

The Importance of Being Umale

Giovanna Bagnasco Gianni

I really can't see why you should object to the name of Algernon. It is not at all a bad name. In fact, it is rather an aristocratic name. (Oscar Wilde, *The Importance of Being Earnest*, Act 2, scene 2)

'Etruscan by Definition' is a very appropriate title for a volume commemorating the work of Sybille Haynes, since the regional and cultural aspects of Etruscan identity have always been of particular interest to her. Thanks to the organisers of a very special day in her honour, I was again able to share her enthusiasm for research in this area and to revive the inspiration I experienced at my first meeting with her. Her intriguing questions later led me to investigate characters that often recur on Etruscan mirrors and whose identities are very much open to conjecture. This is why I turned my attention to Umale/Umale, a controversial figure appearing on a number of Etruscan mirrors, artefacts which are complex, multi-purpose and polysemous, as already noted by many scholars,¹ some of whom were present at the London conference to celebrate the achievement of this renowned Etruscologist. Sybille Haynes herself was one of the first to carry out research on these remarkable objects.²

From the linguistic point of view, Etruscan mirrors have been defined as 'figured bilinguals',³ whereby the scene with its details illuminates the meaning of the inscriptions. In contrast, from the iconographic and iconological point of view, there is often no ready association because characters with names that we instantly recognise in the Greek world assume different rôles on Etruscan mirrors. This makes interpretation far from easy.⁴

Umale/Umale appears on one mirror at the British Museum (**Fig. 8**), taking part in a haruspical scene with his foot placed on a rock, observed by Turms, Alpnu and Aplu.⁵ This representation is different from that on the other mirrors which bear epigraphic or iconographic references to Umale/Umale: these comprise two series of mirrors (**Figs 1–4** and **Figs 6–7**) and an isolated example now in Bern (**Fig. 5**).

According to Cristofani the two series⁶ are connected and hinge in some way on the story of Orpheus' head, as indicated by the inscription *urphe* on one of the mirrors (**Fig. 2**).⁷ The story of the singing head of Orpheus concerns its arrival by sea on the island of Lesbos where it was preserved in a creek. The head was decapitated by the Thracian women in anger because Orpheus would not allow them to take part in his religious rites. The link between the two series is based on the interpretation of an object on the left side of the scene as the bag or net containing the head of Orpheus.⁸

The first series (**Figs 1–4**) has been attributed to the area of Volsinii, on account of the style of the lettering which is typical of the inscriptions of southern Etruria, and the presence of the word 'suθina', incised on the obverse of one of the mirrors (**Fig. 1**). The series is dated towards the end of the 4th or the beginning of the 3rd century BC.⁹ The mirror in Bern (**Fig. 5**)

can be attributed to this same area and period¹⁰ and can be therefore linked to this first series.¹¹

The second series (**Figs 6–7**) comes well into the 3rd century BC, and includes mirrors scattered all over Etruria. It is therefore difficult to attribute them to specific workshops.¹²

This study is not concerned with stylistic attributions, which have been thoroughly investigated by other scholars who have begun to identify particular hands of artists, 'maestros' or workshops.¹³ Such studies deal with small features which tell us little about the specific cultural traits of a territory, particularly since most of the mirrors belong to museum collections and lack any context, except for the mirror in the British Museum (**Fig. 8**).

The documentary value of the mirrors, however, is significant, because while not mass-produced, they refer to a single episode, with variations, which relates to a prophesying head and the presence of two characters on each side. The protagonists in our scene are very often faithful to a single script. For this reason the idea behind the scene needs to be evaluated as an overall construct which is more important than the variety of details. Among these, as we shall see, must be included the epigraphic derivation. Next to be considered will be the individual components of the scene and an analysis of their disposition.

In the first series (**Figs 1–5**), two mirrors bear inscriptions (**Figs 1–2; Tables 1–2**) and three do not (**Figs 3–5**). We can include the mirror once in Naples (**Fig. 1**) in the first group, even though much of the scene is missing, because of the inscriptions and the presence of the seated character on the left. The scene represents the consultation of the oracle, in the presence of a central couple and one individual to either side; the one on the left standing and holding the net in which the head was preserved, and the one on the right sitting. In two cases an additional person is standing between the central couple and the figure on the right (**Figs 2–3**) and in the case of the Naples mirror the number of inscriptions reveals the presence of an additional person in the matching place on the left (**Fig. 1** – most of the figures in this drawing have been restored, only the shaded fragments, top and bottom, were ancient). As far as the left side is concerned, it is possible that the same character is represented both on the Naples mirror (**Fig. 1**), lacking the figure but preserving the name Umale, and on the two non-inscribed mirrors (**Figs 3–4**) due to the similarity of the scene with that of the single well-preserved, inscribed mirror (**Fig. 2**) where the character is identified by the name Umale. On the right side, symmetrically opposed to Umale, the seated figure is holding a diptych, his hand raised to his mouth in the attitude of meditation and doubt.¹⁴ In two cases one can certainly identify this as a male figure (**Figs 1 and 3**) whereas in another (**Fig. 2**) we can see that breasts have been added. This character is named in one instance Talmithe

J. Swaddling, P. Perkins (eds.), *Etruscan by Definition, Papers in Honour of Sybille Haynes, MBE, London 2009*

(Fig. 1), in which we recognise the Greek import Palamedes,¹⁵ and in the other (Fig. 2) the quality of the inscription does not allow a clear interpretation. The inscription so far has been read as: Aliunea,¹⁶ Talmithe (Palamedes),¹⁷ Alponea.¹⁸ In any case the rôle of all these characters – either male or female, bearing inscriptions or not – remains unchanged since they hold a diptych and therefore are involved in the practice of recording oracles.

