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#### Abstract

This dissertation examines the architecture and votive deposits from Umbrian sanctuaries between the sixth and early first century BCE. In line with traditional approaches to central Italian cult places, scholars who focus on the Umbria region have largely considered Roman expansion as the cause of apparent change in the use of Umbrian sanctuaries, as well as in the composition of their votive offerings during the Hellenistic period. Pointing out the limitations of this argument, I suggest a different model to track cultural change in the region's religious sphere. By reviewing all available evidence from the onset of Umbrian religious material culture to the enfranchisement of the Italian peninsula, I analyze each sanctuary as a component of a larger Umbrian regional sacred landscape.

Following my introduction (Chapter 1), the dissertation is divided into two parts. The first part (Chapters 2 and 3), introduces the theoretical frameworks used to approach the study of cultural change and sacred spaces in central Italy and the Umbrian region. The second part (Chapters 4, 5, and 6) elaborates Umbrian sacred spaces in their material and ritual contexts. Chapter 4 offers an overview of the region's history and points out how recent work on Roman expansionism complicates our traditional understanding of the third and second century BCE as crucial to the political, social, and cultural changes that occurred during this time. Chapter 5 explores the topography, architecture, and votive deposits of each of the fifteen Umbrian sanctuaries that form my core corpus. Drawing from archival material, primary and secondary literature, and a first-hand analysis of all figurative votive offerings displayed in museums and stored in local depots in Umbria, I demonstrate that the continued use of Umbrian sanctuaries


during the Hellenistic period did not depend on the political allegiances of local communities to Rome. Furthermore, I argue that the appearance of terracotta votive offerings is not related to Roman expansionism. The practice of dedicating anatomical votive offerings was an established custom in Umbria as early as the sixth/fifth century BCE.

The conclusion (Chapter 6) explores the larger stakes of this work: the transformation of socio-economic and cultural trends over time. I posit that the transformation visible in Umbrian sanctuaries during the Hellenistic period is the result of multiple factors: endemic economical regional trends; the interconnection and negotiations among Umbrian and Roman elites; long-lived ritual practices; and the increasing contacts between Umbrian and Hellenistic cultures. Ultimately, this project shows that indigenous populations maintained extant local architectural and ritual customs while at the same time responding and adapting to the new socio-political realities that accompanied Roman hegemony.

## Chapter 1

## Introduction

During the Middle and Late Republican periods, cult places dotted the Italian landscape, with many concentrated in the ancient region of Umbria. From the layout and location of these sanctuaries to the paraphernalia associated with their cult practices, the archaeological record suggests that a shift in the location, architecture, and ritual practices occurred after Rome's progressive expansion in the region at the end of the fourth century BCE. However, this pattern of change does not seem to follow a single, specific pattern. Some sanctuaries experienced a reduced ritual activity, some were re-shaped in monumental forms, often receiving their first permanent architectural structures, and others continued to be used without any apparent modification to their pre-Roman arrangement.

While sanctuaries do not follow a pattern with regard to their architecture and location, they seem to do so with votive assemblages. During the Roman period, the range of objects associated with cult practices at these sanctuaries expands. Between the fourth and the third century, as the Roman presence in Umbria spread and became a permanent fixture, the bronze figurines that characterize votive deposits of the archaic period noticeably decrease. In their stead, we find a wider array of offerings including black-slip pottery, coins, and, in particular, anatomical terracottas, which remain the most popular type of offering into the first century BCE.

The character of these changes leads me to ask, how did the Roman conquest affect religious behavior in the region of Umbria, and what can the archaeological record tell us about
the change that followed the Roman takeover? In addition, how does the socio-economic and political role of cult places influence their pattern of change? In order to address these questions, my exploration of Umbrian sanctuaries begins in the archaic period (sixth-fourth century BCE) and ends in the early first century BCE, before all inhabitants of the peninsula gained the Roman citizenship and all Italy was enfranchised (except from Transpadane Gaul, beyond the Po River).

A multi-scalar approach to Umbrian sanctuaries and their votive material is used here to evaluate the various contexts-historical, religious, political, socio-cultural-in which sanctuaries functioned. Theories on cultural interactions and ritual are employed to provide an interpretation about the repercussions of Roman expansion in the religious sphere of the region and the meanings behind the practice of dedicating figurative votive objects during the preRoman period. Both goals are essential for moving the discussion about cultural change and ritual tradition forward: in this region in particular, a prevalent trend in the scholarship considers the period after the fourth century BCE as a moment of radical change in the religious life of local peoples due to the Rome's occupation and to downplay the ritual practice of the Umbrian practitioners before this century. As a result, the use of sanctuaries during the fourth-first century BCE and the appearance of terracotta heads and anatomicals are believed to be closely linked to Roman cultural imposition on the religious sphere. My work explicitly tackles these assumptions, testing them against the hard evidence from Umbrian sanctuaries and their figurative votive offerings: I examine both those that are published and displayed in local museums and those that are, quite literally, left to the dust in the boxes of the depots of museums and the Soprintendenza Archeologia Belle Arti e Paesaggio dell'Umbria or lost and only mentioned in archival and excavation reports. As the following chapters will demonstrate, the change that happened in the religious sphere of the region has little to do with Roman influence
and more with extant local customs, long-lived ritual practices, and contemporary socio-political events.

Chapter 2 outlines the theoretical methods that provide a framework for my investigation. They include the most dominant and influential approaches that scholars have applied to the study of cultural change on the Italian peninsula following the Roman expansion, with particular attention to religious contexts. Moving from the general to the particular, I offer a detailed analysis of the way these topics have been dealt with in the geographical context of Umbria and highlight how the discussion falls behind the stimulating debate on cultural change in other areas of the peninsula.

After laying out these theoretical principles, Chapter 3 delves into the ways anthropologists and sociologists have approached the study of ritual and how archaeologists have looked at the physical evidence for ritual practices. There is a tendency in the scholarship to concentrate in particular on the study of anatomical terracottas-and their alleged significance as marker of the spread of Roman religious beliefs- and Etruscan religion, perhaps due to its importance for later Roman tradition, such as divination techniques. As a result of this overly narrow focus, little attention has been given to understanding the meaning of other types of votive depositions. Umbria is no exception to this trend. Here, the abundance of bronze votive figurines of the pre-Roman period has been used to assign socio-political meanings to Umbrian society, while the appearance of anatomical terracottas in the Roman period indicates that the local religious custom had changed following the Roman conquest. Ultimately, approaching the study of this material from a different angle, namely the ritual meanings of their deposition, can allow us to engage with broader questions on how and why anatomical terracottas made their appearance during towards the end of the fourth century BCE.

Chapter 4 places Umbrian sanctuaries in the broad geographical and historical context of the region, from the pre-Roman period to the Social War in the early first century BCE. A much discussed argument that I take on in this chapter revolves around the question of ethnicity and the dynamics of Roman expansionism. Following a close reading of the literary sources, traditional interpretations of the historical trajectories of the region have regarded the Umbrians as a cohesive ethnos and the central centuries of Roman expansion (third and second century BCE ) as crucial to the political, social and cultural changes that happened in the region. Recent studies on ethnicity and identity in the Mediterranean and the intricate dynamics of interactions between Roman and local elites complicate these traditional interpretations of the process of Roman expansion. In this chapter, I highlight that archaeological and epigraphical evidence from Umbria corroborates these new approaches and sheds light on the existence of both diverse local identities (rather than a single monolithic one) and of factionalism and personal agendas that members of the Umbrian elites could pursue in order to steer the Roman imperialistic machinery in their favor. This analysis provides a fundamental framework onto which to interpret the change that happened in the cult places of the region.

Chapter 5 introduces the sanctuary sites and their development between the sixth and the first century BCE. For each of them, I provide an overview of the topographical location, the architectural and spatial organization, and the votive material- published objects, unpublished, and archival objects- with particular attention to figurative votive offerings (anthropomorphic, zoomorphic and anatomical offerings). These are further described at length and catalogued in Appendices (1-3) at the end of this dissertation. The results of this analysis allow us to address crucial questions regarding central Italian sacred places: was the abandonment of cult places related to the laissez-faire policy of Rome? Is the presence of anatomical terracottas an
indication of a change in the cult sphere that followed the spread of more homogenized religious beliefs? The artefactual evidence from Umbrian sanctuaries answers these questions and tells us a different story that the one commonly advanced by scholars by showing both that sanctuaries continued to thrive into the Roman period regardless of their proximity to significant Roman centers and that anatomical terracottas are hardly related to the Roman presence in the region, since the practice of dedicating anatomical votive offering and heads were already widespread from the sixth to fourth century BCE. Once it is shown that a one-way influence from Rome into Umbria is untenable, I focus on what the contextual analysis of sanctuaries and their votive objects can reveal with respect to the broader patters in cultural practice that that spread through the region following the Roman expansion into the peninsula.

Drawing from the data presented in Chapter 5, in the concluding chapter of this dissertation I advance several hypotheses that account for the continuation of Umbrian sanctuaries during the Roman period and the apparent longevity of the ritual practice of dedicating anatomical objects. In doing so, I trace a macro-scale picture of the socio-economic and cultural trend visible in the region's cult places from the archaic to the Hellenistic period. In the first section of the chapter, I focus on the function of sacred places from the sixth to the fourth century BCE and use topographical data and information provided by the figurative votive offerings to argue that sanctuaries function in close connection to individual communities. Furthermore, I explore the possible meanings for the deposition of bronze figurines during this period and propose that it constituted of a ritual of well-being for the individual as wells as for the community. The second section considers the development of cult places after the Roman expansion. First, I analyze the change in the ritual depositions and suggest that the adoption of terracottas needs to be considered as a new medium -both technically advantageous and in
fashion - used to express an already long-lived practice. Second, I provide an interpretation for the decrease of ritual activities at certain sanctuaries and the monumentalization of others with Italic and Hellenistic architectural features. While the former appears to be connected to regional economic trends, the latter ties into the dynamics of interconnection and negotiations among Umbrian and Roman elites, who, for different reasons, had their share of interest in showing public munificence to pursue their civic political goals. On the basis of this interpretation of the evidence, the model I propose to use to approach the topic of cultural change in the religious sphere does not leave much room for the imposition of one culture onto the local people; rather, I advocate for a theoretical framework of analysis which finds similarities with the Middle Ground theory first proposed by White. This "space in between", however, was not solely the one shared by Romans and the Umbrians but rather one that reflected and was informed by complex network of dynamic relationships and associations that involved the broader Italic peninsula and the Mediterranean as a whole.

On a final note, I hope that this work will also provide a useful method of investigation in others areas of research on Italic cult places, especially those that have either not yet been examined, such as Picenum, or are still discussed within the conventional framework of "Religious Romanization". As the example of Umbria demonstrates, a careful analysis of the material evidence from sanctuaries has the potential to rewrite some of the assumptions of Roman cultural influence and to shed light on local traditions, their persistence through time, and their adaptation to new socio-political events.

## Chronology and geographic scope

In this dissertation, I use the chronology of Italic religions outlined by Guy Bradley and Fay Glinister. ${ }^{1}$ Since Italic peoples were profoundly affected by Roman expansion and its aftermath, the historical period of Italic religion can be classified in connection to the three main stages of this process, which can be summarized as follows:

| Archaic/Classical period. I <br> also refer to this period as <br> pre-Roman. | Sixth-fourth century BCE | Appearance of the first <br> significant evidence of Italic <br> religion |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hellenistic period. I also refer <br> to this period as Roman <br> period or Middle Republic. | Late fourth-early first century <br> BCE | Roman conquest and its <br> aftermath: most italic peoples <br> are conquered by Rome and <br> entered into alliances with the <br> urbs. |
| Late Republic | 91 BCE to 14 CE. | With the Social War and the <br> concession of full Roman <br> citizenship, Italy becomes <br> largely homogenized. |

Table 1.1. Chronology of Italic religion

With respect to the geographic scope of this work, it is important to note that ancient Umbria embraced a larger territory that the one encompassed by the modern region. The latter excludes the northern part on the Adriatic side of the Apennines (modern Le Marche and Emilia Romagna regions) and includes areas that were originally Etruscans, such as Perusia and Volsini. As my study of Umbrian sanctuaries is closely dependent upon the permission of the Soprintendenza Archeologia Belle Arti e Paesaggio dell'Umbria to analyze the material, I limit my investigation to the Umbrian sacred places that fall into the area of responsibility of this

[^0]Soprintendenza (fig.1.1). ${ }^{2}$ Excluded from my investigations are therefore the cult places that belong to the authority of the Soprintendenza Archeologia Belle Arti e Paesaggio delle Marche and the Soprintendenza Archeologia dell'Emilia Romagna.


Figure 1.1. Modern Umbria (in red) and location of the Umbrian sanctuaries analyzed in this dissertation.

[^1]
## Chapter 2

## Cultural Change in the Sanctuaries of Central Italy

## Introduction

Investigation of cult places represents a unique opportunity for understanding broader issues of cultural continuity and change. As has been widely demonstrated by scholars working in central and southern Italy, people living in the surrounding areas and the fortified centers used sacred spaces not only to express their religious sentiments but also to gather as a community. Besides, as leading scholars have argued, religion represented an extension of social life, with its function and implication for daily life. As such, sanctuaries provide essential social, political, and economic information on past societies.

Approaches to sacred spaces and their material culture have changed over time as a result of new data and changing perspectives in anthropological and archaeological methods. In this chapter, I review the most dominant and influential ways that scholars have thought about and discussed sacred spaces within the timeframe of this dissertation, from the sixth to the early first century BCE. The discussion is organized into two sections: the first is devoted to cultural change in general, the second is devoted specifically to the religious sphere. Following the general discussion in each section, I focus on the region of Umbria.

I begin with an overview of the theoretical approaches to cultural change. The discussion is structured in two parts. I first summarize the scholarly approaches to cultural change within
the frame of the Roman conquest. Then, I focus on the region of Umbria and the significant contributions to the cultural change that happened in this region following the Roman expansion.

In the second part of the chapter, I discuss how scholars have dealt with the topic of cultural change specifically in religious contexts, and how they have used rural sanctuaries, colonies, and municipia to formulate their theories. I review the traditional interpretation of the topic of cultural change in the sacred sphere, and I highlight how new scholarship has challenged this. By the end of the chapter, it becomes clear that the discussion about the change that happened in Umbria and its sacred spaces following the Roman expansion falls behind the ongoing and stimulating debate on cultural change in the Italian peninsula.

## Cultural Change and the Roman conquest

The process of cultural, socio-political, and economic change in Italy and in the provinces during the Roman conquest, often called Romanization, has been the object of extensive debate from more than two hundred years. One of the theoretical methodologies employed in examining cultural change and processes of conquest, especially in the past, is the colonialist approach. ${ }^{3}$ Its first theorist, Francis Haverfield, saw the process of Romanization as beginning primarily in post-conquest society (e.g., Gaul and Britain) where direct Roman policy from the top prompted an increase in the Roman population of the province through the establishment of veteran colonies. According to this view, Romanization was a deliberate policy on the part of the government of Rome that imparted a systematic and standardized process of acculturation. The moral mission attributed to Rome is evident in Haverfield's claim that "Rome acted for the betterment and happiness of the world" and his suggestion that the use of "Roman

[^2]things" indicated that the conquered territories "realized their value and ceased any national hatred towards them." ${ }^{4}$

This unilinear view of cultural change -where the Romans change the provincials, but the provincials have no impact on Rome - has been maintained by other scholars, especially citizens of modern colonial empires. Scholars living in Britain, France, and Germany seem to have felt a sort of kinship towards the ancient Romans and were particularly interested in topics related to the Roman conquests, the process of acculturation, and the conceptualization of the identity of the "other." ${ }^{5}$ Archaeological studies were interested mainly in the perspective of the colonizers (whether Greek or Roman), while the native population was either largely overlooked or treated as the "passive recipient of new habits." ${ }^{6}$ The acculturation process was seen as a oneway street, with the indigenous elites (and, after a spell, the rest of the population) emulating the customs and the crafts of the invaders. This approach to Romanization has been much criticized since it implies an idea of "a triumph of a superior and more advanced culture over primitive communities," the result of which is "the creation of a very uniform political and cultural entity." ${ }^{7}$

In the later 20th century, after the collapse of the great colonizing empires, scholars began to open a new debate on the concepts of Romanization and to stress adaptation over acculturation, negotiation over emulation, and hybridity over monoculturalism. Most importantly, scholars such as Millett, Woolf, Gosden, Wallace-Hadrill, Terrenato, and Mattingly have attempted to reconstitute the voice of the local people whom they now view as a fundamental agent in the acceptance or rejection of Roman culture. These approaches, many of

[^3]which draw on postcolonial studies in history and anthropology, address the complex effects of colonization, colonialism, and decolonization on cultural formation by placing emphasis on the colonized and striving to develop a new understanding of colonialist experiences, often emphasizing the agency of indigenous people. ${ }^{8}$

Martin Millet's The Romanization of Britain is an influential contribution to the postcolonial reaction to Rome's role in the lives of provincial and native societies. ${ }^{9}$ He focuses on the native and local developments of Roman culture in Britain and argues that the provincial elite had a direct self-interest in adopting elements of Roman culture and identifying themselves with the imperial power. Provincial elites would have, therefore, "self-romanized" through the adoption of material culture, language, and beliefs that they used to reinforce their position within local society. These Roman customs then spread to other levels of society through a sort of trickle-down effect based upon the material benefits to everyone of Roman identity. In studies of Italy, the paradigm of self-Romanization takes an even more extreme turn. In the view of scholars such as Emilio Gabba and Mario Torelli, Italic elites imitated Roman norms not only culturally but also politically. ${ }^{10}$

The concept of self-romanization has been widely criticized. First, the model focuses narrowly on elites, assuming that the rest of the population passively emulated them. Scholars have argued that, although Millett's model frees the process of conquest from a strictly Romanocentric perspective, it does not allow for a diversity of responses to Roman dominion by different groups within a local population. ${ }^{11}$ Indeed, it does not allow the possibility that some groups could have opposed the new order.

[^4]A second point of critique is the simplistic use of "Roman material culture." Millett assumed that Roman goods adopted by the local elites had an intrinsic Roman identity, and he did not consider the possibility that these could have been perceived differently in different areas of the Roman empire. In his review of Millett's book, P. W. M. Freeman successfully demonstrated that new "Roman" goods and traits do not carry necessarily a Roman identity but could incorporate alternative meanings depending, for example, on different geographical contexts. ${ }^{12}$ For example, the appearance of villas and of samian pottery may "reflect regional pre-Roman social practices" rather that "a desire to be 'Roman'". ${ }^{13}$ Most importantly, the adoption of goods may have represented an efficient and technologically new practice, an improvement over what was had before regardless of their origin. Freeman and others have shown that labeling goods as "Roman" is a simplification and that their adoption by local people does not automatically imply the simple acceptance of material elements of Roman civilization. ${ }^{14}$

In more recent years, the dynamics of interaction between locals and Romans have been further problematized. Scholars have moved away from the binary opposition Romans/locals and have developed more complex models of the interrelation between settlers and the indigenous population. One of such models is the Middle Ground theory, ${ }^{15}$ initially used by Richard White to describe the encounters between early European settlers and Native Americans. According to White, people in a new or unfamiliar social context adapt to very different cultural practices and values while continuing to use their own social conventions. This interaction between people of different cultural background creates new cultural structures, a middle ground in which peoples

[^5]live sometimes for some centuries. ${ }^{16}$ White's theory has been applied to the Roman world by Chris Gosden, who emphasized the local hybrid forms created by the contacts between Rome and indigenous people during the Imperial Period. ${ }^{17}$

Creolization, code-switching, bricolage and discrepant identities are other notions used by scholars who tried to explain the process of cultural change that occurred with the incorporation of indigenous societies in the Roman state and to account for the inclusion of nonelite groups in such processes. Jane Webster borrowed the word "creolization" from linguistics, where it was used to indicate the emergence of a mixed speech that derives from two different languages and applied it to the study of the Roman provinces. Focusing on creolization as a mixture of cultural traits recognizable in material culture, Webster stressed that the interaction between Romans and the provinces resulted in a cultural negotiation and mediation involving defined cultural change. ${ }^{18}$ The result of colonial interaction is, in Webster's view, "not a single, normative colonial culture, but mixed cultures" that are evidenced by the various use of material culture. ${ }^{19}$

Rather than looking for instances of the creation of something entirely new, Andrew Wallace-Hadrill has emphasized code-switching, another term taken from the field of linguistics and here used to describe the way individuals move between diverse but coexisting culturesystems. Wallace-Hadrill rejects the traditional belief in cultural superiority and hierarchy and focuses on the set of choices and practices by which a group constructs, interprets, and reproduces its own identity in diverse culture-systems. Switching between different languages to best communicate a message depending on the situation, he argues, may not only be confined to

[^6]bilingualism/multilingualism but may also map onto expressions of material culture. Therefore, Wallace-Hadrill looks at the archaeological record of the Italian peninsula from the midrepublican period onward as a manifestation of diverse culture-systems, "in full awareness of their diversity and code-switching between them. ${ }^{" 20} \mathrm{He}$ argues that cultural modes of expression are added to an individual's repertoire, rather than the local being replace by the Roman, as maintained by colonial and postcolonial theories -Ennius, for example, could maintain his tria corda without having to choose one of them. In short, Wallace-Hadrill's code-switching theory does not require a third space of interaction like Middle Ground theory, where two different cultures merge to form a new single entity. Instead he proposes that cultural cues survive alongside each other in particular social contexts and that people were able to "switch" from a code to the other strategically according to the contexts.

In the context of his exploration of change and continuity at Volterra, Nicola Terrenato offers another theoretical model for cultural encounter. He sees cultural processes within the Roman conquest as processes of bricolage through which old objects acquire "new meaning to serve new purposes within new contexts. ${ }^{, 21}$ That is, an object that already carried a sedimented message can take over new functions according to specific needs. With the adoption of new meanings attributed to pre-existing cultural items, new cultural patchworks come into existence and could be made of different elements: old, new, local, and imported. Each community reacted to the process of Roman expansion in a different way, thereby creating a different bricolage. In the process of Roman expansion, Terrenato highlights the role played by Roman and Italian elites' agendas and encourages consideration of the political scene of the Italians, the existence

[^7]of factions, and even political parties that manipulate the new cultural choices available to them for their own purposes. ${ }^{22}$

David Mattingly similarly focuses on the strategic use of cultural elements by local populations. He stresses the diversity of assimilation to Roman control among different groups according to class, occupation, and gender. He proposes the model of discrepant identities, ${ }^{23}$ closely akin to code-switching, according to which, individuals and groups in the Roman period possessed a range of overlapping identities and expressed themselves differently in different contexts. In the case of burial practices, for example, he notices that the Libyan-Phoenician elite in Lepcis Magna sometimes built tombs in the Roman architectural style but also used NeoPunic characters inside the tomb, even on the interior or exterior of burial urns. Mattingly interprets this as showing that the local elite of Lepcis selected elements of Roman culture to show their connection to the power structure of the empire, while at the same time they maintained local traditions to differentiate themselves from outsiders and visitors.

Despite their differences, the various models are united in their rejection of a binary opposition between native and Roman cultures as too simplistic for so multifaceted a phenomenon as Roman expansion in the Italian peninsula and the provinces. These newer approaches rightly emphasize the specificities of cultures, the role of the inhabitants of different regions, and their negotiation and cultural exchange with the Roman peoples. Furthermore, they make clear that cultures can take on foreign ways of doing or being while still conscious of their own identity. As such, they open a new perspective for the analysis of the dynamic interplay of different groups and currents during the period of Roman expansion. Ultimately, the effects of Roman expansion in the religious sphere of Umbria can be explained with the help of the Middle

[^8]Ground approach. The encounter between Romans and Umbrians creates a middle ground space where no side is clearly the master. Rather, what seems to emerge from this interaction in the sanctuaries of the region is a new set of cultural forms where the preexisting practices and traditions are preserved and integrated with new ones.

## Cultural change in ancient Umbria

The cultural change brought about in Umbria during the Roman conquest of this area has only very recently been the object of sustained scholarly attention. Debate on cultural change in central Italy has revolved mainly around the better investigated regions of Etruria, Latium, and Samnium. ${ }^{24}$ However, the last two decades of archaeological discoveries and historical rethinking have begun to increase our knowledge of ancient Umbria, making this region a promising field of study.

Scholars investigating Romanization in this region have long been influenced by William Harris' monograph Etruria and Umbria. ${ }^{25}$ In this work, not only does Harris over-assess the cultural influence of Rome in the process of the conquest of the region, but he also treats Umbria as a distant second behind Etruria, with its much better documented history and archaeology. In the conclusion of his book, Harris holds that after the Social War, the inhabitants of the towns of Etruria and Umbria "were Romans, not Etruscans and Umbrians." ${ }^{26}$ According to Harris, the spread of Latin and the adoption of Roman magisterial institutions were clear signs of the replacement of one identity and culture (Etruscan, Umbrian) for another (Roman).

[^9]Simone Sisani's Fenomenologia della conquista extends Harry's arguments and adds an extensive discussion of the archaeological evidence to what was previously limited to literary sources. ${ }^{27}$ Sisani praises Harris' take on Roman cultural influence and downplays local Umbrian cultural traits that he considers evanescent. He focuses on Romanization as a voluntary choice by local populations, and he maintains that the latter underwent a process of self-romanization and acculturation. According to him, starting from the fourth century BCE, Etruscan and Umbrian centers share a similar acculturation process that would be officially completed in the first century BCE. Sisani argues that in the decades following the Social War, Italy became a "geographical and political unity, if not a nation ... unified by the Roman politics and inseparable from the notion of romanitas". ${ }^{28}$

Recently, Guy Bradley reacted against the idea that Umbrians were the passive recipients of Roman culture. ${ }^{29}$ His consideration of social change and urbanism during the conquest shows the complexity of the transformations that occurred in the region. He argues that many of these developments are caused not only by external factors (i.e., Rome) but also by internal ones, such as the local environment (proximity to cities as opposed to rural areas) and the Umbrian participation in the Roman army. In addition, he uses archaeological evidence to show the presence of locals in the newly established colonies of the region and advocates for more intricate patterns of cohabitation both in and outside settlements. Most importantly, he concludes that we should not take cultural change as a sign of a culture replacing another, but as the coexistence of different identities. He points out the danger of over-emphasizing the influence of Rome and reassesses the role played by the Umbrian communities in the period of the Roman

[^10]conquest. In doing so, Bradley responds to Caroline Malone and Simon Stoddart's Territory, Time and State and Pierre Fontaine's Citės et encientes de l'Ombrie antique, both of which envision an ancient Umbria that was mostly undeveloped, had little if any state structural systems prior to the Social War, and owed its governmental institutions to Roman intervention in the region. ${ }^{30}$

Bradley raises new exciting questions and challenges for those who study cultural change in Umbria. His problematization of the dynamics of cultural interaction represents a starting point for my investigation of Umbrian sacred space and how they developed following the conquest.

## Cultural change in the religious sphere of central Italy

Recent anthropological and historical research has demonstrated that sanctuaries are a suitable avenue for investigating processes of cultural change. ${ }^{31}$ It seems that, in moments of cultural interaction, communities evoke or reinvent their traditions by reshaping religious and ritual institutions. Yet, Italic sanctuaries have only been the object of a few comprehensive studies that attempt to explain and problematize the change that happened in these places after the Roman conquest. As pointed out by Tesse Stek, ${ }^{32}$ one of the obstacles to the study of inland Italic sanctuaries is the fact that many of them have been excavated only recently and their interpretation lacks, therefore, a firm archeological framework. In addition, a lack of written sources and a dearth of epigraphic material has limited historical interpretation. For this reason, until a decade ago, scholars had long advanced a Romanocentric view that emphasized both

[^11]Rome's policy of non-intervention on rural sanctuaries and Roman colonization as key factors in the spread of Roman religious ideas. ${ }^{33}$

Scholarship on the topic has traditionally assumed that Roman expansion had no repercussion in the religious sphere of conquered people who had not been enfranchised. The received wisdom is that Roman policymakers and representatives did not intervene in the religious matters of unenfranchised areas, which could keep their gods and religious institutions. Conversely, Rome would have had an active role in the religious traditions and material culture of the areas whose inhabitants had gained Roman citizenship, namely colonies and municipia.

The notion of a hands-off Roman policy applies in particular to rural sanctuaries. The prevailing view has maintained the Roman expansion led to a decline in rural cult sites, which did not experience the rapid developments of the Roman world of cities. Yet the archaeological data does not speak in favor of this hypothesis. Many rural sanctuaries continued to be used during the Roman period and some were embellished and monumentalizated. Scholars such as Adriano La Regina, Cesare Letta, and Giovanni Colonna have wondered about the reasons for such investment in rural sanctuaries during the Middle and Late Republican period and have asked whether it relates to Rome's cultural and political role in the peninsula. Specifically, they have tried to tie the motivations behind the temples' visible embellishment to the possible functions of the sanctuaries themselves in the pre-Roman period.

Among the Apennine and Adriatic regions of central Italy, Samnium is by far the area that has received the most scholarly attention. In recent years, the research and fieldwork carried out in Samnium by teams from several Dutch universities led by Tesse Stek have tackled the

[^12]traditional interpretation of rural sanctuaries and shed new light on the Roman impact on religious structures in non-Roman Republican Italy.

The function and role of rural sanctuaries have often been related to the presence of tratturi, ancient paths along which shepherds drove their flocks between cooler mountains pastures and warmer lowlands for grazing. Scholars who have linked rural sanctuaries to the pastoral context of the Italic economy argued that cult places were located along tratturi to provide shelter to herdsman and to offer a place to trade safely. ${ }^{34}$ The wealth associated with these activities would have been used to monumentalize and decorate the sanctuaries, often dedicated to the patron deity of herdsmen, Heracles. As Stek has demonstrated, this interpretation is flawed for two reasons. First, evidence for large-scale pastoralism before the Roman period is scant, and, second, research in Samnium shows that the link between sacred spaces and tratturi is based more on assumptions of a putative topographical correspondence than on hard evidence. ${ }^{35}$

Others have considered Italic sanctuaries as markers of civic, political, and ethnic boundaries. ${ }^{36}$ This view, which originated in studies by Francois de Polignac and Pier Giovanni Guzzo on sanctuaries in Greece and Magna Grecia, holds that Italic sanctuaries functioned as markers of the territory belonging to a specific community. ${ }^{37}$ The focus of this line of

[^13]investigation has been Etruscan sanctuaries, especially those located in the southern part of the region, and Campanian sanctuaries.

Using the concepts of political and frontier sanctuaries as they have has been applied to Greek and southern Italian contexts, Corinna Riva and Stoddart suggest that sanctuaries worked to define boundaries on three levels, according to their spatial relationship to the city center. ${ }^{38}$ Within this model, sanctuaries outside urban areas were placed in liminal spaces between urban and suburban zones in order to delimit and negotiate territorial control. Similarly to Riva and Stoddart, Andrea Zifferero holds that sanctuaries were positioned in very strategic areas delimiting urban and non-urban areas, and between territories belonging to different cities. Thus, he believes that the role of these sanctuaries was to act as a location for the conflicts over territorial control, and their resolution. A similar role has been identified for the sanctuaries of Campania by Paolo Carafa, who emphasizes their role as markers of the edge of a city's influence. ${ }^{39}$

Studies of ethnicity in central Italy have highlighted the difficulty of defining stable ethnic boundaries both during the archaic and in the republican periods. ${ }^{40}$ The presence of ethnic groups is difficult to trace archaeologically, and the concept of ethnicity itself depends on sociohistorical moments and is "therefore very sensitive to historical changes". ${ }^{41}$ This view is supported by the recent work carried out by Rafael Scopacasa, who shows that users of Italic sanctuaries defined themselves fluidly, regardless of their ethnos. ${ }^{42}$ Scopacasa focuses on Samnium, demonstrating that the architecture and architectural decoration of Samnite sanctuaries

[^14]reveal the fluidity (what he calls nested identities) in which social groups defined themselves, rather than a monolithic ethnic identity. For example, the architectural terracottas from temples at Gildone and Petacciato show that iconographical traditions current in Tyrrenian and southern Italy were not only reproduced but also transformed according to particular cultic and aesthetic preferences. On the other hand, the lavish euergetism of temple B at Pietrabbonadante and the fact that the place was overtly named "the cult site of the safinim", as attested by an inscription found on site, ${ }^{43}$ possibly signals that the worshippers at this site wanted to bolster a sense of ethnic unity among the community. Scopacasa interprets this to mean that communities used cult places to articulate their identity differently, according to context, personal interests, and purpose.

Another view popular among scholars is that, in the context of scarce urbanization, rural sanctuaries worked within the so-called pagus-vicus system. ${ }^{44}$ In Latin, pagus refers to local, territorial districts of the people of the central Apennines, while vicus refers to the villages within the larger pagus. According to Adriano La Regina, Cesare Letta and others, in a landscape that lacked secure urban centers, sanctuaries would have functioned as the pole of aggregation, on different levels depending on their association to a touto (tribe), a pagus or a vicus. ${ }^{45}$ The presence of rural sanctuaries in the Roman period in central Italy has been therefore considered as a persistence of the indigenous pagus-vicus system.

Undoubtedly, one of the merits of recent scholarship on Italic sanctuaries has been the deconstruction of their association to the pagus-vicus system. In 2004, the "Sacred Landscape"

[^15]survey project, under the supervision of Jeremia Pelgrom and Tesse Stek, ${ }^{46}$ has demonstrated that the isolation of rural sanctuaries is merely an illusion caused by lack of research. Fieldwork around the sanctuaries of Colle Rimontato, Cupa, and Castel di Galdo in central Samnium has demonstrated that clusters consisting of settlements and cult sites seem to be the rule in all three case studies. The organization of pagus-vicus settlements based on pre-urban centers is therefore debatable. Stek has also questioned the pre-Roman origin of the pagus-vicus system in this region. ${ }^{47}$ Drawing from the work of Michel Tarpin and Luigi Capogrossi Colognesi, Stek demonstrates that pagus and vicus were administrative units created by the expanding Roman power: they not relics of an Italic system of territorial organization. He shows that inscriptions that relate to the involvement of a pagus or vicus in a cult or sanctuary come from Roman areas. When the epigraphical evidence can be connected to archaeological material, the Roman influence in the religious sphere becomes more manifest. The recently excavated temple at Castel di Ieri is a case in point. The structure is built ex pagi decreto, as inscribed on a mosaic at the temple's entrance, ${ }^{48}$ and presents strictly Romanizing aspects that suggest the involvement of the pagus in Roman religious ideology. Similarly, evidence from the vici on the shores of the Fucine lake (Vicus Aninus, for example) points to the adoption of new deities such as Valetudo and Victoria. Cult places associated with pagi and vici seem therefore to function within the Roman reorganization of the land and its people.

As for the fate of religious places after the concession of Roman citizenship at the beginning of the first century BCE, the received wisdom states that all cult places were re-shaped to conform to Rome's model, and Italic rural sanctuaries were closed as they did not serve the

[^16]new political order. This is most often seen as a consequence of the urbanization process in newly founded municipia, a phenomenon amply discussed by Gabba and, more recently, d'Alessio. ${ }^{49}$ The responsibilities and privileges that accompanied Roman citizenship and autonomous local administration required the creation of urban areas and public buildings to house the political and economic functions imposed by this new social and administrative organization. Architecture and urbanism served as tangible evidence of the insertion of new citizens into the system of Roman political values. Non-urban centers would have been left out as they did not fall within Rome's sphere of interest. However, new fieldwork carried out at Samnite sanctuaries (especially at Capochiaro, Vastogirardi, Schiavi d'Abruzzo, and S. Giovanni in Galdo) has demonstrated that the archaeological evidence is inconsistent with the traditional view of the abandonment of countryside sacred areas after the Social War. The data show that activities in rural sanctuaries did not cease after the Social War but continued well into the first BCE.

Contrary to the situation in territories outside direct Roman control, newly established Roman and Latin colonies and municipia would have been chosen for the spread of Roman religious ideas in and outside colonial settlements. In this process of "religious Romanization,, ${ }^{50}$ on the one hand, Rome imposed its will on local people, and, on the other, colonies showed their loyalty to Rome through the emulation of its religious material culture: the Etrusco-Italic temple model and anatomical votives. This view owes its popularity to the work of scholars such as Frank Brown, Edward Salmon, Daniel Gargola, and Olivier de Cazanove, who believed that

[^17]Roman colonies followed a purely Roman imprint and were composed primarily by mono-ethnic settlers from Rome and Latium who moved to the colony with a prescribed cult-package. ${ }^{51}$

The presence of Etrusco-Italic temples and their terracotta decoration has been considered the main proof that colonial establishments replicated the image of Rome. The Capitolium temple, with three cellae, high podium, high axial staircase and a pronaos, would have represented not only an unequivocal symbol of the Roman ideals of urbanity and sophistication but also an appeal to the neighboring Italic people who adopted these model from the colonies. ${ }^{52}$ Mario Torelli, in particular, concludes that the selection of figures and scenes further contributed to forging a stable relationship between the colony and Rome.

The dedication of anatomical ex-votos and votive heads represents another phenomenon believed to be typical of Roman colonies. During the Middle and Late Republican period, moldmade terracotta offerings became a far-reaching phenomenon in central Italian sanctuaries. ${ }^{53}$ They included representations of hands and feet, genitals, internal organs, and facials parts, such as tongues, eyes, and ears. In their pioneering categorization of votive assemblages into three typologies, the Italian archaeologists Maria Fenelli and Annamaria Comella compiled tables of votive finds from all over peninsular Italy and Sicily. ${ }^{54}$ Following a suggestion made by Torelli, ${ }^{55}$ they conclude that the spread of anatomical votives and heads coincides

[^18]chronologically and geographically with the extension of Roman political and religious influence. While these studies represent the first attempts to consider the religious phenomenon of the dedication of anatomicals within a broader context rather than in isolation, they initiated a line of inquiry that overemphasizes the political/ideological aspect of this material.

Scholars such as Patrizio Pensabene, Filippo Coarelli, and De Cazanove accept the connection between terracotta anatomical votive assemblages and Roman expansion and have made increasing efforts to link the distribution pattern to the establishment of Latin colonies. ${ }^{56}$ In their view, this class of material, derived from Greece, was adopted first by centers close to Rome, and then proliferated in central Italy after Rome adopted the Greek cult of Aesculapius, the god of medicine par excellence. Assuming a connection between a settlement's juridical status and religion, they emphasize the ideological role of ex-votos of this type and relate it to the alleged role of colonies as facilitators of the spread of these objects and as staging posts of Rome from a religious point of view. Anatomical votives, like temple architecture, would have represented a "striking sign of Roman superiority, both in the ideological and material sphere. ${ }^{57}$

With respect to the function of anatomical votives scholars generally maintain that they were dedicated as a request for, or in the hope of, a cure for some disease and therefore associate them with healing and fertility cults such as that of Aesculapius. ${ }^{58}$ According to this conventional

[^19]view, votive representations of feet, hands, etc. symbolized the body parts that needed healing by the god or those that had already been healed. ${ }^{59}$

In the past two decades, this prevailing view of Roman colonial policy that resulted in the phenomenon of the "religious Romanization" of Italy has been contested and problematized. First, recent scholarship has shown that the model that assumes deliberate likeness between Rome and the mid-Republican colonies, derived mainly from Rome-centered literary sources, is untenable in light of the archaeological evidence. ${ }^{60}$ Michael Crawford, Elizabeth Fentress, and Edward Bispham, among others, have demonstrated that the evidence at our disposal does not show any clear and consistent link between the construction of capitolia and the award of colonial or municipal status. ${ }^{61}$ A growing body of epigraphic, numismatic, and archaeological sources shows, in fact, that the trend of building capitolia only really develops after 200 BCE. The public buildings at Cosa, which include a capitolium, for example, emerge only in the second century BCE, one century after the colonial establishment. ${ }^{62}$

Scholars have also questioned Rome's supposed role as the sole influence on colonial town building. Fay Glinister emphasizes the efforts and motivations of individuals and small groups not only among the commissioners and the colonists, but also among the locals and settlers from various parts of Italy, who in many cases appear to have been included in the

[^20]colony. ${ }^{63}$ Jamie Sewell has pointed to the Greek influence on Roman and Latin colonies, such as the length of insulae and the fortification system, and has thus underlined the differences between colonies and Rome rather than similarities. ${ }^{64}$ Amanda Coles focuses on the role of cult in the makeup of each colony and how it facilitated the integration of the diverse social and ethnic groups. At Fraegelle, for example, the placement of urban sanctuaries next to the via Latina may point to an effort to reinforce community cohesion and boundaries. ${ }^{65}$ Given this evidence, Cole invites us to consider "the uniqueness of each colony's set of gods, temples, and rituals" rather than their alleged similarity to Rome. ${ }^{66}$

The claim that anatomical votives not only map the extension of Roman expansion but also function as an instrument of Roman domination on a cultural level has been similarly contested. Glinister and Maria Gentili have recently pointed out that there is no good reason to argue that the diffusion of anatomical models coincides geographically with the spread of Roman political influence. First, the tradition of dedicating anatomical votives predates the major phase Roman colonization in the fourth and third century BCE. Excavations at Italic sanctuaries of Marzabotto and Adria, in northern Etruria and Adriatic Italy, brought to light anatomical votives in bronze which are dated as early as the sixth century BCE. ${ }^{67}$ Additionally, it seems that in in the Latin colonies of Paestum, Salerno, and Carseoli anatomical terracotta votives date to at least 50 years before the colonial foundations. ${ }^{68}$ Secondly, the archaeological focus on Campania,

[^21]Latium, and Etruria has led to a biased picture of the distribution pattern of anatomical votives, which does not consider other regions of the peninsula. Glinister pays particular attention to the evidence from Abruzzo and notes the "the map will suffice to show that few of these sanctuaries lie anywhere near significant foci of Romanization such as colonies or roads. ${ }^{,{ }^{69}}$ If to these evidence we add the fact that "on all interpretations the findspots of the earliest anatomical terracottas lie outside Rome", ${ }^{70}$ it becomes apparent that distribution pattern of these votives does not back up the claim that Rome was the epicenter of their distribution.

The findings of Glinister and Gentili have far-reaching implications. By questioning the Romanness of anatomical terracottas, they lay the groundwork for a revisionist approach to the idea of the influence of Rome on the religious traditions of Italic peoples. Over the past few years, other scholars have contributed to this debate and emphasized the influence of local traditions on the appearance of anatomicals during the Roman period. Marlene Turneer's work, for example, focuses on the anatomical votives from three colonies in central Italy and concludes that the pattern of political influence and artistic expression was much more complicated than suggesting a "Roman connection" as the primary source for anything created outside Rome. Similarly, Scopacasa focuses on the use of anatomical votives in the Apennines to argue that local cultural practice had an impact on the political change in these areas during the fourth BCE. ${ }^{71}$

In sum, recent archaeological breakthroughs challenge traditional interpretations of central Italian sanctuaries. Previous studies have emphasized the role of isolated rural sanctuaries as a persistent feature of Italic life, thus emphasizing the hands-off policy of Rome. The

[^22]embellishment of some sacred spaces during the Roman period has been explained in connection with their function as marketplaces, boundary markers, or vestiges of pagus-vicus settlements. Research and fieldwork in Italy show that these explanations are hardly feasible. In particular, the pagus-vicus model relied on anachronistic terminology and a rigid polarization between polis and dispersed settlement which does not correspond to the variety of community forms and structures throughout the peninsula. Steks's and Scopacasa's research, moreover, demonstrates that cult places defy any simplistic ethnic characterization. Instead, Samnite sanctuaries provide evidence that Samnite identity was itself shifting and unstable. It varied in its geographical scope according to the needs and interests of the groups "who defined themselves through the shared use of sanctuaries. ${ }^{, 72}$

In addition to questioning the function of Italic rural cult places, there are several counterarguments to the proposition that Rome influenced colonial cult places and the presence of anatomical terracottas. Even if it is true that many colonies emulated certain aspects of Roman architecture, such as temples, this trend only spread in the Late Republican period. Similarly, the presence of anatomical votives does neither geographically nor chronologically overlaps with Roman expansion.

Ultimately, the archeological record shows that while colonies may have had some Roman political framework by which they set up their community, there was no blanket imposition of Roman culture on the non-Roman or local populations. Rather, each colony took a different religious trajectory shaped by different traditions observed not only Roman governmental representatives and settlers, but also by the local environment and the interaction with the local population. These new archaeological studies not only expand and complicate our

[^23]understanding of the Romanization process but also encouraged to expand the focus of the research to other areas of central Italy.

## Cultural change in the religious sphere of ancient Umbria

In Umbria proper, detailed studies of Umbrian cult places and their topographical and cultual developments are limited. They fall in line with some of the abovementioned traditional approaches and, with the exclusion of Bradley's remarkable contribution, have not been revised according to new scholarship on the topic.

The function of Umbrian sacred spaces has been explored by scholars such as La Regina, Giovanni Colonna, and Paola Bonomi Ponzi. ${ }^{73}$ Drawing on the type of votives and the rural topographical location of the sanctuaries, they interpret Umbrian sacred spaces within a pagusvicus system. In other words, they include Umbrian sanctuaries in the broader category of Apennine sacred places that were assumed to have functioned as political and economic centers in the absence of "real" urban units, subject to the demands of the ruling class. They also agree that the elite group, whose power is visible in the funerary sphere, controlled these cult places and used them to display their status symbol through the dedication of bronze offerings. Similarly, theories linking the continuation of Umbrian sanctuaries into the Roman period and the presence of anatomical votives in the region have their roots in the traditional thinking.

Dorica Manconi, Maria Tomei, and Monika Vezar connect the endurance of Umbrian sanctuaries after the fourth century to the new Roman presence in, and control over, the region. They argue that if, on the one hand, sanctuaries near a Roman area were more likely to be abandoned, and those located in the central Apennine zone had more chances "di una piú

[^24]prolungata continuità. ${ }^{י 74}$ The presence of anatomical votives in some of these sanctuaries is explained by Daniela Monacchi, Simone Sisani, and others as an unequivocal sign of a Roman presence. Assuming that terracotta ex-votos represented a distinctive Roman cultual practice exported during the conquest, they consider them as the index fossil of Roman expansion and, in some cases, as the proof of "the physical presence of Roman colonists in the region" or of the arrival of new cults. ${ }^{75}$

This line of thought on the function and continuity of Umbrian sanctuaries has been revised by Bradley, who in 1987 wrote an article titled "Archaic Sanctuaries in Umbria," and a few years later, in 2000, published the first monograph on the region. ${ }^{76}$ Concerning the function of sacred spaces within the pagus-vicus model, Bradley rightly points out that the model imposes ideal and institutional systems of socio-political level onto physical remains. He emphasizes the geographical diversity of the region and the fact that sanctuaries lie in areas hardly classifiable according to the dichotomy urban/non-urban. According to his analysis, Umbrian communities may well have functioned as self-sufficient centers, even in the absence of cities such as those in the more "urbanized" lowlands of Latium and Campania. Using recent scholarship on related problems concerning Greece, he notes that not all states were poleis and that the absence of a centralized settlement system is not automatically "an example of an earlier tribal form of society that had to yet to evolve into a polis." ${ }^{, 77}$ At Plestia, for example, evidence from burials, hillforts, and the Cupra Sanctuary point to social complexity, craft specialization, and, ultimately, to a communal organization that had a solid collective identity, despite the absence of a town.

[^25]Furthermore, he notes that there is no archaeological evidence that validates the hypothesis that the aristocracy assumed socio-political authority and even more so that cult places were under the control of specific kinship association. I corroborate this argument in the next chapter where I examine the material evidence used by scholars to track the elite active presence in the sanctuaries, namely the votive figurines. Although we cannot exclude that the elite may have had control of sacred spaces, the iconographic and stylistic analysis of these objects does not allow us to link them to of any specific social class.

Although Bradley refutes the existence of the pagus-vicus settlement type, he accepts the hypothesis that sacred places could have had functions that were not only purely religious. By comparison with other central Italian sanctuaries, he puts forth the possibility that they could also function as marketplaces or have some political function. Bradley sees a strong link between archaic Umbrian sanctuaries and their territory, following the land-community model studied by de Polignac and applied to Greece. In addition, he notes the high number of sanctuaries in Umbria and the ample presence of locally produced votive offerings. Although he does not elaborate on this topic much further, he suggests that this may hint at the importance played by religious spaces "in the creation of community identities. ${ }^{78}$

As for the issue of the continuity of Umbrian sanctuaries, it is again Bradley who rebuts the consensus view based on his analysis of archaeological data. Cases in point of his argument are the Monte Ansciano sanctuary, not located in a Romanized territory but where ritual activity decreases noticeably starting with the fourth century BCE, and the Grotta Bella cave, located in southern Umbria, which continued to be used until at least the fourth century CE. The continuation of sanctuaries into the Roman period, he concludes, follows reason other than the

[^26]Roman presence in the region, such as the location of sanctuaries far from growing urban centers where new sanctuaries "took over the function of the old mountain top sanctuaries." ${ }^{" 79}$ Although he does not directly engage with the issue of votive offerings, Bradley suggests caution in considering anatomical votives as a sign of Romanization and considers the variety of votive deposits in the Roman period within the broader frame of central Italian cultural koine, influenced mainly by Roman expansion.

Bradley taps into the ongoing discussion on cultural change and demonstrates that the changing landscape of the region represents an exciting avenue for the investigation of how sacred spaces and ritual behaviors changed following Roman expansion— not only in non-urban but also in urban contexts. New excavation data has accumulated since his initial publication on Umbria, but it has not yet been gathered together nor has it been brought to bear on questions of continuity and cultural change. ${ }^{80}$ No work has been done to evaluate the change in location, architecture, and ritual behaviors of the Italic sanctuaries during the Middle and Late Republican period, or their significance for Italic communities in a crucial historical moment: the aftermath of the Roman expansion in the fourth century BCE. In addition, no attempt has been made to assess the relationship between the Roman conquest and the social and political context within which Umbrian sanctuaries were constructed and functioned.

[^27]
## Overview

Traditional approaches to assessing the impact of Roman on its neighbors in central Italy has focused on new Roman and Latin territories with an emphasis on the supposedly Roman character of the region's sanctuaries and their votive deposits. The spread of the Etrusco-Italic temple type and the presence of anatomical votives have been largely interpreted as an immediate by-product of the increasing Roman presence in the area. Conversely, non-urban cult sites would have been scarcely involved in the historical developments of the middle and late republican periods. According to this view, the demise of some sanctuaries was caused by their loss of importance after the Roman conquest, mainly due to their distance from major city centers. Other rural sanctuaries that continued to exist into the Roman period have been considered a vestige of old rural traditions, a sign of the "immutable character of rustic life." ${ }^{81}$

Recent studies have begun to dispel these axioms and to problematize the Romanocentric image of Roman expansion in central Italy, with significant consequences for many dimensions of Italic sanctuaries, from their architecture and votive deposits to the ability of the local populations to adapt to new modes of worship while continuing their own. Umbria, located just east of Latium, has not yet been a prominent part of this revaluation. Although Bradley has questioned traditional views on the function and development of local sanctuaries during the Roman period, and Glinister has remarked that anatomical votives existed in central Italy well before the conquest, the assumption that Roman conquest brought cultural assimilation is still widespread. In the next chapter, I set research on Umbria cult sites in the context of the relatively new fields of the archaeology of religion and ritual, in general, and of votive religion in particular.

[^28]
## Chapter 3

## For an Archaeology of Religion and Ritual

## Introduction

In recent years, archaeologists have successfully applied new approaches to the investigation of rituals and their material remains and have made significant and novel contributions to the contextualization of ritual theory. This chapter reviews the most influential of these approaches and concludes with the potential benefits of the application of similar methods to the analysis to Umbrian votive deposits.

