4

Urban Growth in the Archaic Period

Piazza d'Armi at Veii and the earliest architectural terracottas

Between the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, some archaeologists believed that the high terrace to the south of the main plateau of *Veii* known as Piazza d'Armi was the *acropolis* of the Etruscan city; George Dennis and eminent scholars Luigi Canina and Rodolfo Lanciani were of this opinion, but not everyone agreed. Its high position, naturally defended on three sides, was notable, but the terrace was separated from the plateau of the city by the gorge of the Fosso della Mola. To Ettore Gabrici, Neapolitan archaeologist then working at the Villa Giulia Museum, the area looked like an uncultivated patch with a few traces of ancient remains. In 1913, he went on to conduct the first ever stratigraphic excavation in the middle of the terrace, and brought to light painted tiles, parts of drystone walls and an elliptical structure dressed with *tufa* blocks, which he assumed belonged to a very early date prior to the flourishing of the Etruscans, but which we now know to be a cistern. Less than ten years later, field investigation in the area continued under the direction of Enrico Stefani who subsequently published the finds in 1944 (Stefani, 1944, p. 143). Among them were Iron Age huts, a series of buildings with stone blocks arranged according to an almost orthogonal plan, the remains of the ancient walls related to a large gate that, he saw, connected the terrace to the ancient city to the north (Figure 4.1).

Stefani also identified a rectangular building of stone blocks sitting above some of the huts, just above 15 metres long and 8 metres wide, which he interpreted as an Italic sanctuary. The finds of this structure included clay tiles, found all around it, antefixes, that is, terracotta heads decorating the edges of roofs, painted eaves and over 400 fragments of terracotta friezes, decorated in relief with processions of armed men, riding on horses or on chariots, and a few traces left of polychrome paint. Because they were found on the front of the building, Stefani saw these friezes as belonging to the decoration of the entablature. These kinds of artefacts were not unknown in central Italy: similar roofing decorated material had been discovered as early as 1784 at Velletri, in *Latium*, near the Church of Santa Maria della Neve, and ended up in the National Museum of Naples. Others had been excavated at Poggio Buco, southern Tuscany, and

the central Italian and Etruscan provenance of yet other pieces belonging to museum collections was identified. At the end of the nineteenth century, a comprehensive study by Giuseppe Pellegrini had been published and the terracottas interpreted as architectural decoration of religious buildings (Pellegrini, 1899). Unlike these others, however, the roof at Piazza d'Armi was found in situ and excavated stratigraphically. Stefani, in fact, recognized two distinct phases of the decoration of the building in the two different styles of the terracottas and antefixes. He thus offered a hypothetical reconstruction of the façade and front entablature of the temple as well as reporting on the plan of the building (Figure 4.2).

Since Stefani's publication, later excavations have partly confirmed and added to his interpretation of what is now known as the *oikos* temple; the building, for example, was found to have been enlarged before its abandonment, and a different reconstruction proposed from that suggested by Stefani (Bartoloni et al., 2006). There is no consensus, however, on the dates of the architectural terracottas, nor on their religious function. The current excavators see two distinct phases, as Stefani did, the first at the beginning and the second at the middle of the sixth century BCE (Bartoloni et al., 2006, pp. 63–8). Others date the roof to *circa* 580 BCE altogether, comparing it to other similar roof decoration from the so-called Regia, a building complex in the Roman Forum in Rome that has also been interpreted as having a religious function (Winter, 2009, pp. 224–8, 568). Further domestic structures and a road network between these structures have also been identified over the decades since the Soprintendenza continued the excavation from the 1960s. The so-called *oikos* temple itself was skirted by the main road, and facing onto this road, on the other side, was an elite house, interpreted as such by fine *bucchero* and other fineware, and by the monumental appearance of the building that included a portico. That different phases pertained to this road network importantly suggests that an urban plan of orthogonal roads was established as early as the second half of the seventh century although it is not until the middle of the sixth century BCE that we see the architectural monumentalization that characterizes Tyrrhenian cities in this century (Acconcia, 2019; Bartoloni et al., 2005). The *oikos* temple, we now know, was no longer used beyond the second half of the sixth century BCE and thus never became a large sanctuary if it ever had this original function. The emergence of increasingly larger sanctuaries dedicated to the worship of deities that we see at *Veii* with the development of the Portonaccio sanctuary, is found across Central Tyrrhenian Italy, as we shall see later. This has led some to doubt the *oikos* temple's cultic function; in fact, the current

excavators of Piazza d'Armi view the area as belonging to a prominent elite family who performed cultic activities at the *oikos* temple and continued to live there after these activities ceased and the building was subjected to spoliation of its terracottas in a phase of change and urban growth.

A building revolution?

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the introduction of roof tiles replacing the use of thatched roofs, and of stone foundation and mudbrick walls was revolutionary in building technology, and as such its impact on urban living cannot be overemphasized enough. Not only did it enable the construction of much larger buildings, thus spearheading other innovations in architectural technical knowledge necessary for ensuring a long life for these buildings, whether they were used for residential or religious purposes, but it also allowed a more rational organization of urban space and the realization of monumental infrastructure and public buildings, from walls and roads to sanctuaries, even though thatched roofs did not completely go out of use (Brandt and Karlsson, 2001; Izzet, 2007, pp. 143–64; Thomas and Meyers, 2013; Wikander and Tobin, 2017).[1] At Acquarossa, the extensively excavated areas have revealed tile-roofed houses of one to four rooms, all arranged in a row, often with a portico in front, and a building, known as House E in zone F, that enclosed a walled courtyard (Strandberg Olofsson, 1989). The so-called courtyard house, in fact, is a house type found elsewhere in Etruria and *Latium*: it may have originally had a special, if not religious, function before becoming a standard feature of domestic architecture from Rome to Spina on the Adriatic as we shall see in the next chapter. An orthogonal plan at Acquarossa is detected only for the last phase of the town's occupation before its abandonment at *circa* 550 or 525 BCE, as the earlier houses were built around communal open spaces, some of which had a well. Only a fraction of Acquarossa's plateau of *circa* 32 hectares has been excavated, and the settlement itself, probably comprising a few thousand inhabitants, was small when compared with the much larger cities in Tyrrhenian southern Etruria. The site nevertheless does give us an idea of what innovation in architecture meant from the middle of the eighth to the late sixth centuries BCE for a sizeable settlement (Pallottino and Wikander, 1986). This is particularly because none of these larger cities have survived in such a well-preserved state. Detailed studies of the roofs at Acquarossa have furthermore demonstrated that it hosted some of the earliest workshops of clay roofs in southern Etruria, beginning between 640 and 620 BCE. Other very early workshops have been identified at *Caere*, but the roofing material there comes from large pits which

were probably originally quarries and were later reused as dumps following the reorganization of the urban space (Winter, 2009, pp. 539–46).

