

Zeitschrift: Cahiers d'archéologie romande
Herausgeber: Bibliothèque Historique Vaudoise
Band: 17 (1979)

Artikel: Some late Etruscan mirrors in the Thorvaldsen Museum
Autor: Melander, Torben
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-835586>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

Download PDF: 06.05.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

Some Late Etruscan Mirrors in the Thorvaldsen Museum

Torben MELANDER

The Etruscan mirrors discussed in the following are to be found in the Antique Collection at the Thorvaldsen Museum. A short introduction to this the third and smallest of the Antique Collections in Copenhagen would be appropriate at this point and will contribute to an understanding of the mirrors that we shall be considering.

Although the Collection with its approximately 8,000 objects is small, it is by no means unimportant. The objects were collected entirely in the first half of the 19th century and, except for part of the collection of coins, exclusively by Thorvaldsen himself during his long stay in Rome from 1797 to 1838.

As is the case with other Antique Collections formed during this early period in the history of Museums of Antiquity, we know practically nothing about where and when the individual pieces were found. As regards the overwhelming majority of them, all we know for certain is that they were all brought to Copenhagen together on Thorvaldsen's final departure from Rome and were then housed in the museum that was built for his works and collections¹.

This event, Thorvaldsen's homecoming and the transport of his works through town, was depicted in monumental murals on the outside walls of the Museum. The frieze derives its inspiration equally from the Parthenon frieze, historical roman reliefs² and Thorvaldsen's own Alexander Frieze³.

Among the works being borne in triumph into the Museum can also be seen a couple of antique objects (*pl. 97, fig. 1*). The section of the frieze reproduced here shows, though very summarily, one of the vases in the Thorvaldsen's collection⁴. Greek vases were not an unusual theme in the painting of the period 1750-1850. The subject has been treated in two very interesting articles by A. Greifenhagen, in which it is put into its cultural-historical context⁵. In this connection it is of particular interest to note that in the Thorvaldsen frieze the vases are not merely there to express the portrayed figures', admittedly, praiseworthy interest in antiquity or to fulfil some other secondary function in the composition; they are the main subject in the representation on an equal footing with the other works of art depicted in the frieze. It is the painting of antiquity itself that is here being borne in triumph. The dominant colour scheme of the frieze, light figures on a dark background is also undoubtedly inspired by Attic red-figure vase-painting.

With its total of 30 bronze mirrors with handles⁶ Thorvaldsen's collection reflects the interest of the early 19th century in Etruscan mirrors. In the beginning of the 19th century the famous Florentine scholar of Antiquity F. Inghirami was already collecting material for a corpus of Etruscan mirrors, which he was among the first to recognize as mirrors rather than paterae, as they had previously been identified⁷. In 1828 this material was handed over to Eduard Gerhard; the first volume of his work *Etruskische Spiegel* (published 1840-43) included a number of Thorvaldsen's mirrors. These mirrors with those of Thorvaldsen's mirrors that Gerhard published later had already been drawn while the collection was still in Rome⁸. Letters and biographies show clearly how great an attraction Thorvaldsen's collection in his home in Casa Butto was in early 19th century Rome⁹.

As regards the origin of Thorvaldsen's mirrors we can be reasonably certain that they were all acquired, directly or indirectly, from the excavations of the Etruscan cemeteries in the 1820s and 1830s. The mere fact that as opposed to other kinds of Etruscan bronzes the mirrors had a limited geographical distribution is evidence of this¹⁰. Furthermore Thorvaldsen was in close

contact with these excavations both as a recognized collector¹¹ and as Artistic Secretary of the Istituto di corrispondenza Archeologica founded in 1828¹².

The first of Thorvaldsen's mirrors reproduced here (*pl. 97, fig. 2*) is directly connected with the widespread interest in mirrors of the period and casts light on a phenomenon that is an inseparable companion of collector's mania—forgery¹³ or, as here, partial forgery. The mirror itself¹⁴ is antique, a 5th century piece of work, but the engraved representation of the making of the Trojan horse is copied from a late-Etruscan mirror that was formerly to be found in the Cabinet de l'Abbaye de Sainte-Geneviève and after 1797 in the Cabinet des Médailles in Paris¹⁵. It would be nice if modern forgers produced just as transparent fakes as this, on which the old patina was merely removed from the middle of the back of the mirror before the engraving was carried out. Forgers of antiquities have unfortunately become more skilled since then. The mirror in question shows with all possible clarity what it was that primarily interested collectors of mirrors: engraved representations preferably accompanied by inscriptions. Then and now a favoured playground for that inseparable companion of Etruscology—Etruscomania.

