

POWER AND PLACE IN ETRURIA

This volume fills a gap in the study of an important, yet neglected, case of state formation, by taking a landscape perspective to Etruria. Simon Stoddart examines the infrastructure, hierarchy/heterarchy and spatial patterns of the Etruscans over time to investigate their political development from a new perspective. The analysis both crosses the divide from prehistory to history and applies a scaled analysis to the whole region between the Tyrrhenian Sea and the Arno and Tiber rivers, with special focus on the neglected region between Populonia on the coast and Perugia and the north Umbrian region adjoining the Apennines. Stoddart uncovers the powerful places that were in dynamic tension not only among themselves but also with the internal structure constituted by the descent groups that peopled them. He unravels the dynamically changing landscape of changing boundaries and buffer zones which contained robust urbanism, as well as less centralised, polyfocal nucleations.

Simon Stoddart is a reader in prehistory at Magdalene College, Cambridge. He has taught at the Universities of York, Bristol and Cambridge.



View of Orvieto from the West. Samuel Ainsley. 21 July 1842.

POWER AND PLACE IN ETRURIA

THE SPATIAL DYNAMICS OF
A MEDITERRANEAN CIVILISATION,
1200–500 BC

SIMON STODDART

Magdalene College, Cambridge



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314-321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06-04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521380751

DOI: 10.1017/9781139043687

© Cambridge University Press 2020

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2020

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-0-521-38075-1 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

*The volume is dedicated to the memory of my aunt,
Dr. Rosemary Hughes,
who studied
the Renaissance politics of Northern Etruria
at the time of Machiavelli*

*'Landscape is the first character'
Tim Winton*

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-38075-1 — Power and Place in Etruria
Volume 1
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

CONTENTS

<i>List of Illustrations</i>	<i>page</i> viii
<i>List of Tables</i>	xii
<i>Preface and Acknowledgements</i>	xiii
1 INTRODUCTION: THE CHALLENGE OF ETRURIA	I
2 ANALYSIS OF THE SPATIAL DYNAMICS OF STATE-ORGANISED SOCIETIES	24
3 THE MATERIAL CONSTRAINTS	55
4 CONTRASTING HIERARCHIES OF SETTLEMENT	83
5 THE SPATIAL DYNAMICS OF SETTLEMENT	109
6 FIVE REGIONS OF CONTRAST	129
7 NETWORKING AND CONNECTIVITY	186
8 CONCLUSIONS	207
<i>Bibliography</i>	225
<i>Index</i>	283

ILLUSTRATIONS

1.1	Etruria showing location of the transect with detailed analysis in Chapter 6.	2
1.2	A. The <i>Forma Italiae</i> tradition. Vetulonia (based on Curri 1978). B. The predictive tradition. Piediluco (based on Carancini et al. 1986).	17
1.3	A. Transect tradition 1. Montarrenti (based on Barker et al. 1986). B. Transect tradition 2. Tuscania survey transects showing 7th- to 5th-century settlement (based on Barker & Rasmussen 1988: 29–32, Figs. 2–5).	20
1.4	Transect tradition 3 (Ager Cosanus).	21
2.1	A. Rank-size diagram curves. A. Lognormal. B. Convex C. Primate. D. Primo-convex. B. XTENT diagrams (based on Renfrew & Level 1979).	33
2.2	Alternative survey outcomes on the plateau of Veii. A. Ward-Perkins (1961). B. Guaitoli (1981).	45
3.1	The geography of Etruria.	56
3.2	A. The geology of Etruria: a. Conglomerates, sandstones and clays; b. Volcanic cones; c. Pliocene plateaux and basins; d. Incised tuff plains. B. Mineral resources.	58
3.3	Above: View of Populonia, Samuel Ainsley, 27 May 1843 (British Museum). Below: View of Val di Chiana from Monte Cetona, Samuel Ainsley, 2 July 1844 (British Museum).	62
3.4	Above: View of Perugia, Samuel Ainsley, 13 April 1843 (British Museum). Below: View of Veii, Samuel Ainsley 27 April (?) 1842 (British Museum).	68
3.5	Proportions of main domesticated animals. A. Bronze Age. B. Iron Age. C. Archaic.	74
4.1	A. Site-size distribution of Final Bronze Age South Etruria (data from Barbaro 2010). B. Rank size of Final Bronze Age South Etruria.	86
4.2	A. Site-size distribution of 9th-century BC South Etruria. B. Rank size of 9th-century BC South Etruria.	88
4.3	A. Site-size distribution of 8th-century BC South Etruria. B. Rank size of 8th-century BC South Etruria.	89
4.4	A. Site-size distribution of 6th-century BC South Etruria. B. Rank size of 6th-century BC South Etruria.	90
4.5	A. Site-size distribution of 5th-century BC Etruria. B. Rank size of 5th-century BC South Etruria.	91