The discussion is organized into three parts. In the first and second part, I review different approaches used by archaeologists to study religion and religious rituals, and the role that these play in shaping the cultural identities of a community. Within the discipline of archaeology, religion has often been treated as a particularly impenetrable domain. Consequently, due to deeprooted aversions against archaeological studies of religion, ritual has been used as a catch-all term for anything that archaeologists find to be odd and without immediate functional value. In the past thirty years, however, religion and religious rituals have come to the fore as an essential topic within the archaeological investigation. Building on anthropological and sociological understandings of religion, archaeologists have begun to address the material remains of religion. The archaeology of ancient ritual is now a dynamic and growing field that continue to generate numerous ongoing debates and areas of new research.

The third part considers the material remains, and the ways they have been used to reconstruct ancient ritual, its continuity across time, and its connection to social identity. This discussion underscores the limitations of the studies of central Italian votive offerings, still largely focused on anatomical terracottas and their connection to the Roman conquest. As a consequence of this, scholars have given scant attention to the ritual function of archaic votives and how it developed during the Roman period. Umbrian votive figurines, in particular, are affected by this narrowly focused interest, and no attempts have been made to consider the ritual meaning of their deposition and how it may have varied over time. It is time for a new study of the votive material.

## Archaeology of religion

Since Christopher Hawkes' influential article in 1954, ${ }^{82}$ religion has been considered a daunting topic for interpreting the data at archaeologists' disposal. According to Hawke's ladder of inference, "religious institution and spiritual life" represent the least appropriate venue for archaeological inquiry. The reason why archaeologists considered religion such an impenetrable realm of analysis lies in the alleged divide between religious belief and religious practice. These two domains were carefully separated in archaeological investigation because archeologists viewed religion as primarily metaphysical and abstract, and therefore in clear contrast with the object of their study, the material world. The "New Archaeology" of the 1960s-1970s further strengthens this view as it portrayed religion as epiphenomenal and downplayed its practical dimension, considering it "materially unidentifiable." 83

[^29]This tendency to view religion as abstract is also manifest in more recent discussions of the archaeology of religion. In his 2004 monograph, Timothy Insoll holds that religion is allpervasive, informing and influencing even aspects of life that archaeologists have typically considered secular. Although Insoll emphasizes the all-encompassing nature of religion, he also stresses the difficulty of delving into its essence. In his view, the numinous character of religion "defies rationality" and thus represents an obstacle for archaeologists.

In the last thirty years, cultural anthropologists, sociologists, and scholars of religion have developed theories for the understanding of ancient religion and have paid progressively closer attention to religious practices, beliefs, and their correlates. Their theoretical understandings of religion have formed the cornerstone of archaeological approaches both to religion and ritual. ${ }^{84}$

Practice theorists such as Pierre Bourdieu, Ernst Bloch, and Catherine Bell advocate for the embeddedness of religion within human actions and emphasize the different ways that religion is present in people's daily lives. ${ }^{85}$ Applying the ideas of Bourdieu's Theory of Practice, where ritual is considered a specific form of social practice that reproduces social relationships, Bell identifies ritual as a form of human action and as an active component of religious practice that creates and alters religious beliefs. ${ }^{86}$ Others emphasize ritual's potential to foster social change and the effect that ritual has on the power relationships between participants. ${ }^{87}$

These approaches to religion explicitly reject the structural approach that has traditionally dominated the discussions of religion. ${ }^{88}$ The structuralist perspective emphasizes the stability of religion as a long-lasting cultural phenomenon. According to this view, ritual is a form of human

[^30]action that enacts religious principle and, therefore, must also be stable over time. This theory has been contested by, among others, practice theorists as being "ill-suited to the consideration of diachronic change" ${ }^{89}$ Rather than focusing on the stability of ritual actions, practice theorists follow Bourdieu's Theory of Practice and highlight the experiential aspects of ritual and how it is continuously reconstructed and modified. ${ }^{90}$

Another approach to the study of religion that relates religious beliefs to practice and material culture is the cognitive approach. Cognitive theories analyze the relationship between the human mind/brain system and external reality. Anthropologists such as Merlin Donald, Robert McCauley, and Thomas Lawson emphasize the dialectic between surroundings and the mind, and they recognize external elements as crucial in cognitive development. ${ }^{91}$ In their foundational book, Rethinking Religion, McCauley and Lawson posit a unified theory that exemplifies the cognitive approach to religious ritual. ${ }^{92}$ According to these two authors, religious rituals are actions guided by the same cognitive system that guides everyday practice.

Despite their slight divergence, these interpretative frameworks offer a significant contribution to archaeological studies when they emphasize that religion is not merely a transcendent phenomenon but is made manifest into the material world. Therefore, the construction of religious architecture, the offerings of objects to gods, and the performance of sacrifice have the potential to leave material remains that archaeologists can study. As becomes apparent in the next part of this chapter, these theories can be particularly amenable to archaeological application.

[^31]Following the lead of anthropological and sociological studies, in the past ten years religion has increasingly entered the interpretative repertoire of archaeologists. Rather than focusing on the unknowable and transcendental aspects of religion, scholars have begun to shift their attention to materiality, agency, practice, memory, movement, and performance; in short, they have started to consider religion as centrally embedded in human actions. This recent emphasis on practice is critical for the archaeological study of religion. As Lars Fogelin has emphasized, ${ }^{93}$ religion is something that people do, and therefore it leaves material traces. Archaeologists, in turn, can examine these traces and, through careful research and investigation, reconstruct not only what people did, but also the religious ideology underlying those actions.

## Archaeology of ritual

Similar to religion, the study of ritual is a field of inquiry that has been largely overlooked in archaeology. For a long time, archaeologists have grappled with the challenges of recognizing and understanding ancient ritual based on archaeological evidence; explicit methodologies for reconstructing ancient ritual and religion have been mostly absent, with the belief that it was a particularly unsuitable area for archaeological inquiry. The main reason for this neglect is the longstanding divide between human beliefs and social practices. Alongside religion, ritual was considered as related to the realm of beliefs/transcendence/the supernatural, and therefore, archaeological data were regarded as insufficient to interpret ritual practices. As Ian Hodder points out, ${ }^{94}$ anything that archeologists have found to be odd and without immediate

[^32]functional value was associated with ritual, which came to be defined in several different ways and cover very different types of behavior. ${ }^{95}$

In recent years, however, the shift from belief to practice in anthropological and sociological studies on religion has had a positive effect on archaeology. Archaeologists have made increased efforts to bridge the apparent divide between ancient ritual and archaeological data. ${ }^{96}$ As Bell observes, in the current scholarship on ancient rituals, there seems to be a shared agreement to define ritual as a "set of crystallized" forms of human action that leaves material traces in the archaeological record. ${ }^{97}$ Since archaeologists attempt reconstructions based on observed patterns, ritual has a higher chance of being tracked than many other activities.

The presence in the archaeological record of repetitions and patterns as characteristic of ritual was noted first by Colin Renfrew, who, in his seminal work on the Bronze Age Cycladic shrine of Phylakopi, attempts to systematize the archaeological identification of religious sites. ${ }^{98}$ He provides a list of indicators of ritual that includes attention focusing (with place, equipment, and symbols), boundary zone, presence of the deity, participation, and offerings. Although this checklist has attracted some criticism, ${ }^{99}$ it has had substantial impact on subsequent work. ${ }^{100}$

The attention devoted in recent years by anthropologists to a more practice-oriented understanding of religion has resulted in increased engagement with material evidence. More

[^33]recent archaeological research focuses on the primacy of ritual practice and emphasizes the agency of human and objects, and the experiential and behavioral aspects of ritual practices. ${ }^{101}$ Influenced by Alfred Gell's "object agency", Bruno Latour's "Actor-Network" theory, and Hodder's concept of "entanglement" between humans and things, ${ }^{102}$ material-based studies of ancient religion explore the embeddedness of religion in the material world in different ways.

Gell challenges the traditional dichotomy between people and objects. He argues that objects are not just mere reflections of human agency, but, rather, active devices "for securing the acquiescence of individuals in the network of functionalities in which they are enmeshed"; in short, artefacts are social agents in themselves. Similarly, Latour's Actor Network Theory (ANT) considers the interactions that happen between humans and nonhumans actors. He maintains that people and things cannot be separated as they have a symmetrical relationship where each affect the other. This proposition is not dissimilar to Karl Knappett's argument on the relation between humans and objects, which "bring each other into being." ${ }^{103}$

Unlike Latour, Hodder considers the relationship between things and humans to be asymmetrical, because the dependencies that one can have on the other lead "to entrapments in particular pathways from which it is difficult to escape". ${ }^{104} \mathrm{He}$ holds that the materiality of things creates a set of dependencies between objects and people (entanglements), which he breaks down into four types: human-thing, thing-human, thing-thing, and human-human.

[^34]This "material turn" is part of a broad range of new approaches to archaeology that have been defined as relational or posthuman: they reconceptualize categories of person and things and their relations in an attempt to consider object intentionality and agency, and to dissociate archaeology from complicated modern notions of human exceptionalism and individualist subjectivity. ${ }^{105}$

Among recent practice-based approaches to religious studies, the work of Lynn Meskell, John Barrett, and Bill Sillar, ${ }^{106}$ who work on Egypt, Greece, and the Andes respectively, has been particularly influential. They emphasize that different objects - from human-made items to features of the natural landscape - have agency and intentionality that shape religious traditions. Likewise, Chris Gosden focuses on the replacement of Iron Age objects from southern Britain with Roman objects and analyzes how the objects' form and style influenced people. He draws from Gell's idea that objects have their own logic and that human behavior and thoughts may "take the shape suggested by the object, rather than objects simply manifesting pre-existing forms of thought." ${ }^{107}$ These scholars observe the inseparability of beliefs and other internal cognitive or emotional experience from material culture: objects express and shape symbolic meanings, identities, relationships, and perceptions. For these reasons, they argue that agency lies in the social relationship people have with the material world and that material objects can have social identities. These approaches emphasize the post-human ethic of decentering of the human: they enable us to consider the archaeological record as the visible materialization of the interdependence between objects and human and challenge the limitations of modernist, western perspectives on the world.

[^35]In addition to re-situating religion within the material world, recent research has emphasized the centrality of change within ritual. In particular, the scholars affiliated with Heidelberg University's collaborative research center "Ritual Dynamics" focused on empirical investigations into the dynamics of ritual practices in various historical and contemporary cultures. ${ }^{108}$ Oriented towards the performative character of ritual, they stress the creativity and meaning-creating character of ritual, and use case-studies from modern and ancient Asia and Near East to elaborate on the centrality of change in ritual practice. First, they demonstrate that rituals are subject to change through human agency. Second, they maintain that rituals may change for reasons that are beyond the control of human agents. Finally, they show that rituals change those who perform or observe them. The "Ritual Dynamics" project shows that rituals are not stereotyped and invariant events and that change within and through rituals is as evident as the continuity that can be observed in many ritual practices.

The recent collection of paper Ritual dynamics in the ancient Mediterranean: agency, emotion, gender, representation edited by Angelos Chaniotis clearly illustrates the application of practice theory in archaeology as emphasized by the "Ritual Dynamics" project and exemplifies the latest trends in the study of ritual performances in the Ancient Mediterranean. ${ }^{109}$ The contributors to the volume utilize diverse source material to identify and explain evidence of changes in the Mediterranean (Egypt, Greece, Northern Italy, North Africa, and the Roman East) through the lens of agency, emotion, gender, and representation. For example, Ioanna Patera's

[^36]account of modifications over time in Eleusinian rites and the article by Eftychia Stavrianopoulou on Greek written texts codifying practice both focus on tradition invoked as a rationale for change. ${ }^{110}$ As in the case of Eleusis, Chianotis notes that many innovations in Greek rituals affect the staging and aesthetics of the ritual actions rather than of the essential form of the ritual that, instead, remains unchanged. Similarly, scholars such as Barbara Mills and William Walker, and Ruth Van Dyke and Susan Alcock, have emphasized the dynamic aspects of ritual. ${ }^{111}$ Although specific rituals may remain the same over long periods, their meaning for society is constantly re-contextualized.

Practice theory elucidates how the ritual experience has the potential to reaffirm, create, or challenge the dominant social order. ${ }^{112}$ Research in this vein often focuses on ritual symbolism and the materialization of ritual symbols. Once materialized, symbolic objects can be controlled and manipulated by people in order to achieve specific aims. Elizabeth DeMarrais and John Robb productively apply these insights in their examination of how the elite can limit access material symbols, such as icons, rituals, monuments, and written text, or change their underlying meaning. ${ }^{113}$ Jerry Moore and Fogelin, among others, employ a practice approach more focused on how people experienced ritual in the past. ${ }^{114}$ They emphasize the ways that different religious architectural layouts promoted different experiences that either serve the interest of authority or resistance to authority.

These practice-based perspectives in the archaeology of ritual emphasize the effects of ritual on the social relations between ritual participants and focus on how ritual change over time

[^37]informs and reflects the development of those relationships. As such, practice approaches downplay the importance of symbolism in the study of ancient ritual and favor the analysis of the use of symbols and the goals of the people who deployed it.

Against these formulations that consider ritual as a "transformative performance," ${ }^{115}$ scholars who support a structuralist perspective emphasize the stability of religion. ${ }^{116}$ Assuming the stability of religion over time, they advocate the stability of ritual and stress its anachronistic and invariant elements. Cultural materialists such as Roy Rappaport and Elizabeth Sobel, ${ }^{117}$ hold onto the stability of religion and argue that ritual actions have the function of retaining and passing down social information over time.

As noted by Fogelin, ${ }^{118}$ few archaeologists follow either the practice-oriented or the structural approach to the archaeology of ritual. More typically, they employ insight from both perspectives in their research without overcoming the contradictions that the two perspectives pose. Similarly, Insoll points out that the current problem that archaeologists face is to find a balance between understanding ritual as subject to change and the existence of an underlying core of stability in practice and belief concerning ritual. ${ }^{119}$

As this discussion has shown, religion and ritual are now far from being tangential to archaeological research. In the past years, scholars have questioned the impenetrability of religion, and new research questions and approaches have opened new perspectives for the development of the field of the archaeology of religion. Following the lead of sociological and anthropological studies, archaeologists are paying increasing attention to the material culture as a

[^38]source to reconstruct ritual and cult practices. A proliferation of new studies on the archaeology of ancient religion examines the complex interactions between humans and objects, their agency, and the role of religion in society. As scholars focus on the agency of objects and participants in a ritual in their specific social, local, and historical context, they are aware that the meaning of ritual can change over time rather than being static as once thought. Within these new and ongoing developments, this section has briefly reviewed the latest scholarly approaches to the entanglement between human and objects' agencies, to religion as a causal force for social change, and to change and re-contextualization of religious rituals. These ongoing investigations contribute to making archaeology of religion and ritual a fundamental component in debates concerning the interactions and interrelationships between individuals, communities, and structure of power.

## Votive religion

In societies accustomed to giving gifts to transcendent beings for supernatural returns, such as Italic and Roman societies, votive offerings represent the most ubiquitous evidence of ritual activity. ${ }^{120}$ Any object could be vowed, but generally votives consisted of perishable items (grains and plants, milk, wine, honey, cakes); personal items (toys, amulets, jewelry); practical items (fish hooks, loom weights, tools, utensils, incense burners); statuettes/statues (gods, men, women, swaddled babies, animals); body parts (miniaturized models of every description); altars, cippi and bases; ceramic items (miniaturized pottery, lamps, temple models); and coins. These offerings are both abundant and ubiquitous. People seeking or receiving the god's attention would leave votive offerings on display in urban, rural, extramural, extra-urban, spring, lake,

[^39]mountain, cave, state, and private cults, all places that Ingrid Edlund- Berry indicates with regard to votive depositions at Etruscan sanctuaries. ${ }^{121}$

The quantity and variety of votive types inspired the term "votive religion" since votives are concrete and long lasting evidence for the principle of reciprocity. ${ }^{122}$ As Walter Burkert has emphasized, votive offerings embody the principle of exchangeability-do ut des (I give so that you will give)-that granted divine aid in exchange for the donor's vow. ${ }^{123}$ As such, they are considered a visible expression of the interaction and communication between the donors and the deities. Thus, the beliefs and motives of the worshipper must have played an essential role in the selection of the dedication. The function of votive offerings as gifts that bind together man and gods makes this class of material a vital tool to explore cultural and ritual dynamics in ancient societies. First, votive offerings illuminate the complex relationship between people and things, and between people and gods. ${ }^{124}$ Second, recent publications show that votives can be used as a source of information towards the reconstruction of an ancient economy, ${ }^{125}$ social and political aspects, ${ }^{126}$ and ritual practices. ${ }^{127}$

Although the relevance of votive religion in Greek and Roman contexts has been recognized, ${ }^{128}$ the study of votive offerings has long been neglected by archaeologists for reasons pointed out by Robin Osborne. ${ }^{129}$ Firstly, archaeologists have devoted their attention primarily to the classification of objects rather than of assemblages. The consequence of this predilection for

[^40]object types, which are believed to provide chronological information, is that we have overlooked the potential of artifacts' assemblages to understand ritual practices. Secondly, it can be difficult to differentiate between objects that have been dedicated and those that have been simply discarded, one of the primary complications in the interpretation of ritual in the archaeological record. ${ }^{130}$ Similarly challenging is the question of how much votive material is needed to classify a site as a ritual space and whether a few objects are sufficient to classify a site within the corpus of sacred spaces. Finally, Osborne rightly points out the hesitance among scholars to agree on one term to refer to dedicated objects. These objects are variously called dedications, offerings, votives, hoards, or only deposits, depending on what feature of the object the writer wants to emphasize the most (permanence of the gift/action of giving/connection with prior vow/ quantity/ circumstances of the act of depositing). ${ }^{131}$

Minoan and archaic Greek votive practices are particularly prominent in the study of Mediterranean religion. Since the beginning of archaeological work on Crete in the $19^{\text {th }}$ century, archaeologists have nurtured a fascination for the origin of ritual practices and belief systems in the Aegean, and their connections to contemporaneous socio-political phenomena. In the past thirty years, in particular, works such as Renfrew's The Archaeology of Cult and Warren's Minoan Religion as Ritual in Action have pioneered new approaches to issues of performance and ritual action, with a specific focus on material culture. ${ }^{132}$ Both authors underscore the importance of performance in ritual actions and of votive (as well as iconographic) material to reconstruct religious practices.

[^41]Experiential and cognitive approaches applied in Minoan archaeology have used votive material to reconstruct the ways people experienced rituals. In her dissertation on mountain peak sanctuaries, Elissa Faro explores the material culture in the ritual spaces of the island and their meaning within the network of the Minoan ritual landscape. She analyses assemblages from extra-urban and urban ritual spaces and makes clear that the differences among them provide evidence for distinct ritual practices. Moreover, she demonstrates that votive assemblages changed over time according to the specific needs of the elite to redefine their status in the new power structure of the Neopalatial period. ${ }^{133}$ Similarly, Camilla Briault considers votive deposits from Minoan sacred places. She concludes that the interpretation of data patterning is a productive way to approach ritual in the Bronze Age Aegean. ${ }^{134}$

The recent publication Cult Material: From Archaeological Deposits to Interpretation of Early Greek Religion further elaborates the theory and practice of interpreting cult and religion with particular attention to votive deposits in their archaeological context. ${ }^{135}$ The contributors to this volume emphasize the role of votive deposits in monitoring processes of change and transformation. Indeed, one of their central arguments is that the analysis of cult places via archaeological methods enables us to observe shifts in structural patterns that reflect on ritual behavior and social agency.

Emma-Jayne Graham's study of the anatomical votives from Fregellae and Punta della Vipera in Latium emphasizes the multivalent nature of anatomical votives and focuses on how these objects impacted the lives of their worshippers. ${ }^{136}$ She argues that anatomical votives not only created permanent relationships between humans and the gods, but also made manifest the

[^42]power of the gods in the real world, thus shedding light on "how people conceptualized, performed, and constructed their knowledge of the gods". ${ }^{137}$

The recent work of Ilaria Battiloro on Lucanian sanctuaries represents another milestone in the study of cult places and ritual practices in southern Italy. ${ }^{138}$ Battiloro's research carefully analyses the votive offerings from Lucanian sanctuaries and the ritual performances associated with them. Her focus on the rituals associated with votives sets Battiloro's research apart from most of the work on Italic religion, which treats votive deposits mainly in terms of their sociopolitical meaning and relationship to the Roman conquest.

## Votive offerings in central Italy

When we turn our attention to central Italy, it becomes clear that the study of votives in general, and Umbrian votives in particular, has been hampered not only by the problems observed by Osborne ${ }^{139}$ but also by an overly narrow focus on anatomical terracottas and Etruscan rituals and beliefs. Much of the current debate about votive offerings in Central Italy revolves around the vast number of votive terracotta deposits in Etruscan and Italic societies during the fourth to the first century BCE. Since 1973, when Torelli, put forward the argument that the distribution of these objects was connected to Rome and the foundation of Latin colonies, scholars have focused on this class of material primarily in order to track the process of Romanization.

Notwithstanding the attempts to deconstruct the ideological aspect of anatomical terracottas, the paradigm of Romanization is still widespread in the studies of ancient votives, as

[^43]the collection of papers in Tesse Stek and Gert-Jan Burgers' recent publication demonstrate. ${ }^{140}$ This scholarly insistence on the anatomical votives as a sign of Roman cultural influence not only simplifies the interactions between Romans and locals, but it also overlooks other categories of ancient Italic votive offerings.

As for the use of votives as a means to reconstruct ancient ritual practices in central Italy, research has been sporadic and focused almost entirely on the region of Etruria. Much ink has been spilled over the "most religious of men," ${ }^{141}$ and recent work considers the potential of votive offerings to shed light on Etruscan religious beliefs and practices. The collection of papers in the volume edited by Nancy De Grummond, The Archaeology of Sanctuaries and Ritual in Etruria, illustrates the recent trends in the study of Etruscan votive religion. ${ }^{142}$ De Grummond's contribution, for example, encourages archaeologists to look carefully for variation in votive contexts and to consider the ritual implications of broken or misshapen objects in sanctuary contexts. ${ }^{143}$ Helen Nagy has also found that comparative approaches shed new light on Etruscan ritual. By comparing votive terracottas from Veii and Cerveteri, she prompts new questions about male and female participation in ritual and raises the possibility that not only certain rituals, but also specific ritual spaces were gendered in the ancient landscape. ${ }^{144}$

[^44]
## Votive offerings in ancient Umbria

More than two-thousand figurative votive offerings, representing worshippers, warriors, animals, anatomical parts and heads have been retrieved from the sanctuaries of ancient Umbria. Although Guy Bradley notes that this material "is a vital source of information for any picture of Umbrian religion," aside from a few site-based publications, this substantial body of evidence have escaped the attention of scholars. A common shortcoming of the few investigations that have appeared is a tendency to focus on the votives' socio-political meaning and to consider anatomical votives strictly as part of the "Romanization" package brought about by Rome during its expansion. Little attention, if any, has been given to the ritual meaning of dedicating votive objects in the region and how this changed during the third to the first century BCE.

Studies of the figurative votive offerings from the region have been influenced by the seminal work of Giovanni Colonna, entitled Bronzi votivi Umbro-Sabellici. Colonna categorizes pre-Roman bronze votive figurines into groups according to their stylistic affinities and labels the groups with one of their main find sites, even if this is not always their likely place of manufacture. ${ }^{145}$ Although individual workshops are difficult to identify, the fact that some types recur in higher proportion in specific sanctuaries of the region has led him to hypothesize that the bronze figurines were produced by local workshops that could travel and sell their products across Umbria and in the neighboring regions. The votive types classified by Colonna go from a low level of sophistication, with figurines of the so-called "Esquiline Group," "Amelia group" and the "Nocera Umbra" group, to figures of the stylistically more sophisticated "Foligno Group". ${ }^{146}$ Colonna identifies the figures of warriors as the most common type and called them

[^45]"Mars in Assault." ${ }^{147}$ Moreover, he recognized some figures as oranti, or worshippers, others as Hercules, walking figures, dancers; besides these, but not discussed by Colonna, figurative votive offerings of the pre-Roman period include simple representations of parts of the body, small warrior crests with two eyes, and animals, including pigs, oxen, goats, and sheep.

Since Colonna's study, little research has been done on Umbrian votive bronzes that goes beyond his classification. Even if we do not consider published catalogs of Umbrian bronzes, ${ }^{148}$ which are purely lists of objects, scholars studying votive bronzes in the region have made little attempt to interpret the nature of the ritual associated with the votives. The trend among scholars in the past years has been to confer upon them socio-cultural meaning or note their presence in the Roman period alongside other types of votives and assess the presence of traditions "salvaguardate dalla romanizzazione." ${ }^{149}$

The likelihood that bronze figurines were publicly displayed in Umbrian sanctuaries has led scholars to point to the ostentation of these votives as a means for the donors to compete within the context of sanctuaries. Paola Bonomi-Ponzi, for example, interprets the subject matter of the figurines of domestic animals and warriors as a representation of the basis of the aristocratic power, while Bradley understands the more sophisticated types of bronzes as a sign of the active presence of Umbrian elite in the sanctuaries. ${ }^{150}$ By the same token, Luana Cenciaioli interprets the presence of schematic and straightforward figurines as markers of the sanctuaries' frequentation by people from outside the social elite. ${ }^{151}$

[^46]Those who focus primarily on the representation of animals and warriors favor an interpretation that considers the sanctuaries as the foci of the pastoral population interested in warfare. Monacchi, for example, has suggested that the more schematic bronzes of animals are thank-offerings for the protection of the donor's herd and that they show the interest of Umbrian society in stock-raising. ${ }^{152}$ Along similar lines, Bradley argues that the "Mars in assault" types are to be interpreted as a manifestation of an agricultural and pastoral community and the worshipper types as representations of the donors. ${ }^{153}$ According to these authors, not only the type of bronzes but also the high altitude of several Umbrian sanctuaries is a reflection of the pastoral lifestyle of the pilgrims.

These socio-economic interpretations are open to debate as most of the archaeological record from Umbrian cult places bears no indication of the social classes involved in the cult. ${ }^{154}$ This holds true in particular for votive figurines. While the refinement of the figurines, their size, and their manufacture may indicate the level of investment put into the dedication, ${ }^{155}$ in the absence of any inscription there is no direct or concrete indication of the wealth of the person who bought and donated a given votive. A refined object is not necessarily the dedication of an elite member of a high social class. It may instead represent a significant investment of money by a lower-class person who cared particularly for their dedication to the god or desired to be self-represented in the religious sphere through the offering, for example, of a well-refined

[^47]warrior figurine. If we look at the more schematic figurines, it is also possible, as Bradley wisely suggests, ${ }^{156}$ that they were the dedication of elite members who left many votives each. Unlike grave goods, which point to the presence of elite members, ${ }^{157}$ individual offerings dedicated in sacred spaces could be the result of the noticeable economic effort of less affluent, as well as elite, individuals. It seems, therefore, unsound to make inferences about the social status of the worshippers of Umbrian sanctuaries and to identify them from a strictly iconographic standpoint. This type of analysis is informative of the investment spent into the practice of dedicating offerings but confines the interpretation of the donor's social class to pure speculation.

By attempting to shed some light onto the socio-economical composition of Umbrian communities, previous works on Umbrian bronze votive figurines have overlooked what ritual practice was associated to them. The only effort to address the ritual aspect of Umbrian cult places is made by Stoddart when he discusses the results of the Gubbio Project. ${ }^{158}$ He addresses the peak sanctuary of Monte Ansciano and its votive deposits in order to hypothesize the ritual landscape present at Gubbio in the archaic period. Stoddart points to the simplicity of the ritual enclosure as suggesting a small scale of investment and a low-key participation. However, he does not evaluate the ritual meaning of the deposition of the objects dedicated in the enclosure.

Between the fourth and the third century, as the Roman presence in Umbria spread and became a permanent fixture, the bronze figurines that characterize votive deposits of the archaic period noticeably decrease. In their stead, we find a more extensive array of votives, including

[^48]coins, miniature pottery, balsamaria, and figurative votive offerings. The latter consist primarily in bronze figurines of worshippers of the so-called Hellenistic worshipper type -female and male with the head wrapped by a wreath of vine leaves or diadem, a patera on the right hand and acerra on the left- and anatomical terracottas, an offering whose popularity begins to fade in the first century BCE.

Although, as noted in the previous chapter, Glinister and Gentili highlight that the exponential increase in the available material does not validate the widespread view that connects anatomical votives to the Roman conquest, the social perspective has also left its mark on the studies on these votives. Anatomical terracottas in Umbria have been used by scholars to draw easy conclusions on the Romanization of the area or the influence of Roman ritual customs on the local ones. ${ }^{159}$ Conversely, their absence or paucity has been connected to concepts such as "resistance" and "safeguard of local traditions." As for the Hellenistic worshipper type, to my knowledge, there is no discussion of the meaning of these figurines within votive deposits. The figurines are simply defined as "typical of the etrusco-italic koine" of the Hellenistic period." 160

## Overview and Looking forward

Following the recognition of a lacuna in our understanding of symbolic behavior, there has recently been a renewed interest in the archaeological study of religion. Among the most important developments are object-oriented approaches that focus on physical evidence for ritual practices. Although a number of publications have addressed the potential of this line of inquiry, there remains a dearth of work on votive religion in central Italy. Here, the study of the ritual

[^49]significance of the deposition of offerings has been largely overshadowed by the focus on anatomical terracottas and Etruscan rituals and beliefs.

In Umbria in particular, little attention, if any, has been given to the ritual meaning of dedicating votive objects and how this changed during the third to the first century BCE. This lack of interest has hindered a deeper examination of the role that these material objects played in the ritual associated with them. Ultimately, this connection is critical for an understanding of the enactment and transformation of the ritual performed in the ancient Umbrian sanctuaries.

It seems that only once we abandon the traditional socio-economic approach to the study of Umbrian votive offerings and find enough evidence to abandon the conventional view of anatomical terracottas as a proof of "religious Romanization" throughout the peninsula, we can attempt to use these and other Umbrian figurines to address broader research questions. While the analysis of sanctuaries and their votive deposits needs to wait for Chapter 5, the next chapter provides a historical background to the study of Umbrian sacred spaces and their material manifestation.

## Chapter 4

## History of the Umbrian Territory

## Introduction

In order to explore Umbrian sanctuaries and their material culture in the pre-Roman and Roman periods, it is paramount to situate the sacred spaces of ancient Umbria within their geographical and historical background. Both factors, in fact, contributed in role that sanctuaries had during the archaic period and in their development during the Roman period.

This chapter aims first to introduce the geographical boundaries of the region and then to provide a historical context for understanding how the social, political, and economic organization of the region changed throughout time. This account provides an historical foundation for the rest of the chapters that follow. By the end of the chapter, the reader will be able to see the Umbrians as a much less well-defined ethnic group and the region's conquest by the Roman as a much more complicated process that it has been traditionally assumed.

Research carried out in the region in the last two decades has shed light on the material culture of the ancient Umbrians and their historical trajectory from the pre- Roman period to the incorporation of Umbria in the Augustan regio sexta. Despite this scholarly progress, a debate is still ongoing regarding the applicability of the concept of Umbrian identity as a cohesive ethnos. The question on the existence, or not, of a solid Umbrian identity is partially related to the fuzziness of Umbria's boundaries as described by ancient sources, which often provide contrasting information about the area occupied by this ancient people. For this reason, the
thread of this chapter is the question of ethnic identity, which affects the possibility to both draw exact regional boundaries and to see ethnic Umbrian identity reflected in the archaeological record.

In the first section of this chapter, I present ancient authors' accounts of the Umbrians and their territories to outline the boundaries of the ancient region. I do not introduce the authors chronologically or divide them into Roman or Greeks, but rather, I put together authors who offer a similar account of the region. Although doubts about the exact boundaries of the area remain, it is possible to extrapolate information from ancient sources and draw a general picture of the region. In the pre-Roman period, the region reaches northward to the Po valley, extends to the south and west, covering the whole of the modern region of Umbria as far as the left bank of the Tiber, and spreads eastward to Adriatic Sea, running from Ravenna to Ancona.

After this geographical overview, I focus on the history of the Umbrian territory during the pre-Roman and the Roman periods. Interest in the archaeology of the ancient region of Umbria has been sporadic for most of the twentieth century, and no research was carried out in the protohistory of the Umbrians. The fact that ancient Umbria includes three modern regions (Umbria, Marche, and Emilia-Romagna), and that the modern region of Umbria corresponds to three Augustan regions contributed to making the study of this Italic people more complicated, generating overlaps, ambiguity among scholars, and a lack of clarity.

However, in the past three decades, new excavations and studies have rekindled interest in this gens antiquissima, to use a renowned attribution to the Umbrians used by Pliny the Elder. ${ }^{161}$ Scholars have begun to investigate different aspects of these peoples, from their settlements to their funerary and religious practices. The efforts of scholars such as Bonomi

[^50]Ponzi, Cenciaioli, and Sisani, together with the field projects carried out by the University of Cambridge, the British School of Rome, and University of Perugia has fleshed out a continuous occupation of the historical settlements of the Umbrians from the Iron Age to the Roman period or beyond. ${ }^{162}$

Such a vast chronological range cannot be treated in detail in this section. After a short overview of earlier periods, I begin with the rise of a seemingly Umbrian culture at the end of the seventh century BCE and trace it down to the concession of Roman citizenship to all Italic communities at the beginning of the first century BCE. While individual sites and their topographical location will be discussed in the next chapter, in this section I focus on providing an outline of the historical trajectory of the region. In brief, during this span of seven centuries, Umbria saw proto-urban settlements develop into territorial polities that controlled the hinterlands and that, ultimately, were highly involved in the Roman conquest and colonization.

Although religious places will be treated in greater details in the next two chapters, this section also includes a short overview of cult places, starting from their first archaeological traces in the sixth century BCE. Sacred spaces represent the "nodal points in the cultic, political, and socio-economic networks of the manifold communities that populated the Italian peninsula" and cannot be excluded from an overview on the history of the Umbrian territory. ${ }^{163}$ As will be shown, the appearance of cult places in the region is the outcome of the socio-economic transformation that occurred in the area during the archaic period. The second section of this chapter deals with Roman expansion in the region, which we can piece together with the aid of

[^51]ancient literary authors, epigraphy, and archaeology. Most of the information at our disposal for this period comes from ancient authors, such as Livy. Consequently, it is important to remember that they couch the details of colonization in terms of their understanding of the late Republican ideology of colonization also offered by Cicero and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, "in which colonization was seen as an ordered, state-controlled process which played a vital part in the success of the Roman Empire". ${ }^{164}$

The end of the fourth century BCE marks the beginning of a long process of Roman interaction in the region. After the foundation of the Roman colony of Narnia, the Roman conquest of Umbria is evident with the establishments of the colonies of Sena Gallica (293 BCE), Ariminum (268 BCE) and Spoletium (241 BCE); in the same year the Via Amerina was built, connecting northern Lazio with Umbrian centers and with the Etruscan cities of Perugia and Chiusi.

## The boundaries of ancient Umbria

The modern region of Umbria is not identical to the ancient region. Modern Umbria occupies a central location within the Italian peninsula and was created with the unification of Italy in 1861. It includes most of the southern part of ancient Umbria but excludes the strip of land east of the Apennines, which is now included in the region of Marche. Moreover, modern Umbria incorporates the Etruscan cities of Orvieto and Perugia and the Sabine center of Norcia.

Ancient Umbria occupied a much vaster territory. In the words of ancient authors, the Umbrians appear as one of the oldest people on the peninsula, who occupied an extended area of central Italy. In the first century CE, both Pliny the Elder and Dionysus of Halicarnassus show an

[^52]awareness that pre-Roman Umbria occupied a vaster area than the sexta regio of Augustan Italy, between the left bank of the Tiber and the Apennines. ${ }^{165}$ However, it becomes clear from the words of the ancient authors that the boundaries of ancient Umbria are not easily traceable in the period that precedes the Augustan reorganization of the Italian territory. ${ }^{166}$

The Greek authors Herodotus and Dionysus of Halicarnassus report the great extent of the Umbrian territory and its origins. ${ }^{167}$ According to both authors, the Umbrian territory covered the southeast Po Valley and central Adriatic coast, ${ }^{168}$ with Herodotus extending it as far north as the Alps. ${ }^{169}$ Both report that Etruscans expanded into former Umbrian areas, conquering, among

[^53]others, the cities of Perugia and Cortona, ${ }^{170}$ which dovetails with Pliny's mention of threehundred Umbrian oppida, probably located along the Tiber, fully occupied by Etruscans. ${ }^{171}$ Additional information on the geographical rivalry between Etruscan and Umbrians is gained from Strabo, who lived in the first century BCE. In book five of his Geography, he maintains that Umbria bordered on the land of the Etruscans and extended from the Apennines to the Adriatic: to the north, it reached Ravenna and Ariminum, whereas to the south its borders were the river Aesis, the modern Esino. ${ }^{172}$ He continues his description of the Umbrians by recounting their expansion north of the Appenines, where, together with the Etruscans, they

[^54]founded colonies in the Po area. ${ }^{173}$ In this area, in addition to Ravenna, ${ }^{174}$ the cities of Butrium ${ }^{175}$ and Mantua ${ }^{176}$ are identified as Umbrian by ancient authors, while Spina is considered an Umbrian city conquered by the Etruscans. ${ }^{177}$

Ancient assertions are supported by the archaeological evidence, which offers a substantial chronological anchor for the expansion of the Etruscans into previously Umbrian areas and for Umbrian colonization in the Po valley. Starting from the end of seventh century BCE, the territory of Arezzo, Cortona, and Perugia shows a significant range of Etruscan materials, with influences mainly from the Etruscan cities of Chiusi and Orvieto. ${ }^{178}$ This data should be considered in the broader context of Etruscan expansion towards the left side of the Tiber up to the offshoot of the Apennines, which led to the shrinking of the western Umbrian boundary. ${ }^{179}$ It is possible to situate Umbrian and Etruscan expansion into the Po valley during

[^55]the same century (sixth) since the archaeological data includes a sixth-fifth century BCE facies with clear signs of Italic and Umbrian influence. ${ }^{180}$

The limits of the region to the east and to the south are mentioned more extensively in the historical records written in the periplos of Pseudo-Skylax (perhaps an Athenian who wrote around 338-335 BCE) and in the periplos of Pseudo Skymnos (second century BCE). ${ }^{181}$ The former "circumnavigation "describes the coasts of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, naming hundreds of towns with geographical features such as rivers, harbors, and mountains. It begins at Gibraltar, moves along the north shore of the Mediterranean, circles the Black Sea, and returns to its starting point through Asia Minor, the Levant, and the coast of Egypt and North Africa. The unknown author maintains that the Umbrians occupied a long stretch of the Adriatic coast between the Etruscans and the Greek inhabitants of Spina to the north and the Picentes to the south, with Ancona described as an Umbrian city. ${ }^{182}$ Pseudo-Skymnos' periegesis, dedicated to a King Nicomedes of Bithynia, reports a similar extent of the Umbrian area. In this periegetic account of the world written in the second century BCE, Umbria extended almost to Apulia. ${ }^{183}$

The reason for the ancient uncertainty in the description of Umbrian boundaries probably lies in the blurry ethnic boundaries between Umbria and Etruria, which prevented ancient authors from differentiating between their corresponding territories. ${ }^{184}$ As modern scholarship has

[^56]demonstrated, the mutability of ethnic boundaries was indeed a characteristic of ancient Italy. In contrast with the view that ethnic boundaries were a social fact, to which ethnic groups a priori belonged, ${ }^{185}$ most archaeologists embrace now a social anthropological model first proposed by the cultural anthropologist Fredrik Barth. ${ }^{186}$ According to this model, ethnicity is just one of the many social identities-alongside family, social, sexual, political, and other identities-that individuals decided to perform. Understood in this way, it becomes clear that ethnic boundaries need to be considered permeable and not simply defined in relation to allegedly monolithic ethnic groups. ${ }^{187}$ Movement between communities of different ethnic background and communities' absorption within local citizen bodies were frequent, both for groups and for individuals. ${ }^{188}$

Indeed, cross-cultural contacts and social movement are apparent in the region from the ninth century BCE. In the Iron Age, the links that local elites developed with neighboring regions of Italy demonstrate the fluid nature of the topographical and cultural boundaries of ancient Umbria. The presence of a rich chariot in an Umbrian burial at Todi, in the necropolis "La Loggia", is a case in point. At Todi, strategically located between the inland Apennine area and the Etruscan world, the role of the community's princeps is highlighted by the remains (in a possible chamber tomb) of a chariot decorated with embossed sheet bronze. This symbol of social class is typical of the Etruscan world and confirms the close ties between this region and Umbria and the permeability of ethnic boundaries and common customs. In the archaic period, there is additional evidence of the mobility of the aristocracy, as indicated by the presence of

[^57]Umbrian groups in the Etruscan cities of Perugia and Orvieto. Here, sixth-century BCE tombs contain aristocratic Umbrian names and point at the peaceful coexistence between the two groups, most likely through intermarriage. ${ }^{189}$

It is also possible to agree with Mario Torelli and consider the intertwined deeds and fates of Etruscans and Umbrians as another reason for the vagueness of Umbrian boundaries. According to him, the Etruscan expansion in Umbrian territories beyond the Tiber and into the Po valley caused vagueness and malleability in the regional boundaries, and confusion in ancient authors' accounts. ${ }^{190}$

A quick scrutiny of the linguistic evidence supports the impression of overall blurring of edges, rather than a sharply divided region. The Umbrian language, a subfamily of the OscoUmbrian, ${ }^{191}$ is almost entirely known from the sacred text of the Iguvine Tablets, the seven bronze tables found in the town of Iguvium (modern Gubbio) in $1444 .{ }^{192}$ These Tables, which date to about the second century BCE, have a twofold importance. First, their content is fundamental for our knowledge of italic religion and cult practice. As will be discussed in further detail in the next chapter, the Iguvine Tables describe a communal purification ritual at Iguvium and instruct to the community to shun their neighbors. Second, the Tables represent the longest text in any non-Latin language of ancient Italy (4000 words).

Otherwise, Umbrian is known from thirty-two shorter inscriptions, which include public inscriptions, sacred dedications, boundary terms, funerary inscriptions, artist signatures, and coin legends. Most are dated to the third to the first century BCE (in Umbrian alphabet and in the

[^58]Latin alphabet), with only a handful of inscriptions dated from between the fifth and the fourth century BCE. The distribution of these inscriptions clearly defies any scholarly attempts to map the Umbrian language into a distinct regional reality. ${ }^{193}$ First of all, Umbrian inscriptions appear in limited areas of the ancient region described by the ancient sources, as they are concentrated only in the north eastern sector of the modern region of Umbria. Second, Umbrian inscriptions are often found together with Etruscan ones, and in towns such as Tuder there are more Etruscan inscriptions than Umbrian. As Enrico Benelli has recently argued, ${ }^{194}$ it is thus impossible to define neat linguistic borders between cultures. ${ }^{195}$ This evidence, besides indicating the presence of mixed language use, further emphasizes the permeability of regional boundaries and the difficulty of drawing clear regional boundaries.

Ultimately, if we piece together these different accounts from the ancient authors, it seems that at least until the end of the archaic period the region of Umbria would have covered central and northern Italy, almost as far as the Alpine region. On the north, this broad area extended up to the Po valley and included the cities of Ravenna, Rimini, Butrium, and Mantua, which in the fifth century were conquered by the Boii and Lingones. ${ }^{196}$ On the west, it may have included the Etruscan centers of Perugia, Cortona and Chiusi/ Camars at least until the end of the seventh century BCE or the beginning of the sixth century BCE. ${ }^{197}$ Following the course of the Tiber, the southern border would have reached Ocriculum, and then followed the Adriatic coast

[^59]bordering Picene territory between Camerino and Sentinum. However, in the fourth century BCE, Umbria lost the swath of Adriatic territory north of the river Esinus (northern area of the modern region of Marche) that was conquered by the Senones, the last Gallic tribe to arrive in the Italian peninsula. ${ }^{198}$ Most likely, the mountainous area on eastern side of the river Nera would have belonged to the Sabines, though it is difficult to pinpoint an exact border between ethnic groups. ${ }^{199}$

The borders of the ancient region of Umbria come to define a clear geographical unit during the Augustan age as a consequence of the division of the peninsula into fourteen administrative regions; Umbria Ager Gallicus became the sixth region. ${ }^{200}$ Pliny the Elder (Nat. 3.112-114) records the extent of Umbria and states that its southern border was the Nar and Tiber rivers and that it encompassed the Apennine slopes bordering the Adriatic from Camerinum to Mevaniola and from Aesis to Pisaurum on the coast. In this geographical reorganization of ancient Italy, the Tiber became came to define the limit between Etruria (Regio VII) and Umbria (Regio VI). ${ }^{201}$

## The existence of an Umbrian identity: an ongoing debate

If we consider the contrasting opinion provided by ancient sources regarding Umbrian boundaries, it is not entirely surprising that scholars cannot agree on the ethnic identity of the Umbrians. Indeed, a question remains as to whether it is possible to identify an Umbrian

[^60]distinctiveness which could have supported the formation of Umbrian ethnicity as described by the literary sources. As noted above in the discussion about the boundaries of the ancient region, the question of ethnicity is a much debated topic among scholars of ancient Umbria, and more broadly, of the ancient Mediterranean. Despite modern research's emphasis on the fluidity of the concept of ethnic identity and problematized the existence of pre-Roman monolithic ethnic groups, archaeologists working in Umbria still struggle to embrace the impossibility of tracing one Umbrian ethnic group. Although a discussion on scholarly work on ethnicity is beyond the scope of this dissertation, it is worth noting here some of the most dominant approaches to the topic.

Looming large over this debate is Jonathan Hall's book Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity. Hall examines the construction, meaning, and function of ethnic identity among Greek communities. ${ }^{202} \mathrm{He}$ argues that ethnicity is a contingent phenomenon linked to current needs but relying on recognizable strategies. In particular, he considers territoriality and genealogy as essential factors in the definition of ethnic identities. Consequently, he argues that ethnicity is fungible and in continuous flux. Similarly, Sian Jones argues that ethnic identity is situational and subjective, but yet connected to people's experiences and social practices. ${ }^{203}$

In the past decade, this concept has been deepened and broadened to include contexts other than mainland Greece. Denise Demetriou, for example, focuses on Greek emporia and trade ports such as Emporion, Gravisca, Naukratis, Pisitiros, and Pireus in order to explain how different ethnic, social, linguistic, and religious groups encountered each other and how each group shaped its identity while interacting with others. ${ }^{204}$ She concludes that diverse populations within

[^61]the emporia constructed their identities relative to themselves and the others through cultural phenomena such as law, political institutions, and religion.

Several other approaches to this topic are described in the recent Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean and in the edited volume Creating Ethnicities and Identities in the Roman World. ${ }^{205}$ The contributors of this volume, which span both geographically and chronologically, emphasize the contingent, mutable and instrumental nature of ethnic identity, together as the impossibility for researchers to provide a synoptic discussion and the necessity to rely on case studies.

The arguments on the flexibility and contingency of ethnicity are also extremely popular among scholars who closely investigate identities in ancient Italy. Emma Blake is aware of the difficulties of studying group ethnic identity in archaeology, and in order to shed some light on identity formation in the murky period of the Bronze Age, she applies network analysis and path dependence to the distributions of imports and other distinctive objects. ${ }^{206}$ She argues that members of an ethnic group interact and communicate through networks that can be identified by examining the material traces of communication between sites. In Bronze Age Etruria and in Latium, she identifies the "proto-Etruscan" and the "proto-Latin" groups, whose close interaction determined, according to the author, the rise of their ethnic identities of the later first millennium.

The monumental work by Stephan Bourdin on the peoples of pre-Roman Italy, however, emphasizes the flexibility of pre-Roman ethnic groups, the so-called nomina. ${ }^{207}$ His arguments, largely based on the scrutiny of ancient literary sources' mention of ancient peoples, are centered on the opposition independent political groups, populi, and larger ethnic groups, nomina, which

[^62]group together the populi (eg., Rome is a populus of the nomen Latinum). Bourdin holds that, if on the one hand, the polulus represent a relatively stable group, the ethnic representations, the nomina, are highly mobile, and he considers that the manipulations of these representations are conscious and voluntary and can be explained by political projects.

This view is only partially shared by Scopacasa, who also remarks on the importance of local identities as well as of shared ethnic identities but argues for a situational use of both ethnic and local identities by ancient peoples. ${ }^{208}$ He uses epigraphical evidence to demonstrate that people could use different levels of identities (e.g., ethnic identity and local identity) depending on the context. ${ }^{209}$ The lustratio described in the Iguvine Tables, written between the third and the first century BCE but reflecting an earlier period, aims to protect the people of Iguvium and curse their nearest neighbors, who also may have defined themselves as Umbrian. This example clearly illustrates the importance of considering ethnic identity as situational as communities belonging to the same ethnos could "pursue very different foreign policies when it suited them". ${ }^{210}$

The importance of local identity is further reiterated by Stek in a discussion about Italic identities and the Romanization of Italy. ${ }^{211}$ First of all, he reiterates the fleetingness of the concept of ethnic identity, closely tied to historical circumstances. For example, the ethnic safinim (Samnite), attested by the sixth century in Abruzzo, is used in the second century in Molise likely as part of the antagonizing strategy against Roman dominion in this period. Thus,

[^63]Stek suggests setting aside the "search" for ethnic groups in favor of a focus on more local identities and the varieties among them. Drawing from recent archaeological research that shows local variegation in material culture and practice, the author shows that in cases such as Samnium and Latium, ethnic identity is characterized by local varieties that stray from a unified political organization. The importance of local civic identities is particularly noticeable in the case of Latium. Here, evidence of shared rituals such as at the sanctuary of Juppiter Latiaris or at the thirteen altars at Lanuvium seems to establish power relationships among different communities rather than a higher level of political organization. Thus, Stek emphasizes the importance of local civic identity and communal organization over ethnicity as a geographical concept. ${ }^{212}$

The preceding survey offers just a handful of examples of current approaches to ethnicity that are representative of a broader intellectual understanding of ethnic identity as multi-layered, negotiable, and variable. In the case of Umbria, it seems that the discussion is not nearly close to an end. As for other peoples of ancient Italy, the narrative of the Umbrian ethne and its distinctiveness is biased both as the authors lived centuries after the period they describe, and because they largely reflect how Greeks and Romans perceived the Italians as ethnic groups. ${ }^{213}$ Although a few inscriptions dated to the fifth century BCE mentioning ethnics exist, much of the controversy related to the identification of an Umbrian ethnic identity relies on fundamentally different views regarding the extent to which Italian people considered themselves as ethnically distinct. ${ }^{214}$

[^64]Archaeologists studying ancient Umbria are divided between the Italian school, led by scholars as Sisani, Bomoni Ponzi, Torelli, and Manconi and the British school, the most visible proponents of which are Bradley and Stoddart. The former bring together material evidence of archaeology and language to argue for the coherence of Umbria as a distinct cultural and ethnic identity in the pre-Roman period. ${ }^{215}$ Sisani, for example, prioritizes Greek and Late Republican written sources, as well as the only inscription of the fifth century BCE that mentions "the plain of Umbria, ${ }^{, 216}$ to claim that the Umbrians represented a well-defined ethnic group, unified by the existence of an Umbria league. ${ }^{217}$ It is worth nothing that this ethnonym is attested from the Sabellic languages only in South Picene ombriíen and that there is no mention from the Umbrians themselves. Manconi supports the idea of an independent Umbrian cultural ethnos which, she argued, appeared already in the late seventh/sixth century BCE. However, she also admits that "a common culture, almost a central Italic koinè, can be recognized, in which there are common forms and affinities in pottery, tomb typologies and funerary rituals" ${ }^{218}$ almost undermining her previous statement about the existence of a clear Umbrian specificity.