Etruscan or, more precisely, Central Italian mirrors present a number of research problems, of which the following three are among the most important:

1) Classification according to workshop and craftsman.

2) The use of the mirrors. A: toilet objects for everyday use, perhaps produced as wedding presents or for other memorable occasion; or B: primarily produced as grave goods with suitable burial motifs.

3) The significance of the motifs as the bearer of a specifically Central Italian theme, perhaps the Italization of a theme borrowed from outside, and its importance for the forming of the special Roman idiom. As personal property the mirrors could, like the glyptics, be expected to offer more than just slavish imitation.

Our discussion of this complex of problems and the solutions we shall suggest to some of them will be based on selected Thorvaldsen mirrors.

Despite the poor state of preservation of the mirror (*pl. 97, fig. 3*) the main outlines of the figures on it are relatively easy to identify¹⁶. The attached drawing by Gerhard (*pl. 98, fig. 4*) is intended as an aid to decipherment¹⁷. On rocky ground, from which large lotuses rise, stands (left) a halfnaked Lasa turning towards a warrior clad in chlamys and shoes; the warrior is supporting himself on a spear and a shield and is wearing a helmet. Behind the warrior is Turms, the Etruscan Hermes, wearing a chlamys and winged petasos. The figure is leaning on a kerykeion. Above the space between the warrior and Turms is a recumbent half-moon.

The mirror can be dated to about 300 B.C. by a comparison with a stylistically related mirror found a few years ago in a grave (grave G) in the cemetery at Ischia di Castro in the Province of Viterbo. The mirror has now been stolen from the local museum¹⁸.

The Lasa figure's function in the totality depends on one's interpretation of the not clearly identifiable objects she is holding. Early analyses of the mirror¹⁹ reveal wide differences of opinion regarding the objects. The object in the raised left hand has been taken as a bolt (Gerhard), an alabastron (Müller) and a mirror (Rathgeber), while the object in the lowered right hand has been taken as a style (Gerhard) and a hammer (Müller). All are agreed on seeing a Goddess of Destiny in the figure. E. Vetter²⁰ designated her Atropos after the middle figure Athrpa on a mirror in Berlin²¹. The object in the left hand cannot be taken for a bolt simply because of its form; nor can it be an alabastron, at least not without disastrous consequences for the contents of the bottle, as the opening would be pointing downwards. The object is, however, convincing enough as a mirror seen in profile²². What Müller took to be the head of a hammer in relation to the object in the figure's right hand is more probably a part of the cloak. Once this misunderstanding has been removed, it is easy to see the object as a perfume staff²³, and thus functionally related to the mirror. Lasa is then holding up a mirror for the warrior after having anointed him with fragrant oil²⁴.

Even if the scene on the mirror is interpreted as representing a warrior (Achilles?) being led to Leuke by Hermes Psychopompos²⁵ to be received by Lasa, the interpretation need not imply that this and other mirrors with correspondingly Hadean scenes have been specially produced as grave goods, as has often been maintained even in recent literature²⁶. I am rather inclined to see the mirror decoration as an attempt at expressing here in this life a sense of the calm, transfigured joy that was associated with Elysium.

It is interesting here to note that the mirror itself contains evidence of its having been in use before it was laid in the grave. There is a break at its weakest point at the top of the handle. The break was repaired in antiquity, and a new peg was riveted to the plate as a replacement for the

old one, which had originally been cast of the same piece of bronze as the plate. The repair was, furthermore, carried out so carefully that the position of the two top rivets corresponds precisely with that of the eyes in the engraved volute motif on the front of the mirror. This is another piece of evidence in support of the argument that the mirror was intended for use in a context in which such care would be appreciated²⁷.

The next Thorvaldsen mirror (*pl. 98, fig. 5*)²⁸ leads us to the heart of our subject, even though it is probably not much later than the previous mirror. It too was repaired in antiquity, as can be seen from the rivets on the talon²⁹. The mirror belongs to a group that was first put together by G. A. Mansuelli under the title "Maestro dei Dioscuri affrontati (?)"³⁰. The group was later rearranged and considerably expanded and called The San Francisco Group by M. A. Del Chiaro³¹. Within Del Chiaro's large group the figures on the mirror are closely comparable to the figures on a mirror in San Francisco and a mirror in Cairo, which Del Chiaro has already assigned to the same craftsman, the San Francisco Master and dated to the early 3rd century³². It is directly apparent that the same hand was involved in connection with Thorvaldsen's mirror. The mirror is also interesting in its combination of features that appear in isolation on other mirrors: the pointing gesture of one of the youths (usually called Dioscuri) and the flower, which is here brought by an owl seen hovering with outspread wings above the heads of the two youths. Del Chiaro has tried to explain the gesture and the flower as respectively a "forgotten spear" and a distorted astral motif, the latter in connection with the San Francisco Master's Cairo mirror³³. The Thorvaldsen mirror opens the way for the quite different interpretation that with his gesture the youth is drawing attention to the propitious sign that is being brought to the youths by the owl³⁴.

