Chapter 1. Introduction: Building Connections

Charlotte R. Potts

Architecture is the will of an epoch translated into space.

– Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, 1924[1]

Exploring central Italic architecture as part of a connected world brings together one of the most prominent themes in the study of the ancient Mediterranean in recent decades, namely connectivity, and a body of evidence that has often been overlooked in many studies of ancient construction, technology, society, economy, and even the archaeology of early Italy, to wit architecture in Etruria and Latium. Such a partnership is an invitation to move beyond the study of individual elements of structures or sites, for example mouldings or terracottas, and instead use such studies to reconstruct a larger picture of architecture in this region as a discipline and to position it more broadly in space and time. The chapters in this volume respond to this challenge by considering connectivity in more than a geographical sense, showing how architecture in western central Italy between approximately 800 and 400 BC has close connections with Bronze Age and Roman building, with practices locally and across the Mediterranean, with the natural world and the cosmos. Architecture emerges as a window into the lives, knowledge, and values of its makers and users, in short into the world in which it stood, and in doing so raises important questions about the ways in which we study the first millennium BC.

[1]Translated from van der Rohe 1924, 31 (‘Baukunst ist immer raumgefaßter Zeitwille’).

This chapter serves as an introduction for what follows by placing this volume's approach into the context of the past and current study of central Italic architecture. It will point out some of the issues that underlie and join the analyses in the subsequent chapters, including why so many major building projects were undertaken in Etruria and Latium in this period, who and what was moving to create them, and how the results blur the boundaries of what has traditionally been considered 'Roman.' Fundamentally it will argue not only for the value of central Italic architecture as a source for regional social and economic histories, but also for its potential contribution to the study of ancient architecture as a whole.

Past and Present

It is worth acknowledging right from the start that the architecture of early central Italy has long had a far lower profile in the study of ancient architecture than the built environments of Greece and later Rome. Its relative neglect is at least partly due to the available evidence. Central Italic architecture – for the purposes of this volume defined as the buildings of Etruria and Latium, including Rome, that emerge from the Iron Age and predate the Roman conquest of Veii in 396 BC[2] – made extensive use of perishable materials. The mudbricks, rammed earth, and timber used in central Italic buildings were all highly subject to disintegration, while the soft tufo stones and calcareous bedrock of southern Etruria and the harder sandstones and limestones of northern Etruria have suffered the effects of prolonged demolition and reuse. The remains of early architecture in this region accordingly often comprise little more than partial foundations, roofs of more durable terracotta tiles, and buried engineering works, although each of these can be substantial. Secondary evidence such as votive models and decorated tomb interiors provide more information about details of

---

[2] On Rome's conquest of Veii as a 'climactic war' see Harris 1990, 507; on its influence on Rome's society, economy, urban form, and self-image see Cornell 2000, 44–46; and Bernard 2012, 38–39.

roofs, columns, doors, windows, and woodwork.[3] Viewed as a whole, and in spite of its limitations, this range of material establishes that the people of 'pre-Roman' central Italy had substantial houses, elaborate tombs, imposing temples, and were accomplished civil engineers. But the interpretation of much of this evidence – its reconstruction, its relationship to other cultural traditions, its historical significance, and the terminology to describe them all – are matters of ongoing debate. This is somewhat a natural consequence of its fragmentary nature. The recent discovery of many remains is another factor, as much only came to light in excavations in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and more is appearing every year, prompting constant revision. Finally, the variation in materials, styles, and building techniques between individual sites is as marked in the architecture of early Italy as other forms of art. Thus, while there is now a substantial body of evidence for central Italic construction, to date there is no extensive, unified account of it.[4]

Yet the last thirty years have seen a notable expansion in the number of publications that address different aspects of this material. Modern excavations have allowed developments to be reassessed and changing interpretive frameworks have asked new questions of old evidence. There are now books on the architecture of Archaic Rome, on religious architecture in Etruria and Latium, on monumentality in central Italy, on Etruscan and Roman mouldings, on building techniques, on architectural terracottas, and a host of chapters in edited volumes.[5]

---

[3] Best surveyed by Damgaard Andersen 1998, i. 25–70.

[4] A short overview, now in need of updating, is provided by Colonna 1986, while the longer treatment by Boëthius 1978 is also out of date. A valuable but unpublished treatment is offered by Damgaard Andersen 1998. See also the works in n.5 below.

[5] Books: Rystedt, Wikander and Wikander 1993; Lulof and Moormann 1997; Edlund-Berry 2000; Edlund-Berry, Greco and Kenfield 2006; Cifani 2008; Winter 2009; Lulof and Rescigno 2010; Thomas and Meyers

These analyses have indicated that architecture has the capacity to refine long-standing accounts of some aspects of central Italic culture. The relationship between Rome and its neighbours, the economy of Tyrrhenian Italy, and networks of specialist craftsmen around the Mediterranean are all coming into sharper relief through the study of buildings created before the middle of the Roman Republic.

Recent studies have also produced more nuanced accounts of changes in building over the timeframe considered in this volume. In general terms, between the eighth and fourth centuries BC thatched huts were supplemented and replaced by monumental temples, rock-cut tombs, and houses with stone foundations and tiled roofs. Plans and building materials diversified, either in response to trends elsewhere or to internal political and socio-economic developments, or more likely a combination of both, while some traditional building techniques were maintained.[6] Building functions appear to have become more differentiated and the use of space in settlements and within buildings seems to have altered.[7] Landscapes acquired cities, sanctuaries, estates, villages, and farms. Over the same period, central Italic society is thought to have become more complex, with hierarchies becoming more visible in the archaeological record and populations increasing and centralising. Scholars offer different interpretations of the precise relationship between these architectural and social developments but agree that this is a period of marked change in both respects.

2012; Potts 2015; Hopkins 2016; Miller 2017. Chapters: Colonna 1986; Izzet 2000; Edlund-Berry 2008; Warden 2012, among others.

[6] On building techniques see Miller 2017. On the difference between 'technology' (the application of calculated ideas) and 'technique' (an operational sequence associated with a specific technology) see Miller 2017, 2 n.1.

[7] Van't Lindenhout 1997; Steingräber 2001; Izzet 2007, 143–64.

What drove these changes, and in particular the role of external influences, is not a new subject. Relationships between Etruria, Latium, Rome, and their Mediterranean neighbours have been studied both in terms of architecture and material culture more generally, and have tended to follow recognizable patterns in Classical archaeology and archaeology as a whole, which in turn have been affected by prevailing paradigms in intellectual history.[8] Albeit to a lesser extent than other parts of Etruscan archaeology – which traditionally subsumed the study of early Rome and Latium – architecture was long interpreted through a Hellenocentric lens through which Greece emerged as the inspiration for central Italic practice. Through the 1970s and 1980s, at the time when the modern discipline of Etruscology was emerging, plans, ornaments, building functions, and town-planning were often seen as pale imitations of Greek systems. Changes were presented as unthinking imitations or the conscious choice of aristocrats seeking to enhance their power by drawing on practices elsewhere. The introduction of buildings with stone foundations and tiled roofs during the seventh and sixth centuries BC, and the subsequent concentration of these buildings in cities, was attributed to the arrival of new materials and concepts from Greece and especially from Corinth or Euboea via Campania.[9] Orthogonal town plans were attributed to exposure to Greek norms that came via colonies in Campania, southern Italy, and Sicily; it was thought that Etruscan houses had rooms resembling the Greek *andron* and dedicated feminine spaces; and the building beneath the later Regia in Rome was once presented as a deliberate formal and functional replica of the *prytaneion* in the Athenian agora.[10] Central Italic architecture has also been seen as a

[8] Trigger 2006, with special reference to pp. 61–6 on the development of classical archaeology.

[9] Pallottino 1975, 174; Drews 1981, 154-57; Ridgway 1988, 666–67.

[10] On town planning: Colonna 1986, 464; Owens 1991, 96, 104–5. On possible Etruscan versions of a *gynaeceum* and *andron* see Torelli 1983, 56 (discussing Poggio Civitate); Small 1994, 90 n.4. On female spaces in Etruscan and Roman houses: Jolivet 2011a, 254–62; Jolivet 2011b. On the *regia* and Athens:

follower of Near Eastern models, particularly in the so-called 'Orientalizing period' of Etruscan history spanning approximately 720–580 BC. While some forms of architecture at this time do indicate strong Near Eastern connections, such as the construction of funerary tumuli across central Italy and the use of the *murs à piliers* technique to build walls at Tarquinia, some scholars have drawn less direct connections, for example seeing the lavish houses built in Latium during the seventh and sixth centuries BC as derivations of *bit hilāni* palaces in Syria.[11] Roman influence has also been posited although more obliquely. Descriptions by Vitruvius have been used as a framework for interpreting buildings that stood half a millennium before his time,[12] and terms from Roman culture have been retrojected onto Etruscan buildings, for example in the category of buildings in central Italy labelled '*regiae*'.[13] Many of these interpretations stemmed from approaches in which texts were given primacy or were outgrowths of historical traditions that viewed the peoples of pre-Roman Italy as culturally overshadowed by those with whom they had contact, as passive recipients of goods, technology, and concepts.