On the contrary, British archaeologists have formulated theories that show awareness of recent theoretical approaches to the archaeology of ethnic groups that emphasize the situational

[^65]construction of most cultures. Bradley does not focus on Umbria as a unified culture but considers local communities. ${ }^{219}$ According to him, the use of the Umbrian collective name was rare until the first century BCE, and local inhabitants of the region preferred to describe themselves in relation to their city. This suggests that in archaic Umbria there was little sentiment of belonging to an Umbrian ethnic group.

In the case of Plestia, located on the eastern side of Umbria, four bronze inscriptions from the fourth century BCE dedicated at the Sanctuary of Cupra read cupras, matres pletinas, sacru esu. ${ }^{220}$ The Plestini are among the groupings mentioned by Pliny in the first century as residing in Umbria. ${ }^{221}$ The reference to this group in the inscriptions to the sanctuary's goddess suggests that the local community had already its own peculiar identity in the pre-Roman period. The importance of the local identity in the region is reinforced in the Iguvine Tables with the list of the enemies of the city of Iguvium. Bradley rightly points out that the presence, among other nomina, of the naharcer (the inhabitants of Nahrs in lowland Umbria) is a strong indicator of the little sense of belonging to an overarching Umbrian identity group. The feeling of individual group cohesion, which emerge from these two examples of Umbrian epigraphy, seems to have been more important than, and quite separate from, that of belonging to an Umbrian ethnos.

Drawing on studies of identity formation in Greece, Bradley argues that local communities, with their distinctive state identity, grew into a shared ethnic identity through interactions for political and military reasons. ${ }^{222}$ In particular, progressive Roman expansion was

[^66]the decisive threat that increased the cohesive forces of Umbrian communities, which were strengthened after the conquest. Bradley notes that the Umbrians are likely to have fought together more frequently in military units of the Roman army after the conquest than before it and that such service may have played an important role in the definition of Umbrian ethnic identity. ${ }^{223}$ As also noted by Benelli, the army provided by local communities (colonies, civitae sine suffragio and allied communities) to the Roman military were precisely organized into units and this may have exercised considerable influence in forging a more fixed definition of perceived ethnic groups. ${ }^{224}$

Simon Stoddart and David Redhouse carry the argument of an absence of a cohesive Umbrian identity even further. ${ }^{225}$ In their most recent article, they examine the role of landscape in the construction of ethnicity and attribute a shadowy identity to the Umbrians, in contrast with other central Italian groups whose identities they consider more developed. They, too, support the existence in the pre-Roman period of local identities that coalesced into a regional identity in response to the advance of Rome. The landscape development of Iguvium, Tuder, Interamna, Ameria, and Spoletium, to different extents, exhibits traits of community bonds and local political power. The overall picture illustrates the absence of a broader sense of ethnicity and the presence of community identity in several of the major pre-Roman settlements of the region. For this reason the authors can conclude that "local community was the primary focus of identity". ${ }^{226}$

[^67]Considering these contrasting voices on the nature of Umbrian identity, it seems reasonable to use caution when we examine ancient Umbrians as a whole. As scholars have shown, the evidence for a strong Umbrian identity is slender, and the sense of Umbrian ethnicity was weaker than the identification with specific states such as Tuder, Plestia, and Iguvium. ${ }^{227}$ In addition, the absence of a clear concept of Umbrian ethnic identity may likely be responsible for the ambiguity of the boundaries of the region. In the next chapter, I will demonstrate that the study of votive offerings from the region's sanctuaries can provide further evidence of the presence of local ethnic groups rather than an overarching Umbrian ethnos.

## Umbria's geography

The inland landscape of the territory outlined above is bounded by the Apennine Mountains to the north and east. These mountains are crossed by low passes, in ancient times were used for transit across the Apennines and allowed good communication between the western and eastern areas of Umbria. Apart from the Apennine Mountains, noticeable peaks are Monte Subasio and Monte Maggiore, which dominate the hills to the south of Gubbio; the Martani Mountains run along the Umbrian valley while the Amerini Mountains dominate the south-west of the region. The presence of rivers, from the Tiber on the west to the many rivers and streams of Romagna and Marche, and valleys eased communication between the coast and the mountains. The largest valley is the Valle Umbra, located in the center of the ancient Augustan region; the northern part of the region is divided between the Gubbio basin and the lower Chiascio basin, while the Terni valley occupies the southern part and the northern Tiber valley covers the west part.

[^68]The geographic and hydrographic features of the Umbrian region together with its key position on the north-south and east-west routes of ancient Italy facilitated the early human occupation of this area and favored contacts with the other pre-Roman groups of the peninsula. Additional elements that favored human occupation were certainly the presence of clays (from the limestone uplands and Plio-Pleistocene terraces), ore bodies in areas such as Gualdo Tadino and Monteleone di Spoleto, and the presence of forests able to guarantee wood supply. This diverse territory is suitable for different types of productive activities ranging from agriculture to livestock and pastoralism, depending on the ground's elevation. ${ }^{228}$

## The history of pre-Roman Umbria

Human occupation of ancient Umbria begins in the northern part of the region during the Lower Paleolithic, one million years- 300,000 years ago. Human habitation has been detected on the terraces above the Tiber, Chiasco, and Topino rivers, and on Monte Peglia, between Todi and Orvieto. In the Neolithic period, from the late sixth millennium, human occupation is evidenced by more permanent settlements established in the foothills, with a preference for the alluvial fans of the Gubbio valley. In the latter phase of the Neolithic period, evidence is concentrated in the area of Norcia and Terni, in the south of the region. ${ }^{229}$

The Bronze Age represents the first well-known phase in ancient Umbria. From the seventeenth century BCE to the twelfth century BCE (Middle Bronze Age) the region becomes dominated by the so-called Apennine culture, that was widespread throughout the whole centralsouthern peninsula in this period, and which may have originated from Umbria. ${ }^{230}$ This phase is

[^69]characterized by seasonal settlements connected to transhumance, especially on the mountains, where people depended on an economy of pastoralism and large-scale stock-raising. In the lowlands, we find more stable settlements that appear to have supported a more mixed economy. ${ }^{231}$ The hallmarks of this culture are a distinctive pottery type with incised geometric designs and the deposition of bronze tools and weapons in inhumation burials.

With the sub-Apennine phase (second half of the eleventh century BCE- tenth century BCE), corresponding to the Late Bronze Age, important changes happened in the region partially due to contacts with the Terramare, the Proto-Villanovan cultures, and the intensification of trade with the Aegean-Mycenean world and that of central Europe. ${ }^{232}$ Although cremation funerary rites (at Gubbio, Spoleto, and Terni) suggest an egalitarian society, the intensification and specialization of agriculture, the increased demographic scale, including polyfocal settlements in areas such as Gubbio, and the presence of metal hoards (e.g., at Gualdo Tadino and Terni) indicate wealth accumulation (or at least conspicuous disposal) and, therefore, suggest social stratification. ${ }^{233}$

At the beginning of the Iron Age (tenth to eighth century BCE), the region underwent further political, economic and cultural changes. Previous settlements were abandoned, and metal hoards ceased to be deposited. Settlements concentrate along the Apennine areas or around large basins and valleys, forming more consistent nucleation of populations in places that endured, such as Todi, Terni, Gubbio, Ameria, the massif of Monte Torre Maggiore and the

[^70]Colfiorito plateau. ${ }^{234}$ The latter, which has been investigated in depth, provides important information both on settlement organization and on burial practices during this phase. ${ }^{235}$ Here, communities appear to be organized in villages consisting of huts located at a regular distance ( 500 meters) from one another with a ditch on the eastern side. The necropolis, similar to the one excavated in Terni, ${ }^{236}$ is characterized by inhumation, with rectangular graves covered with limestone slabs and marked on the ground by a circle of stones. Grave goods of local production found in the tombs are very simple, with one impasto vase and clothing-related objects, fibulae, and razors, which do not allow to suggest social stratification. ${ }^{237}$ Overall, during this first phase of the Iron Age, the Umbrian territory shows a general uniformity, closely related to the contemporary Villanovan and Latial cultures. ${ }^{238}$

## Sixth-fourth centuryBCE

In the sixth century BCE, marked by an expanded trade in imported luxury objects, Umbria was organized partly as emerging nucleated communities and partly as groups of more diffuse fortified upland settlements, both with a division between social classes and the establishment of an aristocratic caste. In such organization some scholars have seen the concrete evidence of an independent cultural identity of the Umbrians. ${ }^{239}$ If, during the previous phase,

[^71]communities began to settle on a more permanent base, it is starting in this phase that Umbrian people established settlements at sites later occupied by the cities of archaic times, both in the sub-mountain areas and in the mountains. In the mountainous territories, the occupation of the territories is based on a series of fortified hill settlements, the so-called castella, which in some cases take the place of the previous Iron Age villages. ${ }^{240}$ Among these fortified settlements on higher ground we can mention Colle Mori at Gualdo Tadino, ${ }^{241}$ Monte Orve in the middle of the Colfiorito plateau, Monte Torre Maggiore at Terni, Colle San Rufino at Assisi, Monteleone at Spoleto, Bevagna, Gubbio, Matelica, Fabriano, and Pitino. ${ }^{242}$

Regarding their structure, these settlements are located on heights ranging from 500 to 1000 meters, and they usually overlook communication routes. ${ }^{243}$ They comprise areas measuring about 120-150 square kilometers defended by a ditch (4-5 meters wide) and a bank of earth or dry-laid stone walls up to 4 meters high around the highest point in the landscape. ${ }^{244}$ The area occupied by the hillforts is divided into several hut villages, each organized to distinguish the living areas from production areas. The presence of streets between villages and common areas such as pastures, sacred areas, ${ }^{245}$ and fortifications has led scholars to hypothesize that villages, although divided into separate units, could cooperate for their maintenance and protection. ${ }^{246}$

[^72]Although a detailed study on Umbrian hillforts is lacking, ${ }^{247}$ surveys and excavations conducted in the ' 80 s and ' 90 s on some of the Umbrian hillforts, such as at Colfiorito and Gualdo Tadino have revealed that they were organized hierarchically, with minor hillforts gravitating around a more complex central site. ${ }^{248}$ The position and richness of the cemeteries associated with the hillfort on Monte Orve, at the center of the Colfiorito Plateau, strongly suggest that it was the most important hillfort in the area and that it controlled the smaller peaks of Monte di Franca and Monte Trella, located elsewhere on the plateau. Another important settlement of this type is at Gualdo Tadino, Col di Mori. Here, a nucleated settlement developed on the hillside of a spur overlooking an upland plain and was surrounded by a fortified circuit. As in the case of Monte Orve, the richness of the cemetery of San Facondino ( 600 m to the west) has led to the hypothesis that this was the central node of the settlement system made of some other ten hillforts in the area, which controlled the main roads coming from Perusia and Iguvium, and the trans-Apennine routes leading to the Adriatic coast. ${ }^{249}$

The hierarchical organization of Umbrian hillforts finds a parallel in the aristocratic political and social organization of the communities of the sixth and fifth century. Within individual communities, archaeological evidence shows the emergence of clear differentiation among social classes, a phenomenon that in Latial and Etruscan areas emerged in the Orientalizing period, if not before. ${ }^{250}$ The presence of an aristocratic elite is clear from the necropoleis that, during this phase, appear in or near a broader spectrum of sites. The necropoleis at Otricoli, Amelia, Todi, Spoleto, Bevagna, Foligno, Nocera, and Gubbio add to the earlier

[^73]necropoleis of Terni and Colfiorito, which continue to be frequented during this period.
Aristocratic burials are signaled by tumuli or stone-circle tombs and, most importantly, by grave goods. These are prestige goods produced locally or largely obtained through importation mainly from South Etruria, Picenum, Faliscan territory, ${ }^{251}$ and Greece. ${ }^{252}$ Women were often buried with spindle whorls, rocchetti (small, spool-shaped terra-cotta objects thought to have been used in weaving or as stamping devices), and fibulae. Male burials contained iron weapons indicating the ranks of individual warriors. For example, at Terni, a lance or javelin alone signified a soldier of lower rank; a sword, a lance, and two javelins, someone of higher rank. ${ }^{253}$ At the necropoleis of Le Logge and San Raffaele at Todi, the typological analysis of the aristocratic burials' grave goods from the sixth/fifth century BCE suggest the presence of hierarchical communities, centered around leading warrior aristocratic figures, who likely benefitted from the favorable position of this center and from controlling commercial routes. ${ }^{254}$ The increasing complexity of Umbrian communities is also manifested by the use of coinage, adopted at Tuder and Iguvium initially employing a Chiusine Etruscan weight standard of about $200 \mathrm{~g} .{ }^{255}$ At an earlier date, aes rude or bronze fragments, widely accepted as representing portable wealth, were employed and suggest a progressive formalization of wealth into an accepted political symbol of the community.

Towards the end of the fifth century BCE, the archaic socio-institutional organization drastically changed, and a process of urban re-organization put an end to the hegemony of the

[^74]aristocratic class of the previous centuries. A change in the settlement patterns can be observed at the well excavated Colle Mori, where buildings had tiled roofs and stone foundations and were articulated in several rooms. ${ }^{256}$ In addition, the presence of a cippus with an inscription mentioning the name of the civic community/touta (tarina) seems to suggest that, starting from these centuries, settlements began to re-define their limits, perhaps in connection with a new foundation of the cities themselves.

The rise of a new class that replaces the aristocratic society of the previous centuries is further evidence of the transformation of some archaic centers into centralized cities. This shift is clearly illustrated by the necropoleis of S. Stefano and Peschiera at Tuder, closer to its urban center than the archaic necropolis of Le Logge and S. Raffaele. ${ }^{257}$ Here, grave goods related to the cure of the body, such as unguentaria, are representative of the new urban society. In the Apennine area of Umbria, the centers which lay along communication routes present similar evidence of urban development. The necropolis Vittorina at Iguvium shows the presence of a wealthy class represented by the a particular grave good: an Attic crater with red figures laid at the feet of the deceased. This evidence may indicate the existence of a lex sumptuaria that eliminated funerary ostentation and aimed to represent the city in a more egalitarian way.

We should not assume that developments had been homogeneous through the region. In the necropolis of Colfiorito, located some distance from major roads, evidence from the necropolis reveals that the aristocratic class continued to dominate until the end of the third century BCE. The grave goods from this necropolis show inequality among individuals and the presence of a wealthy class that continues to express itself through weapons and sumptuous banquet vessels. A similar situation appears to hold true at Hispellum in the Umbrian valley,

[^75]where the necropolis' grave goods demonstrate the prominent role of the warrior until the second century BCE. Although this evidence seems to indicate a different social trajectory of these centers compared to the more urban cities already mentioned, the lack of systematic investigations in most Apennine and southern Umbrian areas represents an obstacle to any precise reconstruction of the socio-institutional and settlements' developments.

## Sacred spaces

Although it is unlikely that religious activity did not exist before the sixth century BCE, it is only toward the end of this century that sacred places become visible in the archaeological record of the ancient region.

As Bradley's survey of Umbrian cult places has shown, ${ }^{258}$ with the exception of a small number of sacred places, most archaic Umbrian cult places have been only identified during ground explorations through the presence of ex-votos representing armed figures or simple male and female bronze figurines or human body parts, common also among the Venetic people and the Etruscans. ${ }^{259}$ This is due not only to a general lack of excavation and the damaged stratigraphy of the few sites that have been excavated, ${ }^{260}$ but also to the nature itself of early cult places, which consisted often only of a pit, a temporary wooden structure, an altar, an enclosure wall, and perhaps a natural landmark such as a spring, a lake or a cave. ${ }^{261}$ As Turfa specifies with

[^76]regard to the Etruscans, a single one of these features was enough for people to make a dedication. ${ }^{262}$

As it will be shown in the next chapter, Umbrian communities of the archaic period relied on some cult sites located, in a custom typical of Italic religion, in a prominent location of the landscape, either in strategic places or those of natural significance, from mountain peaks, to caves and hills, or in the proximity of settlement sites ${ }^{263}$

Notwithstanding the different locations, it seems that a common characteristic of these early shrines was their votive deposits. The most significant part of the votive material is composed of bronze (rarely lead) miniature figures of animals, men, women, and body parts, all usually under 10 cm . The Umbrian production of votive bronzes has been amply studied by Colonna, who classified the umbro-sabellici bronzes into types and established that they were the product of workshops active either in southern or in northern Umbria between the sixth and the fifth century BCE. ${ }^{264}$ As the next two chapters will show, this vast material has the potential to illuminate not only the ritual practices of the archaic inhabitants of the region but also on the function of cult places.

## Late fourth-early first century BCE: The Roman conquest of Umbria

The information passed down by republican and imperial authors such as Livy, Polybius, Appian, Diodorus, and Cassius Dio allows us to partially reconstruct the history of Umbria during the Middle Republican period. However, one must take into consideration that these

[^77]accounts are very selective and therefore problematic for several reasons. First, as these authors write about events well before their own day, they describe the expansionist enterprise of the Romans in terms of their understanding of the late republican ideology of colonization. In this period, in fact, colonization was seen as "an ordered, state-controlled process which played a vital part in the success of the Roman empire", an idea disseminated also by Cicero. ${ }^{265}$ Second, they write under the influence of their own time and agendas, unconcerned with the bias connected to it and inevitably altering the narration. In addition to this, even when they seem to draw on official records, their reliability can hardly be proved. As Bradley wisely advices, it is therefore essential to take into account the possible distortion and selective information provided by the ancient sources when we attempt to reconstruct the Roman conquest of the region. ${ }^{266}$

## Fourth and third century BCE

The beginning of the fourth century BCE represents the first close involvement of Umbria in the expansionist dynamics of Rome. From the onset of this century, the Romans began to expand for the first time in areas adjacent to the region. Aiming at the control of the Tiber valley, after the defeat of Falerii, in 391 BCE, Rome attacked first Volsinii and then its allies, the Sappinates, a shadowy group mentioned by Livy that Sisani locates in Umbria. ${ }^{267}$

[^78]Although the interpretation of Livy's passage is open to interpretation, the information at our disposal regarding the interactions between Romans and Umbrians become clearer by the end of the century. In 310 BCE, as a result of a war between Rome and the Etruscans and Umbrians, a brother of the consul Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus, led an expedition to Umbrian Camerinum on the Adriatic side of the Apennines, with the purpose of signing a treaty of societate amitiaque. ${ }^{268}$ In 308 BCE, ${ }^{269}$ the consul P. Decius Mus suppressed an Umbrian rebellion near Mevania. The initial resistance of the Umbrians is subdued shortly by the Romans; Umbrians capitulated within two days, and the Ocriculani were accepted in amicitiam. ${ }^{270}$

In the years following the battle of Mevania, Roman military activity in the region confirmed Umbria's role as a crucial node in Rome's progressive expansion toward the inland of Etruria and its northern extremities. In 300 BCE, the Romans besieged the Umbrian oppidum of Nequinum, located at a crucial position that allowed them to reach the Adriatic coast through the Apennines. ${ }^{271}$ After the treachery of two townsman, in $299 \mathrm{BCE},{ }^{272}$ the Romans established the colony of Narnia and achieved the twofold aim of preventing an Umbrian invasion (Livy specifies that the colony was sent as an outpost contra Umbros) ${ }^{273}$ and securing the route towards the north, threatened by the Gauls. ${ }^{274}$

As a reaction to the inevitability of Roman dominance over central Italy, shortly after their defeat at Nequinum, the Umbrians joined forces with the Etruscans, the Samnites (who

[^79]were fighting the third Samnite War against the Romans), and the Gauls. ${ }^{275}$ In 295 BCE, after alternating victories and defeats, the Roman army subdued the unified enemy force at Sentinum, at the border between Umbria and Picenum (in the modern region of Le Marche) and occupied the Gallic territory between the rivers Esinus and Rubicon. ${ }^{276}$

Roman expansion in Umbria seems to have been completed in the central years of the third century BCE. The Umbrian centers of Fulginiae and Plestia were incorporated into the Roman state and given civitas sine suffragio; ${ }^{277}$ the praefectura of Ineramna Nahars,,${ }^{278}$ the

[^80]colonies of Sena Gallica, Ariminum, and Spoletium and the market town Forum Flaminii were founded. ${ }^{279}$ The triumph over the Sassinates, who occupied the northern border of the region, is recorded in 266 BCE, and the final capitulation of the Umbrians in 268-265 BCE. ${ }^{280}$ Until the first century BCE, when they opposed the Romans during the Social War, Umbrians remained generally allied with them and provided support and troops.

Starting from the middle of the third century, important roads were built to connect Umbrian centers with other conquered areas. ${ }^{281}$ In 241 BCE, the construction of the via Amerina, which led from Faleri to Ameria, connected Umbrian centers with northern Latium and with the Etruscan cities of Perugia and Clusium. ${ }^{282}$ Most importantly, the via Flaminia, opened in 220 BCE, became a fundamental route across central Italy. ${ }^{283}$ This road crossed the Apennines from Rome to Ariminum on the Adriatic coast and granted the Romans access to the Po valley. Furthermore, the new road passed through the colonies founded in Umbria just a few decades before and thus strengthened Roman control over these territories. ${ }^{284}$

[^81]Treaties represented another way Rome controlled those communities in the region that were not given Roman citizenship (civitates sine suffragio) or colonized. ${ }^{285}$ As already mentioned, Camerinum and Ocriculum stipulated treaties with Rome. To these treaties, Cicero adds a foedus between Iguvium and Rome, which was likely stipulated sometime after 292 BCE. ${ }^{286}$ Although ancient sources mention only these three foedera, we can add other Umbrian towns to the list of allies of Rome. It is likely that the inhabitants of Tuder, Ameria, Mevania and Asisium, which were not Roman citizens until the Social War (Tuder and Ameria) ${ }^{287}$ and which had preserved their local magistracies until 90 BCE (Mevania and Asisium), had been of allied status. ${ }^{288}$ In addition to these centers, Polybius mentions a contingent of Umbrians among the allied armies that aided Rome against the Gauls in 225 BCE and that had to compile lists of all men of military age. ${ }^{289}$ These brief mentions, combined with the epigraphic data from centers that were administratively independent during the late Republican period, leave open the possibility that other Umbrian communities had treaties with Rome. ${ }^{290}$

It is not clear what the status of allied communities entailed. Based on Cicero's discussion of Roman treaties, scholars have suggested that some treaties were aequii and some iniquii. However, as Ernst Badian points out, the unequal treaty, where the second party was required to acknowledge and respect the greatness of the Roman people, is unlikely to have been

[^82]official. ${ }^{291}$ Notwithstanding the possible distinction among individual treaties, the epigraphic and literary evidence suggests that these peoples remained independent, with the obligation to raise and pay troops for Rome and to follow Roman foreign policy. ${ }^{292}$ The amount of men levied by each community was fixed in a list kept in Rome and called the formula togatorum. ${ }^{293}$

## Second and first century BCE

The ancient sources at our disposal for the period between the second century BCE and the Social War are not particularly fulsome, for Umbria is mentioned only in a few sporadic instances. In 199 BCE a commission of triumviri, following a demand from Narnia, was established to increase the number of inhabitants in the colony. ${ }^{294}$ The latest colonial settlements are Pisaurum in184 BCE and Forum Sempronii in 133-130 BCE, founded after the implementation of the lex Sempronia agraria. ${ }^{295}$ Cicero and other authors mention Umbrian presence among Marius' troops at the end of the second century BCE. ${ }^{296}$ In some instances, beneficiaries of Marius, such as the Camertine cohorts, M. Annius Appius of Iguvium, the Latin colonist, and T. Matrinus of Spoletium, received individual grants of Roman citizenship.

[^83]In 91 BCE, Umbrian and Etruscan aristocrats opposed Livius Drusus' proposal to give Roman citizenship to the socii italicii. ${ }^{297}$ This program, which included distribution of land to poorer citizens and Roman citizenship for all the Latins and Italian allies, was felt as a threat to the local Umbrian aristocrats, who feared the possibility of losing their lands. ${ }^{298}$ Following a request of the consul, a contingent of Umbrians and Etruscans came to Rome, where they may have had a share in Drusus' murder. ${ }^{299}$ The failed scheme to offer Roman citizenship to the Italics triggered the outbreak of the Social War. ${ }^{300}$ Although in 91 BCE and the first part of 90 BCE neither Umbrians nor Etruscan joined the Italic forces against Rome, in 90 BCE unidentified Umbrian communities seem to have taken part in the rebellion just a few months before the promulgation of the lex Iulia. ${ }^{301}$ This law, which marked the end of the bellum italicum for most Italic communities, allowed the inclusion of all Roman allies within the citizen body and the grant of municipal status to their cities. ${ }^{302}$ The municipal ruling class could now openly participate in the Roman political process and lead their communities in support of or in opposition to decision-making in Rome.

The concession of Roman citizenship virtually concludes the process of conquest and incorporation of Umbria into the Roman state. The loss of formal autonomy for the Umbrian centers marks the beginning of a new chapter in the history of this region.

[^84]
## Discussion and Conclusions

In conclusion, archaic Umbria appears to have been open to a range of cultural influences from Italy and the wider Mediterranean world. As shown above, not only the attitudes toward death and burial but also the use of symbols of power and wealth link Umbrian cultural practices with other regions of the Italian peninsula, such as Samnium, Etruria, and Latium. Starting in the seventh century BCE, material evidence from the cemeteries of the region (mainly Ineramna, Spoletium, Plestia, and Iguvium) shows that the aristocratic class differentiated itself from the rest of society by means of prestigious goods, some of which were imported from the eastern Mediterranean through Greek traders frequenting the Adriatic coast. Other goods reached this social class through the other major routes that crossed the region, such as the routes from Etruria to Picenum, and the route along the Tiber valley from Volsinii and southern Etruria to Perusia and central Umbria.

In addition to this, the presence of upland hillforts and their organization demonstrates ties with the later Italic urbanization processes in regions such as Samnium and (contemporary) settlements outside Italy in Britain and Gaul. ${ }^{303}$ Lastly, the presence of cult places within preRoman Umbrian communities and their connection to the territory finds parallels with contemporary developments in Greece, northern Italy, and Etruria.

Unlike inland areas such as Plestia and southern areas such as Terni, from end of the fifth century BCE and in particular in the fourth century the areas in closer connection to the Etruscan centers that were along communication routes underwent important urban and socio-economic transformation. The evidence from several pre-Roman centers shows that a new social class took

[^85]the place of the archaic aristocracy, and urban development became more consistent than in the previous centuries. This new oligarchy, whose presence is visible from the region's necropoleis, finds in the new urban structure the social base for its power and the means to control wide territories. Characteristic of the end of the society of the principes are the absence of grave goods related to the war sphere and the adoption of other modes of self-representation such as strigils and imports of pottery from Etruria and the ager Faliscus; an intense urban and sub-urban building activity. Recent excavations at Gualdo Tadino have shown a new settlements’ organization where dwellings had dry-laid stone foundations and wooden support, with flat and curved roof tiles. With respect to cult places, the presence of architectural terracottas and revetment slabs in the fourth century at the suburban sanctuaries of Pantanelli at Amelia and of Monte Santo at Todi are indicative of the influence of Etruria. It is perhaps due to the gradual Roman expansion in Central Italy, and to a lesser extent to the Gallic presence in northern Italy, that during this period some Umbrian centers, such as Ocriculum, Ameria, Spoletium and Bettona, organized themselves with stone-built city walls and gates that surround their main religious sites.

The last four centuries of the first millennium represent a watershed in the history of the region. Following the expansion of Rome, new cities were founded, some centers gained Roman citizenship but without the right to vote, and some others developed foedera with the Urbs. Strategic roads were built to strengthen and connect the conquered territories: the via Amerina, connected northern Lazio with the Umbria and the Etruscan cities of Perugia and Chiusi, and the Via Flaminia crossed the whole Umbria up to the Marche and the Adriatic (Rimini).

Many scholars consider this period (third and second century BCE) crucial to the political and socio-cultural transformation of Umbria. Above all, they have rushed to the conclusion that
most of the changes of this period are linked to the imposition of Roman customs. The list of changes imputable to Rome are long, but a few deserve a special note.

The construction of the roads Amerina and Flaminia has been regarded as the main factor that facilitated the adoption of Roman ways. These roads are considered to be a powerful tool for the spread and the assimilation of Roman models and the subsequent deconstruction of the original local cultural substrate. According to this view, the arrival of Latin and Roman people to the newly founded colonies enhanced the process of acculturation. ${ }^{304}$

The army represents another factor that scholars see contributing to the alleged "acculturation" process. According to some, since the recruiting systems of republican Rome required the Italic allies to contribute with soldiers to Rome, the participation of Umbrians in the Roman troops facilitated the process of integration in the Roman world. ${ }^{305}$

Assumptions about the other types of material evidence also loom large in the scholarship on Umbria during the Roman period. Black gloss pottery and votive deposits represent cases in point. In the region, the growth of Roman political influence is paralleled by an increase in imports of black-gloss pottery (such as the petites estampilles) from Latium and the ager Faliscus, and these have been interpreted as a sign of Roman dominance. ${ }^{306}$ Finally, as noted in the first chapter, the presence of the anatomical votives has been considered as conclusive evidence of this process. Sisani, who considers the changes that happened during the years of

[^86]Roman conquest as a wholesale consequence of a planned strategy, ${ }^{307}$ interprets the diffusion of anatomical votives in the region as "un indicatore non equivoco di presenze coloniali". ${ }^{308}$

These views are clearly based upon an outdated view of Roman expansion as a unilateral and purely hegemonic phenomenon for the conquest and control of Italy. They have been notoriously put forth by Mommsen, who in his work Römische Geschichte wrote that "their object (of the Romans) was the subjugation of Italy, which was enveloped more closely from year to year in a network of Roman fortresses and roads". ${ }^{309}$ This consensus has been subject to dispute on a number of levels. It does not consider the complex interchange of cultural ideas between individual Romans and locals that took place during the last centuries of the Republic. ${ }^{310}$

Indeed, when we take a closer look at the archaeological and literary evidence, we have the impression that the process of Roman expansion into this region had a lesser impact on the local population and was a more complicated process than it has been traditionally assumed.

One of these pieces of evidence comes from the epigraphical record that mentions Umbrian political institutions. Two identically named members of the Babrius family are mentioned in two inscriptions from Assisium, one written in Umbrian language and Latin

[^87]script, ${ }^{311}$ and the other in Latin language and script. ${ }^{312}$ Both inscriptions recall two offices held by Nero Babrius, first the maro and then the uthor. Both offices were probably already used by Umbrian communities by the sixth BCE; the maronate pertained to the construction of buildings and public monuments, ${ }^{313}$ while the uthor was a public magistrate who was given a special role during the sacrifices in honor of Puemun-Vesuna. ${ }^{314}$

The fact that Nero retained two local offices and advertised his achievements using two
languages and scripts is illustrative for two reasons. First, it shows that members of the Umbrian
${ }^{311}$ Um 10: Crawford 2011, 101-102: ager. emps .et termnas .oht(retie)c(aie).u.uistinie.ner.t.babr(ie) Maronatei uois(ie). ner. propartiet. u. uoisiener sacre. Stahu. "A-field bought and bounded in-the-auctorship of-Cauius/Gaius Vistinius (son)-of-Vibius/Vibis (Osc.) (and) Nero Babrius (son)-of-Titus (and) in-the-maronateship of-Voisienus Propartius (son)-of-Nero (and) Titus Voisienius (son)-of-Vibius/Vibis(Osc.). I-stand sacredly". This inscription refers to a field that has been bought and delimited during the period of office of two uthur, C. Vastinius and Nero Babrius, and two marones, Voisienus Propartius and Titus Voisienus. In this text, all Umbrian inscriptions are mentioned according to Rix 2002 inscriptions' catalogue.
${ }^{312}$ CIL 11.390: Post(umus) Mimesius C(ai) f(ilius), T(itus) Mimesius Sert(oris) f(ilius), Ner(o) Capidas C(ai) f(ilius) Ruf(- - -),Ner(o) Babrius T(iti)f(ilius), C(aius) Capidas T(iti) f(ilius) C(ai) n(epos), V(ibius) Voisienus T(iti) f(ilius) marones murum ab fornice ad circum et fornicem cisternâmq(ue) d(e) s(enatus) s(ententia) faciundum coiravere. This inscription is carved over an arch that leads to a Roman cistern and is dated to the second BCE. It records the building of a terrace wall that extended from the arch of the cistern to another arch near the circus during the office of six marones, among whom we find Nero Babrius.
${ }^{313}$ The civic office of the maro is a local Umbrian magistracy and is attested as a collegiate office of two. Since the office doubles the Etruscan MarunuX, it has been suggested that it became part of the political institution of Umbrian communities at least since the fourth century BCE (Bradley 2000, 258). Indeed, it is during this century that the great Etruscan centers, such as Volsinii and Perusia, began to exert influence on Umbrian communities. From the epigraphic evidence, it is clear that the sphere of influence of the marones was limited to the construction of buildings and public monuments. The parallel between maroship and the aedileship is further strengthened by the absence of this office from the Iguvine Tablets, whose religious content excludes the public undertakings associated with the marones. This office is attested at Asisium, Fulginiae (Um 6), Tadinum (UM 7).
${ }^{314}$ Devoto 1947, 370. This office is mentioned also in the Iguvine Tables (TI Va 2, 15) and at Maevania (Um 25). Here, the uthur presides over two moments of the acts and rites of the Atiedian Brethren. In order to define the role and status of this magistracy, early scholarship focused primarily on the mention of the uthur in the Iguvine Tables, by large the most studied among the Umbrian inscriptions. Vetter, Buck and others (Vetter 1953, 211-212; Buck 1904, 301, Coli 1964, 142-143) held that it was an internal office of the Atiedian Brotherhood, perhaps even appointed by its members, while Devoto maintained that it as a public magistracy who was given a special role during the sacrifices in honor of Puemun-Vesuna. This controversy seems to have been resolved in favor of Devoto, when he found the inscription from Maevania, where the uhur is mentioned after the dead man's name in the style of a public magistracy. Recently, the presence of the uhtur in the Umbrian cursus honorum has been further proved by Weiss (2010, 77). The author examines inscription n. 5 and rightly argues that this boundary marking inscription supports Devoto's argument on the political role of the uthur.
elite retained strong political functions in the region during the second century BCE. Second, it seems that the use of languages and script used in inscriptions is the result of a conscience decision made by the elites. Local magistrates had at their disposal languages and scripts that they could deploy in their civic inscriptions and it is reasonable to imagine that this choice was linked to political behaviors that would have a measurable effect on its eventual outcomes.

The recent suggestion by Terrenato to consider the role of elite agendas seems to be particularly suitable for the case just presented. He encourages consideration of the political scene of the Italians, the existence of factions, and even actual political parties that appropriate the Roman imperial machinery to benefit a specific factional group rather than a political abstraction such as "the Roman empire". ${ }^{315}$ It is reasonable to think that the decision to have their local magistracies represented in Latin language, Latin script or Umbrian language underlies the possibility of gaining some sort of public benefit in response to changing local balances of power and evolving political discourse. Some of such advantages could be, for example, maintenance of social order, dominance over the local community, and control over tribal formation and composition. The existence of a variety of options open to the Umbrian elite during the period of Roman expansion help to account for the pluralities of identities that emerge from these inscriptions and for what Terrenato defines as a "brokerage" between the new capital and the Italian communities: "the adoption of Roman political formulas can mask persistence of local power structures and long standing alliances between aristocratic clans" that "managed to

[^88]survive and thrive after the Roman conquest and are now using Latin political terminology to legitimize further their dominant position". ${ }^{316}$

The active role of local people and some sort of factionalism between them and the Romans is also evident from Livy's account of the establishment of the colony of Nahars. In passage 10.10.1. Livy narrates that this city was taken by the Roman thanks to the treachery of two townsman who made a tunnel and came by that secret passage to the Roman outposts. Interestingly, Bradley notes that this action may relate to the help offered to the Roman by the locale elites, who may have had an interest in aiding the Romans. As in the case of the political action of Nero, it is possible to interpret the action of the two townsmen within the frame of elite factionalism and bonds with the Romans, as noted by Terrenato. Nero, with his language choice, and the townsman, with their support to the Romans, may have exchanged favors with Roman in order to retain the privileges of their traditional organization, such as the former's maronate and uthorship. The presence of private individual agendas seems therefore an important factor to take into account when we consider the consequences of Roman expansion in the region.

A close consideration of the military conflicts between the Romans and the Umbrians provides us with another hint to use caution in assessing the effect of the Roman expansion. As we have seen, ancient sources account for a series of important wars against the Umbrians starting with the end of the fourth century. Scholars have traditionally assumed that these wars were part of a long-term vision of Roman imperialist policy. However, recent scholarship has questioned the nature of the wars bought by Rome in the fourth and third century BCE and argued that they were haphazard conflicts of short duration rather than strategically planned enterprises. ${ }^{317}$ In this respect, the Samnite Wars represent a case in point. Tim Cornell has

[^89]closely and critically analyzed the accounts of these wars written by early imperial authors and has demonstrated that the Samnite Wars consisted in a series of unrelated clashes rather than a long military operation. ${ }^{318}$ Bradley's exploration of the new insight in Roman imperialism brings to the fore the importance of the unpredictability of Roman behavior and, consequently, the unlikelihood of a master plan behind Roman expansion. ${ }^{319}$

The conflicts between the Umbrians and the Romans seem to follow a pattern similar to the one just described. The conflicts against the Umbrian communities of Ocriculum and Nahrs are described by Livy as lasting only a couple of days. There is no reason to doubt Livy's information as he, famous for using every opportunity to add rhetorical elaboration and sensational and romantic coloring, would not have missed an opportunity to aggrandize in length these Roman campaigns in Umbria. In addition to this, the conflict with Nahrs ended with the favorable terms of amicitia, one of the many foedera that Rome stipulated with local communities. These dynamics seem to suggest that the Roman expansion in the regione developed in a series of skirmishes where probably the Romans followed short-term political and perhaps even personal goals. As the case of Asisium and Nahars illustrates, not only the Romans but also the local population were involved in such political and personal agendas.

Among scholars studying Umbria, Bradley is the only one who argues that many of social and urban changes of the Roman period are caused not only by external factors (i.e., Rome) but also by internal ones. However, his suggestion to use caution before coming to this conclusion and to consider the importance of local factors as much as Romanization during the region's history remains, so far, unheard. ${ }^{320}$

[^90]In the next chapter, I will examine the development of the sanctuaries of the region and their votive objects from the archaic period to the end of the Roman expansion process (first century BCE). It will be clear that these objects not only problematize the simplistic views of unilateral cultural exchange but also illuminate of the dynamics of acquisition and maintenance of local traditions at play during this period.

## Chapter 5

## A Micro-scale Approach to the Archaeology of Umbrian Cult Places

## Introduction

A comprehensive understanding of the role of Umbrian sanctuaries, the ritual activities that took place therein, and the nature of the change that followed Roman expansion (the subject of next chapter) requires us to delve first into the development of each of these sacred spaces separately. For this reason, this chapter offers a micro-scale approach to Umbrian sanctuaries: it considers their topography, architecture and votive offerings from the sixth century BCE to beginning of the first century BCE, with a focus on the significance that each sanctuary had for the community in the period before and after the Romans established their presence in the region. As the architectural elements are often missing in both pre-Roman and Roman period sacred spaces, attention is paid to the votive offerings, which represent the most significant indicator of the religious activities that took place in ancient Umbrian sanctuaries.

In this chapter, cult places are grouped based on their topographical location within the Umbrian territorial region, mainly defined by the geomorphology of the territory (southern Umbria, Umbrian valley, northern Umbria and Apennine Umbria). I focus on three aspects of each sanctuary. First, I outline their topographic location, which allows me to contextualize it in the contemporary settlement system of the region. Second, when applicable, I discuss its architectural aspects and spatial organization. Lastly, I present an analysis of the votive material. Each individual discussion is organized diachronically, following the chronology of Italic
religions presented in the introduction of this dissertation. It begins with the archaic and classical period (sixth-fourth century BCE) and continuing with the Hellenistic period (late fourth early first century BCE).

All the data presented are the result of an integrated analysis of published, unpublished, and archival material. In order to arrive at a full understanding of the change that happened in religious spaces following Roman encroachment, it is, in fact, necessary to use all the information at my disposal, including those objects that survive today only in the documentation. Since figurative votive offerings (anthropomorphic, zoomorphic and anatomical offerings) represent the most ubiquitous type of votive offering in Umbria, in particular before the Roman conquest, in the discussion on the votive material I focus on this class of objects in greater detail. ${ }^{321}$ I consider published and archival data, but also all the objects displayed in museums and stored in the local depots.

In the conclusion, I show how the review of the architectural and ritual material from Umbrian sanctuary allows us to debunk some of the common assumptions regarding central Italian sacred spaces. Should the widespread observance of the anatomical votive tradition be seen as an indication of a change in the cult sphere as a result of the gradual homogenization of Italy under Rome? Were rural cult places either abandoned or the object of the laissez-faire politics of Rome? Both the available data and new information collected for this study fail to support the conventional scholarly interpretation of central Italian sanctuaries and the role of anatomical votives, thus falling in line with the most recent re-evaluation of sacred spaces put

[^91]forth by scholars such as Stek and Scopacasa. ${ }^{322}$ In fact, contrary to the scholarly consensus, the findings show that sacred spaces continued to thrive into the Roman period regardless of their proximity to significant foci of Romanization, such as colonies or roads. Furthermore, I demonstrate that anatomical votives are hardly related to the Roman presence in the region. This chapter advocates for the abandonment of these common assumptions and concludes that the continuation of cult spaces and the apparent change in the votive depositions needs to be investigated by looking at internal indigenous factors rather than at the hegemonic presence of Rome.

This chapter works in concert with the three appendices presented at the end of this dissertation. Appendix 1 is composed of an introduction to the votive types. In the introduction, the types of offerings that make up Umbrian votive deposits are described in detail, with a focus on their stylistic elements and, if available, the scholarly discussion of their interpretation. Appendix 2 is a tabulated catalog in the form of an Excel database. It collects all the votive figurines of Umbria, mostly unpublished, that I studied first-hand in the museums and depots of the region. All the votive figurines introduced in this chapter are linked in the footnotes to their database entry which consists of the abbreviation of the sanctuary site followed by a number. Appendix 3 is a photo catalog of the figurative votive offerings described in this chapter for each Umbrian sanctuary. While all the heads, the anatomicals, and the offerings belonging to the group "Other" will be accompanied by a photo, in the case of the Umbrian bronze figurines, the repetitiveness of the types does not require a photo for each specimen. Instead, this Appendix includes the photos of the best preserved specimens from each sanctuary.

[^92]
## Methodology notes

Several factors limit the possibility of a clear picture of the life of Umbrian sanctuaries and the role and function of their votive offerings. First, the majority of Umbrian cult places was excavated in the 1960s and 70s, with the result that stratigraphic analysis and techniques were not often applied. For this reason, not all the sanctuaries presented in this chapter are equally illustrated and only rarely quantitative data on their materials are available. This lack of uniformity is due to the different degree of site exploration, the level of relevant research and available publications, and archival data.

Second, Umbrian votives have not been found in their original depositional position. In some cases (Pantanelli, Monte Acuto) votive objects have been found inside votive pits. Like in other parts of the peninsula and Greece, over time votives were removed to make space for other offerings. However, their sacred value was not lost with their removal, for votive objects were accumulated in votive pits in specific areas of the sanctuaries. In other cases, votive material filled wells and/or cisterns when the area was abandoned (Monte Moro) or when the water facility went out of use (Monte Torre Maggiore, Colle Mori). In both cases, the accumulation of layers of different time periods inside the pits means that the find context offers no information for the reconstruction of relative chronology. Each find can, therefore, be dated only by internal stylistic criteria.

In addition to these complications, there are often no remains from any Umbrian sanctuary (such as architectural terracottas or other decorative elements) that may serve as an upper limit for the chronology. This apparent lack of chronological anchors has led excavators to look solely at the finds from each deposit itself. In addition to those found buried in secondary depositions, several Umbrian votives have been discovered accidentally on the surrounding
surface (Monte Pennino, Monte Subasio), often due to the disturbance caused by more recent agricultural production (Monte Santo) or distributed across the sanctuary area in disturbed contexts (Monte Torre Maggiore, Monte S. Pancrazio, Monte Moro, Monte Ansciano, La Rocca, Cancelli, Grotta Bella, Campo La Piana, Colfiorito).

As a result, the circumstances of the discovery have an impact not only on the dating of the artefacts, which is often based on comparanda and stylistic criteria but also determinations about the original purpose of the dedication. Furthermore, the fact that almost all sites were plundered before being fully excavated hinders the possibility of drawing accurate conclusions about the proportion of the different votive type and the level of frequentation of each cult place. Even when the votive material has been recovered through archaeological investigations, we can only assume that the deposition of votives reflects the level of activity on site, and that scant votives mean that the site declined. We can never actually rule out the possibility that activities continued, but that they left no archaeologically visible traces.

In my interpretation, therefore, both simplifications and generalizations are inevitable: the graphics included in this chapters should, therefore, be viewed with the proviso that they can only include the potentially biased sample of the available material.

### 5.1. Southern Umbria

### 5.1.1. Grotta Bella (GB)

## Topographic location

The site is on the north-eastern slope of the Monte L'Aiola ( 756 m . above sea level). This mountain is the easternmost extension of the Monti Amerini chain, between the Monte Castellari
on the south, and the Monte Pianicel Grande on the north. It now makes up of the territory of Avigliano Umbro, eight kilometers from the town of Amelia (ancient Ameria) and some two kilometers east of the village of Santa Restituta.

The cult place appears to have been connected to a system of settlements whose fortifications have been identified on the summit of the Amerine hills on the Monte Castellari and Monte Pianicel Grande. The fortified areas defined by these defensive walls controlled the east-west routes that connected the southern Umbrian centers of Tuder and Ameria with central Etruria. The fulcrum of this territorial organization was the Umbrian town of Ameria, where a permanent settlement seems to have existed at least since the sixth century BCE. ${ }^{323} \mathrm{~A}$ mountainous path connected the cult place with both the Tiber valley and the pre-Roman routes that led to Ameria and were retraced by the Via Amerina in the third century BCE.

The cave was discovered in 1902 during archaeological investigations carried out by the Soprintendenza Delle Antichità dell' Umbria led by M.S. Arena and the Istituto di Paleontologia of the University of Milan. The site had been inhabited from Neolithic times (5000-3000 BCE) until the late Bronze Age (1200-1000 BCE) and became a cult place from the archaic to the end of the Imperial period (sixth to fourth century CE). From the first century CE to the fourth century CE, however, the votive offerings noticeably decrease compared to the previous centuries, thus suggesting a more episodic use of the sacred space. ${ }^{324}$

[^93]
## Sixth-fourth century BCE: architectural and spatial distribution

The cave is set within the hard limestone of the slope of the Monte l'Aiola and consists of a 10 m high cavity whose largest diameter reaches 40 m . A corridor is dug into the wall opposite to the entrance and branches off in two tunnels which are at least 50 meters long.

## Sixth-fourth phase: votive material

The votive material attributed to this phase consists of twenty-four pieces of aes rude and two hundred and eighty-six figurines, mostly made out of bronze and a few of lead (figure 5.1). ${ }^{325}$ Both the fragments of aes rude and the figurines were found by the excavators in disturbed layers, mixed with earlier and later objects.


Figure 5.1. Graph showing the type distribution of the Grotta Bella votive figurines between the sixth and the fourth century BCE

The "Esquiline group" (EG) is, with two hundred and sixty-five specimens, the most attested type of votive figurines (figures A3.1-10). All figurines of this group have a flat, narrow and relatively elongated body with stiff arms and legs. The legs are very slender and have

[^94]pointed endings; the head is also elongated, with eyes indicated by two grooves and the mouth by an incision; the arms' ends are sometimes characterized by transverse grooves to indicate the fingers. There are twenty-six females, one hundred and two males, and thirty-five warriors.

Females are depicted wearing a long tunic; males are naked with clear genital protuberances; warriors bear a highly schematic crest on their heads and their right arms are pierced to make space for a spear. ${ }^{326}$

Similarly schematic in the rendering of the bodies are fifteen figurines of the type Animal (figure A3.11-14). These consist of six cows, one goat, two sheep, five pigs, and one unidentifiable animal. ${ }^{327}$ Standard features of the type are elongated bodies, pointed feet, and anatomical details rendered by grooves or by small circles carved in the bronze.

[^95]Two figurines of the Nocera Umbra type (NuG) represent a warrior, identifiable by the presence of the helmet and a hole for a spear (figure A3.15,16). ${ }^{328}$ Their body is filiform, flat and presented schematically, with only the crest on the head rendered three-dimensionally. Arms and legs are wide opened, and anatomical details are rendered with small grooves, like in the EG type. There is an indication of feet, but these lack any detail. The figurine is supported by two spikes situated underneath the feet. ${ }^{329}$

Three votives present schematic heads and four reproduce anatomical parts of the body (figure A3.17-23). The heads of the former group (A3.21-23) are modeled and rendered like heads of the schematic EG figures, with eyes marked with small grooves and the mouth by a small horizontal incision. The neck is elongated and spiked at the end. The anatomical parts consist of two legs, one foot, and one arm (A3.17-20). Legs are extremely filiform, with little distinction between the upper and lower part. The foot is equally schematic with no rendering of the toes. The arm is represented outstretched and is supported at the elbow's level by a spike; due to a break running above the wrist, the hand is missing. ${ }^{330}$

Twenty-one figurines belong to the group "Other." They stand out from the rest of the Grotta Bella's figurines for two reasons. First, unlike bronze figurines, which are the result of a process of molding and casting, these are made out from lead sheets, which, still hot, were stamped with a mold and cut with shears or scissors along the edges. Second, they occur exclusively in the Amelia area (Grotta Bella and Pantanelli). The group consists of six female

[^96]figurines, six warriors, and nine decorated miniature shields (figure A3.23-32). ${ }^{331}$ As suggested by Monacchi, the shields would have been originally molded together with the male figurines, who must, therefore, have been at least nine. ${ }^{332}$

Both female and male figures are represented in profile, except the bust which is frontal. The former group (A3.26-28) wears a long tunic decorated either with zig-zag motif or with wavy lines, visible also on the back. The hair is held in a sort of ponytail, and the anatomical details are rendered with small embossed circles. The male figurines (A3.24-25) are shown with wide-open legs and wear a short chitoniskos and armor with shoulder straps held by bosses. Their right arms are lifted as in the act of throwing a spear or holding a sword.

The shields are decorated on both sides (figure A3.29-32). While the backside of all specimens shows an arm fastened to the shield, the front one, the episema, presents three possible motifs. The first one (A3.29-31), attested on six specimens, consists of three schematic figures with outstretched arms arranged circularly under a bare tree with several wavy branches. Embossed circles fill the space and are arranged circularly on the outer edge of the episema. The second motif (A3.32) is attested on only a single specimen and shows a gorgoneion with wide open eyes, a long nose and thin mouth with its tongue extended. The outer edge of the episema is decorated with a zig-zag pattern. The last motif (A3.33), also attested on one specimen, depicts a central circle surrounded by what seem to be either waves or rays.