Our next mirror (*pl. 98, fig. 6*) is one of the best preserved in the Thorvaldsen Collection³⁵. Sibylle Haynes has placed the mirror in a group that she has designated "Grossformatiger, grossfiguriger" and dated to the third century B.C. on the basis of a few known grave contexts³⁶.

The wealth of detail in the architecture in the background has made this mirror the subject of many purely architectural discussions³⁷. I shall return to the architecture later but would first like to look at the figures in the foreground. Here in the presence of Athena (left) and a robed youth (right) a youth is putting on his armour. The low pillar in the middleground with the helmet on top can be taken to be a votive offering. This taken together with the temple architecture in the background might suggest that the scene is taking place in a temenos as is the case with a Cassandra scene on another Etruscan mirror now in Newcastle³⁸. It is, however, not difficult to see that there is no sign of a helmet among the pieces of armour, which either have already been handed to the youth or which the woman on the right is handing to him. This makes it rather more probable that the helmet on the top of the column is a part of the armour, which reduces the function of the column to that of an exhibit stand, suggesting no particular locality. It does not seem likely that the helmet, the most eye-catching piece, should be missing, and it is psychologically convincing that the youth took possession of his helmet and shield first; the latter can be seen behind him and has thus already been handed over although both shield and helmet are among the last things that he would actually put on.

Athena's presence assures us of the heroic content of the subject. Among heroic arming-scenes that of Thetis helping Achilles to arm on the shore at Ilion is the arming-scene par excellence in the art of antiquity, and indeed the scene on the mirror has long been interpreted in this way³⁹. Athena's presence at this occasion is, however, an inescapable problem, as it is not in accordance with the *Iliad* (19, 1-39). Nor, of course, is the facade of the temple in the background either. These incongruities could be explained by reference to the Etruscans' alleged tendency to mix up motifs, which can at a most favourable interpretation be taken as decorative compositions void of mythical content. We should be more careful about thus scrapping the Etruscan material and instead remember how little of the literature of antiquity has been handed down to us; the implication is, of course, that many variants may have been lost. We should also consider the fact that the Etruscans must have had their own variations on well-known themes. Finally there are the admittedly few cases in which Etruscan art is alone in representing a myth, known from literature, but of which we know no Greek pictorial presentations⁴⁰. As regards the mirror under discussion it so happens that there is a single Greek example of the variant showing Athena to be present: an Attic, early classical red-figured pelike in London⁴¹. The background architecture can, of course, be taken as merely decorative. In Sibylle Haynes' above-mentioned "Grossformatiger, grossfiguriger" group of mirrors this kind of background is not unusual, and it may well be that it should be interpreted according to the situation depicted, in this case as Achilles' camp in the distance⁴².

There is only one example (*pl. 99, fig. 7*) of the special Prenestian group of mirrors⁴³ in the Thorvaldsen Collection, a Hercules mirror⁴⁴, which Matthies placed in one group Ela and

ascribed to the late 4th century B.C.⁴⁵. Parallels to the Hercules represented here, with the same lightly sketched musculature, are to be found in Apulian vase painting⁴⁶. With its four representations of Hercules⁴⁷ out of a total of seven mirrors group Ela seems to have concentrated on this motif.

There are two particularly noteworthy points about the representation: one is the marked frontality of the figure, and the other—the demonstrative positioning of the club on the rock to the right of the figure. The frontality is strongly reminiscent of sculpture, and the comparison with South Italian vase painting is supported by the fact that on coins from Heraclea in Lucania (*pl. 99, fig. 8 and 9*) we find the same type of Hercules represented with more or less the same attributes⁴⁸. It is highly conceivable that both coins and mirror were inspired by a monumental sculpture⁴⁹.

