

Violence, power and religion in the South Etruscan Archaic city-state

Corinna Riva

University College London

Keywords:

Herakles, cult statues, *Caere*, violence, political community

Abstract:

Changes in architectural terracotta decoration of temple buildings in Archaic southern Etruria indicate changing attitudes towards the encounter with divinity, which, in turn, shaped religious experience for worshippers, as well as offering an opportunity for the exploitation of that experience to political ends. This paper explores this entanglement by taking the city-state of *Caere* and its temple decoration as a case study and particularly the cult and iconography of Greek hero Herakles and related myths into account in order to examine the intersection between ritualization and political power in a phase of urban growth across Tyrrhenian Central Italy.

Focus, explanatory hypotheses, applied concepts and methods

This paper wishes to investigate how the religious environment, which includes worshippers' activities as well as the elaborate decoration of religious spaces, shaped, and was in turn shaped by, political power in the city-states of Archaic Southern Etruria, *circa* sixth to early fifth centuries BC, and hence, to explore the relationship between this power and ritualization (Gordon 1979: 17) in urban settings. It will do so by exploiting theoretically-informed art-historical studies of coeval architectural decoration of Greek temples, which have underlined a system of communication in the decorative programmes of these temples, in which different levels of religious and cultural significance or, one might say, semantic densities pertained to different artistic genres of the decoration, from sculptures in the round to wall paintings and metopes (Hölscher 2009). These studies have furthermore introduced a key conceptual category for understanding such programmes, namely the concept of ornament inherent in the Greek and Latin words *kosmos* and *ornamentum* respectively, which, although different in their original meanings (Saliou 2015: 134), both refer to the moral and social order underlying the aesthetic order and hence physical ornament of cult buildings (Marconi 2004; Hölscher 2009; cf. Tanner 2006 on the relationship between the social and the aesthetic in relation to cult statues). Moral and social values thus drove the decorative choices of Greek temples; at the same time, these values were expressed in a religious space where theological demands equally affected these choices (Osborne 2009; cf. Osborne *et al.* 2016).

In contrast to Greece, Archaic Etruria suffers from a lower level of preservation of temple decoration, which often survives in highly fragmented assemblages, as exemplified by much of architectural terracotta decoration at the city of *Caere* found in cisterns as dumps of building material (Winter 2016: 129). We also lack texts that give us an entry into the Etruscan mentality, and Etruscan social and moral values although analysis across different types of archaeological contexts can partly fill this lacuna (e.g. Riva 2017). Yet, borrowing these conceptual categories and analytical frameworks can greatly assist us. It is not, however, a simple matter of borrowing. Rather, my aim is comparative: the use of these categories and frameworks is aimed at enhancing the distinctive features of Etruscan architectural decoration, and ultimately the culturally-specific encounter with the gods. By examining the architectural terracottas of temples at *Caere* and at *Pyrgi*, *Caere's* coastal port, and the terracotta statue groups of Herakles at these sites, illustrating what has been termed 'a shared iconography of power' along a Tyrrhenian urban elite network (Lulof and Smith 2017a), I will thus address the questions of the moral and social values transmitted by these terracottas, the nature of the encounter with the gods as large-scale acroteria

of deities began being placed on temple roofs, and, finally, the mechanism by which all of the above intersected with political power, which I identify in the expression of violence linked to both sacrifice, intended as apparatus of the sacred (*sensu* Agamben 2006), and the formation of the (political) community, and hence, ultimately sovereignty (Smith 2020). I shall answer these questions by considering: 1) the framing of large-scale acroteria on temple roofs as cult statues placed on altar-like bases, and the placing of these statues at the top of the hierarchy of the decorative programme; 2) the iconography of these cult statues in relation to the narratives and other images as architectural decoration, which allows me to examine the expression of violence at *Caere* and *Pyrgi*. In doing so, I shall not lose sight of the role of craftsmen not simply in introducing innovation in architectural decoration, but also in providing, through that innovation, the appropriate ornament to religious buildings. By building on the scholarship of this material, I ultimately aim to reflect deeper on religious experience, its materialisation and its politicisation at a phase of urban growth.

State of the Art

Recent analyses, re-analyses and major syntheses of architectural terracottas decorating mostly the roofs of buildings within sanctuaries in and outside the major urban centres of the Central Tyrrhenian region as well as further afield has been notable (Lulof 2000, 2008, 2011; Winter 2005; 2009). In particular, the identification of Archaic roof systems (Winter 2009) and the reconstruction of later Archaic roofs' terracotta decoration leading to ongoing research on the evolution of these systems (Lulof 2000, 2011, 2016) leave us with an abundant set of archaeological and visual evidence that is ripe for interpretation in regards to the contexts – historical, economic and socio-political - within which this religious material was produced. Some most recent pleas to exploit this evidence to this interpretive end have been made, particularly in regard to the agency of craftsmen and of their artistic production in promoting, if not engendering, social and political transformation (Smith 2019).

In fact, scholarly analysis of this material has treated the relationship between craftsmanship and politics for some time and in one particular case, namely the production of large-scale terracotta acroteria of Herakles paired with a female deity, and the placing of this pair on the roofs of temples in the central Tyrrhenian region from *circa* 540-530 – so far known at the Etruscan cities of *Veii* (twice) and *Caere* (also twice), *Pyrgi*, the Latin city of *Satricum*, Rome, Velletri, Caprifico

and *Pompeii* (Lulof 2000; 2016: 31, 138, footnote 36; Winter 2009: 377-381). The placing of these acroteria has been read as an act of political propaganda by the local rulers of these cities who probably commissioned these temples. In sharing common iconographic schemata facilitated by the mobility of craftsmen, these rulers exploited the figure of Herakles and the mythological narrative of the hero's labours culminating in his apotheosis in order to legitimise their own political power (Lulof 2000). Such a reading seems to be well-founded: Herakles, a Mediterranean-wide or what might be called a glocal hero (Kistler 2012) serving multiple, highly localised and regional colonial discourses in the Greek world (e.g. Malkin 2011: 119-142), provided Archaic Southern Etruria with a rich ensemble of mythical narratives of the wandering cultural hero who ultimately acquired divine status (d'Agostino and Cerchiali 1999: 147-185). The iconographic material from figured pottery, both imported and locally made, and architectural decoration of elite houses and sanctuaries speaks highly of Herakles' appeal to Etruscan elites, in both private and public contexts.

In private contexts, it is argued, Herakles represented to the elite viewer the archetypal hero in his display of *metis* or cunning (Bonaudo 2004). The remarkable increase of this material in sixth-century southern Etruria, notably in its figurative treatment by local potters and painters (from Caeretan *hydriai* to Pontic vases),¹ at a phase of urban growth when local rulers jostled for political power, has promoted its political interpretation. Hence, in the public context of the sanctuary, the placing of Herakles by the side of a female deity, often identified as Athena, on the ridgepole of the roof of temple buildings dramatized the hero's apotheosis, and served a political propaganda that centred upon the divine nature of these rulers' power by associating female deities with male rulership (Lulof 2016: 276-278). All of this went hand in hand with the monumentalization and overall material elaboration of the sanctuaries, itself evidence of more politically complex urban environments at a phase of heightened interaction in the broader Central Mediterranean region (Potts 2016). While persuasive, this political reading nevertheless neglects the very religious environment in which Herakles stood and was viewed by worshippers, and the effects of this interaction upon these worshippers' votive activities. This reading is moreover weakened by the anachronistic use of a concept, that of political propaganda, which belongs to a much later historical era, resulting in an over-emphasis on architectural decoration's power of communication (Hölscher 2009: 58). By re-focusing the discussion upon religious experience and its politicisation, I intend to fill what this lacuna by building upon this extant scholarship.

¹ Bonaudo (2004: 98) estimates 18% of the *hydriai*, forty or so examples, shows images linked to Herakles' *athla* and that a similar figure applies to the Pontic repertoire

Historical and spatial exposition, agents

2.1 Framing the gods

Changes in architectural terracotta decoration of Central Tyrrhenian temple buildings in the second half of the sixth century exemplify a radically new attitude towards cult statues and therefore the worshippers' encounter with the gods. For the first time, at *circa* 540-530 BC, the temple's decorative programme included an artistic genre that acquired the highest level of religious and cultural significance (*sensu* Hölscher 2009), namely statues in the round of mid- to real-life size, which were reserved for the representation of the god and were placed at the ends of the ridges of temple roofs as acroteria (Winter 2005). In fact, we can trace the evolution in the placing of such terracotta statues on roofs and from an earlier decorative roof system, at *circa* 580 BC, that pertains to elite courtyard buildings, of which the most complete example is the Upper Building at Poggio Civitate (Murlo, Tuscany), and to temple buildings in Rome; among the latter is the first-phase temple at S. Omobono where a fragment of possibly a bull acroterion was found (Winter 2005; 2009: 194-201). As terracotta human and animal figures at over sixty pieces at Poggio Civitate show, the acroteria of this earlier system were attached to ridge tiles and their roof arrangement, insofar as the reconstruction of the roof allows us to see, gave the impression of a frieze-like decoration to the viewer approaching the building (Winter 2017: 135). In the space of twenty years or so, such decorated roofs were limited to religious and public buildings only; three or so decades later still, at *circa* 530 BC, the placing of statues in the round on temple roofs coincided with a veritable boom in such buildings across Tyrrhenian Central Italy: according to Winter (2016: 129; 2017: 148), the so-called *Veii-Rome-Velletri* workshops produced some twenty

roofs at the eponymous sites in a single decade down to 520 BC, while between 540 and 510 BC some twenty-six roofs were produced in *Caere* alone and its hinterland.