Since the earliest excavation at Piazza d'Armi, much scholarship has developed around the origins of this roofing innovation and its integration into existing earlier architecture, particularly because, as indicated before, this innovation spread beyond Etruria into *Latium*, including Rome. The early rooftop terracotta decoration of the workshop of the Orientalizing complex at Poggio Civitate is similar to the roof ridge decoration of contemporary terracotta house-shaped urns coming from *Caere*, but the feline head waterspouts and female head antefixes were mould-made with no indigenous precedent. Likewise, the late seventh-century BCE roofs at Acquarossa were decorated with white-on-red painting that was also employed on local ceramic vessels. At the beginning of the sixth century BCE, however, new elements and decorative motifs were introduced to roofs from Acquarossa to *Caere*.

A broader view on the origins of new architectural forms and techniques points to Greek Corinth, where the early seventh-century BCE temple of Apollo and the later Temple of Poseidon at Isthmia displayed tiles that are comparable to those found in Etruria. The use of female heads and feline head waterspouts on the temple of Hera at Corfu, another Greek temple under the control of Corinth, further suggests that Corinthian craftsmen may have been responsible for introducing the new roof construction technology to central Italy. That Etruscan cities like *Caere* had preferential trade relations with Corinth is confirmed by the volume of Corinthian imported pottery as known from elite tomb groups such as the San Paolo tombs mentioned in the previous chapter. But *Caere* was not the only city with these trade connections: Rome's early sixth-century BCE roofs, such as that of the Regia in the Forum, mentioned earlier, reveal a similar Corinthian connection in the mould-made reliefs that would be adopted across Etruria in the sixth century (Winter Nancy, 2017). Poggio Civitate, too, reveals stylistic and iconographic links with Corinth in the lavish decoration of the roof that covered the new monumental courtyard building: terracotta friezes displaying images of a horse race, a banquet and a procession following a cart have their comparable counterparts in Corinthian vase painting; so do some of the *acroteria* statues that decorated the roof ridges at Murlo and that included animals such as horses, bulls, mythical figures such as sphinxes and a griffin, and seated figures interpreted as the ancestors of the owners of the new residential complex (Winter Nancy, 2017, pp. 134–5).

This is a scenario of technological innovation not unlike the one I described in the previous chapter. However, sixth-century BCE innovation did not simply benefit elites, a phenomenon we often associate with the seventh century BCE as argued previously, but it was also promoted by a growth in mobility and trade at this time across the central-west Mediterranean. This is confirmed by a wide and diverse range of evidence, archaeological and literary as well as epigraphic, which I will explore in this chapter. Scholars have recently argued that this evidence, in turn, throws light upon increasing mobility and exchange as one of the main drivers of urban growth. One example should suffice to illustrate this particular point: after *circa* 560 BCE roof ornamentation that up until then had been used on both elite houses and religious buildings in Etruria became restricted to the latter only; shortly thereafter, from *circa* 550 BCE, we see a further innovation in roof decoration and roof-building techniques. This shift in tradition had implications for the craft environment and, at the same time, coincides with the displacement, recounted by Greek historian Herodotus (1.164–68), of populations from Greek cities in Asia Minor, in the eastern Mediterranean; some of those displaced from the Greek city of Phocaea moved to Corsica. This led, as Herodotus tells us, to a military conflict in 540 BCE, the so-called Battle of the Sardinian Sea, between a Carthaginian and Etruscan alliance and the Greek Phoceans who won in the end and abandoned Corsica to settle in Campania (Winter Nancy, 2017, pp. 147–8). Since historical sources can never be taken at face value, scholars have interpreted the Greek historian's account in different ways, but that Ionian Greeks from Asia Minor were present in substantial numbers in the central Mediterranean in the sixth century BCE is confirmed by the archaeological evidence. With the establishment of Massalia, at *circa* 600 BCE, a Greek settlement today underneath modern Marseilles in southern France, we see the impact of a Greek Ionian style and iconography on material culture, both imported and locally made, from pottery decoration to the very roof ornamentation mentioned above. The impact is detected not only in Etruria but also across the broader central Italian region and further afield in the central-west Mediterranean (Bonaudo, 1999; Cristofani, 1976; Hemelrijk, 2009; Spivey, 1997, pp. 53–76). The closest comparison of the new chariot races depicted on architectural terracottas and other decorative motifs such as floral patterns on roofs after 550 BCE are with motifs found in Greek cities in Ionian Asia Minor (Winter Nancy, 2017); it is not therefore far-fetched to suggest that Ionian Greek craftsmen were responsible for this further innovation at a time when we see a greater investment in communal cult sites inside and outside cities.

Buoyant trade and the productive economy

Growing mobility and exchange also meant the greater opening of Etruscan communities to increasingly buoyant trade links near and far across the central-west Mediterranean from the Tyrrhenian to the Adriatic Sea. There are several lines of evidence pointing to this. I shall focus on three broad themes: first, itinerant craftsmen, as noted earlier, point to interregional contacts; second, the establishment of ports and coastal settlements as trading centres; and third, the movement of goods to and from Etruria. The restriction of innovative roof decoration to religious buildings probably led to a decline in the demand of the craft and therefore in the number of local workshops, and to the corresponding rise of incoming craftsmanship from outside. That some craftsmen were itinerant is implied in the ancient written sources: Pliny the Elder (*HN* 35.157) tells us that according to Varro an Etruscan artist from *Veii*, Vulca was called to Rome by Tarquinius Priscus to create terracotta sculpture for the Capitoline temple in Rome dedicated to Jupiter, Juno and Minerva. Plutarch (*Poplicola* 14), on the other hand, points to the later Tarquinius Superbus as the ruler that commissioned the temple, leaving Vulca to belong to this phase of heightened mobility.

Iconographic and stylistic examination of the actual architectural terracottas has been combined, where possible, with scientific analysis, and this has corroborated our views on interregional exchange. This is the case with the mould-made painted terracotta female head antefixes belonging to the so-called Etrusco-Ionian roof of a small temple dated to *circa* 540–530 BCE and dedicated to an Italic goddess, Mater Matuta, at *Satricum*, a Latin settlement south-east of Rome (Knoop, 1987). Petrographic analysis of the clay of these antefixes has identified this clay as originating in the Tolfa Mountains just north of *Caere*, and the fabric to be the same as that of the products of *Caere*'s workshops. The suggestion that the roof may have been imported from *Caere* has been repeatedly made (Lulof, 2006; Winter, 2009, pp. 436, 537), and sits well with the evidence we have of Etruscans making votive offerings to the sanctuary at *Satricum*. This is startingly documented by a seventh-century BCE Etruscan dedicatory inscription engraved on a *bucchero* cup by a certain *Laris Velchaina* whom we also find at *Caere*. Further evidence of the lively itinerant craft environment at *Caere* comes from Marzabotto, a town over 400 kilometres away: here, a later fifth-century BCE temple dedicated to *Tinia/Tina* (Etruscan Zeus) was decorated with mould-made terracottas that are stylistically close to those found at *Caere* (Sassatelli and Govi, 2005). We shall return to Marzabotto in the next chapter.