On the mirror with the label *urphe*, beside the prophesying head (Fig. 2), the figure on the right is clearly identified by his relationship to the prophesying head which looks intently towards him. Scholars agree that the two figures belong together and that the head is linked to Palamedes writing on the diptych. They consider the legend to be located on the island of Lesbos, corresponding to the location both of the oracular cult of Orpheus, and of the sanctuary of Palamedes (Mount Lepetysmos).¹⁹

The scene on the fifth mirror (Fig. 5) shows four figures, and the central pair includes a Menerva-like figure standing on the left. The character holding the empty net on the right side is directly involved in consulting the oracle of a bearded prophesying head, which is different from the heads on the mirrors of the first series. The two outer characters consist of a Turms-like figure on the left and an Aplu-like figure (holding a laurel branch) on the right.²⁰

Summing up the data of the first series we have five mirrors where Umaele, whether identified or not by his name, is connected with the empty net. On four mirrors (Figs 1–4) Umaele stands behind the prophesying head and could be taken for a spectator, but he is not the only figure adopting such a stance: in no case do any of the characters look at the head. As far as the main figures are concerned, one can see that the eyes of the couple in the middle are turned towards one another (Fig. 2) or towards the figure holding the diptych (Fig. 3). The eyes of the other characters are always turned towards the figure holding the diptych. Only the fifth mirror (Fig. 5) presents a different scheme.

In the second series, both mirrors bear inscriptions (Figs 6–7; Tables 3–4). The scene represents four characters during the moment preceding or following the consultation of the

oracle. The head is presumably meant to be inside a receptacle that could be a net – as the net seems to have something in it, in contrast to the empty net of the first series of mirrors – or a kind of basket which is similar to that represented on an almost contemporary gem from Chiusi with a head emerging from it.²¹

The scheme of these mirrors shows a naked woman in the centre, one figure on each side and another standing in the background. With regard to the left side, the figure is once named Umaile (Fig. 6) and once Talmithe (Fig. 7). In the exergue of one of the two mirrors (Fig. 6) there is an isolated head with a Phrygian cap which Ambrosini recognises as an Orpheus head.²² Summing up the data of the second series of mirrors (Figs 6–7) the recurrent theme is an oracular head, which is preserved in a receptacle. We do not know whether the scene is taking place before the head has been taken out or after it is put away, so the relationship between the haruspex and the head is not clear. Nevertheless in this series of mirrors Umaele and Talmithe exchange their rôles and places, as also happens elsewhere.²³ A forerunner of such a scheme is present on the mirror in Bern (Fig. 5), where the Umaele/Umaile-like figure stands to the right, looking straight at the head, instead of being behind it.

A number of scholars have interpreted the central figures on the mirrors where Umaele/Umaile is represented as incidental elements meant to indicate different stages of the legend of the Orpheus head.²⁴ They have concentrated on the details of the scene and opened up a wide range of explanations of the labels and of the iconography of the figures themselves. Nevertheless these interpretations did not take full account of all the elements of the scene to provide a unified interpretation, in terms of standard Greek and Roman mythology.²⁵

I shall now review the primary matter of the Orpheus legend and describe the basic, recurrent figures on the mirrors in order to understand their rôles through their iconography, rather than their inscribed names. This task has already been tackled by Margot Schmidt, who has assembled three pieces of uninscribed evidence dating to the second half of the 5th century BC. Two of them – a stemless cup by the Painter of Ruvo 1346 (Fig. 9) and a hydria ascribed to the Polygnotus Group (Fig. 10) – each bear a scheme with a prophesying head as the lowest common denominator.²⁶

The cup (Fig. 9) shows a figure in the act of writing before the head, which faces away from an Apollo-like character appearing to the right. He is holding a laurel branch, his arm extended with his finger pointing to the figure who is writing down the oracle. This theme could derive from a tradition dealing with prophets recording in books oracles delivered by characters like Bacis, Musaeus, Abaris or Orpheus.²⁷ As John Dillery has recently demonstrated, more or less at the time the cup was painted, these depictions of chresmologues writing down oracles are ‘negatively shaded’. In this context Herodotus (*Hist.* 7.140–3) provides a sharp contrast between the seer-like figure of Themistocles and the elders of Athens, performing the function of chresmologues.²⁸ Chresmologues seem to have been treated in such troubled times in a way that makes their position ambiguous. Frequent recourse was made to oracles in the second half of the 5th century BC, a difficult moment in Greek history: this was an action which Aristophanes made fun of, implying that it did not receive universal approval.