Rarely has the scholarly literature of these acroteria statues defined them as cult statues (cf. Carlucci 2011: 117) seemingly for two reasons: on the one hand, the statue pair of Herakles with a female deity had no relation to the gods worshipped at these religious sites (Lulof 2000; Winter 2005: 247), while the more complex terracotta statuary groups placed on the ridge of later temples represented mythological stories, namely the temple of Apollo replacing, at *circa* 510 BC, an earlier building that was decorated with the Herakles and goddess pair at *Veii-Portonaccio*, and the temple of Mater Matuta at *Satricum* that was also rebuilt at *circa* 500-490 BC (Winter 2005: 247-149; Lulof 2011). On the other hand, the cult statue defined as the image of the god and hence the focus of worship evokes the Greek tradition of the housing of such a statue inside temple buildings. In fact, such a definition is not uncontroversial even for the Greek world (Donohue 1997), nor was that tradition at all uniform across Archaic Greece or indeed even the case for all Greek temple *cellae* (Sismondo Ridgway 2005: 11-112). Scholars have thus suggested a much more nuanced approach to the interpretation of Greek cult statues that gives prominence to either the spatial relationships of such a statue within a cult building (Sismondo Ridgway 2005) or, more broadly, to the encounter with the god that such a statue or other divine images facilitated (Tanner 2006; Platt 2011). The latter approach has proven particularly insightful for understanding the triangulation among the deity embodied in, even *being*, the statue, the worshipper viewing it and the craftsman representing it, ultimately leading to the problem of representation itself that is laid bare in the materialisation and human-like embodiment of a divine non-bodied being that affords its epiphany (Platt 2011: 10-23, 31-123). Such a materialisation, in fact, underlies the deliberately ambiguous boundary between the permissible and the impermissible in art production and craftsmanship insofar as

representations of the human body are concerned, and the just as ambiguous boundary between the real and imaginary in the representation of the divine and its reception (Gordon 1979); while problematised by later Greek cultural discourses, such relationships and boundaries also characterised earlier religious traditions since the Homeric epic and the Homeric Hymns (Platt 2011: 31-72; Bierl 2017). As primarily visual, the reception of the divine, encapsulated by the Greek word *theoria* meaning viewing, beholding or ‘sacred spectating’ (Nightingale 2004: 45-47), was anything but a passive process (Neer 2010: 57-69): on the contrary, the act of viewing divine representations was itself a ritual performance and one in which the ontological difference between image and deity collapsed (Elsner 2000: 52-63; Tanner 2006: 40-67; Platt 2011: 20). Hence, the craftsmen’s choices of material, stylistic form, composition and iconography or any other figural attribute were theological ones (Tanner 2006: 48-51; Platt 2011: 41-42). At the same time, as noted above, in the overall temple’s decorative programme, sculpture in the round constituted the most culturally appropriate artistic genre for evoking the deity and hence activating divine epiphany (Hölscher 2009: 57).

It is not far-fetched to identify parallel relationships and uses of Etruscan life-size terracotta acroteria-statues considering the similarities in the Greek and Etruscan polytheistic religious systems, and especially the role that the statues and other architectural sculptural decoration played in the transmission of Greek-derived myths in Etruria (Carlucci 2015: 116-117). The decoration and framing of these statues on the roof of Etruscan temple buildings lead to this suggestion: unlike earlier and smaller acroteria that were attached to ridge tiles, the statues and their plinths were inserted into decorated bases that were attached to the roof ridge through what must have been a sophisticated system of installation that ensured the stability of the bases and the maintenance of the roof system (Maras 2011; Carlucci 2011; Michetti 2011). In fact, statues and bases were a coeval innovation, seen first at the Temple of Mater

Matuta at *Satricum*, *Caere-Vigna Parrocchiale*, Pyrgi (Colonna 2000: 290, footnote 147), and then at the second-phase temple at S. Omobono in Rome (Winter 2009: 477-479; 2011). That this was a technical innovation to ensure the stability of the roof decoration is without a doubt: the innovation pertained not only to the conception of the separate elements of the group – bases and acroteria - and the different types of bases conceived for the different sizes and locations of the acroteria on the roof, either the ridge or the pitch, but also to the sophisticated firing technology needed in the manufacturing process (Winter 2010: 65). But the innovation also pertained to the religious significance of the statues themselves. The painted and/or moulded decoration of the bases, in fact, provided a particularly sacred framing to the statues in closely evoking sacrificial altars, which carried similar decorative patterns in some instances, as detected in coeval figured representations of these altars; this is the case with the chequerboard motif that was reserved for the bases of the largest, over-life-size statues placed at the margins of the roof of the temple of Apollo at *Veii-Portonaccio* (Winter 2005: 249; Michetti 2011: 100, 103; Maras 2011: 110; Marzullo 2018: 170-14). In other cases, the decoration alluded to highly charged epiphanic moments (Bierl 2017: 241-253): five bases from the same roof were decorated with painted eyes, which were clearly inspired from similar eye paintings on Attic Black Figure eye cups (Hedreen 2017: 165-170), and were associated with swimming dolphins (Michetti 2011: 101-103). The temple at *Veii-Portonaccio*, which provides the largest repertoire of such bases - a total of eighteen identified so far - and their decoration (Michetti 2011), illustrates the role of these altar-like bases in isolating the acroteria as cult statues, yet framing them for ritual viewing: that the craftsman intended this decoration to be visible at different viewing points of the worshipper's deambulation within the sanctuary is confirmed by the sizes of the motifs painted on the bases, which differed depending on the viewing point, including the chequers on the chequerboard patterns (Michetti 2011: 101, 104 footnote 17). Lastly, the light skin

colour reserved for the bodies of the high-relief plaques, an innovative visual strategy for the decoration of the pedimental space below the roof (see below), may indicate a deliberate intention to differentiate the bodies of the statues on the roof ridge (Carlucci 2011: 117).

This raises a key distinction in regards to the act of viewing the divine image between Archaic Etruscan and Greek sanctuaries: at the former, the statues literally transgressed the frame of the building, blurring the spatial distinction between inside/outside and enhancing the viewing effect, even if from a distance (Platt 2017 on framing the divine in the Greek world; Marconi 2007: 189-191 on earlier seventh-century Greek temple decoration). The different viewing points, identified by the decoration of the bases, may indicate that the worshipper's movement about the sacred space in viewing the divine was not as free or unstructured as might first appear, but must have followed specific patterns of religious behaviour (Moser 2019: 15, 51-53). Later texts, after all, make it clear that rituals at sanctuaries required a very specific liturgical order of movement and action, and altars provided the very foci for tracing the 'topography of ritual correctness' and action through time (Elsner 2000: 54-56); Etruscan and Central Italic sanctuaries and the central role of their altars were no exception (Baglione and Beelli Marchesini 2013; Moser 2019). Moreover, the decoration of the bases that made them, in some cases, look like altars, not only provided a focus for viewing the divine, thus diminishing the viewing distance, but also must have helped frame the relationship between the worshipper and the divine (Blume 2016). Last but not least, the care with which these terracotta statues were discarded once the buildings, which they decorated, were demolished, as best seen at *Veii-Portonaccio*, provides further evidence for interpreting these large acroteria as cult statues and thus foci for divine epiphany although high reliefs and antefixes were buried with just as much care (Glinister 2000: 59-60; cf. Moser 2019: 20).

2.2 Framing narratives vis-à-vis the divine: violence and sacrifice at Caere

As mentioned above, the earliest statues in the round placed on the ridge of temple roofs were the groups of Herakles and a female deity, mostly identified as Athena, at *circa* 540-530 BC (Lulof 2000; Winter 2005: 244-246; 2009: 571). Another near-contemporary innovation, at *circa* 520-510 BC, was the placing of handmade terracotta plaques sculpted in high reliefs at the ends of the central and four side beams supporting the sloping roofs, known as *columen* and *mutuli* respectively. First found at sites within *Caere* and across its hinterland, at *Pyrgi* and *Montetosto* (Winter 2009: 463-466; 2016: 128), this innovation probably began in this city, a datum that corroborates the primary role of Caeretan workshops in innovating and very quickly influencing workshops southwards (Winter 2016: 130). This is shown by the placing of these plaques on the aforementioned temple of Apollo at *Veii-Portonaccio* at *circa* 510 BC (Winter 2005: 248-250; Carlucci 2011: 116), and, later, on other temple roofs decorated with so-called Second Phase terracottas (Lulof 2011: 24-25). As seen from the reconstructions of two Caeretan roofs decorated with these plaques, namely those from a temple at the urban site of *Vigna Marini Vitalini* (Lulof 2008) and *Temple B* at *Pyrgi* (Colonna 2000), these plaques provided the mythological narrative counterpart to the acroteria statues, and thus played a role half way between dilated metopes (Colonna 2000: 283) and pedimental sculpture, both conceptually - being hand-made like the acroteria statues themselves and half life-size - and spatially. In fact, the combination of acroteria-statues and plaques highlights yet another distinction from coeval Greek architectural decoration, which, from the second quarter of the sixth century, shifted towards mythological narratives incorporating divine images within them, save for *Temple C* at *Selinus*, which bucked this trend (Marconi 2007: 190-192). In southern Etruria, by contrast, while the plaques disclose a similar concern with displaying such narratives, the divine statues, isolated on the roof ridge, maintained a remarkable prominence, promoting a particularly enhanced manifestation of the divine, as argued above. The profusion of statues on the Apollo temple at *Veii-Portonaccio*

seemingly indicates a convergence of visual strategies for representing mythological narratives with that of Greek temple decoration, but their placing as statue pairs on the roof ridge, in fact, discloses a culturally distinctive preference with singling out narrative snapshots, so to speak, for the viewer, rather than with whole sculpted pediments.

The differences do not end here, however. Greek architectural sculpture reflected the worshippers' stock knowledge of mythology, which was in turn largely derived from poetic performance from the Homeric epic onwards (Tanner 2006: 48-52; Hölscher 2009: 57). Beside the performance of Archaic epic such as that of Sicilian poet Stesichorus, about which we know very little (see below), Etruscan sanctuaries, on the other hand, arguably provided the earliest instance of a public display of Greek-derived myths, which, up until then - we surmise from the epigraphic and visual evidence - was limited to elite circles and hence responded to the moral and social values of those circles (Menichetti 1994: 44-83; Maras 2002; Bellelli 2010). Hence, as Herakles, a Greek hero at the centre of elites' visual culture, was chosen for the earliest statue groups across Central Tyrrhenian Italy, those values had to translate for the myths to appeal to the wider community (cf. Cristofani 1993: 39-41). Evidence of that translation may be detected at *Pyrgi* temple B where the high-relief plaques singled out Heraklean labours, illustrating a novel visual strategy from that used for the architectural terracotta decoration of elite residential buildings exemplified by the figured friezes from Zone F at Acquarossa (Winter 2009: 265-271): here, Herakles, represented in the act of grasping the Nemean lion and the Cretan bull, was instead couched, almost hidden, within rows of warriors and chariot processions. The novelty of this visual strategy, it must be underlined, was precisely the singling out of mythological narratives, which these plaques enabled, since the use of the latter was not new; it is found at Acquarossa itself at *circa* 600-580 BC and, slightly later, at Poggio Civitate and perhaps Vulci (Winter 2009: 67-68, 143-144). At the same time, however, the choices of myths related to Herakles reflected a specific

social and historical reality, which must have varied across the broader region, as much as it did across the larger Greek world, from Attica to Western Sicily (Marconi 2007: 205-209). In this respect, *Caere's* richness of architectural sculpture, recently augmented by new reconstructions of roofs and identification of sculpture pairs dated from the last decades of the sixth century (Rizzo 2011; Carlucci 2015; Lulof 2016), provides the opportunity to examine how and why, in respect to these aforementioned aspects, these choices were made at a frenetic phase of temple building.