The broader context of this exchange is also strongly political: the iconographic programme of the roof's decoration of religious buildings was chosen carefully by the ruling classes of these cities who exploited the mythical figures and narratives represented on the roofs in order to send political messages that would have been understood by some, though not all, social segments of the community. Thus, the roof of the temple at *Satricum* was notably decorated with a central life-size terracotta statue group placed on the ridge pole and representing Herakles and a female figure with drapery, perhaps Athena; we find similar statue groups adorning coeval temples' roofs elsewhere, from Etruria to Campania. In particular, statue groups of Herakles (Etruscan *Herkle*) and Athena (Etruscan *Menrva*, or another female deity), illustrating the ascension of the hero to the Olympus with the help of the armed female goddess who ensured his protection, have been found in the following locations: in Rome at the *Forum Boarium*, a commercial and port area near the Tiber, underneath a pair of fourth-century BCE twin temples dedicated to the Italic goddesses of Fortuna and Mater Matuta, in the so-called sacred area of Sant'Omobono; at *Veii* at the Portonaccio sanctuary where the statue group is coeval with the earliest monumental building; at *Caere*, at the site of Vigna Parrocchiale within the city where the statue group, found in fragments in a votive pit, must have adorned a temple in the vicinity, possibly similarly dedicated to a female goddess; at *Pyrgi*, *Caere*'s coastal port, where again a fragmentary statue group inside the sanctuary is associated with the worship of female fertility deities; finally at Velletri and Caprifico in *Latium*, and *Pompeii* (Lulof, 2000, 2016; Potts, 2018). We shall return later to the political significance of these figures, but here it is sufficient to note that while these statue groups are all in cities near Rome they are also all associated with places of intense cross-regional interaction and, notably, ports of trade or *emporia*, from Rome's *Forum Boarium* to *Pyrgi* and *Satricum* (Potts, 2018, pp. 119–21).

It is to these ports that I would like to turn to as the second line of evidence of Etruria's greater opening up to the outside world.[2] *Pyrgi* is one of a series of such settlements linked to, and controlled by, the cities located inland, that flourished on the Tyrrhenian coast in the sixth century BCE as a result of this opening (Michetti, 2016). Not all have been excavated; in fact, sporadic findings along the coast suggest that several landing sites must have existed, some smaller than other, with not much infrastructure, but taking advantage of secure mooring points along the northern Tyrrhenian coast that was characterized by lagoons until the end of the nineteenth century of our era. These are, however, difficult to locate archaeologically unlike those

harbour sites that hosted a monumental sanctuary and significant infrastructure. Like *Pyrgi*, Gravisca, less than 10 kilometres away from Tarquinia, is particularly notable in this respect, largely thanks to the forty-year-long investment in field research there: this gives us a fairly accurate picture of the function and transformation of this type of site from its earliest structures dated to *circa* 580 BCE to its destruction in 280 BCE that was followed by the establishment of a Roman *colonia* (Fiorini, 2005; Fiorini and Torelli, 2010; Mercuri and Fiorini, 2014) (Figure 4.3).

Sitting on what used to be a narrow coastal lagoon, belonging today to a protected nature reserve, Le Saline, the excavated area of Gravisca consists of the religious buildings that formed the sanctuary of the harbour. The harbour itself was probably located just south of these buildings, as suggested by recent investigations that partially brought to light, west of the buildings, fourth-century BCE rectilinear structures with an east–west orientation, and which the excavator, professor Fiorini, has interpreted as belonging to slipways for the movement of boats (Fiorini and Materazzi, 2017, pp. 10–11). The sanctuary itself went through several phases of construction and refurbishment, which denote significant changes in the type and nature of religious cult activity at the site over time. The earliest shrine, dedicated to Aphrodite, was followed by the reorganization and enlargement of the sanctuary, which included a shrine dedicated to another Greek female deity, Hera, during the middle of the sixth century BCE. Yet other later renovations were made, including a road linking Tarquinia to the port, constructed at the beginning of the fifth century BCE, thus highlighting the control of the site by the city. Aimed at Greek deities, the earlier cult activities took place in what is known as the Southern Area of the sanctuary: here, furnaces and implements point to metalworking activities and the processing of copper and iron, which we find in other contemporary coastal sanctuaries, most recently at *Regae*-Regisvilla, the partially excavated port of Vulci (Regoli, 2017). To the north of this Southern Area is the so-called Northern Area, that was monumentalized as it became the focus for the worship of two chthonic Etruscan deities, perhaps *Suri* and *Cavatha* (see below), to which two monumental altars were dedicated (Fortunelli, 2007).

That the sanctuary was a meeting ground for worshippers coming from different regions of the Mediterranean is confirmed by the very deities worshipped there, the votive objects offered to them, many of them ceramic drinking vessels imported from Attica in the Aegean, and the inscriptions placed on some of these objects. The inscriptions are particularly valuable because they sometimes allow us to determine the

provenance of non-Etruscan worshippers (Johnston and Pandolfini Angeletti, 2000). Several came from the Greek city of Samos, in Asia Minor, and were probably responsible for introducing the cult of Hera; some of them practised this cult at *Naukratis*, another sanctuary frequented by Samians on the Nile Delta in Egypt, as confirmed by contemporary epigraphic evidence from both *Naukratis* and Gravisca (Johnston, 2019). This significantly adds to the scenario of an increasingly more mobile trading Mediterranean in which Etruscan cities played no insignificant role. The most famous Greek inscription at Gravisca, however, was engraved on a stone anchor by a certain *Sostratos* (Fiorini, 2015; Harvey, 1976): this fragmentary inscription mentions *Sostratos* himself and 'Aeginetan Apollo', to whom the anchor was dedicated, revealing Aegina, an Aegean island in the Saronic Gulf opposite Attica, as the provenance of the dedicant. Whether *Sostratos* at Gravisca, as has been suggested, is the descendant of another Aeginetan *Sostratos*, whom Herodotus mentions (Herodotus IV, 152) as a successful merchant, is difficult to establish. If that correspondence were true, however, it would not simply hint at the extraordinary success of the trading ventures of *Sostratos'* family; it would also demonstrate the role of Gravisca as a key stop-over in these ventures (Figure 4.4).

The benefits that a harbour sanctuary like Gravisca could offer, however, were reciprocal: Etruscan worshippers mixed and mingled with Greek visitors there, and this interaction provided trading opportunities for both while leading to changes in local religious worship habits, as shown by Etruscan inscriptions on votive offerings. I will return to these changing habits below; for now, it is sufficient to emphasize the multiculturalism that denotes Gravisca as well as other harbour sites not only on the Tyrrhenian coast, at *Pyrgi* for example, but also at other later Etruscan coastal settlements and other sanctuaries much further afield (Johnston, 2001). An Etruscan dedicatory inscription on a Greek Laconian cup dated to the third quarter of the sixth century BCE comes from Aegina itself and its extra-urban sanctuary of Aphaia whose cult was as open to outsiders as were the ones at Gravisca (Cristofani, 1993). Closer to home, in the Po Valley and south of it in the area known as Etruria Padana, are the harbour settlements of Adria and Spina, established in the course of the sixth century BCE in the wetland environment of the delta of the river Po along the northern Adriatic coast. These settlements reveal equally lively relations among Greeks, Etruscans and local populations. Their expansion, along with other smaller satellite sites nearby, as a result of the flourishing trade in the region from the late sixth century, is documented by the arrival

there of imported Greek transport *amphorae* and Greek, mostly Attic, painted fine ware, several fragments of which carry Greek inscriptions.