Tables showing different interpretations of the inscriptions

Table 1 Readings of the inscriptions of the mirror in Fig. 1

Emmanuel-Rebuffat 1984	Talmiθe, Elinai, Ziumiθe, Euturpe, Acip.uu, Umaele
Cristofani 1985b	Talmiθe, [e]linai, Ziumiθe, Euturpa, Aliunea, Umaele
Cristofani 1987	Talmiθe, [e]linai, Ziumiθe, Euturpa., A[]i. un.[e]a., Umaele

Table 2 Readings of the inscriptions of the mirror in Fig. 2

Emmanuel-Rebuffat 1984	Talmiθe, Era, E.θial>Elinae, Ime > Ziumiθe, Aiiunis>Atunis, Eθurpa, Umaele, Are
Cristofani 1985b	Aliunea, Erax[, E()θial, Euturpa, Umaele
Mangani 1985a	Aliunea, Erax[, Eθial, Ime, Atunis, E(u) turpa, Umaele, Urφe

Table 3 Readings of the inscriptions of the mirror in Fig. 6

Cristofani 1985	Eyse, Umaile
-----------------	--------------

Table 4 Readings of the inscriptions of the mirror in Fig. 7

Cristofani 1985a	Ite, Xais, Talmiθe
------------------	--------------------

Therefore their diffusion was restricted to private circulation, as in the case of Pisistratus.²⁹

On the other hand the hydria in Basel (**Fig. 10**) shows a bearded figure, laurel-wreathed, with his foot on a rock, bending towards a prophesying head and releasing the cords holding it. The scene takes place in front of six female figures, who may be interpreted as the Muses: they are watching and not playing their instruments. Nevertheless the laurel-wreathed character belongs to Apollo's sphere of influence and this allows his inclusion among those allowed to sing for the god.³⁰

The hydria (**Fig. 10**) shows a relationship between the head and the other characters which is different from that shown on the cup in Cambridge (**Fig. 9**). In such a context a poet might assume a rôle within an Apollonian oracular context closer to the status of the legendary seers of Greek tradition.³¹ This rôle is illustrated by the scene on the hydria in Dunedin (**Fig. 11**). The antecedents of a figure being linked with Apollo, or the Muses, are Hesiod,³² the poets of the Homeric Cycle and Eúmelos of Corinth.³³

Summing up the evidence it seems that the figure recording the oracle from the head, in the presence of Apollo, and the laurel-wreathed person bending towards it, in the presence of the Muses, each have their own rôle and both are fulfilling a mantic function. If this is so, it could explain a specific relationship, in the Greek context, of these two interpreters of a prophesying head and reveal their original rôles.

Having examined the two Greek themes, we can now turn to the debate concerning the presence of a controversial naked female figure appearing close to Umaele on the first series of Etruscan mirrors. Emmanuel-Rebuffat has studied this figure closely, interpreting her as Euterpe, the Muse properly linked to music, whose Etruscan name – E(u)turpa – appears on at least two mirrors beside a naked female (**Figs 1–2**). According to Emmanuel-Rebuffat the Muse is the central element on which the entire significance of the scene depends and her constant association with Umaele relates to a local story unknown to us.³⁴

To judge from a comparison with the character holding strings in front of the head and the Muse on the hydria (**Fig. 10**), it is possible that the Umaele/Umaile-like character is performing the same rôle with the net on the left side of the first series of mirrors, in the presence of E(u)terpe. As previously mentioned, the rôle of E(u)terpe originated in Greek tradition,³⁵ and was also connected with singers officially involved with the worship of Apollo and his oracle. Moreover the contemporary evidence of the British Museum mirror (**Fig. 8**) in which Umaele/Umaile is a haruspex with his foot on the rock,³⁶ in the presence of Apollo in this same position, confirms the Apollonian context. Also the mirror in Bern (**Fig. 5**), close to this first series of mirrors from a production point of view, shows a Umaele/Umaile-like character in a context reminiscent of divination, due to the presence of gods usually involved in this practice (Aplu-, Menerva-, and Turms-like figures).

On the other hand, the theme displayed on the right side of the first series of mirrors, with a figure ready to record oracles from the head – either Palamedes or Aliunea or Alpunea – could be related to the different oracular setting involving the chresmologue that we have already discussed in considering

the Attic cup (**Fig. 9**).

So taking the Greek evidence into account we can identify the existence of an earlier Greek series of compositions and a later Etruscan series, both concerning oracular heads. The echo in the earlier Attic context of the two separate schemes – direct inspiration as opposed to the recording of inspired utterance – persists in the Etruscan mirrors of the first series (**Figs 1–4**). This is perceived through the different direction of the gaze of the characters: Umaele appears not to be involved in the action of the scene, even though he is involved in divinatory practices on other mirrors (**Figs 5 and 8**). On the other hand the relevance of Umaele in the scheme as a whole is confirmed by the presence of the empty net recalling the prophesying head, which represents the lowest common denominator of the two Attic schemes. Therefore the mirrors of the two series we have examined bear scenes which seem to hint at two different means of oracular prophecy.³⁷

In other words, the basic elements of the scene on the first series of mirrors (**Figs 1–4**) are, besides the head, the two side characters performing more or less the same activity. The figure on the left fulfils the inspired function of the poet while the figure on the right fulfils the function of recording the prophecy, according to the two different techniques.

The combination of these two schemes in one might well be Etruscan and express an important view of oracular practices, considering both the voiced and written word, in a way which is similar to that of the mirror where Cacū, playing a musical instrument, sits next to Artile, who holds a diptych (**Fig. 12**).³⁸ Luschi has pointed out the importance of the source of inspiration of Cacū, who must be identified as a prophet inspired by Faunus or Favonius, represented by the head shown at the top of the mirror, and the real source of the oracle.³⁹ If this interpretation is correct we could also surmise that the young Artile is performing a task analogous to that of Cacū, directly receiving the prophecy from the head, not just writing down the responses of the diviner Cacū inspired by the head.