Certain objects, which at first sight appear to be floating freely in the air, seem to constitute a further parallel between coins (*pl. 99, fig. 8*) and mirror. On the coin there is a cup; on the mirror a quiver on a strap. But while the cup on the coin is really isolated, the positioning of the quiver becomes meaningful when we see it in the context of the decoration of the right-hand side of the mirror. Hercules is not merely leaning on the club—he seems rather to be demonstrating it. The outline at the bottom, partly between Hercules' legs, seems at first glance to be the end of the rock. Closer inspection, however, reveals that with its pointed end and regularly curved side, it is markedly different from the amorphous rock above. As with other representations of Hercules on Etruscan mirrors the object can be taken to be a pointed amphora, whence it follows that the scene, as in the parallel cases, shows Hercules striking water from a rock⁵⁰. The amphora symbolizes the water springing forth. Now the undulating object cutting across the border can be identified as a snake, a *genius loci*. The amphoriskos in Hercules' right hand also becomes meaningful in this context, as does the positioning of the quiver, which fully in accordance with the tradition Hercules has put down while carrying out his deed.

A mirror that was formerly to be found in Collegio Romano and whose location now seems to be unknown⁵¹ has recently been identified by M. A. Del Chiaro as the product of a mirror workshop in Cerveteri. Del Chiaro bases his arguments on parallels to the figure decoration in Caeretan red-figured pottery⁵². If Del Chiaro's identification is right it has disturbing consequences for the ascription of Thorvaldsen's Hercules mirror and the workshop group (Ela), in which it is placed. Matthies⁵³ has already placed the Collegio Romano mirror as number 3 in the related EII group of Prenestian mirrors. As is the case with Matthies' other groups, this group is based on the incidence of Latin inscriptions (the EII 1 mirror is identical with the well-known De Vincam Ted/Opeinor inscribed mirror⁵⁴ and cistae found in Preneste. As Del Chiaro does not seem to have been aware of this connection, this "new ascription" represents only an apparent weakening of the mirror ascriptions treated here. At any rate it would need extremely convincing arguments to refute what has been accepted as the ABC of landscape ascription.—Nevertheless it is interesting to see a connection between the Caeretan production of vases and the Latin production of bronzes, in which the inspiration seems to have come from the bronzes. Earlier it had gone the other way, from north to south⁵⁵.

In our discussion of these Central Italian mirrors we have concerned ourselves with such problems as: the use of the mirrors—whether they were produced for daily use or as grave goods; the interpretation of the pictorial content, which led to the conclusion that we should accept the content on Etruscan rather than Greek premises; and finally the tracing of the motifs from the Southern Italian and especially the Apulian area. All this is in my opinion the necessary background for our being able to understand the environment in which a late-Republican/early-Imperial art was to coin its particular idiom.

With the last two mirrors I shall be postulating rather than actually arguing for the existence of this connection. The Central Italian, Hellenistic material lacks basic modern research before it can cast more light on the question of the influence of Central Italy on characteristic features of the later Empire⁵⁶.

The two mirrors (*pl. 99, fig. 10 and 11*) can be dated to the 3rd century and the first half of the 3rd century respectively on the basis of parallel grave finds⁵⁷. They represent two winged beings, of which the first (*pl. 99, fig. 10*) can be directly identified as a Lasa, while the aegis, helmet and shield of the other being (*pl. 99, fig. 11*) are characteristic attributes of Minerva. G. Körte has indeed taken the Promachos motif of this and other related Minerva mirrors at face value: Athena the giantslayer⁵⁸. The undeniably poorly preserved engraving on the Thorvaldsen mirror shows the right hand facing downwards and open, a position that corresponds to that of the Lasa figures, which are often represented with a flower in their hand⁵⁹. There is in fact no reason to question R. Enking's⁶⁰ earlier emphasis on the connection between the Lasa and Minerva figures as messengers and protectors of the world of women in which Athena's warlike aspect is merely an external and well-known manifestation borrowed from Greek art. To

R. Enking's exposition it only remains to add that it might be argued from the evidence of the Etruscan mirrors that Lasa's sphere of activity was expanded to include the world of men⁶¹.

The question arises as to whether there is a connection between this re-interpretative demonization of the Greek divinities and the Roman Imperial family's direct use of divine figures without mythical distance.

The decoration of the relief on the armour of the Prima Porta statue is one of many examples of this lack of distance in Augustan art⁶². Among the figures in the ornamentation of the relief, Aurora (*pl. 100, fig. 12*) with the vessel of dew (or simply the personification of dew)⁶³ is somehow related to the Lasa figures of the mirrors—but only as regards content, of course.

