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ABSTRACT


This thesis discusses the archaeological remains in the Etruscan bridge complex, found during the excavations at San Giovenale in 1959–1963, and 1999. The aim has been to reach a holistic perspective of the bridge complex with the bridge seen as a link between topography, economy, social relationships, politics, symbols and ritual, reflecting its importance for the whole community at San Giovenale and its surroundings. Situated at the border between the two largest city-states Tarquinia and Caere, the site seems to have been an important middle range transit town for foreign ideas, goods and people.

The character of the remains and the various levels of contextual analyses made it possible to distinguish five distinctive functions for the structures at the bridge over the Pietrisco. From a more generalised point of view these suggested that specialized functions may be divided into practical, social and symbolic functions and these aspects have been of help in identifying an object or a structure. Besides practical functions of everyday use, economic and strategic functions have also been considered.

These functions were more or less in use contemporaneously, at least during several hundred years, from about the middle of the 6th down to the first century B.C. Pottery and small finds show that some activity has taken place at the site from the 9th century. Features of continuity, such as in the choice of crossing, the direction of the bridge construction after its destruction, the architectural ground-plans, the use of basins and a well, pottery fabrics of local and Greek imports and shapes, as well as changes in ground-plans, slight changes in the environment due to water erosion, earthquakes and slides, have been observed. The physical as well as the liminal boundary between land and water as well as between man and spirits was accentuated by the tufa building, the water installations, and the road at the northern abutment. The thesis raises the hypothesis that the Etruscans believed that a crossing of a river via a bridge could violate the spirits of nature on land and in the water and therefore special rites were needed to restore the balance between nature and man before entering the bridge in order to reach safely at the other side of the ravine. The bridge itself can be seen as sacred, a liminal area where time and space do not exist and a place where it is easy to gain contact with the supernatural world.
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The investigations at the bridge complex on both sides of the river Pietrisco at San Giovenale started almost forty years ago. The excavations were conducted by the Swedish Institute of Classical studies at Rome between 1959 and 1963 in close conjunction with the Soprintendenza d’all antichità dell’Etruria Meriodinale with Dr. C.E. Östenberg, Dr. I Pohl and Dr. Stig Forsberg as excavators.

Field directors during the excavations at San Giovenale have been Dr. Erik Welin (1958-1960), director of the Swedish institute, Prof. Krister Hanell, University of Lund (1961-62), Prof. Arne Furumark (spring 1963), University of Uppsala, Prof. Carl Nylander (autumn 1963, 1965) director of the Swedish Institute (1981-1997) and Prof. Anne-Marie Leander-Touati 1999. The staff of the excavations at the bridge complex was in 1959 Dr. Carl Erik Östenberg; 1960, Dr. Ingrid Pohl and three workers, 1961-1963 Dr. Stig Forsberg; workers Mr. Baschini Giorgio (1961); Mr. Chiarini Mario (1961); Mr. Menicocci Vivenzio (1961); Mr. Polido Paride (1961-1963); Mr. Polozzi Mario (1961); Mr. Felice Giacomo (1962); Mr. Ubaldini Andrea (1962-1963); Mr. Tedeschi Giovanni (1962-1963); Mr. Pagliari Francesco (1962-1963). Architect: Dr. Valdorso Cicino (1962-1963); Dr. Giovanni Andrea (1963); Dr. Cinquantini Antonio (1963); Dr. Valdorso Cicino; assistants: FK Yvonne Bucke Forsberg (1975-1999), Mrs. Margareta Ohlson-Lepscky (1975), Mr. Peter Nylander (1991-92), Ms Britt-Marie Larsson (1992), Dr. Olle Brandt (1992), FK Richard Holmgren illustrator and photographer (1994, 1999-2001). The photos during the excavations (1961-1963) were taken by S. Forsberg, and the photos of the finds by S. Forsberg and Mr. Börje Tobiasson, the Swedish Institute of Classical Studies in Rome. Mr. Peter Nylander, Ms Britt-Marie Larsson, Dr. Olle Brandt and FK Richard Holmgren, who inked and prepared them for publication, and made the drawings. FK Richard Holmgren also made the reconstructions of the buildings and the bridge in co-operation with the author, and has also taken some photos used in this work. Mrs. Alicja Grenberger has redrawn the section of the well from a sketch made by S. Forsberg and she has also made the illustration on the cover. Dr. C. Sorrentino has studied and published the human bones. FM Margareta Boije investigated the animal bones from the investigation in 1999. FK Daniel Fuglesang revised my English, and Dr. Michael Lindblom has prepared a few of the illustrations.

My participation in the San Giovenale project started in 1975 when I joined the project together with Stig Forsberg, my husband. We became a very good working team and divided the work between us for the publication, and we spent many summers in the storage room and in the library at the Swedish Institute in Rome working with the material. In 1991-1992 we were lucky to get a grant from the HSFRI for one year’s work in Rome. It was a wonderful year, and it felt good to be able to discuss various problems with the finds in front of us. But you do not know for how long your life will last. Stig suddenly died in June 1993 at the Institute in Rome, a place he loved very much. I continued to work according to the plans for one and half a year with grants from Knut and Alice Wallenbergs stiftelse, Fondazione Famiglia Rausings, Rome, and HSFRI. Torsten and Anna Gihls fund, KVHAA, contributed to my stay in Rome in spring 1999 for checking on the material and for a cleansing of two baulks left from 1963. In recent years I received a grant of six months from the University of Uppsala for finishing my thesis.

I would like to express my gratitude to the staff of the Swedish Institute for all valuable help I have gained during all the years working at the Institute: Mrs. Kerstin Bellerba, Mrs. Kerstin Magnoni, Mrs. Margareta Ohlson-Lepscky, Dott.essa Stefania Renzetti, Mrs. Karin Björkman, Dr. Eva & Prof. em. Carl Nylander, Prof. Anne-Mari Leander-Touati, Prof. Barbro Santillo Frizell, Dr. Rafaela Santillo, Mrs. Carla & Dr. Börje Magnusson, Dr. Ingrid Pohl, Dr. Lars Karlsson FK Daniel Fuglesang, Dott.essa Astrid Capoferro, Mrs. Pia Letalick, Mrs. Maria and Mr. Alfredo Piergentili, Mrs. Simonetta and Mr. Enrico Tempera, Mrs. and Mr. Francesco Filippelli, Mrs. Piera Tacchia and Mrs. Bente Theil. I am very grateful to the Mayor of Blerta, Dott. Luciano Santella and Dott. Rosario Guido for all hospitality and help during the excavation in spring 1999, and also to Prof. Francesco di Gennaro. I owe particular thanks to my advisors Prof. Gullög Nordquist, Dr. Lars Karlsson, and Prof. em. Pontus Hellström. I also thank Prof. em. Tullia Linders,
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABF</td>
<td>Attic black-figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABG</td>
<td>Attic black-glaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D.</td>
<td>Anno Domini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ae</td>
<td>bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Alicja Grenberger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARF</td>
<td>Attic red-figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au</td>
<td>gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>brown impasto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicon.</td>
<td>Biconical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>before Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BML</td>
<td>Britt-Marie Larsson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>Börje Tobiasson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu</td>
<td>bucchero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>car.</td>
<td>carinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Carl Fries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEÖ</td>
<td>Carl Erik Östenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cm</td>
<td>centimeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Charlotte Scheffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>copper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cyl.</td>
<td>cylindrical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBF</td>
<td>Etruscan black figured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBG</td>
<td>Etruscan black-glazed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPG</td>
<td>Ezequiel M. Pinto-Guillaume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etr-Arch</td>
<td>Etrusco-Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etr-Camp</td>
<td>Etrusco-Campanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etr-Cor</td>
<td>Etrusco-Corinthian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EW</td>
<td>Erik Wetter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ext.</td>
<td>extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAI</td>
<td>Fine advanced impasto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fal</td>
<td>Faliscan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fal.</td>
<td>Faliscan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>iron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig.</td>
<td>figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figs.</td>
<td>figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find no.</td>
<td>find number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find nos.</td>
<td>find numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frg.</td>
<td>fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frgs.</td>
<td>fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>G. Colonna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha</td>
<td>hectar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM</td>
<td>hand-made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbr.</td>
<td>imbrex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp.</td>
<td>impasto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.</td>
<td>internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Ingrid Pohl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ital-Geom</td>
<td>Italo-Geometric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM</td>
<td>Jan Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kal.</td>
<td>kalypteri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>meter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Margareta Lindgren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLI</td>
<td>Mikael Lindblom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNI</td>
<td>Minimum Number of Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Minimum Number of Vessels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>north-west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>Peter Nylander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protovill.</td>
<td>Protovillanovan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>Richard Holmgren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Red impasto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Red-slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.a.</td>
<td>sine anno (without year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Stig Forsberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBR</td>
<td>San Giovenale bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBRN</td>
<td>San Giovenale bridge north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBRS</td>
<td>San Giovenale bridge south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str.</td>
<td>stratum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Geom</td>
<td>Subgeometric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teg.</td>
<td>tegula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tfill</td>
<td>tufa fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>thickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans.</td>
<td>Transitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unc.</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>Valdoro Cicino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBF</td>
<td>Yvonne Backe-Forsberg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fig. 75. (1-2) Neolithic jars SGBRS 62-813a-b, surface layer; Protovillanovan pottery: (3) biconical jar V12, str. 1; (4) biconical jar SGBRN 62-626, str. 6; (5) biconical jar V4, str. 6; (6) cylindrical jar U19, str. 3; (7) stamnoid jar U18, str. 5; (8) carinated bowl U5, str. 1; (9) carinated bowl U4, str. 1; (10) carinated bowl U6, str. 1; (11) cooking-stand T182, str. 4; (12) cooking-stand T184, str. 1; (13) cooking-stand T185, str. 3.

Fig. 76. Transitional cylindrical and rounded CW bowls with internal slip, HM: (1) S98, str. 3; (2) S112, str. 3; (3) T367, str. 3; (4) T259 int. red-slip, str. 1; (6) T237, str. 3; (8) T271, str. 1; (9) S211 int red-slip, str. 1; basins: (10) T244, str. 4; (11) T242, str. 6; conical bowls: (17) CW int. red-slip S226, str. 1; (18) CW int. brown slip S134, str. 4; (19) CW int. red-slip S226, str. 1; (20) CW int. red-slip S134, str. 4.

Fig. 77. Transitional, brown impasto CW and bucchero vessels: (1) HM cylindrical brown impasto jar T352, str. 6; (2) CW HM ovoid-glob. T58, str. 2; (3) CW ovoid-cyl. T148, str. 3; (4) CW ovoid globular jar S203, str. 1; (5) CW int. red-slip small globular jar T160a, str. 3; (6) CW miniature int. burn. globular jar T112, str. 4; (7) CW jar ovoid cyl. S50, str. 5; (8) brown impasto ovoid-globular jar with T shaped rim T164, str. 5; (9) fluted carinated cup B113a, str. 2; (10) spiral amphoriskos B11, str. 5; (11) spiral amphoriskos B12, str. 1; (12) miniature carinated cup B113b, str. 5; (13) jar SGBRN 63-635, str. 4; (14) biconical handled jar B14, str. 1; (15-16) spiral amphorai SGBRN 62-711, str. 3, B128, str. 5; (22-24) bucchero impasto grooved cups, B165, str. 2; SGBRN 63-641, str. 4, B164, str. 2.

Faliscan ware: (17-19, 20) handles of kantharoi, BI20, str. 1, BI19, str. 3, BI21, str. 6, BI22, str. 3–4; (21) olpe (?) Fal. 45, str. 5; (25) cup U84, str. 5.

Fig. 78. Orientalizing pottery: Italo-Geometric closed shape: (1) 61-60, str. 4; Sub-Geometric: (2) carinated bowls Q58, str. 3; (3) Q64, str. 4–5; plates (spanti): (4) Q65, str. 5; (5) Q55, str. 1; (6) Q56, str. 3; (8) Q57, str. 6, (9) Q66, str. 6; white-on-red: globular jar T371, str. 1; (10) basin Q51, str. 4; (11) basin Q50, str. 2; a similar version of plate Q56 has been interpreted as Gruppo dei ‘Dot wreathed’ etrusco figurata dated to 550-500 B.C., cf. Tarchona 3, 468–469, pl. 135:3/93, 18/49.

Fig. 79. Etrusco-Corinthian pottery: plates: Pittore senza graffito plates (1–3): (1) Q25, str. 1, (2) T335, str. 6, (3) SGBRN 9906-1, str. 4, (4) Q21, str. 6; (5) Q2, str. 4; (6) plate/bowl Q28, str. 3–4; (7) stemmed cup Q4, str. 1; (12) bowl Q15, str. 4; (14) bowl Q37, str. 3; lids: (8) Q11, str. 6; (10) Q79, str. 3; (11) Q81, str. 6; (9) olpe SGBRN 62-612, str. 6; (15) jug Q83; (13) amphora Q34, str. 3.

Fig. 80. Bucchero impasto stemmed cup (1)Y191, str. 1: Bucchero: (2) lip cup Y131, str. 4; (3) kylix Y122, str. 3; (4) carinated chalice Z63, str. 4; (5) carinated chalice Z58, str. 5; (6) cup Z56, str. 1; (7) kalathos (?) Z87, str. 1, 3; (8) carinated chalice Y145, str. 1; (9) carinated chalice Y146, str. 6; (10) high foot of cup Y93, str. 4; (11) trumpet foot of cup Y90, str. 4; (12) miniature cup Z53, str. 3–4; (13) miniature cup Z54, str. 3; (14) kantharos Y112, str. 1, 3; (15) goblet Z72, str. 3–4; (16) goblet Z73, str. 3; (17) carinated bowl SGBRN 62-626, str. 4; (18) rounded bowl Z37, str. 3; (19) rounded bowl Z44, str. 3; (20) rounded bowl Z11, str. 3.

Fig. 81. Bucchero wares: (1) miniature jar Y66, str. 6; (2) jug Z101, str. 1; (3) jug Y5, str. 3; (4) trefoil jug Y170, str. 3; (5) jar Z102, str. 3; (6) jar Y59, str. 3; (7) olpe 61-47, str. 1; (8) ovoid jar with outturned rim Y55, str. 3; lids: (9) Y 77 shape 1c, str. 3; (10) Y82 shape 1b, str. 1, 3; (11) Y84 shape 2a, str. 3; (12) Y86 2b, str. 3; (13) Y80 shape 3, str. 3; (14) Y81 shape 4a, str. 3; (15) Y76 shape 4b, str. 3; (16) Y87 shape 4a, str. 3.

Fig. 82. Etruscan black figured: (1) EBF skyphos R1, str. 3; (2) EBF skyphos R2, str. 1; Attic import: (3) ABG lekyth R4, str. 3; (4) ABG lekyth R9, str. 3; (5) ABF 19, str. 1; (6) ABF cup 9, str. 3; ARF cups: (7) R18, str. 2, (8) R17, str. 3; (9, 11) R15, str. 3; (10) R5, str. 3; (12) Chalkidian krater (?) SGBRN 62-807, str. 3.

Red-slip braziers: (13) SGBRN 61-42, str. 2; (14–15) SGBRN 61-29, inside and outside, str. 1; (16) red-slip baking tray T193, str. 3; (17) coarse white slipped basin with
lead clamp T21, str. 1; (18) TC loom-weight with rod of reed W20, str. 1 (cf. also Fig. 89).

Fig. 83. Orientalizing pottery: (1) black impasto large grooved jar T293, str. 4; red-slip, globular jars with grooved rim (2–8): (2) T53, str. 5–6; (3) T59, str. 1; (4) T50, str. 5–6; (5) T60, str. 3; (6) T103, str. 5; (7) T58, str. 2; (8) T54, str. 4; (9) stamnoid jar S60, str. 2; (10) base of glob. jar T308, str. 4; (11) pyxis T102, str. 5; (12) glob. jar with thickened rim T78, str. 5; (13) glob. jar with outturned, thickened rim T77, str. 4; (14) ovoid-cyl. jar with outturned angular rim T92, str. 3; (15) small ovoid-cyl. jar with outturned rim S45, str. 3; (16) ovoid-glob. jar with slightly hanging rim T211, str. 1; (17) cyl. jar with outturned thickened rim T46, str. 1; (19) glob. jar with outturned round rim T71, str. 5–6; (20) ovoid-cyl. jar with hanging rim T41, str. 3; (21) ovoid-cyl. jar with outturned round rim T83, str. 1–2; (18) CW int. burn. ovoid-cyl. (?) jar with hanging rim S143, str. 4.

Fig. 84. Red-slip ware: (1) carinated bowl S53, str. 3; (2) conical bowl S83, str. 3; (3) small conical bowl S61, str. 3; (4) conical bowl S85, str. 3; (5) conical bowl T1, str. 1; (6) knob of lid T2, str. 3; rounded bowls: (7) S169, str. 4–5; (8) T253 str. 4; (10) bowl 59, str. 1, 3; ring-bases of bowls: (9) torus shaped ring base S171, str. 3; (11) S189, str. 3; (12) S5a, str. 3; (13) S185, str. 3; (14) T301, str. 2; basins (scale 1:4): (15) S271, str. 1, (16) basin with lead clamp T21, str. 1 (scale 1:4); (17) carinated T221, str. 1; (18) int. turned thickened rim T286, str. 1; (19) outturned thickened rim S166, str. 3; (20) everted thickened rim T217, str. 1; (21) everted thickened rim S67, str. 1; (22) stamnoid cauldron with grooved T-shaped rim T82, str. 3–4; (23) stamnoid small jar S42, str. 3; (24) ovoid-globular jar with slightly outturned round rim T358, str. 4; (25) stamnoid jar T81, str. 1; (26) pithos 1, str. 3; (27) pithos 2 str. 1–3, 6 (scale 1:5).

Fig. 85. Red-slip ware: braziers (scale 1:4): (1) SGBRN 62-807, 63-629, str. 3–4; (2) SGBRN 61-29, str. 1; (3) SGBRN 61-42, 62-620, 62-621, str. 2; (4) S52, str. 3; (5) T45, str. 1; (6) T40, str. 1; cooking-stands (scale 1:3): (7, 9) type IIA T180, str. 4; (8) type IIA SGBRN 9906, str. 4; (10) type IIA T188, str. 3; (11) type IIA T183, str. 1; (12) type IIB T185, str. 2–3.

Fig. 87. CW jars with various rims: internal burnished two-handled carinated jar with possible base T161 and T162 (1–2); (3) internal burnished glob. T144, str. 6; (5) plain CW str. 3 cyl. jar S 7, str. 3; (6) internal reddish brown slip ovoid-cyl. T315, str. 4; (7) ovoid-cyl.?; (8) plain CW ovoid-glob. T155, str. 6; (9) ovoid-cyl. T37, str. 3–4; (10) internal slip ovoid-cyl. S108, str. 3; (11) ovoid-cyl. S 136, str. 2; (12) internal burnished ovoid-cyl. S27, str. 3; (13) internal burnished ovoid-cyl. S26, str. 2; (14) ovoid-cyl. str. 3; (15) internal black slip cyl. S 197, str. 1; (16) internal red-slip ovoid-cyl. S113, str. 3.


Fig. 90. Different pottery wares from the south side of the Pietrisco: surface layer, str. 1–2: Red-slip: (1) globular jar BRS 121, str. 1; (5) ovoid-glob. jar BRS 71, str. 2; (7) ovoid BRS 66, str. 2; (9) large bowl BRS 120, str. 1; (29) large bowl SGBRS 61-65c, surface layer; (30) pithos SGBRS 61-65d, surface layer. CW jars: (2) ovoid-cyl. BRS 27, str. 1; (3) ovoid-cyl. BRS 110, str. 1;
(4) ovoid-cyl. BRS 38, str. 1; (6) ovoid-cyl. BRS 108, str. 1; CW bowls: (8, 10) BRS 37, str. 1; BRS 39, str. 1; (11) with hole BRS 140, str. 1. *Bucchero*; rounded bowls: (12-14) BRS 148, str. 1; BRS 81, str. 1–2; BRS 48, str. 2; (15) jar (?) BRS 12, str. 1; (16) grey bucchero lid BRS 11, str. 2: CW lids: (17-19) BRS 150, surface layer; BRS 155, surface layer; SGBRS 61-65a, surface layer. *Etrusco-cor.* jars: (20–21) Q85, surface layer; SGBRS 61-65b, surface layer; (22) *Etrusco-Campanian black-glazed* plate Q42, surface layer; (24) *ABG?* kylix R3, SGBRS 62-809, str. 1; (23) *EBG* bowl R14, str. 1; (25) *Fine cream ware* SGBRS 62-814, surface layer; (26) *Fine cream ware* omphalos BRS 143, str. 1.; (27-28) *EBG* phiale R12-13, str. 1–2: *Red ware*: (31) large bowl BRS 125, str. 1 (32) amphora BRS 132, str. 1).

Fig. 91. Etruscan inscriptions on bucchero: (1) cup SGBRN 60-1, str. 1; (2) cup SGBRN 63-610, str. 3; (3) cup/bowl SGBRN 61-23a, str. 1; (4) cup SGBRN 62-782, str. 3; (5) cup, SGBRN 62-751, str. 3; (6) cup SGBRN 62-704g, 62-744, str. 3; (7) stemmed cup or plate SGBRN 62-700a, str. 3; (8) kalathos SGBRN 62-717, str. 3; (9) stemmed cup or plate SGBRN 62-736b, str. 3; (10) stemmed cup or plate 62-700a, str. 3; (11) rounded bowl with thickened rim, SGBRN 62-734, 62-735b, str. 3 (see appendix 1, and Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, figs. 3, 5, 10).

Fig. 92. Graffiti and Etruscan letters on bucchero: (1) bowl SGBRN 62-675, 62-782, str. 3; (2) cup SGBRN 62-700, 63-616, str. 3; (3) bowl SGBRN 63-619b, str. 3; (4) bowl SGBRN 62-675, 62-700, 62-705, 63-616, str. 3; (5) bowl SGBRN 62-800, bottom of well (see appendix 1, and Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, figs. 3, 5).

Fig. 94a. Small finds and tiles: TC loom-weights impressed decoration or inscription (1) W27, str. 1; (2) W1, str. 1; (3) Z104, str. 3; (4) W10, str. 3; (5) W2, str. 1; (6) W3, str. 3; (7) W4, str. 1; impasto weight (25a) W13, str. 1; (25b) impasto weight W14, str. 1; spindle-whorls: (8) SGBRN 63-630, str. 4; (9) SGBRN 62-766, str. 2; (10) SGBRN 61-14, str. 1; (11) SGBRN 61-15, str. 1; (13) spools SGBRN 62-604, str. 5–6; (14) SGBRN 61-50, str. 1; (15) SGBRN 62-625, str. 4; (12) horn plaque SGBRN 62-749, str. 3; (16) glass bead SGBRN 62-783, str. 3; (17) glass bead SGBRN 63-616, str. 3; (18) bronze navicella fibula SGBRN 62-624, str. 4; (19) teg. or kal. (?)SGBRN 62-665 st. 2–3; (20) teg. 29, str. 2; (21) teg. SGBRN 62-800, bottom of pozzo; (22) teg. SGBRN 63-629, str. 3–4; (23) teg. 110, str. 2–3; (24) teg. SGBRN 63-619, str. 3, (26) kal. 1, 61-43, str. 1; (27) TC lid or architectural terracotta SGBRN 63-625, str. 2–3; (28) TC thymiatierion (?) SGBRN 62-800, bottom of pozzo.

Fig. 94c. Food residues on CW sherds SGBRN 9906a-b, str. 4.

Fig. 95. Metal objects from the Pietrisco bridge complex: iron: (1–3) bolts SGBRN 62-729a–c, str. 3; (4–5) nails 60–1a-b, str. 1, (6) nail SGBRN 62-803a, str. 3; (7) nail SGBRN 62-803b, str. 3; (8) fibula SGBRN 62-605a, str. 6; (20) SGBRN 9901 javelin, str. 3; (19) slag SGBRS 62-812, str. 1; (21) nail 9902, str. 3: bronze: (9) fibula SGBRN 62-605b, str. 6; (12) fibula SGBRN 62-624a, str. 4; (14) fibula SGBRN 62-776, str. 3; (15) fibula SGBRN 62-673, str. 3; (18) fibula (?) SGBRN 63-633, str. 6; (13) unc. thin object SGBRN 9904, str. 4: (10) part of catch-plate of fibula SGBRN 62-702:2, str. 3; (17) ring SGBRN 62-606b, str.6, (16) ornaments SGBRN 62-624b, str. 4, (11) nail SGBRN 62-732, str. 3.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There is a saying – “When you meet with a bridge, pay it more respect than you would to a count—quando vedi un ponte, fa gli più onor che vole ad un conte—” and with good reason, for counts in Italy are plentiful blackberries— you meet them at every turn; but bridges! – they are, deserving of all reverence, albeit patronised by neither saint nor sovereign (Dennis 1848, vol. 2, 261).

1.1 AIM OF STUDY

The aim of this study is trying to reach a comprehensive understanding of an ancient Etruscan bridge complex, consisting of architectural remains, such as buildings, bridge abutments, roads, wells, basins and various categories of finds, found along the Pietrisco brook at San Giovenale in South Etruria. This implies the analysis of the archaeological remains from the site from various perspectives, not only as a topographical and geographical spot on a map, but also in its economical, socio-political and, not least of all, the symbolic/ritual perspective. As a physical link the bridge existed during at least 500 hundred years and was important locally as well as for a larger area. Therefore an analysis of the bridge complex has to consider many factors in order to reach a complete picture of its functions and importance. To achieve my aim the following main issues will be taken into account:

- the type of function or functions the bridge complex had over time
- various levels of contexts from the single object and structure per se will be analysed, via artefact assemblages and structures, the spatial location of the whole bridge complex and its relation to the settlement on San Giovenale, Vignale included, the surrounding necropoleis and the neighbouring settlements
- the concept of landscape and the terminology used in landscape archaeology will be used as a frame to illustrate the archaeological remains from the bridge complex and it may reflect attitudes and ideas seen in the actions of the people using the bridge and its affiliated facilities. Terms such as physical landscape (geography and topography), economic, socio-political and mental landscapes (the latter is the symbolic and the ritual) as a framework to place the bridge complex in a wider context will be used
- the relationship of the bridge complex to a local as well as an interregional and intraregional road network
- production, trade and exchange due to the large quantity of various kinds of pottery, e.g. Greek imports found in different find contexts
- social relationships among the locals and the neighbouring settlements will be studied by analyses of the topography, the imports, and the Etruscan inscriptions and graffiti
- special focus will be on the mental landscape, i.e. the symbolic and ritual environment defined as ‘a dimension of landscape in which features of the landscape represent things and concepts other than those which derive from their physical function or properties’. The term sacral, sacred or religious landscape will not be used since this excludes the wider symbolic aspects and more practical rites.

1 Dowling 2004, 2.
Instead I will use ‘mental landscape’ as a comprehensive term for people’s symbolic and ritual thoughts and beliefs and actions consequently manifested in the material culture and in the landscape. The location of the bridge complex at a physical boundary between land and water and its symbolic meaning as metaphysical border, a liminal place, will be discussed.

- continuity and change at the bridge complex as well as in the settlements and the cemeteries will also be considered.

Chapter 1.2 contains previous research on San Giovenale and 1.3 a section on archaeological, written sources and ethnographical parallels. In chapter 1.4 there is a presentation of the theoretical and methodological approaches used (Fig. 12). Furthermore, some specific issues and definitions of certain terms that are important for the interpretations of the functions will also be discussed. The chapter ends with a discussion of continuity and change and concluding remarks.

A detailed list of illustrated finds will follow at the end of this work, since such information could not be given directly on some of the figures themselves.

Chapter 2 is divided into five sections. The first section deals with previous research on San Giovenale, and the topography, and the second gives a description of the stratigraphy at the bridge complex. The third contains a concise description of the architectural remains and in the fourth there is a similar description of the small finds. The chapter ends with a fifth section with an interpretation and a synthesis of the archaeological remains found during the excavations in 1960–1963, and in 1999.

Chapter 3 contains a contextual interpretation of the architectural remains and the finds in the bridge complex, with a discussion of their functions focusing on its boundary setting in the landscape. Furthermore, this chapter contains a discussion on the socio-economic, political and symbolic importance of the bridge for the communities on the San Giovenale and Vignale plateaux, the surrounding settlements and for the Etruscan city-states.

In Chapter 4 similarities and dissimilarities and the question of continuity and change during distinguishable local chronological phases and a comparison with the chronological phases at the settlement areas and the necropoleis will be discussed and summarized.

This study ends with Chapter 5 containing a general summary of the discussions in previous chapters.

1.2 PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON SAN GIOVENALE

San Giovenale is the modern name of a settlement in South Etruria, located 60 km north-west of Rome, 25 km from Tarquinia, 30 km from Cerveteri and west of the Lago di Bracciano (Lacus Sabatinus) and Lago di Vico (Lacus Ciminius) in the environs of the Tolfa mountains (Fig. 1). The Swedish Institute of Classical Studies in Rome excavated the settlement during 1956–1965. The main settlements are situated on the two high plateaux, here called San Giovenale and Vignale, with the cemeteries located on the surrounding hills. The Pietriscino and the Fammilume brooks and the river Vesca, tributaries to the nearby river Mignone, have cut their waterways deep down creating the plateaux with steep, deep ravines and valleys on both sides, so typical for the Etruscan landscape (Figs. 2–5). Unfortunately, the Etruscan name of this settlement is unknown.

Excavations carried out at several areas on the Acropolis between 1957 and 1963, as well as in 1965, have yielded finds and architectural remains from the Neolithic age to the medieval period. The habitation on the Acropolis dates from the final phase of the Apennine Bronze Age. It was followed by a fair-sized Iron Age village and then by an Etruscan settlement with rectangular huts. These were later replaced with houses all over the plateau. The Etruscan habitation on the northern side of the Borgo is dated to c. 630–500

---

2 Etruscan culture 1962, 279; San Giovenale 1:1, 1972. San Giovenale was marked as a settlement on maps in 1674, 1791 and 1881, cf. Hemphill 2000, 43.
3 The Vignale has only been indirectly included in the discussions of San Giovenale, due to lack of published results from the investigations in 1959 and 1960. This study of the Pietriscino bridge will emphasize the importance of the settlement on this hill and its interrelations with the settlements on the Borgo and Acropolis areas, i.e. the San Giovenale plateau (see Figs. 2–3, 100).
4 San Giovenale 1:1, 1972, map 2.
5 San Giovenale 1:1, 7–10, map 3.
8 Etruscan culture 1962, 290.
10 See From huts to houses 2001; San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming. Cf. sketch of the Acropolis and the Borgo in Etruscan culture 1962, 293.
The investigations on the Vignale hill, located opposite to and south of the Acropolis and Borgo plateau, were conducted by M.A. Del Chiaro, F. Brown, and C.E. Östenberg in 1956–1960 (Figs. 2–3, 99a–b). They uncovered both Archaic architectural remains, such as cellars, wells, and wall foundations, as well as Protovillanovan to Hellenistic pottery.\(^\text{12}\)

The site of San Giovenale has been treated in a number of articles, as well as in publications of tombs, architectural remains and finds from various areas.\(^\text{13}\) G. Bazzichelli published the first note on the excavation of tombs as early as in 1876–77,\(^\text{14}\) and G.F. Gamurrini \textit{et al.} made the first survey of San Giovenale in 1881–1897.\(^\text{15}\) The results from the excavations carried out by members of the Swedish Institute in Rome from 1956 to 1965 were to be published in a specific series (see below). A more popularised book of the results of the excavations, and the Etruscans in general, came in 1962 in the excellent publication, \textit{Etruscan culture. Land and people}.\(^\text{16}\) Östenberg published a general typology of the tombs surrounding San Giovenale, together with the contents of the Castellina Camerata necropolis in 1969, and the results of the excavations from the other necropoleis surrounding San Giovenale continued to be published by various scholars.\(^\text{17}\) The recently excavated tombs by the Gruppo Archeologico Romano (settore Etruria interna) (G.A.R.) were reported in \textit{La Toretta and in Studi Etruschi}.\(^\text{18}\)

On a more detailed level, it may be mentioned that the finds of the Neolithic and the Bronze Age periods, which correspond to single pottery finds at the bridge, have been discussed by P.G. Gierow and B. Malcus.\(^\text{19}\) The archaeological remains from the Protovillanovan hut settlement found in various areas on the Acropolis have been published by B. Olider and I. Pohl, and by B. Malcus,\(^\text{20}\) and those remains confirm the existence of the Protovillanovan pottery finds from the bridge. Likewise, the domestic architectural remains as well as the pottery and other small finds from the Borgo and the Acropolis have been discussed by several scholars, e.g. in \textit{Architettura etrusca}. They have been of great importance for the analysis and the interpretation of corresponding periods at the bridge complex.\(^\text{21}\) P. Hemphill has conducted a few surveys in the area and reported the results both in an article from 1993 as well as in her book \textit{Archaeological investigations in southern Etruria. The Civitella Cesi survey}, from 2000 (Figs. 2b, 6a).\(^\text{22}\) She found an Etruscan chamber tomb dated to the 6th century on the Vignale promontory c. 1.5 km from the previous excavations close to the Valle Vesca cemetery.\(^\text{23}\) She also documented Roman pottery dated from the 3rd to the 1st century B.C. and also to the 2nd century AD mostly at the northern side of the Vignale hill. This is a confirmation of the Roman infiltration in the area.\(^\text{24}\)

The present study is the most substantial research from the bridge area. Previous research was restricted to mostly short notes of the bridge, and its relationship to the Etruscan road network. During the survey in 1887 Gamurrini reported wall remains of a bridge over the Pietriscio or the Vesca,\(^\text{25}\) which is probably the first note on the bridge. The achievements of the two first years of excavations at the Pietriscio bridge were published in 1962 in \textit{Etruscan culture}.\(^\text{26}\) Stig Forsberg gave a more thorough but short preliminary report of the architectural remains of the excavation at the bridge at a

\(^{11}\) Nylander 1984, 65–69; cf. also \textit{San Giovenale} 5:2 forthcoming and \textit{San Giovenale} 5:3 forthcoming.

\(^{12}\) Cf. notebook of Del Chiaro 1959, Östenberg notebooks 2 and 4 from 1959, and Brown 1960, stored at the Swedish Institute of Classical Studies in Rome.

\(^{13}\) For a general bibliography of San Giovenale, see Bellerba & K. Berggren 1984, 11–12, and a revised one by K. Bellerba \textit{et al.} 2001 for the exhibition in Viterbo (unpublished). See also the revised San Giovenale bibliography compiled by K. Bellerba in 2003 at the Swedish Institute of Classical Studies in Rome.

\(^{14}\) Cf. Bazzichelli 1876-77, 151–154; see also Bellerba & K. Berggren 1984, 11.

\(^{15}\) Gamurrini \textit{et al.} 1972.

\(^{16}\) \textit{Etruscan culture} 1962.

\(^{17}\) \textit{San Giovenale} 1: 9; 1:7.


\(^{19}\) Gierow 1984; Malcus 1984.

\(^{20}\) \textit{San Giovenale} 2:4; Malcus 1984. A few other huts in Area F East, very close to Area D will be published by L. Karlsson in \textit{San Giovenale} 4:1 forthcoming, and remains of a few huts on the Borgo by I. Pohl in \textit{San Giovenale} 5:3 forthcoming. For Protovillanovan culture at San Giovenale, see K. Berggren 1984, 61–64.

\(^{21}\) \textit{Architettura etrusca} 1986, 47–53, 56–58, figs. 24–26, 33–36, pls. 2:2 and 3:1; \textit{Materiali e problemi} 1984; 65–82.

\(^{22}\) Hemphill 1993; 2000.

\(^{23}\) Hemphill 2000, 44, figs. 40–41; Carta d'Italia. foglio n.o 143 (Civitella Cesi).

\(^{24}\) Hemphill 2000, 44; see also Hemphill 1993.

\(^{25}\) Gamurrini \textit{et al.} 1972. For a discussion of the location of the bridge either at Pietriscio or Vesca, see further below in chapter 3.

symposium in Rome in 1984. The paper ‘Il complesso
del ponte sul fosso Pietrisco’, was subsequently
published in San Giovenale. Materiali e problemi. Atti
del simposio all’Istituto svedese di studi classici a
Roma, 6 aprile 1983.27 The Etruscan bridge and its
dating have also been shortly commented on in papers
and books by several other scholars.28 The dates given
by these oscillates between the middle of the sixth to the
fifth centuries B.C.29 Its connection with the Etruscan
road network has been more or less discussed by several
authors such as Wetter, Ward-Perkins, Cicognolo, and
Bengtsson.30 The only reconstruction of the bridge, to
my knowledge, was published in a number of a Life
time book, The emergence of Man. The Etruscans, in
1975.31

A few specific artefacts from the bridge complex
have been published and commented on by various
scholars. I. Pohl has made a typology of the braziers
found in the tombs, in the settlements and from the
bridge and Ö. Wikander has studied the roof tiles from
the settlements, but included only a few pieces from the
bridge.32 The osteological remains have been studied by
C. Sorrentino, to be published in San Giovenale 6:1–3,
and by F. Mallegni, as was mentioned earlier.33 The
epigraphic evidence was interpreted and published by
G. Colonna and myself in 1999.34

1.3 SOURCES

Before describing the different types of sources used in
this study, a few source critical aspects of the excavation and the sampling of the finds should be
mentioned. I am fully aware that working with a
material excavated by others may have its limitations.
The main goal of the Swedish excavations at the bridge
in 1960 was to explore the building technique of what
was thought to be part of a defensive wall system.
During the following seasons these remains turned out
to be stone abutments of a bridge with associated
buildings on one side. The excavators carried out this
investigation accordingly, and the abundance of finds
was treated and understood within this concept.
During my study of the archaeological material and the
excavation documentation it has occasionally been
difficult to understand the intentions of discarding, for
example, body fragments of pottery and tiles or
sampling animal bones. This has caused some troubles
to achieve complete profiles of vessels and tiles. Many
animal bones found in fillings as well as in floor levels
were thrown away for uncertain reasons which also has
created uncertainty with regards to species and number
of individuals. Another uncertainty is that the excavated
area only covers c. 370 square meters on the northern
bank and c. 570 square meters on the southern side of
the Pietrisco brook, with the result that that there are
still large unexcavated areas.

1.3.1 Archaeological sources and temporal frames

The sources used in this study are both primary and
secondary. The archaeological remains discussed are
geographically confined to the excavated area at the
Pietrisco brook, which divides the Etruscan settlements
on the San Giovenale and Vignale plateaux (Figs. 2–3).
The remains were discovered by the Swedish Institute
during a field survey in 1959 (Fig. 7), and investigated
during the excavations in 1960–1963.35 A cleaning

27 Forsberg 1984.
28 I. Pohl has discussed the Pietrisco bridge complex in
relationship to the settlements in several articles from 1980–
mentioned the bridge complex in preliminary reports of the
excavations. Nylander 1986b–c; cf. also Gierow 1986; Bosi
1994; Barker & Rasmussen 1998; Boëthius & Ward Perkins
29 Boëthius & Ward-Perkins 1970, 77; Steingräber 1981, 327,
fig. 180; Ward-Perkins 1962, 1641; Ricciardi 1984; 1986a;
Nylander 1986b; Spivey & Stoddart 1990; Cicognolo 1993–
1994; Bengtsson 2000, 94; Barker & Rasmussen 1998, 173;
Hemphill 2000, 44. Damgaard Andersen 1998 has focused on
the functions of the bridge complex, based on my poster on
the multiple functions of the bridge complex in the symposium
‘From huts to houses– Transformations of ancient societies’,
organized by the Norwegian and Swedish institutes in Rome
in 1997.
30 Wetter 1962; Ward-Perkins1957; Cicognolo 1993–94;
Bengtsson 2000.
31 The reconstruction of the Pietrisco bridge was made by N.
Fasciano; cf. Hamblin et al. 1975, 127 and 156. The
reconstruction with a flat superstructure does not correspond
to my own view, which is more like a slightly vaulted wooden
superstructure supported by timber logs put into the water.
32 Pohl 1982; Wikander 1981. For other special objects and
features published, see bibliographies by K. Bellerba and B.
Alroth, Bellerba et al. 2001; Bellerba in San Giovenale 5:2
forthcoming.
33 Mallegni 1979.
34 Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999.
35 The Squadra Volante team, with E. Wetter, G. Fillipetto,
and C.E. Östenberg, conducted this survey; cf. Wetter 1962,
184, fig. 189. The team also made a minor investigation of the
area, followed by the excavations by Pohl in 1960, and
Forsberg in 1961 to 1963.
campaign was conducted in 1999, when the area was cleaned from an accumulation of a thirty-six-year old vegetation cover that had made the bridge remains invisible. During two weeks in February, the author together with R. Holmgren investigated two earth-baulks left from the excavations in 1963, which yielded new information on unclear parts in the stratified sequences (Figs. 8–9). The remains comprise architectural features, such as building foundations and roof tiles, road pavements, bridgeheads, a well, water basins, pottery and other types of finds, e.g. inscriptions, human and animal bones as well as objects of glass and metal. The pottery is the largest find category. It is very fragmentary and found partly in situ but mostly in various fillings, which have been moved and reused many times. This fact has contributed to the complex stratification and the difficulty in interpretation.

The chronological sequences of the material range from the Early Neolithic (only on the southern river bank), to the Protovillanovan period down to the Archaic and Classical/Hellenistic periods. In this study I will attempt to give a concise presentation of the finds and the architecture, since the remains will be thoroughly described, discussed and published in detail in the final publication.

The architectural remains from the Pietrisco bridge complex were, as earlier mentioned, excavated by Forsberg, Pohl and Östenberg and drawn by Validoro Cicino. As also mentioned earlier, Stig Forsberg published a preliminary report on the two building periods. A complete profile over the whole bridge complex was published for the first time in 1986. Just before my husband’s, Stig Forsberg, untimely death I had started to question issues relating to functions and on architecture, e.g. the existence of another possible building not discussed before (see chapter 2.3). This was based on my analysis of the pottery, the tiles and the small finds. However, during the investigation of the two baulks and the architectural remains in 1999, I managed to get some answers to my questions, although a 2 m thick layer of soil for the cultivation of hazel nut trees stopped the investigations of the two basins (see below in chapters 2 and 3). The reconstructions of buildings and roads presented in chapter 3 are based on my interpretations of the archaeological remains.

### 1.3.2 Written sources

The textual evidence from the ancient site at San Giovenale consists of epigraphic material inscribed on pottery, on coffins and walls in some tombs, and from various habitation areas on the Acropolis and the Borgo. The inscriptions from the bridge were recently interpreted as Etruscan and published by Giovanni Colonna and myself. The material is very fragmentary, and only a few inscriptions are complete. It mainly contains samples of single letters, but others can be combined into one or several words or names (see below in chapter 2).

Unfortunately, the fragmentary state of the pottery makes it difficult to gain a complete reconstruction of any word or words. In the case of the inscriptions from the bridge there is some useful information on different aspects such as ritual, Etruscan cosmology, personal names or a gens. Some words have been compared to other more complete and longer Etruscan and Umbrian inscriptions, in order to gain an idea of the meaning. Although some of the epigraphic evidence is from much later periods and remote areas, they have been used as comparative material since they may shed light on specific issues discussed here.

In the discussions of the socio-economic functions in chapter 3 some inscriptions of words meaning territory (tular), and city (spur) will be referred to. The inscriptions on boundary stones (cippi), found at territorial and city boundaries, and as grave markers will be referred to in the discussion of space, physical boundaries and liminal zones, e.g. the Cortona cippus.

---

36 Prof. G. Guidi at the ENEA, Centre Richerche Energia Casaccia in Rome, will examine samples of slag and a copper object from the bridge and from the settlements.

37 San Giovenale 6:1–3 forthcoming.

38 Validoro Cicino was employed as one of the architects during the investigations in 1963, cf. San Giovenale 1:1, 6.

39 Forsberg 1984; Nylander 1986b, figs. 5 and 38.

40 The results from 1999 will be published together with architecture, the tiles and the pottery in the forthcoming publication, San Giovenale 6:1–3.

41 The reconstruction plans of various phases and the reconstructions of the buildings have been made by ARCDOC, Richard Holmgren 2004 ©, and by the author.

42 For inscriptions on pottery found in tombs, see appendix in San Giovenale 1:5, and on a tomb wall in Santella 1996, from settlements cf. Colonna & Pohl 1979; Di Gennaro 1998; Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999.

43 The material is very fragmentary, and only a few inscriptions are complete. It mainly contains samples of single letters, but others can be combined into one or several words or names (see below in chapter 2).

44 The results from 1999 will be published together with architecture, the tiles and the pottery in the forthcoming publication, San Giovenale 6:1–3.

45 The results from 1999 will be published together with architecture, the tiles and the pottery in the forthcoming publication, San Giovenale 6:1–3.
and the Perugia cippus—a boundary stone with 130 words about a property contract between two families.  

Since I also will argue for a ritual function of the bridge complex I will use ritual, funerary, dedicatory, and mythological inscriptions as comparisons.

The finds of longer written documents in Etruscan concerning rituals and specific rites are limited. There are, however, a few objects of metal, terracotta and linen with Etruscan inscriptions, which are interpreted as having a ritual context: the Zagreb mummy, 47 the Capua tile, 48 the lead discs of Santa Marinella 49 and Magliano. 50 The seven bronze tables from Iguvine in Umbria, dated to the late Roman Republican period and with Umbrian/Oscan letters, are the most important ritual texts due to the good illustrations of the content of the rituals. 51 The main sources for Etruscan religion, especially for the divinities, are the inscriptions on the bronze liver from Piacenza, 52 and the Etruscan bronze mirrors with engraved pictures of named mythological persons in specific scenes. 53 The large amount of epigraphic material from other Etruscan sites, for example longer and shorter votive inscriptions, dedicatory inscriptions on objects and sarcophagi, are also important evidence and can be used to shed light on some social features. 54

A third important written source category is the excellent excavation documentations from 1961–1963, viz. notebooks, photos, and drawings. My hypotheses in this study are based on my analysis of that documentation as well as the documentation and interpretations from the investigation in 1999.

As mentioned earlier the Etruscan name of the settlement at San Giovenale is unknown. The name San Giovenale may have originated from Sanctus Juvenalis, a saint, whose cult was well known in the area between the end of the 4th to the 9th centuries AD. A chapel found on the Acropolis a few metres W of the castle and rebuilt several times was probably dedicated to the saint in 8th century AD (see Figs. 2a, 3). The modern name San Giovenale appeared for the first time in some medieval documents attributed to AD 1141. The Di Vico family began to build a castle and a defence system on the Acropolis in AD 1240, which were never completely finished. 55

1.3.3 Ethnographic analogies

Beside archaeological and epigraphic material, medieval as well as a few modern material categories, such as folkloristic songs and legends from Mediterranean cultures have been used to illustrate certain existential questions about life and death at the bridge complex. 56

55 On the medieval period, see San Giovenale 6:4–5, figs. 5–7. The legend of Sanctus Juvenalis tells us that he became bishop at Narni, a place not far from San Giovenale, in AD 369, and that he died in AD 376. His remains were brought to Lucca in 878 but removed to Narni in 880. His grave was incorporated in the Narni cathedral in the twelfth century AD, San Giovenale (Narni) 1998, figs. 14 and 18; San Giovenale 6:4–5, 4–9, figs. 1–2; It has been speculated whether San Giovenale would be one of the twin cities (Contenebra or Cortouso) mentioned by Livy (Liv. 5.1). For a different view, see Fuglesang forthcoming. Other places have also been questioned to be those twin cities, cf. Rossi Danielli 1960, 185–198.  

56 During the Middle Ages superstition was widely spread. Witches and evil spirits were thought to live under bridges, therefore precautions when crossing a bridge were important, cf. Stattin 1987 and Folkloren 1987. Fear and anxiety of the unknown and how to take action against it could be seen in the medieval custom of naming bridges after the devil. Other examples are the constructions of hospitals and chapels at bridges and putting up crosses, statues of the Madonna and other apotropaic symbols. These habits may be survivals from ancient times, considering the remains of the ancient sacella at bridges of various places, cf. Galliazzo 1994, 102–103), and Seppilli 1977, 248–254. Survivals of this ritual can be seen in several places with bridges named the Madonna del ponte, viz. Madonna del ponte at Blera, see Rossi Danielli 1962; see also the bridges named after the devil and witches during the Middle Ages, an expression of coping with fear of the
The eternal questions, who am I, where do I come from and where do I go, fear of the unknown, and fear of death have been relevant in all times and places. The methods to escape this fear are often expressed both in rituals and cult paraphernalia, as well as in erections of monuments: buildings, stones and sculptures. These existential questions are as important to us today as they probably were for the ancient human beings. It was essential also for the ancients to constantly appease the gods and the divinities of nature through rituals and prayers.

The method of using ethnographical analogies has been questioned as evidence for the past. Further comparative studies will be needed in order to explore the cultural similarities and dissimilarities, and I have chosen not to use ethnoarchaeological analogies and ethnographical folklore to any larger extent in this basically archaeological study, since it would lead too far using that line in this particular connection.

---

**DEFINITIONS**

1.4 METHODOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS

My first contact with the material from the bridge complex started in 1975 when I joined the project together with Stig Forsberg. I was given the task of studying and publishing the small finds, including the pottery and the tiles. Forsberg's task was to study and publish the architectural remains, and the intention was to perform an ordinary investigation, based on empirical data to be published in the San Giovenale series. When he sadly passed away in 1993, I decided to incorporate his part into my work. However, my intention here is to make a more comprehensive understanding of the bridge complex focused on a contextual and functional interpretation of the remains from the bridge as well as its relationship to the settlements and the necropoleis at San Giovenale and Vignale and to their neighbours during the late Bronze Age, Iron Age, Orientalizing, Archaic and Classical/Hellenistic periods. Thus, this study is based partly on our common efforts, partly on my own research and analyses of the architectural remains and the find material.

1.4.1 Processing pottery and small finds. Refitting of artefacts, quantification and the MNV method (minimum number of vessel).

Material culture is a concept, which describes artefacts created by humans and is used to analyze and to interpret ancient societies. During the end of the 19th and the entire 20th century several theories about material culture as a source of knowledge, style or function, as signs, as bearers of an ideology, structural archaeology, etc, have been used in archaeology. The ancient material culture in the bridge complex consists of architectural remains of buildings, basins, wells, roads, bridge abutments, and pottery assemblages, roof-tiles, clay, metal and glass objects, human and animal bones, and inscriptions.


---

57 Burkert 1996, 30–33.
58 During the two last decades many studies of fear and how to handle it have been published. In this study I do not intend to comment more closely on the modern topic but only mention a few examples, e.g. Kübler-Ross 2001; Levy 2000; Fear 1997; Thompson 1996.
60 Ethnoarchaeology is a discipline with large and important fields of research. On ethnoarchaeological investigations, methods and theories, cf. Kent 1990; Parker Pearson & Richards 1994. Matthews et al. 2000, 177–188. One example is the method used by Hodder and his fellow scholars at Çatalhöyük, using the knowledge of the local villagers to
Form and function are interdependent aspects, important for the interpretation of the site. The debris (the material culture) also reflects the ideas of the ancient man in a social, religious, and an economic sense. The material may reflect a separate event in a process, or the process itself, be it the daily usage or repetitive actions. The objects were made to function in a given situation, for a special reason, and therefore the form often indicates the function. But items made for one function may also be reused for another: a saucer may serve as an ashtray or a coca-cola bottle as a container for olive oil.

One of my hypotheses in this thesis is that by analysing and interpreting each find category, the composition of finds and the various architectural structures in the bridge complex and their different settings, different aspects of society will be mirrored. Hence, I started with a macroscopic analysis of the pottery, the small finds, and the tiles. The pottery and the tiles have been carefully studied in order to show similarities and differences in the repertoire of forms and sizes relevant for a discussion of functions. The ceramics have been sorted, typologized and classified according to wares (wheel-made and hand-made, fine and coarse, decorated and plain) and forms (open and closed) and the differences in special features such as base, body, rim, lip, handle and decoration have been studied. A major effort has been made on rejoining fragments of pottery and tiles to get as complete a profile as possible in order to determine the shape and the size. I have also tried to get a minimum number of vessels (MNV) of each fabric and each shape, and therefore all the shaped fragments have been counted and not weighed. The results will be presented in Chapter 2. A sample of each pottery ware, profiled tile fragments as well as the rest of the find categories, apart from the osteological remains, have been processed in a database.

The profiling of sherds and body sherds with identifiable decoration, and other clay and metal objects have been drawn and photographed. The aim of the intensive work on the pottery was to discern the number of various types of vessels and wares. A substantial amount of work has been carried out on photography and drawings of the pottery.

To get an idea of the characteristics of the ceramics and tiles, open and closed types, and the number of each category I have used a standard method practiced by archaeologists since the end of the 19th century, and further developed during the 20th century. In order to get as complete a profile as possible and to be able to measure the diameters of rims and bases, fragments were rejoined. The refitting method of pottery fragments or stone artefacts could also be used to establish spatial distribution and locate, for example, a working place or an intentional refuse deposit, a cistern or a favissa. To my knowledge it is an uncommon method when dealing with the spatial and vertical distribution of ancient ceramics, although Wikander has used a similar method in the spatial and vertical distribution maps of tiles and roof terracottas of 49 roofs from almost all zones at Acquarossa.

The original intention was, as mentioned earlier, to find as many joins between pottery fragments as possible in order to get a complete profile. When all joining numbers of a vessel were listed, it became apparent that some fragments from deeper strata joined fragments from the upper strata as well as from different trenches. Therefore, fragments of a few selected pottery vessels and tiles from various wares and periods with refits between several trenches and strata were sampled from that list and processed in four diagrams to show a spatial and stratified distribution. Every selected vessel of various dates with two or more joining potsherds is represented by one or several refitting-lines of two or several trenches and strata. Some of the vessels are renamed with an individual post, consisting of a capital letter and a number. By analysing the rejoined fragments from different layers and areas it has been possible to obtain an explanation of this work. S. Forsberg, R. Holmgren, and B. Tobiasson have photographed the finds.

See the history of research in Cziesla 1990, 11–13; on stone vessels and ceramics from Hauthabu, see Gjöstein Resi 1979, and Schietzel 1981, 53–54, Kart. 5–6.

Wikander 1986, figs. 14, 38, 41, 52, 81–84, 88, 103–104, 124, 130–133, 135; Ch. Wikander 1988, 48–49; Wikander 1993, 87–89, fig. 60.

A vertical taphonomic model was used to see possible mechanisms of vertical displacement of stone artefacts, cf. Colcutt et al. 1990, 228–229.

A list of all refitted potsherds will be included in the final publication, San Giovenale 6:1–3 forthcoming.
of the complexity of the stratigraphy. Basing the interpretations of processes and functions on mostly filling material and only on a few finds in situ may seem odd, especially as the importance of context is emphasised. But the result of the interpretation of the rejoicing fragments may justify this choice.

This intensive and time-consuming work on the pottery and the analysis of the stratigraphy and the architectural remains has made it possible to discern several chronological phases and to understand more of the complex stratigraphy. A few specific artefacts will be studied more closely in order to understand their symbolic content and to relate them to different types of processes/rites.73

The terms used for and the relative dating of the chronological periods in this work will basically follow the established chronology in Italy.74 The relative dating of the finds is based on stylistic analyses of pottery assemblages and inscriptions found in tombs and settlements at San Giovenale and other Iron Age and Etruscan sites. No scientific dating has been made on pottery. The only 14C test on charcoal was taken from a hut under House III on the Acropolis.75 The chronology of the bridge complex discussed in chapters 2 and 4 is based on the analyses of the pottery, the architectural remains and the stratigraphy (Table 33). Within the established chronology, specific features of continuity and change in time and space will form a concluding discussion of this book.

1.4.2 Contextual and interpretative archaeology

In order to get a holistic understanding, and to recognize the people of a society behind the artefacts, the material culture will be focused on. Various levels of contexts will be investigated, viz. from the single object and structure per se, via artefact assemblages and structures, the spatial location of the whole bridge complex and its relation to the town and the surroundings (Figs. 12–13).

The concept of contextual archaeology has been in focus since the 1970s and discussed by many scholars.76 I. Hodder pointed out that the find context is important in order to understand the archaeological remains. The focus is on the material culture as an active and dynamic component of the society,77 on the material symbolism and the search for contextual meaning. In Hodder's contextual archaeology there are close connections to hermeneutic thoughts, viz. to relate the whole to the various parts, an effort to form a whole in the understanding of the material and the ancient society.78 Other scholars in the post-processual tradition stressed a functional and symbolic meaning of the finds at the same time.79

As mentioned earlier, one working hypothesis in this study is the multifunctional use of the bridge complex. The character of the material culture and its location at a natural border invites to an interpretation of a practical, as well as a symbolic meaning. In order to get as complete a picture of the bridge complex it is necessary to analyse it's meaning for the settlements on the Borgo, Acropolis and Vignale and to explore different aspects of the society. I will look at the different types of contexts distinguished at the bridge.80 Each context is a whole per se and forms part of a larger whole. The context may have a two-fold meaning, functional and symbolic. Every context is more or less influenced by thoughts and beliefs of the persons making the artefacts or building the structures. They are, in their turn, influenced by the ideas and values in the specific society in which they live. Thus it is a mutual interaction between all levels of context, i.e. the find, the find composition, the find context, the settlements and the necropoleis, and lastly the Etruscan society shown in Fig 13.

1.4.3 The setting of the bridge complex: physical, economical, socio-political and mental landscapes

To achieve the primary aim of this study, i.e. to create a comprehensive understanding of the bridge complex and its relationship to the community at San Giovenale, and Vignale, as well as the neighbouring settlements, I

74 San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming; San Giovenale 5:1, and 5:3 forthcoming; Bengtsson 2000, 15. Concerning the date of Protovillanovan culture I agree that it continued into the Iron Age, i.e. the 8th century B.C. For the Transitional impasto I follow Pohl, cf. in San Giovenale 3:3–4. For various opinions of dating, see Bengtsson 2000, 16. The dating of the early Neolithic period follows the Italian scholars, cf. Piacenza Palidoro style. The new 14C dating of charcoal from a hut at the Acropolis is more consistent with the chronology presented by Italian scholars, cf. San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming. The Villanovan culture seems to be represented by a few pottery fragments in the settlement on the Acropolis, but that phase is not found in the bridge complex.
75 San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming.
77 Hodder 1986; Vandkilde 2000, 12.
78 Hodder & Shanks 1999, 11, 17; see also Hodder 1986.
79 For a discussion and bibliography, see Olsen 2003.
80 On holistic approaches, see Cifani 2002, 225.
have chosen to look in detail at some specific features related to topography, economy, social relationships, politics and religious beliefs (cf. chapter 3).

The concept of landscape and the terminology used in landscape archaeology has been used as a frame in order to illustrate how the archaeological remains from the bridge complex may reflect attitudes and ideas seen in the actions of the people using the bridge and its affiliated facilities, and thus the whole Etruscan society at San Giovenale. To emphasize some important features used in this field, I will use terms such as physical landscape (geography and topography), economic, socio-political and mental landscapes (the latter is the symbolic and the ritual) as a framework to place the bridge complex in a wider context. A brief discussion will follow in chapter 3 as to what extent the material culture and the proposed activities at the bridge complex can be taken to reflect the Etruscan mind, a concept, which is emphasized in the post-processual archaeological thought.81

There are a number of different approaches to the concept of landscape, and it has been frequently used by many disciplines and with many various meanings. The scale and definitions of the term may vary due to the issues discussed, but it always underlines the ‘spatial correlates of human behaviour’. The human acts transform the physical environment constantly. Landscape is more than a natural place. It has an inherent dynamic, a historical sensitivity and is a strong force of cultural change.82

Landscape research from different perspectives has, during the last decade, been a popular tool for various kinds of analyses in archaeology developed by scholars from Northern Europe.83 The relationship between landscape and perception is an issue much debated during the last decade. There are different approaches to the perception of landscapes, the explicit and the inherent approach, two ways of interpreting the human relationship with the landscape.84 Other traditional approaches to landscape archaeology are the landscapes as objects and subjects, as expressed by Darwill. He has also highlighted the critique against those approaches and also introduced a third approach of the landscape as context and has underlined the conceptions of space, time and ‘the constitution and archaeological manifestation of social action’.85

English scholars, such as Ward-Perkins, Potter and Barker, have dominated the study of the Etruscan landscapes during the last two decades. Potter, as well as Barker, have been members of the South Etruria project.86 Other North European scholars dealing with various aspects of the Etruscan and Italic landscapes are Wetter, Santillo-Frizell, Wiman and Ekman. Among the Italian scholars should Quilici, Rendeli, Zifferero, Naso, di Gennaro, and Attema be mentioned. Recently, Attema published a study of the new development of Italian landscape archaeology.87

My intention, however, has not been to engage in a theoretical discussion on landscape archaeology. In the following, focus will be on T. Darwill’s model of the landscape as context and his space, time and social action model: a study of landscape features is necessary in order to explain functions. Likewise, I find it important to discuss the location of a structure in relation to a natural phenomenon, such as a hill, a mountain, a grove, a spring, a lake or a river in order to find out the character/s of the place. Structures at such places may be considered sacred.88

There are of course other relevant studies of landscapes from different aspects in the ancient Greek world such as Graecia capta. The landscapes of Roman Greece by S. Alcock. Recently, she has also focused on the transformation of the social landscape in early Roman Greece, Archaic Messenia, Hellenistic and Roman Crete.89 Southern Argolid has been characterized in A Greek countryside. The southern Argolid from prehistory to the present day by M. Jameson, C. Runnels and T. van Andel.90 F. De Polignac has chosen to study the landscape in ancient Greece, the city and the boundary sanctuaries from a political and ritual point of view, the political borders

81 Vandkilde 2000, 12.
82 Alcock 1993, 6–7.
83 On the phenomenological approach, see Tilley 1994; whether the meaning of the landscapes has been retained or transformed over time, cf. Layton & Ucko 1999.
between larger territories, between cities and between city and its Hinterland.

The physical landscape

By definition the physical landscape is composed of the topographical features, many environmental factors and physical forms created by man. The physical environment and the characteristics of South Etruria have been presented through the eyes of early travellers in the Etruscan landscape. The results of several field surveys in the Etruscan territory have increased our knowledge during the last decades. Surveys in the San Giovenale area have been conducted, as mentioned earlier, on a few occasions in the 18th century by Gamurrini, several times by Hemphill during the 20th century and by J. Bengtsson in 2000. Furthermore, F. di Gennaro, M. Rendeli, A. Zifferero, G. Barker, I.M.B. Wiman, S. Ekman, and B. Santillo Frizell have investigated different areas in the Etruscan territory from various aspects, which are relevant for the study of the physical landscape around San Giovenale.

Within the study of the physical landscape I intend to look at geological, geographical and topographical features (such as hills, plateaux, rivers, ravines, roads, and fords) in the South Etruria and particularly in the San Giovenale area. During the Second World War the new technique of aerial photography was introduced, which has been used in archaeological surveys as a successful method of detecting ancient remains. The Swedish Institute in Rome adapted this technique during the investigations at San Giovenale. The whole area was aerial photographed in a photogrammetric technique in 1960 by the Military Geographical Institute in Florence and in 1961 by B. Hallert et al. in order to produce a topographic map on scale 1:1000. The contour lines show an interval of one meter, but 5 meters over steeply sloping parts. A topographic map and a physical model of the San Giovenale area in a scale of 1:500 were established. The aerial photo of the whole area (Fig. 3) is one of many photos taken by the Military Geographical Institute in Florence. In recent years the map has been digitalized and complemented with the archaeological remains from different areas including the bridge complex. The map in Fig. 2a is based on a copy of the general map from 2002 with only some remains of the excavation areas enclosed.

All the aerial photos have been a great help in my studies of the specific features and their relationships, which are difficult to see from the ground. In the text, I have deliberately included many photos showing the topography at the bridge and its surroundings to get a clear picture of the physical landscape.

Construction of the economic landscape

The economic landscape will contain a discussion of the infrastructure as, for example, the road network, but also requirements for production, trade and exchange. Scholars have dealt with Roman roads and bridges all over the Roman world since the beginning of the 19th century. Studies on the Etruscan road network and bridges are, however, often shortly commented on, due to few proper Etruscan remains. There are, however, a few scholars, who have treated the Etruscan road networks as well as the Roman road network, including the bridges in South Etruria. The Etruscan road network in South Etruria was established in surveys made in the 18th century by Gamurrini, and in the 1950s by Wetter and the *Squadra Volante*. All the ancient roads and bridges found, as well as the modern ones, were marked on special photos and some of them were used on the map published in Architettura etrusca 1986. Fig. 1 is based on that map and complemented with ancient roads already marked on the aerial photomaps F6–F9 in Etruscan culture 1962, and in Santella 1988. Two
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recent studies of Roman roads and bridges in South Etruria were made by Cristofani et al., in 1985, and Quilici in 1989. Cicognolo is another scholar, who has recently investigated all the Roman bridges along Via Clodia and Via Cassia with comments on the Etruscan remains. 

Trade and exchange of Attic imports found in settlements and tombs are two other issues, which will be treated in this study. The Attic pottery per se, forms and decoration, and its reception by the Etruscans have been debated by a few scholars during the last decades. 

Production of agricultural goods, stock-raising, and the production of different objects such as textile production, metal working on a local as well as regional level will be discussed from the finds found at the bridge, and from the settlements. The practice of a transhumance economy will be studied since an important transit road ran through the town of San Giovenale. Transhumance in this area has earlier been studied by J.E. Skydsgaard, and recent investigations on this subject have been made by L. Santella and G. Ricci, B. Santillo Frizell, and by E. Antonacci Sanpaolo.

Construction of the socio-political landscape

The discussion of the socio-political landscape will focus on physical as well as liminal boundaries, on settlement organisation, social stratifications, identity, and relationships between the locals and the surrounding settlements within a radius of c. 35 km. Different theories on hypothetical boundaries based on mathematical variants of the Thiessen polygonal model will be briefly commented on. One major critique is that these models do not consider natural boundaries, such as rivers and mountains. I will comment on a few of these models since they effect the location of San Giovenale when it either belonged to the ager caeretanus or ager tarquiniensis. My model of the spatial relationships between the settlement, necropolis and other natural features and between two Etruscan states is based on a model of liminal zones presented by Riva and Stoddart (Figs. 10, 100). I have also used their model in the discussion of ritualised boundaries (see below in this chapter).

The urbanization of South Etruria started already during the 7th century. However, a more complex situation has been detected through recent surveys. In the territory of the city-states there are primary and secondary settlements of various sizes, large or medium sites, divided into cities, towns, villages and farms. Some scholars have discussed the origin and the development of the Etruscan cities with focus on the boundaries and the scale of the Etruscan sites, by using different mathematical methods.

Unfortunately, there is no Etruscan written source defining a city. Damgaard Andersen has discussed certain criteria for defining an Etruscan city using the cities from central Etruria. One definition of an Etruscan city is: ‘...a substantial concentration of inhabitants, supported by a hinterland’. She has argued for the physical aspects in which she includes criteria, such as topography, size, buildings, fortifications, roads, and water supplies. Further criteria are the economic conditions, including, trade, agriculture and crafts. A third group of criteria are the political conditions, which have to be considered. The last group of criteria concerns religious rites and sanctuaries. She concludes ‘...that the “ideal city” is a certain size and population and has a substantial number of buildings. Its economy is based on local trade, inter-regional and long-distance trade. It is located near the sea or near crossroads, rivers or in agricultural areas.

The trend in landscape research during the last decade has been to separate the study of the living from the study of the dead, but this has now changed in favour of a study of domestic and mortuary dimensions of landscape in pre-state societies as shown in works by Sharpl, I. Hodder, C. Tilley, and I. Morris. Archaeologists use tombs, skeletons, and grave goods to increase their information about the inhabitants of society, their numbers, their status and gender. This approach can also be used on the cemeteries at San Giovenale and together with the analyses of the finds it may give a picture of various socio-political aspects of the society.

105 Cristofani et al. 1985; Quilici 1989 has discussed all different types of covers for ancient roads.
111 Riva & Stoddart 1996, fig. 1.
112 Damgaard Andersen 1997; Stoddart 1998.
113 Cf. the various Thiessen polygonal models used by scholars such as Santella 1988; Stoddart 1998; Rendeli 1993; Zifferero 1998. But there are those who question those methods used on Etruscan material, see e.g. Damgaard Andersen 1997.
114 Damgaard Andersen 1997, 345.
Construction of the mental landscape: symbolic and ritual aspects

The mental landscape is a term used in various disciplines such as psychology, sociology, and archaeology. It has been defined as ‘the cognitive map, within human minds, of a landscape’, and differs between individuals. Contrary to the physical landscape it is not accessible to our senses, but it is still there. A symbolic and a mythological landscape are often referred to as mental landscapes. A symbolic landscape may be defined as ‘a dimension of landscape in which features of the landscape represent things and concepts other than those which derive from their physical function or properties’.117 In the following work I have chosen to avoid the term sacral, sacred or religious landscape since this excludes the wider symbolic aspects and more practical rites. Instead I will use ‘mental landscape’ as a comprehensive term for peoples’ symbolic and ritual thoughts and beliefs and actions, consequently manifested in the material culture and in the landscape.

The ritual/mental landscape has been treated from different point of views.118 Focus has earlier been laid on the material culture from sanctuaries and burials. This has helped in seeing ‘the individuality of particular Etruscan cities’.119 The point of departure for a discussion, from a ritualised boundary perspective of the archaeological remains in the bridge complex, will be a modified model, showing both a physical and metaphysical boundary between settlements and necropoleis, separated either by a road in a ravine or by a river but linked by bridges. Crossing such boundaries demand rituals of various kinds.120 I intend to investigate if such rites can be distinguished in the archaeological remains in the bridge complex.

Basically, I have used E. Leach’s two models of interaction between space and time in the discussions of the symbolic and ritual function of the bridge complex (Figs. 11, 101). Leach discusses boundaries of social space and time, and he suggests that the use of symbols creates artificial boundaries ‘in a field which is ‘naturally continuous’ when we try to distinguish actions or a class of things from another’.121 He has also stated that ‘The principle that all boundaries are artificial interruptions to what is naturally continuous, and that ambiguity, which is implicit in the boundary as such, is a source of anxiety, applies to time as well as to space’.122

Recently, several studies on ritual landscape in the Greek as well as the Italic world have been published, for example by Tilley, who has dealt with several dimensions of landscape, and by Morris concerning mortuary rituals.123 Studies useful for the investigation of the bridge complex is, as already mentioned, an article by Riva and Stoddart.124 They have studied the Etruscan ritual landscape from a few city-state societies ‘where boundaries and transitional-liminal zones in the landscape became increasingly emphasised by monumental material culture’.125 San Giovenale is used as one example of a liminal zone with cemeteries as a boundary marker (see Figs. 10, 100).126 There are categories of features, which have to be considered in a symbolic and ritual landscape, such as a cemetery with various kinds of tombs, and cippi, temena, sanctuaries, cult buildings, altars, votive deposits, sacred springs, wells and rivers. A few characteristic examples will be discussed more closely, such as the river with its powerful running water,127 the river and the bridge as a natural physical border and a liminal zone symbol,128 and their relationship to the archaeological remains found in the bridge complex. Those are features that can be interpreted as sets of signs or symbols.129

Sanctuaries, tombs and cippi are often considered as symbols used for marking liminal zones. Roads and crossroads, rivers, lakes, springs and bridges can be included in this category of symbols. A bridge may be seen as a physical link between settlements, and as an eschatological symbol of communication between earth and heaven, i.e. a path that leads the soul from the living world to the world of the dead and which bridges the

117 Dowling 2004, 2; see also Ermischer 2003, on the landscape as idea and concept.
118 E.g. Alcock 1993 has discussed sanctuaries in the Roman ritualized landscape of Greece and in 1996 of sanctuaries in Metapont; S. Brink has looked at the choice of sacred places, cults and myths as originated in prayers from the locals, Brink 2001, 76–112.
119 Riva & Stoddart 1996, 92.
120 Edlund 1987, 58.
121 E. Leach 1976, 33–36, 81–84, fgs. 4 and 8.
122 E. Leach 1976, 34.
123 Tilley 1994; Morris 1987, 199.
124 See also articles on sacred and ritual landscapes by Kleinbrink, Zifferero, and Horsnaes in Italian landscape archaeology 2002.
126 Riva & Stoddart 1996, fig. 1. My model in Fig. 7 showing natural and liminal zones at the bridge and in the surroundings is inspired by their model.
129 E. Leach 1976.
dangerous place beneath the bridge.\textsuperscript{130} This is a concept that is common in many ancient and modern religions all over the world in rites of passage. In this manner a cult place and its priest or priestess is the mediator between man and the gods. A bridge is the visible and the invisible liminal point at the same time, and \textit{per se} considered as a holy place, a \textit{janus}, by L. M. Holland. She has also described the river and the water as symbols of divine power.\textsuperscript{131} I. Edlund has chosen to discuss the gods and their various dwellings in the ritual landscape in South Etruria and in Magna Graecia. In her book \textit{The gods and the place} she classified all kinds of sanctuaries in Etruria and Magna Graecia according to their urban location,\textsuperscript{132} and has one category, the natural sanctuary, which includes sanctuaries connected to water. She also underlines the importance of the river as a boundary between the living and the dead, and rituals performed before crossing a boundary.\textsuperscript{133}

The most comprehensive study of the symbolic aspects of the bridge, and the sacredness of water from different ancient cultures known to me, is the work of A. Seppilli. As mentioned earlier, she also deals with sacrificial ceremonies performed during constructions of bridges and at the inaugurations of them, kept in legends and folkloristic songs of bridges in the whole world, for example the famous legends of the bridge of Arta in Epirus in Greece and the bridge over Drina in the Balkans.\textsuperscript{134} Ceremonial rites at territorial passages of various kinds are common.\textsuperscript{135}

The crossing of a bridge, in some cases on a very narrow and sharp-edged bridge, is a ritual and a test where the faithful succeed and the infidel loses. It can also be part of an initiation rite common in the ancient Iranian Zoroastrian religion, among the Algonquies in North America and among some Russian tribes.\textsuperscript{136}

To build bridges for the soul was a common habit in medieval Europe and Scandinavia, where they were particularly commissioned by men and women.\textsuperscript{137}

Examples of dichotomies acknowledged in the environment of the bridge, such as urban and extra-urban, land and water, open and closed, sacred and profane, acropolis and necropolis, visible and invisible, the living and the ancestors, man and his gods, will be studied more closely. Those are a set of ambiguous symbols, quite observable when looking in a wider context. It is possible that some are even more emphasized in a more defined, more significant context as a liminal place and others not.

