Title	Polyphonia Visibilis, I : The Study of Narrative Landscape
Author(s)	Tsuji, Shigebumi
Citation	大阪大学文学部紀要. 1989, 29, p. 1-121
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/9410
rights	
Note	

CHAPTER I
THE ODYSSEY LANDSCAPE AND
NARRATIVE FRIEZES FROM
CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY

Part 1
The First Sections of
the Odyssey Landscape

The eleven fresco panels now in the Vatican with various scenes from the Odyssey once belonged to a long continuous narrative frieze with a splendid depiction of landscape. The frieze was first discovered near Via Graziosa on the Esquiline in Rome in 1843, and is generally called the Odyssey Landscape.[37] This is no doubt one of the best known monuments from Classical Antiquity and has been the object of serious research by art historians as well as archaeologists. The primary purpose of our present study is to analyze the various devices for narrative representation applied upon the landscape setting in this pictorial frieze. The results may further contribute to the study of the origin and the date of this famous example of narrative art from Classical Antiquity.

In the preceding chapter it has already been proposed that different events depicted in a narrative frieze must be appropriately distinguished from each other by one way or another. In the Odyssey Landscape it is mostly done by what may be called insertion motifs. With these separating motifs inserted between scenes one can easily recognize the chronological, Earlier-than/Later-than relation among the scenes. The temporality, however, of the picture frieze also requires that continuity should be established somehow by means of what we have called identity-indices. The artist of the Odyssey Landscape obviously aimed to achieve these two

[37]The bibliography on this famous fresco-frieze is numerous. The major publications are: K.Woermann, *Die Antike Odyssee-Landschaft von Esquilinischen Hügel zu Rom* (Munich, 1876); H. G. van Beyen, *Pompejanische Wanddekoration*, II,1 (Den Haag, 1960), 268ff.; P. H. von Blanckenhagen, 'The Odyssey Frieze," *RM*, 70 (1963), 100-146; W. J. T. Peters, *Landscape in Romano-Campanian Mural Painting* (Groningen, 1963), 27-32.

purposes simultaneously. In addition, the frescoist had as his task to impress the viewer with the huge landscape in a panorama which evolves infinitely in illusionistic space. In the following paragraphs we will closely investigate how the artist solved these complicated problems.

Let us begin our observation with the second section of the pictorial frieze, which is actually the first of the surviving panels (fig. 1). At the upper left corner there are a few winged figures. We can now hardly recognize them since they are not only much effaced but also done in the same colors and hues as the sky in the background. Still we can see them represented in different postures, and some of them blowing horns. Most likely they represent the winds in different directions which were given to Odysseus by Aeolus only to be carelessly released from the container by Odysseus' crew (*Odyssey*, X, 34ff).

The presence of the personification would naturally assume the representation of raging sea underneath. The water below, however, is calm and clear, quite against the narrative of *Odyssey*, X, 47-48. We, therefore, ought to identify the ocean scene as Odysseus' arrival at the land of the carnivorous giants, the Laestrygonians (X, 87-96). The fleet anchored in the bay with the folded sail and the figure aboard in the foreground holding an oar and inscribed ΑΚΤΑΙ faithfully correspond to the Homeric text.

This arrival scene is clearly separated from the next by a huge promontory rising from the earth in the foreground. Generally a motif of huge rock or promontory such as this plays the dominant role in this frieze as a major insertion motif. In the present instance, the promontory separates two scenes not only spatially - sea and land - but also chronologically. The promontory is modelled by strong *chiaroscuro* work - see the brilliantly lit left side as against the dark shaded right side - also reinforces the impression of the spatio-temporal distance.

Another huge rock in the middleground is also modelled in the same fashion. Here the dark side contains a deep cave from which a fountain flows into a small stream in the

foreground. The tall figure of the daughter of the giants' king appears from the left, as if appearing from the upper end of a theatre stage, against the background of the bright rock surface. The three Greek surveyors turn toward her in front of the dark cave, as if lit in a spot light from above. The dramatic effect of light and darkness and the theatrical gestures of figures suggest the possible influence of stage drama.

The clear stream in the foreground leads the spectator's eye to the right of the composition. The huge rock we have just seen at the left throws a long and dark shadow on the middle ground, which extends further beyond the painted pillaster into the third section, containing cattle led by a herdsman (Most part of his figure is overlaid by the pillastar.) and a standing guard or a shepherd at the right end (fig. 2). In contrast to the dark middle ground, both foreground and background of this pastoral scene are cheerfully lit by sunlight. The foreground is inhabited by a few sheep and goats, quietly grazing or drinking from the stream, whereas the background is occupied by a small square-shaped structure (an entrance to a sanctuary?) and several cattle and herdmen. The scene is no doubt the precise representation of the Homeric description of the unusual pastoral life of the Laestrygonians in X, 82ff:

"...where herdsman calls to herdsman as he drives in his flock, and the other answers as he drives his forth. There a man who never slept could have earned a double wage, one by herding cattle, and one by pasturing white sheep; for the outgoings of the night and of the day are close together."

This idyllic pastoral scene is terminated at the right end by two figures seated on a rock in the middle ground. The one lying leisurely on the rock seems to be a satyr. The other seated and holding a staff is inscribed as ΥΟΝΑΔ . The tree in his front is formed in an 'S' shape, as if embracing the preceding pastoral scene with its branches extended to the left on the one hand, while, on the other hand, leading the viewer's eye further toward the right. The entire setting of this pastoral scene is clearly separated from the following scene by a promontory, again rising, rather abruptly, from the

foreground.

The two scenes we have just observed - the encounter of Odysseus' surveyors with the king's daughter and the Laestrygonians pasturing their herds - are contained quite comfortably within an oval, which is formed by the rocks at the left and the tree at the right of the composition.[38] The curved countours of the two huge rocks at left are continued by the small stream in the nearest foreground, until it reaches the tree at the furthest right end. Thus the foreground and middle ground of the picture form a large circular arena seen slightly from above.

The similar circular composition consisting of a large oval can be observed more conspicuously in the next scenes of the slaughter of the Greeks and the destruction of Odysseus' fleet by the giants (fig. 3). Here the oval contour begins with the promontory in the foreground in the third section. (Between the tree at the end of the preceding scene and this promontory there are three giants busily engaged in collecting stones and rods as slaughtering weapons. They form an intermediary scene, announcing the imminent disaster.)

The curve is continued by another promontory in the middle ground, slightly distanced from the first one at right, and then reaches a cliff in the background at the upper left of the following section 4. Then, the curved line is continued beyond the sea horizon and reaches a penninsula and shoreline at right, completing the oval with the shoreline in the foreground. There, several giants are attacking the Greek fleet. The 'deep and tranquil bay' forms a vast arena or circular stage.

The following section 5 seems to present a little different problem to us (fig. 4). The left end of section is occupied by a craggy cliff. Since the sunlight falls from above, only the narrow flat space on the top is lit, while the other parts remain in dark shadows. We can barely recognize two human figures at the foot of the cliff: the one is a giant raising a rock above

[38] Dawson's statement that "the terrain is divided into a series of bays and recesses, each of which contains *a scene* from the *Odyssey*"(Our Italics) is against our observation and incorrect. Ph.Dawson, *Roman-Campanian Mythological Lanscape Paintings* (=Yale Classical Studies, 9) (New Haven, 1944), 196.

his own head, and the other is a poor Greek victim upon whom the giant is about to hurl down the rock he holds. Beyond this dark cliff there opens a wide vista at the right: ocean and a long, complicated coastline. The ship which half appears from behind the cliff must be Odysseus', which alone could escape from the ravaging hands of the giant. Thus, the scene can be identified as the flight of Odysseus from the Laestrygonian land (X, 128-132).

Now, on the seashore at the right of the composition there stands a curious object. It resembles a broom held upside down. Since the same objects are soon to be seen in section 6 at Circe's mansion, this curious object must be a magical tool or symbol, indicating that the coastline is a part of Cirece's island.[39] Thus, section 5 comprises, in addition to the scene of Odysseus' flight, that of the arrival of Odysseus' boat at the charmed land. That the three female figures at the right below are inscribed as $\Delta KTAI$, as was the oarman in the previous section 2, may confirm our identification of the right half of this section as Odysseus' arrival at Circe's land. The two different moments of narrative which are separated in time are combined within a single composition.

Although this section thus contains two successive moments in the Homeric narrative in one composition, the compositional scheme is very different from them. Quite unlike the relaxed, affluent oval shapes of the previous compositions, the one here is abruptly cut at the left end, while the coastline at right still forms a relaxed curve spanning from the horizon down to the foreground.