Of these inscriptions, many consist of trademarks, that is, painted or engraved marks or letter tags that referred to the commercial transaction of the imported vessels themselves and that are also documented across southern Etruria; the surviving majority, in fact, comes from Vulci. Indeed, most Attic vessels bearing these trademarks originate from southern Etruria and, in lesser quantities, from Greek colonial sites in southern Italy (Johnston, 1979, 2006). From Adria, established before Spina in the early part of the sixth century BCE on the northern branches of the Po river, comes an Attic Black-Figure painted cup dated to *circa* 540–530 BCE and carrying a painted inscription that greets the reader and says to him/her 'buy me' (Baldassarra, 2013, pp. 33–9; Gaucci, 2010, 2012). This type of inscription painted on other contemporary similar cups known as little-master cups that are found elsewhere in Italy, from Etruria, including Gravisca, to Sicily, and across the Mediterranean basin, indicates clearly the dynamic commercial network that moved these drinking vessels from Athens across the sea. The presence at Adria of trademarks written in Etruscan rather than Greek script, which we also see at Vulci between the late sixth and first decade of the fifth century BCE, further confirms the commercial entanglement between Greek and Etruscan traders, and the control, by Etruscan traders and middlemen, of the movement of batches of imported vessels in different directions across Etruscan Italy between the Tyrrhenian and the Adriatic (Baldassarra, 2013, pp. 262–3). Recent epigraphic studies have moreover shown that the extant types of Greek trademarks found at Adria are also found at nearby Spina, located in the southern branches of the Po, Bologna, and across southern and inland Etruria, as well as at Campania and Greek settlements in Sicily and southern Italy. Just as interestingly, local types of trademarks identified at Adria, which is probable evidence of Greeks living locally, have been found in the east Mediterranean, from the Aegean to Rhodes and Cyprus (Baldassarra, 2013, pp. 269–70).

I will return to Adria, Spina, and other 'new towns' established in the northern Adriatic in the following chapter in order to examine the broadening of trade contacts from the Italic peninsula to continental Europe via the Po Valley. Here, it is sufficient to highlight the dynamism, which all this epigraphic evidence demonstrates, of these Adriatic harbour sites, which grew into commercial hubs from the late sixth century BCE, and followed the dynamism of Tyrrhenian coastal sites in the earlier decades of the century. It is also, however, worth reminding the reader that, while offering us a direct

and attention-grabbing glimpse into the involvement of individual traders or middlemen, this evidence may very well reflect the tip of the iceberg of the volume of goods that moved in and out of Etruscan Italy. It also gives us a very partial view of what types of goods were traded.

Indeed, if Greek painted fineware appears prominent in the archaeological record this is so for two reasons: first, the high survival rate of pottery vis-à-vis other materials, from organic ones such as wood, leather or textiles, which barely survive in the record, to metals, some of which were recyclable and recycled. This unfortunately fails to offer a precise accuracy of what was traded where. Second, unlike coarseware, painted fineware, even when found in small fragments and especially when carrying figured decoration, is easily recognizable according to type, and therefore datable and traceable to specific contexts of production. Greek pottery with painted figured decoration has ultimately received the lion's share of scholarly attention since the large-scale excavation of tomb groups at Vulci that flooded the art market with it in the nineteenth century. It is only relatively recently that other types of ceramic fineware, especially those produced in Etruria, from *bucchero* ware to painted pottery imitating Greek decorative techniques (Etrusco-Corinthian and Etruscan Black Figure pottery), have received comprehensive attention in studies of Etruscan trade (Bellelli, 2011; Benelli, 2017; Martelli, 1987; Naso, 2004; Paleothodoros, 2008; Spivey, 1987; Szilágyi, 1992). Similarly, coarseware, either imported or locally produced and then exported, has only relatively recently received scholarly attention despite its fundamental importance in the study of ancient trade. Coarseware, in the form of transport *amphorae* and *pithoi* or storage jars, was used for the transport and storage of agricultural produce from olive oil to wine and cereals, that is, the range of products of the agricultural economy that characterized pre-Roman Italy and the Mediterranean more broadly, and is therefore particularly helpful when addressing the nature of the Etruscan economy and the movement of trade goods, the third and final theme of this section.

Our current knowledge of archaic imported transport *amphorae*, which are mostly but not exclusively Greek from across the Mediterranean, is largely known from funerary contexts in southern Etruria. Here we have the earliest presence of these *amphorae* from *circa* the middle of the seventh to the end of the sixth century BCE, with a particular concentration of these transport vessels at *Caere* (Rizzo, 1990). Fewer and mostly fragmentary examples come from settlements, from the larger cities such as Tarquinia (Chiaramonte Treré and Bagnasco Gianni, 1999, pp. 262–77) to smaller communities

such as Poggio Civitate, the Tyrrhenian harbour sites of Gravisca, *Pyrgi* and *Regae*-Regisvilla, and discovered in an underwater shipwreck site off the coast of the Giglio Island opposite the Tuscan coast (Cristofani, 1985). Rather than reflecting an ancient reality, however, the paucity of *amphorae* outside tombs is a result of the incomplete study of this material as well as the genuine difficulty in identifying *amphora* fragments from stratigraphic excavations. Fragments from Greek *amphorae*, for instance, have been identified from coarseware fragments collected during the archaeological survey of the Albegna river valley, but this identification is not certain (Perkins, 1999, p. 143). A more thorough state of the published evidence and therefore of our view over the importation and movement of Greek *amphorae* is from inland and coastal sites of Etruria Padana, including Adria and Spina, where these *amphorae* have been excavated from later tomb groups and settlements (Sacchetti, 2012); we will return to the Adriatic in the next chapter.

To complicate matters further, like many other coarseware and fineware ceramics, specific types of imported transport *amphorae* were copied and manufactured outside their original place of production. This generates tremendous challenges to our attempts at tracing trade routes, and can only be properly assessed through an archeometric analysis of the vessels' clay. This is the case, for instance, with the early Sardinian manufacture of Phoenician Levantine-shaped *amphorae*, known as 'Sant'Imbenia-type' *amphorae*, only very recently identified, and so called from the early first-millennium BCE trading centre at Sant'Imbenia, north-west Sardinia, where these *amphorae* were produced (Roppa, 2012). We now know that these *amphorae* were widely distributed from the eighth century BCE in the central western Mediterranean. Although only a few finds are so far known from Italy, future studies may well change this picture and demonstrate that not only more of them reached Tyrrhenian central Italy, but that they inspired the very early local manufacture of *amphorae* in Etruria (Tronchetti, 2015, p. 273). Indeed, this scenario is not far-fetched given that, by the end of the eighth century BCE, the earliest Phoenician and Greek settlements had been established in the central Mediterranean from Sardinia and Sicily to the north African coast with Carthage, and Phoenicians were travelling even further west all the way to the Iberian peninsula.[3] A final aspect to bear in mind is that, as with Attic fineware or indeed any other traded goods, the actual traders may not have been the producers of the goods: a striking example of this is a type of Attic *amphora* known as SOS *amphora* that circulated throughout the Mediterranean basin from the second half of the eighth to the beginning of the sixth century BCE, and reached south

Etruscan cities such as Vulci and *Veii* with a particular concentration at *Caere*. The presence of these *amphorae* at Phoenician sites and along Phoenician routes across the basin suggests that they reached southern Etruria in the seventh century BCE through Phoenician trade (Pratt, 2015).