Other examples of boundaries of social space are property ownership and national frontiers, but also domestic areas, as distinguished from wild areas, town from country, profane buildings from sacred, centre from periphery and so forth. The time and space boundaries also indicate dichotomies as normal and abnormal, clear-cut and ambiguous, centre and periphery, inside and outside. The tendency of dividing secular and profane areas and functions is not necessarily applicable at the bridge. It is even unlikely that ancient man regarded that kind of division.\textsuperscript{138}

Lately, more and more evidence of secular activities taking place inside sanctuaries, for example metal workshops, has been found, which points to more
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\item \textsuperscript{131} Holland 1961, 8–20.
\item \textsuperscript{132} Edlund 1987; Colonna, Rendeli, and Glinister have classified sanctuaries in a similar way. Damgaard Andersen, however, has classified sanctuaries based on both location and function. For a short summary on the terminology of sanctuaries, see Damgaard Andersen 1998, 170–187, diagram 13. In this diagram she has classified House 1 at the northern side of the bridge as a “political” sanctuary. I do not totally agree with her, that this building should be classified as a political meeting place for religious leagues and administered by a coalition of cities. Such sanctuaries were often located along roads, transhumance routes and along rivers and mounting passes. House 1, located along a road at a river crossing and very close to a main economic and transhumance route may well have been a meeting place for locals and travelers. The political aspect is, in my view, the location at a territorial border, viz. between two city-states. The whole bridge complex was probably administered by the ruling family at San Giovenale.
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\item \textsuperscript{137} Gräslund 1989; 1995; 2001. Neither in the literature of classical antiquity nor in the Bible is there any evidence of the bridge as a symbol for the soul’s passage to the after world, or of a link between this world and God’s world. In the New Testament the concept of the road but not the bridge is mentioned in, for example \textit{John} 4–6; \textit{Acts} 9:2; Galliazzo 1994, 103. On religious meaning of the bridge in various cultures, see also Bleeker 1963, 180–189; Seppilli 1977, 234–247.
\item \textsuperscript{138} Binford 1962; Brink 2003.
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integrated functions. The crucial point here is the attention on the differences and not similarities in a spatial or temporal zone. Such markers of boundaries contribute to the feelings of a special zone as ambiguous, ‘sacred’ and taboo. Before crossing such frontiers or the transition from one social status to another it is important to perform rituals for a safe change. Such a field of activity is the liminal zone (Fig. 11).

1.4.4 Liminality

Liminality is a concept often used in literature. It is defined as a physical and spiritual boundary (Lat. limen) and it is an important concept in rites of passage (transition rites) coined by A. van Gennep. He divided the rite of passage into three phases, viz. the separation, the transition or the liminal phase, and the incorporation phase. The idea of a transition from one state to another during crucial periods of a person’s life, for example birth, manhood, marriage and death or passing a threshold is discussed and the need for special rituals to be performed in order to facilitate the transition and not be left behind in a limbo state. V. Turner has concentrated on the middle phase, viz. the transition phase or the liminal phase. He sees this phase as “between and ‘betwixt and between’ personal and social categories—a phase full of “positive and active qualities” and discusses the many symbols linked to liminality. He also shows that these rites were well known all over the world for a very long time.

The liminal points can be characterised as a beginning of something new and as something that is “order”, preventing the world to fall into chaos. The liminal point also expresses ‘permanent chaos’. The idea of liminality can also be experienced in the physical landscape, e.g. at crossroads, rivers and bridges, boundaries, gates, and doors and the crossing of thresholds and frontiers have always been considered dangerous and therefore connected with specific rituals. Hesiod was fully aware of the dangers related to improper behaviour if the rituals were neglected. In Work and days he gives strict advice not to urinate or to void vapours into rivers, nor springs, and it is most advisable to pray before crossing the flowing water, and to wash the hands in the water and all evil thoughts away. The gods will punish those who do not act accordingly to those rituals.

The idea of evil spirits at all kinds at liminal points, natural or man-made, is not restricted in time and space to a specific culture. This seems to coincide with the rituals of passage at a point in a person’s life when a change or a transformation from something old to something new takes place, from something known to something unknown. The liminal phase in the rites of passage can be connected to the liminal zone, described by Leach in his second model, in which he has pointed out the zone where two spheres of interest interacts. This is an area, which he considered sacred, but also a no-man’s land, and therefore treated as a dangerous place (Fig. 11).

Lately, liminality has also been discussed as an issue in the structure of the ground plans of tombs: the dromos, the main chamber, the furnishings, the doorways and the false door, the paintings of banqueting as well as demons and animals on the walls. M. Cristofani and B. d’Agostini have both, however very briefly, also discussed the funerary ritual from a liminal point of view. The dynamics of ritual have been neglected lately, but a recent paper by Riva and Stoddart has shown that this trend has changed. The structural elements were a very important issue taken together with tomb paintings, sculpture, vase-paintings, and Stattin’s in the Chaldean oracles and in related literature. See also Stattin 1984 and Folkloren 1987.
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143 Turner 1969, 95.
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etc. The tomb and its architectural elements could be interpreted in a social and secular way but primarily ritual since it belongs to a ritual context. V. Izzet has focused on visible and invisible boundaries in funerary contexts, and on changes in the construction of Etruscan tombs from Cerveteri during one particular period, indicating a shift in the attitude towards death and the dead. The concentration seemed to have been more on the external, which concerned ‘viewing and being viewed’. One of her themes concerns the boundaries between the inner and the outer space of a tomb.\footnote{Riva & Stoddart 1996, 92–93.}

Riva and Stoddart have argued for a working model of three levels of liminal zones: a liminal zone between city and \textit{ager}, between states and between cultural, political and religious authorities in the Etruscan, Greek and Phoenician cultures (\textit{Fig. 10}).\footnote{Riva & Stoddart 1996, fig. 1.} Monumental structures like tombs, sanctuaries, temples, votive deposits and \textit{cippi} were territorial as well as symbolic markers found at such transitional zones.\footnote{De Polignac 1996; Naso & Zifferero 1985; Zifferero 1998; 2002b.} They have argued that sanctuaries, temples and votive deposits could be located at all degrees of liminal zones, while tombs and \textit{cippi} were to be found in zone one and two.\footnote{Riva & Stoddart 1996, 93.} They have shown that there is a similarity between Caere and the inland settlements in the placing of these zones. P. G. Guzzo has proposed a similar division of frontiers but with an emphasis on the border between city and necropolis, between city and \textit{ager} and between two settlements, a model more consistent to mine.\footnote{Guzzo 1987, 373–379.}

1.4.5 Definitions of space and rituals

Space, is defined by modern geographers, as ‘a field of study in which all human actions take place; moreover, space is shaped by social processes and reflects human activity that takes place in space’.\footnote{Laurence 1997, 8.} Space in archaeological studies in general has, during a long time, been treated mostly from a processual point of view. Intersite or intrasite space is often categorized as private and public, domestic, sacred with ritual activity, mortuary space, and only more recently more as social space.\footnote{Sjögren forthcoming.} I intend to discuss a few aspects of spatial organisation at San Giovenale, as domestic and mortuary space, but sacred and ritual space in particular.

\textbf{Sacred space}

One way for the ancient Etruscans to deal with the eternal existential questions was to rely on mythology. The evidence has been taken to indicate that the Etruscans created a micro-cosmos on earth, reflecting the macro-cosmos of heaven, a way to divide the heavens following the main four directions of the compass, living by the rules according to the \textit{Etrusca disciplina}.\footnote{Martinelli 1992; Van der Meer 1987; Pfiffig 1975.} The augurs and the haruspices are thought to have created the divine boundaries of the world, a \textit{templum},\footnote{A templum may comprise the city with its boundaries, the sacred area in or outside the city, Van der Meer 1987; Beard \textit{et al.} 1998, 86–87. On \textit{pomerium}, the sacred boundary of a city, see Beard \textit{et al.} vol. 1, 1, 184–181; vol. 2, 1998, 93–96.} and a sacred place using the \textit{groma} according to the Vegoia prophecy. They divided it into a few regions and then four quadrants NW, NE, SE, SW protected by the boundary gods, creating a sacred place suitable for observing the omens.\footnote{Van der Meer 1987.}

Heaven may be not only the realm of the gods but also the exemplar of divine order and regular progression. The sacred place may be a heaven on earth, which transposes the eternal and sanctified order of heaven onto the plane of earth. At the founding of cities within the Roman world, for instance, the augur drew a circle quartered by lines running east-west and north-south. This diagram replicated the heavenly order and thereby established it on earth. Through ritual formulas, the diagram was then projected onto the whole tract of land to be encompassed by the city, so that the periphery of the city reproduced the boundary of the universe. The east-west line represented the course of the sun, the north-south line, the axis of the sky. The augur and the city thus stood at the crossing point of these two lines and hence immovably and harmoniously at the centre of the universe.\footnote{Encyclopedia of Religion 1987, vol.12, 533.}

The ritual of defining a city mentioned above or even the boundaries of a cemetery, may well have been used by an augur at San Giovenale with its very distinctive natural boundaries, as well as the large wall surrounding the plateau. So far, it has been possible to identify the Protovillanovan and the Etruscan domestic spaces within the settlement, but only scanty evidence of sacred space. The so-called Spring building on the Acropolis, dated to the transitional phase between the
Protovillanovan period and the Etruscan period, and the late Etruscan cult building close by are the only features interpreted as sacred. A sacred place, such as a sanctuary is a well-defined area with a temenos wall, often with a small chapel or a structure without a roof. Since there is no evidence of such a clear temenos wall at the bridge complex the structures will be analyzed and discussed more from a symbolic and ritual point of view in chapter 3.

Unfortunately, there are no longer, more substantial written sources, which can reveal something about the mythology of the Etruscans. Seneca indicates possible differences between the Roman and Etruscan way of looking at religion:

This is the difference between us and the Etruscans, who have consummate skill in the interpreting lightning: we think that because clouds collide lightning is emitted; they believe that the clouds collide in order that lightning may be emitted. Since they attribute everything to the divine agency they are of the opinion that things do not reveal the future because they have occurred, but that they occur because they are meant to reveal the future. Whether it is displaying their purpose or their consequences they none the less occur on the same principle. There are many theoretical approaches and methods for analysis of architecture and the interaction between architecture and human behaviour among scholars from various disciplines. The identification of Etruscan buildings is a complicated issue. Buildings may be characterized as public or private, profane or sacred. Scholars have, for some time, discussed characteristics and criteria for the identification of both domestic and sacred buildings. H. Victor has argued that the ritual house expresses the idea of the house where the house is the centre for human beings. It means, not only security and continuity, but together with the daily activities in it, it also symbolizes and expresses the human life and the world. The form of a house was transferred to burial and ritual contexts. A similar transfer of the morphology of the home, house or hut, is to be seen in Etruria and at San Giovenale during the Protovillanovan and Etruscan burial and ritual contexts. Damgaard Andersen has categorized various types of buildings in two groups, public and private, and defined criteria for each building. To the first group she counts temples, sacella, affiliated religious buildings, and civic buildings. The second group, with private structures, contains domestic buildings, workshops, farmhouses, and funerary houses. For every type of building there are some requirements to be fulfilled. For the identification of a sanctuary or a temple there must be evidence of a temenos, a special ground form, an altar, a cult statue, votives, votive deposits, inscriptions and/or literary sources.

Criteria and characteristics for the identification of sacred buildings have altered over time. Not long ago a piece of a decorated architectural terracotta was enough to interpret a structure as a temple. The effect was that several buildings were interpreted as sacred buildings, e.g. the courtyard houses at Poggio Civitate (Murlo), Acquarossa, and Satricum. But now there is enough evidence suggesting that even public buildings as well as residential buildings may have had roofs with acroteria, ridge-tiles, cover-tiles and revetment plaques decorated with painted animal and human figured terracottas and walls with terracotta reliefs. Stone benches, votives, sacred inscriptions, house-plans, altars, and figurines are other criteria used for the identification of sacred structures. A sacellum is defined as a small chapel. It is often a rectangular or square building with only one small room with the entrance at the short side, and often furnished with a
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stone bench along three or four walls.179 J. Bouma and M. Maas Kant-Kleibrink have argued for and against an open-air sanctuary preceding a sacellum at Satricum.180 In that particular case the discussions point to an evolutionary development of a sacred place. Colonna interprets one building at the Pietrisco Bridge as a probable sacellum and this suggestion will be discussed in chapter 3, seeing the bridge as a natural sanctuary.181 Damgaard Andersen’s division of sanctuaries based on functions will also be discussed.182

Rituals and ritual space

As mentioned earlier, one aim of this study is to discuss the evidence of possible rituals being performed at the bridge complex, since several of the finds from the bridge complex show characteristic features of ritual. First, it is necessary to define ritual, which is a complex word. My own definition of a ritual is a deliberate act carried out to obtain a specific purpose in a given moment. The Concise Oxford Dictionary defines religious or other rites as a performance of ritual acts, as ‘a form of procedure in a religious or solemn observance (burial or funeral rites)’.183 ‘Ritual tends to appear timeless and unchanging, because that is its character’. But as rituals can be changed in meaning and form over time, so could also ancient rituals. They can be ‘defined and redefined from time to time within the terms of contemporary society’ according to Wilkins.184 He also states that the context is very important and that the rituals created by society helped to define it.

Burkert defines ritual as ‘an actor redirected to serve for communication’.185 A ritual has to be exact and repetitive, and Renfrew also states that ritual is characterized by repetition, formality and divinity.186 Different kinds of rituals, for example apotropaic, sacrificial, transformation rituals (rites of passages), and expiatory sacrifice were performed at various time periods: daily, periodically or on special occasions.187 According to Ekroth there are two principles of division for rituals, namely the existence of low-intensity and high-intensity rituals, and modified ones. The cult of the dead for example, is defined as a low-intensity ritual while purifications and rites of crossing belong to the group of high-intensity rituals.188

The sources of waters, rivers, lakes, and springs have been considered sacred places and categorized as natural sanctuaries. The crossing of a river was marked by an offering thrown into the water or by a prayer or by putting votives in a deposit.189 Two good examples of this ritual behaviour is the Archaic votive deposit sacrificed to Herakles at the bridge over Acquoria along the Via Tiburtina, ancient transhumance route, and the Hellenistic votive deposit of figurines just beside the road over the stream Picciolana at Sovana.190 To find a building at a bridge is, however, rare. The identification and one of the functions of such a building at crossings will be discussed as being affiliated ritual buildings in a ritual place, i.e. a natural sanctuary.191

R. Whitehouse underlines the importance of distinguishing secular and religious rituals in archaeology. Furthermore, she has suggested a typology of ritual objects, and she distinguishes between six different groups, which differ in form and meaning. They are defined as ritual objects and valued for their symbolic content: sacra, votaries, and sacrifices, objects used in rites, grave goods and amulets.192 She advocates a model with a scale from ‘mostly practical to mostly symbolic’, and she has also discussed how to find these categories in the archaeological record.193

Renfrew and Bahn tried to answer the pertinent question of how to define rituals in an archaeological...
One way was to look at artefacts related to rituals, and they stipulated some archaeological indicators of ritual, which may help the archaeologists in interpreting a ritual context. Renfrew has discussed sixteen indicators of ritual subdivided into four groups: (A) focusing of attention (1–4), which contain the location of the place in a cave, a spring, mountain top, or a special building. The equipment of a building may have features like benches, altars, hearths, movable equipment and many repeated symbols; (B) a boundary zone between this world and the next may be seen in the mysteries, which are reflected in the architecture, basins of water and pools may show thoughts of cleanliness and pollution and a care of the area (5–6); (C) presence of the deity can be seen in cult images, or in abstract symbols, rituals in connection to rites of passages and especially to the funeral ritual (7–9); (D) participation and offering (10–16): prayers and different gestures seen in iconography, examples of religious experience e.g. dance, music, animal and food sacrifices, eating and drinking, libations, votives, investment in wealth seen in the gifts and the equipment used and also in the structures. Some of these sixteen indicators will be commented upon in chapter 3 when discussing the symbolic and ritual landscape. F. Bertemes and P. Biehl have moved a little further than Renfrew, while working out a more precise method to recognize various criteria established for the archaeology of cult and religion based on Hawkes ‘ladder of inference’. They have criticized Renfrew’s theory for what they see as a lack of methodology, and have therefore published a new theoretical approach for the archaeology of cult and religion. Likewise, Bertemes and Biehl discussed the theoretical framework for the archaeology of cult and religion. They see a new definition of context: the artefact per se is a context with its own material culture and furthermore that the context of the artefact and the place is interconnected.

By applying anthropological models of liminality and sacred zones on the finds at the environment at the Pietrisco bridge we may get deeper knowledge of beliefs and thoughts of the Etruscans.

Domestic space

The spatial organisation of San Giovenale in domestic and mortuary spaces will be more closely analysed in chapter 3. Studies of ancient domestic space have mostly been equated with a hut or a house of a certain ground plan and its physical features. However, D. Dvorsky Rohner has applied a method of a predictive model taken from ethnoarchaeology on Etruscan domestic houses from 600 B.C. at Acquarossa, Veii, Vetulonia and San Giovenale. She discusses the importance of the domestic idea within the Etruscan society. The inner and outer spaces (courtyards, back courtyards, common use areas, public streets), and the activities of a house are emphasised.

Domestic houses of rectangular ground-plan (megaron) with one or two rooms and with porches at the front have traditionally been considered as homes for common people because of the domestic character of the finds found in them or in close connection to them. The courtyard houses or the palazzi with three or four wings with square or rectangular rooms often with porches facing the courtyard, have also been identified as a residence, i.e. a civil building for the local clan, or workshops since moulds of tiles and terracottas were found among the debris. The size, the layout, the number of rooms, the placing of the door, porches with columns, internal furnishing, decoration of the roofs, architectural terracottas are some features used in the identification.

Sanders stated that ‘A building is a cultural unit of meaning before it is an object of practical function’, and Hodder has argued that a house is a reflection or an expression of social form or social process. The building is a context per se, but its wider context, the environmental setting, is as important a feature to consider in the interpretation of a building and its

---

199 Bertemes & Biehl 2001, 16–19, figs. 2–3. See also Colonna’s features for identifying temples in Colonna 1985, 60; and the divisions of sanctuaries in Edlund 1987, 29–37.
200 On social space, see Parker Pearson & Richards 1994, and Sjögren forthcoming.
201 Dvorsky Rohner 1996, 116, 123–124, fig. 6. The house from San Giovenale is named House I in Area B on the Acropolis, excavated in the 1950s by Berggren & Berggren, cf. San Giovenale 2:2, fig. 6. On space syntax analyses, see Weilguni forthcoming.
202 Boéthius & Ward-Perkins 1970, 64.
203 Damgaard Andersen 1993, 79.
204 Dvorsky Rohner 1996, 125–127; Ch. Wikander 1988; Rystedt 1983; Edlund-Berry 1994, 16.
206 Sanders 1990, 45.
207 Hodder 1998, 85.
For the meaning and the functions of the buildings at the bridge I will test the above-mentioned criteria (see chapter 3).

Mortuary space

The spatial relationships of cemetery and settlement and the organisation of cemeteries have altered within cultures during time between intra- and extra-mural burials, depending on the relationship between the living and the dead, as well as the ideology and ideas of death. In Etruria from the prehistoric to the Hellenistic periods there seems to be a general pattern of extra-mural burials separated by a ravine or a river. In this area most cemeteries are located on a hill or at the edges of a hill with distinctive natural boundaries or with special boundary markers (such as at Vulci, Veii, Caere, and Tarquinia, cf. Fig. 1. See also the discussion on San Giovenale further below). There are, however, exceptions from this pattern where tombs, often from a late date, have been dug into the steep sides of a settlement hill (see e.g. Blera, Fig. 1). The mortuary practise of intra-mural burials is documented in the early Christian tombs around the chapel on the Acropolis and the medieval tombs found in various settlement areas at San Giovenale.

1.5 CONTINUITY AND CHANGE THROUGH TIME AND SPACE

How do we define continuity and change in archaeological contexts? Were the ancients aware of those phenomena? Continuity and change in various features at the bridge complex as well as in the settlements and the cemeteries will be investigated. Hodder has in a similar way distinguished continuity and change at the Neolithic site of Çatalhöyük. He has noticed walls and houses reconstructed over time, which create a story of the place and show the continuity of the use of space. In that specific case the houses were of a domestic character. He also argued that the domus involved an economic, social and cultural emphasis on the house and its continuity through time, and for a reproduction of a house because it was a good practical and symbolic model and that the house is considered to ‘create continuities between past and present’ in economic, social and ritual areas. Buildings built upon or nearly upon each other show an urge to keep contact with the past, to let the spirit of the past continue into the future. He also claimed that ‘the new had to relate to the old within a narrative’. Changes in the size and form of buildings and other architectural remains indicate a change in the history of the place.

1.6 CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this chapter I have stated the aims of this study and given a short introduction to the excavated site and previous research on the bridge and San Giovenale. Furthermore, I have placed the site in a topographical and chronological frame and myself into a theoretical and methodological frame and described the methods to be used to achieve the aim of this study. During my years as a student in classical archaeology, my methodological and theoretical training has developed from a pure empiric standpoint to an adaptation of an interpretative and more holistic view of the archaeological material. It is essential to highlight the human being, who is the creative force behind all artefacts and the whole historical process. A profound knowledge of the finds and all their contexts is essential, upon which we must base all our interpretations. Asking questions about the material is essential in order to hopefully get the answers we need. This process may be illustrated with a similar model used for creating a liminal zone (cf. Fig. 12). The first circle shows the empirical data of finds and structures, the natural environment, topography, geography, and social relations. The second circle illustrates the landscapes and various aspects, which are reflected by the finds. In the space created by the interaction of the two circles we find the human being, who is the creator behind all the finds handed down to posterity. The finds are products of ancient human activity and thoughts, which in turn reflect the society they live in.

---
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CHAPTER 2

A PRESENTATION OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS AT THE BRIDGE COMPLEX

res ardua vetustis novitatem dare, novis auctoritatem, obsoletis nitorem, obscuris lucem, fastiditis gratiam, dubiis falem, omnibus vero naturam et naturae sua omnia. itaque nobis etiam non assecutis voluisse abunde pulchrum atque magnificum est.

It is a difficult task to give novelty to what is old, authority to what is new, brilliance to the commonplace, light to the obscure, attraction to the stale, credibility to the doubtful, nature to all things and all her properties to nature. Accordingly, even if we have not succeeded, it is honourable and glorius in the fullest measure to have resolved on the attempt. (Plin. NH 1. praef.15).

This chapter is divided into five parts. The first, part 2.1 will deal with a topographic description of the site and a general description of the architectural remains from both sides of the Pietrisco brook. The intention is to give a short presentation of some of the structures crucial for the interpretation of the function of the bridge complex that is the ground plans of buildings, and their furnishing, as well as other installations on the northern and the southern abutments.

In part 2.2 the stratigraphy of the two investigated areas will be presented as a basis for the division of the architectural elements into seven chronological phases. The first three phases, the pre-construction phases, which are without clear evidence of constructions, are mainly derived from the pottery. This will be discussed further below.

Part 2.3 will deal with a general description of the architectural remains related to the pre-construction phases, dated from c. the 4th millennium, the 9th and the early 6th centuries and the four construction phases dated from 565 to c. 200 B.C. During the construction phases the bridge, the road and especially the three houses, House 1, the rectangular house, House 2, the trapezoidal, and House 3 A–B, the apsidal in two phases will be discussed.  

In part 2.4 a general presentation of the characteristic features of the ceramics, the epigraphic evidence on pottery vessels, the small finds of metal, terracotta, glass, and other artefacts such as human and animal bones will be presented. The focus will be on items that can reveal something about the functions of the complex during the different phases. The remains will be fully treated in the final publication.

Finally, in part 2.5 the pottery and other find categories will be discussed, in relation to the architectural units during the different building phases.

215 In the following, blocks in walls are described: Length (L)×Width (W)×Height (H).
2.1 TOPOGRAPHY OF THE SITE

San Giovenale is situated on a tufa plateau surrounded by other plateaux, valleys and steep ravines created by the water systems of the Mignone and the Vesca rivers, and the two small brooks the Pietrisco and the Fammilume (Figs. 2–5).218 The appearance of this type of necked promontory is a well-known sight in this area, e.g. Civitella Cesi, Barbarano Romano, Blera, San Giuliano and at other sites in Etruria (Figs. 1–3, 6a–b).

Geologically, the area consists of limestone, which is the oldest rock and dated to the late Palaeocene–Eocene period.219 The limestone is covered by a thick layer of tufa from volcanic eruptions. There are also conglomerate beds associated with clay from the Miocene period. The streams carried stones and pebbles, which sunk to the bottom and created the massive stone beds. These clay beds with lenses of conglomerate can be seen along the Vesca and are also clearly visible along the banks of the Pietrisco (Figs. 15a–b, 16).

The Pietrisco brook is a natural border between the San Giovenale, Casale Vignale and the Vignale hills. The water has for a long time cut through the tufa plateau and created a deep gully. The placing of the road and the bridge at the most convenient spot for crossing is due to the small width of the stream and to the firm banks at this place. The brook forms a tributary to the Vesca and flows into the river exactly at the spot where a large transit road, later called La Dogana, fords the river (Figs. 1–3, 20). The Vesca is in its turn a tributary to the Mignone, which seems to form a natural boundary between the territories of Caere and Tarquinia (Fig. 1).

The area to be treated in this work is situated on the northern and southern slopes of the Pietrisco brook, c. 170 m E of the Medieval castle and c. 100 m SE of the Borgo, below the SW part of the Casale Vignale plateau at the northern side of the brook and just opposite the Vignale hill (Figs. 2–3).

The northern side is a grass covered slope leading down to the steep edge of the ravine. Further, to the north, this slightly sloping meadow is restricted by the southwestern part of the Casale Vignale plateau rising at this point 2–3 m above the meadow. The meadow follows the river for about 100 m towards the E and a few meters to the W where it changes to an abrupt steep edge down to the bottom of the wide ravine. The small plateau is connected to the meadows further to the NW by a small dirt track running to the medieval Castle and the San Giovenale plateau (Figs. 2a, 23–25). The excavation area is concentrated to the western part of the meadow at the edge of the steep slope towards the ravine. The whole area measures about 18 m in the N–S direction and c. 20 m in the E–W direction c. 360 square metres.221

The excavation area on the southern riverbank covers a larger area, 17×30 m. It is a slope with dense vegetation of trees and bushes and difficult to penetrate. This small gentle west-eastern slope is bordered to the south by the steep cliff of the northern side of the Vignale tufa plateau, which is much larger than the Acropolis and the Borgo plateau (Figs. 2a–3, 23–24, 29–31),222 and to the north by the ravine of the Pietrisco brook (Figs. 2a, 26, 28).

Here, among the abundant vegetation, scholars from the Swedish Institute in Rome discovered the remains of some walls in 1959. They were initially interpreted as part of a defence system but later as a bridge abutment (Fig. 7).223 The river could once be easily reached by a road running to the east of the settlement (La Dogana) (Figs. 2–3, 17–19). From here a smaller path branched down to the small brook Fosso Pietrisco south-east of the plateau. By means of the Etruscan bridge discussed here it linked the Vignale settlement at the other side of the Pietrisco with the town. The road continued to the west and to the east up to the Vignale settlement (Figs. 2a–b). Test trenches were made on both sides of the river already in 1959,224 as well as on the Vignale hill.225

---

217 Hemphill 2000, 19–22, figs. 4-5. The geology and topography around San Giovenale and Civitella Cesi is presented thoroughly by Hemphill; see also Etruscan culture 1962, figs. 249–250.

218 San Giovenale 1:1, map 2. The brook is also called Fosso del Pitale, cf. Santella 1981, map 7.

219 Hemphill 1999, fig. 2, and Hemphill 2000, fig. 1.

220 It is situated precisely at 33 T TG 52–7–79–2, Carta dell'Istituto Geografico Militare, Foglio Civitella Cesi No. 143, IV. SO.

221 Notebook 1, SF1961, 41.
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and proper excavations were carried out in 1960 to 1963.\textsuperscript{226}

### 2.2 Stratigraphy from the Northern and the Southern Banks of the Pietrisco

The discovery of a high ashlar wall along the northern bank of the Pietrisco in 1959 and remains of a similar wall on the southern bank resulted in a further investigation. A short and general description of the stratigraphy in trenches and layers from the investigations in 1960–1963 and in 1999 will be made here as a basis for the proposed architectural phases and for a better understanding of the discussion of the refitting fragments.\textsuperscript{227}

#### 2.2.1 The northern river bank

The excavated area on the sloping northern bank comprised \(c.\) 370 square meters, as mentioned earlier. The area was dug in several trenches, which in their turn were divided into smaller units (shafts within the trenches) (Fig. 34a).

The investigation in 1960 started with the layout of trench 1 measuring 5×3 m and oriented N–S. During the following season this trench was extended to the south and divided into shafts 1 and 2. The area was expanded also with trenches 2–5 to the north, to the east and west of trench 1. Some trenches were divided into minor units called shafts and quadrants and renamed when they in their turns changed into larger areas as the excavation proceeded horizontally as well as vertically (Fig. 34a). The stratigraphic sequences vary in depth, especially on the northern bank, due to the sloping environment and to the activities at the place over time (Figs. 44b, 62).

In the following section a short description of the stratigraphy will be made and the stratigraphic relations between different trenches and their extended shafts. The trench names were, as already said, changed during the course of the excavations as they expanded and united with others. Therefore, as comparison for the reader, the names for the architectural structures have been used as points of departure in the descriptions in the text and on plans and sections.

**Stratum 1**

Stratum 1 is quite homogenous all over the excavated area, with a few exceptions (see below). It consisted of an upper turf layer, \(c.\) 10 cm thick, and a \(c.\) 0.3–0.4 m thick layer of hard compact soil and it was rich in tuff gravel and tuffetti stones, mixed with pottery, tiles, small finds, loom-weights and bones, especially in trench 4. The turf layer of the stratum was probably deposited as accumulated eroded soil from the cliff above (Fig. 45).

**Trenches 1–5 with extensions.** Stratum 1 reached down to the surface of a tufa packing framed by walls A and B (Fig. 34a), and found in trenches 2–4, and in trench 1 to the upper course of an apsidal structure of tufa blocks (House 3) with one block visible above the surface. During the investigations of House 3 it was divided into three units (quadrants Q1–Q3) (Fig. 34a).\textsuperscript{228} A line of blocks (wall F) running in a SE direction to the edge of the abutment wall M was found south of the apsidal house, also in stratum 1 (Fig. 34b). Wall N in shaft 2:4, in the westernmost part of the excavation, was partly covered by stratum 1 soil mixed with many fallen ashlar tufa blocks (Fig. 45).

The turf and humus layers, that is stratum 1, in shafts 3A and 3B, the extensions of trench 3, were 20–30 cm deep.\textsuperscript{229} In trench 5, at the entrance to the excavations area, bedrock was reached at the bottom of the thin layer of stratum 1 under a packing of flat stones. The small shaft 7 in trench 3 and shaft 9 in trench 2 consisted, below the turf layer, of only one layer of eroded clay bedrock, \(c.\) 30–40 cm thick, and almost free from pottery (Figs. 34a, 44b, 62).

**Stratum 2.**

Stratum 2 consisted of a 0.4 m thick layer of densely packed tuffetti stones, small tufa blocks in a matrix of darker brown soil mixed with tiles and pottery.

**Trench 1, the apsidal house (House 3), and shafts 1–2.** Inside the house the typical soil of stratum 2 with its tuff fill was also mixed with a fill of loose greyish brown

\textsuperscript{226} San Giovenale 1:1; Gierow 1986, 29, fig. 2; Forsberg 1984, 73–80.

\textsuperscript{227} A thorough description of trenches and the stratigraphy will be published in San Giovenale 6:1–3 forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{228} Q1 is the south-western part of the apsidal house, Q2 the south-eastern part and Q3 the northern part.

\textsuperscript{229} Description: In the western steep slope two shafts were opened in a E-W direction, trench 3A to the S and 3B slightly more to N. Size: 3A=1.4 m×6 m; 3B=1.4×5.4 m. Find nos. 3B, 62-803; 3A, 62-807, 62-808.
sandstone. The soil is very similar (easily splitting) to the sandstone layer found in natural form above the conglomerate at the bottom of the shaft Q3 (Figs. 34a–b, 37). There is, however, a slight difference in colour, possibly depending on the level of humidity. This layer of sandstone may be interpreted as a floor level in Houses 3A–B.

In shaft 1:1, stratrum 2 contained gravel, and both crude and worked tufa blocks. The soil was dark brown, darker than in the first stratrum.230 Above and inside this stratrum there is found a very coarse fill of tuffetti, smaller tufa blocks and a few river stones mixed with many tile fragments and fragments of coarse ware (pithos ware) and fine ware. This may be interpreted as a fill put against the chain of tufa blocks above wall L (Figs. 62–63). The stratrum could not be identified in shaft 2, west of wall L (Fig. 45).231

Trench 2. In the western part of the large tufa packing, at the surface of stratrum 2, the mouth stones of a well had been covered with the tufa blocks. The first course of the well continued through stratrum 2. In the eastern part of the large tufa packing, also in the surface of stratrum 2, two large basins dug into a tufa boulder had been incorporated into the large tufa packing (see below) (Figs. 34a–b, 59, 62–63).

Trench 3, shafts 3A and 3B. Stratrum 2 could, however, be identified in the shafts 3A and 3B, dug in the strongly sloping western bank. At the same level some smaller and larger worked and crude blocks were found lying in disorder. The blocks became fewer further down in the slope, but gave the impression of belonging to the same formation that has been uncovered further up the slope immediately W of the so-called large tufa packing and the apsidal house.

Further down in shaft 3A, c. 0.3–0.4 m below the lower part of the coarse tufa packing, a small chain of quite small densely packed tufa blocks ran across the trench. Even further down a concentration of tufa blocks was found. They were a continuation of the tufa block packing further up in the trench. To the south of the blocks and below the lowest of them, bedrock was reached.

Shaft 3A was extended from this chain of blocks, mentioned above, one meter towards the E of the so-called large tufa packing. At the same level a layer of hard packed soil was discovered, a stamped level, mixed with more tufa stones than in the stone packing above (road 3). Under this hard level followed a packing of tufa stones and river stones. It is possible that this packing and the hard stamped level of soil are both part of a larger construction, e.g. the remains of a road (road 2) (Fig. 60).

Stratum 3. This stratrum was characterized differently in various shafts.

Trench 2, shafts 6 and 8, loci 1–2. Stratrum 3 comprised a fill c. 0.3–0.4 m thick consisting of a rather hard packed, reddish brown soil mixed with tuffetti, pottery, and bones below the large tufa packing in shafts 6 and 8 in trench 2. This could be interpreted as a clear filling layer without stratigraphy. However, an accumulation, almost like a heap, of tiles, potsherds, and pithos fragments was noticed immediately under the tufa packing in shaft 8 (Figs. 34a–b, 63–67). The pottery frequency diminished c. 5–7 cm above a stamped level that formed the bottom of stratrum 3, a floor level of an open space with tile- and pottery fragments found on the surface and on top of some large tufa ashlars.

Stratum 3 was also easily recognizable in the two L-shaped baulks located in shaft 8 and left from the excavation in the 1960’s. The baulks left unexcavated in 1963 were investigated in 1999, and named locus 1 (E–W baulk) and locus 2 (N–S baulk) in order to facilitate the separation of the finds.232 The baulks were then in a bad state with the sides sloping, due to the collapsing of the protecting tufa packing (stratum 2) and erosion (Figs. 8–9, 34a–b, 47).233

The surface of a wall system belonging to a trapezoidal structure, House 2, was found at the bottom of Sandstone...
of this stratum (Fig. 37). At the bottom of the layer and parallel to wall H was also the upper surface of a wall of a few ashlar blocks. Wall H and the parallel ashlar blocks continued further to the south just under the walls of the apsidal structure that is House 3A–B, up to wall I of the trapezoidal structure named House 2 (Fig. 37).

Trench 4 and shaft 4. In trench 4 and shaft 4, in the eastern part of the large tufa packing, stratum 3, was a c. 20–50 cm thick layer of ceramics in the lower part of stratum 3, and further down a tuffetti packing laid against the northern part of wall E and continuing under the ledge of the two basins. The packing indicated a floor level. This layer was thicker under the ledge, c. 40–50 cm. It seems as if the huge tufa boulder with the two cut basins was dug down into this layer, perhaps an indication that it was transported there in the era of either the trapezoidal house or the apsidal building. Under the packing followed the virgin soil. Against wall H of Houses 1–2, there was a tiny foundation trench with only a few potsherds in it. It seems as if the tuffetti packing had been deposited after the digging of the foundation trench, i.e. after the foundation wall was laid there. The layer of ceramics may have been deposited there in connection with the construction of the apsidal building, House 3.

Forsberg compared this hard stamped layer east of wall H with the stamped floor-like surface on the same level west of the wall, there marked with fragments of a horizontally laid tile and some river stones. The same stamped surface was also found in the space between the south border of the tufa packing and House 3, the apsidal house (Fig. 61c). Forsberg also observed a greenish, 1–2 cm thin layer of sandy clay, over the top ashlar of wall H and the surface of the bench, perhaps the remains of dissolved mudbricks.

Other architectural remains belonging to stratum 3 were the two basins in trench 4, mentioned above, and the well in shaft 6 with its mouth made from two courses of tufa ashlar blocks at the bottom of the stratum (Figs. 40–41, 61b). From this level the well was dug c. 5 m down to the conglomerate layer (see below in chapter 2.3). The well was placed between wall J in the trapezoidal House 2 and wall K, which formed a porch-like space. West of this porch and on the same level as the well, there was the bed of a road, a tuffetti packing mixed with river stones, pottery and tile fragments. The direction of the road was indicated with traces of a cut in the ending block in wall K. This roadbed was also visible in shafts 3A–3B (Figs. 34a, 35, 52).

Shaft 1. Stratum 3 in shaft 1:1 was almost sterile. The soil was much lighter and contained large numbers of fragments of light grey sandstone and small yellow-greenish coloured stones, a porous variety of stone, which very easily splits. This layer lies with the lower part against the top of the wall H extension and continues up to and along wall L (Figs. 34a–b, 45).

Stratum 4. This layer was found in shafts 6 and 8 in trench 2 and in shaft 1 in the area of the apsidal House 3 A–B.

Shaft 1. In shaft 1:1, stratum 4 was characterized as a homogenous fill of dark soil and tuffetti stones down to the bedrock of sandstone. The character of the soil was the same, but a layer of yellowish clay c. 10–15 cm thick divides the stratum in 4A and 4B. The clay layer was packed against the sides of the E–W wall of the rectangular house and at a distance of c. 0.5 m the stratum ended. At a distance of c. 0.50–0.75 m further to the west and approximately at the same level was the bedrock of sandstone sloping towards west and south. Above the bedrock was a yellowish clay layer, obviously a natural deposit. Probably this clay layer had been cut away and removed from the rock when the rock was visible shortly before the wall was built. The clay in the thin yellowish stratum between stratum 4A and 4B mentioned above may have come from this natural deposit (stratum 7) since that has the same character (Fig. 37, 44b).

The sandstone layer corresponds to the stratum 4 soil mixed with a packing of large tuffetti blocks found in the first quadrant of the apsidal house (Q1). Those large tuffetti lying immediately or almost immediately on the sandstone fill ought to be associated to that same layer. The wall system found in Q2 and Q3, that is the northern and south-eastern part of the apsidal building, House 3, also seems to be lying directly on this fill (Fig. 37).

Trench 2. shafts 6 and 8, Q1–Q3, locus 6. Stratum 4 was here characterized by a dense brown clayish soil heavily mixed with bones, carbon, tiles and pottery (Figs. 37, 45) in shafts 6 and 8, locus 6, and Q1–Q3. The foundation walls of a trapezoidal structure, House 2, with a π-shaped bench of tufa blocks had been dug down into stratum 4 to different depths (Fig. 34b).

---

234 Forsberg made a note in his notebook 1963 about renaming stratum 4 to 4A and stratum 6 into 4B divided by the clay layer. However, I have kept the original strata names due to practical reasons since all find numbers from these two layers already were labelled stratum 4 and stratum 6.
In front of the bench, a c. 10–15 cm thick layer of greyish green fine soft fill of sand stone was observed (locus 5). This clay layer was also observed in the two baulks during the 1999 excavation (locus 1 and locus 2) (Figs. 8–9, 34a–b, 42, 46–47). It seems as if the clay layer has functioned as a foundation of the floor layer in House 2. The fine-grained soil was very hard and easy to crumble as long as it was dry, but in contact with water it had a clay-like consistence. In the clay were a few bones and ceramics, which may give an ante quem dating for the construction of House 1 and a post quem for House 2.

In the south-eastern corner of the bench, just below a now removed block in House 3, a small deposit of pottery sherds (named locus 3) was found, beside a construction of squeezed clay originally probably circular in shape. The deposit consisted of a fragment of a pan-tile and a fragment of a jar. C. 5–10 cm below the pan-tile four different distinct dark coloured spots were found. The outer dark coloured spot may have coincided with the circular frame of the clay at the top level of the layer. Two more dark coloured spots, one bigger and almost rectangular and the other smaller and oval was noticed. The former contained a fragmentary thin, rounded bronze object. The dark coloured spots were dissolved more and more the deeper the dig proceeded, and seem to be either remains of decayed construction or some kind of organic material placed in the clay (Figs. 48–51).

On the same level, just at the top of the clay layer (locus 5) where the N–S baulk joins wall A, a similar installed feature, a flat lying tile, was visible, maybe a support for a pithos. This hypothesis may be an explanation for the great accumulation of pithos fragments in this particular area (see below in chapter 2.3) (Fig. 47).

Under the clay layer was a hard packed surface, the top of locus 6, interpreted as a floor level. The new stamped floor level was cut through and investigated in an area of 1×1.5 m. A layer of a clayish dark soil mixed with charcoal and soot, pottery, tiles, and animal bones was discovered under the floor. The stratum continued further down and bedrock was not reached in the southern part of the house. The same characteristics of the soil, apart from the pieces of charcoal and traces of soot, were found in the fill between the bench and wall H, in stratum 4, and under the bench and in front of wall H.

The layer in the northern part of this area was rather thin and bedrock was soon reached. This was also the deepest possible part of the floor in the rectangular house earlier described. The ashlar tufa stones in the north-western part of House 2 seem to be deeply anchored to the hard packed fill.

House 2 was preceded by another construction named House 1, a larger rectangular structure consisting of two rooms (Figs. 36–37) (see chapter 2.3).

We can for good reasons assume that locus 6, equalled to stratum 4 in shafts 4, 6 and 8, and strata 5 and 6, is a levelling layer consisting of material taken from the vicinity and used as a foundation for the rectangular House 1. This fill, mixed with tiles, fragments of clay lining, and pottery, was used to level the steep slope (see Fig. 37) and to strengthen the bridge abutment and probably consisted of debris of older constructions at that place, of which the ceramic material is the only evidence. That may explain why the areas north of the rectilinear Houses 1–2 (see shaft 9 in Fig. 34a) and east of the basins are almost sterile.

Quadrants 1–3 of the apsidal house
Under the floor of the apsidal building (House 3A–B) was a layer of soil reaching down to stratum 4 approximately of the same thickness as stratum 2 and mixed with a few large tuffetti. This layer consisted of a c. 0.2 m thick soil with light grey–grey greenish sandstone, the same material as the sandstone bedrock, stratum 7, just above the natural conglomerate stratum 8 (cf. Fig. 37).

Trench 2, shafts 6 and 8.
The foundation walls of Houses 1–2 and the walls A ext. and K, which together formed the already mentioned porch-like space, were dug down into bedrock. The walls were supported by a fill in the eastern, western and southern parts, perhaps the levelling fill for the construction of the first house (House 1). A well framed by walls A ext. and K was dug into the bedrock (Figs. 36, 44).

In the northern part of shafts 6 and 8 the bedrock, reached under the yellowish brown sandy soil, sloped heavily. The levelling fill continued southwards, following the contour of the bedrock, to the façade walls

---

235 A fragment of small jar was stuck in a construction of clay packing under locus 3, i.e. locus 4. A fragment of this thin jar was also found in stratum 3 in the same area. It is possible that the two loose potsherds had once been part of locus 4. A small circular hole in the bottom of this vessel may cast a light upon the function of locus 4.

236 The sections of the place show that there was in the beginning a quite steep slope, which required a lot of filling soil for the levelling, cf. Figs. See also the refitting diagrams, Figs. 74a–d.
M and N and further down to a clay layer extended over a larger area (Fig. 43). Below the clay layer, stratum 6 was very similar to stratum 4. Here there was a continuation of mixed pottery, architectural terracottas, bones and various kinds of small finds down to the sandstone layer and the conglomerate layer of strata 7 and 8.

**Stratum 5** was observed in shafts 1 and 2.

**Shafts 1 and 2**. The soil only observed below wall L was characterized as a layer of dark brown earth mixed with small tuffetti chips, tiles and pottery, and named stratum 5 (Fig. 45). The frequency of tuffetti was very high and the soil was more reddish along the eastern side of the blocks (shaft 1) as well as along the western side (shaft 2). The fifth stratum continued down to a c. 10–15 cm thick yellow clay layer, deliberately laid, covering the length of shaft 2 to wall M where it lies directly against the coarse tufa fill on the inside of the wall.

The clay layer. A clay layer was observed in shafts 1 below stratum 4 and in shaft 2:1 below stratum 5. The clay was also observed in shafts 2:2–4 below stratum 4A. The yellow clay in shaft 1 corresponded to the 0.10–0.15 m thick clay layer in shaft 2. Here it gently sloped from north to south where it ended at the top of the 7th wall course of the façade of wall M at a distance of c. 0.5 m from the wall (Figs. 44b–45). It might also be traced further to the north, as seen in the southern part of the apsidal house (cf. Fig. 54).

In the southern part of shaft 2, however, it has been possible to locate the clay layer up to the inner side of the façade wall M. At one point under wall L it connects with the inner coarse fill of wall M (Fig. 44b). However, it appears as if the clay layer would have covered almost the whole area of the drainage fill.

**Quadrant 1**. In Quadrant 1 of the apsidal house the thin clay layer was actually named stratum 5 (sic!) (Fig. 54).

**Stratum 6** appeared only in shafts 2:1–4.

**Shaft 2**. The fill under the clay layer was named stratum 6 in shafts 2:1–4. It may be equalled to stratum 4A and 4B in shafts 1 and 2, since it had the same structure and continued down to the natural layer of sandstone at the bottom (stratum 7) just over the natural conglomerate (stratum 8) (Figs. 44b, 45).

**Stratum 7** was found in shafts 1, 2:4 and Quadrant 1.

**Shafts 1 and Q1**. Stratum 7 is characterised by fine-grained sandy and clayish soil. The soil seemed to be sedimentary and there were no finds in it. This fine-grained soil could also be observed below the tufa blocks of wall F and above wall L. In consistency it was the same, but more fine grained, as the sandstone in stratum 3 (Figs. 37, 44b, 45).

**Stratum 8** was reached in shafts 1 and 2:1–4.

**Shafts 1, 2:1–4**. The natural conglomerate (stratum 8) was uncovered at the bottom of shaft 1 and shafts 2:1–4 next to the façade walls M and N. A vertical cut through the sandstone layer to the gravel could be seen in the section A–B. This cut was probably made during the construction as a foundation trench. The conglomerate was levelled and cut in suitable shelves downwards in order to form firm setting beds for the tufa ashlars. The sandstone was unsuitable as a foundation because contact with water would have made it clay-like and slippery. The fill just along the façade wall and to the middle of it, viz. under the wall L consisted of coarse tuffetti and soil (drainage fill) (Figs. 37, 44b, 45). Further on the fill was completely homogenous.

The relationship between a few shafts is summarized in the following Tables 1–2.

---

237 SF notebook 2, 46.

238 SF notebook 1, 26 and in conclusions in SF notebook 2, 1962.

239 SF notebook 2, here named stratum 5 (sic!). This clay layer may be the same as locus 5.
Table 1. The stratigraphical relationship between quadrant 1 (Q1) of the apsidal house (House 3A–B) and shaft 1 (see Figs. 34a–b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant 1 (Q1) in the apsidal house, House 3A–B</th>
<th>Shaft 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turf layer and stratum 1</td>
<td>Turf layer and stratum 1. Coarse tufa fill with chain of blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 2. Floor packing, soil mixed with tuffetti</td>
<td>Stratum 2. Dark soil between the fill packing and the next stratum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 3. Layer of sandstone with large tuffetti blocks</td>
<td>Stratum 3. Sterile fill of light grey-green sandstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Stratum 4. A fill of soil                         | Stratum 4. Fill of soil  
Clay layer  |
| Stratum 5 (sic) clay layer                        | Stratum 5. Restricted below wall L seen also in shaft 2  
Clay layer different from Q1  |
| Stratum 6. =4B Fill of soil (the same as stratum 4B) | Stratum 6. Fill of soil (the same as stratum 4)  |
Stratum 8. Conglomerate layer                      |

Table 2. The stratigraphical relationship between shafts 3A and 3B (see Fig. 34a).240

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shaft 3A</th>
<th>Shaft 3B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turf layer</td>
<td>Turf layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 2. To the W a layer of larger and smaller tufa blocks at a deeper and deeper level. It is important to speak about an upper and a lower part of stratum 2. No clear indication of a border between them.</td>
<td>Stratum 2. To the W a layer of larger and smaller tufa blocks at a deeper and deeper level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 3. Soil mixed with a few minor tufa stones in the E and upper part of the trench</td>
<td>Bedrock (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 4a. A chain of stones and E a battuto di terra and below a fill of tufa stones stratum 4b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strata 3 and 4. They are not visible in the western and lower part of the trench. The tufa packing continues deeper down with soil in between but not in that way of a clear limited layer of earth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2 The southern bank

The architectural remains on the southern bank found in 1959 and 1960 and further explored during the investigations in 1961–1963 in an area of c. 585 square meters were covered by dense bush vegetation (Figs. 24, 29). The remains corresponded well to the remains found on the northern bank. The feature first discovered under the turf layer was some blocks of a wall P in the western edge of the ravine. Those were followed towards the southwest up the slope in a trench named trench West (wall P ext.). Another wall (O) running in a

240 SF notebook 2, 1962, 11, 71-73.
SE–NW direction was found c. 20 m east of wall P and in line with wall L at the northern bank (Figs. 30, 44a, 62). The trench with wall O was named trench East. A third trench, trench East–West, was dug between the two trenches to a depth of 0.6 m and divided into two levels of 0.3 m each and an extension up the slope to the northern edge of the steep Vignale hill (Fig. 62). The space between the two walls contained two levels of a packing of earth, tufa stones and river pebbles mixed with pottery and tiles (Figs. 30, 62). The edge of the southern bank was not as intact as the northern one due to a collapse of the conglomerate layer.

Along the steep northern slope was a cliff ledge running from east to west, which was thought to be the foundation of a road leading up to the hill. Further up on the hill, fallen earth was taken away at the edge and the area was cleared of vegetation. Some pottery and tile fragments were found. Below the layer of earth was found a thick fill of small and large cut tufa blocks. At the bottom the rock was cut horizontally and with a deeper cut into the rock in the shape of an apsidal opening.241 Another small trench was dug further down the slope to locate a road up to the plateau. A cutting in the rock was observed together with some ashlar blocks. The feature was interpreted by Forsberg as a widening of the natural ledge.242 Forsberg has argued for a road towards the west from the bridge along the steep northern slope of Vignale, made evident from the two investigations along the cliff ledge. He dismissed the old theory of a road towards the east along the slope, since no traces of a road were found.

2.3 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REMAINS ON THE BANKS OF THE PIETRISCO

There are three possibilities to reach the road from the main settlement down to the Pietrisco brook with the bridge and the connected structures. First (a) from the main road, La Dogana just below the Borgo (Figs. 2a, 17–19ab) and secondly, (b) via the ancient bridge crossing La Dogana to the Casale Vignale plateau (Figs. 2a, 72, 73a–b) and (c) the road along the tombs, the so called strada delle Poggette, joining the main road and then turning down to the brook (Figs. 2a–b, 32).

The architectural remains, unearthed at different levels on the northern bank just a few metres from the edge of the Pietrisco brook, consisted of tufa foundation walls forming different building layouts, retaining walls, a well, two basins (pestarole), stone packings, and terracottas, i.e. roof tiles (Figs. 25–26, 34b). The corresponding remains on the southern riverbank consisted of long foundation walls of abutments, roads and roof tiles (Figs. 29–31).

As mentioned earlier Stig Forsberg calculated with three building periods on the northern bank.243 However, based on the analyses of the pottery (see below in part 2.4), a study of the notebooks, and the new investigation in 1999, it has been possible to increase the number of building periods with one new building phase and two pre-construction phases. In the following discussion the terms building phase and pre-construction phase instead of period will be used. Thus, the architectural remains have been divided into several phases, viz. pre-construction phases 1–3, building phases 1–4 and an abandonment phase, phase 5, dated from the associated pottery. In each of the phases 1–4, the bridge complex consisted of a road, a house, a well, basins and a bridge with abutments. The three building periods assumed by Forsberg are equal to the building phases 2–4 identified here (Table 34).

In this section a general description of the features on the northern riverbank, forming a unit, will be given in each phase. They will then be related with the corresponding features on the southern riverbank.244 The finds connected to the so-called pre-construction phase 3 will start the description of the various phases (Figs. 44a–b).245

2.3.1 Pre-construction phases 1–3 (4th millennium, 10th to early 6th centuries B.C.)

The finds related to the pre-construction period can be divided into at least three chronological phases based on the analyses of the pottery, some iron and bronze objects,246 and tile fragments. Those were found in strata 4–6, which are the deepest layers on the northern side, and in the two earth layers on the southern side (Fig. 35). There are no traces of huts or foundations of houses associated to the three earlier phases, but the

---

241 IP notebook 1, 1960.
242 SF notebook 1, 1961. For the description of the remains, see below chapter 2.3.
243 Forsberg 1984, 73–75, figs. 35–38.
244 Cf. San Giovenale 6:1–3 forthcoming.
245 The finds are mostly found in the fill of earth in the deep layers behind the abutment walls M and N (strata 4–6). Strata 4 and 6 may be interpreted as one layer separated by a c. 10–15 cm deep clay layer.
246 The metal objects will be discussed below.
pottery and other objects associated with the periods show some kind of activity on the site. Two decorated body sherd s from the southern side were classified to the Pienza-Palidoro style, a style common at Pienza during the Neolithic period. These sherds indicate an activity already during the 4th millennium B.C. Other evidence from the Neolithic have been found below the medieval castle on the Acropolis. The character of the early pottery, dated to the Protovillanovan, Orientalizing and early Archaic periods indicate that this particular spot has been used for some special kind of activity during three phases here, named pre-construction phases 1–3. These phases will be further discussed below (see 2.5 in this chapter). It is reasonable to assume that the inhabitants already at an early stage regarded the place as suitable for a crossing of the brook, and the finds are evidence of several earlier bridge phases, probably also including house constructions.

The latter suggestion is based on the abundance of tile fragments of an early Archaic type (Fig. 94a) recovered on both sides of the Pietrisco, consisting mostly of Etruscan pan-tiles of type Wikander 1A–B, cover-tiles of type Wikander 1–2, and a few ridge-tiles. Nearly 50% of the tiles were found in the deep filling (strata 4–6) behind the large abutment wall M and under House 1, and they indicate the existence of one or several houses with tile-covered saddle roofs built in the neighbourhood. An odd feature at San Giovenale are the pan-tiles with an extremely high raised border with a height of 7–7.5 cm, which may have served as a kind of a “rudimentary, completely undecorated raking sima”.

Another architectural feature, indicating building activity in the last pre-construction phase, is a well, which was dug 5 m down into the bedrock, reaching down to the thick conglomerate layer below the tufa layer (Figs. 35, 53). A more detailed description of the well will be given in the text relating to the next building phase, and the function will be discussed in chapter 3. The reason for referring the initial construction of the well to this early phase is its very odd location close to the entrance of House 1 in the successive phase (Figs. 36, 61b).

Even if no constructional remains of a road or a crossing were found, it is reasonable to assume that this was the spot for a crossing of the brook due to the quite narrow distance to the other side of the gorge, and because of the finds of prehistoric and Archaic pottery and tiles recovered on both the sides, as well as on the Vignale hill. The crossing may have been made via a timber bridge either in an oblique or straight direction connecting the two sides. A hypothetical model would be the wooden bridge from the late 19th century crossing the Mignone at Monterano (Figs. 68–69). How and why the last sub-phase ended is unclear. However, a few Etrusco-Corinthian plates give us a terminus post quem date for the decision to start a building project of such monumental proportions, of which the remains in the succeeding phase bear witness.

I thank F. di Gennaro for the analysis of the fragments; cf. Calvi Rezia 1968; 1969; Calvi Rezia & Sarti 2002; Radmilli 1974, 291–404, figs. 34.5, 39-9, 72. For the Neolithic periods at San Giovenale, see Gierow 1984, 17–36.

247 The pottery and other remains will be discussed further below in chapters 2.2 and 2.3.

248 Wikander 1981, 71–76, figs. 2–5; Wikander 1993, fig. 7.

249 Only three pieces of ridge-tiles (kalypter) of type 1 and IIB with cordons were found (see Fig. 83). See also Wikander 1993, 25–86; fig. 21; Wikander 1986, figs. 1–2; Wikander 1981, 78–82, figs. 9 (nos. 46–48)–11.

250 Pikander 1981, 82, fig. 12, no. 58 from the bridge; see the discussion of the function as revetment tiles also in San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming.

251 Pikander 1993, 42–43, n. 65; 80. L. Karlsson suggests a function as water channels for the pan-tile with extremely high raised border.


253 Etruscan culture 1962, fig. 224; see photos in Stefani 1998, 10, 32–33, 86. On early timber bridges, see O’Connor 1993, 139–145. The earliest known wooden bridge in Rome is Pons Sublicius probably built during the 7th century B.C.; cf. O’Connor 1993, 141–142. Horatius Cocles and his friend defended the bridge c. 600 B.C. according to the legend. After a rebellion by the Romans it was destroyed during an attack by the Etruscan kings Tarquinius and Porsenna. The bridge was rebuilt and later destroyed by a number of floods. A bridge has been documented at the site until the 4th century AD; This bridge is believed to have been built by Ancus Martius, who according to Livy (Livy. 1.33.6) gave it to the high priest for care. A wooden bridge is also suggested over a fossa at Veio-Portonaccio, cf. Colonna 2001.

254 The Etrusco-Corinthian pottery will be presented in chapter 2.2.
Building phase 1 (565–550/530 B.C.)

Building phase 1 started with the remains indicating abutments and retaining walls for a bridge and stone-packings on both sides of the river, a house, a well and a complex of two basins close to the bridge on the northern side.

The preparations for the construction of the abutment walls started with cuttings in the sloping bedrock for the lower courses of the wall M on the northern side (Fig. 44b). A fill of earth, tiles and pottery sherds taken in the vicinity, and a clay layer, 10–20 cm thick, was laid behind the wall as a support and as a drainage fill. It covered the area for the stabilisation of the earth. This filling was also used as a sub-construction of House 1, which was built only c. 3.5 m from the abutment wall M at the same time. Wall M is preserved to a height of 5–6 m, in eight to nine courses of large tufa ashlar blocks with the widest part at the base. It is constructed in a header and stretcher technique without mortar. The wall was built directly on the layer of the natural gravel, which was levelled in a step form at several places before the construction. This is most obvious in the two lowest courses where the cut-away levels are very clear (Fig. 44b).

House 1. House 1 consisted of walls A, H, I and J, oriented N–S, and had a rectangular ground plan measuring 5.5×11 m and probably divided in two rooms, A and B. Room A was entered via a porch at the western front through the doorway, c. 0.8 m wide, corresponding to the size of one block, and slightly placed off-centre (Figs. 36, 38–39, 42a–b). The walls of the room were constructed of larger and smaller tufa blocks and preserved in one to two courses. There is no evidence of a second doorway to room B from the porch. Such an entrance from the porch can only be mere speculation. The tile fragments found inside the filling of room B indicate a tile-covered saddle roof with cordonet ridge tiles (Fig. 94a).

The extension of wall H, one block in width and several courses high, runs to the south and seems to abut wall L. It does not connect with wall M, the façade wall (Fig. 36). The connection between walls L and M, was according to the excavator, very difficult to explain, and it was argued that wall H was a retaining wall for walls L and M and built almost at the same time. However, in the following analysis the hypothesis based on the two parallel extensions of the N–S running walls H and J, the tufa packing S of wall I, and the thin clay layer found between those walls will be tested (Fig. 36).

The extension of wall J, 2.2 m in length towards the south, consisting of two courses of large ashlar tufa block, may in fact have continued c. 3 m further to the south and parallel to the extension of wall H. The hypothetical cross wall between the two may have been destroyed when the transversal retaining wall L was constructed in the succeeding period (Figs. 37, 43, 44a–b, 45). Despite the scanty evidence, I am inclined to see two rooms here based on the two parallel extensions of the N–S running walls H and J, the tufa packing south of wall I and the thin clay layer found between those walls (Figs. 37, 44a–b). The ashlar blocks of wall E seem partly to be sunk into the fill of sandstones, which has been found under the apsidal shaped House 3A, and in conjunction with wall L (see Fig. 52). Here the bedrock slopes towards the S and it was necessary to dig a foundation trench to stabilise the wall (cf. Figs. 37, 45a, 44a–b). To the south of wall I there was a fill of some tufa stones, interpreted as part of the debris from the space south of room A, forming a second hypothetical room (Fig. 36). A second indication of a larger construction is the layer of clay covering the area of the proposed larger building and ending just in front of wall M (Figs. 44a–b). The clay layer may have been laid there to be a stabilising

257 The wall has 8–9 courses of ashlar tufa blocks with the measurements of the headers L. 0.6–0.8, W. 0.45–0.55×H. 0.48–0.68 and stretcher L. 0.75–1.15×H. 0.25.
258 Wall A in Room A is oriented E-W. L. 5.0 m + 2.8 m (extension); W 0.4–0.6 m, H. 1-1.45 m.
259 Block size in the first course of extension: L. 0.7–1.1m, H. 0.42–0.46 m; second course L. 0.48–0.5 m, H. 0.4–0.52 m; the third upper course L. 0.54–0.82 m, H. 0.2–0.5 m, 0.4–0.55 m. The wall is built with one block in width and is preserved to a height of 1–1.45 m. in three courses of ashlar tuff blocks.
259 Similar to the sizes of the houses on the Acropolis at San Giovenale, cf. Architettura etrusca 1986, fig. 26. The finds, especially the large amount of pottery, will be important for the interpretation of this house.
260 N–S direction, L. c. 5.5, W. 0.4 m, H. c. 2.5 m in the S part at the joint to the wall L. Block size: H. 0.4, W. 0.4, L. 0.9 m. The wall seems to be a continuation of the eastern N–S wall of the small rectangular house to the south ending against the transversal wall L. In the first course there is one block cut in a L-shape. This L-shape has also been observed in one of the blocks in the N extension of the western wall of the apsidal house. On techniques to prevent damages on walls see Blomé & Nylander 2001, figs. 5–6. On the dating of the earthquake at San Giovenale, cf. Blomé et al. 1996.
factor for the foundation wall M, as well as for the building a few meters further to the north. Still another indication of a larger house is the tufa packing in stratum 3 visible against the southern wall of house 2 (under the apsidal house). This is also a possible destruction level. The refitted finds from strata 4–6, which will be discussed in part 2.4, support the hypothesis that the three layers should be considered as one filling with a clay layer laid there contemporaneously as earlier proposed by the excavator.

Room A was framed by a porch consisting of wall K, and the extension of wall A, at a right angle, measuring 2.8×1.6 m (Fig. 36). It cannot be excluded that wall K has continued a few meters to the south, forming a larger rectangular porch, later destroyed by the construction of the road in building phase 2 (see below). Wall A joins at a right angle with the N–S wall K, a wall of one block in width and one course high. The original height and length of wall K is impossible to estimate, as only two tufa ashlar blocks of the wall remain in situ. One of the blocks is either very worn or intentionally obliquely cut down (Figs. 44a, 61a). The rectangular ground plan of House I with two rooms and a porch show similarities with a Breithaus, similar to a house found on the Borgo (House G) (Fig. 14), and at Acquarossa.

The internal measurements of Room A were 4–4.6 m (N–S walls) × 4.2–4.35 m (E–W walls). The room was furnished with a π-shaped bench, built of ashlar tufa blocks along wall H and parts of walls A and I. The area from the edge of the bench up to the inner surface of the walls was filled with soil and small rounded river pebbles (Figs. 36, 39, 42). The rounded white river pebbles, found at the end of the northern wing of the bench, together with some larger ones in the filling of the bench, were probably collected from the Pietrisco or the Vesca. The southern wing of the bench measured only 1.5 m in length. An entrance into room B by the partition wall I may have existed by the end of the bench (Fig. 36). The function of the bench and the house will be discussed in Chapter 3.

The floor consisted of a thin, hard packed layer of soil above a levelling layer of hard packed earth, mixed with charcoal, bones, tiles and pottery (cf. locus 5, and locus 6, i.e. the top of stratum 4) (Figs. 39, 42, 47). The function of this feature will be discussed below in chapter 3. East of House 1, i.e. at the backyard, was found a boulder of tufa, c. L 2.40×W 1.6×H. 1.2 m, measured in situ. One of the blocks is either very worn or intentionally obliquely cut down (Figs. 44a, 61a). The rectangular ground plan of House I with two rooms and a porch show similarities with a Breithaus, similar to a house found on the Borgo (House G) (Fig. 14), and at Acquarossa.

The internal measurements of Room A were 4–4.6 m (N–S walls) × 4.2–4.35 m (E–W walls). The room was furnished with a π-shaped bench, built of ashlar tufa blocks along wall H and parts of walls A and I. The area from the edge of the bench up to the inner surface of the walls was filled with soil and small rounded river pebbles (Figs. 36, 39, 42). The rounded white river pebbles, found at the end of the northern wing of the bench, together with some larger ones in the filling of the bench, were probably collected from the Pietrisco or the Vesca. The southern wing of the bench measured only 1.5 m in length. An entrance into room B by the partition wall I may have existed by the end of the bench (Fig. 36). The function of the bench and the house will be discussed in Chapter 3.

The floor consisted of a thin, hard packed layer of soil above a levelling layer of hard packed earth, mixed with charcoal, bones, tiles and pottery (cf. locus 5, and locus 6, i.e. the top of stratum 4) (Figs. 39, 42, 47). The function of this feature will be discussed below in chapter 3. East of House 1, i.e. at the backyard, was found a boulder of tufa, c. L 2.40×W 1.6×H. 1.2 m,

---

263 Forsberg argues for this in SF notebook 2, 1962, and in Forsberg 1984.
264 N–S oriented; L. 1.5 m, W. 0.4 m, H. 0.4 m. The wall is built with one block in width and is preserved with only one course consisting of two blocks, one cubic in shape and one large ashlar tufa block.
265 The wall is built one block in width and has 2–3 courses. The lower first course is set on a few rubble stones levelling the tufa blocks with the blocks further to the E. The wall measures, in the western extension, a height of 0.92–1.8 m, and is 0.4–0.6 wide.
267 Lang 1996, 93; Dreup 1969; Prayon 1975, 128-133, 154-156, and Maaskant-Kleibrink 1992, 135-138. The difference from the ordinary rectangular house is the placement of the entrance, which accentuates the long axis. This is also very obvious on the Etruscan houses, e.g. the House B, C, and F, on the Borgo at San Giovenale, cf. Fig. 14, while House H on the Borgo and House 2 on the Acropolis are similar to a Breithouse; see also House B, zone F, at Acquarossa, Architettura etrusca 1986, fig. 26.
268 San Giovenale 2:5 forthcoming.
269 Materiali e problemi 1984, figs. 33:5, 34:5; Architettura etrusca 1986, fig. 26:11, Casa G on the Borgo. The house is dated to the end of the Villanova period and may belong to the early Orientalizing period. See also Satricum on the discussion of the square modules, rooms of c. 5 or 4 m. House O on the Acropolis at San Giovenale has a square plan with one room of 5×5 m.
270 The bench was constructed of eight ashlar blocks laid in a π-shape. It measured 2×4.6×1.5 m. and was 0.8 wide.
271 The river stones were probably used as an isolating material on the humid floor, cf. Prayon 1975, 130, n. 732, pl. 78:2.
272 A π-shaped construction with a thin layer of large white and flat river pebbles framed by small flat standing stones was found in House I on the Acropolis, cf. Karlsson 2001, 51–53, fig. 1. A bench similar to the one in House 2 at the bridge is seen in the sacellum of Grasceta dei Cavallari in Tolfa, cf. Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, 78, n. 43; cf. also Colonna 1986, 506, fig. 392; Santuari d’Etruria 1985, 155–157; see also the discussion of the function of a room with a bench at Acquarossa by Bergquist 1973, 21–34; cf. also Colonna 1986, pl. 15.
273 Maaskant-Kleibrink 1992, 125 pointed out that it was unusual with entrances between rooms.
274 During the investigation in 1999, a new locus system was introduced. Stratum 4 was renamed locus number 6 and the finds were numbered 9906 with a sub-number.
probably moved here from the cliff just a few meters behind. It had been cut into two rectangular basins on different levels, the larger on an upper level and the smaller on a lower level. The two basins were connected with a small cut rounded hole 0.06 m in diameter. In front of the lowest basin there was a square shelf also cut into the boulder (Figs. 36, 39–40). The boulder was situated with its top in stratum 1, and continued c. 1.5 m down into a layer of ceramics and tuffetti stones, c. 0.2–0.5 cm thick, stratum 4. This layer seems to run under the shelf. Exactly how deep the boulder continued could not be ascertained (Fig. 40), making it difficult to refer the basins to this building phase, or to the succeeding one.