The peculiar compositional scheme of section 5 is in fact explicable by the corresponding Homeric text. The poet describes the scene of Odysseus' flight: "And they all tossed

---

[39]Before the restoration of the fresco panels in a recent time there was visible another stick standing on the ground above the heads of the personifications of 'coast'. In addition a few human figures were still visible on the shore, to the right of the broom-like object. See Woermann, *Odysee-Landschaft*. The present author, however, has no way to decide whether these figures should be a part of the original or a later addition in the nineteenth century.

the sea with their oar-blades in fear of death, and joyfully seaward, away from *the beetling cliffs*, my ship sped on;. . . . (X,130-132). The tall and steep cliff in the picture is no other than " $\epsilon \pi \eta \rho \epsilon \phi \epsilon \alpha s \ \pi \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha s$."

This specific motif of the beetling cliff deserves a brief attention for its visual effect upon the entire composition of section. Due to the large dark screen formed by the cliff, the spatial depth, which has already been made conspicuous by the extended coastline of the peninsula at right, is represented more acute and even dramatic, especially by the strong *chiaroscuro* contrast between the cliff and the distant ocean.[40] In section 2 the vivid juxtaposition of ocean water and the promontory at the left end produces not only the strong spatial effect but also the sharp division in narrative sequence. Here the dark foreground formed by the cliff contains a slaughter scene, whereas the bright ocean in the middle ground embraces the peaceful sail of Odysseus' boat. Again the contrast emphasizes not only the spatial distance but also the dramatic turn of the narrative phase.

* * * * * *

Our preceding observations may be summarized with special regards to the various functions of the landscape motifs in this majestic pictorial frieze.

Their narrative functions seem to be deliberately complex. In the first place, most of the motifs in the foreground and middle ground serve as insertion motifs, separating one scene from the other. Many promontories and cliffs are applied for that purpose. It must be noted, however, that some of the motifs form large circles in ensemble, thus connecting, instead of separating, two adjacent scenes within one frame.

In this regard, we must also pay attention to the temporal

---

[40]Interestingly enough, the same compositional device with a tall cliff at one end and long stretched coastline in the distance at the other end is found in early T'ang landscape paintings and their derivatives in early Japanese painting. The best example is probably the painted pectrum now in the Imperial storage of Shosoin, Nara. Cf. K. Suzuki, *Chuugoku Kaigashi,* I (The History of Chinese Painting)(Tokyo, 1981), 89.ff.

function of the landscape motifs found in the furthest distance: for instance, the high, undulating hills in the background of the third section not only envelop the entire pastoral scene but also extend to the neighboring scene of the slaughter of the Greeks, which is clearly separated from the preceding pastoral scene by the motifs in the fore- and middle ground. In short, the distant hills are an index of the continuity of narrative, leading the viewer's eye smoothly beyond one oval frame to the next. It is obvious that the distant horizon of the high water also serves the same purpose as it remains at the same eye-level all the way through the first four scenes. The temporal-narrative function of such distant landscape motifs may be compared metaphrically with that of *basso continuo* in Baroque music.

Section 5 offers a slightly complicated narrative device by the artist: the abrupt appearance of the craggy cliff, as has been mentioned already, emphasizes the dramatic change of the narrative phase from the Laestrygonian episode to the adventure in Circe's island. But the scene is skillfully connected iconographically by introducing two combatting figures, - a giant with a rock and his Greek victim at his feet. Their presence in this section also implies the continuity of the narrative.

In addition to the narrative function, the particular composition in oval frame produces particular effects. It not only accentuates the horizontal development of the narrative but brings forth a very strong sense of spatial depth.[41]

---

[41] Whereas little has been done with regard to the narrative (or syntactic) function of these subsidiary motifs, a number of scholars have studied the perspective of the Odyssey Landscape: G.Richter, *Perspective in Greek and Roman Art* (New York, 1974?), 47-48 and more recently J. Barchhardt, "ZurDarstelling von Objekten in der Entfernung; Beobachtungen zu den Anfangen der griechischen Landscaftsmalerei," *Tainia, R. Hampe zum 70.. Geburtstag dargebracht* (Mainz,a.R., ?) 526ff. point the strong reduction of the size of objects and human figures, but fail to recognize the strong perspective effect of the particular compositional scheme. In this respect von Blanckenhagen has made more appropriate observations, noting the

Especially the contours which curve sharply into the depth yield almost the same visual effect as the orthogonals converging upon a vanishing point in linear perspective. The strong reduction of the size of objects and human figures as well as the subtle description of atmosphere endorse this impression of spatial depth.

To our present knowledge there is hardly any parallel example of such a particular composition in the Greek and Roman monumental art preceding the Odyssey Landscape. Where was this wonderful device invented? Did it belong to the Hellenistic tradition? Or should it be attributed to the genius of an individual artist of the Odyssey Landscape? We may take this opportunity to briefly survey the major monuments of narrative frieze from Antiquity.

---

perspectival effects of the forms and colors of promontories, etc. But he again fails to note the oval compositional unit at issue. von Blanckenhagen, "The Odyssey Frieze," 114ff.

It is possible that this oval composition developed from the optical theory of the ancient according to which our field of sight is to be shaped spherical after the shape of its receptacle, i. e., human eyeball. See E. Panofsky "Die Perspektive als symbolische Form" *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg* (1924-25), 265, 300ff.

Part 2
The Narrative Frieze
in Ancient Art[42]

Since the time of Carl Robert, the Troilus scene on the famous Francois vase has been quoted repeatedly to explain the typical method of visual narrative from the Archaic period (fig. 5). Two authorities of the study of the narrative representation in the Ancient period, Franz Wickhoff in his study of the *Vienna Genesis*[43] and Kurt Weitzmann in his *Roll and Codex*[44], both took up the case.

According to Wickhoff, plastic art has only three methods of narrative representation: the continuous, distinguishing, and complementary. The last method has more remote origin than the other two. This is called complementary because it does not repeat an event/figure in action, as in the continuous method, but combines the central event/figure with all that happen before and after it. The Troilus frieze on the François vase is the earliest example of this complementary method.

But, Wickhoff continues, the complementary method of narrative representation, just like the continuous method, contradicts our common experience that *at one time we can see only events that happen simultaneously.*[45] Nevertheless,

---

[42] Dawson, *Myth. Landscape Painting*, 188ff. contains a compact and objective history of the landscape paintings in continuous frieze. Although his summary often alludes to the problem of continuous narrative, it never becomes his central issue, little attension being paid to specific methods of narrative representation in landscape frieze.

[43] F.Wickhoff and von Hartel, W. R., *Die Wiener Genesis* (Vienna, 1895), esp.8-9 in the present context.

[44] K. Weitzmann, *Illustrations in Roll and Codex* (Princeton, 1947[1]; henceforth quoted from 1970[2]), esp.13-14. in the present context. Also W.Raeck has recently discussed several Archaic representations of Troilus story in relation to the method of the visual narrative in Greek art. "Zur Erzählweise archaischer und klassischer Mythenbilder,"*JDAI*, 99 (1984),1-25.

[45] Wickhoff's statement here strikes us, since it assumes that even in

---

this method satisfies the phantasy of the viewer better than the continuous method. Wickhoff believes that the relief on Achileus' arm, which is famed for the beautiful description by Homer, must have been executed by this complementary method. Wickhoff further asserts that this method should be the primodial one in the Greek and Roman tradition of narrative art and that both distinguishing and continuous methods are the results of its implementation.

Wickhoff's definition of the complementary method has been reviewed by Kurt Weitzmann: he regards it as one of the variations of his "simultaneous" method. Klitias, the artist of the Francois vase, combined figures and elements which are not to be seen simultaneously according to the Homeric text. But the artist skillfully composed them into a frieze, and, at the same time, changed the gestures of a few figures before and after the actual assassination of the Trojan prince, in order to make them *simultaneous* with what is occurring at the center of the frieze composition.

Thus, both authors unanimously emphasize not only the importance of the central scene but also the *simultaneity* of the related scenes and objects. Especially Wickhoff concludes his description of the Troilus picture as follows: "All that is related to the death of Toilus must be seen completely ("vollständig gesehen werden"). Or, all the phases of the incident must have been surveyed completely ("vollständig übersehen")." The simultaneity of the occurrences in the narrative is, almost unconsciously, compared to the instantaneity of the viewer's reception. It is taken for granted not only that all the figures and motifs in the Troilus scene are combined simultaneously but also that they must be seen simultaneously.

The same analogy between the simultaneity of narrative sequence and the instantaneity of the viewer's cognition can be found in Weitzmann's notion of the simultaneous method. Although he admits that the Troilus scene "creates the

---

simultaneous in its entirety, he was still permeated, even in many other respects, by the modern concept of the time in the visual arts since Lessing, as we have discussed at the beginning of our present study.

impression of a single scene in which the time is not fixed, but transitory", he continues: "If the archaic method thus described is to be characterized by a single term, that word must imply that several actions take place *at the same time* , i. e. simultaneously. Thus we might speak of a *simultaneous method*. . . ." (Our italics). Here it is obvious that the simultaneity of the different actions in the frieze is due indeed to the fact that they are contained in a single picture frame.[46]

We admit that the artist deliberately placed the assasination scene in the center of the composition to emphasize the climax of the incident. Further, both scholars have good reasons to believe that the entire frieze forms a simultaneous representation rather than a continuous: firstly, none of the figures and motifs is repeated in order to indicate continuous development of narrative, and, secondly, there is no insertion motifs - whether architectural or natural - that might serve to establish the chronological sequence of the scenes depicted there.

