. France 39, Musée du Louvre 26*, Paris 2003.

GAULTIER, HAUMESSER, CHATZIEFREMIDOU 2014
F. GAULTIER, L. HAUMESSER, K. CHATZIEFREMIDOU, *L'art étrusque. 100 chefs-d'œuvre du Musée du Louvre*, Paris 2014.

GAULTIER, VILLARD 1985
F. GAULTIER, F. VILLARD, *Les* stamnoi *Fould: un dernier éclat de la peinture sur vases en Étrurie*, in «Monuments et mémoires de la Fondation Eugène Piot», 67, 1985, pp. 1-30.

GAUNT 2005
J. GAUNT, *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Great Britain 21, Harrow School*, Oxford 2005.

GERHARD 1843
E. GERHARD, *Etruskische Spiegel* (Band 1), Berlin 1843.

GERHARD 1845
E. GERHARD, *Etruskische Spiegel* (Band 2), Berlin 1845.

GERHARD 1867
E. GERHARD, *Etruskische Spiegel* (Band 4), Berlin 1867.

GERHARD, KÖRTE 1897
E. GERHARD, G. KÖRTE, *Etruskische Spiegel* (Band 5), Berlin 1897.

GENTILI 2000
M.D. GENTILI, *Il "maestro di* Phaun*" e la sua bottega. Considerazioni su un gruppo di specchi etruschi figurati*, in M.D. GENTILI, ed. by, *Aspetti e problemi della produzione degli specchi etruschi figurati*. Conference Proceedings (Roma 1997), Roma 2000, pp. 115-141.

GENTILI 2009
M.D. GENTILI, *Il sarcofago delle Danaidi di Tuscania e la cultura classica di una matrona etrusca*, in C. BRAIDOTTI, E. DETTORI, E. LANZILLOTTA, ed. by, Ou pan ephemeron. *Scritti in memoria di Roberto Pretagostini*, Roma 2009, pp. 651-661.

GHINI, DIOSONO 2012
G. GHINI, F. DIOSONO, *Il santuario di Diana a Nemi: recenti acquisizioni dai nuovi scavi*, in E. MARRONI, ed. by, Sacra Nominis Latini. *I santuari del Lazio arcaico e repubblicano*, Conference Proceedings (Roma, 2009), «Ostraka» special issue, 2012, pp. 119-137.

GIANNINI 1963
A. GIANNINI, *Studi sulla paradossografia greca, I. Da Omero a Callimaco: motivi e forme del meraviglioso*, in «Rendiconti. Classe di lettere e scienze morali e storiche, Istituto lombardo, Accademia di scienze e lettere», 97, 1963, pp. 247-266.

GILL 1990
D.W.J. GILL, *Museum Supplement: Recent Acquisitions by the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, 1971-1989*, in «The Journal of Hellenic Studies», 110, 1990, pp. 290-294.

GILOTTA 1984
F. GILOTTA, *A proposito della* oinochoe *di Castle Ashby*, in «Prospettiva», 37, 1984, pp. 46-51.

GILOTTA 1985
F. GILOTTA, *Il problema 'earlier red figure'*, in *Contributi alla ceramica etrusca tardo-classica*, Roma 1985, pp. 25-33.

GILOTTA 1986
F. GILOTTA, *Appunti sulla più antica ceramica etrusca a figure rosse*, in «Prospettiva», 45, 1986, pp. 2-18.

GILOTTA 1987
F. GILOTTA, *Nei musei di Berlino e di Civita Castellana*, in «Prospettiva», 49, 1987, pp. 53-60

GILOTTA 1992
F. GILOTTA, *Una cista, il trionfo o la morte: su alcuni aspetti di iconografie celebrative etrusco-italiche*, in «Bollettino d'Arte», 74-75, 1992 , pp. 77-84.

GILOTTA 1996
F. GILOTTA, *"So we go on, dimness after dimness". Osservazioni su alcune tombe dipinte di Tarquinia*, in «Bollettino d'Arte», 96-97, 1996, pp. 81-96.

GILOTTA 2000a
F. GILOTTA, *Specchi prenestini: appunti gli avvii della produzione*, in «Orizzonti. Rassegna di Archeologia», I, 2000, pp. 93-104.

GILOTTA 2000b
F. GILOTTA, *Specchi prenestini tardo-classici: qualche appunto sugli avvii della produzione*, in M.D. GENTILI, ed. by, *Aspetti e problemi della produzione degli specchi etruschi figurati*. Conference Proceedings (Roma 1997), Roma 2000, pp. 143-163.

GILOTTA 2001
F. GILOTTA, *Addenda alla più antica ceramica etrusca a figure rosse*, in «Studi Etruschi», LXIV-1998, 2001, pp. 135-148.

GILOTTA 2002
F. GILOTTA, *Note prenestine*, in A. EMILIOZZI, A. MAGGIANI, ed. by, *Caelatores. Incisori di specchi e ciste tra Lazio ed Etruria*, Roma 2002, pp. pp. 59-81.

GILOTTA 2005
F. GILOTTA, *L'Aiace di Palermo tra teatro e ideologia funeraria*, in F. GILOTTA, ed. by, *Pittura parietale, pittura vascolare. Ricerche in corso tra Etruria e Campania.* Conference Proceedings (Santa Maria Capua Vetere, 28 Maggio 2003), Napoli 2005, pp. 73-77.

GILOTTA 2007
F. GILOTTA, *Pitture etrusche: discussioni e studi recenti*, in «Bollettino d'Arte», 140, 2007, pp. 57-74.

GILOTTA 2010
F. GILOTTA, *A journey to Hades with Turms Aitas*, in L.B. VAN DER MEER, ed. by, *Material Aspects of Etruscan Religion*. Conference Proceedings (Leuven, 2008), «BaBesch» Suppl., Leuven-Paris-Walpole 2010, pp. 105-115.

GILOTTA 2012b
F. GILOTTA, *Un nuovo cratere del Pittore Fould*, in «Prospettiva», 147-148, 2012, pp. 124-125.

GILOTTA 2019
F. GILOTTA, *Il 'vaso' policromo dalla tomba di Monte Abatone 454*, in A. CARDARELLI, A. NASO, ed. by, *Etruschi Maestri Artigiani. Nuove prospettive da Cerveteri e Tarquinia*, Napoli 2019, pp. 108-109.

GINGE 1987
B. GINGE, *Ceramiche etrusche a figure nere. Materiali del Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Tarquinia*, Roma 1987.

GIOVANELLI 2010
E. GIOVANELLI, *A proposito di uno scarabeo da Colle del Forno. Alcune considerazioni sulla produzione di stile globulare*, in «LANX», 5, 2010, pp. 208-216.

GISLER 1994
J.R. GISLER, s.v. *Prometheus*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, VII, Zürich-München 1994, pp. 531-553.

GIUDICE 2015
E. GIUDICE, *Il* tymbos *la stele la barca di Caronte. L'immaginario della morte sulle* lekythoi *funerarie a fondo bianco*, Roma 2015.

GIULIANI 2003
L. GIULIANI, *Bild und Mythos: Geschichte der Bilderzählung in der griechischen Kunst*, München 2003.

GIULIANI 2013
L. GIULIANI, *Image and Myth. A history of Pictorial Narration in Greek Art*, Chicago 2013.

GIULIANI 2017
L. GIULIANI, *The emergence and function of narrative images in ancient Greece*, in «Res», 67-68, 2017, pp. 193-206.

GIULIANI 2021
L. GIULIANI, *Parlare di immagini al simposio. Con un'appendice sulla scena del tuffo*, in A. MERIANI, G. ZUCHTRIEGEL, ed. by, *La tomba del Tuffatore. Rito, arte e poesia a Paestum e nel Mediterraneo d'epoca tardo-arcaica*. Conference Proceedings (Paestum, 4-6 ottobre 2018), Pisa 2021, pp. 215-227.

GIULIANO, BUZZI 1992
A. GIULIANO, G. BUZZI, *Splendore degli Etruschi. Dalle pitture murali agli oggetti in oro, dai bronzi alla ceramica*, Roma 1992.

GNOLI, VERNANT 1990
G. GNOLI, J.-P. VERNANT, ed. by, *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*, Paris 1990.

GOETHE 1983
J.W. GOETHE, *La metamorfosi delle piante*, Milano 1983.

GOMBRICH 1960
E. GOMBRICH, *Art and Illusion. A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation*, New York 1960.

GOMBRICH 1978
E. GOMBRICH, *Norm and Form. Studies in the Art of the Renaissance*, London-New York 1978.

GOMBRICH 1979
H. GOMBRICH, *The Sense of Order: A study in the psychology of decorative art*, London 1979.

GORRINI 2005
M.E. GORRINI, *Museo in Etruria* in F. GIUDICE, R. PANVINI, ed. by, *Il greco, il barbaro e la ceramica attica. Immaginario del diverso, processi di scambio e autorappresentazione degli indigeni*. Conference Proceedings (Roma, 2001), Roma 2006, pp. 57-68.

GORRINI 2006
M.E. GORRINI, *Healing heroes in Thessaly: Chiron the Centaur*, in A. MAZARAKIS-AINIAN, *Αρχαιολογικό έργο Θεσσαλίας και Στερεάς Ελλάδας*. Conference Proceedings (Thessaly-Sterea Ellada 2003), Volos 2006, pp. 283-295.

GOVI 2009
E. GOVI, *Aspetti oscuri del rituale funerario nelle stele felsinee*, in S. BRUNI, ed. by, *Etruria e Italia Preromana. Studi in Onore di Giovannangelo Camporeale*, Pisa-Roma 2009, pp. 455-463.

GOVI 2010
E. GOVI, *Le stele di Bologna di V sec. a.C.: modelli iconografici tra Grecia ed Etruria*, in «Bollettino di Archeologia Online», I, 2010, Special Issue: *Meetings Between Cultures in the Ancient Mediterranean*, pp. 36-47.

GOVI 2011
E. GOVI, *Rinascere dopo la morte. Una scena enigmatica sul-la stele n. 2 del sepolcreto Tamburini di Bologna*, in *Tra Protostoria e Storia. Studi in onore di Loredana Capuis*, Roma, pp. 195-207.

GOVI 2016
E. GOVI, *Scilla sulle stele funerarie etrusche di Bologna. Qualche riflessione*, in *I mille volti del passato. Scritti in onore di Francesca Ghedini*, Roma 2016, pp. 145-156.

GOVI 2017
E. GOVI, ed. by, *La città etrusca e il sacro. Santuari e istituzioni politiche*. Conference proceedings (Bologna, 2016), Bologna 2017.

GOVI, SASSATELLI 2004
E. GOVI, G. SASSATELLI, *Ceramica attica e stele felsinee*, in *I Greci in Adriatico*, 2, Roma 2004, pp. 227-265.

GOW 1934
A.S.F. GOW, Ιυγξ, ῥόμβος, rhombus, turbo, in «Journal of Hellenic Studies», 54, 1934, pp. 1-13.

GRAF 1979
F. GRAF, *Apollon Delphinios*, in «Museum Helveticum», 36, 1, 1979, pp. 2-22.

GRAF 2007
F. GRAF, *Il mito in Grecia,* Taranto 2007 (First German Edition *Griechische Mythologie*, Münich 1985).

GREIFENHAGEN 1978
A. GREIFENHAGEN, *Zeichnungen nach etruskischen Vasen im Deutschen Archäologischen Institut, Rom*, in «Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung», LXXXV, 1978, pp.

GRENIER 1928
A. GRENIER, *Cronique des Études antiques. Nouveau Périodique*, in «Revue des Études Anciennes», 30, 4, 1928, p. 338.

GRETHLEIN 2017
J. GRETHLEIN, *Aesthetic Experiences and Classical Antiquity: The Significance of Form in Narratives and Pictures*, Cambridge 2017.

GRETHLEIN 2018
J. GRETHLEIN, *Ornamental and formulaic patterns: The semantic significance of form in early Greek vase-painting and Homeric epic*, in N. DIETRICH, M. SQUIRE, ed. by, *Ornament and figure in Graeco-Roman Art. Rethinking Visual Ontologies in Classical Antiquity*, Berlin-Boston 2018, pp. 73-96.

GRUZINSKI, ROUVERET 1976
S. GRUZINSKI E A. ROUVERET, *"Ellos son como niiios". Histoire et acculturation dans le Mexique colonia et l'Italie méridionale avant la romanisation*, in «Mélanges de l'école française de Rome. Antiquité», 88, 1, 1976, pp. 159-219.

GUARINO 2011
A. GUARINO, *Croce,* crux interpretum. *Alcune note sulla croce celeste etrusca, sull'orientamento dei templi etrusco-italici e sul fegato di Piacenza*, in F. RONCALLI, ed. by, Munuscula. *Omaggio degli allievi napoletani a Mauro Cristofani*, Napoli 2011, pp. 183-235.

Günter Puhze 1985
Kunst der Antike. Galerie Günter Puhze, VI, 1985.

GURY 1994
F. GURY, s.v. *Selene/Luna*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, VII, Zürich-München 1994, pp. 706-715.

HANFMANN 1937
G.M.A. HANFMANN, *Studies in Etruscan Bronze Reliefs: The Gigantomachy*, in «The Art Bulletin», 19, 3, 1937, pp. 463-485.

HANNESTAD 1974
L. HANNESTAD, *The Paris Painter: An Etruscan Vase-painter*, Copenhagen 1974.

HANSSON 2020
U.R. HANSSON, *"More Feared than Loved". Interactional Strategies in Late Nineteenth-Century Classical Archaeology: The Case of Adolf Furtwängler*, in J. ROBERTS, K. SHEPPARD, U.R. HANSSON, J.R. TRIGG (ed. by), *Communities and Knowledge Production in Archaeology*, Manchester 2020, pp. 129-147.

HARARI 1983
M. HARARI, *Sulla recezione dei modelli classici nella pittura vascolare etrusca*, in S. KAROUZOU *et alii*, ed by, *Praktikà tou XII Diethous Synedrion Klasikis archeologhias*, Athina, pp. 146-150.

HARARI 1988a
M. HARARI, *Les gardiens de paradis: Iconographie funéraire et iconographie mythologique dans la céramique étrusque à figures rouges tardive*, in «Numismatica e Antichità Classiche», 17, 1988, pp. 169-187.

HARARI 1988b
M. HARARI, *Dioniso, i pirati, i delfini*, in «PACT», 20, T. HACKENS, ed. by, *Navies and Commerce of the Greeks, the Carthaginians and the Etruscans in the Tyrrhenian Sea*, Conference Proceedings (Ravello, 1987), pp. 35-45.

HARARI 1990
M. HARARI, *Il Pittore dell'Aja a Leida e il problema del Gruppo "Funnel"*, in «Oudheidkundige mededelingen uit het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden», 70, 1990, pp. 33-48.

HARARI 1995
M. HARARI, *Ipotesi sulle regole del montaggio narrativo nella pittura vascolare etrusca*, in *Modi e funzioni del racconto mitico nella ceramica greca, italiota ed etrusca dal VI al IV secolo a.C.* Conference Proceedings (Raito di Vietri sul Mare, 1994), Salerno 1995, 103-135.

HARARI 1997a
M. HARARI, s.v. *Tuchulcha*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, VIII, Zürich-München 1997, pp. 97-98.

HARARI 1997b
M. HARARI, s.v. *Turms*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, VIII, Zürich-München 1997 pp. 98-111.

HARARI 1997c
M. HARARI, *Di nuovo sul cratere guarnacciano del Pittore di Montebradoni. Questioni di sintassi e di semantica*, in G. MAETZKE, ed. by, *Aspetti della cultura di Volterra etrusca fra l'età del ferro e l'età ellenistica e contributi della*

ricerca antropologica alla conoscenza del popolo etrusco, Conference Proceedings (Volterra, 15-19 ottobre 1995), Firenze 1997, pp. 193-205.

HARARI 2000
M. HARARI, *Le ceramiche dipinte di età classica ed ellenistica*, in M. TORELLI, ed. by, *Gli Etruschi*. Exhibition Catalogue (Venezia 2000), Milano 2000 pp. 439-453.

HARARI 2003
M. HARARI, *Lo specchio di Castro: un giuoco delle parti?*, in *Tra Orvieto e Vulci. Annali della Fondazione per il Museo 'Claudio Faina'*, X, 2003, pp. 499-510.

HARARI 2005
M. HARARI, *La Tomba n. 2957 di Tarquinia, detta dei Pigmei:* addenda et corrigenda, in F. GILOTTA, ed. by, *Pittura parietale, pittura vascolare. Ricerche in corso tra Etruria e Campania.* Conference Proceedings (Santa Maria Capua Vetere, 2003), Napoli 2005, pp. 79-91.

HARARI 2007
M. HARARI, *Lo scudo spezzato di Vel Saties*, in «Ostraka», 16, 2007, pp. 45-54.

