Virtue in Variety: Contrasting Temple Design in Etruscan Italy

Charlotte R. Potts

Abstract

This chapter will consider why temples with variants of peripteral and Tuscan plans were built side by side in select Central Italic sanctuaries during the Etruscan Archaic period (c.580-480 BCE). The collocation of temples with starkly different plans, as exemplified at Pyrgi and Marzabotto, has often been read as a sign that a site underwent a phase of Hellenization in architecture, religion, or culture more generally. The juxtaposition has also been ascribed to the demands of unknown rituals. As excavations uncover more similarities between the sanctuaries of Pyrgi and Regio I at Marzabotto, however, potential explanations for this phenomenon should now evolve to include factors that connect both sites as well as other examples. This chapter will consequently suggest that the collocation of temple plans reflects a Central Italic affinity for visual variety and competition, comparable to the delight in contrasting designs displayed later at sites like Largo Argentina in Rome. The result is a model in which the use of 'Greek' architectural styles in Etruria and Latium is explained with reference to local aesthetic preferences.

Virtue in Variety: Contrasting Temple Design in Etruscan Italy

Charlotte R. Potts

The importance of external stimuli for the development of Etruscan architecture is a matter of ongoing debate. Some accounts hold that exposure to 'Oriental,' 'Hellenic', and 'Roman' cultures in turn was a catalyst for change and innovation, and are part of a wider scholarly tradition in which the external connections that were always characteristic of Etruscan life are seen as signs of acculturation.[1] In contrast, other (largely recent) studies have stressed the role of local forces in driving aesthetic and technical change.[2] In these analyses, factors such as demography, economics, ideology, and cultural conventions play a significant role in shaping the adoption and adaptation of practices from elsewhere. While all of these influences are most likely to have operated in concert in different ways at various times, the balance between them contributes to broader reconstructions of identity, connectivity, and power, and as such is as relevant for histories of Etruria as its buildings.

This chapter contributes to the debate by reassessing the interplay of Greek and Etruscan elements in the construction of Archaic temples. More specifically, it offers close readings of the 'Greek' and 'Tuscanic' temples built next to one another at Pyrgi and Marzabotto, both as individual structures and as pairs, and considers possible reasons for their juxtaposition. Although the heterogeneity of Etruscan sites means they are often studied individually, Pyrgi and Marzabotto offer complementary case studies of design: both have adjacent temples with starkly different plans, built decades apart, and thereby show how two communities responded to architectural choice. Part I of the chapter summarises broad trends in Archaic temple architecture in Etruria and neighbouring Latium to contextualise the evidence of the four temples which is set out in Part II. Part III analyses these buildings in three dimensions, rather than solely from plans, and Part IV evaluates what their proximity suggests about the timing and prestige of Hellenic forms. The results suggest that temples of the time were designed with a local frame of reference as much as, or even more than, a Greek one.

[1] For example: Torelli 1985, 27-32; Cifani 2008, 269-72, on central Italy rather than just Etruria; Torelli 2000, 72-73, 77 (Near Eastern influence); Ampolo 1971; Pallottino 1975, 174; Drews 1981, 154-57; Colonna 1986, 464; Ridgway 1988, 666-67; Owens 1991, 96, 104-05 (Hellenic influence); and for discussions and critique of Roman influence see Edlund-Berry 2013, 695-99; Potts 2014-2015, among others. On the broader tradition see Riva 2018.

[2] Architectural terracottas were one of the first areas in which scholars challenged models of one-way Hellenic influence: see, for example, Bianchi Bandinelli 1972; Edlund Gantz 1972, 188-94; Rystedt 1983, 159-64; Phillips Jr. 1984, 416-17. On temples see Potts 2015; on domestic architecture see Colantoni 2012 (on Latium but with wider relevance) and Miller 2017; and on urban planning see Govi 2014. Important examples outside the field of architecture include Spivey 1991; Riva 2006; Izzet 2007; Riva 2009; Bundrick 2019; cf. also Ridgway 2012.

Archaic 'Hellenization'

Architectural histories recognise that many of the first temples built in Central Italy incorporate elements more familiar in the Greek world. When the first monumental temples appear in Etruria and Latium during the Archaic period (c. 580-480 BCE), seemingly in dialogue with one another, many have features such as peristyles, crepidomas, and decorations that show figures and scenes from Greek myths. Some of the temples built at Satricum, Pyrgi, Marzabotto, and Rome, for example, have peripteral and semi-peripteral plans. The first Temple of Mater Matuta in Rome has a closed pediment rather than the open gables common on other buildings, and is laid out on axis with an external altar. Terracotta sculptures of Herakles, Athena, and gorgons ornament many temples in Etruria and Latium, and a bull-headed man or minotaur is part of the decorated roof of the building beneath the later Regia in Rome (Downey 1995, 9-10, 19-30; Lulof 2000; Lulof 2016). Scholars have argued that the Attic foot is used in the design of temples at Pyrgi and Marzabotto and possibly also the Capitoline temple in Rome (Colonna 1970c, 289; Melis 1985, 130; Cifani 2008, 239 with n.684, 240, 93; Govi 2017b, 157), while technical connections between the Capitoline temple and the Samian Heraion are suggested by the way in which their foundations include a transverse wall between the cella and the frontal colonnade and the longitudinal internal walls are bound to those of the perimeter (Hopkins 2016, 113-15, 18-19). Some temples at Veii, Orvieto, and Tarquinia are even oriented eastwards (Pernigotti 2019).[3] Together these features indicate that Central Italian builders and audiences were familiar with components of Hellenic art and architecture and were willing to use them in the enhancement of their own cult sites.

Explanations for the number of elements that these temples share with their Greek counterparts are slowly changing. Traditional models argue that religious architecture in Central Italy was partly 'Hellenized' in the Archaic period, through changes in building practice, cult, or society more generally (for example, Colonna 1984, 405; Torelli 2000a, 280-84; Cifani 2008, 293, 300; Mura Sommella 2009, 348; Haack 2017, 1008-09; Govi 2017b, 172).[4] Such claims are often informed by theories of diffusionism or acculturation, with a belief that people in Central Italy sought Hellenic glamour and authority, be it achieved by imitation of a certain polity or the practices of a less differentiated Greek world.[5]

[3] Pernigotti 2019 identifies 5 out of 28 Etruscan temples that were oriented east.
[4] cf. Boethius, Ling, and Rasmussen 1978, 36, 164.
[5] For critiques of Hellenization as a concept, including the notion of a monolithic type of Hellenic or Greek culture, see Hall 1997; Malkin 2001; Hall 2002; Dougherty and Kurke 2003; Wallace-Hadrill 2008; Skinner 2012.

Other studies, however, have suggested that concurrences in temple construction in many areas around the Mediterranean are unsurprising in a connected world, and particularly at a time when increased investment in cult sites turned select temples into monumental statements of wealth and piety. The construction of these temples, on a new scale and with new techniques, likely required external expertise; in time, the result may have been mobile or international communities of practice that facilitated common elements (Potts 2022). In this situation, temple building may not merely reflect connectivity but actively drive it. Furthermore, at Ephesus, Samos, Rome, Naukratis, and Pyrgi, among others, the resultant buildings have architectural and religious points of convergence to the point where they can be considered part of a network (Davies 2006; Potts 2015, 114-20; Hopkins 2016, 17-18, 176). At the same time, each has local details in its décor, elevation, proportions, and resident deity. Newer interpretations of this phenomenon range far from the centre-periphery model found in standard accounts of Hellenization, and instead draw on approaches used in studies of globalisation, where convergence finds a corollary in the resurgence of local differences (Hodos 2017, 4-5), as well as studies of economics and different types of network theories. Such conceptual changes prompt scholars to reassess the design of these buildings and the motivations of societies that produced them.

Against this backdrop of sanctuaries as entities that can represent wider attitudes and relationships, the following analysis explores how site-specific and broader architectural practices – both cultural and multicultural – may have been balanced in the creation of temples at two Etruscan settlements.

