This paper focuses on the most characteristic decorative motif to be found on the so-called ‘Phoenician’ jugs, namely the inverted palmette attachment, placed at the lower end of the handle. Firstly, it reviews the origin, evolution and various elaborations of the palmette as an autonomous ornament within the Mediterranean. To that purpose, it will discuss this motif from a morphological and a typological perspective, by analyzing the similarities and the differences detectable in both the metal and clay jugs (the iconography). Building on this analysis, it will re-examine the debate on the provenance and the production of ‘Phoenician’ jugs excavated in the central and western Mediterranean (the context). Finally, it will investigate, against the framework of their findspots, the symbolic connotations apropos the several meanings and functions that this group of jugs took on (the iconology).

**Origin and development of the ornamental motif**

The palmette is one of the most popular decorative motifs in the whole Mediterranean area and in the Middle East during the first half of the 1st millennium BC; it probably was just as commonly seen on the precious and famous Phoenician textiles. In academic literature the motif receives one among the several following definitions: a palm tree, a papyrus or a lotus flower. But in fact it is a combination of all these elements. All the components are related to the one vital feature that palm trees, lotus and papyrus flowers share: in desert environments they represent the oasis, where it is possible to find water and shade and the date palms symbolise the agricultural abundance. The device itself originates from the simplification of the Sacred Tree, or better said, of the Tree of Life that joins male and female elements, so symbolising their vital strength both in Near Eastern cultures and in Minoan-Mycenaean tradition. In this perspective, B.B. Shefton’s definition of it as the Flower of Paradise, or a ‘court style’ Phoenician ornament, seems to be compelling. The palmette motif, as we know it, derives most directly from Egyptian models of the New Kingdom (18th dynasty); its assimilation along the Palestinian and Cypriote coasts took place at the end of the 2nd millennium BC thanks to Canaanite artisans.

The prototypes of this motif can be traced on some so-called Proto-Aeolic capitals in the form of papyrus flowers from the Phoenician-Palestinian area, Megiddo, Samaria, Jerusalem and on contemporary ivories from Megiddo, Samaria and Lachish, where the Tree of Life and palmette are framed by cup-spirals; a golden cup and a part of an ivory table from Ras Shamra-Ugarit show
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1 I would like to thank the Italian School of Archaeology at Athens and its director Emanuele Greco for the opportunity to delve more deeply into this topic. I have also to thank all the scholars and post graduate students I have met there and the anonymous reviewers of the *Annuario* for their useful remarks on an early draft of the article. Obviously I am solely responsible of the ideas here expressed and all responsibility for mistakes, inaccuracies or omissions remains mine.

2 Tallis in *Metropolitan* 2014, 73-4, n° 22: relief of Ashurbanipal showing a banquet in a garden of palm trees, pines and vines where an Assyrian king and queen are dining: the former holds a lotus flower in his left hand.

3 *Petit* 2011, 22-23, 33.

4 *Barnett* 1957, 138-141; *Kourou* 2001 for its assimilation in Greek art and below for other selected bibliography.

5 *Shefton* 1989, 97.

6 Cf. the paintings of the frescoes in Tell-el-Amarna palace and on the bed of Tutankhamun’s tomb (*Pinza* 1915, 432, fig. 385; *Grau-Zimmermann* 1978, 178-180).

7 *Ciasca* 1962, 15-17, pls. I-II; *Siegelmann* 1976, 141, fig. 1; *Walcher* 2009, 52-59, pl. 33, 4; about the interpretation of these capitals as votive capitals and not structural ones cf. *Franklin* 2011.

8 *Barnett* 1982, pll. 18b-c (Megiddo), 21d (Lachish); *Jiménez Ávila* 2002, 81-83.
contemporarily the same motives too\(^9\). These motives speedily reached the Cypriote coast, where two palmette-shaped gold pendants with loops for suspension and a gold plaque with sphinxes symmetrically arranged on both sides of a Sacred Tree tipped with palmettes were founded in Enkomi \(^10\). A little later the Levantine motif of the Sacred Tree reached Euboea, as two imported bronze bowls deposited around 900 BC at Lefkandi indicate\(^11\).

The early adaptation of a floral motif on the handle took also place in the same way in Egypt, where modelled lotus flowers appear at the tip of the handle in a series of Egyptian jugs dated to the New Kingdom\(^12\). Jugs of this kind, also found in Crete (Iaeddian Cave, Prinias, Fortetsa, Knosos, Kato Syme), Cyclades (Thera), Peloponnese (Tegea) and in Euboea (Lefkandi)\(^13\), belong to a type labelled by J. Jiménez Ávila ‘Sidone-Villanueva’\(^14\). However complete development of the motif and wide dissemination occurred in the first half of the I millennium.

The Phoenicians appear to have turned the lotus into a palmette in the 8th century BC and transferred it to the base of the handle. This is evident first in the palmette attachment of a bronze handle from Sidon, that we have already quoted, the only one thus far known in the Near East\(^15\), and then on a small ivory jug from the SW palace of Esarhaddon in Nimrud, with a clearly visible triangular base\(^16\) (Fig. 1, 2). The latter, which can be dated to the second half of the 8th century BC\(^17\), is paralleled in other Nimrud ivories from Fort Shalmaneser\(^18\).

\(^9\) Lagarce 1983, 552, pl. XCVIII,1-2.
\(^10\) Gold pendants (inv. MMA cc 0006, Medelhavs Museum, Stockholm, stray find; Åström 1972, 506, n° 2, fig. 65, 33); plaque (French Mission, tomb 2: COURTOIS-Lagarce 1986, 116, pl. XXII, 1).
\(^11\) Aruz in Metropolitan 2014, 118, fig. 3.4.
\(^12\) Barnett 1957, 94.
\(^13\) Matthäus 1985, nn° 531-532, 553; Popham, Lemos 1996, pls. 132, e 143, t. 39.31, oinochoe: pls. 134 e 145, t. 70.18, bowl; Sakellaraki-Sapouna-Sakellaraki 2013, 74-75, pl. 53, nn° 25-26; lastly Matthäus 2014a, 184-191, figs. 1-6 with a complete list of all the finds.
\(^14\) Jiménez Ávila 2002, 52-3, 65.
\(^15\) Culican 1968, 279-280, pl. XIX,1-3: the upper part of the handle is in the form of a lotus flower, but the vase, recalling the Egyptian type of bronze jugs, is probably made up of two or three different vessels.
\(^16\) Barnett 1957, 94, 199, n° S. 108, pl. LV, fig. 1; Freyer-Schauenburg 1966, 95, pl. 27b; Paris 2007, 351, n° 196; cf. also below.
\(^17\) Freyer-Schauenburg 1966, 95-97; Barnett proposes the same date for the ‘Loftus’ group of ivories from Nimrud (before 700 BC), while Culican says that the group cannot be dated exactly (Culican 1968, 280, note 4,9).
\(^18\) Herrmann 1986, pl. 17, nn° 78-79; pl. 49, nn° 223-226; pl. 54, n° 254 (8th century BC); Paris 2007, n° 288, 295, 314; Metropolitan 2014, 74, fig. 2.9: ivory fan handle from Nimrud, north-west palace, well in room NN; about the Nimrud ivories cf. Aruz and de Lapèrouse in the same volume 141-152.
Fig. 2 - throne Γ and bed A from tomb 79 of Salamis - Cyprus
(Karageorghis 1973, pls. A1, B2-4, C1-2, D1, E3)
The fully-formed ornamental motif reached Cyprus from Assyria and Phoenicia at the end of the 8th century BC, as the ivory objects from Salamis tomb 79 clearly show: their Phoenician character is evident, even if the subjects are reminiscent of the Egyptian style19. The motif occurs in the ivory furniture of the tomb, imported from Phoenicia and assembled locally, probably by the same craftsmen who worked in the Nimrud palace20. The plaques of the throne I are decorated in cloisonné with winged sphinxes (Fig. 2a); there are volute palmettes between their legs with long stemmed lotus flowers. In another plaque from the same throne the palmettes and the lotus flowers are parts of an elaborated stylized Sacred Tree, with parallels from Nimrud, Samaria and Arslan Tash21; the beds show palmettes and papyrus flowers on the plaques of the middle frieze22. In both cases the petals are inlaid with small pieces of blue glass with gold overlay, while traces of gold are added to the cloisons borders (Fig. 2b).