Thus far, much attention has focused upon the extant Herakles-Athena pairs, combined with another divine couple, whose identification has been subject to debate (Lulof 2016: 132-133), and their political significance at *Caere* and beyond, as mentioned in my introduction, with recent attempts at understanding their cultic significance (Maras 2015). In the case of Temple B at *Pyrgi*, built at *circa* 510 BC and possibly succeeding one or more earlier buildings with terracotta roof decoration (Winter 2009: 553-554), scholars have identified the goddess accompanying the hero as either Athena or, more likely, Uni, the deity worshipped at the site, named as Uni-Astart in the Etruscan inscribed dedication on a renown set of golden plaques (Bellelli and Xella 2016), and assimilated to Hera. This second interpretation places emphasis upon a specific characterisation of Herakles' apotheosis, not found elsewhere, that saw him accessing the Olympus under the protection of Uni-Hera and as husband of Ebe, daughter of Hera, who may have been represented in one of the high-relief plaques, and possibly the plaque on one of the *columen's* beam ends (Colonna 2000: 288-290; Maras 2015; Lulof 2016: 137). Less attention has been paid towards the peculiarities of Herakles' characterisation vis-à-vis the iconography of the rest of the architectural decoration of the Caeretan temples where he featured centrally, and what can be inferred about the values underlying the decorative register at these temples.

Although the *mutuli* and *columen* plaques illustrating Herakles' labours at Temple B were highly fragmented, Colonna (2000: 283-287) identified five plaques illustrating the following labours, but not their location on the building: the fight against the Lernaian Hydra, which may have been placed on one of the *columen*'s beam ends, to judge from the size of its fragments, and which has been associated with another set of fragments, also referring to the Hydra and including a lion-skin-wearing Herakles; the killing of the Nemean lion; the capture of Cerberus, the Erymanthian boar, and the fight against the three-bodied monster Geryon. The *mutuli* at the four corners of the building represented pairs of horses moving towards the centre accompanied by a male youth: Colonna (2000: 287) has interpreted these plaques as representations of the outcome of Herakles' taming of the man-eating mares of Thracian king Diomedes, which provided an exemplar of the aristocratic life style for the local horse-owning elites. Lastly, a group of acroteria placed on the corners of the front sima of the roof, probably on both fronts of the temple, with which a torso of a lion-skin-cladded Herakles has been associated (*contra* Carlucci 2011: 125, footnote 8, who refers this torso to a building in *Caere*), has been identified as an Amazonomachy, if not a specific labour, that of the theft of Hippolyte's girdle (Colonna 2000: 284-286).

The life-size Herakles on the ridge was represented with the lion skin and wearing hoplite armour, greaves and a breastplate, which Colonna (2000: 290) has interpreted as the reward for his labours and hence an apt attribute for his apotheosis by conflating Archaic and later textual sources. This armour is a notable contrast to other similar acroteria statues of the hero both here, at *Caere* (Lulof 2016: 132, fig. 11.9), and elsewhere in Tyrrhenian Central Italy although an armoured Herakles sometimes appeared in the broader visual culture of Archaic Etruria with no particular identifiable pattern (Colonna 2000: 290-292). In Archaic Greek visual culture, similarly, there is no pattern in the iconographic choices of Herakles' attributes and/or weapons. If there is any, it is that he only uses his club when fighting against beasts

and monsters with the exception of Attic vase-painting depicting Geryon (see below), and that rarely does he wear body armour; where he does, this happens on the architectural decoration in sanctuaries (Cohen 1994: 698-699). Late Archaic Greek art, furthermore, frames, iconographically, an opposition between the lion-skin-cladded hero and other mythological figures depicted as heavily armoured warriors (Cohen 1994: 699): this opposition expresses a visual discourse on the margins and the centre of the *polis* community and hence its membership and ideology, which Herakles was best placed to exemplify given his incursions across its limits (d'Agostino 1999: 152). The discourse is centred upon the use of appropriate and inappropriate weapons and hence Herakles' characterisation as anti-hoplite (Burkert 1992); it is further enhanced by the reversal of this antithesis as is the case with the mythical story linked to Herakles' foundation of a cult to Hera at Sparta, which saw the hero wearing hoplite armour and fighting the hubristic Hippocoontides who endangered the community's order by grabbing political power (Giangiuglio 1995: 221-229).

At *Caere*, from the extant evidence available, we may find a comparable visual discourse centred on armour that must be related to religious worship and the underlying mythical narrative in which Herakles participated. As mentioned earlier, at the other building, most probably a temple at Vigna Marini Vitalini, coeval to, if not slightly earlier than, Temple B at Pyrgi, where we see the same innovative use of *mutulus* and *columen* plaques, the entire decorative programme centred upon armed fighting (Figure 1). Fragments of more plaques from Vigna Parrocchiale, another site within the city, show similar themes (Winter 2009: 465). According to Lulof's reconstruction of the heavily fragmented Vigna Marini Vitalini roof (2008; 2011; Winter 2009: 463-465; Carlucci 2015), the plaques depicted groups of fighting warriors; fallen warriors fitted into the two plaques placed at the corners of the roof. A bigger plaque, probably placed at the *columen*'s end and depicting a larger number of warriors, may have included Herakles, identified by a head with lion skin, but with no other

associated body fragments. Culminating on the ridge of the roof was a half-life-size hand-made acroterion depicting a frontal-facing fully armed warrior striding towards the right (Winter 2009: 472-3), but lacking any attribute that would allow viewers to identify him with a specific hero or deity; that the warrior acroterion is not a statue in the round with its own separate base as other acroteria cult statues discussed above is significant. On either side of this warrior were smaller quarter-life-size sima acroteria depicting pairs of horses with either single riding Amazons, facing frontally and unarmed but with greaves, or pairs of fully armed riding warriors facing side-ways, all riding towards the roof ridge (Lulof 2008: 204-206).

While Lulof (2010: 25-28; also Carlucci 2015) underlines the experimentation of this roof's decoration that inaugurated a subsequent phase of architectural terracottas of temple buildings focused on battle themes, and which was to be particularly popular in Rome and Latium, the warrior acroterion of the Vigna Marini roof represents thus far an unicum in respect to the decorative system adopted by other coeval temples, as seen above. If Lulof's reconstruction is correct, however, it may not be far-fetched to explain such an unicum by establishing a correlation between this conspicuous display of fully armoured fights at the heart of the city and the just as violent imagery of Herakles' labours on the correspondent and contemporary high-relief plaques on Pyrgi Temple B. That the roofs were coming from the same Caeretan workshops (Lulof 2008: 212) strengthens this suggestion, but the correspondence must have also answered specific theological intentions and demands which, I suggest, are to be found in two interrelated aspects: 1) the relationship between the mortal worshipper and the divine, which was not only established by the embodiment of a deity in a cult statue and hence the religious epiphany as argued above, but was particularly problematised by what seems to me to be a deliberate contrast between a non-divine warrior figure towering over the Vigna Marini building and the armed hero Herakles, about to be

divine, at Pyrgi, a contrast that is enhanced by the reference to the Amazonomachy on both buildings;

2) the role of violence in the establishment of sovereign power and its entanglement with sacrifice.

In regards to the first aspect, it seems reasonable to suppose a shared system of religious communication across the Caeretan city-state, and that this was driven theologically by an intense local worship for Herakles as attested by the inscribed votives dedicated to Etruscan *Herclē* and found at Pyrgi and at the urban sanctuary at Sant'Antonio (Maggiani 2013); some of these votives were imported Greek oversize vessels meant for display such as Attic parade cups (Tsingarida 2009; Cerchiali 2018c). The hypothesis of a shared system is further corroborated by the architectural terracottas of the sanctuary at Montetosto, among which is an Egyptian head whose stylistic features match those of the terracottas at Pyrgi (Winter 2009: 463; Belelli Marchesini *et al.* 2015: 36-37), and thus may also be the product of the same workshops. The head, furthermore, may belong to a depiction of the story of Herakles' violent encounter with Egyptian king Busiris, a paradigm of the transgression of sacrifice, illustrated on the renown Caeretan *hydria* by the Busiris Painter (Hemelrijk 1984: 50-52; Bonaudo 2004: cat. 34).

This story leads me to examine the second aspect raised above: scholars have extensively noted the role of Herakles' labours, in Archaic Greek and Etruscan visual culture, in highlighting the transgression of cultural norms from commensality to sacrifice, and hence their codification and institutionalisation (Cerchiali 2018a with previous bibliography), making the hero's cult particularly apposite in cross-cultural religious spaces such as Pyrgi, the sanctuary of a cosmopolitan *emporion* (Baglione and Gentili 2013). By signalling sacrifice as a codified practice, the illustration of an improper sacrifice, in particular, emphasises the structures of religious space and experience (d'Agostino 1999: 160-161;

2010-2011: 288). Another of Herakles' labours, also present in Etruscan visual culture, crucially combines a paradigm on sacrifice and a discourse on the uses of improper and proper armour, namely Herakles' theft of three-bodied Geryon's cattle and the killing of the monster along with his herdsman Eurytion and dog Orthus. As d'Agostino has argued (1999, 154-157), Herakles' theft of the cattle illustrates an act of rupture, in which the hero moved the bovine animals, object of pious sacrifice, from the world beyond into the human world where such sacrificial acts must take place. To that act of rupture also belongs the killing of Geryon, a monster who is unlike any other Herakles encountered; he is a monster with divine origins, whom Stesichorus characterised as a tragic hero, in his epic poem *Geryoneis*, drawing from the Homeric ones, thus blurring opposed categories of hero and monster (Franzen 2009; Noussia-Fantuzzi 2013; Finglass and Davies 2014: 34; Eisenfeld 2018).