The well. The well was incorporated into the porch, very close to the door and dug into the bedrock in a conical form with a width of 0.5–1.30 m and down to a depth of 5 m into the conglomerate layer. Two large ashlar tufa blocks, c. 0.45 m high, with concave inner surfaces, in two courses, formed a wellhead, only 0.5 m in diameter. Those blocks seemed to be laid obliquely, as if matching the door (Figs. 36, 61a–b). The walls, below the cover of the mouth, were lined with larger, slightly concave blocks down to a depth of 2.75 m where the character of the lining changed to a smaller size of tufa stones. Whether the walls of the well were

---

275 The upper basin measured 1.1×0.6×0.05–0.3 m at the eastern side and the lower c. 0.7 further down, measured 0.6×0.6×0.1–0.6 m (at one side). Cf. wine basins at Norchia in Colonna di Paolo & Colonna 1978, nos. 65, 101,103, 105, 106, 111, 115, 116.

276 0.7×0.8×0.2.

277 The basins contained stratum 1 soil mixed with a few potsherds.

278 The bottom of the tufa block with the basins was not reached, but seems to be at a slightly higher level than the top level of wall H, cf. E–W section through tufa packing and Houses 1–2 (Fig. 32). It may have been constructed at the same time as House 1 in building phase 2. It was used until the end of building phase 5, House 3 B, e.g. and as long as the place functioned, i.e. the beginning of the 3rd century B.C. indicated by Cream ware, Etrusco Campanian, and Black glaze vessels, see Chapter 2.2.

279 Cf. different kinds of wells in connection with sanctuaries at Caere, see Colonna et al. 1988–1989, 11-12, figs. 5, 7-8.

280 The blocks were laid in a stretcher and headers technique in two courses, c. 0.9 m high. The inner face was slightly concave and the outer straight. The blocks were 0.9×0.5×0.4 m and 0.75×0.45×0.4 m.

281 0.2×0.2 m

282 0.1×0.1 m.

283 Cf. the well dug on the Borgo with large steps cut into the walls, Etruscan culture 1962, fig. 268; cf. also the well on court A in San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming.

284 The ashlar tufa block 42×40×95 cm, the second still in situ of wall K of the porch in front of House 2, is the keystone for the interpretation of the first building on the spot. The block has a 12 cm deep cutting in the southern end and has earlier been interpreted as worn down. The cutting must have been intentional, i.e. a cut to tell the direction and the border of the roadway to fit into the corresponding road on the S side


286 The existence of a bridge in a right angle to the brook has earlier been suggested in Etruscan culture 1962, fig. 279; Forsberg 1984, 73–75.
Building phase 2 (550/530–480/470 B.C.)

In order to strengthen and stabilise the foundation for a new road, a construction of a transversal wall L was built in building phase 2. Likewise a parallel wall N was erected in a NW direction in order to support the edge of the slope after the destruction of the monumental bridge and House 1 during building phase 1 (Fig. 44a). Building phase 2 is equal to period 1 mentioned by Stig Forsberg. He argued for a scenario, where the northern abutment wall M, including the retaining wall L, was built on the same occasion. He did not consider the alternative eventuality of an earlier building phase. The bridge seemed to have played such an important role for the community that every time it collapsed it was important to take precautions for the safety of the new road and new approach to the bridge.

House 2. The building, here called House 2, was rebuilt, using the foundation walls of Room A of the preceding House 1 and maybe also parts of wall A. It now had a slightly trapezoidal ground plan consisting of one room only, with a small porch reduced to the extension of wall A outside the entrance (Figs. 38–39, 44a). The tile fragments found in the fill of the room indicated that it had a tile-covered saddle roof similar to the roof of House 1. The furnishing seemed to be the same as in House 1. The x-shaped tufa bench was now reduced to a height of a few cm along three inner walls as the floor was raised to a higher level by a thick layer of clay (Fig. 42). In the clay floor at the SE corner of the bench the builder enclosed one or two wooden objects, perhaps small boxes with a rounded bronze object inside one of them. This deposit was sealed with a tile fragment and a body sherd of a large vessel (Figs. 47–50). In the earth above, pottery fragments were found as well as a base of a brazier and charcoal, interpreted by the excavator as a hearth (Fig. 51). Along wall A, close to the entrance, were pithoi fragments found on the floor (Fig. 47).

The well. A well was situated immediately to the left of the entrance of the single room A. It is the same well, used in building phase 1 (see above) (Figs. 41, 61b).

The basins. The two large rock-cut basins with the shelf earlier described were still located E of the house, that is in the backyard. It is uncertain if this feature was constructed already in the preceding phase (Figs. 39–40, 44a). Unfortunately, due to a large layer of compact soil used for the cultivation of nut trees on the site, it was impossible to reinvestigate the relation of the basins during the investigation in 1999.

Road 2. The road pavement c. 2.5–3 m wide, ran obliquely from NW to SE, just outside the house, between the transversal wall L and the western retaining wall N, and touching the outer part of the second tufa block of wall K (Figs. 44a, 61a). The road crossed the brook over a bridge, possibly with a superstructure of timber, and continued on the southern bank as wall O, a road foundation, which was constructed of large ashlar tufa blocks in one to two courses. This road continued to the SE along the northern slope of the Vignale plateau until it reached the top (Figs. 31, 99a).

Between walls O and P, now built to a height of two or three courses, there was a stone pavement of river stones with earth, pottery and tiles, forming an open area, a ‘piazza’, between the two joining roads (Figs. 26a, 30, 44a). Similar arrangements can be found also at other places and periods, for example by the medieval bridge at Blera (Figs. 70–71). It was an area where there was plenty of space for meeting traffic before going up along the steep slope to the village.

Still another earthquake or earth movements along the fault line may have caused the damage of the bridge, the road and the house, but this cannot be verified. The destruction must in any case, have been extensive with regards to the reorganization of the place in the next phase when a construction with a completely different architectural layout was built immediately on the top of House 2.

Building phase 3 (c. 480/470–400 B.C.)

House 3A. During building phase 3 a new construction, here named House 3A, was erected immediately on top of the debris of House 2 and on the area to the south, i.e. on room B of House 1 (Figs. 52, 56a–b). House 3A, formed by the walls D and E, had an apsidal layout consisting of one single room. Externally it measured

---

287 Forsberg 1984; cf. also SF notebook 2, 1962 stored at the Swedish institute in Rome.
288 See chapter 2.2 about the metal finds.
289 C. 0.4 m from wall A and c. 0.8–1.2 m from wall K, see Fig. 35a.
290 The ashlar tufa block 95×42×40 cm, the second still in situ of wall K of the porch in front of House 2, has a 12 cm deep cutting in the southern end and has earlier been interpreted as being worn down. The cutting must have been intentional, i.e. a cut to show the direction and the border of the roadbed.
291 Cf. the oblique angle of the medieval bridge at Blera, cf. Fig. 71.
4×3 m. It was oriented NNE–SSW and with the entrance facing SW (Figs. 52, 57–58). The foundation walls consisted of 1–3 courses of mixed large ashlar blocks, and smaller square tufa stones probably re-used from the preceding building. A few pieces of clay linings have been found inside and outside the house indicating walls of pisé, wattle-and-daub or mud-bricks and maybe with a hipped roof of straw. Tile fragments and a few pieces of clay lining were found in and beside the house. However, all the tiles seem to be of type Wikander I, dated to the early Etruscan periods. It appears as if there are no tiles or bricks of later date or any example of wedged tiles used in apses.

The doorway in the front wall D is c. 0.8 m wide and slightly off-centre. The threshold was marked with three small irregular tufa stones. On either side of the door, two large ashlar tufa blocks with a horizontal cutting, c. 0.20×0.12×0.5 m in size, indicated wooden plank construction supporting the thatched roof. An optional interpretation of the cuttings may be narrow windows (Figs. 37, 54–55, 57–58), similar to the narrow windows found in tombs in the vicinity of San Giovenale. Between the door and the right tufa block with the horizontal cutting was a large, almost cubic stone standing on edge, 0.7×0.5×0.8 m. The interpretation of this freestanding block may be twofold. It could either be part of the wall or a freestanding block placed in a large door opening for a special reason (for the discussion of the reconstruction of House 3A, see chapter 3, Figs. 37, 54, 98). One, or possibly two, rectangular tufa blocks were used as a staircase, c. 0.45 m high, leading up to the doorway from a road pavement (road 3) found directly in front of the house, similar to the second road of the second building phase. This new road pavement contained hard packed soil mixed with well-cut, larger and smaller, ashlar tufa blocks, tuffetti, river pebbles, tiles and pottery (Figs. 52, 59, 61b), and was also traced W of the well along the northern extension of wall D. To the right of the stair parallel to wall D, a single line of stones, c. 2 m towards the S, was placed as a platform, maybe for the use of the cubic block.

The area to the north of the building was clearly defined by the northern wall A (i.e. the rebuilt wall of Houses 1 and 2) and wall D exterior. This open space may have served as a courtyard, incorporating the well in the NW corner, which was probably reused, as well as the basins in the NNE part of the yard (Figs. 52, 61c).

The dating of the apsidal house is complicated. There are at least two possibilities: (a) it may be dated to the late Etruscan period or (b) to a much later date, viz. a few hundreds years after Christ. The arguments for the first option are (1) that the curvilinear apsidal building was placed on top of House 2, apparently shortly after the destruction of the latter (Figs. 56a, 56b), and (2) the wall technique. The walls are built of Etruscan tufa ashlar blocks in different sizes in a wall technique with no visible mortar between the blocks. Unfortunately, there are no finds in situ. The stratification is very disturbed as shown by the fragments of sherds joining from different areas and levels discussed in part 2.4. A ring-base of a fine bucchero cup inscribed with Etruscan letters dated to c. 480 B.C. was found in the filling of the floor and gives a terminus ante quern for the erection of the building (see discussion further below in part 2.4 on this cup) and the latest Etruscan pottery found is dated to the 3rd century B.C. The second option is that it belongs to a very late date, since the latest datable finds from the site are a few fragments of glazed pottery classified as medieval. But this is not at all clear.

293 The curvilinear layout, the oval as well as the rounded structure, was common in huts from the Protovillanovan period, but not the apsidal one. The change into an apsidal form seems to mirror something new, a new architectural element derived. The analogies are to be seen also in Greece during the Proto-geometric and Geometric periods, cf. Mazarakis-Ainan 1997, 98–113 and Fagerström 1988, 106–116. See also the *Absiden-Bau dated by the excavators to the 6th century B.C. at Larisa, cf. Larisa am Hermos I, p. 25, n. 1, figs. 3–4. Blocks from Building B on the Acropolis at Athens were reused in the Pinakothek. The shape of the blocks indicated an apsidal building dated from the end of the 6th century B.C., and which may have been destroyed in 480 B.C., cf. Hellström 1997, 123. I thank P. Hellström for this information. Since the Pinakothek has been considered a banquet building replacing the Building B it has been interpreted also as a banquet building by Travlos 1971, 482. Another striking resemblance is the apsidal shaped sanctuaries in the Balearic Islands dated from the Bronze Age and in use until the 3rd century B.C., and which may have been destroyed in 480 B.C., cf. Hellström 1997, 123. I thank P. Hellström for this information. Since the Pinakothek has been considered a banquet building replacing the Building B it has been interpreted also as a banquet building by Travlos 1971, 482. Another striking resemblance is the apsidal shaped sanctuaries in the Balearic Islands dated from the Bronze Age and in use until the 3rd century B.C., and which may have been destroyed in 480 B.C., cf. Hellström 1997, 123. I thank P. Hellström for this information. Since the Pinakothek has been considered a banquet building replacing the Building B it has been interpreted also as a banquet building by Travlos 1971, 482. Another striking resemblance is the apsidal shaped sanctuaries in the Balearic Islands dated from the Bronze Age and in use until the 3rd century B.C., and which may have been destroyed in 480 B.C., cf. Hellström 1997, 123. I thank P. Hellström for this information. Since the Pinakothek has been considered a banquet building replacing the Building B it has been interpreted also as a banquet building by Travlos 1971, 482. Another striking resemblance is the apsidal shaped sanctuaries in the Balearic Islands dated from the Bronze Age and in use until the 3rd century B.C., and which may have been destroyed in 480 B.C., cf. Hellström 1997, 123. I thank P. Hellström for this information. Since the Pinakothek has been considered a banquet building replacing the Building B it has been interpreted also as a banquet building by Travlos 1971, 482.

Cf. the road in zone F at Acquarossa, Östenberg 1975, figs. on pages 138, 140, 190, 192, *Architettura etrusca* 1986, figs. 20–21, 75. On the rock-cut roadway at Borgo, *Etruscan culture* 1962, figs. 267 and 316; see also ’strada delle Poggette’ in Ricciardi 1987, plan on p. 21, and photo on p. 23; on the central road-system at Satricum, see Maaskant-Kleibrink 1992, 18–28, maps 2-4, figs. 3, 5.
The question arises if this unusual Etruscan ground plan is a sign of a new architectural tradition inspired by the Romans or of new ideas, perhaps a Greek influence. The Greek influence was strong in the emporium of Gravisca, with its temple dedicated to the Greek god Apollo, and the emporium of Pyrgi with temples A, B and G, dedicated to foreign deities. But the apsidal layout is absent at Pyrgi and at other places in Etruria during the Archaic period. A possible parallel may be the apsidal structure found at Veii, and dated to the Roman period, i.e. after 392 B.C. However, there are only a few examples of such structures dating to the end of the 5th and beginning of the 4th centuries B.C. The apsidal house was in any case important enough to be spared when the courtyard N of House 3A was enlarged in the following building phase (see further below in Chapter 3 on the function/s of the houses).

The occurrence of apsidal houses in general, either from the 8th or the 6th century B.C. is an interesting side-track that, unfortunately, cannot take up a great deal of space within the scope of this thesis.

Building phase 4 (c. 400–200 B.C.)

Tufa pavement–road 4 (?) and House 3B.

The very dense tufa packing c. 0.4 m thick, situated north and north-east of the apsidal building, in this phase called House 3B, distinguishes this period. A part of the packing is situated north to north-east of the apsidal building. It is clearly defined by wall A to the north and by wall C in a north–south direction and by wall B to the south, and slopes slightly to the W. The packing, as well as House 3B, probably still in use, is situated in strata 1–2. At the eastern part of the area, the tufa packing covered the lower part, i.e. the shelf of the large boulder, but leaving the two rock-cut basins from the preceding phase visible (Figs. 34a, 62–63).

The pavement, which measured 4.6×3 m in width and c. 0.2–0.3 m in depth, was limited to the W by a line of tufa blocks, wall C. It followed the contours of House 3B, leaving a small narrow alley between the packing and the northern and eastern parts of wall E. It is likely that the gentle curved pavement once followed the contours of the house but the dense packing could not be traced to the south of the house. The foundation of this tufa stone pavement was a fill (stratum 3) of hard packed soil, c. 40 cm deep, with many broken tiles, and a mixture of pottery wares of both open and closed shapes from different periods. It covered a large part of the former courtyard of House 3A (Figs. 64–67).

On a lower level, however, remains of a stone pavement mixed with earth, pottery and tiles, was unearthed in close conjunction to the southern part of wall E (Figs. 34b, 62–63). The pottery fragments from this area, and the joining fragments found above and below the tufa packing may be an indication that the packing once surrounded House 3B (Figs. 62–63). The densely packed blocks NW and W of the house sloped towards the edge of wall N, as if that part had once sunk. A packing of small tufa stones was traceable in front of House 3B, levelled to the upper stone of the staircase, and probably made it easier to enter the door. A few meters south of the house the packing ended in a single course of tufa blocks (Figs. 62–63). This accumulation of stones on either side of the entrance may well be interpreted as the pavement of a fourth road. If there was a road it is feasible to suggest that there was a bridge spanning to the southern side in the same oblique angle as the earlier ones. It is unclear what the levelling of the pavement to the entrance indicated. The bridge complex may once again have been damaged. The pavement required also a levelling of the road in front of the house and consequently a new approach to the bridge, the old or a new one.

Two spectacular find categories found scattered in the fill as well as in and above the packing were the concentration of inscribed letters on bucchero vessels and the many vessels of Greek imports, especially Attic black-figured and red-figured vessels (see below in chapter 2.4).

The basins. The two rectangular basins cut into the boulder from phase 2 were incorporated into the large tufa packing. They were left uncovered, while the shelf

---

296 Damgaard Andersen 1998, fig. B216; Vagnetti 1971, fig. 1.
297 This accentuates again the earlier debate about San Giovenale being one of the twin cities, Contenebra or Cortuosa, mentioned by Livy (Liv. 3.6.8–10). He stated that the Romans captured these two cities in 388 B.C. before the attack on the Tarquinian border along Vesca and Mignone, cf. Barberi 1991, 117. One was destroyed and the other survived. San Guiliano (near Barbarano Romano) just a few km NE of San Giovenale may be one of the cities, and Blera the other city. According to Livy a Roman regional administration was established at Blera one year after the attack upon Tarquinia; see also the discussion of the original location of the two cities, in Rossi Danielli 1960, 185–198; Fuglesang forthcoming.
298 The finds will be discussed in chapter 2.4.
situated on a lower level was completely covered by the tufa stones (Figs. 62–63). Obviously, those basins were still in use during this fourth building phase.\textsuperscript{299}

\textit{The well.} The well, in use at least from the first building phase maybe earlier, was filled from the bottom up to the mouth with earth, blocks and smaller stones and pebbles mixed with tiles, pottery and bones up to the level of the surface of the large tufa packing. (Figs. 53, 62–63).\textsuperscript{300} At level 2.75 m, measured from the top stones, large blocks were horizontally placed. They formed a kind of border in the hard packed clayish soil.\textsuperscript{301} Down to 3.15 m the soil was mixed with a few smaller blocks\textsuperscript{302} and flat river stones, pottery and tile fragments and some bones.\textsuperscript{303} The character of the soil changed at level 4.0 m with a streak of mica and smaller tufa stones and at level 4.73 m the soil was more greyish-green and clay-like mixed with river stones and tufetti (water level?). At that level a small worked piece of horn was found (see below part 2.4).\textsuperscript{304}

The top of a flat river stone was found at level 5.15 m and the bottom at 5.75 m.\textsuperscript{305} At level 5.25–5.5 m a lot of bones were recorded to the left of the stone.\textsuperscript{306} Below the find of bones at level 5.5–6.0 m were pottery and tile fragments,\textsuperscript{307} and some more bones (Fig. 53).\textsuperscript{308}

\begin{itemize}
  \item Basins or pestarole are found at the highest point of the Borgo plateau, cf. \textit{San Giovenale} 5:1 forthcoming; see discussions of functions in Chapter 3. The function of the many basins found along the Cava Buia and near a bridge crossing the Biedano river, near Norchia is discussed in many basins found along the Cava Buia and near a bridge.\textsuperscript{299}
  \item Down to 3.15 m the soil was mixed with a few smaller blocks\textsuperscript{302} and flat river stones, pottery and tile fragments and some bones.\textsuperscript{303} The character of the soil changed at level 4.0 m with a streak of mica and smaller tufa stones and at level 4.73 m the soil was more greyish-green and clay-like mixed with river stones and tufetti (water level?). At that level a small worked piece of horn was found (see below part 2.4).\textsuperscript{304}
  \item The top of a flat river stone was found at level 5.15 m and the bottom at 5.75 m.\textsuperscript{305} At level 5.25–5.5 m a lot of bones were recorded to the left of the stone.\textsuperscript{306} Below the find of bones at level 5.5–6.0 m were pottery and tile fragments,\textsuperscript{307} and some more bones (Fig. 53).\textsuperscript{308}
\end{itemize}

\textit{The abandonment phase (c. 200 B.C. or later)}

The phase of abandonment of this site is shown by the thick layer of debris in stratum 1, which contained pottery, terracotta loom-weights, metals and tiles from earlier periods as well as later. Many of the potsherds joined fragments found inside the packing and above the packing as well as fragments found in the packing south of the apsidal house (see the refitting diagrams Figs. 74 a–d further below in chapter 2.5).

The latest Etruscan pottery documented at the site is the pottery from the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C. mostly found at the southern side in stratum 1 (see the discussion on the finds below). The latest datable finds are five small body and rim fragments of brown and red-glazed pottery of open shapes dated to the medieval period found scattered over the whole area in stratum 1, trench 4 and trench 5, and in strata 1–2 just over the mouth of the well covered by the large tufa packing (Figs. 53, 63–64).\textsuperscript{311} These are the only medieval fragments found at the spot and they do not add any specific information more than the date.

Contemporary medieval remains found on the Acropolis and the Borgo were a chapel dedicated to Sanctus Juvenalis, as mentioned earlier in chapter 1.

\begin{itemize}
  \item Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, cat. no. 40. Red-slipped jug SGBRN 62-800.
  \item SGBRN 62-796 and 62-800.
  \item Five medieval glazed sherds (SGBRN 61-1, 61-21, 61-31, and 62-793) were found in the mouth of the well and in str. 1–2, in Tr. 4, stratum 1 and in Tr. 5, str. 1.
\end{itemize}
Only a small quantity of pottery from this period was found on the Acropolis and the Borgo. But this period falls outside of the scope of this work.

2.3.2 Summary

It has been possible to refer the architectural remains found in the bridge complex at the Pietrisco brook to four building phases due to the stratified layers stated in the early excavations 1960–1963 and in the small investigation in 1999. Finds of tiles and pottery indicated even earlier activity on the site and of house constructions, a phase called pre-construction phase 3. The other two phases were called pre-construction phases 1 and 2 even if there was only evidence of pottery and not any architectural remains. The three building phases contained remains of either a rectangular, trapezoidal or an apsidal building. The furnishing of two rectilinear rooms consisted of a π-shaped bench of tufa blocks. Other features were a porch, courtyard, well, two basins, a road and a bridge on a stone abutment wall and with a wooden superstructure. The fourth building phase differed from the preceding ones. The courtyard and the well of House 3A were now covered with a stone pavement incorporating the two basins, but leaving the apsidal house rather intact. The pavement also covered the staircase in front of the house and may have been used as the foundation of a road crossing the Pietrisco by a new bridge.

The find categories, related to the architectural remains and the stratigraphy, will be presented in part 2.4 and discussed together with the architecture in part 2.5.

---

312 San Giovenale 6:4–5, figs. 5–7. King Gustaf VI Adolf investigated the chapel in 1963. E. and K. Berggren made further excavations in the chapel in 1964–1965, cf. San Giovenale 6:4–5, pp. 7–10, n. 4. An earlier phase of the chapel was revealed, viz. an earlier tower enclosed in the west tower, which probably was part of a larger building. The building technique of the two towers differs, which shows the difference in age. A new floor on a level of over one meter below the last chapel also shows that it is older. The legend of Sanctus Juvenalis tells us that he became bishop at Narni in 369, and that he died in 376, see San Giovenale 6:4–5, pp. 4–9, figs. 1–2. His remains were brought to Lucca in 878 but were removed to Narni in 880, and his grave was incorporated in the Narni cathedral in the twelfth century A.D. Narni is an Umbrian city situated not far from San Giovenale, see Etruscan culture 1962, pl. 19.

2.4 THE FIND CATEGORIES FROM THE BRIDGE COMPLEX

The purpose of this section is to give a general description and a synthesis of the different find categories found in connection with the architectural remains on both sides of the Pietrisco brook. The excavations resulted in many finds, such as roof tiles, braziers, cooking-stands, terracotta bobbins, spindle-whorls and loom-weights as well as iron and bronze objects, such as pins, nails and fibulae, slag, and glass beads. Osteological remains containing both animal and human bones were also found. Pottery wares from different periods as well as tiles were the most frequent find categories.

The finds come from strata 1–6 at the northern side of the brook and strata 1–2 on the southern side (Fig. 44b). The strata 4–6 are believed to be a levelling fill for the construction of the abutment walls and under House 1. The second fill deposit is the large tufa stone packing in the northern area and the fill below (see the stratigraphy in chapter 2.2). The layer above the stone packing also belongs to this fill and was deposited contemporaneously as seen from the many joining fragments found in these layers (Figs. 74a–d). The minor stone packings, interpreted as roads, contain finds from different periods. The stratigraphy on the southern side is also mixed, due to the several reconstructions of the bridge and the roads (see chapter 2.2.).

2.4.1 Pottery and architectural terracottas

An abundance of pottery and tile fragments was found on both sides of the river, though most came from the layers on the northern riverbank. The pottery formed the largest part, i.e. 90% of all finds, or c. 10.000 fragments.

The pottery from the two riverbanks was thoroughly processed, sorted by wares and forms, and joined with fragments from several strata, classified and dated. Pottery wares, coarse as well as fine, of local and external productions from the Neolithic to Hellenistic periods were identified (Tables 3–4). The surface of the fabrics is either burnished or slipped, sometimes both. Some vessels are decorated in various ways, for example with incisions, impressions, or paint.

A further aim of the study has also been to ascertain the minimum number of vessel shapes (the MNV), through analyses of the bases, the form of the body, the rim, the lip, the thickness, the decoration, etc.314 The

313 For the stratigraphy, see chapter 2.2.

314 A number of 5758 pottery (bases, rims, handles, profiled body fragments with different kinds of decoration) terracotta
The aim was to obtain as many complete profiles as possible, and hence it was necessary to search for compatible parts between fragments from different areas and levels. Although very fragmentary and scattered, the fragments could in some cases be reconstructed into almost whole vessels. Therefore the method known as refitting was applied to the pottery, the roof-tiles, and other terracotta objects. The refitting of stone artefacts for a spatial distribution is a well-known method among Stone Age scholars, but has been used less in Classical archaeology. This method, although time-consuming and trying, can also be applied to pottery and tiles. It should be useful in the interpretation of fills and dumps or to explain an inverted stratigraphy by earth movements in slopes. By using this method for spatial and stratified analyses at the bridge complex it has been possible to clarify specific uncertainties in the stratigraphy, and also to verify an earlier phase of a monumental construction (building phase 1) than was assumed earlier by the excavator. Furthermore, the pottery finds from the investigation in 1999 of the two left baulks of the tufa fill north of Houses 3A–B, together with an analysis of the stratigraphy in that area, has contributed to a better understanding of the complicated stratigraphy in the whole bridge complex (Figs. 8–9, 47–48).

The most predominant open forms among the pottery fragments are cups, goblets, and bowls. Among the closed forms jars, jugs and pithoi of different fabrics dominated, ranging from miniature to large in size. The intention, in this section, is to give a general description and a summary of the different ceramic fabrics and the objects included, and 300 selected profiled fragments of tiles out of 892 tile fragments, as well as 63 fragments of metal objects have been processed in Filemaker Pro 5.0. The aim of this database was to attain an overall picture of the wares, the sizes of base and rims in different layers and areas and to facilitate the analyses. All joining tile fragments and pieces of pottery have been processed to make it easier to understand what has happened at the site; see the diagrams of refitting potsherds in Fig. 74 a–d.

I was inspired by Prof. I. Hägg of this kind of analysis already in 1972–1975 when I joined the Asine project. Hägg studied the Geometric pottery and the inverted stratigraphy in a slope caused by earth-movements. As mentioned in chapter 1, a spatial distribution of refitted tiles for identifying various roofs was made by Wikander at Acquarossa, cf. Wikander 1986.

This small investigation was conducted by the author, in collaboration with R. Holmgren, during two weeks in February 1999. The results will be published in the final publication, San Giovenale 6:1–3 forthcoming.

A more detailed description of each fabric will follow in San Giovenale 6:1–3 forthcoming.
Table 3. The distribution of ceramic wares on the northern and southern riverbanks of the Pietrisco.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware</th>
<th>North side</th>
<th>South side</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic ware</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>c. 3300 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prim imp/transitional</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Final Bronze–early Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown impasto</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Iron Age, Orientalizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucheroid impasto</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Iron age, Orientalizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-slip</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Orientalizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italo-Geometric</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Orientalizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etrusco-Corinthian</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Early Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etrusco-Corinthian linear</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Early Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etrusco-Archaic ware</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucchero fine</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Early Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey buccero</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Early Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucchero ordinary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucchero grey/light grey</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucchero red</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etruscan BF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Late Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campana C ware</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek import (ABF, ARF, ABG, Chalk BF)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Archaic, Late Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Creamware, Late Creamware</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse ware, internal red-slip, internal burnish</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Early Archaic-late Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terracotta loom-weight</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Protovillanova, Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazier</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Early Archaic–Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking-stand</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Protovillanova, early Archaic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Distribution of the number of stratified profiled tile fragments from the northern and the southern riverbanks of the Pietrisco.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/stratum</th>
<th>Tegula</th>
<th>Imbrex</th>
<th>Kalypter</th>
<th>Antefix?</th>
<th>Clay-lining</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SGBRN 1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBRN 2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBRN 3</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBRN 4–6</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBRN Well</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBRS 1–2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>630</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Early Neolithic pottery

Two early Neolithic sherds with impressed herring-bone decoration in the Pienza Palidoro style, dated to c. 3300 B.C., were found on the southern side of the brook.\(^{318}\) These small body sherds were of medium coarse chocolate brown clay and of uncertain form.\(^{319}\) They were found in stratum 2, between the two road foundation walls O and P, in the so-called ‘piazza’ (Figs. 52; 75:1–2).\(^{320}\)

Final Bronze Age and Early Iron Age pottery

Primitive impasto. The primitive impasto pottery of the Tolfia Allumiere group consisted of 131 fragments found scattered in different strata (1–6) on the northern side and a few from the southern side, estimated to 120 individual vessels (Table 5).\(^{321}\) The sherds came from open as well as closed shapes, with a preponderance for the latter, e.g. biconical jars, amphorae, stamnoid, cylindrical and oval-cylindrical handled jars of different sizes, together with carinated and conical bowls (Fig. 75). Some cylindrical jars were decorated with a plain or notched cord just below the rim in the handle zone, and some biconical jars had more complex patterns with incised grooves in zig-zags with or without impressed dimples (Fig. 75:3–7).\(^{322}\) The carinated bowls were often decorated on the carina in the handle area with different kinds of incised or impressed patterns of flutings, dimples and oblique lines (Fig. 75:8–10).\(^{323}\)

Unfortunately, most of the rim fragments were too small to establish a rim diameter. However, by studying the thickness of the rim and the wall of every fragment it was possible to get a rough estimate of the sizes ranging from small to large.

The vessels of the Protovillanova Tolfia/Allumiere period are of the same kind as those found in the Protovillanova habitation on the Acropolis.\(^{324}\) They indicate an early activity at this place. One or several huts may be located in the unexcavated area to the E or at the collapsed slope to the E. Another possible option however, is, that the fragments came from a refuse dump belonging to the settlement on the Acropolis or the Borgo, but that is less probable.\(^{325}\) This issue will be discussed further below in chapter 2.5.

Table 5. Minimum number of vessels and total number of fragments of primitive impasto forms, closed as well as open, from the northern bank based on the rims, feet and attributably body sherds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Frgs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jars (biconical, cylindrical, stamnoid)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl (ear, biconical)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup (carinated)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate (?)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>131</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transitional, brown impasto and advanced impasto wares

The forty-nine transitional impasto fragments represented forty-six vessels.\(^{326}\) The hand-made fragments are from carinated and conical bowls and cups, jars of biconical, cylindrical and carinated shape and of different sizes, made of rather coarse clay, red-

\(^{318}\) Calvi Rezia discusses the Pienza Palidoro style common in Pienza in Tuscany and linked to Basi on Corsica, cf. Calvi Rezia 1968, 291–404, figs. 34.5, 39.9, and 72; Calvi Rezia 1971; 1972; 1973; 1980; 2002. I kindly thank F. di Gennaro for the optical analysis of the sherds and for the references.

\(^{319}\) SGBRS 62-813 a–b.

\(^{320}\) Finds from the Early, Middle and Late Neolithic periods have been documented on the Acropolis. Fragments were found just inside the medieval castle and W of it. I thank Prof. P-G. Gierow for this information. Cf. also Nylander 1986c, 105–112, where only the Middle Neolithic period was mentioned.

\(^{321}\) Only a few fragments join each other, for example U79 (62-807 and 62-815 sporadic).

\(^{322}\) Decoration on biconical jars from the bridge area: cord, chevron and dimple, horizontal chevron, and encircling impressed grooves, oblique lines, oblique lines and chevrons, horizontal impressed grooves, and fluting, cf. San Giovenale 6:1–3 forthcoming.

\(^{323}\) Decoration on biconical bowls such as fluting, dimple, oblique lines, left wing fluting, left wing fluting and relief, horizontal incised grooves below rim, cf. San Giovenale 6:1–3 forthcoming.

\(^{324}\) Cf. San Giovenale 3:3; Malcus 1984; San Giovenale 3:2 forthcoming.

\(^{325}\) I find it, however, more plausible that the pottery belongs to earlier activities (a sort of refuse dump) at the spot rather than from the settlement on the Acropolis or the Borgo area. Why transport earth mixed with settlement debris over such a long distance since there appears to have been enough earth in the vicinity? See the refitting section further below.

\(^{326}\) San Giovenale 2:4, 68–71. Pohl introduced this term for the manufacturing of the hand-made and the fine wheel-made pottery found at San Giovenale.
reddish brown, with burnished or washed surfaces (Table 6, Fig. 76:1–11). This ware belongs to the transitional phase, i.e. between the oval hut phase and the rectangular hut, i.e. the end of the Iron Age/beginning of the Orientalizing phase, found in the settlement areas.\textsuperscript{327}

Table 6. Minimum number of vessels and total number of fragments of Transitional impasto

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Frgs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar (cylindrical, biconical, carinated)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Orientalizing and early Etruscan pottery

The fine sifted pottery (Italo-Geometric and Sub-Geometric), the brown impasto, the fine advanced impasto, the buccheroid and the Faliscan pottery as well as the Etrusco-Corinthian wares were found in the pre-house construction layers, and stratum 4–6. The Etrusco-Archaic pottery from stratum 1–3 will also be discussed (cf. below).

Italo-Geometric and Sub-geometric pottery\textsuperscript{328}

One single body sherd, decorated with a triglyph metope pattern of an uncertain form could be distinguished as Italo-Geometric ware (Fig. 78:1). Fifteen coarse and fine fragments of Sub-geometric date represent thirteen individual vessels, namely five bowls, six plates/lids of which a few are painted with encircling lines and bands and the typical hieron motif, and finally two jugs/jars (Table 7. Fig. 78:2–11).

Table 7. Minimum number of vessel shapes and the total number of fragments of Italo-Geometric and Subgeometric forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Italo-Geom (frgs.)</th>
<th>Subgeom (frgs.)</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>MNV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate/lid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug/jar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brown impasto, fine advanced, and buccheroid impasto

Advanced, fine advanced impasto and buccheroid impasto are fairly fine fabrics, while brown impasto is slightly coarser (Tables 8–9).\textsuperscript{329} Those fine wares were common during the Orientalizing period, and were mostly used as tableware, but some forms were possibly intended also for storing. They were probably produced locally and appeared at the site in a few open shapes, such as a two-handled carinated bowl (Fig. 76:24), bowls with everted, rounded or incurving rims (Fig. 76:17–20), bowls or basins with tongue feet (Fig. 76:12–16), carinated cups and kyathoi with fluted body (Figs. 77:10–16, 17–20, 22–23; 76:9, 12, 25), kantharoi, and the closed shapes of the biconical jar (Fig. 77:25), and the spiral amphorae (Fig. 77:10–11, 15–16), and the amphoriskoi (Figs. 76:18–19; 77:15–16).\textsuperscript{330} This particular kind of kantharos with depressed globular body was decorated with vertical grooves, covering the body. It had a cylindrical neck, a small everted rim and a rope-like double handle finishing above the rim with a loop fixed to the rim by a short strap.

\textsuperscript{327} San Giovenale 2:4, 77–78; Karlsson 2001; San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{328} I have followed the terminology used by Leach 1986, 305–308, while some Italian scholars, e.g. Bagnasco Gianni 2001b, 339–369 in Tarchna III 2001 uses the term Etrusco-Geometric.

\textsuperscript{329} Pohl has discussed the fabric of brown and buccheroid impasto in San Giovenale 2:4, 57–68.

\textsuperscript{330} I use the term kantharos instead of amphoriskos. The Faliscinizing amphoriskos is thoroughly discussed by Pohl in San Giovenale 2:4, 62–67. Also Karlsson prefers the term kantharos, cf. San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming, and Ricciardi, 1984, 15, fig. 16. Karlsson suggests that it was used for drinking purposes, since it was found on the stone beds in the hut phase of House I that was interpreted as a banquetting room, cf. Karlsson 1994 and 2001, as well as Fig. 14. I kindly thank L. Karlsson for this information. An unique example of a bucchero kantharos in the very same shape has been reported from tumulus I, tomb B at Barbarano Romano, cf. Caruso 1986, 127–144, esp. 133, pl. 58:1, see also n. 14.
vertical strut (Fig. 77:14, 17–20). They are represented by c. 30 fragments and a minimal number of 17 vessels. The Faliscan imported ware was represented by only three fragments of an incised plate/lid, an olpe/jug with an incised scale-pattern (Fig. 77:21), and one of uncertain shape. The small and medium sized jars of the globular and ovoid-globular types, as well as cylindrical jars with S-shaped profiles and short everted necks were common (Fig. 77:4–6, 8).

Of the buccheroid impasto fabric there were 93 fragments representing 68 vessels. They represent open as well as closed forms: cups, bowls, amphorae, jugs and jars, pyxides and lids. The cups constitute the majority, especially the carinated cup with one or several horizontal encircling grooves, similar to the typical bucchero carinated cup (Table 10; Fig. 77:22–24). Only a few examples of jugs and jars and only one amphora were found among the debris.

Table 8. Minimum number of vessels and total number of fragments for various shapes of brown impasto ware

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Frgs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowl (conical, carinated, cylinder)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin with tongue feet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphoriskos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar (stamnoid, biconical, uncertain)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain closed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain open</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Minimum number and total number of fragments for various shapes of fine advanced impasto ware

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Frgs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos (?)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphora/amphoriskos</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar (carinated, biconical, uncertain)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain closed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain open</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Estimated minimum number of vessels and total number of fragments for various shapes of buccheroid impasto ware

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Frgs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amphora?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug carinated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyxis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinated cup</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miniature cup</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain closed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain open</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Minimum number of vessels and total number of fragments for various shapes of Faliscan ware

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Frgs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olpe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

331 This form is also reported from the Borgo settlement, cf. San Giovenale 5:3 forthcoming.
332 The carinated bucchero cups decorated with a number of encircling grooves seem to be an imitation of the buccheroid cup.
333 Similar vessels are identified in the Borgo material, San Giovenale 5:3 forthcoming, pl. 20, F. no. 25 and WA, no. 301).
Etrusco-Corinthian, linear and monochrome pottery,\textsuperscript{334} and Etrusco-Archaic pottery

Among the estimated number of vessels, 103 of 199 sherds, plates of fine beige ware with rope handles, and bowls were the most frequently occurring forms (Table 12; Fig. 79).\textsuperscript{335} The plates have profiled rims and are often either painted with encircling rows of single lines and dots or painted both inside and outside of the rim in brown or red; occasionally plain or monochrome plates in different sizes also occur. Those painted with encircling lines with dots in between can be attributed to both the Etrusco-Corinthian\textsuperscript{336} and the Etrusco-Archaic period.\textsuperscript{337}

The plate with rope-handles, plain or linear decorated, is a well-known shape. It is produced in two different fabrics, similar to the figured plates. The shape develops from a plate with very profiled rim with everted thickened lip, a concave body and a small ring-base to a plate with more inturned rim, thickened lip and a conical body. Small horizontal lug-handles were attached to the rims. Later the rope handles attached to the outside of the rim are encircling the whole plate, and the plate now looks more like a bowl (Fig. 79:3–6). The size varies from small (5–11.5 cm), medium (12–15.5 cm) to large above (16 cm) with a predominance of the large bowl.

Some small red monochrome bowls painted inside and partly outside (cf. the bowl with inscription) are also worth mentioning as well as the stemmed bowls or cups (Fig. 79:7).

Fragments of eight individual lids were also found, well suited for pyxides and bowls.\textsuperscript{338} They had incurved thickened lip and were quite deep (Fig. 79:8, 10–11). Conical and rounded bowls with incurved rim, and bowls of different sizes with painted interior and part of the exterior were also found. One small bowl had two inscribed letters (χι) on the outside of the body (Fig. 79:14).\textsuperscript{339}

The closed forms, i.e. the jar, the jug, the olpe and the amphora, comprised in all twenty examples of different sizes. A few fragments of olpai and brown painted amphorae were painted and decorated with incised line and dots, and some were only painted (Fig. 79:13, 15).

\textsuperscript{334} The terminology used for the wares belonging to the Orientalizing and Archaic periods is confusing. Chiaramonte Triré lists all terms used from 1959–1996 for the ceramics called etrusca depurata acroma e a bande, in order to show the diversity of the terms used and also the chronological differences. The summary also shows the difficulty of comparing the ceramics from one place to another, Tarchna II 1999, 104–107; see also Caere 3:1, 115, type 1, 115–116, fig. 322. Piatti con presine laterali, type 1a, depurated ware for tableware, Caere 3:1, 107. Etruscan Orientalizing monochrome and linear wares (often-called Etrusco-Corinthian even if there is only linear decorated monochrome ware (acroma e a bande). Archaic period: ceramica etrusca con decorazione a fasce, ceramica acroma, ceramica a vernice nera. I kindly thank prof. Szilágyi for commenting upon the few Etrusco-Corinthian figured fragments and the linear and monochrome pottery from the same period. He underlined that only painted incised and figured fragments should be named Etrusco-Corinthian. For the convenience of comparing the fragments from different find contexts at San Giovenale I have chosen to follow the terminology for the Etrusco-Corinthian pottery used by Pohl.

\textsuperscript{335} For plates, see San Giovenale 5:5 forthcoming; Karlsson 1999, and San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{336} Gli Etruschi di Tarquinia 1986, 371, fig. 116-n. 333; fig. 371:935, dated to the end of the 7th–the first half of the 6th centuries. See also the Etrusco-Corinthian plates from Tarquinia dated to 565–560 B.C., Tarchna II 1999, 179–183, 204; Szilágyi 1972, 48.

\textsuperscript{337} See production of plates at Vulci and a continuation in later periods in Szilágyi 1977, and 1998.

\textsuperscript{338} Cf. lids in Caere 3:1, fig. 331.

\textsuperscript{339} See below Table 25 (cat. No. 43), and Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, fig. 10:43; for the interpretation of the letters, see idem, page 76.
Table 12. Minimum number of vessels and total number of fragments of shapes of Etrusco-Corinthian wares (figured, painted, linear, plain) divided into three sizes based on the rims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Frgs.</th>
<th>Small 5–11</th>
<th>Medium 12–15</th>
<th>Large 16–34</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stemmed cup</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate (figured, rope handle)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphora</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug/olpe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug/jar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyxis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lid</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phiale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>199</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One body fragment of a closed vessel, an *olpe* or an *amphora* with an encircling row of incised hanging festoons could be attributed to the *Pittore dei cappi*[^340] or the *Pittore di pescia romana*.[^341] A neck fragment of a second *olpe* with an encircling ridge at the junction of the neck was painted in bright light red and decorated with a flower of white dots, framed by horizontal and vertical lines that formed a window, with a probable scale pattern inside just below the ridge. This piece could not be attributed to any specific painter (Fig. 79:9)^[^342]. However, at least three Etrusco-Corinthian plates with painted figures of birds and animals without incisions belong to a group called the *Pittore senza graffito*, a workshop at Tarquinia, whose pottery is dated to c. 575–540 B.C. (Fig. 79:1–3)^[^343]. Those plates

[^340]: Szilágyi 1992, pl. 6a, c and 11c. A vase with a similar decoration was found in a Casale Vignale tomb, cf. Fuglesang 1997–1998, 77, fig. 10:34 attributed to the *Gruppo ad Archetti intrecciati*. Other examples are to be found in other graves at San Giovenale as well, cf. *San Giovenale* 1:5, fig. 49:89; *San Giovenale* 1:6, fig. 14:32. The typical scale pattern may be dated to the transitional period of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery, c. 610 B.C.

[^341]: Cf. an olpe with the lower body decorated with two encircling bands of incised semi-circles, one hanging and one upwards standing, with dots inside the overlapping space, cf. Szilágyi 1992, pl. 40a.

[^342]: *Olpai* of this fine fabric with white paint are exhibited in the archaeological museum at Orvieto. Cf. also similar examples found in tomb 6118 dated to 600–580 B.C. in the Monterozzi necropolis, see *Gli Etruschi di Tarquinia* 1986, 371, fig. 281b: 717; cf. also Szilágyi 1992, pl. 25:c-d.

[^343]: Cf. also the fabric mentioned in *Caere* 3:1, 115. They are made of two different kinds of fabrics; one very hard fired pinkish buff fine clay with a lustrous finish, and the second of greenish white loose clay, where the surface is easily consumed. See also Sansica 1999, 200–204. Vessels from the
will be important for the dating of the pre-construction fill and House 1.344

Bucchero: fine and transitional, grey bucchero, ordinary and light grey, and red bucchero

The bucchero ware consisted of a total number of c. 3150 fragments collected from strata 1–6.346 The bucchero material is varied in terms of quality, colour, etc.347 The fabrics consist of a fine shining black bucchero, transitional bucchero, grey bucchero, ordinary bucchero, and the rare red bucchero.348 Many fragments have lost the burning and the slip, due to the soil taphonomic processes/erosion clearly seen where grey soft worn fragments join those, which are hard and dark in colour, and have the fine shine still left. Therefore it is difficult to date the bucchero fabrics, an observation also made by Rasmussen.350 The fine bucchero fabric is found mostly in the pre-house fill but also in the upper strata (Tables 13–14; Figs. 80–81). Quite a number of fragments from different strata and areas join, something that suggests considerable disturbances over time at the site.

Some vessel forms, mainly cups and jugs, are decorated with rouletted open and closed fans (Figs.

workshop *Pittore senza graffito* have been found in various places such as France, Sardegna, Cartage, Marsilia, and the Iberian islands, and Orchomenos, all possibly shipped from Gravisca.


71:7, 80:8.351 The fan is an Orientalizing palmette pattern and can be localised to several workshops at Cerveteri during the 7th century B.C.352 Rasmussen has dated the fans on the earliest bucchero vessels to the seventh century and they still occur down to the beginning of the second quarter of the 6th century B.C.353 A rouletted open fan was also found on an earlier buccheroid impasto body sherd (see Fig. 80b). Other common decorations on bucchero vessels are the 1–4 horizontal deep lines (grooves), vertical ribbing, notching of the carina on cups, and incisions of figures, lines and letters on bowls, *chalices, kantharoi* and *kyathoi* (Figs. 81:4–5, 9; 81:80–81). Even a plastic figure in the shape of a small bird on top of the handle of a *kyathos* was found (Fig. 91:8).354 A more spectacular and unusual feature called silvering by Rasmussen,355 is the silver-like surface on black as well as on ordinary bucchero cups and jug/jars.

Table 13. Estimated minimum number of vessels and total number of fragments of bucchero fabrics and shapes based on rim and feet, and specific body fragments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bucchero fabric</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Frgs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bucchero fine-transitional</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucchero ordinary</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>1149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey Bucchero</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucchero grey/light grey</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucchero red</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucchero uncertain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1030</strong></td>
<td><strong>1985</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The material shows an abundance of shapes. The most common are the open ones, that is the cups of various types (*chalices, kantharoi, kyathoi, kylikes, lip-cup*),

351 Rasmussen 1979, 3,130; cf. *CVA Louvre* 23, 78, pl. 31, shows an Orientalizing style. On the technique, see Rasmussen 1979, 130–131. 352 *CVA Louvre* 20, 61, pls. 18–19, fig. 12:1–2, bucchero fans, pls. 18–19; Gran Aymerich 1979, 597–636; for the workshops see also Regter 1988, 486–488, and hands A–D in Regter 2003. Regter’s chronology differs from Rasmussen, who has based his on the Greek imports, Regter 2003. 353 Rasmussen 1979, 130–131. 354 Rasmussen 1979, 129–130; cf. Rasmussen type 1f, 112, pl. 35:193 dated to 525 B.C. and slightly later. 355 Rasmussen has discussed silvering of the interior and the exterior surface of open bucchero vessels as an idea of reproducing silver vessels to a reduced cost. This method is mainly reported on earlier bucchero, cf. Rasmussen 1979, 128. See also Naso 2004.
rounded and carinated bowls with different forms of lip. Based on the size of the diameter these bowls have been divided into large (16–20 cm), medium 12–15.5 cm, small (5–11.5 cm) and miniature (3–4.5 cm) bowls. It was possible to mend seventeen bowls (57 frgs.) into a complete profile (Fig. 80). The closed shapes, amphora, jug, olpe, oinochoe, and the jar, have been divided into full-sized and small (Table 14, Fig. 81:1–8). There are also quite a number of lids of four shapes (with sub-shapes) used as covers for bowls, amphorae and jars (Fig. 81: 9–16).

---

Table 14. Estimated numbers of vessels and total fragments of bucchero forms divided into sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>MNV (frgs.)</th>
<th>MNV Small (frgs.)</th>
<th>MNV Medium (frgs.)</th>
<th>MNV Large (frgs.)</th>
<th>MNV Uncertain (frgs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5–11.5</td>
<td>12–15.5</td>
<td>16–20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miniature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;3–4.5</td>
<td>704 (1392)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>122 (250)</td>
<td>148 (264)</td>
<td>86 (221)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl (rounded)</td>
<td>258 (513)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78 (166)</td>
<td>58 (88)</td>
<td>35 (93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl (carinated)</td>
<td>28 (48)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>6 (8)</td>
<td>13 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup F rim</td>
<td>221 (470)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>11 (33)</td>
<td>69 (133)</td>
<td>28 (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup F base</td>
<td>47 (94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar/jug bases</td>
<td>30 (42)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 (26)</td>
<td>3 (22)</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar/jug rim</td>
<td>31 (45)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 (19)</td>
<td>9 (10)</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug (olpe, oinochoe)</td>
<td>63 (130)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lid</td>
<td>25 (50)</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>12 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>704 (1392)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>122 (250)</td>
<td>148 (264)</td>
<td>86 (221)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bucchero material comes from different areas and all strata, but the majority was found above and in the tufa fill to the N of the apsidal house (strata 1–2) and in the c. 40 cm deep soil under that tufa fill (stratum 3). Many fragments were also collected from the lower strata (3–6). Shapes found in the lower levels occur also in the upper strata.357 The carinated cup (chalice) with encircling grooves that occurs frequently in the pre-house fill is the equivalent to the brown impasto and buccheroid impasto chalice with encircling grooves below the rim (see Figs. 77:22–24; 80:4–5). Plain carinated chalices358 were found mostly in the fill under the large stone packing together with the bell-shaped cup,359 and carinated cups with notched carina, common in the pre-house fill.360 Other drinking vessels are the carinated and rounded kyathos with a bird on top of the handle,361 the kyathos (Fig. 91:8)362 and the kantharos with flanged handles.363 The medium and large cups predominate over the small. Only two miniature kyathoi or chalices were found (Fig. 80:12–13).364

357 For example the carinated bowl with everted thickened lip (B3) and the carinated bowl with inturned and straight lip (B1–2), or (C) the rounded carinated body with pointed lip.
358 Rasmussen type 4; Z45–49 (SGBRN 62-713), fill str 3, 63-617 str 3 shaft 3a, 62-751, str. 3 fill, 63-606, str. 3).
360 Y140 62-761; 62-603; for chalice Rasmussen type 3a, kantharos 3e, and kyathos 1d.
361 Z56, Z87 (62-717); Rasmussen type 1f.
362 62-807 (shaft 3A, str. 3), 62-700+62-784 (str. 3); Rasmussen type 3d.
363 Y112, Y6. Carinated kantharos Y134 (61-37) str. 3 below House 3A.
364 Z45 in pre-house fill, and Z53 (62-782) in str. 3 fill.
365 Z10, Z37, Z11.
366 E.g. Z38, Z40, Z78, Z80–82, Z86; cat. no. 15 with inscription in Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999.
368 Y90, Y93, Y99, Y107, Y 131. Low-stemmed cup, Rasmussen type 3.
369 Y141; Rasmussen goblet type 5b. This type also occurs in bucchero.
370 Cf. Y121–122; 44 fragments and at least five vessels, i.e. four from the N side and one from the S side (BRS 147).
fragments of the Ionian lip-cup (Fig. 80:2) occur in the pre-house fill.\(^{371}\)

131 fragments were identified as jugs and jars,\(^{372}\) a minimum number of 61 vessels based on rims.\(^{373}\) The jugs were of various types, e.g. the oinochoe (Rasmussen type 6a), the olpe with rouletted open fans (Fig. 81:7),\(^{374}\) and ordinary jugs of different sizes ranging from miniature to large (Fig. 81:1–6).\(^{375}\) A medium-sized jar with very thin walls and a plastic line indicating the border between body and neck is an unusual form (Fig. 81:8).\(^{376}\)

The large amount of bucchero lids deserves a note, in sum 25 (50 frgs.) were found,\(^{377}\) 23 from the N side and 2 from the S side. They are of four main types with sub-types (Fig. 81:9–16; Tables 14–15)\(^{378}\) ranging between 8.5 to 18 cm in diameter,\(^{379}\) and seem to have been lids for jars, amphorae, bowls and pyxides.\(^{380}\)

\(^{371}\) Cf. Y 130, Y131. cf. also lip cup Rasmussen type 3b dated to 625–575 B.C.; Rasmussen type 4b, dated to 600–550 B.C.

\(^{372}\) Y26, Y19, Y89, Y20, Y110, Y151, Y5, Z101, Y31. Only three jugs were joined to a complete profile.

\(^{373}\) The total numbers of fragments was estimated to 75 and the minimum numbers of jugs and jars, based on the bases and attributive sherds, to 35 (cf. Table 12).

\(^{374}\) Two body fragments of an olpe of fine bucchero decorated with rouletted open fans was found in the soil above the blocks of wall M; Rasmussen type 8.5.

\(^{375}\) Y65, Y66, Z101, Y5, Y62, Y59, Y170, 63-603; cf. Rasmussen types 1–2.

\(^{376}\) Z102 was mended from many scattered fragments from several find numbers in the fill under the large stone-packing (SGBRN 62-675, 62-679, 62-704, 63-606, 63-616). This shape is to my knowledge not mentioned by Rasmussen 1979.

\(^{377}\) They were found in str. 3 and 1 and a few fragments from str. 1 joined those from str. 3, e.g. Y83 (62-675, 62-679 str. 3 join 61-17, str. 1).

\(^{378}\) Type 1a–c, Type 2a–f, Type 3, Type 4a–b. Type 1 was the most common followed by type 4 and type 2 and only two fragments of Type 3. One lid of Type 1 (Fig. 81:11) is, however, classified as a plate on a high foot or low bowl on a foot in *Tarchna* III 2001, pl. 108A, interpreted as a plate made in a Tarquinian workshop dated to 350 B.C., and in Di Silvio *et al*. 2004, fig. 6. See also Rasmussen 1979, 124, pl. 40.

\(^{379}\) Types 1a–e have an estimated diameter of 11–18 cm, Types 2a–b of 16.5–14 cm, Type 3 of c. 16 cm and Types 4a–c of 8.5–9 cm.

\(^{380}\) *CVA British Museum* 7, pl. IV. B, a 24 (Great Britain 10, pl. 455); Accesa 1997, figs. 25, 28–29. Lids in situ on vessels are occasionally found in tombs cf. *San Giovenale* 1:5; pls. 15, 16, but more often found very fragmentary in settlements or in sacred contexts; for finds of various types of lids in tombs, cf. *San Giovenale* 2:4, 71–72.

*Black and red impasto, red-slip,\(^{381}\) and coarse internal burnished and slipped wares, plain kitchen ware\(^{382}\)*

The coarse wares are represented by an abundance of fragments from all periods ranging from the Protovillanovan/Tolfa Allumiere group to the Hellenistic period.

Black impasto was only represented by one globular jar with a grooved everted rim (Fig. 83:1). Red-slip ware was used for many closed shapes, such as pithoi, jars, a pyxis (Figs. 83:2–21; 84:22–27) as well as open shapes, bowl and basins, from different strata mainly from the 4–6, i.e. the levelling layer (Table 17). The cylindrical, ovoid, ovoid-cylindrical and globular jars and dolia of different sizes were the most common followed by the bowls or lids of different sizes, and with different rim shapes. They are normally slipped or burnished or a combination of both, which also may indicate the function of the pots.

---


San Giovenale 2:4, 72–74.
A few rim and handle fragments of a jar and jug in a red-on-white and white-on-red technique of a coarse fabric. To this category the large basins in white-on-red also belong (Figs. 78:7; 10–11).

Table 17. Minimum number and total number of fragments of forms of red-slip wares based on all features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Frgs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jar (base and rim)</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolium/pithos</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl, Bowl/lid</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tray</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain closed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain open</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazier</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking-stand</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louterion (holmos)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>439</strong></td>
<td><strong>1223</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The closed forms are the most frequent ones, whereas the open forms are represented by the bowl of different sizes. Basins and trays are less common (Figs. 84:16–21; 82:16, 17). The base of a possible holmos or as well as a stand for water basin, a louterion, was found close at the bottom of the well (Figs. 94a:28). Fragments of six braziers with and without impressed decoration indicate the method of heating and perhaps also lighting (Figs. 85:1–6; 82:13–15). The cooking-stands of red impasto as well as of red-slip ware could be divided into different types ranging in date from the Protovillanovan down to the Archaic period: They belong to three various types according to the typology made by Scheffer, type IC, IIA and B and IIIA (Figs. 85:7–12; 86a–b).

---

Coarse wares: internal red-slip, internal burnished and plain wares

The coarse ware vessels could be divided into three groups: internal red-slipped, internal brown and red burnished or plain vessels (household wares). At least 450 jars of various sizes, dolia and pithoi of different shapes, a few jugs, and the open forms such as bowls and basins of various sizes and shapes (Table 23; Figs. 87–88).

Ovoid-cylindrical, ovoid and cylindrical shapes of jars were the most common among the coarse ware groups. Stamnoid jars were also found but in less quantity. Basically the form repertoire is the same as the one among the red-slip wares. The 61 flat bases belonged to jars of different sizes. The diameter, the real and the estimated, of the flat bases from 61 jars of different shapes, ranged between 4.2–16 cm. They were distributed as follows: 4.2–5 cm 3 bases; 6–8 cm 57 bases; 9–16 cm 9 bases; 28 base fragments were too small to be estimated.

Table 19. Minimum numbers of Red-slip ware jars based on rims and attributive features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form/size</th>
<th>MNV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jar, ovoid, ovoid-cylindrical</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar, ovoid-globular</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar, globular</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar, stamnoid</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinated two handled jar</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphora</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> (375 frgs.)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. Minimum numbers of vessels and the total number of fragments of different forms of coarse ware, internal red-slip and internal burnished and the range of estimated diameters based on rims, bases and other features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Frgs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jar rim</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar base, body</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolium/pithos</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl base</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl rim</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl/lid rim and base</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin, rim, tongue feet</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>667</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

384 The jars have been divided into the groups A–C, G–H based on various rim and lip features, e.g. small and medium-sized ovoid-cylindrical with everted or slightly everted rims (San Giovenale 2:4, pl. 17), or ovoid jar with everted curved rim with hanging lip (San Giovenale 2:4, pl. 19), or ovoid with vertical rim (San Giovenale 2:4, pl. 25). For shapes of later jars, see San Giovenale 5:3 forthcoming, for example jars with everted rim with thickened lip, thickened rounded or flattened hanging lip.

385 The jars are divided into groups A–H with sub-types based on the different designs of rims and lips. These groups will be discussed more closely in the final publication, see San Giovenale 6:1–3 forthcoming. For red-slip globular or ovoid-globular jar with flaring plain or grooved rim, ovoid jars or ovoid-globular jars with everted grooved rims, see San Giovenale 2:4, pls. 13–15.

386 The forms differ slightly from the coarse ware jars. The coarse ware jar has a more ovoid-cylindrical and ovoid form followed by the cylindrical. The number of carinated jars was larger among the coarse ware jars and the stamnoid jar less.
Table 22. Minimum numbers of vessels and the number of fragments of coarse ware forms distributed into sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form/size</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Very large</th>
<th>Uncertain size</th>
<th>Total MNV (Frgs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jar (rim)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td>346 (465)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doliun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl/lid rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl/lid base</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74 (116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>53 (71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin with feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl (base)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>243</strong></td>
<td><strong>565 (776)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23. Minimum numbers of coarse ware jars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form/size</th>
<th>MNV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jar, ovoid</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar, ovoid-cylindrical</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar, cylindrical</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar, ovoid-globular</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar, stamnoid</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar, carinated</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar, unc</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>450</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sizes of jars based on the estimated diameters of the rim fragments, range from small to large with a majority for the medium followed by the large ones. The small jars constitute about half of the number of medium jars. The number of uncertain size is, however, quite large, which makes these figures somewhat unreliable. Only one jug of uncertain size with the handle intact could be registered (Table 22).387

Bowls of different sizes were more common in coarse ware fabric than in the red-slip ware (Table 22). The medium size of the coarse ware bowl was in the majority, while the small sized bowl was in the minority, but in the case of the red-slip bowls it was the other way around. The very large bowls are here named basins, and some of those deep basins may have had so-called tongue feet for support, similar to the transitional and brown impasto basins (Fig. 76:10–16).

The coarse wares consisted of mostly plain jars, but there were also a few vessels with an internal red-slip on the rim and in the interior, found on the southern side of the river. These fragments comprised jars of different sizes and shapes, lids, bowl/lid, bowls and basins. The jars were distinguished out of 29 individual vessels, based on the rims only. Only four bases of jars were found. Seven lids and twenty-two bowls of different sizes could be established. The basins with tongue feet

387 There are, however, a few vertical handles belonging to jugs.
could be identified based on knobs and rims. Several bowls could also function as lids. Furthermore, eight vessels of uncertain open forms and three uncertain closed forms were found. From the south side of the Pietrisco brook came fifty-two red-slip vessels of jars, amphorae, dolia, bowls, basins, and lids, uncertain open and closed shapes. Three base and rim fragments belonging to plates and unknown closed and open shapes of Etrusco-Corinthian fine ware were also found on the southern side (Table 22).

Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic pottery

Fine ware: Greek imports and local Etruscan Archaic wares

A total amount of 300 fragments of Attic import (Table 24) were found. Thirty-nine different shapes could be identified among them, viz. kylikes and skyphoi for drinking, kraters for mixing, and jugs/amphorae and bowls for pouring/serving, and lekythoi for storing. Many of the fragments join, but not a single pot could be completely restored. Twelve Attic black-figured vessels out of 45 fragments could be recognized, viz. 8 cups, 1 amphora (?) and 3 lekythoi (Figs. 89:1–5; 82:4–5). The Attic black-glaze ware is represented by 193 fragments representing 23 vessels, that is 17 cups, 2 skyphoi, one olpe, one oinochoe, one squat lekythos and one closed vessel (Figs. 89:7, 10, 15(?); 82:3(?)). The Attic red-figured fragments, 62 in all, could be mended into at least 4 cups (Table 4; Figs. 89:6, 8–9, 14; 82:7–11). The only non-Attic import is a Chalkidian black-figured body fragment, probably belonging to a krater, painted with the front part of a horse with reins. The fabric, including the colour of the clay and the decoration differs from the Attic fabric (Fig. 82:12). This fragment is very similar to the Chalkidian hydria identified by Pohl.388

The Etruscan black-figured and black-glazed fragments, 40 in all, yielded 4 cups, 4 skyphoi, 1 kantharos (?), 1 bowl and the spout of a jug (Figs. 89:11–13; 82:1–2). A bowl and a lekane of Campana C ware and a plate of Late creamware as well as a phiale could also be distinguished (Fig. 90). As can be seen from the above most vases of the imported Attic and Chalkidian pottery, together with the local Etrusco-Archaic black-figured pottery and Campania C pottery, were used for drinking, eating and serving, such as cups of different kinds, e.g. kylikes, jugs, lekane together with plates and kraters. Only a few bowls and containers for perfumed oil, such as lekythoi belonged to these categories (cf. Figs. 89:4, 15; 82:3, 4–5). The sizes of the cups vary from 20–35 cm in diameter in general but both smaller and larger c. 10–55 cm are represented and that also applies for the skyphoi.389 The composition of the material shows the characteristics of eating and drinking equipment used at the banquets and the symposion.

388 San Giovenale 5:3 forthcoming.

389 Folsom 1975, 18.
Table 24. Minimum numbers of vessels and the total number of fragments of Attic black-figure, Attic red-figure, Attic black-glaze, Chalkidian black-figure, Etruscan black-glaze, Etruscan black-figure and Campanian black-glaze

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form/Ware</th>
<th>ABF MNV (frgs.)</th>
<th>ARF MNV (frgs.)</th>
<th>ABG MNV (frgs.)</th>
<th>EtrBG, BF MNV (frgs.)</th>
<th>Chalk BF MNV (frgs.)</th>
<th>CBG MNV (frgs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cup (lip cup, kylix type A–B)</td>
<td>8 (34)</td>
<td>4 (62)</td>
<td>17 (103)</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>2 (21)</td>
<td>2 (32)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphora?</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug olpe/oinochoe</td>
<td>2 (44)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekane</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12 (45)</td>
<td>4 (62)</td>
<td>23 (193)</td>
<td>8 (41)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Attic figured pottery consists of nine Attic black-figure cups dated to 550–460 B.C., four red-figured cups dated to c. 520–480 B.C., and 23 black-glazed vessels, dated to the 6th–5th century B.C. Only four Etruscan Archaic black-glazed and four black-figured (locally made?) cups were discovered.

One Attic black-figured and four Attic red-figured eye-cups of type A were decorated with palmettes and protective eyes and could be dated to c. 550–500 B.C. (Figs. 89:5, 6, 9, 14; 82:7, 8, 9, 11). One red- and black-figured cup is attributed to *Epiktetos* or *Oltos* (Figs. 82:9, 11; 89:8, 14), and a second red-figured cup with an open palmette of eight leaves probably to the *Douris* painter (Figs. 82:7; 89:9). The black-figured flower band-cup, dated to 540–520 (Fig. 89:3) and the band-cup dated to 550–520 B.C. and decorated with satyrs, belong to the type B cup (Fig. 89:1). One of the red-figured cups has been attributed to the *Brygos painter* and his circle, based on the *komos* motif inside the cup and on the cone-foot class of type C (Figs. 82:10; 89:8).

The tondo of an Attic black-figure cup shows the face of a young athlete, by a rather late painter, judging from the profile of the eye. The young man’s head is painted in the black-figure technique, and he has a wreath on his head painted in white dots. This may be a fragment of a bilingual cup (Figs. 82:6; 89:2). A tondo fragment of another black-figured cup shows part of a *Medusa* head (a *gorgon*) with a small-drilled hole in the middle, just where the mouth begins (Fig. 89:5).

---

390 SGBRN 62-702, 63-618 (Attic 12).
391 Boardman 1975, 9, 56.
392 Boardman 1975, 56–58. *Oltos* and *Epiktetos* are both cup painters, and they painted bilingual eye-cups. The difference between them seems to be how they filled the palmette heart with red paint, cf. fig. 67.1,2 cup signed by *Epiktetos* and fig. 61.1 cup signed by *Oltos*. On the bridge cup the heart is filled with red and the nose is clearly painted. The palmettes are closed and the eyes are large and end quite blunt. The red-filled hearts are earlier than the black-filled with reserved parts.


395 SGBRN 63-608.
397 SGBRN 62-702 (R19b).
398 The painter of this young athlete is unknown to me. However, the head may be compared to the small black-figured head of a Panathenaic amphora (Athens Acr. 931), cf. also Folsom 1975, 134.
399 SGBRN 60-002 (R45). The thin, drilled hole may be a mending hole, cf. the discussion further below on holes in bottom of vessels. Cf. Attic black-figured cups with a *Medusa* head interior from the sanctuary at Tarquinia, *Tarchna* III 2001, 423, pl. 122:3/1, 199/7 dated to 500–480 B.C.
The Attic black-glazed skyphos is dated to 480 B.C. (Fig. 89:10) and is of the same type as similar finds of skypoi from the Acropolis in Athens.\textsuperscript{400} Etrusco-Archaic black-figured skyphoi (Figs. 82:1–2; 89:11–12) with solid buds were rather common at San Giovenale. They are reported from graves as well as from the settlement on the Borgo NW.\textsuperscript{401}

The small body fragment of an early Chalkidian (?) black-figured, large, open vessel, possibly a krater (Fig. 82:12),\textsuperscript{402} is the only piece possibly imported from outside the region, and not originating from Attica. It is painted in the black-figure technique, showing probably, the breast part of a horse and displaying some similarities to the Attic ware, although it lacks the special black glaze. The colour of the clay is also more yellowish than the Attic ware. It is impossible to be quite sure of its provenance without making an analysis of the clay.\textsuperscript{403} The krater is, however, a shape common from the first half of the 6th century.

The lekythos, a form common from the first half of the 6th century B.C., is represented at the bridge by at least three different shapes.\textsuperscript{404} One is a squat lekythos of Attic black-glaze ware (?) (Figs. 82:3; 89:15),\textsuperscript{405} and two Attic black-figured cylindrical examples dated c. 490–480 (Fig. 82:5),\textsuperscript{406} and the other to c. 475–460 B.C. (Figs. 82:4; 89:4).\textsuperscript{407} The latter is attributed to the Athena painter also identified as the Bowdoin painter, a well-known painter of red-figure vessels.\textsuperscript{408}

The Etrusco-Archaic black-glazed ware found on the N side may be dated to 500–400 B.C.\textsuperscript{409} The Etrusco-Campanian jug, lekane, and kylix found on the south side\textsuperscript{410} seem to be of the Campana C ware, dated to the 4th–3rd century B.C. (Fig. 90).\textsuperscript{411} A few examples of Fine Creamware plates dated to the middle of the 4th century and Late Creamware plates\textsuperscript{412} and one phiale can be dated to the 3rd century (Fig. 90). Obviously, there is a difference in date of the imported black-glazed fabric between the two sides of the brook.\textsuperscript{413}

### 2.4.2. Inscriptions and graffiti on pottery and loom-weights

As I have mentioned earlier, there was a considerable number of incised graffiti on bucchero vessels, i.e. kantharoi, carinated cups (chalices), kyathoi, and bowls.\textsuperscript{414} There are, however, other fabrics with graffiti, for example an Etrusco-Corinthian small bowl\textsuperscript{415} and a pair of red ware jars (dolia),\textsuperscript{416} coarse ware,\textsuperscript{417} and two terracotta loom-weights (Figs. 91–92; 94a).\textsuperscript{418}

\textsuperscript{400} See San Giovenale 5:3 forthcoming; see also the discussion on dating for a similar skyphos found at Acquarossa, Östenberg 1962, 87–107.

\textsuperscript{401} Examples are from a tomb, cf. San Giovenale 1: 5, fig. 54:68 and from the settlements, cf. San Giovenale 5:3 forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{402} SGBRN 62-807 (Chalk 20).

\textsuperscript{405} A Chalkidian hydria is found in a cistern on the Acropolis NW, cf. San Giovenale 2:5 forthcoming. The clay is similar to SGBRN 62-807. The question is, if they are imports from Chalkidiki or not. Some scholars have come to the conclusion that these vessels were produced in workshops at Caere by Chalkidian settlers, see Rumpf 1927, and Reusser 2002. See also the Chalkidian cup fragments from Tarquinia dated to 550–510 B.C., Tarchna III 2001, 410, pl. 117:12/106, 3/655. Another example of a Chalkidian krater is found at Tolfa, cf. Brocato 1998, 25, fig. 13.

\textsuperscript{406} Lekythoi were also found in the settlement; one in the Borgo settlement, cf. San Giovenale 5:3 forthcoming, and one from House III on the Acropolis, cf. San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming, and a third was found in a cistern on the Acropolis, cf. San Giovenale 2:5 forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{409} Cf. San Giovenale 5:3 forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{410} SGBRN 62-603, SGBRS 62-809 (R12) and SGBRS 62-811 (R13b).

\textsuperscript{411} For Q42–Q43 see Morel no. 117162, dated to 280–220 B.C. The black-glazed pottery decorated with stamped palmettes may have been produced in a workshop in Rome c. 300–265 B.C. Cf. Also Bouma 1996, 403, 415, fig. 4; the black-glazed ware found in a votive deposit at Satricum is often decorated with stamped palmette and dated to the 5th–3rd centuries B.C.