In the same way on Cypriote metalworks, all the components of the palmette can be recognized at the tip of the handles of ‘Phoenician’ jugs. However from the beginning of the 7th century BC the motif spread all across the Mediterranean. At that time the palmette was already a frequent and established feature on metal jugs. It remained unchanged through the 7th century BC, even though with regional characterizations23. At this time in Cyprus the motif disappears, only to reappear at the end of the 7th century BC and during the first half of the 6th century BC24. In this period the Proto-Aeolic pilasters from the royal tombs of Tammassos can be dated; the necropolis was excavated in summer 1889 by Max Ohnefalsch-Richter, one of the pioneers of Cypriote archaeology, in the Chomazoudhia area, northeast of the modern village of Politiko25. Here the pillars with Proto-Aeolic capitals made up of double volute and a central triangle flank the gates and the doorways of princely tombs26. It is generally accepted that the motif represents the Tree of Life in the form of date palm27.

Like Cyprus, Carthage also played an important role of transmission in the diffusion of the motif to Italy, the Iberian peninsula and Sardinia as the works of goldsmith28, ivory-carvers29 and bronzesmiths30 all show.

In the following section we will examine how the motif was adopted and reworked in the central and western Mediterranean. The focus will be on the ‘Phoenician’ metal jugs that spread westwards, complete with their most distinctive decorative ornament.

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN THE PALMETTE ATTACHMENTS ON THE ‘PHOENICIAN’ JUGS.

The palmette attachments at the handle’s lower end on silver ‘Phoenician’ jugs can be divided into three main types. The two silver samples from Cyprus held by the Cesnola Collection of the Metropolitan Museum in New York represent the first two types, but unfortunately only one vase is well preserved31. The vase no. 4592 displays the simplest palmette attachment type: a rosette decoration with a central rivet, which is just recognisable despite the bad state of conservation (Fig. 3.1). W. Culican affirmed that this simplified palmette is purely of Egyptian type32, like the palmette of the bronze sample of Cesnola Collection (Fig. 4,1). The second oinochoe no.4591 shows a full-formed palmette, with its middle segment composed of a central ribbon flanked by two smaller ribs (Fig. 3.2). The palmette itself has the triangular base made up of three foreground petals decorated by engraved lines and two background petals; from the petals two double-outlined spirals arise and, beyond them, twelve well-defined petals fan out from a central elongated core. Two more additional buds are attached in a vertical position to the palmette base. This second type is strictly connected to the version occurring on bronze oinochoai from Cyprus, Italy and Iberian Peninsula, as we will examine more fully below. In addition a close match to the second Cesnola vase no. 4591 may be seen in the two silver and reworked palmettes on a bronze cup discovered

19 Karageorghis 1973, 92, 94.
21 Karageorghis 1973, nn° 143; 258, pls. LXII-LXIII, CCXLI; cf. also Metropolitan 2014, figg. 3.7 and 3.66; about ivories from Samaria cf. Suter in Metropolitan 2014, 176-177, from Arslan Tash cf. Fontan in Metropolitan 2014, 152-156.
22 Karageorghis 1973, nn° 148, 251, 277, pls. LXVI, LXVII, LXX-LXXI, CCXLI.
23 Already noted by Grau-Zimmermann 1978, 175.
24 Shefton 1989, 98-99, figg. 6, 10; Grau-Zimmermann 1978, 179 e 181.
25 Matthaus 2014b.
26 Walcher 2009.
27 Frankel 2011, 132-133.
28 Paris 2007, nn° 399-400.
30 Grau-Zimmermann 1978, 217, k25, fig. 11.
31 Met. Mus. 74.51.4591 and 74.51.4592 (Myres 1914, 466, 468, nn° 4591-4592; Gierstad 1948, 161, fig. 33, 14, 2; Blasco Freijedo 1956, 7, fig. 67; Campbell 1962, 63; d’Agostino 1977, 37, n. 138; Grau-Zimmermann 1978, 164-166, 212, k2, pls. 33a, 34c; Mathäus 1985, 240, pl. 71, n° 538, 541; Metropolitan 2000, 178, n° 291); pursuant to Cesnola Atlas III, pl. 34, 4 and 39,12 the place of discovery should be Kourion.
32 Culican 1976, 84.
The palmette attachment on "Phoenician" metal jugs

Fig. 3 - silver oinochoai from Cyprus - Coll. Cesnola (1-2: photos of the author, courtesy of Metropolitan Museum) and from Italian peninsula: Vetulonia, tomb of the Duce (3: photo of the author, courtesy of Archaeological Museum of Florence); Caere, Regolini-Galassi tomb (4: Madrid 2008, n° 32; 5: fragmentary palmette, photo courtesy of Vatican Museums); Praeneste, Bernardini tomb (6: photo of the author, courtesy of National Archaeological Museum of Villa Giulia - Rome); Praeneste, Barberini tomb (7: photo courtesy of photographic archive of "La Sapienza", University of Rome - Department of Humanities); Cuma, Fondo Artiaco, tomb 104, (8: photo of the author, courtesy of National Archaeological Museum of Naples); Pontecagnano, tomb 928 (9: D’AGOSTINO 1977, fig. 23)
Fig. 4 - bronze oinochoai from Cyprus, Coll. Cesnola (1: Matthäus 1985, pl. 71, n° 539), Tamassos (3: Matthäus 1985, pl. 71, n° 540); Crete, Iđean Cave (2: Matthäus 2000, fig. 5); Italian peninsula, Roccia di Papu - tomb of Vivaro (4: Arietti-Martellotta 1998, fig. 16, tav. 12), Caere, Tripod tomb (5: Di Blasi in Sciacca-Di Blasi 2003, n. 52); Iberian peninsula, Spain: Coca (6: Jiménez Ávila 2002, n° 1, pls. I-II), Carmona, Tumulo de la Cañada de Ruíz Sánchez (7: Jiménez Ávila 2002, pls. I-II, n° 4), Portugal, Torres Vedras (8: Jiménez Ávila 2002, pls. I-II, n° 2), Spain, Seville, Alcalá del Río without context (9: Jiménez Ávila 2002, pls. I-II, n° 3), Alcalá del Río, La Angorrilla necropolis, t. 30 (10: Jiménez Ávila 2014, fig. 4)
in the Nuraghe Su Iganti near Uri in the valley of the river Cuga (Sassari-Sardinia)\(^3\). They probably belonged to comparable ‘Phoenician’ jugs, used with parts of four other vases to produce this singular vessel (Fig. 7).

Six silver specimens from Italy comprise the third type; they have been found in the Orientalizing princely tombs from Etruria (Vetulonia and Caere - Figg. 3.3, 3.4-5, Latium Vetus (Praeneste - Figg. 3.6-7) and Campania (Cuma and Pontecagnano - Figg. 3.8-9)\(^3\). It is noteworthy that in the Italian peninsula the motif takes on a different form: here the palmettes are characteristically more markedly decorative, and are given extra bosses in gold foil. The main features are much the same with some altered details: five or six small horizontal ribbons compose the middle segment (where preserved); the triangular base is made up of three foreground and two background petals decorated with engraved lines. From the petals two double-outlined spirals rise while ten well-defined petals fan out from nine little terminal palmettes; the central elongated core has become a palmette itself. Furthermore the two additional buds, attached to the palmette base, are now set to a slant. Two sub-varieties can be distinguished in this type: one where the tips of the palmettes support other well-defined petals, the second is without this feature. These sub-varieties appear in two distinct areas: the first one in Vetulonia, Caere and Pontecagnano (Figg. 3.3, 3.4-5, 3.9), the second one in Praeneste (Figg. 3.6-7)\(^3\).