The popularity of the Geryon myth in the visual culture of the central Mediterranean is well-attested from Sicily to southern Etruria, most likely promoted by the oral performance and circulation of the *Geryoneis* itself (Spivey 2009: 68-69; Davies and Finglass 2014: 23-32); while we know little of the modes of that circulation, the myth must have served different local social and historical realities (Marconi 2007: 205-208). In Etruria, a closer look at the whereabouts and modalities in which the myth is depicted shows a pattern (tables 1, 2): since their earliest occurrence, namely on the so-called second Pania ivory *pyxis*, Etruscan representations of the myth tend to focus upon Geryon's cattle and only occasionally on the actual combat with Herakles, as far as we can see from the severely fragmented extant architectural terracottas, including a fragment from Pyrgi temple B (Colonna 2000: 284). A notable exception is the Etrusco-Corinthian Gobbi krater where the cattle is depicted alongside Herakles' and Geryon's combat, but here the composition is closely comparable to the earliest Greek depiction of the combat on a proto-Corinthian *pyxis* from Phalerum (Brize 1988: 188, no. 11, fig. 2). By contrast, all Greek imported images of the Geryon's myth from

circa 575 BC down to the end of the century, mostly on Attic Black-Figure *amphorae*, a few *hydriae* and a couple of cups, isolate the scene of the combat. Isolating a specific episode of a story is also a choice made by Athenian painters for the depiction of Herakles' encounter with Pholos that was probably targeted at Etruscan viewers (Riva 2017: 252); of the more than eighty Attic vessels depicting the combat thinly distributed from Rhodes to Selinous, thirty-eight have an Etruscan secure or likely provenance, perhaps hinting at a similar targeted exchange of these vessels.² This suggests a particular Etruscan interest for specific scenes that disclose not simply a focus on violent combat, but, more significantly, on violence vis-à-vis a political community within a visual discourse on the use of proper and improper weapons:³ Geryon is always represented fully equipped with hoplite armour in all his triple body, a visually striking composite suggestive of a file of hoplite soldiers (d'Agostino 1999: 156), while Herakles is sometimes equipped with a sword, at other times with a club, or just a bow and arrow, in and out of appropriate weapons, as he attacks what visually appears as a group of hoplite soldiers, an allusion to the citizen body according to the *polis* ideology.

While these images likely circulated among elite viewers, they have to be understood vis-à-vis the social and political transformations across Etruscan city-states from the second half of the sixth century that involved a tension between these elites' political rule and other social groups attempting to widen membership to the political community, as attested by recent analyses of Etruscan iconography of hoplite warriors (Cerchiai 2018b). It is thus not far-fetched to recognize a similar focus on violence vis-à-vis the citizen body, however defined this body was under local circumstances, on the Vigna Marini roof decoration, where it was so much more powerful for what was a public display of violent combat within a religious space where Herakles appeared surrounded by hoplite warriors. Far from sending specific

² Attic vessels with the image of the combat are eighty-four, a calculation based on Beazley Archive data

³ I owe this key detail to Robin Osborne who has made me aware of it in our discussion of this material

messages related to particular mythological themes (Hölscher 2009: 56), however, the cultural significance of this decoration and the underlying values and worldviews that were expressed and that reflected the socio-political tensions of the time may be understood by drawing upon Giorgio Agamben's thought on violence and the control of biological life at the very origins of sovereign power and its entanglement with the sacred. Notwithstanding due criticism of Agamben's reading of ancient sources (Depoortere 2012), his political philosophy cogently locates political power in the politicisation of bare life, namely the ability to place biological life (and hence its control, and the power to end it) outside the political and legal order. The very institution of that order cannot occur without conceiving of what is excluded from it, what Agamben calls 'the exception' which is not simply what is outside the norm in juridical or factual terms, but which is such because imposed *a priori* by sovereign power (Agamben 1995: 22-23). This determination of sovereign power instituting the law *a priori* co-exists with the institution of sacrifice, which, invested with prescriptions and prohibitions, equally determines exclusion and is determined by it. Without wishing to resort to a Girardian perspective, we may still consider violence as intrinsic of sacrifice, at least in the ways in which ancient cultural and moral attitudes made it so (Ando 2012). Agamben defines sacrifice as an apparatus of the sacred, that is, the action that delineates the separate sphere of the sacred, but also triggers a process of subjectification of those involved, namely the worshippers (Agamben 2006: 21-22; Tommasi 2008). Drawing from the Foucauldian concept of disciplinary apparatus and the processes of subjectification which the apparatus generates, Agamben sees subjectification as driven by the relation between a living being and an apparatus, which he defines as "... anything that has in some way the capacity to capture, orient, determine, intercept, model, control or secure the gestures, behaviours, opinions or discourses of living beings" (2006: 14).

If we consider Herakles' double rupture in his theft of Geryon's cattle and the slaying of Geryon as paradigmatic of the entanglement between violence (*sensu* Agamben) and the sacred, the Etruscan reception of the Attic iconographic material can also be understood in relation to the occurrence of Etruscan representations of armed violence at the altar. These are often but not exclusively scenes derived from the Trojan cycle, most notably Achilles' ambush and killing of Troilus, for which scholars have identified a symbolic correlation between death at the altar and animal sacrifice (Cerchiai 1999). To these representations corresponds the paucity of images of sacrifice proper, and isolated images that pose a contrast between sacrifice and violence at the altar (D'Agostino and Cerchiai 1999: 160-161); among the latter is what appears as a mythological scene on a hand-made high-relief revetment plaque from a building at Vigna Marini Vitalini dated to *circa* 540 BC (Winter 2009: 451-452). One of the most renowned images of proper sacrifice, on an Etruscan Black Figure *amphora* from Dresden dated to the beginning of the fifth century, shows the sacrificial act by a certain *Larth Vipe*, his name inscribed along with a description of that very act by him; significantly, the other side of the vessel shows a *pyrrichios*, an armed dance, the cultic nature of which has been convincingly demonstrated (Ceccarelli 1998: 53-57; Cerchiai 2014), reinforcing, again, the relationship between armed violence and sacrifice.

Agamben's articulation of sacrifice as apparatus is ultimately methodologically useful for analysing the broader material evidence at sanctuary sites because it can help us understand religious experience, from sacrificing and making libations to being in the presence of the deities, as discussed earlier, and, at the same time, draw out the politicisation of religion. In regards to religious experience, Pyrgi offers a remarkable preservation of the evidence: the record of altars, their positions vis-à-vis Temple B and other structures within the sanctuary precinct is accompanied by the recent excavation of the southern sanctuary, which gives us an extremely accurate picture of ceremonies marked by specific rites that are contemporary

with the installation and use of the sanctuary of Temple B located to the north of this area. Unlike temple B, this southern area was not monumentalised, nor planned until the beginning of the fifth century; the arrangement and construction of the altars and its ritual deposits, in fact, was purely determined by the offering activities that were remarkably varied, from blood sacrifice and libation linked to chthonic cults, to the deposition of series of offerings underneath altars, and deposits aimed at ritualising the sacred space (Baglione and Belevi Marchesini 2013). In some cases, as attested with deposit *rho*, the deposit was particularly rich in offerings that corresponded closely with the character of the deity worshipped there, Etruscan *Cavatha* that was assimilated to Greek Kore-Persephone; the re-construction of the ceremony from the excavated remains confirms the following of a strict order of use of the votive material and its final deposition carefully reversing that order (Belevi Marchesini, *et al.* 2012: 230). The epigraphic data from the area furthermore indicate a socially varied demographics of worshippers, as well as the worship of other deities, including Etruscan *Hercl*, or Greek Herakles (Maras 2013).

It is reasonable to assume that the terracotta decoration of Temple B culminating with the couple Herakles-Uni, would have shaped worshippers' experience in these sacrificial and votive practices, but that those practices equally drove them to create their own mythopoiesis. This latter was not necessarily built around specific Heraklean myths, but emotionally responding to the allusions prompted by an armed Herakles and episodes from his labours (Marconi 2009 on emotional responses to animated architectural decoration), and the individual worshippers' needs leading to those practices, as well attested by the notable absence of a match between specific votive objects satisfying those needs and the deities worshipped at the sanctuary receiving those votives (Lippolis 2017: 403-404). Indeed, other aspects of Herakles' cult were displayed at Temple B, if the antefixes decorating the roof of the so-called building of the Venti Celle, located just south of Temple B and representing the

Master and Mistress of horses, referred to Herakles and Hera in their journey to the Olympus (Colonna 2000; Maras 2015), among other figures replicating the image of the phiale, the vessel indexical of sacred libation (Gentili 2015). At the same time, all this architectural decoration, along with that of other temples in the city where *Heracle* featured prominently, belonged to a religious space that was explicitly politicized as revealed by the set of inscribed golden plaques, mentioned above, that may have been affixed at the door of the *cella* of Temple B (Santoro and Baglione 2013): in the engraved dedication, an almost bilingual Etruscan and Phoenician text, Thefarie Velianas, calling himself *zilac* or supreme magistrate in Etruscan and ‘ruler of Caere’ in Phoenician, is asked by the goddess Uni, named Astart in Phoenician, to build a *cella* or cult place for her and, probably, the offering of a cult statue (Xella 2016). Scholars (e.g. Belevi Marchesini *et al.* 2012: 230; Xella 2013) have frequently argued for the political significance of this inscription and its bilingualism that highlight the existence of a specific Phoenician cult at the sanctuary, which, in turn, must be understood vis-à-vis a phase of tension and re-grouping among Central Mediterranean city-states, including Carthage, at the aftermath of the Battle of the Sardinian Sea (Herodotus 1.166-167). In fact, the values expressed by the architectural decoration of religious spaces between Vigna Marini Vitalini and Pyrgi, as analysed above, enhanced the political potency of this dedication precisely because of the entanglement between the sacred and violence in the sense of sovereign power that included and excluded and hence defined the political community of the city. It is not far-fetched to imagine that Thefarie exploited these values in his politicization of sacred space; that, however, does not and should not constitute, to us modern interpreters, a divergence to the worshippers’ religious experience that included the performance of sacrifice intended as apparatus, as argued above. On the contrary, one was part and parcel of the other, rendering the assertion of violence effective because fully enmeshed in the sacred. The offering by Thefarie of a cult statue, if Xella’s (2016) proposed

translation of the Phoenician text is correct, furthermore added to the efficacy of the dedication because of the new attitude towards the encounter with the gods that was materialized by the placement of acroteria cult statues, as argued above: in explicitly playing with the ambiguous boundaries of divine representations, Thefarie's claim was also about his power to control the imaginary of the worshippers' community in the communication with the divine, an act, in other words, of symbolic violence (*sensu* Godelier 2015).

Potential generalisations, possible relations to other factors

Conclusion

Archaic Central Tyrrhenian Italy represents a particularly rich laboratory for exploring the relationship between religion and political power in urban settings as attested by recent conference proceedings on power and authority where religion almost dominates the documentary base (Lulof and Smith 2017b); this relationship is not unlike what scholars have identified for the Greek world where the phrase *polis* religion, however highly contested and certainly attuned to more nuanced perspectives now, still seems to maintain a kernel of accuracy (de Polignac 2017). Thus, far, however, the arguments in favour of the uses of religion to serve political propaganda have constrained the debate into a fairly narrow avenue that leaves unanswered the critical question of how such political uses intersected religious experience: this is ultimately a question on the triangulation between the worshippers, agents and subjects of that experience, those detaining political power and using the control of the symbolic imaginary to political ends, and the craftsmen who were fully implicated in the material realisation of that experience. How we answer this question is a methodological challenge, particularly for a region and time period where the highly fragmented nature of the

archaeological evidence is compounded by the lack of texts offering emic perspectives. In this contribution, I have adopted a comparative approach to the evidence that has sought to identify key differences between Etruscan and Greek sanctuaries in how the changing visual and material culture of religion responded to, and was in turn shaped by, new attitudes to the divine and hence the surrounding sacred space. The aim has then been to use these differences and the city-state of *Caere* and its sanctuaries as a case study, in order to demonstrate that, beyond a shared iconography and visual strategies for the decoration of temple buildings across the Central Tyrrhenian region, each city used these strategies to respond to its own socio-political reality much like other cities across the broader Central Mediterranean region.