More recently, just as postcolonial perspectives have been applied in Classical archaeology, the peoples of central Italy have been repositioned as active and independent proponents of cultural change. Their autonomy in areas such as myth, religion, art, and social customs has

Ampolo 1971; cf. Scheffer 1990. More generally: Ward-Perkins 1977, 11; Musgrove 1987, 210, 16–17; and cf. Torelli 2000a, 196–97; Donati 2000, 321–23.

[11] Torelli 1985, 27–32; Cifani 2008, 269–72; Torelli 2000b, 72–73, 77. Walling techniques at Tarquinia: Bonghi Jovino 1991; Ciafaloni 2006.

[12] Discussed and critiqued by Edlund-Berry 2013, 695–99; Potts 2014–2015, among others.

[13] Following *Aeneid* 7.170–191: Torelli 2000b.

been stressed.[14] Ethnography and anthropology have been used to describe changes and account for them without recourse to anachronistic texts, and the selective adoption and adaptation of ideas and practices has been highlighted. Population growth and concomitant economic specialization in cities have been posited as local catalysts for architectural changes, as have related ideologies in which elites sought to renew and differentiate themselves through exclusive lifestyles in which architecture played an important role.[15] There are now accounts of the indigenous origins of certain forms of domestic architecture and urban planning,[16] and studies that show strong connections between buildings and the landscapes in which they appeared.[17] At the same time that local developments have been stressed, the connected world in which they occurred is also featuring more prominently in scholarship. Just as modern society has become more marked by networks, connectivity, migrations, and global phenomena, scholars are re-examining connections between people and cultures in ancient settings including early central Italy.[18] The mobility of traders and elite groups within Italy and around the Mediterranean from the Iron Age onwards is becoming ever clearer, while stories of migrant nobles such as Demaratus of Corinth and wandering heroes like Odysseus, Aeneas, and Hercules are assuming greater significance in

---

[14] Autonomy has been stressed by Hampe and Simon 1964; Small 1994; de Grummond 2006; de Grummond and Simon 2006; and Small 2008, for example.

[15] Nijboer 1998, 339–45; Riva 2010, 23–29, 41-44; Bartoloni 2012, 258–66, 71–78; Leighton 2013, 138–39.

[16] For example, Colantoni 2012; Govi 2014.

[17] Edlund 1987; MacIntosh Turfa and Steinmayer 2002; and for this aspect of tumuli see Zifferero 1991 and Mandolesi 2008.

[18] For example, Horden and Purcell 2000; Riva 2005; Riva 2006; Van Dommelen 2006; Malkin, Constantakopoulou and Panagopoulou 2009; Malkin 2011; Demetriou 2012; Kistler, Öhlinger, Mohr et al. 2015; Isayev 2015; Isayev 2017. For an important critique of earlier concepts of ‘Orientalization’ see Purcell 2006. On the rise of interest amongst archaeologists in such subjects: Trigger 2006, 484–85.

cultural histories.[19] Ongoing studies of places where cultural boundaries may have crossed or broken down, such as cosmopolitan sanctuaries, emporia, and highly-connected settlements like Pithecusae, are suggesting that control of such contacts could be used to maintain power. Globalisation, network theory, hybridity, and peer-polity interaction have all been used to analyse these developments.[20] As a consequence, more interpretations of archaeological remains are now balancing the local and the international, and are being informed by theoretical models from the social sciences in which both elements are viewed positively.

In this volume scholars of central Italic architecture engage with these discussions with results that are beneficial for both local and broader histories. The evidence that architecture was an international industry for much of the first millennium BC means that it can provide new examples of Mediterranean connectivity and the transmission of technical knowledge in antiquity. Cross-fertilization between architectural elements in Asia Minor, the Near East, Greece, and Italy prompts questions about the limitations of traditional typologies, long based upon linguistic divisions, which seldom make allowances for mobile craftsmen and materials, let alone shared concepts and meanings. The migration of architectural concepts and practices in this period moreover puts the mobility that is such a feature of Roman architecture under closer scrutiny, suggesting that the Roman period may have seen a change in the scale of connectivity rather than the fundamental nature of design. The next sections will explore some of these ideas in more detail.

---

[19] For example, Malkin 1998; Bonnet 2005; Della Fina 2013; Della Fina 2014.

[20] For example, Hodos 2009; Malkin 2011; van Dommelen 2017. Cf. Sherratt and Sherratt 1993 and Morris' 'Mediterraneanization' (Morris 2003).

Building in a Connected World

Starting in c.800 BC, at approximately the time when the Phoenicians established a permanent base at Carthage, the Mediterranean world considered in this volume is one in which Phoenician and Greek merchants, traders, craftsmen, agents, and colonists had long been interacting with one another, and, by the eighth century, often in ways that resembled commercial trade more than the elite gift-giving and exchange of earlier periods.[21] As a peninsula in the centre of the Mediterranean Sea with natural harbours, Italy's geography had long made it a natural participant in these ancient networks of trade and cross-cultural contact. Rivers and volcanic activity gave Etruria in particular famous agricultural fertility and mineral resources that drew traders from as early as the Bronze Age. Finds of Mycenean pottery, elephant ivory, and ostrich eggs in Italian sites such as Frattesina – itself exhibiting strong Etruscan connections – show contact between Italy and the eastern Aegean and Africa, while Baltic amber is testament to trade routes to the north.[22] Italian helmets, swords, belts, and razors found in modern Ukraine, Austria, France, and Dalmatia show links with central Europe had existed since at least the eighth century BC.[23] Etruscan trade reached new heights in the seventh and sixth centuries BC with exports of wine and oil to southern France and Spain; at Marseille, for example, amphorae from Etruria appear to have outnumbered those from Greece in the second quarter of the sixth century BC.[24] Caere had a treasury at Delphi (Strabo, *Geography* 5.2.3) while tablets inscribed in Phoenician/Punic and Etruscan at Pyrgi show other connections echoed by finds such as an Etruscan *tessera hospitalis* in Carthage.[25]

---

[21] Hodos 2009, 232.

[22] Bietti Sestieri 1997, 390–96; Pearce 2000, 110; Vianello 2005; Blake 2014, 41, 130–32.

[23] Camporeale 2004, 104–09.

[24] Gantès 1992; Gras 2000; Sourisseau 2002; Gori and Bettini 2006.

[25] Benveniste 1933; Rix 2014, ii. Af. 3.1; recently discussed by Prag 2006, 8–10.

Ceramic technology, metalworking techniques, and painting styles also reveal extensive interaction with other cultures, while epigraphy and linguistics further indicate the movement of people of different ethnicities between regions and countries by the Archaic period.[26] In the first half of the first millennium BC, people in central Italy were clearly in contact with goods, merchants, and migrants from other societies ranging from Carthage to southern France, and often appear to have been the dominant power in interactions.[27]

As the ultimate physical expression of a culture, architecture could be expected to reflect these conditions. The papers in this volume support that theory and argue that such reflection should be sought in more than formal analyses. Architectural design is an organic process, an undertaking in which practical and symbolic elements, people, materials, decoration, and engineering interact to produce a structure that functions in a number of different ways.[28] Architecture is moreover social: in general, substantial buildings represent aggregated resources, make statements about communities, and have a public dimension.[29] By considering the social ideas and conditions that these buildings represent, facilitate, and draw meaning from alongside their visible elements, that is by taking what the philosopher Karsten Harries has called an ethical approach to architecture,[30] these buildings can be read as useful sources of information about the architects, craftsmen, patrons, and communities involved in the life cycles of these buildings. If we can recognize these people in the physical evidence,

---

[26] For example, Ampolo 1976–1977; Moretti 1984; Lejeune, Pouilloux and Solier 1988; Cristofani 1996; Steingräber 2006, 281–301; Gran-Aymerich 2009; Della Fina 2014.

[27] For overviews see Cristofani 1996; Naso 2000; Camporeale 2001; Naso 2006; Della Fina 2013; Della Fina 2014; Isayev 2017.

[28] Revell 2014, 391; Wilson Jones 2014.

[29] Goldberger 2009, x, 15, 43, 174, 82.

[30] Harries 1998.

then these buildings may have as much to tell us about culture as architecture in Etruria and Latium prior to the fourth century BC.

Architecture has been an overlooked resource for the study of central Italic life despite its necessary and transformative properties. Buildings are utilitarian but their ubiquity shapes space, creates place, and thereby provides a framework for all activity. Monumental examples are realised through sustained action and consensus that some theorists believe express cross-generational or intrinsic cultural values, even if they are only those of an elite group, in ways more revealing than any text.[31] As the most plastic of the arts architecture also has abundant meanings that are conferred and altered over time and contribute to the expansion of worldviews, implicating it in the formulation of religious, cultural, and historical identities.[32] Appreciating the potential of this body of evidence for the study of early Italy requires recognition that it has documentary potential irrespective of the controversial literary record, which it nonetheless contextualises, and as such is far from mute; multiple readings of the evidence are possible even if some interpretations are more speculative than others.

Art and Agency in Architecture

The question of who and what was travelling to produce all or part of significant buildings in early central Italy is open to different reconstructions. Studies of human mobility and technological transfer in the ancient Mediterranean have suggested four types of craftspeople that can form a useful basis for such discussions: itinerant entrepreneurs, immigrant artisans,

---

[31] Jones 2000, i. 137–38, and in the context of Indian architecture: Fergusson 1867, 11; Ghosh 1982, 1.
[32] Jones 2000, i. 110.

overseas apprentices, and forced labourers or slaves.[33] The movement of all four groups is subject to socio-historical circumstances and power relationships, both of which would also have affected the contexts in which these people interacted with local populations and one another.[34] To date, such groups have been considered more in relation to the production of art other than architecture in central Italy. Scholars have argued that artistic production in central Italy during the first millennium BC included migrants from Sardinia, Syria, Persia, Greece, and central Europe.[35] Some of these migrants have been regarded as master craftsmen responsible for the introduction of particular styles and techniques in ceramics, metalwork, jewellery, and painting, and as founders of schools and workshops. Whether a similar model of travelling experts can also be applied to architecture, however, is less clear.