Still, we would like to insist that it is not only possible but also far more natural to *read* the narrative from left to right chronologically than to look at the picture frieze as a whole at one glance. This is mainly due to the frieze format of the picture itself, that automatically guides the viewer's eye laterally. But, if we imagine how the viewer of the Archaic period would appreciate the miniature frieze painted on a vase: with all the likelihood he/she had to either turn around the vase, or move his/her eyes around it. Then, the scenes in the frieze must have been found one after another, rather than at a single instant. We, therefore, would like to assume that Klitias had already had at hand a model in the form of narrative frieze, which he deliberately remodeled to emphasize the

---

[46]Weitzmann,*loc.cit.* points out that the girl at the fountain house turns her head to the central scene at right with her hands raised in surprise, while her body is turned toward the building at left. But such an ambiguous stand (contrapposto in Archaic art?)is quite common in Classical continuous narrative. Note the contrapposto of the personification of the fountain in the 2 section, or that of the female figures of ἄκται in the 5 section.

central scene.

For our present discussion, however, equally interesting are the stylistic aspects of this earliest narrative frieze in Greek art. The foremost characteristic of the frieze is the lack of the description of three dimensional space. The background remains completely neutral and the introduction of explanatory motifs and settings into background is limited to the minimum. Further, the size of human figures and architectural motifs are not differentiated in terms of realism so that they both fill the full height of the frieze. The only exceptions are the figures of Polites and Hector who are about to march out from the Trojan fortress: they are represented much lower than the wall.

If we turn to the famous Hellenistic narrative frieze in relief from the second century B.C., the Telephos frieze in Pergamon, the stylistic features have been considerably changed.[47] The main standing figures occupy only three-fouths or four-fifths of the entire height of the relief, and the sense of spatial depth is far richer than the archaic frieze, as seen in the secene of Telephos landing at Argos. Nevertheless, we must not fail to recognize that the stylistic tradition of continuous narrative representation in the Archaic period, such as seen in the Troilus frieze, still persists until the late Hellenistic period.

H. Heres-von Littrow has recently analyzed three different stylistic groups in the frieze.[48] Group A is, more than the other two groups, conscious of the spatial effect on the relief, thus reflecting the contemporaneous development of relief sculpture in the late Hellenistic period (fig. 6). To the contrary, Group B seems to hark back to the tradition of the fifth through fourth century (fig. 7). Group C is characterized by its solid and neutral background, against which the figures are represented in rigid, ritual manner (fig. 8). Although discussing the general retrospective tendency in the late Hellenistic period, to which both Telephos relief and the Neo-

---

[47]H.Winnefeld, *Die Friese des Grossen Altares* (=Altertümer von Pergamon, Vol.III,2) , (Berlin 1910).

[48]H. Heres-von Littow, "Untersuchungen zur Reliefgestaltung des Telephos-frieses," *FuB* 12 (1970), 103-121.

Attic reliefs belong, von Littrow did not investigate the possible specific source of the style of the Group C. It may, however, be justifiable to assume the continuation of the Archaic relief style even down to the second century B. C., when, according to von Littrow, the art was led to *gelehrte Kunstbetrachtung und Anlage von Kunstsammlungen.*[49]

We may add a few more characteristics of this famous narrative frieze: first, except for the unusual scene of the building of the ark, the majority of the figures are placed parallel to the picture surface closest to the viewer. As a result, the ground on which they firmly stand, kneel, or lie, coincides with the lower edge of the relief. Also the isocephaly permeates the frieze, despite the rich variation of the movement of the figures.

Secondly, we must admit that, unlike the Archaic narrative friezes, an additional space in a long continuous band is set in the Telephos frieze above the heads of the main figures in the foreground. Various figures and motifs appear in this upper zone. But again, except for the scene of the construction of the ark, these figures and motifs are provided with certain rational justifications in terms of realism for assuming their elevated places: the figures are always seated on the top of high promontories or elevated chairs. Horses are jumping high, and tree tops and capitals of columns are found always high above human figures.

Hence, we may conclude that the general and fundamental composition of the frieze is still firmly tied to the earlier tradition of relief art. But, simultaneously, the Pergamene sculptors had to make their efforts to break through its hieratic space rendering. Increase of the relative height of the frieze is one example. Naturally, however, their efforts were limited and the results are far from the illusionism that is to be seen in the Hellenistic-Roman narrative landscape.

There are actually a few more examples that seem to suggest this survival of Archaic relief style: Ranuccio Bianchi-Bandinelli has discussed various instances of Hellenistic-Roman narrative frieze with regard to *Ilias Ambrosiana.*[50] Among

[49]*Ibid.*, 120-121.

[50]R.Bianchi Bandinelli, *Hellenistic-Byzantine Miniatures of the Iliad*

them the most interesting for us are the three Iliac cycles in Via Abbondanza.[51] The first, and probably the earliest one is the stucco relief decorating the wall of the sacrarium of Venus and Diana (so suggested by Brilliant) in the House of the Cryptoporticus (fig. 9). Brilliant correctly stressed the symbolic meanings hidden behind the selection as well as the arrangement of the scenes, which by no means conform to the sequence of the Homeric narrative at all.

Our attention, however, is attracted by the formal aspects of the stucco relief: just as in the Troilus frieze on the archaic vase, it has no significantly organic background. Again, both human figures and architetural motifs are represented in the same size, and they both occupy the entire height of the relief. Only when a figure is represented inside the building it is made lower than the architecture, as seen in the figures of Polites and Hector on the Francois vase.[52] Even in other respects - the lack of any insertion motifs, the unevenness of the span occupied by each scene, etc. - the Pompeian cycle reminds us of that Archaic frieze, demonstrating that, even if the figures and motifs are represented more naturalistically than in the archaic frieze, the early formal tradition was still prevalent specifically in the Roman period over the narrative friezes of the Homeric Epics. Brilliant suggests that the extreme narrowness of the three Iliac friezes in Via Abbondanza seems to indicate their origin in illustrated manuscripts. His proposal seems plausible. But, if so, could the archetypal model the papyrus roll illustration be done by the method of *column picture*, as Weitzmann proposes?

There is another group of monuments which raises the same problem, i. e., the so-called *Tabulae Iliacae.*[53] This is the series of small tablets in *piombino* (pulverized marble), measuring from 5 x 8 to 25 x 40 cm, and carved with a number

(Olten, 1955) ,29-30 *et passim.*

[51]V.Spinazzola, *Pompei alla luce degli scavi nuovi di Via dell'Abbondanza,* Vol.2 (Rome, 1953) 865ff. More recently R.Brilliant, *Visual Narratives*, 60-66.

[52]Spinazola, *Op. cit.* 885ff, fig.883.

[53]A.Sadurska, *Les tables iliaques* (Warszaw, 1964)

of scenes mostly from the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*. The central part is often occupied by a large composition containing more than a single scene. Layers of miniature friezes with great many Homeric scenes frank or surround the central section. More often than not the reliefs are accompanied by various kinds of text, including the so-called hypothesis of the Homeric cycles, which are inscribed mostly above or below the frieze, but often filling any available space around the images. The central, what we may call polyscenic, section will be of the utmost importance for our future discussion. Here, however, we must focuss our attention on the formal features of these miniature friezes.

As seen in the best preserved instance, the so-called *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina*, the numerous miniature friezes are all executed in the same manner: both figures and architectural settings are rendered in the same size, filling the entire height of the friezes (fig. 10).[54] Moreover, all the compositions develop laterally, parallel to the surface. In this respect, these early Imperial friezes still maintain the Archaic tradition.[55]

In the catalogue and research on these puzzling objects, the author, A. Sadurska, rejects the theory finding the origin of these miniature reliefs in manuscript illustration, as K. Weitzmann had previously proposed, and suggests instead that a monumental frieze from the Greek period might have served as the ultimate model for a number of later sketches in drawing, monumental art, and such unusual objects like *Tabulae Iliacae.*

[54]*Ibid.,* 17-18 *et passim.*

[55]*Ibid.* 61-64; Brilliant,,*Visual Narratives.* 53-58. Such formal characteristics of the miniature reliefs in *Tabulae Iliacae* are not due to the particular format of the proportionately long extended friezes in the *Capitolina.* In *Tabula Odysseaca Tomasetti,* the figures also fill the entire height of the picture frame in normal proportion.