Indeed, the cultural discourse of violence vis-à-vis community and the power to exclude, which I have developed by bringing together other strands of evidence, may belong to a larger ideological change, which scholars have identified in the so-called Second-Phase terracotta decoration of temple buildings that focused on military themes and battle scenes (Lulof 2011: 27-30). It is in this discourse, ultimately, that we can locate the intersection between cult and ritualization and the appropriation of that cult for political ends. Whether we can then link such a broader ideological change to specific historical events (e.g. Strazzulla 2011), however, is a thorny question, which we should approach cautiously as recently argued (Hopkins 2017). More convincing are, in fact, recent perspectives, enriched by a broader and theoretically supported basis, that explore political rulership in urban settings from different angles and its key relationship to reciprocity in all its facets, religious, political and economic (Smith 2020): from this perspective, historical events can be accommodated into these dynamics and provide the historical context, rather than an explanation to changes in the material and visual culture of urban religion as I have tried to do here.

Acknowledgments:

I warmly thank the organisers of the Erfurt workshop for the warm invitation and, together with all the other participants, for the incredibly stimulating discussions at the workshop. Particular thanks also go to Christopher Smith and Robin Osborne for making me question my ideas and tearing them apart, forcing me to reflect and re-think. Finally, I thank Patricia Lulof for her insight on the Vigna Marini Vitalini roof. All errors above remain my own.

Caption to figures:

Figure 1: The reconstruction of the temple roof at Vigna Marini Vitalini, *Caere* (author: Patricia Lulof)

BIIBLIOGRAPHY

Agamben, Giorgio. 1995 *Homo Sacer*. Torino: Einaudi.

Agamben, Giorgio. 2006 *'What is an Apparatus?' and other Essays*. Translated by David Kishik and Stefan Pedatella. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Ando, Clifford. 2012 "Afterwords." In *Greek and Roman Animal Sacrifice. Ancient Victims, Modern Observers*, edited by Christopher A. Faraone and Fred S. Naiden. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 195-199.

Baglione, Maria Paola and Barbara Belevi Marchesini. 2013. "Altars at Pyrgi." *Etruscan Studies* 16.1: 106-126.

Baglione, Maria Paola and Gentili, Maria Donatella, eds. 2013. *Riflessioni su Pyrgi. Scavi e Ricerche nelle Aree del Santuario*. Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

Belevi Marchesini, Barbara, Carlucci, Claudia, Gentili, Maria Donatella, and Michetti, Laura. 2012. "Riflessioni sul Regime delle Offerte nel Santuario di Pyrgi." In *Il Fanum Voltumnae e*

i Santuari Comunitari dell'Italia Antica, edited by Giuseppe M. Della Fina. Roma: Quasar. 227-263.

Bellelli Marchesini, Barbara, Biella, Maria Cristina, and Michetti, Laura. 2015. *Il Santuario di Montetosto sulla via Caere-Pyrgi*. Roma: Officina Edizioni.

Bellelli, Vincenzo. 2010. "L' Impatto del Mito greco nell'Etruria orientalizzante: la documentazione ceramica." *Bolletino di Archeologia on line* 1, volume speciale, C/C4/4, 27-40.

http://www.bollettinodiarcheologiaonline.beniculturali.it/documenti/generale/4_BELLELLI.pdf

Bellelli, Vincenzo, and Xella, Paolo, eds. 2016. *Le lamine di Pyrgi. Nuovi Studi sulle Iscrizioni in Etrusco e in Fenicio nel Cinquantenario della Scoperta*. Verona: Essedue.

Bierl, Anton. 2017 " 'Hail and take pleasure!' Making Gods Present in Narration through Choral Song and Other Epiphanic Strategies in the *Homeric Hymns to Dionysus and Apollo* ." In *The Winnowing Oar. New Perspectives in Homeric Studies* edited by Christos Tsagalis and Andreas Markantonatos. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter. 231-264.

Blume, Henry S. 2016. "The Furniture of the Gods: the Problem with the Importation of 'Empty Space and Material Aniconism' into Greek Religion." *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 17.1: 55-68.

Bonaudo, Raffaella. 2004 *La culla di Hermes: iconografia e immaginario delle hydriai ceretane*. Roma: L' Erma di Bretschneider.

Brize, Philip. 1988. "Geryoneus." *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* IV/1: 186-190.

Burkert, Walter. 1992. "Eracle e gli Altri Eroi Culturali del Vicino Oriente." In *Héraclès, d'une rive à l'autre de la Méditerranée*, edited by Corinne Bonnet and Colette Jourdain-Annequin. Bruxelles-Rome: Institut historique belge de Rome. 111-127.

Carlucci, Claudia. 2011. "Il Repertorio Figurativo del Ciclo Acroteriale del Tempio dell'Apollo a Veio-Portonaccio." In *Deliciae Fictiles IV. Architectural Terracottas in Ancient Italy. Images of Gods, Monsters and Heroes*, edited by Patricia Lulof and Carlo Rescigno. Oxford and Oakville: Oxbow Books. 115-127.

Carlucci, Claudia. 2015. "La Coroplastica Architettonica tra Caere e Pyrgi nell' Età di Thefarie Velianas." *Scienze dell' Antichità* 21.2: 113-129.

Ceccarelli, Paola. 1998. *La Pirrica nell'Antichità Greco-romana: Studi sulla Danza Armata*. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali.

Cerchiali, Luca. 1999. "La Machaira di Achille. Alcune Osservazioni a proposito della Tomba dei Tori." In *Il Mare, la Morte, l' Amore. Gli Etruschi, i Greci e l'immagine*, Edited by Bruno d'Agostino and Luca Cerchiali. Roma: Donzelli editore. 91-106.

Cerchiali, Luca. 2014. "Una Festa Etrusca per Dioniso?, in *Sacrum facere*." In *Atti del II Seminario di Archeologia del Sacro. Contaminazioni: Forme di Contatto, Traduzione e Mediazione nei Sacra del Mondo Greco e Romano. Trieste, 19-20 aprile 2013*, edited by Federica Fontana, Emanuela Murgia. Trieste: EUT Edizioni Università di Trieste. 95-107.

Cerchiali, Luca. 2018a. "L' Impossibile Sacrificio di Busiride." In *Sacrum facere. Atti del IV Seminario di Archeologia del Sacro*, edited by Federica Fontana, Emanuela Murgia. Trieste: EUT Edizioni Università di Trieste. 171-184.

Cerchiali, Luca. 2018b. "Lo Sviluppo dell' Immagine Oplitica nell'Etruria Arcaica, in *Beiträge zur Sozialgeschichte der Etrusker*. Akten der internationalen Tagung, Wien, 8-

10.6.2016, edited by Luciana Aigner-Foresti and Petra Amman. Wien: Holzhausen Der Verlag. 145-157.

Cerchiai, Luca. 2018x “Arco di Odisseo, arco di Eracle: cultura visuale a Cerveteri tra immaginario attico e committenza locale”, in *Superis deorum gratus et imis. Papers in memory of János György Szilágyi*, edited by Vincenzo Bellelli and Árpád M. Nagy. Roma: Edizioni Quasar, 422-430

Cohen, Beth. 1994. “Bowman to Clubman: Herakles and Olympia.” *The Art Bulletin* 76. 4: 695-715.

Colonna, Giovanni. 2000. “Il santuario di Pyrgi dalle Origini Mitistoriche agli Altorilievi Frontonali dei Sette e di Leucotea.” *Scienze dell' Antichità* 10: 251–336.

Cristofani, Mauro. 1992. “La Decorazione Frontonale in Italia Centrale fra IV e II secolo a. C.. Scelte Iconografiche e Stile.” In *La Xoroplastica Templare Etrusca fra il IV e il II Aecolo a.C.* edited by Guglielmo Maetzke G. Firenze: Leo Olschki. 37-55.

d'Agostino, Bruno. 1999. “Eracle e Gerione: la Struttura del Mito e la Storia.” In *Il Mare, la Morte, l' Amore. Gli Etruschi, i Greci e l'immagine*, Edited by Bruno d'Agostino and Luca Cerchiai. Roma: Donzelli editore. 151-162.

d'Agostino, Bruno. 2010-2011. “Appunti in Margine alla Tomba François di Vulci.” In *Le Rotte di Odisseo. Scritti di Archeologia e Politica di Bruno d'Agostino*, edited by Matteo D'Acunto and Marco Giglio (eds). *Annali di Archeologia e Storia Antica* N.S. 17-18: 285-293.

de Polignac, François. 2017. “Cité et Sanctuaires dans le Monde Grec de l' Intérêt des Décalages.” In *Quand Naissent les Dieux. Fondation des Sanctuaries Antiques: Motivations, Agents, Lieux*, edited by Sandrine Agusta-Boularot, Sandrine Hbuer and William Van Andringa. Rome: Bibliothèque de l' École Française de Rome. 11-18.

- Depoortere, Frederiek. 2012. "Reading Giorgio Agamben's *Homo Sacer* with René Girard." *Philosophy Today* 56.2: 154-163.
- Donohue, Alice. 1997. "The Greek Images of the Gods: Considerations on Terminology and Methodology." *Hephaistos* 14: 31–45.
- Eidinow, Esther, Kindt, Julia, Osborne, Robin, and Tor, Shaul. 2016. "Introduction." In *Theologies of Ancient Greek Religion*, edited by Esther Eidinow, Julia Kindt and Robin Osborne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-11.
- Eisenfeld, Hanne. 2018. "Geryon the Hero, Herakles the God." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 138: 80-99.
- Elsner, Jas. 2000 "Between Mimesis and Divine Power: Visuality in the Greco-Roman World." In *Visuality Before and Beyond the Renaissance*, edited by Robert Nelson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 45–69.
- Finglass, Patrick J. and Davies, M. 2014. *Stesichorus: The Poems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Franzen, Christina. 2009. "Sympathizing with the Monster: Making Sense of Colonization in Stesichorus' Geryoneis." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 92.2: 55-72.
- Gentili, Maria Donatella. 2015. "Thefarie Velianas e l'Edificio delle Venti Celle: Proposte di Interpretazione Funzionale." *Scienze dell' Antichità* 21.2: 101-112.
- Giangiuglio, Maurizio. 2005. "Le Héros Fondateur, l'Espace Sacré de la Déesse. Notes sur Héraclès et les Sanctuaires d'Héra du Péloponnèse à la Grande Grèce." In *Héraclès. Les Femmes et le Féminin*, edited by Colette Jourdain-Annequin and Corinne Bonnet. Bruxelles-Rome: Institut historique belge de Rome. 215-233.