Pyrgi and Marzabotto

Pyrgi and Marzabotto offer unusual insight into Etruscan architecture through the mutual possession of paired, or juxtaposed, temples. As well as having adjacent temples with markedly different plans, sanctuaries at both sites appear to have been created with designs that made use of the Attic foot; excavations at both have yielded inscriptions that hint at the historical conditions of construction; and both have been subject to many years of study that allow their temples to be put into wider contexts. They also have important differences. One site lies on the coast and the other inland, and one is flanked by other cult sites while the other stands amidst a city (Figs. 1, 2). [6] They furthermore lie over 260 kilometres apart. Given that Etruscan art and architecture often diverge markedly over short distances, to the point

[6] For recent overviews of the topography of Pyrgi see Michetti 2016; Baglione 2017, and for Marzabotto see Govi 2017a and Govi 2017b.

that heterogeneity is a key feature of much Etruscan material culture, commonalities between these sites may thus hint at factors that went beyond one locale or setting and were instead cultural. Before studying any trends, however, it is useful to review the data for each building.

[Insert Fig. 1 here]

Fig. 1. Pyrgi and its surroundings along the shore near Caere (after drawing from Turfa 2016, fig. 8.1).

[Insert Fig. 2 here]

Fig. 2. General plan of Marzabotto (after Govi 2017b, 166, fig. 17).

Pyrgi: Temples B and A

In c. 510 BCE, the ground of the monumental sanctuary at Pyrgi was artificially raised by a clay embankment on top of which builders erected Temple B. The foundations of the temple, built of large blocks of tufo imported from the surroundings of Caere, measured approximately 29.65 x 20.10 m and comprised an internal rectangle, divided by a transverse wall, and connected to an outer rectangle by minor walls at one end (Fig. 3) (Melis 1985b, 130; Michetti 2016, 79). Spoliation of the blocks hampers full knowledge of the original height of the base but there are suggestions that the outer rectangle may have narrowed at the two upper levels to produce a stepped crepidoma and stylobate (Melis 1985b, 130). Four fragments of stone columns suggest the superstructure included smooth-shafted columns with a lower diameter of 1 m that were covered in plaster. The walls appear to have been built with tufo blocks that were plastered and painted with red and white pigments, and fragments of a tapering terracotta doorframe with a moulded floral design suggest an impressive entrance (Melis 1970b, 380-87). The excavators propose that the temple had a single cella and a pronaos open to the southwest, surrounded by a perimeter colonnade with four columns across the front and two columns immediately behind, with the whole structure facing the sea (Colonna 1970e, 286). They also suggest that the plan was designed according to the Attic foot of 29.6 cm and used a module of three Attic feet (Colonna 1970e, 289; Melis 1985b, 130). Alternatively, archaeologists not connected with the excavation have read the wide porticoes and short cella as indications that the building may have had one cella and two alae instead of a peristyle, and thus could have resembled a more traditional Tuscanic temple (Nielsen and Poulsen 1992, 78, 131).

[Insert Fig. 3 here]

Fig. 3. Plan of the sanctuary of Pyrgi: 'Monumental Sanctuary' with Temples B and A (left) and 'Southern Sanctuary' (right) (Source: Michetti 2016, 78, fig. 7.5. Courtesy of Sapienza Università di Roma, Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità, Archivio Etruscologia).

Excavations have yielded additional evidence about the roof, setting, and possible historical context of Temple B. Architectural terracottas show that that the inclination of the roof was approximately 15 degrees and the use of large antepagmenta imply a recessed gable (Colonna 1985, 130). Acroteria include statues of women, Amazons, horses, and riders, as well as a possible central acroterion featuring Herakles and Athena; revetments depict horses, riders, men, women, felines, a hydra, and ornamental decoration; and there are antefixes in the form of the heads of men, women, and satyrs.[7] The trabeation is usually reconstructed with queen posts and collar beams while the need for trusses has been debated (Fig. 4).[8] At the time of its construction, the temple appears to have been surrounded by a wall on at least three sides – the western side of the sanctuary has been lost to erosion and the shifting coastline – with an opening to the east that allowed visitors approaching from Caere to access the back of Temple B, and a series of roofed rooms along the south wall (Colonna 1989-1990, 209-12; Baglione 2017, 110-12). Between the north side of the temple and the wall there was a small, enclosed space, now called Area C, containing a well, two or three altars, and animal bones (Cardini 1970; Colonna 1970b). When Temple B was dismantled centuries later, some of its blocks were used to fashion a space within Area C to hold three gold sheets or tablets with Punic and Etruscan inscriptions and eight bronze nails with gilded heads. The tablets record that a ruler of Caere named Thefarie Velianas gave a holy item to a goddess named Astarte in Punic and Uni in Etruscan, in return for her favour. The excavators date the tablets to the late sixth century BCE and believe that the nails were used to fasten the tablets to the doorjamb of the cella of Temple B at the time that it was dedicated, and thereby give the building a named actor and a resident god.[9]

[Insert Fig. 4 here]

Fig. 4. Reconstruction of Temple B, Pyrgi, c.510 BC, without architectural terracottas (Source: Melis 1985, 131, fig. 7.1 B. Courtesy of Archivio di Etruscologia, Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità, Sapienza Università di Roma).

[7] Colonna 1970a; Colonna 1970d; Melis 1970a; Melis 1970b; Colonna 1985, 130-33; Lulof 2016, 137 with n.53.
[8] Melis 1985, 131, fig. 7.1 B; Turfa and Steinmayer 1996, 18-19 with n.27; Damgaard Andersen 1998, 1. 123-24.
[9] The bibliography on the tablets is vast. Key contributions include Colonna 1965; Colonna 1970e; Colonna 2000, 294-309, but see also Heurgon 1966, 7 on debated dating, and Pfiffig 1965, 42 and Heurgon 1966, 6-7 for alternative hypotheses about the structure to which the tablets refer.

In c. 470-460 BCE the sanctuary was nearly doubled in size with a construction programme that included expanding the embankment to the north, building Temple A, extending the boundary wall, and creating a new monumental entrance to the east.[10] Two longitudinal walls, three full-width latitudinal walls, and two shorter latitudinal walls in the inner part of the foundations of Temple A suggest a plan of approximately 34.33 x 23.98 m in which the rear of the building had three cellas, with the lateral cellas divided into front and back areas and both smaller than the single-roomed central space (Fig. 3) (Colonna 1970d, 46-47; Melis 1985a, 134). Fragments of stone drums and a partial capital found to the west indicate a columned porch, and have led to the reconstruction of antae and three rows of columns on the western side of the building, including a central intercolumniation wider than those at the sides (Fig. 5) (Colonna 1970d, 42-44; Melis 1985a, 136). The excavators believe that building was designed with the Attic foot again (Melis 1985a, 134). Spoliation of the blocks in the substructure means there are no traces of features such as stairs, but two remnants of a stone moulding have been read as signs of a decorated podium (Colonna 1970d, 40-43; Melis 1985a, 134). Traces of walls extending from the front of the temple, either side of wells, may outline a large terrace (Melis 1985a, 134). Stone blocks with white plaster have been interpreted as remains of the external walls of the temple while mudbricks with plaster and polychrome paint may have been used for interior walls; a third type of plaster is thought to have covered the underside of the roof tiles (Colonna 1970d, 44-46). As a whole the building is larger than Temple B and, although it may have followed the alignment of the earlier building, it stands noticeably forward from it.

[Insert Fig. 5 here]

Fig. 5. Reconstruction of Temple A, Pyrgi, c.470-460 BC (Source: Colonna 2000, 310, fig. 34. Courtesy of Archivio di Etruscologia, Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità, Sapienza Università di Roma).