HARARI 2008
M. HARARI, *Collo, corpo, piede, lati A e B. Punti di vista nella pittura vascolare*, in G. SENA CHIESA, ed. by, *Vasi, Immagini, Collezionismo. La collezione di Vasi Intesa Sanpaolo e i nuovi indirizzi di ricerca sulla ceramica greca e magnogreca*, Milano 2008, pp. 355-362.

HARARI 2009
M. HARARI, Traditio disciplinae. *Postille allo specchio di Tuscania*, in S. BRUNI, ed. by, *Etruria e Italia Preromana. Studi in Onore di Giovannangelo Camporeale*, Pisa-Roma 2009, pp. 475-480.

HARARI 2010
M. HARARI, *The Imagery of the Etrusco-Faliscan Pantheon between Architectural Sculpture and Vase-painting*, in in L.B. VAN DER MEER, ed. by, *Material Aspects of Etruscan Religion*. Conference Proceedings (Leuven, 2008), «BaBesch» Suppl., Leuven-Paris-Walpole 2010, pp. 83-103.

HARARI 2011
M. HARARI, *Perché all'inferno cresce la barba ai draghi*, in G.F. LA TORRE, M. TORELLI, ed. by, *Pittura ellenistica in Italia e in Sicilia. Linguaggi e tradizioni*, Roma 2011, pp. 387-397.

HARARI 2012a
M. HARARI, *Etruscologia e fascismo*, in «Athenaeum», 100, 2012, pp. 405-418.

HARARI 2012b
M. HARARI, *Orco III*, in C. CHIARAMONTE TRERÉ, G. BAGNASCO GIANNI, F. CHIESA, ed. by, *Interpretando l'Antico. Scritti di archeologia offerti a Maria Bonghi Jovino*, Milano 2012, pp. 287-308.

HARARI 2014
M. HARARI, *Histoire et imaginaire des anciennes Italies*, in M. ABERSON, M.C. BIELLA, M. DI FAZIO, M. WULLSCHLEGER, ed. by, *Entre archéologie et histoire: dialogues sur divers peuples de l'Italie préromaine. E pluribus unum?* Conference Proceedings (Genève, 2013), Bern 2014, pp. 5-18.

HARARI 2017
M. HARARI, *Finem Dare*, in M. CUPITO, M. VIDALE, A. ANGELINI, ed. by, *Beyond Limits. Studi in onore di Giovanni Leonardi*, Padova 2017, pp. 569-576.

HARARI 2018
M. HARARI, *L'insegnamento dell'archeologia nell'Università di Pavia dall'Unità d'Italia alla fine della Prima Guerra Mondiale*, in D. MANTOVANI,

ed. by, Almum Studium Papiense. *Storia dell'Università di Pavia. 2. Dall'Età austriaca alla nuova Italia. II. Dalla Restaurazione alla Grande Guerra*, Milano 2018, pp. 1265-1268.

HARARI, PALTINERI 2010
M. HARARI, S. PALTINERI, *Edilizia etrusca nella* chora *di Adria*, in M. BENTZ, C. REUSSER, ed. by, *Etruskisch-italische und römisch-republikanische Häuser*, Wiesbaden 2010.

HARMAN 2018
G. HARMAN, *Object-Oriented Ontology. A New Theory of Everything*, London 2018.

HARMAN 2019
G. HARMAN, ed. by, *Object-Oriented Ontology and Its Critics*, in «Open Philosophy», 2, 2019.

HARMAN 2020
G. HARMAN, ed. by, *Object-Oriented Ontology and Its Critics II*, in «Open Philosophy», 3, 2020.

HARMAN 2021
G. HARMAN, ed. by, *Object-Oriented Ontology and Its Critics III*, in «Open Philosophy», 4, 2021.

HARRISON 2013
A. HARRISON, *Animals in the Etruscan household and environment*, in J. MACINTOSH TURFA, ed. by, *The Etruscan World*, New York 2013, pp. 890-918.

HAUMESSER 2011
L. HAUMESSER, *Lamine decorate a sbalzo*, in P. BRUSCHETTI, F. GAULTIER, P. GIULIERINI, L. HAUMESSER, ed. by, *Gli Etruschi dall'Arno al Tevere. Le*

collezioni del Louvre a Cortona, Exhibition Catalogue (Cortona, 2011), Milano 2011, pp. 244-245.

HAUMESSER 2018
L. HAUMESSER, *Des oiseaux, des arbustes et des hommes dans la peinture étrusque archaïque*, in «Mediterranea. Quaderni annuali dell'Istituto di studi sulle civiltà italiche e del Mediterraneo antico del Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche», XV, 2018, pp. 355-362.

HEDREEN 2001
G. HEEDREN, *Capturing Troy: the narrative functions of landscape in archaic and early classical Greek art*. Ann Arbor, 2001.

HEDREEN 2007
G. HEEDREN, *Involved Spectatorship in Archaic Greek Art*, in «Art History», 30, 2, 2007, pp. 217-246.

HEDREEN 2012
G. HEDREEN, *Vase-Painting and Narrative Logic: The Death of Troilos in Greece and Etruria*, in S. SCHIERUP, B. BUNDGAARD RASMUSSEN, ed. by, *Red-Figure Iconography in its Ancient Setting*. Conference proceedings (Copenhagen, 2009), Aarhus 2012, pp. 134-146.

HEDREEN 2017
G. HEDREEN, *Unframing the Representation. The Frontal Face in Greek Art*, in V. PLATT, M. SQUIRE, ed. by, *The Frame in Classical Art: A Cultural History*, Cambridge 2017, pp. 154-187.

HEINEMANN 1910
M. HEINEMANN, *Landschaftliche Elemente in der griechischen Kunst bis Polygnot*, Bonn 1910

HEINEMANN 2019
A. HEINEMANN, *The Cave, the Gaze, the Bride, and her Lover The Constraints of Narrating Desire on a Hellenistic Mirror*, in E. WAGNER-DURAND, B. FATH, A. HEINEMANN, ed. by, *Image, Narration, Context. Visual Narration in Cultures and Societies of the Old World*, Heidelberg 2019, pp. 335-369.

HEINEMANN 2021
A. HEINEMANN, *Stasera mi butto. La Tomba del Tuffatore e l'esperienza immersiva del simposio*, in in A. MERIANI, G. ZUCHTRIEGEL, ed. by, *La tomba del Tuffatore. Rito, arte e poesia a Paestum e nel Mediterraneo d'epoca tardo-arcaica*. Conference Proceedings (Paestum, 4-6 ottobre 2018), Pisa 2021, pp. 229-257.

HENRICHS 1987
A. HENRICHS 1987, *Myth Visualized: Dionysos and His Circle in Sixth-Century Attic Vase-Paintings*, in *Papers on the Amasis Painter and His World*, Los Angeles 1987, pp. 94-95.

HERBIG 1933
R. HERBIG, *Verstreute etruskische Denkmäler in deutschen Sammlungen*, in «Studi Etruschi», VII, 1933, 353-366.

HERBIG 1952
R. HERBIG, *Die Jüngeretruskischen Steinsarkophage*, Berlin 1952.

HERBIG 1955-1956
R. HERBIG, *Die Kranzspiegelgruppe*, in «Studi Etruschi», XXIV, 1955-1956, pp. 183-205.

HERES 1987
G. HERES, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Deutsche Demokratische Republik 2, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Skulpturensammlung;*

Leipzig, Museum des Kusthandwerks; Gotha, Schlossmuseum; Jena, Friedrich-Schiller-Universität, Berlin 1987.

HESS 1963
R. VON HESS, *Raccolta R.H. Aus einer privaten Antikensammlung*, Basel 1963.

HIGHBARGER 1940
E.L. HIGHBARGER, *The gate of Dreams*, Baltimore 1940.

HIMMELMANN 1968
N. HIMMELMANN, *Über einige gegenständliche Bedeutungsmöglichkeiten des frühgriechischen Ornaments*, Mainz 1968.

HODGE 2010
A. HODGE, *Actor training*, London 2010.

HOLLIDAY 1993
J. HOLLIDAY, ed. by, *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art*, Cambridge 1993.

HÖCKMANN 1987
U. HÖCKMANN, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum, Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1. Bad Schwalbach, Bochum, Bonn, Darmstadt, Essen, Francoforte, Kassel, Colonia, Mainz, Mannheim, Schloss Fasanerie bei Fulda*, Berlin 1987.

HÖLSCHER 2004
T. HÖLSCHER, *Arte e Società: il progetto di Bianchi Bandinelli per la generazione dei nipoti*, in M. BARBANERA (ed. by), *Storie dell'arte antica. Atti del convegno "Storia dell'arte antica nell'ultima generazione: tendenze e prospettive" (Roma, 19-20 febbraio 2001)*, Roma 2004, pp. 17-24.

HÖLSCHER 2016
T. HÖLSCHER, *'Is painting a representation of visible things?' Conceptual reality in Greek Art: A preliminary sketch*, in J. BINTLIFF, K. RUTHER, ed. by, *Archaeology of Greece and Rome. Studies in honour of Anthony Snodgrass*, Edinburgh 2016, pp. 262-288.

HOLT 1992
P. HOLT, *Ajax's Burial in Early Greek Epic*, in «The American Journal of Philology», 113, 3, pp. 319-331.

HÖPFLINGER 2010
A.K. HÖPFLINGER, *Schlangenkampf: Ein Vergleich von ausgewählten Bild- und Textquellen aus dem griechisch-römischen und dem altorientalischen Kulturraum*, Zurich 2010.

HOSTETLER 2007
K.L. HOSTETLER, *Serpent Iconography*, in «Etruscan Studies. Journal of the Etruscan Foundation», 10, 2007, pp. 203-209.

HROBAT 2007
K. HROBAT, *Use of Oral Tradition in Archaeology*, in «European Journal of Archaeology», 10, 2007, pp. 31-56.

HUERTA SEGOVIA 2019
P. HUERTA SEGOVIA, *Populonia (Livorno), necropoli di San Cerbone, "Tomba delle* hydriai *di* Meidias*"*, in L. BENTINI, M. MARCHESI, L. MINARINI, G. SASSATELLI, ed. by, *Etruschi. Viaggio nelle terre dei Rasna* Exhibition Catalogue (Bologna 2019-2020), Milano 2019, pp. 112-113.

HUMBOLDT 1807
A. VON HUMBOLDT, *Essai sur la Géographie des Plantes*, Paris 1807.

HUMBOLDT 1847
A. VON HUMBOLDT, *Kosmos. Entwurf einer physischen Weltbeschreíbung* II, Stuttgart and Tübingen 1847.

HUMBOLDT 1848
A. VON HUMBOLDT, *Kosmos. A General Survey of Physical Phenomena of the Universe* II, London 1848.

HUMPHREYS 1977
S. HUMPHREYS, *Eleven Ships from Etruria*, in «The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology and Underwater Exploration», 6, 2, 1977, pp. 153-175.

HURWIT 1977
J.M. HURWIT, *Image and Frame in Greek Art*, in «American Journal of Archaeology», 81, 1977, pp. 1-30.

HURWIT 1982
J.M. HURWUIT, *Palm Trees and the Pathetic Fallacy in Archaic Greek Poetry and Art*, in «The Classical Journal», 77, 3, 1982, pp. 193-199.

HURWIT 1991
J.M. HURWUIT, *The Representation of Nature in Early Greek Art*, in D. BUITRON-OLIVER, ed. by, *New Perspectives in Early Greek Art* (Studies in the History of Art, Symposium Papers, 32), 1991, pp. 32-62.

HURWIT 1992
J.M. HURWUIT, *A Note on Ornament, Nature, and Boundary in Early Greek Art*, in «Bulletin Antieke Beschaving. Annual Papers on Classical Archaeology», 67, 1992, pp. 63-72.

HURWIT 2001
J.M. HURWUIT, *Review of* Guy Michael Hedreen, *Capturing Troy: the narrative functions of landscape in archaic and early classical Greek art*, Ann Arbor 2001, in «Bryn Mawr Classical Review», 2002.

HURWUT 2012
J.M. HURWUIT, *Boularchos, the Chigi Painter, and the interdependence of free-painting and vase-painting in the Seventh Century*, in E. MUGIONE, ed. by, *L'Ople Chigi. Storia di un* agalma, Salerno 2012, pp. 103-110.

IACOPI 1956
G. IACOPI, *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, Museo Nazionale Tarquiniense*, 2, Roma 1956.

ISLER-KERÉNYI 2007
C. ISLER-KERÉNYI, *Dionysos in Archaic Greece. An Understanding through Images*, Leuven-Boston 2007.

ISLER-KERÉNYI 2009
C. ISLER-KERÉNYI 2009, *Antefisse sileniche fra Grecia e Etruria*, in «OCNUS. Quaderni della Scuola di Specializzazione in Beni Archeologici», 17, 2009, pp. 55-64.

ISLER-KERÉNYI 2015
C. ISLER-KERÉNYI 2015, *La vite e l'edera di Dioniso*, in G. SENA CHIESA, A. PONTRANDOLFO, ed. by, *Mito e Natura. Dalla Grecia a Pompei*, Milano 2015, pp. 110-120.

JACOBSTHAL 1927
P. JACOBSTHAL, *Ornamente griechischer Vasen*, Berlin 1927.

JAKOB 2005
M. JAKOB, *Paesaggio e Letteratura*, Firenze 2005.

JANNOT 1979
J-R. JANNOT, *La lyre et la cithare: les instruments à cordes de la musique étrusque*, in «L'Antiquité classique», 48, 1979, pp. 469-507.

JANNOT 1984a
J.-R. JANNOT, 1984. *Les reliefs archaïques de Chiusi*, Roma 1984.

JANNOT 1984b
J.-R. JANNOT, *Sur les fausses portes étrusques*, in «Latomus», XLIII, 2, 1984, pp. 273-283.

JANNOT 1985
J.-R. JANNOT, *De l'*agôn *au geste rituel. L'exemple de la boxe étrusque*, in «L'Antiquité Classique», 54, 1985, pp. 66-75.

JANNOT 1987
J.-R. JANNOT, *Sur la représentation étrusque des morts*, in F. HINARD, ed. by, *La Mort, les Morts et l'Au-Delà dans le monde romain*. Conference Proceedings (Caen, 20-22 November 1985), Caen 1987, pp. 279-291.

JANNOT 1988a
J.-R. JANNOT, *Musiques et musiciens étrusques*, in «Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres», 132, 2, 1988, pp. 311-334.

JANNOT 1988b
J.-R. JANNOT, *A propos de la tombe du lit funèbre*, in *Studia Tarquiniensa* (Archaeologia Perusina 9), Roma, 1988, pp. 53-67.

JANNOT 1993
J.-R. JANNOT, *Charun, Tuchulcha et les autres*, in «RM», 100, 1993, pp. 59-81.

JANNOT 1995
J.-R. JANNOT, *À propos des cavaliers de la tombe Querciola. Développement d'une nouvelle cavalerie à l'aube du IVe siècle?*, in «Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome. Antiquité», 107, 1995, pp. 13-31.

JANNOT 2000
J.-R. JANNOT, *Etruscans and the Afterworld*, in «Etruscan Studies», 7, 2000, pp. 81-96.

JANNOT 2009
J.R. JANNOT, *The Lotus, Poppy and other Plants in Etruscan Funerary Contexts*, in J. SWADDLING, P. PERKINS, ed. by, *Etruscan by Definition: Papers in Honour of Sybille Haynes*, London 2009, pp. 81-86.

JEANMAIRE 1951
H. JEANMAIRE, *Dionysos, histoire du culte de Bacchus*, Paris 1951.

JOHNSTONE 1937
M.A. JOHNSTONE, *Etruscan Collections in the Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh, and the National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland, Edinburgh*, in «Studi Etruschi», 11, pp. 387-406.

JOLIVET 1993
V. JOLIVET, *Les jeux scéniques en Etrurie: premiers témoignages (VIe-IVe s.)*, in *Spectacles sportifs et scéniques dans le monde étrusco-italique*. Conference Proceedings (Roma 1991), Roma 1993, pp. 349-377.

JOLIVET 2018
V. JOLIVET, *De la lenteur en céramologie: les 70 ans du Funnel Group*, in «Mediterranea. Quaderni annuali dell'Istituto di studi sulle civiltà italiche e del Mediterraneo antico del Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche», 15, 2018 pp. 243-254.

JUCKER 1997
I. JUCKER, *Tydeus Und Melanippos vor Theben*, in «Antike Kunst», 40, 1997, pp. 82-88.

JUCKER 2001
I. JUCKER, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Schweiz 1. Basel, Schaffhausen, Bern, Lausanne*, Bern 2001.

JURGEIT 2006
F. JURGEIT, *I vasi a gabbia*, in «Scienze dell'Antichità. Storia. Archeologia. Antropologia», 13, 2006, pp. 597-610.