At this point we should consider whether such a scheme on the Etruscan mirrors should be viewed as mythological and within the context of native legend infused with Greek sources,⁴⁰ or whether it reflects two different ways of consulting oracles within the complexity of the *Etrusca disciplina*.⁴¹ With reference to a later period, Adriano Maggiani noted such a differentiation in the case of the oracular twins Cassandra and Helenus.⁴² He recognised some echo of the Ciceronian description of the two chief kinds of Etruscan prophecy, *genera artificiosa* and *genera naturalia*, and the relationship between them. The first could be interpreted as prophecy obtained through the use of specific skills, and the second as directly inspired prophecy.⁴³ In Cicero's description of the two chief kinds of prophecy, inspired and direct, Maggiani sees a reflection of Etruscan practice,⁴⁴ and relates this to an oracular tradition connected with the wedding ceremony, linked to the presence of the oracular head on mirrors.⁴⁵

Such a need for explanation again shows that a co-existence of two different types of prophecy, one inspired and one non-inspired, within Etruscan culture seems incongruent with what we know of Etruscan belief systems during the period in which these mirrors were produced, since divine inspiration had to be controlled and integrated within

J. Swaddling, P. Perkins (eds.), *Etruscan by Definition, Papers in Honour of Sybille Haynes, MBE, London 2009*

the framework of the ruling community.⁴⁶ We should perhaps think in terms of the representation of the origin and evolution of a science created to explain natural phenomena whose significance was considered crucial to survival. So, to quote Dominique Briquel, the oracular response of the original mythical figures formed the basis for a ritual of prophecy that developed over time.⁴⁷

In our case the prophesying heads could refer to such origins and suggest the environment in which the different Etruscan oracular practices were established. This seems to be the case with the bearded head on the mirror in Bern (**Fig. 5**) which is different from the others. This could mean that the main point of interest is the prophesying head, regardless of the inscription which sometimes accompanies it. If this model of representing different functions within the semantic sphere of prophecy is valid, it could help to answer the linguistic questions concerning the interpretation of the name Umaele/Umaile.

Umaele has been interpreted by Adriano Maggiani as a contraction (combined with metathesis) of *ho malóeis*, a hero's name derived from the epithet *Malóeis*, given to Apollo in the cults of Mytilene and possibly in some way connected with the legend of Orpheus.⁴⁸ On the other hand the earliest interpretation of the name, dating back to the 18th century, as a Greek linguistic import (Εὐμήλος),⁴⁹ has not been included in de Simone's list of Greek imports into Etruscan⁵⁰ and has been questioned by several scholars.⁵¹

According to research on ancient Greek literary sources, a direct correlation between characters and names is suggested, reflecting original rôles within legends and prototypes for Etruscan local stories. As a consequence, since these stories change the core of the original Greek ones, they could be considered as misinterpretations on the part of the Etruscans.

This situation finds a kind of parallel with that of Greek linguistic imports into Etruscan relating to vessels. If we assume that these are meant to indicate the shape of the vase in Etruscan, there seems to be both error and misinterpretation, because not only are these names given to vase-shapes which do not correspond with the Greek ones, but they are also applied to different vase-shapes within the Etruscan context. But if we consider these same names denote the function of the vases within their proper ritual context, we recover a specific feature of Etruscan identity, which is to adapt external cultural imports to its own architecture of concepts, especially in the case of vases connected with ritual practice.⁵²

In the case in point, our mirrors are indeed coherent as far as the scheme is concerned, even though it is impossible to find a unique story, whether Greek or Etruscan, in which to insert the characters as actors defined by their names in a mythological context. Therefore we can still try to explain the name Umaele/Umaile within a Greek context, but from a different point of view (since most of the names of the characters appearing on the mirrors derive from the Greek).

Instead of viewing Umaele/Umaile as an actor within a Greek story we should perhaps focus on his rôle as a singer in an Apollonian setting. We might wonder whether the tradition linking the poets to the Muses and to Apollo could support a connection of the Etruscan Umaele/Umaile with the Greek Εὐμήλος, meaning 'rich in herd', relating to his descent from the aristocratic family of the Bacchiads of Corinth. He is one of

the first legendary singers involved in Apollonian oracular response,⁵³ and his career has been connected to Greek expansion in the West.⁵⁴

Regarding Greek linguistic imports into Etruscan, the Doric vowel 'ā' of Εὐμήλος,⁵⁵ corresponds to 'ai' in Etruscan and 'ae' in Latin.⁵⁶ On the other hand we have no examples of the rendering of the Greek accented diphthong 'eu' in the first syllable, since we only have examples without accent.⁵⁷ However we have good documentation in other languages in ancient Italy that, as far as the accent in the first syllable is concerned, they behave like Etruscan:⁵⁸ in these languages the counterpart of 'eu' is 'u'.⁵⁹ As a consequence an origin in the Greek Εὐμήλος for Umaele/Umaile seems possible.

In conclusion the 'persona' of the Greek singer Εὐμήλος could have functioned in an Etruscan context as the echo of an inspired mantic, endowed with mythical origins, connected to the Muses and to Apollo. In addition we have the example of the mirror in the British Museum (**Fig. 8**) in which Umaele/Umaile acts as a haruspex, in a divinatory situation in the presence of Aplu. Indeed the later series of mirrors (**Figs 6–7**) and the one in Bern (**Fig. 5**), with their exchange of positions and rôles, show once more that these same activities within oracular practices are interchangeable.

