

2001

An Orientalizing Period Complex at Poggio Civitate (Murlo): A Preliminary View

Erik O. Nielsen
Franklin College, Switzerland

Anthony S. Tuck
Tufts University

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.umass.edu/etruscan_studies

Recommended Citation

Nielsen, Erik O. and Tuck, Anthony S. (2001) "An Orientalizing Period Complex at Poggio Civitate (Murlo): A Preliminary View," *Etruscan Studies*: Vol. 8 , Article 3.
Available at: http://scholarworks.umass.edu/etruscan_studies/vol8/iss1/3

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Etruscan Studies by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

*An Orientalizing
Period Complex at
Poggio Civitate (Murlo):
A Preliminary View*

BY ERIK O. NIELSEN
AND ANTHONY S. TUCK

Poggio Civitate, a hill adjacent the medieval town of Murlo and about 25 km south of Siena, has been the focus of archaeological excavation since 1966. The hill is situated at the eastern edge of the *colline metallifere*, from which the Etruscans of the region extracted their mineral wealth. The remarkable and unusual discoveries from Poggio Civitate have attracted considerable attention in the years since work began, provoking a variety of theories regarding the original purpose of the site.

The hill of Poggio Civitate is divided into several property zones, one of which is locally known as Piano del Tesoro. This large area, which dominates the central, eastern portion of Poggio Civitate, was the location of a series of buildings of remarkable size, one of the Archaic period and three known predecessors dating to the Orientalizing period. The structure of the Archaic phase consists of a building with four wings, each approximately 60 m in length. The presence of two adjacent rooms projecting from the northeast corner of the building's foundations have been tentatively identified as a watchtower.¹ Moreover, thirty meters south of the building's southeast corner, additional foundations linked to the main building by a defensive wall suggests the existence of a small structure that served a similar function.²

To date the latest material recovered from the immediate area of the Archaic Period Building are fragments of a Laconian III vessel identified as the work of the hand of the Hunt Painter, datable to the years between 550 and 535 B.C.³ The construction date of the building is harder to determine. Imported Greek pottery found sealed under the floor of the Archaic structure provides a *terminus post quem* of ca. 600/580 B.C. This accords well with the style of the architectural terracottas, which adorned the roof of this building.⁴ Therefore, the excavators have posited a chronological span for this Archaic Period building between ca. 600 and 550/535 B.C., while recognizing that some time could have elapsed between the destruction of the earlier building and the construction of its successor.

More recently, excavations along the southern flank of Poggio Civitate's Piano del Tesoro plateau from 1996 to 1998 have helped clarify a puzzling architectural feature that

first emerged during the 1968 season of excavation.⁵ The foundation walls uncovered beneath the southern flank of the Archaic Period building in the 1968 campaign were recognized to be of a date earlier than that of the Archaic Period structure under investigation at that time. Excavators never fully revealed these enigmatic foundations and subsequent reference to a possible building in the area was limited to the portions of walls revealed at that time. Further examination and study has helped clarify these foundations and define the general plan of the building. This work has significantly added to our understanding of the complex of structures that stood on the Piano del Tesoro plateau during the Orientalizing Period, roughly between the years of 675/650 and 600/580 B.C.⁶ Before presenting this new structure, a brief review of information regarding the Orientalizing Phase of Piano del Tesoro and the nomenclature used to describe it is in order.

During the 1970 season, excavators made soundings beneath the floor level of the western flank of the Archaic Period structure; a building at that time termed the “Archaic Sanctuary.”⁷ They revealed foundation walls of an earlier structure as well as a series of pithoi fragments and dense concentrations of carbon and burned material.⁸ This building was initially labeled the “Lower Sanctuary,” a name coined from a term then used to describe the Archaic period structure situated stratigraphically above it.⁹ The following years of excavation revealed the continuation of the foundation walls as well as significant concentrations of materials associated with this structure.¹⁰ When fully excavated, the remains of the building consisted of rectangular, stone foundations without indications of interior divisions. The dimensions of the building were approximately 36.2 m on the eastern and western sides and 8.4 – 8.6 m along the northern and southern faces. Subsequent seasons of excavation reports continue to relate the process of excavation and conservation of the numerous objects found on the building’s floor. These materials, as has been more fully discussed elsewhere,¹¹ indicate a residential function of this structure, although clearly not that of a commoner. Rather, an abundant array of imported Greek pottery,¹² locally produced fine ceramics,¹³ carved bone, antler and ivory inlays and fittings for furniture,¹⁴ bronze objects¹⁵ as well as a limited amount of gold and silver jewelry¹⁶ attest to the wealth and high status of the inhabitants. In addition to these products, storage and cooking wares were found.¹⁷

The building was also decorated with cut-out akroteria.¹⁸ These impressive decorative elements, which were mounted on the ridge pole tiles of the roof, would have been visible from a considerable distance.¹⁹ In fact, Rystedt links such decoration to the social phenomenon of aristocratic display designed not only to adorn, but also to communicate to the viewer the social stature and importance of the building’s occupants.²⁰

The building was interpreted as a residence shortly after its discovery, although the excavators have consistently suggested the building may have served additional purposes.²¹ Several scholars have assumed that the multiple functions and purposes of this “Lower Sanctuary” are reflected in the later Archaic Period building,²² which was constructed on a grander scale. However, early labels for the structure, such as “Lower Sanctuary,” carry with them a weight of inference and interpretation that is no longer appropriate given additional evidence that has since come to light. As a result, the excavators adopted the neutral term “Upper Building” to describe the Archaic Period Structure.²³ Consequently, the seventh century B.C. residential building that lay below its floor level was termed the “Lower

Building” due to the stratigraphic relationship between the two. The recent discovery of another building, situated beneath the south flank Archaic Period structure, renders the singular name “Lower Building” problematic. This difficulty will be addressed below and an alternative system of nomenclature will be suggested.

The distinctive and largely unparalleled stylistic traits of many of the finely wrought items in bone, antler and ivory, as well as bronze found on the floor, raised the possibility that they were locally produced.²⁴ This hypothesis was confirmed in the succeeding years with the discovery of a large structure situated on the extreme southeastern corner of Piano del Tesoro. The building came to be referred to as the “Southeast Building,” because of its position on the plateau.²⁵

This building, impressive in size and decoration, originally stretched no less than 51 m on its sides and was roughly 6.6 m wide.²⁶ Like the Lower Building it displayed an elaborately decorated roof whose pitch is estimated to have been 32° - 35°, as demonstrated by the recovery of plaster elements impacted into the gable.²⁷ Unlike the residential structure discussed above, this building did not employ stone foundations nor were there pise walls. Instead, three rows of at least nineteen wooden columns resting on flat, irregular stone pads supported the tiled roof and covered a floor of beaten earth. To date a total of forty-six column pads have been revealed. Additionally, twelve smaller stone “pads,” placed about 0.35 m to the north of some of the column bases, are preserved along the northern flank of the building.²⁸

Evidence from this building conclusively demonstrates that the structure was a workshop of the middle to late seventh century B.C. Lying directly on the floor at the center of the preserved portion of the building were a series of unfired clay cover tiles, drying in the shade of the roof. These tiles, which clearly indicate the manufacture of architectural terracottas in the building, were partially fired by the conflagration that destroyed the workshop. In fact, in the ensuing chaos, workers inadvertently stepped upon the drying clay, sealing their footprints in the tiles.²⁹ Further to the north, yet still within the building, a terracotta mold for the production of human-headed antefixes was found, lying on the floor.

The eastern portion of the building yielded evidence of production in bone, antler, and ivory as well as bronze.³⁰ Furthermore, spindle whorls, rocchetti, and loom weights found throughout the building indicate that cloth also may have been produced in this structure.³¹

Such compelling and direct evidence for ceramic production in the building has yet to emerge. To date, no pottery kiln has been found in the vicinity. However, the floor and general area around the building have produced an enormous quantity of highly distinctive pottery types rendered in local clay, few of which have any direct parallels at other sites.³² This observation, combined with the production of architectural terracottas, strongly argues for the likelihood of pottery production in this workshop as well.³³

Joins between fragments of ceramic from both destruction fills strongly suggest that both the “Southeast Building” workshop and the “Lower Building” were destroyed at the same time (Figs. 1-2).³⁴ At the very least, these joins indicate that the destroyed remains of both buildings were disturbed at the same time. Complementary evidence, such as stylistic correspondences between architectural decoration as well as ceramics and bone, antler, or ivory figurines and inlays found in both buildings, seems to indicate that the buildings stood together on the plateau during the late seventh century and possibly into the early sixth century B.C.³⁵



figure 1



figure 2



figure 3

The presence of quantities of datable imported Greek pottery within the “Lower Building” provides a chronological anchor for the destruction of this phase of the site. An Early Corinthian skyphos, found on the floor of the Lower Building, has been dated by C. Boulter, John Hayes and others to the end of the seventh century, while fragments of Laconian II pottery also found in the building are placed at roughly the same period (620-600 B.C.).³⁶ The examples of East Greek cups found in the building fall into the same chronological window, i.e., roughly 620-580 B.C.³⁷ Numerous fragments of identical East Greek cups have also been found in the destruction fill of the workshop and on its floor (Fig. 3).³⁸

The presence of a third building, positioned between the Lower Building residence and the Southeast Building workshop, adds another component to a seventh century B.C. complex of buildings on Piano del Tesoro. The presentation of this recently uncovered building will be facilitated by a few words devoted to the nomenclature of all three structures.