Although architectural design is informed by aesthetics and crafts, there is a fundamental difference between small portable works and building projects that span multiple life-times, require vast manpower, and provide infrastructure for the conduct and rituals of civic life. There is moreover a different level of risk: given a building must remain standing, experience and knowledge is just as important as creativity in architectural design, if not more so.[36] The sought-after nature of such expertise in antiquity is hinted at in later literary sources in ways that support a model of itinerant architects or experts for hire, or at least a belief that this had

[33] For recent application of these categories to Mediterranean history see Blake 2016, 189–92; Gosselain 2016, 195–97.

[34] Blake 2016; Gosselain 2016.

[35] Recently summarised by Camporeale 2013. On the role of artisans and master-craftsmen in pre-Roman central Italy, see Colonna 1988; Bonghi Jovino 1990; Nijboer 1997; Smith 1998; Camporeale 2011; Della Fina 2014. But cf. the reminder that nationality may be less important for art history than skill and style: Pallottino 1952, 15 (discussing Etruscan painting).

[36] Cf. Mertens 1994, 196–97; Hopkins 2016, 112–16; cf. the chapter by Turfa in this volume.

been the case in earlier centuries. For instance, the Cretan architect Chersiphron and his son Metagenes are described as the architects of the Archaic Temple of Artemis at Ephesos (Vitruvius, *On Architecture* 7. preface 16; Pliny, *Natural History* 7.125, 36.95), and it has been proposed that Rhoikos, one of the architects of the monumental Temple of Hera at Samos (Herodotus, *Histories* 3.60.4), may be the same individual who inscribed his name on an eye-cup dedicated to Aphrodite at Naukratis in Egypt, another site of significant cultural exchange that happened to have a strong Samian presence and Samian architectural features.[37] For central Italy, Pliny follows Varro in writing that the sculptor Vulca was summoned to Rome from Veii to work on art for the Archaic Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus (*Natural History* 35.157; cf. Plutarch, *Poplicola* 13), and that the Greek artists Damophilos and Gorgasos worked on the Temple of Ceres on the Aventine in Rome in the following century (Pliny, *Natural History* 35.154), again in accounts that should also be understood as part of a tradition of discussions about the influence of Greece on other cultures, often with moralising overtones, and as partial reflections of practices in the period in which they were written.[38] The material remains, however, suggest a comparable scenario of travelling expertise: an unnamed Ionian architect has been proposed for the Archaic Capitoline Temple in Rome, for example, and technical connections have been drawn between this temple and the Heraion on Samos, the Artemision at Ephesus, and the Olympieion in Athens.[39] Both regional and Mediterranean-wide mobility may thus have been a factor in central Italic construction.

---

[37] Boardman 1999, 132. A large quantity of mugs and cups found in the sanctuary of Hera also have exact parallels in the Samian Heraion and were produced from the same clay: Villing and Schlotzhauer 2006, 6, citing analysis by Hans Mommsen.

[38] See, for example, Zevi 1995; Ridgway 2012.

[39] Cifani 2008, 331; Cifani 2012, 132–33; Hopkins 2016, 114.

Ancient authors also describe the permanent migration of artisans to central Italy. In this context the immigrant *par excellence* was Demaratus, a seventh-century exile from Corinth who settled in Tarquinia with an entourage of knowledgeable Greeks, fathered a future king of Rome, and subsequently assumed the role of cultural hero (Livy, *Books from the Foundation of the City* 1.34; Tacitus, *Annals* 11.14; Pliny, *Natural History* 35.152; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities* 3.46–49; Strabo, *Geography* 5.2.2). The 'professional' or 'speaking' names of two of his companions, Eugrammos ('good designer') and Diopos ('keen-eyed'), suggest they may have been architects, and members of the same retinue were also credited with introducing the art of modelling figures in clay (Pliny, *Natural History* 35.152), again in a narrative that may recall changes even if not fully record them.[40] There is physical evidence of migrant ceramicists working in central Italy in the seventh century BC, such as the Greek potter Aristonothos who signed a krater at Caere made of local clay, while in the sixth century BC the Campana Group, the Northampton Group, and those responsible for Pontic Vases are thought to have been Greek or Greek-trained artists working in Italy.[41] Ceramicists were also involved in architecture through the manufacture of architectural terracottas and roof-tiles. In many ways these products bridge the differences between buildings and other forms of art, as multiple copies could be made with moulds, iconography could be used to convey or enhance meaning, and the design of columen plaques, revetments, and roof-top statuary required close working relationships with those responsible for the

---

[40] Camporeale 2013, 890. Bibliography on Demaratus and his entourage is extensive and marked by contradictory views of historical veracity: see, for example Cornell 1995, 122–30; Zevi 1995; Poucet 2000, 164–65 n.12; Ridgway 2006; Rieger 2007, 240–56; Camporeale 2011, 20–21; MacMullen 2011, 22–24; Ridgway 2012; Colonna 2013, 14; Isayev 2017, 98–100.

[41] Discussed recently by Warden 2008. On the Aristonothos krater (c.650 BC, Musei Capitolini, Rome: Castellani 172) see Ducati 1911; Schweitzer 1955; Dougherty 2003, 50–52; Izzet 2004.

woodwork and engineering of the buildings they decorated. As discussed by Winter in this volume, strong arguments have been advanced about the spread of terracotta technology from Greece to Etruria, initially in connection with Corinth and nearby areas, on stylistic and technical grounds,[42] although some scholars have also proposed a migration of some aspects of tile technology from west to east.[43] Once established in Italy, some terracotta workshops undertook commissions in regions outside their own, as happened when the roof of the new temple at Satricum was most likely imported from a workshop in Caere in c.535 BC, and when the same moulds were used for decorations on the roofs of buildings at Veii, Rome, and Velletri in c.530 BC.[44] It is thus possible to discern the ongoing circulation of experts and products to and within central Italy, and to allow for both itinerant and immigrant players alongside local experts.

Contrary to the elision between art and architecture opened by the discussion of terracotta roof elements, it is useful to return to differences with the point that monumental structures were a complex set of artefacts that were usually only generated once rather than in a series. More often than not they were unique: for all that the sixth century BC saw a boom in temple building across central Italy, for example, no two were identical. Rather than being speculative or spontaneous works, they needed to be commissioned and organized in ways that took account of the necessary resources including land, labour, and materials. This combination of singularity and scale allows for the possibility that construction may have been an event with substantial cultural and/or ceremonial significance. New discoveries relating to the construction of Stonehenge in Neolithic Britain, for instance, have spurred the

[42] For a recent example see Winter 2017; cf. Mertens-Horn 1995.

[43] Wikander 1990, 283; Damgaard Andersen and Toms 2001; Stissi 2017, 80, 82.

[44] Satricum: Lulof 2000, 211 with n.13; Lulof 2006, 239–41; Winter 2009, 537. The Veii-Rome-Velletri roofing system: Winter 2009, 311–93.

theory that people may have come to the building site in a 'pilgrimage' of a type paralleled in other prehistoric and preindustrial contexts. Such gatherings became a celebration of the strength of a community and its ability to command such construction.[45] The range of people drawn to building sites in this model is far wider than a master architect. In the following chapters the vision of 'the architect' as an authoritative designer and overseer – or, as some Greek sources suggest, a pair of designers[46] – gives way to the idea of a diverse range of technicians that are likely to have had specialized knowledge of building and go by different names in written sources, including *architekton, tekton, mechanopoios, oikodomos,* and *technites* in Greek, and *architectus, structor, faber, aedificator* in Latin.[47] By introducing the concept of a workforce of diverse levels of expertise that came together more organically, the idea of travelling master architects gives way to the concept of multi-generational projects open to a range of different influences over the entire period of construction.

It is significant that against this backdrop of mobile elements many of the following analyses foreground local needs and knowledge. Familiarity with natural materials other than stone underpinned expertise in wooden and earth construction, with products shaped to meet the demands imposed by local climate, cult, and social priorities. The picture that emerges is one of an industry shaped by custom but simultaneously able to borrow from external practices in order to produce something deeply rooted in a specific community. Indeed, this accords with theoretical work on globalisation, where one of the corollaries of cultural convergence is a

---

[45] http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/about-us/search-news/Building-Stonehenge-Was-One-Long-Celebration, accessed 6 July 2018.

[46] Holst 2017, 7 points out the frequent pairing of architects named in connection with ancient Greek projects, such as Rhoikos and Theodoros, and Eurykles and Kharmophilus.

[47] Cuomo 2007, 134.

resurgence of local differences and identities.[48] It is possible that even within central Italy, architects and builders from Etruria and Latium may have perceived one another as far from 'local'; mobility did not necessarily override identities based on connections to a smaller geographical area. Divergent spellings of names – such as Hercle, Hercules, and Herakles – between chapters is an intentional attempt to acknowledge this potential range of perceptions and a reminder of the cosmopolitan context in which work occurred.