The last quarter of the seventh century BCE is also the date of our earliest secure finds of Etruscan transport *amphorae* documented at Doganella, a newly established site near Marsiliana d'Albegna, and from eastern Languedoc in southern France. These finds mark the beginning of a flourishing trade of Etruscan products aimed at indigenous and Greek communities in southern France after the establishment of Greek Massalia (Dietler, 2005; Gori and Bettini, 2006). This trade is documented by the wide-ranging distribution of *amphorae* and other Etruscan exports such as *bucchero kantharoi* (drinking cups with two high handles) and, in much lesser quantities, metal vessels across the region, from coastal and inland sites to underwater shipwreck sites off the French coast (Long, Pomey, and Sourisseau, 2002). That the content of these *amphorae* was also wine is extraordinarily confirmed by the most noteworthy of these underwater sites: this is the so-called Grand Ribaud F sunken ship dated to the end of the sixth or beginning of the fifth century BCE, and found by the island of Grand Ribaud, east of Marseilles. The cargo of this ship contained about 1,200 to 1,400 Etruscan *amphorae* associated with vine shoots and grape pips, and estimated to have carried 300 hectolitres of wine (Long, Gantès, and Rival, 2006). Although this exceptionally large cargo is not comparable to those of other much smaller ships also carrying Etruscan *amphorae* and sunken off the French coast, it nevertheless gives us an idea of the buoyancy of the Etruscan agricultural economy and its export market towards the end of the sixth century BCE.

Testimony to this buoyancy is the concurrent growth of sites in the course of the sixth century BCE in the southern Etruscan countryside, detected through archaeological field survey. In the Albegna river valley, perhaps the most thoroughly archaeologically investigated valley in Etruscan Italy, the increase of rural sites in this century is twofold and follows the foundation of Doganella, which has been interpreted as a centre for the production and distribution of transport *amphorae*, and from which comes the only archaic *amphora* kiln known so far (Perkins and Walker, 1990). Towards the end of the century and contemporary with the Grand Ribaud F shipwreck, is the emergence of sizeable farms, of which only a few have been excavated. One of these, only very recently excavated near Marsiliana and aptly called the House of Amphorae, held *amphorae* and *pithoi* that contained wine, oil, some kind of resin and bee's wax or honey according to

the scientific analysis of their content's organic residues (Zifferero, 2017). Whether honey was, in fact, used as an additive to wine is not unreasonable. But it is not surprising that Etruscan *amphorae* such as these transported food produce other than wine; analysis of the cargoes of other sunken ships has detected traces of fish bones and olive pips among the contents of the *amphorae* (Figures 4.5, 4.6 and 4.7).

Archaic Etruscan trade went much further afield than southern France: transport *amphorae* and other Etruscan goods, from *bucchero* to other types of fine ware such as Etrusco-Corinthian pottery reached several other southern regions of the central Mediterranean, from *Latium* and Sardinia to Campania and Sicily. However, the northern littorals, from the Ligurian coast to southern France, were undoubtedly the prime destination of Etruscan goods and were frequented by Etruscan traders directly. It is the epigraphic combined with the archaeological evidence, once again, that points to this scenario. A corpus of Etruscan short inscriptions or graffiti engraved on Etruscan ceramics comes from two indigenous settlements on the southern French coast: these are Saint Blaise, a flourishing trading site not far from Massalia and one of the best-known and well-excavated sites of the Lower Rhone basin, and Lattes, a fortified well-planned port town established at around 500 BCE in eastern Languedoc. At Lattes, excavations near the southern gate of the town's fortification have brought to light three houses, built at the beginning of the life of the town, and probably inhabited by Etruscan residents to judge from the predominance of Etruscan pottery, some of which bore Etruscan inscriptions; the destruction of these houses by fire around 475 BCE marks the moment when this Etruscan presence disappears from the site, which goes hand in hand with the decline of Etruscan imports to southern France more broadly from the middle to late sixth century BCE (Gailledrat, 2015).

The date 475 BCE is also the most probable date of another tantalizing epigraphic document, a lead tablet, rolled up in a cylinder, discovered in 1950 at Pech Maho, one of several so-called *oppidum* sites located on a lagoon, just south of Narbonne in western Languedoc. Used as a lead weight for fishing nets, more than twenty years passed before the little cylinder of lead was unrolled, restored and its two inscriptions, one in Etruscan, the other in Ionian Greek, discovered (Pébarthe and Delrieux, 1999). Both inscriptions give details of commercial transactions between parties, but they were not engraved at the same time: the earlier Etruscan one is also the more fragmented and hence difficult to read, but we can easily make out the personal names of two individuals involved in an exchange occurring at Massalia. The later, better preserved Greek text also

records a transaction of goods, one of which is a small boat, between partners associated with the inhabitants of *Emporion*, a coastal Greek–Iberian settlement, located near modern-day Empúries in northern Catalonia. While the reuse of a written text is intriguing, both texts demonstrate the sophistication of commercial transactions, in the formal recording of these (Wilson, 1997–8). They are also not alone in doing so, since more such commercial letters written in some Iberian language have been found in the region, at Pech Maho itself and *Emporion* (Demetriou, 2005, pp. 40–2, 231) (Figure 4.8).

Writing, in fact, had already been put to use for other types of contracts or bonds of reciprocity less than a century earlier: a few minute ivory plaques in the shape of animals and inscribed with the personal and gentilicial names of individuals have been interpreted as hospitality letters on the basis of the later Latin *tesserae hospitales*: these latter, as we know from archaeological and literary sources, were formed of two identical matching pieces that two parties exchanged in the formal act of forging a relationship of reciprocity. One of these plaques, found at the site of Sant' Omobono in Rome, is written in the Etruscan of Rome: the text mentions a well-known Etruscan gentilicial name, *Spurianas*, and another name spelt as if it was a gentilicial name, that may refer to the Phoenician city of *Sulkis*, in south-west Sardinia. Another comes from the S. Monica *necropolis* at Carthage and may have been written at Tarquinia or Vulci according to the palaeographic analysis of its text, which mentions a Punic individual from Carthage. A few others come from the Orientalizing building at Poggio Civitate where they may have been manufactured (Maggiani, 2006). Dating to the earlier part or middle of the sixth century BCE, these plaques may be read as evidence of the evolution of the mechanics of trade towards the middle of the first millennium BCE, when the earlier network of elite alliances expanded as a result of urban and economic growth across the central and west Mediterranean, a situation epitomized by the Pech Maho lead letter.