Finally we might ponder on the significance of this kind of mirror within Etruscan society. Mirrors are usually considered to have some connection with oracles performed in wedding ceremonies,⁶⁰ but the complex range of images they displayed could instead suggest that they had a divinatory function⁶¹ within the *Etrusca disciplina*.⁶²

Notes

- 1 The rich documentation offered by Etruscan mirrors has been approached in different ways sometimes even by the same scholars, considering for example whether these characters and their names could allude to original Greek iconographies or local Etruscan stories influenced by them (Cristofani 1985a, 2; Cristofani 1985b, 10; Pairault-Massa 1992, 202–3; Maggiani 1992, 3–4; Sassatelli 1997, 348; de Angelis 2002; Bonfante, Swaddling 2006); or embody abstract concepts (Cristofani 1985b, 4, fig. 7; Torelli 1988; Pairault-Massa 1992, 143–8; Ambrosini 1998); or cult situations within the *Etrusca disciplina* (de Grummond 2000; Maggiani 2005; Ambrosini 2006; de Grummond 2006, xiii–xiv, 234–8).
- 2 Haynes 1953.
- 3 de Simone 1969, 59–63; de Simone 1972, 515–16.
- 4 de Angelis 2002, 48.
- 5 Krauskopf 1984, 350, n. 112; Maggiani 1986, 12; Pandolfini Angeletti 1994, 10875; Camporeale 1997, 159; Ambrosini 2003, 429–30, fig. 27; Ambrosini 2006, 207; de Grummond 2006, 39.
- 6 The mirror in Princeton (**Fig. 4**) was not included in Cristofani's analysis since it was not published until later (De Puma 2005, 45). The bibliography at the end of the present contribution deals with the main features of the subject of Umaele and the Orpheus head and its different interpretations. For general bibliography: Emmanuel-Rebuffat 1984; Cristofani 1985a, 6–11; Maggiani 2005, 70–1; Ambrosini 2006, 207–9; de Grummond 2006, 32–40.
- 7 Cristofani 1985a, 7–8; Camporeale 1997; Maggiani 2005, 70, 73.
- 8 For different interpretations of the object, with regard to the whole scene: Maggiani 1986, 10; Massa-Pairault 1992, 145–8.
- 9 Colonna 1985, 129; Mangani 1985b, 23, 31; Cristofani 1985b, 11–13; Sassatelli 1997, 350; Ambrosini 2003, 436–8; Maggiani 2005, 70–1.
- 10 Jucker 2001, 75–8.
- 11 Ambrosini 2006, 208.
- 12 Mangani 1985b, 35; Ambrosini 1998, 71–2; Ambrosini 2003, 436–8.
- 13 Wiman 1990, 118, 236–7; Bonamici 2002, 438, 442–3.
- 14 Neumann 1965, 130; de Grummond 2006, 34.
- 15 de Simone 1970, 169, n. 78; Maggiani 1986, 12–13; Krauskopf 1994, 147–9; Woodford 1994, 168.

- 16 Krauskopf 1981; Mangani 1985a; Cristofani 1987.
 17 Emmanuel-Rebuffat 1984.
 18 Maggiani 2005, 70; de Grummond 2006, 37–40.
 19 Emmanuel-Rebuffat, 1984, 506; Massa-Pairault 1992, 145.
 20 Jucker 2001, 76; De Puma 2005, 62.
 21 Harari 1997, 108, n. 117; de Grummond 2006, 38–9.
 22 Ambrosini 1998, 71–2. For another interpretation of the isolated head: Xeni-Garezou 1997, 104–5.
 23 Harari 2003, 507.
 24 Cristofani 1985a, 8–9; Maggiani 1986, 8–26; Massa-Pairault 1992, 145–8; Camporeale 1994, 594; Massa-Pairault 1998, 86–8; Maggiani 2005, 70–1.
 25 Woodford 1994, 169; Bagnasco Gianni 2009.
 26 Schmidt 1972; Cristofani 1985a, 7; Maggiani 1986, 8–9; Graf 1987, 92–5; Xeni-Garezou 1997, 101–2, n. 68–70.
 27 Debiasi 2004, 253–4; Dillery 2005, 178–83.
 28 Dillery 2005, 209–19.
 29 Valenza Mele 1991–2, 31–9; Dillery 2005.
 30 Schmidt 1972, 132; Queyrel 1992, 676–7.
 31 Dillery 2005, 178–83, 206; Struck 2005.
 32 Aloni 1998, 17–18.
 33 Debiasi 2004, 39–52.
 34 Emmanuel-Rebuffat 1984, 508.
 35 Bonamici 1993, 8–14.
 36 Camporeale 1997, 159; Massa-Pairault 1999, 534; Pandolfini Angeletti 1994, 10875.
 37 It is possible that the scheme on the Attic cup (Fig. 9) expresses the popular distrust of prophecy recorded by the chresmologues (Dillery 2005), since the gesture of the Apollo-like figure is not necessarily one of approval: suffice to think of Apollo on the west pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia (Neumann 1965, 32). For a different interpretation: Graf 1987, 92–5.
 38 Maggiani 2005, 69.
 39 Luschi 1991; Michetti 2003, 53; de Grummond 2006, 32–40.
 40 Cristofani 1985b, 10; Maggiani 1992, 3–4; Camporeale 1994; Bonfante, Swaddling 2006, 53.
 41 de Grummond 2006, xiv.
 42 Maggiani 1989.
 43 Maggiani 2005, 53–71.
 44 Maggiani 1994, 68.
 45 Maggiani 2005, 70.
 46 Bagnasco Gianni 2001, 218–19.
 47 Briquel 1993, 72; Maggiani 2005, 69.
 48 Maggiani 1986, 11–12; Torelli 1988, 116, n. 36; Massa-Pairault 1998, 86–8.
 49 For the thesis of a provenance from the Greek Eúmēlos (son of Admetus and Alcestis): Maggiani 1986, 9–10. In particular, for Eúmēlos (as a good singer): Emmanuel-Rebuffat 1984, 508.
 50 de Simone 1970.
 51 Maggiani 1986, 10; Cristofani 1985a, 8; Camporeale 1997, 158.
 52 Bagnasco Gianni 1996.
 53 Debiasi 2004, 47–53.
 54 Lasserre 1976, 120–1; d'Agostino 1996; Cordano 1997, 176–7; Debiasi 2004, 54.
 55 Cassio 1999, 72–5.
 56 de Simone 1970, II, 35, 36.
 57 de Simone 1970, II, 27.
 58 Prosdocimi 1986, 612.
 59 Prosdocimi 1996, 241. Within the Etruscan we have at least two examples of this diphthong which is rendered with 'u': Luschnei (ET, Vs. 7.42; Meiser 1994: eu > ou > u) and L(e)yra (Cristofani 1985a, 4).
 60 Cristofani 1985a; Cristofani 1985b; Maggiani 1986, 25–6; Massa-Pairault 1992, 202–3; Maggiani 1994, 74–5; Michetti 2003, 52–3.
 61 Frontisi-Ducroux and Vernant 1998, 147–60.
 62 de Grummond 2000, 56; Bagnasco Gianni, forthcoming.