We, however, must admit that among more than thirty remnants of *Tablae Iliacae,* the *Capitolina* is perhaps the best in artistic quality: in spite of its archaic features, various efforts are made to introduce spatial depth. as seen in the illusionistic renderings of sea/harbor scenes. Also the human figures have more sculptural quality than the other examples. But isocephaly and lateral development of composition are equally prevailing.

The issue has recently been reexamined by N. Horsefall, who reappraised Weitzmann's view, saying: "We must conclude that Theodorus [the editor and artist of the major pieces of these tablets] himself excerpted the pictures from a complete [pictorial] sequence [of the Epic Cycle] and linked them with the hypotheses. It is his combinations, his juxtapositions and his craftsmanship that make his products so unique." At the same time, due to the frequent and obvious discrepancies between texts and reliefs, Horsefall suggests that "Theodorus is likely to have derived texts and reliefs from distinct and independent sources." [56]

With the meticulousness characteristic of his scholarship, Horfseall has opened a new horizon of research. But his conclusions in fact have posed us another crucial and complicated problem: we may admit, following Weitzmann, that the only possible artistic medium must have been none other than the illustrated papyri of the Epic Cycles, which could have a capacity to contain a complete set of the Homeric cycles with their illustration (as Horsefall suggests). Horsefall's conclusion, therefore, inevitably calls for an assumption that the miniature friezes on *Tabulae Iliacae* were excerpted from a complete set of illustrated Homeric rolls.

Now, if we accept the reconstruction of the earliest Homeric papyrus illustration by Weitzmann, it must have been executed by the method of *column picture*, where the physical relation between text and image must have been kept very closely.[57] How, then, could the discrepancies between the relief scenes and hypothesis text occur in the tablets, if his model was such an illustrated Homeric Cycle in the form of column picture? Wasn't the system of column picture the best method to establish the closest relation between text and illustration? Or, should we blame Theodorus as so promiscuous an artist that he completely ignored the correspondence not only between the

[56]N. Horsefall, "Stesichorus at Bovillae?" *JHS,* 99 (1979), 26-48, esp.45-46. He bluntly rejects Sadurska's hypothetical primary source in Greek monumental art. See p.45, n.160. See further Brilliant, *Visual Narratives,* 54-59.

[57]Weitzmann, *Roll and Codex,* 77-81.

text and image in the model papyri, but also between the original Homeric text and hypothesis text as well?

This argument automatically leads us to the following assumption: if we want to save Theodorus from this notoriety, we must prove that the real cause of the inconsistent correspondence between text and image on the Iliac Tablets is to be found in a default in his model rather than in his dubious connoisseurship. In other word, it must be demonstrated that his model was actually short of exact correspondence, in form or content, between the Homeric text and its images.

Since Wickhoff's *Wiener Genesis* the historians of Roman and Byzantine art have been tirelessly debating the existence of picture roll in ancient art. The publication of Weitzmann's *Roll and Codex* certainly "poured oil over the fire",[58] and in fact the controversy between von Blanckenhagen and Schefold about the pictorial model of the Odyssey Landscape added an important chapter to the history of this debate.[59]

It is true that, considering the present state of relevant materials at our hand, the existence of picture rolls without any text is difficult to prove.[60] However, it would be reckless to conclude that a papyrus roll would never contain a picture in any form of frieze. In this respect the large number of extant Egyptian papyri seems to offer interesting materials for our present discussion. Many of these Egyptian papyri are actually illustrated not only with column pictures distributed among text, but also with miniature friezes which run along the top of the rolls.

Probably the best instance of such miniature friezes is the so-called Greenfield Papyrus in the British Museum,[61] written during the second quarter of the tenth century B. C. (fig. 11).

[58] For example see E.Kitzinger's refutation over Weitzmann's theory in his " Observations on the Samson Floor at Mopsuestia," *DOP* 27 (1973), 133-144, esp. 141ff.   .

[59] von Blanckenhagen, *"The Odyssey Frieze,"* Appendix, 142-146.

[60] Weitzmann, *Roll and Codex*, 56, 123ff. *et passim*.

[61] *Ibid.*, 61-62, fig.47a-b.

Interestingly enough, here the length of the miniature frieze fills the entire width of the text column underneath, and whenever the illustration requires more space, two friezes are superimposed. The chance is that, if the text required the illustration in a very long frieze, there could have been many layers of miniature friezes, which might not be unlike those miniature friezes in *Tabulae Iliacae*.

In the face of the fact that the ancient Greeks received inspiration for their own papyrus illustration from the Egyptians, it is more than likely that the Greeks adapted not only the column picture but also the miniature friezes from the Egyptian tradition. It must be purely accidental that there is no extant Greek papyrus with illustration in miniature friezes.

It must be remembered here that many of the surviving Greek papyrus illustrations in column pictures accompany scientific or magical text, which do not necessarily require a syntactic construction of the text itself.[62]

Our observations about the early Greek papyrus illustration does not ignore the fact that a literary work was illustrated by a set of column pictures: we have a few examples of Greek papyrus fragments of unidentified romances which are illustrated by a set of column pictures. But, as demonstrable by the examples quoted by Weitzmann, many of the illustrations of literary prose texts, both Egyptian and Greek, retain frieze form rather than the form of column pictures.[63]

We, therefore would like to propose that in order to illustrate a long literary cycle such as Homeric Epics, a series of friezes could be conceived as more suitable a form than that of hundreds of column pictures. There is another reason to suggest that the archetypal illustrations of Homeric Epics were done in miniature friezes on papyrus rolls: for the ancient Greeks the Homeric text could well be the most venerable of all the other literary works, partly at least, for its very remote

[62] This holds true, to a certain degree, with the representation of the Twelve Labors of Hercules. They are depicted always in the set of twelve but there seems to be no rigid chronological order among them.

[63] K. Weitzmann, *Ancient Book Illumination* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), 95-115.

origin. Then, it would be quite natural that the Greeks adapted the format of miniature friezes which had been in the ancient Egyptian papyri with sacred text. This also explains why the Archaic frieze style persisted even in the early Imperial period: it was a deliberate retrogression to visually venerate the ancient text.

If our conjecture is justifiable, it may explain why those Iliac cycles in frieze, the one in the sacrarium of the House of Cryptoporticus and the other in the miniature reliefs on Iliac Tablets, are manifestly miniaturistic, sharing the same formal tendencies found in those early papyrus illustrations: the completely neutral background, the all-prevailing isocephaly which comprises even architectural motifs, etc.

It seems that the length of a miniature frieze in book illustration is the multiple of the width of a single column, *i. e.*, it corresponds precisely to the total sum of the width of the columns topped by the frieze. Thus the picture may not completely lose its correspondence to the text in terms of form and content.[64]

It, however, must have been less convenient and more faulty than in the column picture system, if one wanted to find exact correspondence between the scenes contained in the frieze and pertinent text. Especially if more than two friezes were superimposed in a single column, as has been seen in the Greenfield Papyrus, it might well be painstaking for an artist like Theodorus to find a text-image correspondence as precise as that in column picture system.

Such were the inconvenience and the implicit chance of fault

[64]Manuscripts from Early Byzantine period, such as the Vienna Genesis or Ilias Ambrosiana are often provided with miniature friezes which contain multiple scenes, and it is not unusual that such friezes are superimposed one above another. This indicates neither that the model might have been a long picture frieze and the Byzantine illustrators might have cut and piled them up in layers, as Wickhoff assumed, nor that these miniature friezes might be the result of jointing single column pictures one by one, as Weitzmann would have conjectured. We assert that already in the ancient prototype, these epic illustrations (*Genesis* included) were provided with such layers of miniature friezes.

in finding exact correspondence between text and image that might well happen to the viewer/reader of the miniature frieze in a papyrus roll. These faults must have increased, as the matter of fact, when the proportion of the space occupied by text to that occupied by picture was reversed. An Oxyrhynchus fragment in Florence contains a large drawing of Amor and Psyche in fine, classicizing style. Due to the unusually huge size of the picture, about 25cm in width, it has been variously conjectured as to whether the fragment might have really constituted a picture in a text column or even a part of a picture roll without text. Weitzmann preferred the former view, because the full width roughly corresponds to the multiple of the width of a single text column in Classical papyrus.[65] Even if we safely adhere to the conservative view as expressed by Weitzmann, we must admit that the correspondence between text and image had to suffer a great deal due to the large size of the picture: the full written account of the scene could no longer be found directly above or below the picture. The worst case was probably that the artist saved the artistic quality of the picture at the expense of the text. Then a complete account of the picture could never be found in the role, or, at best, could be found only in a much abbreviated form. That such was not an unlikely case can be proved by the incompleteness of the text in those luxurious picture books from the early Byzantine period, such as the Vienna Genesis.[66]

In concluding our brief consideration about the prototype of the Hellenistic-Roman Homeric frieze, we would like to suggest that it might be miniature pictorial friezes illustrating Homeric Epic rolls rather than column pictures inserted between text lines. The former could normally contain two to three different scenes and were placed along the top of the roll, more remotely indeed from the corresponding text than the latter which theoretically contained just a single scene much in close physical relation to the text. Finally we cannot exclude the possibility that the text accompanying such miniature friezes in papyrus roll might alo be abbreviated for the sake of the artistic fulfillment.