As regards style and type the figure has its origins elsewhere. A close, contemporary parallel to Aurora/The Dew Goddess is the Victoria relief in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek; its relationship to Augustus's Parthian arch in the Forum Romanum was first recognized by E. Paribeni⁶⁴. There is yet another parallel in Copenhagen (*pl. 100, fig. 13*), a bronze relief, representing a hovering Victoria or Nike, depending on whether the bronze is taken to be Roman or Greek⁶⁵. A comparison between the Thorvaldsen relief and the second century B.C. terracotta figurines from a grave at SS Francesco e Paolo in Taranto⁶⁶ should make it apparent that the inspiration for both Aurora/The Dew Goddess and the Victoria relief from the Parthian arch is Greek and, be it noted, Southern Italian, Tarentine. It is, then, not inspired by the art of the Parthenon as Erika Simon suggests⁶⁷.

That the Thorvaldsen bronze is also related to the Tarentine Nike statue that Octavius had erected in the Curia in 29 B.C. can be seen from a comparison with the coins minted in honour of the victory at Actium, since it is thought that these coins represent the Victoria in the Curia⁶⁸.

I began by speaking of Greek vases on neo-classical monuments. And the interest of neoclassicism in Greek vase painting has often been considered the cause of the change in drawing styles from the 18th to the 19th century, when a growing concentration on contours makes itself felt. There is no doubt that vase painting may have been the inspiration here, but it may well be that it came to an even greater degree from some of the engraved late-Etruscan mirrors and among these, perhaps, first and foremost from the Lasa mirrors.

A comparison of yet another Lasa mirror in the Thorvaldsen Museum (*pl. 100, fig. 14*)⁶⁹ with Thorvaldsen's first, loosely sketched study for the Baptismal Angel in the Church of Our Lady in Copenhagen (*pl. 100, fig. 15*)⁷⁰ reveals a striking similarity. It is unlikely that Thorvaldsen shared his archaeologist friends' interest in interpreting the content of the "mysterious mirrors". When he was buying Etruscan mirrors it was, as always, the beauty of things that was important for him.

Notes

I wish to express my gratitude to the Ny Carlsberg Foundation for the financial support which made possible my participation in the Bronze Colloquium in Lausanne from the 8th to the 13th of May 1978.

My Danish manuscript was translated into English by John Kendal.

¹ On Thorvaldsen's Antique Collection in Rome see P. Fossing, *Cat. of Gems* (1929) 13-17; D. Helsted, Thorvaldsen as a Collector, *Apollo* 96, Sept. 1972, 228-34.

² The inspiration from Roman reliefs is demonstrated by M. Gjødesen in an unpublished part of a Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek Lecture: Historical Reliefs at the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek.

³ Executed for the decoration of an apartment in the Quirinal Palace in connection with Napoleon's expected arrival in Rome in 1812. The most recent discussion of the frieze is by Uwe Westfeling, in: Gerhard Bott, *Thorvaldsen, Untersuchungen* (Kölner Berichte zur Kunstgeschichte 1977) 285-87.

⁴ Inv. Th. Mus. H552. L. Müller, *Musée-Thorvaldsen* 3, 2 (1847) 62 cat. 52. The vase will be published in the forthcoming CVA Thorvaldsen Museum 1.

⁵ A. Greifenhagen, Griechische Vasen auf Bildnissen, *NAWG* 1939, 199f.; *id.*, Nachklänge, *JBerIM* 5, 1963, 84f.

⁶ Müller *op. c.* 169f. cat. 150-179.

⁷ E. Gerhard, *Metallspiegel*, Berl. Akad. (1836) 324 with n. 2.

⁸ Gerhard *l. c.*; E. Gerhard, *Etruskische Spiegel* 3 (1863) 10 (introduction).

⁹ Helsted *l. c.* (*supra* n. 1).

¹⁰ J. G. Szilagyi, *AAnthung* 10, 1962, 260 n. 35 gives a survey of mirror finds outside Italy.