\textsuperscript{412} Fuglesang 1997–1998, and Fuglesang forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{413} A deposit of late fourth to late third century B.C. fine pottery was found in a well on the eastern part of Vignale. Cf. Östenberg notebook 2, 1959. The deposit is still unpublished. Finds from the 3rd to the 1st century B.C. were also registered during the field survey by Hemphill 2000.

\textsuperscript{414} The vessels are almost of the same type as those typical for banqueting equipment, cf. Rathje 1983, 7–29.

\textsuperscript{415} Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, 76, 81, figs. 8:43, and 10:43.

\textsuperscript{416} Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, 77, 81, figs. 8:44, 48, and 10:44, 48.

\textsuperscript{417} Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, figs. 8:45-46, and 10:45–46.

\textsuperscript{418} Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, 77, 81, figs. 8:47, and 10:47.
The inscriptions and graffiti found on 48 vessels and one terracotta loom-weight have already been published (Fig. 94a:7). The letters and the graffiti, mostly inscribed after firing, were placed vertically or horizontally inside and outside the bases, on the wall or on handles (cf. Table 25; Figs. 91–92).

The number of letters on each piece differs from 1 to 15. They are written from right to left, and have been interpreted as being Etruscan. They are of a votive character, mentioning e.g. names of gods, family names, or personal names, female as well as male. There was also one verb meaning ‘to sacrifice’ (see Table 25).

---

419 Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, figs. 9:47, and 10:47. One new inscription was found on a bucchero body sherd in 1999 (9902) not yet published, and one new letter, probably U, inscribed on one side was recently detected on a second loom-weight, SGBRS 62-810 (W8), unpublished.
Table 25. The inscriptions and graffiti from the bridge complex according to location and stratum, catalogue numbers and form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription/graffiti</th>
<th>Catalogue numbers</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Location, stratum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$k$, incised cross, cross, $A P$, <em>mi larza</em>, $n$, $u$ (inscribed before firing)</td>
<td>20, 34, 45, 47, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>Bowl, bowls/cups, carinated cup, on loom-weight</td>
<td>Tfill N of apsidal-house, Tr. 2, str. 1, Eastern part, str. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$, <em>alix, mi vi, --v--, --cu--, tu, --ua--, checkerboard, mi, mi fasthi alsita, xesitala, star or χ, cross, χi</em></td>
<td>21, 7-9, 10,11,12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 29, 30, 43</td>
<td>Cup, bowls, bowl/cups, <em>kalathos</em></td>
<td>Tfill N of apsidal house, str. 3, eastern part of rectangular house, 5–7 cm above stamped floor? Level in rectangular house; between fill and stamped level above the rectangular house, Eastern part of rectangular house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Impressed cross, u, mi, u, u</em></td>
<td>18, 26, 27, 24, 25</td>
<td>Bowls, bowl/cups</td>
<td>Tfill N of apsidal house, str. 3, western part of rectangular house, near well, western part of fill, under blocks at SW part; outside rectangular building, on stone packing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u$</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Western bank, under blocks 1–5, str. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mi urqenas</em></td>
<td>1,</td>
<td>Bowl/cup</td>
<td>S of apsidal house, str.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised cross</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>Tfill N of apsidal house, str. 3, western part, + S of apsidal house, str. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>38</td>
<td><em>Chalice</em></td>
<td>Beneath apsidal house str. 3+ fill in rectangular house, phase 1 str. 3–4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mix–arunitha, cross, cross, E potter’s mark</em></td>
<td>37, 46, 48</td>
<td>Cup, bowl, <em>dolium</em></td>
<td>Beneath apsidal house str. 3, + fill in rectangular house, phase 2, str. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u$</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>In well level 560 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised cross</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>S side of the Pietrisco. Trench E–W, str. 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

420 Cf. Fig. 34.
421 Cf. Figs. 34a, 66–67.
2.4.3. Holes in bottoms of vessels

In a few cases perforated holes in the bottoms of vessels were noted. There is one in an Attic black-figured kylix (Fig. 89:5), and one in a bucchero cup or bowl, both perforated after firing. Finally, there is one pre-fired hole in the bottom of a coarse ware bowl,422 and one large hole in a red impasto ring-base (Figs. 90; 106).423 The function of these holes will be discussed in section 2.5.

2.4.4 Various small finds and bones

The small finds consist of terracotta objects, such as loom-weights, bobbins, and spindle-whorls, braziers and cooking-stands, glass beads, metal objects, slag refuse and a horn object (Figs. 93). There are also charcoal and residues, animal and human bones (Figs. 94a–c). The animal bones as well as the organic remains will be treated in part 2.5. They comprise 68% of the special finds, and the human bones 11%, while the terracotta objects comprised 7% and the braziers/cooking-stands 8%, and finally the metals 5%. Only two glass beads were registered.

**Terracotta objects**

*Loom-weights.* Of the total number of 32 loom-weights, twenty-seven were found on the northern side of the Pietrisco and five on the southern side. They are of the truncated pyramidal type with a transversal horizontal hole at the upper part made with a rounded tool or a reed in the wet clay (Fig. 94a:1–7, 25).424 Remains of a reed and a piece of wood are still in situ in the perforated holes of two loom-weights (Fig. 82:18).425 The height varies from 5–13.67 cm and the weight from 33 g to 520 g and one extreme weight of c. 900 g. They were found scattered in strata 1–2 in the tufa fill N of the apsidal house and in stratum 2 on the southern side of the Pietrisco. All but one can be dated to the Archaic period. One small burnished loom-weight is dated to the Protovillanovan time.

*Bobbins and spindle-whorls.* There are six fragmentary terracotta bobbins or spools (Fig. 94a: 13–15), used in textile working for winding up the spun thread, found in different areas in strata 4–6, a levelling fill. Two different shapes are represented: (a) the cylindrical with rounded top, concave sides and slightly flared ends, (b) the cylindrical with flat or slightly concave top, and concave sides. The four spindle whorls are either wheel-made or hand-made in an advanced impasto or in the bucchero technique (Fig. 94a:8–11).426

*Cooking-stands.* The cooking-stands are represented by thirty-one fragments and can be divided into several categories accordingly the typology established by Scheffer (Figs. 85:7–21; 86a-b; Table 26).427 Six belong to type IC, which is a hand-made cylindrical shape, covered on top with four rounded holes (Figs. 75:11–13; 86b). Seven fragments were of type IIA, a horseshoe-shaped stand with three projecting small triangular supports. It is probably hand-made,428 open at the bottom and the top, and with rather thin walls (Fig.

---

424 The opening is often larger and uneven at one end. The rectangular, trapezoidal and rectangular-trapezoidal forms with a transversal horizontal perforated hole are the most common, see Bouma 1996, 390.
425 SGBRN 61-11(W20), SGBRN 61-12 (W2). A reed still in situ in the transversal hole is a rare phenomenon. A further example of this method of suspension are the weights from Caere, cf. Caere 3:2, figs. 716:R1.17; 718:R1.18, R2.1. See also the women weaving on a warp-weighted loom with a metal ring in the hole of each weight, depicted on an Attic black-figured lekythos, c. 560 B.C., Barber 1991, figs. 2.38 and 3.13.
426 Two biconical impasto whorls SGBRN 61-14, 63-630, and one biconical terracotta whorl SGBRN 61-15; one melon-fluted bucchero whorl SGBRN 62-766.
427 Scheffer 1981.
Four are of type IIB, more or less semi-cylindrical in form with projecting supports (Fig. 85:12). 430 Type IIIA2 is represented by five fragments. It is a new variant of Scheffer's type IIIA barrel-shaped stand with finger-impressed decoration and often with incisions on the straight plain rim. It can be characterized as an everted, thickened rim with a cord decoration (Fig. 85:7–9). 431

The stands of Type IC were found scattered in the strata 2 and 4–6, and can be dated to the Final Bronze Age/Protvillanovan period. 432 Type II and type III are dated between the 7th and 6th century B.C. Most of the fragments came from the pre-house strata 4–6, 433 which seems to have a terminus ante quem of c. 560 B.C. based on the date of a few Etrusco-Corinthian plates found just under the rectangular house (see above). The date of the coarse ware and red-slip jars and bowls do not contradict this date even though there is difficulty in dating those vessels more precisely.

Only a few fragments show traces of fire. However, one triangular support is covered with a white cream substance identified it as a glaze that was applied on the dried clay before firing. 434 A striking feature is the conservatism in households object, braziers and cooking-stands in particular. Scheffer states in her book: ‘We must conclude that the object, braziers and cooking-stands in particular. Most of the fragments came from the pre-house strata 4–6, 433 which seems to have a terminus ante quem of c. 560 B.C. based on the date of a few Etrusco-Corinthian plates found just under the rectangular house (see above). The date of the coarse ware and red-slip jars and bowls do not contradict this date even though there is difficulty in dating those vessels more precisely.

Only a few fragments show traces of fire. However, one triangular support is covered with a white cream substance identified it as a glaze that was applied on the dried clay before firing. 434 A striking feature is the conservatism in households object, braziers and cooking-stands in particular. Scheffer states in her book: ‘We must conclude that the object, braziers and cooking-stands in particular. Most of the fragments came from the pre-house strata 4–6, 433 which seems to have a terminus ante quem of c. 560 B.C. based on the date of a few Etrusco-Corinthian plates found just under the rectangular house (see above). The date of the coarse ware and red-slip jars and bowls do not contradict this date even though there is difficulty in dating those vessels more precisely.

A striking feature is the conservatism in households object, braziers and cooking-stands in particular. Scheffer states in her book: ‘We must conclude that the object, braziers and cooking-stands in particular. Most of the fragments came from the pre-house strata 4–6, 433 which seems to have a terminus ante quem of c. 560 B.C. based on the date of a few Etrusco-Corinthian plates found just under the rectangular house (see above). The date of the coarse ware and red-slip jars and bowls do not contradict this date even though there is difficulty in dating those vessels more precisely.

Braziers. From the bridge area there are sixteen fragments of braziers representing at least 4-7 individuals braziers. Four come from braziers of form Ic and III, all with cylinder-stamped decorations (Figs. 82:13–14; 85:1–3). 436 A few undecorated rim fragments indicate at least three more braziers of type Ic (Fig. 85:4–6). 437 Type Ic with a rounded body, which differs from the other types, is probably a local variant. 438 The decoration on the rim and in one case also inside the rim, were made by three different cylinders, showing sphinxes and rams, animals in rows, and boar hunting scenes with humans and horses (Fig. 85:1). 439

The fragments were found in separate areas and strata, viz. strata 2–3 in shaft 1A, stratum 3 shaft 3A and stratum 4 in the pre-levelling fill under the rectangular house. Several of the pieces were joining fragments from different strata indicating that a couple of the braziers belonged to the pre-construction level dated to the 7th–6th century. 440

Metal objects and metals
The metal objects comprise only 5% of the small finds. They consist of objects in iron, bronze, lead and copper. They are fibulae, pins, small rings, nails and bolts, point of a javelin, lead mending, slag and a piece of pure copper (Table 27). The preserved state of the metal finds is fragmentary and the fragments are often much corroded. The twenty-three iron objects and the eleven bronze objects came from different strata. The pure copper, and the lead clamp used for mending were located in stratum 3 and stratum 1 respectively.

The fibulae are represented by six examples in bronze, two of the navicella type and four of the bow type, and one iron fibula, probably of the bow type. That makes bronze fibulae the largest group, followed by three pieces of bronze rings and one sheet fragment (Figs. 94a, 95). One small piece of pure copper, weighing 31 g, may be part of an ingot (Aes rude?). Among the iron finds, iron nails and bolts are the two largest groups, followed by a blade of a knife (?), a point of a javelin,
and by two pieces of slag (Fig. 95).\textsuperscript{441} The only example of lead is the mending found \textit{in situ} in the lower part of a coarse Late Italo-Geometric basin (Fig. 82:17).\textsuperscript{442} A couple of metal finds suggest metal production evidence at San Giovenale, if perhaps not at the bridge site: iron slag and a copper ingot (?) (see further below on metal production in chapter 2.5).\textsuperscript{443}

\textit{Glass beads}

The two glass beads in blue and turquoise, probably belonging to a necklace, are of two different shapes, a spherical one and one melon shaped (Fig. 94a:16–17). They were recorded W of the water basin in stratum 3, i.e. under the large tufa packing, and at the well.\textsuperscript{444}

\textit{Horn plaque}

The small plaque of horn of unknown species\textsuperscript{445} was found in the well, at levels 3.75–4.9 m as measured from the top of the well. It has an incised decoration of an outstretched animal, a boar, rabbit or a dog, and can stylistically be compared with some carvings on Phoenician ivory plaques (Fig. 94a:12). It may have been part of an intarsia of a box.\textsuperscript{446}

\textsuperscript{441} The slag will be analysed by prof. Guidi at ENEA, Rome, in order to decide the metal, and to establish the level in the production process, that is whether they are refuse from smelting or smithing.

\textsuperscript{442} Lead clamp in a basin SGBRN 60-4 (T21), stratum 1 (Fig. 82).

\textsuperscript{443} Two pieces of slag: SGBRN 62-773 weight 15 gr.; 1 bottom slag SGBRS 62-812, weight 119 gr.; 1 copper ingot (?) SGBRN 62-807 weight 31 gr.; L. 3 cm; W. 3 cm; Th. 0.6 cm, cf. Massa-Pairault 1997, 131–137.

\textsuperscript{444} Bead, fluted, melon-shaped, depressed globular with a central vertical perforation, turquoise coloured (Fig. 94a). D. 1.25; H. 0.7; D. of hole 0.4. Till W of wine/water basin, under fill, str. 3. SGBRN 62-783; Bead, light blue, globular or spherical with a central, vertical perforation, D. 0.95; H. 0.65; D. of hole 0.25. Tfill, cleansing at well under fill, str. 3; SGBRN 63-616.

\textsuperscript{445} SGBRN 62-796, L. 2.0, pres. H. 1.0. Th. 0.2. I thank Margareta Boije for her osteological examination of this piece.

### Table 26. Minimal number of cooking-stands and the number of fragments of cooking-stands based on Scheffer’s typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>MNV (frgs.)</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Bronze Age/Protovillanovan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Bronze Age/Protovillanovan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td>1, 2, 4</td>
<td>Final Bronze Age/Protovillanovan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Bronze Age/Protovillanovan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>2, 4,</td>
<td>7th–6th century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>4 (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7th–6th century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIA</td>
<td>4 (12)</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>7th-6th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>7th–6th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24 (31)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 27. Number of metal objects from the bridge complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object/Metal</th>
<th>Bronze (Ae)</th>
<th>Copper (Cu)</th>
<th>Iron (Fe)</th>
<th>Lead (Pb)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fibula</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife (?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javelin</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slag</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper ingot?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mending on sherd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

451 SGBRN 9906-9, T186 (61-22).
2.4.5 Organic finds

Osteological remains: animal bones

Animal bones from different areas, including the well, are mentioned in all the notebooks, but only a few bones from the well,\(^452\) the pre-construction fill (strata 4–6) and (strata 1–3) were collected and sent for examination. The results will be fully discussed in the final publication (Fig. 94c).\(^453\)

Table 28. Minimal Numbers of Individuals and the number of bone fragments of wild and domestic animals at the bridge complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Frgs.</th>
<th>MNI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>417</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29. Minimal Numbers of Individuals and the number of fragments of domestic and wild animals at the bridge complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>MNI</th>
<th>Frgs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>417</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30. Minimal Numbers of Individuals and the total number of fragments of animal bones found in the well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>MNI</th>
<th>Frgs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well 5.75 level</td>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well 5.50 level</td>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheep/goat(^454)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>199</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Osteological remains: human bones

The human bones, in all seventy fragments, the cranium included, were found almost at the bottom of the well.\(^457\) They were examined by Prof. F. Mallegni from the university at Pisa, and were revealed to be the remains of a skeleton of a young, healthy, and muscular man, 23–25 years old.\(^458\) They can be dated from the beginning of the 5th century to the beginning of the 4th century B.C. for stratigraphical reasons.

---

\(^{452}\) From the well at level 5.5 m and 5.75 m measured from the upper stones, at the mouth.

\(^{453}\) As mentioned earlier, Dr. Sorrentino at the University of Pisa examined the animal bones found during the excavations in 1960–1963. These will be included as an appendix in the final publication, *San Giovenale* 6:1–3 forthcoming.

\(^{454}\) Cf. Mallegni 1979, 36.

\(^{455}\) The 54 domestic animal bones and teeth found in loci 1–2, and loci 5 and 6 during the cleaning in 1999 belong to at least one individual of each species, i.e. pig, *sus scrofa domestica*, with chopmarks, and marks of gnawing, burnt and unburnt young animals of cattle, *bos taurus*. From locus 5, a bone from a cow and from locus 6 bones, feet and teeth from cattle, *bos taurus*, and teeth and mandibula of and sheep/goat, *ovis aries/capra hircus*, as well as bones and teeth of pigs. These bones were examined by M. Boije, cf. Fig. 94c.

\(^{456}\) Loci 1–2 are equalled to str. 3 in the two baulks. Locus 6 is the construction layer, i.e. str. 4 below House 1. For loci 4–6, see Figs. 34b, 46–48, 50–51.

\(^{457}\) The bones were found at level 5.15–5.6 m. Cf. Fig. 54 and the description of the well in chapter 2:1.

\(^{458}\) The analysed bones were marked with 62-1001, 1004, 1005, see Mallegni 1979, 36–47. In the report the bones have been given new find numbers, while in the notebooks the find numbers are SGBRN 62-799, and 62-800.
**Charcoal and food residues**

Four lumps of charcoal or carbonised wood were recorded from the well and in the corner of the bench in House 2, the trapezoidal building and in stratum 4, perhaps from wooden objects or furniture and not from a hearth as stated in the excavation notebook. Food residues have been found on two body fragments probably belonging to the same cooking jar (?) (Fig. 94c). The content has not yet been analysed. The white, pink and bluish incrustation inside the so-called pig-ware stamnoid jars also remains to be chemically analysed.

---

2.4.6 Concluding remarks

The most frequent category of finds is the pottery. It contains both fine and coarse fabrics of open and closed shapes, divided over a long period of time, ranging from the Neolithic to Hellenistic periods. Another spectacular find category are the inscriptions and graffiti on bowls, cups, jars and loom-weights. A third important group of finds are the osteological finds, that is the domestic animal bones scattered in all the layers and in the well and the human remains from the bottom of the well. Terracotta objects, consisting of loom-weights, spindle whorls, spools, braziers and cooking-stands comprise a fourth find category as well as the metal finds of jewellery, working tools, nails and bolts, weaponry and refuse from metal production.

---

2.5 DISCUSSION OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL FINDS AND THEIR CONTEXTS

A general overview of the stratigraphy, the architectural remains and the different find categories have earlier been presented in chapter 2.2–2.4. The aim of this section is to discuss certain find contexts and the related archaeological finds of importance for the bridge complex from a functional point of view and to focus on similarities and differences during several recognized phases. The phases are based on the analysis made of the architectural finds in different layers and the stratified finds related to them (see Tables 35–36). There have been some difficulties relating the small finds to certain structures and phases, due to a disturbed stratigraphy, caused by disturbances such as earthquakes, landslides, and reconstructions of houses, roads, walls and bridges over a long period of time. Consequently, even the dating of the phases has met with some difficulties. However, with the help of the refitting method of pottery sherds from various strata described below in this chapter I have attempted to match the finds with the different pre-construction phases as well as with the building phases.

Table 35. Minimum number of vessels of refitted fragments sorted after fabric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Frgs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bucchero</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic imports</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etrusco-Corinthian</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etrusco-Archaic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etruscan black-glaze/black-figure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional impasto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red impasto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-slip</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse Ware</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black impasto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faliscan impasto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>321</strong></td>
<td><strong>1928</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36. Minimum number of tiles and terracotta objects of refitted fragments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terracotta objects</th>
<th>MNV</th>
<th>Frgs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiles SGBRN</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiles SGBRS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking-stand</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazier</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>161</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The fabrics and tiles presented in the tables are those which consist of two or more joining fragments. The profiled tile fragments of pan-tiles (*tegulae*), ridge-tiles (*kalypter*) and cover-tiles (*imbrices*) are counted here and they yielded 260, representing 186 different tiles. 104 joining fragments represented 29 individual tiles. Of those are 3 *tegulae* and 2 *imbrices* from the northern bank, joined with tile fragments from various trenches. Six cooking-stands consisted of more than one fragment and comprised 13 fragments altogether. Two stands...
were refitted from four fragments coming from separate trenches. The five braziers comprised 17 fragments.

One closed Faliscan impasto vessel with a scale pattern was rejoined with two more body fragments. The same kind of pottery fabrics, as well as later wares, is also found in the upper strata 1–3, and many of them join. However, there are no matches hitherto found between finds from strata 4–6 and the upper layers.

As stated earlier in chapter 2.4 a sample of refitting pottery fragments has been plotted out to illustrate the spatial and the stratified distribution of pottery and tile fragments (Fig. 74a–d). The refitted pottery and tile samples represented fragments from different trenches, shafts and levels (strata) and also of various fabrics, shapes and periods. A line in the diagram represents two or more refitted fragments of a specific vessel. The fragments are named by the find number or by a specific letter combined with a number. The four diagrams show a clear spatial and stratified distribution of a selected number of rejoining fragments between different layers on the northern river bank, i.e. strata 3–6 behind the foundation wall M and the layer under House 1, the shafts 3A and B strata 3–4. Pottery from the fill under the large tufa packing joined fragments found in stratum 2 of the tufa packing and in stratum 1 above this packing as well as fragments from the well (Fig. 74c). Joining fragments from stratum 2 of the tufa packing, and stratum 4 under House 1, stratum 3 under the tufa packing, and stratum 4–6 of the pre-construction fill indicate that soil mixed with refuse was used at different occasions during a long period of time. The refitting fragments from strata 4–6 in area S and under the apsidal house show that these were deposited there contemporaneously as a fill, probably to support the large retaining and foundation wall M. During the excavations these layers were treated as separate, but the pottery analyses showed that they were better treated as one fill with a deliberately constructed clay layer in between as Forsberg already had suggested.

Diagram 1 (Fig. 74a) shows fragments of red-slip, coarse and fine wares from six trenches in area N, three trenches and shafts in area S and the three quadrants of the apsidal house (House 3A–B) refit potsherds from strata 1–3, 2–6, 3–6. One particular refitting line (number 2) consists of fragments of a large pithos found in the deepest layer in shafts 1 and 2 and stratum 2 in shaft 1 in area S and refits with potsherds found in trench 8 area N (see Fig. 34a, 37). In diagram 2 (Fig. 74b) the refitting lines connect a few trenches in Area N to the third level of the apsidal house, and Area W. Only a few lines, number 5, 10, 11 and 9, combine fragments from the lower layers with fragments of the upper ones. Diagram 3 (Fig. 74c) shows that there are refits between fragments of various fabrics and periods from the 3 m level in the well with the third and the second stratum in area N, i.e. the layers above and under the large tufa packing (line 1). This indicates that the creation of the tufa fill and the filling of the well must have been simultaneous. The lower part of the first stratum also contained fragments, which refitted with some in the third stratum of the apsidal house, that is in the floor filling of the house. This is another example of how the soil, used to level the area in building phase 3, was taken from a dump nearby (see line 2), where the debris of earlier building phases was collected. Diagram 4 (Fig. 74d) shows the concentration of a few refitted Attic imports in the filling of the courtyard of House 3A (stratum 3), the tufa packing (stratum 2) and the upper fill of the well and their connection with the levelling layer under House 3A. The rest of the Attic imported fragments also come from this area, that is the fill used as foundation for the stone pavement in building phase 4.

Based on the analyses of the refitting artefacts, I am inclined to suggest that a deliberately made refuse dump of discarded pottery, tiles and other finds and debris from destroyed features was located near the bridge. It seems highly probable that people during several periods, from the Protovillanovan to the Hellenistic periods, used material from the same dump, mixed with soil for, levelling purposes and foundations for road packings. The joining fragments from the upper strata indicate that the filling up of the well and the courtyard of House 3A was made for the necessary foundation for the construction of the large tufa pavement during building phase 4. Only a few objects and pottery were found in situ.

Since the material culture of the earlier periods is so similar between the settlement areas and the bridge complex another explanation of the dump may be conceivable. This, however, is more farfetched. Soil mixed with refuse from the settlements on the Acropolis and the Borgo might have been transported down to the bridge during periods of reconstructions due to the similarities of the pottery and their functions.

2.5.1 Phases 1–7

Due to the various analyses of the related pottery and other find categories, and of the architectural constructions and their contexts from the northern and
the southern riverbanks of the Pietrisco brook, it has been possible to make a diachronic study of the remains. Those have resulted in a relative and absolute dating of seven phases.

**Pre-construction phases 1–3 (c. 3300, 950–700, 675–565 B.C.)**

The pre-construction phases 1–3 are mainly established through finds (pottery, metal objects, tile fragments) from the layers in the fill (strata 3–6) behind the large foundation walls M and N (Fig. 37), under the floor of House 1 (stratum 4), as well as below the basins E of the house. The pottery consisted of various wares of local and non-local production, fine as well as coarse wares. Similar pottery fragments were also found in the fill under the large tufa packing N of House 3B (Figs. 66–67) as well as in and above the tufa packing (stratum 1). The fact that there were many refits between sherds from strata 1–3 shows that there have been lots of disturbances in the area, as stated above.

The first pre-construction phase is represented only by the two Early Neolithic body sherds dated to c. 3300 B.C. (Fig. 75), found in the second stratum on the southern side of the Pietrisco brook. To my knowledge the two Neolithic sherds from the bridge area are the first found on the Vignale side.

The second pre-construction phase of the fill is represented by the primitive and the transitional impasto wares. The dating of the Protovillanovan pottery of the Tolfa/Allumiere group and transitional impasto vessels and objects to c. 900–725 B.C. i.e. Early Iron age, has now been challenged. Recently, a sample of charcoal from a hearth in one of the oldest oval huts on the Acropolis has been analysed by C-14 with an astonishing result. It showed a date of 1400–1200 B.C., which contradicts the theory that the Protovillanovan phase at San Giovenale would be contemporary with the Iron Age, i.e. the Villanovan period.

The various types of jars represented functions such as storing, preparation and cooking, and the carinated bowls for eating and drinking. No remains of huts or other architectural features have been found but there may have existed some in the neighbourhood, judging from the domestic character of the pottery and the small finds (Figs. 75–77). There are also a few examples of cooking-stands of Scheffer’s type I, probably used for cooking outdoors (Fig. 75:11–13).

Similar find groups are to be found in Area F on the Acropolis, from the hut level. The southern side of the Pietrisco yielded also Protovillanova pottery fragments from strata 1–2. A single small loom-weight and a few bobbins indicate textile production and indirectly sheep/goat breeding (Fig. 94a).

The third pre-construction phase comprises the Orientalizing period and the Early Archaic period, represented by the fine Italo-Geometric and Subgeometric pottery. There are also coarse ware jars, painted white-on-red or red-on-white pottery dated to the 8th century, the brown (8th century) and fine advanced impasto, buccero and Faliscan impasto wares (7th century), impasto spindle-whorls, and bobbins (Figs. 77–79, 94a). This phase may be dated to c. 675–565 B.C. Bones, small finds of different metals, bronze fibulae, spindle-whorls, and glass beads are also connected to this period as well as some pottery inscriptions dated to 600 B.C. (Table 25; Figs. 94a, 95). The Archaic tile fragments indicate that there were buildings with tile-covered roofs (Fig. 94a). The well may have been dug during this phase, or possibly earlier.

The Early Archaic material could be dated to 625–565 B.C. The pottery represents different categories.

---

465 This date has been set by the so-called Swedish school, cf. *San Giovenale* 3:3, while the Italian scholars have a different opinion and are dating it to the late 2nd millennium B.C., the Bronze Age, see *San Giovenale* 4:1 forthcoming.

466 *San Giovenale* 4:1 forthcoming.

467 Scheffer 1981, fig. 2.

468 San Giovenale 3:3; San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming; Malcus 1984.


470 This impasto ware represented by a jug, a plate and an uncertain closed form was produced during a much longer period in the Faliscan area. In other areas the fine advanced impasto was replaced by buccero forms, cf. Rasmussen 1979.

471 See the dates of the finds in the hut and houses in Area F, *San Giovenale* 4:1 forthcoming. The various types of pottery of this period are dated to 750–650 B.C. The same wares and forms found in the tombs are dated later. Consequently, these tombs should be updated c. 50 years, cf. *San Giovenale* 1:5, 1:7, 1:8.

472 Houses with tile-covered roofs are reported from other areas of San Giovenale, for example from the Borgo; see Nylander 1986a, *San Giovenale* 5:2 forthcoming, and various areas on the Acropolis, see *San Giovenale* 4:1 forthcoming; *San Giovenale* 2:2; Fuglesang forthcoming; *San Giovenale* 3:1; Wikander 1981. Foundations of houses with cellars and many Archaic tiles of Wikander type 1 and 2 have been found on the Vignale plateau, see Del Chiaro notebook 1959 and Brown notebook 1960, and *San Giovenale* 6:1–3 forthcoming.

473 Pohl has the same date of the Early Archaic period on the Borgo, cf. *San Giovenale* 2:4. Similar pottery wares and
long wooden logs with wooden parapets on both sides, superstructure is supposed to have been constructed of the long walls of ashlar tufa blocks built as retaining walls seem to have been reinforced through the construction phases. The bank of the Pietrisco brook.

The next phase, building phase 1, started with a large rebuilding project. The banks of the Pietrisco brook seem to have been reinforced through the construction of the long walls of ashlar tufa blocks built as retaining walls and abutments for a possible wooden bridge. The superstructure is supposed to have been constructed of long wooden logs with wooden parapets on both sides, since there is no evidence for a vaulted superstructure. The distance between the two banks was measured to c. 18 m across, and the depth from the northern abutment to the bottom of the brook was measured to c. 12 m in the first section made in 1959. The curved and obliquely placed roads, however, indicate an even longer span. In that section and also in the section over the whole complex (Fig. 44b) made in 1962, it is clearly seen how the water in the brook, during a long period of time, has eroded the riverbed. As seen in the section, the sloping and uneven northern riverbank before the construction of the first stone foundation had to be levelled with a considerable fill. It consisted of clay mixed with earth, blocks and other debris, such as pottery and tiles under and above a 10–15 cm thick layer of greenish clay, which probably functioned as drainage. Considerable cuttings for the wall were made in the conglomerate bedrock (Fig. 44b).

The construction of the monumental bridge marked the end of third pre-construction phase and indicated the beginning of building phase 1, dated to c. 560 B.C. Simultaneously as the bridge was built, House I was constructed just a few meters north of the retaining wall M. It had a rectangular ground plan and walls of tufa blocks and wattle-and-daub, covered by a tiled roof. The few fragments of ridge-tiles indicate a saddle roof for both House 1 and House 2. The rectangular house with two large rooms was orientated north-south and entered from the west. Room A, furnished with a tufa bench, and which may have functioned as a combination of a dining room, i.e. triclinium, for reclining and a bedroom.

Building phase 1 (560–550 B.C.)

The next phase, building phase 1, started with a large rebuilding project. The banks of the Pietrisco brook seem to have been reinforced through the construction of the long walls of ashlar tufa blocks built as retaining walls and abutments for a possible wooden bridge. The superstructure is supposed to have been constructed of long wooden logs with wooden parapets on both sides, since there is no evidence for a vaulted superstructure. The distance between the two banks was measured to c. 18 m across, and the depth from the northern abutment to the bottom of the brook was measured to c. 12 m in the first section made in 1959. The curved and obliquely placed roads, however, indicate an even longer span. In that section and also in the section over the whole complex (Fig. 44b) made in 1962, it is clearly seen how the water in the brook, during a long period of time, has eroded the riverbed. As seen in the section, the sloping and uneven northern riverbank before the construction of the first stone foundation had to be levelled with a considerable fill. It consisted of clay mixed with earth, blocks and other debris, such as pottery and tiles under and above a 10–15 cm thick layer of greenish clay, which probably functioned as drainage. Considerable cuttings for the wall were made in the conglomerate bedrock (Fig. 44b).

The construction of the monumental bridge marked the end of third pre-construction phase and indicated the beginning of building phase 1, dated to c. 560 B.C. Simultaneously as the bridge was built, House I was constructed just a few meters north of the retaining wall M. It had a rectangular ground plan and walls of tufa blocks and wattle-and-daub, covered by a tiled roof. The few fragments of ridge-tiles indicate a saddle roof for both House 1 and House 2. The rectangular house with two large rooms was orientated north-south and entered from the west. Room A, furnished with a tufa bench, and which may have functioned as a combination of a dining room, i.e. triclinium, for reclining and a bedroom.

---

475 Etruscan culture 1962, fig. 279.
476 Since the Etruscan roads and bridges were used and reconstructed by the Romans there are no comparisons. The Pietrisco is unique in this respect since it seems that the bridge has not been used since the abandonment in the 3rd century B.C. Remains of another bridge with only the abutments left and a stone-paved road on the western bank is recorded at Norchia with a crossing over the Biedano (cf. Colonna di Paolo & Colonna 1978, fig. 79; Cicognolo 1993–94, figs. 33–34). There are several Roman stone bridges with one or several arches in the area, for example the three-arched Roman bridge called the Ponte Diavolo and the one-arched Ponte della Rocca over the Biedano, and Ponte Piro near Barbarano Romano; cf. Cicognolo 1993–94, figs. 24–26, 31–32, 61. See also the famous medieval arched bridge at Vulci, the Ponte del’Abbadia built on Etruscan remains, in Rasenna 1986, fig. 43.
477 Colonna mentions a similar bench in a small sacellum at Grasceta dei Cavalleri in the Tolfa Mountains, Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, cat. no. 43; see also Colonna 1986, fig. 392.
with couches for sleeping. The almost square shape of the room, 5×5.5 m,478 and the slightly off-centred door are typical of a banqueting room (Figs. 36, 39, 42).479

The bench could either be a platform for klinai or couches as we can see in the Etruscan tombs from San Giovenale480 or they may have been covered with cushions to sit or lie on, similar to the π-shaped river-pebble construction in House 1 on the Acropolis of San Giovenale.481 The habit of reclining at diners, as opposed to being seated, was more common during the late Archaic period than during the Villanovan and early Archaic periods.482 There are some differences between these benches: the bench in House 1 at the bridge is constructed of tufa blocks laid in a π-shape along the whole central wall, but not the side walls; river pebbles and soil have been used to cover the space between the blocks and the walls. The dating differs: the house on the Acropolis is dated much earlier viz. c. 675 B.C.483 while House 1 at the bridge can be dated to c. 560–550 B.C.

To the south of room A there appears to be the remains of another room, B, of roughly the same size as room A. This room is a hypothetical one and its plan is based on a few tufa ashlars in two courses (wall J ext.) visible at the western side of the construction, the eastern wall H ext. of at least two courses, continuing almost to the bridge abutment and the worn foundation blocks in wall K forming the courtyard (Fig. 36). The last block of wall K is either worn down or intentionally cut down. This stone is the key-stone for the interpretation of room B and for building phase 1. The debris of the huge number of pottery and tile fragments in strata 3–4 under and S of the apsidal house may also belong to this phase.

The walls may have been constructed of either tufa stones or mud bricks and pisé walls. There is no indication of a doorway connection between the two rooms A and B, although there may have existed one by the southern end of the bench. A change in the sizes of the blocks in this partition wall may indicate an entrance. An abundance of scattered tile fragments indicate that the roof was probably covered by flat terracotta pan-tiles, cover-tiles and ridge-tiles.

Immediately outside the door of Room A, in the small courtyard or the antechamber there was the cut well, which probably supplied the need for fresh water (Fig. 36). However, the location of the well so close to the door is strange. This may support the idea of an earlier date for the well.484 The two carved basins with an interconnecting hole placed in the backyard of the house may have functioned for washing or in wine production. Basins cut in the tufa rock or in large tufa boulders are quite common in San Giovenale during the Hellenistic periods. Such basins are found on the Borgo, placed along the northern side of the wheel-marked road very close to the bridge crossing to the Casale Vignale necropolis. These large basins are interpreted as pestarole,485 wine presses, the usual interpretation of such basins. Another interpretation is made by Colonna based on the five large basins cut into the cliff along the road Cava Buia at Norchia and two rock-cut basins very close to the remains of a stone arched bridge crossing the Biedano river. He sees them as public dyery basins or for public tanning and washing. The supply of water may explain the close location to the river, and the location far from the settlement may have depended on the polluted air from dyeing and tanning.486 Another example of basins along roads are the basins found along the road near the necropolis of Grotta Porchina, probably functioning for refreshing.487

The two basins placed at the Pietrisco bridge may have functioned for collecting water during rainy periods, for washing and for purification since they were placed so near the well and the Houses 1, 2 and 3A–B. They do not seem to have been regular wine presses as the large, square, pressing floor with a

478 A common size of Greek dining rooms is 4.5×4.5 m and a common size of a building modul at Satricum is 4.8×4.8 m, cf. Maaskant-Kleibrink 1992, 130-131).
480 San Giovenale 1:5, figs. 30, 55, 58
481 See the discussion of klinai (reclining beds) and the occurrence of river stones in houses in Karlsson 1994, 265–269.
483 House 1, the hut phase, in Area F East on the Acropolis is dated from the tableware found on the couches, San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming.
484 I thank R. Holmgren for our discussions of the strange placing of the well so close to the door. One reason may be that the well was there during an earlier phase, that is the pre-construction phase 2 or 3, and was incorporated into the porch in front of House 1 in building phase 1.
485 San Giovenale 5:1 forthcoming. See also Etruskerna 1960, fig. 143.
486 Colonna di Paolo & Colonna 1978, n. 9, figs. 128–129; 133–134:1–3; see also a typology of wine presses from Megiddo in Jordan, Ahlström 1978.
circular or square hole in the middle is missing. These two depressions/basins are cut into a large tufa boulder with a small round conduit connecting them and with a shelf in front of the lower basin. It is quite possible that there may have been a small-scale production of wine made by hand and used in possible banquets at the bridge. Obviously, the basins have played a major role since they were left uncovered during the last building phase. The Pietrisco basins are dated to the Archaic time, thus much earlier than the Norchia basins, which are dated to the Hellenistic period, as well as the basins on the summit of the Borgo (the spina), which are also Hellenistic.

Concerning the date of this house and the rest of the bridge complex, there was no pottery found in situ. But immediately under House 1, among the pottery in the proposed foundation sacrifice, there were some fragments identified as Etrusco-Corinthian figured plates attributed to the workshop of the Pittore senza graffiti (Fig. 79: 1–2, 5–7). This is a Tarquinian workshop with a special production of plates painted with birds and animals without the common incisions of Etrusco-Corinthian pottery. The potters worked during a short period of time, 575–565 B.C. This gives a terminus post quem date to 565 B.C for the house and a terminus ante quem for phase 2.

An attempt of reconstructing this rectangular two-roomed house, the well in the porch, the road and the wooden bridge on the stone has been made based on the stratigraphy, the stone packings, and the architectural remains. Architectural details such as doors, windows, walls, roofs in tombs and other house reconstructions have also been studied (Fig. 96).

Phase 1 probably ended with the destruction of the bridge complex on the northern bank, i.e. House 1, the foundation walls, the road and the bridge, as well as the wall and the road on the southern side. An earthquake, recently dated to c. 550/530 B.C., caused a considerable damage to the settlement on the NW slope of the Borgo, as well as on the houses on the Acropolis. This has been very convincingly demonstrated through a very careful investigation of cracks in the walls and in the bedrock of the Borgo settlement. A complete change in the settlement plan tells us of the magnitude of this natural disaster. The bridge complex and the surroundings did not escape this devastation. The earthquake caused such severe damages on the environment and the structures at the Pietrisco bridge, that the whole complex almost totally collapsed. A landslide west of the bridge, probably caused by the earthquake, may have destroyed a large part of the western end of retaining wall M.

Building phase 2 (550–480/470 B.C.)

The second building phase started with the rebuilding of the whole complex, i.e. House 2, the road, the bridge and the walls (Fig. 44a). The debris from the preceding house was carefully swept away and probably put in a dump for earlier refuse located quite near the bridge, as the result of the spatial and stratified analyses of the tiles and the pottery shows (see discussion below). Unfortunately, the slope north-east and east of the excavated area was not investigated further during the excavations in 1961–1963.

Quite substantial changes were done during this phase. The new transversal retaining wall, from the foundation wall M over the debris of room B of House 1 and abutting the southern wall of House 2, was dug down into the construction fill. It caused much turmoil in the construction layers, which can be noted in a blending of pottery, as did the building of a second retaining wall N, towards the north, which abutted wall M of a c. 100° angle. The walls were necessary as reinforcements of the long wall M, and for the bedding of the new road, as well as reinforcements of the edge of the collapsed western slope. The road was, in this manner, moved a few meters towards the north-east, where it, in an oblique way, passed just in front of the house and intersected the area of room B in House 1. Consequently, it ended at the new bridge with its wooden superstructure and then the new south-east road on the southern side of the brook. This new roadway made it difficult to construct a building with more than a single room on this spot. A larger building demanded a change in the ground plan and a move, either further towards north or north-east. But the builders preferred to reconstruct only a part of the rectangular House 1.

House 2, measuring c. 5×5.5 m with a trapezoid ground plan and with a single room, was.....
reconstructed on the foundations of the preceding room A with re-used tufa blocks,497 and with the asymmetrical doorway facing west (Fig. 44a). The room probably got its trapezoidal shape due to movements along an identified fault line, which crosses the area, and which also made the southern wall of the room curve inwards in the second building phase. The walls, probably made of ashlars blocks, mud bricks or wattle-and-daub, rested on a foundation of large and small ashlars blocks. Based on the many scattered Archaic tile fragments found the saddle roof seem to have been covered with pan-tiles and cover-tiles. The floor was levelled with a layer of hard-packed clayish earth and small pebbles to half the height of the π-shaped bench still in situ. Before the old floor was completely covered with a layer of clay, a small, thin and rounded bronze object was laid in an oval, wooden box in the southern corner of the π-shaped bench together with another small box (cf. chapter 2.3) (Figs. 50–51). A fragment of a pan-tile was put on top, and this small structure was surrounded by a circle of shaped clay (Fig. 50). In the soil above this tile fragment were found charred carbon, a base fragment of a bowl and a grooved base fragment belonging to a red-slip brazier decorated with a frieze of animals (Figs. 48, 85:1). The soil was reported to be hard and red burnt in this area, and consequently was interpreted as being a hearth. This interpretation could not, however, be sustained, as the removing of a tufa block next to this area did not show any evidence to support this suggestion. The brazier per se indicated that it was used for heating and lighting, but cannot be connected directly to the burnt area. The supposed wooden box, with the round and very corroded bronze object inside, sealed by the clay ring, and the tile fragments, point to an intentional deposit used in a foundation ritual for the erection of House 2.

The π-shaped bench lined the whole of wall H, the northern and southern walls partially, and was supposedly still used as a triclinium for banqueting and symposia although with lower benches (see further discussion on functions in chapter 3.). Some pieces of inscribed bucchero pottery of the second group dated to 550–470 B.C. found in the filling of this space may belong to the third phase.498 The shapes of fine, ordinary and red bucchero wares show that they were used for drinking as well as eating and serving.499 The fine Etrusco-Archaic ware, the Attic black- and red-figure ware were also used as tablewares; red-slip, coarse wares (internal and red-slipped as well as plain coarse ware) for food preparation, cooking and storage purposes (Figs. 80–81, 83–85, 87–89), Braziers, cooking-stands, loom-weights, spindle-whorls, and iron objects could also be referred to this phase (Figs. 85, 94–95). In other words, there is still evidence for food preparation and eating/drinking.

The two basins, with a shelf cut out in front of the lowest basin, and the well, seem to have still been in use (Figs. 39–40, 44a). The human skeletal remains and the bones of a dog, a sheep and cattle, found almost at the bottom of the well, contaminated the water in the well and made it undrinkable. Exactly when the man and the animals were dropped into the well is difficult to say. One suggestion is that this happened at the end of building phase 3 before the complete filling of the well in phase 4. The only datable artefact from the bottom of the well is the red-slip jug (Fig. 53). It has been dated to the 6th century B.C. and may have been lost in the well long before the bones were placed there.

The space between the two road pavements on the southern side of the brook seems to have been filled with white river stones, forming a small piazza in front of the bridge. Similar structures can be seen on the southern side of Blera (Figs. 70–71). Following a small road down to the end of the southern steep slope of the Blera plateau a medieval bridge built on Etruscan foundations crosses the Biedano river. Situated near one end of the bridge is a small watchtower called La Toretta. On the other side of the river there are three crosstree with a small space covered with river pebbles in between. One road continues through a tufa cut road lined with cuniculi and tombs and the second is leading down to Ponte della Rocca and the third southwards to San Giovenale.500 This medieval bridge complex at the river Biedano seems to be a very good parallel to the Pietriscu complex.

The triangular space located to the south of House 2 towards the edge of the bridge may have been made for

---

497 An interesting note is that tombs with rectangular rooms have a bench along three walls, while a square room has benches along two walls. This may indicate that there has been a rectangular house from the beginning, as I have argued for (see above); cf. Maaskant-Kleibring 1992.


499 See Gnade et al. 1992, 49, n. 3, and 55, esp. n. 20, on the discussion of reddish bucchero as a special ware at Satricum. It seems that we might have an import of Satrican reddish bucchero at San Giovenale.

500 Santella 1981, map 2, figs. 56, 58–59.
the purpose of parking animals and wagons. A reconstruction has also been made of House 2 based on the same evidence as for House 1 (Fig. 97).

The bridge complex was destroyed by an earthquake during building phase 1. What caused the destruction of the bridge complex during the second building phase is unclear. Yet, another possible earthquake may have activated the fault crossing the well and the house, and caused considerable damages to House 2, the bridge and the well. Supposedly, rather soon after this event, a new building was erected on the remains of House 2. After that the pottery and other finds related to this phase had been carefully swept away, i.e. the beginning of building phase 3.

**Building phase 3 (c. 480/470–400 B.C.)**

The third building phase started with the layout of a new building, House 3A, directly upon parts of the destroyed House 2 and a fill, placed as a reinforcement of the wall in the southern end.

The new building, House 3A, was probably constructed of re-used blocks, now in an apsidal shape, and orientated NE–SW, directly on the debris of House 2, reaching it at the north-western part (Figs. 34b, 52, 56a–b, 57). The ground plan of this new building was laid out more perpendicular to the new road on the west side of the house. It is reasonable to assume that the house had pisé walls with a tiled roof, due to a few lumps of mud brick and lots of tile fragments found in the fill inside the house. Mud brick walls on a stone foundation are still another option, as is the case on the Borgo. Since no wedged tile fragment was found, or any blocks with hollows for logs or postholes between the blocks as in House I on the Acropolis, a second suggestion may be walls of tufa blocks or pisé walls, holding a thatched roof as seen in a tentative reconstruction (Fig. 98).

The doorway is placed slightly off-centre, and facing west (cf. Figs. 54, 57). The existence of large ashlar blocks on either side of the entrance with large cuttings through them, together with the rectangular block placed to the right of the door, renders it more difficult to reconstruct the western facade of House 3A. These two blocks may indicate the construction of a wooden T-shaped frame around the door documented on numerous Etruscan tombs found at San Giovenale and at other Etruscan places. The high block has in this suggestion been considered as a table for offerings or custom fees (Fig. 98). Another suggestion is that the entrance was framed with tall, narrow windows like those found in a tomb in Cerveteri. The huge tufa block placed immediately to the south of the door could be part of the wall. Another suggestion is that there was a wide opening framed with wooden planks on both sides. The floors of Houses 3A and 3B seem to have been of compact earth and there were no traces of furnishing inside (Fig. 56a).

The only complete apsidal ground plan found in Etruria is House 3A–3B from San Giovenale. This type seems thus to be very unusual among the Etruscans. If this is an indigenous ground plan or an imported one is difficult to say. Despite the lack of parallels a tentative reconstruction is presented in Fig. 98.

The house was built on a slightly higher level than House 2, and was entered by a staircase from the road (Fig. 58). The road had the same direction as before, but it had been slightly moved towards north-east. The superstructure of the bridge was probably still of wood with the bridgeheads of stone. The road and the bridge followed the same direction as before, and connected to the south-eastern road on the southern side of the stream. There was, however, a change when the road had to be moved further up to the east in order to get a more firm foundation for the road or probably to avoid the risk of sliding (Figs. 55, 59–60, 61b).

The only finds inside House 3A consisted of a few pottery fragments found on the floor. In the filling of the floor there was mixed pottery from different periods as

---

503 Karlsson 2001, 51–53; *San Giovenale 4:1* forthcoming. See also the reconstruction of a wattle-and-daub wall in Acquarossa in Østenberg 1975, 133.

502 The one-room apsidal domestic buildings, apsidal dwellings of the elite and apsidal cult buildings from Protogeometric and Geometric periods found in Greece are often reconstructed with thatched roofs, see Mazarakis Aman 1997, tables 4–5, figs. 47b; 89; 118–119, 134; 151, 270, 362, and 402: clay models of apsidal buildings, figs. 495–496, 499a, f, and 507. See also n. 293.

504 Naso 1996, figs. 125-126.

505 For example in Archaic tombs at *San Giovenale* 1:5, figs. 30 (tomb P.9), 55, and 58 (tomb P.S.1), and the Tomba della Cornice in Cerveteri, *Rasenna* 1986, figs. 305–306.

506 Damgaard Andersen 1998, 4:104–105. Only a few other apsidal walls are found, viz. building B in Tarquinia with uncertain date and the semi-circular structure at the western end, cf. Damgaard Andersen 1, 72, figs. B 198, 174:2. See also the cult-room on the Acropolis, Fuglesang forthcoming.

507 Østenberg 1975, 139, 189, 191, 193; Nylander 1986a, figs. 20–21.
well as fragments of pan-tiles and cover-tiles, indicating the use of dump material. One important piece of pottery found under the floor level is the inscribed bucchero base of a cup with the name of the Etruscan god Lurs Larunita dated to c. 480/470 B.C., which gives a terminus post quem for House 3A and the third building phase, and a terminus ante quem for building phase 2 (Fig. 91:1–2). The bucchero base itself is, however, of fine black and glossy bucchero, dated to the beginning of the 6th century, i.e. one hundred years earlier than the inscription. Unfortunately, there were no other fine bucchero fragments found that could be connected to this cup. The use of a much earlier vase or just an ostrakon for a later dedication to this god even in such a fragmentary state could indicate a kind of sacrificial ritual in connection with the construction of a new building (see discussion further below on the function/s of the house). 508

The pottery related to phase 6 is Attic red-figured, Attic black-glazed, Etruscan black-figured and black-glazed ware, grey/light grey bucchero and tronoconical loom-weights and a few inscribed fragments belonging to Colonna’s second period of inscriptions. These finds, dated to c. 480/70 and later, were found under and above the large tufa packing and on the south side of the brook (Figs. 82, 89–90, 94). The tablewares, such as lekythoi, cups, skyphoi and bowls, trefoil jugs, were now, and in contrast to earlier periods, in the minority. Instead, many coarse ware jars, bowls/lids and lids also belonged to building phase 3.

Three examples of Etruscan Archaic black-glazed skyphoi with a row of drop-shaped black-glazed figures were found in the fill (Figs. 82:1–2, 89:11–12). This type of skyphos is reported from the settlement as well as from tombs at San Giovenale, 509 and in the tumuli at San Guiliano. 510 They are also well represented at Caere, dated to 525–470, Tarquinia, Rome, Nepi, Satricum, 511 and in Rome from the area of the temple of Castor and Pollux. 512 Similar vessels found at Veii are dated to the last quarter of the 5th cent. B.C. 513 Three examples from the bridge may belong to both phases 3 and 4, dated between 470–200 B.C.

The area north of the apsidal House 3A, clearly defined by the northern wall A and its extended wall, may have served as a courtyard, open or covered by a tiled roof, or an antechamber. The well and the basins were still in use during this phase (cf. Figs. 52, 60). The pile, mixed with tiles and pottery towards the northern wall, observed during the excavations, may hint at a tile-covered roof at the courtyard although there was not a single posthole found.

Building phase 4 (c. 400–275 B.C. or later)

What caused the destruction of the bridge complex in the preceding phase is unknown. The fourth phase began with the construction of the large semicircle-shaped tufa pavement on the courtyard north of House 3A (Figs. 62–65). The courtyard was completely covered by a fill, c. 40 cm high and consisting of earth mixed with tile fragments, bones, and pottery wares, ranging from primitive impasto of Protovillanovan type to Etruscan black-figured and Hellenistic black-glazed pottery. This fill functioned as a substructure for a tufa pavement, i.e. a packing of large and small stones and blocks. In front of the house the tufa packing was laid in line with the entrance so that it was possible to go inside directly from the tufa pavement interpreted as road 4. The fact that the tufa packing was constructed around House 3A may indicate two things: (1) that the house was visible and reused as House 3B or, (2) that the ruins of House 3A were held in reverence for a specific reason. I prefer, however, the first option, since the location is important and the building could be used for different purposes. Unfortunately, the notebooks from 1960–1962, do not give much information about whether the tufa packing continued up to the abutment or not. A row of tufa blocks on wall M may indicate that this was the case (Figs. 62–63). The question arises then, if the road pavement was at too high a level for the third bridge or if a fourth one was constructed in the same place (Fig. 65).

The dense packing of earth, tufa stones, pottery and tiles, was clearly defined in the north, and south by two slightly converging walls (see Figs. 62–64) and a transversal wall in the middle for reinforcement. The packing ended in a gentle curve towards the east but was traced again south of the House 3B. The packing sloped slightly towards the west, and is, as the apsidal

508 Colonna & Bucke-Forsberg 1999, 67, 76, n. 34, figs. 6:37 and 10:37.
509 San Giovenale 5:3 forthcoming; San Giovenale 1:5, tomb P.S. 1:68, pl. 54.
511 The type is also found in Gravisa in a votive deposit dated to the first quarter of the 5th century; see Caere 3:1, 133–5, figs. 333–339. The type is probably originally produced in workshops at Vulci.
512 Personal comments by Birte Poulsen.
513 Murray Threipland & Torelli 1970, 70, fig. 14.
house, located in strata 1–2. At the eastern part of the area, the tufa packing covered the ledge of the lower basin, leaving the two basins visible.

The function of this clearly limited pavement is unclear. It may have been an intentionally made road pavement, continuing a few meters to the east, although the ‘road’ could not be traced. The space between the southern border of the pavement and House 3B formed a narrow alley. The tufa packing was traced in front of the house and covered the former road (road 3) and the staircase from building phase 3. The packing was now on the same level as the entrance to the house (Figs. 62–63).

This feature can also be interpreted as a foundation for a defence construction, such as a wooden palisade around the apsidal building. The soil of this fill would have been taken from the proposed refuse dump nearby that contained debris accumulated from earlier phases (see above the beginning of this section). This conclusion is based on the many refitting sherds of various wares from several periods found in the three upper levels in this particular area and from others as well. It is obvious that they have been mixed during a long period of time. Even from the first stratum and in the surface layer there are fragments which join fragments from the third stratum (see discussion below of the refitted pottery and tile fragments).

The well was, during this phase, completely filled with soil and tufa blocks in level with the large tufa packing/pavement covering the mouth. The soil of this fill would have been taken from the proposed refuse dump nearby that contained debris accumulated from earlier phases (see above the beginning of this section). This conclusion is based on the many refitting sherds of various wares from several periods found in the three upper levels in this particular area and from others as well. It is obvious that they have been mixed during a long period of time. Even from the first stratum and in the surface layer there are fragments which join fragments from the third stratum (see discussion below of the refitted pottery and tile fragments).

The well was, during this phase, completely filled with soil and tufa blocks in level with the large tufa packing/pavement covering the mouth. The soil of this fill would have been taken from the proposed refuse dump nearby that contained debris accumulated from earlier phases (see above the beginning of this section). This conclusion is based on the many refitting sherds of various wares from several periods found in the three upper levels in this particular area and from others as well. It is obvious that they have been mixed during a long period of time. Even from the first stratum and in the surface layer there are fragments which join fragments from the third stratum (see discussion below of the refitted pottery and tile fragments).

The well was, during this phase, completely filled with soil and tufa blocks in level with the large tufa packing/pavement covering the mouth. The soil of this fill would have been taken from the proposed refuse dump nearby that contained debris accumulated from earlier phases (see above the beginning of this section). This conclusion is based on the many refitting sherds of various wares from several periods found in the three upper levels in this particular area and from others as well. It is obvious that they have been mixed during a long period of time. Even from the first stratum and in the surface layer there are fragments which join fragments from the third stratum (see discussion below of the refitted pottery and tile fragments).

The well was, during this phase, completely filled with soil and tufa blocks in level with the large tufa packing/pavement covering the mouth. The soil of this fill would have been taken from the proposed refuse dump nearby that contained debris accumulated from earlier phases (see above the beginning of this section). This conclusion is based on the many refitting sherds of various wares from several periods found in the three upper levels in this particular area and from others as well. It is obvious that they have been mixed during a long period of time. Even from the first stratum and in the surface layer there are fragments which join fragments from the third stratum (see discussion below of the refitted pottery and tile fragments).

There are, however, refits between pottery fragments from level 3.75 m and the bottom layer 5.5–6 m as well as joining fragments from level 2–3.15 m. Fragments from that level refitted with fragments from stratum 3 in the fill under the tufa packing (see the refitting diagrams below). Unfortunately, there is no exact position of the joining fragments from level 2–3.15 m. Almost at the bottom, at 6 meters, there were bones of a cow and a sheep/goat and above that those a dog. The human skeleton discovered in the lower part of the well had been dumped above the animals and was found at level 5.15–5.5 m, probably due to the narrow width of the well, 1.1×1.2 m. The big, flat river stone thrown on the body separated the head from the rest of the body (Fig. 53).

If the dumping of the animals and the human corpse were done contemporaneously or on different occasions is uncertain. But from the moment the animals were thrown into the well, it became contaminated and unfit for use.

The finds of a late red-slip jug and the lower part of a terracotta object interpreted as a thymiaterion at the bottom of the well suggest a date for this layer to the last quarter of the 6th century B.C. The Attic black-glazed skyphos found in the upper levels at 2–3.75 m dated to c. 480 B.C. consisted of joining fragments from stratum 3 under the tufa packing (see Figs. 74c–d). The complete fill of the well must have occurred sometimes after 480 B.C., probably in the late 5th century B.C.

Building phase 4 with the large tufa packing and House 3B comprises coarse ware bowl/lids, Late Creamware plates and a phiale (?), and Campana C ware (found on the southern bank, dating to the beginning of the 3rd century B.C.) (Figs. 88, 90). This phase seems to be the next to last occupation of the site. The shape of the many loom-weights found in strata 1 and 2 was common during a long period of time. They were probably discarded from earlier building periods and used in the construction of the tufa pavement as filling material.

There is a possibility that the bridge complex was abandoned already after phase 4, dated to c. 400–275 B.C. or even later based on the Etruscan black-glazed pottery and the Campana C ware and the Late

514 Colonna interprets the two constructions as a casa torre, Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, 78, n. 44.

515 This pipe shaped object may be the lower part of a stand with a large basin on top for washing, i.e. a type of a holmos or louterion, cf. Rescigno 1996, figs. 1, 12, 16, and Carandini 1995, 3-20.

516 Moore 1986.
Creamware,\textsuperscript{517} with a possible reoccupation during the medieval period attested for on the Acropolis and based on the four red-glazed medieval sherds and the arrangement and the shape of the tufa packing around House 3B.

\textit{The abandonment (after c. 275 or in the 2nd century B.C.)}

The exact abandonment of the bridge complex is more problematic. The Hellenistic pottery dated to the 3rd century from tombs and from the cult cave and a house on the Acropolis show that the settlement still functioned.\textsuperscript{518} The Hellenistic tableware found in a well on the Vignale plateau confirms that dating. The late pottery, especially an \textit{amphora} dated to the 1st century B.C. that was found on the southern bank of the Pietrisco, shows some activity at a later date at least on the Vignale side (cf. the red ware amphora on Fig. 90). The surface finds dated to the 1st century B.C. from the Vignale survey are consistent with the date of the \textit{amphora}. A crossing at that time would not be plausible. The crossing to the Vignale may have been done further downstream at a more accessible spot along the Pietrisco (see Fig. 2).

\textsuperscript{517} Pohl 1985 favours an abandonment of San Giovenale in the late third century or in the early second century B.C. This is also confirmed by the many late chamber tombs located in the necropolis of Casale Vignale already in 1887. Two of them were excavated by the Swedish Institute in Rome in 1958 and published by Fuglesang 1997–1998, These have been dated to late 4th/early 3rd century B.C. The Late Classical and Hellenistic periods are also confirmed in the so-called cult cave dated to late 4th/early 3rd century and in a house dated to mid 4th to late 3rd centuries B.C. found on the Acropolis, see Fuglesang forthcoming. Debris from late 4th to late 3rd century B.C. is found on the Vignale plateau in 1959–1960, and during field surveys in 2000. Even Roman finds from the 1st century B.C. were found, cf. Hemphill 2000.

\textsuperscript{518} I thank R. Holmgren for discussing this option with me.
2.5.2 Characteristic features of the place: similarities and differences between the phases

In each phase a few characteristic issues have been given extra attention. There are similarities as well as differences and in the following section these features will be highlighted and summarized.

**Abundance of pottery**

A similarity in several of the phases is the abundance of pottery represented by many different wares and forms, and the large variety of rims, lips and bases of each shape. This is especially observed in the building phases 1–3. Cups on high or low feet (chalices, kantharoi, kyathoi, kylikes), plates, bowls, jars, and jugs dominated among the tablewares, while the jar of various shapes and sizes (dolia and pithoi), from small to large, and the bowls and the basins of different sizes were used for food preparation, cooking, baking, storage, and the bowls for eating. The shallow conical bowls were probably also used as lids, covering bowls, jars and amphorae. The miniature cups in bucchero and buccheroid impasto are few.

The finds from the second pre-construction phase show, despite the small number and the fragmentary state, a good picture of the different forms used, both for drinking, eating, storing and cooking. The first preconstruction phase, as well as the fourth building phase, show another picture with only a few fragments and very few forms and wares.

**The use and distribution of fine and household wares**

Tablewares and household wares are found in all layers. The coarse fabrics are well represented in all the phases except the pre-construction phase 1 and the building phase 4. The second and third pre-construction phases had very distinguished tablewares, e.g. the bowls and cups of the Protovillanovan period, the Italo-Geometric and the Subgeometric bowls and plates, the fine advanced impasto, the buccheroid impasto cups, amphorae, and plates during phase 3. The Etrusco-Corinthian figured, linear and monochrome decorated plates and bowls, and the abundant buccheroid shapes were all in the majority during the third pre-construction phase and the following first building phases.

Figured and linear decorated Etrusco-Corinthian bowls and plates found at the bridge are quite many, compared to the number of Etrusco-Corinthian vessels found in Houses I –III in Area F East on the Acropolis, on the Borgo settlement, and in the numerous tombs. The three figured plates from the bridge, attributed to the Pittore senza graffito, the special Tarquinian workshop dated to 575–565 B.C. show that imports from Tarquinia and Vulci were important during the early Archaic period. These plates, a specialty of this workshop, seem to have been made for export for an elite, according to the many finds outside Italy. Colonel has called these plates spanti after an inscription found on a plate, and they may have been used in rituals.

There are also several other workshops identified in the tombs and at various areas at San Giovenale (Fig. 4:1 forthcoming; San Giovenale 5:3 forthcoming.

520 San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming; San Giovenale 5:3 forthcoming.
521 Castellina Camerata (CC) tomba 14, two plates, cf. Ricciardi 1984, 13, figs. 9–10, and a plate from tomb C9 and CC3; San Giovenale 1:7, 29, n. 36, fig. 14. This type of plate, very common at Vulci and originally produced there, continued to be locally produced at e.g. Tarquinia, especially in the Pittore senza graffito workshop; cf. Szilágyi 1998, 445–447, see also table on 761–762; Donati & Michelucci 1981, 64, no. 111.
522 Szilágyi 1998, 443, pls.175–181; Szilágyi 1972, 48. cf. also Caere 3:1, 115. A fourth example is found in the Borgo settlement, cf. San Giovenale 5:3 forthcoming. Several other Etrusco-Corinthian vessels from the tombs and the settlements have been attributed to different workshops, see Szilágyi 1998.
523 On Il pittore senza graffito, and the various shapes used, cf. Sansica 1999, 177-204.
524 The name *spanti* refers to the special shape of this plate by Colonna 1973–74, 146. A group of eight plates of two various wares with the word *spanti* are found in tombs. Two types of fabrics exist: one coarse impasto decorated in red paint (red-slip, red-ware) and the other of fine fabric decorated with hierons in red so-called Subgeometric plates after Leach, probably produced at Cerveteri. The forms of the plate differ. Either it has a deep carinated body with a long protruding rim or a shallow rounded body with long protruding rim. The base is either a low thin ring-base with a protruding omphalos inside or without. The diameter of the rim varies from 30–34 cm. They are dated between the middle and the end of the 8th century to the first quarter of the 7th century B.C., cf. Bagnasco Gianni 1993, 21. The interpretation of the ritual use of the object *spanti* is based on the existence of the word found three times on an altar in the Iguvine tables, Prosdocimi 1993, 24, and also on the interior central peak of the base, Bagnasco Gianni 1993, 21. These plates are found in tombs and habitations in Etruria, Latium, Pithekoussa, and other Phoenician areas, cf. Bagnasco Gianni 1993, 13–18.
Pittore dei cappi is represented by one small body fragment with an encircling band of incised hanging festoons on the lower part of the body of the olpe and the oinochoe. This vase is attributed to the Pittore di Brown. Similar fragments are found in a tomb in the necropolis of Castellina Camerata.

The Monte Abatone painter is represented at San Giovenale by an amphora from a Valle Vesca tomb not far from the bridge. This painter was probably working at Caere. But there are also examples from Vulci and it cannot be excluded that there was a workshop even at that site. The Castellani painter is represented in the tombs and is dated after 600 B.C.

A third group consisted of some polychrome vessels, similar to the Monte Abatone and the Castellani group. The olpai from the bridge, one with the typical design of a scale pattern, may be dated to the transitional period of the Etrusco-Corinthian period, e.g. 610 B.C. and the other dated to c. 600 B.C. or slightly later could not be attributed to any special workshop (Fig. 79). The location of the Etrusco-Corinthian polychrome workshops may have been at both Caere and Vulci.

Another category of fine ware is buccheroid impasto dated to the early 7th century and the end of the third quarter of the century. A few bowls, carinated cups/kyathoi with fluted bodies as well as small and miniatures used for drinking/offerings are represented by a few examples. A buccheroid cup with rouletted zigzag decoration and a brown impacto cup with a rouletted open fan with 14 rays left is the forerunner of the rouletted fan on early bucchero vessels (Fig. 80:8, 81:7).

Aryballoi and alabastra, two oil and perfume containers, have not been found in the bridge material, but are nevertheless frequently occurring in the tombs (Table 37).

Here should also be mentioned fragments of Greek imported wares, mostly Attic, found in a limited space under the tufa packing on the northern side. The Attic black-figured vessels were found both during phases 4 and 5, while the red-figured and the black figured could be referred to phases 5 and 6. The forms are typical for the banqueting and symposion set, mostly cups of different types, lip-cups, band-cups, eye-cups many painted with dionysiac motifs indicating libations to the wine god. One red-figured eye-cup with palmettes can be attributed either to Oltos or Epiktetos, while another small red-figure cup painted with a komos scene was attributed to the Brygos painter or his school (Figs. 82:10, 89:8 the cup of Brygos, and Figs. 82:9, 11, 89:14 for Oltos or Epiktetos). A red-figured palmette cup may be attributed to the Douris painter (Figs. 89:9 and 82:7).

Comparing the finds of these Greek imports to the finds from the settlement and the tombs we can see that there are quite a number of Attic open shapes, viz. cups, and only a few closed shapes whereas Chalkidian imports are found in the settlement as well as in the tombs, but very rarely at the bridge (Table 37). The Attic shapes indicate the use of banqueting sets in the household and not only as funerary equipment.

The small lekythos is represented by four vases in the material, two Attic black-figured and two black-glazed (Fig. 82:3–5, 89:4, 15). They are normally c. 15–25 cm high or higher, containers for oil and ungues, and seem to have been a popular vessel both in the household and later for furnishing common graves in chamber tombs in Etruria, in Attica, and Boetia.
The form is the most common in black-figured technique from the late 6th century to the beginning of the 5th century and the major workshops of lekythoi are found in Athens. The popular shape continued to be produced in black-figured, even if the red-figured technique was established since c. 500 B.C. There are several painters represented in the material at the bridge, such as the Athena painter (500–470 B.C.), also identified as the Bowdoine painter, making red-figured and white-grounded lekythoi (c. 475–450 B.C.) (Fig. 82:4, 89:4), and a painter of the Little lion class, represented by one vase (Fig. 82:5). The squat lekythos in black-glaze with reserved red horizontal circle bands on the widest part and on the shoulder (Figs. 82:3; 89:15) is the most common shape from c. 510 B.C. and was popular until the end of the 5th century B.C.

As a comparison it may be mentioned that there are only two lekythoi noted hitherto from the Borgo settlement. In House III in Area F East on the Acropolis an Attic red-figured kylix was found together with an Attic lamp (early 5th century), and in House II a fragment of a lip-cup dating to 550–525 B.C. A mouth of a lekythos and a few unidentified fragments of Attic black-glazed and Etruscan black-glazed wares, dated after 530 B.C., were also found among the debris. Greek imports, Attic and Laconian (?) black-figured, open as well as closed vessels, were also found in the remains of House K on the southern edge of the Acropolis (see Fig. 2a).

Greek imports are also often represented in the funeral equipment, which is seen in Table 32. This table is based on earlier published grave finds. The Attic imports consist of mostly black-figured cups followed by ten red-figured and six black-glazed cups. Only one bowl, one krater, one amphora and three uncertain shapes were reported from all the published tombs.

---

536 Folsom 1975, 31. The shape was developed from Corinthian shapes: the earliest were the round shape very much alike the alabastron, and the elongated oval similar to the aryballos.
537 Boardman 1974, 114.
538 Boardman 1974, 146.
539 Boardman 1974, 148, figs. 250-255.
540 Boardman 1974, 113, 147–150.
542 San Giovenale 5:3 forthcoming.
543 San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming. I thank Lars Karlsson for this information.
544 I thank M. Lindgren for this information.
545 Only a small part of the complete material found in the recently excavated tombs is published, cf. Ricciardi 1987.
546 San Giovenale 1:5, 1:7, 1:8, and 2:2; see also Reusser 2002, table 9.
Table 32. Attic imports, Attic black-figure (ABF), Attic red-figure (ARF), Attic black-glaze (ABG) individual vessels from published tombs at San Giovenale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/shape</th>
<th>Cup</th>
<th>Bowl</th>
<th>Krater</th>
<th>Amphora</th>
<th>Lekythos</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABF</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARF</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABG</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recent excavations in the Casale Vignale cemetery have resulted in more Attic imports as well as other Greek imports such as Chalkidian, Laconian and Corinthian. A few examples of other Greek imports are noted in the Borgo settlement, but only one possible Chalkidian crater from the bridge has been found (Fig. 82:12).

The import of Greek vases reaches a peak in the middle of the 6th century and diminishes strongly in the 5th century. This is also traceable in the material from San Giovenale, both from the settlements, the tombs and from the bridge where the Attic black-figured vessels are in the majority (see Table 24). Two trade routes –one through the straits to Campania and the other to the Adriatic with Spina as an important central place and further to Campania is suggested.

A recently published thesis by Ch. Reusser deals with distribution and function of Attic imports found in various contexts, in tombs, settlements and sacral areas. He has focused on places in southern, central and northern Etruria, Campania and in Etruria padana, both in the hinterlands and at the coast. Based on eleven hypotheses he proposes a new model concerning the Attic pottery in Etruria, hypotheses that contradict the traditional ideas.

Concerning Attic finds found in tombs, San Giovenale is one of the investigation areas, while he has not had access to the finds from the settlements and the bridge. He has listed 53 Attic vessels, dated to the second half of the 6th to the first quarter of the 5th centuries B.C., from the necropoleis at San Giovenale.