[65]Weitzmann, *Roll and Codex*, 55-56.

[66]O.Mazal, *Kommentar zur Wiener Genesis* (Frankfurt a M. 1980), 13-27.

Brilliant reports that the total length of the second Iliac cycle in Pompeii, in the cryptoporticus of the House of Crypotoportico, reaches almost three hundred feet. Wasn't such a long frieze possible by jointing a number of short friezes rather than by jointing hundreds of single, independent scenes?

* * * * * *

This second, long painted Homeric frieze in the cryptoporticus begins with the plague of pests in the Achaean camp and concludes with the flight of Aeneas from the fallen Troy, thus connecting the Greek epic with the founding mythology of the Roman Empire (fig.12).[67] Nevertheless, the Greek inscriptions ubiquitously found in the twenty-five episodes reveal the Greek origin of the narrative frieze. It even reflects the same 'Romanizing' tendencies as the *Capitolina* and a few other Iliac Tablets in concluding the cycle with the Aeneas scene. Compared with the first Pompeian Homeric cycle in the sacrarium of the same house, this second cycle yields certain changes in style: figures have now gained more space surrounding them to move more freely than in the previous stucco cycle. The new medium, fresco painting, allowed the artist to introduce definite *chiaroscuro* effect which did serve to accentuate the spatial depth. Especially the narrow band along the upper edge of the frieze provided the artist the space to depict diminuted figures and objects in fine, receding atmosphere (e.g. the plague scene). Unprecedented in the pictorial Homeric cycle is the introduction of natural motifs such as rocks which occasionally separate two adjacent scenes or produce spatial depth as backdrops.

The new tendency which appeared in the second Homeric cycle becomes more evident in the third cycle in the 'oecus triclinis' of the House of Decimus Octavius Quartiones (fig. 13).[68] Of the two layers of the Homeric friezes, the lower

[67]Spinazzola, *op. cit.* 903-969. The frieze, however, is often interrupted by huge painted hermes.

narrow frieze offers a more fruitful comparison with the two previous cycles due to their similar contents. The figures move more freely; natural motifs are applied more frequently and more manifestly; *chiaroscuro* has now gained an almost expressive quality, as seen in the nocturnal scene of Priamus in the vigil of Patroclos' corpse. In fact, some scenes appear almost landscape paintings rather than epic scenes.

The illusionistic devices thus introduced into the Iliac cycles in the two Pompeian houses, however, essentially deviate from what seems to be the method traditionally applied by Greek and Hellenistic artists. If we compare these frieze scenes with the so-called '*pinakes*' in the *oecus triclinis* in the House of Cryptoporticus, our Iliac scenes are obviously far inferior in quality and coarser in execution, indicating that this new 'naturalistic' rendering is by a Roman hand rather than by a appropriately trained Greek hand. The Roman frescoists in Pompeii, with their Archaic-Classical model of Iliac friezes at hand, modified the hieratic and rigorous quality of the models in trendy manner: that even in these later Iliac cycles the isocepahy of standing figures still persists seems to prove this point.

Perhaps the second and first centuries B.C. were the time when the Greeks began to deliberately modify the stern, hieratic nature of the earlier epic tradition in art, in response to contemporary taste, and their creation was immediately adopted by the Roman artists. The Telephos frieze in Pergamon from c.150 B. C. is an early example of such transformation of an earlier Classical epic style into something more dramatic and expressive. Then, we must ask from where the inspiration came. If the Archaic, hieratic tradition of the pictorial Homeric cycle did not provide such a majestic landscape setting as seen in the Odyssey Landscape, where did it come from? Where did the tradition of the Roman narrative landscape originate? This is the question we would like to address next.

[68]Spinazzola, *op. cit.*,969ff.

Part 3
The Odyssey Landscape Again

Returning to the first sections of the Odyssey Landscape, it is now obvious that they yield very little formal resemblance to those Pompeian Iliac friezes. It is true that the last cycle in the House of O. D. Quartiones is the richest of the three in its illusionistic landscape and dramatic *chiaroscuro* effects. There, however, is no such wide vista as seen in the Odyssey Landscape.

It may be useful to recapitulate here a few major points where the Odyssey Landscape fundamentally differs from the Pompeian cycles. Firstly, throughout the first four surviving sections, the viewpoint is set differently from that in the Pompeian cycles: the viewer can look over the entire scenes slightly from above, as if he/she is looking out through the colonnade of an imaginary *loggia* located at an elevated place. In contrast, the figures and motifs in the Pompeian cycles are always seen from the viewpoit of the spectator who stands on the same ground level as that in the picture frieze. Significantly, in the Pompeian cycles, retaining the tradition of the Archic-Classical frieze as the are, the groundline generally coincides with the lower frame of the picture.

The same deliberate conservatism in the Pompeian Iliac cycles can be seen in their human figures, which make the second remarkable difference between the Pompeian and the Roman works. Above all, the size of the human figures in the Odyssey Landscape is quite small, even miniaturistic, in proportion to the vast landscape setting. In contrast, the figures in Pompeii still preserve the Classical grandeur in demeanor with which they dominate the scenes. In Rome, as the result of the miniature size, the figures are often silhouetted, without the sculptural quality, which is evident in the last Pompeian cycle.

In fact these two characteristic of the Odyssey Landscape are also observable in the famous fresco-painting representing a riot at the Pompeian arena. This, however, completely lacks the atmospheric expression which is patent of the Odyssey Landscape.

Thirdly, as we have already disussed in detail, the landscape setting of the Odyssey Landscape has manifold functions and is significantly far more complicated than that of the last two Pompeian cycles. In the latter, the landscape motifs tend to remain in the foreground, only intermittently extending into background. Basically they serve simply to separate one scene from the other, without the complicated function -visual and narrative as well - as those in the Odyssey Landscape. If we may compare the very particular effects of the landscape setting in Rome to those of polyphonic music, the impression we receive from the last two Pompeian cycles is certainly monophonic.

Before we resume our search for the pictorial source of the landscape setting appropriate of the Odyssey Landscape, a comment is necessary on the traditional notion of the general development of the landscape painting in Classical Antiquity. For scholars like Franz Wickhoff or Alois Riegl at about the turn of the century, the illusionistic rendering of landscape was one of the major contributions of the Romans to the development of art in Classical Antiquity. About half a century later, Bianchi-Bandinelli reviewed the history of the study of Roman art and expressed his notion that the origin of illusionistic landscape painting would have to be sought into the late Hellenistic rather than Roman period.[69]

Bianchi-Bandinelli was not alone in assuming an early origin of perspectival rendering of motifs and objects in the Greek Classical period.[70] Until recently, however, evidence of a full-scale landscape painting done in atmospheric perspective from the Classical period was not available to us, leaving a chance of scepticism regarding the Greek invention of illusionistic landscape painting. Such scepticism has finally been wiped out with the discovery of the fresco-paintings decorating the

---

[69]R. Bianchi-Bandinelli,"L'arte romana, due generazioni dopo Wickhoff," The paper was first presented at the Third Internaional Congress of Classical Studies in London, 1959, and is now included in R. Bianchi-Bandinelli, *Archeologia e cultura* (Rome, 1981), 224ff. esp.244-246.

[70]For instance, see the detailed analysis of the perspectival treatment of the fifth and fourth century B. C. vase paintings by J. White, *The Birth and Rebirth of Pictorial Space* (Northampton, 1972), 236-249.

number of hypogeia at Vergina in Macedonia in the late 1970s (fig. 14).[71] Especially the large fresco-frieze decorating the attic of the so-called tomb of Phillip, which has been unanimously dated between 440-430 B. C., opened up a completely new vista of the development of landscape painting in Classical Antiquity. Quite unlike the hieratic Iliac frieze in the Archaic-Classical tradition, the large hunting scene in Vergina contains a number of figures and motifs in lively movements distributed in a spacious landscape where distant hills and sky are visible through the screens of thick foliage in the middle ground.

The discovery of such a developed landscape painting actually encourages scholars' assumption that some of the surviving Greek paintings even from the fifth century may possibly reflect the coeval landscape painting. The famous panel paintings by Polygnote displayed at the Knidian lesche in Delphi have long been suspected to have contained at least landscape motifs. The rather scanty landscape elements in the famous vase painting by the Niobid painter can be only a partial reflection of the original landscape painting in much grander scale.

The existence of full-scale landscape painting behind vase painting is more likely in the case of the Meidias painter, whose works show three-dimensional renderings of landscape elements such as promontories or undulating, vegetated hills from behind which various figures emerge.

In spite of all these possibilities, however, the evidence from the Greek Classical period is lamentably so meager that it can hardly help us to reconstruct the archetypal landscape painting in monumental size that could serve as the model of the Odyssey Landscape.