The closest comparisons to Grotta Bella's lead figurines of warriors, women, and shields are from Laconia. The ancient sanctuary of Artemis Orthia and the Menelaion have yielded a significant number of small figurines of cast lead that have been dated between the eight and the

[^97]fourth century BCE, with a peak in the sixth century. ${ }^{333}$ These Laconian figurines, carefully classified by Martin Boos, include winged figures, types identified as Olympian deities, warriors and women. The women are festively dressed and turned either to the left or to the right with their arms, in most cases, resting by their sides, with only the head shown in profile. The warrior figures are equipped with helmet, spear, shield, and sometimes greaves. A distinctive feature of the warriors is the shield design which can consist of concentric circles around a central boss, straight lines radiating from a central boss, rosettes, curved lines radiating from a central boss, and, in a few cases, blazons (bucranium, scorpion, and cockerel).

The presence of similar votive offerings in two places in the Mediterranean illustrates how common figurative themes - such as the radiant sun, the male warrior, and the womancould be adopted by faraway local manufacturers to create standardized votive types that could satisfy the request of the devotees without an expensive investment. Some motifs seem, however, to reflect individual choices and preferences of the worshipping communities. Similarly to Laconian votives, where artisans used a variety of motifs often inspired by local religious beliefs (demons and gods from the Greek pantheon), the shields depicting men under a tree may have drawn from local myths or ritual performances, or, perhaps, from the local activities of the area (the harvest?) and the ritual context of Grotta Bella.

## Late fourth-early first century BCE: Architectural aspects and spatial organization

No architectural remains belonging to this phase have been unearthed in the cave.

[^98]
## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: votive material

The material from this phase has been found in disturbed layers inside the cave, mixed with materials from different time periods. It consists primarily of ceramics, coins, four anatomical terracottas and three bronze figurines (fig. 5.2).

Coins are attested with seventy-nine specimens, mainly asses of the prow series. ${ }^{334}$ Besides the coins from the Roman Republic, six belong to the Romano-Campanian series and one appears to have been minted in Tuder. Ceramics include locally produced black gloss, mostly paterae, and miniature vases.


Figure 5.2. Graph showing the type distribution of the Grotta Bella figurative votive offerings between the late fourth and the early first century BCE.

The anatomical terracottas are dated to the fourth-second century and include three feet and one breast (figure A3.34-45). ${ }^{335}$ The terracotta breast (figure A3.34) is hemispherical and broadens sharply at the bottom. The nipple is rendered in high relief and has a light circular

[^99]incision around it which seems to indicate the areola. As for the terracotta feet, only the picture of one right foot survives in the archaeological documentation (A3.35). It terminates at the upper ankle, which continues to swell as it rises. The heel is rounded at the back and the foot tapers at the center and widens toward the toes. These are rendered by grooves incised between them and by separation. The bottom of the foot shows evidence of a sole.

The bronze figurines belong to the "Hellenistic worshipper with radiant crown" type and are dated to the third-second century BCE (figure A3.36-38). ${ }^{336}$ Two are of the male type which is portrayed holding a patera in the right hand and a round box (acerra) in the left (A3.36-37). They wear a long himation draped over the left shoulder; on the head, they wear a wreath of ivy leaves. The third one depicts one of the possible variations of the Hellenistic female worshipper (A3.38). The figurine has cap-like hair and is dressed in a chiton and mantle draped over the left shoulder and arm. The hands are open, the palms directed upwards.

### 5.1.2. Pantanelli sanctuary

## Topographic location

The sanctuary site is in the Pantanelli necropolis, one km southwest of the ancient settlement of Ameria (modern Amelia). The area is characterized by the presence of mountains that divide the Tiber valley to the west, the Terni basin (Conca Ternana) and the valley to the east and northeast. Influenced by the morphology of the territory, the settlement of Ameria lies on a limestone spur, overlooking the Tiber river to the east and the Nera river to the west. The presence of the Tiber and the roads that lead from its valley into Umbrian territory (later replaced

[^100]by the Via Amerina) facilitated regional commerce and trade between Ameria and nearby Faliscan and Etruscan areas.

Human occupation at Ameria begun during the Bronze Age, as suggested by the presence of impasto ware fragments, and became more robust starting with the ninth century BC. During this period, the limestone outcropping seems to have hosted one of a number of hill that offered temporary protection to a diffused rural community. The Pantanelli necropolis and sanctuary represent the most substantial evidence of Ameria's first nucleated settlement, which grew up on this site during the seventh /sixth century BCE. They were discovered between 1860 and 1881 when the owner of the land in the Pantanelli area carried out an excavation after noticing artifacts emerging from the surface. Giovanni Eroli, a resident of the nearby city of Narni and an archaeology enthusiast, took on the task of documenting these findings. Except for a few votives, they survive only in his report. A century later or so, a number of terracotta slabs were found in the Pantanelli area, not far from where Eroli identified the presence of votive materials and of the necropolis.

According to Eroli's documentation, the necropolis was dug in the clastic travertine and used from the sixth to the first century BCE. It consisted of corridors and chamber tombs which yielded fine gold jewelry and Attic vases likely imported from Etruria. With respect to the sacred area, the excavation yielded several votive offerings spanning from the sixth to the second century and fragments of decorated terracotta slabs. Most of this material is now lost, and no excavation followed the nineteenth century exploration. Our understanding of the Pantanelli sacred area is thus minimal and relies on Eroli's brief report and Monacchi's more recent study of the terracotta slabs. ${ }^{337}$

[^101]
## Sixth-fourth century BCE: architectural and spatial distribution

No architectural structure of this period has been found during the ninth century excavation.

## Sixth-fourth century BCE: votive material

This phase is attested by fragments of aes rude and forty-nine votive figurines (figure
5.3). According to the nineteenth century excavation report, this material was found buried under a thin layer of soil covered by large tufo slabs.


Figure 5.3. Graph showing the type distribution of the Pantanelli votive figurines between the late sixth and the fourth century BCE.

Most of the votive figurines belong to the EG type, but none of them survives. Based on Eroli's succinct account, we know that there were forty figurines representing women, men, and warriors. Similarly lost are also two cow figurines.

[^102]The only bronzes noted by Eroli which survive today are seven figurines that belong to the type "Other." They are made of lead and belong to the same production of Grotta Bella lead figurines. In particular, the Pantanelli specimens consist of one human figure (figure A3.40), whose poor state of preservation does not allow further identification, a fragment of a warrior (figure A3.39), and five decorated warriors' shields (figure A3.41-42). ${ }^{338}$ Like their counterparts from Grotta Bella, the shields' reverse side depict an arm fastened by three straps while the motif on the episema varies. Three specimens are decorated with a zig-zag motif with the addition of knobs in relief (A3.42), and one with the gorgoneion motif (A3.41). The monster's head is schematically rendered with elongated eyes and waggling tongue.

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: Architectural aspects and spatial organization

A rich assemblage of Etrusco-Italic architectural terracotta revetments (anapagmenta)
found spread across the Pantanelli necropolis has been attributed to the monumentalization of the sacred area during the end of the fourth/third century BCE. They are decorated with feathered palmette leaves, lotus flowers, and volutes, sometimes displayed in two rows (figure 5.4). ${ }^{339}$ This decorative motif belongs to the repertoire of so-called "Etrusco-Italic" architectural decoration. It seems to have been first used in Etruria at the Scasato temple in Falerii in the fourth century and

[^103]then adopted for the decoration of many sanctuaries of the Italic peninsula during the third and second century BCE. ${ }^{340}$


Figure 5.4. Revetment slab from Pantanelli (after Monacchi 1997, 179)

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: votive material

The votive material of this phase consists of coins belonging to the Roman series of aes grave, fragments of black gloss pottery, fifteen terracotta heads, and two anatomical terracottas (figure 5.5). Except for one votive foot, this material is entirely lost, and Eroli provides no information on the objects' appearance.


Figure 5.5. Graph showing the type distribution of the Pantanelli figurative votive offerings between the late fourth and the early first century BCE.

[^104]The single surviving anatomical terracotta, dated to the third-second century BCE, is a fragment of a right foot (figure A3.43). The poor state of preservation, with forefoot, toes, and bottom entirely missing, does not allow for secure identification of the object as an isolated foot, leaving open the possibility that it was part of a complete leg. Traces under the heel suggest that the foot rested on a sole.

### 5.1.3. Monte San Pancrazio Sanctuary

## Topographic location

The sanctuary is located on the southern Umbrian massif known as Monte San Pancrazio, some 9 km to the east of the ancient settlement of Ocriculum (modern Otricoli). From a height of ca. 1000 meters above the sea level, the Monte San Pancrazio massif overlooks the plain known today as the Conca Ternana, establishing visual control not only with the Tiber valley but also with the communication paths to the interior. Monte San Pancrazio, together with Monte Torre Maggiore (5.1.4. below), determined the course of communication in and out of the Conca Ternana, which has probably always formed a vital crossroads in southern Umbria.

Our knowledge of this site is extremely fragmented. In the 1960s, following the fortuitous discovery of votive material on the slopes of the mountain, Umberto Ciotti carried out an archaeological investigation of the mountain peak, where a few travertine blocks were visible on the surface. However, the results of Ciotti's excavation remain undocumented and unpublished, including the votive objects. In his short description of Monte San Pancrazio sanctuary, he reports that he uncovered the remains of a Hellenistic porticus. Based on this
evidence and the analysis of the votive objects, he suggests that the sanctuary was used at least until the second century BCE. ${ }^{341}$

## Sixth-fourth century BCE: architectural and spatial distribution

No structure has been attributed to this phase.

## Sixth-fourth century BCE: votive material

Bronze figurines are so far the only evidence of ritual activity on Monte San Pancrazio
(figure 5.6).


Figure 5.6. Graph showing the type distribution of the S. Pancrazio sanctuary's votive figurines between the sixth and the fourth century BCE.

The best attested figurine type is the EG, with five male and four female figurines (figure A3.44-49). ${ }^{342}$ Nine votive bronzes represent anatomical parts and heads (figure A3.50-53). ${ }^{343}$

[^105]The limbs represented are two legs and two arms (A3.50-51), while the heads depict male individuals (A3.53). Two of them resemble the heads of the EG type, while the remaining three have features of the male heads of the Amelia Group type. They are filed on the front, with the result of two flat surfaces that form an acute angle and end on the upper part with a curved edge. The eyes are indicated with small circles and the mouth with an incision at the base of the angle, that identifies the nose. On the forehead, a linear groove suggests the presence of a band of some sort.

Three specimens belong to the Eyed Crest type (A3.54). ${ }^{344}$ The crests stand on spikes, they are filed and have two grooves made with a punch that resembles eyes. The remaining types are attested only by one specimen. ${ }^{345}$ A warrior of the type Foligno Group (FoG) is represented naked and striding towards the left, on his head he wears a crest (figure A3.55). Eyes, nipples, and navel are rendered with punched roundels and the mouth with a small slit. The figurine is supported by two short spikes situated underneath the feet. A second warrior belongs to the type Todi Group (ToG). This figurine stands out from the group for its size (three times the average size of the other human figurines) and accurate rendering of the details. The warrior is depicted wearing an armor with hinged shoulder guards, belt, and greaves (figure A3.56). On his head, he wears an Attic helmet which is decorated with geometrical motifs similar to those carved on the greaves.

The last two figurines belong to the Bronze Sheet (BS) type and the Animal type. ${ }^{346}$ The former shows a figure cut from a sheet of bronze and turned sideways; an eye in profile is carved into the metal (figure A3.57). Right above it, a hole pierces the figurine's forehead. The state of

[^106]preservation does not allow determination of the figure's gender. The latter depicts an ox, characterized by two small circlets carved in the bonze, possibly to symbolize the animal's genitals (figure A3.58).

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: Architectural aspects and spatial organization

There is only limited archaeological information on the appearance of the sanctuary during this phase. Umberto Ciotti opened two trenches on the mountain in 1962 and claims to have exposed the foundation of a Hellenistic porticus that bounded the sacred areas and was intersected by a water channel. He reports that both the porticus foundation and the channel were dug into the rock.

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: votive material

Among the materials found scattered in the area, only a fragment of a terracotta head and twelve coins can be attributed to frequentation of the sanctuary during this period. The coins are mostly illegible. The only one with a readable surface depicts the head of a horse on the front side and has been dated to the 280-245 BCE. ${ }^{347}$

The terracotta head, broken under the eyes, portrayed a male figure with somewhat wavy hair, parted at the center of the crown (figure A3.59). The eyes are deeply carved in an almond shape and have marked eyelids; they develop more laterally than frontally. Such features are present in some of the heads from Vulci and Tessennano, classified by Martin Söderlind as

[^107]belonging to the type A1. ${ }^{348}$ This comparison allows us to suggest a date for this head within the last fifty years of the second century BCE.

### 5.1.4. Monte Torre Maggiore Sanctuary

## Topographic location

The sanctuary site is located on the summit of Monte Torre Maggiore (1120 meters above sea level). This mountain is the highest peak of the Monti Martani and lies about 20 km north of the Umbrian settlement of Interamna Nahrs (modern Terni). From its high position, the massif has a visual connection with Monte S. Pancrazio and overlooks both the Conca Ternana and much of the access routes to northern and southern Umbria. Unfortunately, during the Renaissance and the second World War, the mountain peak was used as a firing range and antiaircraft station. These anthropic interventions have profoundly altered the appearance of the area and inevitably compromised its stratigraphy.

Evidence for early human frequentation of the mountain consists of flint arrow heads dated between the fourth and the second millennium BCE. The mountain appears to be inhabited only from the sixth century BCE when a spur was occupied by the fortified settlement of S. Erasmo. This was the center of a more extensive system of fortified settlements on mountain peaks (between 700 and 1000 m . high) scattered along the southern slopes of the Monti Martani and identified almost solely by the presence of imposing fortifications. At S. Erasmo, they consist of a megalithic wall built with limestone blocks that run for 160 meters, covering an area

[^108]of ca. $7000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. Archaic settlements have also been identified in the territory around Monte Torre Maggiore, at Maretta Bassa and Interamna. ${ }^{349}$

At the same time as these settlements were inhabited, the summit of Monte Torre Maggiore began to be used as a cult place. From 1984 to 2006, the Soprintendenza Archeologica dell'Umbria (under the direction of Laura Bonomi Ponzi) intermittently excavated the peak of this mountain and identified its development as a cult site from the pre-Roman period to the fourth/fifth century CE. ${ }^{350}$

## Sixth-fourth century BCE: architectural and spatial distribution

In the sixth-fourth century BCE, the sanctuary site was not marked by permanent architectural structures. The original sacred area was most likely marked only by a funnel-shaped pit and a channel connected to it (figure 5.7). Because of the pit's peculiar location in the pronaos of the later third century temple (temple A), and because it was found filled only with sterile sand, the excavators interpreted this depression as the foundation ditch, the mundus, of the sacred area.

[^109]

Figure 5.7. On the right: foundations of the third century and the first century temples (temples A and B). Notice the channel and the pit inside the pronaos of temple B (after Bonomi Ponzi 1988, 23, tav. V). On the left: section of the pronaos of temple A and of the funnel-shaped pit (after Bonomi Ponzi 2006, 116, fig. 6).

## Sixth-fourth century BCE: votive material

Ritual activity in these centuries is indicated by several fragments of aes rude, a gilded bronze object in the shape of a thunderbolt, ${ }^{351}$ and bronze figurines (figure 5.8). These objects were recovered in disturbed layers throughout the sanctuary and in a well in the north-western corner of the area, where they were mixed with later material.


Figure 5.8. Graph showing the type distribution of Monte Torre Maggiore sanctuary's votive figurines between the late sixth and the fourth century BCE.

[^110]One hundred and fifty-six figurines of the EG type take up most of the assemblage (figure A3.60-65). One hundred and six of them represent males (A3.60-62), six represent female (A3.64-65), and forty-four depict warriors (A3.63). ${ }^{352}$

Five votive figurines belong to the Amelia Group type (AmG); four represent a man striding forward (figure A3.66-67), and one depicts a warrior (figure A3.68). ${ }^{353}$ Characteristic of these figurines are the heads, filed on the front, with the creation of two flat surfaces forming an acute angle and ending on the upper part with a curved edge. On the surfaces, the eyes are indicated with small circles and the mouth with a cut at the base of the angle, which identifies the nose. The striding men have their right legs slightly bent and the left leg straight. The left arm is raised with the palm facing upwards and the thumb stretched wide, while the right arm is bent downwards with opened hand and outstretched thumb. The warrior is shown holding a shield on the left and a spear on the right.

Five votives represent schematic heads and two depict anatomical parts (figure A3.6972). ${ }^{354}$ The heads (A3.69-70) are rendered in the same manner as the heads of figurines of the AmG type while the anatomical parts consist of a left foot and a left hand (A3.71-72). The latter is shown opened, with the thumb outstretched. A break at the wrist does not allow us to

[^111]reconstruct the original appearance of the figurines, which, like the other anatomical bronzes of the pre-Roman period, may have been supported by a spike or have been part of a larger figurine.

Four figurines of the NuG type represent warriors with a lozenge crest and the open arms (figure A3.73-74). ${ }^{355}$ Four more warriors pertain to the FoG type and are represented naked and striding forward (figure A3.75a and b). ${ }^{356}$ Lastly, attested by one specimen is the Eyed crest (figure A3.76) and the Animal type (figure A3.77-78). ${ }^{357}$ To the latter belongs two bull figurines (one in bronze and the other in impasto rosso), whose heads are partially preserved.

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: Architectural aspects and spatial organization

In the third century BCE, a temenos in opus quadratum (20x20.80 m.) was laid around the area of the earlier mundus and organized in nine small utility rooms (ca. $16 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ). The center of this precinct was occupied by a temple (A), which incorporated elements of the Etrusco-Italic temple architecture as well as those of Hellenistic type. ${ }^{358}$

On a tall podium in opus quadratum with travertine crown molding stood a rectangular temple oriented east-west ( $11.80 \times 7.90 \mathrm{~m}$.), with pronaos ( 5.70 x 2 m .) and cella ( $5.70 \times 5.70$ m.). The presence of fragments of columns around the temple and the impression left on the ground by a column's base allowed the excavators to hypothesize that, unlike Etrusco-Italic temples, the one on Monte Torre Maggiore was surrounded by columns on all sides. The entrance to the building was by a flight of stairs, whose remains survive in front of the pronaos.

[^112]This temple's plan did not obliterate the ritual pit of the sixth century BCE, but incorporated it inside the pronaos, proof of its importance.

A roughly circular well ( 1.27 x 1.33 m .) found in 2006 in the southwestern sector of the sanctuary and identified as a well may tentatively be attributed to this phase (figure 5.9). It was built with limestone blocks laid without mortar and was found filled with pottery and votive offerings of the pre-Roman and Roman period. Although we cannot determine the well's construction phase, an imperial coin of Commodus found therein provides us with the terminus post quem of its obliteration.

The excavations also recovered fragments of the travertine architectural and sculptural decoration of the building. Among these fragments are lion-headed waterspouts and a female head, the iconographies of both of which are directly inspired by Hellenistic art.

The area underwent a second renovation in the first century BCE. A second temple (B) in opus caementicium and covered with limestone slabs was built northwest of temple A and oriented north-south. In addition to the construction of a new building, the renovation of the sanctuary included the extension of the temenos to the southern side with more facility rooms (figure 5.10). This seems to have been the last major refashioning of the sanctuary, which, as attested by several fragments of lamps and imperial coins, remained in use until the end of the third century CE.


Figure 5.9. Well identified in 2006 in the sacred area of Monte Torre Maggiore (courtesy of the Soprintendenza Archeologia Belle Arti e Paesaggio dell'Umbria)


Figure5.10. Plan of Monte Torre Maggiore sanctuary with the two temples (after Bonomi Ponzi 2006, 113, fig. 5)

Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: votive material
The materials from this phase come primarily from the area between temples A and B and the facility rooms of the temenos: fragments of pottery and terra sigillata, black gloss bowls, plates, miniatures vases, coins of the as and semis denomination, a black-gloss bowl with the
name "PVPVN" - inscribed in the Umbrian alphabet and dated to the end of the third/beginning of the second century BCE - unspecified coins, one fusiform balsamarium made of glass, and bronze figurines identified as Hellenistic worshippers by the excavators, and terracotta anatomicals (figure 5.11).


Figure 5.11. Graph showing the type distribution of Monte Torre Maggiore figurative votive offerings between the late fourth and the early first century BCE.

The votive figurines consist of fifteen specimens of the Hellenistic worshipper type, two terracotta heads and two terracotta anatomical offerings.

The Hellenistic worshipper type is attested by ten male and one female worshipper, and four fragments of arms holding a paterae, all dated to the third century BCE (figure A3.7981). ${ }^{359}$ The female worshipper wears a long chiton, wrapped under the breast, and a himation on the left shoulder, around the hips and hanging from the forearm. On the left arm, she carries an acerra and on her head is a diadem with several rays.

The terracotta anatomicals are dated to the Middle Republican period and represent a right hand and a foot (figure A3.82-83). ${ }^{360}$ The hand (A3.82) is clenched into a fist and broken at

[^113]the level of the wrist. The index finger seems to wear a ring. The foot is now lost and only a picture of three fragment of it survives in the archaeological documentation. Two fragments belong to the platform on which the foot must have stood and one to part of the big toe and the two closest to it (A3.83). The poor state of preservation of both pieces does not allow a more precise dating through stylistic comparison.

The two terracotta heads are mostly broken (figure A3.84-85). One specimen (A3.84) represents an individual whose gender is difficult to detect; the only facial features preserved are half of the nose, part of the mouth, the chin, and part of the face below the eyes. Despite the few anatomical details preserved, the resemblance of the chin and mouth to the male heads of the $\mathrm{Al}(\mathrm{i} 1) /(\mathrm{i} 2)$ group from Tarquinia may suggest a more precise dating to the end of the third century BCE ${ }^{361}$ The second head (A3.85) is equally damaged; only its crown, with wavy hair parted at the center, and the left eye is preserved. The hairdo finds comparisons with some female heads of the BVI (a2) type from Tessennano, thus suggesting a dating to the beginning of the second century BCE ${ }^{362}$

### 5.1.5. Monte Moro sanctuary

## Topographic location

Monte Moro is a limestone upland mountain (696 above sea level) located on the north bank of the Nera river, at the border between Umbrian and the Sabine territory. Before the Romans began their expansion into Umbria, the mountaintop of Monte Moro was occupied by a

[^114]sacred space and its southern slopes by a settlement, a few structures of which made of dry stones and possibly connected to the natural water sources have been identified further south.

The sanctuary fell within the area of the Conca Ternana and had strong visual links with both Umbrian and Sabine territories. It overlooked the route connecting Spoletium (Umbria) with Reate (Sabina) through the passes of Somma and Forca Sant'Angelo, and its position created a strong visual link with Monte Arrone peak sanctuary, located on the left bank of the Nera in Sabine territory.

In 1998, 2004, and 2010 the Soprintendenza Archeologica per l'Umbria, directed by Liliana Costamagna, carried out archaeological campaigns and surveys of the mountain summit to investigate structures brought to light by previous clandestine excavations. ${ }^{363}$ Here, the excavators identified the presence of a sacred building whose stratigraphy had been entirely compromised by looters and reforestation activities. Based on the ceramic analysis, excavators were able to determine that the area was used from the fifth century BCE to the third century CE when it seems to have been the object of spoliation aimed at removing construction materials. Only sporadic frequentation is attested in the fourth century CE.

## Sixth-fourth century BCE: architectural and spatial distribution

Based on a few fragments of bricks, limestone sherds, and pottery used as fill for a later sacred building and on the presence of archaic schematic votive bronzes, it is possible to hypothesize that an Umbrian sanctuary existed on the summit at least since the fifth/fourth

[^115]century BCE. ${ }^{364}$ However, nothing conclusive can be said of its original appearance and chronology, for the monumentalization of the area that occurred in the second century BCE required the leveling of the entire mountaintop and the use of any previous structure as excavation waste.

A pit, partially destroyed by looters, was found in 1998 on the eastern side of the later building and tentatively attributed to the pre-Roman sacred space. It is dug into the rock, lined with clay and rocks and covered with small squared bricks. The excavators have suggested that it may have served as a cistern to collect rainwater or as a silos to store foodstuff. This and a second century BCE pit located just east of it were intentionally destroyed after the abandonment of the sanctuary site in the third century CE and used as garbage pits for architectural and votive materials accumulated at the sanctuary.

Sixth-fourth century BCE: votive material
The votive material from this phase comprises fragments of aes rude and bronze votive figurines (figure 5.12). This material has been found in two pits where it was mixed with material of the Roman period such as bronze nails, architectural elements, anatomical votives, and terracotta heads.

[^116]

Figure 5.12. Graph showing the type distribution of Monte Moro votive figurines between the fifth and the fourth century BCE.

The bronze votive figurines consist of seven men belonging to the EG type (figure A3.86-88), five eyed crests (figure A3.89-90), two warriors of the FoG type (figure A3.91), two animal figurines - a horse and a fragment of an ox (figure A3.92-93) —and one schematic head with facial features that recall the rendering of the heads of the EG type figurines (figure A3.94). ${ }^{365}$

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: Architectural aspects and spatial organization

The sanctuary seems to have received an architectural form only at the end of the second century BCE, when the entire summit was leveled to make space for a building (figure 5.13). The new complex was 26 meters long and articulated into at least four rooms. The first (room A) is currently interpreted as the cult room. It runs northwest/southeast and measures $10 \times 6 \mathrm{~m}$. It was paved with concrete with small limestone and lithic inclusions; at the center of this room stood a

[^117]rectangular structure lined with rock slabs set vertically into the bedrock. An opening in the northern corner room A connected it to room B, where the concrete floor is interrupted by large postholes and depressions related to the original setting of the room. On the north-western side of the building, a small corridor granted entrance to both rooms. The 2010 excavation has established that the building extended southwest with more rooms, possibly used as service spaces.

A plastered large pit lined with mortar and possibly also used as a silos was dug south of room A and next to the previous one. Both pits fell out of use in the late imperial period, when they were destroyed and used as garbage pits.

The scant architectural material makes the decoration of the building impossible to reconstruct; two fragments of draped female figures have been attributed tentatively to the architectural decoration of the sanctuary's pediment.


Figure 5.13. Monte Moro sanctuary's structures (after Sisani 2013, 18 fig. 2).

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: votive material

The archaeological material dating to this phase consists principally of pottery, seven anatomical terracottas, and four heads (figure 5.14). These objects have been found in the pits mixed with other refuse material used to fill them. ${ }^{366}$

Nearly 3000 fragments of pottery have been found in the sanctuary area. Black gloss (paterae, cups, and plates) is the most attested pottery class, followed by unpainted pottery (tableware and cooking ware) and terra sigillata.


Figure 5.14. Graph showing the type distribution of Monte Moro figurative votive offerings between the late fourth and the early first century BCE.

The anatomical terracottas have been dated to the third-second century BCE. They consist of two uteri, two hands, one nose, one foot, and one set of male genitals (figure A3.95101). ${ }^{367}$ The uteri (A3.95-96) survive in fragments and have an ovoid body tapering slightly

[^118]toward the top to create a rounded point; several striations cross the body of the uterus to represent musculature. The hands are highly fragmented. One specimen (A3.97) represents the second, third, and fourth finger of a right hand. Palm and thumb are missing, and no anatomical details like fingernails are visible. The second hand (A3.98) shows the palm of a left hand which has lost all its fingers. The nose (A3.99) is broken on all sides and noticeably larger than lifesize; small indentations indicate the nostrils. Concerning the votive foot (A3.100), only the second and third toes are preserved. These are attached to each other and marked by a groove in between. There are signs of footwear, most likely a sandal. Lastly, the testicles of the male genitalia are depicted as low-hanging (A3.101). The penis is entirely missing, leaving a fracture line where it was attached.

Similarly to the anatomical offerings, the votive heads are dated to the third-second century BCE and survive in fragments (figure A3.102-104). ${ }^{368}$ One head (A3.102) represents the left part of a male face. The cheek is smooth and rounded towards the chin. The mouth is straight, and the lips are separated. Another specimen (A3.103) consists of three forwardwriggling locks and part of the left eye and low eyebrow of a male individual. A third head (A3.104) is a small fragment of the hairdo of a veiled head. No facial features are preserved. The last specimen shows the neck of head.

### 5.1.6 Monte Santo sanctuary

The sanctuary site lies one km west of Todi, close to the border between Etruria and Umbria. As the grave goods of the pre-Roman settlement of Tuder show, this proximity and the

[^119]presence of the Tiber river contributed to making the area a critical place for commercial exchange and a link between the inland Apennine area and the Etruscan world. ${ }^{369}$

The existence of an archaic sacred place on Monte Santo has been hypothesized on the basis of scattered material found on the mountain, namely a statue of Mars in the act of libation, parts of an inscribed honorary travertine column, and several small bronze figurines. ${ }^{370}$ The limited available evidence pinpoints two moments of the sanctuary's frequentation: the fifth and the end of the first century BCE when Tuder became Colonia Iulia Fida Tuder. However, in the absence of excavation, it is not possible to establish if the sanctuary remained continuously in use during these centuries. ${ }^{371}$

## Sixth-fourth century BCE: architectural and spatial distribution

No excavation has been carried out on the mountain, and no architectural evidence are visible on the ground.

Sixth-fourth century BCE: votive material
In 1835, a local inhabitant of Todi who noticed a few travertine blocks of a column (below) and a bronze statue emerging from the ground on his property, located on the western slopes of Monte Santo, carried out a private excavation of these objects. The statue, known as Mars of Todi after Francesco Roncalli's publication, is dated to the end of the fifth/beginning of

[^120]the fourth century. It is 1.41 m . high and represents a warrior wearing armor and portrayed in the act of pouring libation from a cup held in his extended right hand, while with the left he holds a spear. An Umbrian inscription carved in the Etruscan alphabet on the edge of the warrior's armor recalls that it was given as a gift by a man named Ahal Truitis, possibly a local inhabitant. It is possible that the statue was the product of a sculptural workshop at Volsinii, famous for its bronze sculptors and fulcrum of trade with Umbrian territory.

Forty-nine bronze figurines may be related to the sacred area on Monte Santo (figure 5.15.). In only one case is a provenance from the mountain known, while for the remaining objects the only information available in the archive of the Museo Civico di Todi is that they were found in Todi. Notwithstanding the lack of provenance, a case can be made for the association of all these objects with Monte Santo. It is worth noting that other sanctuaries identified in this city -at the sites of la Rocca, S. Maria in Camuccia, Porta Catena, and the Cathedral - have been dated between the end of the fourth and the third century BCE and the bronze figurines to the fifth century BCE. ${ }^{372}$ Monte Santo seems therefore to be the only (known) temple that existed in the area of Tuder during the fifth century BCE where these votives could have been dedicated.


Figure 5.15. Graph showing the type distribution of the Monte Santo votive figurines between the fifth and the fourth century BCE.

[^121]Sixteen figurines belonging to the AmG type make up the majority of Monte Santo votive figurines (figure A3.106-109). Three of them depict a warrior (A3.106), and the rest depict a man striding forward (A3.107-109). The EG type is represented by six male and two female figures (figure A3.109-113), the FoG type by six warriors (figure A3.114-116) and the NoG type by five warriors and one woman (figure A3.117-119). Five warriors belong to Monte Santo type (MSG), whose characteristic features are chiseled eyes, the presence of a small tunic that leaves the genitalia uncovered, and a helmet distinguished by the narrow point and raised cheekpieces (figure A3.120-121). Among the warrior figurines at Monte Santo, only one belongs to the ToG. Five figurines belong to the Animal type; three depict bulls, and two horses (figure A3.122-123). Three figurines represent heads whose facial features stylistically recall the AmG (figure A3.124-126). ${ }^{373}$

Lastly, five figurines belong to the group "Other" (figure A3.127-) Even though they resemble some of the types identified by Colonna, the overall rendering of the body and features seems to indicate an original creation of an individual craftsman operating in the Todi area or directly on the sanctuary site. It is possible that a local craftsman re-utilized known casts and applied subtle changes in order to create unique figurines that perhaps were more in line with the preferences of the donor or the artist. MTS_23 and MTS_24 represent a warrior naked except for a helmet; the body is solid, the left arm lies on the left hip, and the right arm is either bent

[^122]upward (MTS_23) or forward (MTS_24) in the act of holding a spear. The modeling of the body recalls Colonna's Maestro Rapino. ${ }^{374}$

MTS_7 shows resemblance with Colonna's Chiusi type. ${ }^{375}$ It represents a nude warrior in the act of striding forward with his left leg. He wears a helmet with a low crest and carries a shield in the left arm; the right arm is bent forward. The body is slender, and the facial features are roughly indicated.

MTS_45 portrays Hercules in the nude. ${ }^{376}$ The right arm is bent upward as in the act of brandishing a club, and his left is straight forward; a lionskin hangs from his left forearm. The protruding ears and nose and the bulging eyes find similarities with Colonna's Maestro "Le Arti" and Biel types. ${ }^{377}$

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: architectural aspects and spatial organization

No architectural evidence belonging to this phase has been found on Monte Santo. The column identified in 1835 is dated to the end of the first century BCE when the entire region received Roman citizenship. ${ }^{378}$

[^123]
## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: votive material

Although several bronze figurines of Hellenistic worshipper are displayed in the Museo Civico di Todi, none of them can be associated with certainty with the Monte Santo sanctuary due to the lack of provenance.

### 5.2. Umbrian valley

### 5.2.1. La Rocca sanctuary

The cult site takes its name, "La Rocca", from the imposing medieval papal fortress (Rocca Albornoziana) that occupies the entire summit. La Rocca is located on the height of the Colle di Sant'Elia, a foothill of the Apennines (452 m. above sea level) in the town of Spoleto in east-central Umbria. Due to its location at the head of a large, broad valley surrounded by mountains and overlooking communication routes between the Umbrian valley and southern part of the region, the hill occupies a strategic geographical position and has been continuously occupied since the Middle Bronze Age. Unfortunately, the major work of land leveling connected with the construction of the Rocca Albornoziana has entirely compromised the archaeological record of the ancient settlement's phases. Our knowledge of its development comes primarily from the dump layers accumulated along the hill's slopes.

The earliest evidence of activity on Colle di Sant'Elia includes pottery fragments, a piece of a bronze fibula, spools and loom weights. Their presence suggests the existence of a settlement which probably occupied the eastern and western slopes of the hill. Following the Bronze Age, archaeological evidence points to gradual expansion. Iron Age activity is attested by the presence of postholes both on the summit of the hill and in the area of San Nicolò, 3 km northwest of Colle S. Elia. Numerous fragments of bucchero found both on the hill and in the
modern centro storico, and the presence of three necropoleis of the seventh to the sixth century BCE, suggests that during the archaic period the settlement had expanded and occupied the whole southwest slope of the hill.

Although a settlement existed before the Roman expansion, Spoletium appears in the historical record only after it was deducted as a Latin colony in 241 BCE . The settlement covered ca. 30 hectares and was structured along an orthogonal grid with insulae along the main slope of the site, which was purposefully terraced to regularize the terrain. The main street of the ancient village was maintained, regularized, and connected to the Via Flamina which functioned as the cardo of the new settlement. With the foundation of the colony, the summit of the hill became the citadel of the new city.

Although the construction of the Albornoziana Fortress leveled any preexisting structures, restoration and construction work carried out in the last thirty years on the slopes of the hill and inside the Fortress, have yielded evidence of the existence of at least one sacred area used from the fifth century BCE to the fourth century BCE. ${ }^{379}$

## Sixth-fourth century BCE phase: architectural and spatial distribution

No cult building of this period has been unearthed.

[^124]
## Sixth-fourth century BCE: votive material

The votive material attributed to a cult place in this phase consists of eleven bronze figurines (figure 5.16). ${ }^{380}$ These have been found in disturbed layers during excavations carried out in the Fortress' "Cortile delle Armi" and "Cortile ovest" and on the northern and southern slopes of the Rocca.


Figure 5.16. Graph showing the type distribution of La Rocca sanctuary's votive figurines between the late sixth and the fourth century BCE.

The votive figurines consist of four male figures of the EG type (figure A3.131-133), three warriors of the FoG type (figure A3.134-135); two NuG figurines, a warrior (A3.136) and a striding man (A3.137), one striding male figure of the AmG (figure A3.138), and one anatomical depicting an arm (figure A3.138). ${ }^{381}$

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: architectural aspects and spatial organization

[^125]Backfill layers on the northern slope of the hill have yielded two fragments of EtruscoItalic antepagmenta (figure 5.17) and two fragments of terracotta antefixes. These fragments can be attributed to the architectural and coroplastic decoration of the sacred building(s) that existed on La Rocca during this phase.

The slabs appear to depict spiraling volutes, ${ }^{382}$ while the antefixes show part of the lower body of a winged, draped, female figure, identified by the excavators as the Potnia theron (Mistress of the Animals). This motif, which is believed to have originated in Faliscan territory in the fourth-third century BCE, became a common decorative motif on the antefixes of central Italian sanctuaries between the third and the first century BCE. The goddess is traditionally represented winged, draped and flanked by two panthers by her side. ${ }^{383}$


Figure 5.17. Architectural terracottas from La Rocca (after Pani 2011, fig. 20-23)

[^126]
## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: votive material

The material from this phase consists of several fragments of pottery, one third-century BCE Roman bronze coin of the triens denomination, nine anatomical votives, two heads, and one terracotta figurine of a bovine (figure 5.18). These objects were found in a modern landfill and in a dump layer. The latter, based on the terminus post quem provided by the presence of a fragment of sigillata italica and amphorae, appears to have been deposited in the first century CE.

Pottery is the most abundant category of material found at La Rocca. Common ware is the most frequent ceramic class (1796 fragments mostly ollae), followed by black gloss (1027; some pieces are of local production), coarse ware (203) and grey pottery (9).


Figure 5.18. Graph showing the type distribution of La Rocca figurative votive offerings between the end of the third and the early first century BCE

The anatomical terracottas are dated to the third/second century BCE and consist of two feet, two big toes, two fingers, two uteri, and one phallus (figure A1.140-142). ${ }^{384}$ The feet are preserved in two fragments (A3.140): Rocca_13 represents a right foot with toes individually

[^127]formed and separated from one another; the toenails are executed by means of incision and rise slightly off a small platform. A break runs through the entire left side of the foot, cutting off the big toe and a large part of the heel. Rocca_12 depicts the second, third, and fourth toe from a right foot set on a high platform. They are attached to each other and marked by a groove in between. Toenails were indicated by rounded incisions. Rocca_14 and Rocca_5 show the big toe of a left foot, whose platform is partially preserved (A3.140). Rocca_16 represents a thumb whose shape is rendered realistically. It terminates in a break midway down. Rocca_21 shows an unidentifiable finger. It is long and thin and it slightly curves in a way reminiscent of the joints of the finger. The tip is pressed, perhaps indicating a fingernail. It terminates at the bottom in a break (A3.140). Rocca_18 and Rocca_19 show an ovoid uterus (A3.141) slightly tapering toward the top to create a rounded point. Striations are visible along both fragments. The body of the organ rests on a flat and featureless bottom, the edges of which extend beyond it. Rocca_17 depicts part of a pair of low-hanging testicles (A3.142). An irregular break surrounds the entire fragments and cuts off half of the testicles. There is no trace of the penis attached initially to the piece.

The terracotta heads are dated to the third/second century BCE (figure A3.143). ${ }^{385}$ Rocca_22, represents the oval face of a veiled female. The hair is swept back from the forehead and falls over the sides of the face forming two lines of ringlets, completely covering the ears. The forehead is short, the eyes are narrow, and the nose is big with a rounded tip. The mouth is chipped off, and the chin is round and fleshy. A large break runs along the left edge of the face, from the crown of the head to the cheek. A comparison with heads of the BIV type classified by Comella, and dated between the fourth and the third century BCE may suggest a third century

[^128]BCE date for this head. ${ }^{386}$ The second head, Rocca_20, is worn out and broken in multiple places; the only facial features preserved are the right eye, part of the nose, the mouth, parts of the cheeks and the chin. The eye is shallow and framed by a low eyebrow. The upper eyelid is thin and plastic. The mouth is small, and the lips are even; the lower lip is slightly thicker with a soft undercut. Although the poor state of preservation prevents the identification of typologically similar heads, the resemblance of the chin and mouth to the male heads of the AI from Vulci, Tarquinia, and Tessennano suggest a dating to the second half of the third century BCE ${ }^{387}$

Finally, Rocca_23 belongs to the group "Other" since it is an isolated find and its presence in the region is limited to the sacred area on Colle S. Elia (figure A3.144). It represents a terracotta quadruped, most likely a bovine. The head is entirely cut off, and the features that remain after heavy wear do not show any details revealing what particular kind of bovine is represented. Terracotta animals, although otherwise absent in Umbrian sacred contexts, are common in the western part of central Italy and southern Italy and Sicily. ${ }^{388}$

### 5.2.2. Monte Subasio sanctuary

The sanctuary site is located on the summit of the San Rufino hill, which represents the northernmost peak of Monte Subasio. The mountain is located 7 km east of Assisi (ancient Asisium) and, from a height of 1290 m . above sea level, dominates the surrounding hills and valleys: on the western slopes are the towns of Assisi and Spello; on the east, Nocera Umbra and

[^129]Valtopina, in the northern territory of Gualdo Tadino, and on the south the city of Foligno. In antiquity, the mountain functioned as a regular stop for the summer transhumance that took place between the Umbria-Marche Apennines and the Ager Romanus via routes later retraced by the Via Flaminia.

The cult place was connected to a vast settlement area that occupied the slopes of Monte Subasio. The only settlement in the area that has been archaeologically investigated is Assisi. After an early occupation in the Bronze and Iron Ages, the central area of the modern town (Via Arco dei Priori) seems to have been continuously inhabited starting from the sixth century BCE. Some other settlements may have existed in the area, as suggested by the presence of bronze material dating from the Bronze Age to the seventh century BCE and grave goods, in the form of jewelry of the sixth century BCE. On Colle San Rufino itself, a system of moats and earthwork ramparts was perhaps associated with a high settlement on the summit.

Archaeological evidence related to the cult place on the hill's summit consists solely of a few votive offerings. The scarcity of evidence is due to the history of the site's excavation. In 1879, archaeologist Wolfgang Helbig reported the discovery near a sulphur spring of seventyfive votive figurines, mostly coarse male figurines about 3 cm high and fragments of handmade vessels made of brown clay. He locates these finds in the locality of Torre Maser, on top of S. Rufino hill which stands 1 km away from a sulfurous water vein. In 1923, Francesco Pennacchi, an official of the municipality of Assisi excavated the area indicated by Helbig but did not find any structural remains. Since then, no other excavations have been undertaken. Furthermore, in 1984, when Monacchi published the votive assemblage from the hill, the votive figurines mentioned by Helbig had been entirely lost except for eight specimens.

As a consequence of the disappearance of the votive objects found in the ninthteenth century and of the lack of any excavation record, our knowledge of the Monte Subasio sacred area is extremely fragmented. Based on Monacchi's publication, it seems that the area was utilized from the end of the sixth century/beginning of the fifth century BCE to the third/second century BCE. ${ }^{389}$

## Sixth-fourth century BCE phase: architectural and spatial distribution

No cult building of this period has been unearthed.

Sixth-fourth century BCE: votive material
Bronze figurines seem to have been the only votive offerings found on the Colle S .
Rufino (figure 5.19).


Figure 5.19. Graph showing the type distribution of Monte Subasio votive figurines between the fifth and the fourth century BCE (the unspecified figurines are those mentioned by Helbig.

[^130]Although Helbig noted the presence of seventy-five votive figurines (see above), Monacchi was able to study only five of them: one male figure of the EG type (figure A3.145), one striding man of the AmG type (figure A3.146), and three figurines classifiable under the umbrella of the group "Other" (figure A3.147-149). ${ }^{390}$

The first offering of this type (Other), CSRufino_1 represents a warrior figure with a miniature situla -a bucket-shaped vessel used for carrying liquids during religious ceremonies - attached to his left foot (A3.147). The warrior is shown in a striding stance with the left leg forward and the right arm lift as in the act to throw a spear. The left arm is bent to hold the shield. He wears a helmet with a fissure to hold the crest. The shoulder straps and the lower part of the greaves are decorated with small circlets. The iconography of the warrior belongs to the "Gruppo San Fortunato di Genga" ascribed by Colonna to northern Umbrian production and common in the Picenum region. ${ }^{391}$ As for the situla, its miniature size and its association with a warrior figure have led Colonna to consider it as suggestive of the lustratio agri, a Roman ceremony described by Cato in De Agricoltura 141: farmers would address the god Mars with a prayer, beseeching him to "keep away, ward off and remove" all kind of catastrophes from their household, fields and the animals. ${ }^{392}$

CSRufino_7 (A3.148) shows an elongated and rather flat figurine dressed in a tight, ankle length dress with long sleeves; the surface of the dress is covered with a motif of incised circles

[^131]that form parallel lines. The tips of the finger of the left hand are bent to touch the side of the head; those of the right hand are laying on the right hip. The facial features are coarsely rendered; the breast signaled just with incised circled. As Monacchi notes, although the figurine is stylistically in line with the Umbrian production of schematic offerings, its iconography recalls that of some Etruscan figurines found at Chiusi interpreted as dancers. ${ }^{393}$ The uniqueness of this object, as well as of CSRufino_1, suggests that they were most likely local products.

CSRufino_3 (A3.149) is an animal pendant with a hole through the center portion. The animal is schematically rendered, with no anatomical details. Pendants of this type are found most often in tomb context in Picenum. ${ }^{394}$ Their presence among the materials of the Colle S . Rufino sacred area highlights the abovementioned cultural contacts between the two areas.

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: architectural aspects and spatial organization

No cult building of this period has been unearthed.

## Late fourth-early first centurys BCE phase: votive material

The material of this phase consists of three bronze figurines belonging to the "Hellenistic worshipper" type and dated to the third-second century BCE (figure A3.150). ${ }^{395}$ Two represent the male worshipper type, and one is a fragment of an arm holding a patera.

[^132]
### 5.3. Northern Umbria

### 5.3.1. Monte Ansciano sanctuary

## Topographic location

The sanctuary site is located on the northern edge a limestone mountain (893 m. above sea level) northeast of Gubbio (ancient Iguvium), overlooking the Gubbio valley. This area lies in the north-eastern part of the region and is located strategically on the watershed between the Tyrrhenian and the Adriatic coast, albeit closer to the Adriatic. To the west, the upper Tiber valley represents a natural communication route to south Etruria; to the east is the Gualdo Tadino Basin; to the east and north lie the Apennines. To the south, lower hills prevent easy access from Perugia and the extensive former lake basins of central Umbria

Bronze Age frequentation is attested in the area from the 1100 BCE to 950 BCE . The presence of a drystone wall running around the summit within which a midden accumulated mostly bones and pottery but also a distinctive bronze fibula, daub, and blue glass beads - and a large oval posthole structure have led excavators to surmise that the summit served as an upland outpost, and that the majority of the population lived on the colluvial slopes below. During the same period, a similar settlement system existed on Monte Ingino, just northeast of Monte Ansciano, and a hut of the Late Bronze Age has been identified in the area of modern Gubbio, at the beginning of Via dei Consoli.

By the eighth century, occupation shifted entirely from the summits of Monte Ansciano and Monte Ingino to the basin lying below them - the area of the Vescovado and S. Agostino -where a nucleated settlement and associated cemetery continued to be used until the Roman period. The material of this phase, mostly impasto pottery, suggests that these dwellings ceased
to be used in the fourth century BCE when domestic structures and mortuary display became conspicuous in the area of Gubbio.

The Gubbio Project carried out a systematic excavation of the entire Gubbio valley between 1983 and 1987, published in 1988 and 1994. ${ }^{396}$ One of the findings of this research is that, by the sixth century BCE, the upper part of the Gubbio valley landscape was explicitly ritualized. On Monte Ansciano, archaeologists unearthed a sacred area that appears to have been used from the sixth century BCE to the fourth-third century BCE, with sporadic use thereafter until the first centuries CE.

## Sixth-fourth century BCE: architectural and spatial distribution

The sacred area of this phase appears to have consisted of a simple drystone platform that capped a previous wall of the Bronze Age period (figure 5.20).


Figure 5.20. Plan of the sanctuary on Monte Ansciano (after Malone and Stoddart 1994, 146, fig. 5.2).

[^133]
## Sixth-fourth century BCE votive material

Materials associated with this phase consist of one hundred and sixty-nine nails and some fragments of pottery, fifty-nine bronze figurines, and one fragment of a terracotta head (figure 5.21). ${ }^{397}$ This material has been found mixed with earlier and later material in the upper soil layers of the excavations.


Figure 5.21. Graph showing the type distribution of the Monte Ansciano votive figurines between the fifth and the fourth century BCE.

The votive figurines consist of thirty-five males (figure A3.151-154), twelve warriors (figure A3.155), and eight females (figure A3.156-158) of the EG type; three warriors of the NuG type (figure A3.159-160), and one head (figure A3.161). ${ }^{398}$

[^134]Unlike the Umbrian bronze votive heads of this period, the head from Monte Ansciano is made of clay. The face is characterized by large oval eyes and a mouth with closed lips. Fractures run right above the eyelids and along the left and lower part of the face; the nose is entirely chipped off. Despite the poor state of preservation of this artifact, the shape of the eyes and the mouth recalls specimens from Veii dated to the end of the sixth-early fifth century BCE. ${ }^{399}$

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: architectural aspects and spatial organization

 No cult building of this period has been unearthed.
## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: votive material

Starting with the third century BCE, cult activity at Monte Ansciano seems to decrease.
The only material evidence of this phase is represented by a coin of a very early Roman republican issue and a bronze fragment depicting a patera (figure A.3.162), most likely related to a figurine of the type "Hellenistic worshipper." ${ }^{400}$

### 5.3.2. Monte Acuto sanctuary

## Topographic location

The sanctuary site is located at the height of 926 m . on the summit of Monte Acuto. This mountain lies on the right bank of the Tiber river, in northwestern Umbria, and from its peak dominates the surrounding territories: the river and the Fratta plain, at the border between the Etruscan and the Umbrian territories.

[^135]This position of control over river and transit routes has been exploited since the Late Bronze Age. In this phase, a fortified settlement —identified on the ground by a ditch, an embankment of stone heaps, and fragments of bowls, handles (a cornetti and a maniglia), and impasto cooking ware -was built on the extreme limit of the crest in direct visual control of the Umbrian plains and territory. A series of fortified settlements on the lower mountain peaks at about 700 m . above sea level (Monte Elceto di Murlo, Monte Civitelle, Cerchiaia, Monte Corona, Monte Santa Croce) gravitated to this axis of control. These settlements shared similar features of altitude and were equipped with circular or elliptical enclosures, whose local drystone elements are still visible on the ground.

After an apparent hiatus of hundreds of years, the summit of Monte Acuto was transformed into a sacred place starting from the sixth/fifth century BCE. Given its position, the sanctuary had a viewshed that enclosed other similar Umbrian sanctuaries in Umbria: from north to south, Gubbio (Monte Ansciano); Umbertide (Monte Acuto); Assisi (Monte Subasio, Monte Subasio); Terni (Monte Torre Maggiore); and Calvi dell’Umbria (Monte S. Pancrazio). It seems, therefore, that the original purpose of the mountain of controlling the height was reiterated during the archaic period and accompanied by a sacred function. It is reasonable to imagine that the population of the surrounding territories used the sanctuary on Monte Acuto not only for religious purposes but also to find shelter and gather in moments of danger.