All of these people, be they working on sites near or far from home, were involved in works that had public, and thereby political, significance. In this sense builders again resemble artists, possessing skills that could be commissioned to bolster the prestige of clients and communities, albeit on a monumental scale. But was the promotion of status the only rationale for building?

Why Build?

For all that many buildings were unique, the act of building was not. The regularity with which some structures in central Italy were rebuilt, redesigned, and refurbished between approximately 800 and 400 BC hints that some projects were less the product of an experienced, creative force than the result of more experimental, and ultimately less successful, techniques. The rapidity with which some temples were refashioned during the sixth and fifth centuries BC, for example, may reflect the testing of new designs, technologies, or materials. Indeed, temples have been the focus of many recent studies due to the excellent preservation of many of their foundations and roofs, and the significant role that these buildings played in cityscapes and landscapes, making them ideal for studies of

[48] Hodos 2017, 4–5.

architectural connectivity.[49] In the few decades after c.530 BC, up to 15 temples appear to have been built in Rome and its surrounds in rapid succession, with roofs that were produced or influenced by one Roman workshop.[50] At least 25 podium temples were erected in central Italy between c.580 and 475 BC, and in the city of Rome alone 23 substantial buildings were constructed between 550 and 460 BC.[51] This burst of construction has been variously connected with an aggrandising programme of the Roman king Tarquinius Priscus and comparable authorities elsewhere, with a network of elite patrons who had competing or complementary agendas, and in some cases with the commercial success of one or more fashionable ateliers.[52] Less glamorously, it may be that the instability or unsuitability of certain products required remedial work after one or two generations. Truss design, whole or partial stone columns,[53] closed pediments, wooden joinery, and foundations that withstood extra loads and precarious geology and topography may all have taken time to resolve. In some instances construction may have been a necessity rather than a symbol.

The context of experimentation suggested here raises the question of whether architecture was driving change rather than responding to it. Regardless of whether buildings were being commissioned to replace existing ones that were no longer fit for purpose or to make statements about wealth and power, the search for solutions to problems of new scale or materials may have fostered greater connectivity. Once the decision to build a temple of unprecedented size or materials was taken, external expertise may have been required to

---

[49] For example, Lulof 2000; Lulof 2014; Potts 2015.

[50] Lulof and Smith 2017, 7–9.

[51] Potts 2015, 46–49; Hopkins 2017, 141 n.14; cf. the chapter by Hopkins in this volume.

[52] Summarised by Lulof 2000; Lulof and Smith 2017, 9, with important challenges to the idea of regnal patronage offered by Terrenato 2011; and Hopkins 2017.

[53] On the evidence for the use of stone in columns see Potts 2014–2015, 92.

realise it or to solve problems that arose during construction. Such situations may have created communities of practice that were ultimately self-reinforcing. The model of competition between centres is so familiar in accounts of early Italy that it can be forgotten that competition requires knowledge of, and comparison with, others and thus presupposes a level of connection. Connectivity may thus have a greater force in building than competition in certain circumstances.

Cultural Constructs

One result of the growing number of studies of 'pre-Roman' and early Roman practices, including those by Turfa and Hopkins in this volume, is a prompt to reconceptualise Italian architecture in the first millennium BC as a continuum that encompasses many local traditions. Rather than viewing Etrusco-Italic and Roman architecture as separate though related disciplines, largely as a consequence of how they have been studied, it is also possible to see both as branches of a more broadly conceived type of central Italic architecture, an idea reflected in the title of this volume. Over time the role of precedent in Roman architecture has been increasingly acknowledged. When Roman bricks were developed as a large-scale replacement for trimmed roof tiles in wall facings during the first century AD, they represent a development in a tradition of fired terracotta building materials in Italy that goes back to the seventh century BC (cf. Vitruvius, *On Architecture* 2.8.19–20). The arch, an engineering solution that was translated into concrete and then used to cover large spaces in entirely new ways during the Roman period, was already in use at Rome in the sixth century BC.[54] It has been argued that domestic buildings centred on courtyards and atria are direct descendants of

[54] Cifani 2008, 322–23.

spatial patterns in housing that can be traced back as far as protohistoric Latium and Etruria,[55] and Roman expertise in hydraulic engineering was arguably anticipated by extensive Etruscan systems of water management that allowed intensive cultivation of land.[56] Basic materials also remained the same. Local tuffs, limestones, clay, and timber all shaped Republican buildings just as they did their predecessors, until the gradual introduction of *pozzolana* sand and thereby hydraulic mortar and concrete fundamentally altered construction. It is consequently becoming more difficult to draw the boundaries of Roman architecture as a field of study chronologically and geographically.

As a result the very word 'Roman' is no longer straightforward in architectural histories. The traditional view that Roman architecture grew out of a mixture of Etrusco-Italic and Greek influences can now be challenged on a number of fronts. As some studies have suggested that Rome was developing an independent architectural style as early as the sixth century BC, it could be argued that 'Roman' architecture actually began in the Archaic period.[57] At that time Rome was already in close contact with other communities in Italy, Greece, and other parts of the Mediterranean and there is evidence that patrons, architects, and craftsmen in the city adapted practices from elsewhere to meet their own needs. Other accounts suggest that architectural differences can be recognized between Etruria and Latium by the sixth century BC, further complicating the position of Rome in relation to both.[58] Moreover, if buildings in Rome already show familiarity with and use of Greek architectural elements by the sixth

[55] Colantoni 2012; cf. Maiuri 2000, 89 (= Maiuri 1946, 127, reprinted); Jolivet 2011a; Meyers 2013; cf. Rohner 1996, 119–33.

[56] Ward-Perkins 1961, 47–50; Judson and Kahane 1963; Ortalli 1990; Bergamini 1991; Ortalli 1994; Ortalli 1995; Izzet 2007, 177. On early hydraulic architecture in Rome: Cifani 2008, 307–18.

[57] Cifani 2008; Hopkins 2016.

[58] For example, Potts 2015.

century BC, then the nature of Hellenization in the late Republic needs careful formulation.[59] Comparable studies of Greek architecture are furthermore repositioning Hellenic architecture in relation to other media and cultural practices.[60] The parameters of national classifications, of Etrusco-Italic, Roman, and Greek architecture and their interrelationships are thus becoming more complicated and may be ready for reconsideration.

Finally, narrowing discussion back down onto one aspect of architectural culture rather than its whole expression, the chapters in this volume suggest that although the mobility and interconnectedness that is often viewed as a feature of Roman architecture may seem a logical outcome of extensive territorial control, a comparable situation can be recognized in Italy and parts of the Mediterranean prior to the fourth century BC. The case studies of tie-beam trusses, sanctuary design, tomb styles, and architectural terracottas presented here show unique combinations of local and foreign details in ways that are reminiscent of analyses of Roman imperial and provincial architecture. The flow of labour and materials across vast distances is integral to understanding many of the principles of Roman architecture ranging from modular systems to the sequence of work.[61] If architecture was a mobile business prior to the Roman Republic, however, then in this regard the difference with the Roman period becomes one of scale rather than nature, and mobility becomes another factor supporting the concept that architecture in central Italy can be seen as a continuum.

[59] Hopkins 2016, 172–80. The concept of 'Hellenization' in relation to Rome has been increasingly criticized, for example, by Flaig 1999; Hall 2002; Wallace-Hadrill 2008.

[60] Wilson Jones 2014.

[61] Such as modular design and columnar proportions: Wilson Jones 2000, 143–55.

Contributions

The themes outlined above weave through the following chapters, which can be read individually (with bibliographies placed immediately after each chapter for ease of further dissemination) or together, where collectively they provide a snapshot of scholarship on central Italic architecture that goes beyond typological studies.

Jean MacIntosh Turfa begins with a re-examination of tie-beam trusses and argues that their invention arose from the woodworking techniques and tools honed in the construction of Bronze- and Iron-Age *palafitte* (pile dwellings). Showing that the earlier type of architecture developed in response to particular environmental conditions, she establishes that early builders had extensive knowledge of the potential of their raw materials and how they could be engineered. Out of this came the truss as a refinement in wooden roof structures that was able to counter the side-loads of heavy terracotta roofs when the latter came into use during the seventh century BC. Through its eventual use in the sizeable roofs of basilicas in the fourth century AD, the truss represents a form of woodworking expertise that connects architecture in Italy from the Bronze Age through to Late Antiquity.

The subject of architectural terracottas touched on in Turfa’s chapter has been one of the most productive areas of ancient architectural history in recent decades. Analyses of styles, techniques, and materials have enabled the reconstruction of entire roofs, the networks of workshops that produced them, and the distribution of decorations across settlements and regions. Regular international conferences have promoted the publication of findings and there is now a wealth of information available about particular buildings, sites, iconography, and workshops that is regularly being supplemented by excavations and studies of museum

collections.[62] In light of the expansion of the field and the diversity of its contents, Nancy Winter has taken this opportunity to provide a much-needed reassessment of the place of Etruscan architectural terracottas in their Mediterranean context. As one of the scholars who initiated the study of this material, her synthesis of its interconnections provides an expert overview of the subject that will be valuable for both specialists and new students. Her up-to-date model of the diffusion of terracotta roofing technology shows what artisans in Etruria borrowed from and contributed to wider practices, demonstrating that the spread of knowledge and decoration was not a one-way process.