The roof decorations from Temple A are masterpieces of Etruscan terracotta art. The rear of the building had several antepagmenta that indicate a roof slope of 18 degrees and are large enough to suggest a recessed gable, possibly as part of a roof built with cypress beams arranged in tie-beam trusses (Melis 1985a, 136; Colonna 1988-1989, 111, fig. 88). All of the antepagmenta at the rear of the building may illustrate episodes from the myth of the Seven

[10] An alternative dating of Temple A to c. 490-480 BCE has also been proposed: Damgaard Andersen 1998, iv. 88 with n.487; countered by Colonna 2000, 311-12.

against Thebes: the column plaque shows Zeus/Tinia throwing a lightning bolt towards Capaneus/Capne, as Athena/Menrvra watches Tydeus/Tute eating the brains of his opponent; a plaque to the left depicts four or six warriors, who Colonna theorises may be Argives; and a plaque to the right includes a male helmeted head that could, according to Colonna, be part of a depiction of the fratricide of Eteocles and Polynices.[11] The original reliefs from the front of the building have been lost, but seem to have been replaced in the late fifth century BCE with scenes of Herakles and Amazons, judging by fragments preserved in wells. A third redesign in the fourth century BCE may have shown Ino/Leucothea and Palemone being received by Herakles, perhaps at Pyrgi itself given Herakles' possible role in the mythical foundation of the site (Colonna 2000, 304-05, 25-33). Colonna (2000, 326-27, 31) has argued that the successive decorations on the front of the temple stress Herakles not as a solitary hero but as a champion of civil society, opposing the disorder represented by the Amazons and promoting of the right of asylum. Scholars have also suggested that the scenes on the front and the back of the temple may be connected to one another on two levels: as allusions to political events, either in connection with Syracuse or with Caere, the latter as a condemnation of the recent tyrannical rule of Thefarie Velianas through references to the dangers of hubris and the reassertion of order; or alternatively as hopes for salvation after death, reflecting concerns in contemporary Etruscan and Greek religion.[12] The possible use of Greek figurative language to express Etruscan values will be explored further below.

Marzabotto: The Temples of Uni and Tinia

Excavations carried out from 2013 to 2015 in Regio I at Marzabotto uncovered a Tuscanic temple previously known only from geophysics and archaeological surveys (Govi 2017b, 146-58). The remains are largely those of the foundations, formed of medium-sized pebbles arranged in up to seven layers with a height of approximately 1.10 m in the best-preserved areas, and include sandstone boulders up to 1 m long placed predominantly at corners (Fig. 6). The foundations sink into virgin soil and appear to date to the late sixth century BCE and thus roughly the same time that the town was substantially rebuilt. Above the pebbles lie larger quadrangular stones thought to mark the base of the podium, and a layer of travertine workings that suggest the shaping of blocks onsite. The remaining walls indicate a plan measuring 19.14 x 25.7 m in total, perhaps following the Attic foot (Govi 2017b, 157),

[11] Colonna 1970b; Colonna 2000, 311-25; Baglione 2017, 115 with n.72.

[12] Allusion to politics: Pairault Massa 1992, 72-75; Colonna 2000; Haynes 2000, 180-81; Jannot 2005, 111 ; Baglione 2013, 619-20; Smith 2014, 83; Michetti 2016, 79; Baglione 2017, 113-15; Haack 2017, 1003. Salvation: Colonna 2000, 334-35.

although the arrangement at the front of the building is unclear; traces of two walls extending either side to the south may have bounded stairs (Garagnani, Gaucci, and Gruška 2016, 79; Govi 2017b, 150-51). The back part of the building appears to have had three cellas, each divided internally into a front and back room, with the largest front room located in the central cella. A deep porch preserves two supports on the western side that suggest two rows of columns, possibly four in front and two behind, laid against two transverse walls in the substructure. Based on materials used elsewhere in the settlement, it has been suggested that the walls of the superstructure were made of mudbrick, supported by beams, while the columns could have been made of wood or stone with bases and capitals of local travertine.[13] Paleobotanical studies indicate the presence of oak trees that may have supplied the roof beams, thought to have been arranged in a pseudo-truss system (Garagnani, Gaucci, and Gruška 2016, 79-80). Few roof decorations have survived, but some come from palmette antefixes (Garagnani, Gaucci, and Gruška 2016, 80; Govi 2017b, 163).

[Insert Fig. 6 here]

Fig. 6. Plan of the foundations of the Temple of Uni, Marzabotto, late sixth century BC (Source Govi 2017b, 147, fig. 2).

Finds in and around the temple may offer a political context for construction. Two pieces of a bucchero amphora placed in one of the southwest foundation walls are inscribed with the Etruscan words *kainu*[...] and *śpural*[...] (Govi 2017b, 158-63). The term *Kainua* is known from other inscriptions at Marzabotto and appears to be the ancient name of the settlement. *Śpura* is thought to be the genitive of a word referring to the city as a politically-organised community, akin to *civitas* in Latin. The fragments may record the dedication of the temple on behalf of the city (the *śpura*) rather than an individual, and their concealment in the walls is reminiscent of a foundation ritual (Govi 2017b, 160-63). The discovery of another, later inscription in the vicinity of the temple refers to the goddess Uni and makes it possible that the building was dedicated to her (Govi 2017b, 163-65).

A few decades later a second temple was built near the first. It was larger and closer to the road than its neighbour, had a peristyle, and as discussed below appears to have been dedicated to Uni's consort, Tinia. A small street between the two buildings formalised their distinct identities (Govi 2017a, 92; Govi 2017b, 171-72). The new temple stood above, and

[13] Sassatelli and Govi 2005, 26; Govi and Sassatelli 2010, i. 213-18; Garagnani, Gaucci, and Gruška 2016, 79.

partially reused, the pebble walls of a pre-existing structure with a different orientation; the presence of a fragmentary rim of a bucchero chalice from the last decades of the sixth century BCE dates this structure to the same era as the adjacent temple (Sassatelli and Govi 2010, 33). The fifth-century temple faced south, like its neighbour, but was built with a different technique that provides an unusually clear plan (Sassatelli and Govi 2005; Sassatelli and Govi 2010) (Fig. 7). The foundations consisted of two or three layers of pebbles beneath blocks of local stone, and up to four layers of cobbles beneath columns, indicating that the placement of columns was planned from the start. L-shaped walls at the front indicate a staircase measuring 10.60 m wide and 3.80 m deep and a podium at least 1.20 m high likely decorated with moulded stone revetments given their presence in a well to the northeast (Sassatelli and Govi 2010, 31-32). Visible column bases record the use of a peristyle with four columns at the front, five at the back, and six either side, in a plan of 35.5 x 21.9 m. A single cella in the middle was subdivided into a bipartite rear space and a pronaos with anta walls. The excavators believe that the roofing system did not use a truss, and tiles found in the well to the northeast differ in shape and size from those currently recognised in the rest of the settlement (Sassatelli and Govi 2010, 32). The measurements of the temple are again thought to correspond with the Attic foot (Sassatelli and Govi 2005, 26-30; Sassatelli and Govi 2010, 32). The recovery of a small bucchero olla, inscribed with the word *tins* after firing, has seen the temple assigned to Tinia (Sassatelli and Govi 2005, 38-47; Sassatelli and Govi 2010, 34).

[Insert Fig. 7 here]

Fig. 7. Plan of the foundations of the Temple of Tinia, Marzabotto, c.480-470 BC (Source: Sassatelli and Govi 2005, 14, fig. 5).