As on the silver vessels, the palmettes on the bronze jugs are of three types, though they all seem to derive from the well-preserved silver example n° 4591 in the Cesnola Collection. The first type is illustrated by a single vase from the Idaean Cave of Crete\(^3\); here the ornamental motif is completely abstract - two almost circular elements, one at the lower end of each of the two bronze components of the handle, pulled together and closed by two little rivets (Fig. 4.2). Even though the shape of the Idaean vase is very close to the one of the Cesnola bronze oinochoe (n° 4919, Fig. 4.1), the absence of decoration and the use of a metal plate distinguish this oinochoe from the others, which were made with the lost-wax casting technique. These features make the Cretan vase similar to the jugs with a high slender body. These are a specific group of Orientalizing bronze vases, firstly recognized as produced by a single workshop by B. d'Agostino in his publication about the princely tombs of Pontecagnano (Salerno-Italy)\(^3\).

The second type - illustrated by the Cesnola sample n° 4919 - shows a heavily-stylized palmette composed of two simple components closing the central triangular core and finished off by an arched segment without any petals separately portrayed\(^3\) (Fig. 4.1). Nothing similar has been found in the
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33 Bernardini-Botto 2011, 65; Santocchini Gerg 2014, 165, n° 739, pl. 29.
35 Cerveteri, Regolini-Galassi tomb, 2 exx., inv. 20461: PARETI 1947, 224, n° 165, pl. XVII; BLANCO FREIDERO 1956, 7, fig. 7; CAMPOAREALE 1962, 62, pl. 45, 1; STROM 1971, 127-128, 251, n° 165; GRAU-ZIMMERMANN 1978, 167-168, 214, k11, pls. 38a-b, 43b; Cristofani in CRISTOFANI-MARTelli 1983, 261-265; SANNIBALE 1992, 90, n° 1, fig. 14.1; COLONNA-DI PAOLO 1997; BURANELLI-SANNIBALE 1998, 268-271, n° 110, fig. 107a-b, fig. 108; Bartoloni in Bologna 2000, 166-167; Sannibale in Madrid 2008, 95, n° 32; about the tomb, 84-87, catt. 27-36; PITZALIS 2011, 86; SANNIBALE 2012, 312, fig. 10; about the tomb, 307-316; SANNIBALE 2013, 125, fig. 6.33; Sannibale in Metropolitan 2014, 326-7, n° 198; inv. 20456 (fig. 3.5): PARETI 1947, 224, n° 166 (and maybe n° 187e); BLANCO FREIDERO 1956, 7, n° 16; CAMPOAREALE 1962, 62; SANNIBALE 1992, 90, n° 1, fig. 14.4; about the inscription: Bagnasco GIANNI 1996, 81-2, n° 49 with further bibliography; BURANELLI-SANNIBALE 2005, 220-231. Praeneste, Barberini tomb, inv. 13224: CURTIS 1925, 13, n° 17; pl. 6, 1-2; CAMPOAREALE 1962, 63; GRAU-ZIMMERMANN 1978, 166-169, 214, k1, 3: pl. 38d; RATHIE 1979, 156-158, fig. IV-1, 1d; 1994, 346, fig. 4, lion head engraved on the foot bottom; Bernardini tomb (fig. 3.6): inv. 61575: CURTIS 1919, 51, n° 36, pl. 29, 2-3; CAMPOAREALE 1962, 63; GRAU-ZIMMERMANN 1978, 166-169, 214, k12, pl. 38c; CANCIANI-VON HASE 1979, 42, n° 32, pl. 20, 4-5 (with further bibliography).
37 The palmette of the jugs from Cuma, t. 104, was found as a shapeless fragment; and it may not have survived in the storage-area of the Archaeological Museum of Naples.
39 D’AGOSTINO 1977, 20-23. This subject will be investigated further by the writer, thanks to a six-month DAAD scholarship at the University of Erlangen-Nurberg (Germany), under the supervision of Professor Hartmut Matthäus.
40 Met. Mus. 74, 51, 5698: MYRES 1914, 495, n° 4919; GRAU-ZIMMERMANN 1978, 166,212, k3, pl.35a; MATTHÄUS 1985, 239, pl. 71, n° 539.
Italian or Iberian peninsula and it can be labelled of Egyptian type rather than Phoenician\(^{39}\). The few comparisons in fact are the handle of an Egyptian oinochoe from Halan Sultan Tekke and the lower end of a fragmentary bronze handle from Cyprus, but the precise origin is unknown\(^{40}\), in addition it can be compared with the handle attachments of two silver jugs, part of a rare wine service found in the tomb of Hat-Nüfer in Thebes (c. 1500 BC)\(^{41}\).

The third and last type forms the biggest group. It includes another sample from Cyprus and all the Italian and Iberian bronze palmettes. All examples echo the silver palmette on Censola oinochoe n°4 4591 mentioned above. The first oinochoe (Fig. 4,3) comes from the royal tomb n. 12 of Tamassos necropolis\(^{42}\). Its palmette must be considered separately because the details are realized by engraving, and not by casting in a mould\(^{43}\). It can be interpreted as one of the latest in the series since the tomb 12 of Tamassos can be dated at the Cypro-Archaic II because of the associated pottery, perhaps 600 BC.\(^{44}\). The ‘Phoenician’ bronze and silver bowls of last phase dated to the 7th century BC also show only engraved decoration and not on relief\(^{45}\). In addition the tomb architecture shows Proto-Aeolic pilasters displaying a triangle in their centre from which double volutes spring from a base made of several parallel ribbons\(^{46}\). The same pilasters were found also in tomb 5 of the same necropolis: here there are Blattzungen (additional buds) following the outer frame of the volutes\(^{47}\). The comparison among these architectonical features and the palmette attachment of the bronze oinochoe from Tamassos is strict.

From the royal cemetery of Tamassos two other palmette attachments are known. One belonged to another elegant bronze jug found in tomb 16, held by the Antikensammlung of Berlin and unfortunately lost at the end of the 2nd World War, only known thanks to a water-colour which was made for M. Ohnefalsch-Richter\(^{48}\). If Ohnefalsch-Richter’s water-colour may be trusted the palmette seems to be casted and well-defined (Fig. 5,1) and it is very similar to the palmette of the bronze oinochoe found in the princely tomb of Vivaro - Rocca di Papa\(^{49}\) (Fig. 4,4). Tomb 16 was a chamber tomb cut in the rock with two clay sarcophagi, jewels, pottery, stone alabastra and Attic pottery of CA II; unfortunately nothing can be said about the position of the metal jug in the chamber\(^{50}\). The second piece, always stored in Berlin, is part of a fragmentary and heavy handle (gr. 220) found in the outfit of tomb 4\(^{51}\). It is one of the few ‘Phoenician’ bronze and silver bowls of last phase dated to the 7th century BC also show only engraved decoration and not on relief\(^{46}\). In addition the tomb architecture shows Proto-Aeolic pilasters displaying a triangle in their centre from which double volutes spring from a base made of several parallel ribbons\(^{46}\). The same palmettes were found also in tomb 5 of the same necropolis: here there are Blattzungen (additional buds) following the outer frame of the volutes\(^{47}\). The comparison among these architectonical features and the palmette attachment of the bronze oinochoe from Tamassos is strict.

They display a middle segment composed of three thin horizontal ribbons, an expanded foreground triangular base and two background petals, sometimes filled by engraved lines. From the petals two double-outlined spirals rise, from which fan out between twelve and fourteen well-defined petals (with a central elongated pistil). The two additional buds are attached to the palmette base and are either set at an angle to it (Tamassos, tomb 12 and Tripod tomb samples) or are vertical (Tamassos tombs 4, 16 and Vivaro tomb).

\(^{39}\) Culican 1976, 85.

\(^{40}\) Matthäus 1985, 235 and 245, pl. 70, n° 532 and pl. 72, n° 545.

\(^{41}\) Culican 1976, 88, fig. 11.

\(^{42}\) Matthäus 2014b, with further bibliography.

\(^{43}\) Inv. Met 67: MYRES-OHNEFALSch RICHTER 1899, n° 3557; Gierstad 1948, 154, fig. 29, 10, jug 5; Masson 1964, 225-231 about the context; oinochoe 231, n. 2; d’Agostino 1977, 38 and note 138, pl. XXXa-b; Grau-Zimmermann 1978, 164-166, 175, 212, k5, pls. 35b, 43a; Matthäus 1985, 239-240, pl. 71, n° 540; Frouentzo in Bologna 2000, 114, n° 46; Frouentzo in Atene 2003, 447, n° 773, (incorrectly ‘unknown provenance’); Matthäus 2014b, 117.