The terms “Lower Building” and “Southeast Building” require reconsideration. With respect to the “Southeast Building,” the overwhelming weight of evidence indicates that it served as a workshop. As mentioned above, the building itself is not oriented on a southeast axis, but rather a nearly east/west axis, a point of confusion to some scholars.

Most observers of the “Lower Building” are in agreement as well, viewing the structure as some form of residence. The obviously neutral term of “Lower Building” could be allowed to stand, were it not for the fact that another building has been identified beneath the foundations of the Archaic Period building.

For the sake of clarity, the following definitions will be used: the “Lower Building,” which functioned as a domicile, among other possible uses, will be called Orientalizing Complex Building 1/Residence (OC1/Residence). The “Southeast Building” henceforth will be labeled Orientalizing Complex Building 2/Workshop (OC2/Workshop). The presentation of the newly defined third structure will follow this schema and the building will be called Orientalizing Complex Building 3 and abbreviated OC3/Tripartite. Since we are not yet prepared to posit a function for this structure, the additional element of the abbreviation refers only to the building’s form.³⁹

OC3/Tripartite was positioned approximately seven meters south of the southern end wall of OC1/Residence (formerly the “Lower Building”) and ran perpendicularly to it

(Ill. 1). Although the foundations are poorly preserved in some areas, sufficient evidence remains to determine the floor plan and approximate dimensions of the structure.

The building's overall length is 23.2 - 23.25 m as measured along its northern face and 9.2 m wide in areas where both the northern and southern foundation walls are preserved. Two interior cross walls divide the building into three chambers. The central room measures 9.45 m from the eastern interior wall to the western interior wall and is 7.1 m wide from the northern interior wall to the southern interior wall. The eastern room measures 4.6 m from the eastern to the western interior walls and 7.0 - 7.1 m from the northern to the southern interior walls. The western chamber is 4.6 m from the eastern to the western interior wall and, while the southern foundation wall is lost along its southwestern edge, is assumed to have been approximately 7.0 - 7.1 m from the northern to the southern interior wall.

These dimensions present us with a building divided into three rooms. The central room is almost twice the size as its two flanking chambers. This relationship is certainly not accidental, as the building's dimensions appear to have been organized according to a predictable unit of measurement. Hans Linden, the excavation architect during the early years of work at the site, hypothesized a basic unit of measurement for the construction of the Archaic Period building.⁴⁰ This unit of .27 meters appears to have been employed not only for the building of the Archaic Period, but also those structures datable to the Orientalizing Period.⁴¹

For example, the total length of OC1/Residence along its western wall is 36.2 meters, while the building's width is 8.4 - 8.6 meters. These dimensions yield measurements in Linden's "Oscan foot" of 134.0 units by 31.1 to 31.8 units.

While OC2/Workshop does not provide us with measurable foundation walls, the intercolumniations, both longitudinal and transverse, are approximately 2.7 meters, a length evenly divisible into 10 of Linden's units.⁴² Perhaps even more compelling are the measurements of the pan tiles and lateral sima elements. Each measures 0.54 meters, or two of Linden's units, perhaps suggesting that the tiles themselves were the mechanism of measurement.⁴³

Finally, OC3/Tripartite presents a series of dimensions that closely correspond to the same unit of measurement (Table 1):


TABLE 1:

(Overall Dimensions)

Width - 9.2 meters wide	$9.2/.27=34.0$
Length - 23.25 meters long	$23.25/.27=86.1$

(Interior Dimensions)

Central cella - 9.45 meters (eastern interior wall to western interior wall)	$9.45/.27=35.0$
7.1 meters (northern interior wall to southern interior wall)	$7.1/.27=26.2$
Western cella - 4.6 meters (eastern interior wall to western interior wall)	$4.6/.27=17.0$



POGGIO CIVITATE MURLO

ORIENTALIZING PERIOD STRUCTURES

SCALE 1:200

0 10 20 30

C COPELAND

1999

illustration 1

Width of western cella is indeterminable

Eastern cella – 4.6 meters (eastern interior wall to western interior wall)

$4.6/.27=17.0$

7.0 meters (northern interior wall to southern interior wall)


$7.0/.27=25.9$

It bears repeating that the foundations of these structures are often poorly preserved and any hypotheses dependent upon the dimensions presented here should therefore be regarded with a degree of caution. The variable state of preservation of these foundations, especially the poor condition of the southern wall of OC3/Tripartite, may be due in part to the robbing of stone for the construction of the Archaic Period building's walls. The close correspondence between this basic unit of measurement and the dimensions of OC3/Tripartite suggest that the building was planned and constructed according to a specific architectural plan, however cursory, and with the use of a unit of measurement that is utilized in the other buildings of the Orientalizing Period as well as that of the Archaic Period.⁴⁴ The use of a constant unit reinforces the conclusion of a continuity of inhabitants or builders throughout the floruit of the site.

In 1996, when excavation was reinitiated beneath the floor of the Archaic Period building, large portions of the western side of the Archaic building's southern flank had already been extensively excavated. As a result, only a limited portion of this area remained available for further examination. It represents approximately 9.5 square m of a floor area of OC3/Tripartite, which can be estimated to have originally been 131.49 square meters.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, even this limited preserved area yielded stratigraphic evidence of a burned stratum immediately above the structure's beaten earth floor. This stratum is characterized by heavy concentrations of carbon, burned material, and plaster. An identical stratum of burned soil is visible immediately west of the building's western wall and runs north beneath the foundation wall of the Archaic Building's western face. Although previous years of excavation have made an intact, continuous section between the northern wall of OC3/Tripartite and the southern wall of OC1/Residence impossible, the northern extent of the section illustrated here aligns approximately with the southern wall of OC1/Residence (Ill. 2). The same burned stratum appears to rest upon the floor levels of OC3/Tripartite and OC1/Residence, indicating both were destroyed by the same event.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to determine the precise stratigraphic relationship between OC2/Workshop, OC1/Residence and OC3/Tripartite. The level of bedrock rises in elevation to the center of Piano del Tesoro and the continuation of the burned stratum associated with OC2/Workshop's destruction is lost. Nevertheless, both the character of the soil and the materials found within the destruction fills of all three buildings suggest that they were destroyed in the same event.⁴⁶ While the evidence points to a time in the late seventh century B.C. when all three buildings were standing together, it has yet to confirm if they were built contemporaneously or sequentially, and if so in what order.

Several interesting and chronologically significant materials were recovered from the floor of OC3/Tripartite. In comparison to the quantities of ceramics recovered from




NOTES:

ARROW/LEADER SYMBOLS DESIGNATE DIRECTION OF VIEW TO TRENCH BULK. NOT ACTUAL SECTION LOCATION.
 HORIZONTAL LENGTH OF METERS IS DISTORTED/EXTENDED TO REFLECT TRUE MASTERPLAN LOCATION THAT IS RELATIVELY ASKEWED WITH TRENCH BULK.

LEGEND

	TOPSOIL 2.5Y 5/3		BURN LAYER 10YR 4/2-5/2
	STONES		TERRA COTTA
	LT BRN SOIL 2.5Y 6/3		PLASTER
	MD BRN SOIL 2.5Y 7/3		STERILE
	YELLOW SOIL 2.5Y 7.4-7/6		BEDROCK

illustration 2



POGGIO CIVITATE MURLO

AG 9 EXT

SCALE 1:20



C COPELAND

1998

the floors of OC1/Residence and OC2/Workshop, substantially less pottery was recovered from the preserved floor of OC3/Tripartite. Those ceramics that were found on OC3/Tripartite's floor consist almost exclusively of fine wares, including several examples of narrowly datable vessels imported from elsewhere in Etruria (see appendix, Nos. 1, 4, 5, 9 - 17). They appear to have been manufactured no later than the second quarter of the seventh century. This is particularly true of Nos. 16 & 17.

TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS:

The presence of pan and cover tiles on the floor of OC3/Tripartite in combination with the unusually wide foundations lead one to conclude that the roof was tiled. Less certain is the question of architectural decoration. Excavation in 1968 yielded several fragments of cut-out style akroterial sculpture from within the area bounded by the walls of the building. Excavation in 1998 produced another impressive fragment of such sculpture, although its precise form is difficult to determine. The piece was not found within the area of the walls of OC3/Tripartite foundations, but a few meters to the north (see appendix, No. 18). Given the presence of fragments of such akroterial sculpture, as well as the ample evidence for the related decorative schemes of OC1/Residence and OC2/Workshop, it is likely that OC3/Tripartite was similarly decorated.⁴⁷

The stratigraphic evidence from the destruction horizon of OC3/Tripartite suggests that it was destroyed in the same event that burned down the other two structures of the complex. While both OC1/Residence and OC2/Workshop produced several examples of intact or fragmentary Ionian pottery datable to the last quarter of the seventh century, the same cannot be said for OC3/Tripartite.⁴⁸ Instead, materials recovered from the floor of OC3/Tripartite, such as those presented in the Appendix (see especially Nos. 13-17), appear to cluster around or fall earlier than the upper chronological bracket of the site's imported Greek pottery. This may suggest that the building's function encouraged a more conservative use of materials than either the residence or the workshop.

The addition of this building to the other Orientalizing Period structures previously known on Piano del Tesoro raises some intriguing possibilities. The presence of two buildings, OC1/Residence and OC3/Tripartite, set at perpendicular angles to one another and creating an open space between may help shed light on the emergent form of the subsequent building of the Archaic Period and its large, enclosed courtyard.⁴⁹ With these three buildings of the Orientalizing Period, we may be seeing the formation of a complex of related, similarly decorated structures, each with a separate and distinct function. Its second iteration, in the Archaic period is manifested by a single, unified, structure that draws the disparate functions of the site's earlier phase into a single multifunctional architectural unit. The architectural form of OC3/Tripartite may be an important clue to its original function and the tripartite division of rooms immediately invites comparison with religious architecture of a later period. Yet nothing recovered from the floor of the structure allows the excavators to conclude definitively that the building served a

religious function. The form of OC3/Tripartite does raise an interesting question: what might an Etruscan religious structure of the mid to late seventh century look like? Our recent excavations of OC3/Tripartite have not revealed any indications of a podium or a frontal colonnade characteristic of many later Etruscan temples.⁵⁰ It is intriguing to see this complex of buildings fulfilling different functions in the service of an emergent elite class at Poggio Civitate: OC1/Residence standing as a monumental domicile, OC2/Workshop operating as the community's center of manufacturing, and OC3/Tripartite serving as the architectural expression of the religious beliefs of this early Etruscan community.

The recent work at Poggio Civitate has served to provide much greater detail to an Orientalizing Complex originally suggested by Nielsen and Phillips.⁵¹ To date, all material recovered from OC3/Tripartite provides a chronological spectrum ranging from the second quarter of the seventh century B.C. to the end of that century, a range in keeping with material from OC1/Residence and OC2/Workshop. Furthermore, this material serves to support the earlier conclusions of Rystadt and Winter regarding the date of the Orientalizing period architectural decoration.⁵² The current state of evidence suggests that all three structures stood together at some point on Piano del Tesoro, perhaps constructed some time either shortly before or shortly after the middle of the seventh century B.C. and destroyed around the end of that century. It is possible all three buildings were constructed at roughly the same time or within a decade of one another. In considering a sequential order for their appearance on the hill, one might see in the unusually thick foundations of OC3 a manifestation of the builders' inexperience and insecurity at supporting the weight of a heavily tiled and decorated roof, something not evident in the other two buildings and thus suggesting its primacy.

To date, these early structures on Piano del Tesoro appear to form a complex of related buildings, sharing a close physical proximity and similar terracotta roofing systems. While future work may further clarify the function of these buildings or reveal additional structures of the Orientalizing Period on the plateau or elsewhere on the hill, discoveries and data outside of Poggio Civitate are needed with which to place the site within its proper context. Definitive statements regarding the purpose of the site should be taken with a degree of caution. As yet, the absence of comparanda outside of Poggio Civitate need not indicate that the site was unique, nor can we assume that sites with monumental complexes like Poggio Civitate were necessarily common. Until such comparative information emerges, excavation at Poggio Civitate will serve to add further nuance to an already enigmatic site.

Erik O. Nielsen
Franklin College, Switzerland

Anthony S. Tuck
Tufts University

Appendix



figure 4 – Incised Bucchero

NO. 1 (FIG. 4)

Murlo Inv. 96-111

Incised Bucchero

Max. Pres. Width: 0.048m; Max. Pres. Length: 0.034m; Max. Pres. Thickness: 0.004m

Condition: Broken on all sides. Incised decoration is preserved on the exterior face. The surface is well preserved.

Grid Location: E141/S19

Fabric: Bucchero

Munsell: gley N3/ dark gray

Fragment of an incised bucchero vessel. The fragment, possibly a portion of the vessel's shoulder, is highly burnished on its exterior, convex face, and equally burnished with indications of wheel marks on its concave face. The convex face is decorated with an incised pattern. The center element of the preserved pattern consists of two intersecting V-shaped elements surmounted by a semi-circular line, forming a lotus bud. Portions of three semi-circular lines flank this central element, perhaps forming the fronds of a palmette. Three smaller portions of semi-circular lines are preserved on one edge of the fragment.

This fragment, with its fine incised decoration, is unusual at Poggio Civitate. The decorative pattern appears to be that of a vegetal motif, although indications of further incision suggest that the motif was somewhat more developed. The wheel striations on the vessel's interior surface indicate two possible orientations for the pattern, either with the V-shaped portions of the lotus bud at an apex or a nadir.

The overwhelming majority of decorative motifs at Poggio Civitate employ stamped designs, although some incised designs have been recovered. However, such incised designs are not typically as complex or as carefully rendered as that displayed on this fragment, perhaps suggesting the vessel was imported, possibly from a center such as Vulci.⁵³



figure 5 – Bronze Fibula

NO. 2 (FIG. 5)

Murlo Inv. 98-135

Bronze Fibula

Max. Pres. Length: 0.021m; Max. Pres. Width: 0.011m; Max. Pres. Diameter: 0.013m

Condition: The piece is heavily oxidized and broken at the extension point of the pin, at the attachment point of one pin to the upper body and the second pin at the lower point of the coil. One of the ball segments of the upper body is broken off but preserved.

Grid Location: E137.61/S22.86

Fabric: Bronze

The fibula is of a form commonly called a drago fibula. A single bar separates the body of the fibula from the rounds of the spring. Portions of one spring are preserved and round to the break. The preserved portions of the body project from the bar to a diamond shaped segment. A narrow extension projects to a pair of lateral balls, one of which is now detached from the body of the fibula. From the ball segment projects a second diamond shaped segment that displays a broken face at the outer end.

Fibulae of this type are fairly common throughout the Orientalizing Period of Etruria. Only one example is previously known from Poggio Civitate and is a stray find, perhaps washed from one of the tombs of Poggio Agguzo.⁵⁴ Warden notes that the fibula is found across a rather broad chronological range, from the beginning of the 7th to the end of the 6th century B.C.⁵⁵ This piece is the only example of a fibula from the floor of this building.

NO. 3 (FIG. 6)

*Murlo Inv. 97-183**Impasto Bowl**Max. Pres. Diameter of Rim: 0.129m; Max. Pres. Diameter of Body: 0.193m, Max. Diameter of Base: 0.090m**Condition: A full profile of the vessel has been restored from 25 fragments of varying size. The surface of the fabric is worn and pitted on both the interior and exterior faces of the bowl.**Grid Location: E136/S25**Fabric: Impasto**Munsell: Ranges from 7.5 YR 7/2 pinkish gray to 5YR 4/4 reddish brown to 7.5 YR 5/1 gray**figure 6 – Impasto Bowl*

This impasto vessel displays a full profile. The vessel rests on a flat base and rises with steeply convex sides to a slightly articulated shoulder. A line of incision surmounted by a low ridge defines the shoulder. The ridge is reticulated by a series of short, hatched, evenly spaced lines, positioned roughly one centimeter apart from one another. The slightly convex rim rises from the shoulder and terminates at a flat, angularly edged rim.

The well preserved condition of this vessel strongly suggests that the object was resting on the floor of OC3/Tripartite at the time of the building's destruction. Although other shards of impasto were recovered from the building's destruction fill, only this example produced a full profile. However, fragments of similar vessels, both in terms of form and decoration, have been found elsewhere on the site and are by no means uncommon in the destruction fills of either OC1/Residence or OC2/Workshop. The fabric of this example, as with others like it from Poggio Civitate, is certainly local.⁵⁶ The piece is included here to demonstrate that at least one example of a coarseware vessel was present in the building in addition to the finewares described below.