**Inscribed vessels**

Another special feature is the large number of inscribed bucchero vessels and inscriptions on Etrusco Corinthian and red wares (Figs. 91–92, Appendix 1) found in such a limited area as the bridge complex. Many of them were found together with the Attic imports, i.e. from the fill under the large stone packing north of the House 3, referred to as building phase 4. Only a few inscribed vessels were found on the southern side. The inscribed vessels as well as the Attic wares were used as tableware and the shapes are of the typical banqueting and symposion set. The Etruscan epigraphic material on mainly bucchero pottery has contributed to raise the discussion of the finds to another dimension.

Unfortunately, some of the inscribed words are fragmentary, but they show quite clearly the character of the inscriptions; they give us information of the family (gens Urcena) probably in charge during the end of the 7th century B.C.; the male prename Larth and the female prename Fasthi of the Alsi family from the second half of the 6th century. B.C.; the name Lurs Larunita, a possible war god, and the close connection to Laran functioning as a border divinity (tutor finium= the protector of the border); the chthonic goddess Vesuna together with the verb mul (‘sacrifice!’), the...
word χι, probably meaning ‘all’; indicate the religious and the ritual significance this place once had. The fact that the words, the names and the graffiti of crosses, stars and pentagrams are inscribed inside/outside or under bases of open shapes, i.e. the kantharos, the carinated cup (chalice), kyathos, plate and bowl, are all functioning as drinking and serving vessels at banquets and symposia, also underlines a ritual character.557

Colonna discusses the first three letters of the prename Fasthi, i.e. fas, written on the wide bucchero bowl (Fig. 91:11) He mentions several options of interpretation; a female prename, a term which means a sacred place, a reference to a ritual vase, or fase the name of a gift often mentioned on the Liber linteus document.558 Since a ritual activity at the bridge will be argued for his interpretations of the letters fas can be used to see the bucchero bowl with this particular inscription as a gift by the Alsi family used in the rituals for Vesuna (and Fufluns). It may also be a possibility that fasthi, alludes to a priestess that was taking care of the cult. The Etruscan letters A and U559 inscribed respectively on two loom-weights can be interpreted as a merchant’s or the owner’s mark or a votive inscription meaning Ais or Aiser, the gods,560 the letter U may be a merchant’s mark or the owner’s, for example a short form for the gens Urcena found on a bucchero base. A few other examples of a single letter U are found among the inscribed material.561

The inscriptions, divided in two chronological groups, could be related to phases 3–6. Examples of inscriptions and graffiti on bucchero pottery and red impasto are also reported from other settlement areas at San Giovenale,562 and from the tombs in the vicinity.563 These inscriptions consisted of names, for example the name of an ex-slave,564 the name of vessel or a god,565 single letters, votive inscription to gentes.566 The function of these inscriptions and graffiti will be discussed further below in the chapter on functions (Table 25, Appendix 1).567

Terracotta objects related to cooking, heating and lighting

Even if the pottery is the most distinguished find category, there were other artefacts that were related to the preparing of meals, cooking and baking bread, namely the braziers and the cooking-stands (Table 26).568 The mere existence of those artefacts in several phases is important for the interpretation of the functions at the bridge complex. Serra Ridgway569 equals the brazier with a cooking-stand, while Scheffer separates the cooking-stand and the brazier.570 According to Scheffer, the brazier, especially the open flat one, is used for heating, lighting and for the people without a permanent hearth. The cooking brazier intended for food is a better variant of the cooking-stand, not produced before the 5th century B.C.571 The brazier is rarely documented from tombs at San Giovenale,572 but is more frequent in the settlement

556 Cf. Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, 76, n. 35; figs. 8:43 and 10:43.
557 The vessels are almost of the same type, typical for banqueting equipment, cf. Rathje 1983, 7–29.
559 This recent discovered letter U on loom-weight W 9 is not yet published.
560 Macintosh 1974, 35–36, 42, fig. 7, C-32-129, C-32-130. Macintosh Turfa 1986, 73, 88, n. 86, wants to see the letter A as short for Aiser, a dedication to the gods. Camporeale suggests a pottery workshop, which used the letter A on bucchero pottery. Vessels and loom-weights with the letter A inscribed are often found in sanctuaries, and used as votives. Cf. also Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, 77, cat. no. 47, figs. 8–9. For the discussion of Aiser, see Macintosh 1974, n. 19, and Olzsha 1971, 93–105.
563 San Giovenale 1:5, appendix 1, examples in the graffiti list. There are examples of the letter A on three goblets from two graves in the Porzarago necropolis. Cf. the long inscription on the wall of a tomb interpreted as a male name probably of African origin, Santella 1993; 1996.
564 Colonna 1997.
565 San Giovenale 1:5, appendix 1.
567 The total number of graffiti on bucchero and other wares from a votive deposit at Veii is 43, and dated to the 5th century B.C. Some fragments of a finer quality may belong to an earlier period, cf. Murray Threipland 1969, 3, see tables on p. 9, fig. 5:14–26
568 See above chapter 2.4.4.
569 Scheffer 1981, n. 282.
570 Scheffer 1981, 80.
571 Scheffer 1981, 98.
572 Fragments of four braziers have been recorded from graves, cf. Pohl 1982.
There are also a few new rim fragments of undecorated braziers among the bridge material not mentioned by Pohl in her publication. Pohl and Colonna argue for a local production influenced by the Caeretan braziers, both in form and motif. Colonna has made some interesting remarks on the specimens from San Giovenale in his excellent article about the potter Larices Crepus, a name inscribed on the rim of a brazier. Also Pieraccini supports a local production of cylinder-stamped braziers. She has recently proposed that workshops at San Giovenale, Tolfa and Barbarano Romano were influenced by Caeretan craftsmen in their production of stamped ware. They imitated the Caeretan cylinder braziers. Tolfa has been proposed as the most productive workshop probably with a Caeretan skilled artisan moving to Tolfa and starting a workshop of his own.

The many cooking-stands of various types (type IC, IIA-B and IIIA-B) found in the bridge complex were dated from the period to the middle of the 5th century B.C. The cooking-stands of type I could be referred to pre-construction phase 1, the Protovillanovan phase, whilst the Etruscan types II and III belong to the pre-construction phases 2-3 and the building phases 1-3, dated from the 7th to the middle of the 5th centuries B.C. No braziers or cooking-stands dated to c. 450–150 B.C. are found (cf. Fig. 86a).

The shape of the cooking-stand changed over time as well as the function. Type III, the barrel shaped cooking-stand, could probably also be used as an oven as was the case in the Near East. There are also proof of Archaic terracotta cooking-stands of Scheffer type IIC and IIIA–B that may suggest that cooking has taken place outdoors. No built ovens have been found in this area (Table 26, Figs. 85–86a). The indoor cooking might have occurred on portable braziers with the cooking-stand put on the braziers or outdoors in special kitchen areas as the examples at Acquarossa show. Bread may have been baked in large tins as the one found at the bridge (Fig. 82:16).
Holed pottery

There are four bases of cups and bowls with small or larger holes in the middle made either before firing or drilled afterwards. Three of them are found in different layers on the northern bank and one on the southern bank. One small, perforated hole in the centre of the bottom of an Attic black-figure cup (kylix) may be a mending hole (Fig. 89:5). A larger hole from a fine bucchero cup or bowl dated to c. 6th century B.C. and one pre-fired hole in base of a coarse ware bowl dated to the late 6th century. A large rounded hole in the bottom of a ring-base of an open or a closed red-slip vessel seems to have been intentionally made (Figs. 90 106).583

Metal objects

The metal objects are found mostly on the northern side and in layers belonging to the pre-construction phase three and the building phases 1–3. The remains of metal working (cf. Table 27) indicate a metallurgical activity in the area of San Giovenale. The working place/s may have been located on the north-western part of the Acropolis, the Borgo settlement,584 or on the western side of the Acropolis,585 where finds of metal production have been made. The metal artefacts from the bridge and from the settlements on the Acropolis are few in number comparing to the abundance and diversity of metals artefacts in the tombs, viz. golden jewellery, bronze pins, fibulae, pendants, buds, bronze weapons like arrowheads, knives, lances, javelins, spearheads, implements of bronze, e.g. nails, axeheads, knives, pick axes, sickles; wheel-dressings, mountings; lead pestle/s objects of iron, e.g. nails, rings, etc (cf. Table 37).586

The objects from both the settlement and the tombs give us an idea of the metal consumption during the 7th to the middle of the 5th centuries B.C. Local production is indicated by a stone mould, lumps of metal scrap, iron and bronze slag,587 pieces of pure copper588 at least at two areas, viz. on the Borgo NW slope, two large hearths inside and one outside House A during the 6th century,589 and on the western part of the Acropolis where there are both a hut settlement from the Protovillanova period and houses from the Archaic period.

The metal finds from the bridge are made of copper, bronze, lead and iron and represent jewellery, weapons, tools and other equipment. The fibula, as already stated, is represented by six examples in bronze, two of the navicella type and four of the bow type, and one made in iron probably of the bow type. The most common find context for fibulae are inhumation as well as cremation tombs.590 The well-preserved fibula from the bridge, that is the navicella with long slender catchplate, is dated to the Late Protocorinthian period. The navicella types at Pithekoussai are dated from the Middle Protocorinthian to the Late Geometric period.591

Houses I–III in Area F and D. I also thank D. Fuglesang for letting me see the metals from the cult room and the Hellenistic house on the Acropolis, cf. Fuglesang forthcoming.586 Cf. San Giovenale 1:5; see also Reusser 2002, table 9.

583 K. Berggren kindly informed me about a similar custom performed by the American Indians. Similar holes in bases occur in the Archaic material from Vigna Parrochiale at Caere, cf. Caere 3.2. See also chapter 3 in this study. The examples in Fig. 106 come from Vignale, the bridge complex, and the bowl on the right side from the Borgo.

584 San Giovenale 5:2 forthcoming; San Giovenale 5:3 forthcoming, in which Pohl mentions evidence for metal production in one of the houses on the Borgo NW slope where large hearths and traces of copper inside the hearths are detected as well as lumps of metal scrap, copper and iron slag. I thank Prof. Carl Nylander for his kindness in allowing me to be part of the investigations of the metals from the Borgo area as well as the other areas at San Giovenale. Prof. Guidi at ENEA in Rome will be in charge of the analyses, which will be published in San Giovenale 5:2 forthcoming.

585 Scattered finds of iron slag and bronze scrap, both from the huts and the Etruscan houses and a stone mould from House K, on the Acropolis, cf. Etruscan culture 1962, 298, also called House V in area C in Materiali e problemi 1984, fig. 1, on the southern edge of the promontory. Dr. M. Lindgren kindly informed me about a structure, which has been interpreted as an oven. This is important if we can locate a metal workshop at the edge of the site where they may have taken advantage of the difference in level and to avoid the risk of fires as well. My thanks to Prof. B. Malcus, who kindly let me look at the metals from Area D, the Protovillanova huts and Dr. L. Karlsson for letting me see the metals from the

586 Cf. San Giovenale 1:5; see also Reusser 2002, table 9.

587 The pieces of iron slag will be analysed in order to see if they are smelting or smithing slag. Smithing slag have been found at Murlo, Acquarossa, Satrium and Pithecousai, cf. Nijboer 1995, 389; Populonia, and Lago dell’Accesa show traces of large scale metal production (smelting-furnaces of iron) during the 6th century located near mining areas. At Doganella there are traces of metal working during late 6th to middle of the 4th centuries B.C.

588 Backe-Forsberg forthcoming b.

589 See the photo of one of the hearths in House A, Nylander 1984, 65–74.

590 Many fibulae of the navicella type with romboid bow have been reported from inhumation and cremation graves found at Pithekousai, cf. Pithekousai I 1993.

591 Pithekousai I 1993, pl. 101, tomb 263:7; pl. 123, tomb 326:6, dated to Middle Protocorinthian period and Late
This type also occurred at Murlo. The two fragmentary fibulae with a rectangular or square catch plate ending in a knob, the so-called Certosa type, are dated to late 6th century B.C. A parallel example is found in one of the tombs from the Castellina Camerata cemetery.

The blade of a possible knife was the only object, which could be interpreted as a tool. The point of the javelin was the only weapon found. The nails and the bolts may have been used in the woodwork of the roof.

Architecture

The similarities between the architectural remains are considerable in the first to the fourth building phases. Each phase was represented by complex of a building of ashlar tufa blocks and tile-covered roofs located with the entrance towards the west, a well in a porch or a courtyard, either in front or beside the building and a basin in the backyard. The location of the building is almost the same just a few meters from the large ashlar abutment at the slope of the Pietrisco brook with a road in front of the building ending in a bridge which crosses the brook and join the other side, where the road continues to the settlement on the Vignale Hill.

Roof tiles dated to pre-construction phases indirectly indicate the presence of a house and the odd location of the well may point to an earlier use of the well. It is also reasonable to suggest a more simple wooden bridge over the brook before the construction of the monumental wooden bridge on abutments of ashlar tufa blocks. It is tempting to suggest the same scenario for an even earlier pre-construction phase.

One architectural difference between the building phases 1 and 2 is the size of the building, which changes from a large rectangular construction with two rooms to a smaller almost square building with only one room. The main differences between the building phases were found in the ground plan of the houses and in the furnishing. The apsidal plan replaced the rectangular and the more squarish ones. The rectilinear buildings were furnished along three walls with a χ-shaped stone bench, which was lower during the second phase, while the apsidal buildings lacked those. There is, however, a possibility that the furnishing of chairs and benches may have been of perishable material. The small room may have been used as a dining room with couches or cushions put on the bench. The size of the room is common for a triclinum, suited for at least five κλιναί. A similarity is the abundance of pottery, both kitchen and tablewares, drinking and eating vessels, related to these two phases. This fact suggests that there has been a lot of consumption of food and beverages. The number of pottery from the earlier phases with no registered architecture also suggests this. The quantity of vessels of different wares related to the building phases 3 and 4 is smaller than in the preceding ones. The number of Attic import and Etruscan local fine wares as well as the coarse ware connected to the third and the fourth building phases seemed to have diminished a lot. The well probably supplied the need of fresh water during all the building phases except the last one when the well was filled up and integrated in the tufa pavement. The tufa basins behind the house seemed to be part of the building complex from the first to the third building phase. They were spared for a reason when they were built into the tufa pavement during the last building phase.

Roads and bridges

Evidence for several bridges over a long period of time can be traced in the material, discussed in chapter 2.3. Remains of three to four road pavements and abutment walls on both sides of the brook suggest that there were probably three to four bridges, as already stated. Earlier wooden bridges may have existed. A good illustration of what this hypothetic bridge looked like is seen in the modern wooden bridge at Monterano (Figs. 69ab). Pons Sublicius, the famous wooden bridge in Rome dated to 600 B.C. and mentioned by Livy (Liv.2.10) is another

Protocorinthian period respectively; pl. 121, tomb 323:11, dated to Late Geometric II; tomb 259:514: 9 dated to the 6th century B.C.; a parallel to the small navicella fibula, is found in Bologna (Arnoaldi) dated to Iron-Age 3 period, Montelius 1895, pl. 83:15, Série B; cf. also Furumark 1947, and Sundwall 1943, 228 ff. Langfussige Navicellafibeln, fussende mit Knopf, dated to the 6th century B.C.

592 Warden 1985, 38–41.


594 San Giovenale 1:5, pl. 60; Pithekoussai I 1993, fig. 258:1.

595 Points of javelins occur in both Archaic tombs and in Iron Age tombs, cf. San Giovenale 1:5, pl. 60; Pithekoussai I 1993, fig. 258:1.

596 See the dining room with river-stone beds dated to 675 in House I, the hut phase, on the Acropolis Area F East at San Giovenale, cf. Fig. 14. The stone bench at the bridge differs in size and construction, and is dated to 550 B.C.
example of such an early wooden bridge, at the boundary between Latium and Etruria.\textsuperscript{597}

The first monumental bridge over the Pietrisco brook in building phase 1 was built on abutments of ashlar tufa blocks in the \textit{opus quadratum} technique, placed on either side of the brook and probably had a superstructure of wood. Part of an abutment and a large wall, c. 15 m long running towards the SW, is preserved on the southern side of the brook (\textit{Figs. 36, 44a, 52}).\textsuperscript{598}

This southern abutment had collapsed due to the undermining of the water, but some stones were still seen \textit{in situ}. There were no traces of a vaulted or corbelled vaulted construction even if it cannot be excluded that there had been a corbelled stone bridge.\textsuperscript{599}

As already mentioned in chapter 2, the span of the bridge at a right angle was estimated to a length of c. 14 m. The height from the uppermost ashlar block down to the bottom measured c. 12 m,\textsuperscript{600} but the span may have been a few meters longer because of the oblique setting of the bridge (\textit{Figs. 36, 44a, 52}). The large foundation wall M on the northern side continued to the east and also to the west.

The second bridge in building phase 2 was constructed in the same way as the first one. It ran in a similar oblique way, but now a few meters further to the NE as suggested by the large transversal wall L of House 2, the stone packing outside and the corresponding SE wall on the south side. The area between the first and the second bridge seems, during this phase, to have been levelled with a large stone packing of earth, tufa blocks, river stones and pebbles.

The third bridge in building phases 3, was also moved slightly further towards north-east, as indicated by House 3A and the road packing on the northern side, but the direction of the bridge is the same as in the preceding periods. The area was now levelled much higher, as indicated by at least two courses of square blocks in wall D (\textit{Figs. 54, 56b}). The space between the two walls was packed with river stones, tiles and earth. See discussion in chapter 4.

A possible fourth bridge in building phase 4 can be hypothesised due to the large stone-packing that covered the courtyard of House 3A, forming a distinct border to the S and House 3B. This packing continued slightly towards the E and may even have surrounded the apsidal house. There are, however, no clear indications of a fourth repaired bridge at the same place as before. A second alternative bridge may have been a few m to the NE, while the terrace wall was traced further up along the riverbank. This should mean a more angular crossing to the other side, than previously.

\textsuperscript{597} O’Connor 1993, 141–142.

\textsuperscript{598} The general opinion for many years has been that clearly identified debris of Etruscan bridges is very rare, and that the Etruscans did not have the ability to construct bridges. In contrast Ward Perkins 1957, 139, declared that the Etruscans were excellent bridge builders. They also used crossings over fords with hard bottoms. He explains the scarcity of the remains by suggesting that most bridges were made of wood and that many were replaced with Roman arched stone built bridges. The only written source found is the ten books on architecture by Vitruvius (\textit{Vitr. De Arch.}), cf. also O’Connor 1993, 45.

\textsuperscript{599} Forsberg 1984, 75 stated that there might have been a stone bridge, since the Etruscans were capable of building corbelled structures. The Etruscans were familiar with the corbelling technique, rounded or rectangular spaces with corbelled roofs, which is clearly visible in the large tombs in the Banditaccia cemetery at Caere, the Regolini Galassi tomb and in the tholos tombs in the northern Etruria, e.g. the beehive tombs at Quinto Fiorentino, La Cucumella di Caiolo near San Guiliano, see cf. Boéthius & Ward-Perkins 1970, 78. It is highly probable that they used this technique in bridge constructions as well.

\textsuperscript{600} Measurements of the bridge in inches: 59’ width, height 39’, height of masonry 15.9–18.8’, see \textit{Etruscan culture} 1962, fig. 279.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Buildings</th>
<th>Other features</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-construction phase 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pottery, Pienza Palidoro style, early Neolithic on S bank</td>
<td>3.300 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-construction phase 2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Hut?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Final Bronze Age/Protovillanovan &amp; transitional pottery, cooking-stands, metal objects</td>
<td>950-700 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-construction phase 3</td>
<td>Wooden bridge (?)</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Roof tiles</td>
<td>Digging of well (?)</td>
<td>Orientalizing &amp; Early Archaic pottery, braziers, glass beads, inscriptions, Caeretan and Tarquinian imports</td>
<td>675-565 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building phase 1</td>
<td>Bridge 1, of stone and wood</td>
<td>Road 1 not found</td>
<td>House 1 with rectangular plan, tiled saddle roof, porch ?</td>
<td>Well with stone mouth and paved walls, construction of two tufa cut basins with ledge</td>
<td>Attic imports, inscriptions, cooking-stands, braziers. Destruction by earthquake and landslide (?)</td>
<td>565-550 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building phase 2</td>
<td>Bridge 2, of stone and wood</td>
<td>Road 2 pavement of earth, stones, tiles, pottery</td>
<td>House 2 with trapezoidal plan, tiled saddle roof, porch (?)</td>
<td>Well in use, tufa cut basins in use</td>
<td>Forsberg period 1, Attic imports, inscriptions, objects of textile production. Destruction by earthquake (?), foundation deposit (?) of wooden box with rounded bronze object, metal objects</td>
<td>550-480 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building phase 3</td>
<td>Bridge 3a, of stone and wood</td>
<td>Road 3 pavement of earth, stones, tiles, pottery</td>
<td>House 3A with apsidal plan, thatched roof (?), courtyard</td>
<td>Well in use until contaminated, tufa cut basins in use</td>
<td>Forsberg period 2, Attic imports, human skeleton, dog, other animal bones in well, inscription on bucchero base in floor fill. Destruction cause unknown</td>
<td>480/470-400 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building phase 4</td>
<td>Bridge 3b, a possible continuation of bridge 3a, of stone and wood</td>
<td>Road 4 pavement of earth, stones, tiles, pottery</td>
<td>House 3B with apsidal plan, thatched roof (?)</td>
<td>Well filled up, filling of court yard and covered with stone pavement, fill material from old dump</td>
<td>Forsberg period 3. Etruscan black-fig, Campana C ware. Destruction cause unknown</td>
<td>400-275 B.C. or later</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abandonment       c. 275
B.C. or
later
Reoccupation       -       -       -       -       medieval pottery       A.D. 800-
1300 A.D.

Location
Another similarity in common for the phases is the choice of rebuilding the structures almost exactly upon the preceding ones. The same choice was made for the oblique location of the road and the bridge. The difference consists of the slight change of the road towards the NE during every phase in order to get solid ground, due to destruction by earthquakes and soil movements.

2.5.3 Summary of the chronological phases
The finds from the bridge complex mirror the finds discovered at the different settlement areas at San Giovenale including the Vignale and in the surrounding tombs. My seven chronological phases based on the successive architectural remains and the related pottery differ slightly from the periods reported from the various settlement areas on the Borgo and the Acropolis. I have chosen the term *phase* for my chronology in order to give a clearer account of what had happened at the bridge. The phases at the bridge range mainly from the Neolithic, the Final Bronze Age, Protovillanovan to the Hellenistic periods.

The Neolithic phase, i.e. the pre-construction phase 1, corresponds to the Neolithic period found on the Acropolis. The Bronze Age phases, corresponding to Per. 1 on the Acropolis, are not confirmed at the bridge except for the Final Bronze Age. Pre-construction phase 2, the Protovillanovan phase, and the pre-construction phase 3 correspond to the Pre-house period on the Borgo and Per. 1–2 on the Acropolis. Building phase 1 is almost consistent to Per. I on the Borgo and Per. 3 on the Acropolis. All areas were affected by the devastating earthquake in 550/530 and the proceeding building phase 2 corresponded to Per. II on the Borgo and Per. 4 on the Acropolis. Building phase 3 and 4 at the bridge were equalled with Per. II and Per. 4 at the settlements. The abandonment seemed to have occurred at the same time on the northern side of the Pietrisco while it may have occurred slightly later on the Vignale plateau (*Table 34*).
Table 34. Summary of the chronological phases at the bridge in comparison with the habitations areas on the Borgo and on the Acropolis Area F, and the Vignale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Borgo</th>
<th>Acropolis Area F</th>
<th>Vignale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>Pre-construction phase 1, c. 3300 B.C. southern side</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>c. 3000 B.C. in Area B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Per. 1 1400 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Bronze Age-Iron Age: Protovillanova/Gruppo di Tolfa Allumiere/Transitional phase Villanovan</td>
<td>Pre-construction phase 2 950–700 B.C.</td>
<td>Pre-house per. Per. 1 950-675 B.C.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age: Orientalizing, Early Archaic</td>
<td>Pre-construction phase 3 675–650 B.C.</td>
<td>Pre-house per. Per. 2. 675–625 B.C.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>Building phase 1 560–550/530 B.C.</td>
<td>Per. I 630–550/530 B.C.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Archaic</td>
<td>Building phase 2 550/530–480/470 B.C.</td>
<td>Per. II 530–275 B.C.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classic</td>
<td>Building phase 3 after 480/470–400 B.C.</td>
<td>Per. II Per. 4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
<td>Building phase 4 400–275 B.C.</td>
<td>Per. II Per. 4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandonment</td>
<td>After c. 275 or 1st century B.C.</td>
<td>Per. II</td>
<td>After 1st century B.C. (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3

THE BRIDGE—A LINK BETWEEN PHYSICAL, ECONOMIC, SOCIO-POLITICAL AND MENTAL LANDSCAPES

There might be several imaginable reasons, practical (social, economic, strategic, defensive reasons) as well as symbolic why the Iron Age inhabitants built a road and placed a bridge at this particular spot and then continued to reconstruct the bridge for more than five hundred years.

The impact of human activity on the environment is often discussed. In the following, however, will be emphasized the importance of the physical environment also as seen not only in the socio-political, economic landscape, but also in the symbolic/ritual landscape. The dramatic shifts in the landscape of South Etruria from high, even plains framed by high hills and mountains into deep ravines created by water erosion have helped to create a parallelism between the physical and the mental landscapes at San Giovenale.

One of the aims of this study is to analyse the complex relationships between the Pietrsico bridge and the settlements on the San Giovenale and the Vignale plateaux, and the surrounding area. The relationship between San Giovenale and more distant communities will also be considered.

A model will therefore be tested where the bridge is recorded as a link between the physical, socio-political and mental landscapes during several chronological phases (Fig. 100).

This model is not to be seen as unique for San Giovenale. It may also be a pattern valid for the whole of Etruria even during the Protovillanovan period, as clearly shown in the organization of the settlement and the necropoleis for Blera, San Giuliano, Vulci, and other Etruscan sites.

There will also be a discussion of the possible functions of the structures located along the road on the northern bridge abutment during several periods, and continuity and change, based on an analysis of archaeological remains in the Pietrsico bridge complex.

3.1 THE PHYSICAL LANDSCAPE

The physical landscape will be discussed from two aspects: (1) the natural environment and (2) communication seen from the Etruscan road network on various levels.
3.1.1 The natural environment

The topography undoubtedly played an important major role in the decision-making. Rivers and brooks create the natural boundaries of San Giovenale: the Fammilume brook to the north forms the boundary between the settlement and the northern Porzarago necropolis, while the Vesca forms the south-western boundary and the Pietrisco brook the south-eastern. The Pietrisco brook is the natural boundary between the San Giovenale promontory, the hills of Casale Vignale and Vignale. It forms the northern boundary of the settlement of Vignale while the Vesca is the southern limit (Figs 2–3).

Crossing the river by foot or with a vehicle without a bridge is almost impossible, since the ravine is quite steep at this spot (Fig. 24). The shortest distance across the two riverbanks is estimated to c. 18 m, making it possible to span by using long logs of e.g. oak tree. Such logs may have been used in a wooden bridge, later replaced by a superstructure of wood on stone abutments. The remains of Roman bridges along Via Clodia and Via Cassia are an indication of the need for bridges also during the Etruscan periods.

This southern riverbank is narrow and bordered by the steep northern hillside of the Vignale hill. An early crossing via a few timbers over the brook or via a wooden bridge construction like the modern wooden bridge at Monterano would be plausible. A bridge may have existed here already during the Protovillanovan phase, i.e. pre-construction phase 2, as suggested by the presence of pottery and the cooking-stands, indicating a residential use of the area (Fig. 33).

3.1.2 Communications: the Etruscan road network

A developed infrastructure is the key to a well-functioning society. A well-developed road system with bridges and fords facilitates the social, economic and political communications on several levels: on a local level (within the settlement), interregional (between the neighbouring sites) and an intraregional level (transports of goods, animals and humans on a longer distance between one site and the city-state). The results of many field surveys and excavations in this area have yielded a well-developed Etruscan road system including bridges in South Etruria and at San Giovenale in particular (cf. Fig. 1).

The easiest way today to approach San Giovenale from Rome is by car along the ancient Roman highway...
Via Cassia and then turning into the Via Clodia to the south-east and to approach the area from the northeast (Fig. 1). The journey continues through a rather flat country with fertile plains of grain, orchards and vineyards. Olive trees and hazel nut trees cover the gentle hillsides and in the background the contours of the Tolfa Mountains are visible. A few small and larger volcanic lakes, such as Lago di Bracciano (Lacus Sabatinus) and Lago di Vico south-east of San Giovenale interrupt the fertile landscape. After passing the small towns of Vetralla and Blera, it is time to turn down to the small village of Civitella Cesi. Suddenly the character of the landscape changes into a hillier environment, while the narrow road boarded by flowers and bushes winds along the hillsides. In the forests of oak trees there are both wild boar and red deer.

When approaching the ancient site of San Giovenale and the small medieval town of Civitella Cesi the hilly landscape changes again into a flat country of large meadows with flocks of grazing sheep and goats, watched by shepherds and their sheep dogs. Another turning and soon, far away at the horizon, the ruins of the medieval castle of San Giovenale becomes visible. Suddenly, the road disappears down into a ravine and crosses a small brook and in front of us high up on a tufa plateau one can see the ruins of the castle and also the ancient ruins of an Etruscan town on the north-eastern part of the plateau, the so called Borgo.

The road continues even deeper into the ravine, running into the ancient tufa cut road down to the large valley of the Vesca and its ford south of the tufa plateau, just at the spot where the small brook enters the river. The water of the rivers has, for thousands of years, cut down into the tufa rock and shaped valleys and steep hillsides into crescent-like promontories. Here the journey stops. The streaming water is too high for fording by car, but not by walking. The road continues on the other side of the Vesca also here deep down in the tufa rock and it is possible to travel to the Tolfa Mountains and further to the coast.

In this dramatic ravine and river landscape it was essential to bridge the obstacles in one way or another. However, only a few remains of Etruscan bridges have been found in the area. By studying the topography it will be easier to locate places where there may have been bridges and fords. In the plains it seemed easier to construct roads, but cutting through the tufa rock in the hills required more engineering skills.610

Local level

On a local level the bridge complex and its roads were the link between the settlement hills and the nearest necropoleis (Figs. 2a–b). At the crossing of the Pietrisco there are remains from several phases, Protovillanovan to Hellenistic, reflecting activities during the same periods as the habitations on the Acropolis, the Borgo and the Vignale hill. The activity during the first two pre-construction phases is only confirmed by small finds, whereas the finds of terracotta tiles suggest that buildings with tiled roofs existed during the third pre-construction phase (cf. Fig. 94).

The local road system on the Acropolis may have consisted of a few major roads along the city/fortification wall of the plateau with smaller streets among the houses. The building complex of House I–III is arranged in a large insula, which may indicate a systematic division of the plateau with streets and alleys in between house blocks. A small stepped road leading down to a cave was found in connexion with the large monumental building in Area C at the southern edge of the promontory (Fig. 2a). This road will be discussed further below.

At the eastern edge of the Acropolis traces of a road, cut into the tufa, was found on the southern side of the Borgo. It measured c. 1.95–2 m in width with deep wheel-tracks indicating traffic of carriages with iron-clad wheels.611 This road is supposed to have started on the Acropolis and to have traversed the entire Borgo. It ended abruptly at the gully between the Borgo and the Casale Vignale plateau (Figs. 2a–b, 72–73a). Cuttings in the tufa rock and traces of wheels found on the other side of the ravine indicate that the road continued over the gully by a bridge to the Casale Vignale hill, the main burial place during the Etruscan period (Figs. 2a–b). The span over the deep gully was long, and therefore it is probable that this bridge was constructed of a superstructure of wooden beams. On the Vignale side the road ran through the large cemetery with tumuli graves towards the east and then headed towards San Giuliano (Figs. 1, 2a–b). This road may have been one of the main entrances to the settlement. Another possible entrance to the Borgo settlement is from the northern city-wall, indicated by a lane running through the settlement quarters and an opening in the wall.612 This entrance was

610 See Quilici 1989, fig. 5, road sections at Blera along via Clodia; fig. 7a-f on road sections of Cava Buia at Norchia; fig. 18, road sections at Corchiano; pls. 1a–d on the deep cuttings in the tufa rock at Sutri and Castel d’Asso near Viterbo.

611 A number of iron fragments with nails in situ found in the tombs have been interpreted as wheel-dressings of wooden wheels as already mentioned, cf. San Giovenale 1:1, pls. 61–62, PP.1.Dr.1; P.S.1:76–77 in Pontesilli.

612 San Giovenale 5:2 forthcoming, lane K-Ka/K1-C4; opening at area Ch. I thank Prof. C. Nylander for this information.
closed after the re-organisation of the site after the earthquake in 550/530 B.C.\textsuperscript{613}

Not far from the edge of the Casale Vignale hill the road branched off into another cut road with deep wheel tracks going in a more southern direction. It was lined with chamber tombs and was connected to the main road, \textit{La Dogana} also called \textit{La Dogana dei Pascoli or delle Pecore}, which ran deep down in the gully between the Borgo and the Casale Vignale.\textsuperscript{614} The main road runs partly through a natural passage, partly through a cutting in the tufa rock on the southern side of the Acropolis down into the open river valley of the Vesca and fords exactly at the point where the Pietrisko brook flows into the Vesca. It continues on the other side of the Vesca, uphill through the necropoleis of Montevangone (Figs. 1, 5, 17–18, 19a–b).

The road running down to the Pietrisko bridge branched off the main road at the south-eastern corner of the Casale Vignale hill and followed the edge c. 50 m before it reached the bridge (Fig. 17). The bridge road was 2.5 m wide and partly dug into the tufa rock. Closer to the bridge it was partly constructed of tufa blocks mixed with earth, river stones, tiles and pottery. The Pietrisko Bridge, with a \textit{terminus ante quem} c. 560 B.C., is so far the oldest Etruscan bridge remains found. That the remains of this bridge were preserved in such a good state is due to the fact that San Giovenale and the bridge were abandoned and not built over by Roman or Medieval constructions as was the fate of the neighboring towns of Blera, Barbarano Romano, and Civitella Cesi.\textsuperscript{615}

Still another possible crossing over the Vesca may be to the south of the Vignale hill, just opposite the Castellina Camerata necropolis (Figs. 2a–b). Gamurrini surveyed the area during the 19th century,\textsuperscript{616} and Hemphill during the 20th century.\textsuperscript{617} A wall of five courses of ashlar tufa blocks in a slope was found during the Gamurrini survey in 1877 (Figs. 7, 27) and was interpreted as a bridgehead. In the figure text it is referred to as the bridge over the Vesca. The sketch marked as No. 37 in the text was, however, not marked on the map, which has made it difficult to re-locate the bridge.\textsuperscript{618} The location is questioned by P.G. Gierow, who argues that the bridge on the sketch was located along the Pietrisko.\textsuperscript{619} My argument for a location at the Vesca is based on the red lines, which I interpret as marking roads drawn on the map, showing that the road continued over the Vignale as well as over the Vesca.\textsuperscript{620} The red line forks into two directions on the other side of the Vesca and it is suggested that after crossing the Pietrisko, people chose the western road along the northern part of the Vignale hill, along the southern bank of the Pietrisko, and then rounded the tip of the hill continuing some hundred metres along the Vesca and later crossing the river opposite the Castellina Camerata tombs (Fig. 100). Another argument is, however, the sketch of the stones by Cozza that does not fit that well with the actual remains. Unfortunately, there are no remains whatsoever registered from the banks of the Vesca. Neither does the recent field survey by Hemphill mention any finds from the Vesca area. One reason may be due to heavy erosion on the riverbanks.

A third crossing either by a ford, which is the case today, or a bridge over the Famamilume brook or even both was probably needed to reach the Porzarago burial ground north of San Giovenale. At this place there may have been a low wooden bridge as well, located in order to increase the possibilities of passing during periods of high water.\textsuperscript{621} Due to erosion the ancient water and road levels may have been much higher than today (Figs. 2a–b, 22, 100).

Another example of a crossing can be seen where \textit{La Dogana} fords the Vesca. A ledge-like cutting in the rock along the road, although on a much higher level, seems to indicate a kind of support for wooden beams (Figs. 2–3, 5, 21–22.). They may have served as a causeway built of tree trunks, or a freestanding bridge of poles put into the water with a superstructure of timber logs. This crossing of the Vesca was necessary for the local people in order to reach the necropoleis of Montevangone and Pontessili on the south side of the Vesca,\textsuperscript{622} and for visitors and traders travelling down the road to the coastal areas.

\textsuperscript{613} Blomé \textit{et al.} 1996; Blomé & Nylander 2001.

\textsuperscript{614} Santella & Ricci 1994, 55–63.

\textsuperscript{615} During the Roman Republican and Imperial periods there were several magistrates who were responsibel for the construction of roads and bridges. They became the \textit{curator viarum}, a highway commissioner. Augustus established c. 20 B.C. four other engineering offices with responsibilities for the bed of the Tiber, the bank of the Tiber, and public works, cf. O’Connor 1993, 38–42.

\textsuperscript{616} The drawing was made by Cozza, cf. Gamurrini \textit{et al.} 1972.

\textsuperscript{617} Hemphill 1993; 2000.

\textsuperscript{618} Gamurrini \textit{et al.} 1972, 146, 172, figs. 4 and 103:3.

\textsuperscript{619} Gierow 1986, n.11.

\textsuperscript{620} Gamurrini \textit{et al.} 1972, fig. 4.

\textsuperscript{621} \textit{Etruskerna} 1960, 180–182, mentions a Roman bridge over the ford with the abutments visible but there are no specific evidence for that statement, unless the structure on Fig. 21 is one of these abutments mentioned.

\textsuperscript{622} The Civitella Cesi survey yielded material from a few more tombs, dated to the first half of the 6th century and in use to the 5th–3rd century B.C., cf. Hemphill 2000, 51.
The following requirements were needed for a bridge and road construction: an authority for decision making, technical experts, labourers as well as the supply of construction material. These requirements seem to have been fulfilled at least at two places at San Giovenale: the bridge complex at the Pietrisco and the bridge linking the Borgo with the Casale Vignale necropolis.

**Interregional level**

On an interregional level some of the local roads and tracks are connected to a larger network of roads and bridges in the immediate surroundings of San Giovenale (Fig. 1). The roads located to the west, north-west, north and north-east of the town form a fan with San Giovenale in the centre. Starting from the west it was possible for the inhabitants to reach Tarquinia and Gravisca via Luni by a road following the edge of the river valley. *La Dogana* branched in two roads north of San Giovenale: one into a direct link to Blera passing Cerrachio, Viterbo and Acquarossa. The second branch ran towards the north-west, crossing the main horizontal route Tarquinia Blera-Faleri-Rome and passing Norchia, Castel d’Asso, Acquarossa and Orvieto (Volscini) in the north.

Via the roads running along Casale Vignale and Vignale it was possible to connect with San Giuliano to the north-east and further to Falerii and Rome and to the north-west, crossing the main horizontal route Tarquinia Blera-Faleri-Rome and passing Norchia, Castel d’Asso, Acquarossa and Orvieto (Volscini) in the north.

There were two options to reach Caere and the coastal cities in the south. *La Dogana* continued southwards after crossing the Vesca through a rough landscape with deep ravines and high plains covered with woods down to the Tolfa mountains. It continued via Tofa down to Rota and Passo di Viterbo crossing the Mignone either by fords during summer time when the water level was low or by bridges during times of high water. A second main road running from Blera and San Giuliano passed Monterano and joined *La Dogana* at Rota (Fig. 1). At Monterano and Stigliano, *La Dogana* crosses the Mignone by bridges. The modern wooden bridge at Monterano can, as has been suggested earlier, be used as a model for an early Etruscan bridge before the use of stone bridge constructions (Figs. 68–69).

When the Romans expanded their territory during the 4th century B.C., they used the existing Etruscan roads and bridges. During the third century B.C. bridges in the vicinity and along the commercial and military high roads of Via Clodia and Via Cassia were rebuilt by the Romans. The remains of several arched stone bridges dated to the 3rd century in the neighbourhood, and the roadbeds of large basalt stones and lined with kerbstones bear witness of this. The road system changed dramatically after the Roman systematisation of roads and bridges in 174 B.C.

**Intra regional level**

The local and interregional roads were connected to roads running from territories and mountain areas in the north down to the coastal areas in the south. *Via Dogana* can be considered as such an intraregional road since it seems to have started in the Umbrian mountains, then ran by way of Viterbo and San Giovenale and further southwest to Tolfa. From there it continued to Civitavecchia and Caere in the coastal areas. The road was probably a transhumance route already in the Bronze Age as suggested by Skydsgaard and Östenberg. It seems to have continued being an important economic route during the Orientalizing and the Etruscan periods judging from the numbers of tombs lining it dated to c. 625–450 B.C. and the beginning of the 3rd century B.C.

If we assume a transhumance route through

---

623 Pliny, for example, used the word architectus for the engineer, the leader of the building, cf. Plin. Ep. 10.37–10.40.3.1.
624 Names of the emperor or of other bridge builders were sometimes inscribed on the stone bridge itself. Bridge builders from c. 65 B.C. are listed in O’Connor 1993, 38–42, table 2.
625 Hemphill 2000, 146.
626 There may have been a bridge at this place, now disappeared, according to Wetter 1962, 169–170, fig. 143. Cf. Naso et al. 1989, figs. 7-8 for the distribution of necropolises and habitations south of San Giovenale.
627 Hemphill 2000, 84.
San Giovenale from the coast to the Umbrian mountains, the seaward contact cannot fully be excluded.633 This road with its links to the south, north and northwest would, however, have been important also on an intraregional level, since it facilitated social, political and economical contacts with the growing city-states of Tarquinia and Caere, and their harbours, Gravisca, Regisvillae, and Pyrgi as well as the inland areas of Umbria. The economic importance of these in the area during the early Archaic period is shown in the expanding road system of which La Dogana is a part.634 The trading of Greek pottery from Caere, Pyrgi and Gravisca, is reflected especially in the large number of Attic pottery, but also in Corinthian and Laconian vessels found in the tombs, as well as other wares from the bridge complex.

Along La Dogana, there are few remains of Etruscan bridges to be found. There are, however, remains of a few Roman bridges, such as Ponte a Norchia over the Biedano along Via Clodia.635 Southwards of San Giovenale there is another Roman bridge, Ponte del Diavolo at Manziana near the baths at Bagni di Stigliano, dated to the first century B.C. (Fig. 1).636

A papal decree issued in 1257 AD indicates that La Dogana continued to be a socially and economically important communication route used for transhumance also during the medieval period.637 Archaeological remains along La Dogana, such as buildings used as rest houses and the medieval chapel of Ave Maria (also called Madonna Del Poppa) near Norchia support the written text (Fig. 1).638 The function of this complex may be compared with the Pietrisco bridge building, also located along the road and at the northern bridgehead, and where the large number of pottery sherds from several periods, associated with drinking, eating, cooking and storing, also point to a place where food and drinks were served, i.e. an inn or a rest house. This becomes more evident when connecting the π-shaped bench in Houses 1-2, interpreted as a foundation for klinai (see below on function).639

3.2. THE ECONOMIC LANDSCAPE
In the following section on the economic landscape I will focus on various types of production and exchange using the archaeological remains from the bridge.

3.2.1 Production
The faunal remains (the food residues), the animal bones, the small terracotta and metal artefacts, and the abundance of pottery in the bridge complex reflect, together with similar finds from the settlements, how the people of San Giovenale earned their living (Figs. 94a-d, 95).

Pollen analyses from south and south-east of the area suggest that the climate has been quite stable from c. 1000 B.C. until today making it possible to compare the crops of today with the ancient ones.640 Agriculture, olive and wine production are still an important part of the economy. The domestic and wild animals painted or stamped on clay objects, pottery and tomb walls as well as the remains of their bones in archaeological contexts are the same species that we see today: large herds of sheep, cattle and horses grazing on the meadows watched by shepherds and their dogs, and wild boars in the open wooded landscape (Figs. 19a–b, 82:13–14, 85:1–3, 94:17).

Food production
The production of staple food was one of the most important activities in a growing society. Archaeobotanical remains of carbonised seeds of emmer, barley and peas from the Acropolis have shown that crop husbandry was practiced.641 A recent find of an imprint of a grape pip on a potsherd dated to the Protovillanovan or early Etruscan period was found under House III in Area F East (Fig. 2a).642 Despite the scarce evidence,
they are important enough to be mentioned, as they inform us of the diet of the inhabitants at San Giovenale.

The cereals, emmer and barley, were used for porridge and bread baking in large pans, such as the one in Fig. 82:16.\textsuperscript{643} Hopefully, the two sherds of two closed jars with food residues in situ found at the bridge, as already mentioned in chapter 2, will give more information about the diet when analyzed (Fig. 94d).\textsuperscript{644} The food residuals cannot answer question, of the character of the food used by the visitors at the bridge, but other organic finds made in the settlement of San Giovenale, can give a clue. These finds, together with the information collected by the Civitella Cesi surveys, on more minor Etruscan villages and farms and later Roman villas and farms around San Giovenale indicate a rural landscape. The conditions for cultivation were good. The physical environment consisting of the rather flat fertile plains of the volcanic tufa and clay slopes surrounding San Giovenale and Civitella Cesi were well-suited for agriculture. The tufa has excellent qualities for cultivation as it is nutritious, permeable and thus well drained and easy to dig into in order to get fresh water from wells and springs.\textsuperscript{645} Installations probably for pressing wine are found on the Borgo and for the cultivation of wine on the Vignale. The many drinking cups and jugs from several periods from the bridge, the tombs and the settlements are indirect evidence of either a local production or import of wine in the vicinity of San Giovenale and Civitella Cesi.\textsuperscript{646} The cultivation may have primarily been for subsistence but the surplus was probably sent to the regional markets for exchange of other goods.

It is likely that the middle and eastern part of the Vignale hill were used for the cultivation of cereals and wine. Evidence of wine cultivation from later periods, 4th-3rd centuries B.C., was found during the excavations in 1959 and 1960.\textsuperscript{647} If the Vignale area was used for cultivation the Pietrisco bridge must have been necessary for the transportation of the crops, and thus it became an important link for the food supply to the inhabitants on the Borgo.

Stock- and sheep-farming have obviously been important activities as seen from the archaeozoological evidence from the bridge complex as well as the remains within the settlements. Domestic animals, such as cattle, sheep, goats, pigs and a dog were recorded in the bridge remains and similar species were also found in the settlement.\textsuperscript{648} Domestic animals, such as horses, sheep/goats, and dogs as well as wild animals (red deer, wild boar) were popular patterns stamped on braziers and red slipped pithoi (Fig. 82:13–15; 85:1–3).\textsuperscript{649} The sporadic find of a terracotta head of a ram from the summit of the north-eastern part of the Borgo,\textsuperscript{650} and a recently identified large terracotta head of a ram with nail holes found in a cistern on the Vignale,\textsuperscript{651} may strengthen the view of the ram as an important status symbol: the ram is the leader of the herd, reproducer of the pecus as well as producer of wool and hides.\textsuperscript{652} Furthermore, are the spindle-whorls, bobbins and loom-weights indirect evidence of sheep-farming. These also inform us of other activities, such as textile production, dyeing, and even tanning, activities based on the products from the animals, such as wool, skins, and bone implements. There may also have been shepherds practising some small-scale transhumance in the area although long-distance transhumance is mentioned first by Roman authors in the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C. It is also possible that this pastoralist economy was in use during the Etruscan period and even earlier during the Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{653}

The drier, high limestone hills to the E of San Giovenale, partly covered with forests of oak, elm, walnut, almonds and hazels, have probably been more

---

\textsuperscript{643} Recently, Zifferero 2002 has suggested that the four lugged basins dated from the 7th down to the 5th century B.C. are baking lids.

\textsuperscript{644} SGBRN 9906. These samples have not been analyzed yet.

\textsuperscript{645} Hemphill 2000, 20–22, figs. 1–3.

\textsuperscript{646} Hemphill 1993; 2000, 131–145. See also the Etruscan farm found at Podere Tartuchino in Perkins & Attolini 1992, 71–134.

\textsuperscript{647} Cf. notebooks by Del Chiario 1959 and Brown 1960. See also the many wine presses located on the E part of the Borgo close to the road and the bridge interpreted as wine presses and dated to the 4th century B.C. They indicate that wine was cultivated either in the settlement or brought there from the surroundings to be processed, cf. San Giovenale 5:1 forthcoming. Cultivation of various crops, vegetables, wine and cereals was common during the 1960s and is still common on this land, cf. Etruscan culture 1962, figs. 154, 218-219, 228, 242-243, 247 and 323.

\textsuperscript{648} Sorrentino 1981a; 1981b.

\textsuperscript{649} Pohl 1982; see also San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{650} Berggren & Moretti 1960, 3–4, fig. 2; San Giovenale 5:1 forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{651} The fragments were found in the basement of the Swedish Institute in Rome, in a box labelled pozzo 6, Vignale hill 1959, and identified as a ram’s head by the author in 2003. The cistern is mentioned in the notebook written by Östenberg in 1959; see also Aversa 1997, 11.

\textsuperscript{652} Barker 1981, 22.

\textsuperscript{653} Barker & Rasmussen 2000, 198; see also De Grossi Mazzorin 2001b, table 2, for the high percentages of sheep and goats on the Acropolis at San Giovenale.
suitable for pig breeding. Pig bones were found in the bridge complex as well as in the settlement areas indicating that pigs were used as food and/or as sacrificial animals. Osteologists have interpreted marks on pig bones as an indication of stress related diseases, and concluded that pigs were kept in small spaces instead of in open areas or in the woods in extensive systems. No such mark was reported on the pig bones from the bridge complex or from the settlement areas. That fact could be an indication of pig-breeding in open areas. Pig-breeding seems to have increased during the Early Iron Age and continued to do so during the Archaic period, due to changes in the demographic conditions.

The bone remains of red deer from the bridge layers and the bones and antlers of red deer found in the Spring-building on the Acropolis indicate hunting in a forested landscape for food, for tools and also sacrifice. The fragments of animal bones were found scattered in several layers of the pre-construction phases 2-3, and the building phases 1-3, and in the well. They consisted of both a minimal number of 30 individuals of domestic species (pigs, sheep/goats, cattle, one example of a dog) and one example of deer. Meat, milk, cheese, all products of domestic animals, such as sheep, goat, s and cattle seem to have been the basics in the diet of the people at San Giovenale during the Archaic periods as well as the meat from wild game, the red deer in particular. Nothing in this indicates whether the bones were parts of ordinary meals, of funerary meals or used in sacrifices. They were found together with a great deal of pottery used for eating and cooking. Wild boar, deer and wild goats were also probably part of the diet, at least at more ceremonial occasions and the catch of those species may be refer to the hunting of the aristocracy.

It is also easy to assume that the diet was mixed with fish from the rivers and wildfowl from the forest (Fig. 85:1). The rate of bones of red deer, found in the Spring-building on the Acropolis, is quite high, 416 fragments or 11 individuals (Table 38). This high rate of 56% should be compared to the 21% of red deer bones found at Tarquinia. The reason for this difference may be the largely wooded landscape around San Giovenale, while Tarquinia was then more agricultural.

Table 38. The number of bone fragments and the minimum number of individuals of domestic and wild animal in different contexts at San Giovenale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Domestic (frgs)</th>
<th>Domestic MNI</th>
<th>Wild (frgs)</th>
<th>Wild MNI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cult-room</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring-building</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cistern I</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>705</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>430</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further activities shown in the finds in the bridge complex and within the settlement are various examples of crafts specialization. Local pottery workshops are supposed to have existed within the settlement. As mentioned above the potter Larices Crepu produced braziers and pithoi during the end of the sixth century. However, there are no remains of pottery kilns, although clay beds have been found north of San Giovenale.

---

654 Hemphill 1993.
656 High percentages of pigs dated from the 7th-the 6th centuries and from the 2nd century B.C. have been recorded from the Acropolis, cf. De Grossi Mazzorin 2001b, 327–328, table 3.
657 The well was probably filled up during the fourth building phase, that is the end of the 5th century. B.C. Some bones were found at a depth of 4.75 m and 5.5 m measured from the mouth-head of the well. Unfortunately, many of the stratified bones from the site were discarded during the excavations in the 1960's for some reason.
658 Sorrentino forthcoming.
659 Spivey & Stoddart 1990, 67.
660 The animal bones found in other areas and analysed contained the same types of species as those at the bridge complex, except for the mule and the horse, cf. Sorrentino 1981. The predominance of red deer at the sacred Spring-building show a cult connected to water and to this animal, which can be interpreted as the companion of Artemis, cf. San Giovenale 2:4, 80-83, Sorrentino 1981, fig. 32; see also holy springs, Chellini 2002, 195-212.
661 For the bones on the Acropolis, see Sorrentino 1981. The animal bones from Area F East on the Acropolis will be published by prof. T. Sjøvold.
662 San Giovenale 2:4, 82–84; for the animal bones, see Sorrentino 1981, 85–89. See also the discussion of fresh water springs in Etruria and particular the spring and the Spring-building at San Giovenale, in Chellini 2002, 37-68, esp. 39-41.
663 Spivey & Stoddart 1990, 67.
Giovenale, which may have been used in the production of pottery and tiles. Another clay source very close to the settlement could be the fine clay at the bottom of the Vesca and the Pietrisco. 664

Textile production
The production of textiles is evidenced by the many artefacts found related to textile working, i.e. loom-weights, spindle-whorls and bobbins (Fig. 94; see chapter 2:4). The sheep and goats produced wool, which was spun, and woven in standing looms. The abundance of objects related to textile production all over the plateau from several periods, shows that wool production and textile handicrafts were important parts of the economy for the duration of the existence of the settlement at San Giovenale.

Metal working and smithing
Evidence of metalworking is indicated by artefacts and remains related to metallurgical activity at several places. The few metal objects of bronze, iron and lead, the pure copper piece and the slag found at the bridge indicate a metallurgical activity, but not necessarily at the bridge (Fig. 95; Table 27). On the Acropolis and the Borgo a black smith’s and bronze smith’s workshop seems to have been located. 665 As mentioned earlier in chapter 3, finds of scrap-bronze, a terracotta mould for casting, fragments and drops of pure copper, and pieces of iron flakes from forging and large hearths support this hypothesis. The many fragments of bronze scrap and the few examples of raw copper (ingots?) from hut contexts show that bronze and copper working was known already in the Protovillanovan period. 666

The provenance of the metals is so far unknown. The nearest metal resource rich in copper, iron, lead, zinc and alum is located at the Tolfa mountains, only a few kilometres south of the area (Fig. 1). 667 The short distance, and the well-established road net to the south and to Tolfa may have facilitated the transport of copper ingots and iron bars to San Giovenale. There is as yet no evidence of ancient mining or places of primary smelting in the Tolfa Mountains. 668 The analyses of slag, pure metal and artefacts may answer the question of origin. 669 Obviously, there was a local production of metal objects for domestic use but perhaps also used as in exchange for other goods. The tombs contained an abundance of metal objects: bronze and iron weapons, silver and gold jewellery, bolts, nails, tools and wheel-dressings. Some of the objects may have been manufactured locally but the major part was probably imported or gifts of exchange. 670

3.2.2 Commerce, trade and exchange of goods
With a well-established network of roads on a local as well as on an interregional and intraregional level with short distances between the markets, an important requirement for trade and exchange seemed to be fulfilled. The distance to Caere and its port Pyrgi was only c. 30 km and almost the same distance took travellers to Tarquinia and Gravisca. Other towns easy to reach within one or two day’s journey were Norchia, Blera and Acquarossa N-NE of San Giovenale (Fig. 1). How exactly this trade or exchange of goods was

664 In 1985 Prof. B. Malcus, S. Forsberg and the author found a similar type of clay in the river beds of Vesca and Pietrisco. Chemical analyses have to be made on the clay and the ceramics from San Giovenale in order to see if these sources were used or not. Recently, clay taken from the beds of Vesca was used in buccero production during some days of experimental archaeology at Civitella Cesi, see Vallesi 2004. See also the analyses of the clay samples taken from various areas at San Giovenale in 2004 by D. Fuglesang and A. Lindahl, the University of Lund, in Fuglesang forthcoming.
665 Remains of metallurgic activities have also been reported from the Etruscan house in Area F on the Acropolis, Fuglesang forthcoming.
666 San Giovenale 5:2 forthcoming.
667 The iron ore from Elba was transported to Populonia where it was smelted. Remains of kilns and huge slag heaps directly on the shore are evidence of primary smelting. Another large smelting place was found at Campiglia Marittima. Two other possible sources are the Colline Metallifere rich in copper, tin, iron, lead and silver and on the island Elba rich in iron, cf. Barker 1981; Barker & Rasmussen 2000, 205–206. See also Zifferero 1991; 1995. On the provenance of alum, see Zifferero 1990; Brunori & Mela 1990; Holmgren 2002.
669 The analyses of a number of slag, and raw scrap metal have been made by Prof. G.F. Guidi at ENEA in Rome and will be published in San Giovenale 5:2 forthcoming. Chemical analyses of the debris may give some information as to the origin of the metal. The Tolfa mountains and the Colline Metallifere north of Populonia or Elba are possible sources.
670 Many of the excavated tombs had already been visited by tomb robbers so the number of precious metals may originally have been larger, cf. Bazzichelli 1876-1877 mentioning many metal finds, such as bronze mirrors; cf. also San Giovenale 1:1. See also a critical article by Zifferero 1991 about the supposed ancient mining in the Tolfa mountains.
organized, is uncertain. Finds from the bridge complex during several periods, show various imports of tablewares as well as other find categories that are examples of trading contacts on different levels.

These goods may to some extent have been part of a gift exchange network between leading families in the city-states as suggested by some scholars, products that were then redistributed to the ruling family/families at San Giovenale. Other goods may have been brought by travellers and merchants or itinerant potters or smiths passing by, in exchange for drinks, food and rest for example at the rest house at the bridge. Finds of both fine and coarse pottery, stamped terracotta braziers, the Faliscan and the Etrusco-Corinthian pottery made at Vulci, Tarquinia, and Caere as well as the Greek imports of tableware from Caere are some examples of the foreign influences. Also news, gossip, and religious and technological ideas may have travelled on the roads. One example of how knowledge of foreign gods is spread is the dedication to the Umbrian chthonic goddess Vesuna on a bucchero bowl from the Pietrisco bridge complex.

3.3 THE SOCIO-POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

The archaeological remains from the bridge will, as earlier stated, together with evidence from the settlements and the tombs and the natural environment be used in an attempt to describe the socio-political landscape at San Giovenale (Fig. 102).

3.3.1 Territorial boundaries and political influences during the 7th–4th centuries B.C.

San Giovenale is a frontier site located at the water systems of the Mignone and the Vesca, which also were the northernmost territorial boundary between the city-states Caere and Tarquinia during the Iron Age and the Archaic periods, as they are today between the Provincia di Roma and the province of Viterbo. According to Rendeli, San Giovenale was an important strategic frontier site in the ager caeretanus colonized by Caetan aristocratic clans. Other scholars, using various mathematical theories, have created models for hypothetical territorial boundaries in the region. These models have, however, been criticized for being too artificial and not considering the physical environment such as valleys and rivers when calculating the boundaries between settlements and territories. According to one such model San Giovenale belonged to the southern periphery of ager bleriana, from the 7th to the 4th century B.C. During the end of the 5th and the beginning of the 4th centuries San Giovenale and the other settlements in the ager bleriana became politically and culturally dependant on Tarquinia and as such were important strongholds in the Tarquinian-Roman wars, which lead to the capture of Veii in 397, Sutri and Blera a few years later. The cities could not depend on Caere since the city had become an allied to Rome when the Gauls attacked Rome in 390 (Fig. 1). My point of departure when analyzing the natural as well as the symbolic boundaries has been partly based on the model in three levels of liminal zones, discussed by Stoddart and Riva in a paper on ritual landscapes in South Etruria. They investigate the presence of tombs, votive deposits and sanctuaries at the boundaries at two levels, such as between the city and country, and between cities and territories. In the following, visible physical boundaries such as the river, the gully, the road net with the bridge will be examined to show their importance for the local communication between two settlements and their necropoleis, corresponding to the first level in Riva and Stoddart’s model. According to their second level San Giovenale and the bridge complex will be looked upon as a frontier boundary between two city-states (Fig. 10). In section 3.4, on the mental landscape, I will use the

671 Barker & Rasmussen 2000, 210–211.
672 Vesuna has also been associated to Vesta, the goddess of the hearth and the domestic fire, Letta 1997, 317–339. On Greek visiting gods, see Alroth 1989, 65-105, 108-113.
673 Östenberg 1962, 89–90; Rendeli 1993, fig. 87.
674 Rendeli 1993, figs. 111, 135, 349.
675 See Rendeli 1993, 98–112; and the critics against the Thiessen polygons, Barker & Rasmussen 2000, 174–176; cf. also Stoddart 1998, 198–199. Modified models of the Thiessen polygons have been used; for modes of measuring territory around Tarquinia, see Spivey and Stoddart 1990, fig. 17.
676 Santella 1988, figs. 1, 3 and 9.
677 Santella 1988, 6–7. Sutri was a small site, probably Etruscan, bordering the Faliscan area, before the capture by the Romans in 394 B.C., cf. Barbieri 1991, 131. According to Livy (Liv. 6.9.3–12) Sutrium and Nepi were first captured by the Etruscans and shortly after by the Romans, that is in 386 B.C. Etruscan tombs along cut roads have been found in the surroundings of Blera, cf. Forma Italia 1980, 85–87, 88–89, figs. 132–134, 136–137.
679 Riva & Stoddart 1996.
same model to discuss the symbolic and ritual boundaries.

During the Archaic period San Giovenale was an economic centre in the Hinterland of Caere or c. 20 km from Caere and 25 km from Tarquinia. The location of the frontier boundary between those two states made the political situation very fragile and competitive. It was the frontier boundary between those two states that made the economic centre in the boundaries.

The border between the Etruscan inscriptions show at least five expressions for marking-off both public and private landholdings. The border between the Etruscan period at San Giovenale follows a scheme common to many smaller and larger Etruscan habitationary units. San Giovenale was on Blera is uncertain due to the lack of written documents. How politically dependant the inland centers situated far from the city-state were, is uncertain. It seems likely that the impact of the political control decreased the longer from the city the site was located. Blera is an example of a central place gravitating other settlements in the area. It is a settlement of 18 ha situated at the Biedano river and at the cross-road of the two main commercial routes Tarquinia-Falerii-Veii-Rome, and Caere-Orvieto (Volsinii) (Fig. 1). This commercial centre, still politically dependant on Caere, has been suggested to have drawn aristocratic families to colonize the arable land and to create commercial centres within the ager bleriana. How dependant socially, economically and politically, San Giovenale was on Blera is uncertain due to the lack of written documents.

The arable land around each site with farms and smaller villages was thus rather small and probably well defined, when considering the Etruscan's interest in marking-off both public and private landholdings. Etruscan inscriptions show at least five expressions for various types of boundaries. The border between the town and the country was usually marked by a cippus or a stele inscribed with the Etruscan words tular spural or the ager publicus (the town border). Not a single cippus has yet been found between the boundaries of San Giovenale and the ager. Inscribed cippi at the boundary of a cemetery have shown that this was called the tular.

The boundary between two private farms was named tular alfil, and the family graves were often marked with a tomb marker (cippus) in various shapes or a stele made in limestone or tufa. The gully and the river were seen as natural boundaries between the settlements and the cemetery and therefore there was no need of a marker there. The territorial boundary was usually marked by a cippus like the one found at Cortona inscribed with tular rasnal, which means the Etruscan frontier to the Umbrian territory in the E. The concept of boundary was apparently very important and something to respect because of its sacredness, and to change a boundary was seen as crime.

The minor centres were more or less politically, as well as socially and culturally dependent on the city-state of Caere, but since San Giovenale was a frontier settlement there were also influences of other city-states e.g. Tarquinia. Veii and Vulci, which are shown in goods, domestic and funeral architecture, as well as layouts of settlements and cemeteries.

3.3.2 Organisation of settlements: structural relations between the settlement and the necropolis

The settlement pattern during Late Iron Age and the Etruscan period at San Giovenale follows a scheme common to many smaller and larger Etruscan habitations: a settlement on an acropolis surrounded by one or several cemeteries, divided by ravines with

680 Riva & Stoddart 1996, 93; Stoddart 1990, 47. The Hinterland, consisting of arable pastures, and forests, was often localised around a minor town c. 7 km in diameter from the centre. San Giuliano and Blera were also part of the ager caeretanus during the 7th century B.C., cf. Rendeli 1993, fig. 42.

681 This is known from Corpus agrimensorum Romanorum, a collection of documents in Latin, which dealt with boundary-making.

682 Scullard 1967, 73–74, Morandi 1991, 186. The Etruscan word tular is the Roman pomerium. On Etruscan tular, see also Magi 1929, 67-72, and Formentini 1929.
running water or roads (Figs. 2a-b, 100).\textsuperscript{693} There is, however, a minor difference at San Giovenale, since a second settlement on the Vignale plateau is connected to the San Giovenale habitation via the monumental bridge complex. The bridge(s) and the road net around and inside the settlement had, as already stated certainly played a major role both on a local as well as on an interregional level. Despite the position of the bridge, c. 100 m from the main economic trade route in the southern slope of Casale Vignale, it was easy for travellers passing by to pay a visit, knowing that the building along the road and at the bridgehead could have functioned as a resting place and an inn.

The settlement located on the San Giovenale plateau consists of two parts, the Acropolis and the Borgo. A second settlement found on the Vignale plateau is located only a few hundred meters away on the south side of the Pietrisco brook. Due to a lack of proper surveys and excavations it is difficult to estimate the scale of the Vignale settlement (see below). There are different opinions about the number of inhabitants \textit{per ha} among scholars: 50 persons have been proposed, while others have suggested 120-210 \textit{per ha}, which is the case at Acquarossa. San Giovenale is considered to be a small settlement. It is only 3.4 ha, excluding the Vignale, and could have had an estimated population of c. 170 or 208/714 depending on the number used.\textsuperscript{694} The urbanisation, well-documented at places like Acquarossa, Caere, Vulci and Tarquinia during the beginning of the 6th century, can be traced also at San Giovenale and Vignale.\textsuperscript{695}

Minor investigations in 1959 and 1960 on the western part of the Vignale hill revealed architectural remains such as wells, cisterns full of pottery, architectural terracottas and small finds, and substructures of houses. A new Etruscan settlement had been found that dated from the middle of the 7th century B.C. to the beginning of the 5th centuries, and with a rebuilding phase in the early 3rd century.\textsuperscript{696} The hypothesis made by Pohl that the Vignale settlement was probably abandoned at the latest in the 5th century B.C. is debatable.\textsuperscript{697}

The modern name Vignale indicates a place where there have been vineyards, and remains of vineyards were also found on the hill.\textsuperscript{698} It is likely that this area was used for viticulture also during ancient times. Some Hellenistic wine presses on the Borgo area, indicate that dating of the new settlement strengthens the proposed chronological phases at the bridge, i.e. the pre-construction phases 2-3 and the construction phases 1-4. The dates confirm the early activity on the Vignale plateau. This fact may also be used as an argument for my hypothesis that there has been a crossing at this spot and in the shape of a more simple wooden bridge before the erection of the monumental bridge on stone abutments.

Although no evidence of Protovillanovan architecture has yet been found either on the Vignale or on the northern bank, fragments of Protovillanovan pottery found on both sides of the Pietrisco, and among the remains on the Vignale plateau show that some kind of activity occurred long before the construction of the first monumental wooden and stone bridge. A crossing at this particular place would save a lot of time and effort for people and animals who otherwise had to take a much longer route to reach the pastures on the Vignale hill.

The hypothesis made by Pohl in the notebook by Brown 1960, she stated that there was no 4th century pottery in the material, and concluded that Vignale was abandoned at the latest in the 5th century or in the late 6th, probably still before the Borgo (1983). The pottery dated to the middle of the 3rd century found on the southern side of the Pietrisco and on the northern slope of the Vignale contradicts this statement. A pozzo, excavated by Östenberg in 1959 near a modern farming house on the Vignale, also yielded a great deal of Late Creamware and Etruscan red-figured ware, stamped black-glaze plates and undecorated tableware, which can be dated to the middle of the 4th and the beginning of the 3rd centuries B.C., i.e. the Late Etruscan period.

693 See the city-states of Caere, Tarquinia, Veii, and Vulci, in Rendeli 1993; Sgubini Moretti & Ricciardi 2001; for the minor settlements, e.g. San Giuliano and Blera, cf. Rendeli 1993; Santella 1988. There is, however, at least one exception to this pattern. At Pian di Stigliano in the Tolfa mountains S of San Giovenale there is an Archaic burial ground on the same hill as the settlement with clear Caeretan influences as well as local, cf. Naso & Zifferero 1985, 239–260.

694 Damgaard Andersen 1997, 346–347. The Vignale is not included.


696 The excavations conducted by C.E. Östenberg, and M. Del Chiaro in 1959 and by F. Brown in 1960 yielded pottery at least from the 8th to the 5th centuries and from the mid third centuries B.C. as well as architectural terracottas and various small finds. A preliminary study of the find material, plans and notebooks from the Vignale investigations has been made by the author, since they were to be published by Stig Forsberg. The material will be published in \textit{San Giovenale} 6:1-3. So far a few Protovillanovan and transitional fragments have been identified. Pohl has also looked at the material and discussed them in Pohl 1980; 1985; 1986. See also the result of the survey by Hemphill 2000.

697 According to a short commentary by Pohl in the notebook by Brown 1960, she stated that there was no 4th century pottery in the material, and concluded that Vignale was abandoned at the latest in the 5th century or in the late 6th, probably still before the Borgo (1983). The pottery dated to the middle of the 3rd century found on the southern side of the Pietrisco and on the northern slope of the Vignale contradicts this statement. A pozzo, excavated by Östenberg in 1959 near a modern farming house on the Vignale, also yielded a great deal of Late Creamware and Etruscan red-figured ware, stamped black-glaze plates and undecorated tableware, which can be dated to the middle of the 4th and the beginning of the 3rd centuries B.C., i.e. the Late Etruscan period.

698 Pohl 1980; 1985, 55.
cultivation of grapes probably occurred on the Acropolis at least during the later periods. If the Vignale habitation should be considered a part of San Giovenale or an independent village is difficult to say. But considering the urban development well documented in South Etruria during the middle of the 7th century B.C., the roads and the earlier bridges over the Pietriscio may be taken as evidence for a close connection between these two settlements.

Obviously, some activity on the Vignale hill was of such an importance that the building of a bridge was justified to keep the communication open between the two areas. Pohl has interpreted the demolishing of the buildings on the Vignale to the beginning of the fifth century and suggested that the installations of viticulture together with some later buildings took over the hill. This demolishing of buildings may have been related to the destruction of the second bridge in the beginning of the 5th century B.C. That the connection to the Vignale was important even after the destruction of the buildings is, however, indicated by the third bridge and the apsidal building (House 3A). The bridge may also, during this period, have been an important link when transporting the grape harvests for the wine presses on the Borgo. Finds of later ceramics in a cellar on the plateau and in a well near a modern farmhouse on the Vignale confirm a late activity on the Vignale, i.e. 4th to the early 3rd centuries and even later. Similar finds found at the southern side of the Pietriscio Bridge and the large semicircular stone pavement and the remains of House 3B on the northern bank point strengthen my hypothesis of a fourth bridge at the same place as the other bridges or further towards the E (Fig. 25).

Village or town?

San Giovenale has been considered a village or a small town during the Orientalizing and Early Archaic periods as well as during the Post-archaic periods, viz. the 5th to the 3rd centuries. It has also been considered as a middle-ranked town, and as a satellite town to the city-state of Caere. At the same time not located far from the political boundary of the city-state of Tarquinia with the Mignone and the Vesca rivers as physical boundary markers. As already mentioned in chapter 1 Damgaard Andersen has argued for some preconditions for calling a place a city, while Pohl has chosen not to call the settlement a city because there is no evidence of a temple, only indications (see below).