\(^{44}\) Matthäus 2007, 211; Matthäus 2014b, 105; tomb 11 ‘according to Bucholz’ system of numbering at that time’.

\(^{45}\) Markoe in Paris 2007, 169.

\(^{46}\) Walcher 2009, 45-46, pls. 16-17.

\(^{47}\) Walcher 2009, 46-47, pl. 5.

\(^{48}\) Matthäus 2014b, 118, fig. 12.


\(^{50}\) I am really thankful to Professor H. Matthäus for his help and for the information he gave me about the princely tombs of Tamassos.


\(^{52}\) Matthäus 2007, 211; Matthäus 2014b, 104, 118-119.

\(^{53}\) Cerveteri, Tripod tomb, inv. 2017: Pareti 1947, n° 446, 385, pl. LIX; Blanco Freireu 1956, 3-8, fig. 8; Camporeale 1962, 63, pl. 45, 12; Grau-Zimmermann 1978, 166, 21, k4, pl. 34 a-b; Arrietti-Martellotta 1998, 71, pl. xiv; Di Blasi in Sciacca-Di Blasi 2003, 230-234, n° 52, 272, figg. 10-12; Sannibale in Sciaccia-Di Blasi 2003, 291-2; it is also possible, as proposed by M. Cristofani (Cristofani 1980, 14), that the association of this tomb with later objects was due to a confusion of materials from different funerary contexts and that the oinochoe is one of the jugs held by Vatican collections (obtained when objects of the Regolini-Galassi excavation were sold). However since there are not enough elements to attribute with certainty the vases to the furnishings of the Regolini Galassi tomb, it is not possible to remove it from the material assigned to the Tripod tomb (Di Blasi in Sciacca-Di Blasi 2003, 247).
A bronze fragmentary palmette from the Idaean Cave attached by a rivet \(^{54}\) (Fig. 5,3) and the palmette from an alabaster oinochoe found in a female royal tomb in Northern Sudan, in the necropolis of El Kurru (tomb K4 of Queen Khensa), dated to 690-664 BC \(^{55}\) (Fig. 1,1) could be also attributed to this group.

Even two ivory juglets, perhaps better defined as aryballoi because of their dimensions \(^{56}\), show a comparable palmette motif (Figg. 1,2-3). They come respectively from the SW palace of Esarhaddon in Nimrud and from the well G of the Heraion in Samos; like the previous metal jugs they can be dated between the second half of the 8th century (Nimrud) and the mid 7th century BC (Samos)\(^{57}\). Nothing can be said about the bronze palmette of an oinochoe from Carthage which comes from a female tomb of the Late Orientalizing period. Unfortunately, it has been lost and we only have a poor drawing by the excavator R.P. Delattre\(^{58}\). Nonetheless, it seems very similar to a contemporary oinochoe from the Tomb of the Bronze Fans at Populonia, which recalls the Rhodian jugs. Much the same can be said about a little alabaster jug from Assur, probably from a female tomb: this is known only from a picture published by W. Andrae\(^{59}\). It has meantime displaced in the stores of the Museum of the Ancient Near East in Berlin, but it has been lost.

The Iberian bronze palmettes are little different from both the Cypriote and Italian examples, though it can be understood they do at least derive from them. The group can be considered as a sub-variety of the third type, where the central segment is made up of only one rib or with a central rib closed by two other smaller ones (Figg. 4,6-10; 6,1-9). The main ornament lacks the triangular base, replaced by petals from

\(^{54}\) Matthäus 2000, 526, fig. 7; Pappalardo 2012, 39, Br-Al 26, fig. 80; Sakellarakis-Sapouna-Sakellarakis 2013, 72-3, tav. 53, n. 24. The palmette definitely does not belong to a metal jug because the technique of riveting does not fit the usual technique of assemblage of metal jug handles.

\(^{55}\) Inv. 21.2783 (Dunham 1950, 31, fig. 11c, pl. 39, n° 19-3-562; Grau-Zimmermann 1978, 172, 217, k27, fig. 13; Berman in Metropolitan 2014, 227, n° n° 119 with further bibliography). There is another alabaster oinochoe from the same tomb (inv. 21.2784-a-b), but the ornament is not preserved, as in another oinochoe of quartzite from the queen tomb 35 of the same necropolis (inv. 17-4-157; Dunham 1955, 18, fig. 8, n° 17-4-157; Grau-Zimmermann 1978, 172, 217, k26, fig. 12).

\(^{56}\) D’Agostino 1977, 39, for a different viewpoint.

\(^{57}\) Nimrud, Esarhaddon palace (inv. S108/127166; h. preserved 10 cm: Barnett 1957, 94, 199, n° S. 108, pl. LV, fig. 1; Paris 2007, 351, n° 196); for the Nimrud vase cf. also above; Samos, Heraion well G (inv. E37; H. preserved 8,6 cm: Freyer Schaenburh 1966, 10, 95, n° 24, pl. 27a.; about the Heraion cf. Niemeier in Metropolitan 2014, 295-296.

\(^{58}\) Delattre 1897, 136-138, fig. 88; Freyer Schaenburh 1966, 95, pl. 27; Culican 1968, fig. 1; Grau-Zimmermann 1978, 217, k25, abb. 11.

\(^{59}\) Andrae 1938, 14, pl. 12b; D’Agostino 1977, 39, n. 151; Grau-Zimmermann 1978, 173, 218, k28.
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which two doubled-outline spirals rise, ending with the fan of more or less well-defined petals. Sometimes the elongated central core is substituted by a rivet (La Joya, t. 17 - Fig. 6,4), while the additional buds on both sides of the base are set to a slant (Spain: Coca, Carmona, Alcalà del Río, La Angorrilla, La Zarza; Portugal: Torres Vedras, Beja) or vertical (La Joya, tt. 17-18 and Lazarro Galdiano)60. The two jugs with animal head spout (La Zarza and Lazarro Galdiano) instead of the usual Italian and Cypriote trefoil mouth differ too in the decorative attachments61 (Figg. 6,8-9). Here the central segment and the sepals are completely covered by an engraved network of cross-hatched, convergent or parallel lines like in the example from the necropolis of La Angorrilla, or it may carry four thin parallel ribs (Figg. 6,8-9).

In the third type a variant can be distinguished within the Iberian palmettes. It corresponds to a particular group of bronze jugs with plain circular mouths62. Here the main feature - and the main difference - is the transformation of the additional buds on both sides of the palmette into two elongated and high-arched curlicues ending with downturned lotus flowers (Figg. 6,1-5). A comparison to them can be founded in the Nimrud ivories63 and in the decoration of gold bracelets from the Aliseda tomb64. To this type a new bronze oinochoe from the necropolis of Alcácer do Sal (Portugal) can be added, unfortunately it is without a precise context of discovery65 (Fig. 6,6). Though fragmentary, it shows a palmette attachment that is close to the ones with high arched curlicues: it can be probably included in the group A,
type 2 of Jiménez Ávila’s classification - the one characterized by a plain circular spout. In particular it recalls the palmette attachment of the Las Fraguas oinochoe66.

In the Iberian peninsula the ‘Phoenician’ jugs are not imitated in the local pottery repertoire as it happens in Italy. Red-slip jugs were founded only in the colonies of the southern coasts both in necropoleis and in settlements.

From the excavations of the Phoenician settlement in Morro di Mezquitilla (Málaga) comes one of the rarest examples of a ceramic palmette attachment at the lower end of the handle. The vase is fragmentary, but it belongs to a closed shape and the presence of the palmette motif makes almost certain its interpretation as an oinochoe (Fig. 8,1). A middle segment of several little horizontal ribbons fronts the palmette itself. This shows a triple triangular base and two well-defined pistils from which two double-outlined spirals arise. From the central and elongated core with its double outline fan out eleven well-defined petals. The additional auxiliary buds are in a vertical position. The result is very precise, and is very close to the contemporary parallels on metal. Unfortunately the fragment has no certain stratigraphy: it was found in court 9, at the top of an area that was subject to severe placer mining in later years67.