In a striking parallel with Pyrgi, an inscribed bronze tablet was found between the western wall of the temple and its enclosure (Govi 2015; Govi 2017b, 169-71). The text is incomplete, but the extant portion has five lines in Etruscan and a nail hole that suggests it was displayed. The first two lines appear to refer to an action performed by one or two people, and the other three lines contain the verb *hecce*, meaning to build, construct, or make, in an act involving an additional two people. The tablet has been dated to the second quarter of the fifth century BCE, like the adjacent building, and the excavators propose that the whole was a record of activities related to the foundation of the temple. In such a scenario, the people mentioned could be priests or magistrates and the use of the word *śpura* in the

second line again evokes an institutional framework. The way in which the temple occupies a whole block of the newly reorganised city, lying at the intersection of two of its most important roads and on the route to the acropolis (Fig. 2), also reinforces the sense that its construction should be understood as part of a systematisation of urban life encompassing architecture, topography, and public performance (Govi 2017b, 172-74). In this way the temple can be placed within a larger socio-political context much like Temple B at Pyrgi, paving the way for discussion of connections between architecture and culture.

From Plans to Buildings

Although the data presented so far are relatively straightforward, the buildings they generate challenge the cultural labels used in traditional architectural typologies. A significant part of the problem lies in the habit of studying buildings on the basis of their plans alone. Recourse to plans is arguably justifiable when the remains of many Central Italian structures comprise little more than foundations, but it effectively reduces a building to two dimensions. A plan is only one element of architecture: elevations, decor, and setting all shape how structures look and are perceived, as do patterns of use, sensory stimuli, and more abstract factors such as memory and time. When the temples under consideration here are explored as three-dimensional entities with an everyday, lived reality, it complicates the idea that a peripteral plan produces a 'Greek' temple and a plan with a closed rear and frontal columns creates an 'Tuscanic' or 'Etrusco-Italic' one. This, in turn, affects assessments of cultural influence and rationales for particular choices.

The Temple of Tinia at Marzabotto is a prime example of the need to avoid reading the presence of a peristyle as shorthand for 'Greek' sacred design. The excavators have pointed out that the Temple of Tinia has multiple features that are characteristic of local, not Greek, architecture. The peristyle has five columns at the rear but only four in front, and those at the front are aligned with the cella walls to give a wider central intercolumniation that highlights the façade (Sassatelli and Govi 2010, 32). The frontal emphasis is strengthened by the staircase, itself part of a monumental podium that raises the floor and restricts access to those approaching from the south. The asymmetrical use of columns in the plan has comparanda in Campania and Sicily, for example in the basilica at Paestum and the Olympeion at Agrigento, and also at Ionian sites such as Ephesus, but the way in which it is part of a design marked by frontality and axiality at Marzabotto may find a closer parallel in the Capitoline temple at Rome, where a peristyle or *peripteros sine postico* arrangement is thought to have stood atop a high podium (Cifani 2008, 105, 07; Mura Sommella 2009;

Hopkins 2012); the excavators have noted that the association of the Marzabotto temple with Tinia, the Etruscan equivalent of Jupiter, may not be coincidental (Sassatelli and Govi 2010, 32; Govi 2014, 97). When the elevation, deity, and unusual peristyle are considered together, the result is a building that embodies Central Italian architectural preferences as much as Greek ones.

A similar blurring of the architectural grammars usually read as 'Greek' and 'Tuscanic' occurs at Pyrgi. As mentioned above, the use of a peristyle in Temple B at Pyrgi is less secure than in the Temple of Tinia at Marzabotto, but the temple ostensibly displays Greek connections on its roof as well through imagery connected with Herakles. Scenes from myths featuring the hero appear to have decorated the gables and eaves, and a central acroterion depicting Herakles with Athena is likely to have crowned the whole edifice. Such subjects were not uncommon in Etruscan art, and similar acroteria appear to have decorated at least twelve other Central Italian temples in the Archaic period.[14] At Pyrgi, the choice of these seemingly Greek subjects has been partly explained by Hellenic analogies: the conjunction of Boardman's theory that Peisistratos used Herakles imagery to bolster his rule in sixth-century Athens and the high number of tyrants in Archaic Greece has seen Thefarie Velianas, the ruler of Caere named in the tablets, interpreted as a comparable tyrant who used Temple B to assert his power.[15] The theory that Herakles and Athena acroteria were popular in Etruria and Latium because they represent a male leader bolstered by the support of a female deity, a legitimising concept traceable in sources from the Pyrgi tablets to accounts of early Roman kings (for example, Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.27.7; 4.40.7; Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 36, 74; Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 10, describing Fortuna's favouring of Servius Tullius), dovetails with this perception.[16] The dedication of the building to the Punic goddess Astarte adds a cosmopolitan dimension, as does the possibility that Herakles could be assimilated to Melqart (Colonna 2000, 304-05; Malkin 2011, 119-41), further bridging multiple cultural frameworks. Again, however, these elements are combined with features more characteristic of the Etruscans. The front of the temple is emphasised by a double row of four columns. Terracotta decorations are held up by roof with a recessed gable and perhaps tie-beam trusses, while the original wall around the temple and the construction of Area C impose an axial experience. Finally, the equivalence of Astarte and the Etruscan goddess Uni in the tablets likely represents assimilation with a local goddess. The result is a temple with 'Greek-

[14] Lulof 2000; Lulof 2016, with n.36; Lulof and Smith 2017, 7-9.
[15] Boardman 1972; Colonna 2000, 283-94; Baglione 2017, 112-14.
[16] Coarelli 1988, 253-55, 301-28; Pairault Massa 1992, 60-63; Cornell 1995, 146-47; Linke 2010, 188-92; Lulof 2016, 136-37.

Italian' features (Colonna 2000, 304-05; cf. Mertens 1980, 49-50), with references to Punic and Etruscan cults, in an Etruscan sanctuary. The reality is that this is far from a simple Greek temple.

The nearby Temple A at Pyrgi also has a dense layer of mythological imagery, but this time placed over a classic Tuscanic plan. Scenes from the Theban mythological cycle appear on the rear of the building, while Herakles has a starring role at the front. As outlined in the previous section, the Greek material on Temple A has been read as another commentary on local events, this time the end of Thefarie Velianas' rule. The imagery on the rear gable that faced visitors approaching Pyrgi from Caere has also encouraged interpretations that link the narratives with the Etruscan city.[17] Explanations in this vein do not have to centre on Thefaire Velianas though. The Theban cycle was popular in Etruscan art (Krauskopf 1974; Vacano and Freytag gen Löringhoff 1982, 34-46), and is it possible that the display of myths connected with Thebes, on a symbol of Caere's piety and wealth, was as much about equating the Etruscan city with its counterparts in Greece as it was an attempt to elevate the building through Hellenic-inspired decor.

At this point, one can also question the extent to which patrons, builders, and worshippers saw the myths illustrated at Pyrgi as Greek rather than Etruscan, or alternatively as part of a common heritage. The Pyrgi tablets suggest that the same goddess could simultaneously be known as Uni and Astarte, or at least worshipped by visitors under different names in the same place. It is thus plausible that Herakles, celebrated in the sculptural decoration of both Temple B and A, may also have been understood to be Etruscan Hercle, and perhaps even the Roman Hercules and Phoenician Melqart, by those using the sanctuary. Etruscan Hercle is far from a carbon copy of the Greek Herakles. Etruscan artists show Hercle in exploits unknown in Greek myth, such as the abduction of the lady Mlacuch, or performing deeds that in Greece are ascribed to other heroes, such as the slaying of the Minotaur.[18] In another disparity with Greek tradition, artworks show him attaining immortality by being breastfed by Uni in adulthood, perhaps reflecting an Etruscan belief in the transformative power of bodily fluids.[19] With his own mythology and cult, he appears to have been worshipped in Etruria as a god rather than a hero (de Grummond 2006, 182).

[17] Jannot 2005, 111; Bonfante and Swaddling 2006, 23; Baglione 2013, 619-20; Carpino 2016, 412-13.

[18] Note that these representations appear after the Archaic period, for example the abduction of Mlacuch is shown on a mirror from c. 480-470 BCE now in the British Museum, and the image of Hercle as Minotaur-slayer appears on a mirror from Civita Castellana of c. 300 BCE, present location unknown: see de Grummond 2006, 180-88.