4.6	A. Changes in the rank–size indices (Etruria). B. Changes in the rank–size indices (<i>Latium vetus</i>). Data for Etruria summarized in Table 4.1.	93
4.7	The primate centre of Veii in the 6th century BC (based on Cascino et al. 2012).	95
4.8	The buffer centre of Acquarossa (based on Romagnoli 2014; Wikander & Roos 1986).	99
4.9	A. The port of trade of Pyrgi (based on Spivey & Stoddart 1990). B. The internal emporium of Doganella (based on Perkins & Walker 1990).	102
4.10	A. The village of Lago dell’Accesa (based on Camporeale 1997). B. The house structure of Casa delle Anfore, Marsiliana d’Albegna (based on Zifferero et al. 2009).	106
5.1	Mapping three values of k using XTENT.	114
5.2	A. Analysis by Thiessen polygons. B. Territorial area based on Thiessen polygons.	115
5.3	A. Contrasting fates of Veii and Acquarossa. B. Contrasting fates of major centres in South Etruria.	117
5.4	A. Contrasting fates of Murlo and Chiusi. B. Contrasting fates of major centres in North Etruria.	118
5.5	A. Contrasting fates of Gubbio and Perugia. B. Contrasting fates of centres in eastern Etruria and northern Umbria.	119
5.6	A. Plot of XTENT for value $K=0.2$. B. Plot of XTENT for value $K=0.1$.	120
5.7	A. Plot of XTENT for value $K=0.08$. B. Plot of XTENT for value $K=0.07$.	121
5.8	A Plot of XTENT for value $K=0.055$. B. Plot of XTENT for value $K=0.03$.	123
5.9	A. Plot of XTENT for value $K=0.02$. B. Plot of XTENT for value $K=0.018$.	126
5.10	A. Plot of XTENT for value $K=0.016$. B. Plot of XTENT for value $K=0.014$.	127
6.1	Territory of Veii in the 6th century BC. A. Site size. B. Rank size.	131
6.2	New analysis of the territory of Veii. A. Trends of site numbers in the South Etruria survey area (based on Di Giuseppe 2007: 436). B. Trends of sherd numbers in the Ager Veientanus and in the city of Veii (based on Witcher & Craven 2012). C/D. Seventh- and fifth-century site distributions in a sample area of the territory of Veii (based on Patterson et al. 2004: 12, Fig. 4).	132
6.3	Territory of Veii. A. Density of settlement at increased distance from the urban centre (7th century and 5th century).	133
6.4	The changing Nepi landscape (based on di Gennaro et al. 2008). A. Areas sampled (above); Final Bronze Age (below). B. 10th century (above); 8th century (below). C. 7th–5th century (above); 4th–2nd century (below).	134