Yet, it seems that a few manuscript illustrations from the Late Antiquity do reflect, though only to some extent, the tradition of Classical paintings in monumental size, whether it be panel painting or wall decoration. *Ilias Ambrosiana* is one of the Antique manuscripts.[72] A survey over the forty-eight

remaining miniatures in this famous codex reveals that at least fourteen of the compositions fundamentally consist of a coastline and ocean view with the distant horizon placed near left or right upper corner of a framed miniature. Take the miniature VIII for an example: it represents the famous episode of the return of Chryseis, the daughter of the priest of Apollo, to her father in two consecutive scenes (fig. 15).[73] At the upper left corner of the miniature there is Odysseus' ship sailing in a hurry to, or arriving at, the virgin's homeland (*Iliad*, I, 389-91 or 431). Then, in the foreground Odysseus unites the hands of the father and his daughter (*Ibid*. 439-446).

First, we must note that the entire composition yields a strong tendency to develop laterally. Bianchi-Bandinelli judged Group A₁ of the miniatures in this codex, which includes this miniature, to trace its origin to early papyrus illustration.

The characteristic of the miniatures in this group is, according to Bianchi-Bandinelli, that "they are essentially narrative compositions" and reduceable "to a scheme suitable for *mere outline illustrations in the manner of the roll*. But this primitive scheme is enriched by an architectural or landscape background to which the figures do not belong but which serves, one might say, as a backcloth, as in some modern scenery" (Our italics).[74] In short, Bianchi-Bandinelli recognizes a kind of synthesis of the tradition of early papyrus illustration with that of a more or less illusionistic background.

He therefore had to classify this miniature, though partly, also in another Group B. He characterizes this group as follows: "To this group have been assigned the more complex compositions with figures placed perspectively on varying

[71]M. Andronicos, *Vergina, the Royal Tombs and the Ancient City* (Athens, 1987), esp.97-119.

[72]R.Bianchi-Bandinelli, *The Milan Iliad*.
[73]*Ibid*. 56ff.
[74]*Ibid*. 113ff.

levels and with indications of the setting in which the scene takes place. These compositions could very well have derived from decorative painting, painted friezes, ... This scheme can be called 'the manner of the painted frieze.'"[75]

Curiously, Bianchi-Bandinelli does not explain why this Chryseis miniature must belong to both groups at the same time, but this apparent contradiction serves to prove our own interpretation. First, we should not discard the chance that a column picture inserted between the text lines could contain more than one scene within a single space. The extant illustrated papyrus fragments show that the width of the text column is often much wider than necessary to contain just a single configuration. If the space for illustration spans over the entire width of such a text column, the illustration could well contain multiple scenes or a long frieze composition. Or, a more probable case is that the picture space is extended laterally beyond the span of a single column, when such an illustration virtually forms a small frieze, just as we have proposed in the preceding part. The laterally extended form of the Chryseis miniature reflect, not the short rectangular picture format in narrow text column, but the format of a miniature frieze in early papyrus roll.

Then, we must assume that the landscape setting of the Chryseis scene has a different origin. Bianchi-Bandinelli tries to compare the miniatures in Group B with those Iliac cycles in the House of Cryptoporticus. As far as the landscape settings are concerned, however, none of them yield formal similarity to the miniature. Here, the coastline rises from the lower left corner of the miniature and runs toward the upper right corner in a relaxed curve, thus dividing the ocean and the land to

describe the geographical setting of the narrative. It, however, divides simultaneously the two different scenes occuring at different points of narrative time.

There is one more important function of this particular landscape setting: Odysseus' ship is overlapped by the coastline, while cutting the distant water horizon. Thus, the three motifs -coastline, ship, and horizon - in ensemble skillfully visualize the three dimensional space receding into infinite distance. Naturally the miniaturist's performance is coarse, but his intention is obvious: the combination of narraitve sequence in frieze with deep and wide pictorial space.

Such functions of landscape motifs are obviously very similar to those in the Odyssey Landscape. Moreover, from a purely morphological point of view, it is not difficult at all to imagine that, by connecting two such mniature compositions symmetrically, one could get, if not a huge oval as seen in the Odyssey Landscape, a large semispherical composition. [76]

---

[75]*Ibid.* 116.

[76] In the Vatican Vergil (Vat.Lat.3225) there are several compositions which contain the depiction of ocean and coastline. The artist, however, a Roman of the Late Antiquity as he was , could not understand the perspectival effect of the unique composition, which he must have learned from the Homeric illustration in the Greek tradition. He, therefore, always curved the coastlines wrongly in the opposite direction. As the result, the depicted ocean does not yield the sense of spatial depth but looks like a pond or lake, or, at best, shoreline seen in bird's eye view, e. g. , Pictura 13 or Pictura 25. [Th. B. Stevenson, *Miniature Decoration in the Vatican Virgil; A Study in Late Antique Iconography* (Tubingen, 1983), 45-46 and 60-61]. That is, the view point is set much higher than in the MIlan Iliad or the Odyssey Landscape so that the entire scene tends to be conceptual and schematic rather than naturalistic and atmospheric, thus inevitablly following the Late Antique custom.

In fact Weitzmann has already suggested the liaison between *Ilias Ambrosiana* and the Odyssey Landscape with regard to the landscape elements in the former. According to him, the miniatures which had once illustrated the *Iliad* in the Homeric papyri grew out of their direct tie with the text, i. e., out of the column picture system, and became individually framed *tableaux* of certain artistic quality. The landscape element was introduced into such framed pictures to increase the aesthetic effect. Then, Weitzmann suggested the possible sources of a landscape setting in both monumental landscape painting such as the Odyssey Landscape, or encaustic panel paintings "of which, however, too few are left to support this hypothesis."[77]

As for the very particular landscape composition in the Milan Iliad, both panel painting and monumental art could equally claim their primacy as the ultimate source of inspiration, though we are inclined to think more of the former than the latter.

In fact, a glance at another instance of the transposition of an Archaic-Classical frieze composition into a new landscape setting in *Ilias Ambrosiana* well deserves a short excursion: the stucco frieze in the sacrarium of the House of Cryptoporticus has at the beginning the scene of the journey of the old King Priam to the Achaean camp. (*Iliad*, XXIV, 311-447)[78] An architectural motif at the left end of the frieze seems to indicate the city of Troy. There are two jars under drapes in the interior, representing the treasures in the Trojan thesauros. The chariot is taken by a servant walking to right. Before him Priam is received and led by Hermes in his usual attire with helmet, caduceus, etc.

[77]Weitzmann, *Roll and Codex*, 99-102. esp. 100.

[78]Spinazzola, *Op. cit.*897ff identifies the scene as the return of the corps of dead Hector to Troy in *Iliad*, XXIV, 691ff. The scene, however, seems to us Priam carrying the treasure as the gift to the Greeks, because of the description of the treasure under drapes at the extreme left and the active part played by Hermes who is leading the cart .

In *Ilias Ambrosiana*, the scene is found at the end of the pictorial cycle (fig.16). The iconography proves the closer link of the miniature with the archetypal text illustration than that of the Poempeian stucco frieze. Namely, more faithful to the Homeric text, the miniature represents two chariots, and the mules drinking water from the river of Scamander, as is narrated in *Iliad*, XXIV, 348-357. Behind them there remained faint traces of the city of Troy where the king left. In their front there is the figure of Hermes receiving them. Unlike the stucco relief in the earlier tradition, the composition develops in wide open space viewed slightly from above. The undulating line of the Trojan hill topped by the city echoes the winding river in the foreground. The general impression of the miniature reminds us, in spite of its bad condition of preservation, of the idyllic landscape setting in sections 2 and 3 of the Odyssey Landscape. We should even note a lyrical atmosphere as opposed to the epic sternness of the stucco frieze.

Such a transposition of Archaic frieze composition into vast landscape setting could occur more likely in a panel painting rather than in monumental decoration. The reason is firstly that, during the late Republican and early Imperial age, the mural decoration based on the Iliac cycles seems to have been still permeated by the Archaic tradition in the early Imperial age, as we have attested in the three Pompeian cycles. Secondly, the oval compositional scheme we have discussed above could bring forth the best visual effect specifically in a solid rectangular shape of frame or panel.[79] This can be easily confirmed in the Chryseis scene in the Milan Iliad, too.

On these premises, we may propose that a long continuous frieze like the Odyssey Landscape could not be the primary and

[79]By 'panel' we do not necessarily mean a portable wooden panel. A *pinakion*, or any framed picture painted on wall could yield the same visual effect.

ideal form in order to conceive such a perspectival composition and to appreciate it. Our inference is that the simple composition as seen in the Chryseis miniature in *Ilias Ambrosiana* reflects the very initial stage of the development of such a space construction indeed in a panel painting.