[19] As shown on a bronze mirror of c. 400-375 BCE now in the Museo Civico Archeologico in Bologna, and on another mirror from Volterra, c. 325 BCE, now in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale in Florence: de Grummond 2006, 84-85. On the belief more generally see Brandt 2015: 125-131.

Hercle may also have had special status at Pyrgi itself. Colonna notes that the connection between Hercle and sacred waters in Etruscan religion mean it is not inconceivable that Hercle was once worshipped at the freshwater spring that flowed east of the monumental sanctuary at Pyrgi, and likely accounts for the original siting of the port; his cult may therefore predate the worship of multivalent goddesses there (Colonna 2000, 274-75, 92-93). It is thus debateable to what extent the Herakles/Hercle imagery is 'Greek' rather than 'Etruscan' or even multicultural. Looking beyond the Herakles/Hercle scenes, the wielding of a lightning bolt on the columen plaque of Temple A may also chime with Etruscan reverence for such portents (Turfa 2012, 61). There are thus grounds to acknowledge that Etruscan visitors may have understood the decoration of the temples at Pyrgi differently from their Greek equivalents.

Another issue in quantifying the 'Greek' elements of the four temples in this study relates to claims that they were built with designs that utilised the Attic foot. Damage to blocks and the hypotheses involved in reconstructing temple plans mean that precise measurements always risk giving a misleading sense of accuracy (Turfa and Steinmayer 1996, 1), and while the use of an empirical or relative building module can be identified at some sites – for instance, between roof tiles and other elements – the recognition of fixed, independent units is open to challenge. Notwithstanding these caveats, metrologists call a foot of 29.6 cm both 'Attic' and 'Attic-Roman', as the unit was widely used in Archaic and Republican Italian architecture and in time became the standard 'Roman' foot;[20] a chronological marker for when the measure passed from being a hallmark of building in Greece to building in Italy must be arbitrary and overlooks shared practice. If one accepts that a temple was built with a module of 29.6 cm, that does not automatically make the result a Greek temple.

All of the above suggests that at least three of the four paired temples at Marzabotto and Pyrgi combine elements that, in isolation, can be mapped onto cultural categories ranging from Greek and Etruscan to Punic, Central Italian, and even Roman. Yet dissecting buildings in this way overlooks the reality to which each element contributed, as does trying to describe the end product with just one of these labels based on anything other than its location (cf. the arguments by John North Hopkins elsewhere in this volume). One should also be aware of imposing ethnic and cultural classifications that contemporaries may have deemed less relevant than ideas held by local inhabitants and external visitors (Riva 2009, 91). Regardless

[20] Robertson 1969, 82 with n.3. 149 with n.1; Turfa and Steinmayer 1996, 2, n.3; Jones 2000, 73-74 with fig.1; Maras 2013, 486.

of their forms, these temples stood in sanctuaries in Etruria and helped Etruscans to communicate with their gods. This is not to deny that people from other cultures used these sanctuaries, nor to side-line features more characteristic of Punic, Greek, or Roman culture, but to emphasise that the primary frame of reference for viewers and visitors of these temples was their location in Etruria. Here, visible and invisible geographies could establish an Etruscan frame of reference. For instance, the reorganisation of the urban plan at Marzabotto at the end of the sixth century BCE appears to have been guided by solar and religious precepts, which saw the paired temples in Regio I located in the northeast part of the city just as Tinia and Uni and were thought to reside in the northeast part of the Etruscan heavenly *templum* (Malgieri 2007b; Morpurgo 2007; Govi 2017b). Such a scenario reinforces that the intrinsic function of these temples was to facilitate the worship of gods in Etruria. Calling two of the results 'Greek' would prioritise style over location, setting, and cults identified epigraphically, or, more accurately, would make the peristyle the typological determinant in a typology that is moreover purely visual.

At this point, the use of peristyles and Greek myths – and perhaps also anthropomorphic deities who enjoyed monumental houses – in Etruria needs justifying. If local needs were important, why incorporate such features at all? The traditional answer is acculturation, arguing that builders and worshippers believed Greek features were superior. An alternative answer, just as speculative as the traditional one, is that there was little or no change in the underlying concepts that shaped Etruscan religion or its architecture, but instead a selective, superficial change that worked to local advantage. Here the pairing of temples becomes significant and it is to this that I now turn.

Paired Temples

The sequence of decisions that produced adjacent temples at Pyrgi and Marzabotto differs enough between sites to challenge the notion that Hellenic features, or more specifically peristyles, were always preferable for temple designs in Etruria. While the temple with the peripteral plan was the first of the two built at Pyrgi, at Marzabotto it was the second. The chronological gap between the construction of the first and second temples at both sites accordingly suggests that the use of a peripteral plan should not be attributed to a fastmoving trend in Etruria in either the late sixth century or early fifth century BCE. The relative prominence of each plan in the pair is also dissimilar. At Pyrgi, the peripteral temple is the smaller of the two and is set back in the sanctuary; the Tuscanic temple is physically and visually dominant (Baglione 2017, 114-15). At Marzabotto, however, the peripteral temple is

significantly larger and placed forward of its neighbour, obscuring the smaller temple from visitors approaching from the south or west (Fig. 8) (Govi 2017a, 92; Govi 2017b, 172). The divergent sizes indicate that there was no inherent drive to make temples with a peripteral plan larger or smaller than those without. The comparison therefore suggests there was no perception that peristyles belonged in temples that were bigger, somehow better, or first.

[Insert Fig. 8 here]

Fig. 8. Virtual reconstruction of the two urban temples at Marzabotto, viewed from *Plateia* B (Source: Garagnani, Gaucci, and Govi 2016).

Nonetheless there are similarities between the sites that hint at larger trends. Both communities appear to have wanted the second temple to be larger than the first, reflecting an increase in resources or confidence. More importantly, both seem to have believed that temples with different plans were desirable. This went beyond having a variety of temples spread across a sanctuary or settlement. The juxtaposition was deliberate, emphatic, and not an isolated case. One can therefore theorise, albeit cautiously, that the decision to duplicate, but not replicate, an existing structure may represent a preference that transcended one city and one part of Etruria.

One explanation for diversified temple exteriors is that the visual culture of Archaic Etruria included an aesthetic that could be termed 'eclectic'. Although this adjective has been used pejoratively in regard to Roman art history, the term is gradually being rehabilitated through recognition of the connoisseurship that can be involved in selecting creations to create new meanings and serve new functions. Heterogeneity is being recognised increasingly in Roman rhetoric, literature, and other intellectual endeavours, suggesting that a delight in *varietas* was not merely a feature of Roman art, but one characteristic of Roman culture (Tronchin 2012; Fitzgerald 2016, 47-83). It therefore does not have to have a negative connotation when applied to the culture of neighbouring Etruria, nor contribute to what are now outdated views about the stylistic unity, and therefore superiority, of Hellenic visual culture; indeed, the concept of *poikilia* in Archaic Greek aesthetics may be comparable (Grand-Clement 2015, 410). As has been noted, however, it is not enough to view eclecticism as a valid aesthetic and go no further; scholars should attempt to understand how and why such a style arose and what it may convey about those who celebrated it (Tronchin 2012, 275; Petersen 2012). In terms of architecture, one could propose that the eclectic designs of the four adjacent temples in the Largo Argentina sanctuary at Rome at the end of the second

century BCE derive from a tendency fostered centuries earlier by examples such as the paired temples at Pyrgi and Marzabotto.[21] This inevitably returns focus to the Archaic period and the question of why such variety may have been cultivated by Etruscan communities.