JURGEIT 2017
F. JURGEIT, *Im Bann der Bronze*, in *Die Etrusker. Weltkultur im antiken Italien*. Exhibition Catalogue (Karlsruhe, 2017-2018), Darmstadt 2017, pp. 248-249.

KAMPAKOGLOU, NOVOKHATKO 2018
A. KAMPAKOGLOU, A. NOVOKHATKO, ed. by, *Gaze, Vision, and Visuality in Ancient Greek Literature*, Berlin-Boston 2018.

Karlsruhe 2017
Die Etrusker. Weltkultur im antiken Italien. Exhibition Catalogue (Karlsruhe, 2017-2018), Darmstadt 2017.

KÉI 2015
N. KEI, *L'estetica floreale dei vasi attici: dal* kosmos *alla* charis, in G. SENA CHIESA, A. PONTRANDOLFO, ed. by, *Mito e Natura. Dalla Grecia a Pompei*, Milano 2015, pp. 156-165.

KEI 2020
N. KEI, *L' "ornement" en abyme ou la sémantique du détail*, in G. PUMA, S. WYLER, ed. by, *Les images dans les images. Antiquité et Moyen Âge, Images re-vues* (Hors-série 9), 2020.

KERENYI 1989
K. KERÉNYI, *Gli dèi e gli eroi della Grecia. Il racconto del mito, la nascita della civiltà*, Milano 1989.

KÖRTE 1879
G. KÖRTE, *Vasi etruschi con rappresentanze relative all'Inferno*, in «Annali dell'Instituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica», 51, 1879, pp. 299-307.

KRASKOPF 1981
I. KRAUSKOPF, s.v. *Agamemnon*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, I, Zürich-München 1981, pp. 256-277.

KRAUSKOPF 1984
I. KRAUSKOPF, s.v. *Apollon/Aplu*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, II, Zürich-München 1984, pp. 337-363.

KRAUSKOPF 1984
I. KRAUSKOPF, *Myth in Etruria*, in S. BELL, A.A. CARPINO, ed. by, *A Companion to the Etruscans*, Hoboken 2016, pp. 388-409.

KRAUSKOPF 1987
I. KRAUSKOPF, *Todesdämonen und Totengötter im Vorhellenistischen Etrurien. Kontinuität und Wandel*, Firenze 1987.

KRAUSKOPF 1988
I. KRAUSKOPF, s.v. *Eros (in Etruria)*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, Zürich-München IV, 1988, pp. 1-12.

KRAUSKOPF 1991
I. KRAUSKOPF, *Ex oriente Sol. Zu den orientalischen Würzeln der etruskischen Sonnenikonographie*, in «Archeologia Classica», XLIII, 1991, pp.1261-1283.

KRAUSKOPF 1998
I. KRAUSKOPF, *Artemis*, in *Annali della Fondazione per il Museo 'Claudio Faina'*, V, Roma 1998, pp. 171-206.

KRAUSKOPF 2002
I. KRAUSKOPF, *I Sette contro Tebe nell'arte etrusca arcaica e classica*, in *Dei ed Eroi in Grecia: l'altorilievo di Pyrgi con i Sette contro Tebe* (= «Scienze dell'Antichità», 10), 2002, pp. 497-510.

KRAUSKOPF 2005
I. KRAUSKOPF, *Die Verehrer des Dionysos in Etrurien*, in B. ADEMBRI, ed. by, ΑΕΙΜΝΗΣΤΟΣ. *Miscellanea di Studi per Mauro Cristofani*, Firenze 2005, pp. 611-619.

KRAUSKOPF 2017
I. KRAUSKOPF, *Die Götte der Etrusker. Etruskischer Kern und viele fremde Einflüsse*, in *Die Etrusker. Weltkultur im antiken Italien*. Exhibition Catalogue (Karlsruhe, 2017-2018), Darmstadt 2017, pp. 214-217.

KRIS 1967
E. KRIS, *Ricerche psicoanalitiche sull'arte*, Torino 1967.

Kunst der Etrusker 1980
Kunst der Etrusker: in Zusammenarbeit mit dem Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe Hamburg, Hamburg 1980.

LACHMANN 1848
K. LACHMANN, ed. by, *Gromatici Veteres*, I, Berlin 1848.

LAMBRECHTS 1970
R. LAMBRECHTS, *Les inscriptions avec le mot «tular» et le bornage étrusques*, Firenze 1970.

LAMBRECHTS 1978
R. LAMBRECHTS, *Les miroirs étrusques et prénestins des Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire à Bruxelles*, Brussel 1978.

LAMBRECHTS 1987
R. LAMBRECHTS, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Belgique 1. Collections mineurs,* Roma 1987.

LAMBRECHTS 1995
R. LAMBRECHTS, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Stato della Città del Vaticano 1. Città del Vaticano, Museo Profano della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Roma, Collezione di antichità dell'Abbazia di San Paolo fuori le mura*, Roma 1995.

LAMBRECHTS 2000
R. LAMBRECHTS, *L'étude et l'édition des miroirs étrusques. Quelques réflexions et questions de méthode*, in M.D. GENTILI, ed. by, *Aspetti e problemi della produzione degli specchi etruschi figurati.* Conference Proceedings (Roma, 1997), Roma 2000, 165-179.

LAMBRUGO 2011
C. LAMBRUGO, *Il mondo degli Etruschi. Guida alla sezione. Civico Museo Archeologico di Milano*, Milano 2011.

LAMONT, MOLNÁR 2002
M. LAMONT, V. MOLNÁR, *The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences*, in «Annual Review of Sociology», 28, 2002, pp. 167-195.

LAMONT, PENDERGRASS, PACHUCKI 2015
M. LAMONT, S. PENDERGRASS, M.C. PACHUCKI, *Symbolic Boundaries*, in «International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences», 23, 2015, pp. 850-855.

LA ROCCA 2008
E. LA ROCCA, *Lo spazio negato. La pittura di paesaggio nella cultura artistica greca e romana*, Milano 2008.

LATOUR 1996
B. LATOUR, *On actor-network theory. A few clarifications*, in «Soziale Welt», 47, 4, pp. 369-381.

LAURINSICH 1929
L. LAURINSICH, *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Italia 5, Bologna 1. Museo Civico di Bologna*, Milano-Roma 1929.

LAVAGNE 1988
H. LAVAGNE, Operosa Antra. *Recherches sur la grotte à Rome de Sylla à Hadrien*, Roma 1988.

LAVIOSA 1958
C. LAVIOSA, SU ALCUNI VASI ETRUSCHI SOVRADIPINTI, IN BOLLETTINO D'ARTE,
LAWLER 1951
L.B. LAWLER, *The dance in Ancient Crete*, in G.E. MYLONAS, D. RAYMOND, ed. by, *Studies presented to David M. Robinson on his seventieth birthday*, Saint Louis 1951, pp. 23-51.

LAWLER 1964
L.B. LAWLER, *The Dance in Ancient Greece*, London 1964.

LAZZARI 1939-1940
M. LAZZARI, *La tutela delle bellezze panoramiche*, in «Le Arti», 2, 1939-1940, pp. 79-88.

LECLERCQ-NEVEU 1989
B. LECLERCQ-NEVEU, *Marsyas, le martyr de l'*aulòs, in «Métis», IV, 1989, pp. 251-268.

LEJARS 2014
T. LEJARS, *L'armement des Celtes d'Italie*, in *Les Celtes et le Nord de l'Italie (Premier et Second Âges du fer)*. Conference Porceedings (Vérona, 2012), 2014, pp. 401-434.

LESKY 2000
M. LESKY, *Untersuchungen zur Ikonographie und Bedeutung antiker Waffentänze in Griechenland und Etrurien*, Munchen 2000.

LEVI STRAUSS 1948
C. LEVI STRAUSS, *La vie familiale et sociale des Indiens Nambikwara*, Paris 1948.

LEVI STRAUSS 1955
C. LEVI, *Tristes tropiques*, Paris 1955.

LIEPMANN 1988
U. LIEPMANN, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Bundesrepublik Deutschland 2. Braunschweig, Göttingen, Hamburg, Hannover, Kiel, Münster, Steinborst, Wolfenbüttel*, München 1988.

LINIGTON, SERRA RIDGWAY 1997
R.E. LINIGTON, F.R. SERRA RIDGWAY, *Lo scavo nel fondo Scataglini aTarquinia*, Milano 1997.

LISSARRAGUE 1987
F. LISSARRAGUE, *Un flot d'images. Une esthétique du banquet grec*, Paris 1987.

LISSARRAGUE 1990a
F. LISSARRAGUE, *The Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet: Images of Wine and Ritual*, Princeton 1990.

LISSARRAGUE 1990b
F. LISSARRAGUE, *Around the Krater: An Aspect of Banquet Imagery*, IN O. MURRAY, ed. by, *Sympotica. A Symposium on the Symposion*, Oxford 1990, pp. 196-209.

LISSARRAGUE 1990c
F. LISSARRAGUE, *L'autre guerrier. Archers, peltastes, cavaliers dans l'imagerie attique*, Roma 1990.

LISSARRAGUE 2015
F. LISSARRAGUE, *Gli dei nella natura*, in G. SENA CHIESA, A. PONTRANDOLFO, ed. by, *Mito e Natura. Dalla Grecia a Pompei*. Exhibition Catalogue (Milano 2015), Milano 2015, pp. 72-77.

LISTA 2009
M. LISTA, Hydria *etrusca a figure nere*, in *Vasi Antichi. Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli*, Napoli 2009, pp. 18-19.

LOEWY 1900
E. LOEWY, *Die Naturwiedergabe in der älteren griechischen Kunst*, Roma 1900.

LOEWY 1907
E. LOEWY, *The Rendering of Nature in Early Greek Art*, London 1907.

LOEWY 1946
E. LOEWY, *La natura nell'arte greca. Una teoria sulla genesi della espressione figurativa*, Treviso 1946.

LUBTCHANSKY 1998
N. LUBTCHANSKY, *Le pêcheur et la mètis. Pêche et statut social en Italie centrale à l'époque archaïque*, in «Mélanges de l'école française de Rome», 110, 1, pp. 111-146.

LUBTCHANSKY 2006
N. LUBTCHANSKY, *Divines ou mortelles ? Les femmes de la Tombe du Baron à Tarquinia*, in F.H. MASSA PAIRAULT, ed. by, *L'image antique et son interprétation*, Roma 2006, pp. 219-236.

LYONS 2009
C.L. LYONS, *Nikosthenic Pyxides between Etruria and Greece*, in J.H. OAKLEY, O. PALAGIA, ed. by, *Athenian Potters and Painters II*, Oxford 2009, pp. 166-180.

MACCABRUNI 1977
C. MACCABRUNI, *Recupero di un noto specchio prenestino*, in «Numismatica e Antichità Classiche», VI, 1977, pp. 53-71.

MACCHIA 1997
F. MACCHIA, ed. by, *La flora e la vegetazione spontanea della Puglia nella scienza, nell'arte e nella storia*. Conference Proceedings (Bari 1993), Fasano di Brindisi 1997.

MACRÌ 2009
S. MACRÌ, *Pietre viventi. I minerali nell'immaginario del mondo antico*, Torino 2009.

MADDEN 1983
J. MADDEN, *The Palms do not Weep. A reply to Professor Hurwit and a Note on the Death of Priam in Greek Art*, in «The Classical Journal», 78, 1983, pp. 200-201.

MADERUOLO 2005
J. MADERUOLO, *El paisaje. Génesis de un concepto*, Madrid 2005.

MAETZKE 1955
G. MAETZKE, *Nuova matrice di antefissa etrusca da Chiusi*, in «Bollettino d'Arte», 3, pp. 259-261.

MAGI 1943
F. MAGI, *Vasi etruschi a figure nere della collezione Vagnonville del R. Museo Archeologico di Firenze*, in «Studi Etruschi», XVII, 1943, pp. 523-526.

MAGGIANI 1984
A. MAGGIANI, *Qualche osservazione sul fegato di Piacenza*, in «Studi Etruschi», L-1982, 1984pp. 53-88.

MAGGIANI 1986
A. MAGGIANI, *La divination oraculaire en Etrurie*, in *La divination dans le monde étrusco italique*. Conference Proceedings (Paris 1986), Tours 1986, pp. 6-41.

MAGGIANI 1992
A. MAGGIANI, *L'uomo e il sacro nei rituali e nella religione etrusca*, in *Le Civiltà del Mediterraneo e il sacro*, Milano 1992, pp. 191-209.

MAGGIANI 2012
A. MAGGIANI, *Le fontane nei santuari d'Etruria*, in *Il* Fanum Voltumnae *e i santuari comunitari dell'Italia antica*. *Annali della Fondazione per il Museo 'Claudio Faina'*, XIX, Roma 2012, pp. 265-292.

MAGGIANI, SIMON 1984
A. MAGGIANI, E. SIMON, *Il pensiero scientifico e religioso*, in M. CRISTOFANI, ed. by, *Gli Etruschi. Una nuova immagine*, Firenze 1984.

MAJOREL 2003
F. MAJOREL, *Hermès ou le mouvement spiralé de l'initiation*, in «Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé», 1, 2003, pp. 53-81.

MALASPINA 2011
E. MALASPINA, *Quando il paesaggio non era stato ancora inventato*. Descriptiones locorum *e teorie del paesaggio da Roma a oggi*, in G. TESIO, G.PENNAROLI, ed. by, *Lo sguardo offeso. Il paesaggio in Italia:*

storia geografia arte letteratura. Conference Proceedings (Vercelli, Demonte, Montà, 2008), Torino 2011, pp. 45-85.

MALFITANO 2012
A. MALFITANO, *La gestione del paesaggio: il caso della Pineta di Ravenna*, in A. Ragusa, ed. by, La Nazione allo Specchio. Conference Proceedings (Firenze, 2011), Manduria-Bari-Roma 2012, pp. 165-180.

MALINOWSKI 1922
B. MALINOWSKI, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*, London 1922.

MALINOWSKI 2011
B. MALINOWSKI, *Argonauti del Pacifico occidentale. Riti magici e vita quotidiana nella società primitiva* (trans. M. Arioti), Torino 2011.

MANDOLESI, CASTELLO 2009
A. MANDOLESI, C. CASTELLO, *Modellini di navi tirrenico-villanoviane da Tarquinia*, in «Mediterranea. Quaderni annuali dell'Istituto di studi sulle civiltà italiche e del Mediterraneo antico del Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche», VI, 2009, pp. 9-28.

MANESCHI 2011
L. MANESCHI, *L'organizzazione dello spazio nel mondo etrusco*, in *Turisti in Viaggio*. Conference Proceedings (Viterbo, 2008), Viterbo 2011.

MANGANI 1993
E. MANGANI, *Le fabbriche a figure rosse di Chiusi e Volterra*, in «Studi Etruschi», LVIII-1992, 1993, pp. 115-143.

MANGANI 2005
E. MANGANI, *L'officina del Gruppo di San Francisco*, in B. ADEMBRI, ed. by, ΑΕΙΜΝΗΣΤΟΣ. *Miscellanea di studi per Mauro Cristofani*, Firenze 2005, pp. 635-650.

MANINO 1980
L. MANINO, *Semantica e struttura della figura demoniaca*, in *Orvieto Etrusca. Annali della Fondazione per il Museo 'Claudio Faina'*, 1, 1980, pp. 59-72.

MANSUELLI 1943
G.A. MANSUELLI, *Materiali per un supplemento al "corpus" degli specchi etruschi figurati*, in «Studi Etruschi», 17-1943, 1943, pp. 487-521.

MANSUELLI 1948
G.A. MANSUELLI, *Gli specchi figurati etruschi*, in «Studi Etruschi», XIX-1946, 1948, pp. 9-137.

MANSUELLI 1949
G.A. MANSUELLI, *Studi sugli specchi etruschi. IV. La mitologia figurata negli specchi etruschi*, in «Studi Etruschi», 20-1948-1949, 1949, pp. 59-98.

MANSUELLI 1967
G.A. MANSUELLI, *Le sens architectural dans les peintures des tombes tarquiniennes avant l'époque hellénistique*, in «Revue Archéologique», 1, 1967, pp. 41-74.

MARANGONI 1911
G. MARANGONI, *Il paesaggio nella legislazione e nell'arte*, in « Touring Club Italiano. Rivista mensile», XVII, 1911, pp. 469-474.

MARAS 2016
D.F. MARAS, Numero avium regnum trahebant: *Birds, Divination, and Power amongst Romans and Etruscans*, in P.A. JOHNSTON, A.

MASTROCINQUE, S. PAPAIOANNOU, ed. by, *Animals in Greek and Roman Religion and Myth*. Conference Proceedings (Potenza 2013), Cambridge 2016, pp. 85-114.

MARAS 2018
D.F. MARAS, *Frammenti di altorilievo frontonale in terracotta*, in A. RUSSO, R. COSENTINO, R. ZACCAGNINI, ed. by, *Pittura di Terracotta. Mito e immagine nelle lastre dipinte di Cerveteri*, Roma 2018, pp. 199-200.