- Glinster, Fay. 2000. "Sacred Rubbish." In *Religion in Archaic and Republican Rome and Italy: Evidence and Experience*, Edward Bispham and Christopher Smith. Chicago-London: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers. 54-70.
- Godelier, Maurice. 2015. *L'Imaginé, l'Imaginaire et le Symbolique*. Paris: CNRS Editions.
- Gordon, Lindsay Richard. 1979. "The Real and the Imaginary: Production and Religion in the Graeco-Roman World." *Art History* 2.1: 5-34.
- Hedreen, Guy. 2017. "Unframing the Representation. The Frontal Face in Athenian Vase-painting." In *The Frame in Classical Art. A Cultural History*, edited by Verity Platt and Michael Squire. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 154-186.
- Hemelrijk, Jaap M. 1984. *Caeretan Hydriae*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- Hölscher, Tonio. 2009. "Architectural Sculpture: Messages? Programmes? Towards Rehabilitating the Notion of 'Decoration'." In *Structure, Image, Ornament*, edited by Peter Schultz and Ralf von den Hoff. Oxford: Oxbow. 54-67.
- Hölscher, Tonio. 2014 "Semiotics to Agency." In *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Art and Architecture*, edited by Clemente Marconi. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199783304.013.030
- Kistler, Erich. 2012 "Glocal Responses from Archaic Sicily." *Ancient West and East* 11: 219-233.
- Lippolis, Enzo. 2017. "Fondare un Luogo di Culto e Costruire un Sistema Sociale. Alcune Osservazioni conclusive." In *Quand Naissent les Dieux. Fondation des Sanctuaries Antiques: Motivations, Agents, Lieux*, edited by Sandrine Agusta-Boularot, Sandrine Hbuer and William Van Andringa. Rome: Bibliothèque de l' École Française de Rome. 397-410.
- Lulof, Patricia. 2000 "Archaic Terracotta Acroteria Representing Athena and Heracles: Manifestations of Power in Central Italy." *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 13: 207-219.

- Lulof, Patricia. 2008. "Le Amazzoni e i Guerrieri di Vigna Marini-Vitalini." *Mediterranea* 5: 197–214.
- Lulof, Patricia. 2011. "The Late Archaic Miracle. Roof Decoration in Central Italy between 510 and 450 BC. In *Deliciae Fictiles IV. Architectural Terracottas in Ancient Italy. Images of Gods, Monsters and Heroes*, edited by Patricia Lulof and Carlo Rescigno. Oxford and Oakville: Oxbow Books. 23-31.
- Lulof, Patricia. 2016. "New Perspectives on the Acroteria of Caeretan Temples." In *Caere*, edited by Nancy Thomson de Grummon and Lisa Pieraccini. Austin: Texas University Press. 131-140.
- Lulof, Patricia and Smith, Christopher. 2017a "The Age of Tarquinius Superbus. History and Archaeology." In *The Age of Tarquinius Superbus. Central Italy in the Late 6th Century*, edited by Patricia Lulof and Christopher Smith. Leuven: Peeters. 3-13.
- Lulof, Patricia and Smith, Christopher, eds. 2017b *The Age of Tarquinius Superbus. Central Italy in the Late 6th Century*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Maggiani, Adriano. 2013. "Il Pantheon Ceretano in Epoca Arcaica." In *Gli Etruschi e il Mediterraneo. La città di Cerveteri*, edited by Françoise Gaultier, Laurent Haumesser, Paola Santoro, Vincenzo Bellelli, Alfonsina Russo Tagliente, Rita Cosentino. Paris: Somogy éditions d'art. 151-153.
- Malkin, Irad. 2011. *A Small Greek World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maras, Daniele F. 2002. "Note sull' Arrivo del Nome di Ulisse in Etruria." *Studi Etruschi* LXV-LXVIII (Serie III): 237-249.
- Maras, Daniele F. 2011. "Gli Dei sul Tetto. Le Basi Acroteriali del Tempio di Veio-Portonaccio: Messa in Opera e Funzione." In *Deliciae Fictiles IV. Architectural Terracottas*

in *Ancient Italy. Images of Gods, Monsters and Heroes*, edited by Patricia Lulof and Carlo Rescigno. Oxford and Oakville: Oxbow Books. 107-114.

Maras, Daniele F. 2013. "Area Sud: Ricerche in Corso sulla Documentazione Epigrafica (Contesti, Supporti, Formulari, Teonimi)." In *Riflessioni su Pyrgi. Scavi e Ricerche Nelle Aree del Santuario*, edited by Maria Paola Baglione and Maria Donatella Gentili. Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider. 195-305.

Maras, Daniele F. 2015. "Miti e Riti di Divinizzazione in Italia Centrale nell'Età Tirannica." *Scienze dell' Antichità* 21.2: 75-98.

Marconi, Clemente. 2004. "Kosmos. The Imagery of the Archaic Greek Temple." *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 45: 211-224.

Marconi, Clemente. 2007. *Temple Decoration and Cultural Identity in the Archaic Greek World. The Metopes of Selinus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marconi, Clemente. 2009. "Early Greek Architectural Decoration in Function. In *KOINE: Mediterranean Studies in Honor of R. Ross Holloway*, edited by Derek B. Counts and Anthony S. Tuck. Oxford: Oxbow Books. 4 – 17.

Marzullo, Matilde. 2018. *Spazi Sepolti e Dimensioni Dipinte nelle Tombe Etrusche di Tarquinia*. Milano: Ledizioni.

Menichetti, Mauro. 1994. *Archeologia del potere*. Milano: Longanesi.

Michetti Laura M. 2011. "Gli Dei sul Tetto. Le Basi Acroteriali del Tempio di Veio-Portonaccio: Struttura e Apparato Decorativo." In *Deliciae Fictiles IV. Architectural Terracottas in Ancient Italy. Images of Gods, Monsters and Heroes*, edited by Patricia Lulof and Carlo Rescigno. Oxford and Oakville: Oxbow Books. 96-106.

Moser, Claudia. 2019. *The Altars of Republican Rome and Latium. Sacrifice and the Materiality of Roman Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Neer, Richard. 2010. *The Emergence of the Classical Style in Greek Sculpture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nightingale, Andrea W. 2004. *Spectacles of Truth in Classical Greek Philosophy. Theoria in its Cultural Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Noussia-Fantuzzi, Maria. 2013. "A Scenario for Stesichorus' Portrayal of the Monster Geryon in the Geryoneis." *Trends in Classics* 5. 2: 234–259.

Osborne, Robin. 2009. "The Narratology and Theology of Architectural Sculpture, or What You can do with a Chariot but can't do with a Satyr on a Greek Temple." In *Structure, Image, Ornament*, edited by Peter Schultz and Ralf von den Hoff. Oxford: Oxbow. 2-12.

Platt, Verity. 2011 *Facing the Gods. Epiphany and Representation in Graeco-Roman Art, Literature and Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Platt, Verity. 2017. "Introduction." In *The Frame in Classical Art. A Cultural History*, edited by Verity Platt and Michael Squire. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 384-391.

Riva, Corinna. 2017. "Wine Production and Exchange and the Value of Wine Consumption in Sixth-century-BC Etruria." *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 30.2: 237-261.

Rizzo, Maria Antonietta. 2011. "Terrecotte Acroteriali e Frontonali di Età Arcaica da Santuari di Cerveteri." In *Deliciae Fictiles IV. Architectural Terracottas in Ancient Italy. Images of Gods, Monsters and Heroes*, edited by Patricia Lulof and Carlo Rescigno. Oxford and Oakville: Oxbow Books. 138-147

Saliou, Catherine. 2015. "Architecture and Society." in *A Companion to Ancient Aesthetics*, edited by Pierre Destrée & Penelope Murray. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. 128-139.

Santoro, Paola and Baglione, Maria Paola. 2013. "Caere e Pyrgi: la Figura di Thefarie Velianas." In *Gli Etruschi e il Mediterraneo. La città di Cerveteri*, edited by Françoise,

Gaultier, Laurent Haumesser, Paola Santoro, Vincenzo Bellelli, Alfonsina Russo Tagliente, Rita Cosentino. Paris: Somogy éditions d'art. 149-150.

Sismondo Ridgway, Brunilde. 2005. “ ‘Periklean’ Cult Images and their Media.” In *Periklean Athens and its legacy*, edited by Judith M. Barringer and Jeffrey M. Hurwit. Austin: University of Texas Press. 111-118.

Smith, Christopher. 2019. “Architectural Terracotta and the Historian.” In *Deliciae Fictiles V. Networks and workshops*, edited by Patricia Lulof, Ilaria Manzini and Carlo Rescigno. Oxford: Oxbow. 1-5.

Smith, Christopher. 2020. *The Gift of Sovereignty: Kings from Mauss to Sahlins and Graeber. Politica Antica.*

Spivey, Nigel J. 2009. “Volcanic Landscape with *Kraters*.” In *An Archaeology of Representations. Ancient Greek Vase-painting and Contemporary Methodologies*, Dimitrios Yatromanolakis. Athens: Institut du Livre. 50-75.

Strazzulla, Maria J. 2011. “Gli Altorilievi Tardo Arcaici tra Roma e Lazio.” In *Deliciae Fictiles IV. Architectural Terracottas in Ancient Italy. Images of Gods, Monsters and Heroes*, edited by Patricia Lulof and Carlo Rescigno. Oxford and Oakville: Oxbow Books. 32-43.

Tanner, Jeremy. 2006. *The Invention of Art History in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tommasi, Francesco V. 2008. “ ‘Homo Sacer’ e i Dispositivi. Sulla Semantica del Sacrificio in Giorgio Agamben.” *Archivio di Filosofia* 76.1/2: 395-402.

Tsingarida, Athena. 2009. “Vases for Heroes and Gods: Early Red-figure Parade Cups and Large-Scaled Phialai.” In *Shapes and Uses of Greek Vases*, edited by Athena Tsingarida. Brussels: Centre de Recherches en Archéologie et Patrimoine. 185–201.

Winter, Nancy. 2005. "Gods Walking on the Roof: the Evolution of Terracotta Statuary in Archaic Etruscan Architecture in Light of the Kings of Rome." *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 18: 241-251.