We may now conclude that the complicated, grandiose landscape composition of the Odyssey Landscape could be conceived exclusively on the premise of an experience of the transposition of miniature frieze into landscape setting. Such a bold experiment may have been already done in the Hellenistic period, the birth of narrative landscape in portable size. Those miniatures in *Ilias Ambrosiana* are the witnesses. Then, in the late Hellenistic period, an artist adapted the results of the experiment in a much larger scale of wall decoration, whereby he skillfully combined a series of panel paintings to form a long, apparently uninterrupted frieze.

We must remember that such accomplishments were being made quite independently from the continuing tradition of the Archaic-Classical frieze composition of the Homeric cycles in the late Republic and early Imperial age. This actually belongs to the deliberate retrogressive trend at that time, which produced such sophisticated works as the stucco relief in the sacrarium of the House of Cryptoporticus, or those puzzling *Tabulae Iliacae*. The presence of the insertion motifs in the Odyssey Landscape and the virtual absence in the Pompeian cycles as well as *Tabulae Ilacae* are due to these two different traditions existing side by side at the critical period of the history of ancient painting.

*   *   *   *   *

Before discussing the section 6, which occupies the center of the frieze, let us briefly look at sections following it. Section 7

has been so damaged that nothing legible remains on the picture surface. The invisible picture may well have represented the scene where Odysseu's companions, once transformed into animal forms as they were, are recovering their human shapes, as told in the *Odyssey*, X, 388-399 (fig.17).

Section 8 represents Odysseus' arrival at the land of the Cimmerians, the souls of the dead (XI, 13ff), and the conversation with them (fig.18). Many inscriptions of the dead were visible in the nineteenth century, of which a few still remain, including that of Tiresias.

The story continues to the next section 9 with the scene of Hades where scattered are several mythological figures who are alluded to in vv.563ff: Orion, Tityos, Sisyphos, et al. (fig.19).

Interesting are the compositions of the scene in section 8 rather than its iconography. We are now familiar with this type of composition with the ocean scene at left and the land scene at right, which is sharply demarcated from the former by a huge rock rising in a curve and connected with the hill in the middle ground. The strong *chiaroscuro* effect as well as the strange tunnel-like formation of these motifs all the more heighten the dramatic character of Odysseus' descent into the netherworld. At the same time the long horizon line visible through the huge rock and the tunnel in the middle ground stresses the infinite distance. In spite of these unusual devices, the basic compositional scheme is still based on that which has been found in *Ilias Ambrosiana* and shares the same visual-narrative functions with it.

The large cliff beside the left pilaster in the Hades scene in section 9 has its precedent in section 5. Since the artist was not able to complete the panel due to the given architectural setting, we can hardly imagine what the original composition

could have been like.[80] If, however, we are not mistaken, there is water horizon barely visible to the right of the stretched end of the cliff. Also the irregular grassy mound beyond Tityos on the ground perhaps forms waterfront. If so, the original composition could have consisted of a high cliff at the left end and vast space and ocean open to the right of the coast line, exactly as seen in section 5. The curved silhouette of the dark side of the cliff might have been extended to the right of the lost composition, forming a semisphere or an oval.

These two scenes demonstrate that the particular compositional scheme observed in *Ilias Ambrosiana* is in fact a basic formula, which must have been originally invented for panel painting and then applied to a miniature *tableau* in manuscript illustration. Eventually it is found modified and adapted in the monumental decoration with *Odyssey* scenes. Further, the Homeric motifs and scenes in the *Aeneid* may well be derivatives of this Greek tradition. Both epic narratives do require constant shifts of geographical setting from ocean to land, and *vice versa*, literally *ennaratio per topia*, as Vitruvius said. This seems to prove why the same compositional formula cannot be found as often in other kinds of Classical or Biblical narrative, such as the *Genesis*. Hence we may tentatively propose that the unique compositions in the Odyssey Landscape are no other than the developments of this new type of pictorial cycle on Homeric literature which was invented for media of a larger scale than papyrus illustration. Naturally the iconography still had to depend on the earlier tradition of the miniature friezes in papyrus illustration or of the painted/carved friezes. But the new aesthetic exigency in the first century B. C. instigated the revolutionary development of the new type of pictorial narrative.

---

[80]Von Blanckenhagen, "The Odyssey Frieze." 109.

56

Part 4
The Mansion of the Sorceress

Section 6 once formed the center of the long frieze (fig.20). The entire picture space is dominated, as has been described by previous authors, by a huge building. The impression considerably differs from that which we receive from the other scenes: instead of the rich landscape which develops as far as the horizon, the enormous architectural setting in this section gives an austere, or rather ominous, impression to the viewer.

In spite of von Blanckenhagen's careful articulation of various evidence from Roman architecture, not only the structure of the building but also the depicted surroundings still seem strange and unreal[81]: to the left of the axis of the entire composition there is an elaborate entrance to the courtyard of Circe's mansion. The doorway consists of two panels of door and the frame encasing them. They all seem to be elaborate craft works made of wood. On both sides of this entrance there are very thick and tall 'walls'. The one at the left of the entrance is lower than the other at the right. The one at the left stands a little closer to the viewer than the other at the right: this seems to stand at the same picture plane as the doorway. The 'wall' at the left seems to be connected with the doorway by a lower fence, which is barely visible between the 'wall' and the door.

Probably the unusual motifs of this pair of tall 'walls' may correspond to 'δώματα Κίρκης ξεστοίσιν λάεσσι, περισκέπτῳ ἐν χώρῳ (X, 210-211).' But, in fact, they do not really look like walls but like towers, or rather bastions, with flat rooftops. We do not know if any Roman residence or villa was provided with such a defensive motif.

The water at the lower left corner in the foreground is also unlikely: it by no means resembles a *pulvium* found in a

---

[81]Von Blanckenhagen, "The Odyssey Frieze," 127-128.

57

Roman courtyard. With the surrounding bushes and earth mounds, it seems rather a small inlet of a river or sea. We may not be surprised if there is found a boat harboring at the foot of the 'wall/bastion' at the left. Could any natural motif such as this be found in the interior of a Roman residence?

Lastly, the huge exedra at right with double ('two-storied' by von Blanckenhagen) colonnades and a sumptuous 'aedicula' seems more appropriate for a palatial building rather than for a private house, however gorgeous a rich Roman's residence might be.[82] Nevertheless, due to the theatrical appearance of the building, the two consecutive scenes performed on the stage in front gain vivid and dramatic quality. We shall later find the real cause for these anormalities of the architectural setting.

The foreground is roughly divided into two parts by the left front wall of the exedra and a tree beside it. Not unlike the tree in the previous section 3, this tree-motif again spreads its large branches into two opposite directions, each embracing a different scene. As has been already identified, the scene at the left represents Odysseus' arrival at Circe's mansion and the other at the right Odysseus menacing the sorcerer. The figures of a young girl who appears in both scenes - first standing behind Circe at the doorway and then fleeing away from the threatening scene - has been identified as a maid. In the first scene she turns her back toward the guest and holds a spinning staff in her hands, alluding to the weaving, the sorceress' daily work. In the second scene, the maid apparently holds a cup, which must have been used by Circe to bewitch the hero in vain. There is another iconographical detail worth mentioning here: the gorgeous utensils on a round table ("a so-called baluster with large vessels" by von Blanckenhagen) just in front of the 'aedicula' seem to be a kind of *prolepsis* of the

---

[82]It is interesting to compare this architectural setting with that in Pictura 39 in Vergilius Vaticanus (Stevenson, *Op. cit.*, 76).

luxurious objects which are describe in details as they are brought out by Circe's four maids for a banquet of Circe and Odysseus (vv.349-359).

So much for iconographical details. In von Blanckenhagen's thesis, the formal and narrative-structural characteristics of this particular scene hold the key to interpret the art historical nature of the whole fresco frieze. First he confirms that the stylistic traits of the preceding panels still continue unchanged in this section 6. Especially the atmospheric and perspectival renderings of the entire composition perfectly conform to those that have been observed previously. In spite of these stylistic similarities, von Blanckenhagen believes, the narrative structure is an obvious Roman concoction, since the same figures of Odysseus and Circe (and if we are right, the maid, too) are repeated twice in one composition. According to the respectable archaeologist, the Greek in the ancient time dared not to violate the rule of 'the accordance of time with place' by introducing two different narrative moments within one picture space: 'Only one element guards against accepting this section [6] as an equally faithful copy [of the Hellenistic model]: the two-fold appearance of both Ulysses and Circe in the courtyard. Such duplication naturally destroys the impression of a realistic representation and is therefore not in keeping with the character of the telling and staging of the story in sections 2-5."[83]

He also recognizes the same iconographical anormalities in section 8: the ship of Odysseus is, according to the author, still approaching the land of the Cimmerians, while at the right hand we see Odysseus already greeting Teresias. The author says that "the result of such conflations is a manner of narrative alien to sections 2-5 and, indeed, not appropriate to the realistic character of the composition as a whole."[84]

---

[84]*Ibid.* 120.