MARCHESE 1944
L. MARCHESE, *Il mito di Amico nell'arte figurata. Fortuna di un mito greco nell'arte etrusca*, in «Studi Etruschi», XVIII, 1944, pp. 45-81.

MARCONI 2017a
C. MARCONI, *The Frames of Greek Painted Pottery*, in V. PLATT, M. SQUIRE, ed. by, *The Frame in Classical Art: A Cultural History*, Cambridge 2017, pp. 117-153.

MARCONI 2017b
C. MARCONI, *I vasi del simposio tra rito e mito*, in «Engramma», 143, 2017.

MARIANI 1901
L. MARIANI, *De' più recenti studi intorno alla questione etrusca. Prolusione al corso di Archeologia nella Regia Università di Pisa. 1900*, Pisa 1901.

MARRONI 2017
E. MARRONI, Tyndaridai Philoxenoi. *I Dioscuri e l'accoglienza dello straniero*, in C. MASSERIA, E. MARRONI, ed. by, *Studi in onore di Mario Torelli*, Pisa 2017, pp. 261-274.

MARTELLI 1987a
M. MARTELLI, ed. by, *La ceramica degli Etruschi. La pittura vascolare*, Novara 1987.

MARTELLI 1987b
M. MARTELLI, *Per il Pittore delle Gru*, in «Prospettiva», 48, 1987, pp. 2-11.

MARTELLI 1987c
M. MARTELLI, *Del Pittore di Amsterdam e di un episodio del nostos odissaico. Ricerche di ceramografia etrusca orientalizzante*, in «Prospettiva», 50, 1987, pp. 4-14.

MARTELLI 1987d
M. MARTELLI, *La ceramica orientalizzante*, in M. MARTELLI, ed. by, *La ceramica degli Etruschi. La pittura vascolare*, Novara 1987, pp. 16-22.

MARTELLI 1992
M. MARTELLI, *"Festa etrusca"*, in *Kotinos. Festschrift jur Erika Simon*, Mainz-Rhein 1992, pp. 342-346.

MARTELLI 2001
M. MARTELLI, *Nuove proposte per i Pittori dell'Eptacordo e delle Gru*, in «Prospettiva», 101, 2001, pp. 2-18.

MARTELLI 2005
M. MARTELLI, *Sculture vulcenti arcaiche: paralipomena. I. I Maestri di Civitavecchia e di Ambugo - New York*, in B. ADEMBRI, ed. by, ΑΕΙΜΝΗΣΤΟΣ. *Miscellanea di studi per Mauro Cristofani*, Firenze 2005, pp. 395-406.

MARTELLI 2006a
M. MARTELLI, Arete *ed* Eusebeia: *le anfore attiche nelle necropoli dell'Etruria Campana*, in F. GIUDICE, R. PANVINI, ed. by, *Il greco, il barbaro e la ceramica attica. Immaginario del diverso, processi di scambio e autorappresentazione degli indigeni*. Conference Proceedings (Roma, 2001), Roma 2006, pp. 7-37.

MARTELLI 2006b
M. MARTELLI, *Antichità etrusche e italiche di collezioni ottocentesche nel Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Madrid*, in J. BELTRÁN FORTES, B. CACCIOTTI, B. PALMA, ed. by, *Arqueología, coleccionismo y antiguedad: España e Italia en el siglo XIX*. Conference Proceedings (Sevilla, 2004), Sevilla 2006, pp. 351-371.

MARTELLI 2008a
M. MARTELLI, *Variazioni sul tema etrusco-geometrico*, in «Prospettiva», 132, 2008, pp. 2-30.

MARTELLI 2008b
M. MARTELLI, *Il fasto delle metropoli dell'Etruria meridionale. Importazioni, imitazioni e arte suntuaria*, in M. TORELLI, A.M. MORETTI SGUBINI, *Etruschi. Le antiche metropoli del Lazio*. Exhibition Catalogue (Milano, 2008-2009), Milano 2008, pp. 120-139.

MARTELLI 2017
M. MARTELLI, *Il pittore dei satiri danzanti*, Roma 2017.

MARTELLI 2018
M. MARTELLI, *L'agguato di Achille a Troilo in un'hydria del Pitore del Vaticano 238*, in «Mediterranea. Quaderni annuali dell'Istituto di studi sulle civiltà italiche e del Mediterraneo antico del Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche», XV, 2018, pp. 363-404.

MARTIN, JAMES 1981
G.J. MARTIN, P.E. JAMES, *All Possible Worlds. A History of Geographical Ideas*, New York 1981.

MARZULLO 2016
M. MARZULLO, *Grotte Cornetane: Materiali e apparato critico per lo studio delle tombe dipinte di Tarquinia*, Milano 2016.

MARZULLO 2017
M. MARZULLO, *Spazi sepolti e dimensioni dipinte nelle tombe etrusche di Tarquinia*, Milano 2017.

MASCI 2008
M.E. MASCI, Picturae Etruscorum in Vasculis. *La raccolta Vaticana e il collezionismo di vasi antichi nel primo Settecento*, Roma 2008.

MASSA PAIRAULT 1975
F.-H. PAIRAULT MASSA, [Intervention in the Debate], in *Orfismo in Magna Grecia*. Atti del XIV Convegno di Studi sulla Magna Grecia (1974), Napoli 1975, pp. 196-202.

MASSA PAIRAULT 1992a
F.-H. MASSA PAIRAULT, *Iconologia e Politica nell'Italia Antica. Roma, Lazio, Etruria dal VII al I secolo a.C.*, Cuneo 1992.

MASSA PAIRAULT 1992b
F.-H. MASSA PAIRAULT, *Aspetti e problemi della società prenestina tra IV e III sec.*, in P. BAGLIONE, ed. by, *La necropoli di Praeneste. Periodi orientalizzante e mediorepubblicano*, Palestrina 1992, pp. 109-145.

MASSA PAIRAULT 1993
F.-H. MASSA PAIRAULT, *Aspects idéologiques des* ludi, in *Spectacles sportifs et scéniques dans le monde étrusco-italique*. Conference Proceedings (Roma 1991), Roma 1993, pp. 247-279.

MASSA PAIRAULT 1994
F.-H. MASSA PAIRAULT, *Contribution à la réflexion sur le catalogue et l'exposition*, in F. REBECCHI, ed. by, *Spina e il Delta Padano. Riflessioni sul catalogo e sulla mostra ferrarese*, Roma 1994, pp. 143-165.

MASSA PAIRAULT 1996
F.-H. MASSA PAIRAULT, *La cité des Étrusques*, Parigi 1996.

MASSA PAIRAULT 2000
F.-H. MASSA PAIRAULT, *Problemi ermeneutici a proposito degli specchi. Esame di alcune scene connesse con il mito di Eracle*, in M.D. GENTILI, ed. by, *Aspetti e problemi della produzione degli specchi etruschi figurati*. Conference Proceedings (Roma 1997), Roma 2000, pp. 181-207.

MASSA PAIRAULT 2006
F.-H. MASSA PAIRAULT, ed. by, *L'image antique et son interprétation*, Roma 2006.

MASSA PAIRAULT 2008
F.-H. MASSA PAIRAULT, *À propos d'un cratère falisque attribué au Peintre de Diespater. Mythe et musique, initiés et acteurs*, in S. ESTIENNE, D. JAILLARD, N. LUBTCHANSKY, C. POUZADOUX, ed. by, *Image et Religion*. Conference Proceedings (Roma, 2003), Napoli 2008, pp. 461-473.

MATTIROLO 1911
O. MATTIROLLO, *I vegetali nell'arte degli antichi e dei primitivi*, in *Annuario della R. Università di Torino 1910-1911*, Torino 1911, pp. 7-67.

MAUSS 1923-1924
M. MAUSS, *Essai sur le don. Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques*, in «Année sociologique», 1923-1924, pp. 30-186.

MAUSS 2000
M. MAUSS, *Teoria generale della magia e altri saggi*, TORINO 2000.

MAUSS 2002
M. MAUSS, *Saggio sul dono. Forma e motivo dello scambio nelle società arcaiche*, Torino 2002.

MAVLEEV 1981
E. MAVLEEV, s.v. *Amazones Etruscae*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, Zürich-München I, pp. 654-662.

MAYER-PROKOP 1967
I. MAYER-PROKOP, *Die gravierten Etruskischen Griffspiegel archaischen Stils*, Heidelberg 1967.

MAYO 1998
M. MAYO, *Ancient Art: Virginia Museum of Fine Arts*, Richmond 1998.

MAZZARINO 1957
S. MAZZARINO, *Sociologia del mondo etrusco e problemi della tarda etruscità*, in «Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte», 6, 1, 1957, pp. 98-122.

MAZZARINO 1980
S. MAZZARINO, *Antico, tardoantico ed èra costantiniana*, 2, Bari 1980.

MELLI 2009
P. MELLI, *Un nuovo vaso del Pittore di Sommavilla e le importazioni di ceramica etrusca a figure rosse a Genova*, in S. BRUNI, ed. by, *Etruria e Italia Preromana. Studi in Onore di Giovannangelo Camporeale*, Pisa-Roma 2009, pp. 591-598.

MENICHETTI 1995
M. MENICHETTI, Quoius forma virtutei parisuma fuit... *Ciste prenestine e cultura di Roma medio-repubblicana*, Roma 1985.

MENICHETTI 1999
M. MENICHETTI, *Una città e le sue immagini: la mitologia delle ciste prenestine*, in F.H. MASSA PAIRAULT, ed. by, *Le mythe grec dans l'Italie Antique. Fonction et Image*. Conference Proceedings (Roma, 14-16 novembre 1996), Roma 1999, pp. 485-510.

MENICHETTI 2006
M. MENICHETTI, *La donna alla fontana.* Charis *e matrimonio sulle ciste prenestine*, in *Iconografia 2005. Immagini e immaginari dall'antichità classica al mondo moderno*, Roma 2005, pp. 51-64.

MENICHETTI, CERCHIAI 2017
M. MENICHETTI, L. CERCHIAI, *L'agone della Gigantomachia*, in F.-H. MASSA PAIRAULT, C. POUZADOUX, ed. by, *Géants et gigantomachies entre Orient et Occident*, Napoli 2017, pp. 31-44.

MESTURINI 2001
A.M. MESTURINI, Rhythmos*. Percorsi (alternativi) della tradizione classica*, Genova 2001.

MEURER 1909
M. MEURER, *Vergleichende Formenlehre des Ornamentes und der Pflanze*, Dresda 1909.

MICALI 1844
G. MICALI, *Monumenti inediti a illustrazione della storia degli antichi popoli italiani*, Firenze 1844.

MICHEL 1884
E. MICHEL, *Le Paysage dans les arts de l'antiquité*, in «Revue des Deux Mondes», 63, 1884, pp. 856-889.

MICHETTI 2003
L.M. MICHETTI, *Le ceramiche argentate e a rilievo in Etruria nella prima età ellenistica*, Roma 2003.

MICHETTI 2005
L.M. MICHETTI, *La ceramica argentata volsiniese: temi iconografici e scelte stilistiche*, in «Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome. Antiquité», 117, 1, 2005, pp. 99-136.

MICHETTI 2010
L.M. MICHETTI, *Gli dei sul tetto. Le basi acroteriali del tempio di Veio-Portonaccio: struttura e apparato decorativo*, P. Lulof, C. Rescigno, ed. by,

Deliciae fictiles, IV. Architectural Terracottas in Ancient Italy. Images of Gods, Monsters and Heroes, Oxford 2011, pp. 96-106.

MICHETTI 2013
L.M. MICHETTI, *Riti e miti di fondazione nell'Italia antica. Riflessioni su alcuni contesti di area etrusca*, in G. BARTOLONI, L.M. MICHETTI, ed. by, *Mura di legno, mura di terra, mura di pietra: fortificazioni nel Mediterrraneo antico*. Conference Proceedings (Roma 2012), Roma 2013, pp. 333-357.

MICHETTI 2016
L.M. MICHETTI, *Note sulla circolazione della ceramica etrusca a figure nere nell'Agro falisco*, in M.C. BIELLA, J. TABOLLI, ed. by, *I Falisci attraverso lo specchio. Atti della giornata di studi per festeggiare Maria Anna De Lucia Brolli* (Mazzano Romano. 2015), Roma 2016, pp. 170-186.

MICHETTI 2017
L.M. MICHETTI, *Veio nell'età di Tarquinio il Superbo: appunti sulle produzioni artigianali*, in C. SMITH, P. LULOF, ed. by, *The age of Tarquinius Superbus. Central Italy in the late 6th century*. Conference Proceedings (Roma, 2013), Leuven 2017, pp. 177-186.

MICHETTI 2019
L.M. MICHETTI, *Elementi simbolici e aspetti rituali nei corredi funerari dell'agro falsico tra IV e III secolo a.C.*, in M. ARIZZA, ed. by, *Società e pratiche funerarie a Veio. Dalle origini alla conquista romana*. Atti della Giornata di Studi (Roma, 7 giugno 2018), Roma, pp. 109-124.

MICHON 2018
P. MICHON, *Elements of Rhythmology. I. Antiquity*, Paris 2018.

MICOZZI 1994
M. MICOZZI, *"White-on-red". Una produzione vascolare dell'orientalizzante etrusco*, Roma 1994.

MINGAZZINI 1971
P. MINGAZZINI, *Catalogo die vasi della Collezione Augusto Castellani*, II, Roma 1971.

MÖBIUS 1929.
H. MÖBIUS, *Die Ornamente der griechischen Grabelsten*, Leipzig 1929;
MOGGI, OSANNA 2010
M. MOGGI, M. OSANNA, ed. by, PAUSANIA. *Guida della Grecia. Libro IX. La Beozia*, Milano 2010.

MONTAGNA PASQUINUCCI 1968
M. MONTAGNA PASQUINUCCI, *Le* kelebai *volterrane*, Firenze 1968.

MONTE 2006
L. MONTE, *Talos, l'uomo di bronzo*, in «Annali, Associazione nomentana di storia e archeologia», 7, 2006, pp. 61-63.

MORANDI 1991
A. MORANDI, *Nuovi lineamenti di lingua etrusca*, Brescia 1991.

MORANDI TARABELLA 2004
M. MORANDI TARABELLA, *Prosopographia etrusca I. Corpus. Etruria Meridionale*, Roma 2004.

MORETTI 1966
M. MORETTI, *Nuovi monumenti della pittura etrusca*, Milano 1966.

MORETTI 2005
F. MORETTI, *La letteratura vista da lontano*, Torino 2005.

MORETTI SGUBINI 2008
A.M. MORETTI SGUBINI, *Gruppo dell'Amazzone cadente*, in M. TORELLI, A.M. MORETTI SGUBINI, ed. by, *Etruschi. Le antiche metropoli del Lazio*. Exhibition Catalogue (Milano, 2008-2009), Milano 2008, p. 235.

MUGIONE 2000
E. MUGIONE, *Miti della ceramica attica in Occidente: problemi di trasmissioni iconografiche nelle produzioni italiote*, Taranto 2000.

MUGIONE 2014
E. MUGIONE, *Uccisioni sacrificali e rappresentazioni del grottesco in Licofrone e nella documentazione magnogreca*, in «Aitia», 4, 2014.

MURRAY, WILSON 2004
P. MURRAY, P. WILSON, ed. by, *Music and the Muses. The Culture of 'Mousiké' in the Classical Athenian City*, Oxford 2004.

MUSTI 2001
D. MUSTI, *Il simposio nel suo sviluppo storico,* Roma-Bari, 2001.

NAGY 1973
G. NAGY, *Phaethon, Sappho's Phaon, and the White Rock of Leukas*, in «Harvard Studies in Classical Philology», 77, 1973, 137-177.

NAGY 2013
H. NAGY, *Etruscan Terracottas Figurines*, in J.M. TURFA, ed. by, *The Etruscan World*, New York 2013, pp. pp. 992-1006.

NAGY, PRESCENDI 2013
A. NAGY, F. PRESCENDI , ed. by, *Sacrifices humains: dossiers, discours, comparaisons*. Conference Proceedings (Geneve 2011), Turnhout 2013.

NASO 1996
A. NASO, *Architetture dipinte. Decorazioni parietali non figurate nelle tombe a camera dell'Etruria meridionale (VII-V sec. a.C.)*, Roma 1996.

NASO 2000
A. NASO, *The Etruscan Aristocracy in the Orientalizing Period: Culture, Economy, Relations*, in M. TORELLI, ed. by, *The Etruscans*. Exhibition Catalogue (Venezia 2000), Milano 2000, pp. 111-129.

NEGRI 1927
G. NEGRI, *Come si possa ricostruire la fisionomia della vegetazione della Toscana durante il periodo etrusco*, in «Studi Etruschi», I, 1927, pp. 363-373.