Recent surveys in the surroundings of San Giovenale have yielded new sites with evidence of Etruscan occupation, villages, farms and cemeteries from the early to late Etruscan period with a strong expansion during the 6th to the 5th century B.C. A new Etruscan settlement was found by the Civitella Cesi survey on a promontory north of the settlement, dated to the 6th and 5th centuries B.C. During the 4th–3rd centuries the people seemed to have moved eastward to the area of Civitella Cesi. But, as pointed out by Pohl already in 1984, evidence shows that San Giovenale was still inhabited at least until c. 200 B.C. while the Vignale settlement seems to have been abandoned during the 4th century and then rebuilt during the 3rd century. The settlements were probably not more than wealthy villages during these later periods, due to the offset position from the important military Roman roads.

Due to the character of the archaeological remains I would classify the settlement as an important political frontier town, a social and an economical transit centre, comparable to the larger town of Blera. Caere and the coastal cities were all agriculturally and strategically dependent on the inland centres. San Giovenale was culturally a minor copy of a city-state. This is based primarily on the existence of many excavated tumuli of both Caeretan and Tarquinian style around the site. The number of tumuli show a high status of an aristocratic character. Also the building activity on the Acropolis and the exclusive furnishing of the houses, the remains of chariots in tombs together with the names of several aristocratic families inscribed on pottery and on tomb walls, indicate not only a literate but also a relatively wealthy society. Another discovery which increases the status of the town, are the remains of metal working on

---

699 San Giovenale 5:1 forthcoming.
701 The finds from the Vignale are stored at the Swedish Institute in Rome; Roman finds found during the Civitella Cesi survey were concentrated to the N slopes of the Vignale valley and dated to the 2nd/1st century B.C. and even later, cf. Hemphill 2000, 44, no. 55.
702 Notebook 2 by Östenberg 1959.
703 Pohl 1985, 44–45. Pohl has highlighted the post-Archaic periods at San Giovenale and shown that there was a continuation on the Acropolis and the Borgo as well as on the Vignale, see also Pohl 1984.
704 Rendeli 1993; Riva & Stoddart 1996, 93.
706 Pohl 1984, 93.
707 Hemphill 2000, 91. The settlement has been destroyed by modern quarrying.
708 Hemphill 2000, 135.
709 Pohl 1985, 61. Pohl has, after seeing the material, stated that no 4th century pottery was found (see note in notebook by Brown 1960).
the Borgo and the Acropolis, i.e. the large hearths for forging and casting, indicating probably a substantial local production of iron and bronze objects. Whether the objects of iron and bronze found in the tombs were locally produced or imported has not yet been confirmed by metallurgical analyses. The large bridge construction over the Pietrisco brook, as well as the construction over the gully from the Borgo to the necropolis of Casale Vignale points at a well-organised society, with some interest in taking part in economic and social transactions in the region.

3.3.3 Location and organisation of cemeteries around San Giovenale

The necropolis at Casale Vignale E of the promontory was surveyed and partly excavated for the first time during the end of the 19th century and later surveyed by the Swedish Institute in Rome in 1959 (Figs. 2a–2b). In 1982 and 1984 the Soprintendenza Archeologica per L’Etruria Meridionale excavated several Etruscan chamber tombs in tumuli in this huge burial ground, which could be reached by several road cuttings (see Fig. 2b). 710

Two large necropoleis, Porzarago 711 and Grotte Tufarina were located on the northern side of the Fammilume (Figs. 2–3). This area was already surveyed in 1877 when a few of the c. 200 tombs were investigated. 712 The excavations of these two cemeteries continued in 1956, 1959 and 1960 by the Swedish Institute in Rome, and rendered remains of an Iron Age cemetery and 14 chamber tombs located in tumuli and cubic tombs. 713 A road was found between the tombs P2 and P3. 714 The tombs are dated from the beginning of the 6th to the 2nd centuries B.C. 715

The main access for the inhabitants on the Acropolis to the Porzarago cemetery seems to have been by the bridge at the main gate at the east end of the Borgo. It seems to have been necessary to cross the Borgo Bridge and then following the strada delle Pogette down to the main road, La Dogana, and then to cross the Fammilume brook, unless there was a gate at the northern hillside between the Borgo and the Acropolis. This route may have been the only choice to approach the site for visitors coming from the north-east and north-west and those coming from the Vignale by the bridge may have taken the road from the Pietrisco bridge running up to La Dogana which branched up to Strada delle Pogette and further up to the Borgo bridge to enter the town or to visit the cemetery (Fig. 100).

Only four Etruscan tumuli were investigated in the Grotte Tufarina necropolis west of the Porzarago. 716 The Swedish team investigated in 1958 another Etruscan necropolis located c. 50 m north of Porzarago and Grotte Tufarina, not far from the brook Fosso della Staffa (Figs. 2–3). It contained three tumuli with chamber tombs cut into the tufa rock. The tumuli were worn by cultivation and ploughing. 717 Unfortunately they were robbed, as is the case with almost all tombs in the area. Whether this burial ground also belonged to San Giovenale is uncertain. Recently, Hemphill and the Civitella Cesi survey discovered an Etruscan settlement on a small hill in the area. This route may have been the only choice to approach the site for visitors coming from the north-east and north-west and those coming from the Vignale by the bridge may have taken the road from the Pietrisco bridge running up to La Dogana which branched up to Strada delle Pogette and further up to the Borgo bridge to enter the town or to visit the cemetery (Fig. 100).

Two more necropoleis were located south of the Vesca: Montevagone, very close to the ford along the transit road and Castellina Camerata south of the Vignale hill (Figs. 2–3). Castellina Camerata comprised at least 16 excavated Etruscan tombs of different architectural forms. 719 It was investigated again during the 1980s by L. Ricciardi. 720 This particular cemetery has been proposed to be the burial ground for the Etruscan settlement on the Vignale hill, situated south-east of the San Giovenale Acropolis and on the south side of the Pietrisco (Fig. 100). 721 The Caeretan and Tarquinian

711 Porzarago was the local Italian name of the tree corbezzola, which often grow on ancient remains and tombs, cf. San Giovenale 1:5, 9, pls. 1.2.
712 San Giovenale 1:5, 9, n. 2, pp. 60–67, pl. 2; Berggren & Moretti 1960; 31–37; Pohl 1985, 46–49.
713 San Giovenale 1:5, 10, 20–108.
714 This road ended in a possible former quarry, cf. San Giovenale 1:5, 93, figs. 44–45.
715 As mentioned earlier hundred of tombs were located on the Casale Vignale hill, Gamurrini et al. 1972, fig. 100, but only a few were excavated and published, cf. Fuglesang 1997–1998, 67–89; see also San Giovenale 1:9.
716 San Giovenale 1:5, pl. 1, 97–108; addendum by O. Wessberg, tomb G.T. 4, 131–134.
717 The three tombs are dated between 625–550 B.C., San Giovenale 1:6, 7–11, fig. 1A.
718 San Giovenale 1:6; Hemphill 2000, 46. The La Staffa burials could have belonged to a family, which had moved out from San Giovenale and built a place of their own on the fertile plain, see also Riva & Stoddart 1996).
719 San Giovenale 1:5, 109–126 (Montevagone); San Giovenale 1:7.
721 Gierow 1986, n. 2; San Giovenale 1:1, 7-9; Etruscan culture 1962, 304. In the centre of the promontory the Civitella Cesi survey found pottery indicating a continuation of the Vignale settlement, cf. Hemphill 2000.
cultural influences were shown very clearly in the funerary architecture as well as in the pottery.\footnote{Rendeli 1993.}

It is questionable whether the necropoleis of \textit{Fosso Pietrisco} and \textit{Valle Vesca} east of the settlements belonged to San Giovenale (Figs. 2b, 3).\footnote{See Rendeli 1993, 348.} The survey by Hemphill and the small survey conducted by the Swedish Institute in 2001 show that the Casale Vignale hill contained far more tombs than expected, some of them quite far from the town.\footnote{Hemphill 2000, and a report from a survey in 2001 by students, stored at the Swedish Institute in Rome. The many tombs on the Casale Vignale were registered already by Gamurrini \textit{et al.} 1972, fig. 100.} Even if they were situated at quite a distance from the settlements, it is probable that they belonged either to San Giovenale or the Vignale settlement. This hypothesis is based firstly on the similarities in grave goods and dating of the other graveyards in the vicinity and secondly that no other Etruscan settlement has been found in that area.\footnote{On the location of cemeteries at Veii, see Bartoloni 2001, fig. 1; Vulci, see Moretti Sgubini 2001, fig. 1. For Tarquinia and Cerveteri, cf. Rendeli 1993, figs. 91 and 113.}

The two Etruscan settlements of San Giovenale and Vignale were encircled by at least eight cemeteries. Some of them were used during a long period of time, from the early 7th to the middle of the 3rd centuries B.C. while others date from c. 650 to c. 450 B.C. The \textit{Porzarago} and the \textit{Pietrisco} tombs were the only burial grounds from the early Iron Age that contained cremation tombs, all located on top or on the margins of a hill (Fig. 2b). The same pattern, i.e. the organisation of the cemeteries around the settlement, often on the other side of rivers or gullies or along the main roads running from the town to the countryside, can be seen at the city-states of Caere, Tarquinia, and Vulci as well as at the surrounding Etruscan towns at Blera and San Guiliano (Barbarano Romano).\footnote{Naso 1996, fig. 90 (San Giuliano), fig. 172 (Vulci); Colonna 1986, pls. 3 (Caere), and 1 (Tarquinia).}

\textbf{The Etruscan society at San Giovenale}

Who were the inhabitants that constructed the bridges and the houses, made the artefacts, wrote the messages and the names on the pottery, on the cists, and on the tomb walls? Monumental constructions of that scale require a well-functioning society as well as supplies of stone, know-how, skilled workers, and someone who is in charge of the maintenance of the roads and bridges. The social structure in the Etruscan city-states and their satellite towns, such as San Giovenale, seems to contain a well-stratified society with aristocratic families, slaves, freedmen, merchants, and artisans.

How was the society organized when the first monumental bridge was constructed in building phase 1 and why? Who built it and for whom? Some reflections will be made, based on the archaeological evidence, in this case, basically the inscriptions on the pottery from the bridge complex, the settlements as well as the funerary contexts. So far there are eight names of clans of Etruscan aristocratic families inscribed on pottery, mainly bucchero, found in the settlement, in the bridge complex and in tombs. From from the bridge there are the \textit{Urcena} dated to 600 B.C., and \textit{Alsi} and \textit{Laivena} dated to 550 B.C. The name \textit{Una} was inscribed on a bucchero sherd found at the Borgo dated to 550-500.\footnote{CIE III:1, 10454. \textit{mi unas} inscribed on a bucchero fragment and found in the settlement on the Borgo NW slope has been interpreted by Colonna as being a \textit{gens} originally from a Faliscan town, dated to 550–500 B.C., see Colonna & Pohl 1979, 316-317.} Other examples of family names are \textit{Venel Vefuna} (600-550) on a base from Area F East on the Acropolis,\footnote{San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming. I thank L. Karlsson for letting me use this information.} and \textit{Reices} inscribed on a base found in a tomb dated to the beginning of the 6th century.\footnote{Di Gennaro 1998, 6–7.} The names may be compared to similar ones from other Etruscan towns and what is attested for at Orvieto, Chiusi and Perugia. \textit{Zixan} was a family name from Tarquinia, dated to the middle of the 6th century, written on the wall of a tomb in the Camerata necropolis.\footnote{Santella 1996, 19–20.} \textit{Hanphi avhirici}, Hanphi the African, was a person, whose name appeared in a long inscription on a \textit{kline} in the Grotte Tufarina necropolis.\footnote{Ricciardi 1986b. On \textit{klina} as funerary couches, see Boardman 1990.}

The \textit{Utres} family name was found in a tomb in the Castellina Camerata necropolis, dated to 550-500 B.C. It must be emphasized, however, that the names found at the bridge may equally belong to families living on the Vignale as well on the settlements on the Acropolis and the Borgo. Unfortunately, this cannot be verified since not a single inscription from the Vignale hill has been recorded so far.

Also individual names, like the man \textit{Larth} and the woman \textit{Fasthi Alsi} are known. \textit{Larices Crepu} is another male name written on the rim of a decorated brazier. He is interpreted as being an artisan, a former slave, but now a free man and a citizen with close relations with the \textit{Una}
family. He probably moved from the Faliscan area to San Giovenale and started a workshop of braziers and pithoi at the Etruscan settlement on the north-western slope of the Borgo. The beginning of the workshop lies in the 6th century B.C., with the florum in the middle of the century. Whether the families, whose names were found in the tombs of Grotte Tufarina, Montevangone or the Camerata Necropoleis on the southern bank of the Vesca, belong to the communities of San Giovenale or Vignale or other smaller communities nearby is of course uncertain.

The initiative to build the bridge complex and especially the monumental bridge in building phase 1 may have come from one of the aristocratic families. Possible candidates are the Urcena family or the Vefina family. Another possibility is the Una family, which probably existed already during this period. How important was it to make an impact on the neighbouring towns in building roads, bridges, and other constructions and what could the families gain in prestige? These are difficult questions, which lie beyond the scope of this thesis but a few features are worth commenting upon, which will be discussed below.

Social differentiation

The pattern of social differentiation of the Etruscan society of San Giovenale is uncertain, but the inscriptions of names, the settlement pattern and the organization of the cemeteries could be used as indications of a socially complex society. The Acropolis and the Borgo, during the Orientalizing and Archaic periods all show evidence of social differentiation. The Borgo with its cluster of houses irregularly placed and separated by narrow streets and drainage channels has been interpreted as a dwelling area for workers and specialized craftsmen and their families in a work area assigned to various small-scale production, placed on the hillside of the north-eastern part of the promontory. The more monumental dwellings lay on larger plots in the centre of the Acropolis. The location in the centre of the hill may indicate that they were the homes of more noble and literate families, as suggested by the family names inscribed on the pottery found on the Acropolis and also on the Borgo.

The choice of monumental tombs such as tumuli and cubic tombs, influenced by the mortuary treatment patterns at Caere, and the rather well furnished tombs also indicate high status and wealth. The pottery from the bridge with inscribed individual and family names, together with names found in the tombs, are other indications of an aristocratic society. The construction of the monumental bridge in the middle of the 6th century B.C. is another indication of a wealthy society. The construction of tombs, houses, roads and bridges that required various types of skills and know-how, indicate a class of artisans with different skills, as for example the potter Larices Crepus mentioned above. According to A.J. Nijboer specialized craftsmen probably had a high status and held an intermediate position in society.735

The character of social differentiation on the Vignale is, due to a lack of larger surveys and excavations, more difficult to evaluate.

Gender and ethnicity in Italy have been discussed in many works during the end of the 20th century. Cornell suggests that kinship was based upon the family clan and not upon an ethnos. The identity of people is very much related to the concept of boundary on different levels. The symbolic boundary between people living in various societies may be strong. G. Bradley has recently stated the importance of more complex discussions of ethnic identity of the Iguvines, Umbrians and Romans in pre-Roman and Roman Italy. He underlines the importance of defining ethnic groups during the first millennium and onwards.738

The aim with the following is not to discuss ethnicity, but rather to pose some questions concerning the identity of the inhabitants at San Giovenale. We will be looking

---

732 CIE III:1, 10486 larices crepus, from a tomb from the necropolis of Pontessili, cf. Berggren & Moretti 1960, 64, n. 5; Colonna 1997, 61–76.

733 Caere 3:2, 399–438. The numerous fragments of differently shaped braziers with stamped decoration were produced at Caere in a workshop, which also made pithoi with stamped decoration. The fragments are divided into 29 groups, dated from c. 590 to c. 510 B.C., cf. Caere 3:2, 432. See also the pithos fragment with a unique stamped decoration found in House 2 at the Acropolis, cf. San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming. Cf. Pieraccini 2003.

734 Nylander 1986a, 47-50, figs. 25-26; Nylander 1986b, 37–40; 1986c, 105–112; San Giovenale 5:2 and 5:3 forthcoming; Colonna 1986, pl. 8; Colonna 1997. See also photos in Bosi 1994, 33, 39, 42–43.

735 Nijboer 1997, 386-401, about production and various craftsmen at Acquarossa, Murlo, Satricum, and Pithekoussai. See also Zifferero 2002 on local workshops and their distribution.


at identity on a local communal level, i.e. how the inhabitants of San Giovenale related to those on the Vignale hill. Another question is how the neighbouring settlements and the far distance travellers and strangers passing by on the transit road related to the inhabitants of San Giovenale and if they had free access to the bridge, the roads and the settlements.

The main question is whether San Giovenale and Vignale were two separate entities or parts of the same town or village. The Vignale hill is only partly examined and the limited remains from the Early and Late Iron Age, are not sufficient to answer these questions. We know that there was some kind of connection between these two areas and that the bridge complex, must quite early, have played an important role as a link, since there are early pottery and Etruscan Archaic tiles on both banks of the Pietrisco.\(^{739}\)

The social contacts of the people at San Giovenale and the surrounding Etruscan farms as well as the neighbouring towns west, north-west and north-east of the Vesca, i.e. Luni, Grotte Porcina, Anguillara, Blera, Cerracchio, San Giuliano, all minor centres around Blera, were facilitated by a well-built network of roads (Fig. 1). The well-established road network facilitated also external contacts with other ethnic groups such as the Umbrians, Faliscans and Romans. The imports of pottery and other goods from Umbria and the Faliscan area indicate contacts over any territorial borders. Another piece of evidence of long-distance contact is the inscription of the Umbrian vegetation and chthonic goddess Vesuna (see below) found on a bucchero cup.\(^{740}\) It may either indicate a gift from a travelling Umbrian, perhaps passing San Giovenale or that the goddess was integrated among the divinities venerated at San Giovenale.

There were also other means of communication, such as the language. Considering that the Etruscan language did not belong to the Indo-European language group,\(^{741}\) it is difficult to find out how well the Etruscans understood written and spoken Umbrian and Oscan.\(^{742}\) Etruscan words are found in the Umbrian dialect and Umbrian, Latin, and Greek words in Etruscan inscriptions. One example is the Etruscan word for boundary (\textit{tular}), which is very similar to the Umbrian word \textit{tuder} (boundary), found in the Iguvine Tablets of Gubbio.\(^{743}\) This is a ritual document written partly with the Etruscan alphabet in an Umbrian language, and partly in Latin.\(^{744}\)

Another possible way of defining groups at San Giovenale is to study the Etruscan family names (\textit{gentes}). As already mentioned Zixana,\(^{745}\) Hanphina avhircina, Reices, Crepus, Vefunas, Alsi, Urcenas, and Una have been interpreted as having connections with Tarquinia, Caere and Umbria. They thus indicate a mixture of ethnic groups in the society of San Giovenale during the end of the 7th century and during the 6th century B.C.\(^{746}\) One explanation for this diversity of origins at San Giovenale could be the location at a city-state frontier. Another explanation could be that the main road passing through San Giovenale made it easier for families to meet and to bond. But the question is how much the satellite centres were controlled by the city-state and which families would have settled in this frontier settlement and to what degree intermarriage occurred.

\textit{Hanphina avhircina}, is a male of the Avhircina family. The word avhirei is an ethnic epithet meaning the African. It could be interpreted in two ways, either that the head of the family had been to Africa or that he himself or his father was of an African (Punic) origin. The fact that it was written on the funeral bed in an aristocratic tomb probably excludes the possibility that he was a slave of African descent.\(^{747}\) The freed slave \textit{Larices Crepus} was supposedly from the Faliscan territory, but has been connected to the \textit{Una} family documented on the Borgo.\(^{748}\) This may be taken as evidence for the existence of a patron-client relationship. The finds of names in tombs and in settlements can be interpreted as belonging to people living at the site but the names in the bridge complex i.e. \textit{Urcenas} and \textit{Alsi} cannot automatically be interpreted as families living either in the settlements of Vignale, the Acropolis or the Borgo. Due to the closeness to the main road through San Giovenale, it may be the name either of a visitor or a local, \textit{Larth} or \textit{Zixana},745 another possible name for an African foreigner.

\(^{739}\) See also the comments by Pohl 1985, and Fuglesang forthcoming.

\(^{740}\) Ancilotti & Cerri 1996, 187–188.

\(^{741}\) Wilkins 1996, 130.

\(^{742}\) Wilkins 1996, 135, 137. Umbrian and Oscan have been considered as belonging to the Indo-European languages, cf. Wilkins 1994, 159, fig. 5.11.
Fasthi, whose cup or bowl was given as a gift for good luck, toll or a gift to the spirits living at the bridge (see below). However, the interpretation of Urcena as a family living in the settlement may be right. The four examples of the letter U inscribed on pottery found at the bridge may stand for Urcena, but another option could be the initial for the Una family living on the Borgo. Of course the members of the Una family, known to have lived at San Giovenale around 575, may have replaced the Urcena family living here c. 600–550 B.C. Venel Vefuna lived in House I on the Acropolis at the same time as the Urcena family and considering the location of this house he was probably of the ruling family (Figs. 2a, 14). 749

3.3.4 Functions of the bridge in the socio-political landscape

In this section the remains of the bridge complex, the buildings with the well and the basin and the furnishings, will be discussed with the purpose of identifying possible secular and/or sacred functions. The evidence mentioned above will form the basis of the discussion of functions for the whole bridge complex.

The building associated with the bridge has earlier been seen as a way-station and a custom house. 750 After the analyses of the archaeological evidence the suggested functions will be discussed in relation to the new results. 751 The wider context of the bridge complex, that is the location at a liminal place, at a natural boundary as well as multiple (integrated) functions have so far not been considered. 752 The following functions will be discussed: (a) domestic function of the building; (b) public way-station, rest place, an inn/taverna; (c) strategic-defensive function of the place, a watch-house, a casa torre, (d) a means of communication between two settlements; and lastly (e) custom-house.

As a point of departure for the discussion I will focus on the most characteristic find category from the bridge complex, namely the abundant number of pottery dated to several periods ranging from the Protovillanovan to the Hellenistic/Roman periods. The ceramics have been divided into functional classes such as tableware; cooking/kitchen ware and storage ware, locally produced and imported Italic wares (Tables 5–24).

The pottery

The different wares and their characteristic shapes found at both riverbanks of the Pietrisco were similar to those found in the settlement and in the tombs at San Giovenale. They also correspond in large to pottery categories found in the Houses I-III in Area F East as well as in the Borgo settlement. Because of the many disturbances in the stratigraphy, there are some difficulties in dating the complex, but thanks to the rather clearer stratigraphy in other areas it is possible to relate the pottery from the bridge to the different phases in Area F on the Acropolis and at the Borgo.

The shapes indicate normal pottery functions, that is eating, drinking, pouring, storing, cooking, heating and lighting (Figs. 75–89). Some shapes are identical to those in the set of banqueting vessels from House I on the Acropolis as well as those from Ficana. These are dated to the Orientalizing period and contain a cup, a plate, a jug, a holmos (a support for containers at the table and at banquets), 753 and for water basins, louttherion, 754 and a kantharos. The same set of vessels connected to drinking and eating, is represented also in the bucchero wares, and the local and imported Greek fine tablewares. A simplified version of the holmos is represented at the bridge whereas there are fragments of an Etrusco-Corinthian example found in the Borgo settlement. 755 Consequently the pottery of the Orientalizing and the Archaic periods from the bridge area does not differ from the settlement and the tombs. Also many pieces of Protovillanovan pottery found at the bridge consisted of shapes (biconical jars and bowls, 749 A similar family name, Ramatha Vefarsianai, has been documented near Blera, cf. Colonna in San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming.

750 Forsberg 1984, 75.

751 I have already discussed a multifunctional use at a symposium in 1997 at the Swedish Institute in Rome. Based on my text Damgaard Andersen proposed a ‘political’ sanctuary at the bridge.

752 Damgaard Andersen 1998 has discussed the political palazzi as meeting places of both a sacral and profane function. Based on my research she has classified the bridge area as a sacellum with integrated functions.


754 Cf. the basin on a stand beside a fountain, depicted on a mural in the Tomb of the Bulls at Tarquinia, dated to the middle of the sixth century B.C., Etruscan culture 1962, fig. 452.

755 San Giovenale 5:2 forthcoming.
conical and carinated bowls, cups) similar to those found in the huts on the plateau of the same period. The amount of Greek imports of high quality fine tableware, mostly black-figure, red-figure and black-glaze, make the bridge area unique, both compared to the tombs and the residential areas, where such finds are less common (Figs. 82, 89). The many imported vessels, mostly from Attica, together with the single Chalkidian fragment and a couple of Etrusco-Campanian bowls, underline the importance of the site. A few of the Greek imported vessels, Attic black-figured and red-figured kylikes, cups and lekythoi are attributed to well-known Attic painters and their schools, for example Oltos or Epiktetos, Douris (?), the Athena painter and the Brygos painter and his circle (Figs. 82:12, 9, 11, 4, 10; 89:4, 9, 8). One explanation of these finds can be the closeness of the bridge to the main transit road, La Dogana, with links to the coastal cities of Cerveteri and to the emporia of Pyrgi and Gravisca. A fragment of an Attic black-glazed cup/skyphos, dated to 480 B.C. joins another fragment found in stratum 3 near the well, i.e. the soil under the tufa packing (Fig. 89:10). This shows that the cup was not intentionally put there, but belonged to the debris of the filling.

The four to five Attic lekythoi found in the debris may have been used as oil containers, either for the table, or for personal use in sports, for perfumed oil used by the women, or for funeral use (Figs. 82:3–5; 89:4, 14; Table 24). The Etruscans used the lekythos, common during the late Archaic time, while the alabastron and the aryballos were the corresponding vessels for oil during the Orientalizing period and the early Archaic. The small amount of oil or essences in the lekythoi or alabastra may have had both economic as well as medical purposes. Iris oil seems to have been used for a long period of time in funeral practices in the Middle East, Egypt and Greece. Did the Etruscans use similar ethereal oils and essences and where in that case did they acquire it? Was it also used in cult or in funerary preparations? These are difficult questions to answer. Lekythoi with garlands are often seen placed outside beside the tomb or on the tombstone seen on Attic imported vessels.

The pottery forms are the usual sets of equipment of an ordinary household. An important observation is the high concentration of bucchero forms indicating drinking and eating as well as the Greek imports and the many inscriptions on pottery found in such a small area. This fact really sets aside the bridge from other find areas at San Giovenale, including the tombs. Another interesting pottery feature worth mentioning is the large amount of lids, basins and coarse jars of different sizes, ranging from small to very large vessels (see Tables 21–23). These forms of coarse ware suggest that there has been a need for storage and cooking in the houses, for whatever purposes used at banquets for the dead or for travellers resting and eating in an inn at the bridge or as storage for liquid goods.

There are many occasions in life to gather and to celebrate with food and drink. What kind of celebrations we are dealing with here may depend on how we interpret the find categories; ordinary daily meals for travellers, feasts, sacred meals or funeral meals (see below).

---

756 San Giovenale 5:2 forthcoming; San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming; San Giovenale 3:2 forthcoming.
757 This is based on both published material and unpublished material from the Swedish Institute in Rome. The tombs excavated by the Italian archaeologists are not yet published in full. Some results have been reported in articles and in the information signs put up in front of the tumuli and chamber tombs at San Giovenale. For example, they mention the import of Lakonian, and Chalkidian pottery.
758 Reusser 2002, 269–270, has also concluded that Attic pottery was distributed in various contexts (thesis 1) and bought for various reasons, not specifically for the funerals (thesis 2). He has after the investigations of Attic pottery found in many Etruscan and Campanian settlements been able to conclude (thesis 3) that the Attic vessels were common in central places as well as in the hinterlands, and that they were also used by other social classes than the aristocracy or the upper class (thesis 4) and that they were not seen as luxury goods (thesis 5).
759 Cf. Backe-Forsberg forthcoming a. Pottery by the Brygos painter and his circle has also been found in the workshop quarter on the Borgo, cf. San Giovenale 5:3 forthcoming.
760 Sparkes & Talcott 1970.
761 Flavours of their time 1999, 44–49, 50, 55, and 262–265. The use of scented oils has been revived today through the many aroma therapists and the alternative doctors (healers) using flower remedies essences extracted from flowers; cf. Medeiros 1995, 4–9, and 19–20.
762 Salskov Roberts 2002, 11, figs. 4–5.
The buildings in the bridge complex: identification and function

The architectural remains, e.g. the buildings at the northern bridge abutment, have already been presented in chapter 2. The character of the two buildings as well as the pottery and the small finds signal ambigiousness concerning function, which has urged me to discuss whether we can talk about multiple integrated functions. In the following these structures and their identification and function will be discussed from a secular aspect, whereas the sacred aspect will be dealt with below in chapter 4.

There are certain difficulties in distinguishing a structure as a private or a public building, a secular or a sacred building. As mentioned earlier in chapter 1, Damgaard Andersen has argued for four criteria for the identification of domestic buildings: the form, the size, the location of a building, and the remains found. In the following these structures and their identification and function will be discussed from a secular aspect.

Given that the construction of House 1, the first abutment bridge and the road were constructed at the same time, they should be treated as a unit in the discussion of function, as is also the case for the succeeding House 2 and Houses 3A-B.

Before the finds are combined with each structure of the bridge complex and the functions discussed, it will be necessary to apply the four above-mentioned criteria on the four buildings from the bridge, i.e. on House 1, House 2 and Houses 3A-B.

(a) Domestic function. The definition of a house is a building with a stone foundation, dug down or laid directly on the ground, with a rectangular, square, trapezoidal or an apsidal ground-plan, and a domestic house is defined by its rectangular or oval ground-plan, that is a rectangular house with one or several rooms, or a hut used by a family or household. There are, so far, only a few examples of trapezoidal, oval or apsidal ground-plans. The most popular plan is the rectangular one, with either one or several rooms in one or two storeys. At the bridge complex both rectilinear and apsidal buildings were found.

Some scholars have also tried to identify different types of domestic houses, such as oikos, Breit-house and courtyard houses, i.e. a classification of architecture without any mentioning of function. The sizes and the number of rooms of these types may therefore vary depending on the function. This leads to the question of what the ground-plan and the other architectural features really tell us about the function. There are two rectilinear buildings at the bridge: House 1 has two rooms and measures c. 11×5 m, and House 2, with a single room, measures 5×5.5 m. Both buildings had two-saddle faced roofs and were covered with tiles. These two houses correspond well in size with the domestic houses on the Acropolis (Fig. 12b). The abnormal ground-plan in the apsidal shape found in Houses 3A-B, has so far no parallel in Etruscan architecture.

To fulfil the requirements for a domestic building, the finds inside it should be domestic pottery, braziers, and hearths, spinning and weaving implements. Other criteria are a courtyard, a beaten earth floor and a hearth. The location of the building is also important, whether it is built alone or together with other similar

---

765 Renfrew 1994 has listed some criteria for identifying rituals in a context.
766 All domestic buildings in Archaic Etruria and Latium are listed in Damgaard Andersen 1998, diagrams 7–8. Many of these criteria also fit sacred buildings, cf. Bouma 1996, part 3. The location of several buildings in a town; burials of infants under floors or just outside the houses. Domestic pottery, (hearths), spinning and weaving implements, see Damgaard Andersen 1998, 206.
767 Damgaard Andersen 1998, 206. This definition is used for urban houses.
768 See the discussion of the oval building with a supposed tiled roof in Ficana, and the apsidal walls at Tarquinia in Damgaard Andersen 1998, 72f.
769 This ground-plan has been interpreted by Quilici as a casa torre and supported by Colonna, see also Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, 78, n. 44. Damgaard Andersen also mentions the apsidal building at the bridge, cf. Damgaard Andersen 1998, 72f.
770 Buildings with two storeys have been found at Murlo, the insula on the slope of the Palatine, a house on the Via Sacra, interpreted by Gjerstad as having two storeys, cf. Gjerstad 1972. For alternative reconstructions, cf. Manino 1988; Damgaard Andersen 1998, 72 and nn. 327–328.
773 The apse is a common ground-plan used for domestic dwellings in Greece during the Late Bronze Age and the Geometric periods, see Mazarakis Ainian 1997.
houses. The only furnishing in the two rectilinear houses consists of the \( \pi \)-shaped tufa and pebble bench along three walls (one whole wall and half of the two other walls). The rectangular house had a small porch outside room A, with a well dug very near the entrance. In the backyard there was in either case two basins, carved from a big tufa boulder. All these features, together with the domestic character of the pottery, the braziers and the cooking-stands, and the small finds especially the implements of textile production may be taken to speak in favour of a domestic interpretation of the houses: a house for the keeper of the bridge and his family or just an ordinary family.

What speaks against this interpretation is, above all, the close location of the house to the bridge deep down in the river valley and only c. 20 m from the southern side of the necropolis of Casale Vignale. The main settlement is instead located high up on the promontory. In view of the strict division of the living and the dead found here and in other Etruscan settlements the location of the two houses does not favour an interpretation of them as domestic buildings.

It would also have been a risky place for an ordinary family to live in time of unease, due to the vulnerable location at the brook, i.e. the strategic position at the boundary between the two settlements. Even if the area would have been surrounded by a fortification wall as the settlements on the Acropolis and the Borgo NW obviously were, it was not suitable for a family, but perhaps rather for soldiers or guardians of the bridge (see below). However, the finds point to a function where eating, drinking, cooking, and storage seems to have been important ingredients.

\( (b) \) way-station, and inn/tavern. Neither the rectangular, trapezoidal nor the apsidal ground-plan or the size of the buildings contradict the function as a way station and an inn. The most important criteria to consider are the related finds and the location. The furnishing of the \( \pi \)-shaped stone bench together with the numerous finds of drinking and eating vessels of different wares such as the bucchero in room A, Attic imports, serving and cooking vessels related to these structures, indicate a dining-room/living-room or maybe a bedroom. The second room of House 1, room B, could have been used for different purposes, such as storage or cooking. Braziers were used for lighting and heating. The cooking of food on cooking-stands can also have been done in the porch or inside. The well in the porch has supplied fresh water, and the two basins may have functioned for the production of wine as well as for washing and cleaning. All these features, together with the location along a road and near a bridge, indicate a function as a way-station, a place where travellers could rest and have something to eat.

The preparation and cooking of meals could have been done outdoors as well as indoors, according to Scheffer, who counts with two categories of kitchen, e.g. kitchens inside the houses and kitchens in a shed, not far from the main building. The cooking-stands to be put on the portable braziers may indicate either indoor or outdoor cooking, while there is no evidence for special kitchen areas as the examples found at Acquarossa show. The portable braziers would also have served as a source of light, and heat. Bread may have been baked in large pans as the one found at the bridge (Fig. 82:16).

All the various tablewares, as well as coarse ware vessels for cooking and storage, can also be taken to indicate that the building functioned as a tavern, a place for travellers, merchants or locals for eating and drinking before they continued their journey. It is important to consider the closeness to the main road and the turning road leading down to the bridge and its location very near the bridge. The room with the \( \pi \)-shaped bench and its off-centre door in the two rectilinear houses point clearly to a function as a dining room and/or a bedroom.

The location of the building right at the edge of the bridge along a river and a small road, which runs only a hundred metres from the main road, La Dogana, may be an excellent place for travellers, visitors from a distance to rest, eat and meet others. Facilities for washing and drinking are satisfied through the well, the two basins supplied fresh water, and the two basins may have functioned for the production of wine as well as for washing and cleaning. All these features, together with the location along a road and near a bridge, indicate a function as a way-station, a place where travellers could rest and have something to eat.

The preparation and cooking of meals could have been done outdoors as well as indoors, according to Scheffer, who counts with two categories of kitchen, e.g. kitchens inside the houses and kitchens in a shed, not far from the main building. The cooking-stands to be put on the portable braziers may indicate either indoor or outdoor cooking, while there is no evidence for special kitchen areas as the examples found at Acquarossa show. The portable braziers would also have served as a source of light, and heat. Bread may have been baked in large pans as the one found at the bridge (Fig. 82:16).

All the various tablewares, as well as coarse ware vessels for cooking and storage, can also be taken to indicate that the building functioned as a tavern, a place for travellers, merchants or locals for eating and drinking before they continued their journey. It is important to consider the closeness to the main road and the turning road leading down to the bridge and its location very near the bridge. The room with the \( \pi \)-shaped bench and its off-centre door in the two rectilinear houses point clearly to a function as a dining room and/or a bedroom.

The location of the building right at the edge of the bridge along a river and a small road, which runs only a hundred metres from the main road, La Dogana, may be an excellent place for travellers, visitors from a distance to rest, eat and meet others. Facilities for washing and drinking are satisfied through the well, the two basins and many large basins and stands, such as thymiateria (holmoi). If we regard this as a way-station in combination with a place for visitors to rest before or after crossing the river, the essential requirements are

---

774 Damgaard Andersen 1998, 205–206. Pre-historic infants buried under the floor of a house are also seen as a domestic criterion, cf. Ingvarsson-Sundström 2003. 775 For Veii, Tarquinia, Vulci, San Giuliano, and Caere, see Rendeli 1993, figs. 43, 88, 74–75, 90, and in Città d’Etruria 2001, fig. 1 for Veii, for Vulci, p. 179, fig. 1, and p. 187, fig. 1; Rasenna 1986, 507, figs. 1–2; 28; for Tarquinia, Rasenna 1986, 509, fig. 3. The medieval towns were often located on top of the Etruscan and Roman towns, cf. Blera in Santella 1981 map, 2, colour photos on pp. 19, 21, 23, and Civitella Cesi in Santella 1981, map 6, photos 2, 97–98. 776 See Etruscan culture 1962; Karlsson 1999.

---

there: a building with a three-winged tufa stone bench interpreted as a combination of a dining-room and bedroom, and a well with a supply of fresh water for drinking and washing.

The braziers and cooking-stands found were used for cooking, heating and lighting, coarse pottery for cooking and storing, fine pottery for eating, and drinking. The space outdoors could have been used for the horses and donkeys or other beasts of burden, as magazines/storage area for goods and food. The basins in the backyard may have had multiple functions for example, for washing, cleaning with water taken from the well in the courtyard, and for wine making. All these features were suitable for a small taverna along the road.

The rooms have approximately the same size as the dining rooms found at different Greek sites, as well as Etruscan and Latial examples. The bench may in this case be intended as a platform for couches or klinai, beds for reclining. It may also have been used not only to sit on but also to sleep on. The stone bench used as a foundation for couches or madrasses was used for both dining and drinking: banqueting and symposia. The same interpretation has been made for the low beds made of river pebbles, only 8–10 cm high found on the Acropolis, and dated much earlier than the stone benches. Benches in buildings at other sites are interpreted in a similar way. They seem to occur in both domestic buildings as well as public houses like the one along the Via Sacra at Forum Roman in Rome, and also in sacred buildings and palazzi.

Whether the Houses 3A-B with an apsidal layout and with only one room should be classified as a way-station and as an inn is more uncertain. This is to my knowledge the first published apsidal house with one room of its kind in Etruria so there is nothing to compare it with. The pottery, related to the building, consists of Attic imports, bucchero bowls, cups and household pottery. There are no special cooking-stands referred to this phase. Unfortunately, the interior furnishings were lacking, which could have supported the interpretation of the function. But that fact does not exclude the possibility of the House 3A–B functioning as a resting place and a dining room, since the furnishings could have been in a perishable material. The well and the basins may have had the same function as in the preceding phase. A strong indication for the interpretation as a way-station and an inn is the location of the houses along a road and near a bridge.

---


781 Karlsson 1996, figs. 1–2, 264–269; Karlsson 2001. The same kind of low bench made of small rounded stones is seen in the Tomba della Capanna in Cerveteri, Etruscan culture 1962, figs. 74–75; see also Ricci 1955, fig. 73. For the bench as a sleeping bench, see Damgaard Andersen 1998.


783 Damgaard Andersen 1998 mentions the apsidal house. Curved structures are found also in Tarquinia, cf. Damgaard Andersen 1998, but those are not complete curved structures and cannot be compared to the apse-shaped structure at San Giovenale.
Eating and drinking: different kinds of dining. As seen from the abundance of different pottery wares and forms eating and drinking have, as earlier stated, been important activities at the bridge during almost every phase. What does that tell us about the functions of the place? Do these remains belong to an ordinary household, to an inn for travelers or can we talk about real banqueting of the elite and/or banqueting for the dead? What kind of other evidence indicates banqueting or at least food consumption on a regular basis?

The room of the rectilinear Houses 1 and 2, furnished with the tufa bench, was suitable as a dining room. Its interior 4.5×4.3 m is a common size for a dining room with 7-9 couches set along three sides. There is a possibility that the wings were larger in the one-room House 2, since there was no door to consider. There may have been space for at least 5-7 couches, which points to a celebration for a small company with 10-14 persons if two shared one couch. The kitchen terracotta plaques demonstrate that cooking and storage also have been important, even if there are scanty remains of a direct storage facility in the form of e.g. a magazine. The building could only house a relatively small group of persons unless there were other buildings used for the same purpose in the neighbourhood or the dining was performed outdoors.

The banqueting set, viz. the many cups, bowls, jugs and jars indicate that drinking and dining were very important. The drinking cups with or without handles were often used at the symposium, the drinking part of the banqueting, as shown in tombs and on friezes in Acquarossa and Murlo, and the many pestarole, i.e. wine presses found on the Borgo plateau at San Giovenale and maybe in one case at the bridge, indicate the use of wine and of viticulture. However, the finds of small amphorae from the Orientalizing period are quite substantial but larger vessels, used for transporting liquids, are few.

Banqueting has also been depicted on terracotta plaques found at large building complexes at Murlo, Acquarossa, Velletri, and in the necropolis of Ara del Tufo near Tuscania, and in the Regia in Rome. The architectural evidence for a dining room or a banquet hall is attested for in House I on the Acropolis at San Giovenale from an early date (c. 675 B.C.). This room is compared to the innermost room with the π-

---

784 The stone bench measured 4.5×0.9 m at the rear and 2.5–1.8×0.9 m at the wings.
785 The tomb paintings of banqueting show how either one, two or three persons shared a kline, see Etruscan culture 1962, fig. 356 grave stele; fig. 390 terracotta cist with a married couple; fig. 450 (Tomb of the leopards); fig. 454 (Tomb of the lionesses); cf. Rasenna 1998, figs. 7 (Tomba dell’Orco), 223 Tomba della caccia), 224–225 (Tomba degli scudi); 216 ash urn from Chiuss, 298 terracotta plaque (Murlo), 511 on terracotta plaques with three persons on one bed (Acquarossa). The scale and the layout of Greek Archaic and Hellenistic formal dining-rooms, the andron, are very homogenous. The dining-room is defined as ‘a near square room with an off-centre door, and a trottoir (or kline) for the couches around the edge of three-and-a-half sides’, cf. Dunbabin 1998, 82–83. See also Bergquist 1973, 23. The number of couches decides the size. One couch is 1.8 – 1.9 m by 0.8 to 0.9 m, cf. Dunbabin 1998, 83. The Roman dining-room, the triclinium, differs from the Greek andron. The word shows that it is a room with three couches. The Archaic Etruscan dining-room is more like the Greek one, furnished with a stone bench along three walls, in a small room with an off-centre door. This small scale (4×4 m) is also common in rooms with benches at Satricum, cf. Bouma et al. 1995; room 4 in House C at Acquarossa measured 4.8×4.3 m. These dining-rooms are found in sanctuaries, in civic centres and in private houses, cf. Bergquist 1973, 23. For a definition of a banquet, cf. Small 1994b, 86.
786 The two basins at the bridge may also have been used as water basins in purification rituals (see below).
787 Evidence of viticulture is recorded from at least the 3rd century B.C. at the Borgo and on Vignale, cf. Pohl 1980; Pohl 1985; San Giovenale 5:2 forthcoming. The names of Vignale and Casale Vignale also indicate later wine-growing on the hills, cf. also Hemphill 1993; 2000.
788 Costantini & Giorgi 2001, 246. There are quite few examples of large amphorae used for the transport of wine, similar to those found at the farm of Podere Tartuchino.
790 Strandberg Olofsson 1985; Rasenna 1986, figs. 510–511.
791 Fortunati, 1993, 255–265, figs. 7, 12 shows relief plaques with banqueting scenes from the Stimmati temple at Velletri. The Veio-Roma-Velletri type originated from a Caeretan workshops probably even from the same mould.
792 Sgubini Moretti & Ricciardi 1993, 163, 166, figs. 11–13. A wooden chapel in connection with a circular structure, which is a possible altar found in Ara del Tufo necropolis near Tuscania. This building dated to the Archaic and Hellenistic periods is related to funerary cult; see also the terracotta plaques of banquet scenes similar to the Acquarossa C plaques p. 166, figs. 11–13. This shows that similar kinds of revetment terracotta plaques is used to illustrate banqueting in public, domestic as well funerary contexts. The banquet scenes are followed by processions, riding warriors, chariot races, games, as well as seated figures.
shaped beds covered by river stones of the Tomba della Capanna in Cerveteri.\footnote{Rasenna 1986, fig. 265.}

A parallel to this dining-room, however of much later date, can be seen in Room A of House 1 in the bridge complex, dated to the middle of the 6th century B.C., and interpreted as the ‘sacellum’ and probably also in House 2 in the following period, dated from the middle of the 6th century to the first decades of the 5th century B.C. The latter can be compared with the platform, which the reclining beds (\textit{klinai}) in the tombs seem to have been standing on.\footnote{San Giovenale 2:2, figs. 30, 55, 58.}

A similar \pi-shaped bench, completely carved out from the tufa rock, was found on the Borgo in a house consisting of several rooms and located along the main road.\footnote{Etruscan culture 1962, fig. 250; San Giovenale 5:1 forthcoming; personal comments by L. Karlsson.} This bench can be compared to the benches carved out in the tombs. Similar banquet rooms are also found at Acquarossa,\footnote{Bergquist 1973.} Satricum\footnote{Bouma 1996; Maaskant-Kleibrink 1992 and 1995.} and at the Forum Romanum in Rome.\footnote{Pfiffig 1975.} Do they illustrate a special funerary banquet or a banquet of the living, and do they show what the Etruscan ideas of the afterlife were?\footnote{Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999.}

Some finds of terracotta friezes and revetment plaques from a temple associated with a necropolis, indicate that the iconography of banqueting has been used for both categories (see chapter 2.5).

Stone benches have been revealed even in funerary buildings at Castro and in a \textit{sacellum} at Tolfa Allumiere Cavallari,\footnote{Wetter 1962, figs. 182–183; Santuari d’Etruria 1985; Colonna 1986; Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999.} and they also occur frequently in tumuli and chamber tombs as a foundation for the funeral beds.\footnote{See Naso 1997; Etruscan culture 1962, pl. 33, fig. 255.}

(c) custom-house. Another possible function of the bridge complex, already proposed by the excavator,\footnote{Etruscan culture 1962; Materiali e problemi 1984.} may have been to control all those who crossed the bridge and even to collect tax or customs duty for using the bridge. It may have been a customs collector living at the bridge in combination with running an inn. These two functions do not contradict each other. This interpretation is very plausible due to the mere placing of the building at the bridge on the northern riverbank of the Pietrisco brook, being the natural boundary between the two settlements. If the bridge was private property, owned by an aristocratic family, it is natural that tax or toll was paid by the locals as well as travellers, for using the bridge. It is, however, difficult to speculate on the nature of the tax or duty paid, whether it was a private or public tax or if the toll was paid with perishable goods such as bread, herbs, fruit, wine and oil etc. since there are, unfortunately, no traces left. The surviving finds are the pottery, such as the imported painted and linear decorated Etrusco-Corinthian plates from Tarquinia and Vulci, the fine bucchero vessels probably originating from Caere, fine Greek imported black-figured, red-figured and black-glazed drinking cups and \textit{lekythoi}, spinning and weaving implements, and the metal objects, including the piece of pure copper, an \textit{aes rude} (?). All these items are plausible duty goods for using the bridge.

(d) \textit{watch-house} - casa torre. There has been earlier a discussion on whether the whole promontory of San Giovenale was fortified or not.\footnote{Karlsson 1999. A high and long tufa wall of 58 reused tufa blocks in 8 courses, 23 m long, dividing the Borgo area and the Acropolis, was also interpreted as a fortification wall, dated to c. 300 B.C. This theory was based only on historical and topographical information, since San Giovenale and Luni were situated at the border between the territories of Tarquinia and Caere. This area was affected by the war between Rome and Tarquinia, a period of great turbulence when the Roman started to expand in the area, Nylander 1986b, 38–39; Blomé 1984, 81; Blomé 1986, 56–58, 81. There are, however, some doubts both about the dating and its function. Pohl has argued for a date during the 3rd century B.C. due to seven blocks with profiles of \textit{kyma reversa}, a technique not used until the 3rd century B.C. while other scholars have interpreted it as an early medieval fortification wall, dated to the 6th and 7th centuries.} One important reason for a strong protection against intruders from the north or south is the location of the site at the political border between Caere and Tarquinia. The tufa landscape, with its steep hillsides and river valleys, created a natural defence of the sites and promontories such as San Giovenale and Vignale. They were important strategic places to control the traffic along the roads in both the north and south directions. It is plausible to suggest that there was some kind of strengthening of the natural defence system by high tufa walls or wooden palisades to make it more difficult to climb the hillsides. The new evidence on the northern cliff west of the Borgo NW slope of a palisade wall dated to the Protovillanovan period, and a later city wall of square tufa blocks from the early 6th century B.C. can be seen in that light.\footnote{Etruscan culture 1962; Materiali e problemi 1984.}
The excavations in Area C on the Acropolis yielded a few monumental structures dated from 625-530 B.C., e.g. walls and a tiled house with two storage rooms and a ‘cantina’ at the edge of the plateau and remains of two huge walls of large ashlars tufa blocks on the 155-150 m level further down in the slope (Fig. 2a). The monumental building was built at a very strategic place with an excellent view over comings and goings at the ford over the Vesca. It probably functioned as a dwelling but also as a watch-house during the Etruscan period. Remains of post-holes of huts (?) and Protovillanovan pottery and the post-holes above the Etruscan double wall at the slope may indicate an earlier defense system on the Acropolis already during the Protovillanovan period. Also on the westernmost part of the plateau there are huge blocks forming part of the city wall (Fig. 2a).

Whether the bridge complex was part of this defense system during the Iron Age and the Archaic period is uncertain. Since it is closely situated to the town, only c. 50 m away from the main road La Dogana, it is natural to expect some kind of defence at this place. The location at a physical boundary between two settlements, made it vulnerable at periods of unrest. Another strong reason for a protective function was the close vicinity to the Casale Vignale necropolis and its large tombs, by the Pietrisco road and its easy access to the main road, that is to say also the entrance to the town.

The main road and the activities down at the ford over the Vesca could also be controlled from the double walls on the southern slope of the Acropolis mentioned above. It was not that easy to arrive unseen on the main road into the town, but it was easier for an intruder to sneak over the ford or go down streams and follow the northern bank of the Vesca or the southern bank of the Pietrisco until they reached the bridge. Therefore, soldiers or locals may have guarded the place during periods of unrest. San Giovenale is, after all, a frontier town between the Caeretan and the Tarquinian territories (Fig. 10). Attacks could be expected from the southern and also from the north depending on which city-state San Giovenale belonged to. Therefore, the long monumental wall along the northern riverside of the Pietrisco could have functioned as a defensive wall with a wooden palisade, at least during building phase 1. A similar situation with fortification installations during two periods, Protovillanovan and Archaic, is argued for at the northern side of Borgo.

The apsidal structure by the bridge has been proposed as being such a watch-house, a casa torre. This theory is even more likely after the discovery, under the floor of the building, of the inscribed bucchero sherd with *Lurs (?) Larunita*, an Etruscan god with a warrior aspect, and protector of the boundary. The previous two rectilinear buildings may have had the same function during the preceding phases. It is important, however, to see this as a function integrated with the two functions already discussed, and the sacred function discussed below. If it has only been a watch-house, it would be difficult to explain the existence of such high quality Greek imported red figured ware and black-glazed ware as well as the serving sets of bucchero. They may have been used by the custo-dkeeper or the officer in charge, but that is unlikely, as the vessels were probably high status goods more appropriate to the aristocratic families. The bridge complex, strategically placed along the road and the bridge carrying the road over the river, may thus have played an important part of the defence system of the site during periods of unrest.

On the other hand there are no structures left on the southern side of the river Pietrisco pointing to a defensive character of the bridge. The northern steep hillside of the Vignale would have been a good place to watch over the bridge. The apsidal house may have

---

807 Karlsson 1999.
808 Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, n. 44. A large public apsidal building (10×9 m) was recently found at Stageira in Greece and identified as a kind of tower in a fortification. It was built of well-carved blocks of poros, marble and limestone. One reused block had an inscription, which, however, could not help in identifying the function of the building, dated to the 6–5th century B.C.; cf. Ridgway 2002, 178, figs. 113.
809 This base of a fine bucchero cup was found under the floor of the apsidal house 3A. As stated in chapter 2.3 it is almost hundred years earlier than the inscription, which is dated to c. 480/470 B.C. It may have been a complete cup or just an ostraka used for a dedication to the god *Lurs (?) Larunita*, cf. Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, cat. no. 37, figs. 6, 10.
810 Karlsson 1999; San Giovenale 3:1 forthcoming; Etruscan culture 1962; 302–304, figs. 276–278.
functioned more as a watch-house in the last building phase when a large part of the area was covered by a well limited stone packing used as a platform or a road beside or in front of the apsidal house 3B. There is neither any other indication of struggle save the single iron arrow found in the debris.

3.3.5 Concluding remarks

The archaeological remains from the Pietrisco bridge have been interpreted in relationship to various scales of contexts. The monumental bridge complex, as a means of communication between two habitations, played an important social and economic role for the Etruscans living on the settlement hills on either side of the Pietrisco brook during a long period of time, viz. c. 800 to c. 200 B.C. or even later. The contacts between the towns, villages and single farms in the neighbourhood were facilitated by roads cut into the tufa or constructed on even ground, and by bridges and fords radiating from the settlement in all directions. The roads have played an important role on all three levels: the local, the interregional and the intraregional.

The characteristics of the place also strengthen dichotomy concepts, such as: us and them; the living and the dead; humans and gods. The physical boundaries between the settlements and the necropoleis are narrow though very clearly seen in the rivers and the gullies creating sharp borders between those living on one side of the river and those on the other. The environment affected the organisation of the settlement into working areas and residential areas, as well as the clear separation of the living and the dead on two hills, separated either by a ford, a ravine or a river but connected by a bridge.

The Etruscan aristocratic families, known through the many inscriptions on pottery in the bridge complex and from the settlements, had connections in Caere and Tarquinia, and they were in charge of the workers, the freedmen, and the slaves. The Pietrisco bridge played during a long period of time a major economic and socio-political role as the link between the settlements on the Vignale and the San Giovenale plateau. Whether there was any social differentiation between the inhabitants on the Vignale hill and the San Giovenale plateau is so far not known (Fig. 102).

The strategic position of San Giovenale as a frontier boundary is mirrored by the probable defence walls around the Acropolis and the Borgo, maybe even the moat across the plateau, as well as buildings functioning as watch-houses located along the road at important gateways and crossings. The political situation between the city-states probably demanded a strong defence during periods of unease.

That San Giovenale and Vignale, located along an important commercial route, have been a transit place for goods, people and animals, are shown for example in the inscriptions of personal and family names, as well as the imported goods found at the bridge, in the settlements and in the tombs. The debris indicating metal activity, the imports of iron ore, copper, lead and zinc, either from the Tolfa mountains, Colline Metallifere or the island of Elba are examples of imported goods. Another is the evidence of imports of various pottery wares from Tolfa, Tarquinian, Caeretan, Faliscan, and even Campanian workshops. The import of Greek pottery, mainly from Attica, shows that a substantial trade and exchange of goods took place during a long period on an interregional and as well as an intra-regional level.

The close location to La Dogana and other roads in the road system on the Vignale and the Casale Vignale hills strengthen the theory that especially Houses 1–2, with one room equipped with a z-shaped bench for a dining or banqueting reclining on couches, could have functioned as a way-station, a public rest place and an inn for travellers as well as a watch house, casa torre, and a place where customs were paid for using the road and the bridge. Despite their lack of interior furnishings, this may also have been the case with the apsidal Houses 3A–B. The archaeobotanical and the archaeozoological remains, taken together with the abundance of vessels for drinking, eating and cooking, strengthens the suggestion that banqueting took place in Houses 1 and 2 and probably also in Houses 3A-B.

It may have been important for the travellers and the merchants in their social and economic enterprises to use the bridge complex and its facilities as a meeting point, as well as for the local herdsmen transferring their flocks of animals, e.g. sheep and goats from the pastures on the Vignale hill over to the San Giovenale settlement and the Vesca ford. Other neighbouring herdsmen, who transported animals from the mountains down to the coastal pastures by using the main road, established market places and located near the sea, a river, along roads, and transhumance routes, cf. Edlund 1984; 1987, 85–92.

---

811 See the Roman military way-stations from Rome and northward mapped on the Tabula Peutingeriana, Etruscan culture 1962, pl. 18.
812 Damgaard Andersen 1998, 181. See the discussion of the meaning of a meeting point in Turner 1979. For a ‘political’ sanctuary Edlund suggests a large, open and walled area for a meeting place and an altar. Banquets were probably held there. A political sanctuary was administered by several places and located near the sea, a river, along roads, and transhumance routes, cf. Edlund 1984; 1987, 85–92.
may have stopped for a rest and a drink at the local inn or to visit the road sanctuary. A narrow bridge on a well-travelled road always becomes a kind of meeting place.

The arguments for and against the more practical functions during the established phases have been listed in Tables 39–40, and a discussion of multiple functions will follow below in chapter 3.5.

3.4 THE MENTAL LANDSCAPE: SYMBOLIC AND RITUAL ASPECTS

The functions of the archaeological remains in the bridge complex, discussed in the preceding section, have all been of a secular and more practical kind. However, in the following the intention is to investigate the bridge complex and its various contexts from symbolic and ritual aspects.

The natural landscape creates a framework for how the territory will appear. The physical environment with its wide flat tufa plains, which suddenly and abruptly changes into a dramatic ravine landscape with steep hillsides created by the streaming river water, show very clearly sharp contrasts between plain and ravine, land and water. Specific natural features, such as mountain peaks, large single trees and groves, wells, springs, rivers, large moulded stones or rocks, boundaries between land and water, caves etc. have often been considered to be numinous. It would have been easy for the ancients to mythologize these places.\(^{813}\) The spirits and the gods living there had to be respected and honoured with sacrifices and rituals, which some of the archaeological remains in the bridge complex at San Giovenale may indicate (see below).

The concept of mental landscape\(^ {814}\) with its symbolic and ritual character will be treated in a similar way as the physical, the economic, and the socio-political landscape with the remains from the bridge complex as a point of departure and as a link between all landscapes (Figs. 101–102).

In the following, various symbols of status and power, such as tombs, grave gifts, literacy and banqueting will be discussed. Furthermore, mental boundaries, liminality and liminal zones, road buildings and different kinds of rituals connected to them will be treated as well.

813 Dowden 2000, 29.
814 See chapter 1.4.3 for a definition of mental landscape. See also Ermischer 2003.

3.4.1. Symbols of status and power in the community at San Giovenale

Tombs

Large tumulus tombs have been considered symbols of power, showing an aristocratic status of the people living in the settlement. The organization of cemeteries in the city-state seems to have been inspired by the same patterns used in the city-state. The custom of building monumental tombs along the roads leading into a settlement was probably meant to show the visitors the power of the community and the status of the aristocratic families. The tumuli on the Casale Vignale hill were similar to the minor tumuli in the Banditaccia and the Monte Abatone necropoleis at Caere. They must have been impressive, already at a distance, for those who entered San Giovenale along La Dogana from the east as well as from the north (Figs. 2a-b, 32, 33a–b). The tumuli in the Porzara necropolis, north of the settlement, were of different sizes. Minor chamber tombs cut into the tufa rock side by side could be seen only by travellers walking along La Dogana where it passed under the Borgo Bridge, as well as the chamber tombs along the Strada delle Pogette. The rock-cut tombs continued along La Dogana on the other side of the Vesca (Figs. 2a–b).

Grave gifts

To judge from the published Late Iron Age and Archaic tombs and information on recently investigated tombs in preliminary reports by the Gruppo Archeologico Romano (G.A.R.), pottery is the most frequent category of grave gifts, equally distributed in the necropoleis. The most dominant forms, irrespective of type of wares, are the cup, the bowl and the jug, indicating drinking, eating and pouring either for the deceased or during a meal at the time of the funeral. Jars in various sizes for storage were also common. The Greek imports, especially the Attic imports of drinking sets, are found in some richly furnished tombs, indicating that banqueting was important both for the dead soul, as the wall paintings of banqueting in tombs show and for the living, seen in the relief plaques with banqueting motifs from the courtyard houses at Acquarossa, Murlo, Vetralla and the Regia at Forum Romanum in Rome.\(^ {815}\) Especially the Castellina Camerata and the Montevangelo tombs yielded a large number of Greek imports (cf. Table 37).\(^ {816}\)

816 See also the compilation of Attic imports from tombs in San Giovenale and other cities by Reusser 2002, tables 3–21.
The imported pottery may be considered as status gifts reserved for the aristocracy.\(^{817}\) Other such categories are the jewellery: bronze and iron fibulae, discs, pendants of precious metals, such as gold and silver, amber beads from necklaces,\(^{818}\) the iron weapons, bronze vessels, the glass beads and the glass vessels. The number of those finds is small and this may be due grave robbers, ancient, as well as modern.

The carriage is another such status symbol as well as a symbol of power and an aristocratic symbol. Some examples of iron wheel-dressings with nails and wood still attached to them were found in several tombs, often in the dromos, and they may indicate that the deceased was transported to the grave on a chariot with iron dressed wheels.\(^{819}\) This enforces the idea as to how the grave was seen as an important liminal zone with the funeral transport (\textit{ekphora}) of the dead on a chariot drawn by horses or mules.\(^{820}\) Finds of small terracotta wagons and wheels are seen as symbolic objects showing a kind of rite of passage, or as simply a status object to display that the family could afford to give their ancestors a worthy burial.

All the bronze and iron nails and mountings also found in the tombs may have been used in the decoration of the cart. The members of the lower classes may have been carried to the grave.\(^{821}\) The grave gifts also have a cosmologic symbolism. The carriage is a symbol of the safe journey to the world of the dead, since it carried the corpse to the grave and was left there.

\(^{817}\) Reusser 2002, 269–270, has another opinion. He states that the Attic pottery was more spread among the classes and not reserved for the aristocracy in the city-states, based on finds from various contexts in Etruscan and other settlements. However, I find it difficult to see which social class the pottery belonged to. Many of the aristocratic families or the upper classes seem to have moved into new settlements in the Hinterland of each city-state and they may have brought the pottery with them or bought new ones.


\(^{819}\) Sorrentino 1991, 1:5, 34, n. 32; see also tomb P.P.1 in Montevangelo, 113; Porzarago tombs, P2, P4, P6, P11, P12. Such a funeral cart was found in the Regolini-Galassi tomb, and has now been reconstructed, cf. Sorrentino, 1991, 97. See also the drawing of a funeral chariot driven by two horses in Pfiffig 1998, fig. 73a. Two parade chariots, one life size and the second a smaller votive offering, were found under the \textit{dromos} of a tomb in the necropolis of Caiolo at Barbarano, cf. Sorrentino 1991, 15.

\(^{820}\) Izzet 1996.

\(^{821}\) Sartorio 1994, fig. 24.

Still another class of gifts to the dead is the faience scarabs indicating status as well as cosmologic symbolism.\(^{822}\) The Egyptian scarab is an amulet for resurrection and transformation after death and laid on the body at the funeral.\(^{823}\) Imported as well as locally made scarabs have been found in aristocratic tombs in Etruria and Latium and are interpreted as an apotropaic symbol.\(^{824}\)

\(^{822}\) A small unfinished agate scarab was found in the upper layer of Court A in Area F East and dated to Hellenistic time, cf. \textit{San Giovenale} 4:1 forthcoming. Two more faience scarabs dated to an earlier period than the one mentioned above were found at San Giovenale, pers. comment by U. Hansson.

\(^{823}\) Lexikon der Ägyptologie 968–970. The hieroglyph for scarab means transformation.

Table 37. The distribution of grave goods in the Etruscan necropoleis at San Giovenale and Vignale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Necropolis/grave goods</th>
<th>Porzaro</th>
<th>Grotte Tufarina</th>
<th>Casale Vignale</th>
<th>Castellina Camerata</th>
<th>Montevangone Pontesilli</th>
<th>La Staffa</th>
<th>Valle Vescia</th>
<th>Fosso del Pietrisco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>525 B.C.</td>
<td>400–275 or 250 B.C.</td>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking/eating/pouring vessels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plate</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kantharos</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kyathos</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skyphos</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goblet</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kylix</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krater</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phiale</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kotyle</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jug, oinochoe, olpe</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vases for storing liquids and solids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jar</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lid</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pyxis</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aryballos</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alabastron</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vase-carrier</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amphoriskos/amphora</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storage jar/dolium, pithos</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stand</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holmos/thymiaterion</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek imports</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinthian imports</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBF pottery</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tc objects</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protemes ring-vase</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proteme, coffin, egg,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whorls</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loom-weights</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whorls</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whorls</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ae plate, Fe frgs.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ae plaque,</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe knife</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ae arrowhead lance</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe spearhead</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe spearheads, Fe</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buckles?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheel -dressings/</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mountings, Fe</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implements</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ae &amp; Fe</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ae &amp; Fe nails</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture revetments</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe nails</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ae &amp; Fe nails</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coins 250-260 AD</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewellery</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ae fibula, pendant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ae fibula</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ae bracelet, ring</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fibula</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ae fibula, Ag</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ae pendant, Ag</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ae pendant, Ag</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ae pendant, Ag</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair pin, Fe ring,</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibula</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair ring</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hairpin, Fe ring,</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibula</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewellery</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beads</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faience</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

826 San Giovenale 1:5, 114–126, P.S.1: 9 in main chamber; Berggren & Moretti 1960, 3. On Larices Crepus, see Colonna 1997. This fragmentary brazier was joined with a sherd found in one of the wells excavated in 1957, cf. Pohl 1982, 89–99. This joint strengthens the evidence of a connection between the Borgo and the Montevangone cemetery.
Literacy

In important question is whether the knowledge of reading and writing was something in common for all social groups in the Etruscan community at San Giovenale, or an expression of status and power of the elite. There are different opinions among scholars like Stoddart and Whitley, who claim that these skills were restricted to an elite class during the Archaic period. Cornell, on the other hand, suggests that writing on pottery was a common feature used by ordinary people in the daily life.

The finds of graffiti on pottery found in the bridge complex bear witness of the knowledge of writing and reading among at least some of the inhabitants living in the two settlements on the Acropolis and the Vignale and of those using the road down to the bridge. There is, however, a problem in knowing whether literacy was restricted to a group of specialist scribes or not. The inscription mi larices crepus, found on a brazier in the workshop area on the Borgo and in a tomb has been interpreted as the name of a freedman from the Faliscan area, a potter, making decorated braziers and dolia signed with his name. He may be an example of such a specialist group: a man who worked as a scribe before he was enslaved and now as a freedman connected to the Una family on the Borgo, who could use his former skills. There is also evidence that Greek artisans knew how to sign their work. Due to the lack of signed objects Hodos came to the conclusion that it is more difficult to see if the craftsmen in Etruria were more literate than in Greece. It cannot be excluded that other limited social groups knew how to read and write. The female name Fasthi Alsi points to another problem and that is whether women from a special class could read and write. The large inscription on the bucchero bowl belonging to Fasthi Alsi is of high and distinct letters and clearly meant to be read by others. This woman may have owned the vessel and either written the text herself or had it made by a scribe. Obviously she had chosen to leave it at the bridge as a sacrificial gift. Her role at the bridge may only be hypothesized but it cannot be excluded that she had an assignment for taking care of the cult and the building, as done by the Vestals in Rome.

Banqueting: dining for the living–a status symbol and a ritual for the dead

Banqueting is considered an aristocratic custom, open for both men and women, clearly seen on the relief plaques found on public houses, courtyard houses or so called palazzi. The banquet scenes depicted on walls in chamber tombs have been interpreted in different ways. The most reasonable assumption to me seems to be that these scenes are narratives of various occasions in the life of the deceased.

Evidence of different archaeological finds interpreted as banqueting during the middle and late 6th century B.C. are found in the bridge complex, in the room with the θ-shaped stone bench used as a foundation for klinai, tableware for eating and drinking and pouring and coarse ware for cooking and storage. Banqueting was, however, practiced already during an earlier period in the dining room of House I, the hut phase, in Area F East on the Acropolis where a low θ-shaped bed of white river stones was probably covered with mats and cushions. People drank and ate from a set of pottery of impasto and bucchero cups and bowls of various forms typical of banqueting found on the beds. These are similar to the typical set of banqueting pottery identified at Ficana, and dated to the 7th century B.C.

---

828 Spivey & Stoddart 1990.
830 Colonna & Backe Forsberg 1999. See also the inscriptions from other areas at San Giovenale, e.g. Colonna & Pohl 1979; Colonna 1997; the notebooks of F. Brown and M. Del Chiario 1959, Ricciardi 1986b, Santella 1996; Di Gennaro 1998; San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming.
832 The skills of writing and reading were included in the education of Greek women in ancient times according to Plutarch, cf. Hodos 1998, 198–201.
835 Small 1994b.
836 Karlsson 1996.
837 Karlsson 1996; Rathje 1983.
3.4.2 The bridge complex in a symbolic and ritual landscape: a ritual space with visible and invisible boundaries.

The road and the bridge have hitherto been studied mostly from a secular perspective but here the importance of a symbolic and ritual perspective will be argued, as well as the parallelism between the two views. In the following the Etruscan beliefs about the road and the bridge as features with strong symbolic significance, invoking rituals will be discussed and below the significance of an associated building.

Nature created physical boundaries as well as mental boundaries expressed as liminality, a term often used by anthropologists during the last decades. The definition of liminality and its uses has been discussed earlier in this work in the methodological section of chapter 1. Other examples of constructions are sanctuaries, temples, votive deposits and necropoleis often found at the boundary between two city-states, between local ethnic groups (Etruscans, Umbrians, Latins) or between indigenous and foreign nationalities.\textsuperscript{838} Riva and Stoddart use the term ‘the ritualised boundary’ for three or four levels of liminal zones: the centre of the city, the margins of the city, the margins of the territory and the margins of the Etruscan civilization. In their article from 1996 they only discuss the last three levels and state that tombs are found in the first two transition zones and sanctuaries in all three.\textsuperscript{839}

The margin of the city centre and the margins of the city, where various symbols mark the visible boundaries at San Giovenale, will be discussed.

Examples of symbols marking a ritual space in the landscape\textsuperscript{840} are the cippi as well as individual tombs, sanctuaries (temples, cult buildings - sacella) and votive deposits, often placed at territorial boundaries.\textsuperscript{841}

It is also worth stressing the importance of the act of erecting other boundary markers, such as roads, and bridges, all clearly visible in the landscape.

The Etruscan mortuary ideas were ruled by religious and mythological ideas of the afterlife, reflected in the choice of grave form, funeral architecture and furnishings, and the treatment of the body after death. Riva and Stoddart have pointed out that the aristocratic families and their beliefs of death decided the ritualisation in the Etruscan society.\textsuperscript{842} By studying the funeral contexts at San Giovenale it may be possible to gain some information of these mortuary ideas in the tombs and to identify the liminal boundaries, visible as well as invisible as well as liminal symbols.

Firstly, by looking at the location of the cemeteries it is possible to distinguish boundaries. The eight burial grounds surrounding San Giovenale including Vignale are all placed on the opposite side of a river or gully and clearly separated from the settlement of the living by the crossing of a road or a river by a bridge.\textsuperscript{843} Marking boundaries was important so that the soul of the dead should not interfere with the living. Here we see not only a distinct physical boundary with the bridge, but also an obvious liminal zone where an invisible transformation occurred according to the three-phase scheme used in structural analyses of rituals, that is the rite of separation, the marginal state, and the rite of aggregation.\textsuperscript{844} The cemetery with its family tombs was visible at a safe distance to the living and the dead had vice versa visible contact with the world of the living from the burial site and from another dimension, separated by a river or a road as the liminal zone.