NO. 4 (FIG. 7)

*Murlo Inv. 97-113**Decorated Bucchero Fragment**Max. Pres. Length: 0.043; Max. Pres. Height: 0.020m; Max. Pres. Thickness: 0.004m**Condition: Fragment is broken on all sides. Both the concave and convex surfaces are slightly worn and pitted.**Grid Location: E138.87/S23.61**Fabric: Bucchero**Munsell: 5Y 3/1 very dark gray**figure 7 – Decorated Bucchero Fragment*

The exterior, convex face of the fragment displays three lines of incision, running laterally along the fragment at its point of greatest convexity. Surmounting the uppermost line of incision are portions of two preserved fan patterns, rendered in finely stippled dots. Immediately above the fan pattern, the fragment turns slightly, suggesting an everted rim.

The fragment appears to come from a shallow cup with a sharply everted rim. The fan pattern displayed along the uppermost portion of the fragment is unusual for Poggio Civitate, although a few examples of similar decoration have been recovered elsewhere on the site. Although this fragment is small, its shape and decoration appear to correspond to a type identified by Rasmussen.⁵⁷ This Type 3C cup is, according to Rasmussen, rare and only known from Tarquinia. He lists only four known examples and places the group within the last quarter of the seventh century. The distinctive fan pattern decoration, unusual for Poggio Civitate, may indicate that this piece was imported, perhaps from Tarquinia.



figure 8 – Handle Fragment



figure 9 – Handle Fragment

Phillips had previously suggested that the Ionian cups from the floor of OC1/Residence could represent a fine banquet service.⁵⁹ Conceivably, pouring vessels could have accompanied cups intended for drinking as well.

NO. 5 (FIGS. 8-9)

Murlo Inv. 97-151

Handle Fragment

Max. Pres. Length: 0.035m; Max. Pres. Width: 0.027m; Max. Pres. Thickness: 0.008m

Condition: Broken on both ends. Two finished faces and two finished edges are preserved. Black paint is visible on one surface. Both surfaces are worn and scratched.

Grid Location: E135/S18

Fabric: Ionic ceramic

Munsell: 2.5Y/7/3 pale yellow; paint: 5YR 5/3 olive.

Fragment of a strap handle with a roughly elliptical cross section. One surface of the handle preserves grayish black paint.

Numerous examples of Ionian cups or fragments of such cups were recovered from the floors of OC1/Residence and OC2/Workshop and have been dated to roughly 620-600.⁵⁸ While this fragment certainly comes from a different type of vessel, perhaps a pouring vessel of some type, its fabric indicates that it is Ionian.



figure 10 – Bucchero Wing Handle Fragment



figure 11 – Bucchero Wing Handle Fragment

NO. 6 (FIGS. 10-11)

Murlo Inv. 98-116

Bucchero Wing Handle Fragment

Max. Pres. Length: 0.046m; Max. Pres. Height: 0.26m; Max. Pres. Thickness: 0.011m

Condition: Conserved from two fragments. The handle displays two break edges, one at the attachment point to the vessel and the other through the tubular terminal finial. The surface is slightly worn and pitted.

Grid Location: E138.04/S23.61

Fabric: Bucchero

Munsell: 2.5Y 3/1 very dark gray

The fragment preserves one extending strut and one lateral, terminal finial. The break edge of the extending strut is slightly concave, suggesting an attachment point to the vessel wall. The extending strut attaches to a tubular finial that runs laterally along the outer edge of the handle and parallel to the vessel wall.



figure 12 – Bucchero Wing
Handle Fragment

NO. 7 (FIGS. 12-13)

Murlo Inv. 97-88

Bucchero Wing Handle Fragment

Max. Pres. Length of Fragment: 0.055m; *Max. Pres. Width:* 0.049m;
Length of Handle: 0.045m; *Thickness of Handle:* 0.011m

Condition: The handle fragment is restored from ten pieces. One outer corner of the handle is missing as well as a portion of the interior edge along the attachment point to the bowl. The surface is slightly cracked, but highly burnished and well preserved.

Grid Location: E138/S26

Fabric: Bucchero

Munsell: Gley N2.5/



figure 13 – Bucchero Wing
Handle Fragment

This fragmentary wing handle consists of a flat element projecting laterally from the shoulder of the vessel. Portions of two evenly spaced, finished perforations are visible through the center of the handle. The handle's outer edge is defined by one and fragmentary portions of another finial that project laterally from the outer edge.



figure 14 – Bucchero Wing
Handle Fragment

NO. 8 (FIG. 14)

Murlo Inv. 97-87

Bucchero Wing Handle Fragment

Max. Pres. Length: 0.017m; *Max. Pres. Width:* 0.017m; *Thickness:* 0.009m

Condition: The fragment is broken on three sides with one finished edge preserved. The surface is smooth and burnished.

Grid Location: E136/S26

Fabric: Bucchero

Munsell: gley N2.5/

This wing handle fragment preserves portions of the finished outer terminal edge. A portion of a finished bore hole, similar to the perforations of No. 7, is visible on the edge opposite the finished edge. The similarity in fabric and form suggests that this fragment and No. 7 may represent one vessel.

These three fragments, possibly representing two vessels, were found directly on the floor of OC3/Tripartite. They represent examples of a regionally distinctive type of cup with projecting, terminal handles, or wing handles. Several examples of such wing handled cup vessels have already been identified at Poggio Civitate, although these fragments represent types previously unparalleled at the site.⁶⁰ No. 6 is somewhat smaller, but similar in form to an example of a wing handled cup from Tolle and probably originally displayed a series of willow-leaf shaped fenestrations through the broad, flat face of the handle.⁶¹ Nos. 7 and 8 are similar to a type already identified at Poggio Civitate, but differ in that they display two perforations rather than a single perforation through the handle's center.⁶² When recovered from secure contexts at Poggio Civitate, such wing handle cups are only found in association with Orientalizing strata.



figure 15 – Stamped Bucchero Fragment

NO. 9 (FIG. 15)

Murlo Inv. 98-123

Stamped Bucchero Fragment

Max. Pres. Length: 0.059m; Max. Pres. Width: 0.045m; Max. Pres. Thickness: 0.011 Width of Stamped Decoration: 0.021m

Condition: Fragment is broken on all sides and the surface is worn and pitted.

Grid Location: E137.81/S23.36

Fabric: Bucchero

Munsell: 7.5 YR 2.5/1 black

The lower edge of the fragment displays a finished, beveled ridge, suggesting a recessed tondo. Above this beveled ridge is a burnished, undecorated band surmounted by a deep, curved ridge. This ridge forms the groundline for a roulette-stamped decorative scheme. The preserved portions of the stamped design consist of anthropoid figures and quadrupeds. The leftmost figure appears to preserve a portion of an animal torso attached to a human body, perhaps a centaur, striding toward a standing human figure who reaches out to the first. In the center of the fragment stands a grazing stag with its head touching the groundline defined by the decorative ridge. In front of the stag are the hindquarters of another quadruped.

Roulette-stamped decoration such as this is not common at Poggio Civitate, although several roughly comparable examples have been recovered.⁶³ While such roulette-stamped decoration suggests a close affinity with larger centers such as Chiusi and Roselle, many roulette stamps from Poggio Civitate, such as No. 9, remain unparalleled outside the site, suggesting that such decorative techniques were locally utilized for products that were also locally consumed.



figure 16 – Bucchero Rim Fragment with Cutout Decoration



figure 17 – Bucchero Rim Fragment with Cutout Decoration

NO. 10 (FIGS. 16-17)

98-117

Bucchero Rim Fragment with Cutout Decoration

Max. Pres. Length: 0.019m; Max. Pres. Width: 0.021m; Max. Pres. Thickness: 0.002m. Max. Pres. Thickness of Rim: 0.006; Diameter of Circular Cutout: 0.007m

Condition: The fragment is slightly worn and scratched and the interior surface is unfinished. Portions of five finished edges are visible on the various faces of the fragment.

Grid Location: E137.81/S23.36

Fabric: Bucchero

Munsell: 10YR 2/1 Black

The fragment displays a high, finished beveled edge. The convex face of the fragment is burnished and displays portions of several geometric cutout designs. One circular cutout design is nearly intact while three additional linear finished edges appear to suggest triangular cutout designs. The interior, concave surface of the fragment is rough and unfinished with several visible areas where excess clay from the process of cutting out the geometric designs protrudes from the surface.