- 6.5 Territory of Cerveteri in the 6th century. A. Site size of Cerveteri. B. Rank size of Cerveteri. C. Density of settlement at increased distance from the urban centre (data corrected from Rendeli 1993). D. Distribution of settlement in the 6th century BC (providing the data for C) (data based on Enei 2001: 50, Fig. 38). 136
- 6.6 Territory of Tarquinia in the 6th century. A. Site size. B. Rank size. C. The territory of Tarquinia, showing the dendritic structure of the settlement system above 1 hectare (data drawn from (Barker & Rasmussen 1988: 27, Fig. 1, with corrections overlain by XTENT boundary). Dotted lines show location of survey transects detailed in Figure 1.3B. 138
- 6.7 Territory of Orvieto in the 6th century. A. Site size. B. Rank size. 141
- 6.8 Territory of Vulci in the 6th century. A. Site size. B. Rank size. 142
- 6.9 Albegna valley in the 6th century. A. Site size. B. Rank size. 143
- 6.10 Volterra. A. Bronze Age. B. Iron Age. C. Orientalising. D. Archaic (based on Maggiani 2010). 149
- 6.11 Etruscan Pisa (based on Bini et al. 2013). 151
- 6.12 The chronological development of the Populonia/Vetulonia/Roselle area and their hinterlands. A. Bronze Age. B. Iron Age. C. Orientalising Box shows inset of Figure 6.15B. D. Archaic. 152
- 6.13 Populonia. A. Bronze Age. B. Iron Age. C. Orientalising. D. Archaic (based on Fedeli 1983). 155
- 6.14 Vetulonia A. Bronze Age. B. Iron Age. C. Orientalising. D. Archaic. 156
- 6.15 Poggio Civitate. A. Archaic structure. B. The Poggio Civitate hinterland (based on Campana 2001). Archaic period. Asterisk – Poggio Civitate; Square – Farmstead; Circle – earth house; triangle – brial 159
- 6.16 Pian d'Alma farmhouse (based on Morandini 2011). 162
- 6.17 The chronological development of the Chiusi area and its hinterlands. A. Bronze Age. B. Iron Age. C. Orientalising. D. Archaic. 166
- 6.18 The chronological development of the immediate Chiusi area. A. Bronze Age. B. Iron Age. C. Archaic settlement D. early Archaic burials (based on Cappuccini 2010). 168
- 6.19 Palimpsest of Etruscan burial (and one ritual) sites in the Chianciano Terme area. Settlement has to be largely inferred (based on Paolucci & Francovich 2007). 171
- 6.20 The chronological development of the Perugia area and its hinterlands. A. Bronze Age. B. Iron Age. C. Orientalising. D. Archaic. 175
- 6.21 Villanovan and Etruscan Perugia. 181
- 6.22 A. Cima Cerchiaia (based on Cencioli 1998). B. Gubbio. 181
- 6.23 Sanctuaries. A. Pasticetto di Magione (based on Bruschetti 1989). B. Monte Acuto (based on Cencioli 1996). C. Colle dei Mori (based on Stefani 1935). 183
- 7.1 A. Distribution of coppe ioniche. B. Distribution of balsamari plastici (based on Spivey & Stoddart 1990). 193
- 7.2 A. Distribution of inscriptions early 7th century. B. Distribution of inscriptions late 6th century (based on Spivey & Stoddart 1990). 194

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS xi

8.1	Varied hierarchical structures in different territories.	210
8.2	Varied frontier zones. White buffer zones. Hard black line denotes more formalised boundary between Cerveteri and Tarquinia.	212
8.3	Different tempo of settlement duration in metropolises and internal frontiers.	213
8.4	Contrasting distribution of inscriptions between city and countryside in the 7th century between South and North Etruria	215
8.5	Location of tular boundary stones in frontier zones of Etruria	215
8.6	The tempo of state formation following the criteria of Peterson and Drennan (2012).	217
8.7	Zones where reliable rural settlement is available for the Archaic period.	221
8.8	Diagrams comparing citations of Etruscan centres by Livy with their size across time.	224

TABLES

2.1 Chronological schemes	<i>page</i> 42
4.1 Changes in the rank-size index for South Etruria over time (Fig. 4.6)	91
5.1 Estimated site size	113