Winter, Nancy. 2009. *Symbols of Wealth and power. Architectural Terracotta Decoration in Etruria and Central Italy, 640-510 B.C.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Winter, Nancy. 2011. "The Evolution of Bases for Acroteria in Etruria and Latium (640/630-510 BC). In *Deliciae Fictiles IV. Architectural Terracottas in Ancient Italy. Images of Gods, Monsters and Heroes*, edited by Patricia Lulof and Carlo Rescigno. Oxford and Oakville: Oxbow Books. 62-68.

Winter, Nancy. 2016. "Temple Decoration and Civic Pride. *Caere's Place in the Evolution of Etruscan Architectural Terracotta Decoration, 550-510 BCE.*" In *Caere*, edited by Nancy Thomson de Grummon and Lisa Pieraccini. Austin: Texas University Press. 125-130.

Winter, Nancy. 2017. "Traders and Refugees: Contributions to Etruscan Architecture." *Etruscan Studies* 20.2: 123-151.

Xella, Paolo. 2013. Le Lamine di Pyrgi: il Testo Fenicio." In *Gli Etruschi e il Mediterraneo. La città di Cerveteri*, edited by Françoise, Gaultier, Laurent Haumesser, Paola Santoro, Vincenzo Bellelli, Alfonsina Russo Tagliente, Rita Cosentino. Paris: Somogy éditions d'art. 220.

Xella, Paolo. 2016. "Il Testo Fenicio di Pyrgi. In *Le lamine di Pyrgi. Nuovi Studi sulle Iscrizioni in Etrusco e in Fenicio nel Cinquantenario della Scoperta*, edited by Vincenzo Bellelli and Paolo Xella. Verona: Essedue. 45-68.

Table 1: Geryon and Herakles: Etruscan representations

Context: F = funerary; D= domestic; R= religious

Object	Provenance	Context	Date (in centuries BC)	Geryon scene	Other scenes	Bibliography
Second Pania pyxis, ivory	Chiusi	F	early 6 th	Unarmed three-headed Geryon leading his cattle	Frieze above: women carrying offerings and gesturing to their head (mourning?) next to shielded warrior. Frieze below: men under sheep moving L to R	Cristofani (1971: Tav. XXXV)
Revetment plaque - traces of polychromy, mould made	Tarquinia, near Pozzo E, Porta nord-ovest	D/R?	Associated with ceramics predating 3 rd quarter of 6 th	cattle moving in one direction	n/a	Carlucci (2004: 71, 77-78)
Revetment	Tarquinia,	R	mid-6 th	cattle	n/a	Carlucci

plaque - traces of polychromy, mould made	Ara della Regina			moving in one direction		(2004: 72, 85)
Mutulus high relief plaque - traces of polychromy, mould made	Tarquini a, city	R	End of 6 th	Hoof	n/a	Carlucci (2004: 73, 86)
Revetment plaque – 2 fragments	La Castellina del Marangone , SW slop (Saggio 34)	D?	Late Archaic	Cattle	n/a	Prayon (2006)
Revetment plaque - traces of polychromy, mould made	La Castellina del Marangone , pendio sudocciden	D?	Late Archaic	Lowered leg with greave	n/a	Prayon (2006: 121-22)

	tale (Saggio 34)					
Etrusco- Corinthian krater (Gobbi krater)	Banditaccia Tomb 1, <i>Tumulus 1,</i> <i>Caere</i>		c. 590- 560 BC	Armed Geryon opposite Herkales throwing arrows. Cattle behind Geryon moving in opposite direction	Behind Herakles Pholos holding kantharos and facing opposite direction towards mantled figure holding small rounded object; behind horse rider facing other mantled figure walking towards an altar, on which is walking figure carrying other figure	Martelli (1987: 289-291)

Table 2: Geryon and Herakles: Greek imported representations

Context: F = funerary; D= domestic; R= religious; BF = Black Figure; RF= Red Figure; CVA

= *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*

Object	Provenance	Context	Date	Geryon scene and attributes	Other scenes	Biblio. + museum ref.
1. BF Chalcidian belly amphora	<i>Caere</i>	F	c. 550- 530	Heracles plunging sword into fully armed and winged Geryon– one head dying – frontal face. Athena attending. Inscribed	On side B: Perseus with Naiades and Athena (inscribed)	Brize (1988: 188, 15)
2. BF Chalcidian neck amphora	Vulci	F	c. 540- 530 BC	Herakles with quiver shooting arrows against fully armed	Between bulls and Geryon: warrior on frontal chariots, two	Brize (1988: 188, 16)

				<p>and winged Geryon in profile, throwing lances to Herakles - Eurytion and Orhtros fallen. Behind Herakles Athena with lance and serpents; behind her cattle. Inscribed.</p>	<p>eagles/sirens? flying</p>	
3. BF Athenian Amphora B	Most probably Vulci (previous collection from Canino)	F	c. 550- 500 BC	<p>Herakles with quiver plunging sword into fully armed Geryon with spear. 3rd head</p>	<p>On B side: Birth of Athena (?): at centre Zeus seated in chair with sceptre; Hermes with</p>	<p>CVA, London, British Museum 3, III.He.4, Pl. (146)</p>

				has fallen, beneath which is a siren. Eurytion fallen. Behind Herakles Athena with lance.	<i>caduceus</i> & 2 men with spears; behind him, two men with spears.	26.3A-D
4. BF Athenian Neck amphora	Vulci	F	c. 550- 500 BC	Herakles with quiver plunging sword into fully armed Geryon throwing a spear. Eurytion fallen.	On B side: Dionysos with vine and kantharos between satyr holding a kithara and maenad.	CVA, London, British Museum 4, IIIHe.5, Pl. (198) 53.4A-B
5. BF Athenian hydria	Vulci	F	c. 550- 500 BC	Herakles with quiver holding one of Geryon's head and aiming with the sword. Fully	Inscriptions under foot. On shoulder: charioteer stepping into 4-horse chariot,	CVA, London, British Museum 6, III.H.E.5, Pl.(337,33

				armed Geryon is throwing spear - one head fallen. Eurytion with spear about to fall b; helmeted Athena and Hermes behind Herakles	towards which a bearded man (Hades?) carries the woman (Persephone?) in his arms. Two other women come up to her rescue	9) 78.3, 80.2
6. BF Athenian amphora A	Vulci	F	575-525 BC	Herakles with quiver holding one of fully armed Geryon's head and aiming with the sword. Geryon is throwing a spear - one head fallen on the other side.	On B side: Chariot to front, horses turning to right, in which are a charioteer with pilos, long white chiton and nebris, shield at back, and a <i>parabates</i>	CVA, London, British Museum 3, III.He.7, Pl. (157) 37.1A-B

				Eurytion fallen – blood gushing out; Orthros fallen on him.	looking to right with high-crested helmet, cuirass, and spear.	
7. BF Athenian eye cup	Civita Castellana, necropoli di Celle, tomba LXXII (possibly imported via Etruria)	F	550- 500 BC	Between eyes: Herakles shooting arrow; behind – superimposed - armed Athena shooting spear; on other side, fully armed Geryon – one head fallen – shooting spear.	Underneath handles, on each side respectively: 1 youth, mantled seated on cushion; a man fallen, spear in his body and blood gushing out of face. 'Nonsense' inscriptions.	CVA, Roma, Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia 3, III.H.E.18, Pl.(113,11 4) 29.2-5, 30.1-2
8. BF Athenian neck amphora	Bologna (necropoli del Giardino	F	525- 475 BC	Herakles with quiver shooting arrow. Orthros	B: Fully armed Geryon shooting spear, 1 head fallen	CVA, Bologna, Museo Civico 2,

with lid	Margherita, Tomb 14)			at his feet, about to fall.		III.H.E.7, III.H.E.8, Pl. (311) 12.3-4
9. BF Athenian hydria in fragments.	Presumably Etruscan since current collection: Florence, Museo Archeologi co Etrusco	F	575- 525 BC	Fully armed Geryon shooting spear – one fallen head.	On shoulder: warriors fighting. 'Nonsense' inscriptions.	CVA, Firenze, Regio Museo Archeolog ico 5, III.H.8, Pl.(1880) 16.2
10. BF Athenian neck amphora	No provenance	F	550- 500 BC	Herakles brandishing sword (or club?) to fully armed Geryon. Eurytios fallen.	On B side: Dionysos at centre with kantharos between two maenads and a satyr on side.	CVA, Limoges and Vannes, Musée Adrien Dubouche et Musée de la société

						Plymathiq ue, III.H.E.3- 5, Pl.(1062,1 064) 1.3- 4, 3.1-4
11. BF Athenian column krater in fragments.	No provenance	?	575- 525 BC	On frieze below main scene: Herakles driving Geryon's cattle.	On main body: One side, Hephaistos on a donkey with satyrs & maenads. Under one handle, satyrs filling a krater, satyrs and maenads. Under other handle, satyr filling a vase at a volute-krater, maenad with wineskin.	Bulletin of the Metropolit an Museum of Art, New York: FALL 1998, 8

12. RF Athenian cup B	Vulci	F	550- 500 BC	Herakles with club, arch & arrows against fully armed Geryon throwing spear – one head fallen. Orthros fallen. At left of Herakles, Athena, Iolaos & fallen Eurytion under handle. To right of Geryon, a woman gesturing. All names inscribed except the latter.	Signed by Euphronios (painter) and potter on foot. On B side: bulls herded by four fully armed warriors. Tondo: horseman in petasos and Thracian cloak with spear.	Brize (1990: 77, no. 2501)
13. RF Athenian cup in	Previously at Florence, probably	F	525- 475	Herakles shooting arrow against fully	On B side: Artemis seated with bow.	CVA, Firenze, Regio

fragments.	Etruscan		BC	armed Geryon – woman.	Women, men, some seated. Tondo: naked woman with phallos bird. With unclear inscription.	Museo Archeolog ico 1, III.I.3, III.I.8, III.I.15, III.I.22, III.I.23, PLS.(376, 381,386,3 87,395) 1.8.12.25- 26.40, 6.29, 11.65, 12.37, 20.55
14. RF Athenian volute krater in fragments.	Now at Getty previously at Florence, probably Etruscan	F	525- 475 BC	Two friezes on krater rim: below frieze, Herakles against Geryon;	Herakles fighting the hydra; Esperides' tree; Amazonomach	J. Paul Getty Museum Journal, 4, 1977: 68

				Eurytion and Orthros fallen.	y. By Kleophrades Painter.	
15. BF Athenian amphora B	Vulci	F	575- 525 BC	Herakles with club against fully armed Geryon - one head fallen; Eurytion fallen.	On B side: Herakles with lion between woman (Athena?) and Iolaos (naked youth)	Beazley (1956: 133.1)
16. BF Athenian amphora B	Vulci	F	575- 525 BC	Herakles with club against fully armed Geryon throwing spear- one head fallen. Eurytion with sword and Orthros fallen.	On B side: Herakles with sword and lion between Athena and Iolaos (naked youth) - iconography on both sides almost identical to 15.	CVA, New York, Metropolit an Museum of Art 3, 10-11, Pl.(547) 15.1-2
17. BF Athenian amphora B	Vulci	F	575- 525 BC	Herakles with club against fully armed	On B side: Dionysos with ivy and horn	Beazley (1956: 133.5)