¹¹ Helsted *l. c.*

- ¹² W. Schiering, in: U. Hausmann, *Handbuch der Archäologie, Allgemeine Grundlagen* (1969) 45.
- ¹³ H. Brunn, *Boll. dell'Istituto* 1859, 111-112 on a workshop in Chiusi district that fabricated mirror forgeries.
- ¹⁴ Inv. Th. Mus. H2175. Diam. 13,4 cm. For the form of the mirror, see I. Mayer-Prokop, *Etruskische Griffspiegel, MDAI(R)* 13, Ergh. 1967, 114-15.—Here, as for the mirrors mentioned below, only the relevant lit. will be cited. For a more exhaustive bibliography and commentary reference can be made to the forthcoming *Catalogue of the Thorvaldsen Collection of Antique Bronzes*.
- ¹⁵ D. Rebuffat-Emmanuel, *Le miroir étrusque d'après la Collection du Cabinet des Médailles* (1973) cat. 51 (252f.).
- ¹⁶ Inv. Th. Mus. H2168. Diam. 18,2 cm.
- ¹⁷ Gerhard *op. c.* 2 (1845 [*supra* n. 8]) pl. 230.
- ¹⁸ R. Lambrechts, *BIBR* 39, 1968, 5f. The stylistic relations of the Thorvaldsen mirror are noted on p. 16 n. 5. (The Castro mirror now stolen from the local museum see L. Bonfante, *SE* 45, 1977, 167 n. 82).
- ¹⁹ Gerhard *op. c.* 2, pl. 230; *id.*, *op. c.* 3 (*supra* n. 8) 216-17; Müller *op. c.* (*supra* n. 4) 175 cat. 168; G. Rathgeber, *Archäologischen Schriften* (1857) 289 cat. 12.
- ²⁰ *RE* 2, Rh. 14 col. 1396; thus already Rathgeber *op. c.*
- ²¹ K. Schefold, *Die Griechen und ihre Nachbarn* (1967) pl. 420.
- ²² For representations of mirrors on Etruscan mirrors see Bonfante *l. c.* (*supra* n. 18) 151 n. 4, 164-65.
- ²³ D.K. Hill, *Archaeology* 18, 1965, 187f.; C. Friederichs had already explained the function of the staff in: *Berlins Antike Bildwerke* 2 (1871) 61-62, cat. 73-78.
- ²⁴ For cosmetic scenes on Etruscan mirrors in connection with men or, perhaps, male divinities, see Gerhard *op. c.* 1-4 (1840-1867 [*supra* n. 8]) pl. 82, 281, 389; Gerhard *op. c.* 5, bearbeitet von A. Klügmann und G. Körte (1884-1897) pl. 28 (Atunis); see also D. von Bothmer, *Ancient Art from New York Private Coll.* (1957) cat. 157.
- ²⁵ For "Hermes Psychopompos" on Etruscan mirrors, see Gerhard *op. c.* 5, 14 n. 1; Lambrechts *l. c.* (*supra* n. 18) 25.
- ²⁶ Mayer-Prokop *op. c.* (*supra* n. 14) 120-22; see also O.W. von Vacano, *Gnomon* 43, 1971, 294.
- ²⁷ For Etruscan mirrors which similarly seem to have been repaired in antiquity, see Gerhard *op. c.* 1-4, pl. 69; 254, 2; 288, 1; 338, 2; 391, 2-3; 420, 1; and Gerhard *op. c.* 5, pl. 7,2; 33; 130, 1-2; 159. See also the following mirror (*pl. 98, fig. 5*).—It is well known that the care shown in connection with the Thorvaldsen mirror inv. H2168 was not always the rule—even at the first mounting. As regards the Etruscan context, see T. Dohrn, *Die Ficoronische Ciste* (1972) 7 with n. 3, 14.
- ²⁸ Inv. Th. Mus. H2158. Diam. 15,0 cm.
- ²⁹ The substituted handle is an Etruscan handle, fitted in modern times. As will appear from the parallels mentioned below, the mirror originally had a peg that could fit into a handle made of different material.
- ³⁰ *SE* 19, 1946-47, 55.
- ³¹ *AJA* 59, 1955, 281-82. More recent literature J. G. Szilagyi *l. c.* (*supra* n. 10) 250f.; M. Bizzari, in: *Hommages M. Renard (Coll. Latomus* 103, 1969) 55-58; Rebuffat-Emmanuel *op. c.* (*supra* n. 15) 502f.
- ³² *L. c.* (*supra* n. 31) 279-80, pl. 78,2 & 79,3. For dating, see *l. c.* 285-86.
- ³³ *L. c.* (*supra* n. 31) 277-78, 279, 283.
- ³⁴ Cf. a mirror with a Judgement of Paris scene (Gerhard *op. c.* 2 [*supra* n. 17] pl. 184), on which there is a similar representation of an owl on the talon of the mirror; see also Gerhard *op. c.* 5 (*supra* n. 24) pl. 28.
- ³⁵ Inv. Th. Mus. H2170. Diam. 14,8 cm.
- ³⁶ *MDAI* 6, 1953, 30. For dating, see 36-37 with n. 68.
- ³⁷ Most recently A. Ciasco, *Il Capitello detto Eolico* (1962) 48 cat. 23 pl. 21,2.
- ³⁸ Gerhard *op. c.* 4 (*supra* n. 24) pl. 400, 2; B.B. Shefton, *AR* 1969-70, 57 cat. 8.
- ³⁹ Gerhard *op. c.* 2, pl. 228; *id.*, *op. c.* 3, 215; Müller *op. c.* (*supra* n. 4) 176 cat. 170; W.H. Roscher, *Myth. Lex.* 5, 799; see also Rebuffat-Emmanuel *op. c.* (*supra* n. 15) 549-50.
- ⁴⁰ For example J.D. Beazley, *JHS* 69, 1949, 16 (fig. 21).
- ⁴¹ K. Friis Johansen, *The Iliad* (1967) 126, 260 cat. 14p.
- ⁴² The late O. Vessberg, *BMNE* 4, 1964, 62, thought that the background architecture was inspired by the theatre.—In later Greek art the motif of the arming of Achilles was frequently represented with a procession of nymphs over the sea on hippocamps and other fabulous sea-animals. In his article "Achilleus in der unteritalischen Vasenmalerei", *BJ* 161, 1961, 221-23, K. Schauenburg mentions under "Bewaffnungs" scenes only one single example in which Achilles himself appears. But see also A.D. Trendall, *The Red-Figured Vases of Luc., Camp., and Sic.* (1967) 252 cat. 173.
- ⁴³ G. Matthies, *Die Praenestinsche Spiegel, Ein Beitrag zur italischen Kunst und Kulturgeschichte* (1912); Rebuffat-Emmanuel *op. c.* (*supra* n. 15) *passim*.
- ⁴⁴ Inv. Th. Mus. H2157. Diam. 13,6 cm.
- ⁴⁵ Matthies *op. c.* 89-90, group Ela 3.
- ⁴⁶ H. Sichtermann, *Griechische Vasen in Unteritalien* (1966) pl. 117, K71 (détaille).
- ⁴⁷ Matthies Ela1=Gerhard *op. c.* 4, pl. 343; Ela3=The Thorvaldsen mirror; Ela4=Gerhard *op. c.* 2, pl. 51; Ela5=Gerhard *op. c.* 4, pl. 342.
- ⁴⁸ L. Müller, *Musée de Thorvaldsen* 3, 4 (1851) 155 cat. 1085, 1086.
- ⁴⁹ See also G. Horster, *Statuen auf Gemmen* (1970) 15-17.
- ⁵⁰ R. Stiglitz, *JAEI* 44, 1959, 128-31. See also P. Zazoff, *Etruskische Skarabäen* (1968) 81, 89-90, 123, 124. See furthermore the ivory plaquette from Preneste, which is also interesting in this connection *AJA* 68, 1964, pl. 15, 12; the suggested dating (*l. c.* 40-41) of approx. 100 B.C. is probably too late.
- ⁵¹ Gerhard *op. c.* 1 (*supra* n. 24) pl. 40.