Bibliography

- Aloni, A. 1998, *Cantare glorie di eroi. Comunicazione e performance poetica nella Grecia arcaica*, Turin.
 Ambrosini, L. 1998, 'Una coppia di specchi del gruppo "delle Lase" con un nuovo tipo di raffigurazione', *StEtr* 42 (1996), 63–94.
 Ambrosini, L. 2003, 'Specchi volsiniesi e vulcenti. Contributo ad una definizione preliminare della produzione volsiniese', *AnnFaina* 10, 409–510.
 Ambrosini, L. 2006, 'Le raffigurazioni di operatori del culto sugli specchi etruschi', in *Gli operatori cultuali. Atti del II incontro di studio del organizzato dal 'Gruppo di contatto per lo studio delle religioni mediterranee'*, Rome 10–11 maggio 2005, eds M. Rocchi, P. Xella, J.-A. Zamora (*Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente Antico XXIII*), Verona, 197–233.
 Bagnasco Gianni, G. 1996, 'Imprestiti greci nell'Etruria del VII secolo a.C.: osservazioni archeologiche sui nomi dei vasi', in *Dall'Indo a Thule: i Greci, i Romani, gli altri*, Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studio, Trento 23–5 febbraio 1995, eds A. Aloni and L. Definisi, Trento, 307–18.
 Bagnasco Gianni, G. 2001, 'Le sortes etrusche', in *Sorteggio pubblico e cleromanzia dall'Antichità all'Età Moderna, Atti della Tavola Rotonda*, Milan 26–7 gennaio 2001, eds F. Cordano and C. Grottanelli, Milan, 197–220.
 Bagnasco Gianni, G. 2009, 'Orpheus/ Urphe', in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, 'Supplementum 2009', Düsseldorf, 1, 405–7.
 Bagnasco Gianni, G. forthcoming, 'Tra uomini e dei: funzione e ruolo di alcuni oggetti negli specchi etruschi', in *Öffentliche und private Kulte bei den Etruskern und ihre Auswirkungen auf Politik und Gesellschaft*, Internationales Kolloquium der Sektion 'Wien/Österreich' des Istituto Nazionale di Studi Etruschi ed Italici, Wien 4–6 Dezember 2008.
 Bonamici, M. 1993, 'Le Muse in Etruria', *Prospettiva* 70, 1–21.
 Bonamici, M. 2002, 'Contributo agli specchi perugini', *AnnFaina* 9, 435–74.
 Bonfante, L. and Swaddling, J. 2006, *Etruscan Myths*, London.
 Briquel, D. 1993, 'Les voix oraculaires', in *Les bois sacrés*, Actes du Colloque International (Naples 23–25 November 1989) eds O. de Cazenove and J. Scheid (Collection du Centre Jean-Bérard, 10), Naples, 77–90.
 Camporeale, G. 1994, 'Purich', *LIMC* VII, 1, 593–4.
 Camporeale, G. 1997, 'Umaele, Umaile', *LIMC* VIII, 1, 158–9.
 Cassio, A.C. 1999, 'Cassio, Epica greca e scrittura tra VIII e VII secolo a.C.: madrepatria e colonie d'Occidente', in *Scritture Mediterranee tra il IX e il VII secolo a.C.*, Atti del seminario, eds G. Bagnasco Gianni and F. Cordano, Milan, 1999, 67–84.
 Colonna, G. 1985, 'Società e cultura a Volsinii', *AnnFaina* 2, 101–31.
 Cordano, F. 1997, 'Le Cicladi e la colonizzazione', in *Le necropoli arcaiche di Veio. Giornata di studio in memoria di Massimo Pallottino*, ed. G. Bartoloni, Rome, 175–8.
 Cristofani, M. 1985a, 'Faone, la testa di Orfeo e l'immaginario femminile', *Prospettiva* 42, 2–12.
 Cristofani, M. 1985b, 'Il cosiddetto specchio di Tarchon. Un recupero e una nuova lettura', *Prospettiva* 41, 4–20.
 Cristofani, M. 1987, 'Originis incertae', *StEtr* LIII (1985), 236, n. 51.
 d'Agostino, B. 1996, 'L'esperienza coloniale nell'immaginario mitico dei Greci', in *I Greci in Occidente*, ed. G. Pugliese Carratelli, Milan, 209–10.
 de Angelis, F. 2002, 'Specchi e miti. Sulla ricezione della mitologia greca in Etruria', *Ostraka* 11, 37–73.
 Debiasi, A. 2004, *L'epica perduta. Eumelo, il Ciclo, l'occidente*, Hesperia 20, Rome.
 de Grummond, N.T. 2000, 'Mirrors and manteia. Themes of prophecy on Etruscan and Praenestine mirrors', in *Aspetti e problemi della produzione degli specchi etruschi figurati. Atti dell'incontro internazionale di studio*, Roma 2–4 maggio 1997, ed. M.D. Gentili, Rome, 27–67.
 de Grummond, N.T. 2006, *Etruscan Myth, Sacred History, and Legend*, Philadelphia.
 De Puma, R.D. 2005, *CSE. United States of America, 4. Northeastern collections: Amherst-Mead Art Museum Amherst College, Bryn Athyn-Glencairn Museum, Academy of the New Church*, Rome.
 de Simone, C. 1969, 'Gli prestiti greci in etrusco. Prospettive e problemi', *Studia classica et orientalia Antonino Pagliaro oblata* II, Rome, 41–63.
 de Simone, C. 1970, *Die griechischen Entlehnungen im Etruskischen I–II*, Wiesbaden.
 de Simone, C. 1972, 'Per la storia degli prestiti greci in etrusco', *ANRW* I, 2, 490–521.
 Dillery, J. 2005, 'Chresmologues and Manteis: Independent Diviners and the Problem of Authority', in Iles Johnston and Struck, 167–231.
 Doerig, J., 1991, 'La tête qui chante', in *Orphisme et Orphée. En l'honneur de Jean Rudhardt*, ed. P. Borgeaud, Geneva, 61–4.