John Hopkins also analyses architectural terracottas in the following chapter, this time as proxies for buildings and thus as valuable signs of construction in the city of Rome during the fifth and fourth centuries BC. In doing so he challenges the neglect of these centuries in many histories of Roman architecture and argues that this was far from a period of architectural stagnation. Here terracottas function as temporal connectors, linking buildings across centuries in the eyes of their builders and users, and as evidence that Rome remained in touch with wider trends in building and decoration in a time that has too often been read as a rupture between a highly-networked Archaic world and one increasingly in thrall to Greece. Promoting the study of this era supports the view of Etrusco-Italic and Roman architecture as closely related fields of study and encourages broader recognition of terracottas as evidence not just for roofs but for buildings now lost from the archaeological record.

Patricia Lulof builds on this point by reconnecting the architectural terracottas from different roofs of the cult building on the acropolis at Satricum with related foundations and in the process discovering a hitherto-unknown temple. While it was known that the cult building at

[62] For example, see the collected papers in Rystedt, Wikander and Wikander 1993; Lulof and Moormann 1997; Edlund-Berry, Greco and Kenfield 2006; and Lulof and Rescigno 2010.

the site went through multiple phases of extension, refurbishment, and reconstruction, the application of 3D modelling techniques in which all elements of the buildings are connected has succeeded in reconciling problematic data by identifying a new structure named 'Sacellum II.' When the results are compared to contemporary temples in Rome the relative precociousness of different cities' architecture can be re-evaluated, leading to the suggestion that Caere, along with eastern Greece and Sicily, may have been influential in the development of religious architecture in central Italy. The findings show the value of studying terracottas and foundations together, something not yet done as a matter of course.

Moving further north, previous studies have examined manifold connections between the city of Tarquinia and other parts of Italy and the Mediterranean.[63] Giovanna Bagnasco Gianni adds to these with a holistic analysis of the monumental complex and the Ara della Regina sanctuaries, drawing out the cultural and religious attitudes of the community at Tarquinia that may have shaped their adoption and adaptation of external stimuli. Connections between the buildings on the plateau, the city they served, and the natural world around them are explored in ways that yield new potential insights into Etruscan rituals and the buildings that supported them. In arguing for the embeddedness of architecture in its local and religious contexts, the chapter emphasises the importance of returning to the lived experience of buildings, and in so doing raises important issues about the interplay between the local and the international in architectural design.

Lastly, Stephan Steingräber adds funerary architecture to the body of evidence that can profitably be analysed through the lens of connectivity. As material that connected the living and the dead, both at the level of the individual and the community, funerary architecture

[63] The list is extensive, with examples including Bonghi Jovino 1999; Bonghi Jovino 2006; Bagnasco Gianni 2010.

exhibits the values held important in both realms and, like religious architecture, is a vehicle for connecting the tangible and intangible. A case study of rock tombs shows the problems that arise in trying to identify some forms as either predominantly local or international, and thus effectively signals the limits of analyses of geographical connectivity and the need to go beyond typology in certain cases.

Conclusion

This volume attempts to do more than present current thinking on the relative importance of external and internal stimuli for architectural change in early Italy. It promotes recognition of architectural design as a multifaceted process in which interactions between patrons, architects, and workers took place in a highly connected world, but above all in communities with specific, local skills and concerns. It argues that the biographies of buildings, from commission and construction to refurbishment and replacement, are sources for social as much as architectural history. It furthermore hopes that exploring the selected material in a new way, through the deliberately loose lens of connectivity, will prompt additional study by others – on topics such as domestic architecture, possible civic structures, and vernacular buildings, to select only a few rich areas of potential study – that similarly endeavour to position central Italic practices in relation to others before, after, and elsewhere, to raise the profile of this material in regional histories and this region in studies of antiquity. As such it is one step in an ongoing process of rebuilding and revalorization.

Bibliography

Ampolo, C., 1971. 'Analogie e rapporti fra Atene e Roma arcaica. Osservazioni sulla *Regia*, sul *rex sacrorum* e sul culto di Vesta'. *La parola del passato* 26: 443–60.

Ampolo, C., 1976–1977. 'Demarato. Osservazioni sulla mobilità sociale arcaica'. *Dialoghi di archeologia* 9–10: 333–45.

Bagnasco Gianni, G., 2010. 'Fenomeni di contatto nelle più antiche iscrizioni etrusche: spunti tarquiniesi'. *Annali Faina* 17: 113–32.

Bartoloni, G., 2012. 'L'architettura'. In *Introduzione all'etruscologia*, edited by G. Bartoloni, pp. 253–308. Milan: Hoepli.

Benveniste, E., 1933. 'Notes Étrusques. 1. La tablette d'ivoire de Carthage'. *Studi Etruschi* 7: 245–9.

Bergamini, M. (ed.), 1991. *Gli Etruschi maestri di idraulica.* Perugia: Electa.

Bernard, S., 2012. 'Continuing the Debate on Rome's Earliest Circuit Walls'. *Papers of the British School at Rome* 80: 1–44.

Bietti Sestieri, A. M., 1997. 'Italy in Europe in the Early Iron Age'. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 63: 371–402.

Blake, E., 2014. *Social Networks and Regional Identity in Bronze Age Italy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blake, E., 2016. 'Commentary: States and Technological Mobility – A View from the West'. In *Human Mobility and Technological Transfer in the Prehistoric Mediterranean*,

edited by E. Kiriatzi and C. Knappett, pp. 181–92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boardman, J., 1999. *The Greeks Overseas: Their Early Colonies and Trade*, 4th edn. London: Thames and Hudson.

Boëthius, A., 1978. *Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture*, 2nd edn. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Bonghi Jovino, M. (ed.), 1990. *Artigiani e botteghe nell'Italia preromana: Studi sulla coroplastica di area etrusco-laziale-campana.* Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

Bonghi Jovino, M., 1991. 'Osservazioni sui sistemi di costruzione a Tarquinia: Technice locali ed impiego del "muro a pilastri" fenicio'. *Archeologia Classica* 43: 171–91.

Bonghi Jovino, M., 1999. '*Tantum ratio sacrorum gerebatur*. L'edificio beta di Tarquinia in epoca orientalizzante e alto-arcaica. Ancora in merito alle tecniche edilizie, agli aspetti architettonici, sacrali e culturali con comparanda mediterranei'. In *KOINA. Miscellanea di studi archeologici in onore di Piero Orlandini*, edited by M. Castoldi, pp. 87–104. Milan: Edizioni ET.

Bonghi Jovino, M. (ed.), 2006. *Tarquinia e le civiltà del Mediterraneo: Convegno internazionale, Milano, 22–24 giugno 2004.* Milan: Cisalpino.

Bonnet, C., 2005. 'Melqart in Occidente. Percorsi di appropriazione e di acculturazione'. In *Il Mediterraneo di Herakles: Studi e ricerche*, edited by P. Bernardini and R. Zucca, pp. 17–28. Rome: Carocci.

Camporeale, G. (ed.), 2001. *Gli Etruschi fuori d'Etruria.* Verona: Arsenale.

Camporeale, G., 2004. 'The Etruscans in Europe'. In *The Etruscans Outside Etruria*, edited by P. Bernardini and G. Camporeale, pp. 102–29. Los Angeles, CA: J. Paul Getty Museum.

Camporeale, G., 2011. 'Maestri d'arte e mercanti d'arte ai primordi della storia etrusca'. In *Corollari. Scritti di antichità etrusche e italiche in omaggio all'opera di Giovanni Colonna*, edited by D. F. Maras, pp. 19–23. Pisa: Fabrizio Serra.

Camporeale, G., 2013. 'Foreign Artists in Etruria'. In *The Etruscan World*, edited by J. M. Turfa, pp. 885–902. London: Routledge.

Ciafaloni, D., 2006. 'Nota sulle tipologie architettoniche e murarie tarquiniesi. Ulteriori corrispondenze con il vicino oriente antico'. In *Tarquinia e le civiltà del Mediterraneo: Convegno internazionale, Milano, 22–24 giugno 2004*, edited by M. Bonghi Jovino, pp. 145–61. Milan: Cisalpino.

Cifani, G., 2008. *Architettura romana arcaica: Edilizia e società tra monarchia e repubblica.* Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

Cifani, G., 2012. 'Società, architettura e immagini all'origine dell'arte romana'. In *Arte e potere. Forme artistiche, istituzioni, paradigmi interpretativi. Atti del convegno di studio, Pisa Scuola Normale Superiore. 25–27 Novembre 2010*, edited by M. Castiglione and A. Poggio, pp. 129–46. Milan: LED – Edizioni Universitarie di Lettere Economia Diritto.

Colantoni, E., 2012. 'Straw to Stone, Huts to Houses: Transitions in Building Practices and Society in Protohistoric Latium'. In *Monumentality in Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture: Ideology and Innovation*, edited by M. Thomas and G. E. Meyers, pp. 21–40. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Colonna, G., 1986. ‘Urbanistica e architettura’. In *Rasenna: Storia e civiltà degli Etruschi*, edited by G. Pugliese Carratelli, pp. 371–530. Milan: Libri Scheiwiller.

Colonna, G., 1988. ‘La produzione artigianale’. In *Storia di Roma I. Roma in Italia*, edited by A. Momigliano and A. Schiavone, pp. 291–316. Turin: Giulio Einaudi.