NERI 2000
D. NERI, *Le coppe fenicie della Tomba Bernardini nel Museo di Villa Giulia*, La Spezia 2000.
NICHOLLS 1993
R.V. NICHOLLS, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Great Britain 2, Cambridge*, Cambridge 1993.

NOGARA 1934
B. NOGARA, *Di alcuni specchi del Museo Vaticano Etrusco*, in «Studi Etruschi», VIII-1934, 1934, pp. 129-132.

NOLL 1932
R. NOLL, *Eine Gruppe etruskischer Spiegel*, in «Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien», 1932, pp. 153-160.

OLESON 1978
J.P. OLESON, *Technical aspects of Etruscan rock-cut tomb architecture*, in «Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung», 85, 1978, pp. 283-314

OLIVIER-TROTTENBERG 2014
Y. OLIVIER-TROTTENBERG, *CVA Deutschland 96. München 17, Antikensammlungen, Ehemals Museum Antiker Kleinkunst*, München 2014.

OLMOS 2003
R. OLMOS, *Gran ánfora itálica orientalizante con ciervo herido*, in P. CABRERA BONET, ed. by, *La Colección Várez Fisa en el Museo Arqueológico Nacional*, Madrid 2003, p. 118-119.

OLSEN CARLUCCI 1978
R. OLSEN CARLUCCI, *An Etruscan Black-Figure Gigantomachy in Minneapolis*, in «American Journal of Archaeology», 82, 1978, pp. 545-549.

OSBORNE 1987
R. OSBORNE, *Classical Landscape with Figures*, London 1987.

OSBORNE 1994
R. OSBORNE, *Desiring Women on Athenian Potttery*, in N.B. KAMPEN, ed. by, *Sexuality in Ancient Art*, New York 1994, pp. 65-80.

OSBORNE 1996
R. OSBORNE, *Classical Landscape with Figures revisited*, in «Topoi. Orient – Occident», 6, 1996, pp. 49-64.

OSBORNE 2018
R. OSBORNE, *The Transformation of Athens. Painted Pottery and the Creation of Classical Greece*, Princeton 2018.

PACETTI 1998
M. PACETTI, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Italia 4, Orvieto, Museo "Claudio Faina"*, Roma 1998.

PACETTI 2011
M. PACETTI, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Roma, Museo nazionale etrusco di Villa Giulia; Antiquarium: la collezione del Museo Kircheriano*, Roma 2011.

PAGLIERI 1960
S. PAGLIERI, *Origine e diffusione delle navi etrusco-italiche*, in «Studi Etruschi», XXVIII, 1960, pp. 209-231.

PAIRAULT MASSA 1992
F.H. PAIRAULT MASSA, *Iconologia e Politica nell'Italia antica. Roma, Lazio, Etruria dal VII al I secolo a.C.*, Milano 1992.

PALEOTHODOROS 2007
D. PALEOTHODOROS, *Dionysiac Imagery in Archaic Etruria*, in «Etruscan Studies», 10, 2007, pp. 187-201.

PALEOTHODOROS 2010
D. PALEOTHODOROS, *Etruscan Black-figure in Context*, in «Bollettino di Archeologia Online», I, 2010, Special Issue: *Meetings Between Cultures in the Ancient Mediterranean*, pp. 1-11.

PALEOTHODOROS 2011
D. PALEOTHODOROS, *A Complex Approach to Etruscan Black Figure Vase Painting*, in «Mediterranea», VIII, 2011, pp. 33-82.

PALLONETTI 2019
M. PALLONETTI, *Cuma, Capua, Pompei. La mobilità artigianale e la circolazione di matrici*, in P. LULOF, I. MANZINI, C. RESCIGNO, ed. by, *Deliciae Fictiles V. Networks and Workshops: Architectural Terracottas and Decorative Roof Systems in Italy and Beyond*, Oxford-Oakville 2019, pp. 278-283.

PALLOTTINO 1979
M. PALLOTTINO, *Uno specchio di Tuscania e la leggenda etrusca di Tarchon*, in «Saggi di Antichità», 2, 1979, pp. 679-707 (before in «Rendiconti dei Lincei», VI, 6, 1930, pp. 49-87).

PALLOTTINO 1984
M. PALLOTTINO, *Etruscologia*, Milano 1984.

PAMPANINI 1930
R. PAMPANINI, *Le piante nell'arte decorativa degli Etruschi*, in «Studi Etruschi», IV-1930, 1930, pp. 293-320.

PAMPANINI 1931
R. PAMPANINI, *Altri soggetti fitomorfi nell'arte decorativa etrusca*, in «Studi Etruschi», V-1931, 1931, pp. 415-426.

PANOFSKY 1939
E. PANOFSKY, *Studies in Iconology*, New York 1939.

PANOFSKY 1955
E. PANOFSKY, *Iconography and Iconology. An introduction to the study of Renaissance art*, in E. PANOFSKY, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, New York 1955.

PANOFSKY 1975
E. PANOFSKY, *Studi di iconologia. I temi umanistici nell'arte del Rinascimento*, Torino 1975.

PAOLUCCI 2000
G. PAOLUCCI, *Nota su una* kylix *etrusca a figure nere da Chianciano Terme*, in «Ocnus», 8, 2000, pp. 119-126.

PAOLUCCI 2001
G. PAOLUCCI, *Due nuove anfore del Pittore di Gerusalemme da Chianciano Terme*, in «Archeologia Classica», 52, 2001, pp. 207-221.

PAOLUCCI 2003
G. PAOLUCCI, *Nel Museo di Siena nuovi vasi del Pittore di Gerusalemme*, in «Archeologia Classica», 54, 2003, pp. 331-339.

PAOLUCCI 2007
G. PAOLUCCI, ed. by, *Immagini Etrusche. Tombe con ceramiche a figure nere dalla necropoli di Tolle a Chianciano Terme*. Exhibition Catalogue (Castelluccio La Foce 2007), Milano 2007.

PAOLUCCI 2011a
G. PAOLUCCI, *I gruppi vaticano 265 e Monaco 883 riuniti e rivisitati*, in «Mediterranea. Quaderni annuali dell'Istituto di studi sulle civiltà italiche e del Mediterraneo antico del Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche», VIII, 2011, pp. 151-196.

PAOLUCCI 2011b
G. PAOLUCCI, *'Scopritore di tali magnificenze sepolcrali che renderanno immortale il di lui nome'. Nuovi dati sulla collezione Casuccini di Chiusi*, in *Annali della Fondazione per il Museo 'Claudio Faina'*, 18, 2011, pp. 333-358.

PAOLUCCI 2019
G. PAOLUCCI, *Coppa su piede*, in L. BENTINI, M. MARCHESI, L. MINARINI, G. SASSATELLI (ed. by), *Etruschi. Viaggio nelle terre dei Rasna*. Exhibition Catalogue (Bologna 2019-2020), Milano 2019, p. 79.

PARILLI 2016
M. PARILLI, *Le "Illustrazioni di storia agraria" della Biblioteca Archivio Emilio Sereni di Gattatico: l'immagine come espressione storica del paesaggio*, in A. BERRINO, A. BUCCARO, ed. by, *Delli Aspetti de Paesi. Vecchi e nuovi Media per l'Immagine del Paesaggio. I. Costruzione, descrizione, identità storica*, Napoli 2016, pp. 765-774.

PARPAGLIOLO 1923
L. PARPAGLIOLO, *La difesa delle bellezze naturali d'Italia*, Roma 1923.

PASQUALI 1953
PASQUALI 1953, G. PASQUALI, *Storia dello spirito tedesco nelle memorie d'un contemporaneo*, Firenze 1953.

PATRONI 1901
G. PATRONI, *Buccheri campani: contributo alla storia della ceramica italiana e delle relazioni tra l'Etruria e la Campania*, in «Studi e materiali di archeologia e numismatica», 1, 1901, pp. 290-299.

PATRONI 1908
G. PATRONI, *La forma originaria dell'antica colonna etrusca e delle colonne del tempio sul foro triangolare in Pompei*, in «Atti dell'Accademia di archeologia, lettere e belle arti», 25, 1908, pp. 37-77.

PATRONI 1930
G. PATRONI, *Valori etici del paesaggio nell'arte antica. (A proposito d'una recente pubblicazione intorno al Toro Farnese)*, in «Historia», VIII, 1930, pp. 132-152.

PATRONI 1932
G. PATRONI, *Recensione a* Gli Antichi Italici *di G. Devoto*, in «Athenaeum», 10, 1932, pp. 279-298.

PATRONI 1937
G. PATRONI, *Storia Politica d'Italia. La preistoria*, Milano 1937.

PENNY SMALL 1987
J. PENNY SMALL, *Left, Right, and Center: Direction in Etruscan Art*, in «Opuscula Romana», XVI, 7, 1987, pp. 125-135.

PERNIGOTTI 2019
A.P. PERNIGOTTI, *A Contribution to the Study of the Orientation of Etruscan Temples*, in G. MAGLI *et alii*, ed. by, *Archaeoastronomy in the Roman World*, Cham 2019, pp. 31-43.

PERUCCHI 1983
L. PERUCCHI, *I significati del visibile*, in G. SIMMEL, *Il volto e il ritratto. Saggi sull'arte*, Bologna 1983, pp. 7-40.

PESCE 1939
G. PESCE, *Un vaso falisco decorato a tempera*, in «Studi Etruschi», XIII-1939, 1939, pp. 437-446.

PETERSEN 1917
E. PETERSEN, *Rhythmus*, in «Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse», 16, 1917, pp. 1-104.

PETTENÒ 2004
E. PETTENÒ, Cruciamenta acherunti. *I dannati dell'Ade romano. Una proposta interpretativa*, Roma 2004.

PIANU 1980
G. PIANU, *Ceramica etrusca a figure rosse. Materiali del Museo Archeologico di Tarquinia*, Roma 1980.

PICCIONI 2014
L. PICCIONI, *Il volto amato della patria. Il primo movimento per la protezione della natura in Italia 1880-1934*, Trento 2014.

PICOZZI 2013
M.G. PICOZZI, ed. by, *Ripensare Emanuel Löwy*, Roma 2013.

PIERACCINI 2003
L.C. PIERACCINI, *Around the Heart. Caeretan Cylinder-Stamped Brazier*, Roma 2003.

PIERACCINI 2014
L.C. PIERACCINI, *Artisans and Their Lasting Impressions: Clay Stamping and Craft Connectivity at Caere During the Sixth Century BCE*, in «Etruscan and Italic Studies», 17, 2, 2014, pp. 140-153.

PIERACCINI, DEL CHIARO 2014
L.C. PIERACCINI, M.A. DEL CHIARO, *Greek in Subject Matter, Etruscan by Design: Alcestis and Admetus on an Etruscan Red-figure Crater*, in S. SCHIERUP, V. SABETAI, ed. by, *The regional production of red-figure pottery: Greece, Magna Graecia and Etruria*, Copenhagen 2014, pp. 304-310.

PINNA 2008
G. PINNA, "Und die Sonne Homers, siehe, sie lächelt auch uns". *Dialettica dell'antico in* Der Spaziergang *di Schiller*, in P. CHIARINI, W. HINDERER, ed. by, *Schiller und die Antike*, Würzburg 2008, pp. 299-314.

PISTOLESI 2004
M. PISTOLESI, *Sui vasi etruschi a figure nere atticizzanti: il Gruppo di Monaco 892*, in «ΑΓΩΓΗ. Atti della Scuola di Specializzazione in Archeologia dell'Università di Pisa», 1, 2004, pp. 99-122.

PITTAU 1997
M. PITTAU, *La lingua etrusca. Grammatica e Lessico*, Enna 1997.

PIZZIRANI 2005
C. PIZZIRANI, *Da Odisseo alle Nereidi. Riflessioni sull'iconografia etrusca del mare attraverso i secoli*, in «Ocnus», 13, 2005, pp. 251-270.

PIZZIRANI 2009
C. PIZZIRANI, *Iconografia dionisiaca e contesti tombali tra Felsina e Spina*, in R. BONAUDO, L. CERCHIAI, C. PELLEGRINO, ed. by, *Tra Etruria, Lazio e Magna Grecia: indagini sulle necropoli*. Conference Proceedings (Fisciano, 5-6 marzo 2009), Paestum 2009, pp. 37-49.

PIZZIRANI 2011
C. PIZZIRANI, *Un* Mystes *dionisiaco nel sepolcreto felsineo Tamburini*, in *Tra Protostoria e Storia. Studi in onore di Loredana Capuis* (Antenor Quaderni 20), Roma 2011, pp. 105-117.

PIZZIRANI 2014
C. PIZZIRANI, *Il mare nell'immaginario funebre degli Etruschi*, in G. SASSATELLI, A. RUSSO TAGLIENTE, ed. by, *Il viaggio oltre la vita. Gli Etruschi e l'Aldilà tra capolavori e realtà virtuale*. Exhibition Catalogue (Bologna 2014), Bologna 2014, pp. 71-79.

PIZZIRANI 2018
C. PIZZIRANI, *Viaggi di immagini. Riflessioni sulla ricezione e appropriazione di schemi iconografici tra Grecia ed Etruria*, in «Mediterranea. Quaderni annuali dell'Istituto di studi sulle civiltà italiche e del Mediterraneo antico del Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche», XV, 2018, pp. 123-134.

PLAOUTINE 1941
N. PLAOUTINE, *CVA France 15. Palais des Beaux-Arts. Petit Palais*, Paris 1941.

PLATT, SQUIRE 2017
V. PLATT, M. SQUIRE, ed. by, *The Frame in Classical Art: A Cultural History*, Cambridge 2017.

PODDA 2012
M. PODDA, *All'ombra delle Palme. Fenice, Nestore, le palme della tomba François e altri elementi vegetali*, in M. HARARI, S. PALTINERI, M. ROBINO, ed. by, *Segni e Colore. Dialoghi sulla pittura tardoclassica ed ellenistica*. Conference Proceedings (Pavia 2012), Roma 2012, pp. 123-128.

POGGI 2010
S. POGGI, *Il genio e l'unità della natura. La scienza della Germania romantica (1790-1830)*, Bologna 2010.

POLA 2010
A. POLA, *Dal saggio all'edificio B. Novità per lo studio della ceramica etrusca figurata a Tarquinia*, in G. BAGNASCO GIANNI, ed. by, *Mura Tarquiniesi.*

Riflessioni in margine alla città (= Aristhonothos. Scritti per il Mediterraneo antico, 14), 2018, pp. 267-310.

POLA 2016
A. POLA, *La più antica produzione vascolare falisca a figure rosse: elementi stilistici, iconografia e sintassi decorativa*, tesi di dottorato di ricerca, XXVIII ciclo, Scuola di Dottorato in Archeologia (Etruscologia), Sapienza Università di Roma, 2016. [Under publication as A. POLA, *La più antica produzione falisca a figure rosse*, "Monumenti Etruschi", Roma 2022].

POLA 2017
A. POLA, *Il Pittore di Civita Castellana 8238 e la pianificazione di un rapimento su uno* stamnos *falisco a figure rosse del Museo di Grosseto*, in «Scienze dell'Antichità», 23, 2017, pp. 195-208.

POLA forthcoming
A. POLA, *Coast To Coast: da Philadelphia a Berkeley. Alcuni corredi falisci al Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology*, in M.C. BIELLA, J. TABOLLI, ed. by, *The strange case of Mancinelli Scotti (merchants of antiquities and terracottas from excavation).* Conference proceedings (Fondazione Marco Besso, 2018), forthcoming.

POLUNIN, EVERARD 1976
O. POLUNIN, B. EVERARD, *Trees and Bushes of Europe*, London 1976.

PONTELLI 2017
E. PONTELLI, *Roccia e sacro in Etruria. Dal rito al segno*, in *DialArchMed*, I.5, Paestum 2017, pp. 1277-1282.

PONTELLI 2018
E. PONTELLI, *Scultura tardo-etrusca di Volterra. Firenze, Palazzo Strozzi (La Strozzina), 4 marzo-5 luglio 1964*, in S. MASSA, E. PONTELLI, ed. by,

«Mostre permanenti». Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti in un secolo di esposizioni, Lucca 2018, pp. 245-246.

PONTELLI forthcoming
E. PONTELLI, [Bronze bowl 80.AC.84], in C.L. LYONS, *Etruscan and Italic Art in the J. Paul Getty Museum*, Los Angeles forthcoming.

PONTRANDOLFO 1989
A. PONTRANDOLFO, *Greci e indigeni*, in *Un secolo di ricerche in Magna Grecia. Atti del ventottesimo convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia* (Taranto, 7-12 ottobre 1988), 1989, pp. 329-350.

PONTRANDOLFO, ROUVERET 1990
A. PONTRANDOLFO, A. ROUVERET, *Ideologia funeraria e società a Poseidonia nel IV sec. a.C.*, G. GNOLI, J.-P. VERNANT, ed. by, *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*, Paris 1990, pp. 299-317.