J. Swaddling, P. Perkins (eds.), *Etruscan by Definition, Papers in Honour of Sybille Haynes, MBE, London 2009*

- Emmanuel-Rebuffat, D. 1984, 'Aliunea n'a jamais existé', *Latomus* 43, 501–9.
- Emmanuel-Rebuffat, D. 1988, *CSE. France, 1. Paris. Musée du Louvre*, 1, Rome.
- ES: Gerhard E. 1840–1867, *Etruskische Spiegel*, I–IV, Berlin.
- Frontisi-Ducroux, F. and Vernant, J.-P. 1998, *Ulisse e lo specchio. Il femminile e la rappresentazione di sé nella Grecia antica*, Rome (Italian translation 2003).
- Graf, F. 1987, 'Orpheus: A Poet Among men', in *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, ed. J. Bremmer, London, 80–106.
- Harari, M. 1997, 'Turms', *LIMC* VIII, 1, 98–111.
- Harari, M. 2003, 'Lo specchio di Castro: un giuoco delle parti?', *AnnFaina* 10, 499–510.
- Haynes, S. 1953, 'Ein neuer etruskische Spiegel', *Mitteilungen der archäologischen Instituts* 6, 21–45.
- Iles Johnston, S. and Struck, P.T. eds, 2005, *Mantikê. Studies in Ancient Divination*, Leiden-Boston.
- Jucker, I. 2001, *CSE. Schweiz, 1. Basel, Schaffhausen, Bern, Lausanne, Bern*.
- Krauskopf, I. 1981, 'Aliunea', *LIMC* I, 1, 529–31.
- Krauskopf, I. 1984, 'Aplu', *LIMC* II, 1, 335–63.
- Krauskopf, I. 1994, 'Palamedes. B. Etruskische Darstellung', *LIMC* VII, 1, 147–9.
- Lasserre, F. 1976, 'L'histoire grecque à l'époque archaïque', *Quaderni di Storia* 4, 113–42.
- Luschi, L. 1991, 'Cacu, Fauno e i venti', *StEtr* 57, 105–17.
- Maggiani, A. 1986, 'La divination oraculaire en Etrurie', *Caesarodunum* suppl. 56, 6–48.
- Maggiani, A. 1989, 'Immagini di aruspici', in *Atti del Secondo Congresso Internazionale Etrusco* (Firenze, 26 maggio–2 giugno 1985), (*Studi Etruschi*, suppl.), Rome, 1557–63.
- Maggiani, A. 1992, 'Iconografie greche e storie locali nell'arte etrusco-italica tra IV e III secolo a.C.', *Prospettiva* 68, 3–12.
- Maggiani, A. 1994, 'Mantica oracolare in Etruria: litobolia e sortilegio', *RdA* 18, 68–78.
- Maggiani, A. 2005, 'La divinazione in Etruria', *ThesCRA* III, 52–78.
- Mangani, E. 1985a, '4. Specchio', in *Civiltà degli Etruschi*, Exhib. cat., ed. M. Cristofani, Milan, 354, n. 4.
- Mangani, E. 1985b, 'Le fabbriche di specchi nell'Etruria settentrionale', *BdA* 70, 21–40.
- Massa-Pairault, F.H. 1992, *Iconologia e politica nell'Italia antica. Roma, Lazio, Etruria dal VII al I secolo a.C.*, Milan.
- Massa-Pairault, F.H. 1998, 'Libri acherontici, sacra Acheruntia. Culture grecque et Etrusca disciplina', *AnnFaina* 5, 83–103.
- Massa-Pairault, F.H. 1999, 'Mythe et identité politique. L'Etrurie du IV^e siècle à l'époque hellénistique', in *Le mythe grec dans l'Italie antique. Fonction et image. Actes du colloque international*, Rome 14–16 novembre 1996, ed. F.H. Massa-Pairault, Rome, 521–54.
- Meiser, G. 1994, 'Accessi alla protostoria delle lingue sabelliche', in *La Tavola di Agnone nel contesto italico. Convegno di Studio*, Agnone 13–15 aprile 1994, ed. L. Del Tutto Palma, Florence, 187–209.