Secondly, the method of interment, cremation or inhumation, influenced the choice of tombs. Cremation was practiced during the Iron Age, seen in the seven pozzo tombs reported from the Porzarago burial ground and a few along the Pietrisco, all with few grave goods.\textsuperscript{845} The view of the treatment of the dead body changed during the Orientalizing period from cremation to inhumation, a custom that continued at San Giovenale to the 3rd century B.C. and is best seen in the many tumulus tombs from the surrounding burial grounds. The tomb forms also varied, from large tumuli and cube tombs (tomba a dado) with several persons buried, to smaller rock-cut chamber tombs with fewer bodies. The chamber tombs are dated from c. 625 B.C. to the 5th century B.C. and divided into five types.\textsuperscript{846} Later, there

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{838} Van Gennep 1960; Turner 1966; 1967; E. Leach 1976; Riva & Stoddart 1996.
\item\textsuperscript{839} Riva & Stoddart 1996.
\item\textsuperscript{840} Rudebeck 2002.
\item\textsuperscript{841} See for example De Polignac 1996; Riva & Stoddart 1996.
\item\textsuperscript{842} Riva & Stoddart 1996, 92.
\end{itemize}
are also more simple tombs, such as Hellenistic and Roman tile-covered tombs e.g. Porzarago, Fosso del Pietrisc and Casale Vignale.847

Thirdly, the custom of putting stone cippi, either around the tomb or on special benches, was meant to mark visible boundaries between the dead and the visitors of the graves. It has further been argued, that the dromos in the tumuli and the chamber tombs was a liminal area, i.e. the utmost zone of transformation into a new world.848

Finally, the funerary architecture and furnishings also depicted mortuary ideas as well as indicating the social group or status of the family. The tombs were built as rooms in an ordinary house protected by the tumulus. Some rooms were furnished as living- and dining rooms with couches on π-shaped stone platforms. Two of the rooms in Tomb P9 from the Porzarago necropolis contained doors and windows, all with frames alla egiziana.849 couches with sculptured legs, benches, incised volutes with traces of paint above the door between the chambers, and traces of black paint on the ridge-pole (columen) as well as on a 5 cm wide band between the wall and the roof.850 A row of iron nails above the lintel was probably used for hanging various objects similar to the tombs in the Banditaccia cemetery at Caere.851 The tombs on the northern slope of the Montevagone hill were also furnished with couches, benches, doors and windows and in one case a small table.852 One of the tombs at the western end of Casale Vignale also had a chair beside the couch, similar to Tomba delle Scudie and delle Sedie at Caere.853 The layout of those rooms is similar to the banqueting room in the bridge complex and the earlier parallel in House I at the Acropolis, showing that the furnishing was the same as in the world of the living.

There are other visible and invisible boundaries in the landscape important to emphasize, such as the river, a distinct physical boundary between land and water, and as a transformation or liminal zone.854 The uniting link between these features is the bridge creating a clear parallelism between the physical and the symbolic landscapes (Fig. 101). This will be demonstrated by an interpretation of the archaeological remains and by looking at ancient views on water as a sacred power at various types of crossings.855

The primary function of a bridge is to connect two banks in order to facilitate the safe crossing of a ravine or a river for people and animals. Religious thoughts about spirits and gods in rivers and especially at crossings and the strong power of flowing water as well as the importance to protect oneself from their powers and to honour them when interfering in their space initiated the need of rituals. Rituals have to be performed every time before the crossing of a stream, but it could also be done once at the construction of the bridge and after every reconstruction.856

A bridge is by itself considered as having a strong symbolic value, especially during the Early Roman period. For example Janus, depicted with two faces, was the god of passages and the keeper of the bridges over the Tiber in Rome.857 Holland argues for a close general connection of Janus with the bridge as a construction. She suggests that the bridge itself is a janus and therefore to be considered as sacred.858 Therefore, the secondary function of the bridge may even be as a link to the gods and the ancestors. This hypothesis is based on the view of the liminal or the transformation zone as a place where neither time nor space exists and where contacts with dead souls and the gods were possible.859 The bridge itself can therefore be regarded as a sanctuary where objects could be thrown into the sacred water to appease the deities. Throwing objects from a bridge was said to have been a yearly...
ritual performed by the Vestals and the pontifex on the sacred bridge Pons Sublicius in Rome.\footnote{Liv. 2.10; Holland 1961.}

Consequently, the road and bridge at the Pietrisco can be regarded as a link between the visible world of the living and the invisible world of the dead, the gods and the spirits, a sacred place where ritual activity was crucial (Fig. 101).\footnote{E. Leach 1976, fig. 8.} Every time the bridge was crossed, either for a burial or a journey, some kind of ritual, a sacrifice of food or liquid or a prayer had to be made in order to appease those gods and spirits dwelling in this liminal zone. The mourners went back to their homes over the bridge leaving the dead in the tomb. But they could also revisit their ancestors in the town of the dead, the necropolis whenever they wanted (Fig. 100).

A parallel situation of such a transformation zone (transition zone), perhaps even more obvious, can be found at the eastern edge of the Borgo plateau, where the road and the bridge linked the settlement areas on the San Giovenale plateau with the Casale Vignale necropolis. The bridge and the road, bordered with the monumental tumuli across the Casale Vignale cemetery, would have had a very strong symbolic value for the inhabitants and also for visitors to this place. This crossing, which is at the same time one of the main gates to the settlement, is also a good example of how important economical and social functions integrate with a symbolic function.

At fords and river mouths structures or artefacts indicating rituals are often found.\footnote{Examples of divinities associated with liminal places, such as crossroads, doors and gates are Hekate, cf. S.I. Johnston 1990, 23–26; 1991, 217–224; Janus cf. Holland 1961. For Turnus (Hermes) as psychopompos, the bringer of the soul to the underworld, see Pfiffig 1975, 240, 369. Calu is an Etruscan chthonic deity, while Vanth, Calusans, Charon and Tuchulcha are death demons, cf. Pfiffig 1975, 319–320, 327–336.} These areas were regarded as liminal or transformation zones where it was important to appease and honour the water gods and nymphs before crossing. At San Giovenale there are at least two locations where we may expect such liminal zones and eventually deposits of votives: where the transit road (La Dogana) fords the Vesca, and where the Pietrisco runs into the Vesca. Hitherto no soundings have been made in this area (Figs. 2–3, 20).

Sanctuaries, temples and sacella are also examples of boundary markers often found at political boundaries, as mentioned earlier. The sanctuaries have been classified and named according to the location and distance from the city boundary, e.g. extra mural, extra urban, rural and political.\footnote{Edlund 1987, 63–93; Santuari d’Etruria 1985, 67–69, 98–99, 116, 127, 149; Damgaard Andersen 1998.} Hitherto no identified sacral buildings have been found outside the settlement area at San Giovenale. However, the small Etruscan tufa building erected along the road and right at the edge of the bridge may be the first such structure. The building has been reconstructed on top of the destroyed structure in all building phases (1–4). Based on the inscriptions of ritual and dedicational character Colonna has interpreted the building as a sacellum of an aristocratic family and with a funerary character. The characteristics of the pottery and the remains of the interior furnishings of the building support the assumption of a building with connections to ritual functions, beside the more practical functions discussed earlier.

One argument against an Etruscan sacred structure would be the rectangular ground-plan of House 1 with a small porch and with the door on the long side. Neither are there any painted and decorated architectural terracottas except red painted tiles and one piece of a red-and-white painted pan-tile. A sacellum and a temple is by definition a sacred construction within a sanctuary, according to Festus.\footnote{According to Fest. 422L a sacellum is defined as ‘sacella dicuntur loca disacrata sine tecto and according to Trebutius, Gell. 8.12.2; ‘locus parvus deo sacratus cum area’. Cf. Damgaard Andersen 1998, 146.} There is, however, a lack of a common definition of what a sanctuary is. Damgaard Andersen defines it ‘as a place consecrated for the reverence and worship of the divine, a place where god and man may meet, outside the domestic sphere’.\footnote{Damgaard Andersen 1998, 142.} H.W. Turner’s view of the functions of a sanctuary is a centre, a meeting place, a microcosm, and ‘as an imminence-transcendent presence’.\footnote{Damgaard Andersen 1998, 142.} He explains the meeting point as a ‘point of communication between heaven and earth, the place where the gods have revealed themselves and where men go to meet their divinities’ (Figs. 11, 101).\footnote{Damgaard Andersen 1998, 142–143.} The locations of a sanctuary may vary— in the woods, a tree, a spring, a cave, as temples and other structures,\footnote{Turner 1979, 22.} by rivers and even as a bridge.\footnote{Turner 1979, 18–33; Damgaard Andersen 1998, 142–143.}

Following those definitions it is more likely to see the bridge itself as a sanctuary, reinforced furthermore by the liminal context at the river. This fits well with Turner’s description of a liminal context. The other associated features, e.g. the buildings, the well, the
basins, the inscriptions, and the pottery, would then complete the picture of the structure as a special building with profane as well as sacred functions beside the more practical ones. The primary aim of the bridge was to connect the two banks of a river or the edges of a ravine in order to transport people and animals safely from one side to another. The bridge, however, seems also to have had a symbolic and ritual function, as a link from the world of the living to the unknown world on the other side, the world of the ancestors and the gods. At such a place it was important to perform various kinds of rituals to protect oneself from the spirits and demons living under the bridge in the water and on the banks, similar to the yearly rituals by the Vestals and the pontifex performed from the sacred bridge Pons Sublicius in Rome.870

Colonna has also proposed another possible function for the building, namely as a funerary house for the ruling family.871 The close position to the river and the necropolis, two important liminal zones indicating a link to the other world, i.e. to the ancestors, the eating and drinking vessels and the names of the gods and ritual words may justify this. However, so far it has been problematic to define such a building type since the architectural remains are scanty; there are no stone foundations, terracottas or cippi with pictures usually found in cemeteries.872 Some architectural terracotta objects could have been used on ‘mortuary chapels’ or on banquet buildings.873 These structures were located in cemeteries874 or near rivers.875 This type of building was connected to the cult of the ancestors, and had a mortuary as well as honorary function.876

Other structures than tombs have not been found in the cemeteries around San Giovenale, unless the remains of a rectangular structure found on Casale Vignale by the surveying students in 2001 should be interpreted as a funeral house, where funerary rituals may have been performed.

---

871 On the interpretation of a sacellum at the bridge, see p. 142; Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, 63, 78.
872 Damgaard Andersen 1998, 217–22 mentions Orvieto, Cannicella, Vetralla, Vulci; Ponte Sodo, Tuscania, Palestrina, Rome, and Cerveteri, and she also discusses whether the buildings were sanctuaries or not.
873 Damgaard Andersen 1998, 220.
875 For example at the other side of the Fiora at Vulci, the funerary building at Ponte Rotto, see Città d’Etruria 2001, fig. 1:10.

The Pietrisco ‘sacellum’ is located a few meters from the bridge and only c. 20 meters from the southern slope of the Casale Vignale necropolis, very close to a few chamber tombs.877 The apsidal building with a tufa stone foundation and pisé or wattle-and-daub walls, had no inner furnishings, unless a high block placed in the straight western wall with two blocks with a cutting c. 20×10 cm on either side of the door, is interpreted as an offering-table. It is difficult to reconstruct the front of the house. It may have had an open front framed with wooden planks with a high ashlar block placed to the right of the door at the top of the small staircase, easy access for people to place things on it (Fig. 98). Another reconstruction of the front and the cuttings in the tufa blocks is that these could be part of high narrow windows, as seen in the façade of a tomb in the Grotta Porcina necropolis.878 These buildings would, according to this mode, have been used as mortuary chapels for a prothesis (lit de parade) and for funeral banquettes. They may have been temporary buildings or buildings constructed of stone and with tiled roofs, with or without architectural terracottas.879

A funeral house was a place where preparations for the dead and annual rituals for the ancestors were made.880 It was important that the last journey to the graveyard was done properly. The importance of honouring the dead in sacrificial meals seems to be crucial, due to the many bowls, plates, cups and jugs found at the site. The location at the bridge may in this case be symbolic. This is the place where you travel from the world of the living to the world of the dead, crossing the bridge as the liminal space where the contact with the gods is strong. It would have been natural to please all the chthonic gods, and the spirits of the underworld, before the transfer of the deceased to the other world, through pouring libations of wine or other liquids, from oinochoai and kylikes.881 The libation is thought to mark the beginning and the end in this transformation process.882

There are at least three options as to where the funerary meal could have taken place at San Giovenale: in the building at the edge of the bridge before or after the funeral, or outside the family grave or in a funerary chapel close by.883 Objects and structures indicating

---

877 The dating of these tombs is unknown.
878 Naso 1996, fig. 126.
879 Damgaard Andersen 1998, 221.
880 Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999.
883 Damgaard Andersen 1993, 81–84, has pointed out that the prothesis may have taken place in a funerary house located in
funerary rituals and meals in close vicinity of the tombs are the temples/funerary chapels built among the tombs, i.e. at Vulci and Velletri. Other examples of such meals are the frequent occurrence of braziers found in Etruscan tombs. One very informative example is the brazier filled with charcoal, together with a bucchero jar, a kylix and kantharoi, metals and two eggs found in a tomb at Caere. The four fragmentary examples of braziers found at the bridge may have been used in such funerary rituals taken place at the bridge. Fragments of braziers stamped with a variety of patterns as well as undecorated are found in a deposit with sacred indications at Vigna Parrochiale at Caere, in different sacred buildings at Gravisca, in a votive deposit at Veii, Pyrgi, and at a cult place at Lanuvium. The use of braziers and different kinds of bowls, vessels for liquids and dry food in sacrificial ceremonies is also mentioned in the Umbrian ritual text.

There are several features that make the bridge complex unique: the location close to a necropolis, along a road, and a river, the architectural remains, the finds as well as the obvious continuity during several phases.

Given that the building at the bridge had a funerary function because of its closeness to the Casale Vignale necropolis and the liminal location at a river, the many finds of pots for eating and drinking, cooking and storage from the bridge, it cannot be excluded that some kind of ritual meal in connection with funerary events had occurred, as stated earlier in this chapter. The rituals may have taken place in the dining room of the rectilinear houses (Houses 1 and 2), but whether any banqueting has taken place in the apsidal house (Houses 3A and B) is more difficult to say because of the lack of interior furnishings. However, the remains of Attic pottery, bucchero bowls and cups strengthen the possibility of banqueting, even during those phases. The liminal position of the bridge and the ‘sacellum’ may have played a major role in the ritual for the dead. The bridge, a sanctuary per se, could be seen as the link between this and the other world. The numerous forms of pottery from various periods indicate, as stated before, drinking, and eating, libations through holes in the bases and the offering of herbs, fruits, bread, meat and objects. If this was made in close connection to the funeral procession, when the body was transported on the chariot to the grave (ekphora), or made in a yearly celebration in honour of the ancestors cannot be argued for. The eating and drinking would also be seen as a social rite, a need for the mourners to gather and to feel allied to each other at times of loss or disasters, the consolidation of the new situation, e.g. the last phase in the rite of passage.

Some cooking-stands are found in sacred contexts but whether those actually are ritual objects or just used by the priests and the priestesses in preparing the ritual meals is impossible to decide. However, the ritual texts from Gubbio give us more information about the

the necropolis or nearby, due to the cippus decorated with a prothesis scene inside a building with architectural terracottas on the roof.

884 Fortunati 1993, fig. 7.
885 Paschinger 1992, fig. 104.
886 This brazier found in Tomb Marrei III, Banditaccia, is now displayed in the Villa Giulia museum, Pieraccini 2003, front cover, fig. 10.
888 Caere 3:2, 401–402, 413, inv. II.10989; 411, 418, inv. 73.3497, 73.8523. See also Pieraccini 2003, 233.
889 Caere 3:2, 418. Pieraccini 2003, 236.
891 Bouma 1996, part 3, 44, n. 407. The temple of Juno Sospita dated to early 5th or late 6th century B.C. preceded a sacellum. The brazier found belonged to a later phase of the temple. See also Pieraccini 2003, 233.
893 Damgaard Andersen 1993, 82, has argued that the cult of the dead and the ancestors were the predecessors of the worship of the chthonic gods and the spirits because of the many paintings of chthonic deities dated to the 4th and the 3rd century B.C. I do not fully agree with her. Given the inscription on a kantharos, interpreted to be the chthonic goddess Vesuna and dated to the middle of the 6th century, contradicts her dating of this cult. Cf. Pfiffig below.
895 Bouma 1996, part 3, 22, n. 148; examples of cult places: Arpino 47, n. 433; Lavinium 86, n. 910; S’Omobono, 107, n. 1171; Campetti II, near porta Caere 108, 1197; Veii, Piazza d’Armi, 79, n. 824. I thank Prof. Scheffer for valuable help in identifying the fragments supposed to come from votive contexts. It is very difficult to relate those to a sacred use with regard to the scanty information about the find contexts.
use of cooking-stands and braziers, for example in purification rituals.

3.4.3 Rituals at the Pietrisco bridge

The fact that sanctuaries and votive deposits are located at boundaries as well as my own suggestion in favour of a liminal location of the bridge complex, has urged me to look more closely at the remains from a more symbolic/ritual perspective. In this section I will focus on some distinct archaeological finds in the bridge complex, which may point to special ritual acts performed in daily life, periodically and on special occasions, or, as pointed out by van Baal and Ekroth, a kind of low- and high-intensity rituals, as well as modified rituals. Since our knowledge of rituals is mostly derived from studies of sanctuaries and burials the interpretation of the finds from the bridge context is very important. I will start by trying to identify possible rites at the bridge through an analysis of some distinct elements chosen from the remains, such as the pottery, and the animal and human bones and then continue with rituals connected to water.

Ritual as defined in chapter 2 may be performed (1) at a place with special natural associations (e.g. a cave, a grove of trees, a spring or a mountain-top); (2) in a special building used for sacred functions (a temple or church); (3) at attention-focusing devices as altars, benches, hearths and in movable equipment (lamps, gongs, bells, ritual vessels, censers, altar cloths, paraphernalia of ritual; (4) when the sacred zone is rich in repeated symbols.

Crossing a river or building a bridge over a river was an act of disrespect for the spirits living there and, in politicised landscape, Riva & Stoddart 1996, 91–92.

Based on the above-described features, there seems to be a preference for daily, annual rites and rites on special occasions in the ‘sacellum’ or on the bridge at the Pietrisco brook. Ekroth has discussed these kinds of rituals but has chosen, as mentioned earlier, the terms low-intensity and high intensity rituals, a classification first made by van Baal. The special character of a high intensity rite is that it is often performed when the good relation to the gods is disturbed in connection to major catastrophes, for example sacrifices of humans and dogs performed in a crisis for purification purposes, and at places of crossings. The low-intensity rite is used to keep up a good relation to the spirits and the divinities on a daily basis, for example the different kinds of food-offerings and the cult of the dead.

Of special interest are plates with or without graffiti, found in a cultic context, and the view that they have been used in cultic ceremonies for libations and gifts. This may explain the function of the many plates found in levelling layers and other strata, as well as the plates deposited as grave gifts in the tombs. How shall we interpret the many plates found in the Borgo settlement? Were they ordinary tableware or were they meant for rituals in tombs and sacred buildings? The Subgeometric and Etrusco-Corinthian plates referred to

Evidence of yearly ceremonies at crossings on Forum Romanum or when a bridge was inaugurated, see Holland 1961.

A similar scenario may be for the funerary chapel (Venus cloacina) on the other side of the Fiora river at Vulci, Bartoccini 1960, Città d’Etruria 2001, fig. 1:10, the funeral building at Ponte Rotto. Due to the location in a cemetery the building has been interpreted as a shrine for the family buried in the large tumulus grave, Carter 1998, but it can also have functioned for funerary meals and for prothesis, cf. Damgaard 1998, 220, appendix vol. 2, diagram 7 building identification; see also a map of possible and certain funerary buildings in fig. 153; Rendeli 1996, fig. 62, n. 48, 171 the living space separated from the space of the dead.

van Baal 1976, 168-172.


as *spanti*, after the Etruscan inscription *spanti*, on a plate, are thought of as having been made specially for pouring libations (Fig. 78:4–6, 8–9). Other vessel forms related to libations are the *oinochai* and the *kylikes*, which occur frequently in pottery remains. The *phiale* is another pottery form only represented by a small number (Fig. 90:27–28). Among hundreds of bases of different pottery wares and forms, there were only three vessels with perforated bases (c. 1 cm in diameter), viz. one in coarse ware made before firing, found on the southern river bank, one buccero cup/bowl drilled after firing and one big whole made after the firing in the bottom of a red-slip jar found on the northern bank (Figs. 90, 106). Another perforated hole was recently identified on an early carinated buccero chalice in a cistern on the Vignale hill together with a lot of coarse and fine pottery indicating libations. Having a chthonic and death aspect, the libation of wine from cups may also have been a tribute to *Fufluns*, the Etruscan wine god.

A fifth, quite small perforated hole at the bottom of an Attic black Figured eye-cup decorated with the head of a gorgon (*Medusa*), seemed to be of the same kind as the other four examples, but a very small joining fragment showed that it could be a mending-hole instead. A similar hole at the bottom of an Etrusco-Corinthian bowl/plate was found in one of the tombs in the *Vale Vesca* necropolis not far from the settlement (Fig. 2b).

Other examples of perforated holes were noted in the dump at Vigna Parrochiale in Caere. Some have a small hole in the middle of the base, sometimes perforated after firing, sometimes before, and some seem to have been deliberately chopped off, rounded as they are.

This phenomenon has also been noted in Greece, mostly in funerary contexts, in Southern Italy and Sicily. Several examples of perforated holes were found at the city of Metapontion. In the Pantanello necropolis holes were found in the bases of all kinds of Late Archaic Ionian vessels, open (cups, *skyphoi*) as well as closed (jars, *amphorae*, jugs) of fine and coarse ware pottery. Ionic vessels from the 6th century B.C. with such holes were also found at a spring and interpreted as vessels for libations to chthonic deities.

There are several reasons for perforating the base of a vessel. One explanation is ‘a ritual killing of the vessel to render it useless to the living or perhaps useful to the deceased’, but a practical function cannot be excluded. The vessels found inside and outside tombs have been used in funerary rituals and especially at the libation, which is seemed to be the culmination of the funeral. The sacrifices (the *choai*) of different liquids were poured from jugs and *amphorae* into all kinds of cups, *skyphoi* and *phialai*. My suggestion is that the perforated bowls and drinking cups found at the bridge indicate pouring libations of wine, water, milk and honey to appease the chthonic spirits and deities, as well as the dead souls on various occasions. This ritual, together with more substantial animal offerings, may have occurred during periods of turmoil and sudden catastrophes like earthquakes.

At Satricum the deposits of jars with remains of meat and other food residuals were found, indicating that ordinary pottery, viz. cooking jars and other coarse ware jars and bowls would be used in rituals. The abundance of this kind of pottery found at different levels at the bridge, unfortunately not in situ as in Satricum, may offer a clue as to an integrated use of the coarse pottery.

**Animal sacrifices**

The bones of sheep/goat, pig and cattle found in the remains are evidence of either everyday meals or ritual ones or both. Some rituals have been documented in the ritual texts inscribed on the six Iguvine bronze tables found at Gubbio in Umbria. They contain some lines on sheep as well as different kinds of bread sacrificed to...
Vesuna and Pomone (Puemeone Puprise), and information about other organic products, e.g. vegetables, incense, flour, oil, wine, salt, and other agrarian products, which are difficult to find in the debris.

The sheep was used as the sacrificial animal, per preference, often together with pig and cattle in the suovetaurilia sacrifice. Both the unburned and the few burnt bones of sheep and goats in the bridge complex may indicate sacrifices to special divinities as protectors of the herds and the textile handicrafts. But together

---

922 Ancillotti & Cerri 1996, 149, 157 and table 5.4; see also above on cereals and plants.

923 The cultivation of olives and wine seems to have been part of the agricultural system during the Etruscan period in Etruria and Rome. This is supported by Pliny (Plin. HN. 14.8–15), who mentioned that viticulture was common from the period of Numa Pompilius, see Costantini & Giorgi 2001, 246.

924 Ancillotti & Cerri 1996, 186. Costantini & Giorgi 2001, 245, fig. 1, have discussed charred plant remains from the Forum Romanum and the Palatine. Evidence of cereals, such as emmer, einkorn and barley, legumes (horse beans, peas, bitter vetch, and grass peas), pips of grapes, stones of olives and seeds of figs and grapes have been found at the Palatine, the Via Sacra, and in tombs on the Via Sacra of the 8th-6th centuries, cf. Costantini & Giorgi 2001. Abundant remains of grapes, olives and figs were examined in Archaic tombs by Helbaek 1956. Cereals from the pozzo of Vesta, Costantini & Giorgi 2001, fig. 2, table 1, stones of olives and seeds of figs and grapes from the sanctuary of San Omobono from the 8th century. The figs and the grapes as well as the olives are supposed to have been used in certain rituals. The olive oil was used for meals, perfume, ointment, washing and lighting. The olives, grapes and figs are supposed to have been served at meals, the grapes for wine, and also used for medicine, see Costantini & Giorgi 2001, 245–246. Remains of stones and seeds of fruits and olives and wine charcoal are reported from the Villanova/Etruscan settlement Gran Carro at Bolsena, and stones of olives and grape pits at Cures Sabina in Rieti dated to the 8th century B.C.; cf. also Bagnasco Gianni 2001a, 41–42 for carbonised and mineralised seeds and fruits found inside jars and bowls of votive deposits at Tarquinia. The five deposits show local forms of pottery such as bowls, cups, jars dated to two distinctive Archaic periods. Other votive deposits of pottery also contained celery, figs, vegetables, and carbonised and mineralised seeds, cf. Rottoli 2001, 59–60.


926 Cf. the seven loom-weights found in Hera sanctuaries weighing 200gr each with pointed crosses on the top similar to the examples from the bridge complex, in Zancani Montuoro 1966, 80, fig. 16:c–d.

927 Three bones from three different dogs of small and medium size. Two adults and one youth were also reported, cf. Plummel 1996, 432, 434; the minimum numbers of individuals (MNI) differ among the assemblages. The age of the sacrificed animals varied depending on the species. Most of the animals were males, Plummel 1996, 440. Sheep/goats were slaughtered between one and two months to two and five years. Some cattle were sacrificed between 24 or 28 months and others at the age of three to six years. Many pigs were killed and used for offerings during their first year and up to an age of two years, Plummel 1996, 434. The bones show that the ritual of burning parts of the meat was more common during the 5th century than during the 6th century B.C.; see Plummel 1996, 426. All parts of the animals were used for the offerings, viz. the skull, especially the front pieces, the vertebral column, the foreleg and the hind leg, Plummel 1996, 429. The sacrificial rites at Satricum are proposed as having been performed mostly in wintertime, but also in spring and summertime. It is unknown how the animals were killed. The animals were divided in suitable parts in order to be put into the jars. It is also suggested that one animal was put into one or several jars. Some of the remains were probably eaten by the participants of the cult, Plummel 1996, 440.

928 San Giovenale 2:4, 82–83; Spivey & Stoddart 1990, 67; the large amount of worked deer horn in the Spring building indicated that they were collected and worked on by artisans, De Grossi Mazzorin 2001b, 323, table 1.

929 At level 4.5 m; cf. section of well (Fig. 53).

930 Cf. Sorrentino forthcoming.
The charred pieces of wood may suggest that the dog had been placed in a wooden box carrying the unburned dog bones inside. The small plaque of horn from an unknown species, found below the dog skeleton, was decorated with an incised picture of an animal, a boar, rabbit or a dog framed by a thin dented border, possibly part of the intarsia of a box (Fig. 94:17). If there is any connection between these two finds, it is difficult to prove.

The find of the dog bones is puzzling and it is difficult to find good explanations for those remains. The dog may have fallen down into the well by accident, or it may have been deliberately thrown into the well as part of a purification rite. An essential question to consider for an interpretation is the Etruscan view of dogs. A dog could have had several duties: as a hunting companion, a guardian of the place, or a shepherd’s dog, but also as a symbolic meaning. It was thought to have connections with death.

Both archaeological and secondary written sources provide information on rites with dogs. The archaeological evidence of domestic animals and dog sacrifices in wells, burials, and votive deposits is quite large. Analogies to animal sacrifices in general can be found at Pyrgi, where both wild and domestic animals have been sacrificed to the gods. A sacrifice of an adult dog was found as the only gift in a burial dated to the end of the seventh to the beginning of the sixth century. It resembles a ritual mentioned by Columella, cf. Chiarmonté Treré, 1988, 568–569, n. 5.

For the dog skeleton of a terrier tribe in a ritual well outside temple A at Pyrgi; cf. Colonna et al., 1988–1989b, 11.

Gianferrari 1995, 133, n. 72; other dog sacrifices from settlements were made in Val Freddana at Montecatino. Evidence of eating meat from dogs is reported from Casale di Rivalalta in Reggio Emilia from the fifth century B.C. where sacrificial bronze knives used at the ceremony were found together with the bones and miniature vessels. Dogs have also been reported from foundation sacrifices of towers and houses, cf. Gianferrari 1995, 133, nn. 75–76. Several ancient writers mention dog sacrifices among the Romans to Mana Getes and the Lares Praestites, in the official Lupercalia feast, cf. Soren 1999; Smith 1996, 82; Caloi & Palombo 1980, 293–328, and Robigalia, cf. Colonna 1988–89, 17–19, n. 19, and Gianferrari 1995, n. 72. On the use of dogs in purifying rituals in the Laws of the Twelve Tables, cf. Scholz 1937.

Ovid is one of the ancient authors, who have described the ritual eating, cf. Ov. Fasti 901–942; Cf. the Robigalia sacrifice initiated by king Numa, and the dog sacrifice mentioned in the Iguvine Tablets. There are parallels between these two rituals, and it may also be that the Robigalia originated from the Etruscans. The Robigalia is a very important agricultural cult probably taken place in April in honour of Robigo to secure the crops against diseases such as mildew. The Etruscan prophetess Vegoia, as well as Columella, has underlined a close connection with boundaries and different diseases. The chthonic gods had to be bribed, and the dog, which was seen as special, was chosen to be a scapegoat, and to protect the crops. The entrails of a young dog were sacrificed. Smith also underlines that a dog sacrifice is connected with boundaries and that this ritual has something to do with the military expansion of Rome, Smith 1996, 82–86, n. 20. About the ceremonials of a similar celebration in the Iguvine tablets, where there was a sacrifice of bones, and entrails of a dog, cakes, libations of wine and mead, unguents and dancing at the altar, see Gianferrari 1995.


For three various definitions of the piaculum and references to ancient authors, see the Oxford Latin dictionary, 1377; piaculum is (a) ‘a victim offered by way of atonement, expiatory offering’, (transf. of human beings); (b) a rite or...
wells), for example at the temples at Pyrgi, were closed. They became a compensation for offerings to the goddess of the temple.\textsuperscript{944}

A few other examples of the composition of bones represented in the offerings of the suovetaurilia together with dog bones is the votive deposit found just over the Lapis Niger on the Roman Forum,\textsuperscript{945} and in cisterns in the sanctuary of Centocamere, dedicated to Aphrodite at Locri.\textsuperscript{946}

Dogs are also found in tombs, a common feature in Italy during the Neolithic, Bronze Age, in the Hellenistic period and in the second to the 5th centuries A.D.\textsuperscript{947} In Lugnano, in southern Umbria, an infant cemetery dated to the fifth century A.D. was found in the debris of a Roman villa. Several of the 49 infants were fetuses buried in amphorae together with 12 puppies, only a few months old.\textsuperscript{948} The puppies were believed to have had apotropaic powers and interpreted as being part of a ritual in order to remove the evil spirits, who had caused the disaster.\textsuperscript{949}

A clear connection between death and the dog in several ancient Nordic texts has been argued for, and it has been claimed that the dogs found in Nordic graves confirm this observation. The mythical dog is seen as a bridge at the border between the living and the dead. Discussions on dogs from a cultic point of view have resulted in the same conclusions. The dog, thus, has an important symbolic-mythological meaning in this rite of passage.\textsuperscript{950} The dog found in the well in the bridge complex may have played a similar role.

An offering of expiation (transf. an act of atonement); (c) an act, which demands expiation (an occurrence (natural disaster, etc.) requiring the performance of expiatory rites.

\textsuperscript{944} Gianferri 1995, 133, n. 73.

\textsuperscript{945} Gianferrari 1995, 167, nn. 105–106, a sacrifice for the disturbance of a sacred place.

\textsuperscript{946} Gianferrari 1995, 136, n. 102; Torelli 1977, 148–149. Dog sacrifices in abundance to Aphrodite are also found in Athens, cf. Gianferrari 1995, n. 103.

\textsuperscript{947} De Grossi Mazzorin 2001b; 2001a, 81–93, cf. also the bibliography for dog burials in Italy.

\textsuperscript{948} Soren & Soren 1995, 43–48.

\textsuperscript{949} Thukydidides (Thuk. 2.50) has described the plague of Athens and has noted that birds and animals, including dogs, ate the corpses of the victims and consequently died. Another example comes from Kolonos Agaraios in Athens where more than 130 dogs including puppies were found in a Hellenistic well together with c. 450 fetuses, Little & Papadopoulos 1998, 384, nn. 38-39.

\textsuperscript{950} Gräslund 2002, 247–258; 2004. Cf. also the small bronze dog with a dedication to the chthonic deity Calu in Etruschi 2000, 162.

\textsuperscript{951} The skeleton was found in the well at a depth of 5.15–5.6 m (Fig. 53).

\textsuperscript{952} Mallegni 1979, 36–47. Under the human body at level 5.60 m a base of an open vessel inscribed with one letter u (No. 40) dated to c. 550 B.C. and a red-slip jug (T3=SGBRN 62-800), dated to 550 B.C., were found as well as bones of an oxen and a sheep, see section of well (Fig. 53).

\textsuperscript{953} See the discussion of wells and burials in Little & Papadopoulos 1998.

\textsuperscript{954} Little & Papadopoulos 1998, 375–381. Ethnographical parallels for human sacrifices are known, e.g. in the folk-song of the Arta Bridge in Epirus, cf. Frizell Santillo 1982, 8–18.

\textsuperscript{955} Cf. Rives 1995, 65–85, with the motifs for human sacrifices in different places in the Mediterranean world described by ancient writers.
indication of human sacrifices. However, also on late Etruscan urn reliefs there seems to be evidence of human sacrifices.

Skeletons of humans of all ages found in wells, in the mouth or further down, have been reported from several places in Greece, including Athens. Some scholars, however, have rejected the arguments for human sacrifices. Several reasons for the many bodies buried in wells, e.g. victims of floods, plagues, war and earthquakes, have been discussed, but a uniform explanation has been rejected. Also in this case there can be no certain explanation.

An interesting idea is whether there was a possible link between the dog and the young man in the Pietrisco well. Judging from the section and the notebooks, the human and the animal skeletons were found at different levels (Fig. 53). The dog, the ox and the sheep, seem to have been thrown into the well before the human. Whether they were put there simultaneously or not is uncertain. The well, however, must have been polluted after that occasion. I have assumed earlier that the well was filled up on two occasions in building phase 4, probably after an earthquake or another unknown disaster and when the well was seated by the large tufa packing north of House 3B.

The finds of a red-slip jug and a few tile fragments at the bottom, dated to the 6th century B.C., gives a terminus post quem for the filling debris above. In the mouth of the well there was a fragment of an Attic black-glazed skyphos dated to 480 B.C., which joined fragments from the fill below the large tufa packing (Fig. 89:10).

Rituals connected to water

The calm water, e.g. from a well, and the flowing water in the river, is a phenomenon discussed by several scholars. Water has always been considered sacred in Italy and in Greece, particularly at sanctuaries. It was thought to be a gift from the gods and especially clean water was holy and therefore used in rituals for cleansing and purification. Hence, we find many water cults at rivers, lakes, hot and cold springs, and near water basins in sanctuaries in Etruria and the Italic area. Before entering a sacred area one had to be sprinkled with fresh water in order to be clean and pure. Therefore there were water basins called perirrhanteria or hagisteria, placed at the entrance of a sacred area. The meaning was to ‘mark the special transition between secular and sacred territory, between secular and sacred activities’, and they occur in sanctuaries of all kinds of deities. Different kinds of water basins could be used in sacrifices. The sprinkling of water made before a sacrifice can also be seen as a boundary.

The water in the rivers was, by the Etruscans and the Romans, considered sacred since it was thought to be inhabited by a numen, a spirit. It also played a very important part in daily life. To cross a river at a ford or by bridges required sacrifices so as not to disturb the divinities. There was a division between water divinities and water demons living in the rivers and the lakes. Neth (Nethuns), for example, is an old water god, especially honoured at springs and he required libations of wine eight times on the 24th of September. Rain water and spring water originated from different spirits, e.g. the nymphs and the earth goddess. Hercle, the protector of herds and shepherds, has also been related to

---

956 Recently, the tradition of human sacrifices at the Pons sublicius has been dealt with by Wifstrand Schiebe 1999, 189–209.
959 Dogs and other animals found together with human skeletons in wells are recorded in Greece, cf. Little & Papadopoulos 1998, 383, Corinth (EH), Eleusis (MH), Argos (LH) and Mycenae (LH).
water, especially from springs, lakes and in caves. This is an interesting connection especially as Santillo Frizell recently has highlighted the healing effect on sheep and goats from water from sulphurous springs. Such a spring is situated not far from the transhumance route at Bagni di Stigliano, a few km south of San Giovenale. A votive deposit of three bronze figurines of Hercle, dated to the 3rd century B.C. found at the temple of Bagnarello, indicate a cult of the god. His cult was obviously popular at Caere and in the ager caeretanus already during the 5th century. The head of a ram at San Giovenale is an interesting terracotta object often found in sanctuaries and dedicated to Hercle. There are only a few examples found: a terracotta head of a ram, probably architectural, from the Borgo and the large fragmentary ram’s head from a cistern on the Vignale excavated in 1959. The latter may be a lateral acroterion, belonging to a civic or a sacred building on the Vignale, maybe connected to Hercle, a parallel to his cult in Caere.

The installations connected with water at the bridge are the fresh water well in front of the houses and the two basins cut out from a huge tufa block. One of these is located at a higher level and it has a drilled hole to join the lower placed basin at the backyard of House 1, House 2 and House 3A (cf. Chapter 2:3; Figs. 36, 45, 55). Fresh water from the well was important for many reasons: drinking, mixing with wine, cleaning cloth and people, and this is clearly shown in the many pottery forms (jugs, cups, bowls, small and large basins). Fresh water could also have been used in rituals of purification used at sanctuaries, as suggested above, and obviously it was important to take it from a well despite the close access to river water.

The basins were interpreted earlier as an installation for making wine, a pestarola, but they could also have been used for other purposes, for example cleaning. Water installations are often located outside the buildings but sometimes we find them in a yard in front of the building. A parallel to the tufa basins are the many basins interpreted as pestarole along the Cava Buia road in front of Ponte a Norchia over the Biedano river. They are, however, interpreted as public basins for dyeing or tanning, but not connected to any ritual use of water. Two of them were located very close to the bridge Ponte a Norchia, as earlier mentioned, and separated from the others. The question is if these could have been used in a ritual before crossing the bridge.

It is reasonable to suggest that the large tufa basins at the bridge could have had an integrated function for wine production used at banqueting but also for cleaning purposes, profane or sacred together with the large pottery basins with or without feet, using fresh water from the well.

There are some traces of ritual connected with water also in the settlement on the San Giovenale plateau. Firstly, the semi-subterranean structure in Area B on the Acropolis, dated to the transition between the Protovillanovan and the Etruscan periods (second half of the 8th century), is interpreted as a spring building with a sacred dump. The finds of pottery and mostly bones, of red deer, have been associated with a water cult and an unknown divinity associated to the red deer, maybe a counterpart to Artemis, a poina themon, and also to the water spirits.

---

970 Pfiffig 1975, 343, 346; Chellini 2002, 208–210. On Hercle, see further below in this chapter.
973 On the Borgo ram, see Berggren & Moretti 1960, fig. 2, and San Giovenale 5:1 forthcoming. The ram’s head from the Vignale plateau was found in pozzo (well) 6. Traces of at least 4 holes of different sizes are found on the fragmentary head. Two of them seem to be nail holes and the other twomay be the eyes. On ram's head on roofs, see note below. The content of the well consisted mostly of bucchero cups and jugs, dated to the beginning of the 6th century B.C., red-slip and coarse ware bowls, jars and jugs, tile fragments, cf. notebook of Del Chiaro 1959.
974 Cf. the fountain and the pottery basin on a stand in a mural painting in the Tomb of the bulls at Tarquinia dated to the 6th century B.C., and the large basins on a mural painting from the Tomb of the Augurs, also from Tarquinia, dated to 550 B.C. in Etruscan culture 1962, figs. 451–452, pl. 47.
975 For the pestarole found at San Giovenale, see San Giovenale 5:1 forthcoming.
977 Colonna di Paolo & Colonna 1978, n. 9.
978 Rituals of purification correspond to the indicators of the second category of indicators used by Renfrew, namely the concepts of cleanliness and pollution, cf. Renfrew 1994, 51.
980 Chellini 2002, 199.
981 Sorrentino 1981, 85; San Giovenale 2:4, 81–84. The interpretation of the subterranean structure as a Spring-building has been questioned but I find this interpretation quite plausible due to the geology of the place. Artesian wells are quite common in tufa areas with clay and conglomerate beds. The existence of other structures associated with water as, for example, the well, which was connected to a channel (cuniculus) by a drainage canal covered by cover tiles (imbrices) and associated with the moat not far from the well, strengthen the interpretation by Pohl. The well is dated from the fourth to the third century B.C., cf. San Giovenale 2:5 forthcoming. The wells found on the plateau are, however,
The second structure possibly connected with water is the underground cave with a staircase leading down to a wooden platform, dated to Hellenistic time, and located east of the Spring-building. A staircase led down to four postholes placed in a square at the moist clayish bottom of the subterranean room. Those two may be examples of an organized cult in the area during different periods.

A third spectacular structure is a cave with a column dug into the tufa rock at the southern edge of the promontory in Area C, not far from the Etruscan house complex of House V. One of two cuniculi (water channels) was situated at this place. There were clear traces of a road with a few steps running from the plateau along the western side of the monumental Etruscan house to the cave (see Fig. 2a). Unfortunately, there were no finds whatsoever that could help to identify the function of the place or give a secure date. It may, however, be reasonable to see at the cave as a kind of cult place dedicated to water spirits and chthonic deities due to a few features: its location at the opening of a cuniculum and at a clear physical boundary and its construction of a room with a column dug rather deep into the rock, which can be seen as a clear liminal zone, a threshold into the underground and the chthonic world, a place where it was easy to connect with the spirits.

The underground room in Area B, dated to the Hellenistic period, seems to be another example of the reverence for chthonic spirits and the Spring-building in Area B, though dated to an earlier period.

### 3.4.4 Divinities connected to roads and bridges

There are a few Etruscan gods, heroes and demons, which have been connected to liminal places such as roads: *Hekate, Turms*, the bringer of the souls (Hermes/Mercurius),* and Herce (Hercules) protector of the herdsman and of the picus, occur frequently at cult places along transhumance routes. Janus, or the Etruscan Culsans, is the double-faced god connected to gates and bridges.

There is no direct evidence of any adoration of Herce at the Pietrisco bridge, but the mere fact that this deity is pictured on several bronze mirrors together with the goddess Vesuna, represented at the bridge and with Fufluns, the wine god, is worth mentioning. However, it may be an indirect connection with Herce, namely through the terracotta ram's heads found on the Borgo and in a well on the Vignale plateau, mentioned earlier. Similar terracotta heads related to Herce have been found in both sacred as well as public profane contexts, e.g. at Orvieto, Murlo, Acquarossa, Caere and Veii.

983 Remains of cultic buildings honouring Herce are found along the transhumance roads in Italy, Frizell Santillo 1996; 1999, 15-19; 2004; Chellini 2002, 209-210; Burket 1979, 84-85; and along the transhumance route in Daunia, see Antonacci Sanpao 2001. See also the votive deposit at the temple of Bagnarello near Bagni di Stigliano, cf. Chellini 2002, 95–96, 210. Cf. also note above on archaic votive deposit and a sanctuary decreed to Hercules at Acquarosa (Tivoli).
984 Holland 1961.
985 Pfiffig 1998, 246–247, fig. 108. Some scholars have equalled Culsans to Janus, but since the cult of Culsans is only found in Cortona, one has to be cautious with this comparison.
986 Vesuna, Fufluns and Herce together on a mirror, see Pfiffig 1975, 274, fig. 119.
987 Aversa 1997, 3–10, figs. 1–3, 6; at the sanctuary Scasato at Faleri, cf. Aversa 1997, 9. Other ram protomes were found in the Cannicella sanctuary at Orvieto, cf. Stopponi 1997, 199–205, figs. 1–5; and Jucker 1991, 262, cat.no. 342; a few examples found at Capua, Bonghi Jovino 1993, 45-54. Terracotta ram heads interpreted as lateral acroteria are found at the Portonaccio sanctuary at Vei, cf. Melis 1985, 104, fig. 5.1 C3, Stefani 1953, 62, *Città d'Etruria* 2001, 63-64, pl. 2, I.F.3.4, Jucker 1991, 262, cat.no. 341, dated to 500 B.C.; at the Poseidon temple at Civita Castellana, cf. Maggiani 1997, 101-104; Andrén 1940, 162, pl. 51:1:35; a terracotta ram head from Caere in Ny Carlsberg glyptothek 1928, fig. 173; Vighi 1931, 119–124, pl. 11:4; Andrén 1940, pl. 15:3:2. One ram head from a cippus was found outside a tomb in the Crocifisso del Tufo necropolis at Ischia di Castro, cf. Rasenna 1986, 449, fig. 311. A terracotta house model probably from a tomb in South Italy was decorated on the ridge with a ram's head at each gable of the roof, dated to the mid-5th century. B.C. cf.
No direct evidence of *Janus/Culsans* is found at the bridge, but his function as the protector of bridges makes it reasonable to mention him as one possible god important to honour at the Pietriscro bridge.

*Hekate* is regarded as a chthonic, fertility, and lunar goddess, and she is often connected with boundaries, especially at crossroads where she brought the souls safely to the other side. 993 Further, she has also been associated with dogs and sacrifices of dogs, especially puppies, alone or together with infants. 994 The dog found in the well together with human bones is therefore an interesting element with regards to sacrifice. The location of the well and the bridge building at a liminal place reinforces the symbolic-mythological aspect of the dog as important in the rite of passage of death, especially the liminal stage. 995 *Hekate* shares the chthonic aspects with *Vesuna* (see below). So far there is no evidence that shows if *Vesuna* was connected to dogs, unless the sacrifice of a puppy together with agricultural products, bread, flour, salt and wine made once a year at the *Honda* festival, documented in the ritual texts on the Gubbio bronze tablets, can prove the opposite. 996 The dog in the well could be linked to *Vesuna*, even though there is a time gap of c. 150 years between the date of the inscription and the date of the dog. 997

The name *Lurs (?) Larunita*, inscribed under the base of a cup found below the floor of House 3A, has been interpreted as a rather unknown god, connected to *Laran*, the war god and the protector of the boundary (Fig. 91:1-2). 998 The reason for his veneration at the bridge is uncertain. The inscription of a god with protective qualities found in the floor of the apsidal House 3A and dated to the 5th century B.C. may point to a period of change and unrest.

*Fufluns*, the wine god, the Etruscan equivalent to *Dionysos*, mentioned on the Piacenza bronze liver, is indirectly represented at the bridge during the first three building phases. 999 There are several arguments for that hypothesis. First, the existence of the many eye-cups and especially those with Dionysian decorations (satyrs, apotropaic eyes, the Medusa head, and the *komos* scene) may also be regarded as possible evidence for a cult of *Fufluns*, possibly introduced at San Giovenale by Faliscans visiting the town in trading matters. 1000 Faliscan pottery appears at San Giovenale to some extent and the local potters have probably produced pottery, mostly *amphoriskoi* or *kantharoi*, very similar to the Faliscan ones. 1001 Secondly, another reason to include *Fufluns* who also had a chthonic aspect and considered to be the male aspect of a vegetation and birth divinity, is his close relationship with *Vesuna*, the chthonic divinity and the goddess of the life force. 1003 These two gods indicate that there are connections to the underworld, and therefore libations through the perforated vessels, as stated above, were important.

**Gifts to the gods: Inscriptions and graffiti**

One indicator of ritual, as suggested by Renfrew, is the presence of deities represented by, for example
terracotta or metal figurines. In the bridge complex no figurines related to gods have been found, but there are, however, a few deities mentioned in the many inscriptions on pottery sherds and terracotta objects.1005 This category of written evidence is not mentioned by Renfrew but may be included in his fourth category (see above in chapter 1) and to the indicator of votives. The existence of votive inscriptions facilitates the interpretation of a structure. The inscriptions on cups, plates and bowls from different periods show that some of the vessels probably containing herbs, fruits and liquids were dedicated to the divinities of the place. Some of the inscriptions are interpreted as names of the individual owner, e.g. Larth and Fasthi Alsi, and the name of the genses, e.g. the Urcena and Laivena (?), meanwhile others are ritual words written on the body or under the bases (cf. Table 25, Nos. 7, 11, 17, 43).

The word for sacrifice, mul, and other words such as alike and yi, inscribed on the exterior of a cup is one evidence of a special rite performed at the bridge complex (Figs. 91:4, 10; 79:14). It also confirms libations of wine as being an important feature of the rituals used in the rectangular building/s as well as gifts per se as discussed earlier.

The loom-weight with one single letter, A, inscribed on one side (cf. Fig. 94:7) found together with other votive inscriptions on vessels may also be interpreted as a possible votive gift.1006 The same applies for another loom-weight with the letter Y (U) recently found in the same area.1007 Many loom-weights, from votive deposits, are dedicated to the Greek goddess Hera,1008 the equivalent Etruscan goddess Uni and the Roman Juno.1009 There are no inscriptions to this goddess at the bridge. However, it would be reasonable to assume that the loom-weights and other domestic items could be gifts to Vesta, the protector of the home and the hearth.1010

As already stated there were some graffiti consisting of single lines in different patterns, inscribed on bases, bodies and rims, which could be categorized into four groups. One category is the cross (X), found inscribed on the inside and outside of bases of bowls and cups. A second is the single five-pointed star, the pentagram, inscribed under the base of a bucchero bowl found at the bridge complex (Fig. 92:1).1012 A third group is the asterix occurring a few times, and a fourth consists of a checkerboard pattern (see Appendix 1).

Compared to the inscriptions and graffiti from the tombs and the settlement areas the number from the bridge complex is exceptionally high.1013 In general the cross (X), which is scratched after firing inside and outside on bucchero bowls has been recorded in several find contexts, viz. habitations, funerary, as well as sacred,1014 and at many places and time periods.1015 It has been interpreted in various ways:

1004 See the indicators of ritual in Chapter 1, and in Renfrew 1985.
1005 The 48 published and 2 unpublished inscriptions, concentrated to such a small area, emphasize the importance of the bridge area, cf. Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999.
1006 A truncated pyramidal loom-weight (H. 9.2) with a pre-firing letter z on one side was found at Murlo, cf. Phillips 1985a, 149, no. 671.
1009 Pfiffig 1975, 24, 30.
1010 Damgaard Andersen 1997, 363–365. Colonna has suggested that Vesta was the goddess venerated at Roselle in a rectangular building (5×5 m) interpreted as a sanctuary dated to the second quarter of the 7th century B.C. He does this due to the domestic utensils found, Colonna 1986, 401–402, and the nearby votive fossa, Santuari d’Etruria 1985, 53–55. Donati 1994, 2–3, is of the same opinion. Many loom-weights with marks on top and some in crude clay were found in the building, cf. Enea nel Lazio 1981, 54–55. Some marked loom-weights were also found in a Hellenistic house on the Acropolis at San Giovenale, cf. Fuglesang forthcoming. See also the discussion of Vesta and the dog bones above.
1011 Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, figs. 6–7, cat.nos. 29, 36, 38–39, and 45–46. Crosses on pottery are also reported from the tombs at San Giovenale, cf. San Giovenale 1:5, appendix 1, and from the Borgo settlement, cf. San Giovenale 5:3 forthcoming.
1012 Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, figs. 4:22, 5:22.
1013 There are 40 inscriptions and graffiti found in the tombs and in the settlement at San Giovenale documented in CIE III:1; the Acropolis, the Borgo, the tombs 10452–10492 (the Acropolis 10452–10453, Borgo 10454–10456; 10454–10492 tombs, Porzarago, Pontesilli). Another inscription, found on a bucchero ring-base from Area F, House III, will be published by L. Karlsson in San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming.
1014 A few crosses on coarse ware bowls are found at the Vigna Parrochiale at Caere, which is interpreted as a sacred context, see Caere 3:2, 308, Kc26. 4 after firing, Kc28.2, Kc28.8, cross before firing; Kc30.10–11; bucchero phiale with omphalos; Caere 3:1, E28.1.
1015 de Grummond et al. 2000, 37–38, tables 8–9. Crosses are reported to be numerous from Tarquinia, Bologna, and Marzabotto, The X has also been recorded in a Gordion (Phrygian) grave and settlement contexts from the 8th to the 3rd centuries B.C. L.E. Roller has recorded 23 crosses, cf. Nonverbal graffiti 1987, 8–9.
owner’s signature, potter’s and artisans mark, measurement of content and price, numerals, alphabets, production marks, trading marks, craftsmen’s guide, and mere decoration. It has also been taken as the numeral 10 on rather early dated bowls and cups, supposed to have been a spell to get ten times of good luck. The sign occurs mostly alone, but now and then in combination with one or two other characters.

Another sign with a magic touch is the pentagram. Although there is only one example of this sign recorded from the bridge area, and possibly one from the workshop quarter on the Borgo, it has to be noted. The five-pointed star or the pentagram has been used over a long period of time. According to comparative studies it is a symbol indicating a very strong, protective, apotropaic power.

The sign occurs on many kinds of objects, although in abundance on terracotta bowls and cups either inside or outside the base, either scratched or impressed, and it is not restricted to a specific culture or period of time.

Sacrifices of other gifts than pottery

Besides the pottery with votive inscriptions and all the imported pottery, there are other find categories, although few compared to the large quantity of pottery, which may help us to characterize the site, viz. the terracotta objects used in textile production, the braziers, the metals, the glass beads, and the decorated piece of horn, found in various levels.

Several of the loom-weights found have a few impressed patterns on the top, divided into five groups as noted earlier (Fig. 94:1–6). An abundance of similar whorls, decorated and undecorated, are recorded from the settlements on the Acropolis and the Borgo, showing that wool production has been essential during a long time. They are recorded in different find contexts in Etruria during different periods. The purpose of pre-firing and post-firing decorations on top or at the side is uncertain. Are they mere decorations or do they symbolise something? Are these mostly pre-firing marks, an expression of a simple and decorative picture, do they express a value of the weight important for the warp, production marks, or are they marks of ownership? The various patterns are difficult to interpret. One explanation may be that each pattern may show a special weight. Further investigations have to be done in measuring the weight and to match it with a special sign. The examples with post-firing marks, like

---

1017 de Grummond et al. 2000, 37, table 14. There are 2000 different signs recorded in a database and 178 of them are the X sign. Many scholars have dealt with potter’s marks made before or after the firing in the Aegean, mostly from the Bronze Age, cf. Papadopoulos 1994, 438, nn. 8–9, pot marks from the early Iron age (Protogeometric and Geometric periods. For Early and Middle Helladic potmarks from Asine, see Lindblom 2001, and from Lerna, see Lindblom forthcoming.
1020 de Grummond et al. 2000, 32.
1021 Lindblom 2001, 121, 132-133.
1022 This sign found scratched on some amphorae from Spina, Marzabotto, Bologna and Cetamura, is probably intended as a trading mark made by an owner. Numerous crosses are exported from Tarquinia, Bologna and Marzabotto, cf. de Grummond et al. 2000, table 8.
1023 de Grummond et al. 2000, 32–33. Cf. marks on objects, tiles and stones.
1024 de Grummond et al., 2000, table 12.
1026 Heurgon 1973, 547–575. Usually it was used as a kind of protection against demons, witches and trolls and used in the realm of magic. If marked on doors, walls, or storage houses it gives the owner protection against all kinds of threats. It may be seen as a sign with magical powers, and to be interpreted differently, depending on the direction of the inscribed points.
1027 The pentagram is found under the base or inside a bowl or cup, at the body of jars, or at the neck on amphorae of different kinds of wares and vessels at places in Etruria and South Italy dated from 650 to 250 B.C. It is recorded from geographically dispersed areas and periods. The pentagram on ancient pottery, its use, distribution and meaning will be discussed in a forthcoming article by the author.
the incised letters, may be interpreted as the owner’s mark and as a votive gift to a deity, depending on the context in which they were found or it may be the initial of a deity (see above).1029

The textile implements from various periods can be interpreted in two ways. They may either be considered mere refuse from a household or gifts to a special deity/deities associated with textile production and animal breeding, of locals and travellers.1030 The building in the bridge complex is not a common private house. It may be a house for the keeper of the cult at the bridge or it may be a public building functioning as either a rest house/an inn, a custom house a watch house (casa torre) and at the same time a sacred building where banqueting rituals were performed.

Examples of small objects related to textile production; loom-weights (one inscribed with the single letter A), spindle-whorls and spools, show that wool from sheep and goats was essential and that sheep and goat-breeding were important in the subsistence economy. The existence of objects related to textile production in the bridge complex makes sense if we see those objects as a symbol of the wool, offered by women and herdsmen or travellers passing by, to the divinities associated with textile production and herding.

Another category of finds are the metal objects discussed in chapter 2:4 that can be interpreted in a similar way. The 33 objects of bronze, copper, iron and lead, divided into categories as jewellery, tools, weapons, metal production, nails and bolts, could be merely debris from an older building or hut, sacred or profane, in the neighbourhood or gifts to the gods and the spirits venerated at this particular site. The nails and bolts from the site are probably remains from the roof construction or blade fragments from knives for daily use. The bronze arrow, or the point of a javelin, may have been offered to the warrior god Lurs (?) Larunita or they could have been weapons belonging to a soldier guarding the bridge or defence weapons carried and lost by travellers. Weapons are quite common in the San Giovenale tombs.

The small rounded bronze object, found in a possible wooden box in a clay layer that sealed the floor of the rectangular house, seems to me as a foundation offering.

The remains of slag and pure copper, aes rude (?) found in the debris indicate metal production (Fig. 95, Table 27). They may be interpreted as refuse from a local production at the bridge or as votives similar to the metal refuse found in votive deposits i.e. in Latium,1031 and in sanctuaries.1032 The slag and the copper object may also have come from metal workshops in the settlements on the Acropolis and on the Borgo, since remains of bronze and iron working have been recorded there.1033

The abundance of metal finds from the graves, the settlements and the bridge area in San Giovenale indicate a metal producing society, a production intended for consumption, and possibly also a society in need of showing its status.

A third find category are the two glass beads dated to 625-550 B.C. Glass beads of different colours occur in chamber tombs from San Giovenale.1034 Similar beads are often found in Villanova tombs,1035 and in Archaic graves on Sardinia, dated to 575-550 B.C.1036 Melon ribbed beads also occur in tombs at Metapontion, dated to 440-400 B.C.1037 They are also common in votive deposits.1038

1029 I thank R. Holmgren for paying attention to this problem, which made me aware of the importance of weighing the loom-weights.
1030 The dates range from 625-475 B.C.
1031 An enormous amount of aes rude has been found at Satricum, Bouma et al. 1995, 188.
1033 Slag, copper prills, raw copper, bronze and iron objects are recorded from the settlement areas; see article on metallurgy on the Borgo by Guidi in San Giovenale 5:2 forthcoming, see also San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming on metal objects found in Houses I–III in area F East; on metals in the Hellenistic house on the Acropolis, cf. Fuglesang forthcoming; finds of scrap-metal and a mould were found among the debris of House K in Area C on the Acropolis to be published in San Giovenale 3:1 forthcoming. I thank M. Lindgren for mentioning those finds.
1034 San Giovenale 1:7, tomb 1, nos. 14, 22; San Giovenale 1:5, tomb P.14 nos. 163, 166; tomb P.10:23; tomb no. 1 (G.T.12) 134, small beads belonging to a necklace; tomb VV1:94; tomb VV3:113.
1036 Bartoloni 2000, 15–27, pl. 4b, fig. 74.
1037 Carter 1998, 836–837, fig. 21:3.
1038 Bouma 1996, part 3, 134 in the index.
The large amount of inscriptions from the bridge, found in a small limited area, and the character of them, indicating votives, ritual words and the names of a few gods, in comparison to the inscriptions and the graffiti from other areas at San Giovenale, makes them extraordinary. The names of a few gods allow us to interpret them as belonging to a sacred context, and they can be referred to the house structures.

My suggestion that rituals were performed in this area in addition to other activities was strengthened by the existence of inscriptions related to ritual and divinities such as *Vesuna, Lurs (?) Larunita* and *A.* 1039

The name of a goddess beginning with the single letter *A* on loom-weights referred to by Colonna could be the goddess *Ana.* 1040 This is suggested as being sufficient to identify the building or the area they are found in as a temple, or a sanctuary, provided that the dating of the structure and the inscriptions are the same. 1041 In this case Colonna has drawn the conclusion that the rectangular house (Houses 1-2) and later the apsidal house (Houses 3A-B) can be interpreted as a *sacellum,* a small private cult building. 1042

### 3.4.5 Archaeological evidence concerning rituals at bridges, rivers and roads and sanctuaries and funerary houses from locations outside San Giovenale

The archaeological evidence of Etruscan extra-mural and extra-urban sanctuaries or small cult buildings at roads and bridges in particular is scarce. One reason may be that areas around bridges have not been investigated. Nevertheless, votive deposits are sometimes found at fords and bridges, as well as crossroads. What does the ritual landscape look like in other neighbouring sites in South Etruria, if we relate the location of sanctuaries and votive deposits to gates, bridges and other crossings?

1039 In a poster session at the conference ‘From huts to Houses’ at the Swedish Institute in Rome in 1998 I proposed a multifunction (integrated functions, cf. Damgaard Andersen 1998) for the buildings at the bridge. The daily life and the Etruscans’ belief in their gods and their many nature spirits were very intertwined with each other. The civic life was very much linked to the religious sphere probably to the extent that it was difficult to see where one thing started and the other ended. The ratio between the different wares and other small finds fits with the find categories from sacred areas as temples, sanctuaries and votive deposits.

1040 Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, figs. 8:47, 10:47.

1041 Damgaard Andersen 1993, 75.

1042 Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999.

One important parallel is the crossing at Sovana, north-west of Monte Becco. The brook Picciolana is here the southern boundary to a Hellenistic necropolis consisting of rock cut tombs. Near the spot where a road cut into the tufa rock crosses the brook some tufa blocks of a rectangular platform have been found. Some terracotta figurines of animals, humans and some anatomical votives, dated to the 3rd-2nd centuries B.C., were placed in a ditch surrounding the platform. There may be different reasons for the deposit, funerary or for healing. At Norchia, near Cava Buia, there are a large number of *pestarole* along the road and very near the stone abutment of a bridge. Whether those have been part of a ritual at that bridge is not reported. 1043 Rituals at crossings were seen as important in order to please the spirits. 1044

The last crossing in a person’s life was the journey from the world of the living to the world of the dead after paying a fee. A few ancient writers (Verg. *Aen.* 231, 298-304, Apul. *Met.* 6,18; 6,298-299; 6,326-328) talk about *Charun,* the frontier guardian and the ferry man, who transported the dead in a boat after the burial across the river Acherson (*Aisch. Sept.* 856) or *Styx* (*Hom.* *Il.* 8, 369) for a custom fee of two obols (Aristoph. *Ran.* 137-142, 185-187).

An interesting illustration to the road and bridge building at the Pietrisco are the ancient sanctuaries identified along transhumance routes in the inland and the medieval churches along the route from the Umbrian mountains down to the winter pasture at the coast. 1045 I would like to suggest a similar ritual function for the bridge complex, connected to transhumance if we accept the main road (*La Dogana*) as a transit route for animals also during the Early Iron Age. It is not exactly located along the main road as is the case of Ave Maria, but not far from it (cf. Fig. 1). 1046 However, a more suitable place for such a sanctuary would have been at the ford over the Vesca, and also the spot where two rivers meet, and where there is plenty of space for gatherings as well. That area has not been investigated to my knowledge but a future survey at the southern slope of the San Giovenale plateau and around the mouth of the Pietrisco may


1044 See also Edlund 1987, 59; Holland 1961.


1046 I thank B. Santillo Frizzell and R. Santillo for this information and for all the valuable discussions on this subject; Santella & Ricci, 1994, 56–63.
provide us with valuable information, since votive deposits are often found near river joints.

The custom of separating the world of the living from the world of the dead is a common feature during the Etruscan periods as shown in the necropoleis surrounding the city-states of Vulci, Tarquinia, Caere and Veii, as well as the minor satellite centres, e.g. Monterano, Blera, San Giuliano, and Grotte Castro. They are placed around the walled settlements, very often on hills at the other side of rivers.1047 However, there are few remains of bridges found at those sites. Nevertheless, the inhabitants had to cross the rivers or the gullies by some kind of crossing, for example a bridge or a ford to reach those places, so they must have existed.

The same burial pattern, with burial-grounds on the other side of a river, is also found during the Villanovan period. Vulci with its four necropoleis, one at the Ponte d’Abbadia, and three north of Ponte Rotto, is a good example of this burial pattern.

The location of small temples and funerary houses on the other side of a river and also votive deposits in combination with gates and bridge deposits on the corresponding side are best attested for at Vulci. These examples belong to different periods, mostly from the Classical, and Hellenistic-Roman periods. However, I find it possible to use them since there often is continuity in bridge building and in placing sanctuaries and votive deposits at the same place. At Vulci a sacellum on the acropolis was placed along the traversing road running down to Ponte Rotto and after crossing the Fiora River by the Ponte Rotto bridge, one finds the small funeral building or sacellum, Venus cloacina, not far from the bridge and the necropolis where the famous Tomba François was found.1048 A note on the remains of a bridge opposite the northern entrance and a sacred area at the necropolis of Osteria dell’Osa was made already during the 18th century. Important to note are also the finds of a votive deposit above the northern entrance.1049

The placing of the building interpreted as a sacellum at Vulci, in direct contact with the bridge, is a clear parallel to the buildings at the Pietrisco bridge and the bridge between the Borgo and Casale Vignale from the early Archaic period.1050 Veii is another example of a city with intra-mural road sanctuaries at gates.1051

Another example are the remains of an oval hut found along a crossroad inside a stone and wooden fortification wall with two gates during an excavation in 1985 along Via Sacra in Rome. The hut bordered a fossa dated to the 7th century B.C. In front of the hut there was a hearth with bones and pottery. The road continued outside the wall and crossed the deep fossa by a simple wooden bridge.1052 An earlier fortification wall and remains of a hut indicated continuity at the site from the 8th century down to at least the end of the 7th century B.C. There are two alternative interpretations of the huts: a cult house with rituals performed inside and outside and/or a watch-house.1053 The function of the houses has been connected with the rituals described in the Iguvine tablets.1054 This is an important parallel to the San Giovenale case that can explain the remains of Protovillanovan and Transitional pottery and the example of a fortified liminal zone.

3.4.6 Analogies from medieval Europe

The custom of placing some kind of monument at one end of a bridge or on the bridge was common in Europe during the 5th century until the 16th century AD, either it was a statue, a chapel, or a monastery, dedicated to a saint or to the Holy Virgin. This phenomenon is attested for at many places all over Italy as well as in other European countries. The church of Madonna del Ponte at the small bridge over the Mazzocchio brook at the small village Madonna del Ponte between Vetralla and San Giovenale (Figs. 1, 104a–c), and the chapel at the Augustan bridge at Narni may exemplify two analogies with the cult building at the Pietrisco bridge.1055 The bridge over the Mazzocchio is probably medieval but may have been built on Etruscan foundations, since Etruscan burials have been located along the road that

---

1048 On Venus cloacina, see n. 309.
1049 Massabò 1988–1989, 103–135, fig. 1, dated to the 6th to the 3rd centuries B.C. or to the 1st century AD.
1050 Rendeli 1993; Colonna 2001.
1051 Colonna 2001; 2002.
1053 See also the reconstructions of the huts in Serlorenzi 1995, figs. 44–46.
1055 Chapels at bridges dedicated to the Madonna are quite common all over Italy. To investigate the chapels, their location in relation to the bridge, earlier ancient remains at the place, e.g. votive deposits temples, the existence of burial grounds in the neighbourhood, and their placing related to transhumance routes etc, will be the aim of a future project. On chapels and hospitals at bridges, e.g. at the Pont d’Avignon in France, cf. Lefranc 2000.
runs over the brook.\textsuperscript{1056} Obviously, the need of rituals for protection before going over a river or a ravine is the same as during antiquity.

The medieval Ponte dell’Abbadia at Vulci is probably built upon Etruscan foundations.\textsuperscript{1057} It may have been the bridge crossing the Fiora River to the necropolis of Cavalupo. The modern name of the building at one end of the bridge, the Castello dell’Abbadia, seems to derive from the word for abbazia, i.e. monastery in the shape of a castle. This is all the more fascinating when making an analogy of the placing of sacred buildings on one end of the bridge with the medieval custom to place churches, chapels, and statues of the Madonna etc. at one end of a bridge.

3.5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

The bridge complex has been analysed in relation to its context at the Pietrisco brook– a boundary between two settlements. Furthermore, it has also been discussed from a wider contextual point of view, i.e. its relation to the whole community of San Giovenale and Vignale as well as the neighbouring cities, as San Giovenale was a frontier settlement at the border between Caere and Tarquinia.

The material culture, i.e. the pottery, the inscriptions, the small finds from the bridge complex and the architecture has been tested from five presupposed secular as well as sacred functions: a domestic house, a rest place/inn, a watch-house, a custom house and a sanctuary with funeral aspects. Below I will give a summary of the arguments for and against the assumed functions.

3.5.1 The functions: arguments for and against

(a) domestic house

For a domestic use of Houses 1, 2, and 3A-B the following arguments can be used: Firstly, domestic tiled houses with rectilinear ground-plans of one or two rooms together with deep wells in the courtyards are common within the San Giovenale settlement during several periods and can be seen attributed to Houses 1 and 2.

Secondly, the furnishings with the \(\pi\)-shaped tufa bench in both houses point to a function as a living/dining-room, a later example of the river stone beds in House I on the Acropolis and a banqueting hall, like those often depicted in tomb paintings, and on architectural plaques on public houses. The entrances to the room were slightly off-centre in both cases.

Thirdly, in the porch in front of the building there was a fresh-water well supplying the water need. Also in favour of a domestic function is the fact that the roofs have been covered with painted tiles but with neither antefixes nor acroteria or terracotta reliefs. The furnishings and the abundance of tableware, coarse ware, cooking ware and stands, braziers, charcoal indicating the use of fire and a lot of animal bones (cattle, sheep/goats, swine) all point to a function as a dining-room. Several of these phenomena are the same that B. Bergquist regarded as the criteria of a Greek dining room. There are many similarities between the dining-room in House 1 in Area F East, the dining-room in the Delion on Paros, and the dining-room in Houses 1 and 2 at the bridge.

Finally, the many terracotta objects related to textile production, loom-weights, a few spindle-whorls and bobbins are typical for a domestic dwelling as well as private jewellery, tools, and other equipment. The metal finds and the metal refuse may on the other hand indicate local metal production.

The argument against a domestic dwelling is firstly the location deep down in a ravine at the edge of a bridge and not, as is common, on a protected plateau. Secondly, types of finds, such as inscriptions of votive and symbolic character, the abundance of high quality Attic imports of cups and lekythoi, Etruscan black-figured cups of high status value at such a small space, and other high quality imports of pottery also suggest a non-domestic function. Another argument against the domestic function is the one room apsidal ground-plan of houses 3A-B with the entrance via a few steps directly from the road–a unique form at San Giovenale with no parallel whatsoever in settlements in the Etruscan or Latin world.

(b)–(c) watch-house (casa-torre), and custom house

There are several arguments for regarding the buildings Houses 1–2 and 3A–B as watch-houses. The strategic location on the northern bank of the Pietrisco along a road and a bridge at the natural boundary between two settlements, close to the necropolis and the main roads into the town makes it a perfect place for a defensive function. The inscription of \textit{Lurs (?) Larunita}, a war god, interpreted as the protector of boundaries also

\textsuperscript{1056} On fosso Mazzochio and Madonna del Ponte, see also Quilici Gigli 1976, 316 (57-58, 73, -75, fig. 68 tombs at Madonna del Ponte.