Certainly von Blanckenhagen is right in pointing out that such repetition of specific figures, like the protagonist Osysseus, cannot be found in the other sections of the Odyssey Landscape. Our question, therefore, has to be very naive at first: Does this particular manipulation of the sequential, or rather syntactic, order of the narrative so conspicuously 'destroy' the whole 'realistic' impression of the scene? Is it really so destructive as we might have to suddenly face in the course of our journey through the picture frieze a very different, hitherto yet unexperienced negative mood? As we have described above, the composition of section 6 is entirely dominated by the sumputous architectural setting that produces a very different, oppressive impression. But, we must insist that the syntactic disarrangement here is least spoiling the essential aesthetic quality of the scene.

This last point we have just made can be said more convincingly about the following Section 8, representing Odyssues' arrival at and visit of the netherworld. The picture is unmistakably much inferior to the preceding sections in its artistic quality as well as the technical performance: the form of individual objects is far less persuasive and the brush work is pitifully feeble. But the mode of telling the story is not destroyed at all by the implicit 'duplication' of the figure of Odysseus, in spite of von Blanckenhagen's criticism.

According to the scholar, there is another peculiarity in the Roman narrative representation in general, i. e., the inconsistency in perspectival combination of the represented objects. To illustrate this point, he quotes a fragment in the British Museum with the scene of Odysseus' adventure with Sirens.[85] In further advancing his theory he notices the same peculiarity in the reliefs of those *Tabulae Iliacae*, including the fragment in Warszaw, *Tabula Odysseaca Rondanini*,

representing the same Circe episode (fig. 21).[86] Although these examples share these formal-iconographical peculirities in common, von Blanckenhagen does recognizes a particular aesthetic quality in them, saying 'We do not do justice to a painting of this character if we describe it in terms of realistic landscape. what would have been a mistake in the latter can be, and is, a positive quality in the former.... Suggestiveness rather than representation is the aim of the painter, and it is curiously blended with completeness in all details. The result has the effect of a dream."[87]

Moreover, von Blanckenhagen goes so far to include section 6 of the Odyssey Landscape in this group of patently Roman works, although the peculiarity specific of this section is not in perspectival inconsistency but the disarrangement of narrative syntax. Thence, he has been automatically led to appreciate the particular aesthetic quality - the effect of a dream- in this fresco-painting, too, concluding: "The Circe episodes, represented in the Odyssey frieze and the tabula, illustrate the differences with respect to form, to content, and to purpose between the Greek and the Roman way of representing a legend."

Our criticism of von Blanckenhagen's observations is this: he is right in recognizing an artistic quality unique of Roman art in the Circe adventure scene in section 6. The quality is, according to von Blanckenhagen, due to the suggestiveness of the narrative structure, that does produce a dream-like quality. But, we must ask, is such dream-like quality limited to this single section? Isn't it specifically this quality that has

[84]*Ibid.* 121.

[85]von Blanckenhagen, 'The Odyssey Frieze," 131.

[86]Sadurska, *Tables Iliaques*. 61-64.

[87]von Blanckenhagen, "The Odyssey Frieze," 131-132, note 94. In this regard von Blanckenhagen has not so much criticized the perspectival rendering in the Section 6 as appraised the continuation of Hellenistic space representation in the picture.

long been appreciated as the most attractive phase of the entire Odyssey frieze?

It is true that the unique aesthetic quality of the Odyssey Landscape has been thus appreciated mostly due to the exquisite representation of landscape in subtle atmospheric perspective. But, we are now convinced in that the unique aesthetic function due to the rearrangement of narrative syntax does also contribute to create thie unique aesthetic quality. Furethermore, this Roman ingenuity in the art of visual narrative is found not only in the repetition of the same figures within one setting but also in a number of other narrative devices, which we are going to analyze with regard to the other sections of the Odyssey Landscape. Our analysis will explain convincingly the formal-iconographical process of the creation of that 'Romantic' mood filling the entire frieze.

Before concluding this chapter we would like to compare section 6 with *Tabula Odysseaca Rondanini* in our search for a more specific artistic source of this mysterious scene.

This fragment of miniature relief now in Warszaw contains three scenes from the Circe adventure within a single picture space: Odysseus' encounter with Hermes, Odysseus menacing Circe, and the recovery of human forms of Odysseus' companions once transformed by the sorcerer.(fig.21)[88] For some reason Sadurska has overlooked one important characteristic of this *Odysseaca* fragment: many other remnants of the Iliac Tablets - the *Capitolina*, the *Veronensis* I, the lost piece now preserved in Sarti's drawing, and others - do permit us to infer that the present form of the *Rondanini* can hardly be complete. In its original state it must have formed the central part of a single panel, being surrounded by a number of miniature friezes, just as seen in the *Capitolina*.

––––––––––––––––––
[88]See Sadurska, *Tables iliaques*. loc. cit.

The artist of these plaques obviously intended to represent the climax of the entire narrative in the form of, rather than a narrow frieze, a rectangular panel, which contain a short narrative sequence consisting of more than a single scene.

Our observations on the Rondanini fragments permits us to further assume a certain structural resemblance between the fragment and the Odyssey Landscape. We have already suggested that the frescoist must have had an iconographical source in the form of miniature friezes, and then integrated them into the landscape setting. If we may assume the presence of miniature friezes behind the other scenes, isn't it also likely that the model for this central section was something very much like the *Rondanini* fragment with a short narrative cycle from the Circe story? Further, it may not be a simple coincidence that these narrative scenes in the *Rondanini* plaque is set against a grand-scale architectural setting provided with long colonnades and two small annexed edifices.

There is in fact something more than a general resemblance, and a closer look at the tablet reveals several interesting details: first, the main entrance of the palatial mansion of Circe on the tablet is set in a wall which, in its turn, is franked by two tall bastions. They seem to explain the unusual forms of the two tall 'walls/bastions' connected with the doorway in section 6. More interestingly, at the lower left of the tablet there Hermes and Odysseus are conversing at the seashore. (A few bows are visible there.) Doesn't the waterfront visible at the lower left corner of the fresco-painting indicate the presence of seashore like this in the original composition? Moreover, the liberation of Odysseus' companions is taking place in a sort of square courtyard surrounded on three sides by long roofed corridors with colonnades. The colonnade at right actually cuts the facade of the small building at the upper right corner. Isn't this unusual combination of the facade with

a colonnade running in front of it more or less reflected in the sumptuous architectural setting of the courtyard scene in the right half of section 6? Lastly, as has been often pointed out, the iconography of Odysseus threatening Circe in supplication in the tablet is almost identical with that in the fresco-painting.[89]

Thus, *Tabula Odysseaca Rondanini*, in its original form consisting of a large *tableau* surrounded by a number of miniature friezes with a short narrative sequence, indicates positively that at least one of the models consulted by the artist of the Odyssey Landscape must have been a *Tabula Odysseaca* very much like the *Rondanini*. While adopting the general scheme as well as iconographical details of the tablet, the artist of the Odyssey Landscape developed the splendid landscape in frieze with his thorough familiarity with the panel paintings in monumental composition.

If our last remarks on the *Tabula Odysseaca Rondanini* and subsequent inferences are justifiable, the date of the Odyssey Landscape cannot be much earlier than the time of the production of *Tabulae Iliacae*, namely Augustan rather than late Republican as has been generally believed. Such a late date as proposed here contradicts the general opinion that the deep perspectival setting which is emphasized by the rows of solid pilasters is typical of the Second Style.[90] At present we have not yet thoroughly investigated their stylistic features. But we have a strong suspicion that their elaborate decorative character, such as the gilded capitals or the fine ornaments in relief on the front of the pilaster, could also be a product of the late Second Style. Further, at least at one point, the Odyssey Landscape shows a remarkable feature which seems to suggest

[89]Sadurska, *Tables iliaques*, 63.

[90]This traditional notion was proposed at the earliest stage of the history of scholarship and continued to be accepted.

this late dating. That is the miniaturistic size of the human figures and motifs in proportion to the broad landscape setting. This becomes almost a patent of those mythological landscape paintings from the late Augustan period.[91] Within the tradition of the Second Style, human figures dominate the whole scene with its majestic size in proportion to the entire picture space. Suddenly, however, from the late Augustan period, the emphasis begins to be laid upon the background landscape rather than the human images in the foreground. This reflects a drastic change in the manner of appreciation among aristocrats near the turn of the century. We shall come back to discuss this crucial issue in detail in the following chapter.

[91]H. P. von Blanckenhagen and Ch. Alexander, *Paintings in the House at Boscotrecase*, (=Erganzung 6, *RM*),(Heidelberg, 1962). As for the relation between the Odyssey Landscape and the Roman mythological paintings our opinion differs from that of von Blanckenhagen's. See our subsequent discussion in Chapter III.