PONTRANDOLFO, ROUVERET 1992
A. PONTRANDOLFO, A. ROUVERET, *Le tombe dipinte di Paestum*, Modena 1992.

PONTRANDOLFO 2015
A. PONTRANDOLFO, *Spazio e racconto mitico*, in G. SENA CHIESA, A. PONTRANDOLFO, ed. by, *Mito e Natura. Dalla Grecia a Pompei*. Exhibition Catalogue (Milano 2015), Milano 2015, pp. 36-47.

PRAYON 1977
F. PRAYON, *Todesdämonen und die Troilossage in der Frühetruskischen Kunst*, in «RM», 84, 1977, pp. 181-197.

PRAYON 1991
F. PRAYON, *"Deorum sedes". Sull'orientamento dei templi etrusco-italici*, in «Archeologia Classica», 43, 1991, pp. 1285-1295.

PRAYON 1997
F. PRAYON, *Sur l'orientation des édifices cultuels*, in F. GAULTIER, D. BRIQUEL, ed. by, *Les Etrusques, les plus religieux des hommes*. Conference Proceedings (Paris, 1992), Roma 1997, pp. 357-371.

PRELOZNIK 2013
A. PRELOZNIK, *Lovski motivi v situlski umetnosti*, in «Keria Studia Latina et Graeca», 15, 19, 2013, pp. 19-34.

PROIETTI 1980
G. PROIETTI, ed., *Il Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia*, Roma 1980.

PRÜCKNER 1980
H. PRÜCKNER, *Das Budapest Aktium-Relief*, in F. KRINZINGER *et alii*, ed. by, *Forschungen und Funde. Festschrift für Bernhard Neutsch*, Innsbruck 1980, pp. 357-366.

PUCCI 2005
G. PUCCI, *Il* rhythmos *nell'arte figurativa greca*, in «Quaderni Warburg Italia», 2-3, 2004-2005, pp. 137-152.

PUGLIESE CARRATELLI 1993
G. PUGLIESE CARRRATELLI, *Le lamine d'oro 'orfiche'. Edizione e commento*, Milano 1993.

QUANTIN 1992
F. QUANTIN, *Gaia oraculaire: tradition et réalités*, in «Mètis. Anthropologie des mondes grecs anciens», 7, 1992, pp. 177-199.

RENDELI 1996
M. RENDELI, *Anagoghe*, in «Prospettiva», 84, 1996, pp. 10-29.

RESCIGNO 1998
C. RESCIGNO, *Tetti Campani. Età arcaica. Cuma, Pitecusa e gli altri contesti*. Roma 1998.

RESCIGNO 2014
C. RESCIGNO, *Decorazioni architettoniche fittili arcaiche da Policoro: vecchie nuovi percorsi di lettura*, in F. MEO, G. ZUCHTRIEGEL, ed. by, *Siris Herakleia Polychorion. Città e campagna tra antichità e medioevo*. Conference Proceedings (Policoro, 2013) = «Siris», 14, 2014, pp. 43-61.

REUSSER 1988
C. REUSSER, *Etruskische Kunst. Antikenmuseum Basel und Sammlung Ludwig*

RICCARDI 2005
A. RICCARDI, *Il cratere del Pittore di Talos*, in E. LO SARDO, ed. by, *Eureka. Il genio degli antichi*, Napoli 2005, p. 72.

RICCI 1900
S. RICCI, *Del metodo sperimentale nelle discipline archeologiche*, in «La Rassegna Nazionale», 22, 114, pp. 22-49.

RICCI 1901
S. RICCI, *Il sentimento della natura nella monetazione della Grecia e della Magna Grecia (Lezione pronunciata durante il Corso libero di Archeologia tenuto presso la R. Università di Pavia)*, in «Rivista Italiana di Numismatica e Scienze Affini», XIV, 1901, pp. 55-74.

RICCI 1931
S. RICCI, *Etruscologia e Folklore*, in «Lares», 2, 3, 1931, pp. 84-86.

RICHTER 1968
G.M.A. RICHTER, *Engraved Gems of the Greek and the Etruscans: a history of Greek Art in miniature*, London 1968.

RIDI 2009
C. RIDI, *Policromia delle strutture murarie. Riflessi della tecnica di costruzione a blocchi policromi nella ceramografia etrusca e greca*, in M. BONGHI JOVINO, F. CHIESA, ed. by, *L'Ara della Regina di Tarquinia, aree sacre, santuari mediterranei*. Conference Proceedings (Milano, 13 giugno 2006), Milano 2009, pp. 153-174.

RILKE 1932
R.M. RILKE, *Von der Landschaft*, in *Insel-Almanach Auf Das Jahr 1933*, Leipzig 1932, pp. 40-46

RILKE 1949
R.M. RIKE, *Del Paesaggio e altri scritti*, Milano 1949.

RITTER 1962
J. RITTER, *Paesaggio, la funzione dell'estetico nella società moderna*, in J. RITTER, ed. by, *Soggettività*, Genova 1962, pp. 105-142.

RIZZO 1983
M.A. RIZZO, *La tomba Bernardini e la tomba Barberini di Palestrina*, in M. CRISTOFANI, M. MARTELLI, ed. by, *L'oro degli Etruschi*, Novara 1983, pp. 253-257.

RIZZO 1987
M.A. RIZZO, *La ceramica a figure nere*, in M. MARTELLI, ed. by, *La ceramica degli Etruschi. La pittura vascolare*, Novara 1987, pp. 31-42; 297-312.

RIZZO 1988
M.A. RIZZO, ed. by, *Un artista etrusco e il suo mondo. Il pittore di Micali*, Roma 1988.

RIZZO 2016
M.A. RIZZO, *Rappresentazioni di navi su due grandi pissidi white-on-red dalla tomba 1 di San Paolo a Cerveteri*, in E. MANGANI, A. PELLEGRINI, ed.

by, Ghia to filo mas. *Scritti in ricordo di Gaetano Messineo*, Monte Compatri 2016, pp. 323-332.

ROBERTSON 1988
M. ROBERTSON, s.v. *Europa I*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, IV, Zürich-München 1988, pp. 76-92.

ROGER 1994
A. ROGER, *Histoire d'une passion théorique ou Comment on devient un Raboliot du Paysage*, in A. BERQUE, ed. by, *Cinq Propositions pour une Théorie du Paysage*, Ceyzérieu 1994, pp. 109-123.

ROGER 1996
A. ROGER, Les proto-paysages, in G. SIEBERT, ed. by, *Nature et paysage dans la pensée et l'environnement des civilisations antiques*. Conference Proceedings (Strasbourg, 1992), Paris 1996, pp. 199-205.

ROGER 2010
A. ROGER, *Vita e morte dei paesaggi. Life and Death of the Landscapes*, in «Lettera inernazionale», 105, 2010, pp. 83-90.

RONCALLI 1986
F. RONCALLI, *L'arte*, in *Rasenna. Storia e civiltà degli Etruschi,* Milano 1986, pp. 539-567.

RONCALLI 1987
F. RONCALLI, *La decorazione pittorica*, in F. BURANELLI, ed. by, *La tomba François di Vulci*. Exhibition Catalogue (Vatican City 1987), Roma 1987, pp. 79-110.

RONCALLI 1990
F. RONCALLI, *La definizione pittorica dello spazio tombale nella "età della crisi", Crise et transformation des sociétés archaiques de l'Italie antique au V*

siècle avant J.-C. Conference Proceedings (Roma 1987), Roma 1990, pp. 228-243.

RONCALLI 1994
F. RONCALLI, *Cultura religiosa, strumenti e pratiche cultuali nel santuario di Cannicella a Orvieto*, in M. MARTELLI, ed. by, *Tyrrhenoi Philotechnoi.* Conference Proceedings (Viterbo, 1990), Ghezzano, pp. 99-118.

RONCALLI 1996a
F. RONCALLI, *Laris Pulenas and Sisyphus: Mortals, Heroes and Demons in the Etruscan Underworld*, in «Etruscan Studies», 3, 1996, pp. 45-64.

RONCALLI 1996b
F. RONCALLI, *Sull'aruspice del Museo Gregoriano Etrusco*, in *Scritti di archeologia e storia dell'arte in onore di Carlo Pietrangeli*, Roma 1996, pp. 47-51.

RONCALLI 1997
F. RONCALLI, *Iconographie funéraire et topographie de l'au-delà en Étrurie*, in F. GAULTIER, D. BRIQUEL, ed. by, *Les Etrusques, les plus religieux des hommes*. Conference Proceedings (Paris, 1992), Paris 1997, pp. 37-54.

RONCALLI 2001
F. RONCALLI, *Spazio reale e luogo simbolico: alcune soluzioni nell'arte funeraria etrusca*, in «Acta Hyperborea», 8, 2001, pp. 249-272.

RONCALLI 2003
F. RONCALLI, *La definizione dello spazio tombale in Etruria tra architettura e pittura*, in A. MINETTI, ed. by, *Pittura etrusca: problemi e prospettive*. Conference Proceedings (Sarteano-Chiusi, 2001), Siena 2003, pp. 52-62.

RONCALLI 2005
F. RONCALLI, *La Tomba dei Giocolieri di Tarquinia: una proposta di lettura*, in B. ADEMBRI, ed. by, ΑΕΙΜΝΗΣΤΟΣ. *Miscellanea di Studi per Mauro Cristofani*, Firenze 2005, pp. 407-423.

RONCALLI 2009
F. RONCALLI, *Mito, leggenda e disciplina etrusca visti da Roma*, in *Gli Etruschi e Roma. Fasi Monarchica e alto repubblicana*. *Annali della Fondazione per il Museo 'Claudio Faina'*, 16, 2009, pp. 239-259.

RONCALLI 2010
F. RONCALLI, *Between Divination and Magic: Role, Gesture and Instruments of the Etruscan Haruspex*, in L.B. VAN DER MEER, ed. by, *Material Aspects of Etruscan Religion*. Conference Proceedings (Leuven, 2008), «BaBesch» Suppl., Leuven-Paris-Walpole 2010, pp. 117-126.

RONCALLI 2014a
F. RONCALLI, *L'Aldilà: dall'idea al paesaggio*, in G. SASSATELLI, A. RUSSO TAGLIENTE, ed. by, *Il viaggio oltre la vita. Gli Etruschi e l'Aldilà tra capolavori e realtà virtuale*, Bologna 2014, pp. 55-61.

RONCALLI 2014b
F. RONCALLI, *Eredità geometrica e linguaggio figurativo. Il caso delle stele felsinee*, in *Artisti, committenti e fruitori in Etruria tra VIII e V secolo a.C. Annali della Fondazione per il Museo 'Claudio Faina'*, XXI, 2014, pp. 221-241.

RONCALLI 2016
F. RONCALLI, *Abitare il palazzo, abitare il tempio: riflessioni su un rapporto antico*, in *Annali della Fondazione per il Museo 'Claudio Faina'*, XXIII, 2016, pp. 21-37.

RONCALLI 2017
F. RONCALLI, *Tra dimora e viaggio. La fascia policroma nelle tombe dipinte tarquiniesi di VI sec. a.C.*, in L. CICALA, B. FERRARA, ed. by, *«Kithon Lydios». Studi di storia e archeologia con Giovanna Greco*, Napoli 2017, pp. 567-580.

RONCALLI 2018
F. RONCALLI, *Le lastre dipinte da Cerveteri*, in A. RUSSO, R. COSENTINO, R. ZACCAGNINI, ed. by, *Pittura di Terracotta. Mito e immagine nelle lastre dipinte di Cerveteri*, Roma 2018, pp. 101-109.

ROSE 2001
L. ROSE, *The Survival of Images: Art Historians, Psychoanalysts, and the Ancients*, Detroit 2001.

ROSEN 1903
F. ROSEN, *Die Natur in der Kunst*, Leipzig 1903.

ROSSI 2019
D. ROSSI, *Kantharos*, in L. BENTINI, M. MARCHESI, L. MINARINI, G. SASSATELLI, ed. by, *Etruschi. Viaggio nelle terre dei Rasna.* Exhibition Catalogue (Bologna 2019-2020), Milano 2019, pp. 156-159.

ROUVERET 1975
A. ROUVERET, *L'organisation spatiale des tombes de Paestum*, in «Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome. Antiquité», 87, 2, 1975, pp. 595-652.

ROUVERET 1988
A. ROUVERET, *Espace sacré/espace pictural: une hypothèse sur quelques peintures archaïques de Tarquinia*, in «AION. Annali di Archeologia e Storia Antica», 10, 1988, pp. 203-216.

ROUVERET 1992
A. ROUVERET, *La tombe tarquinienne de la chasse et de la pêche: quelques remarques sur la peinture de paysage a l'époque archaïque*, in «Revue Archéologique», 1, 1992, pp. 170-171.

ROUVERET 2004
A. ROUVERET, *Pictos ediscere mundos. Perception et imaginaire du paysage dans la peinture Hellénistique et romaine*, in «Ktema», 29, 2004, pp. 325-344.

ROUVERET 2015
A. ROUVERET, *Dalla natura al paesaggio nella pittura ellenistica romana*, in G. SENA CHIESA, A. PONTRANDOLFO, ed. by, *Mito e Natura. Dalla Grecia a Pompei*, Milano 2015, pp. 208-218.

RUSSO KRAUSS 2017
G. RUSSO KRAUSS 2017, *«Rinnovare Conservando». Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli, archeologo riformatore*, in «Ananke», 82, 2017, pp. 7-14.

SACCHETTI 2000
F. SACCHETTI, *Charu(n) nella pittura funeraria etrusca*, in «Ocnus», 8, 2000, pp. 127-164.

SALVADORI 2002
M. SALVADORI, *Orfeo tra gli animali. L'utilizzo dell'immagine in ambito ufficiale*, in in I. COLPO, I. FAVERETTO, F. GHEDINI, ed. by, *Iconografia 2001. Studi sull'immagine*, Roma 2002, pp. 345-353.

SANDULLI 1967
M.A. SANDULLI, *La tutela del paesaggio nella Costituzione*, in «Rivista Giuridica Edilizia», II, 1967, pp. 69 ss.

SANNIBALE 2007
M. SANNIBALE, *Tra cielo e terra. Considerazioni su alcuni aspetti della religione etrusca a Vulci*, in «Studi Etruschi», LXXII-2006, 2007, pp. 117-147.

SANNNIBALE 2019a
M. SANNIBALE, *Immagini svelate. Le copie al vero di Carlo Ruspi nel Museo Gregoriano Etrusco*, in «Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome. Antiquité [en ligne]», 131, 2, 2019.

SANNIBALE 2019b
M. SANNIBALE, *Il crescente lunare con dedica etrusca a* Tiur *già collezione Borgia*, in «Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia. Rendiconti», XCI, 2019, pp. 169-207.

SANTONI 2000
A. SANTONI, *Introduzione*, in Palefato. *Storie Incredibili*, Pisa 2000, pp. 9-43.

SAPELLI 1975
M. SAPELLI, *Temi letterari nei graffiti prenestini*, in «ACME», XXVIII, 1975, pp. 221-250.

SARTI 1992
S. SARTI, *Gli strumenti musicali di Apollo*, in «AION. Archeologia e Storia Antica», XIV, pp. 95-104.

SARTI 2003
S. SARTI, *La kithara greca nei documenti archeologici*, in «Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire», 81, 1, 2003, pp. 47-68.

SARTI 2011
S. SARTI, *Un esempio di competizione musicale nel mito in Grecia: Tamiri*, in D. CASTALDO, F.G. GIANNACHI, A. MANIERI, ed. by, *Poesia, musica e agoni nella Grecia antica*, Lecce 2011, pp. 219-240.

SAUER 1925
C.O. SAUER, *The Morphology of Landscape*, in «University of California Publications in Geography», 2, 2, 1925, pp . 19-53.

SASSATELLI 1981
G. SASSATELLI, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Italia 1, Bologna Museo Civico 1*, Roma 1981.

SASSATELLI 1984
G. SASSATELLI, *Una nuova stele felsinea*, in *Culture figurative e materiali tra Emilia e Marche. Studi in memoria di Mario Zuffa*, Rimini 1984, pp. 107-137.

SASSATELLI 1993
G. SASSATELLI, *Rappresentazioni di giochi atletici in monumenti funerari di area padana*, in *Spectacles sportifs et scéniques dans le monde étrusco-italique*. Conference Proceedings (Roma 1991), Roma 1993, pp. 45-67.

SASSATELLI 2009
G. SASSATELLI, *Riflessioni sulla "stele della nave" di Bologna*, in S. BRUNI, ed. by, *Etruria e Italia Preromana. Studi in Onore di Giovannangelo Camporeale*, Pisa-Roma 2009, pp. 833-840.