An eclectic aesthetic has the potential to denote authority. A varied assemblage can signal the ability to source items of different provenance, informed by knowledge of what is available and the resources to acquire it (Elsner 2006, 272; Tronchin 2012, 280). The application and interweaving of elements of different origin, style, type, iconography, and narrative to a unified end can also demonstrate the imposition of meaning and thereby its command. It is thus possible to see architectural design as an exercise in curation. By investing in the collection of columns, myths, and gods, the sanctuaries at Pyrgi and Marzabotto may exemplify the ability to select and subordinate elements of multiple entangled cultural spheres, and to manipulate them to engage a variety of viewers and achieve their own ends (cf. Potts 2015, 111-17). The construction of temples that integrated varied elements and put them to local service can thus be seen as monumental declarations of power, not of Greece over Etruria, but by Etruscan communities in their own right. It may not be coincidental that the Archaic period represents the high point of Etruscan urbanism; the exploration of different ways to mark and celebrate related forms of socio-political organisation and status might be discernible here in the built environment.

This suggestion, offered with due caution, is far from traditional Hellenizing tropes. It now remains to consider the religious dimension of these temples as a potential rationale for their designs. This aspect has not been analysed in depth earlier in this chapter because much about the relationship between gods and temples in Etruria remains unclear and tends to be hypothesized on the basis of later or external written sources and other classical Mediterranean comparanda. For example, when votive inscriptions establish that a certain god was worshipped at an Etruscan temple, as at Marzabotto where the *olla* inscribed with the name of Tinia was excavated close by, it is uncertain if worship there was restricted to that god (or a pair or triad). The phenomenon of 'visiting gods' in Greece opens the possibility that a number of cults could be observed at an ancient temple, even if it was dedicated to a certain one or ones, meaning that votive inscriptions may identify only a subset of cults performed in the vicinity (Alroth 1987, 9 with n.4; Alroth 1989-1990, 303 with n.5;

[21] I am grateful to Janet DeLaine for this suggestion. Interestingly, support for the idea that there was a desire for architectural variation in Etruria may be found elsewhere even within Marzabotto. Remains of at least five buildings lie on the acropolis: structures B and D were roof-less and appear to be altars, while structures A, C, and E are likely to be the foundations of temples. The substructure of Building C suggests a triple cella-plan with frontal columns but Building A, in contrast, has been reconstructed with a peripteral plan above a podium, akin to the Temple of Tinia on the valley floor below. See Vitali 1985; Vitali, Brizzolara, and Lippolis 2001; Malgieri 2007; Gilotta 2017, 1050.

Maras 2009, 95-96). Comparing the location or orientation of a temple with reconstructions of the Etruscan *templum* suffers the same problem.[22] Theoretically, a plan with one cella could suggest that a temple was dedicated to one god and a plan with a triple cella to three, but that leaves open the question of whether other gods could also be approached there, as well as the issue of how syncretic gods were housed, conceptualised, and worshipped. These uncertainties about the nature of deities and communication with them limit our understanding of connections between the form and religious function of temples at present and mean there is little secure ground for rationalising particular choices; one should be wary of any claim that architectural style offers a window onto religious mentality in the absence of contemporary, emic evidence. Reconstructing the relationship between architecture and society thus remains contingent on both data and models for its interpretation, and changes in either element will undoubtedly spur new considerations.

Conclusion

This chapter has suggested that religious architecture in Archaic Etruria did not incorporate Greek elements either unthinkingly or in slavish imitation of Hellenic examples. Instead, Etruscan communities may have drawn on skills and fashions circulating in the Mediterranean to create buildings in accord with local architectural, ritual, and visual preferences. The idea that the collocation of temples with different plans may reflect a Central Italian affinity for visual variety and competition, comparable to the delight in contrasting designs later connected with Roman eclecticism, also redirects the study of connections between the architecture of Etruria and other cultures to those within Italy rather than Greece. The result is a proposed reorientation of agency and effect.

Reframing discussions of Archaic architecture in this way permits greater acknowledgement that Etruscan religious buildings as well as the activities they supported assimilated features from elsewhere throughout the first millennium BCE. From this broader perspective, growth in overt connections with Greece in the sixth and fifth centuries BCE appear to be less a step change than a temporary intensification. Evaluating what is cosmetic and what is deep-seated about these changes is not simple, but greater contextualisation – in three-dimensions, in setting, in the region, and in time – may be a useful start. The relationship between Etruria and external cultures has long reflected prevailing intellectual

[22] On different reconstructions of the *templum* see Stevens 2009.

trends as much as ancient evidence and as such is far from settled; remodelling, now as in antiquity, can be worthwhile.

Bibliography

Alroth, B. 1987. 'Visiting Gods - Who and Why?' in T. Linders and G. Nordquist (eds), *Gifts to the Gods. Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1985* (Uppsala: University of Uppsala), pp. 9-19.

———. 1989-1990. 'Visiting Gods', *Scienze dell'antichità*, 3-4: 301-10.

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.

Baglione, M. P. 2013. 'The Sanctuary of Pyrgi.' in J. M. Turfa (ed.), *The Etruscan World* (London: Routledge), pp. 613-31.

———. 2017. 'Tra Caere e Pyrgi. I grandi santuari costieri e la politica di Caere.' in E. Govi (ed.), *La città etrusca e il sacro. Santuari e istituzioni politiche. Atti del Convegno, Bologna 21-23 gennaio 2016* (Bologna: Bononia University Press), pp. 97-120.

Bianchi Bandinelli, R. 1972. 'Qualche osservazione sulle statue acroteriali di Poggio Civitate (Murlo)', *Dialoghi di archeologia*, 6: 236-47.

Boardman, J. 1972. 'Herakles, Peisistratos, and Sons', *Revue Archaeologique*, 1: 57-72.

Boethius, A., R. Ling, and T. Rasmussen. 1978. *Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

Bonfante, L., and J. Swaddling. 2006. *Etruscan Myths* (London: British Museum Press).

Brandt, J. R. 2015. 'Passage to the Underworld. Continuity or Change in Etruscan Funerary Ideology and Practices (6th-2nd Centuries BC)?' in J. R. Brandt, M. Prusac and H. Roland (eds), *Death and Changing Rituals: Function and Meaning in Ancient Funerary Practices* (Oxford: Oxbow), pp. 105-183.

Bundrick, S. D. 2019. *Athens, Etruria, and the Many Lives of Greek Figured Pottery* (Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press).

Cardini, L. 1970. 'Area C: Il riempimento del pozzo. Materiale osteologico.' in, *Pyrgi: scavi del santuario etrusco (1959-1967). Notizie degli scavi di antichità suppl. 2, 1970* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei), pp. 610-25.

Carpino, A. A. 2016. 'The "Taste" for Violence in Etruscan Art: Debunking the Myth.' in S. Bell and Alexandra A. Carpino (eds), *A Companion to the Etruscans* (Chichester: Wiley Blackwell), pp. 410-30.

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

Coarelli, F. 1988. *Il foro boario: dalle origini alla fine della repubblica* (Rome: Quasar).

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

Colonna, C. 1965. 'L'identificazione del tempio di Astarte e la questione dello 'ŠR QDŠ', *Studi Etruschi*, 33: 201-09.

———. 1970a. 'Il tempio B: le terrecotte eseguite a mano. Gli acroteri.' in, *Pyrgi: scavi del santuario etrusco (1959-1967). Notizie degli scavi di antichità suppl. 2, 1970* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei), pp. 300-11.

———. 1970b. 'L'area sacra C: le strutture.' in, *Pyrgi: scavi del santuario etrusco (1959-1967). Notizie degli scavi di antichità suppl. 2, 1970* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei), pp. 587-97.

Colonna, G. 1970c. 'Il tempio A: l'altorilievo mitologico.' in, *Pyrgi: scavi del santuario etrusco (1959-1967). Notizie degli scavi di antichità suppl. 2, 1970* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei), pp. 48-82.

———. 1970d. 'Il tempio A: le strutture.' in, *Pyrgi: scavi del santuario etrusco (1959-1967). Notizie degli scavi di antichità suppl. 2, 1970* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei), pp. 23-47.