\textsuperscript{1057} Galliazzo 1994, vol. 2.
points to this function as does the existence of a few weapons. A knife, an arrowhead and a point of a javelin may be examples of the weapons used by the watchmen or the soldiers located in the neighbourhood. The existence of metals and debris of metalworking could, according to this interpretation, be remains from a metal working place in the vicinity providing the supply of iron weapons and other objects.

The import of Attic pottery as well as other high quality imports point to trade and indicate, a custom function. Another argument is the close location to the important economic and transhumance route (La Dogana) running between the town of San Giovenale and the Casale Vignale necropolis and in contact with interregional and intraregional roads both southwards and northwards, also via the Vignale settlement. In that respect the bridge linking the two settlements and the building on the northern side were important for the control of people and goods and for collecting toll for the use of the bridge and the road. Various graffiti on pottery and loom-weights may indicate production marks. The water from the well and maybe also from the river covered the need for water for the animals and visitors. The few examples of weapons could in this interpretation have been forgotten belongings of travellers or soldiers.

Against these functions speaks the abundance of domestic pottery, votive inscriptions on pottery and inscriptions of divinities, objects for textile production, the π-shaped tufa ashlar bench stone, interpreted as a banqueting room in the rectilinear buildings and the lack of furnishing in the apsidal house. The pedestal or the wine-press for making wine in the back yard of the houses is still another argument against these two functions.

(d) way-station, rest place/inn

There are several arguments for a way-station or a rest house/inn. A strong indication is the close location along a road branching from one of the two main north-south roads and the placement at the bridge linking the two settlements to each other. Another indication is the π-shaped tufa ashlar bench for couches in a room of the rectilinear building, suggesting that it has been used as a combination of dining-room and bedroom. Furthermore, this suggestion is strengthened by the abundance of pottery for drinking and eating, storage, cooking and other facilities, such as cooking-stands and braziers for heating and lighting as well as domestic and wild animal bones and some other food residues. The second room in House 1 may in this case have been used for storage. House 2 had only one room with a bench without any storage facilities. However, there seemed to have been room for animals and carriages south of the building.

The apsidal house, consisting of only one room, had no traceable furnishings, but that does not exclude the possibility of wooden couches, tables and chairs.

The water supply was provided for by the fresh water well in front of the house and the pedestal, the tufa cut basins in the back yard, seemed to have provided for a supply of wine.

The arguments against the function as rest place/inn would be the small size of the room, too small for dining with many people. The existence of Attic and other Greek imports as well as other high quality imports from Tarquinia and Vulci was too valuable for ordinary drinking and dining. Other arguments against this theory are the existence of votive inscriptions, the ritual words and graffiti, and owner’s marks on bowls and cups.

(e) sanctuary–sacellum.

A strong indication of a sacred function of the house and the bridge is the location at a physical boundary between the settlement and necropolis, but a boundary that is a liminal invisible zone between the living and the domains of the water and the chthonic spirits and the ancestors as well. The bridge may have been the link between the two worlds, a place where neither time or space existed, where it was easy to communicate with the world beyond. To build a bridge over a river was to offend the powerful spirits of the running water. Therefore it required rituals of different kinds to appease them before entering the bridge, on the bridge and after reaching the other side similar to the rituals performed at the sacred Pons Sublicius in Rome.

An even stronger argument for a ritual function of the bridge and the house are the inscriptions of the two divinities, ritual words and other graffiti (the X mark, star and pentagram) with apotropaic functions on pottery. The abundance of high quality Attic imported cups, bowls and crater as well as pottery of Etruscan black-glazed ware and cream ware, cups, plates and bowls, all point to libations of wine and ritual drinking and eating. This could have taken place on couches standing on the π-shaped stone bench in the dining-room, a proper banquet room suitable for an aristocratic family. The animal bones of pigs, sheep/goats and cattle may also indicate ritual meals, as well as sacrifices. The perforated holes in the bases of bowls and cups also point to libations of wine, milk or water to the chthonic divinities and spirits living at the place. The inscribed cups and bowls and the small finds of terracotta, i.e. loom-weights, spindle-whorls and bobbins and other metal finds and debris of metal slag...
may be votive gifts. The braziers with decorated rims of processions and hunting scenes were the only sources of lighting and heating in the house and may also indicate a ritual use.

The argument against an interpretation of the building as a *sacellum*, are the lack of decorated tiles and plaques, terracotta acroteria and antefixes, usually found on sacred buildings. However, most of the tiles were covered with red paint but only one small tile fragment was painted in red and white and the few ridge tiles found had a cordoned ridge. Another argument against a ritual function is the lack of figurines. The size of the room, only 5×5.5 m, which is too small for a large company but enough for c. 10-14 persons, also speaks against ritual banqueting. This fact instead presupposes outdoor celebrations nearby or on the bridge.

The bridge itself spans a liminal area. It is, in other words, in a state of being ‘betwixt and between’, spanning two worlds and therefore a place of transformation, where it is possible to have contacts with the dead souls and the spirits. It may be seen as a sacred place, a sanctuary *per se* where protective rituals have been performed before entering the bridge, on the bridge and after reaching the other side.

(f) *funeral building*

One argument for the interpretation as a *sacellum* with funerary aspects, as earlier proposed, is once again the location at a liminal place where the contacts with the ancestors are good, the boundary between land and water, and the boundary between the living and the dead, just below one of the large necropoleis and placed at the road running from the necropolis close by. Another argument for this function is the room with the stone foundation for banqueting coaches, which may be compared to the benches with nicely carved funeral beds and those seen on the funeral paintings in tombs from Cerveteri and Tarquinia. Pottery for drinking and eating, storage and cooking, braziers for heating and funeral meals, together with high quality Attic and other Greek imports of cups, *lekythoi* and craters and jugs also seen in the funeral banqueting scenes in the tombs. In this interpretation, names of male and female individuals, as well as aristocratic families (*gentes*) also fall into place. The interior measurements of the room, c. 4×4.5 m, is a common size for a dining-room/banquet room for example, with five couches and suitable for a private chapel, rather than a public house used at yearly celebrations of the dead. The apsidal shaped house is slightly smaller than the rectilinear, and lacks traceable furnishings of reclining beds or tables, but that does not exclude the use of the building as a *sacellum* with a funerary aspect. Another possible indication of a chthonic and maybe funeral aspects are the cups and bowls with perforated holes used for libations of wine to the chthonic divinities, *Vesuna* and *Fufluns*, and to the spirits and souls of the ancestors.

The argument against a funerary building is the habit of placing such a structure inside a necropolis, close to the family tomb, where also funeral meals were eaten either at the funeral or at other rituals. Still another argument is that the hidden location of the bridge would have broken the visible contact between the dead and the living.

3.5.2 Multiple functions

The analysis of the contextual data of the pottery and the small finds indicate that the bridge and the affiliated constructions, i.e. the house with the porch or court yard with a fresh water well and the two basins in the backyard, had practical as well as symbolic and ritual functions. Both the find contexts and the environmental contexts have played a major role in the argumentations for and against a specific function. Three practical functions of the complex have been discussed and two symbolic and ritual functions, viz. the domestic, strategic (watch-house), economic (custom house) social (rest-house), and ritual (*sacellum* with funerary aspects and an open air sanctuary with affiliated ritual buildings). Among the practical functions the domestic seems less probable, mainly because of the location of the house deep down in the ravine. Domestic areas during the Protovillanovan and Etruscan periods were mainly for defensive reasons located on top of the plateaus.

The bridge and the road have, during all phases, played a socially and economically important role as a link between the settlements. Likewise, the vessels of both fine and coarse wares from the Protovillanovan to the Classical period indicated that not only drinking and eating, but also storage, cooking and baking had taken place either inside or outside the building. This fact together with the close connection to the main transit road, indicate a practical function as a place for travellers passing the city, with possibilities to eat, drink and to rest. But this function does not contradict the indications of ritual banqueting discussed below.

The watch function at the bridge seems to have been an important issue during all the phases simply because of the strategic location at a physical border. The major control of the flow of travellers and/or enemies coming into the town via *La Dogana* and fording the Vesca was from the southern edge of the Acropolis. However, it was also possible for them to pass along the Pietrisko...
stream and to come from the Vignale hill by the bridge. Therefore, it is reasonable that some kind of control and defence was necessary at the bridge, due to its strategic position between the two hills. The continuous war between Tarquinia and Rome during the last two bridge phases also showed the importance of a watch function since San Giovenale, Blera and San Giuliano constituted the frontier between Tarquinia and Rome before the conquest of Blera in 388 B.C. 1058

The last practical function discussed is as a place where toll has been collected, whether the bridge was private property belonging to the ruling family or collective property. Locals and foreigners using the bridge and the facilities there may have had to pay toll for crossing and for bringing animals and commodities over it. But this function may very well have been secondary and does not contradict other functions.

It has also been argued for a symbolic and ritual function, parallel to the practical functions. The location of the buildings at a physical crossing together with an assumption of a belief that a bridge violated the sacredness of running water has been taken to indicate that specific rites, e.g. pouring libations, drinking and eating or just prayers were performed at this site. Such rituals may be seen as three phases in a rite of passage, i.e. before leaving one side, on the bridge itself and when safe on the other side. The few finds of terracotta and metals objects and the total lack of figurines usually common in rivers or in deposits at rivers speak against sacrifices at every crossing. However, rites of more ordinary daily character involving acts and depositions, which do not leave any traces in the material, may have been performed every time the bridge was crossed. Such simple daily acts may have existed in combination with yearly, periodically more ceremonial rites or at a renewal ceremony, for example after a destruction, to please the spirits and to restore order.

The abundance of drinking, eating and serving vessels, as well as vessels for storage and preparation of food from various periods, can be seen as evidence of ritual banqueting outside or inside the buildings furnished with a \( \pi \)-shaped bench with at least five \( klinai \). Libations of liquids, such as milk, wine and water, were poured from cups and bowls, a few with perforated bottoms, to appease divinities and spirits, e.g. the chthonic gods and the water spirits. Inscribed cups and bowls and terracotta and metal objects seemed to have been given to the gods to secure a safe crossing and prayers were probably said.

In other words, the bridge can also be seen as not only a practical means of communication but also as a symbolic link between this world and the other world, symbolizing the place where it was possible to communicate with the gods and the spirits with some assistance from the priest or the priestess and therefore considered sacred. Seeing the bridge in that way the structures on the northern river-side can be interpreted as buildings with a multifunctionality for banqueting and storage. The symbolic and ritual acts seen in the few inscriptions of ritual character, the two named divinities and two sacrificial words, and the pottery bases with holes, the \( \pi \)-shaped bench interpreted as the foundation of \( klinae \), all suggest that this function existed at least during the early Archaic periods down to the end of the 5th or beginning of the 4th centuries B.C. It may have also been the case during the earlier Iron Age periods.

The funerary connection could also be justified. Ceremonies to the memory of the ancestors may have been performed at the bridge, since it was placed close to the Casale Vignale necropolis and by the river, i.e. at the liminal zone, the area between the visible world and the invisible world, where communication with the souls of the dead was possible. If this function could be applied to the Protovillanovan hut period is uncertain, but it would be plausible for the Orientalizing and the Archaic periods. Whether it continued to have a funeral connection until the place was abandoned during the 3rd century is uncertain. The decline in Greek pottery imports as well as other kinds of pottery during the last period, the filling up of the well, and the stone pavement around the apsidal house are a few indications that the ritual function ceased to be for unknown reasons.

Table 39. Functions of the bridge complex during pre-construction phases 1–3 and building phases 1–4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function of bridge complex</th>
<th>Preconstruction phases 1–3</th>
<th>Building phase 1</th>
<th>Building phase 2</th>
<th>Building phase 3</th>
<th>Building phase 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication link</td>
<td>? (1) x (2–3)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic house</td>
<td>? (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch-place, strategic function</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest-place/way-station</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom-place</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritual place/sacellum</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sacellum</em> with funerary aspect</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up: Some of the proposed functions seem to have been more in focus than others during some phases, but the interpretation of the material culture in the bridge complex has shown that several possible functions of practical, symbolic and ritual character could be considered, and that these multiple functions (integrated) were in use more or less contemporaneously. The crucial point here is the location of the complex by the river, the natural boundary, as well as the symbolic meaning of the running water of the river as an important liminal zone and the vicinity to the necropolis with its own liminal zones. That concept is also reflected in the status of the bridge crossing of the liminal zone as a feature, which takes on sacred, as well as practical functions. The bridge itself could be seen as a uniting factor between practical, symbolic and ritual functions, due to its closeness to an important main road, the closeness to the necropolis and being a link between settlements, and its liminal location.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Argument for</th>
<th>Argument against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication link</td>
<td>Remains of bridge abutments on both river banks, remains of road beds on both sides; part of a local and intraregional road network; connection between settlements and necropoleis on several plateaux.</td>
<td>The remains of bridge abutments and road beds suggest its role in transportation, but its location on liminal zones is also a factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic house</td>
<td>Buildings with rectilinear ground-plan, one or two rooms, one dining-room with π-shaped bench, table wares, coarse ware pottery indicating eating, drinking, storing, cooking, braziers, animal bones, food residues, water-supply, well, basins, ordinary tiles, objects for textile production; refuse of metal production.</td>
<td>The tradition to locate dwellings on top of a promontory speaks against a location in the valley at a liminal place, inscriptions on pottery suggesting a symbolic/ritual function, abundance of high quality Attic imports of cups and lekythos products, Etruscan black-figure cups of a high status value, high quality imports (?!). The apsidal ground-plan of Houses 3A-B so far unique and not associated with Etruscan dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch-house, strategic and defensive function</td>
<td>The strategic location at a territorial border linking two settlements; weapons.</td>
<td>The abundance of domestic pottery, Greek imports of high value for the nobility, votive inscriptions, objects for textile production, lack of furnishing in the buildings. The π-shaped bench common in living-rooms at banquets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom house, trade</td>
<td>Buildings at a bridge connecting two settlements, close to a main economic road and transhumance route; sheep/goat, pig and cattle bones, inscription of a divinity as protector of boundaries, owner’s names; graffiti, refuse of metal production for supply of weapons, bolts, nails; water-supply from well.</td>
<td>Location at the road and bridge, close to main road, rectilinear house plan with one and two rooms with a bench for couches, dining-room, water-supply from well, tufa basins, lots of pottery for drinking and eating, storing, cooking, storing, washing, space for animals and carriages, bones of domestic animals, food residues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way-station, rest-house/ tavern/inn</td>
<td>Location at the road and bridge, close to main road, rectilinear house plan with one and two rooms with a bench for couches, dining-room, water-supply from well, tufa basins, lots of pottery for drinking and eating, storing, cooking, storing, washing, space for animals and carriages, bones of domestic animals, food residues.</td>
<td>Too small for banqueting with many people, Attic imports and other pottery too valued for ordinary dining, high quality imports, owner’s inscriptions, votive inscriptions on bowls and cups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bridge as a ritual place with nearby ritual buildings, the building used as a sacellum</td>
<td>Location at a liminal zone, along the road and close to the bridge, the bridge itself a sanctuary, close to transhumance routes, houses with rectilinear and apsidal ground-plans, π-shaped bench, water-supply, fresh water well and terracotta basins for purification rituals, building continuity, gifts to divinities: terracotta loom-weights, bobbins and spindle-whorls, metal objects; braziers, coarse wares; high status pottery: high quality, Attic imports of eye-cups with Dionysian patterns, cups and lekythos, or Etruscan black-figure cups of, eye-cups, votive inscriptions, graffiti as, star and pentagram; ritual words on pottery and loom-weights, libation through cups and bowls with perforated holes at the bottom; spanti (plates and phialai) vessels used in libation rituals, domestic and wild animal bones, dog and human skeleton.</td>
<td>No terracotta or metal figurines, no coins, no literary sources, few miniatures of pottery. The size of the room too small for being a banquet room for a large company presupposing instead outdoor celebrations nearby or on the bridge; no acroteria, no terracotta antefixes, no hearth inside the building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sacellum with a funerary aspect

Location at a liminal place, close to roads running to cemeteries close by, houses with \( x \)-shaped bench suitable for platforms of coaches at banqueting for the dead and the ancestors: pottery for drinking and eating, storing, cooking, braziers for heating and funerary meals, high quality Attic import of cups and lekythoi, jugs also used in tombs and in funerary rituals, female and male names of individuals and names of aristocratic families, libations to chthonic; ritual words, fresh water well and traces of purification rituals; water-supply from the well, space for carriages, animal bones and food residues, the size common for a dining-room-banquet room with e.g. 5 couches.; the size of the rectilinear or apsidal building suitable rather for a private chapel than a public house; building continuity of house, road and bridge.

3.5.3 Concluding remarks

The boundaries between the settlement and the cemeteries were very clear. It was obviously important to separate the living from the dead by placing the necropoleis on the other side of a clearly defined boundary, such as a ravine or river and on a nearby promontory visible from the settlement. The visible boundary of each individual family grave was also marked by cippi placed either upon or beside the grave. Fear of evil and death was obvious, and rites have to be performed.\(^{1059}\) Death can be seen as a rite of transformation. Rites of passage consist of three phases: rite of separation, marginal state and a rite of aggregation.\(^{1060}\) The marginal state or the liminal phase is when the person is in a state of limbo, neither in the world of the living nor in the world of the dead, but where the contact with the gods and the spirits are good. The person is neither ‘betwixt nor in between’. The funeral preparations started in the house of the dead with mourners around the bed (prothesis). It may be seen as the first phase of separation.\(^{1061}\) The second phase is when the soul was separated from the body and the corpse was taken on a funeral carriage (ekphora) on its journey to the unknown world. It was brought via the bridge to the cemetery to be put into the family tomb where funeral rites were supposed to be performed outside and inside the tomb. The liminal zones are several: at the bridge, at the tomb, in the dromos and inside the tomb itself. The adaptation phase was when the mourners turned back home and the body was left in the tomb waiting for the soul to be brought to the world of the dead.\(^{1062}\) The Etruscan interest in making boundaries and their view of the afterlife is also underlined in the location of the necropolis as well as the funeral architecture, exterior as well as interior. Izzet has explored boundaries within the tomb, and she argues that the funeral architecture and the furnishings show how the Etruscans used special symbols for how they looked

---

\(^{1059}\) The death demons and gods were often pictured as very horrifying creatures, cf. Pfiffig 1975, figs. 97, 101, 131–133.

\(^{1060}\) E. Leach 1976, fig. 7. See also van Gennep 1960 (1909), 27, where he divides the rites in preliminary, liminal and post-liminal rites; cf. Widengren 1965, 287–309.

\(^{1061}\) Spivey & Stoddart 1990, fig. 64; Pallotino 1975, fig. 59.

\(^{1062}\) Morris 1987; winged demons bringing souls to the other world are often pictured in tomb paintings through doors to the other world, cf. Spivey & Stoddart 1990, fig. 8:51.
upon death and afterlife.\textsuperscript{1063} It was as important for the living as for the dead souls that the visual contact between the settlement and the necropolis was established.

The monumental tumuli and the chamber tombs were placed on either side of a road running through the cemetery up to the settlement. They were clearly visible from the town, the main roads or the surrounding villages. The idea of separation of the dead from the living is obvious in the choice of the special areas for the dead, for example on the opposite side of a river or a gully, which became a clear boundary and an important liminal zone between this world and the other world. This mortuary pattern at San Giovenale and other neighbouring sites (Blera, San Giuliano, Tolfa, Monterano) is influenced and inspired by the same burial patterns of the other Etruscan city-states during the Orientalizing and the Archaic periods.\textsuperscript{1064} Riva and Stoddart have already observed a special phenomenon in the mortuary pattern, viz. that the boundary of the settlement was also seen as a liminal zone and is often marked by one or several burial grounds, located on opposite hills.\textsuperscript{1065} The Porzarago necropolis, north of San Giovenale, and the tombs along the Pietrisco are the only burial grounds around San Giovenale, which yielded cremation tombs from the early Iron Age following the funeral practices of the Protovillanovan and Villanovan cemeteries at Caere, Tarquinia, and Veii.\textsuperscript{1066} Consequently, there is continuity in the choice of space for the dead, but the way of treating the body changed from cremation and burials in pit graves during the Iron Age to earth burials in monumental tumulus and chamber tombs during the Orientalizing and Archaic period and tile covered graves during the Hellenistic-Roman period.

The arguments for and against the above assumed functions of the architectural remains and the bridge have been presented, and discussed. They were of a secular as well as a sacral nature. The only secular function I want to exclude is the pure domestic one, and that is because of the placing of the buildings. They may, however, have been the homes of the person who took care of the cult or the officer in charge of the protection of the bridge or the keeper of the cult. My conclusion from the arguments for and against the assumed functions is that they have played an important role at the same time during the life time of the bridges, a few more significant than others during the suggested periods. There has not been 'either or' but rather 'both and' due to the character of the remains and the special find context, viz. the natural boundary between two settlements and the liminal and the metaphysical boundary between the known and the unknown, between the living and the dead, and between the people and the gods.

\textsuperscript{1063} Izzet 1996; 2001a; Riva \& Stoddart 1996.
\textsuperscript{1064} Another settlement and funerary pattern with the houses at the foot of the promontory and the tombs located upon the hill was found in the \textit{ager caeretanus}, cf. Rendeli 1993. On the mortuary pattern of burying the dead on the same hill as the houses, for example at Plan di Stigliano, see n. 693.
\textsuperscript{1065} Riva \& Stoddart 1996.
\textsuperscript{1066} See \textit{Città d'Etruria} 2001 for Veii and Caere; for Tarquinia, see Rendeli 1993.
CHAPTER 4

CONTINUITY AND CHANGE

Now Past, Present, Future have mingled
A new sort of Present to make;
And my life is all disembodied,
Without time, without space, without break.
(F.W. Faber, s.a., 95).

Human nature tries to aim at continuity in every respect of life, and change is often considered as a threat, something that disturbs the balance of life and requires acts of restoration. But the change caused by nature or human acts has to be accepted and enclosed in daily life, and the Etruscans were not an exception.

On the basis of an analysis of the character of the material culture and its contexts a set of integrated functions of the bridge and the building complex have been interpreted. These functions seem to have played a significant role in the communication between the two settlements at the site and the surrounding necropoleis as well.

This chapter will complete the discussion by considering both continuity and change of some features and functions in time and space in the bridge complex as well as in the settlement and the surrounding environment from the 9th to the 2nd centuries B.C.

4.1 FEATURES OF CONTINUITY

The meaning of continuity and change in time and space has been discussed in Chapter 1. Through analyses of the contextual data, it has been possible to discern similarities and dissimilarities in the material culture found in the bridge complex, indicating continuity and change on the site over several hundreds years. The analyses have also been the base for establishing chronological phases at the bridge, compatible with the phases at the San Giovenale plateau and the dates of the surrounding tombs.

The analysis of the architectural remains and the finds, especially the pottery, testify to continuous activity at both banks of the Pietrisco from at least the Early Archaic time until c. 200 B.C. or even later. However, pottery from the Early Neolithic, the Protovillanovan and the Orientalizing periods indicates that there was some kind of activity on the spot much earlier. The efforts laid on constructing buildings and new bridges, almost on the same spot as the older damaged ones, also show the importance of the place and the need of continuity with the past. The same concept is to be seen in the mortuary practises where rituals are important in order to keep in touch with the ancestors.

The continuity in the case of the bridge complex consists in using exactly the same spot, the deep river banks of the Pietrisco brook, for a crossing. The crossing was made possible by a bridge of pure wood or a mixed structure of stone and wood. Traces of, at least, four stone and wooden bridges and four roads dated from the 6th to the 3rd centuries B.C., or even later, were discovered. The early remains of pottery and tiles indicate that there has been activity on the spot before the stone bridges, making it plausible to suggest the existence of earlier roads and wooden bridges. The roads and the bridges seem to have been rebuilt immediately after destruction with minor changes in location in order to obtain a stable ground and to secure a safe crossing. Likewise the tufa building, constructed contemporaneously with the road and the bridge, was

1067 See the discussion of continuity at Catalhöyük in Hodder 1998.
reconstructed almost on the same spot as the collapsed building. There may have been various reasons, both practical and symbolic, for continuity. The more practical and economical reasons may have been the reuse of existing walls, stones and tiles. But it is also plausible to suggest that the direct contact with the older building and the reuse of the old building material may have had a specific symbolic meaning, a feeling of security and closeness with the past. Foundations of four tile-covered tufa houses were identified, and tiles from an earlier phase indicated a possible fifth tile-covered house.

Furthermore, the roads and the bridge over the Pietrisko stream were connected to a large and well-developed road network. This network facilitated communication between people on an interregional and intraregional scale during the 8th up to the 3rd centuries B.C., as well as on a local level within the settlements. The network was important for the transport of people, animals and for the surplus of commodities down to the coastal areas, as well as for social contacts between families and relatives. This communication path would have been used by locals and strangers, either if they passed over the bridge to the neighbouring hill or just visited the site to eat or rest when passing through San Giovenale. The flow of visitors to the bridge and to San Giovenale would have changed with the growth of the settlement from a hut village to an important Etruscan town. Intensified contacts during some periods with the surrounding settlements and the city-states, affected the life conditions in the settlements and consequently the activities at the bridge.

Activities of a practical and a more symbolic and ritual character have more or less functioned contemporaneously during all the suggested phases, with no sign of a division between profane and sacred. There is neither nor rather both and. The westernised man has a tendency of separating these aspects in a manner that is anachronistic and does not necessarily reflect the conceptions of ancient people. The crucial point here is the location of the complex by the river, the natural boundary, as well as the symbolic meaning of the running water of the river, as an important liminal zone, and the vicinity to the necropolis with its own liminal zones.

The construction of tile-roofed stone houses, roads and bridges during the local pre-construction phase 3 and the succeeding four building phases at the bridge, i.e. the Etruscan periods, bears witness to a strong well organized society, a good supply of labourers and skilled workers, e.g. architects, carpenters, masons, and a good supply of raw materials, such as clay, timber and tufa blocks.

Continuity, in many of the proposed multiple functions, can be distinguished over time, some longer than others. The continuous use of the place as a crossing from Protovillanovan time down to the 3rd century B.C., or even the 2nd, shows that people valued this location as a proper communication link to the inhabitants on the Vignale plateau (Table 37). One reason for the choice of this particular place may be the closeness to the necropolis. A more appropriate spot for a crossing of the brook some hundred metres west of the bridge, where it today seems easy to cross, was probably used at a later date when the bridge was destroyed and abandoned. However, although this location has not yet been fully investigated it cannot be excluded that this crossing also was used during earlier times.

The function as a watch-place on the northern side of the Pietrisko, for protective reasons, may have been important during the whole durability of the area, due to the strategic location at a border between two settlement hills. Intruders from the Vignale hill and from the Vesca area could be stopped at this place.

The function as a custom site is also supposed to have continued as long as there has been a bridge between the two hills, used both by locals or visitors.

Continuity, at least from the pre-construction phase 3 to building phase 2, regarding the building and the other facilities functioning as a rest-house with banqueting possibilities and a way-station, has also been distinguished. The function may have continued even during building phase 3, despite the lack of interior furnishings, indicating foundations for klinai. It is less probable that this function continued during the last phase since the water supply from the well was closed.

The symbolic and ritual functions of this area, due to its boundary and liminal character, including the bridge and the buildings nearby, has been proposed to have occurred, since the area started to be used as a crossing. The banqueting sets from various periods support this assumption even if the frequency varied during the different phases. The rites, either the most common such as prayer, offerings of fruit, flowers or such of a more ceremonial character, such as libations, banqueting to the gods and the ancestors or inaugurations may have been continuously performed daily, periodically and/or yearly as long as people used the bridge.

Given that the buildings have functioned as a small shrine, a sacellum with a funerary aspect, it would have been possible that it was in use at least from the first building phase, if not earlier, until the abandonment phase.
4.2 FEATURES OF CHANGE

By focusing on the dissimilarities in the material culture, e.g. the reconstructions of bridges, slight changes in road directions, reconstructions of buildings, and new building techniques, there are distinguished features also indicating a break in continuity and thus showing the introduction of a new phase. The analyses of the architectural remains, the pottery, and the stratification have yielded possibilities to create three pre-construction phases and four building phases, dating from the 9th to the 3rd–2nd centuries B.C., for the bridge complex as well as for four main building phases.

In general, the ravine landscape changed very slowly over a long period of time. The physical environment around San Giovenale and especially along the Pietrisco and the bridge complex seemed to have undergone changes, due to erosion caused by human action, such as the clearing of trees or building activity. However, sudden natural disasters such as earthquakes and landslides could change the environment entirely which made it necessary for the people to adapt accordingly. The earthquake/s effected also the settlement areas and caused serious damage to the buildings.

4.2.1 Pre-construction phases 1-3 (9th-6th centuries B.C.)

The Final Bronze Age and Protovillanovan pottery indicate some kind of activity on both sides of the stream (Fig. 35). In the following phases there were obvious changes in both the bridge construction technique as well as in the house plans. A plain wooden bridge over the Pietrisco, similar to the modern wooden bridge at Monterano, was suggested in the phase before 565 B.C. (cf. Figs. 68–69). This plain wooden technique was abandoned for a bridge in a mixed technique of tufa ashlar abutments, and a wooden superstructure.

Starting with the obvious architectural changes it may only be hypothesized whether there was a hut or not at the bridge. Given a hut, it would have been oval or rounded with a thatched roof like those on the Acropolis and the Borgo. Despite the lack of evidence there may have been such a structure at the site, judging from the domestic character of the finds (see Figs. 75–77, 94).

The Orientalizing pottery of pre-construction phase 2 also indicates activity and perhaps a structure similar to the rectangular hut with a straw roof in Area F East on the Acropolis (Figs. 78, 80, 83). Pre-construction phase 3 is based on the existence of 6th century pottery and tiles, which may reflect the first rectangular house at the bridge roofed with tiles (Figs. 77–80, 83–85). Other minor changes within the continuum were seen when the road and the bridge on stone abutments, with a wooden superstructure and parapet, were moved higher and higher up the slope but in the same oblique direction after each destruction.

4.2.2 Building phase 1 (565–550/530 B.C.)

The main change between pre-construction phase 3 and building period 1 occurred when the decision was made to build a more stable bridge on stone abutments with a wooden superstructure, a road and a building with integrated functions. This decision partly changed the environment down at the bridge. Cuttings were made in the bedrock for the construction of a long and high wall of aslar stones along the northern river bank as well as on the southern side, as earlier mentioned in chapter 2.3 (Fig. 44b). The slope behind the walls was filled up with soil and debris of architectural terracottas (tiles), tufa stones and finds from a probable refuse deposit after the preceding structures. The road, paved with soil mixed with river stones, tuffetti, tile fragments and pottery, and the bridge was now placed obliquely to the other side for an uncertain reason. The rectangular building House 1 with two rooms was placed a few meters from the road and the bridge, with the main entrance from the courtyard. In this phase the two large tufa basins were also placed in the backyard of the house (Fig. 36).

The next dramatic change occurred when the whole area, including the settlements, was struck by an earthquake which destroyed the bridge, the road and the house, and also probably caused a landslide. On the Borgo, the settlement on the north-eastern slope, was completely demolished. This devastation lead to the beginning of building phase 2.

4.2.3 Building phase 2 (550/530–480/470 B.C.)

On the Borgo the north-eastern slope was filled up and new houses with wells were built in a completely different orientation. At the bridge site, the road and the bridge were reconstructed, still in the same oblique way, but placed a little further to the east. House 2 was rebuilt on the same foundation as room A in House 1. The old floor was sealed with a layer of clay and the flat bronze object, within a probable wooden box, is interpreted as a foundation sacrifice. The foundation of the klinai from House 1 was still used but now with a reduced height, due to the new floor. The courtyard became smaller, caused by the road’s changed position near the house.
(Fig. 44a). The long ashlar wall seemed to have collapsed due to the slide and therefore two parallel walls were built to strengthen the area and one of the walls was made at an angle to the abutment wall. On the south side a second road was built more in line with the new road and bridge and a space forming a piazza between the two roads was paved with earth, tiles, pottery and big and small river stones (Fig. 44a). The reason of the destruction of this second phase is uncertain. It may have been either another earthquake or another reason of the destruction of this second phase is uncertain. It may have been either another earthquake or another reason of the destruction of this second phase is uncertain. It may have been either another earthquake or another reason.

4.2.4 Building phase 3 (480/470–400 B.C.)

The major change occurred in the house architecture in the 6th phase, dated after 480/470 to 400 B.C. when the rectilinear ground-plan was changed into a curvilinear shape, i.e. an apse (Figs. 34b, 52). A curvilinear apsidal plan in house architecture is rare in Etruscan late Archaic architecture. No parallel has been found from this period, not even in Rome, but as mentioned earlier, the apsidal shape was very common in domestic as well as sacred buildings in Greece during the 11th to 8th centuries. This change from a rectilinear back to curvilinear is as dramatic and strange as the change in ground plans during the 7th century B.C. 1068.

Here the bronze model of a sheep’s liver from Piacenza, dated to c. 100 B.C. may be mentioned.1069 The visceral side has six triangular units stretching from a circle in the middle, forming an apsidal structure. Each section has an Etruscan inscription of a god’s name. This apsidal shape is surrounded by a double line, which is also divided into sections with an inscribed Etruscan name of a god in each section, showing where the different types of the gods resided (Fig. 104d). The similarity between the apsidal ground-plan of House 3A and this structure on the Piacenza liver is striking. Etruscan haruspices used this kind of liver model for liver consultations.1070 The art of consulting a sheep’s liver in order to learn about the future before taking actions was also used by the Greeks, among other things before crossing a boundary, e.g. a river.1071 This ritual makes the structure on the liver even more interesting although there is no evidence of it at the bridge. Another feature on the Piacenza model are the names of four gods, interpreted as the boundary gods of the four cardinal points.1072 However, none of the two gods in the inscriptions from the bridge is mentioned on the bronze liver.

The single room in House 3A did not contain furnishings of the kind found in Houses 1 and 2, but benches and tables in perishable material can not be excluded. Another uncertainty is whether the house has been thatched or tiled.

What actually caused this puzzling change from a rectilinear back to curvilinear is unknown. It has been argued that this major change depended on several causes: a need of order inside and outside a house and to make clear distinctions or boundaries between domestic and public space, based on a new attitude towards domestic areas, a new inner organisation of space, a constructional cause, or in order to build larger buildings other building material was required. This change was not evidenced at the bridge during the pre-constructional phases 1–2, due to the lack of architectural remains. But since the rich pottery evidence from the equivalent periods on the Acropolis and Borgo show activity at this site it is plausible to suggest that a similar change in architecture may have occurred. The arguments are based on a conviction that house construction is never arbitrary. The owners and the builders of a house were governed by cultural and social rules. The domestic houses are the product of beliefs and ideas of the Etruscans. Thus, the choice of a

1068 For the change from curvilinear forms to rectilinear forms in huts and houses in general and in the settlements at San Giovenale in particular, see Huts and Houses 2001; Karlsson 2001.

1069 The bronze liver is 12.6 cm high, 2.3 cm thick and weighs 635 grams, Van der Meer 1987, figs. 69–70. Regarding the W-E orientation of House 3A–B, it does not, however, correspond to the orientation of the cardinal points on the bronze liver.

1070 Cicero has described ars haruspicina in his De divinatione, written in 44 B.C. He has also mentioned that there were no connections between liver consultation in Greece, Egypt or Carthage, cf. Van der Meer 1987, figs. 72–73, bronze mirrors with livers dated to c. 300 B.C., and an ash urn from Chiusi with a haruspex holding a liver, fig. 74. However, there are some similar features in Mesopotamian and Greek liver consultations. For a general introduction to Etruscan liver consultations, see Pfiffig 1998, 36–48, 111–127; see also index p. 413.

1071 Van der Meer 1987, 17–21, 159.

1072 Van der Meer 1987, figs. 69–70. Regarding the W-E orientation of House 3A–B, it does not, however, correspond to the orientation of the cardinal points on the bronze liver.
particular shape for a house may have a special meaning. A change in house plan must also reflect a change in attitudes and ideas in the society. I agree with Izzet and want to add that my conviction is that all material culture, not only domestic houses, expresses those beliefs and ideas.

A new bridge, probably similar to the previous one, and a new paved road built on a slightly higher level but still in an oblique direction, were constructed after the destruction. If the bridge complex was destroyed by a new earthquake or just a landslide is uncertain. However, the slide/s caused a slight move towards the north-east of the road and the bridge but basically the oblique directions of the roads and the bridges were constant.

4.2.5 Building phase 4 (c. 400–3rd or 2nd century B.C.)

The main change during the fourth building phase occurred when the courtyard, including the well, to the north of House 3 was covered with a delimited dense tufa packing once surrounding the apsidal house (Fig. 62). The two basins in the backyard and the apsidal House, now called House 3B, were left uncovered and incorporated in the packing. Whether the house was totally demolished and rebuilt again or if the house was intact, maybe with just a change of roof, is uncertain. The level of the road was higher though and that must also indicate a new bridge. The pottery defined to this period is scarce and the small finds, viz. metal implements, bronze and iron jewellery, terracotta loom-weights, spindle-whorls and bobbins, which dominated during the 7th to the 6th centuries, decreased in number, almost to zero, in this building phase.

Another change during this phase concerns the ceramics with Etruscan inscriptions, deposited during c. 150 years (see chapters 2 and 3), and which were now no longer found. One possible reason for the total absence of inscriptions from the later phases may be a diminished ritual function of the bridge complex. The diminishing pottery frequency may also be connected to this change. Another explanation can be connected to the political and social situation during this phase. A decrease in the population, shown in the smaller number of houses on the settlement, may have had an effect on the amount of finds. The surveys in the area have shown that people preferred the areas east of San Giovenale for settlements and used the plateaux more for agriculture and viticulture.

The major change of the bridge building during the first building phase may have depended on a social and economic reorganization of the city-state of Caere. This was the case in Rome during the middle of the 6th century, for example imposing toll and restrictions in the wine and oil production, with resulting effects on the satellite towns. The population growth in the area resulted in an increase of food supply and a need for a good infrastructure. A well functioning network of roads for transporting humans and goods, used both by locals and non-locals as well as herdsmen and their animals for long distance transhumance, was important.

Also the characteristics of the material culture changed. Small finds and pottery followed the usual development of wares and shapes from the Protovillanovan period to the 3rd century, but a change in frequency could be seen during the two last building phases (see Table 39). The abundance of fine and coarse pottery, local as well as regional, from Protovillanovan to the Hellenistic periods indicates activity on both banks (see Tables 39–40). The characteristic dominating pottery shapes were jugs, cups, and bowls used for serving, drinking and eating. Jars, basins, dolia, and pithoi made of coarse wares were used for storing dry foodstuffs and liquids, cooking and eating. Cooking-stands and braziers were common during the Protovillanovan period down to the end of the 5th century.

There are clear changes in Etruscan funeral architecture and ritual space over time especially during the transition from Archaic to Classical time, due to changes in social behaviour and beliefs. Such a major change is distinguished during 700–680 B.C. in funerary architecture when there was a shift from individual burials to aristocratic elite tombs, the tumulus. This period was the birth of funeral architecture. The next major change occurred c. 670–525 during the Orientalizing and Archaic periods when the chambers and doors more and more resembled the form of domestic buildings. Similar major changes during 150 years can be distinguished both in the funeral architecture and in the domestic architecture at San Giovenale, viz. changes from oval huts and a gradual transition from rectangular thatched huts to rectangular tile roofed houses. The town seems to have changed to a well-organised community of aristocratic clans with the ability to build monumental funeral and domestic architecture as well as bridges. A

1074 Izzet 1996.
1075 Izzet 1996, 58.
1076 Colonna 1986, 395, 398.
1077 Karlsson 2001; San Giovenale 4:1 forthcoming.
In the concept of Etruscan ritual space, social as well as physical boundaries are essential. Izzet has argued for a boundary between the dichotomies profane–sacred and inside–outside, tombs–community. A change in the boundary reflects changed ideas in the society. From the middle of the 6th century onwards there is a concentration on the concept of the boundary in funeral architecture. Focus is drawn to the dromos and the door in the tombs and how these features change over time, from an internal to an external focus of the tomb.1082 This proposed focus on boundary and the dichotomies over time in funeral architecture by the Etruscans is further emphasised by the road, the bridge and its affiliated building at the Pietriscio bridge complex, and the pouring of libations, drinking and eating rituals performed at a physical as well as a liminal boundary.

Change in the view of death and death rituals was reflected in the choice of burial and funerary practice. Cremation was replaced by inhumation. The funerary practice of putting the ash urn in individual *pozzo* tombs from the Protovillanovan period changed into laying out the bodies on beds in large family tumulus tombs.

These changed views and ideas on architecture must also have been reflected particularly in the monumental bridge and House 1 at the Pietriscio and in the rituals performed before crossing the river, i.e. the visible and the invisible boundary. The next major period of change in funerary architecture occurred c. 525 to 480/70 B.C., a period when cultural changes at different places and at different times occurred. Architectural mouldings appeared on the outside of the tomb and the inner decorations of the tombs were less. The big tumuli were replaced by smaller rectangular structures of tufa blocks, more like the domestic structures. Colour was used on the walls and there was a change in the arrangements of space within the cemeteries, with the tombs more organised along roads in order to solve the problem of lack of space.1078 This is also discernable at San Giovenale in the necropoleis where cube tombs and chamber tombs cut into the tufa rock have been found.1079 This period of change has been connected with the decline of the *gens* and with the development of a new middle class.

The next change occurred in the middle of the 5th century, characterized by chamber tombs with staircases up on the roof and a change in ritual space.1080 This type of tomb has not been found yet at San Giovenale but single chamber tombs dug directly into the rock are frequent.1081 In the leading Etruscan society there was a decline both in power and trade after the defeat at Cumae 474 B.C. During the period there was also a major shift in the morphology of House 3 from a rectilinear to a curvilinear shape, something not seen before either in funerary or domestic architecture. Furthermore a decline in Attic imports and inscribed vessels are recognized. This declining trend seems to have continued until the bridge complex and the town were abandoned during the 3rd century B.C., or later.

---

1078 Izzet 1996, 59; Naso 1996, fig. 111; for the use of colours and decoration of the Porzarago tombs at San Giovenale and other cemeteries, see Naso 1996, 142–154. The Porzarago cemetery was in use from Protovillanovan period, and from the end of the 7th to the end of the 6th centuries.
1080 Izzet 1996, 60.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

One of the goals of an archaeologist is to study processes from the past. In the case of the Pietrisco bridge complex the character of the archaeological remains, their contexts and an established local chronology have helped to reveal part of the place’s history and made it possible to discuss things, such as continuity and change with the regards to the use of space, architecture, and of practices and functions.

The presentation of the archaeological remains, the architectural as well as the pottery and small finds, has been made in chapter 2. In chapter 3 the discussions of the finds from the Pietrisco bridge complex have been made within a frame of landscape archaeology, i.e. the physical, economic, socio-political and mental landscape. With quantity, stratigraphical and spatial analyses of the remains from various levels of context, that is, the natural setting, the topography and the geography, it has been possible to make a comprehensive interpretation of the bridge complex and to study its significance for the community at San Giovenale and its surroundings (chapters 2 and 3). Especially, the latter, i.e. the placing of the remains at a boundary between settlements and necropoleis, has shown that the structures could have been used in multiple ways, reflecting over a long period of time, not only in practical functions of everyday life, but that they also reflect attitudes and beliefs of the human beings. There always was an intention behind every object and every action.

The diachronic study has revealed activities in the area divided into three pre-construction phases and four building phases, ranging from the 10th down to the 2nd centuries B.C. Within these phases it has been possible to distinguish both features of continuity and features of change in time and space, during the Etruscan periods. Features of continuity are, for example, that the place was an important crossing, and that is shown in the repeated reconstruction of roads, bridges and in their directions, and also in the existence of buildings during four building phases. Probably also the pre-construction phases shared in some of these continous functions.

The features of change that can be distinguished are due both to nature and to man. To the former are changes in the environment due to landslides and earthquakes, in their turn making changes in the bridge constructions necessary. Human agents decided on changes in building material from wood to a mixture of stone and timber, on the ground plans and the size of the buildings (chapter 4).

There are many physical boundaries at San Giovenale, as may be expected in this flat plain and ravine landscape. Located at the Mignone river system, the territorial border between the ruling city-states, Caere and Tarquinia, San Giovenale might be considered a frontier settlement during the 7th to the 5th centuries B.C., inhabited by aristocratic families, probably originating from the Caeretan aristocracy, and with a middle class of artisans, smiths, potters, masons, architects and labourers (freedman and slaves). The society was politically, socially and culturally influenced by the leading cities, which is reflected in the mortuary patterns and the material culture.

The physical boundaries between the settlements and the cemeteries were thus very clear at San Giovenale, as were the symbolic and liminal boundaries. This is shown in the habit of separating the living from the dead by placing the necropoleis on the other side of a clearly defined boundary, such as a ravine or a river, and on a nearby promontory near to and visible from the settlement. The road, La Dogana, running through the ravine and separating the settlement hill and the Casale Vignale cemetery was a clear example of a physical boundary, as were the brooks Famnilume between the settlement hill and the Porzarago graveyard, and the Pietrisco.
The finds from both sides of the Pietrisco bridge complex have shown that the Vignale hill, with its settlement and roads on the south side of the Pietrisco, was connected via the bridge. The Vignale plateau seems to have played a more significant role for the whole San Giovenale community than previously has been assumed, as evidenced by the bridge and its nearby building. However, the remains from the Vignale are unpublished and it has hitherto not been possible to confirm whether the Vignale hill was a village or town of its own or if it was incorporated into the communities on the Borgo and the Acropolis.

The character of the remains and the various levels of contextual analyses made it possible to distinguish five distinctive functions for the structures at the bridge over the Pietrisko. From a more generalised point of view these suggested specialised functions may be divided into practical, social and symbolic functions and these three aspects have been of help in identifying an object or a structure. Besides practical functions of everyday use, economic and strategic functions have also been considered.

Crossing the Pietrisko bridge or other bridges in the area, may have meant several things to the people. Geographically and topographically the local and the interregional road networks including the bridges were necessary to facilitate communications between the settlements and the necropoleis on the surrounding hills. For the locals it meant to meet and socialize with neighbours and relatives on the opposite hill, and for the non-locals, and visitors from neighbouring Etruscan villages or towns or other territories it was a way of reaching an entrance to the town.

It could also have meant to bring goods for exchange and trade and to bring animals to and from the pastures on the surrounding hills. It could have given the people of San Giovenale a welcome income in the form of a toll fee for using the bridge. Contemporaneously the chthonic spirits and the gods got their share, maybe as a prayer or a libation of wine, milk or honey to please the gods for trespassing on sacred space and for a safe return. These rituals may have been more elaborate at special celebrations when eating and drinking to the honour of the gods or the ancestors was a part of the ceremonies. To bring vessels or terracotta objects with inscribed names and ritual words seemed to have been important.

Specific archaeological remains have been interpreted as being used in different types of rituals: such as banqueting-eating and drinking, sacrificing of animals (suovetaurilia), libation offering, gifts, ritual acts performed periodically, yearly or at closing a structure and the inauguration of a another structure, purification by sacrificing a dog after a ritual killing or an accidental death of a human being, acts ceremonies to the ancestors etc. The simple everyday rituals crossing the bridge, the liminal and ritual zone, may have been of simple kind which does not leave any traces, such as saying a prayer, offering fruits or flower to the spirits just before entering the bridge, on the bridge and when reaching the other side etc.

The bridge is therefore the physical visible link between the acropolis and the necropolis, between land and water, but also the metaphysical invisible link between life and death, between the living and the ancestors, between man and his gods. This bridge pattern is visible at San Giovenale, but it may also be plausible to apply it on other Etruscan sites.

The Etruscans seem to have valued continuity in various aspects of life and death. This is observed in the continuity of their settlements on high plateaux, in the location of their necropoleis also on high plateaux, often on the other side of a ravine or a river and close to the habitation. Continuity is also seen in ritual acts performed at crossings of various kinds. Continuity and change at the same time can be observed in the reconstructions of new houses or bridges at the same place and in touch with the old ones but with minor or major changes. Such changes may have been caused by nature or by human acts, due to ideological, economic or social changes.

Crossing defined borders between various disciplines, their theories and methods, has been challenging, like jumping out from the edge of a cliff in full trust of landing safely.

The following scenario may have been possible where the boundaries between profane and sacred functions are blurred. While a herdsman transported his animals across the river he could have met merchants with imports and exports passing and by paying toll for using the bridge, both persons pouring libations before entering the bridge to appease the local spirits and gods on his long or short journey. Non locals, either from the nearest town or a stranger from Umbrian or Faliscan areas passing San Giovenale on the La Dogana rested at the house at the bridge drinking fresh water from the well. He could have met children quickly running over the bridge to avoid the fearful spirits living under the bridge, adults in prayer on the bridge, a sacred space where the contacts were good between man and the gods. He could also meet a funeral procession from the Vignale hill crossing the bridge to the necropolis on the other side and that has stopped for drinking and eating inside or outside the small building to the memory of the deceased and the ancestors. If he had passed the bridge after a period of major changes he could have
passed the local priest or priestess celebrating and inaugurating the new bridge after the earthquake bringing locally produced pottery and Greek imports and other inscribed gifts from the locals and performing libations and animal sacrifices. At that time he also may have met soldiers guarding the bridge for the sake of himself and the inhabitants of San Giovenale.
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Figs. 1–92, 94–106
Fig. 1. Plan of cities and main roads in southern Etruria (after *Architettura etrusca* 1986, 28).
Fig. 2b. Plan of San Giovenale and its surroundings (drawing by EMPG (after Etruscan culture 1962)).

Fig. 3. Aerial photo of San Giovenale (after Stato Maggiore aeronautica militare, no. 07386, 1961).
Fig. 4. View over the plain at San Giovenale (photo ML).

Fig. 6a. The modern habitation at Civitella Cesi (photo ML).

Fig. 5. View of the eroded landscape and the ford over the Vesca (photo SF).

Fig. 6b. The modern habitation at Barbarano Romano (photo JM, courtesy of Nordiska museets bildbyrå).

Fig. 6c. The ruins of the medieval castle at San Giovenale with viticulture in the foreground (photo YBF).

Fig. 7. The unexplored northern abutment at the Pietriscò in 1959 (photo CEÖ).
Fig. 8. The two baulks left from 1963 (photo SF).

Fig. 9. The two baulks (loci 1-2) investigated in 1999 (photo RH).
Fig. 10. Model of liminal zones (after Riva and Stoddart 1996, fig. 1).

Fig. 11. A liminal and sacred zone and a field of ritual activity formed by boundaries of this world and the other world (after Leach 1976, figs. 4 and 8).

Fig. 12. Model of theoretical approaches used.
Fig. 13. Various levels of context. Each unit is a part of a bigger unit forming a holistic understanding of the bridge complex. F (find), FC (find composition), BC (the bridge complex as find context), SG (San Giovenale).
Figs. 15a-b. The conglomerate layer at the N bank of the Vesca and the effect of water erosion (photo YBF).

Fig. 16. The conglomerate layer below the northern abutment (photo SF).

Fig. 17. The main Etruscan tufa cut road and the modern *La Dogana* south of the promontory (photo SF).

Fig. 18. The main Etruscan tufa cut road (photo YBF).

Fig. 20. The ford at the Vesca (photo YBF).

Fig. 21. Cuttings forming a possible bridge abutment (photo YBF).
Figs. 19a-b. The Etruscan and modern road (*La Dogana*) running through San Giovenale still used by herdsmen (photo JM, courtesy of the Nordiska museets bildbyrå).

Fig. 22. Ford over the Mignone used during the summer by herdsmen, and a bridge used during the winter (photo JM, courtesy of Nordiska museets bildbyrå).
Fig. 23. The location of the architectural remains on the banks of the Pietrisco. Casale Vignale to the left and Vignale to the right with the Tolfa mountains in the distance (photo SF).

Fig. 24. A close-up picture of the architectural remains on the riverbanks of the Pietrisco (photo SF).

Fig. 25. A general view of the excavation area on the northern river bank of Pietrisco taken from the Vignale in 1963 (photo SF).
Fig. 26. The northern abutment with the stonework in the foreground on the southern bank of the Pietriscio (photo SF).

Fig. 27. Drawing of a bridge abutment over the Vesca (after Gammurini 1972, fig. 103:3).

Fig. 28. The autumn flow of the Pietriscio (photo SF).

Fig. 29. The remains of the SW foundation walls P and Q to the right on the southern river bank of the Pietriscio (photo SF).
Fig. 30. A general view of the architectural remains on the S bank of the Pietrisco: wall O to the left, the stone packing in the middle and walls P and Q to the right. Note the collapse of the conglomerate layer (photo SF).

Fig. 32. Strada delle poqette, the tomb road to the necropolis of Casale Vignale (photo YBF).

Fig. 31. The southeastern road from the Vignale plateau down to the Pietrisco bridge (photo SF).

Fig. 33a. Tumulus dated to the 7th to the 5th centuries B.C. in the Casale Vignale necropolis (photo YBF).

Fig. 33b. Tumuli along a tomb road in the Banditaccia cemetery at Caere (photo SF).
Fig. 34a. Trench and shaft plan over the northern part of the bridge complex at San Giovenale (after drawing by SF).
Fig. 34b. Architectural elements at the northern bank of the Pietrisco (after drawing by VC).

Fig. 37. E-W section of the architectural remains on the northern bank of the Pietrisco (after drawing of VC).
Fig. 35. Plan of the pre-construction phases 1-3 of the bridge area (drawing by YBF and RH).
Fig. 36. Plan of building phase 1 of the bridge complex (drawing by YBF and RH).
Fig. 38. Part of wall A of Houses 1 and 2 and part of the south border of the large tufa packing (photo SF).

Fig. 39. Wall H of Houses 1 and 2 with the bench in the front and the two basins in the backyard (photo SF).

Fig. 40. The lower basin filled with water and the ledge below in relation to the wall H of Houses 1 and 2 (photo SF).

Fig. 41. The well head of the first and the second building phases (photo SF).

Fig. 42. The complete bench in Houses 1 and 2 with the clayey floor of House 2, and the foundation deposit in the right corner (photo RH).

Fig. 43. Wall A of Houses 1 and 2 with the surface of floor in House 2 visible in the middle and the bench in the background (photo RH).
Fig. 44a. Plan of building phase 2 of the bridge complex (drawing by YBF and RH).
Fig. 44b. General section A-A N to S through the excavation areas on both banks of the Pietrisco (after drawing by VC).
Fig. 45. E-W section of shafts 1-2 (strata 1-8) (after drawing by VC).

Fig. 44c. Part of general section A-A, on the northern side of the Pietrisco.
Fig. 46. The lower remains of the clay floor (locus 5) in front of the bench in House 2 (photo RH).

Fig. 47. A sketch of loci 1, 2, and 5 (drawing by RH).

Fig. 48. Pottery and charcoal in the corner the bench just above locus 4 (photo SF).

Fig. 49. Sketch over locus 3 (drawing by RH).

Fig. 50. Sketch over tile fragments and squeezed clay (locus 3) above dark coloured spots (locus 4) (drawing by RH).

Fig. 51. Dark coloured spots in locus 4 (photo RH).
Fig. 52. Plan of building phase 3 of the bridge complex (drawing by YBF and RH).
Fig. 53. Section of well based on drawing in SF notebook 1962 (drawing by AG).
Fig. 54. N-S section of apsidal House 3A-B (drawing by RH after drawing by SF).

Fig. 55. W-E section Quadrant 1 in the apsidal House 3A-B (drawing by RH after drawing by SF).
Fig. 56a. The floor in House 3A-B (photo SF).

Fig. 56b. The location of House 3A-B directly on House 2 (photo SF).

Fig. 57. House 3A-B with the entrance facing west towards the Vesca valley (photo SF).

Fig. 58. Wall D with the entrance and the stairs of House 3A-B. Note the square cutting in one ashlar block, and roads 2 and 3 in the foreground (photo SF).

Fig. 59. The pavement of road 3 beside the well and House 3A (photo SF).

Fig. 60. The pavement of road s 2-3 to the left of the well. Note the cutting of block (the end block in wall K) (photo SF).
Fig. 61a. The pavement of road 2 in foreground (photo SF).

Fig. 61b. The well head in the 3rd building phase and its relation to wall J in Houses 1 and 2. The pavement of road 3 is visible to the left of the well (photo SF).

Fig. 61c. The two baulks left in 1963. The surface of the bench to the left and the stamped floor level at the courtyard of House 3A is visible in the center (photo SF).

Fig. 65. The tufa pavement to the left, the road pavement of road 2 in the foreground and the entrance to House 3A with the high tufa block next the door in the background (photo SF).
Building phase 4  
(House 3B)

Fig. 62. Plan of building phase 4 of the bridge complex (after Forsberg 1984).
Fig. 63. The architectural remains of the northern bank uncovered in 1961, mainly the tufa packing the pavement of road 4 (?), House B, and the two basins (photo plan SF).
Fig. 64. The large tufa packing and its connection to House 3B, the apsidal house (photo SF).

Fig. 66. The excavation of the tufa packing north of House 3B (photo SF).

Fig. 67. The dense fill of soil (stratum 3), tiles and pottery below the tufa packing (photo SF).

Fig. 68. The modern wooden bridge over the Mignone (in section) (courtesy of Jan Mark).

Fig. 69. The modern wooden bridge over the Mignone at Monterano (after Etruscan culture 1962, fig. 224, courtesy of the Nordiska museets bildbyrå, photo CF).
Fig. 70. The pebble cobbled 'piazza' in front of the medieval bridge over the Biedano south of Blera with the medieval tower, La Toretta, on the slope next to the bridge (photo RH).

Fig. 71. The oblique placing of the medieval bridge over the Biedano south of Blera (photo RH).

Fig. 72. The east of the Borgo area with the Etruscan road and bridge crossing the ravine to the Casale Vignale hill (after Etruscan culture 1962, fig. 250, courtesy of the Nordiska museets bildbyrå, photo JM).

Fig. 73a. A close-up picture of the tufa cut Etruscan road with deep wheel traces. To the right the remains of a rectangular building (after Etruscan culture 1962, fig. 267, courtesy of the Nordiska museets bildbyrå, photo JM).

Fig. 73b. The continuation of the tufa cut Etruscan road on the Casale Vignale plateau on the other side of the ravine with the Borgo area and medieval castle in the background (courtesy of the Nordiska museets bildbyrå, photo JM).
Fig. 74a. A spatial and stratified analysis of refitting/rejoining potsherds from Area N, Area S and the apsidal house: (1) red slip tray 60-2, 61-40, 61-42; (2) RS jar T170 (61-22, 61-46); (3) RS jar T56 (61-22, 61-48); (4) RS jar T51 (61-22, 61-34, 63-603); (5) CW jar T90 (61-54, 63-608); (6) RS pit/tray 60-660, 62-615, 62-616, 62-636, 62-655, 62-703, 62-770, 62-773, 62-782, 608, 62-775, 62-712, 62-605, 62-783b); (8) CW jar S136 (62-667, 63-600); (9) CW jar S26 (62-621, 62-733); (10) Bu cup (62-679); (11) RS T52 (63-623, 63-629); (12) CW jar T106 (63-628, 63-635); (13) RS brazier (62-789, 62-624); (14) EA small bowl Z103 (62-612, 63-608, 63-619, 63-640); (15) EC plate Q28 (62-765, 63-610, 63-635, 63-643); (16) CW lid T223 (63-610, 63-635); (17) Bu cup (62-626, 62-771); (18) CW large bowl T324 (62-772, 63-635); (19) CW basin T236 (62-603, 63-643); (20) RS carinated jar T161b (62-623, 62-756); (21) EC pyxis (?) (61-60, 62-603); (22) EC plate Q26 (62-602, 62-654); (239 CW jar T109 (62-756, 62-633); (24) Tr imp T352 (62-761, 62-633); (25) CW jar T129 (62-608, 62-633); (26) FA1 bowl B1 94 (62-650, 62-606).

Fig. 74b. A spatial and stratified analysis of refitting/rejoining potsherds from Area N, the apsidal house, Area S, and Area W: (1) Bu cup (63-606, 62-704, 61-31, 63-618); (2) ABF kylix R19a (61-22, 62-623, 62-686, 62-752, 62-788); (3) ARF eye-cup R15 (62-616, 62-688, 62-689, 62-695, 62, 612, 62-723, 62-742, 62-775, 62-783b, 63-602, 63-605 (?), 63-606, 63-608); (4) ABG squat lekythos R4 (62-730, 62-743, 63-606, 62-807, 62-680); (5) EA bowl (?) (61-47); (6) RS jar T52 (?); (7) CW jar 62-619; (8) EC plate Q87 (?); (9) EC plate Q29 (?); (10) Bu cup (61-47); (11) CW jar T138 (?).

Fig. 74d. A spatial and stratified analysis of the refitted potsherds of Attic import found in the pozzo, Area N, and the apsidal house: Then numbers 1-8 are the same as in Fig. 74c.
Fig. 75 Neolithic closed form (1-2); Protovillanovan: biconical jars (3-5), ovoid jar (6), stamnoid jar (7) carinated bowls (8-10); cooking-stands type IC (11-13)
Fig. 76. Transitional, brown and advanced impasto wares:
Fig. 77. Transitional, brown impasto, buccheroid and Faliscan wares:
Fig. 78. Orientalizing pottery (scale 1:3): Italo-Geometric closed shape (1); Subgeometric carinated bowls (2-3); plates (spanti) (4-6, 8-9); white-on-red jar (7); coarse white-on-red basins (10-11).
Fig. 79. Etrusco-Corinthian pottery: plates (*Pittore senza Graffito* 1-3); plates (4-6); stemmed cup (7); lids (8, 10-11); olpe (9); jug (15); amphora (15); bowls (12, 14).
Fig. 80. Buccheroid impasto stemmed cup (1); Bucchero: kylikes (2-3); carinated chalices (4-5, 8-9); kalathoi (6-7); stemmed cups (10-11); miniature carinated cups (12-13); kantharos (14); goblets (15-16); carinated and rounded bowls (17-20) (scale 1:3).
Fig. 81. Bucchero wares: jugs (1-4), olpe (7), jars (5-6, 8), lids: type 1-3 (9-16). (scale 1:2)
Fig. 82. EBF (1-2); EBG (3); Attic import (4-11); Chalkidian import (12); braziers (13-15); baking tray (16); basin with lead clamp (17); loom-weight with reed (18) (photo BT).
Fig. 83. Orientalizing pottery. Black impasto jar (1); RS globular jars (2-8, 10); RS stamnoid jar (9); RS pyxis (11), RS globular, ovoid-globular and ovoid-cylindrical jars (12-21).
Fig. 84. Red slip ware: carinated bowl (1); conical bowls (2-5); lid (6); rounded bowls (7-8, 10); ring-bases of bowls (11-14); basins (15-21) (scale 1:4); stamnoid jars (22-23, 25); globular jar (24); pithoi (26-27) (scale 1:5).
Fig. 85. Red slip braziers (1-6) (1-3 drawings by IP); cooking-stands type IIIA (7-9), type II A (10-11), type II B (12) (scale 1 (drawings by RH).
Fig. 86a. Cooking-stands according to Scheffers typology (after Scheffer 1981b, fig. 2, courtesy of C. Scheffer).

Fig. 86b. Cooking-stands of type IC from San Giovenale (to the left), and type IIB from Acquarossa to the right (courtesy of C. Scheffer).
Fig. 87. Coarse wares. Internal burnished, internal slipped and plain CW bowls (1-6); jars with various types of rim, ovoid-globular (21, 24, 26); ovoid-cylindrical (7, 9-19); cylindrical (8, 20, 25).
Fig. 88. Coarse wares cont: internal slipped, internal burnished and plain CW jars with various types of rim:
Carinated two handle jar (1-2); ovoid-globular (3); ovoid-cylindrical (4-14, 16); cylindrical (15).
Fig. 89. ABF cups (1-3, 5), lekyth (4); ARF cups (6, 8-9, 14); ABG skyphos (10); EBG jug (7), skyphoi (11-12), oinochoe (13), lekyth (15).
Fig. 90. Different pottery wares from the south side of the Pietriscio bridge complex: RS ovoid globular jars (1-7); RS conical bowls (8-10); CW bowl with perforated base (11); bucchero bowls (12-14); bucchero goblet (15); bucchero lid (16); RS knobs of lids (17-19); Etrusco-Corinthian bases of jar (20-21); EBG plate (22), bowl (23), kylix (24), pyxis (27-28); Late Creamware omphalos (25); RS basin (29); CW pithos (30); Red ware bowl (31), amphora (32) (scale 1:3).
Fig. 91. Etruscan inscriptions on bucchero: under bowls and cups (1-3), outside cups (4-7, 9, 11), inside handle (8), inside cup or plate (7, 10) (see appendix 1; Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, figs. 3, 5, 10).
Fig. 92. Graffiti and Etruscan letters on bucchero: (1) pentagram under base; (2) cross and the letter $U$ under base; (3, 5) the letter $U$ inside bowl; (4) cross inside and the letter $U$ under base (see appendix 1; Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, figs. 3, 5.)
Fig. 94a. Small finds and tiles: loom weights with inscribed or impressed decorations (1–7, scale 1:3); impasto and bucchero spindle whorls (8–9), terracotta whorls (10–11, 25a) scale 1:2), impasto weight 25b; impasto spools (12–14, scale 1:2), glass beads (15–16, scale 1:1), horn plaque (17, scale 1:1), navicella fibula in bronze (18, scale 1:1), pan-tiles (19–24), ridge tile (26), terracotta lid or architectural terracotta (27, scale 1:2), thymisterion (?) (28, scale 1:4).
Fig. 94b. Animal bones from loci 1-2 and 6 (photo BT).

Fig. 94c. Food residues found on CW sherds in locus 6 under House 1 in 1999 (photo BT).

Fig. 95. Metal objects from the Pietrismo bridge complex: iron: bolts (1-3), nails (4-7, 21), fibula (8), javelin (20), slag (19); bronze: fibula (9, 12, 14-15 18?), uncertain thin object (13), sheet (10), ring (17), ornament? (16), nail (11) (photo BT).
Fig. 97. Reconstruction of House 2 and road 2 on the northern bank of the Pietrisco (drawing by YBF and ARCDOC, Richard Holmgren 2004, ©).
Fig. 98. Reconstruction sketch of House 3A on the northern bank of the Pietrisko (drawing by YBF and ARCDOC, Richard Holmgren 2004, ©).
Fig. 99a. The western part of the Vignale plateau with the medieval castle in the distance (photo YBF).

Fig. 99b. The southern slope of the Vignale plateau (photo YBF).

Fig. 99c. Cuttings for a road (?) on the southern slope of the Vignale plateau (photo YBF).
Fig. 100. Model of physical and liminal boundaries at San Giovenale and its surroundings.

Fig. 101. A liminal and sacred area with the bridge as a symbol of communication between two worlds, and as a place of ritual activity (after Leach 1976, figs. 4 and 8).
Fig. 102. The bridge as a link between two settlements.

Fig. 103. The interaction between the physical and the cultural landscapes at the bridge complex.
Figs. 104a-b. The church Madonna del ponte in the Vetralla area (photos YBF).

Fig. 104c. The Madonna in a small shrine placed on the bridge (photo YBF).

Fig. 104d. Drawing of the Piacenza liver (after Van der Meer 1987, fig.).

Fig. 105. Terracotta sheep head found in a pozzo on the Vignale plateau (photo YBF).

Fig. 106. Holes in bases from San Giovenale (photo YBF).
### Appendix 1

Etruscan inscriptions and graffiti on bucchero, Etrusco-Corinthian, red ware, coarse ware and loom-weight from the bridge\(^ {1083} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Cat.no(^ {1084} )</th>
<th>Find no.</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Inscription/ graffiti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91:1</td>
<td>No. 1</td>
<td>60-1</td>
<td>base of open shape</td>
<td>mi urqenas *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 2</td>
<td>61-17</td>
<td>base of open shape</td>
<td>pi[---]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91:3</td>
<td>No. 3</td>
<td>61-23a</td>
<td>base of open shape</td>
<td>mi larza *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 4</td>
<td>61-23b</td>
<td>body fragment of open shape</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 5</td>
<td>61-23, 63-646</td>
<td>carinated cup, base</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 6</td>
<td>62-719</td>
<td>base of bowl</td>
<td>mi tu[---]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91:10</td>
<td>No. 7</td>
<td>62-700a</td>
<td>base of bowl/cup</td>
<td>[-?] alix[---]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91:7</td>
<td>No. 8</td>
<td>62-700b</td>
<td>base of stemmed cup</td>
<td>mi vi[---]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 9</td>
<td>62-700c</td>
<td>body fragment of open shape</td>
<td>[-?] [---]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 10</td>
<td>62-728</td>
<td>body fragment of cup?</td>
<td>[-] jcu[---]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91:8</td>
<td>No. 11</td>
<td>62-717</td>
<td>handle of kyathos</td>
<td>Lai[---] *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91:9</td>
<td>No. 12</td>
<td>62-736b</td>
<td>bottom of open shape</td>
<td>[-] ua[---]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 13</td>
<td>62-735a</td>
<td>base of bowl</td>
<td>H, checkboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 14</td>
<td>62-735c</td>
<td>rim of cup</td>
<td>m[i]---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91:11</td>
<td>No. 15</td>
<td>62-735b</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>mi fasišia alsia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91:6</td>
<td>No. 16</td>
<td>62-744</td>
<td>body fragment of cup</td>
<td>[-?] kešiša *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91:4</td>
<td>No. 17</td>
<td>62-782</td>
<td>body fragment of cup</td>
<td>mul *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92:2</td>
<td>No. 18</td>
<td>62-700, 63-616</td>
<td>base of bowl</td>
<td>cross ext. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 20</td>
<td>61-17</td>
<td>base of open shape</td>
<td>cross ext.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91:5</td>
<td>No. 21</td>
<td>62-75</td>
<td>rim of cup</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92:1</td>
<td>No. 22</td>
<td>62-675, 62-782</td>
<td>base of bowl</td>
<td>pentagram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 23</td>
<td>63-627</td>
<td>body fragment of closed shape?</td>
<td>χ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 24</td>
<td>63-619a</td>
<td>base of bowl</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92:3</td>
<td>No. 25</td>
<td>63-619b</td>
<td>base of bowl</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 26</td>
<td>63-608a</td>
<td>base of bowl</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 27</td>
<td>63-618</td>
<td>body or base fragment</td>
<td>mi[---]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 28</td>
<td>62-679</td>
<td>base of cup?</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 29</td>
<td>63-608b</td>
<td>base of open shape?</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 30</td>
<td>62-735</td>
<td>base of goblet</td>
<td>χ or star (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 32</td>
<td>62-679b</td>
<td>base of open shape</td>
<td>part of cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 33</td>
<td>62-679e</td>
<td>base fragment of open shape</td>
<td>part of cross?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 34</td>
<td>61-19</td>
<td>base of open shape</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 35</td>
<td>62-675 (no. 35)</td>
<td>base of open shape</td>
<td>cross?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 36</td>
<td>62-626</td>
<td>base of goblet/cup</td>
<td>cross int.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91:3</td>
<td>No. 37</td>
<td>63-610</td>
<td>base of cup</td>
<td>mix[---] grnutšla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 38</td>
<td>62-774, 63-631 (no. 38)</td>
<td>base of carinated cup</td>
<td>cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 39</td>
<td>62-680</td>
<td>base of bowl</td>
<td>cross int.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92:5</td>
<td>No. 40</td>
<td>62-800</td>
<td>base of bowl</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 41</td>
<td>62-806</td>
<td>rim of cup</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90:14</td>
<td>No. 42</td>
<td>62-810</td>
<td>base of bowl</td>
<td>cross ext.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79:14</td>
<td>No. 43</td>
<td>63-606</td>
<td>Etr-cor bowl</td>
<td>gi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 44</td>
<td>62-704g</td>
<td>red ware jar/dolium</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 45</td>
<td>61-2</td>
<td>coarse ware jar</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 46</td>
<td>62-772a</td>
<td>coarse ware jar</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94a:7</td>
<td>No. 47</td>
<td>61-8</td>
<td>TC Loom-weight</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 48</td>
<td>62-772b</td>
<td>red ware jar/dolium</td>
<td>e?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 49 not publ.</td>
<td>9901-4</td>
<td>base fragment of plate</td>
<td>n?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 50 not publ.</td>
<td>W8, 62-810</td>
<td>TC loom-weight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1083 After Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999.

1084 The same cat. nos. as in Colonna & Backe-Forsberg 1999, except the two last Nos. 49 and 50.