Fine bucchero with such cutout decoration is not common at Poggio Civitate, although a few similar examples have been recovered from the OC2/Workshop destruction fill. The precise function of these delicate and unusual vessels remains unknown, although vessels with similar cutout decoration from Artimino have been recovered from Artimino as well as other sites.⁶⁴ The convex outer surface of this example indicates that it is unlike the example from Artimino and is probably not the base of a flared, conical stand. Instead, it seems possible that this example served as a cover or lid, perhaps for a thurible of some sort.



figure 18 – Painted Oinochoe
Fragment

NO. 11 (FIGS. 18-19)

Murlo Inv. 98-121

Painted Oinochoe Fragment

Max. Pres. Length: 0.044m; *Max. Pres. Width:* 0.033m; *Max Pres. Thickness:* 0.005m

Condition: The fragment is broken on all sides and the surface is heavily abraded and worn.

Grid Location: E137.74/S22.78

Fabric: Italo-Corinthian

Munsell: 7.5 YR 8/3 pink



figure 19 – Painted Oinochoe
Fragment

This fragment consists of two joined elements. On the exterior face, this juncture forms an acute angle of roughly 35° and is delineated by a raised, beveled band. On the interior, obtuse side, the juncture is irregularly raised with the excess clay of the join clearly visible. Red paint is preserved on the lower half of the exterior face. Although poorly preserved, this red paint infills several delicately rendered intersecting scallops emanating from the raised beveled band. Each scallop design is rendered by two parallel semi-circular lines. Red paint is also visible on the upper portion of the neck.



figure 20 – Italo-Corinthian
Plate Fragment

NO. 12 (FIG. 20)

Murlo Inv. 98-142

Italo-Corinthian Plate Fragment

Max. Pres. Length: 0.069m; *Max. Pres. Height:* 0.039m; *Max. Pres. Thickness:* 0.009m

Condition: The fragment is broken on all sides and the surface is lightly worn. The paint is generally well preserved, although somewhat faded.

Grid Location: E136.18/S23.95

Fabric: Italo-Corinthian

Munsell: 7.5 YR 8/3 pink

This fragment of pottery preserves portions of reddish brown and red paint on its concave surface. Two painted curved lines are preserved along the lower edge of the fragment. These lines form a groundline for a partially preserved painted feline. The feline is crouching and its shoulder is rendered by two lightly incised semicircular lines. Three parallel red bands of paint render the animal's torso. Another lightly incised line is used to render the rear haunch and paw of the lion. Above the shoulder of the lion is a single painted dot surmounted by another painted, curved line. Above this upper curved line is a rosette rendered by an X pattern incised onto the surface of a large painted dot.

No. 12 is almost certainly a plate fragment since the piece displays little curvature and is painted on its concave surface. Unfortunately, nothing is preserved that would indicate the vessel's form. However, with respect to another Italo-Corinthian vessel from the floor of OC1/Residence, Phillips has previously noted that tombs from Vulci have produced large numbers of Italo-Corinthian vessels with incised decoration and overpainted animals.⁶⁵ This fragment, which is similarly decorated, may represent another example of such an import from Vulci.

NO. 13 (FIG. 21)

Murlo Inv. 97-129

Fragmentary Bucchero Handle

Fragment A: Max. Pres. Height: 0.041m; Max. Pres. Width: 0.0664m; Max. Thickness: 0.0046m

Fragment B: Max. Pres. Height: 0.0245m; Max. Pres. Width: 0.017m; Max. Thickness: 0.0021m

Fragment C: Max. Pres. Height: 0.0039m; Max. Pres. Width: 0.0020m; Max. Thickness: 0.0036m

Fabric: Bucchero

Munsell: gley N2.5/black

Grid Location: E136.66/S25.56; E136/S26



figure 21 – *Fragmentary Bucchero Handle*

Fragment A is conserved from 15 pieces and broken on three sides with one finished edge preserved. Both the interior and exterior surfaces are burnished and well preserved.

Fragments B and C both display portions of finished edges, but do not join to Fragment A. Fragment B is conserved from two pieces while fragment C is conserved from three fragments.

Fragment A preserves a slight curvature and is convex on its decorated surface. The decoration consists of a large circular element with traces of a recessed decorative element projecting from its lower side. In the center of the incised circular element is another incised circle divided into four quadrants by a cross pattern. At the center of the cross is a small recessed circular area. Neither fragment B nor C displays indications of the decorative pattern.

NO. 14 (FIG. 22)

Murlo Inv. 97-128

Decorated Bucchero Handle

Max. Pres. Height: 0.066m; *Max. Pres. Width:* 0.039m; *Max. Pres. Thickness:* 0.010m

Condition: Broken at both ends and restored to its current condition from seven fragments. The surface is slightly worn and pitted.

Grid Location: E137/S26

Fabric: Bucchero

Munsell: gley N3/very dark gray



figure 21 – *Decorated Bucchero Handle*

Fragment of a bucchero handle with a generally ovoid section. The piece tapers from its base to a narrow upper end, thickening slightly and rounding in section as it rises. The lower portion of the handle is decorated with portions of six stamped registers of decoration. Each stamped design consists of a rhombus divided by four thin lines. The lowest register is fragmentary, preserving portions of four stamps. The next register preserves portions of two stamps and six intact stamps. The third displays seven intact stamps, the fourth six, the fifth, five and the uppermost register displays four. Surmounting the registers of rhombi are four parallel lines comprised of articulated diagonal lines.



figure 23 – Decorated Bucchero Handle

NO. 15 (FIG. 23)

Murlo Inv. 97-179

Decorated Bucchero Handle

Max. Pres. Length: 0.025m; *Max. Pres., Height:* 0.017m; *Max. Pres. Thickness:* 0.006m

Condition: Fragment is broken on two sides and rather worn and pitted across its surface.

Grid Location: E136-139/S25-26

Fabric: Bucchero

Munsell: 5YR 2.5/1 black

This fragment is of a handle nearly identical to No. 14, although portions of only three rhomboid stamps are preserved. Portions of three lines comprised of stippled dots surmount these stamps. The interior face of the fragment is striated and unfinished, perhaps indicating work lines at the interior attachment point to the upper portion of the handle.

Although these three fragments do not join, their form suggests that they represent portions of two handles of a highly distinctive type. The handle's form is akin to that of the Monteriggioni kyathos, now displayed in Volterra's Guarnacci Archaeological Museum.⁶⁶ The tapering finished edges of the broad, flat fragment (no. 13) indicate that the original piece displayed a hooded handle with the narrow end of No. 14 attaching in the center of the handle's apex. In fact, the stamped rhomboid patterns on the handle's inner face are identical to those on the Monteriggioni kyathos, suggesting both were manufactured in the same location. We agree with Cristofani that this location is most likely Populonia.⁶⁷



figure 24 – Bucchero Base with Inscription

NO. 16 (FIG. 24-25)

Murlo Inv. 97-126

Bucchero Base with Inscription

Fragment A: *Max. Pres. Height:* 0.046m; *Max. Pres. Width:* 0.055m; *Max. Pres. Thickness:* 0.0035m

Fragment B: *Max. Pres. Height:* 0.040m; *Max. Pres. Width:* 0.021m; *Max. Pres. Thickness:* 0.003m

Fragment C: *Max. Pres. Height:* 0.030m; *Max. Pres. Width:* 0.011m; *Max. Pres. Thickness:* 0.003m

Condition: Fragment A is roughly triangular in shape, restored from five pieces and broken on two sides, preserving one finished edge. Fragment B is rectangular, broken on three sides and preserves a portion of a finished edge as well. Fragment C is triangular, but preserves no finished edges. All three fragments are well preserved and display little wear. There are traces of burnishing marks on the interior faces of all three fragments.

Grid Location: E135.5-135.8/S25.2-25.8

Fabric: Bucchero

Munsell: gley N2.5/ Black



figure 25 – Bucchero Base with Inscription

These three fragments represent portions of an inscribed conical base. Fragment A is decorated with a pair of incised lines that run parallel to the base of the vessel, forming a broad register. Within this register is an incised pattern of an inverted, interlocking double lotus palmette chain. Each lotus palmette consists of two intersecting semi-circular lines. At the nadir of each pair is another, smaller pair of opposed semi-circular lines that form the branches of the palmettes. Between these smaller lines is a circular element, which forms the lotus bud. Above the upper line of incision that defines the border of the lotus chain register are portions of four inscribed letters, apparently arranged in two registers. The rightmost

NO. 16 (FIG. 24-25) – CONTINUED

letter consists of a single vertical stroke and two diagonal strokes that project to the left, perhaps a digamma. The central letter consists of two diagonal strokes that meet an apex, forming an alpha. The left-most letter of the lower register consists of only a single vertical stroke, possibly an iota. Above the alpha is a portion of another fragmentary letter.