Religion and the city

As has been noted earlier, the rise of monumental sanctuaries both inside and outside cities is part and parcel of this regional growth. These sites are, in fact, absolutely crucial to understanding the multiple levels of engagement in religion by urban communities, from the political use of these sanctuaries by local rulers to the actual votive habits of individual worshippers (Colonna, 1985).[4] They illustrate at once the tremendous cultural and economic vivacity of archaic Etruscan society already outlined, and the political competition and instability within and among cities in the context of an increasingly unstable wider central Mediterranean region. The Battle of the Sardinian Sea, noted

earlier, was the first in a series of sea battles which saw cities in the region jostling for dominance and economic control. The sanctuary at *Pyrgi*, one of *Caere*'s coastal harbours, exemplifies this magnificently: here, first one, then a second monumental temple, was constructed in the space of about fifty years, following the earliest shrines known largely from decorative terracotta fragments, at a time when inside *Caere* the renovation of the urban infrastructure, from roads to hydraulic works, went hand in hand with the construction of other sanctuaries at the heart of the city (Bellelli, 2016)[5] (Figure 4.9).

At *Pyrgi*, the earlier temple was erected in the last decade of the sixth century BCE along with a stone precinct which led to the sanctuary via a monumental entrance, together with other ancillary buildings and structures that included altars, pits, a cistern, and a series of twenty small rooms of equal size running along the southern side of the temple and facing a series of altars. While the function of these rooms is still debated, their position and the terracotta antefixes that decorated them clearly point to a religious use, perhaps for ritual dining. Contemporary with this imposing building programme was the renovation of a cult area south of this first temple separated by a channel linked to a fresh water source: here, votive objects, mostly in the form of pottery, much of which imported from Athens, were offered at shrines to cults connected to *Fufluns*, the Etruscan deity who was merged with Greek Dionysos. Demeter was also worshipped here, as we know from the inscribed dedications to *Cavatha*, an Etruscan female goddess corresponding to *Kore* (later *Persephone*), Demeter's daughter, and *Śuri*, corresponding to Greek Hades, Kore's husband (Baglione and Gentili, 2013; Michetti, 2016).

This first temple at *Pyrgi* was decorated with the sculpture group of Herakles and a female deity, which Etruscologists have interpreted as Hera, and which, in the Etruscan pantheon, corresponded to *Uni*, whose cult is well-attested across southern Etruria. Etruscologists seem to agree that here, as at other sanctuaries where a similar group was placed on the temple roof, as noted earlier, the decorative programme was intended to represent Herakles' ascension to Mount Olympus following the successful outcome of the hero's labour, and hence his transition from hero to god (Colonna, 2000; Lulof, 2000; Lulof and Smith, 2017; Winter Nancy and Lulof, 2016). Several of these labours have also been identified in the rest of the terracotta decoration of this first temple, much of which has been found in fragments, thus making the accurate identification of many of the mythical figures represented difficult. It is, however, clear that, at *Pyrgi* as elsewhere, these figures were not simply borrowed from Greek mythology. They were rather the result of a local adoption and adaptation of a variety of source material, which Etruscan

rulers and whoever commissioned these buildings used in order to express and communicate specific religious and political messages.

At *Pyrgi* luckily we know who commissioned this first temple thanks to a dedicatory inscription engraved on three golden leaves, which were discovered in 1963, as noted in Chapter 1. The leaves were carefully deposited, along with the nails used for hanging them, when the temple was dismantled in the early third century BCE, in an area (Area C) where the most important altars were located, just north of the temple. Two leaves contain the Etruscan text of the dedication, and the third is a close Phoenician translation of the main Etruscan text (Bellelli and Xella, 2016; Wallace, 2016, pp. 45–7). In the dedication, a certain *Thefarie Velianas*, is self-proclaimed ruler or supreme magistrate of *Caere*, holding, that is, *zilac selaita*, a political office named in the Etruscan text (Maggiani, 1996, pp. 102–5); he also states that he built a house to goddess *Uni-Astarte* as she requested. In the Phoenician text, the named goddess is *Astarte*, a well-known Phoenician deity found in Phoenician sanctuaries across the Mediterranean. The inscription tells us two things: first, much like other sanctuaries at coastal harbours, *Pyrgi* spoke to a multicultural community of worshippers although it is important to note that no Phoenician finds of this period have been so far recovered there. Second, as ruler of *Caere* at the moment of the dedication, *Thefarie Velianas* used the temple in order to convey the most powerful political message that the deities were on his side. Herakles' mythical ascension to divinity may have been part and parcel of that message: did *Thefarie* identify himself with Herakles? Whoever approached the temple would have been able to see the entire architectural decoration crowned by the statue group on top of the roof (Figure 4.10).

Pyrgi was linked to *Caere* by a monumental 10-metre-wide road, which, in the sixth century BCE, upon reaching the sanctuary, bent steeply northwards to a settlement area, currently under excavation by the University of Rome, that was established before the monumentalization of the sanctuary (Baglione et al., 2017). Along this road and roughly 4 kilometres outside *Caere*, another sanctuary was built a few years earlier than *Thefarie*'s temple (*circa* 530 BCE), not far from one of the largest Orientalizing *tumuli* outside the city, the Montetosto Tumulus mentioned in the previous chapter, and other smaller *tumulus* burials (Belelli Marchesini, Biella, and Michetti, 2015). Towards the end of the sixth century BCE, we are, in other words, in front of a remarkable building programme, sponsored by the ruler of *Caere*, that transformed the landscape on the coast and between it and the city into a veritable landscape of power and control by the city.

This was accentuated roughly fifty years later when a larger temple was built nearer the coast as the embankment established for the earlier temple was enlarged to the north. The sanctuary doubled in size, but its monumentality was achieved not simply by the larger dimensions of the new building and the installation of a square in front of it. Its floor plan also made a difference: unlike the first temple that had a single *cella*, the inner temple room, and a columnade running along its perimeter, the new temple sat on a high *podium*, had a series of three *cellae*, adjacent to one another, facing a deep porch which hosted the only columns of the temple set in three lines. The plan followed what the Roman architect Vitruvius, writing centuries later, would call the Tuscanic temple, a local tradition of temple building documented at several other Etruscan sanctuaries (Colonna, 2000, pp. 309–36).

The sanctuary, as it stood in the mid-fifth century BCE, thus created an imposing sacred maritime façade, comparable to the similar, though much more grandiose, façade at *Selinus*, the Greek city in south-west Sicily that built several temples visible from the sea. Indeed, this comparison aptly makes us realize that *Pyrgi* was not simply a harbour sanctuary like Gravisca. Rather, it was a major cult centre where myth and politics were indissolubly intertwined. The myth chosen to decorate the new temple was the Greek Seven Against Thebes, well known from literary sources, as well as later figurative representations in Etruria, to which we will return in Chapter 6. It featured Oedipus' two sons, Eteocles and Polynices, going to war with each other in a power struggle for the control of the city of Thebes. Upon approaching the temple from the *Caere-Pyrgi* road, which by now had become a veritable sacred way, worshippers could view an extremely violent scene in the terracotta decoration of the pediment at the rear of the temple that showed the two brothers slaughtering each other. Like the Herakles' myths displayed on the earlier temple, this myth, too, conveyed an unmistakable political message: the tale was a warning, to those threatening to subvert the divine and human order, of the consequences of their action (Baglione, 2013, pp. 210–11). While we are unable to identify who these people might be, the decision to admonish visually this danger in such a strikingly violent manner indicates that political instability was not a remote reality at *Caere*. Whether it was more or less remote than it had been fifty years earlier, at the height of *Thefarie Velianas*' power, is difficult to say since the audacious propagandistic tone in *Thefarie*'s Phoenician dedication may reveal an equally supreme yet unstable sovereignty. Indeed, the suggestion that the new temple signalled a change of political rule at *Caere* is not far-fetched (Figure 4.11).