				Geryon throwing spear– one head fallen. Eurytion – blood gushing - fallen.	between satyrs. Iconography on A side identical to 16. 'Nonsense' inscriptions.	
18. Athenian amphora B (BF)	Etruria (not specified)	F	575- 525 BC	Herakles with sword against fully armed Geryon– one head fallen. Eurytion fallen.	On B: Dionysos with ivy, vine and kantharos b/w satyrs. Iconography on A side almost identical to 16.	CVA, Napoli, Museo Nazionale 1, III.H.E.4, III.H.E.5, PL.(948) 4.1-2
19. BF Athenian amphora B	Tarquinius	F	575- 525 BC	Herakles with sword against fully armed Geryon– one head fallen. Eurytion with sword fallen.	On B: warriors departing, 1 on chariot, woman, man, two youths. Iconography on A side almost	CVA, Tarquinia Museo Nazionale 1, III.H.9, III.H.10, PL.(1147) 15.1-2

					identical to 18.	
20. BF Athenian amphora B	Vulci	F	550- 500 BC	Herakles with sword against fully armed Geryon – one head fallen. Eurytion with sword fallen. Armed Athena behind Herakles. Youth behind Geryon.	On B: H. and Kyknos, draped man (Zeus), Athena, Ares, shield in the middle with tripod. 'Nonsense' inscriptions. Iconography on A side similar to 19.	CVA , Munich, Museum Antiker Kleinkunst 1, 13-14, Pl.(104,10 7,122) 10.4, 13.1- 2, 28.3
21. BF Athenian amphora B	Vulci	F	550- 500 BC	Herakles with club against fully armed Geryon – one head fallen. Eurytion with sword fallen. Armed Athena behind Herakles.	On B: horseman between warriors with shields (star, discs and crescent on shields). Iconography on A side	Beazley (1956: 312.3)

				Iolaos with club behind Geryon.	similar to 20.	
22. BF Athenian neck amphora	Vulci	F	550-500 BC	Herakles with sword against fully armed Geryon – one head fallen. Eurytion fallen.	On B side: daughters of Pelias, old man (Pelias?) seated on stool with staff, Medea, women, ram in cauldron on stand. Iconography on A side similar to 19.	CVA, London, British Museum 4, IIIHe.5, PL.(199) 54.1A-B
23. BF Athenian hydria	Vulci	F	550-500 BC	Herakles with bow against fully armed Geryon – one (or two?) head fallen. Eurytion fallen. Armed	On shoulder: Achilles, chariot dragging body of Hektor between Iris and tomb of Patroklos with	Beazley (1956: 361.13)

				Athena behind Herakles.	snake and warrior (<i>eidolon</i>). 'Nonsense inscription'. Iconography on A side similar to 21.	
24. BF Athenian oinochoe	Vulci	F	550-500 BC	Herakles with club and bow and cattle (of Geryon?), one suckling calf, birds on trees, quiver.	Under handle: panther.	Beazley (1956: 377.245)
25. BF Athenian hydria	Previously in Castellani collection so probably Etruscan	F	575-525 BC	Herakles with bow against fully armed Geryon – one head fallen. Eurytion fallen.	On shoulder: siren between two lions.	Beazley (1956: 108.14, 685)
26. BF Athenian	Vulci	F	575-525	Herakles with sword against	On B side: warrior on	CVA, Paris,

amphora B Exekias as potter			BC	fully armed Geryon – one head fallen. Eurytion with sword fallen. All named with inscriptions.	chariot, siren above – all named with inscriptions. Lid: animal frieze of sirens and deer, with inscriptions. Iconography on A side similar to 19.	Louvre 3, III.He.13, PLS.(156- 157) 19.1- 3, 20.1-4. Brize (1990: 82, cat. No. 2486)
27. BF Athenian amphora B	<i>Caere</i>	F	575- 525 BC	Herakles with club against fully armed Geryon – one head fallen. Eurytion fallen. Armed Athena behind Herakles Orthros behind Geryon.	On B: fight of warriors, one driving chariot, another one fallen. Shields (1 Beotian, one with tripod). Iconography on A side similar to 19.	Beazley (1956: 138.1)
28. BF Athenian	Vulci	F	550- 500	Herakles with club against	On B side: Dionysos with	Beazley (1956:

amphora B			BC	fully armed Geryon – one head fallen. Eurytion fallen. Hermes behind Herakles. Man with club by Geryon.	ivy and horn opposite veiled woman (Ariadne?), two satyrs and maenad. Iconography on A side similar to 19.	296.8)
29. BF Athenian neck amphora	Tarquinoa	F	550- 500 BC	Herakles with club against fully armed Geryon– one head fallen. Orthros fallen.	On B side: two warriors departing between draped men – 1 youth behind. Iconography on A side similar to 19.	CVA, Tarquinoa, Museo Nazionale 2, III.H.8, PL.(1180) 31.2-3
30. BF Athenian neck amphora with	Previously in Basel private collection, probably,	F?	575- 525 BC	Herakles on one side aiming with bow and arrow; fully	On neck: draped youth procession (pipe playing, gift carrying)	Moore (2013)

pointed base	Etruscan ⁴			armed Geryon– one head fallen - on other side.	Below each handle: siren.	
31. BF Athenian column krater in fragments.	No provenance	?	c. 560- 540 BC	On frieze below main scene: Herakles driving Geryon's cattle.	On main body: One side, Hephaistos on a donkey with satyrs & maenads. Under one handle, satyrs filling a krater, satyrs and maenads. Under other handle, satyr filling a vase at a volute-krater, maenad with wineskin.	Antike Kunst: 49 (2006) PL.7
32. BF Athenian	No provenance	F	575- 525	Herakles with club fully	On B side: Dionysos with	CVA, Paris,

⁴ There are less than 20 of these Attic pointed amphorae, in both Red and Black Figure; while fairly variable in shape, they have, when known, an Etruscan provenance, probably funerary, and the Black Figure vessels almost always show Herakles' exploits (Cristiana Zaccagnino pers. comm.)

amphora B	, but CVA: poss. Italy		BC	armed Geryon– one head fallen. Eurytion fallen.	horn and ivy between satyrs. Iconography on A side similar to 19.	Louvre 3, III.HE.12, III.HE.13, Pl.(152,15 5) 15.6.9, 18.4
33. BF Athenian column krater in fragments	No provenance but Hearst private collection	F	575- 525 BC	Herakles with club fully armed Geryon– one head fallen. Eurytion fallen.	On B side: Dionysos with horn and ivy between satyrs, opposite veiled maenad/woma n (Ariadne?)	CVA, Los Angeles, County Museum of Art 1, 4-5, Pl.(843) 3.1-2
34. BF Athenian column krater in fragments	No provenance but private Hirsch collection	F	575- 525 BC	H. with sword against fully armed Geryon– one head fallen. Eurytion fallen. Orthros between Geryon’s legs.	On B side: warrior arming with greaves and helmet, between men, 1 draped, draped youth, woman.	Beazley (1956: 133.8)
35. BF	No	F	550-	H. with	On B side:	CVA,

Athenian neck amphora	provenance , but from Campana collection, probably Etruscan (CVA: <i>Caere</i>)		500 BC	Beoetian shield against fully armed Geryon (named)– one head fallen. Eurytion fallen. Armed and in attack Athena behind Herakles.	man on chariot turning. On B neck: seated satyr with wine skin and ivy. On A neck: Dionysos with horn and ivy.	Paris, Louvre 4, III.He.22, Pl.(203) 37.10- 11.14-15
36. BF Athenian neck amphora	No provenance , probably Etruscan (CVA: Gherard's 1831 notice)	F	550- 500 BC	Herakles with club against fully armed Geryon – one head fallen. Eurytion fallen.	On B side: Herakles reclined at banquet with food, taking phiale from helmeted Athena, vines. Behind Herakles, Iolaos/Hermes.	CVA, Northampt on, Castle Ashby, 5- 6, Pl.(664,66 5) 9.1-2, 10.1-4
37. BF Athenian	No provenance	F	550- 500	On both side (identical	'Nonsense' inscriptions.	Marchetti (2009: 31)

amphora B	, but probably Etruscan ('scavi clandestini centro-meridionali')		BC	scene with slight variation): Herakles with club against fully armed Geryon – one head fallen. Siren between them.		
38. BF Athenian amphora B	Vulci	F	575-525 BC	Herakles and Geryon – Eurytion and Orthros fallen.	On B side: Warriors between draped youths.	Beazley (1956: 133.9, 674)
39. BF Athenian column krater	Bologna	F	550-500 BC	Herakles seated on rock with Geryon's cattle; vine (?).	On B side: Dionysos with maenad and satyrs.	Beazley (1956: 376.234)
40. BF Athenian neck amphora	Unprovenanced but at Villa Giulia, probably Etruscan	F	550-500 BC	Herakles and Geryon with Orthros fallen.	On B side: Athena between Herakles and Hermes.	Beazley (1956: 394.1)

Bibliography from Table 1 and 2:

- Beazley, John D. 1956 *Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brize, Philip. 1990. L. Herakles and Geryon (Labour X), *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* V/1: 73-85.
- Carlucci, Claudia. 2004. "Tarquinia. Terrecotte Architettoniche dalla Civita." In *Scavo nello Scavo. Gli Etruschi non Visti. Ricerche e "Riscoperte" nei Depositi dei Musei Archeologici dell'Etruria Meridionale*, edited by Anna Maria Sgubini Moretti. Roma-Viterbo: Ministero per i beni e le attività culturali. 68-88.
- Cristofani, Mauro. 1971. *Nuove Letture di Monumenti Etruschi dopo il Restauro*. Florence: Leo Olschki.
- Marchetti, Cristiana. 2009. *L'Arma per l'Arte. Archeologia che Ritorna*. Livorno: Sillabe.
- Martelli, Marina. 1987. *La ceramica degli Etruschi: la Pittura Vascolare*. Novara: Istituto Geografico De Agostini.
- Moore, Mary B. 2013. "Herakles Takes Aim. A Rare Attic Black-Figured Neck-Amphora Attributed to the Princeton Painter." *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 48. 1. 37-58.
- Prayon, Friedhelm. 2006. "Lastre Architettoniche di Tipo Tarquiniese da Castellina del Marangone." In *Tarquinia e le civiltà del Mediterraneo, Quaderni di Acme* 77: 119-125.