Fragment B is decorated with a portion of the lower incised line and portions of two lotus palmettes, while Fragment C displays a portion of the lower incised line and nearly all of one lotus palmette.

The interior surface of each fragment displays indications of burnishing.



figure 26 – Bucchero Base with
Inscription



figure 27 – Bucchero Base with
Inscription



figure 28 – Bucchero Base with
Inscription

Fragment A displays a decorative scheme that consists of a register of inverted triangles running parallel to the fragment's lower edge. Above this register of triangles is an inverted double lotus palmette chain design, although the incision of this vessel is significantly more refined and cautious than that of No. 16. The lotus palmettes of this vessel are also derived from two intersecting semi-circular lines. At the nadir of each intersection are two, small opposed semi-circular lines and a circular element. Three small lines crown each lotus bud. Above this double lotus palmette chain are two deeply incised lines that separate the lotus palmette chain from the inscription. As on No. 16, the inscription appears to occupy two registers, although fragments of only three letters of the upper register are preserved, while portions of thirteen letters are visible along the lower register. The right-most letter of the lower register is indeterminable, with its preserved portion consisting of only a portion of a diagonal stroke. The next letter consists of a single vertical stroke with a semi-circular line, forming a rho.⁶⁸ The letter that follows is a single vertical stroke surmounted by a single diagonal stroke, forming a gamma. The next letter is an alpha, formed by two intersecting diagonal strokes and a diagonal stroke between the two. The alpha is followed by an iota, formed by a single vertical stroke, followed by a theta, comprised of a

NO. 17 (FIGS. 26-28)

Murlo Inv. 97-127

Bucchero Base with Inscription

Fragment A: Max. Pres. Height: 0.089m; Max. Pres. Width of Base: 0.077; Max. Pres. Thickness: 0.004m

Fragment B: Max. Pres. Height: 0.040m; Max. Pres. Width: 0.050m; Max. Pres. Thickness: 0.003m

Fragment C: Max. Pres. Height: 0.028m; Max. Pres. Width: 0.018m; Max. Pres. Thickness: 0.0025m

Condition: Fragment A is restored from 14 pieces and preserves a portion of the finished edge of the base. The surface is well preserved toward the top of the fragment and rather worn toward the edge of the base. Fragment B is restored from five fragments and preserves a portion of the base's finished edge. The surface of Fragment B is lightly worn. Fragment C is broken on all sides with a well preserved, glossy surface.

Grid Location: E136.61-136.84/S25.41-25.95

Fabric: Bucchero

Munsell: gley N2.5/ Black

Fragment A displays a decorative scheme that consists of a register of inverted triangles running parallel to the fragment's lower edge. Above this register of triangles is an inverted double lotus palmette chain design, although the incision of this vessel is significantly more refined and cautious than that of No. 16. The lotus palmettes of this vessel are also derived from two intersecting semi-circular lines. At the nadir of each intersection are two, small opposed semi-circular lines and a circular element. Three small lines crown each lotus bud. Above this double lotus palmette chain are two deeply incised lines that separate the lotus palmette chain from the inscription. As on No. 16, the inscription appears to occupy two registers, although fragments of only three letters of the upper register are preserved, while portions of thirteen letters are visible along the lower register. The right-most letter of the lower register is indeterminable, with its preserved portion consisting of only a portion of a diagonal stroke. The next letter consists of a single vertical stroke with a semi-circular line, forming a rho.⁶⁸ The letter that follows is a single vertical stroke surmounted by a single diagonal stroke, forming a gamma. The next letter is an alpha, formed by two intersecting diagonal strokes and a diagonal stroke between the two. The alpha is followed by an iota, formed by a single vertical stroke, followed by a theta, comprised of a

circle. The theta is followed by an iota formed by again by a vertical stroke. Following this iota is a nu consisting of two roughly parallel vertical strokes connected by a diagonal stroke. Following the nu is another alpha, formed in the same manner as the first, followed by another iota, formed as are the other two. Following this iota is a partially preserved letter formed by a single vertical stroke that intersects with three diagonals, possibly forming an epsilon. The upper register of letters is represented on this fragment by an epsilon, formed by a single vertical stroke that intersects with three parallel, diagonal lines. This epsilon is positioned directly above the rho of the first register. Small portions of another letter to the right of the epsilon are visible, but the letter form is impossible to determine.

Fragment B preserves more of the base's edge, displaying the register of triangles and portions of three lotus palmettes.

Fragment C features a small portion of the uppermost line of incision that separates the double lotus chain from the inscription. Above this line are portions of four letters, two of the lower register and two of the upper register. The right-most lower letter is a mu, comprised of five intersecting diagonal strokes. The mu is followed by an iota, formed as are those of Fragment A. The portions of letters of the upper register are illegible.

Both of these vessels appear to correspond to an unusual and distinctive type of kantharos (Type 4) or kyathos (Type 3) identified by Rasmussen.⁶⁹ Camporeale assembles sixteen examples of such vessels and identifies a single workshop for their production, which he locates at Cerveteri.⁷⁰ Cristofani has re-examined the inscription of one of Camporeale's 16 vessels, the Monteriggioni kyathos, and demonstrated that the letter forms of the inscribed base of that example are northern, locating a workshop producing such vessels at Populonia.⁷¹ In the case of these two vessels from the floor of OC3/Tripartite, the difference in style and technique of decoration suggests at least two hands, and very likely two workshops. The less precise design and rendering of No. 16 is akin to the double lotus chain design seen on the Monteriggioni kyathos. Furthermore, the similarity of the hooded handle of the Monteriggioni kyathos to that of the fragmentary examples displayed by Nos. 13-15 suggests that they and No. 16 may represent as few as one or as many as three vessels of the variants produced in Populonia.

Simple visual analysis seems to indicate that No. 16 should probably be associated with a different hand than that of No. 17. The sharply rendered decoration and letter forms of No. 17 are similar to those of the kyathos recovered from the Tomba del Duce from Vetulonia. As Camporeale has demonstrated for the Tomba del Duce kyathos, that workshop is probably located at Cerveteri.⁷²

The Tomba del Duce, which produces examples of such vessels from both Populonia and Cerveteri, provides a strong chronological anchor for this vessel type. The presence of imported Proto-Corinthian pottery in Group V of the tomb suggests that these vessels are produced sometime shortly before the middle of the seventh century.⁷³

The inscriptions of these vessels are currently under study and will be published separately in the near future. Moreover, it should be noted that other examples of such vessels from both the Populonia and Cerveteri workshops have been recovered from Poggio Civitate as well as the nearby necropolis of Poggio Aguzzo. As with the inscriptions presented above, this group is currently under study and will be published at a later date.

NO. 18 (FIG. 29)

Murlo Inv. 98-143

Cut-Out Akroterion Fragment

Max. Pres. Length: 0.27m; Max. Pres. Width: 0.16m; Max. Thickness: 0.0040m

Condition: The fragment has been restored from eight pieces of varying size. The piece is broken on four sides, preserving portions of five finished edges in addition to the finished surfaces of both faces. The overall surface is rather worn and chipped, preserving portions of slip on only one face.

Grid Location: E129.20-129.45/S12.12-12.39

Fabric: Murlo Terracotta

Munsell: 2.5 YR 5/4 reddish brown



*figure 29 – Cut-Out Akroterion
Fragment*

This fragment of cut-out akroteria is of an indeterminate form. From one possible angle of orientation, the fragment displays two finished edges that form what appears to be a rectangular stem. At roughly .075m, one side cuts downward to a curved projection while the opposite side appears to curve upward. Traces of four further finished edges indicate two more curved projections rising at tangential angles to those projections previously described.