From the Mediterranean area only another pottery sample is known with a moulded palmette decoration: it is an oinochoe held in the collection of the Studium Biblicum Franciscanum in Jerusalem (Fig. 8,2). Also this finding is without provenance and it is plus évidemment la copie d’un prototype en métal. Un élément plastique au bout de l’anse est la réplique en poterie de la palmette à deux tiges latérales recourbées visibles sur les cruches métalliques68.

In Italy the ‘Phoenician’ oinochoe is imitated in the local pottery: brown impasto, bucchero, red impasto and Italo-geometric wares. On these ceramic samples the palmette motif is no more placed at the lower end of the handle, but the ornamental motif itself is largely adopted and reworked in items in metal, ivory and clay. On clay vases it is mostly encountered in the impasto69 and bucchero70 wares (engraved or excised) or on italo-geometric ware (painted)71. The main shape on the ceramic imitations has engraved palmettes and spaced out cup-spirals, both singly and in stranded chains (Fig. 8,3-4). This motif enters the Etruscan iconographic repertoire in two different phases: from the first half of the 7th century BC it is realised on gold72, bronze73, silver74 and ivory75 works of art and on ostrich eggs76; while during the second half of the same century, under Corinthian influence77, it is found in a painted version78. The prototype of the cup spirals motif have been identified in tomb 45 of Assur dated to the 14th/15th centuries BC; it also turns up on some gold and electrum plaques in the foundation deposit of Ephesus79, in Cyprus on the Phoenician silver bowl from Kourion80, on bracelets from Tharros in Sardinia and from the La Aliseda treasure in Spain, dated to the 7th century BC81.

A highly stylized version occurs too: it looks rather like a quarter of a circle, with the curve of the periphery and the two pairs of radii meeting at the centre; in the example illustrated (Fig. 8,5) the motif is almost isolated, being connected only to a horizontal line. From the mid-Orientalizing period this simplified motif will grow to become more popular on pots than the earlier one as. At the same time, on bucchero ware it is found another extreme abstraction of the motif, with inverted features: little fans both opened or semi-opened and made of dots from the comb-tool. This version is attested until the first decades of the 6th century BC82 (Fig. 8,6). The dotted fans are present both on the impasto vases and on silver artworks83.

G. Camporeale disagrees with the hypothesis followed by F. Sciacca84, namely that the dotted triangular fans might originate from the stylization of the lotus flowers motif or better of the Tree of Life motif. Instead he argues the possibility that the ornament comes from the evolution of the papyrus flower.

67 Schubart 1979, 182, pl. 8f.
68 Culican 1968, 284, pl. 21, 2.
70 Regter 2003, 23 ss.
72 Cristofani-Martelli 1983, 275, no 77; Sannibale 2009, 350 figg. 15-16, with Hathoric head.
73 Johansen 1971, pl. XXXIII, 39-40.
74 Canciani-von Hase 1979, 41, no 28-29, pls. 18,5 e 19.2.
75 Aubet 1971, figg. 20, 22.
76 Johansen 1971, pl. XL1; jugs from Pittino San Severino t. 14 (Landolfi-Sgubini Moretti in Matelica 2008, 141, fig. 66; Caubet in Metropolitan 2014, 226, n° 117) and Matelica 1 (De Marinis in Matelica 2008, 190-3, n° 231).
77 Martelli in Martelli 1987, 26.
78 Micozzi 1994, 126.
80 Vella 2010, fig. 1b.
81 Paris 2007, no 397 and 401; Metropolitan 2014, 215, n° 102 (bracelet from Tharros).
82 Camporeale 2003, 13, 19.
83 Canciani-von Hase 1979, 41, no 28-29; Camporeale 2003, 13, pls. I-IV.
84 Sciacca in Sciacca-Blasi 2003, 84, n. 90.
THE PALMETTE ATTACHMENT ON ‘PHOENICIAN’ METAL JUGS

Fig. 8 - 1 (Schubart 1979, pl. 8f, out of scale); 2 (Culican 1968, pl. 21, 2), 3 (drawing of the author: Caere, necropolis of Monte Abatone, tomb 410, local impasto; unpublished), 4 (drawing of the author: Veii, necropolis of Casalaccio, tomb III, local impasto; Vighi 1935, p. 47, n° 4, tav. I, 3, down left), 5 (drawing of the author: Tarquinia, without context, RC 1926, local impasto; Cataldi Dini in Milano 1986, p. 231, n° 673, fig. 233), 6 (drawing of the author: Veii, necropolis of Casalaccio, tomb III, local impasto; Vighi 1935, p. 47, n° 8, tav. I, 3, down right)
or the palm tree. But it is possible that all these elements are a simplified version of the Tree of Life; furthermore T. Petit suggested that the central triangle may signify the Tree, in tant qu’un de ses éléments essentiels (...) C’est là une caractéristique qui se transmettra au domaine grec and, we can add, to the Etruscan repertoire too.

By this stage, however, the question is if the ancient symbol has merely an ornamental purpose or not. But to this question I shall return below in the last paragraph which is dedicated to the iconology of the ornamental motif.

The dispute about the origin and the production of ‘Phoenician’ jugs.

As illustrated above, we can isolate three different areas involving the palmette ornament at the lower end of the handles of ‘Phoenician’ jugs: Cyprus, Italy and Iberian peninsula. This gives a starting point to examine the old debate on the origin and the production of these vases. Phoenician, Cypriote or Assyrian? Imports or locally made objects? If imported, made in one place and then travelling, perhaps more than once or not? If made on the spot, realized by immigrant artisans or by local craftsmen?

These questions are also available for other so-called ‘Phoenician’ vessels, like the metal bowls found from Mesopotamia to Italy that show the same fluidity, the same hybrid melting pot of cultures.

The silver and bronze jugs from Cyprus, belonging to the Cesnola Collection, might be interpreted like objects made by ‘Phoenician’ craftsmen working on the island. We can compare these metal objects with similar red-slip ceramic jugs from the necropoleis of Cyprus and along the Levantine coasts. On the island the earliest metal types with globular body, were ousted gradually by ones with ovoid body, as the Tamassos bronze jugs shows: the same happens in the pottery production.

Again with the Kushite alabaster jugs: although L.M. Berman affirms that they are locally made Egyptian artefacts, I would argue for a ‘Phoenician’ production. The relations between Assyria and the 25th Ethiopian dynasty are accredited. In all probability Levantine craftsmen were engaged in making luxury copies of this vessel-type and trading them - precious and gracious gifts to the local queens and kings.

Much harder to define is the line-up of the bronze oinochoe from the Idaean Cave, in Crete, as we have seen above. This vessel has no typological parallels in the Aegean area, but can be compared to the globular Cesnola oinochoe n° 4919 from Cyprus, where the Egyptian tradition is more evident as I have stressed before talking about the palmette. The singular use of the metal sheet and the complete abstraction of the palmette attachment at the lower end of the double-rod handle mark out the Idaean jug. On the other hand the Cypriote oinochoe is composed of three parts, made by lost-wax casting and with its solid handle soldered to the vase.

In Italy the seven silver jugs, as noted before, show differences from the Cypriote examples beyond the decorative motif. First the material is dissimilar; then the shape is ovoid, like in Tamassos bronze jugs. Furthermore there is a difference in chronology. Unlike the globular Cesnola oinochoe and the Italian samples date later in the first half of the 7th century BC. Among the silver Italian jugs we can distinguish, thanks to details in the palmette’s rendition, two varieties that perhaps correspond to two different workshops: on the one hand Caere, Pontecagnano and Vetulonia; on the other Praeneste.

Moreover the Italian bronze jugs from the Tripod and Vivaro tombs, even though they are very close to the Cypriote samples in shape, display some idiosyncrasies that keep them apart. These concern the palm tree. But it is possible that all these elements are a simplified version of the Tree of Life; furthermore T. Petit suggested that the central triangle may signify the Tree, in tant qu’un de ses éléments essentiels (...) C’est là une caractéristique qui se transmettra au domaine grec and, we can add, to the Etruscan repertoire too.

By this stage, however, the question is if the ancient symbol has merely an ornamental purpose or not. But to this question I shall return below in the last paragraph which is dedicated to the iconology of the ornamental motif.