Colonna, G., 2013. ‘Prima di Demarato. Un’eco della *Tebiade* epica nella tomba tarquiniese detta di Bocchoris’. In *Dall’Italia. Omaggio a Barbro Santillo Frizell*, edited by A. Capoferro, L. D’Amelio, et al., pp. 3–18. Florence.: Polistampa.

Cornell, T. J., 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c.1000–264 BC).* London: Routledge.

Cornell, T. J., 2000. ‘The City of Rome in the Middle Republic (400–100 BC)’. In *Ancient Rome: The Archaeology of the Eternal City*, edited by J. Coulston and H. Dodge, pp. 42–60. Oxford: Oxford University School of Archaeology.

Cristofani, M., 1996. *Etruschi e altre genti nell’Italia preromana: Mobilità in età arcaica.* Rome: G. Bretschneider.

Cuomo, S., 2007. *Technology and Culture in Greek and Roman Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Damgaard Andersen, H., 1998. *Etruscan Architecture from the Late Orientalizing to the Archaic Period (c.640–480 B.C.).* PhD thesis, University of Copenhagen.

Damgaard Andersen, H., and J. Toms, 2001. ‘The Earliest Tiles in Italy?’. In *From Huts to Houses: Transformations of Ancient Societies. Proceedings of an International Seminar Organized by the Norwegian and Swedish Institutes in Rome, 21–24 September 1997*, edited by J. R. Brandt and L. Karlsson, pp. 263–8. Stockholm: Paul Aströms Förlag.

De Grummond, N. T., 2006. *Etruscan Myth, Sacred History, and Legend.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology.

De Grummond, N. T., and E. Simon (eds.), 2006. *The Religion of the Etruscans.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Della Fina, G. M. (ed.), 2013. *Mobilità geografica e mercenariato nell'Italia preromana. Atti del XX convegno internazionale di studi sulla storia e l'archeologia dell'Etruria.* Orvieto: Fondazione per il Museo Claudio Faina.

Della Fina, G. M. (ed.,) 2014. *Artisti, committenti e fruitori in Etruria tra VIII e V sec. a. C. Atti del XXI convegno internazionale di studi sulla storia e l'archeologia dell'Etruria.* Rome: Quasar.

Demetriou, D., 2012. *Negotiating Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean: The Archaic and Classical Greek Multiethnic Emporia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Donati, L., 2000. 'Civil, Religious, and Domestic Architecture'. In *The Etruscans*, edited by M. Torelli, pp. 313–33. London: Thames and Hudson.

Dougherty, C., 2003. 'The Aristonothos Krater: Competing Stories of Conflict and Collaboration'. In *The Cultures Within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*, edited by C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, pp. 35–56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drews, R., 1981. 'The Coming of the City to Central Italy'. *American Journal of Ancient History* 6: 133–65.

Ducati, P., 1911. 'Sul Cratere di Artistonous'. *Mélanges d'Archéologie et Histoire*: 33–74.

Edlund-Berry, I., 2008. ‘The Language of Etrusco-Italic Architecture: New Perspectives on Etruscan Temples’. *American Journal of Archaeology* 112.3: 441–7.

Edlund-Berry, I., 2013. ‘The Architectural Heritage of Etruria’. In *The Etruscan World*, edited by J. M. Turfa, pp. 695–707. London: Routledge.

Edlund-Berry, I., G. Greco, and J. Kenfield (eds.), 2006. *Deliciae Fictiles III. Architectural Terracottas in Ancient Italy: New Discoveries and Interpretations. Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the American Academy in Rome, November 7–8, 2002.* Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Edlund-Berry, I., 2000. ‘Etruscan Architecture and Architectural Mouldings: New Discoveries and Interpretations from 1965 to the Present’. In *Etruscan and Republican Roman Mouldings*, edited by L. Shoe Meritt and I. Edlund-Berry, pp. xxi–xxix. Philadelphia, PA; Rome: University Museum, University of Pennsylvania.

Edlund, I., 1987. *The Gods and the Place: The Location and Function of Sanctuaries in the Countryside of Etruria and Magna Graecia (700–400 B.C.).* Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Rom.

Fergusson, J., 1867. *On the Study of Indian Architecture.* London: John Murray.

Flaig, E., 1999. 'Über die Grenzen der Akkulturation. Wider die Verdinglichung des Kulturbegriffs’. In *Rezeption und Identität: Die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Griechenland als europäisches Paradigma,* edited by G. Vogt-Spira and B. Rommel, pp. 81-112. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

Gantès, L.-F., 1992. ‘L’apport des fouilles récentes à l’étude quantitative de l’économie massaliète’. In *Marseille grecque et la Gaule. Actes du colloque international d'histoire*

et d'archéologie du Ve congrès archéologique de Gaule méridionale (Marseille, 18–23 novembre 1990) (Collection Études Massaliètes 3), edited by M. Bats and G. Bertucchi, et al., pp. 171–8. Lattes: A.D.A.M. Éditions.

Ghosh, S. P. 1982. *Hindu Religious Art and Architecture*. Delhi: D. K. Publications.

Goldberger, P., 2009. *Why Architecture Matters.* New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press.

Gori, S., and M. C. Bettini, 2006. *Gli Etruschi da Genova ad Ampurias. Atti del XXIV Convegno di studi etruschi ed italici, Marseilles-Lattes, 26 settembre–1 ottobre 2002.* Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali.

Gosselain, O. P., 2016. 'Commentary: On Fluxes, Connections and their Archaeological Manifestations'. In *Human Mobility and Technological Transfer in the Prehistoric Mediterranean*, edited by E. Kiriatzi and C. Knappett, pp. 193–205. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Govi, E., 2014. 'Etruscan Urbanism at Bologna, Marzabotto and in the Po Valley'. In *Papers on Italian Urbanism in the First Millennium B.C.* (JRA Supplementary Series 97), edited by E. C. Robinson, pp. 81–111. Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology.

Gran-Aymerich, J., 2009. 'Gli Etruschi fuori d'Etruria: Dons et offrandes étrusques en Méditeranée occidental et dans l'ouest de l'Europe'. In *Votives, Places, and Rituals in Etruscan Religion: Studies in Honor of Jean MacIntosh Turfa*, edited by J. M. Turfa, et al., pp. 15–41. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Gras, M., 2000. 'Les Étrusques et la Gaule méditerranéenne'. In *Mailhac et le premier âge du fer en Europe occidentale, hommages à Odette et Jean Taffanel* (Monographies

d’Archéologie Méditerranéenne 7), edited by T. Janin, pp. 229–41. Lattes: Association pour la recherche archéologique en Languedoc oriental.

Hall, J. M., 2002. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hampe, R., and E. Simon, 1964. *Griechische Sagen in der frühen etruskischen Kunst.* Mainz: Von Zabern.

Harries, K., 1998. *The Ethical Function of Architecture.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Harris, W. V., 1990. ‘Roman Warfare in the Economic and Social Context of the Fourth Century BC’. In *Staat und Staatlichkeit in der frühen römischen Republik*, edited by W. Eder, pp. 494–510. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Hodos, T., 2009. ‘Colonial Engagement in the Global Mediterranean Iron Age’. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 19.2: 221–41.

Hodos, T., 2017. ‘Globalization: Some Basics. An introduction to the *Routledge Handbook of Archaeology and Globalization*’. In *The Routledge Handbook of Archaeology and Globalization*, edited by T. Hodos, pp. 3–11. London: Routledge.

Holst, J., 2017. ‘The Fall of the *Tektōn* and the Rise of the Architect: On the Greek Origins of Architectural Craftsmanship’. *Architectural Histories* 5(1).5: 1–12.

Hopkins, J., 2017. ‘Tarquins, Romans and Architecture at the Threshold of Republic’. In *The Age of Tarquinius Superbus: Central Italy in the Late 6th Century. Proceedings of the Conference ‘The Age of Tarquinius Superbus, A Paradigm Shift?’ Rome, 7–9 November 2013*, edited by P. S. Lulof and C. J. Smith, pp. 135–42. Leuven: Peeters.

Hopkins, J. N., 2016. *The Genesis of Roman Architecture.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Horden, P., and N. Purcell, 2000. *The Corrupting Sea: A Study of Mediterranean History.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Isayev, E., 2015. 'Polybius' Global Moment and Human Mobility through Ancient Italy'. In *Globalisation and the Roman World. World History, Connectivity and Material Culture*, edited by M. Pitts and M. J. Versluys, pp. 123–40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Isayev, E., 2017. *Migration, Mobility and Place in Ancient Italy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Izzet, V., 2000. 'Tuscan Order: The Development of Etruscan Sanctuary Architecture'. In *Religion in Archaic and Republican Rome and Italy: Evidence and Experience*, edited by E. Bispham and C. J. Smith, pp. 34–53. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Izzet, V., 2004. 'Purloined Letters: The Aristonothos Inscription and Krater'. In *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean: Papers in Honour of Brian Shefton*, edited by K. Lomas, pp. 191–210. Brill, Leiden.

Izzet, V., 2007. *The Archaeology of Etruscan Society.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jolivet, V., 2011a. *Tristes portiques. Sur le plan canonique de la maison étrusque et romaine des origines au principat d'Auguste (VIe–Ier siècles av. J.-C.).* Rome: École française de Rome.