NOTES

**The 1997 through 1999 excavation seasons, during which our reinvestigation of Piano del Tesoro's southern flank was carried out, were made possible through the kind support of Dr. Angelo Bottini, Soprintendente Archeologico per la Toscana as well as the members of the Archaeological Service in Florence, particularly Dottoressa Sylvia Goggioli, the regional inspector. We are equally grateful for the generous support of the University of Evansville and Franklin College, Switzerland.*

The findings presented here are the result of a significant collective effort. Alexis Christensen (The Florida State University) coordinated work at the site during the 1997 and 1998 seasons and directed areas of excavation together with Gretchen Meyers (University of Texas) and Margarita Gleba (Bryn Mawr College) during those years. They were joined in the 1997 season by Lena Sisco (Brown University) and in 1998 by John Beeby (University of Evansville), Phoebe Segal (Brown University), Elaine Marchese (Rutgers University), and Michele Kunitz (Brown University). The success of our 1999 campaign was due in large measure to the efforts of Dr. Edward Clarke (Ph.D., University of British Columbia), John Beeby, April Combs (University of Evansville), and Tracy Bergstrom (Yale University), all of whom directed areas of excavation. April and Tracy also kindly agreed to shoulder the work of cataloguing during the 1999 season as well. The drawings and plans presented here are the product of Craig Copeland (Duda Paine, Inc.), our excavation architect in 1997 through 1999. The conservation of all materials was directed by Susi Pancaldo (London Museum), and her assistants, Eugenie Milroy (IFA) and Perry Choe (IFA). The photographic documentation is due to the efforts of Jamison Miller, our excavation photographer since 1997, as well as David Cooper (South Bend Tribune), who joined Jamison in 1999. The complex and challenging work of integrating previous years of localized grids into a single Master Grid was coordinated by Michael Tuck (Brown University), who also handled the task of cataloguing in 1997 and 1998. It is no understatement to say that without the dedication of our staff as well as their considerable patience in dealing with the excavation directors, our work would not have been possible.

As always, the success of our work at Poggio Civitate depends in large part upon the commitment and efforts of our student excavators. Their hard work and enthusiasm is greatly appreciated.

Lastly, Dr. Burton Kirkwood (University of Evansville), and Tracy Bergstrom are to be thanked for their willingness to read earlier iterations of this paper and provide helpful suggestions and corrections. However, any errors are ours alone.

1. Nielsen 1991, 245-250.
2. Nielsen 1991, 247.
3. Phillips 1989, 32.
4. Nielsen and Phillips 1977, 100.
5. Phillips 1969, 333-339.
6. For recent discussions regarding the chronology of this phase of the site, see Nielsen 1987, 116-119, and Phillips 1989, 17-18.

7. Phillips 1971, 260-261.
8. Phillips 1971, 261.
9. Phillips 1972, 252.
10. Nielsen & Phillips 1974, 265-278.
11. K.M. Phillips, Jr., et al, in Stopponi 1985, 69-98.
12. Nielsen and Phillips 1974, 265-278; K. M. Phillips, Jr. et al, in Stopponi, 1985 74-80 and Phillips 1989, 29-42 .
13. The bucchero from the floor of this building has been recently studied by Dr. Jon Berkin. His publication of this material is expected shortly.
14. Nielsen et al, in Stopponi, 1985, 94-98.
15. Warden 1985, 139, for a description of the context wherein these materials were recovered.
16. DePuma 1981, 78-89.
17. Phillips 1971, 261.
18. The authors have chosen to retain the terminology for these elements employed by Rystedt in her 1985 publication.
19. Rystedt 1983, *passim*.
20. Rystedt 1984, 367-376.
21. Phillips 1972, 321.
22. For the most recent statement to this effect, see Phillips, 1993, 80.
23. Nielsen 1991, 245-259. This publication is the first to consistently adopt these names for various structures described, although periodic uses of these terms can be found in some earlier literature as well.
24. Nielsen and Phillips in Stopponi 1985, 66. Also see Nielsen 1983, 333-348 and Nielsen 1984, 397-399.
25. Nielsen 1991, 245-259. Although Nielsen does not refer to this building as the “Southeast Building” within the text of this article, the name is used in the labels for illustrations and photographs. The name was fully adopted in other articles: Nielsen 1987, 91-119 and Nielsen 1993, 29-40.
26. This width is determined by the measurement of the outer edges of the column pads that supported the tiled roof of the structure. Considering the likely overhang of the eave of the roof, the actual dimensions of the building would probably have been slightly wider.
27. Nielsen 1991, 252, fig. 15 and Nielsen 1987, 91-92.
28. Although the function of these stones remains obscure, it appears that they were placed at regular interval before each column pad of the northern flank of the building. They may provide evidence of an attempt to support an extended overhang of the roof thus increasing the work area protected from the elements.
29. Nielsen 1991, 257, 258 fig. 30 and Nielsen 1987, 91-93.
30. Nielsen 1993, 29-40, and Nielsen 1995, and Nielsen 1998, 95-107.
31. These materials were recently studied by Margarita Gleba in conjunction with her Masters Degree from Bryn Mawr College. She is currently in the process of preparing her findings for publication.

32. Tobey, Nielsen, Rowe 1986, 115-127, concludes that the clay source utilized for virtually all of the ceramics found at the site appears to be local.
33. Nielsen and Phillips in Stopponi 1985, 69 and 80, suggest that the majority of refined ceramics of the late Orientalizing period on the site was of local production. Phillips 1994, 29-46, argues for the production of stamped impasto pottery at the site. Tuck 1999, 99, supports the argument of local production for most ceramics from the site while postulating the existence of several similar workshops located at sites throughout the region.
34. All of the bowl and one leg of this tripod bowl (Fig. 1) were found during the 1972 excavation season and were resting on the floor of the Lower Building: Murlo Inv. 72-354, Max. Pres. Height: 0.080m. Diameter of Rim: 0.11m Diameter of base: 0.10m. The original find location of the vessel was recorded based on local grid coordinates which can now be located on the overall Master Grid. Thus, the original find location of these fragments was approximately N20.2/E150.2.
- During the 1992 excavation season, work along the northern flank of the Workshop yielded another fragment of this vessel, a single leg of the tripod. The fragment was catalogued separately as: Murlo Inv. 92-42, Max. Pres. Length: 0.039m, Width at Wider Fracture: 0.019m, Width at Narrower Fracture: 0.013m. The Master Grid coordinates of this fragment are circa S57.7/E183.3, a distance of approximately 87 meters from the remaining portion of the bowl. For a published example of a similar tripod vessel also from the floor of the Lower Building, see Nielsen and Phillips 1974, 272, ill. 9.
- Additionally, a fragment of a large bucchero vessel (fragment A of Fig. 2) decorated with quadruped stamps was found in 1972 immediately outside OC1/Residence to the west in the approximate area of N22/E144: Murlo. Inv. 72-166, Fragment A (recovered in 1972): Max. Pres. Length: 0.088m, Max. Pres. Width: 0.046m, Max. Pres. Thickness: 0.010m., Fragment B (recovered in 1990): Max. Pres. Length: 0.058m, Max. Pres. Width: 0.042m, Max. Pres. Thickness: 0.010m. A joining fragment (Fragment B of fig. 2) was discovered in 1990 along the northern flank of OC2/Workshop at approximately S62/E193, a distance of circa 97 meters. NB. The Master Grid coordinates provided for these fragments indicates the approximate northwestern corner of the meter in which the pieces were found.
35. Nielsen and Phillips 1987, 94, note 5.
36. Phillips, in Stopponi 1985, 75 and Phillips 1989, 29-30.
37. Phillips, 1989, 31.
38. Fragment A: Murlo Inv. 89-78, Max. Pres. Height: 0.020m, Estimated Diameter of Base: 0.073m, Thickness of Vessel Wall: 0.003m. Grid Location: S57.879/E185.003 NB. This grid location provides the northwestern corner of the meter in which this fragment was found. Fragment B: Murlo Inv. 90-11, Max. Pres. Height: 0.039m, Max. Pres. Width: 0.035m, Thickness of Vessel Wall: 0.003m. Grid Location: S183.42/E56.3 NB. This grid location provides the northwestern corner of the meter in which this fragment was found. Fragment C: Murlo Inv. 90-74, Max. Pres. Height: 0.047m, Max. Pres. Width: 0.047m, Thickness of Vessel Wall: 0.003m. Grid Location: E189.114/S58.191 NB. This grid location provides the northwestern corner of the meter in which this