Investigations of the summit of Monte Acuto were undertaken between 1986 and 1995 by the Soprintendenza Archeologica dell'Umbria led by Luana Cenciaioli and have brought to light a cult place used from the sixth to the fourth century BCE and sporadically frequented until the fourth century CE. ${ }^{401}$

[^136]Such archaeological research notwithstanding, over time the area on top of Monte Acuto has suffered from deterioration caused not only by atmospheric agents but, first and foremost, by human actions. Recently, the installation of cell towers has caused serious damage to the area, and clandestine activities and looters have led to stratigraphic disturbance and the loss of important archaeological data.

## Sixth-fourth century BCE: architectural and spatial distribution

The sanctuary is characterized by a pseudo-rectangular enclosure ( 35 x 20 m .) with a wall about 3 m . wide built with local stones and aligned and constructed without the use of mortar. On the western side of the enclosure, a small drystone corridor led to the sacellum, built with two courses of dry-stone rocks (figure 5.22). The presence of three small channels cut in the rock of the rectangular foundation suggests that this area was dedicated to the sacrifice of animals, whose remains (bovine) have been recovered inside the votive pit. The latter ( 4 m . deep and ca. 3.50 m . wide) is dug into the rock south of the sacellum. Beside bones and votive figurines (below), the pit has yielded brick fragments -interpreted as the material of the structure's roof - one spindle, impasto clay, the base of a cup, and a ribbed handle related to a previous occupation of the area.


Figure 5.22. Excavation plan of the Monte Acuto sanctuary. A: entrance; B: precinct; C: sacellum; D: votive pit (after Cenciaioli 1998, 46).

## Sixth-fourth century BCE: votive material

Votive figurines represent the only type of offerings found at the Monte Acuto sanctuary. The excavation has retrieved 1600 specimens, of which I could analyze only one hundred and eighteen (figure 5.23). Sixty-nine of them have been recovered inside the votive pit, while the rest has been found spread across the entire excavation areas in disturbed layers.

The most common type of figurine is the EG (figure A3.163-166). At Monte Acuto this group comprises sixteen male figures (A3.163-164), twenty females (165-166), and six warriors (A3.167). Animal figurines (figure A3.168-172) are attested by twelve pigs (A3.168), ten sheep (A3.169), seven oxen (A3.170), two goats (A3.171), and three unidentifiable quadrupeds (A3.172). Thirteen human figures cut from thin sheets of bronze belong to the BS type (figure A3.173-174). The extreme approximation of their bodily features and poor state of preservation allows us only to identify two as men while the rest remains unrecognizable. The NuG is attested by nine figurines of warriors (figure A3.175-176) and the AmG by six figurines representing a striding man (figure A3.177-178). Lastly, eleven votive figurines represent specific parts of the
human body (figure A3.179-182): five heavily deteriorated heads (A3.179) with features that resemble the heads of the EG figurines, four legs (A3.180), one hand (A3.181), and one arm (A3.182). ${ }^{402}$

The excavation has also retrieved a situla in the shape of a basket (MTA_118). This vessel has a narrow foot, two small rings (broken on the upper part) attached to each handle and, unlike the situla found on the Monte Subasio sanctuary (CSRufino_1), is not hollow. If Colonna's interpretation of the connection between this miniature vessel and the god Mars is right, ${ }^{403}$ it is possible that also in the case of Monte Acuto the objects relates to the lustratio agri, the propitiatory ceremony dedicated to the god Mars to augment the abundance of fields and cattle. In this respect, the high number of animal figurines dedicated at this site may be a further indication of the practice of this type of purification ceremony.

[^137]

Figure 5.23 Graph showing the type distribution of the Monte Acuto votive figurines between the sixth and the fourth century BCE.

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: architectural aspects and spatial organization

No interventions seem to have been made at Monte Acuto during this phase.

Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: votive material
Fragments of black gloss and sigillata italica, and a miniature vase provide the only archaeological evidence from Monte Acuto during this phase. This apparent decline in use of the sanctuary continues during the imperial period, as attested by a group of coins of the second century CE and the fourth/fifth century CE.

### 5.4. Apennine Umbria

### 5.4.1. Colle Mori sanctuary

## Topographic location

The sanctuary site is on the summit of Colle Mori ( 743 m . above sea level), some 3 km north of the modern town of Gualdo Tadino. The hill lies on the western side of the UmbriaMarche Apennines, a few kilometers from the mountain passes of Fossato di Vico (740 m.) and of Scheggia ( 575 m. .). The surrounding landscape is characterized by mountains on the east (Monte Serra, Monte Fringuello and Monte Penna) and hills on the west. From north to south, stretches a plain bounded by the mountains and the hills.

The presence of iron and copper deposits in the area controlling important transApennine routes encouraged human occupation since the Late Bronze Age (thirteenth century BCE). During this period, a protohistoric settlement seems to have existed on the summit of the hill, where archaeologists recovered traces of circular hearths, and a consistent number of objects dated between the thirteenth and the ninth century, such as cups and ollae of impasto, spindle whorls, loom weights, and bronze ornaments. Additional evidence of Bronze Age occupation of the area has been identified some two kilometers to the southeast of this settlement, where a costly deposit consisting of two golden discs, horse bits, and scalpels has been found.

After a break of four centuries, Colle Mori appears to have been inhabited again starting from the sixth century BCE (figure 5.24). A small nucleated settlement covering a few hectares has been identified on the western slope of the hill. It was situated on artificial terraces positioned along the contour levels and constructed with walls of dry-laid limestone slabs. On the terraces, there were both public and private buildings made of three rooms, sometimes on
more than one floor. ${ }^{404}$ The cemeteries of San Facondino, Malpasso, and Cartiere, ${ }^{405}$ and the sacred area located on the summit of the hill were associated with the settlement. From the top of the hill, the sanctuary overlooked the entire valley and the access roads that straddled the

Apennines.


Figure 5.24. Plan of the Colli Mori Umbrian settlement. On the right: the sacred area (after Bonomi Ponzi 2010, 184 fig. 25).

The settlement, possibly occupied by the Tadinates mentioned in the Iguvine Tables and attested in an inscription of the fourth century BCE, ${ }^{406}$ was defended by a series of small fortified settlements that controlled access routes from the neighboring territories of Perugia and Gubbio,

[^138]in addition to the Apennine routes towards the Adriatic Sea. The ceramic material, which covers cooking and food conservation needs, indicates that the settlement on the Colle Mori was occupied until the third century BCE before being abandoned, perhaps due to a fire. At the end of the third century BCE, following the abandonment of the Umbrian center, a new settlement was founded in the valley, southwest of the modern town of Gualdo Tadino and facing the Via Flaminia.

Our knowledge of the site is owed to the detailed fieldwork of Enrico Stefani and Laura Bonomi Ponzi. In 1921 and 1935, Stefani uncovered the remains of the necropolis of San Facondino and evidence of the sacred area on the summit of the Colle Mori. Between 1992 and 2002, Stefani’s work was resumed by the Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici dell'Umbria under the direction of Bonomi Ponzi. This decade of archaeological investigation brought to light the existence of the Bronze Age and archaic settlement and clarified the phases of the sacred area on the summit of the hill. ${ }^{407}$ Based on the votive material, the latter seems to have survived the abandonment of the settlement on the slopes and to have been frequented until at least the second century BCE.

## Sixth-fourth century BCE: architectural and spatial distribution

The sacred complex during this period consisted of a temple (11.90 x 10.70 m .) with rectangular cella and pronaos, oriented almost precisely according to the cardinal points (figure 5.25). The perimeter walls (A, B, C, D) are built with dry-laid and irregularly shaped limestone

[^139]blocks. Regularly spaced openings on the walls have been interpreted as the post holes that once supported the poles that held the structure of the walls.

Inside the cella, Stefani reports the presence of a pit (E) where a bronze foot and a slab with two clumps, possibly related to a cult statue, were found. A 3 m . deep pit ( F ), interpreted by the Soprintendenza's excavator as a cistern connected to the religious activity practiced on site, was dug inside the space of the pronaos.


Figure 5.25. Plan of the sacellum: letters A, B, C, indicate the walls of the cella; E is the pit; F is the cistern inside the pronaos (modified after Stefani 1935, 156, fig. 2).

Sixth-fourth century BCE: votive material
The votive material is composed of eight specimens of aes rude-noted by Stefani and now lost—six bronze figurines and one terracotta head (figure 5.26). Except for two bronze figurines and the coins, which Stefani reports to have been found in the temple's cella, the offerings were found deposited inside the cistern.


Figure 5.26. Graph showing the type distribution of the Colle Mori votive figurines between the sixth and the fourth century BCE.

The bronze figurines consist of five males of the EG type (figure A3.183-185) and one warrior of the FoG type (figure A.3.186). ${ }^{408}$ Although only the head of the latter is preserved, the original appearance can be reconstructed with the aid of a drawing produced by Stefani (A3.186).

The terracotta head is wheel-made and entirely in the round (figure A3.187). ${ }^{409}$ Due to a large break running across the figure's mouth, the only features preserved are the lower lip, the chin, and the neck. The lips appear to be pursed in a faint "archaic smile", the chin is pointed, and the neck tapers at the center and widens at the bottom. The rendering of the smile and neck is clearly derived from Attic korai, or maiden figures, sculpted in Athens around 530-500 BCE. The closest central Italian parallel is a head (AIV according to Vagnetti's classification) from Veii that is dated around the end of the sixth to the beginning of the fifth century BCE. ${ }^{410}$ It is likely that the terracotta head from Colle Mori was also made in the same timeframe.

[^140]The cistern and the temple are paved in cocciopesto (figure 5.27)


Figure 5.27. Colle Mori cistern clad in bricks (after Bonomi Ponzi 2010, 189, fig. 35).

Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: votive material

The materials from this phase comprise a black gloss miniature vase with Umbrian letters inscribed on the bottom and the outer wall, a black gloss plate, fragments of a black gloss cup, and three figurative votive offerings (figure 5.28). While the black gloss pottery is mentioned by Stefani to have been found alongside the eastern wall of the temple (D), the figurative votive offerings come from the cistern from inside the pronaos. These consist of one bronze figurine of
the Hellenistic female worshipper type (figure A3.188) and two terracotta heads, all dated to the end of the fourth/third century BCE (figure A3.189-190). ${ }^{411}$


Figure 5.28. Graph showing the type distribution of Colle Mori figurative votive offerings between the late fourth and the early first century BCE.

One head (A3.188) is represented in profile (left). The face is oval and slightly titled back. The hair is curly and combed tidily forward. A few locks stick out of a hairband and rise above the center of the crown, and some cover the temple and the ear. The eye is oval and deep and the nose is straight and small. The mouth is straight. The soft lines and features create a slightly androgynous overall effect that does not allow for a gender attribution. A comparison with some Etruscan heads classified by Söderlind into type AI may suggest a dating for this type to the second half of the third century BCE. ${ }^{412}$

The second piece (A3.190) represents the back of a head rejoined from four pieces. The hair is perfunctorily indicated by a series of wavy incisions made by hand. A diadem, which signals a female head, surrounds the top of the head. The state of preservation of this specimen is poor, and the details of the hairdo are too scant to be compared to dated heads from central Italy and to allow for more precise dating.

[^141]
### 5.4.2. Cancelli sanctuary

## Topographic location

The sanctuary site is in the modern cemetery of Cancelli, 13 km east of Foligno (ancient Fulginae), on a mountain that is almost 1000 meters above sea level. It is situated in the heart of Apennine Umbria, along a mountain chain that marks the eastern boundary of the Umbrian valley, on the left of the river Menotre, a tributary of the Topino. The centrality of this site as a crossroads and crossing point is highlighted by the presence of a series of ancient paths that, originating in the Umbrian valley, converge at Cancelli.

The first traces of occupation of the area date back to the sixth century BCE, when a fortified settlement was established in the valley below the mountain ( 910 m . above sea level). At the same time, the cult place was built halfway up the slope in the locality of La Corte, at the height of 934 m . above sea level. A fortification (1010 m. above sea level) with moat and embankment has been identified on the hilltop. It was part of a larger system of fortified settlements that dotted the mountains around Foligno and that have been identified, for example, on the monte Aguzzo (1100 meters above sea level), on the two peaks of Monte Cologna, and in the area of Acqua Santo Stefano. In addition to their defensive function, these fortified settlements offered control over the vast surrounding territory and the approach routes such as the Via Plestina and the road that led to Cancelli.

Although the sacred area on the hill has been known since the last decade of the ninth century, it is only in recent years that the site has been the object of systematic archaeological campaigns. ${ }^{413}$ As part of the project "Archeologia a scuola" in summer 2012 and 2013, the

[^142]Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici dell'Umbria (directed by Maria Laura Manca) and a team of students from a local high school (supervised by archaeologists Maria Romana Picuti and Matelda Albanesi) investigated the central and northern sectors of the modern cemetery of Cancelli and exposed an area of $20 \times 8 \mathrm{~m}$. belonging to the ancient cult place. ${ }^{414}$ According to the results of the excavations, the sacred place was continuously used from the sixth century to the Augustan period, when it seems to have been abandoned, possibly as a result of an earthquake. A few fragments of lamps dated to the fourth/fifth century attests to the occasional frequentation of the area until the Late Antique period.

## Sixth-fourth century BCE: architectural and spatial distribution

No architectural remains belonging to this phase have been unearthed in the area.

Sixth-fourth century BCE phase: votive material
Materials associated with this phase consist of vessels for cooking and eating food-both locally produced (impasto ollae and cups) and imported from Etruscan and Faliscan territory (bucchero bowls and Faliscan overpainted black gloss cups and plates)—a few miniature vessels, such as jugs and bowls in impasto or purified ware, bronze Etruscan vessels, one bronze fibula, one bronze pendant, loom weights, and twelve figurative votive offerings in bronze (figure 5.29). All these materials have been found mixed with later objects in two layers of charcoal-rich soil that have been interpreted as the layers that leveled and sealed the earliest architectural structures (below).

[^143]

Figure 5.29. Graph showing the type distribution of the Cancelli votive figurines between the sixth and the fourth century BCE.

Among the figurative votive offerings, the most frequently represented types are FoG (figure A3.191-192) attested by three warrior figurines and the EG, which includes the figure of one man (3.193), one woman (A3.194), and one warrior (A3.195). The other figurines consist in two bulls of the Animal type (figure A3.196), one warrior of the NoG type (figure A3.197), one bronze sheet depicting a male figure (figure A3.198), one "eyed crest" (figure A3.199), one schematic head (figure A3.210), and one schematic limb representing a left arm (figure A3.201). ${ }^{415}$

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: architectural and spatial distribution

Although the complete layout of the sanctuary is not known, it is during this phase that it was monumentalized. The earliest monumental phase (fourth/third century BCE) is represented by drystone walls aligned northwest/southeast and built directly on the bedrock. A large dolium,

[^144]buried into the ground and filled with lime, has been attributed to this phase. Although there are no comparisons available on such use, according to the excavators lime was stored into the vessel to be used in ritual activities.

These structures underwent a significant change sometimes during the second century BCE when they were rebuilt and rotated on a north-south/east-west axis. Three rooms (one has been excavated only partially) were built following the new orientation (figure 5.30). Two of them, equipped with opus signinum floors, show evidence of later alterations, such as the blocking and substitution of two openings with a drain, which also went out of use and was subsequently replaced by a drain with opus reticulatum inserts. It appears that lime was widely used in the first century BCE to seal dry-stone walls after they had been systematically razed. The original function of these rooms is unknown, although the presence of the water channel suggests water-related rituals.


Figure 5.30. Plan of the excavation. The features in green belong to the first phase of the structure, while the ones in brown to the second century BCE phase (after Manca et al. 2014, 31, fig. 10).

With respect to the architectural decoration of the complex during this phase, the excavation has yielded a terracotta antefix and a small sandstone fragment belonging to the vegetal ornaments of a capital. The former, destroyed during the Second World War, depicts a
female head surrounded by acanthus leaves. At the base of the antefix, there is a socle decorated with an ionic freeze with ovules and smooth listels. This motif, with human heads surrounded by a decorative shell that begins at the base with a pair of acanthus leaves, has its origins in southern Italy in the area of Taranto and is believed to have been elaborated in Etruria around the fourth century BCE. A comparison with similar specimens found at Arezzo, Chiusi, Cortona, Perugia, and other centers of Apennine Umbria suggests a dating for the piece from Cancelli around the late third-second century BCE. ${ }^{416}$

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: votive material

The material from this phase consists of ceramics (one south-Etruscan or northern-Latial overpainted kantharos and small cups with black floral motif), a bronze bowl, one Roman republican coin, one figurine of Hellenistic worshipper, one head, and one foot (figure 5.31).

The coin is a republican as of the first century BCE and shows a Janus on the obverse and three prows on the reverse. Ceramics are mostly represented by imported and locally produced black gloss pottery, a vast proportion of which includes plates, bowls, and cups. Miniature pottery is also abundant and includes amphorae, one of which has the letter $\boldsymbol{a}$ inscribed on the outer wall, and pitchers.

[^145]

Figure 5.31. Graph showing the type distribution of Cancelli figurative votive offerings between the end of the fourth and the first century BCE.

The figurine of the type Hellenistic worshipper is unfortunately lost but preserved in one drawing produced by Michele Faloci Pulignani and published by Picuti (figure A3. 212), which shows the figure of a male wearing a long tunic and a rayed crown; in his right hand he holds a patera.

The terracotta anatomical offerings have been both generically attributed by the excavators to the republican period. ${ }^{417}$ They are in an extremely poor state of preservation, with breaks that hinder a comprehensive understanding of the whole item. ${ }^{418}$

The foot is realized in a summary way without most anatomical details, except for a slight separation between the big toe and the other toes (figure A3.203). The toes are not separated and there is no indication of toenails. It rests on a rounded shoe sole that follows the contours of the foot. The poor state of preservation does not allow the object to be dated more

[^146]precisely than to the republican period. Furthermore, we cannot exclude the possibility that the foot was part of a statue rather than a votive offering of its own.

The head, which preserves traces of red paint on the orbital region and the crown, presents deeply carved eyes with their pupils plastically rendered and protruding eyebrows with sharp lines (figure A3.204). Overall, the hair and features are coarsely rendered. The few surviving typological properties seem to correspond with Söderlind's AIX type and thus can be tentatively attributable to the second century BCE. ${ }^{419}$

### 5.4.3. Campo La Piana sanctuary

## Topographic location

The sanctuary at Campo La Piana, like the sanctuary at Monte Pennino (5.4.4, below), is in the territory of Nocera Umbra (ancient Nuceria) located in the Umbrian Apennines some 20 km north of Foligno. This large area measures about $100 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ and lies on a hill flanked by the valleys of the rivers Topino and Caldagnola. The river valleys and the roads that run on both sides of Monte Pennino guaranteed a functional connection between the Tyrrhenian and the north-central Adriatic coast prior to the construction of the Via Flaminia. They connected the Nucerian territory with, on the one hand, the road system of the Colfiorito plateau, and, on the other, the valley of the Potenza river in the modern Le Marche region. Such territorial organization was complemented since the sixth century BCE by the cult places identified at Campo La Piana and on Monte Pennino.

Traces of occupation in the Nuceria area begin during the Orientalizing period (eight century BCE) and become more frequent in the archaic period (sixth/fifth century BCE). During

[^147]this phase, the dominant settlement pattern was one of fortified villages set on hilltops. These settlements have been identified mainly through aerial photos and surveys (pottery, tiles, millstones' fragments), and they appear to have been surrounded by moats and ramparts of stones and grouped around major topographical elements such as mountains, valleys or plans.

The necropoleis associated with the hilltop villages were laid at the bottom of the hill. Grave goods from the necropolis of Portone (second half of the eight century to the end of the sixth century BCE) and Boschetto-Ginepraia (end of the seventh century to the early fifth century BCE) illustrate the existence of a wealthy aristocracy and lively trade with both the Tyrrhenian and the Adriatic coasts. Among the most remarkable grave goods are ceramic and metallic imported objects, such as Etruscan bronze basins and red-figure vases, fibulae and cups from Picenum, amber beads and glass paste, weapons, and precious ornaments in bronze, silver, and iron (bracelets, fibulae, pendants, decorated discs).

The Campo La Piana sanctuary was located near a transhumance route that, crossing the Subasio mountain, connected Asisium (modern Assisi) with Tadinum (modern Gualdo Tadino), and the Umbrian valley with the valley formed by the Topino river. The sanctuary was discovered and excavated in 1890 by a local resident, Pierleone Ticchioni, in the aftermath of the fortuitous discovery of votive bronzes, coins, and pottery. Edoardo Brizio, at the time "Ispettore dei Musei e degli Scavi presso la Direzione Generale degli Scavi di Antichità", was appointed to write a report of Ticchioni's investigation and examine the objects found on site. ${ }^{420}$ Based on the coins he found, Brizio determined that the sanctuary was in use from the fifth century BCE to the second BCE, and then again in the third century CE.

[^148]It is not possible to verify Brizio's assessment for two reasons. First, the area has not been investigated since 1890, and the documentation has thus not been updated. Second, apart from four figurines and two coins, the material has been irretrievably lost and was never documented.

## Sixth-fourth century BCE: architectural and spatial distribution

The complete layout of the cult place is not known. The excavation carried out by Ticchioni brought to light a wall in opus quadratum (wall A) which run for ca. 50 m . and was preserved for a height of 10 m . This wall intersected at an acute angle a smaller wall in opus incertum (wall C; figure 5.32).


Figure 5.32. Drawing of the walls identified by Ticchioni in loc. Campo La Piana. Letter D indicates the space where votive materials were found (after Brizio 1891, 309).

## Sixth-fourth century BCE phase: votive material

A large quantity of votive material has been recovered in the sanctuary area. No quantitative data are available, and there has been no stratigraphic contextualization of the finds. This material was found in the space between the two walls ( D in the figure above) under a thick layer of ash. It is composed of fragments of aes rude and several figurative votive offerings,
whose number and type remains unknown. Although Brizio records the presence of more than one hundred and fifty items-mostly figures of warriors and devotees but also two bronze
heads-only four specimens survive (figure 5.33). These are four male figurines of the EG type (figure A3.205-206) and one clay head that falls under the broad umbrella of the group "Other" (figure A3.207). ${ }^{421}$

The clay head is dated to the fourth century BCE and was part of a now-missing statuette. It represents an individual with rounded eyes, a large nose, and wide mouth wearing a pointed hat. This peculiar hat provides an important clue that allows the identification of the subject. Scholars have recognized hats as identifying elements in Etruscan priestly costume. ${ }^{422}$ In particular, the pointed hat has been attributed to the haruspices, the diviners specializing in the reading of animal entrails to determine the will of the gods, who were used by the Romans during the period of the roman Republic and the Empire. ${ }^{423}$

Although the available evidence points to the presence of haruspices in Umbria from Etruria or trained there only in the first BCE, ${ }^{424}$ our figurine may represent the dedication of such

[^149]a priest (or his family member) who either was traveling or was asked to intervene at the Campo La Piana sanctuary in the region in the fourth BCE. However, since Umbrian priestly attire is unknown, our figure arguably represented a local priest with uncertain functions.


Figure 5.33. Graph showing the type distribution of the Campo La Piana votive figurines between the sixth and the fourth century BCE.

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: architectural and spatial distribution

No cult building of this period has been unearthed.

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: Votive material

Like the pre-Roman material, objects of this phase have been found under the ash layers inside the walls. None of them have survived to the present, and only scant information can be gathered from Brizio's account. He lists black-gloss pottery, fibulae, glass beads, Greek and

[^150]Roman coins, and figurative votive offerings. These are generically attributed to the Hellenistic and Republican period on the basis of the votive type they represent: one female "Hellenistic worshipper" and two forearms (figure 5.34). ${ }^{425}$


Figure 5.34. Graph showing the type distribution of Campo La Piana figurative votive offerings between the late fourth and the early first century BCE.

### 5.4.4. Monte Pennino sanctuary

## Topographic location

The cult site is located on the peak of Monte Pennino (1590 m. above sea level), on the border between the province of Macerata, in the region Le Marche, and the province of Perugia in Umbria. As mentioned above, this high peak represented an important passage between the eastern and northern areas of the Apennines. Roads ran on both sides of the mountain and connected the Colfiorito basin, the Umbrian valley, and the Val Nerina.

The existence of a sacred area on top of Monte Pennino was hypothesized in the aftermath of World War II, when Pietro Staderini, a resident of Nocera Umbra and an antiquities collector, found several votive offerings and a pit dug into the rock. Based on the numismatic evidence, he suggested that a cult place existed on the mountain from the sixth century to the late republican period.

[^151]Unfortunately, the information provided by Staderini cannot be confirmed. No archaeological investigation of the peak followed his discovery, and no accurate documentation of it exists except an account of the discovery published by Gino Sigismondi. ${ }^{426}$ To add to these problems, most of the votive offerings gathered by Staderini are now either lost or privately owned. As a result, it is impossible to determine where exactly the sanctuary was, what was its layout, and for how long people continued to frequent it. Based solely on the information provided by Sigismondi, it seems that ritual activity on the mountain lasted from the sixth to the second or first century BCE.

## Sixth-fourth century BCE phase: architectural and spatial distribution

In the absence of excavation, it is impossible to know if a cult building existed on the mountain.

## Sixth-fourth century BCE phase: votive material

Part of the votive deposit was contained within a small pit ( 60 cm deep) found and excavated by Staderini. The material found therein consists of a small iron blade, a pot, and remains of animal bones belonging to a rooster, a jackdaw, and a toad, interpreted as the remains of animal sacrifice.

Other material found scattered on the peak included an indefinite number of bronze votive figurines, only sixteen specimens of which survive, either displayed in a local museum or

[^152]privately owned (figure 5.35). ${ }^{427}$ These are eight male figures of the EG type, seven figurines of the BS type (figure A3.208), and one warrior of the NoG type. ${ }^{428}$


Figure 5.35. Graph showing the type distribution of the Monte Pennino votive figurines between the sixth and the fourth century BCE.

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: Votive material

Some finds provide evidence for the use of the area during the Roman period. They include three Roman republican asses and several fragments of painted pottery.

### 5.4.4. Sanctuary of Cupra at Colfiorito

## Topographic location

The sanctuary site lies 200 m . north of the ancient settlement of Plestia, in the large upland plateau of Colfiorito, situated between modern Foligno (Umbria) and Camerino (Le Marche). From the Pleistocene, a large lake had covered the plateau, and, by the Iron Age, the

[^153]lake had reduced to two large basins forming the mashes of Colfiorito to the south and a lake (Lacus Plestinus, now drained) in the plain of Casone to the north.

The plain of Colfiorito which was formed by the mashes and the lake was the only passage linking the eastern and western shores of the peninsula and for this reason had been since the pre-historic times an important central Italic crossing point between the Tyrrhenian and the Adriatic coasts. The movement of peoples traveling east-west over the Apennines was facilitated by the presence of several communication roads which, crossing the plateau, connected Umbria with Etruscan, Sabine, and Picene territories. In addition to its position on significant supra- and interregional communication routes, the plain was in direct visual communication with other Umbrian territorial landmarks, such as Monte Pennino, Monte Acuto and Monte Torre Maggiore, all visible beyond the basin.

The plateau appears to have been inhabited seasonally from at least the Neolithic period, but the first evidence of permanent occupation of the area dates to the end of the ninth or the beginning of the eight century BCE. Initially, three villages of huts were placed on the banks of the former upland lake basin (Lacus Plestinus 700 m . above sea level), at approximately 500 m distance from one another. The cemeteries of these settlements contain only inhumation burials and continued to be used until the third century BCE.

Perhaps in connection with the flooding of the lowland settlements, at the end of the seventh century occupation shifted to higher fortified positions, located ca. $8000-1000 \mathrm{~m}$. above sea level. These hillforts were all surrounded by moats and ramparts of stones; they could be either circular/elliptical or organized in artificial terraces that sloped downward toward the outermost fortification. ${ }^{429}$ Some of the contemporary grave goods from the lowland cemeteries

[^154]consisted in weapons, drinking vessels, bronze discs, and luxury objects from Etruria, Greece, and southern Italy, all elements that point to the presence of wealthier individuals and families. The cult focus for the inhabitants of the Colfiorito plateau was the sanctuary of the goddess Cupra, situated on the shores of the Lake Plestinus near the hillforts and their cemeteries. This location and the fact that the foundation of the sanctuary was simultaneous with the settlements have led Bonomi Ponzi to the conclusion that the sanctuary was the "federal" sanctuary of the territory. ${ }^{430}$

Sometime during the third century BCE, the fortified settlements and associated cemeteries seem to have fallen into disuse, perhaps as a consequence of the reorientation of the trans-Italian trade routes onto a north-south axis centered in Rome. ${ }^{431}$ The population moved back to the area of the Iron Age village and at least by the end of the third century the settlement of Plestia was established just 200 m . south of the Sanctuary of Cupra.

The sanctuary's excavation, directed by Anna E. Feruglio, began in 1962 and continued in 1966 and 1967. Feruglio established that the sacred area was used from the sixth to the first century BCE. Unfortunately, the available information on the sanctuary is not as prolific as the body of publication that surrounds the Colfiorito area and its necropoleis. The results of Feruglio's investigations have only been published in the form of short reports, and no additional documentation is present in the Soprintendenza's archive. ${ }^{432}$ As a result, it is not possible to

Ponzi $(2010,176)$ of the discovery of bronze figurines and walls of a temenos, the results of the excavation of the Monte Orve sacellum remain unpublished and the materials mentioned by Bonomi Ponzi unobtainable. From the survey of the Archive of the Soprintendenza, I was able to find only the report of the 2001 excavation, where it was possible to identify only three sides of the temenos and an east-west wall running for 11 meters N of the temenos. (Monte Orve 2001, Sergio Occhilupo, saggio 2, p. 2).
${ }^{430}$ Bonomi Ponzi 1982, 142; 1985, 213; 2010, 179.
${ }^{431}$ Roncalli and Bonfante 1991, 61.
${ }^{432}$ The results of the excavations have been briefly summarized in Ciotti 1964, 99-112; Feruglio 1966, 306; Manca and Menichelli 2014. For an overview of the Colfiorito territory and its necropoleis from the Iron Age to the Roman period see in particular the results of the survey and excavation carried out by Bonomi Ponzi (1985 and 1997). See
reconstruct with precision the sanctuary's archeological phases nor to have a clear idea of the amount and context of discovery of the votive material.

## Sixth-fourth century BCE: architectural and spatial distribution

During its earliest period of use, the sacred area does not seem to have been marked by any permanent architectural structure.

## Sixth-fourth century BCE phase: votive material

Particularly noteworthy among the votive material of this phase is the presence of four bronze sheets dated to the fourth century and bearing a dedication to the goddess Cupra, the "mother of the Plestini." ${ }^{433}$ I have already mentioned in Chapter 4 the importance of this epitaph for the study of ethnic identity. Here it is worth noting that they represent the only archaeological evidence in the region linking a sanctuary site firmly to the goddess to whom it was dedicated.

Alongside the inscribed bronze sheets, the archaic and classical phase is attested by the presence of a wealth of Etruscan red figures pottery, large dolia, and two hundred and sixty bronze figurines (figure 5.36). Other materials mentioned by Feruglio but difficult to phase in the absence of available records are coins, spindles, and looms. All this material appears to have been found scattered around the sacred area.

[^155]

Figure 5.36. Graph showing the type distribution of the Sanctuary of Cupra votive figurines between the sixth and the fourth century BCE.

The bronze figurines are represented by a wide array of votive types. Those of the EG type, sixty-nine males (figure A3.109-110) and fifty females (figure A3.111-112), make up most of the assemblage. The BS type is also well represented, with seventy-one specimens all depicting males (figure A3.213-214). The NoG type follows with seventeen figurines of females (figure A3.215-216) and thirty of warriors (figure A3.217-218). The remaining types are represented by a few figurines. The AmG type comprises five figurines of a male striding forward (figure A3.219-220), and the Animal type consists of two figurines representing a horse (figure A3.221) and three oxen (figure A3.222). One figure of a warrior belongs to the type FoG (figure A3.223), one to the Fabriano (FaG; figure A3.224), and one to the Fossato di Vito (FoVG; figure A3.225). The FaG type warrior is represented striding forward with the right arm bent upward in the act of throwing a weapon. The body is slender and anatomical details are coarsely rendered; he wears a skirt of pteruges or leather straps, greaves, and a crested helmet with raised cheek-pieces. The FoVG type warrior similarly strides forward. He wears a high, thick belt, a large and flat crest, and is represented with his left arm bent upward in the act of throwing a weapon. The front of the helmet ends in an interrupted curve, and a crisscross pattern
decorates the defensive skirt. A single anatomical offering, a bronze foot, was also present (figure A3.226). ${ }^{434}$

Seven bronze figurines with zoomorphic features belong to the group "Other" (figure
A3.227-230). The characteristic feature of these figurines is the body, schematically rendered as the EG type, with lower limbs ending with spikes. Unlike the EG type, however, the head and the upper limbs do not seem to depict a human figure but rather an animal. Six figurines
(A3.227-229) present bird-like features: small head, with round eyes and a horizontal slit as the

[^156]mouth, broad neck and flat upper limps with incisions that seem to be intended on rendering of feathers. The remaining one (A3.230) has short upper limbs and an almost monkey-like snout with protruding nose and mouth. ${ }^{435}$

In the absence of direct comparanda, it is difficult to hypothesize what these figurines aimed to represent. Perhaps the closest comparison for the type is with seventh-century BCE clay figurines from Cyprus representing standing males with a bull's head. ${ }^{436}$ Following a tradition that originated in the Levant, where anthropomorphic clay masks were popular, ${ }^{437}$ the masks from Cyprus have been interpreted as masks worn by priests or worshippers. It is possible that the zoomorphic features of the figurines from the Sanctuary of Cupra were also intended to depict a mask or a costume.

## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: Architectural aspects and spatial organization

Although the complete layout of the sanctuary is not known, during this phase it consisted of a temenos, wherein a small sacellum was erected. East of the sacellum there was a quadrangular basin, most likely a cistern (figure 5.37).

With regard to the architectural decoration, the sacellum was covered in the third century BCE with Etrusco-Italic architectural slabs depicting floral motifs (palms, garlands, lotus flowers) and antefixes with female and male heads. ${ }^{438}$ Noteworthy among these is a slab

[^157]representing a winged female figure riding a chariot and dated to the first half of the second century BCE. The image has no central Italic comparanda (figure 5.38). ${ }^{439}$


Figure 5.37. Plan of the sanctuary of Cupra (after Bonomi Ponzi 2010, 180 fig. 21).


Figure 5.38. Revetment slab from the Sanctuary of Cupra (after Manca and Menichelli 2014, 27).

[^158]
## Late fourth-early first century BCE phase: votive material

A large quantity of pottery and six figurative offerings belong to this phase (figure 5.39). The ceramic material consists of Etruscan red figure pottery, overpainted Etruscan/Faliscan vases, and black gloss vessels. Five coroplastic objects are dated to the third-second century BCE and include one terracotta left foot and four heads of now-lost Tanagra statuettes. The terracotta foot terminates halfway up the calf in an irregular break. It is realized in a summary way without any attention to most anatomical details, except for the toes which are rendered through horizontal incisions (figure A3.231). ${ }^{440}$ The Tanagra statuettes' heads have the hair gathered in a low bun; on the heads is a wreath of ivy leaves, with a circular element in the center. The faces have a small, fleshy mouth and a prominent nose. They wear large circular earrings (figure A3.232). ${ }^{441}$

One last figurine belongs to the "Other" type. It is dated to the third-second century BCE and represents Heracles (figure A3.233). The demigod is represented in the nude, with the left leg forward and the left arm bent and raised in the act of holding a spear/club. The lionskin is wrapped around his left forearm; on the head he wears a Phrygian cap. ${ }^{442}$


Figure 5.39. Graph showing the type distribution of the Sanctuary of Cupra figurative votive offerings between the late fourth and the early first century BCE.

[^159]
## Discussion

This chapter provides an up-to-date, comprehensive survey of the archaeological evidence of Umbrian sanctuaries between the sixth and the early first century BCE. The archaeological evidence allows us to question two widespread assumptions about the fate of Umbrian sacred places and their connection to the Roman encroachment: 1) Roman presence is related to a decline in the use of rural sanctuaries, specifically those closer to Romanized areas. In contrast, sanctuaries located in internal, Apennine areas, had more chances of survival. 2) the presence of anatomical votives and heads in terracotta is a sure sign of Roman influence and proof of a change in the religious behaviors of the Umbrian peoples. The material evidence of Umbrian sanctuaries shows that these arguments are untenable.

First, it is clear that anatomical parts and heads were widespread during the sixth-fourth century in virtually all Umbrian sanctuaries. They were mostly in bronze, in two cases in terracotta, and could be made in various forms. Their presence in Umbria shows that the practice of dedicating anatomicals before the fourth century was not limited to a few sites of the Adriatic Etruscan region (Marzabotto and Adria) and, therefore, should not be considered as a sporadic phenomenon, as Turfa and Fenelli held. ${ }^{443}$ Most importantly, these votives demonstrate an earlier ritual practice of dedicating parts of the body and heads -one that existed in Umbria before the beginning of the Roman expansion at the end of the fourth century BCE. In approaching the change that followed the conquest, it seems therefore necessary to abandon the old paradigm that sees in the terracotta anatomicals of the Roman period a wholesale change in the religiosity of the Italic peoples connected to the spread of romanitas through the foundation of Roman colonies.

[^160]In sum, the evidence of pre-Roman anatomical votive figurines from Umbrian sanctuaries shows a vital and widespread ritual practice during the sixth-fourth century, rather than an isolated phenomenon limited to a few sites in northern Etruria.

Second, the evidence makes clear that the continuation of rural sanctuaries and the distribution of terracotta votive heads and anatomicals during the late fourth- early first century BCE phase are not related to the political status of communities in relation to Rome. Although the degree of frequentation may have changed, all rural sanctuaries of the region continued to be used at least until the end of the second century or early in the first century BCE. This is true not only for the sanctuaries located in the Apennine areas, but also for the rural sanctuaries near more Romanized territories, such as the sanctuaries of Monte Torre Maggiore, Monte San Pancrazio, Colle Mori. These sacred spaces continue to be used in the Roman period and received a monumental structure. In the next chapter, I explore the level of frequentation of Umbrian sanctuaries during this phase was related to their proximity to urbanized centers, as suggested by Bradley. ${ }^{444}$

Concerning the terracotta anatomicals and heads, their presence in Umbrian sanctuaries during the Hellenistic period is independent of the Roman presence in the region. These objects can be found in areas under the direct control of Roman rule (La Rocca), but also in remote rural sanctuaries within a day's walk from a Roman praefectura (Monte Torre Maggiore, Monte Moro) or near a civitas sine suffragio (Cancelli and Sanctuary of Cupra), as well as in those areas that remained independent until the Social War (Monte S. Pancrazio, Pantanelli). That the presence of anatomical votives has little to do with the Roman conquest is also supported by the absence of anatomical votives in areas geographically closer to colonies, where we might expect

[^161]these artifacts to be more present. As Scopacasa rightly points out, neither heads nor anatomicals have been retrieved at the sanctuary of Monte Subasio, despite its proximity to areas where Roman citizens received plots of land in the third century BCE and to the Roman center of Forum Flaminii. ${ }^{455}$ All of this shows that there is no intrinsic connection between terracotta anatomical votives and the Roman expansion and colonization, confirming Glinister's idea that their spread was a product of different variables. ${ }^{446}$

All this suggests the need to revisit the traditional interpretation of the role of sanctuaries in Umbria during the Roman period and the alleged cultural change indicated by the presence of anatomical votives and heads. Rather than approaching Umbrian sanctuaries from a standpoint that wants to identify one-way influences from Rome into central Italy, it seems more profitable to focus on the contextual analysis of the sanctuaries and their votive objects, and what they can tell us about broader patterns in cultural practice that swept through the region following Roman expansion. What is the significance of the deposition of anatomical votives and figurines before the fourth century BCE watershed? What motives led to the frequentation and monumentalization of certain sanctuaries during the Hellenistic period? If anatomical votives and heads were already used in Umbria before the fourth century BCE, what does their continued presence tell us about the ritual practice of the Umbrian peoples during the centuries of the Roman conquest?

These are some of the questions that are addressed in the next chapter, where the data laid out in this chapter will be interpreted using a macro-scale approach, considering the broader situation of all the sacred spaces of Umbria together. Here, I put forth a hypothesis not only to account for the continuation and monumentalization of Umbrian sacred places during the Roman

[^162]period but also for the apparent longevity of the practice of dedicating heads and anatomical votives.

## Chapter 6

## Conclusions: A acro-scale Approach to the Archaeology of Umbrian Cult Places between the sixth and the early first century BCE

## Introduction

The sanctuaries of ancient Umbria are particularly suited tool to an investigation of the political, economic, and social changes brought about by the Roman expansion. In Chapter 5, careful examination of the material evidence from the sacred spaces of the region, has demonstrated that the assumed link among Roman expansion, the demise of cult places, and the appearance of anatomical votives is untenable. In this chapter, I draw on the dataset explored in Chapter 5 to argue that the continuation of cult activities at Umbrian sanctuaries depended on endemic geographical and social factors. The practice of dedicating anatomical votives largely emerged from a previous local tradition and thus did not represent a wholesale change in the ritual practice of Umbrian peoples. Furthermore, I draw broader conclusions about the socioeconomic and cultural trends visible in Umbrian sanctuaries during the archaic and the Hellenistic period.

I first focus on the function of sacred spaces from the sixth to the fourth century BCE, before the Romans began their expansion in the region. The evidence that offerings were produced in situ and that some figurines were typical of certain areas, as well as the relatively low level of investment in the votive offerings, suggests that sanctuaries functioned in connection with local communities. This data corroborates the argument put forth by Bradley about the existence of a community identity in ancient Umbria rather than a generic Umbrian
ethnic identity, and thus it adds to the debate on ethnicity formation in the region. Then, I discuss the possible meanings of the ritual deposition of archaic figurines in Umbrian sacred places. The presence of archaic anatomical votives in almost all of the analyzed contexts suggests that Glinister's reading of anatomical votives of the Roman period may be extended back to preRoman practice. I propose that the deposition of figurines and anatomical objects constituted a ritual of wellbeing for the individual and the community. The figurines of warriors and of Heracles evoke stability and protection, and they may be connected to the requests presented to the gods. Likewise, the more generic figurines of humans and animals focus attention on the object of the request of well-being, the individual and the community, together with their sources of livelihood. By focusing on the ritual action of offering votives rather than on their possible socio-economical meanings, I detach the objects from their association with the specific social class who dedicated them, which, as discussed in Chapter 3, is not possible to determine.

Next, I examine the development of Umbrian cult places after the Roman expansion, highlighting the level of frequentation, the possible agents behind some sanctuaries' monumentalization, and the significance of new votive materials. It becomes clear that changes that happened in the religious sphere during the late fourth-early first century BCE was less drastic than previously assumed, and that they were largely influenced by previous religious tradition and contemporary social and political situations.

Although there is evidence of continued frequentation in all sanctuaries during the late fourth-early first century BCE, the votive material suggests that some sanctuaries, especially those in elevated locations and/or near urban centers, saw a decline in use. This phenomenon can be related to broader social trends discernable in the region, such as the abandonment of high peak settlements and the beginnings of temple building activity in some Umbrian centers. The
relocation of communities closer to roads and commercial centers may have led to the reduced frequentation of the Monte Acuto sanctuary, and, as suggested by Bradley, the presence of new cult buildings at Iguvium and Asisium may have caused a shift to fewer cult activities at the Monte Subasio and the Monte Ansciano sanctuaries

When we turn to the design of sanctuaries, it is clear that the level of investment in cult places escalates at the end of the fourth and in the third century BCE. The enlargement and restoration of religious complexes points to the increasing interest of individuals/groups in promoting building activities and may be related to the development of a new political scene that arose in the wake of Rome's control of the peninsula (and at a broader scale of the entire central Mediterranean). As recent work carried out by scholars such as Terrenato and Colivicchi has rightly underscored, public munificence becomes an important part of central Italian aristocrats’ political agenda, which could intertwine with the expansionistic plans of elite factions from Rome. I thus argue that the interaction and negotiation between dominant elites in both Umbria and Rome aimed at strengthening their own private status and may have been the driving force behind the monumentalization of Umbrian sanctuaries.

Similar dynamics, in which local traits mingle with and are shaped by the contemporary socio-political environment, are visible in the Umbrian votive deposits. Instead of being considered as evidence of a ritual change motivated by the use of foreign models, the adoption of terracotta for molding into anatomical shapes should be seen as a technical improvement on a long lived ritual practice and part of a fashion which, alongside the use of Hellenistic figurines of worshippers and miniature vessels, was widespread throughout the Italic peninsula as well as in Greece.

By tracing the development of Umbrian sanctuaries from the archaic (sixth-fourth century BCE) to the Hellenistic period (late fourth-early first century BCE), I elucidate the complex ways indigenous populations responded and adapted to the new socio-political realities that accompanied Roman hegemony and more intense cultural borrowing from other regions of the peninsula and the Greek world. The interplay between new architectural models, materials and artefacts and local religious traditions fittingly follows the substance of White's Middle Ground theory, where different cultural backgrounds create new cultural structures. ${ }^{447}$ The influences recognizable in the material evidence from Umbrian sanctuaries are connected, however, not only to the interaction between locals and Romans, but also to broader context of the Italic peninsula and the Mediterranean.

## Umbrian pre-Roman sanctuaries in context

## Topographical aspects

As the topographical information presented in Chapter 5 shows, Umbrian sanctuaries were located in a variety of positions, mostly in accordance with prominent landscape features and near fortified or inhabited areas. The most common setting is the mountain peak. The sanctuaries of Monte Torre Maggiore, Monte Ansciano, Monte Ingino, Monte San Pancrazio, Monte Pennino, Monte Moro di Montefranco, Monte Subasio and Cancelli are located on summits whose height varies from 1000 to ca. 1600 meters. Some sanctuaries were associated with other types of natural phenomena, such as caves (Grotta Bella sanctuary), lakes or other

[^163]bodies of water (sanctuary of Cupra at Colfiorito, Monte Moro, Monte Subasio), ${ }^{448}$ or hills (Colle Mori sanctuary). Some were located in or near settlement sites (Colle Mori, Pantanelli, Monte Torre Maggiore, Monte San Pancrazio, Monte Moro, Monte Subasio, Monte Ansciano and La Rocca sanctuaries) and in the vicinity of one or more hillforts (Monte Torre Maggiore, Cupra, Cancelli). ${ }^{449}$

Beside this proximity to natural landmarks, settlements, and hillforts, a distinctive feature of some Umbrian cult places, such as Colle Mori, Monte Ansciano, Monte Acuto, Grotta Bella, and La Rocca sanctuaries, is their location in areas of long-abandoned Bronze Age sites (twelfth to tenth century BCE), whose frequentation is attested by the presence of vessels, ornaments, spools, and loom weights.

The link between Umbrian archaic sanctuaries and earlier sites has been noted by Bradley and Stoddart who reasonably connected it to similar situations in Greece and Latium, where it was not unusual to legitimize the sacralization of a place by appealing to its antiquity. ${ }^{450}$ At Palaikastro, on Crete, for example, the memory of an earlier association of the place with a cult for a Bronze Age deity is believed to have prompted the building of a temple in later times. ${ }^{451}$ Similarly, at Lavinium a mound covering a tomb of the seventh century BCE was re-used as the "heroon of Aeneas" at the end of the fourth century BCE, and at Setia an archaic sanctuary was placed in the location of an earlier Bronze Age cult place. ${ }^{452}$

[^164]Although the available evidence does not enable us to determine the specific functions of the earlier Umbrian Bronze Age sites (religious/domestic etc.), comparisons with elsewhere in Italy and Greece enables us to infer with a certain degree of confidence that the memory of earlier site occupation played an important role in the establishment of archaic cult places in the region in the sixth / fifth century BCE, and perhaps even served to legitimize their sacralization.

## Architectural aspects

Any attempt to generalize about the original appearance of pre-Roman Umbrian sanctuaries is necessarily complicated by the fact that many of them have been excavated only partially, nor have they been thoroughly recorded. ${ }^{453}$ Based on the nine Umbrian sanctuaries that have been both fully excavated and documented (Monte Acuto, Monte Ansciano, La Rocca, Monte Torre Maggiore, Colle Mori, Monte Moro, Grotta Bella, Cancelli, and Colfiorito) it seems that there was no unifying principle of spacial organization and that the layout of pre-Roman sanctuaries responded to the ritual and practical needs of each individual community. Similar to the majority of archaic sanctuaries in the peninsula, Umbrian sacred places were mostly open-air, sometimes marked by the presence of a pit dug into the bedrock and only rarely equipped with a building of any kind. ${ }^{454}$

Monte Acuto, Colle Mori, and Monte Ansciano are the only sanctuaries where some sort of architectural structure indicated the existence of a sacred area. At Monte Acuto and Colle Mori, a drystone wall demarcates the sacred area; at Monte Ansciano this boundary consisted in

[^165]a platform constructed of dumps of limestone. ${ }^{455}$ The layout of the rest of Umbrian sacred sites shows little, if any, anthropic intervention. ${ }^{456}$ While the examples of Colfiorito and Cancelli suggest that the sanctuary had no hand-made feature during the archaic period, the sanctuaries of Monte Acuto, Monte Torre Maggiore, Monte Moro, and Colle Mori, have in common the presence of a pit dug directly into the rock for either religious or infrastructural and practical uses. ${ }^{457}$ The circular pit at Monte Acuto seems to have had a sacrificial function, the one at Monte Torre Maggiore has been interpreted as the foundation ditch of the sacred space, and that at Colle Mori was used as a well for cult related functions. Finally, the pit at Monte Moro functioned as a cistern to collect rainwater or as a silos to store foodstuff.

If it is possible to draw any tentative conclusion from the known examples of religious places in Umbria, it is that, unlike the neighboring regions of Etruria and Latium that developed in the sixth century "a separate architectural language for cult buildings" (eg. podia and altars), ${ }^{458}$ Umbrians felt no need to separate cult areas visually from their surroundings. Rather than the presence of a manmade structure, what appears to have distinguished Umbrian sanctuaries and defined them as places for ritual activity was primarily their topographical locations, the significance of which resided in their historical relevance or their connection to natural features or inhabited centers, and, sometimes, the presence of a pit, whose function may have varied according to the ritual needs. As the second part of the chapter shows, cult places were provided with a functional spatial organization and permanent architecture starting with the end of the

[^166]fourth century BCE, mostly as a result of elite munificence within the new political network brought about by Roman expansion.

## Function of pre-Roman sanctuaries

As the evidence presented above show, most Umbrian sanctuaries were topographically associated with particular settlements. Even those that appear to have been located away from inhabited settlements, such as the Grotta Bella, Campo La Piana, and Monte Pennino sanctuaries, are sited in areas where hilltop fortified villages have been detected.

Scholars have long attempted to explain the relationship between these settlements and sacred spaces. Owing to the popularity of the pagus-vicus model, ${ }^{459}$ they have generally assumed that, in the absence of "real" urban units, such as those in Latium or Etruria, Umbrian sanctuaries functioned as civic, political, and economic centers. However, when we look at the material evidence, this interpretation can be hardly proved.

As I have discussed, Bradley rightly points out that the pagus-vicus model is inherently flawed for it revolves around an ideal dichotomy between urban and non-urban, and it does not take into consideration that Umbrian centers may have functioned as self-sufficient even in the absence of cities like in Latium and Etruria. Furthermore, it is virtually impossible to establish with certainty what type of political and administrative connections existed between cult places and inhabited centers. The main complication is that, with the exception of Colle Mori and Colfiorito, the settlements (whether hilltop or not) and their internal organization are not well known. Moreover, in cases such as Monte Moro and Grotta Bella, the presence itself of a settlement in based on pure conjectures and surmises rather than archaeological evidence.