Jolivet, V., 2011b. ‘Uno spazio per la donna nella casa etrusca e romana (VI–I sec. a.C.)?’. *Medicina nei secoli arte e scienza* 23.1: 57–80.

Jones, L. 2000. *The Hermeneutics of Sacred Architecture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Judson, S. and A. Kahane, 1963. ‘Underground Drainageways in Southern Etruria and Northern Latium’. *Papers of the British School at Rome* 31: 74–99.

Kistler, E., B. Öhlinger, and M. Mohr, et al. (eds.), 2015. *Sanctuaries and the Power of Consumption: Networking and the Formation of Elites in the Archaic Western Mediterranean World. Proceedings of the International Conference in Innsbruck, 20th–23rd March 2012.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Leighton, R., 2013. ‘Urbanization in Southern Etruria from the Tenth to the Sixth Century BC: The Origins and Growth of Major Centers'. In *The Etruscan World*, edited by J. M. Turfa, pp. 134–50. London: Routledge.

Lejeune, M., J. Pouilloux, and Y. Solier, 1988. ‘Étrusque et ionen archaïques sur un plomb de Pech Maho (Aude)’. *Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise* 21: 19–59.

Lulof, P. S., 2000. ‘Archaic Terracotta Acroteria Representing Athena and Heracles: Manifestations of Power in Central Italy’. *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 13.1: 207–19.

Lulof, P. S., 2006. ‘Roofs from the South: Campanian Architectural Terracottas in Satricum’. In *Deliciae Fictiles III. Architectural Terracottas in Ancient Italy: New Discoveries and Interpretations. Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the American*

Academy in Rome, November 7–8, 2002, edited by I. Edlund-Berry, G. Greco, et al., pp. 235–42. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Lulof, P. S., 2014. 'Reconstructing a Golden Age in Temple Construction: Temples and Roofs from the Last Tarquin to the Roman Republic (c.530–480 B.C.) in Rome, Etruria and Latium'. In *Papers on Italian Urbanism in the First Millennium B.C.* (JRA Supplementary Series 97), edited by E. C. Robinson, pp. 113–25. Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology.

Lulof, P. S., and E. M. Moormann (eds.), 1997. *Deliciae Fictiles II. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Archaic Architectural Terracottas from Italy, Held at the Netherlands Institute in Rome, 12–13 June 1996.* Amsterdam: Thesis.

Lulof, P. S., and C. Rescigno (eds.), 2010. *Deliciae Fictiles IV. Architectural Terracottas in Ancient Italy: Images of Gods, Monsters and Heroes. Proceedings of the International Conference held in Rome (Museo Nazionale Etrusco di Villa Giulia, Royal Netherlands Institute) and Syracuse (Museo Archeologico Regionale 'Paolo Orsi'), October 21–25, 2009*. Oxford: Oxbow.

Lulof, P. S., and C. Smith, 2017. 'The Age of Tarquinius Superbus. History and Archaeology'. In *The Age of Tarquinius Superbus: Central Italy in the Late 6th Century. Proceedings of the Conference 'The Age of Tarquinius Superbus, A Paradigm Shift?' Rome, 7–9 November 2013*, edited by P. S. Lulof and C. J. Smith, pp. 3–13. Leuven: Peeters.

MacIntosh Turfa, J., and A. G. Steinmayer Jr., 2002. 'Interpreting Early Etruscan Structures: The Question of Murlo'. *Papers of the British School at Rome* 70: 1–28.

MacMullen, R., 2011. *The Earliest Romans. A Character Sketch.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Maiuri, A., 1946. *Lezioni sulla casa romana e pompeiana.* Naples: Raffaele Pironti e Figli.

Maiuri, A., 2000. *La casa pompeiana. Struttura, ambienti, storia nella magistrale descrizione d'un grande archeologo.* Naples: G. Procaccini.

Malkin, I., 1998. *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Malkin, I., 2011. *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Malkin, I., C. Constantakopoulou, and K. Panagopoulou, 2009. *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean.* London: Routledge.

Mandolesi, A., 2008. 'Ricerca sui tumuli principeschi orientalizzanti di Tarquinia: prime indagini nell'area della Doganaccia'. *Orizzonti* 9: 11–25.

Mertens-Horn, M., 1995. 'Corinto e l'Occidente nelle immagini. La nascita di Pegaso e la nascita di Afrodite'. In *Corinto e l'Occidente. Atti del trentaquattresimo convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto, 7–11 ottobre 1994*, pp. 257–89. Taranto: Istituto per la storia e l'archeologia della Magna Grecia.

Mertens, D., 1994. 'Elementi di origine etrusco-campana nell'architettura della Magna Grecia'. In *Magna Grecia, Etruschi, Fenici. Atti del trentatreesimo convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia: Taranto 8–13 ottobre 1993*, pp. 195–209. Taranto: Istituto per la storia e l'archeologia della Magna Grecia.

Meyers, G. E., 2013. ‘Approaching Monumental Architecture: Mechanics and Movement in Archaic Etruscan Palaces’. *Papers of the British School at Rome* 81: 39–66.

Miller, P. M., 2017. *Continuity and Change in Etruscan Domestic Architecture.* Oxford: Archaeopress.

Moretti, L., 1984. ‘Epigraphia 26: Sulle iscrizioni greche di Gravisca’. *Revista de filosofía, Madrid* 112: 314–27.

Morris, I., 2003. ‘Mediterraneanization’. *Mediterranean Historical Review* 18.2: 30–55.

Musgrove, J. (ed.), 1987. *Sir Banister Fletcher’s A History of Architecture.* London: Butterworths.

Naso, A., 2000. ‘Etruscan and Italic Artefacts from the Aegean’. In *Ancient Italy in its Mediterranean Setting* (Accordia Specialist Studies on the Mediterranean 4), edited by D. Ridgeway, F. Serra Ridgway, et al., pp. 193–207. London: Accordia Research Institute.

Naso, A., 2006. ‘Anathemata Etruschi nel Mediterraneo Orientale’. In *Gli Etruschi e il Mediterraneo. Commerci e politica. Atti del XIII covegno internazionale di studi sulla storia e l;archeologia dell’Etruria*, edited by G. M. Della Fina, pp. 351–416. Orvieto: Fondazione per il Museo Claudio Faina.

Nijboer, A. J., 1997. ‘The Role of Craftsmen in the Urbanization Process of Central Italy (8th to 6th Centuries B.C.)’. In *Urbanization in the Mediterranean in the 9th to 6th Centuries B.C.* (Acta Hyperborea 7), edited by H. Damgaard Andersen, H. W. Horsnæs, et al., pp. 383–406. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Nijboer, A. J., 1998. *From Household Production to Workshops: Archaeological Evidence for Economic Transformation, Pre-Monetary Exchange and Urbanisation in Central Italy from 800 to 400 BC.* Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

Ortalli, J., 1990. 'Nuovi dati sul popolamento di età celtica nel territorio bolognese'. *Études Celtiques* 27: 7–41.

Ortalli, J., 1994. 'Bolognia, Via della Dozza – Svincolo arcoveggio: resti di insediamento rurale'. In *La pianura bolognese nel villanoviano: Insediamenti della prima età del Ferro*, edited by M. Forte, M. P. von Eles, pp. 291–6. Florence: All'Insegna del Giglio.

Ortalli, J., 1995. 'Bonifiche e regolamentazioni idriche nella pianura emiliana tra l'età del ferro e la tarda antichità'. In *Interventi di bonifica agraria nell'Italia romana*, edited by L. Quilici and S. Quilici Gigli, pp. 59–86. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

Owens, E. J., 1991. *The City in the Greek and Roman World.* London: Routledge.

Pallottino, M., 1952. *Etruscan Painting.* Geneva: Skira.

Pallottino, M., 1975. *The Etruscans.* Trans. J. Cremona. Edited by D. Ridgway. Revised and enlarged from the 6th edn. London: Allen Lane.

Pearce, M., 2000. 'Metals Make the World Go Round: The Copper Supply for Frattesina'. In *Metals Make the World Go Round: The Supply and Circulation of Metals in Bronze Age Europe*, edited by C. F. E. Pare, pp. 108–15. Oxford: Oxbow.

Potts, C. R., 2014–2015. 'Vitruvius and Etruscan Design'. *Accordia Research Papers* 14: 87–99.

Potts, C. R., 2015. *Religious Architecture in Latium and Etruria, c.900–500 BC.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Poucet, J., 2000. *Les rois de Rome: Tradition et histoire.* Brussels: Académie royale de Belgique.

Prag, J. R. W., 2006. 'Poenus plane est – but who were the "Punickes"?'. *Papers of the British School at Rome* 74: 1–37.

Purcell, N., 2006. 'Orientalizing: Five Historical Questions'. In *Debating Orientalization* (Monographs in Mediterranean Archaeology 10), edited by C. Riva and N. C. Vella, pp. 21–30. London: Equinox.

Revell, L., 2014. 'Romanization'. In *A Companion to Roman Architecture*, edited by R. B. Ulrich and C. K. Quenemoen, pp. 381–98. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.

Ridgway, D., 1988. 'The Etruscans'. In *The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. 4: Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean c.525 to 429 BC*, edited by J. Boardman, pp. 634–75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ridgway, D., 2006. 'Riflessioni su Tarquinia. Demarato e l'"ellenizzazione" dei barbari'. In *Tarquinia e le civiltà del Mediterraneo. Convegno internazionale, Milano, 22–24 giugno 2004*, edited by M. Bonghi Jovino, pp. 27–47. Milan: Cisalpino.