———. 1970e. 'Il tempio B: le strutture.' in, *Pyrgi: scavi del santuario etrusco (1959-1967). Notizie degli scavi di antichità suppl. 2, 1970* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei), pp. 275-89.

———. 1970f. 'Il tempio B: le terrecotte eseguite a stampo. Le antefisse a figura intera.' in, *Pyrgi: scavi del santuario etrusco (1959-1967). Notizie degli scavi di antichità suppl. 2, 1970* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei), pp. 311-32.

———. 1970g. 'L'area sacra C: il recinto delle lamine.' in C. Colonna (ed.), *Pyrgi: scavi del santuario etrusco (1959-1967). Notizie degli scavi di antichità suppl. 2, 1970* (Rome), pp. 597-604.

———. 1984. 'I templi del Lazio fino al V secolo compreso', *Archeologia Laziale*, 6: 396-411.

——— (ed.) 1985. *Santuari d'Etruria* (Milan: Electa).

———. 1986. 'Urbanistica e architettura.' in G. Pugliese Carratelli (ed.), *Rasenna: storia e civiltà degli Etruschi* (Milan: Libri Scheiwiller), pp. 371-530.

———. 1988-1989. 'Gli oggetti lignei.' in, *Pyrgi: Scavi del santuario etrusco (1969-1971). Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità 42-43, Suppl. 2* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei), pp. 111-21.

———. 1989-1990. '"Tempio" e "santuario" nel lessico delle lamine di Pyrgi', *Scienze dell'Antichità 3-4*: 197-216.

———. 2000. 'Il santuario di Pyrgi dalle origini mitistoriche agli altorilievi frontonali dei Sette e di Leucotea', *Scienze dell'Antichità 10*: 251-336.

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

Damgaard Andersen, H. 1998. 'Etruscan Architecture from the Late Orientalizing to the Archaic Period (c. 640-480 B.C.)' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Copenhagen).

Davies, P. J. E. 2006. 'Exploring the International Arena: The Tarquins' Aspirations for the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus.' in C. C. Mattusch, A. A. Donohue and A. Brauer (eds), *Common Ground: Archaeology, Art, Science, and Humanities. Proceedings of the XVIth International Congress of Classical Archaeology, Boston, August 23-26, 2003* (Oxford: Oxbow), pp. 186-89.

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

Dougherty, C., and L. Kurke (eds). 2003. *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Downey, S. B. 1995. *Architectural Terracottas from the Regia* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press).

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

Edlund-Berry, I. 2013. 'The Architectural Heritage of Etruria.' in J. M. Turfa (ed.), *The Etruscan World* (London: Routledge), pp. 695-707.

Edlund Gantz, I. 1972. 'The Seated Statue Akroteria from Poggio Civitate (Murlo)', *Dialoghi di archeologia*, 6: 167-235.

Elsner, J. 2006. 'Classicism in Roman Art.' in J. Porter (ed.), *Classical Pasts: The Classical Traditions in Greece and Rome* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), pp. 270-97

Fitzgerald, W. 2016. *Variety: The Life of a Roman Concept* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Garagnani, S., A. Gaucci, and E. Govi. 2016. 'ArchaeoBIM: dallo scavo al Building Information Modeling di una struttura sepolta. Il caso del tempio tuscanico di Uni a Marzabotto', *Archeologia e Calcolatori*, 27: 251-70.

Garagnani, S., A. Gaucci, and B. Gruška. 2016. 'From the Archaeological Record to ArchaeoBIM: The Case Study of the Etruscan Temple of Uni in Marzabotto', *Virtual Archaeology Review*, 7: 77-86.

Gilotta, F. 2017. 'Late Classical and Hellenistic Art, 450-250 BCE.' in A. Naso (ed.), *Etruscology* (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp. 1049-78.

Govi, E. 2014. 'Etruscan Urbanism at Bologna, Marzabotto and in the Po Valley.' in E. C. Robinson (ed.), *Papers on Italian Urbanism in the First Millennium B.C.* (Portsmouth, Rhode Island: Journal of Roman Archaeology), pp. 81-111.

———. 2015. 'Una nuova iscrizione dal tempio urbano di Tinia a Marzabotto', *Studi Etruschi*, 77: 109-47.

———. 2017a. 'Kainua-Marzabotto: The Archaeological Framework', *Archeologia e Calcolatori*, 28.2: 87-97.

———. 2017b. 'La dimensione del sacro nella città di *Kainua*-Marzabotto.' in E. Govi (ed.), *La città etrusca e il sacro. Santuari e istituzioni politiche. Atti del convegno, Bologna 21-23 gennaio 2016* (Bologna: Bononia University Press), pp. 145-79.

Govi, E., and G. Sassatelli (eds). 2010. *Marzabotto. La Casa I della Regio IV, Insula 2* (Bologna: Ante Quem).

Grand-Clement, A. 2015. 'Poikilia.' in P. Destress and Penelope Murray (eds), *A Companion to Ancient Aesthetics* (Chichester: Wiley Blackwell), pp. 406-21.

Haack, M.-L. 2017. 'Ritual and Cults, 580-450 BCE.' in A. Naso (ed.), *Etruscology* (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp. 1001-11.

Hall, J. M. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

———. 2002. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Haynes, S. 2000. *Etruscan Civilization: A Cultural History* (London: British Museum Press).

Heurgon, J. 1966. 'The Inscriptions of Pyrgi', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 56: 1-15.

Hodos, T. 2017. 'Globalization: Some Basics. An Introduction to the *Routledge Handbook of Archaeology and Globalization*.' in T. Hodos (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Archaeology and Globalization* (London: Routledge), pp. 3-11.

Hopkins, J. N. 2012. 'The Capitoline Temple and the Effects of Monumentality on Roman Temple Design.' in M. Thomas and G. E. Meyers (eds), *Monumentality in Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture: Ideology and Innovation* (Austin: University of Texas Press), pp. 111-38.

———. 2016. *The Genesis of Roman Architecture* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

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

Jannot, J.-R. 2005. *Religion in Ancient Etruria* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press).

Jones, M. W. 2000. 'Doric Measure and Architectural Design 1: The Evidence of the Relief from Salamis', *American Journal of Archaeology*, 104.1: 73-93.

Krauskopf, I. 1974. *Der thebanischen Sagenkreis und andere griechische Sagen in der etruskischen Kunst* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern).

Linke, B. 2010. 'Kingship in Early Rome.' in Giovanni B. Lanfranchi and Robert Rollinger (eds), *Concepts of Kingship in Antiquity: Proceedings of the European Science Foundation Exploratory Workshop, held in Padova, November 28th-December 1st, 2007* (Padova: S.A.R.G.O.N. Editrice e Libreria), pp. 181-96.

Lulof, P., and C. Smith. 2017. 'The Age of Tarquinius Superbus. History and Archaeology.' in P. S. Lulof and C. J. Smith (eds), *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.* (Leuven: Peeters), pp. 3-13.

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. 2016. 'New Perspectives on the Acroteria of Caeretan Temples.' in N. T. de Grummond and L. C. Pieraccini (eds), *Caere* (Austin: University of Texas Press), pp. 131-40.

Malgieri, A. 2007a. 'The Acropolis.' in E. Govi (ed.), *Marzabotto: An Etruscan Town* (Bologna: Ante Quem), pp. 20-22.

———. 2007b. 'The Urban Temple of *Tinia*.' in E. Govi (ed.), *Marzabotto: An Etruscan Town* (Bologna: Ante Quem), pp. 23-25.

Malkin, I. (ed.) 2001. *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, MA: Center for Hellenic Studies, Trustees for Harvard University).

———. 2011. *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Maras, D. F. 2009. *Il dono votivo: gli dei e il sacro nelle iscrizioni etrusche di culto* (Pisa: Farbizio Serra).

———. 2013. 'Numbers and Reckoning: A Whole Civilization Founded upon Divisions.' in J. M. Turfa (ed.), *The Etruscan World* (London: Routledge), pp. 478-91.