[^167]Without concrete archaeological data to support the pagus-vicus model, the role of sanctuaries as political and economic center can only remain speculative.

Upon viewing the published material, Bradley put forth an alternative interpretation of the function of Umbrian sanctuaries that does not frame them within the conventional pagusvicus purview but consider them as poles of aggregation for local communities. Specifically, he notes that the number of sanctuaries within Umbrian territory and the presence of local votive offerings "strongly suggest that sanctuaries were closely related to particular communities". ${ }^{460}$ Indeed, as the presence of metal slugs at the sanctuaries of Monte Torre Maggiore and Grotta Bella shows, ${ }^{461}$ it was possible for metal workshops to produce and sell votive offerings directly in situ. The existence on the sanctuary sites of casting workshops manufacturing votive figurines together with the topographical proximity between sanctuaries and inhabited centers undoubtedly anchors the activities at the sanctuary to the life of the local community.

In support of the close link between sanctuary and local community, Bradley adduces the low level of investment in votive offerings, which shows that the full gamut of society was active in these sanctuaries. The examination of all votive figurines from Umbrian sanctuaries backs up the author's observation.

The graphs below (figures 6.1 and 2) draw from the graphs presented in the previous chapter and compares the types of votive offerings from each Umbrian cult place. The first graph shows the numeric presence of votive offerings for each sanctuary, the second one the percentage of each votive type with respect to the total of the figurines dedicated at a given sanctuary. It is apparent that the most commonly dedicated figurines in Umbrian sanctuaries belong to the less elaborate types, characterized by the coarse rendering of anatomical details and

[^168]scant attention to the plastic cogency of the object. Among these types, the Esquiline Group (colored light blue in the graphs) is the most prevalent, followed by the simple figurines made from bronze sheets (red), the schematic eyed Crests (orange), and the Foligno and Amelia Groups (purple and dark green respectively).

Of similar, small economic value are the votive offerings of the type "Other" (salmon color in the graphs) which are distinguished by an overall simplified outline and an extremely small size. These characteristics apply not only to bronze specimens, but also to those made from lead and found at Grotta Bella and Pantanelli sanctuaries. As pointed out by Monacchi with respect to Grotta Bella, the mass production and small size of lead figurines provided a particularly inexpensive and easy way to shape the character of the rituals, just as the figurines of the Esquiline Group and the Nocera Umbra Group. ${ }^{462}$ Only in the case of the Mars with attached situla from Assisi (CSRufino_1; figure A3.147) we can imagine that the dedication of the object could have been the result of a more substantial economic expenditure.

As the percentage graph shows (figure 6.2), larger and more refined figurines, such as those belonging to the Fabriano, Fossato di Vico, and Todi types (or the so called "Mars of Todi" not in the graph) are virtually nonexistent in Umbrian sanctuaries and not more than two specimens for each type has been recovered in the region (two figurines, one belonging to the type Fabriano and the other to the Fossato di Vico have been found at the Sanctuary of Cupra; one figurine of the type Todi comes from Monte San Pancrazio and one from Monte Santo). Unlike contemporary necropoleis, sanctuaries do not seem to have been regarded as a place suitable for expensive dedications aimed at the self-glorification and display of social status of the donor. Conversely, the small scale of investment in the figurines suggests that the ritual

[^169]practice of dedicating these objects was within the reach of different strata of the community and that people acted in the sacred sphere in a more collective way regardless of the place they occupied in the society. The low expenditure in these objects and the possibility for virtually the entire community to partake in the practice of dedicating votive figurines emphasizes the bond between inhabited centers and sacred spaces. It is possible, as Bradley notes, that the use of local sanctuaries may have strengthened a sense of belonging to specific communities and may have played a role in the formation of community identity.

Additional evidence of the use of sanctuaries by individual community resides in the presence of figurines that I labeled under the type "Other". Figurines of this type are exclusive to specific cult places and do not present comparisons anywhere in central Italy. The uniqueness of the zoomorphic figurines from the sanctuary of Cupra at Colfiorito, the warrior figures from Monte Santo (Tuder), and the lead figurines from Pantanelli and Grotta Bella (near Ameria) may represent a conscious effort to develop a distinctive aesthetic through which the worshipping community would have singled itself out. It is interesting to note that the areas where these figurines have been found also yielded some of the first evidence from Umbria of the names of individual groups: the fourth century inscription from Colfiorito recording the ethnic name pletinas and the third century BCE bronze and lead coins from Tuder and Ameria with the local ethnics tutere, and amer/ ameri. ${ }^{463}$ It is therefore tempting to associate the use of local figurines with the emergence of distinctive regional groups during the Republican period.

Overall the evidence from the votive figurines dedicated at Umbrian sanctuaries supports Bradley's argument that these spaces were linked to the individual communities that occupied the area near them. Without disregarding the possibility that worshippers from other parts of the

[^170]region could dedicate objects, as the presence of the animal pendant -characteristic of the Picene area - from Monte Subasio shows (CSRufino_3; figure A3.149), it appears that local groups were the main users of sacred spaces. Their participation in the ritual activities of dedicating votive offerings may have strengthened the sense of belonging to a particular community and eventually the formation of the regional identities attested in the middle republican period. ${ }^{464}$

[^171]


Figure 6.2. Graph showing the percentage of votive figurines dedicated in each Umbrian sanctuary.

## Towards an understanding of the ritual function of Umbrian votive offerings

When we look to the subjects that they represent, the archaic figurative votive figurines from Umbrian sanctuaries can divided into four groups (figure 6.3). ${ }^{465}$ The first and most widespread group comprises figures of males and females, perhaps, as suggested by Colonna, representing worshippers. The second group, present in thirteen out of fifteen sanctuaries, includes figurines of warriors, often represented in a position of attack, bearing a shield and a spear. The third group is attested in ten sanctuaries and comprises body parts and heads. Lastly, the fourth group is attested only by one specimen of the god Heracles.


Figure 6.3. Graph showing the groups of votive figurines dedicated in each Umbrian sanctuary.

[^172]As pointed out in Chapter 3, these objects have been interpreted with a view to the socioeconomic life in archaic Umbrian communities. Scholars have looked at the refinement and iconology of the figurines and tried to tie them to worshippers of a specific social class that may have dedicated them. I have already discussed the limitations of this approach and stressed the fact that, although the size, manufacture, and refinement of the figurines may indicate the level of investment put into the dedication, we do not have any substantial indication of the wealth of the people who bought and donated them. In this section, I direct the attention away from the socio-economic connotations of these figurines and toward the ritual meaning of their dedication. In order to do so, I apply to those archaic offerings Glinister's interpretation of anatomical terracottas during the Roman period.

In Chapter 2 in the context of the Italic peninsula and in Chapter 5 with respect to Umbria, I have illustrated that the traditional view linking the spread of anatomical terracottas across the Italian peninsula to Roman dominion is untenable. ${ }^{466}$ To counter the traditional assumption that votive terracottas are evidence of an "obsession with health and fertility" that developed as a consequence of Roman conquest, Glinister points out that anatomical terracottas were dedicated to a wide range of deities and that only a few of them had a definite "health" specialization. ${ }^{467}$ Second, she emphasizes that the presence of anatomical votives in pre-Roman sanctuaries illustrates that this type of votive preceded the spread of Asclepius' healing cult that has sometimes been associated with the diffusion of anatomical terracottas. Furthermore, shrines of Asclepius are barely attested in the peninsula in the fourth and third century BCE. Although

[^173]some anatomical votives from Latium and Etruria do seem to indicate specific concerns for health and body pathology, most anatomical votives do not exhibit a clear-cut connection with healing. Indeed, the presence of body part dedications representing open torsos or inner organs is limited to Latin and Etruscan areas (we can think of the polyvisceral plaques from Veii, Fregellae, Pozzarello, and the Manganello sanctuary at Cerveteri, or the internal organs from Tarquinia, Veii, Gravisca, Ponte di Nona, and Lavinium). ${ }^{468}$ In light of these considerations, Glinister's suggestion - that anatomical terracottas from the Roman period are most likely associated with a ritual of well-being, rather than with health in a medical way - is even more attractive. This broader connotation of the ritual connected to the deposition of these offerings implies wishes for a healthy, serene, and prosperous (physically, as well as morally) life and not necessarily a concern for healing.

It is difficult to imagine that well-being rituals were performed in the Italian peninsula only after the Romans arrived in a given area. It is unlikely, in my view, that locals did not express their desire for happiness and comfort through ritual practices prior to their first intense cultural interaction with Rome in the fourth century BCE. Furthermore, the presence of bronzes representing body parts in six out of fifteen archaic Umbrian sanctuaries (see figure 6.1) strongly suggests that Glinister's interpretation should not be restricted to the Roman period. It seems possible to hypothesize that figurines from the sacred shrines of the region were connected to the same ritual of well-being as the one identified by Glinister in the anatomical terracottas of the Roman period.

[^174]If the function of the votives from Umbria was to request general well-being, a question arises as to whether this ritual function was assigned to the objects a priori, before their production, or not. As recent post-humanist studies have shown, human-made objects can shape religious tradition. This means that the ritual function of votives can be achieved by the objects themselves because they lend themselves to such function. To use a line of thought originated by Alfred Gell, ${ }^{469}$ it is not a given that objects were created purposefully with their function in the mind of the maker, but rather they may assume a function once they became enmeshed in social relationships.

Indeed, the abovementioned groups of votive represent the basic recognizable figures through which worshippers could identify themselves and their environment: the warrior, identifiable also with Mars, who, as Sigismondi argues, ${ }^{470}$ for Italic populations had the twopronged function of is able to protect people, animals, and crops from nature's plagues; female and male figures; animals that constituted the base of Umbrian economy; and, finally, heads and parts of the body, which, through synecdoche, may stand for the whole male or female figure. The dedication of these categories of votives may be related to the complex concept of personhood applied to archaeology by Chris Fowler and recently used by Emma Graham. ${ }^{471}$ In

[^175]summary, heads and parts of bodies are a "visual abbreviation of the whole being of a suppliant", and animal votive figurines are representative of the divisible part of a dividual human being (defined as the part of the selves that can be detached and entrusted to the care of the gods) for they represent the things which people "grow, cultivate, and, most vitally, exchange". ${ }^{472}$ As Graham argues with respect to anatomical and animal votives, these votives offerings represent bodies, their extension, and the base of their subsistence. They can be considered a prime means of dedication to an intangible divine power.

In his investigation of the effect that objects have on people, Gosden demonstrates that an artifact's form displayed en masse can suggest thought and mental representation. ${ }^{473}$ This means that artifacts influence the way people use them and that their use may have nothing to do with the human intention that created them. It is, therefore, possible that these figurines, made because they represented a familiar and recognizable association with the everyday life of worshippers, used together and displayed in the specific context of the sanctuary, influenced the meaning of the ritual they came to represent. As Glinister noted, ${ }^{474}$ Italic and Roman religions were concerned with the gods' close interaction with humans and control of human fates, individual and collective. The images of worshippers and animals displayed in the sacred areas of the region contributed to creating a ritual whose teleological aim was the overall prosperity of the community and the worshippers. We can read the same association in the warrior group, and, although limited to one case, in the figure of Heracles, as both soldiers and the deity evoke maintenance of stability and more general protection.

[^176]It is interesting to note that bronze figurines are not the only evidence of this concern in Umbria. The Iguvine Tables also highlight the well-being of the Iguvine community. For example, Tablet I.1.5 reads: "Commence this ceremony by observing the birds, those from in front and those from behind. Before the Trebulan Gate sacrifice three oxen to Jupiter Grabovius. Present grain-offerings, place the ribs on a tray, sacrifice either with wine or with mead, for the Fisian Mount, for the state of Iguvium". ${ }^{475}$ These tablets mention a ritual that, according to Bradley, ${ }^{476}$ remains invisible in the archaeological record of Umbrian sacred spaces. However, when we turn our attention to Umbrian sanctuaries, the votives of humans, animals, parts of the body, warriors, and animals represent additional evidence of the presence of rituals of wellbeing, whose importance over time is emphasized by the presence of the Tablets during the Roman period in the Umbrian town of Iguvium.

When considered from this point of view, the anatomical votives that are part of the votive assemblages of Umbrian sanctuaries during the Roman period do not represent a novelty. As we have observed, not only were anatomical bronze votives already in use in Umbria during the archaic period, but, together with male, female, warrior, and animal figurines they were used for the same ritual of well-being. I will return to this point about the presence of anatomical votives after the fourth century BCE in the next section.

## Display of votive offerings

[^177]Unfortunately, given the lack of information on the original depositional position of these objects - votives have been found in secondary deposition, either spread out across the area, the cella, or inside pits/cisterns -it is not possible to know with certainty where they were displayed within any given sanctuary. Nevertheless, some hypothesis can be put forward to explain how and for how long such objects were displayed. As it became clear from the survey of the material presented in the previous chapter, almost all figurine types present sharp points on the lower surface. It seems reasonable to agree with Bradley, who argues that this characteristic feature may indicate the possibility that "they were designed for display, probably for being fixed onto a wooden surface" ${ }^{477}$ This hypothesis seems even more convincing when we consider the several nails that have been retrieved at sites such as the Monte Ansciano and the Colle Mori sanctuaries. Such items may have been either used to affix together multiple wooden planks and/or to mount them on the walls/platform of the temple, or, in the absence of a built structure, to fix them somewhere within the sacred perimeter of the area. In this respect, the 169 nails found on Monte Ansciano may have been used to fix a wooden plank somewhere within the sacred area. ${ }^{478}$

The presence of a hole on the surface of bronze sheet figurine from Monte San Pancrazio (MSP_12; figure A3.57) suggests that an alternative method of display may have been possible. ${ }^{479}$ Perhaps pierced figurines of this type were suspended on trees, in a way similar to

[^178]the display of ox and cow masks on Cyprus. ${ }^{480}$ This solution may have been particularly suitable for the thin offerings cut from bronze sheets or for those made of lead, whose state of preservation does not allow any conclusion regarding their display. Indeed, the extreme thinness of the lead figurines makes it unlikely that they could have been fixed into the wood without being irreparably damaged.

Once fixed on the wooden planks or hung in the sanctuaries, votive figurines were likely visible until there were too many to be exhibited. In Umbria, four sanctuaries provide evidence of where the votives were placed after their removal from display. Keeping up with a practice seen in the Greek world and elsewhere in the Italic peninsula, ${ }^{481}$ in some cases (Pantanelli, Monte Acuto), it seems that they were placed in pits, and in some others (Monte Torre Maggiore, Monte Moro) in wells and cisterns after these structures fell out of use. In the case of Monte Torre Maggiore, it is possible to know how long the archaic votive figurines were displayed before being discarded. Some of these objects, mixed with pottery, an aes rude, and an imperial balsamarium were found in a layer that filled the well located in the northwest corner of the sanctuary area. Although we do not know the construction phase of the well, an imperial coin of Commodus found therein provides us with a terminus post quem of its obliteration. This datum suggests that the well fell out of use at the end of the second CE, after which it was used as a refuse pit for some of the many objects that accumulated in the sanctuary over the centuries. Thus we can surmise that, at least in the case of Monte Torre Maggiore, the figurines continued

[^179]to be displayed for many centuries after their first deposition, and that they were displayed alongside the other votives that began to be dedicated in the centuries following the fourth BCE.

## Umbrian sanctuaries between the late fourth and the early first century BCE

## Votive offerings in the Hellenistic period

As we saw in Chapter 5, during the archaic period the votive assemblages in Umbria consisted mainly of figurative offerings, namely bronze figurines, and occasional pieces of aes rude. In keeping with a pattern visible in other regions of central Italy, during the Hellenistic period votive assemblages throughout the region became more diversified and now contained chiefly terracotta parts of the body, heads, bronze figurines of the Hellenistic worshipper type, miniature vases, and unguentaria. Before delving into the types of figurative votive offerings that became common in the sanctuaries of the region during this period, it is worth noting that, when compared with the pre-Roman period, it becomes apparent that the number of figurative offerings drops significantly during the Hellenistic period and that the production of locally produced bronze figurines, which were predominant prior to this phase, came to a halt.

Three reasons could be responsible for this change. First, the decline in the dedication of figurative votives can be partially explained by the Umbrians' adoption of a wider array of votive objects that was typical of much of central Italy. As Bradley notes, ${ }^{482}$ the connectivity brought about by the Roman expansion, in particular by means of opening of new trade and communications routes across the peninsula, facilitated the acquisition and dedication of objects of more imported material: not only molded terracottas but also miniature vases, balsamaria, and

[^180]black gloss and terra sigillata wares. As new routes opened, others declined, such as those across the Apennines from Volsinii, sacked by Rome in 264 BCE. Since most supply sites for the raw material used to produce Umbrian bronze figurines were in the Etruscan colline metallifere, ${ }^{483}$ it is possible that the decline of this trade route affected local production of bronze offerings.

Bradley suggests that another possible explanation for the decline in quantity of votive offerings may reside in "the greater focus of life on city sites", apparent as early as the end of the fourth century BCE. ${ }^{484}$ As I examine below, this phenomenon coincided with the new political situation that opened up for local elites, who, through actions of public munificence, could aim at public recognition, profitable connections with Roman aristocrats, and a role in the Roman imperial machinery. In this context, it seems reasonable to imagine that the resources of individuals across the regions were increasingly directed towards public architecture in city centers and the monumentalization of buildings and less directed towards the investing in in votives to be displayed in rural sanctuaries.

Lastly, it is worth noting that, as the number of votive offerings seems to decrease during this period a large quantity of pottery appears in Umbrian sanctuaries. In the few instances in which the excavation reports allow us to gauge pottery forms (Monte Moro and La Rocca), it appears that the most represented shapes are paterae, ollae, plates, cups and bowls. While a patera is an offering dish related to sacrifices, the other pottery forms identify drinking and eating vessels that may not have been made exclusively for votive purposes. In general, these shapes are the same as those found in burials and settlements and related to commensality:

[^181]cooking, drinking, and feasting. ${ }^{485}$ The increased prevalence of pottery shapes related to feasting and banquets could be owed to a more clear diversification of the activities that took place in the sacred sphere not only in terms of dedications to the gods, but also banquets, either ritual or not.

## Anatomical votives revisited

With respect to the dedication of figurative votive objects, anatomical votives and heads, present at eight out of the twelve Umbrian sanctuaries that continued to be used during the late fourth-early first century BCE, are the most ubiquitous (figure 6.4). Also widespread is the Hellenistic worshipper votive type, while the types Animal, Tanagrine, and Other are attested only at one sanctuary each.


Figure 6.4. Graph showing the groups of figurative votive objects dedicated in each Umbrian sanctuary.

[^182]Although the Hellenistic worshipper votive type has been rightly seen as part of the more homogenized central Italian cultural koine, the presence of heads and anatomical votives has been regarded as prime evidence of the cultural Romanization of the Umbrian community and a wholesale change in the religiosity of the local peoples. In line with some recent critique of this assumption, ${ }^{486}$ I have already shown in the previous chapter that the link between their presence and the progression of Roman conquest in Umbria is untenable.

To recap some of these counterarguments, the presence of anatomical heads and body parts in Umbrian sanctuaries is independent of the political status of communities in relation to Rome. As the graph above shows (fig. 6.4.), they can be found both in areas under direct Roman control, such as La Rocca, and in independent or rural areas (Monte S. Pancrazio, Pantanelli, Grotta Bella, Monte Torre Maggiore, Monte Moro), as well as near a civitas sine suffragio (Cancelli and Sanctuary of Cupra at Colfiorito). In addition to this, the practice of dedicating anatomical and heads does not suddenly sweep through the region starting with the late fourth or the beginning of the third century, but rather it was a widespread and established tradition in the region as early as the sixth century BCE, when worshippers would dedicate these object mostly in bronze, and in two cases (Monte Ansciano and Colle Mori) in terracotta. ${ }^{487}$ When considered from this point of view, the anatomical votives that are part of the votive assemblages at Umbrian sanctuaries during the Hellenistic period do not represent a novelty, as Comella and Turfa have argued. ${ }^{488}$ As we have observed, not only were anatomical bronze votives already in virtually all sanctuaries of the archaic period, but, together with male, female, warrior, and

[^183]animal figurines they were used for the same ritual of well-being that Glinister associates with the anatomical votives of the Hellenistic period.

Once we abandon the idea that the presence of anatomicals and heads is connected to Roman influence and once we consider the development of the material evidence from Umbrian sanctuaries across time, there is no reason to believe that anatomical votives and heads of the Hellenistic period are connected to a new ritual practice. Conversely, the evidence suggests that the same ritual practice of dedicating anatomical votives and heads was connected to a ritual of well-being, which begun in the archaic period, continued in the Hellenistic period. The only change was in the medium.

The possibility that the same ritual was performed over time in two different media (bronze and lead figurines, during the pre-Roman period, and anatomical terracottas during the Roman period) falls in line with current ideas on the archaeology of ritual. Archaeologists working on ritual practices have demonstrated that the same ritual is not always necessarily manifested through similar material and that rituals can remain the same throughout time, even if the physical expressions change. ${ }^{489}$ Many of the contributions in the recent book edited by Stek and Burgers ${ }^{490}$ successfully show that it was not uncommon in cult places of the Italic peninsula to add new votives to rituals that were already in existence.

The question remains as to why a ritual should persist, but its votive form should evolve. According to the anthropologist Anthony Cohen, it is in phases of significant social and spatial change that groups tend to emphasise and enhance old community borders, often in a ritual

[^184]context, by reinterpreting the past. ${ }^{491}$ The ability of ritual to articulate group identity and promote group cohesion, trust, and cooperation has been discussed in archaeology through various perspectives. Colin Renfrew emphasises that the experience of ritual activity creates links between people and thus that ritual participation defines the membership of certain groups. ${ }^{492}$ While this process is likely to have impacted more heavily the colonies, where, as recent scholarship has emphasized, local and Roman people of varying statuses were included as founding members, ${ }^{493}$ the "the winds of change" brought about by new settlers in the region must have been incisive also for those Umbrian communities that remained independent. It seems therefore possible that the persistence of the well-being ritual in the Hellenistic period may have helped the local people to define the identity of their communities in the period that followed the Roman conquest and the formation of new cultural and political settlements, and thus to unite their members.

Although, as already mentioned, anatomical bronzes are present in Umbrian pre-Roman cult places, it is undeniable that they replaced bronze figurines during the Hellenistic period. The question remains as to why locals selected the terracotta votives as a new means of offering within the well-being ritual that they were accustomed to practice. We can identify three nonmutually exclusive reasons to account for the presence of anatomical heads and body parts in terracotta instead of bronze limbs, heads, animal and human figurines. The first is the

[^185]effectiveness of the message: as they represented an extension of the corporeal body, in all likelihood, the offering of parts of the body instead of full bodies may have seemed more immediate and effective for a ritual whose teleological aim was the contentedness and wellness of the individual or group. The second reason is efficiency: anatomical terracottas were usually moldmade and produced within a serial mass-production technique. In general, they were made of coarse fabrics, without extensive reworking or retouching, and were easily portable. ${ }^{494}$ When compared to bronze figurines, the fact that anatomical votives and heads were stock productions and relatively easy to produce made them more convenient not only for craftsmen but also for worshippers of different socio-economic statuses, given their overall low cost. ${ }^{495}$ To draw from Freeman's reaction to Millett's book, the adoption of Roman goods had indeed often a lot to do with the "arrival of new, technologically better and cheaper goods" and "does not prove a desire to be seen as Roman". ${ }^{496}$ Lastly, the sheer number of anatomical votives that were spread throughout Central Italy and Greece during the Middle Republican period may suggest that this class of material was looked upon as desirable and in line with the latest demands and preferences for votive objects. It is important to stress that by viewing these objects as fashionable there is no implication of their alleged Rommannes even more so since Rome was not even the findspot of the earliest anatomical terracottas. ${ }^{497}$

A question remains as to why a worshipper dedicated one particular part of the body instead of another one. Glinister proposes that some objects express a request more specific than

[^186]generalised well-being. For example, a dedication of terracotta genitalia could be seen as a petition for fertility or to mark a rite of passage into puberty, while other parts of the body, such as feet, may represent a journey or pilgrimage, hands a prayer, and so on. ${ }^{498}$ Although it is difficult to ascertain the exact meaning of these separate body parts, the variety of anatomical dedicated in Umbria and more broadly, in Central Italian sanctuaries, seems to suggest that forms were indeed an important factor in the worshipers' decision to make a vow. ${ }^{499}$

To conclude, if we want to recognize any Roman contribution to the phenomenon of the presence of anatomical terracottas in Umbria, it is probably the development of a new road network, as Glinister suggested. ${ }^{500}$ The presence of a new road network crossing central Italy may certainly have created the preconditions for the spread of this new material into colonial and non-colonial areas. Traders and artisans from different parts of the Mediterranean could now easily reach this central region without the difficulty of overpassing the Apennines. However, if roads and freer trade may have facilitated their diffusion, the presence of anatomical terracottas in Umbria is most likely linked to reasons other than Roman imposition of new cultic material evidence, such as convenience a fashion and the earlier local custom of dedicating such objects.

## Continuity and abandonment of pre-Roman cult places

Contrary to traditional assumptions that the continuation of Umbrian sanctuaries is connected to the Roman presence in the region, in the previous chapter I showed that pre-Roman Umbrian sanctuaries continued to be used after the end of the fourth century BCE, regardless of

[^187]the political status of communities in relation to Rome. Yet, when compared to the previous centuries (sixth/early fourth BCE), the material evidence for ritual activity (figurative offerings, pottery, coins) seems to diminish drastically in some sanctuaries (Monte Acuto, Monte Subasio, Monte San Pancrazio, Monte Santo, Monte Ansciano ) in the period between the end of the fourth and the beginning of the first century BCE, thus suggesting a decrease in the level of the frequentation of the place. ${ }^{501}$ Conversely, the archaeological data from the sanctuary of Grotta Bella, Monte Torre Maggiore, Colfiorito, La Rocca, Campo La Piana, Monte Pennino, Cancelli, Pantanelli does not seem to significantly decrease. In this section I consider the level of frequentation of Umbrian sanctuaries and suggest some possible explanation for the decline in use of some of them.

Before delving into this issue, however, it is important to evaluate the reliability of the archaeological data. As mentioned above, most Umbrian sanctuaries have been only partially excavated (Pantanelli, Monte S. Pancrazio, Monte Subasio, Campo la Piana, Monte Pennino, Monte Santo) and the archaeological data has been recorded poorly (Pantanelli, Campo La Piana) or not at all (Monte S. Pancrazio, Monte Pennino, Monte Subasio, Monte Santo). ${ }^{502}$ As a consequence, our knowledge of the archaeological material from these sanctuaries is extremely limited; except for the little information from the archaeological reports, it relies either on later studies of specific classes of objects, as in the case for Monte Santo and Monte Subasio, or on the presence of a selection of bronze figurines, whose original number is unknown, in the local

[^188]museums of the region. At these sanctuaries, the changing proportion of the votive offerings between the archaic and Roman periods is, therefore, not representative of the overall frequentation of the site.

The sacred spaces that have been both recently and fully reported and can thus provide a more representative picture regarding their frequentation are the rural sanctuaries of Grotta Bella, Monte Ansciano, Monte Torre Maggiore, Monte Acuto, Colle Mori, Monte Moro, La Rocca, and Colfiorito sanctuaries. The almost complete absence of votive material dated between late fourth-early first century BCE at the sanctuaries of Monte Acuto and Monte Ansciano seems to indicate that there was an interruption in the activity of the sanctuaries. Starting with the beginning of the third century BCE, a coin of a very early Republican issue and a fragment of a figurine belonging to the "Hellenistic worshipper" type constitute the only material evidence for cult activity at Monte Ansciano. At Monte Acuto, the late fourth/early first century BCE phase is attested only by fragments of black gloss and sigillata italica, and a miniature vase.

A possible explanation for the reduced frequentation at the Monte Ansciano sanctuary has been offered by Bradley. ${ }^{503}$ He notes that the apparent ending of ritual activity on Monte Ansciano is paralleled by the beginning of temple activity at Iguvium, which is attested for the Hellenistic period by a number of architectural terracottas found in the city center. ${ }^{504}$ The possibility that ritual activity at an archaic cult place may have decreased following the construction of a new sacred space in the general vicinity seems even more plausible when we consider other excavated sanctuaries that were both close to Umbrian centers and witnessed a

[^189]continuation of cult activity during the Hellenistic period. Similar to Monte Ansciano, the sanctuaries at Colle Mori, Colfiorito, and Cancelli were close to urban centers but, unlike Iguvium, no new sacred buildings were built in these centers until the beginning of the first century BCE. Following the fourth century BCE, the development of new temples at Iguvium may have attracted the local community that previously used to worship on Monte Ansciano and thus led to a serious decline in its frequentation. ${ }^{505}$

A different explanation needs to be put forth to account for the apparent decline of ritual activity at the sanctuary on Monte Acuto, which, unlike Monte Ansciano, lay nowhere near major settlements during the Hellenistic period. As Bonomi Ponzi points out, surface surveys carried out in the territory surrounding Umbrian high-peak settlements testify to a significant decrease in the number of sites early in the Roman period ${ }^{506}$ She notes that the trend of abandoning high peaks after the fourth century BCE corresponds to the relocation of peoples towards market places closer to the main commercial routes became and likely followed increasing attention to lowland, sub-Apennine settlements (see below). It seems therefore likely that the decrease in ritual activity during the Hellenistic phase on Monte Acuto, unconnected to major road paths and isolated from populated areas, may have been conditioned by the new socio-economic reality. The fact that frequentation at other hilltop sanctuaries (Monte Torre Maggiore and Monte Moro) does not show a serious decline in connection to new settlement pattern is probably due to their proximity to both major commercial routes (the via Flaminia for

[^190]Monte Torre Maggiore and a branch of the via Salaria for Monte Moro) and urban settlements (Carsulae and Internamna Nahrs were respectively 6 and 17 km away from Monte Torre Maggiore; Internamna Nahrs and Spoletium are ca. 14 and 18 km away from Monte Moro).

Although the available data does not allow us to have a complete picture of the level of frequentation of Umbrian sanctuaries, the analysis of the evidence from a few well excavated cases suggests that, overall, sanctuaries continued to be frequented during the Hellenistic period. It is plausible to hypothesize that, in the few cases where the evidence points to an apparent cessation of ritual activity, factors such as the construction of new temples in nearby settlement areas and the concentration of the economic life away from mountainous areas and towards commercial routes played a role in the progressive abandonment of a sacred area.

The continuation of ritual activity at the La Rocca sanctuary demands separate consideration. The site is distinct from other Umbrian sanctuaries in two ways. First, this sanctuary is in an urban context, unlike the other rural sanctuaries we have already discussed. Second, it is the only Umbrian, pre-Roman cult place that, in this period, sat within the area of a Latin colony (Spoletium). Although I demonstrated that overall there does not seem to be a link between the continuation of an Umbrian sanctuary and the political status of nearby communities' relationship to Rome, Stek and Perna have made a case for the correlation between urban cult places and Roman colonization and incorporation. ${ }^{507}$ Significantly, Stek points out that the religious, social, and economic power of pre-Roman cult places represented an "important attraction for Roman expansion". ${ }^{508}$ Similarly, Perna notes, with respect to the region

[^191]of Picenum, that the continuation of ritual activity at pre-Roman urban sanctuaries after the foundation of colonies and municipia may have been the result of the conscious choice to use the importance of cult places as an element of syncretism between local and Roman cultures.

Notwithstanding the presence of new sacred places built after the foundation of the Latin colony of Spoletium, it seems plausible that the Umbrian sanctuary at La Rocca continued to represent power on a tangible level, in socio-economic and religious terms. The fact that, as Glinister points out, "collective cults enhanced an already dynamic interactive process, integrating different groups into society ${ }^{" 509}$ makes it possible that the La Rocca sanctuary served a role as facilitator for cultural contact between the new settlers and local people. ${ }^{510}$

## Monumentalization of Umbrian sanctuaries: architectural features

At the time of the Roman conquest of Umbria, the region was composed of numerous politically autonomous communities, which, as explained above, were complemented by specific settlements and sanctuaries. From the end of the fourth or early in the third century BCE, both Umbrian allied communities and Latin centers underwent extensive building projects. The Latin colony of Spoletium and the allied centers of Ameria, Asisium, and, likely, Urvinum Hortense are equipped with massive defensive walls dated around the mid-third century BCE; new temples are built at Spoletium, Iguvium, Urvinum Hortense, Asisium, Vettona, and Mevania; stone walled buildings are erected at Hispellum, ${ }^{511}$ and an inscription from Fulginiae attests the

[^192]presence of work concerned with the management of water supplies. ${ }^{512}$ As Bradley puts it, during this phase, towns began to "gain monumental physical dimension to complement their political identity". ${ }^{513}$

Between the end of the fourth and the second century BCE, this trend of intense building activity affected also some rural sanctuaries of the region; complexes underwent phases of complete restructuring, involving the construction of buildings in areas previously marked by no permanent architectural structure. Although the availability of published material and the lack of complete publications are a major obstacle to an exhaustive illustration of architectural and spatial organization of Umbrian cult places, the fact that some of them were embellished during this phase points to the interest of individuals or groups in investing in sacred buildings. The surviving evidence suggests that different architectural solutions mainly borrowed from contemporary Italic and Hellenistic templar architecture were applied to the architectural and decorative aggrandization of Umbrian sanctuaries.

Architectural evidence for the monumentalization of Umbrian sacred buildings during the Hellenistic phase comes from the sanctuaries at Monte Moro, Monte Torre Maggiore, Cancelli, and Monte San Pancrazio. At Cancelli and Monte San Pancrazio, the archaeological evidence is too scant to reconstruct the original appearance of the building, thus only a few inferences can be made on the available data. The building at Cancelli appears to have consisted of at least three rooms, partially covered in opus signinum, and a drain used for water-related functions; the Monte San Pacrazio sacred area was bounded by a Hellenistic porticus, intersected by a water

[^193]channel. The less fragmented data from the Monte Moro and Monte Torre Maggiore sanctuaries provides for a better reconstruction. The sacred complex at Monte Moro was organized around three main rooms oriented along a northwest/southeast axis, with the central one being likely the main cult room. To the south, additional rooms formed an L-shaped space around an unpaved and open area. At Monte Torre Maggiore, the only sanctuary in the region where both architectural layout and architectural decoration are preserved, a precinct bounded the sacred area where a tall podium in opus quadratum supported a rectangular temple made of large limestone blocks, oriented east-west, with pronaos, cella, and columns all around it.

With respect to the architectural decoration, the evidence, although fragmented, suggests that the majority of Umbrian sacred areas adhered to Etrusco-Italic forms. While Monte Torre Maggiore has yielded lion-headed waterspouts and a female head directly inspired by Hellenistic art, the antapagmenta and antefixes discovered at the sites of Pantanelli, Cancelli, Colfiorito, and La Rocca conform to decorative motifs that were popular in contemporary sanctuaries of Latium Alatri, Anagni, Minturnae), southern Etruria (Civita Castellana), and Samnium (Pietrabbondante). ${ }^{514}$

During the Hellenistic period, Umbrian sanctuaries did not share uniform architectural and planimetric features. The few cases that allow an architectural and spatial reconstruction seem to either draw from the Hellenistic tradition (Monte San Pancrazio) or to utilize the axiality of the Etrusco-Italic architecture and eclectically combine it with decentralized rooms (Monte Moro) or with elements of the Hellenistic tradition (Monte Torre Maggiore) in a local fashion. The use of different architectural models is most noticeable at Monte Torre Maggiore. Here, the

[^194]Hellenistic temple plan, with columns on all sides, matches what remains of the decorative elements, namely the lion spouts and a statue's female head. These Hellenistic features are juxtaposed to local elements (locally carved limestone blocks) and the frontality of the highpodium temple style, typical of the Etrusco-Italic canon. The skill to manipulate different architectural canons and experiment with variations in a local fashion has been noticed by Battiloro and Scopacasa in Lucania and Samnium and framed within the context of what Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli named "Italic Hellenism", which entailed the assimilation of Greek cultural forms into the Italic decorative and stylistic traditions. ${ }^{515}$

After a first phase- from the middle of the fourth to the middle of the third century BCEin which the penetration of Hellenistic culture in central Italy was mainly due to the contacts that Italic communities maintained with Greece, southern Italy, and Sicily, Hellenistic iconographic models became a widespread "language of power" in other parts of the peninsula as Italy became more integrated into the economic and cultural networks with the Hellenistic East. This phenomenon impacted, among other regions, the Samnite and Lucanian areas, where pre-Roman cults were revitalized through the use of monumental religious complexes, such as the sanctuary of Rossano di Vaglio, or the erection of new buildings and complementary structures, most noticeably at Pietrabbondante. ${ }^{516}$ Although in Umbria the new architectural stimuli and influence took less scenographic forms than their Samnite and Lucanian counterparts, they are nonetheless integrated into the same broader cultural trends. In other words, during the Hellenistic period the

[^195]architectural layout of Umbrian sanctuaries is the result of the adoption of new architectural trends, common to all Italic communities as a consequence of an increased dialogue between the peninsula and the eastern Mediterranean, and their integration with more local and Italic traditions.

The transformations that involved Umbrian sanctuaries during the Hellenistic period raise the question of who were the promoters of their monumentalization during the last centuries of the Republic, when the hilltop centers were abandoned, and Umbrian society was redefining itself under the push of Roman preeminence in Italy and in the Mediterranean.

## Monumentalization of Umbrian sanctuaries: possible agents

As we have seen above, much of the public munificence visible of the Hellenistic period needs to be considered in the context of the relationship between Rome and the Italian allies, which strengthened noticeably when communities became involved in Rome's expansionistic plans. As Terrenato has recently underscored, ${ }^{517}$ an important part of this interconnectedness was played by Roman and Italic elite networking and negotiations. On the one hand, having local contacts would benefit Roman aristocrats trying to advance their own specific agendas, such as "dominance of local community, maintenance of the established order, control of the political brokerage between the community and the center of power, piloting tribal formation and composition". ${ }^{518}$ On the other, having the support of powerful Roman friends would facilitate the career of Italic elite members, either in their cities or in Rome itself. In short, Terennato's model

[^196]bypasses the classic dichotomy between Romans and Italians and suggests that the process of integrations may have been the result of a broad network of factional projects.

In central Italy, archaeological, epigraphical, and prosopographical material from some Etruscan, Latin, and Campanian polities provides evidence for factionalism in the context of Italic integration with Rome. ${ }^{519}$ Caere is a particularly illustrative case of the types of contacts that existed between peer groups in Rome and in the Italic regions of the peninsula. Here, contacts between local elite members and those in Rome are attested as early as the fourth century $\mathrm{BCE}^{520}$ and intensify in the third century, when two members of the Roman family of the Genucii added to their name the appellative Clepsina, represented in Etruria at Tarquinia, Tuscania, and Caere. In order to strengthen the family ties with this region, C. Genucius Clepsina dedicated an underground cultic building in Caere and, likely due to his connection with the area, had a role in facilitating the interactions and negotiations between this city and Rome in the second decade of the century. ${ }^{521}$

A similar dynamic of interwoven personal interests among local and Roman aristocrats has been noticed by Coles in the contexts of the Latin colonies of Latium and Campania. ${ }^{522}$ In particular, she demonstrates that the impetus to found a colony was a desire for a combination of

[^197]benefits, including a closer tie to regions of personal concern, clientele, and political and economic advancement. Given these ties between specific geographical areas and the interest of colonial officials, Coles adds, it is not hard to envision the profits that this group would have gained - in particular in terms of personal network and assistance up the cursus honorum - by monumentalizing traditional religious landmarks.

In the Umbrian region, which gradually became involved in the Roman expansionistic network, mainly through local alliances, the foundation of colonies, and establishment of civitates sine suffragio, evidence of elite agendas and factionalism is provided by two emblematic cases already mentioned in Chapter 4. In context of the foundation of the colony of Nahars, as Livy recounts, the pre-Roman city was betrayed to the Romans by two townsman; at Asisium, Nero Babrius chose to recall his offices in two inscriptions, one written in Umbrian using Latin script, and the other in Latin language and script.

In this varied and hybrid political scenario, where competition for a successful position within the nascent empire must have been particularly intense among the elites, it is difficult to pinpoint specific agents for the monumentalization of Umbrian sanctuaries. Rather than the result of economic investment by either Roman or Umbrian aristocrats, the possibility should be considered that the monumentalization of pre-Roman sanctuaries during the Hellenistic period was the result of a dynamic interplay of local and Roman interests and interaction both in colonial and allied territories. The embellishment of a local temple, in fact, would have brought equal benefits to both Roman and local elites interested in either extending their system of clientele, or to having access to a political career in a new territory. Umbrian and Roman agents
were similarly interested in affirming themselves in the new political scenario of the Hellenistic period, and public munificence was an ideal tool to achieve this goal.

## Overview and Looking forward

This chapter analysed the data laid out in Chapter 5 and puts them in the context of the broader developments of cult places in Umbria between the archaic and Hellenistic periods. In particular, I explored four crucial themes of this dissertation, namely (1) the function of archaic Umbrian sanctuaries, (2) the meaning of the votive practice of dedicating bronze figurines during this period, (3) the continuation and monumentalization of sacred places, and (4) the appearance of anatomical terracottas in the Hellenistic period. The pagus-vicus model and the political status of local communities with respect to Rome do not really explain the function of ancient sanctuaries and their decline after Roman expansion into the region. As an alternative approach, I have paid close attention to the analysis of the topographical features of cult places and their votive deposits.

The analysis of the topographical relationship between sanctuaries and inhabited centres, as well as the identification of the most common votive figurines and locally produced offerings, has revealed that archaic sanctuaries in Umbria were closely linked with the individual communities that occupied the area near them. The presence of figurines that appear only at specific Umbrian sanctuaries provides us with further crucial evidence that sacred places were used by distinctive communities that, in addition to dedicating the types of votive offerings widespread in the region, strove to highlight their own uniqueness. In the Hellenistic period, the decline in the ritual activities of two of the sixteen sanctuaries considered in this dissertation was
determined by endemic factors, such as the construction of new temples in nearby settlement areas and the concentration of the economic life away from high peaks and towards commercial routes.

The study of figurative votive offerings has also been the centre of my interpretation of the ritual associated with their deposition. The ritual identifiable through the analysis of the votive figurines from Umbrian sanctuaries provides a glimpse of cultural continuity, modifications, and reinterpretation as a result of, and in response to, Roman expansion. The ritual practiced in the cult places of the region from the archaic period onward was likely aimed at securing the wellness of the individuals as well as the community. In addition to this, I have suggested that the function of the objects was not decided a priori during their making. Through their materiality, by the appropriation of identification data, along with the spatial association with the sacred sphere, votive figurines may have dictated the well-being ritual associated with them.

The presence of anatomical terracottas and heads in the Roman period indicates the continuity of this ritual but also sheds light on the mechanism of adoption and adaptation visible in the material culture after Roman expansion. As Wallace-Hadrill demonstrated when he applied the code-switching model to Roman material culture, elements of foreign culture were selectively adopted and adapted in response to active local social mechanisms rather than mere emulation. In the specific case of the region of Umbria, the tradition of dedicating anatomical votives, widespread on the Tyrrhenian coasts of Latium and Etruria, was selectively applied in the Roman period to a ritual rooted in the archaic period. Moreover, the fact that archaic votive offerings were likely still visible in sanctuaries during the Hellenistic period further demonstrates
that the local past was tangible and visible to the worshippers. In the context of the Roman conquest, the offering of parts of the body and heads, new to neither the Umbrians nor to Roman settlers, may have also acted as a point of contact that helped strengthen the bonds of newly formed communities.

The presence of more varied votive assemblages, containing heads and anatomicals alongside figurines of the Hellenistic worshippers, miniature vases, and coins, is not the only sign of the adaptation of local, regional traditions to the wider cultural trends that swept through the Italic peninsula during the Hellenistic period. The architectural embellishment that some Umbrian sanctuaries evince, with a skilful use of local, Etrusco-Italic, and Hellenistic elements, points to the opening of the region to new artistic stimuli that were widespread elsewhere in the peninsula, for example in Samnium and Lucania. As for the agents of the refashioning of Umbrian religious landmarks, the contemporary political scenario in which elite alliances between Roman and locals appear to have been the key for personal success and a public career suggests that Umbrian, as well as Roman, elites could have been equally interested in using public munificence to pursue their political goals.

In such an account of the change that happened in the cult places of the region after the Romans began their expansion, there is little space for a systematic imposition of Roman culture onto the local people of the region. The conquest of the region did not happen in the unilateral model of the imposition of one culture on another, but rather in a middle ground, a space "in between and within which peoples interact", ${ }^{523}$ where the encounter between different cultural traditions created new cultural structures. In this case, in the middle ground shared between the

[^198]Romans and the Umbrians, we find also the influence of the Hellenistic koine shared by the broader Italic peninsula and the Mediterranean. The continuation of the ritual tradition of dedicating anatomical votives and heads mingled with the affordability of a new material (terracotta), new offering types popular elsewhere in the Mediterranean, and a variety of architectural solutions that monumentalized sacred area.

The type of approach advocated in this study-that sanctuaries and their votive deposits need to be studied simultaneously as components of a larger regional sacred landscape and with an eye toward each site specificity and its development from the archaic to the Hellenistic periods-can be fruitfully applied to the study of the sanctuaries of other regions. In the context of the Italic peninsula, this detailed analysis has been successfully conducted in Lucania and Samnium, but is lacking in other regions of Central Italy, such as Picenum and Latium. As the example of Umbria shows, once a more complete picture of Italic sacred places is achieved, then we can re-evaluate the impact of Rome on the sacred sphere of the peninsula.

## Appendix 1

## Types of Umbrian Figurative Votive Offerings

The typologization of votive figurines is largely based on Colonna's classification and my own grouping of the votives not considered by him. ${ }^{524}$ In this Appendix, for each type I present a description, ${ }^{525}$ the average measurements, the areas of distribution, and when suitable, I briefly outline the scholarly framework of their interpretation.

## Sixth- fourth century BCE

Fabriano Group (FaG; figure A3.234): ${ }^{526}$ the type belongs to north Umbrian production comprises elongated figures of warriors characterized by course anatomical details of both the body and the face. They wear a defensive skirt and a tall crest with raised cheekpieces, and some specimens have greaves. The eyes are rendered with a circular punch and the mouth with a small horizontal line.

[^199]The height varies from 14 to 25 cm . Figurines of this type have been found at Sassoferrato, ${ }^{527}$ Fabriano, ${ }^{528}$ and Colfiorito (Sanctuary of Cupra).

Fossato di Vico Group (FoVG; A3.235): ${ }^{529}$ the type belongs to north Umbrian production and comprises figures of warriors. Overall the figures are characterized by an almost skeletal elongation, a cuirass, which is worn with a high and thick belt, a helmet ending in an interrupted curve, and a defensive skirt (pteryges) decorated with X lines and a crisscross pattern.

The height of these figurines varies from 20 to 32 cm . Besides two specimens from Fossato di Vico ${ }^{530}$ andf Colfiorito (Sanctuary of Cupra), figurines of this type lack provenance.

Todi Group (ToG; A3.56): ${ }^{531}$ the type belongs to southern Umbrian production and comprises figures of warriors. Some characteristics shared by the figurines of this group are the modeling of the face with indication of the eyelids, the gentle modeling of the body, the helmet, with raised cheekpieces and a big crest that rises directly from the cap, a leather cuirass with hinged shoulder guards, a belt, and greaves. In addition, the armor and the helmet are highly decorated with geometrical motifs.

The height varies from 18 to 24 cm . Due to the size and sophisticated rendering of the figurines of this group, Colonna defines it as "the most noticeable episode of the southern

[^200]Umbrian school". ${ }^{532}$ Figurines of this type have been found in the Sabine area at Ancarano ${ }^{533}$ and in Umbria at Calvi dell’Umbria (Monte San Pancrazio sanctuary) and Todi (Monte Santo). ${ }^{534}$ The latter is considered by Colonna the most likely place of manufacture of these figurines.

Amelia group (AmG; A3.66-68; A3.106-109; A3.138; A3.146; A3.187-188; A3.229-
230): ${ }^{535}$ the type belongs to southern Umbrian production and comprises warriors, striding men, and male and female figurines of worshippers. The most distinctive characteristics of these figurines are the heads, which are filed on the front to create two flat surfaces forming an acute angle and ending on the upper part with a curved edge. The eyes are indicated with small circles and the mouth with a cut at the base of the angle, which identifies the nose. The naked bodies have nipples and navels incised with circles; the men have protruding genitals. The striding men have the right leg slightly bent and the left leg straight; the left arm is raised with the palm facing upwards and the thumb stretched wide; the right arm is bent downwards with opened hand and stretched out thumb. The lower limbs end with spikes.

The height of the figurines varies between 5 and 10 cm . In Umbria, specimens have been found at Todi (Monte Santo), ${ }^{536}$ Umbertide (Monte Acuto), ${ }^{537}$ Spoleto (La Rocca), Assisi (Colle S. Rufino), ${ }^{538}$ and Colfiorito (Sanctuary of Cupra). ${ }^{539}$ Outside the region, figurines of this

[^201]typology come from the Sabine (Ancarano) and Etruscan (Fiesole) areas, and from Rome (via Magenta). ${ }^{540} \mathrm{~A}$ few examples have been also found beyond the Alps, in Switzerland (at Bessonens and Sembracher) and France (at Menthon-St-Bernard). ${ }^{541}$ The abundance of this type at Todi has led Colonna to hypothesize that this was the center of manufacture.

Foligno group (FoG; A3.55; A3.91; A3.144-155; A3.196; A3.201-202; A3.233): ${ }^{542}$ the type belongs to southern Umbrian schematic production and comprises figures of warriors and striding men. Both are represented naked and striding towards the left; the warriors are crested. Eyes, nipples, and navel are rendered with punched roundels, the mouths with a small slit. The legs end with pointed feet.

The height of the figurines of the Foligno group varies between 7 and 10 cm . Specimens have been found in Terni (Monte Torre Maggiore), ${ }^{543}$ Montefranco (Monte Moro), ${ }^{544}$ Todi (Monte Santo), ${ }^{545}$ Calvi dell'Umbria (Monte S. Pancrazio), Spoleto (La Rocca), Gualdo Tadino (Colle Mori), ${ }^{546}$ and Foligno (Cancelli and Sanctuary of Cupra). ${ }^{547}$ Outside this region, figurines of this type come from the Etruscan area (Fiesole), northern Italy— Altino (Veneto) and Aquileia (Friuli-Venezia Giulia) — and Spain (Ampurias). ${ }^{548}$ The abundance of this type at Todi has led Colonna to hypothesize that this was the center of manufacture of the FoG.

[^202]Nocera Umbra Group (NuG; A3.15-16; A3.73-75; A3; 117-119; A3.136-137; A3.159160; A3.175-176; A3.197; A3.215): ${ }^{549}$ the type belongs to southern Umbrian schematic production and comprises flat figurines of warriors and females. Typical of the warriors of this group is the lozenge crest and open arms. Female worshippers have open arms, hands indicated by grooves and different types of tutulus on the head.