Ridgway, D., 2012. 'Demaratus of Corinth and the Hellenisation of Etruria'. In *From the Pillars of Hercules to the Footsteps of the Argonauts* (Colloquia Antiqua 4), edited by A. Hermary and G. R. Tsetskhladze, pp. 207–22. Leuven: Peeters.

Rieger, M., 2007. *Tribus und Stadt. Die Entstehung der römischen Wahlbezirke im urbanen und mediterranen Kontext (ca.750–450 v. Chr.).* Göttingen: Edition Ruprecht.

Riva, C., 2005. 'The Culture of Urbanization in the Mediterranean c.800–600 BC'. In *Mediterranean Urbanization 800–600 BC*, edited by R. Osborne and B. W. Cunliffe, pp. 203–32. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Riva, C., 2006. 'The Orientalizing Period in Etruria: Sophisticated Communities'. In *Debating Orientalization* (Monographs in Mediterranean Archaeology 10), edited by C. Riva and N. C. Vella, pp. 110–34. London: Equinox.

Riva, C., 2010. *The Urbanisation of Etruria: Funerary Practices and Social Change 700–600 B.C.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rix, H., 2014. *Etruskische Texte: Editio minor*, 2 vols, 2nd edn. Tübingen.: G. Narr.

Rohner, D. D., 1996. 'Etruscan Domestic Architecture: An Ethnoarchaeological Model'. In *Etruscan Italy: Etruscan Influences on the Civilizations of Italy from Antiquity to the Modern Era*, edited by J. F. Hall, pp. 115–45. Provo, UT: Museum of Art, Brigham Young University.

Rystedt, E., C. Wikander, and Ö. Wikander (eds.), 1993. *Deliciae Fictiles. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Central Italic Architectural Terracottas at the Swedish Institute in Rome, 10–12 December 1990.* Stockholm: Svenska Institutet.

Scheffer, C., 1990. '*Domus Regiae* – A Greek Tradition?'. *Opuscula Atheniensia* 18: 185–91.

Schweitzer, B., 1955. 'Zum Krater des Aristonothos'. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Römische Abteilung* 62: 78-106.

Sherratt, A., and S. Sherratt, 1993. 'The Growth of the Mediterranean Economy in the Early First Millennium BC'. *World Archaeology* 24.3: 361–78.

Small, J. P., 1994. ‘Eat, Drink and be Merry: Etruscan Banquets’. In *Murlo and the Etruscans: Art and Society in Ancient Etruria*, edited by R. D. De Puma and J. P. Small, pp. 85–94. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Small, J. P., 2008. ‘Looking at Etruscan Art in the Meadows Museum’. In *From the Temple and the Tomb: Etruscan Treasures from Tuscany*, edited by P. G. Warden, G. C. Cianferoni, et al., pp. 40–65. Dallas, TX: Meadows Museum, SMU.

Smith, C. J., 1998. ‘Traders and Artisans in Archaic Central Italy’. In *Trade, Traders and the Ancient City*, edited by H. Parkins and C. J. Smith, pp. 31–51. London: Routledge.

Sourisseau, J. C., 2002. ‘Les importations étrusques à Marseille: De Gaston Vasseur aux grandes interventions d’archéologie préventive: Une découverte progressive, des problématiques renouvelées'. In *Les Étrusques en mer. Épaves d’Antibes à Marseille*, edited by L. Long, P. Pomey, et al., pp. 88–95. Aix-en-Provence: Edisud.

Steingräber, S., 2001. ‘Etruscan Urban Planning’. In *The Etruscans*, edited by M. Torelli, pp. 291–311. London: Thames and Hudson.

Steingräber, S., 2006. *Abundance of Life: Etruscan Wall Painting.* Trans. R. Stockman. Los Angeles, CA: J. Paul Getty Museum.

Stissi, V. V., 2017. ‘Believing the Unbelievable? A Greek Perspective on the Tarquinian World’. In *The Age of Tarquinius Superbus: Central Italy in the Late 6th Century. Proceedings of the Conference ‘The Age of Tarquinius Superbus, A Paradigm Shift?’ Rome, 7–9 November 2013*, edited by P. S. Lulof and C. J. Smith, pp. 79–84. Leuven.: Peeters.

Terrenato, N., 2011. ‘The Versatile Clans: Archaic Rome and the Nature of Early City-States in Central Italy'. In *State Formation in Italy and Greece: Questioning the Neoevolutionist Paradigm*, edited by N. Terrenato and D. C. Haggis, pp. 231–44. Oxford: Oxbow.

Thomas, M. L., and G. E. Meyers, 2012. *Monumentality in Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture: Ideology and Innovation.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Torelli, M., 1983. ‘Gli spettacoli conviviali di età classica. Documenti archeologici su possibili fatti genetici e sviluppi’. In *Spettacoli conviviali dall’antichità classica alle corti italiane del '400. Atti del VII convegno di studio, Viterbo, 27–30 maggio 1982*, pp. 51–64. Viterbo: Amministrazione provinciale di Viterbo.

Torelli, M., 1985. ‘Introduzione’. In *Case e palazzi d’Etruria*, edited by S. Stopponi, pp. 21–32. Florence: Regione Toscana.

Torelli, M., 2000a. ‘The Etruscan City-State’. In *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures: An Investigation Conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre*, edited by M. Hansen, pp. 189–208. Copenhagen: Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab.

Torelli, M., 2000b. ‘Le *regiae* etrusche e laziali tra orientalizzante e arcaismo’. In *Principi etruschi: tra Mediterraneo ed Europa*, edited by G. Bartoloni, F. Delpino, et al., pp. 67–78. Venice: Marsilio.

Trigger, B., 2006. *A History of Archaeological Thought,* 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van't Lindenhout, E., 1997. ‘Architectural and Spatial Organization of the First Towns in the Coastal Plain of Latium (6th century BC): Towards a General Scheme’. In

Urbanization in the Mediterranean in the 9th to 6th centuries B.C. (Acta Hyperborea 7), edited by H. Damgaard Andersen, H. W. Horsnæs, et al., pp. 297–315. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Van der Rohe, M., 1924. 'Baukunst und Zeitwille'. *Der Querschnitt* 4.1: 31–2.

Van Dommelen, P., 2006. 'The Orientalizing Phenomenon: Hybridity and Material Culture in the Western Mediterranean'. In *Debating Orientalization* (Monographs in Mediterranean Archaeology 10), edited by C. Riva and N. C. Vella, pp. 135–52. London: Equinox.

Van Dommelen, P., 2017. 'Classical Connections and Mediterranean Practices: Exploring Connectivity and Local Interactions'. In *The Routledge Handbook of Archaeology and Globalization*, edited by T. Hodos, pp. 618–33. London: Routledge.

Vianello, A., 2005. *Late Bronze Age Mycenean and Italic Products in the West Mediterranean: A Social and Economic Analysis.* Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.

Villing, A., and U. Schlotzhauer, 2006. 'Naukratis and the Eastern Mediterranean: Past, Present and Future'. In *Naukratis: Greek Diversity in Egypt. Studies on East Greek Pottery and Exchange in the Eastern Mediterranean*, edited by A. Villing and U. Schlotzhauer, pp.1–10. London: British Museum.

Wallace-Hadrill, A., 2008. *Rome's Cultural Revolution.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ward-Perkins, J. B., 1961. 'Veii: The Historical Topography of the Ancient City'. *Papers of the British School at Rome* 29: 1–119.

Ward-Perkins, J. B., 1977. *Roman Architecture.* New York: H. N. Abrams.

Warden, P. G., 2008. ‘Ritual and Representation on a Campana Dinos in Boston’. *Etruscan Studies* 11: 121–33.

Warden, P. G., 2012. ‘Monumental Embodiment: Somatic Symbolism and the Tuscan Temple’. In *Monumentality in Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture: Ideology and Innovation*, edited by M. Thomas and G. E. Meyers, pp. 82–110. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Wikander, C., 1990. ‘The Artemision Sima and its Possible Antecedents’. *Hesperia* 59: 275–83.

Wilson Jones, M., 2000. *Principles of Roman Architecture.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Wilson Jones, M., 2014. *Origins of Classical Architecture: Temples, Orders and Gifts to the Gods in Ancient Greece.* New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press.

Winter, N. A., 2009. *Symbols of Wealth and Power: Architectural Terracotta Decoration in Etruria and Central Italy, 640–510 B.C.* (Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome Supplement 9). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Winter, N. A., 2017. ‘Traders and Refugees: Contributions to Etruscan Architecture’. *Etruscan Studies* 20.2: 123–51.

Zevi, F. 1995. ‘Demarato e i re “corinzi” di Roma’. In *L’incidenza dell’antico: Studi in memoria di Ettore Lepore. Atti del convegno internazionale, Anacapri, 24–28 marzo 1991*, edited by A. Storchi Marino, pp. 291–314. Naples: Luciano.

Zifferero, A., 1991. 'Forme di possesso della terra e tumuli orientalizzanti nell'Italia centrale tirrenica'. In *Papers of the Fourth Conference of Italian Archaeology 1: The Archaeology of Power*, edited by E. Herring, R. Whitehouse, et al., pp. 107–34. London: Accordia Research Institute.