- ⁵² *AJA* 75, 1971, 85-86; M.A. Del Chiaro, *Etruscan Red-Figured Vase-Painting at Caere* (1974) 97-98.
- ⁵³ Matthies *op. c.* (*supra* n. 43) 64, 92-94.
- ⁵⁴ Beazley *l. c.* (*supra* n. 40) 13 fig. 17.
- ⁵⁵ P.J. Riis, *Tyrrhenika* (1941) 59.—Two of Matthies' Prenestian mirrors, BII10 and DII2 are known to have been found in Cerveteri. See the list of finds Matthies *op. c.* 61-64. Matthies lists 11 mirrors of provenance other than Palestrina as against 63 from Palestrina. For 42 no provenance is given.
- ⁵⁶ See now P. Zanker, Einleitung, in: P. Zanker (ed.), *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien, Kolloquium in Göttingen 5 bis 9 Juni 1974* (1976).
- ⁵⁷ *Pl.* 99, fig. 10, inv. Th. Mus. H2152. Diam. 12,0 cm. Cf. the contexts of the Lasa mirror finds from the Portone Necropolis, Volterra (*SE* 25, 1957, 369, Bronze cat. 1 fig. 4; 380, Bronze cat. 5 fig. 15) and the Lasa mirror from a grave at Papena, Siena (*NSA* 1967, 38-40 cat. 36 fig. 10).—*Pl.* 99, fig. 11, inv. Th. Mus. H2153. Diam. 14,7 cm. Gerhard *op. c.* 1, pl. 36, 4. Cf. the newly found mirror by the same master from the San Giuliano Necropolis, Viterbo (*NSA* 1963, 55 cat. 6 fig. 58; *Repertorio delle opere d'arte trafugate in Italia* 3 [1966] 53 fig. 67).
- ⁵⁸ Gerhard *op. c.* 5 (*supra* n. 24) 13 (pl. 7,2).
- ⁵⁹ The Minerva figure with a flower in her hand but without a shield is found transferred to the Turan toilet scene on the recently published mirror in Indiana, Bonfante *l. c.* (*supra* n. 18) pl. 21, 23. Because of the shape of the object in Minerva's hand Bonfante presumes it to be a fig., p. 149.
- ⁶⁰ *MDAI(R)* 57, 1942, 13-14; *JDAI* 59-60, 1944-45, 120-21.—See also A. Rallo, *Lasa* (1974). For the presumably earliest Lasa representation on the handle attachment of a so-called Schnabelkanne, see U. Liepmann, *Forsch. u. Berichte* 8, 1967, 31-32.
- ⁶¹ Cf. the discussion above in connection with the mirror *pl.* 97, fig. 3 and the mirrors cited in n. 24 in relation to the world of men.
- ⁶² W. Helbig, *Führer*⁴ 1 (1963) 411 (H. v. Heintze).
- ⁶³ E. Simon, *Der Augustus von Prima Porta (Opus Nobile* 13, 1959) 11 and 19; Helbig *l. c.* (*supra* n. 62) 315.—The armour detail shown here is reproduced from Simon *op. c.* pl. 7.
- ⁶⁴ I. N. 842. F. Poulsen, *Cat. of Ancient Sculpture* (1951) 511. Most recently discussed by P. Zanker, *Forum Romanum* (1972) 16 pl. 19.
- ⁶⁵ Inv. Th. Mus. H2060. Preserved height 14,5 cm; preserved wing span 9,9 cm. Müller *op. c.* (*supra* n. 4) 163 cat. 60.
- ⁶⁶ E. Langlotz, *Kunst d. Westgriechen* (1963) pl. 146-7.
- ⁶⁷ Simon *op. c.* (*supra* n. 63) 19.
- ⁶⁸ Zanker *op. c.* (*supra* n. 64) 9-11, pl. 12, 1-3.
- ⁶⁹ Inv. Th. Mus. H2151. Diam. 11,9 cm.
- ⁷⁰ The Thorvaldsen Museum A 10, 270. Pen, 11,6×14,3 cm. D. Helsted, Bertel Thorvaldsen's Drawings, *The Connoisseur* Febr. 1962, 81, fig. 8 (p. 79).