The dispute about the origin and the production of ‘Phoenician’ jugs.

As illustrated above, we can isolate three different areas involving the palmette ornament at the lower end of the handles of ‘Phoenician’ jugs: Cyprus, Italy and Iberian peninsula. This gives a starting point to examine the old debate on the origin and the production of these vases. Phoenician, Cypriote or Assyrian? Imports or locally made objects? If imported, made in one place and then travelling, perhaps more than once or not? If made on the spot, realized by immigrant artisans or by local craftsmen?

These questions are also available for other so-called ‘Phoenician’ vessels, like the metal bowls found from Mesopotamia to Italy that show the same fluidity, the same hybrid melting pot of cultures.

The silver and bronze jugs from Cyprus, belonging to the Cesnola Collection, might be interpreted like objects made by ‘Phoenician’ craftsmen working on the island. We can compare these metal objects with similar red-slip ceramic jugs from the necropoleis of Cyprus and along the Levantine coasts. On the island the earliest metal types with globular body, were ousted gradually by ones with ovoid body, as the Tamassos bronze jugs shows: the same happens in the pottery production.

Again with the Kushite alabaster jugs: although L.M. Berman affirms that they are locally made Egyptian artefacts, I would argue for a ‘Phoenician’ production. The relations between Assyria and the 25th Ethiopian dynasty are accredited. In all probability Levantine craftsmen were engaged in making luxury copies of this vessel-type and trading them - precious and gracious gifts to the local queens and kings.

Much harder to define is the line-up of the bronze oinochoe from the Idaean Cave, in Crete, as we have seen above. This vessel has no typological parallels in the Aegean area, but can be compared to the globular Cesnola oinochoe n° 4919 from Cyprus, where the Egyptian tradition is more evident as I have stressed before talking about the palmette. The singular use of the metal sheet and the complete abstraction of the palmette attachment at the lower end of the double-rod handle mark out the Idaean jug. On the other hand the Cypriote oinochoe is composed of three parts, made by lost-wax casting and with its solid handle soldered to the vase.

In Italy the seven silver jugs, as noted before, show differences from the Cypriote examples beyond the decorative motif. First the material is dissimilar; then the shape is ovoid, like in Tamassos bronze jugs. Furthermore there is a difference in chronology. Unlike the globular Cesnola oinochoe and the Italian samples date later in the first half of the 7th century BC. Among the silver Italian jugs we can distinguish, thanks to details in the palmette’s rendition, two varieties that perhaps correspond to two different workshops: on the one hand Caere, Pontecagnano and Vetulonia; on the other Praeneste.

Moreover the Italian bronze jugs from the Tripod and Vivaro tombs, even though they are very close to the Cypriote samples in shape, display some idiosyncrasies that keep them apart. These concern

86 PETIT 2011, 65.
87 It is quite impossible here to give an exhaustive bibliography on the question, but a short list of the main scholars who have been involved in the subject includes: Blanco Freijero 1956, García y Bellido 1960, Camporeale 1962, Strom 1971, D’Agostino 1977, Grau-Zimmermann 1978, Rathie 1979; Mathäus 1985, Jiménez Ávila 2002; for an overview of all the Mediterranean area cf. Taloni 2016.
89 Núñez Calvo in Aubet 2004, Tyre-Al Bass, 318-319, types Jv2a-c, 358-364 periods III and IV, dating from the mid-8th to the beginning of the 7th c. BC; Núñez Calvo 2014, with further bibliography.
91 Culican 1958, 100-101; about the Phoenician role, even though it is difficult to define, in the trading of alabaster at the time of the XXVth dynasty and about the manufacture of the stone vessels in Egypt, cf. also Oeghiano 2010, 191-193, in particular on the production of stone amphoras.
92 Recently Mathäus has identified among the Idaean Cave bronze finds a handle that presumably belongs to another and larger Phoenician jug, but unfortunately the fragmentary piece does not help us in better defining the well-preserved Idaean oinochoe (Mathäus 2011, 117, fig. 18).
93 Also Grau-Zimmermann 1978, 176.
technical aspects. These bronze jugs are composed of several separate parts just like the silver jugs: the ovoid body with the palmette attachment, a truncated-conical neck with spout and a double handle. No x-ray analyses have been made on the Vivaro oinochoe as done for the Caere’s oinochoe, but from a macroscopic examination it is possible to recognize the same approach at work. The vase is made up of several parts - probably the handle with its palmette attachment, next the conical neck with mouth, then the body and foot. The positioning of the fractures at the central horizontal rib and the missing foot reinforces this belief94. M. Sannibale clearly demonstrated that a horizontal rib masks the joins between the several parts of the vase like in the silver Italian jugs95. In addition the Italian bronze samples show the same wall thickness (0.7 cm). However the oinochoe from Tamassos seems to be made from one piece (an x-ray analysis is required though to confirm this): the vase is heavier than the Italian samples96.

Taken together, these points suggest that all the Italian samples, both silver and bronze, are not imports, but are produced locally by foreign craftsmen, probably bringing with them the raw materials or using the local mining sources97. The metoikoi artisans of Levantine origin worked in very close contact with local ones in a multicultural context, creating exotic, symbolic and prestigious objects for the consumption needs of the local élites. Similar considerations can be also done about the ‘Phoenician’ bronze and silver bowls well-known from Italy to Mesopotamia showing the same eclectic ensemble of cultural elements. Even for these vessels different geographical areas of diffusion have been identified and symbolic value98.

We cannot be sure at least if those vases were made by immigrant craftsmen or by local Etruscan artisans under the guidance of ‘Phoenician’ craftsmen. The ethnic origins of these foreign artisans are very difficult to identify, but that is not the crucial point, in my opinion. What is to underline is that the absence of cultural, ideological and ethnichurdles within the economic, social and diplomatic relationships among the Mediterranean aristocracies created a common repertoire of symbols, ornaments and - in this case - vessels. This koiné - a melting pot of influences - united the Mediterranean area, from East to West. What is really concern is not who did and where did those artefacts, but how and why, the meaning that in such a case has a dynamic nature, because it continually changes, both geographically and diachronically99.

The above theme is even better illustrated by the Iberian bronze jugs. As in Italy a protracted debate developed on the provenance and on the production of those vessels: scholarly opinion is divided into three categories - imports, local imitations, colonial productions100. The quandary has persisted because of the complex reciprocal relations among the several ‘Orientalizing’ cultures, and most of all because of the lack of metal samples along the Levantine cost, the area where the shape was developed. In the future the now-comprehended variations in the technical aspects of manufacture should help settle the question, even though the ancient artisans were adept at concealing traces of their working. The most accepted thesis considers these objects of western Phoenician production, as it has been proposed for the Italian jugs101. Oriental craftsmen, living and working in the Phoenician colonies in Heulva, Extremadura and Portugal, produced these artefacts for the Tartessian élites. It is also possible, maybe even probable, that they worked together with Tartessian artisans, training them up in their workshops.

Decorative details in the palmette ornament, technical peculiarities in manufacture and variations in the shape (e.g. plain versus figured mouth) are in keeping with the hypothesis of a western Phoenician production by craftsmen settled in two main areas at least: Seville-Guadalquivir and Huelva-Estremadura. From there two trade-routes developed: one along the rivers Guadiana and Guadalquivir until Coca, through the Sierra Morena and on to Lisbona (Olisipo); the other runs along the coast line or through the upper valley of river Tago. Portugal, where recent discoveries illustrate a complex Orientalizing process existed as much as in southern Spain, can be considered both as a market and perhaps as another production area: further studies will enlighten us102.