The height of the figurines is between 5 and 13 cm . In Umbria, specimens have been found at Amelia (Grotta Bella), ${ }^{550}$ Terni (Monte Torre Maggiore), Todi (Monte Santo), ${ }^{551}$ Umbertide (Monte Acuto), ${ }^{552}$ Spoleto (La Rocca), ${ }^{553}$ Gubbio (Monte Ansciano), ${ }^{554}$ Foligno (Cancelli and Cupra Sanctuary), ${ }^{555}$ and on Monte Pennino. Outside the ancient region, figurines of the NuG type have been fount in Sabine and Etruscan areas (Ancarano, Nocera Umbra, and Orvieto) and in northern Italy at Villazzano (Trentino-Alto Adige) and Altino (Veneto). ${ }^{556}$

## Esquiline group (EG; A3.1-10; A3.44-49; A3.60-65; A3.86-88; A3.110-113; A3.131-

133; A3.145; A3.151-158; A3.163-167; A3.193-195; A3.205-206): ${ }^{557}$ the type, defined by
Richardson as a typically Umbrian phenomenon, ${ }^{558}$ belongs to southern Umbrian schematic

[^203]production and is comprised of figurines of male and female worshippers and warriors. All figurines of this group have a flat, narrow body, and outstretched arms and legs. The arms are marked with transverse grooves to indicate the fingers, while the legs have spikes at the end. The heads are long and narrow, with the eyes indicated by two grooves and the mouth by a cut. The male figures are represented naked and characterized by a genital protruberance; women wear a long, tight tunic, and warriors can be recognized by the high crest that rises from the top of the needle-sharp head and by the presence of a hole in the right arm to insert a weapon. In some cases, the bodies are so schematized that they resemble the shape of a star.

The height varies from 2 to 6 cm . Specimen of the EG type have been found abundantly in the region of Umbria at Amelia (Grotta Bella and Pantanelli), ${ }^{559}$ Todi (Monte Santo), ${ }^{560}$ Umbertide (Monte Acuto), ${ }^{561}$ Calvi dell’Umbria (Monte S. Pancrazio), Gualdo Tadino (Colle Mori), ${ }^{562}$ and Foligno (Cancelli and Cupra Sanctuary) ${ }^{563}$. The type is also attested in the Picene (San Severino Marche, Pievetorina, and Pioraco), ${ }^{564}$ Sabine (Ancarano di Norcia and Forma Cavaliera), ${ }^{565}$ Etruscan (Bettona, Maggione, and Orvieto), ${ }^{566}$ Aequian (Carsoli) ${ }^{567}$ and Roman (Rome, Piazza dell'Esquilino) ${ }^{568}$ areas. A few examples have been also found beyond the

[^204]Alps, in northern Italy (at Vertova in the Lombardy region), Austria (Zollfeld), and Hungary (Keszthely and Szombathely). ${ }^{569}$

Montesanto group (MSG; A3.120-121): ${ }^{570}$ the type belongs to southern Umbrian schematic production and comprises solely figures of warriors. The type repeats the ToG costume, but the warriors do not wear greaves. The features are geometric: the nose is sharp; the eyes are rendered with carved circles and the mouth with a small horizontal gash.

The height of these figurines ranges between 11 and 14 cm . Besides those from Todi (Monte Santo), ${ }^{571}$ the figurines of this group lack provenance.

Bronze sheets (BS; A3.57; A3.173-174; A3.198; A3.213-214): ${ }^{572}$ figurines of this type are cut from bronze sheets and are characterized by extremely flat and elongated bodies. These almost resemble a long strip where limbs and head are the only anatomical details; when preserved, the genitals hang between the legs of the male types.

The height of these figurines can vary from 3 to 55 cm . Given the presence of this type of figurines in several sanctuary contexts of Roman (Campidoglio and Sant'Omobono) ${ }^{573}$ and Latin (Tivoli, Sermoneta, Satricum, Segni, and Norba) ${ }^{574}$ areas, Colonna hypothesizes that their

[^205]production began in Rome. In Umbria, the BS type is attested at Calvi dell'Umbria (Monte San Pancrazio), Umbertide (Monte Acuto), ${ }^{575}$ Foligno (Cancelli), ${ }^{576}$ and Colfiorito (Sanctuary of Cupra). Outside the region, a few figurines have been found in the Aequian and Sabine areas (Carsoli and Ancarano), ${ }^{577}$ in Picenum (Montefortino di Arcevia), ${ }^{578}$ and in Etruria (Bagnolo S. Vito). ${ }^{579}$

## Animals (A3.11-14; A3.58; A3.77-78; A3.92-93; A3.122-123; A3.168; A3.196;

A3.121-122): this type comprises bronze figurines representing pigs, goats, bulls, cows, and horses. Their execution is similar to that of the schematic human figurines as they were cast and hand finished at the edges. In most cases, the figurines are highly stylized and sometimes it is difficult to identify the animal represented. The bodies are flattened and elongated; the legs are pointed. When anatomical details are present, they are rendered with punch circles for the eyes and with notches or grooves for mouth and fur.

The height varies from 2 to 6 cm In Umbrian territory, votives of this type have been found at Grotta Bella, ${ }^{580}$ Todi (Monte Santo), ${ }^{581}$ Calvi dell’Umbria (Monte San Pancrazio), Monte Torre Maggiore, ${ }^{582}$ Monte Moro, ${ }^{583}$ Foligno (Cancelli) ${ }^{584}$, Umbertide (Monte Acuto), ${ }^{585}$

[^206]and Colfiorito (Sanctuary of Cupra). Outside this region, specimens come from Etruscan (Pasticcetto di Magione, Cortona, and Colle Arsiccio) ${ }^{586}$ and Sabine (Ancarano) ${ }^{587}$ areas. Since the level of schematization is close to the schematic rendering of the figurines of the EG type, it is possible that the bronze animal figurines were also a southern production, as suggested by Cenciaioli. ${ }^{588}$

Eyed crests (A3.54; A3.76; A3.89-90; A3.199): this type, commonly understood as a simplification of the warrior figure, ${ }^{589}$ comprises small filed crests. These objects stand on spikes and have two grooves made with a punch to resemble eyes.

The height varies between 2 and 4 cm high. This type is widespread in southern Umbria (Monte San Pancrazio, Monte Moro, and Monte Torre Maggiore) ${ }^{590}$ and limited to one sanctuary in the region Apennine area (Sanctuary at Cancelli). ${ }^{591}$

## Archaic heads (A3.21-22; A3.53; A3.69; A3.94; A3.124; A3.161; A3.179; A3.187;

A3.200): this type comprises bronze figurines depicting human heads. ${ }^{592}$ They are characterized by an extremely geometric execution that does not allow gender distinction. The modeling of the heads is faceted, with details added with a burin or a circular punch. The striking similarity of

[^207]these heads to those of the figurines of the types Esquiline Group and Amelia Group suggests that some of the same casts may have created them. The bottom of the heads presents a sharp spike.

The height of the figurines varies from cm 2.5 to 4. In Umbria, the type is attested throughout the territory, at Amelia (Grotta Bella), Umbertide (Monte Acuto), Calvi dell'Umbria (Monte San Pancrazio), Terni (Monte Torre Maggiore), ${ }^{593}$ Montefranco (Monte Moro), ${ }^{594}$ Todi (Monte Santo), ${ }^{595}$ Gualdo Tadino (Colle Mori), and Folingno (Cancelli). ${ }^{596}$ Outside Umbria, Mauro Cristofani mentions the presence of fifth century BCE bronze heads at Arezzo and Fiesole, but does not offer an image of these objects. ${ }^{597}$

Archaic anatomicals (A3.17-20; A3.50-52; A3.139; A3.201; A3.226): this type comprises bronze representations of limbs (legs, feet, and arms). These are represented schematically with little attention to the rendering of anatomical details. Arms are represented outstretched with hands characterized by small incisions indicating the fingers. Legs are extremely filiform, with little distinction between the upper and lower part. Similarly realized in a summary way are the feet. They conform to the general shape of the feet, but lack most anatomical detail, with the exception of slight swellings on both sides of the ankle that represent the ankle bones. Similarly to the aforementioned bronze votive types, the votive legs stand on high spikes.

[^208]The height of the specimens of this type varies from cm 2 to 8 . In Umbria, they have been found at Amelia (Grotta Bella), Calvi dell’Umbria (Monte San Pancrazio), Terni (Monte Torre Maggiore), Umbertide (Monte Acuto), ${ }^{598}$ Spoleto (La Rocca), Foligno (Cancelli), ${ }^{599}$ and Colfiorito (Sanctuary of Cupra). Outside this region, the presence of bronze anatomical votives has been noticed in the Adriatic and northern Etruscan region, at Pasticcetto di Magione, Marzabotto, Servirola San Polo, Bologna, and Adria. ${ }^{600}$

## Late fourth- second century BCE

Hellenistic worshipper with rayed crown (A3.36; A3.79-80; A3.150; A3.162; A3.188;
A3.202): this type comprises figurines of female and male worshippers. The male devotee wears a long tunic to the knees; on the right hand he holds a patera and on the left the acerra. On his head, he wears a crown with three or five leaves. ${ }^{601}$ The female figurine wears a long chiton to the feet, wrapped under the breast, and a himation on the left shoulder and around the hips. On the left arm, she carries either an acerra or focaccia bread; on the head, she wears a diadem with several rays or a crown/diadem.

Both female and male worshippers originally stood on a cubic travertine small base, which is preserved in one specimen from Grotta Bella (GB_285; figure A3.36) and from Monte Torre Maggiore (MTM_6; A3.80). Given the slight stylistic difference among the Umbrian Hellenistic figurines, with in common the fact of being straight, with rectangular contour

[^209]irrespective of their different grade of stylization, Galastin suggests that several workshops were active in the region during the third and second century BCE , and that the figurines may have been manufactured at or near the sanctuary where they were deposited. ${ }^{602}$

This type is inspired by the Hellenistic art that in the third century start to gradually spread over great parts of Italy and became known to Central Italian areas through the Greek centers of Southern Italy. ${ }^{603}$ In the second century BCE, the increasing contacts between the Italians, the Romans, and the Greeks from Greece and Asia Minor led to the presence of Greek artists in Rome, Volterra, and Ancona and consequently to an increase of the impulses from Hellenistic art. For this reason, the Hellenistic worshipper group is amply attested in the peninsula during the Hellenistic period as part of the Central Italy artistic koine of Latium, Etruria, and Umbria. ${ }^{604}$ In Umbria, this type is attested at Amelia (Grotta Bella), ${ }^{605}$ Terni (Monte Torre Maggiore), Assisi (Monte Subasio), ${ }^{606}$ Gubbio (Monte Ansciano), Gualdo Tadino (Colle Mori), ${ }^{607}$ and Foligno (Cancelli). ${ }^{608}$ Outside this region, figurines of this type have been found in Latin (Nemi), ${ }^{609}$ Etruscan (Chiusi, Colle Arsiccio, and Caligiana di Magione), ${ }^{610}$ and Aequian (Carsoli) areas. ${ }^{611}$

[^210]
# Terracotta heads (A3.59; A3.84-85; A3.1-2-104; A3.189; A3.143; A3.204) and anatomical terracottas (A3.34; A3.43; A3.82-83; A3.95-101; A3.140-142; A3.203; A3.231) : 

terracotta heads and anatomicals are part of the Etrusco-Latial-Campanian group, which was classified by Comella in 1981 and has generally been considered to be indicative of healing shrines and connected with the process of Romanization. ${ }^{612}$

The forerunners of terracotta heads have been identified in the heads dedicated Veii and Falerii as early as the sixth BCE. ${ }^{613}$ According to Torelli, the custom of dedicating heads in Eturia was influenced by similar practices in Magna Grecia linked to the chthonic cults of Demeter and Kore; ${ }^{614}$ in the course of the fifth century BCE, they would have begun to spread at Caere, Capua, Teano, and Carsioli, to then appear in Rome and be finally "exported" to central Italy during Rome's expansion, ${ }^{615}$ following the "the direttrici della conquista romana" and becoming a distinctive mark of Romanization. ${ }^{616}$

[^211]Antomical votives are shaped like parts of the internal or external human body and represent the most conspicuous type in the Etruscan-Latial-Campanian group. As explained in Chapter 2, the first anatomical votives are believed to have appeared in southern Etruria in the fourth century BCE and derive from the practice to offer body parts at the sanctuary of Asclepius at Corinth. In a manner similar to the terracotta heads, after Rome came into contact with Etruria via Veii, anatomical votives would have spread following the stages of the Roman conquest of Italy, in particular in the areas occupied by Latin colonies. ${ }^{617}$

Tanagra figurines (A3.232): this type comprises figurines of women, sometimes seated but more usually standing. They wear intricately folded and form-fitting garments, and sometimes high, conical sun-hats with broad brims; often they carry fans. They stand in an apparently infinite variety of poses and their dress is similarly varied. Since many specimens are represented carrying offerings, the subject is likely to have represented worshippers, either engaged in religious rituals and public festival or in specific moments of their lives (such as purification rites before a wedding, puberty, or prenuptal rites). ${ }^{618}$

These types of objects developed in Athens in the second half of the fourth century BCE and became increasingly common in the Italic peninsula as part of the Hellenistic koine. During the third century, spreading from Magna Graecia and especially Tarentum, this style reached

[^212]Samnium, Lucania, Latium, Etruria, and the Marricine area. ${ }^{619}$ In Umbria, their presence is limited to the site of the Sanctuary of Cupra at Colfiorito.

Other (A3.24-33; A3.39-42; A3.127-130; A3.147-149): This group comprises votive offerings that do not fit within any known figurative type and/or whose presence is circumscribed to one or two Umbrian sanctuaries. For the pre-Roman period, figurines belonging to this group are: 1) male and female lead figurines from Amelia (Grotta Bella and Pantanelli); 2) a zoomorphic pendant, a warrior attached to a situla, and a dancing figurine from Assisi (Colle S . Rufino); 3) zoomorphic figurines from Foligno (sanctuary of Cupra). For the Roman period, the figurines that belong to this group are: 1) a terracotta figurine of a bovine (La Rocca Sanctuary); 2) a figurine depicting Hercules from Colfiorito (Sanctuary of Cupra).

[^213]
## Appendix 2

## Tabulated Catalog of Umbrian Figurative Votive Offerings

This catalog goes beyond the published reports and attempts to provide a comprehensive re-examination of all the votive figurines, including many currently unpublished. At present, such task has been achieved for three particular types of artifacts: figurines of humans, animals, and anatomical parts in bronze, lead, or terracotta. For other votives, such as pottery and coins, such inventory remains a major desideratum. For the present, the tabulated catalog allows us to see the patterns of dedications, but also to bring some order to the current haphazard state of the published evidence, scattered over numerous publications, museums, and depots.

For the sake of completeness, the catalogue includes pieces that no longer are available for study. These have been lost, and no images seem to exist for most of them. Museum records and previous scholarship is used to provide as exhaustive a record as possible

## Criteria for Classification

The data are presented in a quantitative form, covering the archaic and Hellenistic period (sixth to early first century BCE). The entry of each votive object starts with a catalogue number, always preceded by the abbreviation of the site name, ${ }^{1}$ followed by the votive type. ${ }^{2}$ A list and

[^214]description of the possible votive types can be found in Appendix 1. Under the label "other" are grouped the exceptions to the norm, namely the figurines that either differ slightly from known types and/or figurines that are unique of specific sanctuaries.

Date: in Umbria it is impossible to date bronze and terracotta figurines based on stratigraphy. This is because they were either buried in votive pits without external datable evidence or scattered in the area near sanctuary sites. Most scholars rely on Colonna's and Richardson's studies of bronze offerings and adhere to their suggested chronology of sixth to fourth century BCE for the votive of the archaic sanctuaries. ${ }^{3}$ As for the terracotta votives, they are generally ascribed to the third-first century BCE, based on similarities with those of Latium, Campania, and Etruria. ${ }^{4}$

Measurements: the measurements are given in centimeters. The first number refers to the maximal height and the second number to the width of the object.

Preservation: the missing parts are accounted for. If more than $50 \%$ of the object could be estimated to be missing, the object is defined as a fragment (only the identifiable ones have been catalogued). The categories of preservation are: Good, Fair, Poor, and Fragment.

Sanctuary site: refers to the sacred space where the votive figurines have been found.

[^215]Find spot within site: refers to where on site the object was found. Votive figurines retrieved on the surface without a proper archaeological investigation are signaled as fortuitous finds. For objects retrieved from archaeological excavation, the available excavation reports record them as generically found in pits and/or in disturbed layers across the sacred areas and thus hinder the possibility of knowing where each figurine was found. For this reason, in most cases the find spot is indicated as a deposit/ disturbed layer, and only when available I provide the SU of the find spot. When none of this information from the available publications and archival documents is available, the find spot is signaled as NA (not available).

Location of the object: refers to where the object is displayed (museums) or stored (depots). The names of museums and depots are shortened with the following acronyms: CAOS (Centro Arti Opificio Siri,Terni); Dunarobba (Centro di Paleontologia Vegetale della Foresta Fossile di Dunarobba); MAC (Museo Archeologico di Colfiorito); MANS (Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Spoleto); MANU (Museo Archeologico Nazionale dell’Umbria); MANUdep (Magazzini del Museo Archeologico Nazionale dell’Umbria); MANoU (Museo Archeologico Nocera Umbra); MAU (Museo Archeologico Antichi Umbri - Polo Museale Gualdo Tadino); MCA (Museo Civico di Amelia); MCT (Museo Comunale di Todi); MCU (Museo di Santa Croce Umbertide); MSAP (Magazzino della Soprintendenza Archeologica Perugia); Pconsoli (Museo Civico Palazzo dei Consoli di Gubbio); PzTrinci (Museo della città di Palazzo Trinci, Foligno).

Inventory number: refers to the inventory number that the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria and the Polo Museale dell'Umbria have associated with the artifacts.

Photo number: refers to the number associated in this dissertation with the images of the votive figurines. These photos are presented in Appendix 3.

Bibliography: Previously published literature mentioning the object. All the objects that do not have a bibliographic reference are unpublished.

Comparanda: Essential bibliography of stylistically analogous types.

| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_1 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 3,2x1.3 | Good | Grotta Bella | Riq. I.; liv. 195 | MSAP | 41 | A3.1 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_2 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $4,9 \times 2.1$ | Fair | Grota Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50306 | A3.2 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_3 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $4.2 \times 2.2$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50709 | A3.3 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_4 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 1.5x 1 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50351 | A3.4 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_5 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | 5.9x2.1 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III | MSAP | 50310 | A3.5 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; } \\ & \text { Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, } 218 \\ & \text { tav. } 58 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| GB_6 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.2$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea I 060-080 | MSAP | 50227 | A3.6 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_7 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3.1 \times 0.9$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea I 060-080 | MSAP | 50274 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; } \\ & \text { Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, } 218 \\ & \text { tav. } 58 \end{aligned}$ |
| GB_8 | EG | Highly schematic figure of female | 6th-4thBCE | $2.4 \times 1.6$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea I 060-080 | MSAP | 50228 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_9 | EG | Highly schematic figure of female | 6th-4thBCE | $3.5 \times 2.3$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea I 060-080 | MSAP | 50230 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_10 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | $6 \mathrm{th}-4 \mathrm{thBCE}$ | $2.2 \times 1$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea I 060-080 | MSAP | 50243 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_11 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.2$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50314 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_12 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.6x1 | Good | Grota Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50744 | A3.7 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_13 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 50225 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_14 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $6.5 \times 6$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III | MSAP | 50775 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_15 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $5.1 \times 5.1$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III | MSAP | 50786 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_16 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 13x18 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_17 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | 1.9x0.6 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III | MSAP | 50787 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_18 | EG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $1.4 \times 1$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-010 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_19 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 0.9x0.5 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-010 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_20 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $1.1 \times 0.9$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-010 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_21 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $1.7 \times 0.6$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-010 | MSAP | 50325 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_22 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $1.7 \times 0.7$ | Good | Grota Bella | Trincea III 000-010 | MSAP | 50327 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_23 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.3 \times 0.5$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-010 | MSAP | 50374 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_24 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $1.2 \times 0.3$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-010 | MSAP | 50405 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_25 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2 \times 0.6$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-010 | MSAP | 50323 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_26 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.5x1 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-010 | MSAP | 50324 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_27 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $1.5 \times 0.6$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-010 | MSAP | 50404 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; } \\ & \text { Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, } 218 \\ & \text { tav. } 58 \end{aligned}$ |
| GB_28 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2x0.8 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50380 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_29 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.4 \times 0.7$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50385 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_30 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $1.8 \times 0.9$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50389 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_31 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3.1 \times 0.6$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50390 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_32 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.6x1 | Good | Grota Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50416 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_33 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.2 \times 0.7$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50413 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_34 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | 1.9x0.8 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50412 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_35 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $1.8 \mathrm{x}-0.5$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50402 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_36 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | 1.9x1 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50401 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_37 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2x1 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50371 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; } \\ & \text { Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, } 218 \\ & \text { tav. } 58 \end{aligned}$ |
| GB_38 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 1.1$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50368 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_39 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 1.9x0.6 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50353 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_40 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.2 \times 0.8$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50312 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_41 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | $4 \times 1$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50311 | A3.8 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_42 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 1.1$ | Good | Grota Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50322 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_43 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.5x1 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50321 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_44 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $5.1 \times 2.7$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50313 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_45 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.1 \times 0.9$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50316 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; } \\ & \text { Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, } 218 \\ & \text { tav. } 58 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| GB_46 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3.2 \times 1.3$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50317 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_47 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.3 \times 1.3$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50336 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; } \\ & \text { Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, } 218 \\ & \text { tav. } 58 \end{aligned}$ |
| GB_48 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | 4×1.2 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50309 | A3.9 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_49 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | 6x2 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 50713 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_50 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | $4.5 \times 1.8$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 50711 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_51 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | 6.6x26 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 50707 | A3.10 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_52 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | $4 \times 2$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 50712 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_53 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | 4.2×2.2 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 50716 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_54 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2×1.2 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50352 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_55 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2x1 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50334 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_56 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50350 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_57 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.2 \times 1.1$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50365 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_58 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $4 \times 1.9$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50307 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_59 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 1.7x1 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50370 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_60 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.0.3 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50398 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_61 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 1.7x1.3 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50399 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_62 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 1.9x1.2 | Fair | Grota Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50406 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_63 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $1.7 \times 0.5$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50407 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_64 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $1.7 \times 1.3$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50414 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_65 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2×1.2 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50377 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_66 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 0.3$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50391 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_67 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2×0.4 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50376 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; } \\ & \text { Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, } 218 \\ & \text { tav. } 58 \end{aligned}$ |
| GB_68 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2×1.6 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50320 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_69 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | 1.9x0.9 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50326 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_70 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.4 \times 1.2$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50331 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_71 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.4 \times 0.7$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50341 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_72 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $1.8 \times 1.2$ | Fair | Grota Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50372 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_73 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3.2 \times 1.3$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50756 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_74 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50730 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_75 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3.2 \times 1$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50729 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_76 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 1.2$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50760 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_77 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.2x-1.2 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50759 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; } \\ & \text { Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, } 218 \\ & \text { tav. } 58 \end{aligned}$ |
| GB_78 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50758 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_79 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 3x1.4 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50757 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_80 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50754 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_81 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50746 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_82 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grota Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50741 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_83 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50742 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_84 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50743 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_85 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50740 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_86 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50738 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_87 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50737 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_88 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50736 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_89 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50734 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_90 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50723 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_91 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50726 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_92 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50725 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_93 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.3x2 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50724 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_94 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3.2 \times 1.6$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50750 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_95 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 1.2$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50748 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_96 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.2$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50749 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_97 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.4 \times 1.7$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50765 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_98 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 3.2x1.3 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50764 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_99 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.3x2 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50714 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_100 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3.2 \times 1.6$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50715 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_101 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.4 \times 1.7$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50763 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_102 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 1.9$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50762 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_103 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.4 \times 1.7$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50761 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_104 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 1.2$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50747 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_105 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.8$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50755 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_106 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.7 \times 1.6$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50754 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_107 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.2$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50753 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_108 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 1.2$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50752 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_109 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.4 \times 1.7$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50751 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_110 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 1.6x1 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50332 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_111 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.2$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50408 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_112 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3.4 \times 1.3$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50392 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_113 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 3.3x1.3 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50400 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_114 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.3x2 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50387 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_115 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 3.5x1.8 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50384 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_116 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.4 \times 1.7$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50383 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_117 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 1.9$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50381 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_118 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.4 \times 1.7$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50378 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_119 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.4$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50358 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_120 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.8$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50359 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_121 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.7 \times 1.6$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50361 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_122 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.2$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50360 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_123 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 1.2$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50362 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_124 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 3.1x1.9 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50364 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_125 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.8x1.6 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50367 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_126 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3.2 \times 1.3$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50373 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_127 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 3.3x1.3 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50348 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_128 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.3x2 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50347 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_129 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3.5 \times 1.8$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50346 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_130 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.4 \times 1.7$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50345 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_131 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 1.9$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50344 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_132 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.4 \times 1.7$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50340 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_133 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50349 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_134 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.4 \times 0.8$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50343 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_135 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2x0.8 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50347 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_136 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2×0.5 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50338 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_137 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50339 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_138 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2×0.9 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50357 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_139 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 1.9$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50363 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_140 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.3$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50366 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_141 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.7x2 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50415 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_142 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE |  | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-071 | MSAP | 50411 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_143 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE |  | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-072 | MSAP | 50409 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_144 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.9x1 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50330 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_145 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.4 \times 0.8$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50397 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_146 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $1 \times 0.6$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50388 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_147 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2×0.5 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50386 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_148 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50382 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_149 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2 \times 0.5$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50379 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_150 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.3 \times 1.3$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50328 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_151 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2x 0.7 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50333 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_152 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.2 \times 0.6$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50410 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_153 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.7 \times 1.1$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50329 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_154 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 2.2$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50319 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_155 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2×1 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50315 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_156 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 0.5$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-070 | MSAP | 50335 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_157 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3.3 \times 1.1$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50770 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_158 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.3$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50735 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_159 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.7x2 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50732 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_160 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 1.3$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50728 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_161 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $4 \times 2 \times 1.6$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50708 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_162 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 3.9x 1.5 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50731 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_163 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | 4x2x1.6 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50727 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_164 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | $4 \times 1.4$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50739 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_165 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | 5x2 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_166 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | $4.5 \times 2.3$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_167 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | $5 \times 2.2$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_168 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | $4 \times 3.2$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_169 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | 4×1.7 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_170 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | $4.3 \times 2.3$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_171 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | $5 \times 2$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_172 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3.3 \times 1.1$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50670 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_173 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.3$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50735 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_174 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.7x2 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50732 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_175 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 1.3$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50728 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_176 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | 3.5x2 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_177 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | 3.3x2 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_178 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | 3.6x2.3 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_179 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | 3.5x2 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_180 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | 3.6x2 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_181 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $4 \times 2.2$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_182 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | 3.5x2 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_183 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $5 \times 2.6$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_184 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 5x2.3 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 070-100 | MSAP | 50305 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_185 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $5 \times 2.7$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_186 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.8$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_187 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.5$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_188 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.8$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_189 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.6$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_190 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.7$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_191 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.8$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_192 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2×1.3 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_193 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.7$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_194 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.8$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_195 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.8$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_196 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.9$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_197 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.7$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_198 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.6$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_199 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 4x2 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 50308 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_200 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.8 \times 1.6$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 50318 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_201 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.9x0.9 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 50722 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_202 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 4x.1.5 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 50721 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_203 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.1 \times 0.9$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 5720 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_204 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3.2 \times 1.3$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 5718 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_205 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.6x1 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 5717 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_206 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.4 \times 1.1$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 5719 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_207 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.2 \times 1.2$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 130-160 | MSAP | 50766 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_208 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2x1 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 130-160 | MSAP | 50768 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_209 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.3x2 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 130-160 | MSAP | 50775 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_210 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.3x2 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 070-100 | MSAP | 50356 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_211 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.1 \times 3$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 070-100 | MSAP | 50375 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_212 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2×1.8 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 100-130 | MSAP | 50354 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_213 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2×1.8 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 100-130 | MSAP | 50369 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_214 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.6x1 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50744 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_215 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2 \times 1.5$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 50395 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_216 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2 \times 1.6$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 50396 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_217 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2×1.7 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 50394 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_218 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2x1.8 | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | MSAP | 50393 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_219 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 0.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea I 080-100 | MSAP | 50234 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_220 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 0.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea II 000-030 | MSAP | 50259 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_221 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 0.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea II 000-030 | MSAP | 50260 |  | Monacchi 1988, tav. 35 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_222 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 0.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea II 000-030 | MSAP | 50265 |  | Monacchi 1988, tav. 35 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_223 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 0.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea II 000-030 | MSAP | 50267 |  | Monacchi 1988, tav. 35 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_224 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.5x1.4 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea II 000-030 | MSAP | 50268 |  | Monacchi 1988, tav. 35 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_225 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.9x1.3 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea II 000-030 | MSAP | 50261 |  | Monacchi 1988, tav. 35 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_226 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 3.1x1 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea II 000-030 | MSAP | 50269 |  | Monacchi 1988, tav. 35 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_227 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.7 \times 0.7$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea II 000-030 | MSAP | 50249 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; } \\ & \text { Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, } 218 \\ & \text { tav. } 58 \end{aligned}$ |
| GB_228 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 0.9$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea II 000-030 | MSAP | 50250 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_229 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.8x0.4 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea II 000-030 | MSAP | 50248 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_230 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 0.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea II 000-030 | MSAP | 50237 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_231 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.8$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea I 030-060 | MSAP | 50235 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_232 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea I 030-060 | MSAP | 50247 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_233 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.8$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea I 030-060 | MSAP | 50252 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_234 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.6$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea I 030-060 | MSAP | 50253 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_235 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.7$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea I 030-060 | MSAP | 50232 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_236 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.8$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea I 030-060 | MSAP | 50237 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_237 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2 \times 1.3$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea I 030-060 | MSAP | 50239 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_238 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE |  | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea I 030-060 | MSAP | 50240 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_239 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE |  | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea I 030-060 | MSAP | 50245 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_240 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.8 \times 0.5$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea I 030-060 | MSAP | 50262 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_241 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3.5 \times 1.9$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Tricea II 030-060 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_242 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a cow | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 4.1$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Livello 100 | MSAP | 50271 |  |  | Bruschetti 1988, 220, 4.18; Cenciaioli 1989, 222, <br> $4.41,4.43$ |
| GB_243 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a cow | 6th-4thBCE | $3.6 \times 4.1$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 070-100 | MSAP | 50418 |  |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 222, 4.41, 4.43 |
| GB_244 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a cow | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 4.3$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea II 000-030 | MSAP | 50254 |  |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 222, 4.41, 4.43 |
| GB_245 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a sheep | 6th-4thBCE | 0.9x2.6 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50771 |  |  | Cenciaioli 19991, 223, 4.44-45 Bruschetti 1989, 1214.23 |
| GB_246 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of an ox | 6th-4thBCE | 3.1x4.5 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50770 | A3.11 | Monacchi 1988, tav. 35 | Cenciaioli 1991, 222, 4.41 4.43; Falcone Amorelli 1977 95f |
| GB_247 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | 6th-4thBCE | 2.4x1 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 010-035 | MSAP | 50420 |  |  | Bruschetti 1989, 121, 4.23;Bruschetti 1988, 53, n. 38. Cenciaioli 1991, 223. 4.44-45. |
| GB_248 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a cow | 6th-4thBCE | $2 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50772 |  |  | Bruschetti 1988, 220, 4.18; Cenciaioli 1989, 222, 4.41,4.43 |
| GB_249 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a bovine | 6th-4thBCE | 4.3x3.1 | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III | MSAP | 50417 | A3.12 |  | ${ }_{4.41,4.43}$ Brushetti 1988, 220, 4.18; Cenciaioli 1989, 222, |
| GB_250 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a goat | 6th-4thBCE | $3.6 \times 6.1$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 070-100 | MSAP | 50419 | A3.13 | Monacchi 1988, tav. 35 | Cenciaioli 1991, 223, 4.43 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_251 | Animal | NA figure of an animal | 6th-4thBCE | 3.6x0.6 | Fair | Grota Bella | Trincea III 060-080 | MSAP | 50274 | A3.14 |  | Bruschetti 1989, 1214.23 |
| GB_252 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 6 6t-4thBCE | 3.9x2 | Fair | Grota Bella | NA | MSAP | NA | A3.15 |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| GB_253 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 6 6th-4thBCE | $11 \times 4.5$ | Good | Grota Bella | NA | MSAP | 50785 | A3.16 | Arena 1981-82, tav 18; Monacchi 1988, tav.35c | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| GB_255 | Other | Lead warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 5.4×2.5 | Poor | Grota Bella | Trincea I and II saggioA | MSAP | 50705 |  |  | Cavanagh and Laxton 1984, plate 2-3 and 5 . |
| GB_256 | Other | Lead warrior figure | 6 6th-4th BCE | 4.5x2.2 | Poor | Grota Bella | Trincea III 010-35 | MSAP | 50429 |  |  | Cavanagh and Laxton 1984, plate 2-3 and 5 . |
| GB_257 | Other | Lead warrior figure | 6 6th-4th BCE | $5 \times 2$ | Poor | Grota Bella | Trincea III 010-35 | MSAP | 50436 | ${ }^{\text {A3.24 }}$ |  | Cavanagh and Laxton 1984, plate 2-3 and 5. |
| GB_258 | Other | Lead female figure | 6th-4th BCE | $7.2 \times 4$ | Poor | Grota Bella | Trincea IIII 010-35 | MSAP | 50704 | A3.26 |  | Cavanagh and Laxton 1984, plate 2-3 and 5 . |
| GB_259 | Other | Lead female figure | 6th-4th BCE | $6 \times 3$ | Poor | Grota Bella | Trincea III 010-35 | MSAP | 50431 | ${ }^{\text {A3.27 }}$ |  | Cavanagh and Laxton 1984, plate 3 and 6. |
| GB_260 | Other | Lead female figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.x1.4 | Fragment | Grota Bella | NA | Dunaroba | 108775 |  | Monacchi 1988, tav.36 | Cavanagh and Laxton 1984, plate 3 and 6. |
| GB_261 | Other | Lead female figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4 \times 2.6$ | Fragment | Grota Bella | Trincea III 010-35 | MSAP | 50433 | A3.28 |  | Cavanagh and Laxton 1984, plate 3 and 6. |