Be that as it may, while *Pyrgi* may be unique, our knowledge of other sanctuaries within and outside cities gives us an indication of their sheer number across Etruria and the remarkable variety in construction, location and refurbishment through time (De Grummond, Edlund-Berry, and Bagnasco Gianni, 2011). At *Caere*, not only do we have monumental temples developing from earlier seventh-century BCE cult areas as at Vigna Marini Vitalini in the vicinity of the *forum* of the later Roman city, and the recently excavated Sant'Antonio area (Thomson de Grummond, 2016), but here, near the gate on the eastern side of the city, two monumental temples on a *podium* were built in a radical renovation at the end of the sixth century BCE, which was followed by other phases of change up to the second century BCE (Maggiani, 2013). From Vigna Marini Vitalini we also have a rich dossier of architectural terracottas that have allowed us to reconstruct the roofs of sacred structures (Fiorini and Winter Nancy, 2013; Lulof, 2008). Lastly, near the theatre of the later Roman city, at Vigna Parrocchiale, another temple, also Tuscanic in plan, was built upon an earlier residential and manufacturing neighbourhood that was destroyed to make space for the sanctuary in the early fifth century BCE; a large *tufa* quarry dug nearby provided the building material for this monumental building project (Bellelli, 2013; Cristofani, 1992, 2003).

At Tarquinia, continuity of cult is even more remarkable. At Pian di Civita, at the centre of the urban plateau, the beginnings of ritual activities date to the tenth century BCE, as we saw in Chapter 2. In the course of the eighth century BCE, the deposition of offerings, ritual structures and human burials, of an infant and an adult, made the area into a sanctuary that was given a new layout in the early seventh century. At that point, a cultic building with its bench altar in the inner room was erected, and later surrounded by a precinct. Inaugurating the erection of this building were two votive pits in front of it, one of which contained three bronze artefacts, a shield, a trumpet or *lituus* and an axe: the first two had been intentionally bent, hence rendered unusable, while the lack of wooden remains on the axe suggests that it had never been used before deposition (Bagnasco Gianni et al., 2018; Jovino, 2010). We are, in other words, dealing with symbols rather than functional objects, which evoked some form of political authority linked to the most powerful elites who, as we saw in the previous chapter, displayed their social power at the tomb through similar symbols. Here, too, and a couple of centuries earlier than *Pyrgi*, we witness the indissoluble link between the political and the sacred at a sanctuary whose cult, according to epigraphic evidence, was to a chthonic deity, perhaps *Uni*. Cultic activities continued in the early sixth century BCE with the

refurbishment of the sacred area as well as the placing of more offerings in votive pits and more infant burials. At the same time, *circa* 570 BCE, the earliest temple building of a monumental sanctuary was built west of Civita at Ara della Regina, a site that would become one of the largest temples in pre-Roman Italy, first discovered at the beginning of the twentieth century (Bonghi Jovino and Bagnasco Gianni, 2012). That the ground was levelled and a base of stone blocks created for the earliest building there shows the intention, from the very beginning, to monumentalize. The archaic temple and its related structures, from altars to precinct walls, went through different phases of change until a major phase of refurbishment at the beginning of the fourth century BCE; by then, the sacred complex at Civita had gone out of its original use (Figure 4.12).

Perhaps the one large south Etruscan city where we have the richest archaeological evidence of sanctuaries is *Veii* thanks to the intense interest and attention that the city has received from Italian and foreign archaeologists alike for a very long time (Edlund-Berry, 2019). Several of the ritual sites attested are, in fact, known from the ploughsoil and thus not easy to characterize. Others are known from votive deposits, architectural features such as roof terracotta decoration and structures suggesting the presence of a sanctuary. This is the case, for instance, of a sacred area near the so-called *Caere* Gate north of the city that included a basin, a cistern, a votive deposit and architectural terracottas (Edlund-Berry, 2019, pp. 130–1). In yet other cases, we can trace phases of refurbishment and change, similar to what can be seen elsewhere, lasting for the whole second half of the first millennium BCE. At the locality of Campetti South-West, for example, on the western limits of the city and just north of the Portonaccio sanctuary, a late seventh-century BCE sacred area, perhaps to do with water cults to judge from the presence of wells, a cistern and votive material, was refurbished in the sixth century BCE, as a roof was added to what was a large open-air precinct.

But it is the Portonaccio sanctuary that has given us the most extraordinary evidence of the long life of an Etruscan sanctuary (Ambrosini, 2009; Colonna, 2002, 2019). Located just outside the city walls on a terrace, the site was first excavated in 1914 by E. Gabrici, followed by the campaigns directed by Giglioli to whom we owe the discovery of the famous walking Apollo (*Apollo che cammina*). Excavations continued to the end of the last century when, in the early 1990s, the most remarkable feat was achieved with the addition of a light non-invasive structure, which recreated the temple; this gives the visitor to the site a clear understanding of the prominence of the temple building around the remains of other structures. Here, too, we have continuity of

worship since the first half of the seventh century BCE; the earliest structures, which show that earlier worshippers' activities took place in the open air, date to the second half of the century. The number of votive offerings from then onwards, besides the buildings and the monumentalization of these, makes the Portonaccio record a veritable laboratory for the study of religious behaviour over half a millennium (Michetti, 2002) (Figure 4.13).

For the early phase, dedications consist mainly of vessels of *bucchero* and Etrusco-Corinthian ceramics, several inscribed, as well as more distinctive offerings such as bronze, ivory and terracotta figurines, smaller objects including textile-making tools such as loom weights, and personal ornaments. That these latter objects point to a cult of a female divinity is confirmed by inscriptions from the first phases of religious activities, which dedicated the offerings to *Menrva*, although other deities worshipped from these early phases included *Herkle*, Etruscan Herakles, and *Rath* connected to *Aplu* (Etruscan Apollo) (Colonna, 2019, pp. 118–19). The similarity of these early dedicated objects to those of the same date found at Sant' Omobono in Rome, from which comes the ivory *tessera hospitalis* described above, and at other Latial sites such as *Satricum*, attests further to the lively mobility of people, whether worshippers or craftsmen, across Tyrrhenian central Italy. This is confirmed by the inscriptions that give us the elite gentilicial names of the givers of offerings to the deity at Portonaccio (Maras, 2002, 2013): we find both local people and worshippers coming from other cities, Chiusi, *Caere* and Vulci. Among them is a certain *Avle Vipinas*, inscribed on the foot of a *bucchero* chalice or incense burner (Maras, 2002, p. 262): the name is the same as that of *Aulus Vibenna*, known not only from the literary sources but also from other inscriptions. One of these comes from the François Tomb at Vulci where he is represented with his brother *Caile*, whom we will encounter in the final chapter.