SASSATELLI 2014
G. SASSATELLI, *L'area padana e Bologna etrusca tra Grecia ed Etruria*, in G. SASSATELLI, A. RUSSO TAGLIENTE, ed. by, *Il viaggio oltre la vita. Gli Etruschi e l'Aldilà tra capolavori e realtà virtuale*. Exhibition Catalogue (Bologna 2014), Bologna 2014, pp. 99-109.

SASSATELLI 2006
M. SASSATELLI, *Presentazione*, in G. SIMMEL, *Saggi sul paesaggio*, Roma 2006, pp. 7-50.

SASSATELLI, TAGLIENTE 2009
G. SASSATELLI, A. RUSSO TAGLIENTE, ed. by, *Il viaggio oltre la vita. Gli Etruschi e l'aldilà tra capolavori e realtà virtuale*. Exhibition Catalogue (Bologna 2014-2015), Bologna 2014

SBROLLI forthcoming
C. SBROLLI, *Fusti fogliati e calami striati, ovvero la vegetalizzazione degli elementi architettonici verticali*, in M. HARARI, E. PONTELLI, ed. by, *Le cose nell'immagine*. Conference Proceedings (Pavia, 2019), forthcoming.

SCALA 1997
N. SCALA, *La tomba del Letto Funebre di Tarquinia: un tentativo di interpretazione*, in «Prospettiva», 85, 1997, pp. 46-52.

SCARRONE 2014
M. SCARRONE, *Kyathoi etruschi ad alto piede e strategie di rappresentazione*, in «KuBA», 4, 2014, pp. 35-55.

SCARRONE 2015
M. SCARRONE, *La pittura vascolare etrusca del V secolo*, Roma 2015.

SCHAUENBURG 1970
K. SCHAUENBURG, *Zu Griechischen Mythen in der Etruskischen Kunst*, in «Jahrbuch des Deutschen Arcaologischen Instituts», 85, 1970 pp. 28-81.

SCHAUENBURG 1982
K. SCHAUENBURG, *Arimaspen in Unteritalien*, «Revue Archéologique», 2. 1982, pp. 249-262.

SCHEID 1989
J. SCHEID, Lucus, nemus. *Qu'est-ce qu'un bois sacré?*, in *Les bois sacrés.* Conference Proceedings (Napoli, 1989), Napoli 1993, pp. 13-18.

SCHILLER 1794
F. SCHILLER, *Über Matthisons Gedicht*, in «Jenaer Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung», 11-12.9.1794.

SCHILLER 2005
F. SCHILLER, *La passeggiata. Natura, poesia, storia* (ed. by G. Pinna), Roma 2005.

SCHNAPP 1997
A. SCHNAPP, *Le Chasseur et la cité. Chasse et érotique en Grèce antique*, Paris 1997.

SCHNAPP 2006
A. SCHNAPP, *L'immagine della natura nella pittura vascolare*, in *Iconografia 2005. Immagini e immaginari dall'antichità classica al mondo moderno*, Roma 2005, pp. 73-81.

SCHNAPP 2015
A. SCHNAPP, *La rappresentazione della natura nell'arte* greca, in G. SENA CHIESA, A. PONTRANDOLFO, ed. by, *Mito e Natura. Dalla Grecia a Pompei*. Exhibition Catalogue (Milano 2015), Milano 2015, pp. 24-35.

SCHULTZ 2017
P. SCHULTZ, *Review of* V. Platt, M. Squire, ed. by, The Frame in Classical Art: A Cultural History, in «American Journal of Archaeology», 122, 4, 2018.

SCHWARZ 1983
S.J. SCHWARZ, *A Vulci Vase in the Getty Museum*, in «Occasional Papers on Antiquities», 1, 1983, pp. 121-134.

SCHWARZ 1984
S.J. SCHWARZ, *Etruscan black-Figure Vases in the U.S. National Museum of Natural History*, in «Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung», 91, 1984, pp. 47-77.

SCHWARZ 1989
S.J. SCHWARZ, *Orvieto Vases in the Getty Museum*, in «The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal», 4, 1989, pp. 167-180.

SCHWARZ 1990
S. SCHWARZ, s.v. *Herakles/Hercle*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, V, Zürich-München 1990, pp. 196-253.

SCIACCA 2006-2007
F. SCIACCA, *La circolazione dei doni nell'aristocrazia tirrenica. Esempi dall'archeologia*, in «Revista d'Arqueologia de Ponent», 16-17, 2006-2007, pp. 281-292.

SELVAGGI 1961
F. SELVAGGI, *Conspectus. Rassegna di filosofia della natura e della scienza*, in «Gregorianum», 42, 1961, pp. 117-137.

SENA CHIESA 2007
G. SENA CHIESA, *Gli inizi e gli anni Trenta: il periodo di Giovanni Patroni*, in «Annali di Storia delle Università Italiane», 11, 2007, pp. 153-165.

SENA CHIESA, PONTRANDOLFO 2015
G. SENA CHIESA, A. PONTRANDOLFO, ed. by, *Mito e Natura. Dalla Grecia a Pompei*, Milano 2015.

SENA CHIESA, GIACOBELLO 2016a
G. SENA CHIESA, F. GIACOBELLO, *Mito e Natura dalla Grecia a Pompei. Il Fuorimostra 1. L'archaologia* in verde. *Quattordici conversazioni a Milano sulla percezione della natura nel mondo antico*, Firenze 2016.

SENA CHIESA, GIACOBELLO 2016b
G. SENA CHIESA, F. GIACOBELLO, *Mito e Natura dalla Grecia a Pompei. Il Fuorimostra 2. Gli dei in giardino. Due convegni su mito, natura e paesaggio nel mondo antico*, Firenze 2016.

SERENI 1961
E. SERENI, *Storia del paesaggio agrario italiano*, Bari 1961.

SERENI 1972
E. SERENI, *Storia del paesaggio agrario italiano*, Bari 1972.

SERRA RIDGWAY 2015
F.R. SERRA RIDGWAY, [Presentation], in I. WERNER, *Dionysos in Etruria. The Ivy Leaf Group*, Stockholm 2005, pp. 11-13.

SETTIS 1993
S. SETTIS, ed. by, *L'Archeologia italiana dall'Unità al Novecento* (*Ricerche di Storia dell'Arte*, 50), Roma 1993.

SETTIS 2008
S. SETTIS, *La villa di Livia. Le pareti ingannevoli*, Milano 2008.

SETTIS 2011
S. SETTIS, *Benedetto Croce ministro e la prima legge sulla tutela del paesaggio* (Prolusion held on October 3rd 2011 at the Università Ca' Foscari in Venice).

SEVERINI 2019
G. SEVERINI, *"Paesaggio": storia italiana, ed europea, di una veduta giuridica*, in «Aedon», 1, 2019 (also edited with the title *L'evoluzione storica del concetto giuridico di paesaggio*, in G. MORBIDELLI, M. MORISI, ed. by, *Il 'Paesaggio' di Alberto Predieri*, Firenze 2019).

SHIFF 1991
R. SHIFF, *Cézanne's physicality: the politics of touch*, in S. KEMAL, I. GASKELL, ed. by, *The Language of Art History*, Cambridge 1991, pp. 129-180.

SIEBERT 1996
G. SIEBERT, ed. by, *Nature et paysage dans la pensée et l'environnement des civilisations antiques*. Conference Proceedings (Strasbourg, 1992), Paris 1996.

SIMMEL 1994
G. SIMMEL, *The Picture Frame: An Aesthetic Study*, in «Theory, Culture & Society», 11, 1, 1994, pp. 11-17.

SIMON 1973
E. SIMON, *Die Tomba dei Tori und der etrus/eische Apollon/eult*, in «Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts», 88, 1973, pp. 27-42.

SIMON 1981
E. SIMON, s.v. *Amymone*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, I, Zürich-München 1981, pp. 742-752.

SIMON 1984
E. SIMON, s.v. *Laran*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, II, Zürich-München 1984 pp. 498-505.

SIMON 1997
E. SIMON, *Sentiment religieux et vision de la mort: représentations, imaginaire, histoire*, «AION. Annali di Archeologia e Storia Antica», 9, 1997, pp. 145-158.

SMALL 1982
J. P. SMALL, *Cacus and Marsyas in Etrusco-Roman legend*, Princeton 1982.

SMITH 1987
J. Z. SMITH, *To Take Place. Toward Theory In Ritual*, Chicago 1987.

SMOQUINA 2012
E. SMOQUINA, *I centauri e le sfingi nell'Etruria di età orientalizzante : tra decorazione e narrazione*, in M.C. Biella *et alii* (a cura di), *Il bestiario fantastico di età orientalizzante nella penisola italiana*, Trento 2012, pp. 287-314.

SOLARI 1931
A. SOLARI, *Vita pubblica e privata degli Etruschi*, Firenze 1931.

Sotheby's 1984
Egyptian, Classical, and Near Eastern Antiquities and Islamic Art, Sotheby's Auction Catalogue, New York, March 1-2, 1984.

SPERTI 2008
L. SPERTI, *Il mito come sussidio funebre*, in «Engramma», 65, 2008, pp. 14-22.

SPIVEY 1985
N.J. SPIVEY, *La carriera del Pittore di Micali: una rivalutazione*, in «Prospettiva», 40, 1985, pp. 10-19.

SPIVEY 1987
N.J. SPIVEY, *The Micali Painter and his Followers*, Oxford 1987.

SPIVEY 1988a
N.J. SPIVEY, *Il Pittore di Micali*, in M.A. RIZZO, ed. by, *Un artista etrusco e il suo mondo. Il pittore di Micali*, Roma 1988, pp. 11-21.

SPIVEY 1988b
N.J. SPIVEY, *The armed dance on Etruscan vases*, in J. CHRISTIANSEN, T. MELANDER, ed. by, *Ancient Greek and Related Pottery*. Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium (Copenhagen, 1987), Copenhagen 1988, pp. 592-599.

SPIVEY 2015
N.J. SPIVEY, *Paradossografia etrusca. Uno sguardo alla ceramica a figure nere*, in M.C. BIELLA, E. GIOVANELLI, ed. by, *Nuovi studi sul bestiario fantastico di età orientalizzante nella penisola italiana*, Trento 2016, pp. 385-394.

SPIVEY, STODDART 1990
N.J. SPIVEY, S. STODDART, *Etruscan Italy*, London 1990.

SQUIRE 2016
M. SQUIRE, ed. by, *Sight and the Ancient Senses*, London 2016.

SQUIRE 2018
M. SQUIRE, *'To haunt, to startle, and way-lay': Approaching ornament and figure in Graeco- Roman art*, in N. DIETRICH, M. SQUIRE, ed. by, *Ornament and figure in Graeco-Roman Art. Rethinking Visual Ontologies in Classical Antiquity*, Berlin-Boston 2018, pp. 1-36.

STANSBURY-O'DONNELL 2009
M. STANSBURY-O'DONNELL, *The Structural Differentiation of Pursuit Scenes*, in D. YATROMANOLAKIS, ed. by, *An Archaeology of Representations: Ancient Greek Vase-Painting and Contemporary Methodologies*, Athina 2009, pp. 342-373.

STEARN 1960
W.T. STEARN, *Humboldt's* Essai sur la géographie des plantes, in «Journal of the Society for the Bibliography of Natural History», 3, 7, 351-357.

STEINER, NEILS 2018
A. STEINER, J. NEILS, *An Imported Attic Kylix from the Sanctuary at Poggio Colla*, in «Etruscan Studies», 21, 2018.

STEINGRÄBER 1985
S. STEINGRÄBER, *Catalogo ragionato della pittura etrusca*, Milano 1985.

STEINGRÄBER 2006a
S. STEINGRÄBER, *Affreschi etruschi. Dal periodo geometrico all'Ellenismo*, Verona 2006.

STEINGRÄBER 2006b
S. STEINGRÄBER, *Abundance of Life. Etruscan Wall Painting*, Verona 2006.

STIBBE-TWIEST 1977
A.G.E. STIBBE-TWIEST, *The Moon-Goddess from Chianciano Terme*, in «Meded», 39, 1977, pp. 19-28

STOPPONI 1983
S. STOPPONI, *La Tomba della 'Scrofa Nera'*, Roma 1983.

STOPPONI, GIACOBBI 2017
S. STOPPONI, A. GIACOBBI, *Orvieto, Campo della Fiera. Forme del sacro nel "luogo celeste"*, in E. GOVI, ed. by, *La città etrusca e il sacro. Santuari e istituzioni politiche*. Conference Proceedings (Bologna, 2016), Bologna 2017, pp. 121-144.

STRASSLER 2009
R.B. STRASSLER, ed. by, *The Landmark Xenophon's* Hellenika, New York 2009.

STRAUSS 1994
M.S. STRAUSS, s.v. *Telephos*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, VII, Zürich-München 1994, pp. 856-870.

STRAZZULLA 1994
M. J. STRAZZULLA, *Attestazioni figurative dei Dioscuri nel mondo etrusco*, in L. NISTA, ed. by, *Castores: l'immagine dei Dioscuri a Roma*, Roma 1994, pp. 39-52.

STUTZINGER 2012
D. STUTZINGER *Griechen, Etrusker und Römer: eine Kulturgeschichte der antiken Welt im Spiegel der Sammlungen des Archäologischen Museums Frankfurt*, Regensburg 2012.

SWADDLING 2002
J. SWADDLING, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Great Britain 1, British Museum 1,* London 2002.

SZILÁGYI 1981a
J.G. SZILÁGYI, *'Impletae modis saturae'*, in «Prospettiva», 24, 1981, pp. 2-23.

SZILÁGYI 1984
J.C. SZILÁGYI, *Discorso sul metodo. Contributo al problema della classificazione degli specchi tardo-etruschi*, in M. MARTELLI, ed. by, *Tyrrhenoi Philotechnoi.* Conference Proceedings (Viterbo, 1990), Ghezzano, pp. 161-172 .

SZILÁGYI 1992
J.G. SZILÁGYI, *Ceramica etrusco-corinzia figurata I*, Firenze 1992.

TAPLIN 2013
O. TAPLIN, *About* Pots and Play, in G. BORDIGNON, ed. by, S*cene dal mito. Iconologia del dramma antico*, Venezia 2013, pp. 9-21.

TASSO 2013
A. TASSO, Pylai Aidao. *Un percorso iconografico e letterario sulla diffusione del tema delle Porte dell'Ade da Oriente a Occidente*, Oxford 2013.

THUILLIER 1985
J.P. THUILLIER, *Les jeux athlétiques dans la civilisation étrusque*, Rome 1985.

THUILLIER 1993
J.P. THUILLIER, *Les représentations sportives dans l'oeuvre du Peintre de Micali*, in *Spectacles sportifs et scéniques dans le monde étrusco-italique*. Conference Proceedings (Roma 1991), Roma 1993, pp. 21-44.

THUILLIER 1997a
J.P. THUILLIER, *Dieux Grecs et Dieux Etrusques*, in F. GAULTIER, D. BRIQUEL, ed. by, *Les Etrusques, les plus religieux des hommes*. Conference Proceedings (Paris, 1992), Paris 1997, pp. 373-393.

THUILLIER 1997b
J.P. THUILLIER, *Un relief archaïque inédit de Chiusi*, in «Revue Archéologique», 2, 1997, pp. 243-260.

THUILLIER 2012
J.P. THUILLIER, *Sur/*Śuri/Śuris/Sorex/Sors: le dieu et les sorts*, in «Studi Etruschi», LXXV-2009, 2012, pp. 33-50.

THUILLIER 2017
J.P. THUILLIER, *Sports*, in A. NASO, ed. by, *Etruscology*, Boston-Berlin 2017, pp. 221-232.

TIRELLI 1981
M. TIRELLI, *La rappresentazione del Sole nell'arte etrusca*, in «Studi Etruschi», XLIX, 1981, pp. 41-50.

TODISCO, SISTO 1998
L. TODISCO, M.A. SISTO, *Un gruppo di vasi attici e il problema della "special commissions" in Italia meridionale*, in «Mélanges de l'école française de Rome», 110, 2, 1998, pp. 571-608.

TORELLI 1966
M. TORELLI, *Un* templum *augurale di età repubblicana a Bantia*, in «Rendiconti dei Lincei», XXI, 1966, pp. 293-315.

TORELLI 1983
M. TORELLI, *Ideologia e rappresentazione nelle tombe tarquiniesi dell'Orco I e II*, in «Dialoghi di archeologia», 2, 1983, pp. 7-17.

TORELLI 1988
M. TORELLI, Etruria principes disciplinam doceto. *Il mito normativo dello specchio di Tuscania*, in *Studia Tarquiniensa* (Archaeologia Perusina 9), Roma, 1988, pp. 109-118.

TORELLI 1995
M. TORELLI, *A Templum Augurale of the Republican Period at Bantia*, in M. TORELLI, ed. by, *Studies in the Romanization of Italy*, Edmonton1997, pp. 97-129.

TORELLI 1997a
M. TORELLI, *Il rango, il rito e l'immagine: alle origini della rappresentazione storica romana*, Milano 1997.