- fragment was found.
39. N.B. In adopting these terms, the authors wish to state that the term Orientalizing should in no way be viewed as culturally specific. Instead, we use the term to refer to the generally recognized chronological time frame of the Orientalizing Period, into which these buildings fall. Since the writing of this article in 1999, there has been a suggestion in print regarding the nomenclature of these structures. We hope this new system finds favor with the broader academic community.
 40. Phillips 1971, 257-258.
 41. It must be noted that the foundation walls of these structures are poorly preserved in many places. The measurements presented here are drawn from those portions of walling where dimensions can be reasonably derived. However, minor variations between the current preserved walls and the dimensions of these buildings as they stood in antiquity are to be expected.
 42. Nielsen 1987, 91, note 2.
 43. Nielsen 1987, 114, fig. 81.
 44. Phillips 1972, 251, for a schematic plan of the Archaic Period building with notation of divisions of these units of measurement.
 45. This approximation of the floor area is derived by adding the total interior floor area of the central chamber with that of the total interior floor areas of both the eastern and western wings. It is an interesting coincidence that this number translates into 487 square units of Linden's "Oscan foot."
 46. Phillips 1993, 53. He notes that the fire that destroyed OC2/Workshop was a "similar fire" to that which destroyed OC1/Residence.
 47. Rystedt 1984, *passim*. Rystedt's compelling argument regarding OC1/Residence and the later structures at the site of Acquarossa, that elaborate and decorative roofing systems should be understood in terms of aristocratic display, might also extend our understanding of all three structures of this complex. The possibility of control over production by an elite class could explain why OC2/Workshop is also elaborately decorated. See Tuck 1997, 370. A similar connection between the site's social elite and the function of OC3/Tripartite is equally intriguing, especially considering the attractive, but as yet unproven possibility of a religious function to this new building (see below).
 48. Phillips 1989, 31, for the date of the Ionian pottery recovered from the site.
 49. Phillips 1993, 54, suggests that this open space within the perpendicular area between OC1/Residence and OC3/Tripartite is not unlike that seen at Zone F of Acquarossa in the middle of the sixth century B.C. See also C. Wikander in S. Stopponi 1985, 47.
 50. However, it must be noted that the rare examples of early sixth century tripartite structures, such as that from Piazza d'Armi at Veii and another from Volsinii, have traditionally been viewed as temples in spite of the fact neither possesses a podium or pronaos. See Boëthius 1970, 35.
 51. Nielsen and Phillips in Stopponi 1985, 65.
 52. Rystadt 1983, 154 and Winter 1977, 22-23. However, in a recent communication, Nancy Winter indicated that she is uncomfortable with a construction date as early as suggested by some of the upper chronological brackets for the ceramics from the floor

- of OC3/Tripartite. She points to the moveable nature of pottery and prefers a date after the middle of the seventh century for the construction of these buildings.
53. Bonamici 1974, 163-175, presents several examples of bucchero from Vulci with incised decorative motifs. One example presented by Bonamici (pl. 23), a kantharos of a date slightly later than the other materials found on the floor of OC3/Tripartite, displays a lotus palmette motif that may be stylistically similar to the style of this example.
 54. Warden 1985, 42.
 55. Warden 1985, 42.
 56. Bouloumié-Marique 1978, 90-91, pl. XXVII, presents a series of vessels with a profile similar to this example. However, the notched decoration on the shoulder of this example remains unusual at Poggio Civitate.
 57. Rasmussen 1979, 120-121.
 58. Phillips 1989, 31.
 59. Phillips 1989, 32.
 60. Tuck 1999, 85-108.
 61. This example from Tolle was recently excavated and remains unpublished. However, it is currently on display in the Museo Civico di Chianciano Terme. It is associated with a tomb group containing an early canopic urn and Proto-Corinthian pottery datable to the second quarter of the seventh century.
 62. Tuck 1999, 82-83, and 89, although only catalogue nos. 4-5 display the finished perforations seen on these examples.
 63. Phillips 1972, fig. 25, presents a rim fragment with rouletted decoration consisting of a striding stag. Furthermore, Phillips 1970, fig. 6 shows a roulette-stamped interlocking motif of vegetal elements. Finally, Phillips 1971, fig. 31, shows a standing human figure reaching back to grasp the muzzle of a quadruped.
 64. Nicosia 1972, 376-378.
 65. Phillips 1973, 324, refers to group photographs of these tombs, which have never been formally published.
 66. Cristofani 1972, fig. 5.
 67. Cristofani 1972, 94.
 68. The authors are grateful to Dr. R. Wallace, University of Massachusetts, for his kind observations regarding the inscriptions.
 69. Rasmussen 1979, 114-115.
 70. Camporeale 1967, 119.
 71. Cristofani 1972, 94.
 72. Camporeale 1967, 119.
 73. Strøm 1971, 178-180, for a synopsis of arguments regarding the date of the *Tomba del Duce* and its various burial groups.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boëthius, A. 1970. *Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture*. New Haven.
- Bonamici, M. 1974. *I buccheri con figurazioni graffite*. Florence.
- Bouloumié-Marique, A. 1978. “La ceramique commune de Murlo (Poggio Civitate).” *MEFRA* 90.
- Camporeale, G. 1967. *Le Tomba del Duce*. Florence.
- Cristofani, C. 1972. “Osservazioni sul kyathos di Monteriggioni.” *StEtr* 40.
- DePuma, R. 1981. “Etruscan Gold and Silver Jewelry from Poggio Civitate (Murlo).” *ArchCl* 23.
- Nicosia, F. 1972. “Un bucchero di Artimino.” *StEtr* 40.
- Nielsen, E. 1984. “Speculations on an Ivory Workshop of the Orientalizing Period.” In *Crossroads of the Mediterranean*. Brown University.
- Nielsen, E. 1984. “Lotus Chain Plaques from Poggio Civitate.” In *Studi di Antichità in onore di Guglielmo Maetzke*, edited by G. Bretschneider. *Archaeologica* 49.
- Nielsen, E. 1987. “Some Preliminary Thoughts on New and Old Terracottas.” *OpRom* 16, 5.
- Nielsen, E. 1991. “Excavations at Poggio Civitate.” *Studi e Materiali* 6.
- Nielsen, E. 1993. “Further Evidence of Bronze Working at Poggio Civitate.” In *Antiche officine del bronzo: materiali, strumenti, tecniche* edited by E. Formigli. Siena.
- Nielsen, E. 1995. “Aspetti della produzione artigianale a Poggio Civitate.” In *Preziosi in oro, avorio, osso e corno: arte e tecniche degli artigiani etruschi: atti del seminario di studi ed esperimenti, Murlo, 26 settembre - 3 ottobre, 1992*, edited by E. Formigli (Siena).
- Nielsen, E. 1998. “Bronze Production at Poggio Civitate (Murlo).” *Etruscan Studies* 5.
- Nielsen, E. and Kyle M. Phillips, Jr. 1974. “Bryn Mawr College Excavations in Tuscany, 1973.” *AJA* 78.
- Nielsen, E. O. and Kyle M. Phillips, Jr. 1977. “Bryn Mawr College Excavations in Tuscany, 1977” *AJA* 81.
- Phillips, K.M., Jr. 1969. “Bryn Mawr College Excavations in Tuscany, 1968.” *AJA* 73.
- Phillips, K.M., Jr. 1970. “Bryn Mawr College Excavations in Tuscany, 1969.” *AJA* 74.
- Phillips, K.M., Jr. 1971. “Bryn Mawr College Excavations in Tuscany, 1970.” *AJA* 75.
- Phillips, K.M., Jr. 1972. “Bryn Mawr College Excavations in Tuscany, 1971.” *AJA* 76.
- Phillips, K.M., Jr. 1973. “Bryn Mawr College Excavations in Tuscany, 1972.” *AJA* 77.
- Phillips, K.M., Jr. 1989. “Greek Objects at Poggio Civitate.” *AnalRom* 17-18.
- Phillips, K.M., Jr. 1993. *In the Hills of Tuscany*. Philadelphia.
- Phillips, K.M., Jr. 1994. “Stamped Impasto Pottery Manufactured at Poggio Civitate.” In *Murlo and the Etruscans*, edited by R. DePuma and J. P. Small. Wisconsin.
- Rasmussen, T. 1979. *Bucchero Pottery from Southern Etruria*. Cambridge.
- Rystedt, E. 1983. *Acquarossa IV: Early Etruscan Akroteria from Acquarossa and Poggio Civitate (Murlo)*. Stockholm.
- Rystedt, E. 1984. “Architectural Terracottas as Aristocratic Display. The Case of 7th Century Poggio Civitate.” *OPUS* 3.
- Stopponi, S., ed. 1985. *Case e Palazzi d’Etruria*. Milan.

- Strøm, I. 1971. *Problems Concerning the Origin and Early Development of the Etruscan Orientalizing Style*. Odense.
- Tobey, M., E. Nielsen, and M.W. Rowe. 1986. "Elemental Analysis of Etruscan Ceramics from Murlo, Italy." In *Proceedings of the 24th Archaeometry Symposium, 1984: The Smithsonian Institution* edited by J.S. Olin and M.J. Blackman. Washington.
- Tuck, A. 1997. "Image and Ancestry in Etruria." Abstract in *AJA* 101, no. 2.
- Tuck, A. 1999. "Orientalizing Period Wing Handled Cups from Poggio Civitate: Ceramic Traditions and Regional Production in Inland Etruria." *Etruscan Studies* 6.
- Warden, P.G. 1985. *The Metal Finds from Poggio Civitate*. Rome.
- Winter, N. 1977. "Architectural Terracottas with Human Heads from Poggio Civitate (Murlo)." *ArchCl* 29.