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the four major institutions (the Department of Archaeology of the University of Cambridge, the British School at Rome, the Departments of Anthropology of the University of Michigan and SUNY Buffalo) that provided the background for the development of the ideas within this volume, which has its distant ancestry in my doctoral dissertation of 1987. This volume is, nevertheless, a radically new approach of the new century rather than the last. Within these institutions, many individuals have granted me considerable time and attention. I would like to thank, in particular, the late John Alexander, Graeme Barker, John Coles, Charles French, Kent Flannery, Joyce Marcus, Jeffrey Parsons, the late Tim Potter, Colin Renfrew, Nigel Spivey, Sander Van der Leeuw, Ruth Whitehouse, the late David Whitehouse, James Whitley, the late John Wilkins, Henry Wright and Ezra Zubrow. The Università per Stranieri of Perugia also gave a first indication of the challenges of Etruria and introduced me for the first time to many of the leading protagonists of the day: Massimo Pallottino, Mauro Cristofani, Carlo De Simone, Giovanni Colonna, Ambrose Pfiffig and many others. In addition, I would like to thank my students who have now become colleagues and whose success has stimulated me to complete the task before it is undertaken by someone else: Michael Anderson, Letizia Ceccarelli, Bela Dimova, Matthew Fitzjohn, Francesca Fulminante, Vedia Izzet, Skylar Neil, Catalin Popa, Sarah Ralph, Ulla Rajala, Corinna Riva, Elena Scarsella and Camilla Zeviani. I am particularly grateful to Letizia Ceccarelli for her support in fieldwork and to Francesca Fulminante whose work runs in parallel to my own, south of the Tiber. Above all, I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor, now Lord, Renfrew, for his guidance during the writing of the original dissertation. Numerous Italian colleagues have given me much time, many ideas and factual corrections, even if they will not entirely agree with the eventual outcome: Micaela Angle, Marco Bettelli, Anna Maria Bietti-Sestieri, Laura Bonomi Ponzi, Luana Cencioli, Maria Cristina De Angelis, Giorgia di Paola, the late Riccardo Francovich, Francesco di Gennaro, Adolfo Gianni, Claudio Giardino, Alessandro Guidi, Alessandro Naso, Dorica Manconi, Marco Pacciarelli, Giulio Paolucci, Giorgio Postrioti, Renato Peroni, Marco Rendeli, Mario Torelli and Andrea Zifferero. I also owe a great debt to the late Dr Peter

Partner, who introduced me to the *Lands* of St Peter, to Jock McDonald, who (along with my late parents) first led me towards the Etruscans, and to Mark Stephenson, who inadvertently convinced me that prehistory was a much better route than documentary history.

I would like to acknowledge scholarships and fellowships from the British School at Rome (the original Rome scholarship (1980) and a later Balsdon fellowship (2004)), the Power Foundation and the Department of Education and Science/British Academy and Wolfson College, Oxford, during this period.

Financial support during the course of writing the dissertation is gratefully acknowledged from Magdalene College in the form of a Leslie Wilson Scholarship and a Junior Research Fellowship. I am also grateful to the Department of Archaeology at York and Wolfson College, Oxford and, once again, Magdalene College, Cambridge, for providing agreeable surroundings in which to revise the manuscript. The Department of Classics and Archaeology at Bristol also provided a creative context, confirming my views of those solely immersed in the literary world: its most promising creation was an, albeit short-lived, Department of Archaeology. I am particularly grateful to Eric Grant, who supplied the XTENT algorithm in suitable format, to Andrew Harrison, who developed the XTENT modelling, and to David Redhouse, who brought this task to completion within a DEM, following a suggestion from Ezra Zubrow.

Financial support has been received indirectly from the British Academy, the Emslie Horniman Fund of the Royal Anthropological Institute, the National Geographic of America, the Society of Antiquaries. The assistance of Olivetti S.p.A. and British Olivetti is gratefully acknowledged in providing the technology to process information at an early stage in the development of the volume.

The Trustees of the British Museum have kindly given permission for the reproduction of the Ainsley drawings.

Penultimately, I would like to thank those who have, at various stages, patiently guided me to completion: Jessica Kuper, Beatrice Rehl and Bethany Johnson of Cambridge University Press. I am also indebted to Vigneswaran Viswanathan for the processing of the images and to Jacqueline French, who has copy edited this volume, although in all cases any remaining errors remain my own.

My wife, Caroline, has, as always, provided considerable moral support and practical help, tolerating my absences from working on Maltese matters.