TORELLI 1997b
M. TORELLI, *«Limina Averni». Realtà e rappresentazione nella pittura tarquiniese arcaica*, in «Ostraka», 6, pp. 63-86.

TORELLI 1999
M. TORELLI, *Funera Tusca: Reality and Representation in Archaic Tarquinian Painting*, in «Studies in the History of Art», 56 (Symposium Papers XXXIV: The Art of Ancient Spectacle), 1999, pp. 146-161.

TORELLI 2000
M. TORELLI, ed. by, *Gli Etruschi*. Exhibition Catalogue (Venezia 2000), Milano 2000.

TORELLI 2002a
M. TORELLI, *Autorappresentarsi. Immagine di sé, ideologia e mito greco attraverso gli scarabei etruschi*, in «Ostraka», 11, pp. 101-155.

TORELLI 2002b
M. TORELLI, *Divagazioni sul tema della palma . La palma di Apollo e la palma di Artemide*, in B. GENTILI, F. PERUSINO, ed. by, *Le orse di Brauron: un rituale di iniziazione femminile nel santuario di Artemide*, Pisa 2002, pp. 139-151.

TORELLI 2002c
M. TORELLI, *Ideologia e paesaggi della morte in etruria*, in I. COLPO, I. FAVERETTO, F. GHEDINI, ed. by, *Iconografia 2001. Studi sull'immagine*, Roma 2002, pp. 45-61.

TORELLI 2004
M. TORELLI, *L'arte degli Etruschi*, Roma-Bari 2004.

TORELLI 2006
M. TORELLI, *Lo scudo pseudoesiodeo di Eracle. Ζῆλος ὁμηρικός, immagine e fonti di ispirazione*, in F.-H. MASSA PAIRAULT, ed. by, *L'image antique et son interprétation*, Roma 2006, pp. 19-39.

TORELLI 2007A
M. TORELLI, *Linguaggio ellenistico e linguaggio "nazionale" nella pittura ellenistica etrusca*, in «Ostraka», 16, 2007, pp. 149-170

TORELLI 2007B
M. TORELLI, *Le strategie di Kleitias. Composizione e programma figurativo del Vaso François*, Milano 2007.

TORELLI 2012
M. TORELLI, *L'esigenza della chiarezza. La pittura parietale etrusca tardo-classica ed ellenistica e le conquiste pittoriche greche*, in M. HARARI, S.

PALTINERI, M. ROBINO, ed. by, *Segni e Colore. Dialoghi sulla pittura tardoclassica ed ellenistica*. Conference Proceedings (Pavia 2012), Roma 2012, pp. 9-26.

TOSO 2007
S. TOSO, *Fabulae grecae: miti greci nelle gemme romane del I secolo a.C.*, Roma 2007.

TOUBERT, RAGGIO 1990
P. TOUBERT, O. RAGGIO, *Marc Bloch e il dopo: la storia agraria e le «Annales» (1929-1985)*, in «Quaderni Storici», 25, 74, 1990, pp. 487-499.

TOYNBEE, PERKINS 1950
J.M.C. TOYNBEE, J.B.W. PERKINS, *Peopled Scrolls: a Hellenistic Motif in Imperial Art*, in «Papers of the British School at Rome», 18, 1950, pp. 1-43.

TRAFICANTE 2006
V. TRAFICANTE, *Recezione e risemantizzazione in Etruria di modelli iconografici della ceramica attica: il caso di Nereo*, in F. GIUDICE, R. PANVINI, ed. by, *Il greco, il barbaro e la ceramica attica. Immaginario del diverso, processi di scambio e autorappresentazione degli indigeni*. Conference Proceedings (Roma, 2001), Roma 2006, pp. 75-84.

TRENDALL 1955
A.D. TRENDALL, *Vasi antichi dipinti del Vaticano. Vasi italioti ed etruschi a figure rosse*, Vatican City 1955.

TRENDALL 1983
A.D. TRENDALL, *Red-Figured Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily. Third Supplement*, London 1983.

TRENDALL 1989
H.D. TRENDALL, *Red Figure Vases of South Italy and Sicily*, London 1989.

TRIGGER 1989
B.G. TRIGGER, *A history of Archeological Though*, Cambridge 1989.

TRIGGER 1994
B.G. TRIGGER, *Childe's Relevance to the 1990s*, in D.R. HARRIS, ed by, *The archaeology of V. Gordon Childe. Contemporary Perspective*, Chicago 1994, pp. 9-34.

TURK 2005
P. TURK, *Images of Life and Myth*. Exhibition Catalogue (Ljubljana 2005), Celje 2005.

UCCHINO 2009
D. UCCHINO, *La garanzia del sangue*, in M. HARARI, S. PALTINERI, M. ROBINO, ed. by, *Segni e Colore. Dialoghi sulla pittura tardoclassica ed ellenistica*. Conference Proceedings (Pavia 2012), Roma 2012, pp. 187-196.

VACCARO 2011
V. VACCARO, *Caronti e finte porte*, in G.F. LA TORRE, M. TORELLI, ed. by, *Pittura ellenistica in Italia e in Sicilia. Linguaggi e tradizioni*. Conference Proceedings (Messina 2009), Roma 2011, pp. 349-359.

VAGLIO 2000
M. VAGLIA, *I Dioscuri scomparsi: Crotone, Sparta, Cirene e le tradizioni mitiche della baggaglia della Sagra*, in «Hesperìa. Studi sulla grecità di Occidente», 10, 2000, pp. 227-235.

VAN DEER MEER 1979
L.B. VAN DER MEER, *Iecur placentinum and the Orientation of the Etruscan Haruspex*, in «Bulletin Antieke Beschaving», 54, 1959, pp. 79 ss.

VAN DEER MEER 1986
L.B. VAN DER MEER, *Greek and Local Elements in a Sporting Scene by the Micali Painter*, in J. SWADDLING, ed. by, *Italian Iron Age Artefacts in the British Museum*, London 1986, pp. 439-445.

VAN DER MEER 1987
L.B. VAN DEER MEER, *The Bronze Liver of Piacenza. Analysis of a polytheistic structure*, Amsterdam 1987.

VAN DER MEER 1993
L.B. VAN DEER MEER, *Tragedie et réalité. Programmes iconographiques des sarcophages étrusques*, in *Spectacles sportifs et scéniques dans le monde étrusco-italique*. Conference Proceedings (Roma 1991), Roma 1993, pp. 379-393.

VAN DER MEER 1995
L.B. VAN DER MEER, Interpretatio Etrusca. *Greek Myths on Etruscan Mirrors*, Amsterdam 1995.

VAN DER MEER 2001
L.B. VAN DEER MEER, *Decorated Etruscan Stone Sarcophagi. A Chronological and Bibliographical Appendix to R. Herbig, Die jüngeretruskischen Steinsarkophage (Berlin 1952)*, in «Bulletin Antieke Beschaving. Annual Papers on Classical Archaeology», 76, 2001, pp. 79-100.

VAN DER MEER 2011
L.B. VAN DEER MEER, Etrusco Ritu, *Case Studies in Etruscan Ritual Behavior*, Leuven 2011.

VAN DER MEER 2014
L.B. VAN DEER MEER, *The Etruscan Bronze Lamp of Cortone, its Cosmic Program and its Attached Inscription*, in «Latomus», LXXIII, 2014, pp. 289-302.

VAN DER MEER 2016a
L.B. VAN DEER MEER, *Elite ideology in Praeneste. On the imagery of pear-shaped mirrors and cistae*, in «Bulletin Antieke Beschaving. Annual Papers on Classical Archaeology», 91, 2016, pp. 105-128.

VAN DER MEER 2016b
L.B. VAN DEER MEER, *Reevaluating Etruscan Influences on the Engravings of Prenestine Pear-shaped Mirrors and Cistae*, in «Etruscan Studies», 19, 2016, pp. 68-86.

VAN GENNEP 1909
A. VAN GENNEP, *Les rites de passage*, Paris 1909.

VARRIALE 2010
I. VARRIALE, *La rappresentazione del mito come forma di comunicazione. Il caso di Atteone e Diana*, in «Annali dell'Università degli Studi Suor Orsola Benincasa», 2010, pp. 555-566.

VASSILIKA 1998
E. VASSILIKA, *Greek and Roman Art* (Fitzwilliam Museum), Cambridge 1998.

VENTURA 1987
E. VENTURA, *Alle origini della tutela delle bellezze naturali in Italia*, in «Storia Urbana», XI, 1987, 40, pp. 3-41.

VERNANT 1976
J.-P. VERNANT, *Figure dell'invisibile e categoria psicologica del 'doppio': il 'kolossos'*, in *Mito e tragedia nell'antica Grecia*, Torino 1976.

VERNANT 1981
J.-P. VERNANT, *Théorie générale du sacrifice et mise à mort dans la* thusia *grecque*, in *Le sacrifice dans l'Antiquité*, Genève 1981, pp. 1-39.

VERNANT 1986
J.-P. VERNANT, *Preface*, in A. PONTRANDOLFO, ed. by, *La Città delle immagini: religione e società nella Grecia antica*, Losanne 1986, pp. 6-7.

VERNANT 1991
J.-P. VERNANT, *Mortals and Immortals. Collected Essays*, Priceton 1991.

VIAN 1949
F. VIAN, *Une gigantomachie Étrusque au Musée de Marseille*, in «REA», 51, 1949, pp. 26-40.

VIAN 1951
F. VIAN, *Répertoire des Gigantomachies figurées dans l'art grecque et romaine*, Paris 1951.

VIAN 1988
F. VIAN, s.v. *Gigantes*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, IV, Zürich-München 1988, pp. 191-270.

VIGHI 1932
R. VIGHI, *La più antica raffigurazione di nave etrusco-italica in un vaso della necropoli veiente*, in «RendAccLinc», 8, 1932, pp. 367-375.

VITALI 2014
D. VITALI, *Danza e banchetto sulle stele funerarie felsinee*, in «Notizie Archeologiche Bergomensi», 21, 2013, pp. 119-145.

VLAD BORRELLI 1958
L. VLAD BORRELLI, s.v. *Amazzoni*, in «Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica», 1958.

VLAD BORRELLI 1985
L. VLAD BORRELLI, *Tecnica e conservazione della pittura etrusca*, in S. STEINGRÄBER, *Catalogo ragionato della pittura etrusca*, Milano 1985, pp. 91-99.

VOLONTÉ 2017
P. VOLONTÉ, *Il contributo dell'Actor-Network Theory alla discussione sull'agency degli oggetti*, in «Politica e Società», 1, 2017, pp. 31-58.

WALTERS 1926
H.B. WALTERS, *Catalogue of the Engraved Gems and Cameos, Greek, Etruscan and Roman. British Museum*, London 1926.

WARD-PERKINS 1964
J. B. WARD-PERKINS 1964, *Landscape and History in Central Italy*, Oxford 1964.

WARDEN 2016
P.G. WARDEN, *Communicating with Gods. Sacred Space in Etruria*, , in S. BELL, A.A. CARPINO, ed. by, *A Companion to the Etruscans*, Hoboken 2016, pp. 162-177.

WARLAND 1996
D. WARLAND, *La tombe "du Plongeur". Étude de la relation entre le symposion et le plongeon*, in «RHR», 213, 2, 1996, pp. 143-160.

WEBER-LEHMAN 1987
C. WEBER-LEHMAN, *Tomba delle Bighe*, in H. BLANK, C. WEBER LEHMAN, ed. by, *Malerei der Etrusker in Zeichnungen des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Mainz 1987, pp. 104-117.

WEBER-LEHMAN 1995
C. WEBER-LEHMAN, *Polyphem in der Unterwelt? Zur Tomba dell'Orco II in Tarquinia*, in «Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung», 102, 1995, pp. 71-100.

WEBER-LEHMAN 1996
C. WEBER-LEHMAN, *Ulisse nella tomba dell'Orco II a Tarquinia*, in B. ANDREAE, C. PARISI PRESICCE, ed. by, *Ulisse: il mito e la memoria*. Exhibition Catalogue (Roma 1996), Roma 1996, pp. 160-173.

WEBER-LEHMANN 1997
C. WEBER-LEHMANN, *Kentauroi (in Etruria)*, in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, VIII, Zürich-München 1997, pp. 721-727.

WEBER-LEHMANN 2009
C. WEBER-LEHMAN, *Halsamphora des „Malers der Krotalentänzerin" mit Deckel*, in M. KUNZE, ed. by, *Die Etrusker. Die Entdeckung ihrer Kunst seit Winckelmann*, Ruhpolding-Mainz 2009, pp. 80-81.

WEBER-LEHMAN 2019
C. WEBER-LEHMAN, Urna cineraria dipinta, in A. CARDARELLI, A. NASO, ed. by, *Etruschi Maestri Artigiani. Nuove prospettive da Cerveteri e Tarquinia*, Napoli 2019, pp. 183-187.

WEEGE 1921
F. WEEGE, *Etruskische Malerei*, Halle 1921.

WEHGARTNER 2001
I. WEHGARTNER, *Spurensuche: Frauen in der Klassischen Archäologie vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg*, in J.K. KOCH, E.-H. MERTENS, ed. by, *Eine Dame zwischen 500 Herren: Johanna Mestorf, Werk und Wirkung*. Münster, pp. 267-279.

WEINSTOCK 1946
S. WEINSTOCK, *Martianus Capella and the Cosmic System of the Etruscans*, in «The Journal of Roman Studies», 36, 1946, pp. 101-129.

WEIS 1982
A. WEIS, *The motif of the* Adligatus *and Tree. A Study in the Sources of Pre-Roman Iconography*, in «American Journal of Archaeology», 86, 1982, pp. 21-38.

WEISSL 2015
M. WEISSL, *"Fuori dalle solite rotte già tracciate". Emanuel Löwy dopo il 1915*, in «Archeologia Classica», 66, 2015, pp. 377-406.

WĘCOWSKI 2002
M. WĘCOWSKI, *Towards a Definition of the* Symposion, in T. DERDA, J. URBANIK, M. WECOWSKI, ed. by, *Euergesias charin. Studies Presented to Benedetto Bravo and Ewa Wipszycka by Their Disciples*, Warszawa 2002, pp. 337-361.

WERNER 2005
I. WERNER, *Dionysos in Etruria. The Ivy Leaf Group*, Stockholm 2005.

WINTER 1978
N.A. WINTER, *Archaic Architectural Terracottas Decorated with Human Heads*, in «Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung», 85, 1978, pp. 27-58.

WINTER 2006
N.A. WINTER, *Le terrecotte architettoniche arcaiche di Tarquinia. Scambi e modelli*, in M. BONGHI JOVINO, ed. by, *Tarquinia e le civiltà del Mediterraneo*, Milano 2006, pp. 127-144.

WISEMAN
T.P. WISEMAN, *Liber: Myth, drama and ideology in republican Rome*, in C. BRUUN, ed. by, *The Roman middle republic: politics, religion, and historiography. c. 400-133 B.C.*, Roma 2000, pp. 265-299.

WIMAN, EKMAN 2000-2001
I. M.B. WIMAN, S. EKMAN, *Man and Nature in Etruria. Natural Resources Management in the Massetano Area (Tuscany, Italy)*, in «Opuscola Romana», 25-25, 2000-2001, pp. 109-124.

WOERMANN 1876
K. WOERMANN, *Die Landschaft in der Kunst der alten Völker*, Munich 1876.

WUNDT 1912
W. WUNDT, *Elemente der Völkerpsychologie*, Leipzig 1912.

WUNDT 1912
W. WUNDT, *Elementi di Psicologia dei Popoli*. *Lineamenti di una storia psicologica dell'evoluzione dell'umanità*, Torino 1929.

ZANONI 1998
I. ZANONI, *Natur- und Landschaftsdarstellungen in der etruskischen und unteritalischen Wandmalerei*, Bern 1998.

ZANONI 2009
V. ZANONI, *Uno specchio figurato inedito da Tarquinia*, in «LANX», 3, 2009, pp. 72-88.

ZAZOFF 1968
P. ZAZOFF, *Etruskische Skarabäen*, Magonza 1968.

ZAZOFF 1983
P. ZAZOFF, *Die Antiken Gemmen*, Monaco 1983.

ZECCHI 1983
S. ZECCHI, Introduzione a J.W. Goethe, *La metamorfosi delle piante*, Milano 1983.

ZIMMER 1995
G. ZIMMER, *Corpus Speculorum Etruscorum. Bundesrepublik Deutschland 4. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Antikensammlung 2*, München 1995.

ZUCHTRIEGEL 2011
G. ZUCHTRIEGEL, *An open-air sanctuary on an amphora by the Pittore delle Gru and the cult of Artemis in early Etruria*, in «Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Antiquité», 123, 2011, pp. 5-11.

While the images reproduced in the hard copy version of this dissertation are used under fair use principles or with permission of the copyright holder, the images do not appear in the thesis as it is published in the Online Institutional Repository