How did this shape reach the Iberian peninsula? Most likely through Carthage. Together with the bronze oinochoe above mentioned, an ivory one is known from the excavation of Delattre. Both come from a woman’s burial of the Late Orientalizing period103. In Carthage a bucchero jug is also known from

---

94 The editors of the tomb’s publication hold a different opinion, namely that the vase was made in one piece with lost-wax casting, except for the handle (ARIETTI-MARTIELLOTTA 1998, 70-75; Ghini in Bologna 2000, 204, n° 216; Ghini in Atene 2003, 447, n° 775).
96 MATTHÄUS 1985, 239-240.
97 MARKOE 2003, 209-215; Markoe in Paris 2007, 170; instead STRÖM 1971, 128-129 and GRAU-ZIMMERMANN 1978, 190 interpreted the silver Italian jugs as imports from Phoenicia because of the different palmette attachment.
99 For a similar approach cf. FELDMAN 2014a.
102 JIMÉNEZ ÁVILA 2002, 94-98.
103 DELATTRE 1897, 129, fig. 83 (bronze oinochoe); 136-138, fig. 88 (ivory oinochoe).
a pit grave dated to the mid-7th century BC. The jug, perhaps from Tarquinia or Caere, replaces the red-slip one normally found with the mushroom-lipped jug\textsuperscript{104}.

Furthermore, there is another more interesting hypothesis that requires verification: the possibility that a connection existed between Sardinia and Spain. Some hints support this thesis: 1- the two silver palmettes reworked on the Uri bronze cup mentioned above; 2- the palmette attachment at the lower end of the handle in the \textit{askos} from nuraghe Ruju of Buddusò\textsuperscript{105}; 3- a fragmentary ivory palmette from Tharros\textsuperscript{106}, and finally 4- two bronze jugs, with trefoil and plain mouths like the Iberian ones, from the indigenous settlement of Nurdòle\textsuperscript{107}.

**SYMBOLIC MEANINGS BEYOND THE ORNAMENT ITSELF**

As noted above the palmette motif is an extrapolation of the Tree of Life that can be found in several varieties on the Nimrud ivories\textsuperscript{108}. The most common representation has the ‘Tree of Life’ as the central element, made of papyrus, palmettes or lotus flowers, between two men, women, real (goats and, rarely, bulls) or unreal animals (sphinxes or griffins) who flank it symmetrically. The sacred tree represents both male and female elements and symbolizes their combined vital strength\textsuperscript{109}. The presence of real animals around the Tree has been interpreted as symbol of fertility, fecundity and agricultural abundance, of the life \textit{hic et nunc}\textsuperscript{110}. While if sphinxes and griffons flank the Tree they show similar sacred function linked to the Afterlife, to the eternal life. In fact they are not only guardians of the Tree, but also the emissaries of the deity, finally its hypostasis, like the cherubs in Old Testament that combine both human and animal nature\textsuperscript{111}.

The lotus flowers themselves, which sometimes tip both the Holy Tree and the palmette attachments in the silver jugs, were in Egyptian cosmogony a strong funerary symbol of regeneration and it was a symbol of life for all the cultures in the eastern Mediterranean\textsuperscript{112}. They represent the first element born from the primordial waters and the creation of the world owed to the sun\textsuperscript{113}. In Egyptian tombs real lotus petals have been found: they were offered symbolically to the dead, as it results clear from the chapter 81 of the Book of the Dead. Maurizio Sannibale identifies this concept in the Odyssey episode of the Lotofagi: here the lotus, that makes the Greeks lose their memory and the desire of returning home, recalls the idea of rebirth, of a new beginning after death\textsuperscript{114}. In addition he stresses the presence of lotus flowers in the Regolini-Galassi chamber tomb of Cerveteri. We underlined above the presence of the palmette attachments in the two silver jugs. These were part of the silver outfit belonging to princess Larthia; another twenty-eight such flowers are visible on the cult chariot\textsuperscript{115}. Other palmette pendants, this time of gold, springing from lotus flowers, are attached to the ceremonial gold fibula from the same funerary context. Furthermore several funerary banquets in Cyprus show guests bringing a lotus flower in their hands from which they inhale the life-giving fragrance of deity\textsuperscript{116}.

Finally, on the silver Italian jugs all the palmettes are covered by gold leaf: this material, not to be sourced in Italy, is connected with the incorruptibility of God’s body in Near East and in Ancient Egypt\textsuperscript{117}.

On the other hand, in the Cesnola silver sample n° 4592 from Cyprus (Fig. 3, 1), the palmette is replaced by a rosette attachment with seven or eight petals (the vase is not well-preserved). We know that

---

\textsuperscript{104} von Hase 1993, 189, \textit{fig. 2, n° 7} (similar to a bucchero \textit{oinochoe} from Tarquinia - Raccolta Comunale 7772: Locatelli 2004, 77, 4.6).

\textsuperscript{105} Jiménez Ávilla 2002, 90.

\textsuperscript{106} Uberti in Acquaro 1975, 98, pl. 36, D12.

\textsuperscript{107} Bernardini-Botto 2011, 92 with further bibliography. About the cultural relations between Sardinia and Spain during the I millennium BC. Cf. also Botto 2011.

\textsuperscript{108} Barnett 1957, 138-141, C. 1-4, 10-11, D. 8-9. Barnett prefers the term Sacred Tree instead of the Tree of Life, as scholars sometimes refer to this motif, equating it with the Tree of Immortality in the Garden of Eden, as described in the Bible; From Fort Shalmanasar, palace SW: Herrmann 1986, pl. 143, n° 602, 617, 619; cf. also Paris 2007, n° 294, 295, 298, 299.

\textsuperscript{109} About the Sacred Tree or Tree of Life motif, cf. Bisi 1980; Cerchiai 1988; Canciani 1970, 68 ss.; Jiménez Ávilla 2002, 351-2; for a religious overview: Oliver 1967; Russell 1982; Parpola 1993; for the assimilation of the motif in Greek art: Kourou 2001; for a wider point of view cf. Petit 2011.

\textsuperscript{110} Petit 2011, 27.

\textsuperscript{111} Petit 2011, 29-32, 37, 54.

\textsuperscript{112} Petit 2011, 68.

\textsuperscript{113} Pinza 1915, 440; Sannibale 2009, 352; Petit 2011, 36.

\textsuperscript{114} Sannibale 2009, 352.

\textsuperscript{115} For the symbolic meaning of the chariot cf. Sannibale 2009, 353 with further bibliography and for the connection with Astarte/Hathor cf. Lagarce 1983 and Courtois-Lagarce 1986, 86-93.

\textsuperscript{116} Petit 2011, 78.

\textsuperscript{117} Sannibale 2009, 348.
the motif of the star or rosette with eight rays is much more than a decorative motif, being also the aniconic representation of deities, Ishtar/Inanna in Syria and Palestine, Shausgsha in Anatolia. In addition the rosette might be another synecdoche of the Tree of Life as it is well pointed out by T. Petit.

The palmette - like the rosette - refers to a deity connected with the Afterworld, the moment of passing away and the chthonian cults, just as Astarte was. She is the Canaanite translation of Egyptian Hathor and Babylonian Ishtar - who becomes in Cyprus Aphrodite, with several ritual aspects linked to Nature that only in a later stage will assume specific characterizations. Not accidentally lotus flowers, palmettes and rosettes often occur in Neo-Assyrian reliefs as attributes of kings, queens and deities: they symbolise fertility and ideal beauty both for women and men. And not for a chance but for its connection to the death and the rebirth, probably, the palmette will continue to be used on funeral Attic stelae.

Furthermore the auxiliary buds that are always attached to the palmette base, set to a slant or vertically, represent the dates emerging from the date palm while the entire handle can be seen as an inverted column or pilaster like the ones the flank the temples in Palestinian area or the princely tomb of Tamassos or Etruria. These chamber tombs are built not only like aristocratic houses, but also like sanctuaries giving security and immortality to the burial dead who surely has a divine status or who is going to receive a process of heroisation.

In the Regolini-Galassi tomb the outfit and personal objects make it certain that the deceased is portrayed not just as a princess, but as a goddess as well. In addition the partial closure of the cell (the thalamos) created a window through which the goddess-donna-queen Larthia could reveal herself. She would thus become an epiphany to those lamenting around the empty bed in the vestibulum created a window through which the goddess-domina-queen Larthia could reveal herself. She portrayed not just as a princess, but as a goddess as well. In addition the partial closure of the cell (the thalamos) created a window through which the goddess-donna-queen Larthia could reveal herself. She would thus become an epiphany to those lamenting around the empty bed in the vestibulum. This must be interpreted symbolically: here the dead is equated to a deity.

Again with the jugs from the Kushite tomb belonging to the queen Khensa, such an equation is made manifest by the two hieroglyphics inscriptions at the lower part of the neck.