Melis, F. 1970a. 'Il tempio B: le terrecotte eseguite a stampo. Le altre antefisse (tipi B : 1 - B : IV). Notizie degli Scavi Suppl. 2, 1970.' in, *Pyrgi: scavi del santuario etrusco (1959-1967). Notizie degli scavi di antichità suppl. 2, 1970* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei), pp. 332-46.

———. 1970b. 'Il tempio B: le terrecotte eseguite a stampo. Le terrecotte non figurate (tipi B: 1 - B : 9). Notizie degli Scavi Suppl. 2, 1970.' in, *Pyrgi: scavi del santuario etrusco (1959-1967). Notizie degli scavi di antichità suppl. 2, 1970* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei), pp. 346-402.

———. 1985a. 'Modello di ricostruzione del Tempio A.' in G. Colonna (ed.), *Santuari d'Etruria* (Milan: Electa), pp. 134-36.

———. 1985b. 'Modello di ricostruzione del Tempio B.' in G. Colonna (ed.), *Santuari d'Etruria* (Milan: Electa), pp. 130-31.

Mertens, D. 1980. 'Parallelismi strutturali nell'architettura della Magna Grecia e dell'Italia centrale in età arcaica.' in M. Padua (ed.), *Attività archeologica in Basilicata, 1964-1977. Scritti in onore di Dino Adamesteanu* (Matera: Edizioni Meta), pp. 37-82.

Michetti, L. M. 2016. 'Ports: Trade, Cultural Connections, Sanctuaries, and Emporia.' in N. T. de Grummond and L. C. Pieraccini (eds), *Caere* (Austin: University of Texas Press), pp. 73-86.

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

Morpurgo, G. 2007. 'The Urban Layout.' in E. Govi (ed.), *Marzabotto: An Etruscan Town* (Bologna: Ante Quem), pp. 11-13.

Mura Sommella, A. 2009. 'Il tempio di Giove Capitolino: una nuova proposta di lettura.' in G. M. Della Fina (ed.), *Gli Etruschi e Roma: fasi monarchica e alto-repubblicana. Atti del XVI convegno internazionale di studi sulla storia e l'archeologia dell'Etruria (Annali Faina 16)* (Orvieto: Quasar), pp. 333-72.

Nielsen, I., and B. Poulsen (eds). 1992. *The Temple of Castor and Pollux. Vol.1: The Pre-Augustan Temple Phases with Related Decorative Elements* (Rome: De Luca).

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

Pairault Massa, F.-H. 1992. *Iconologia e politica nell'Italia antica: Roma, Lazio, Etruria dal VII al I secolo a.C.* (Milan: Longanesi).

Pallottino, M. 1975. *The Etruscans* (London: Allen Lane).

Pernigotti, A. P. 2019. 'A Contribution to the Study of the Orientation of Etruscan Temples.' in G. Magli, A. C. González-García, J. Belmonte Aviles and E. Antonello (eds), *Archaeoastronomy in the Roman World* (Cham: Springer), pp. 3-15.

Petersen, L. H. 2012. 'Collecting Gods in Roman Houses: The House of the Gilded Cupids (VI.16.7, 38) at Pompeii', *Arethusa*, 45.3: 319-32.

Pfiffig, A. J. 1965. *Uni-Hera-Astarte: Studien zu den Goldblechen von S. Severa-Pyrgi mit etruskischer und punischer Inschrift (Osterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 88)* (Vienna: H. Böhlaus).

Phillips Jr., K. M. 1984. 'Protective Masks from Poggio Civitate and Chiusi.' in, *Studi di antichità in onore di Gugliemo Maetzke II* (Rome: Bretschneider), pp. 413-17.

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

———. 2015. *Religious Architecture in Latium and Etruria, c.900-500 BC* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

———. 2022. 'Introduction: Building Connections.' in C. R. Potts (ed.), *The Connected World of Central Italic Architecture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 1-30.

Ridgway, D. 1988. 'The Etruscans.' in J. Boardman (ed.), *The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. 4: Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean c.525 to 429 BC* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 634-75.

———. 2012. 'Demaratus of Corinth and the Hellenisation of Etruria.' in A. Hermary and G. R. Tsetskhladze (eds), *From the Pillars of Hercules to the Footsteps of the Argonauts* (Leuven: Peeters), pp. 207-22.

Riva, C. 2006. 'The Orientalizing Period in Etruria: Sophisticated Communities.' in Corinna Riva and Nicholas C. Vella (eds), *Debating Orientalization* (London: Equinox), pp. 110-34.

———. 2009. 'Ingenious Inventions: Welding Ethnicities East and West.' in S. Hales and T. Hodos (eds), *Material Culture and Social Identities in the Ancient World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 79-113.

———. 2018. 'The Freedom of the Etruscans: Etruria between Hellenization and Orientalization', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 25: 101-26.

Robertson, D. S. 1969. *Greek and Roman Architecture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Rystedt, E. 1983. *Acquarossa IV: Early Etruscan Akroteria from Acquarossa and Poggio Civitate (Murlo)* (Stockholm: P. Aström).

Sassatelli, G., and E. Govi. 2005. 'Il tempio di *Tina* in area urbana.' in, *Culti, forma urbana e artigianato a Marzabotto. Nuove prospettive di ricerca* (Bologna: Ante Quem), pp. 9-62.

Sassatelli, G., and E. Govi. 2010. 'Cults and Foundation Rites in the Etruscan City of Marzabotto.' in L. van der Meer (ed.), *Material Aspects of Etruscan Religion* (Leuven: Peeters), pp. 27-37.

Skinner, J. E. 2012. *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus. Greeks Overseas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Smith, C. 2014. *The Etrucans: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Spivey, N. 1991. 'Greek Vases in Etruria.' in T. Rasmussen and N. Spivey (eds), *Looking at Greek Vases* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 131-50.

Stevens, N. L. C. 2009. 'A New Reconstruction of the Etruscan Heaven', *American Journal of Archaeology*, 113.2: 153-64.

Torelli, M. 1985. 'Introduzione.' in Simonetta Stopponi (ed.), *Case e palazzi d'Etruria* (Florence: Regione Toscana), pp. 21-32.

Torelli, M. 2000a. 'Etruscan Religion.' in M. Torelli (ed.), *The Etruscans* (Milan: Bompiani), pp. 273-89.

———. 2000b. 'Le *regiae* etrusche e laziali tra orientalizzante e arcaismo.' in G. Bartoloni, F. Delpino, C. Morigi Govi and G. Sassatelli (eds), *Principi etruschi: tra Mediterraneo ed Europa* (Venice: Marsilio), pp. 67-78.

Tronchin, F. C. 2012. 'Introduction: Collecting the Eclectic in Roman Houses', *Arethusa*, 45.3: 261-82.

Turfa, J. M. 2012. *Divining the Etruscan World: The Brontoscopic Calendar and Religious Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

———. 2016. 'Prisoners and Plagues.' in N. T. de Grummond and L. C. Pieraccini (eds), *Caere* (Austin: University of Texas Press), pp. 87-94.

Turfa, J. M., and A. G. Steinmayer, Jr. 1996. 'The Comparative Structure of Greek and Etruscan Monumental Buildings', *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 64: 1-39.

Vacano, O. W. v., and B. v. Freytag gen Löringhoff. 1982. *Talamone. Il mito dei Sette a Tebe. Catalogo della mostra, Firenze, Museo Archaeologico, 19 febbraio - 3 ottobre 1982* (Florence: Vision).

Vitali, D. 1985. 'L'acropoli di Marzabotto.' in C. Colonna (ed.), *Santuari d'Etruria* (Milan: Electa), pp. 91.

Vitali, D., A. M. Brizzolara, and E. Lippolis. 2001. *L'acropoli della città etrusca di Marzabotto* (Imola: University Press Bologna).

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