At Portonaccio from the middle of the sixth century BCE we see changes in the organization of the sanctuary that would culminate with its monumentalization and the erection of a Tuscanic temple, contemporary with the first temple at *Pyrgi*. An extraordinary repertoire of terracotta sculpture also dates to the end of the sixth century, ranging from figurines to larger pieces, including the *Herkle* and *Menrva* group and even larger, life-size pieces, the *acroteria*, which decorated the ridge pole of the temple roof. Among these *acroteria* were *Herkle* and *Aplu* (walking Apollo), twice represented and illustrating different mythical episodes that saw the two deities in conflict with one another. This echoes the struggle between them for the tripod, which is represented at

the Apollo sanctuary at Greek Delphi. Although there are ongoing questions as to how these episodes fit together on the roof, it seems most plausible to associate the main cult at the temple with *Herkle* and *Aplu* even though fragments of a large sculpture possibly representing *Tinia* (Etruscan Zeus) may also point to another related cult (Colonna, 2019, pp. 120–3) (Figure 4.14).

Having thus returned to *Veii* where this chapter began at Piazza d'Armi, we can fully appreciate the enormous growth that Etruscan cities went through in little less than this remarkable century. It is not for nothing that Etruscologists see the sixth century BCE as the apogee of Etruscan civilization. If there is no consensus yet on the dating and function of the so-called *oikos* temple which Stefani dug at Piazza d'Armi, this is not due to our lack of knowledge. It is rather the outcome of a historical trajectory: it is often difficult to distinguish, prior to the second half of the sixth century BCE, religious from other types of structures. It is only after the middle of the century that we see the emergence of temple buildings, clearly differentiated from other, non-religious structures, and a focused investment upon these buildings through architectural decoration as well as monumentalization, as discussed earlier. It is therefore plausible to see such buildings as veritable testimony not only to the wealth and growth of Etruscan cities but also to the astonishing sophistication reached by religion and its related aspects, from ritualization to the adoption and adaptation of Greek-derived myths and the development of an indigenous pantheon. The sociopolitical exploitation of such aspects is part and parcel of urbanism, as exemplified by *Pyrgi*'s sanctuary at the time of *Thefarie Velianas*.

That all of this went hand in hand with the dilation of trade contacts outside the core of Tyrrhenian Etruria is borne out once we begin to look further afield and towards the north: the site that has received equal if not more attention than *Veii* for its sacred areas within the city is that of Marzabotto, located in the middle Reno river valley, an Appennine valley south of the Po river. Here, as noted before, *Tinia*, the head of the Etruscan pantheon, was worshipped at a monumental peripteral temple that was built in the first quarter of the fifth century BCE, fully integrated in the layout of the city. Both the placing of the temple and the layout of the city were established through complex religious practices that set the contours of the relationship between the sky and its deities and the human world on earth. Marzabotto is not known for its sanctuaries only, however: its growth from the last decades of the sixth century BCE along with that of several other settlements in Etruria Padana discussed here attest to a flourishing of this

region. This occurred as trade contacts broadened to the north as well as to the south of the core of Etruria in a phase, from the end of the sixth and early fifth century BCE, of increasing mobility and later instability, as we are about to see.

Figure 4.1 Piazza d'Armi, *Veii* © Sapienza Università di Roma, Scienze dell'Antichità.

Figure 4.2 So-called *oikos*, reconstruction, Piazza d'Armi, *Veii* , drawing by Renate Sponer Za for Winter, N. 2009 *Symbols of Wealth and Power: Architectural Terracotta Decoration in Etruria and Central Italy, 640-510 B.C.* MAAR Suppl. 9, Ann Arbor.

Figure 4.3 Gravisca, aerial view of the sanctuary, from Bagnasco Gianni, G. and L. Fiorini 2018 Between Tarquinia and Gravisca, in É. Gailledrat, M. Dietler and R. Plana-Mallart (eds) *The Emporion in the ancient western Mediterranean. Trade and colonial encounters from the Archaic to the Hellenistic period*, 155–66, Montpellier.

Figure 4.4 Inscribed stone anchor with Sostratos' dedication, Gravisca ©Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia. Archivio fotografico.

Figure 4.5 House of Amphorae, the site under excavation, Marsiliana d'Albegna, photograph Archivio UNISI by Andrea Zifferero, courtesy Andrea Zifferero.

Figure 4.6 House of Amphorae, plan, Marsiliana d'Albegna, author Duccio Calamandrei, photograph Archivio UNISI, courtesy Andrea Zifferero.

Figure 4.7 House of Amphorae, virtual reconstruction, Marsiliana d'Albegna, author Duccio Calamandrei, photograph Archivio UNISI, courtesy Andrea Zifferero.

Figure 4.8 Pech Maho lead tablet, Greek text (above), Etruscan text (below) © Centre Camille Jullian.

Figure 4.9 *Pyrgi*, the plan of the site © Sapienza Università di Roma, Missione Archeologica di Pyrgi.

Figure 4.10 Golden plaques with *Thefarie Velianas*' dedication, *Pyrgi* (Villa Giulia Museum), photograph by Sailko (CC BY-SA 4.0), from Wikimedia Commons.

Figure 4.11 Pediment illustrating the myth Seven against Thebes, Temple A, *Pyrgi* (Villa Giulia Museum), photograph by Giuseppe Savo (CC BY-SA 4.0), from Wikimedia Commons.

Figure 4.12 Dedication of bronze artefacts, Civita sacred complex, La Civita di Tarquinia, Tarquinia, from Bonghi Jovino, M. 1987 Gli scavi nell'abitato di Tarquinia e la scoperta dei bronzi in un preliminare inquadramento, in M. Bonghi Jovino, C. Chiaramonte Treré (eds), *Tarquinia. Ricerche, scavi e prospettive*, 59–77. Milano.

Figure 4.13 Portonaccio sanctuary, *Veii*, photograph by Livioandronico2013 (CC BY-SA 3.0), from Wikimedia Commons.

Figure 4.14 Large-scale terracotta *acroteria*, Portonaccio sanctuary, *Veii* (Villa Giulia Museum), photograph by Sailko (CC BY-SA 4.0), from Wikimedia Commons.

---

[1] The masterful Winter (2009) provides the most complete overview on architectural terracotta decoration in Etruria and central Italy.
[2] For a Mediterranean view, see Eric Gailledrat, Dietler, and Plana Mallart (2018).
[3] For a detailed argument and overview on wine production and trade in this section, see Riva (2018). See Botto and Vives-Ferrándiz (2006) on Etruscan imports in the west Mediterranean from the eighth to the fifth centuries BCE.
[4] For a Mediterranean-wide view of sanctuaries, see Kistler, Öhlinger, Mohr, and Hoernes (2015) and Russo Tagliente and Guarneri (2016).
[5] On these developments and the urban growth at *Caere,* see: Bellelli (2014); Gaultier, Haumesser, and Santoro (2013).