But did the artisans and the local customers understand these symbols with their ritual and religious meanings? And for how long did they continue to be readable as symbols? Were they used in the same way in all the Mediterranean regions?

That these vases were special and personal vessels used for pouring wine is proven by the Italian princely tombs and the direct connection of the metal jugs with the buried body. Furthermore, the ritual importance of the palmette attachment and its relation with the deceased can be recognized in tomb 104 of Cuma Fondo Artiaco (fig. 3,8). Here the palmette attachments covered by gold leaf were put inside the cinerary urn, while the rest of oinochoe’s fragments, burnt with the body on the funerary pyre, were found amongst the stones lining the tomb, along with the most important funerary vessels.

It can be assumed that both artisans and local aristocrats were well aware of the profound connotations of these ancient symbols and how they were associated with the royalty of the East. The decorative motives are simple representations, but obvious and well understood by those cultures: now we need deepened studies for reconstructing that system of symbols. Finally local aristocrats used them to convey a precise message. They used the Orientalizing aesthetic in order to differentiate themselves from the other social classes that could not afford such outfits. At the same time, in this way, they consolidated their social identity. That, after all, was the way they wanted to be represented: rich, powerful and as divine as their oriental counterparts were.

In order to answer the second question (how long were they valid as symbols) it should be analyzed the transformation that occurred on the ‘Phoenician’ jugs in central Italy. During the Middle Orientalizing period, to which are dated all the Italian metal examples (only the oinochoe from Cuma is a few older), the ‘Phoenician’ oinochoe gets translated into several ceramic versions. Afterwards there will be no more metal specimens in Italy. The symbolic motif degenerates into merely a decorative pattern: effectively
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palmette attachments at the lower end of the handles cease to be part of the repertoire of central Italy. In all probability it has been going to lost its distant links to the Near East and its previous role as a status symbol connected with royalty and the sustaining power of the divinity, her power and prosperity. It is worth underlining that the previously funerary-related shape starts to appear in settlement contexts, like Veii and Fidenae, as well as in sanctuaries, as Portonaccio at Veii. Finally, the vessel-type becomes a common vase, used in daily life by a wide range of people. At the end of the 7th century BC it is replaced by other kinds of vases, like *olpai* or Rhodian jugs.

In conclusion to the third question: did the same symbols take on the same meaning from East to West in the Mediterranean?

The lack of precious-metal ‘Phoenician’ jugs on the Levantine coasts prevents one from comparing what happens in Cyprus, Italy and the Iberian peninsula. But from the red-slip version of the jugs we know that the piriform jugs were used in funerary contexts in association with the mushroom-lipped jugs. This combination was permanent, lasting from the 8th century BC until the 6th century BC in Phoenician burials. The excavation of Tyre Al-Bass showed how the vases were filled with precious liquids, perhaps different ones, given the different shapes. The trefoil jug was perfect for pouring lighter fluids like wine, while the mushroom-lipped jug seems to be more of a storage vessel, closed by a wax lid, for a thicker liquid or a paste, maybe honey or mead.

In Cyprus we have the first connection among the ‘Phoenician’ metal jugs and the rich local tombs where they were prestige items connected to funerary banquet as we can see examining the set of banquetting metal vessels of tomb 12 in Tamassos: here jugs for pouring wine, cauldrons for mixing wine and drinking bowls with an high number of *obeloi* and two stone tripods well represent both Phoenician and Greek components of symposium.

In Greece these jugs can be found only in sanctuaries in border areas, confirming the Greeks’ tendency from VIII century BC on to give precious vessels not to denote private wealth but as gifts to gods and goddesses. The tendency is strictly connected to the emerging of new social system, the *polis*, and to the emergence of the concept of citizenship.

Unfortunately almost can be said about the Kushite jugs because of a lack of documentation and to an absence of a general study about the Egyptian metalwork during the New Kingdom. But in the royal tomb K4 of queen Khensa where they have been found, they were associated with precious vessels, like a large bronze basin (98.8 cm) with lion-headed handles, a combination commonly encountered in the Iberian peninsula.

It is in the Iberian peninsula that we find the largest number of bronze ‘Phoenician’ jugs, with trefoil, circular and figured mouths. Here a glass *oinochoe* is also known from the Aliseda (Cáceres) princely female tomb with a hieroglyphic inscription like on the Nubian vases. The Iberian metal jugs are reserved for the local elites (like in Italy and in Cyprus) and presumably carry the same connotation as a status symbol. In these princely Iberian tombs the jugs were often associated with other vessels, such as brazier and *thymiateria*, used for incense, forming an assemblage of precious objects, perhaps part of a wide-spread ritual. It is possible that ‘Phoenician’ jugs in Iberian peninsula were not used for pouring wine, but water during libations. These vases were employed in ritual washing or lustral bath, as we know not only from Homeric poems, but also from Punic libations and Semitic ablution habits.

It is evident that despite the emergence of different functions concomitant with the alteration of the shape across the several areas of its diffusion, yet the powerful connotation of those ancient symbols were yet transported widely. In all the funerary contexts the palmette as their supports preserved its connection with the divine and held onto its powerful symbolic meaning - when closely connected with contexts where ‘Phoenician’ jugs were discovered. This conservatism and sharing of a common symbolic code made the so-called Orientalizing period the first Mediterranean-wide art movement and the Mediterranean a community of styles, symbols, meanings and ideas.

Maria Taloni
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LA DECORAZIONE A PALMETTA SULLE BROCCHE ‘FENICIE’ IN METALLO - In questo articolo si affronta il tema del caratteristico motivo decorativo delle cd. brocche ‘fenicie’ in metallo: la palmetta posta all’attacco inferiore dell’ansa. Nella prima parte si presenta una sintesi dell’origine, dell’evoluzione e delle elaborazioni del motivo decorative nel corso del tempo nel Mediterraneo. A questo fine lo studio del motivo decorativo è condotto da un punto di vista morfologico e tipologico, confrontando sia le oinochoai in metallo e materiale di pregio sia le imitazioni ceramiche (l’iconografia). Sulla base di quest’analisi preliminare si riesamina, poi, il dibattito scientifico sulla provenienza e sulla produzione di tali vasi rinvenuti soprattutto in contesti del Mediterraneo centrale e occidentale (il contesto). Infine si tratta il tema delle possibili connotazioni simboliche sottese a tale decorazione anche in considerazione dei differenti significati e funzioni che tale particolare gruppo di oggetti assume nei vari contesti di rinvenimento (l’iconologia).

ΤΑ ένθέτα ανθέμια στις λεγόμενες μεταλλικές ‘φοινικικές’ πρόχοι - Στο άρθρο αυτό αντιμετωπίζεται το πρόβλημα του πιο χαρακτηριστικού διακοσμητικού θέματος στις λεγόμενες ‘φοινικικές’ πρόχους. Το ανθέμιο τοποθετημένο στο κατώτερο σημείο σύνδεσης της λαβής. Στο πρώτο μέρος παρουσιάζεται μια σύνθεση των απαρχών, της εξέλιξης και των διαφόρων επεξεργασιών του διακοσμητικού θέματος κατά τη διάρκεια των αιώνων στη Μεσόγειο. Με αυτό το στόχο η μελέτη του διακοσμητικού θέματος αντιμετωπίζεται από τη μορφολογική και τυπολογική άποψη, συγκρίνοντας και τις μεταλλικές οινοχόες και πολύτιμο υλικό και τις κεραμικές μιμήσεις (η εικονογραφία). Με βάση αυτή την προκαταρκτική ανάλυση επανεξετάζεται η επιστημονική συζήτηση για την προέλευση και την παραγωγή των αγγείων που ήλθαν στο φως σε χώρους της κεντρικής και της ανατολικής Μεσογείου (το κλειστό σύνολο). Τέλος διαπραγματεύεται το πρόβλημα των πιθανών συμβολικών χαρακτηριστικών της συγκεκριμένης διακόσμησης και σε σχέση με τις διαφορετικές σημασίες και λειτουργίες που λαμβάνει αυτή η ιδιαίτερη ομάδα αντικειμένων ανάλογα με το πλαίσιο των σημείων εύρεσής τους (η εικονολογία).
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