List of illustrations

- Pl.* 97, fig. 1: Detail of the murals on the Thorvaldsen Museum.
- Pl.* 97, fig. 2: Etruscan mirror. The Thorvaldsen Museum inv. H2175.
- Pl.* 97, fig. 3: Etruscan mirror. The Thorvaldsen Museum inv. H2168.
- Pl.* 98, fig. 4: The Thorvaldsen Museum inv. H2168. After Gerhard.
- Pl.* 98, fig. 5: Etruscan mirror. The Thorvaldsen Museum inv. H2158.
- Pl.* 98, fig. 6: Etruscan mirror. The Thorvaldsen Museum inv. H2170.
- Pl.* 99, fig. 7: Prenestian mirror. The Thorvaldsen Museum inv. H2157.
- Pl.* 99, fig. 8: Lucanian silver drachme. The Thorvaldsen Museum inv. K1348.
- Pl.* 99, fig. 9: Lucanian silver drachme. The Thorvaldsen Museum inv. K1347.
- Pl.* 99, fig. 10: Etruscan Mirror. The Thorvaldsen Museum inv. H2151.
- Pl.* 99, fig. 11: Etruscan mirror. The Thorvaldsen Museum inv. H2153.
- Pl.* 100, fig. 12: Statue of Augustus, from Prima Porta, detail of the cuirass. The Vatican inv. 2290.
- Pl.* 100, fig. 13: Nike. Bronze relief. The Thorvaldsen Museum inv. H2160.
- Pl.* 100, fig. 14: Etruscan mirror. The Thorvaldsen Museum inv. H2151.
- Pl.* 100, fig. 15: A. Thorvaldsen, sketch for the Baptismal Angel in the Church of Our Lady, Copenhagen. Sepia. The Thorvaldsen Museum A10, 270.