- Michetti, L.M. 2003, *Le ceramiche argentate e a rilievo in Etruria nella prima età ellenistica* (Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. *Monumenti Antichi. Serie miscellanea*, 8), Rome.
- Neumann, G. 1965, *Gesten und Gebärden in der griechischen Kunst*, Berlin.
- Pandolfini Angeletti, M. 1994, *CIE 3:3, Inscriptiones in Instrumento et Volciis et in Agro Volcentano Repertae*, Rome.
- Prosdocimi, A.L. 1986, 'Sull'accento latino e italico', in *O-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. A. Etter, Berlin-New York, 603–18.
- Prosdocimi, A.L. 1996, 'Etnici e strutture sociali nella sabina: Cures', in *Identità e Civiltà dei Sabini. Atti del XVIII Convegno di Studi Etruschi e Italici* (Rieti-Magliano Sabina 30 maggio–3 giugno 1993), Florence, 227–55.
- Queyrel, A. 1992, 'Mousa, Mousai', *LIMC* VI, 1, 657–81.
- Sassatelli, G. 1997, 'Specchio. Etruria', *EAA*, secondo supplemento 1971–94, V, 346–52.
- Schmidt, M. 1972, 'Ein neues Zeugnis zum Mythos vom Orpheushaupt', *AntK* 15, 128–37.
- Struck, P.T. 2005, 'Divination and literary criticism', in Iles Johnston and Struck, 147–65.
- Torelli, M. 1988, "'Etruria principes disciplinam doceto" il mito normativo dello specchio di Tuscania', in *Studia Tarquiniensia* (*Archaeologia Perusina* 9), eds M. Torelli and F.H. Massa-Pairault, 109–18.
- Valenza Mele, N. 1991–2, 'Hera ed Apollo a Cuma e la mantica sibillina', *Rivista dell'Istituto nazionale d'archeologia e storia dell'arte* 14–15, 5–71.
- Wiman, I.M.B. 1990, *Malstria, Malena. Metals and motifs in Etruscan mirror craft* (Studies in Mediterranean archaeology, 91), Göteborg.
- Woodford, S. 1994, 'Palamedes seeks revenge', *JHS* 114, 164–9.
- Xeni-Garezou, M. 1997, 'Orpheus', *LIMC* VIII, 1, 81–105.



Figure 1 Mirror (unshaded part was restored), present location unknown, ex-Collezione Borgia, then Museo Archeologico Naples (from *ES*, II, 196).



Figure 2 Mirror, from Chiusi, Museo Archeologico Siena, ex-Raccolta Bonci Casuccini, inv. 176 (from Maggiani 1992, fig. 2)



Figure 3 Mirror, from Castelgiorgio, The Louvre, Paris, inv. 1724 (from Emmanuel-Rebuffat 1988, no. 2)



Figure 4 Mirror, Princeton University, inv. 1998. 46 (from De Puma 2005, no. 45)



Figure 5 Mirror, Bern, Collection of H. and I. Jucker (from Jucker 2001, 37)



Figure 6 Mirror, Florence, Museo Archeologico (from *ES*, II, 207.2)



Figure 7 Mirror, from Cetona?, ex-Collezione Terrosi (from *ES*, III, 275A.2)



Figure 8 Mirror, from Castelgiorgio (Orvieto), tomb in 'proprietà Gualterio', context datable to c. end of the 4th–beginning of the 3rd century ac. British Museum, GR 1873.8–20. 109



Figure 9 Stemless cup, 410 BC, Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, inv. 103.25, Painter of Ruvo 1346 (from Doerig 1991, fig. 15)



Figure 10 Hydria, 440–430 BC, Antikenmuseum Basel and Sammlung Ludwig, inv. BS 481, Polygnotus Group (from Doerig 1991, fig. 13)



Figure 11 Hydria, 420 BC, Otago Museum, Dunedin, inv. E48.266 (from Doerig 1991, fig. 14)



Figure 12 Mirror, from Bolsena, British Museum, London, GR 1873.8-20.105 (from de Grummond 2006, fig. II.5)