| ${ }^{\text {Cat. No. }}$ | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_263 | Other | Lead female figure | 6 6th-4th BCE | 4.5x1.9 | Fragment | Grota Bella | Trincea III 010-35 | MSAP | 50432 |  |  | Cavanagh and Laxton 1984, plate 3 and 6. |
| GB_262 | Other | Lead warrior figure | 6 6th-4th BCE | $5 \times 2.3$ | Poor | Grota Bella | Trincea III 010-35 | MSAP | 50430 | A3.25 |  | Cavanagh and Laxton 1984, plate 2-3 and 5. |
| GB_264 | Other | Lead warriof figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.1x2.3 | Fragment | Grota Bella | Trincea III 010-35 | MSAP | 50451 |  | Monacchi 1988, tav.36 | Cavanagh and Laxton 1984, plate 2-3 and 5. |
| $\mathrm{CB}_{2} 665$ | Other | Lead warriof figure | 6 6th-4th BCE | 1.5x0.8 | Fragment | Grota Bella | Trincea III 010-35 | MSAP | 50434 |  |  | Cavanagh and Laxton 1984, plate 2-3 and 5. |
| GB_266 | Other | Lead episema with three men under tree | 4th BCE | $3 \times 2.7$ | Fair | Grota Bella | Trincea IIII 010-35 | MSAP | 50435 | A3.29 |  |  |
| GB_267 | Other | Lead episema with three men under tree | 4th BCE | $3 \times 2.5$ | Good | Grota Bella | Trincea III 035-70 | MSAP | 50437 | A3.30 | Monacchi 1988, tav.36 |  |
| GB_268 | Other | Lead episema with three men under tree | 4 th BCE | $3 \times 2.6$ | Fair | Grota Bella | Trincea III 010-35 | MSAP | 50438 |  |  |  |
| GB_269 | Other | Lead episema with three men under tree | 4th BCE | 3.112.3 | Fair | Grota Bella | NA | MSAP | 50452 |  |  |  |
| GB_270 | Other | Lead episema with three men under tree | 4th BCE | $2.2 \times 2$ | Fair | Grota Bella | Trincea III 010-35 | MSAP | 50443 |  |  |  |
| GB_271 | Other | Lead episema with three men under tree | 4th BCE | $3.3 \times 2$ | Poor | Grota Bella | Trincea III 010-35 | MSAP | 50442 |  |  |  |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_272 | Other | Lead episema with three men under tree | 4th BCE | 3.1×2.2 | Poor | Grotta Bella | Trincea III 035-70 | MSAP | 50440 | A3.31 |  |  |
| GB_273 | Other | Lead episema with gorgoneion | 4th BCE | $2.1 \times 1.8$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108773 | A3.32 | Monacchi 1988, tav. 36 | Matteini Chiari 1996, 228 |
| GB_274 | Other | Lead episema with radiating sun | 4th BCE | 2.9x2.1 | Poor | Grota Bella | Trincea III 010-35 | MSAP | 50445 | A3.33 | Monacchi 1988, tav. 36 |  |
| GB_275 | AAnat | Bronze leg | 6th-4th BCE | $5 \times 0.3$ | Good | Grotta Bella | Trincea 035-060 | MSAP | NA | A3.17 |  | Gualandi 1974, 42, fig. 2. |
| GB_276 | AAnat | Bronze arm | 6th-4th BCE | 0.7x2.9 | Good | Grota Bella | Trincea 035-060 | MSAP | NA | A3.18 |  | Bruschetti 1989, 122, 4.28; Cenciaioli 1991, 226 4.51; Manca et al. 2014, 57 fig. 41 |
| GB_277 | AAnat | Bronze leg | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.5$ | Good | Grota Bella | Trincea 035-060 | MSAP | NA | A3.19 |  | Gualandi 1974, 42, fig. 2. |
| GB_278 | AAnat | Bronze foot | 6th-4th BCE | 3.9x1 | Fair | Grota Bella | NA | MSAP | 114336 | A3.20 |  | Gualandi 1974, 63, fig. 11. |
| GB_279 | AH | Schematic bronze head | 6th-4th BCE | 2.8x0.6 | Good | Grota Bella | Trincea 035-070 | MSAP | 50425 | A3.21 |  | Bonomi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39; Falcone Amorelli 1977 tav 74b and d |
| GB_280 | AH | Schematic bronze head | 6th-4th BCE | 3.8x0.9 | Fair | Grotta Bella | Trincea III | MSAP | 50423 | A3.22 |  | Bonomi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39; Falcone Amorelli 1977 tav 74b and d |
| GB_281 | AH | Schematic bronze head | 6th-4th BCE | 3.6x1 | Good | Grota Bella | Trincea 035-060 | MSAP | 50424 | A3.23 |  | Bonomi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39; Falcone Amorelli 1977 tav 74b and d |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Compranda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_282 | Anat | Ter | 4th-2nd BCE | 6.5x4.5 | Good | Grota Bella | Saggio E | MSAP | NA | A3,34 | Monacchi 1986, 84. | Pensabene $1980,246-248$; Fenelif 1975b, 28 Comella 1982, 131-133. |
| GB_283 | Anat. | Terracota foot | 4th-2nd BCE | NA | Fair | Grota Bella | NA | Lost | 108757 | A3,35 | Monacchi 1988, tav. 36 | Almagro 1982, 295; Rizzello, 1980, 18-19; Vagnetti 1971, 95. |
| GB_284 | Anat | Terracota foot | 4th-2nd BCE | NA | Fair | Grota Bella | NA | Lost | NA |  | Monacchi 1986, 84. | Almagro 1982, 295; Rizzello, 1980, 18-19; Vagnetti 1971, 95 . |
| GB_285 | HellWorsh | Worshipper holding a patera and standing on a base | 3rd-2nd BCE | $4 \times 3.6$ | Good | Grota Bella | NA | MSAP | 3038 | A3.36 | Monachi 1988, tav. 37 | Bonomi Ponzi 2006, 121 fig. 19; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-d |
| GB_286 | HellWorsh | Worshipper holding a patera | 3rd-2nd BCE | $3.6 \times 2$ | Good | Grota Bella | Trincea III 000-030 | MSAP | 50225 | A3.37 | Monachi 1988, tav. 37 | Bonomi Ponzi 2006, 121 fig. 19; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-d |
| GB_287 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | $6 \mathrm{th}-4 \mathrm{thBCE}$ | na | na | Grota Bella | NA | na | na |  | Monacchi 1988, 79 | 4.44-45.Srucheri 1989, , 21, 4.23; Cenciaioir 1991, 223. |
| GB_288 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | $6 \mathrm{th}-4 \mathrm{thBCE}$ | na | na | Grota Bella | NA | na | na |  | Monacchi 1988, | Bruschetti 1989, 121, 4.23; Cenciaioli 1991, 223. 4.44-45. |
| GB_289 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | 6th-4thBCE | na | na | Grota Bella | NA | na | na |  | Monacchi 1988, 79 | Bruschetti 1989, 121, 4.23; Cenciaioli 1991, 223. 4.44-45. |
| GB_290 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | 6th-4hBCE | na | na | Grota Bella | NA | na | na |  | Monacchi 1988, 79 | Bruschetti 1989, 121, 4.23; Cenciaioli 1991, 223. 4.44-45. |
| GB_291 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a sheep | $6 \mathrm{th}-4 \mathrm{thBCE}$ | na | na | Grota Bella | NA | na | na |  | Monacchi 1988, 79 | Cenciaioli 1991, 223 4.44; Bruschetti 1989, 121 4.23 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_292 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 0.6$ | fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108777 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_293 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.1 \times 0.8$ | fragment | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108778 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_294 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.2 \times 1$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108779 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_295 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2×1.2 | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108780 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; } \\ & \text { Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, } 218 \\ & \text { tav. } 58 \end{aligned}$ |
| GB_296 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 0.5$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108820 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_297 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 1.2$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108821 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_298 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 1.8x0.6 | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108822 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_299 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 1.9x0.8 | Fair | Grota Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108823 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_300 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 2.3x1.4 | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108824 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; } \\ & \text { Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, } 218 \\ & \text { tav. } 58 \end{aligned}$ |
| GB_301 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $1.2 \times 0.8$ | Fragment | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108825 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_302 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.6 \times 0.6$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108826 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_303 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.3 \times 1.2$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108827 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_304 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 0.7$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108828 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_305 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108829 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; } \\ & \text { Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, } 218 \\ & \text { tav. } 58 \end{aligned}$ |
| GB_306 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3.2 \times 0.8$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108830 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_307 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 1.2$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108831 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_308 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.1 \times 1.7$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108832 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_309 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $3 \times 0.7$ | Fair | Grota Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108833 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_310 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.1 \times 0.2$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108834 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; } \\ & \text { Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, } 218 \\ & \text { tav. } 58 \end{aligned}$ |
| GB_311 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | $1.3 \times 0.4$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108835 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GB_312 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 3.9x1.1 | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108836 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_313 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 1.9x0.6 | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108837 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_314 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4thBCE | 1.6x0.6 | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108838 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_315 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | $2.5 \times 1.6$ | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 108786 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_316 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4thBCE | 1.6x0.7 | Fair | Grotta Bella | NA | Dunarobba | 10878 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| GB_318 | HellWorsh | Worshipper with outstretched arms | 3rd-2nd BCE | $4 \times 2.9$ | Good | Grotta Bella | NA | GB_285 | 50304 | A3.38 |  | Galestin 1987, 95; Rendini 2001, 290 tav. 4a |
| PNT_1 | Other | Lead warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.9x3 | Poor | Pantanelli | Votive pit | MCA | NA | A3.39 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Matt } \\ & 227 \end{aligned}$ | Cavanagh and Laxton 1984, plate 2-3 and 5. |
| PNT_2 | Other | Lead warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.2x1.2 | Poor | Pantanelli | Votive pit | MCA | NA | A3.40 | Matteini Chiari 1996, <br> 227 | Cavanagh and Laxton 1984, plate 2-3 and 5. |
| PNT_3 | Other | Lead episema with gorgoneion | 6th-4th BCE | $1.2 \times 1.1$ | Poor | Pantanelli | Votive pit | MCA | NA | A3.41 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Matt } \\ & 229 \end{aligned}$ | Monacchi 1988, tav. 36 |
| PNT_4 | Other | Lead episema with zigzag and knobs motif | 6th-4th BCE | $1.7 \times 1.5$ | Poor | Pantanelli | Votive pit | MCA | NA | A3.42 | Matteini Chiari 1996, 229 |  |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PNT_5 | Other | Lead episema with zigzag and knobs motif | 6th-4th BCE | $2.7 \times 2.5$ | Poor | Pantanelli | Votive pit | MCA | NA |  | Matteini Chiari 1996, 228 |  |
| PNT_6 | Other | Lead episema with zigzag and knobs motif | 6th-4th BCE | $2.8 \times 2.8$ | Poor | Pantanelli | Votive pit | MCA | NA |  | Matteini Chiari 1996, <br> 228 |  |
| PNT_7 | Other | Lead episema with gorgoneion | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 2.5$ | Fair | Pantanelli | Votive pit | MCA | NA |  | Matteini Chiari 1996, 228 | Monacchi 1988, tav.36 |
| PNT_8 | Anat | Foot | 4th-2nd BCE | $18 \times 15$ | Fair | Pantanelli | Votive pit | MCA | 124019 | A3.43 | Matteini Chiari 1996, <br> 229 | Comella 1986, 70-71, tav. 35c, 36, E8; Coarelli 1986, 140, tav. 86-83; Potter 1989, 25-29, figg. 14 18. |
| PNT_9 | Anat | Foot | 4 4t-2nd BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 58 |  |
| PNT_10 | Animal | Cow | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1860, 119 | Monacchi 1988, tav. 35d; Cenciaioli 1989, 220, 4.40-43; Manca et al. 2014, 56 n. 34 |
| PNT_11 | Animal | Cow | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1860, 120 | Monacchi 1988, tav. 35d; Cenciaioli 1989, 220, 4.40-43; Manca et al. 2014, 56 n. 34 |
| PNT_12 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_13 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74 Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_14 | EG | "'idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74 Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PNT_15 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_16 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_17 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_18 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_19 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; } \\ & \text { Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, } 218 \\ & \text { tav. } 58 \end{aligned}$ |
| PNT_20 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_21 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_22 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_23 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_24 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PNT_25 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_26 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_27 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_28 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_29 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_30 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_31 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_32 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_33 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_34 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PNT_35 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_36 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_37 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_38 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_39 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_40 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_41 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_42 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_43 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_44 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PNT_45 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantaneli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1 864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_46 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantaneli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_47 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantaneli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_48 | EG | "'idoli ordinari, alcumi di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_49 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_50 | EG | "idoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_51 | EG | "ddoli ordinari, alcuni di buona foggia" | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| PNT_S2 | Head | "two Heads well preserved" | 3 rd -1stBCE | NA | NA | Pantaneli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1 1864, 58 |  |
| PNT_53 | Head | "two Heads well preserved" | 3 rd - stBCE | NA | NA | Pantaneli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 58 |  |
| PNT_54 | Head | "quindici o piu' teste di uomini e donne" | 3 rd-1 stBCE | NA | NA | Pantaneli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1 864, 58 |  |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Wihin Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Billiography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PNT_5 | Head | "quindici o piu' teste di uominie donne" | 3rd-lstBCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1 1864, 58 |  |
| PNT_56 | Head | "quindici o piu' teste di uomini e donne" | 3rd-stBCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 58 |  |
| PNT_57 | Head | "quindici o piu' teste di uomini e donne" | 3rd- stitce | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 58 |  |
| PNT_58 | Head | "quindici o piu' teste di uominie donne" | $3 \mathrm{rd-1stBCE}$ | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 58 |  |
| PNT_59 | Head | "quindicio o piu' teste di uomini e donne" | 3rd-stisCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1 1864, 58 |  |
| PNT_60 | Head | "quindicio o piu' teste di uominie donne" | 3rd-IstBCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1 1864, 58 |  |
| PNT_61 | Head | "quindici o piu' teste di uomini e donne" | 3rd-stisce | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 58 |  |
| PNT_62 | Head | "quindici o piu' teste di uomini e donne" | 3rd- stigCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 58 |  |
| PNT_63 | Head | "quindici o piu' teste di uomini e donne" | 3rd- 1 stBCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1 1864, 58 |  |
| PNT_64 | Head | "quindicio o piu' teste di uomini e donne" | 3 3rd-stBCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1 1864, 58 |  |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PNT_65 | Head | "quindici o piu' teste di uominie donne" | 3rd-1stBCE | NA | NA | Pantanelli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 58 |  |
| PNT_66 | Head | "quindicio o piu' teste di uominie donne" | 3rd-1stBCE | NA | NA | Pantaneli | Votive pit | Lost |  |  | Eroli 1864, 58 |  |
| MSP_1 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-5th | $2.6 \times 0.8$ | Fragment | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | manu | 721816 | A3.44 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MSP_2 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-5th | $2.1 \times 0.6$ | Fragment | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | MANU | 721817 | ${ }^{\text {A3.44 }}$ |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MSP_3 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6 6th-5th | $1.5 \times 1.3$ | Fragment | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | MANU | 721818 | A3.44 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MSP_4 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-5th | $4 \times 1.3$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Foruitous finding | Manu | 721836 | ${ }^{\text {A3.45 }}$ |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MSP_5 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-5th | $3.8 \times 1.6$ | Poor | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | MANU | 721837 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74 Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MSP_6 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-5th | $5.8 \times 1.3$ | Fair | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | MANU | 721862 | A3.46 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MSP_7 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | $6 \mathrm{th}-5 \mathrm{th}$ | $4.1 \times 1$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Foruitous finding | MANU | 721863 | A3.47 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MSP_8 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-Sth | $4.5 \times 1.1$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | MANU | 721861 | A3.48 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74 Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MSP_9 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-5th | $4.1 \times 1.1$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | MANU | 721860 | A3.49 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MSP_10 | FoG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 6th-5th | $7.2 \times 3$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | MANU | 721867 | A3.55 |  | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| MSP_11 | ToG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 6th-5th | 26 x | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | V.lla Giulia | NA | A3.56 | Paribeni 1937, 359- <br> 363. Colonna 1970, 76 <br> 80, tav.65-56 | Colonna 1970, 76-78 tav. 50-51 |
| MSP_12 | BS | Schematic figure turned sideways | 6th-5th | 6.3x 3.5 | Fair | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | MANU | 721871 | A3.57 |  | Colonna 1970,107-114 tav. 76; Tabone 1995-96, 219-22 tav. 59.5-7 |
| MSP_13 | AH | Schematic head | 6th-5th | $3.5 \times 1$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | MANU | 721875 | A3.53 |  | Bonimi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 74a and c |
| MSP_14 | AH | Schematic head | 6th-5th | $3.3 \times 0.3$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | MANU | 721876 | A3.53 |  | Bonimi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39. |
| MSP_15 | AH | Schematic head | 6th-5th | $3.5 \times 0.3$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | MANU | 721877 | A3.53 |  | Bonimi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39. |
| MSP_16 | AH | Bronze male head | 6th-5th | $3.2 \times 1$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | MANU | 721878 | A3.53 |  | Bonimi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 74a and c |
| MSP_17 | AH | Bronze male head | 6th-5th | $3 \times 0.7$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | MANU | 721879 | A3.53 |  | Bonimi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39. |
| MSP_18 | AAnat | Bronze leg | 6th-5th | $3.8 \times 0.9$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | MANU | 721864 | A3.50 |  | Gualandi 1974, 42, fig. 2. |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Compranda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MSP_19 | AAnat | Bronze leg | 6th-5th | 3.8× 0.9 | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | manu | 721865 | A3.50 |  | Gualandi 1974, 42, fig. 2. |
| MSP_20 | AAnat | Bronze a | 6th-5th | $3 \times 5.1$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | manu | 721820 | A3.51 |  | Bruschetti 1989, 122, 4.28; Cenciaioli 1991, 226 4.51; Manca et al. 2014, 57 fig. 41 |
| MSP_21 | AAnat | Bronze arm | 6th-5th | $6 \times 5.1$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | manu | 721821 | A3.52 |  | Bruschetti 1989, 122, 4.28; Cenciaioli 1991, 226 4.51; Manca et al. 2014, 57 fig. 41 |
| MSP_22 | Anat | Terracota half-head | 2nd 1/2 2ndBCE | $7 \times 8.2$ | Fair | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | manu | 721815 | A3.59 |  | Sönderlind 2002, 62;60. |
| MSP_23 | EC | Schematic crest with two eyes | 6th-5th | $2 \times 1.5$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | manu | 721872 | A3.54 |  | Manca e tal. 2014, 57 fig. 38; Sisani 2013, |
| MSP_24 | EC | Schematic crest with two eyes | 6th-5th | $2.9 \times 3$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | manu | 721873 | A3.54 |  | Manca etal. 2014, 57 fig. 38 ; Sisani 2013, |
| MSP_25 | EC | Schematic crest with two eyes | 6th-5th | $2.8 \times 1.7$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | manu | 721874 | A3.54 |  | Manca e tal. 2014, 57 fig. 38; Sisani 2013, |
| MSP_26 | Animal | Schematic figure of an ox | 6th-Sth | $3.1 \times 5$ | Good | Mt. S. Pancrazio | Fortuitous finding | MANU | 721819 | A3.58 |  | Bruschetti 1989, 20, 4.18; Falconi Amorelli, 1977, 183, 95c; Monacchi 1988, 79. |
| MTM _ 72 | Head | Female terracota head | 2nd BCE | $8.7 \times 10.1$ | Fragment | Mte Torre Maggiore | NA | caos | 209163 | A3.85 |  | Söderlind 2002, 180 |
| MTM_1 | HellWorsh | Worshipper holding a patera | 3 rrd BCE | $5.7 \times 4.1$ | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers | MANU | 721804 | A3.79 |  | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | h. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_10 | HellWor | Worshipper holding a patera | 3rd BCE | 5.7x4 | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers | caos | 273891 |  |  | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38, d.e-; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 acc ; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTM_11 | HellWorsh | Worshipper holding a patera | 3rd BCE | $6.5 \times 6.1$ | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers | caos | 212191 |  |  | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTM_12 | HellWorsh | Worshipper holding a patera | 3rd BCE | 9.116 | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers | caos | 202103 |  |  | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTM_13 | HellWorsh | Female worshipper holding an acerra | 3rd BCE | $8.1 \times 4.9$ | Good | Mte Torre Maggior | Disturbed layers | caos | 212196 | A3.81 |  | Falcone Amorelli 1977 tav. $93 \mathrm{e}-\mathrm{f}$ |
| MTM_14 | HellWorsh | Worshipper holding a patera | 3rd BCE | $5 \times 3$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggior | Disturbed layers | MSAP | 212165 |  | Bonomi Ponzi 2006, 116 fig. 7 | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTM_15 | HellWorsh | Worshipper holding a patera | 3rd BCE | $5 \times 2.2$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 8 quad. AA3 | MSAP | 212169 |  |  | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTM_2 | HellWorsh | Arm of Worshipper with patera | 3rd BCE | $4 \times 1.8$ | Fragment | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers | caos | 212171 |  |  | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTM 3 | HellWorsh | Arm of worshipper with patera | 3rd BCE | $4 \times 1.8$ | Fragment | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers | caos | 212194 |  |  | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| мтМ_4 | HellWorsh | Arm of worshipper with patera | 3rd BCE | $4 \times 1.8$ | Fragment | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers | caos | 22198 |  |  | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| мTM_5 | HellWorsh | Arm of worshipper with patera | 3rd BCE | $2.4 \times 1.1$ | Fragment | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 1 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_6 | HellWorsh | Worshipper holding a patera | 3rd BCE | $4.8 \times 3.7$ | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers | CAOS | 209160 | A3.80 |  | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTM_7 | HellWorsh | Worshipper holding a patera | 3rd BCE | $6.1 \times 3.2$ | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Quad. DE1-2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTM_8 | HellWorsh | Worshipper holding a patera | 3rd BCE | $7.4 \times 4.4$ | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers | CAOS | 209165 |  |  | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTM_9 | HellWorsh | Worshipper holding a patera | 3rd BCE | 4.9x3.8 | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers | CAOS | 212190 |  |  | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTM_69 | Anat | Terracotta hand with ring | 3 rd -1stBCE | $2.8 \times 4.9$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | caos | NA | A3.82 | Bononi Ponzi 1989, 26 | No comparanda has been located for this piece. |
| MTM_70 | Anat | Terracotta foot | 3rd-1 stBCE | NA | Fragment | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | NA | NA | A3.83 | Bononi Ponzi 1989, 26 <br> fig. 21 | Fragment is too small. |
| MTM_71 | Head | Male terracotta head | 3 rd -1 stBCE | $9 \times 10$ | Fragment | Mte Torre Maggiore | NA | caos | 341470 | A3.84 |  | Söderlind 2002, 70-71 |
| MTM_100 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2×0.8 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | 209113 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_101 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $1.6 \times 0.6$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | 209113 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_102 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 4x2 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Quad. AA2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_103 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.5 \times 0.5$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Quad. AA2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_104 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4 \times 1.7$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Quad. AA2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_105 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.2x1 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | Quad. AA2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_106 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3 \times 1.5$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 9 quad. AA4 | MSAP | 212197 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_107 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3 \times 1$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 9 quad. AA4 | MSAP | 212197 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_108 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.3x1 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 9 quad. AA4 | MSAP | 212197 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_109 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.3x1.4 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 9 quad. AA4 | MSAP | 212197 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_110 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.2 \times 1.2$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 9 quad. AA4 | MSAP | 212197 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_111 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $1.9 \times 1$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 9 quad. AA4 | MSAP | 212197 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_112 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.6 \times 1.9$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 9 quad. AA4 | MSAP | 212197 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_113 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.1 \times 1.8$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 9 quad. AA4 | MSAP | 212197 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_114 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.5$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 9 quad. AA4 | MSAP | 212197 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_115 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.2x0.8 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 9 quad. AA4 | MSAP | 212197 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_116 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.4 \times 0.6$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 9 quad. AA4 | MSAP | 212197 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_117 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.7$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 9 quad. AA4 | MSAP | 212197 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_118 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.2 \times 1.1$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 9 quad. AA4 | MSAP | 212197 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_119 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.3 \times 0.5$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MSAP | 209106 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_120 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.1 \times 0.4$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MSAP | 209106 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_121 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3 \times 0.5$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MSAP | 209106 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_122 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.5x1 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 8 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_123 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 1.3$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 8 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_124 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 1.6$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 8 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_125 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.5 \times 1.2$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 8 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_126 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 1.3$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 8 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_127 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.5x0.7 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 7 quad. AA5 | MSAP | 212170 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_128 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.1 \times 0.9$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 7 quad. AA5 | MSAP | 212170 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_129 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.2 \times 1.1$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 12 quad AA4 | MSAP | 212166 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_130 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.9$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 15 | MSAP | 209100 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_131 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.9x1.2 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 15 | MSAP | 209100 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_132 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $0.5 \times 0.5$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 15 | MSAP | 209100 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_133 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.8x0.9 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 15 quad. AA5 | MSAP | 212192 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_134 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.4 \times 1$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 15 quad. AA5 | MSAP | 212192 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_135 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.3 \times 0.8$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 15 quad. AA5 | MSAP | 212192 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_136 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.2 \times 0.8$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 15 quad. AA5 | MSAP | 212192 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_137 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.4 \times 1.1$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 15 quad. AA5 | MSAP | 212192 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_138 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $1.8 \times 0.5$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 15 quad. AA5 | MSAP | 212192 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_139 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 1.7x0.7 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 15 quad. AA5 | MSAP | 212192 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_140 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2×0.8 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 15 quad. AA5 | MSAP | 212192 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_141 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4th BCE | 5.4x2.9 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Votive pit | MSAP | 209173 | A3.62 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_142 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.8 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 209133 | A3.62 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_143 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 1.8$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 209133 | A3.62 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_144 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.4 \times 1.3$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 209133 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_145 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.5x1 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 209133 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_146 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.2 \times 0.6$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 209170 | A3.63 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_147 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.2x0.8 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 209170 | A3.63 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_148 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.3 \times 0.6$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 209170 | A3.63 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_149 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.7 \times 0.5$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 209170 | A3.63 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_150 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2×0.4 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 209170 | A3.63 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_151 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.8x1 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 209170 | A3.63 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_152 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2 \times 0.42 \times 0.6$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 209170 | A3.63 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_153 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 1.8x0.4 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 209170 | A3.63 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_154 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.9x1.4 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 209170 | A3.63 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_155 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.1x1.2 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 209170 | A3.63 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_156 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4 \times 2.1$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | NA | A3.63 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_157 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.1 \times 0.9$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_158 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.6$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_159 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 4.2x0.9 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 quad. AA2 | MSAP | 209131 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_16 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | 6th-4th BCE | $7 \times 4.2$ | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MANU | 721805 | A3.66 |  | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 1995- $96,217 \text { tav. 56.1-5 }$ |
| MTM_160 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.9x1 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 quad. AA2 | MSAP | 209131 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_161 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.2 \times 0.9$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 quad. AA2 | MSAP | 209131 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_162 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $1.6 \times 0.6$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 quad. AA2 | MSAP | 209131 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_163 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.2 \times 0.6$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 113842 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_164 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.2 \times 1.1$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | SW side of sanctuary | MSAP | 207665 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_165 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 4.9x2 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 209130 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_166 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2×1.3 | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 202129 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_167 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3 \times 0.9$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 3 | MSAP | 209158 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_168 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.2 z 0.8 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 3 | MSAP | 209158 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_169 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.4 \times 0.5$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 1 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_17 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | 6th-4th BCE | $6.5 \times 2.6$ | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MANU | 721808 | A3.67 |  | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-5 |
| MTM_170 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.5 \times 0.5$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 1 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_171 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 4.9X2 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_172 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.9x0.9 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_173 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.3$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_174 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.6$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_175 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 1.6x0.7 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_176 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4.2 \times 1.9$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 3 | MSAP | 907783 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_177 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 4×1.4 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | quad. CA $1 / 2$ | MSAP | NA | A3.60 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_178 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.6x1 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 14 quad. A3 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_179 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3 \times 1.1$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 14 quad. A3 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_18 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | 6th-4th BCE | 7.1x4.5 | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 3 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-5 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_180 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4 \times 1.6$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 14 quad. A3 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_181 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 5.3x2.7 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Quad. DE1-2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_182 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.8x0.6 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Quad EF/2-3 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_183 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.6$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 3 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_184 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4th BCE | 4.4×2 | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Quad. F5G5/F6G6 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_185 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.9x0.8 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Quad. F5G5/F6G7 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_186 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $1.7 \times 0.7$ | Fragment | Mte Torre Maggiore | Quad. F5G5/F6G8 | MSAP | NA |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; } \\ & \text { Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, } 218 \\ & \text { tav. } 58 \end{aligned}$ |
| MTM_187 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.7x1 | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MSAP | 94421 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_188 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 5.5x1.5 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MSAP | 94313 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_189 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 5.5x1.7 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MSAP | 94314 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-5 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_19 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | 6th-4th BCE | 5x2.4 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | quad. CA $1 / 2$ | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_190 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.1 \times 0.6$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_191 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.1 \times 0.7$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MSAP | 209113 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_192 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.1x1.2 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MSAP | 209113 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_193 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.3x1.2 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MSAP | 209113 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_194 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.5$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MSAP | 209113 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_195 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.7 \times 1.2$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MSAP | 209113 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_196 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 1.6x0.8 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MSAP | 209113 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_197 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $1.8 \times 1.6$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MSAP | 209113 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_198 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $1.4 \times 0.6$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MSAP | 209113 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_199 | FoG | Highly schematize warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 7.1x1.6 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 94382 |  | Bonomi Ponzi 1989, 22 | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| MTM_20 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | 6th-4th BCE | $9 \times 4.4$ | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 3 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-5 |
| MTM_21 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4th BCE | $6.8 \times 3$ | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 338231 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_22 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4th BCE | $5 \times 2.5$ | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MANU | 721809 | A3.64 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_23 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.2 \times 0.9$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 | A3.65 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_24 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.7 \times 0.9$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_25 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.2 \times 1.1$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_26 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.5 \times 0.9$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_27 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.2 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_28 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.2 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_29 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3 \times 0.8$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_30 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.8x0.5 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_31 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3x.1.1 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_32 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2×0.9 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_33 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.8$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 | A3.61 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_34 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.4 \times 0.4$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_35 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.9x1 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_36 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.5x1.1 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_37 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3 \times 0.7$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_38 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.2 \times 0.8$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_39 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4 \times 0.5$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_40 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.8x 0.4 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_41 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4 \times 0.9$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_42 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.5$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_43 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.6 \times 0.5$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_44 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3 \times 1$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_45 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.5 \times 1.1$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_46 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3 \times 0.7$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_47 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.9x0.8 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_48 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4 \times 0.5$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_49 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4 \times 0.7$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_50 | EG | Extremely schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.6$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_51 | EG | Highly schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.6 \times 0.6$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_52 | EG | Highly schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4 \times 0.9$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_53 | EG | Highly schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.5 \times 1.1$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  | Bomoni Ponzi 1989, 22 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_54 | EG | Highly schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.3 \times 0.7$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  | Bonomi Ponzi 1989, 22 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_55 | EG | Highly schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.9x0.3 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  | Bonomi Ponzi 1989, 22 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_56 | EG | Highly schematize male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $5.3 \times 2.4$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 721809 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_57 | FoG | Highly schematize warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $11 \times 2.9$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 113484 | A3.75 |  | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| MTM_58 | FoG | Highly schematize warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $11.7 \times 2.6$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | CAOS | 94420 | A3.76 |  | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_59 | AmG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | 6th-4th BCE | $7 \times 4$ | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MANU | 721807 | A3. |  | Colonna 1970, 90, 92-95 tav. 66-68; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.6 |
| MTM 60 | Animal | Schematic head of a b | 6th-4th BCE | 1.9x2.5 | Fragment | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers pit | caos | 338233 | A3.77 | Bononi Ponzi 1989, 26 fig. 22 | Monacchi 1988, tav. 35d; Cenciaioli 1989, 220, 4.40-43; Manca et al. 2014, 56 n. 34 |
| MTM _61 | Animal | schematic head of a bull in impasto rosso | 6th-4th BCE | 2.882.2 | Fragment? | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | caos | 94429 | A3.78 | Bononi Ponzi 1989, 26 fig. 22 |  |
| MTM_63 | Ан | Bronze Schematic head | 6th-4th BCE | $3.4 \times 0.8$ | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers pit | manu | 721806 | A3.69 | Bononi Ponzi 1989, 22 | Falcone Amorelli 1977 tav. 74a and c |
| MTM_64 | Ан | Bronze Schematic head | 6th-4th BCE | $4 \times 1.1$ | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers pit | caos | NA | A3.70 |  | Falcone Amorelli 1977 tav. 74a a and c |
| MTM_65 | Annat | Bronze hand | 6th-4th BCE | $2.3 \times 0.8$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers pit | caos | 273867 | A3.71 |  |  |
| MTM 66 | Ан | Bronze Schematic head | 6th-4th BCE | $3 \times 2$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | caos | 94310 |  |  | Bonimi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 74b and d. |
| MTM _67 | AH | Bronze Schematic head | 6th-4th BCE | $1.9 \times 0.9$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | caos | 209161 |  |  | Bonimi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 74b and d. |
| MTM_68 | AAnat | Bronze foot | 6th-4th BCE | $2.7 \times \mathrm{h} .0 .9$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers pit | caos | 313 | A3.72 |  | Gualandi 1974, 63, fig. 11. |
| MTM_72 | Ан | Bronze male head | 6th-4th BCE | $4 \times 1$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore |  | MSAP | NA |  |  |  |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_73 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.9x1.6 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_74 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.6 \times 0.7$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_75 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.6$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_76 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2×0.5 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_77 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.5 \times 1.2$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_78 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.9x1 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_79 | EG | Schematic crest with two eyes | 6th-4th BCE | 4×2.1 | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | 113414 | A3.76 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_80 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4th BCE | 1.5x0.8 | Fragment | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | 113425 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_81 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.5 \times 0.9$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | 113408 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_82 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $5 \times 2.6$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | Disturbed layers/pit | MSAP | 94422 | A3.74 |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_83 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 5.2x2.2 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | 113411 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| MTM_84 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.5$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | 113412 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_85 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.3x0.8 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | 113409 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_86 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.9 \times 1.5$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | 273843 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_87 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $5.3 \times 2.9$ | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 3 | MSAP | 212099 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_88 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 1.9x0.5 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 6 quad. AA3 | MSAP | 209172 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_89 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $1.9 \times 1.6$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 6 quad. AA3 | MSAP | 209172 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_90 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $0.6 \times 1.9$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 6 quad. AA3 | MSAP | 209172 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_91 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3 \times 1$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 6 quad. AA3 | MSAP | 209172 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_92 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3 \times 1.9$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 6 quad. AA3 | MSAP | 209172 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTM_93 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 1.8x1 | Fragment | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 6 quad. AA3 | MSAP | 209172 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| MTM_94 | FoG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 4.2x6 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 4 | MSAP | 209129 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| MTM_95 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 4×2.1 | Fair | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | 209104 | A3.73 |  | 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 <br> Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. $57.5-6$ |
| MTM_96 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3 \times 7 \times 1.2$ | Good | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | 209105 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_97 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.5 \times 0.7$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | 209109 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_98 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 1.6x0.2 | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | 209111 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTM_99 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.9$ | Poor | Mte Torre Maggiore | US 2 | MSAP | 209113 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MM_1 | FoG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | 8.5x3.3 | Good | Monte Moro | Silos/cistern | MANS | 230034 | A3.91 |  | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| MM_2 | FoG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | 7.5x2.4 | Good | Monte Moro | Silos/cistern | MANS | 183030 |  | Sisani 2013, 134 | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| MM_3 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 3.9x2 | Good | Monte Moro | Silos/cistern | MANS | 183026 | A3.86 | Sisani 2013, 135 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MM_4 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5 \times 1.9$ | Good | Monte Moro | Silos/cistern | MANS | 183024 |  | Sisani 2013, 135 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MM_5 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5x1.9 | Fair | Monte Moro | Silos/cistern | MANS | 230054 | A3.87 | Sisani 2013, 135 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MM_6 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 3.2×1 | Good | Monte Moro | Silos/cistern | MANS | 230031 |  | Sisani 2013, 135 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MM_7 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3.9 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Monte Moro | Silos/cistern | MANS | 230028 | A3.88 | Sisani 2013, 135 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MM_8 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $2.9 \times 0.8$ | Fair | Monte Moro | Silos/cistern | MANS | 230020 |  | Sisani 2013, 135 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MM_9 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $1.7 \times 0.8$ | Fragment | Monte Moro | Silos/cistern | MANS | 230052 |  | Sisani 2013, 135 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MM_10 | EC | Schematic crest with two eyes | 5th-4th BCE | $3.5 \times 1.5$ | Good | Monte Moro | Silos/cistern | MANS | 183031 | A3.89 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Costamagna 1999, } \\ & \text { Sisani 2013, } 136 \end{aligned}$ | Manca et al. 2014, 57 fig. 38 |
| MM_11 | EC | Schematic crest with two eyes | 5th-4th BCE | 3.8x2 | Good | Monte Moro | Silos/cistern | MANS | 183034 | A3.90 | Costamagna 1999, $9 ;$ Sisani 2013, 136 | Manca et al. 2014, 57 fig. 38 |
| MM_12 | EC | Schematic crest with two eyes | 5th-4th BCE | 3x1 | Good | Monte Moro | Silos/cistern | MANS | 183035 |  | Costamagna 1999, $9 ;$ Sisani 2013, 136 | Manca et al. 2014, 57 fig. 38 |
| MM_13 | EC | Schematic crest with two eyes | 5th-4th BCE | $3 \times 0.7$ | Fair | Monte Moro | Silos/cistern | MANS | 183036 |  | Costamagna 1999, <br> 9;Sisani 2013, 136 | Manca et al. 2014, 57 fig. 38 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Compranda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MM_14 | EC | Schematic crest with two eyes | Shh-4h BCE | 2.9x | Fragment | Monte Moro | Silosc/istern | MANS | 230010 |  | (esisani 2013, 136 | Manca etal. 2014,57 fig. 38 |
| MM_15 | AH | Schematic head | Sth-4h BCE | 2.9x0.2 | Good | Monte Moro | Siloscisistem | MANS | 23026 | A3.94 | Costamagna 1999, 9; Sisani 2013, 136 | Bonimi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39; Falcone Amorelli 1977 tav 74b and d |
| MM_16 | Animal | schematic figure of horse | Sth-4h BCE | 2.9x4 | Fair | Monte Moro | Siloscisistem | MANS | 230045 | A3.92 | Costamagna 1999, 10; Sisani 2013, 136 | Bruschetti 1989, 120, 4.17; Falconi Amorelli 1977, tav. 95i |
| MM_17 | Animal | schematic figure of an ox | Sth-4th BCE | $0.5 \times 1.5$ | Fragment | Monte Moro | Silosc/istern | MANS | 230023 | A3.93 | Sisani 2014, 136 | Bruschetti 1989, 20, 4.18; Falconi Amorelli, 1977, 183, 95c; Monacchi 1988, 79. |
| MM_18 | Head | Terracota head of a male | 3 rd -2ndBCE | 7x4.2 | Fragment | Monte Moro | Silosc/istem | MANS | 232366 | A3. 102 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { Costamagna 1999, 10; } \\ \text { Sisani 2013, 137 } \end{array}$ |  |
| MM_19 | Head | Terracota head with | 3 rd -2ndBCE | $4.5 \times 6$ | Fragment | Monte Moro | Siloscisistem | MA | 232373 | A3. 104 | Sisani 2013, 13 |  |
| MM_20 | Head | Terracota head of a male | 3 rd -2ndBCE | $4.3 \times 6.4$ | Fragment | Monte Moro | Siloscisistem | MANS | 232375 | A3.103 | Sisani 2013, 137 |  |
| MM 21 | Anat | Hand | 3 rd -2ndBCE | 7x6. 8 | Fragment | Monte Moro | Siloscisistem | MANS | 183019 | A3.98 | Costamagna 1999, <br> 10;Sisani 2013, 137 | Comella 1986, 67, tav. 33b; Gatti Lo Guzzo 131, tav. LI |
| MM_22 | Anat | Hand | 3 rd -2ndBCE | 5.5x4.5 | Fragment | Monte Moro | Siloscisistem | MANS | 232345 | A3.97 | Costamagna 1999, 10 <br> Sisani 2013, 13 | Comella 1986, 67, tav. 33b; Gatti Lo Guzzo 131, tav. LI |
| MM_23 | Anat | Uterus | 3 rd -2ndBCE | 5.2x4.3 | Fragment | Monte Moro | Siloscisistem | MANS | 232367 | A3.95 | Sisani 2013, 138 | Zaccagni, 1980, pl. 41; Baggieri and Veloccia 1996, figg. 66 e 69 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MM 24 | Anat | Uterus | $3 \mathrm{rd-2ndBCE}$ | $3.7 \times 4.9$ | Fragment | Monte Moro | Silosc/istern | MANS | 232368 | A3.96 |  | Zaccagni, 1980, pl. 41; Baggieri and Veloccia 1996, figg. 66 e 69 |
| MM_25 | Anat | Nose | 3rd-2ndBCE | 7.5x4.4 | Fair | Monte Moro | Silosclistem | MANS | 232369 | A3.99 | Sisani 2013, 137 | Zaccagni, 1980, pl. 41 |
| MM_26 | Anat | Testicles | 3rd-2ndBCE | 4.8x5 | Fragment | Monte Moro | Siloscisistem | mans | 232374 | A3. 101 | Sisani 2013, 138 | Zacagni, 1980, pl. 41; Comella 1982av. 84d; |
| MM_27 | Anat | Foot | $3 \mathrm{rd-2ndBCE}$ | 7x5. 8 | Fragment | Monte Moro | Siloscicistern | MANS | 232376 | A3.100 | Sisani 2013, 138 | Comella 1986, tav. 36c; Gatti Lo Guzzo 1978, nr. 19, tav. 51 |
| MM_28 | Head | Base of terracota head | 3rd-2ndBCE | 4.387.4 | Fragment | Monte Moro | Siloscisistem | MANS | 232370 | A3. 105 |  |  |
| MTS_1 | Other | Highly schematic figure of warrior | 5th BCE | $18.3 \times 4.3$ | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 300 |  | Colonna 1970, 52, n 89; F.Amorelli 1977 167 a |  |
| MTS_2 | ToG | Highly schematic figur of warrior | Sth BCE | 5.8x3.1 | Fragment | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 328 |  | Colonna 1970, 78-79, tav. $54-56$ |  |
| MTS_3 | MSG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | $10.8 \times 4.2$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 337 | A3.120 | Colonna 1970, 71, n. 156; F.Amorelli 1977, 167 c. | Colonna 1970, 71-72 tav. 42-43 |
| MTS 4 | MSG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | 3.2x1.5 | Fragment | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 317 |  | F.Amorelli 1977, 168 <br> c. | Colonna 1970, 71-72 tav. $42-43$ |
| MTS_5 | MSG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | 5th BCE | $6.5 \times 3.3$ | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | NA |  | F.Amorelli 1977, 168 <br> f. | Colomna 1970, 71-72 tav. 42-43 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTS_6 | MSG | Highly schematic figur of warrior | Sth BCE | $12.6 \times 3.4$ | Fair | Monte Sar | NA | MCT | 301 |  | F.Amorelli 1977, 167 b. | Colonna 1970, 71-72 tav. 42-43 |
| MTS_7 | Other | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | 9×3.1 | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 307 | 9 | Colonna 1970, 88, n. 211; F.Amorelli 1977, 168 b. |  |
| MTS_8 | ${ }_{\text {FoG }}$ | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | $6.8 \times 3.6$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 332 | A3.114 | F.Amorelli 1977, 169 | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| MTS_9 | FoG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | $0.6 \times 3.3$ | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 348 |  | F.Amorelli 1977, 170 | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| MTS_10 | AmG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | $10 \times 3.1$ | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 306 |  | F.Amorelli 1977, 169 d. | Colonna 1970, 90, 92-95 tav. 66-68; Tabone 1995 96, 217 tav. 56.6 |
| MTS_11 | AmG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | $7 \times 3.1$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 342 | A3.106 | F.Amorelli 1977, 169 f f | Colonna 1970, 90, 92-95 tav. 66-68; Tabone 199596,217 tav. 56.7 |
| MTS_12 | AmG | Highly schematic figur of warrior | Sth BCE | $9.5 \times 3.6$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 326 |  | ${ }_{\text {a }}^{\text {a.Amorell } 1977,169}$ | Colonna 1970, 90, 92-95 tav. 66-68; Tabone 199596,217 tav. 56.8 |
| MTS_13 | FoG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | 9.7x3 | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 334 | A3.115 | F.Amorelli 1977, 169 | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| MTS_14 | FoG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | $10.5 \times 3.6$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 260 |  | F.Amorelli 1977, 170 d. |  |
| MTS_15 | FoG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | $7.3 \times 4.6$ | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 347 |  | F.Amorelli 1977, 170 |  |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTS_16 | FoG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | $8.6 \times 2.2$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 333 | A3.116 | Colonna 1970, 97, n. 271; F.Amorelli 1977, 170 i. |  |
| MTS_17 | FoG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | $6.8 \times 3$ | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 293 |  | F.Amorelli 1977, 170,e |  |
| MTS_18 | NuG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | 622.6 | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 330 | A3.117 | F.Amorelli 1977, 171 i | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| MTS_19 | NuG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | 5.9x1.6 | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 331 |  | F.Amorelli 1977, 171 | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| MTS_20 | NuG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | $6.8 \times 2.1$ | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 352 |  | F.Amorelli 1977, 171 | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| MTS_21 | NuG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | $4 \times 3.3$ | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 329 |  | F.Amorelli 1977, 171 e | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| MTS_22 | NuG | Highly schematic figur of warrior | Sth BCE | $7.3 \times 3$ | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 322 | 118 | 1 f | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. $57.5-6$ |
| MTS 23 | Other | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | 9.655 .5 | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 303 | A3. 127 | F.Amorelli 1977, 172 c |  |
| MTS_24 | Other | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | 7.4x3.3 | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 308 | A3.128 | F.Amorelli 1977, 172 d. |  |
| MTS_25 | MSG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | Sth BCE | $14 \times 4$ | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 302 | A3.121 | F.Amorelli 1977, 167 | Colomna 1970, $71-72$ tav. $42-4$ |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTS_2 | AmG | Schematic figur of striding male | Sth BCE | $4 \times 2.5$ | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 364 |  | F.Amorelli 1977, 173 | Colonna 1970, 90, 92 -95 tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-5 |
| MTS 27 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | Sth BCE | $5.2 \times 2.2$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 358 | A3.107 | F.Amorelli 1977, 173 e e | Colonna 1970, 90, 92 -95 tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-6 |
| MTS 28 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | Sth BCE | $5.8 \times 2.8$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 357 |  | F.Amorelli 1977, 173 | Colonna 1970, 90, 92-95 tav 6, 6,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. $56.1-7$ |
| MTS_29 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | Sth BCE | $7.5 \times$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 324 |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { 1.;Colonna 1970, 92, n. } \\ & 243 \end{aligned}\right.$ | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-8 |
| MTS_30 | AmG | Schematic figur of striding male | Sth BCE | $6.8 \times 3.1$ | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 348 | A3.108 |  | Colonna 1970, 90, 92-95 tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-9 |
| MTS_31 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | Sth BCE | 7.64 | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 323 |  | relli 1977, 174, | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-10 |
| MTS_32 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | Sth BCE | $8.6 \times 5.2$ | Goo | Monte | NA | MCT | 325 | A3.109 | Colonna 1970, 92 n . 237; F.Amorelli 1977, 173, i. | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-11 |
| MTS 33 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | Sth BCE | $8.3 \times 3.9$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 344 |  | Falconi Amorelli 1977, 174 d. | Colonna 1970, 90, 92-95 tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596,217 tav. 56.1-12 |
| MTS_34 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | Sth BCE | 4.2x3.2 | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 361 |  | Falconi Amorelli 1977, 174 b. | Colonna 1970, 90, 92 -95 tav. 66,67; Tabone 1995$96,217 \mathrm{tav} .56 .1-13$ |
| MTS_35 | AmG | Schematic figur of striding male | Sth BCE | $4.6 \times 1.6$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 363 |  | Falconi Amorelli 1977, 174 m. | Colonna 1970, 90, 92 -95 tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-14 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | h. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTS_36 | AmG | Schematic figure of male | Sth BCE | $6 \times 2.6$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 353 |  | Falconi Amorelli 1977, 176 ci . | Colonna 1970, 90, 92-95 tav. 66,67; Tabone 1995 96, 217 tav. 56.1-5 |
| MTS 37 | AmG | Schematic figure of male | Sth BCE | $5.6 \times 2.2$ | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 351 |  | Falconi Amorelli 1977, 173 e. | Colonna 1970, 90, 92-95 tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-5 |
| MTS_38 | EG | Schematic figure of male | Sth BCE | $3.8 \times 2.4$ | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 381 |  | Falconi Amorelli 1977, 1741 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTS_39 | EG | Schematic figure of male | Sth BCE | 4×2 | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 356 | A3.111 | Colonna 1970, 103 n . 307; Falconi Amorelli 1977, 175 c | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTS_40 | EG | Schematic figure of male | Sth BCE | $5 \times 1.7$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 362 |  | Colonna 1970, 103 n . 307;Falconi Amorelli 1977, 175 f. | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTS_41 | EG | Schematic figure of male | Sth BCE | $5.6 \times 2.5$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 355 |  | Falconi Amorelli 1977, 175 m. | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTS_42 | EG | Schematic figure of male | Sth BCE | $7.1 \times 3$ | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 349 | A3.110 | Falconi Amorelli 1977, 175 g. | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTS_43 | EG | Schematic figure of male | Sth BCE | $5.2 \times 3.5$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 359 |  | 175 a. <br> Falconi Amorelli 1977, | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTS_44 | AmG | Schematic figure of male | Sth BCE | $6 \times 3$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 354 |  | Falconi Amorelli 1977, 175 g. | Colonna 1970, 90, 92-95 tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-5 |
| MTS_45 | Other | Schematic figure of Heracles | Sth BCE | $10 \times 3$ | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 304 | A3.130 | Colonna 1970, 146 n . 442; F.Amorelli 1977, 171 a . |  |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTS_46 | EG | schematic female figure | 5th BCE | $9.5 \times 3$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 379 | A3.113 | Falconi Amorelli 1977, 176 e. | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTS_47 | NuG | Schematic female figure | 5th BCE | $9.5 \times 3.1$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 380 | A3.119 | Colonna 1970, 102, n. 302; F. Amorelli 1977, 176 i. | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |
| MTS_48 | EG | schematic female figure | 5th BCE | $3.3 \times 2.6$ | Fragment | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 382 | A3.112 | F. Amorelli 1977, 176 d. | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTS_49 | Animal | schematic figure of a bull | 5th BCE | 3x7 | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 394 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 183 e. | Bononi Ponzi 1989, 26 fig. 22; Monacchi 1988, tav. 35d; Cenciaioli 1989, 220, 4.40-43; Manca et al. 2014, 56 n. 34 |
| MTS_50 | Animal | schematic figure of a bull | 5th BCE | $3.5 \times 4.5$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 395 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 183 d. | Bononi Ponzi 1989, 26 fig. 22; Monacchi 1988, tav. 35d; Cenciaioli 1989, 220, 4.40-43; Manca et al. 2014, 56 n. 34 |
| MTS_51 | Animal | schematic figure of a horse | 5th BCE | $4 \times 6.5$ | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 303 |  | F. Amorelii 1977, 184 <br> i. | Bruschetti 1989, 120, 4.17 |
| MTS_52 | Animal | schematic figure of a horse | 5th BCE | $4 \times 7.5$ | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 396 | A3.123 | F. | Bruschetti 1989, 120, 4.17. |
| MTS_53 | Animal | schematic figure of a bull | 5th BCE | $3 \times 7$ | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 392 | A3.122 | F. Amorelli 1977, 184 <br> f. | Bononi Ponzi 1989, 26 fig. 22; Monacchi 1988, tav. 35d; Cenciaioli 1989, 220, 4.40-43; Manca et al. 2014, 56 n. 34 |
| MTS_54 | HellWorsh | Schematizeed figure of female worshipper | 3rd-2nd | 5.5x | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 376 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 177 <br> h. |  |
| MTS_55 | HellWorsh | Schematizeed figure of female worshipper | 3 rd -2nd | 10x3 | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 305 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 177 <br> f. |  |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTS_56 | HellWorsh | Schematizeed figure of female worshipper | 3 rd -2nd | $5.2 \times 3.1$ | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 374 |  | F. Amorelil 1977, 177 |  |
| MTS_57 | HellWorsh | Schematizeed figure of female worshipper | 3 rd -2nd | 5.5x3 | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 373 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 177 m. |  |
| MTS_8 | HellWorsh | Schematizeed figure of female worshipper | 3 rd -2nd | $5 \times 2.9$ | Fair | Mo | NA | MCT | 372 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 177 n. |  |
| MTS_59 | HellWorsh | Schematizeed figure of female worshipper | 3 rd -2nd | 3.5x3.5 | Fragment | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 377 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 177 g. |  |
| MTS_6 | HellWorsh | Schematizeed figure of male worshipper | 3 rd -2nd | $7 \times 3.7$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 271 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 180 | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTS_61 | HellWorsh | Schematizeed figure of male worshipper | 3 rd -2nd | 5.92, | Poor | Mo | NA | MCT | 341 |  |  | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTS_62 | HellWorsh | Schematizeed figure of male worshipper | 3 rd -2nd | $9.7 \times 2.2$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 340 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 179 | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTS_63 | HellWorsh | Schematizeed figure of male worshipper | 3 rd -2nd | $9.6 \times 4$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 368 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 178 <br> e. | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTS_64 | HellWorsh | Schematizeed figure of male worshipper | 3 rd -2nd | $6 \times 2.3$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 366 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 179 | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTS_65 | HellWorsh | Schematizeed figure of male worshipper | $3 \mathrm{rd}-2 \mathrm{~d}$ d | 3.2 x | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 381 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 179 | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTS_66 | HellWorsh | Schematizeed figure of female worshipper | 3rd-2nd | $6 \times 1.6$ | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 339 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 179 h. |  |
| MTS_67 | HellWorsh | Schematizeed figure of male worshipper | 3rd-2nd | 5.6x3.3 | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 371 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 178 | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38, d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTS_68 | HellWorsh | Schematized figure of male worshipper | 3rd-2nd | 6.2x4.3 | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 369 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 178 | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTS_69 | HellWorsh | Schematized figur of male worshipper | 3rd-2nd | 6.2×4.3 | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 370 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 178 c. | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTS_70 | HellWorsh | Schematized figure of male worshipper | 3 rd | 4.8x3.7 | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 378 |  |  | Monacchi 1988 tav. 38,d-e; Monacchi 1986, tav. 34 a-c; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-e |
| MTS_71 | HellWorsh | Schematized figure of female worshipper | 3rd-2nd | $6 \times 3.8$ | Fair | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 375 |  | F. Amorelli 1977, 179 |  |
| MTS_72 | AH | Bronze male head | 6th-4th | 5.1x1.3 | Good | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 385 | A3.124 | F. Amorelli 1977, 180 |  |
| MTS 73 | AH | Female head | 6th-4th | 2.9x1.9 | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 310 | A3.125 | F. Amorelli 1977, 180 |  |
| MTS_75 | AH | Bronze male head | 6th-4th | $2.1 \times 1.1$ | Poor | Monte Santo? | NA | MCT | 319 | A3.126 | F. Amorelif 1977, 180 |  |
| Roca_1 | FoG | Highly schematic figure of a warrior | 5th-4th BCE | 5.6x3.2 | Poor | La Rocca | NA | MANS | 109559 | A3.135 | De Angelis 1994, 47 <br> fig. 30.1 | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Compranda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rocca_2 | FoG | Highly schematic figure of a warrior | Sth-4th BCE | $8.3 \times 1$ | Good | La Rocca | NA | MA | 109557 | A3. 134 | De Angelis 1994, 47 <br> fig. 30.3 | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| Rocca_3 | FoG | Highly schematic figure of a warrior | 5th-4th BCE | 2.5x3.2 | Fragment | La Rocca | W slope SUSS 10-11 | MANS | 305949 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| Rocca_4 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | Sth-4th BCE | $5.2 \times 2.5$ | Good | La Rocca | NA | MANS | 109558 | A3.131 |  |  |
| Rocca 5 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | Sth-4th BCE | 4.6x3.2 | Good | La Rocca | NA | MANS | CS1729 | A3.132 | Bruni 1983,29 fig. 20 |  |
| Rocca_6 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | Sth-4h BCE | 4.1 11.3 | Good | La Rocca | NA | MANS | CS1728 | A3.133 | De Angelis 1994, 47 <br> fig. 30.2 |  |
| Rocca_ 7 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | Sth-4th BCE | 4.9x2 | Fair | La Rocca | Cortile delle Armi US 16 | MA | 305670 |  |  |  |
| Rocc_ 8 | NuG | Highly schematic figure of a warrior | 5th-4th BCE | $7.3 \times 3$ | Fair | La Rocca | Piaza Campel | MANS | 337381 | A3.136 | Costamagna et al. <br> 2011, 41 fig. 6 | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| Rocca_9 | NuG | Highly schematic male figure | Sth-4th BCE | $7 \times 4.2$ | Good | La Rocca | Cortile delle Armi US 16 | MANS | 305069 | A3.137 |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| Rocca_10 | AmG | Schematic male figure striding forward | Sth-4h BCE | 4.9x2.3 | Fair | La Rocca | NW slope of the Rocca | MANS | CS1727 | A3.138 | Bruni 1983, 29 fig. 19 | Colonna 1970, 90, 92-95 tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-5 |
| Rocca_11 | Aanat | Bronze arm | 5th-4h BCE | 3.7x0.6 | Good | La Rocca | Cortile delle Armi US 16 | MANS | 305671 | A3.139 |  | Bruschetti 1989, 122, 4.28; Cenciaioli 1991, 226 4.51; Manca et al. 2014, 57 fig. 41 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rocca_12 | Anat | Foot | 3rd-2nd BCE | $9 \times 6.5$ | Fragment | La Rocca | Cortile Ovest, US 14 | MA | 305628 | A3.140 | Costamagna et al. 2011, fig. 24 | Almagro 1982, 295; Rizzello, 1980, 18-19; Vagnetti 1971, 95 . |
| Rocca_13 | Anat | Foot | 3rd-2nd BCE | 15 | Fragment | La Rocca | Cortile Ovest, US 14 | MANS | 305631 | A3.140 | Costamagna et al. <br> 2011, fig. 24 | Almagro 1982, 295; Rizzello, 1980, 18-19; Vagnetti 1971, 95 . |
| Rocca_14 | Anat | Big toe of a foot | 3 rd -2nd BCE | 8.5 | Fragment | La Rocca | Cortile Ovest, US 14 | MANS | 305626 | A3.140 | Costamagna et al. <br> 2011, fig. 24 |  |
| Rocca_15 | Anat | Big toe of a foot | 3 rd -2nd BCE | 10.5 | Fragment | La Rocca | Cortile Ovest, US 14 | MANS | 305627 | A3.140 | Costamagna et al. 2011, fig. 24 |  |
| Rocca_16 | Anat | Thumb | 3 rd -2nd BCE | $6 \times 1.3$ | Fair | La Rocca | Cortile Ovest, US 14 | mans | 305629 | A3.140 |  |  |
| Rocca_17 | Anat | Test | 3 rd -2nd BCE | NA | Fragment | La Rocca | Cortile Ovest, US 14 | MA | 275102 | A3. 142 |  | Zacagni 1980, pl. 41. |
| Rocca_18 | Anat | Ute | 3rd-2nd BCE | 6.5x5 | Fragment | La Rocca | Cortile Ovest, US 14 | MANS | 305645 | A3.141 |  | Zaccagni, 1980, pl. 41; Baggieri and Veloccia 1996 , figg. 66 e 69 |
| Rocca_19 | Anat | Uterus | 3 rd -2nd BCE | $7 \times 4.5$ | Fragment | La Rocca | Cortile Ovest, US 14 | MANS | 305646 | A3.141 |  | Zaccagni, 1980, pl. 41; Baggieri and Veloccia 1996, figg. 66 e 69 |
| Rocca_ 20 | Head | Terracota head | 3 rd -2nd BCE | 10x7.5 | Poor | La Rocca | Cortile Ovest, US 14 | MANS | 305632 | A3.143 | Costamagna et al. 2011, fig. 24 | Söderlind 2000, 58-68 |
| Rocca_21 | Anat | Unidentifiable finger | 3 rd-2ndBCE | $4.5 \times 0.5$ | Fragment | La Rocca | Cortile Ovest, US 14 | MANS | 305630 | A3. 140 |  | Fragment is too small. |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rocca_22 | Head | Terracotta head | 3rd BCE | $21.5 \times 17.5$ | Fair | La Rocca | Cortile Ovest, US 15 | MANS | 305652 | A3.143 | 2011, fig. 24 | Comella 1981, fig. 19 |
| Rocca_23 | Other | Terracotta bovine | 3rd-2ndBCE | 19,5 | Poor | La Rocca | Cortile Ovest, US 16 | MANS | 305623 | A3.144 |  | Catalli 2005, tav.2c; Reggiani Massarini 1988, fig. 112 |
| CSRufino_1 | Other | Schematic figure of a warrior with situla | 6th-5th BCE | 14.7x6 | Fair | Colle San Rufino | Locality Torre Maser | Lost | 1 | A3.147 | Monacchi 1986, tav. 38; Colonna 1970, 46 |  |
| CSRufino_2 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-5th BCE | $2.4 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Colle San Rufino | Locality Torre Maser | Lost | 10 | A3.145 | Monacchi 1986, tav. 38b | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CSRufino_3 | Other | Pendant in the shape of a quadruped | 6th-5th BCE | 2×3.2 | Poor | Colle San Rufino | Locality Torre Maser | Lost | 12 | A3.149 | Monacchi 1986, tav. <br> 38d |  |
| CSRufino_4 | HellWorsh | Schematic figure of male worshipper | 3rd-2nd BCE | 4.8 | Poor | Colle San Rufino | Locality Torre Maser | Lost | 10 | A3.150 | Monacchi 1986, tav. $39 a-b$ | Bonomi Ponzi 2006, 121 fig. 19; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-d |
| CSRufino_5 | HellWorsh | Schematic figure of male worshipper | 3rd-2nd BCE | 3.5 | Poor | Colle San Rufino | Locality Torre Maser | Lost | 13 | A3.150 | Monacchi 1986, tav. $39 a-b$ | Bonomi Ponzi 2006, 121 fig. 19; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-d |
| CSRufino_6 | HellWorsh | Arm of worshipper with patera | 3rd-2nd BCE | 4 | Fragment | Colle San Rufino | Locality Torre Maser | Lost | 18 | A3.150 | Monacchi 1986, tav. 39c | 1977, tav. 93a-d <br> Bonomi Ponzi 2006, 121 fig. 19; Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 93a-d |
| CSRufino_7 | Other | Dancing figure | 6th-5th BCE | 9.3 | Fair | Colle San Rufino | Locality Torre Maser | Lost | NA | A3.148 | $39 \mathrm{~d}-\mathrm{e}$ | Richardson 1983, plate 193 figs. 562-563 |
| CSRufino_8 | AmG | Schematic male figure striding forward | 6th-5th BCE | $8.4 \times 3.5$ | Good | Colle San Rufino | Locality Torre Maser | Lost | NA | A3.146 | Monacchi 1986, tav. $39 \mathrm{~d}-\mathrm{e}$ | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 1995- <br> 96, 217 tav. 56.1-5 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | h. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAAnsc_1 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4th BCE | $5.7 \times 2.5$ | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Scattered in area | Pconsoli | 625957 |  | Monacchi 1986, tav <br> 39 f | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74 Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_2 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.9x1.8 | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Scattered in area | Pconsoli | 625954 | A3.157 | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 151 n. 57 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74 <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 - <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_3 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4th BCE | 4.2x1.6 | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Scattered in area | Pconsoli | 625955 | A3.156 | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 151 n. 59 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_4 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $5.7 \times 2.5$ | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Scattered in area | Pconsoli | 625957 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 148 n. 4 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_5 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $5.6 \times 3.0$ | Good | Monte Ansciano | Scattered in area | Pconsoli | 625958 | A3.151 | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 148 n. 3 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_6 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 4.5x2.8 | Good | Monte Ansciano | Scattered in area | Pconsoli | 625959 | A3.151 | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 149 n. 18 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74 <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc 7 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4.7 \times 2.6$ | Good | Monte Ansciano | Scattered in area | Pconsoli | 625960 | A3.151 | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 149 n. 17 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74 Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 . 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_8 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.2x0.8 | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Scattered in area | Pconsoli | ${ }^{625963}$ |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 149 n. 27 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_9 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.1 \times 0.8$ | Poor | Monte Ansciano | Scattered in area | Pconsoli | ${ }^{625964}$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Malone and Stoddart } \\ 1994,150 \mathrm{n} .46 \end{gathered}\right.$ | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_10 | AH | Terracota head | 6th-4th BCE | $3.1 \times 2.4$ | Poor | Monte Ansciano | Scattered in area | Pconsoli | 162596 | A3.161 | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 152 fig. 5.9 | Lucia Vagnetti 1971, 33; tav. V |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MtAnsc_11 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3 \times 1.6$ | Poor | Monte Ansciano | Context 6, VII | MSAP | 20 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 150 fn. 45 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_12 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $1.9 \times 0.9$ | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Context 6, VII | MSAP | 21 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994,150 n. 53 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_13 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2 \times 1.6$ | Poor | Monte Ansciano | Context 7, IX | MSAP | 38 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 151 n. 65 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_14 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $5.4 \times 1.8$ | Good | Monte Ansciano | Context 7, XX | MSAP | 41 | A3.152 | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 148 n. 11 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_15 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $1.5 \times 1$ | Fragment | Monte Ansciano | Context 37 | MSAP | 44 | A3.159 | Malone and Stoddart <br> 1994, 150 n. 44 | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| MtAnsc_16 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.7 \times 0.9$ | Poor | Monte Ansciano | Context 52 | MSAP | 46 | A3.160 | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 150 n. 45 | 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 <br> Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| MtAnsc_17 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.7 \times 0.10$ | Good | Monte Ansciano | Context 52 | MSAP | 47 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 150 n. 37 | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| MtAnsc_18 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.7 \times 0.11$ | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Context 52 | MSAP | 65 | A3.158 | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 151 n. 58 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_19 | HellWorsh | Hand with patera | 3rd-1 stBCE | $3.7 \times 0.12$ | Fragment | Monte Ansciano | Context 55 | MSAP | 73 | A3.162 |  |  |
| MtAnsc_20 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.7 \times 0.13$ | Good | Monte Ansciano | Context 85 | MSAP | 93 | A3.153 | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 148 n. 2 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MtAnsc_21 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.8×2.3 | Good | Monte Ansciano | Context 85 | MSAP | 146 | A3.154 | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 149 n. 21 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_22 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 4×2.3 | Good | Monte Ansciano | Context 87 | MSAP | 192 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 148 n. 15 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_23 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 1.7x0.6 | Poor | Monte Ansciano | Context 118 | MSAP | 193 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 150 n. 55 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_24 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $5 \times 1.6$ | Good | Monte Ansciano | Context 193 | MSAP | 204 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 148 n. 9 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_25 | Animal | Lead head of a bird |  | $1.3 \times 0.7$ | Fragment | Monte Ansciano | NA | MSAP | 206 |  |  |  |
| MtAnsc_26 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 4.9x2.1 | Good | Monte Ansciano | Context 52 | MSAP | 207 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 149 n. 19 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_27 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4th BCE | 5.2x2.1 | Good | Monte Ansciano | Context 86 | MSAP | 263 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 151 n. 56 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 - <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_28 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4.7 \times 1.8$ | Good | Monte Ansciano | Context 7 | MSAP | 316 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 148 n. 1 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_29 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $1.6 \times 2.4$ | Fragment | Monte Ansciano | Context 85 | MSAP | 352 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 149 n. 34 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 - <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_30 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 4.6x2.1 | Good | Monte Ansciano | Context 6, VII | MSAP | 356 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 148 n. 8 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MtAnsc_31 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4th BCE | 5x1.5 | Good | Monte Ansciano | Context 52 | MSAP | 360 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 148 n. 5 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_32 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.6 \times 0.7$ | Good | Monte Ansciano | Context 6, II | MSAP | 382 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 151 n. 61 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_33 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 0.9x0.7 | Fragment | Monte Ansciano | Context 6, VII | MSAP | 384 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 150 n. 52 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_34 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4 \times 2.3$ | Poor | Monte Ansciano | Context 87 | MSAP | 397 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 149 n. 22 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_35 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $5.3 \times 2.2$ | Good | Monte Ansciano | Context 86 | MSAP | 403 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 149 n. 6 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_36 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $5 \times 1.6$ | Good | Monte Ansciano | Context 6, VIII | MSAP | 409 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 149 n. 35 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_37 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $1.5 \times 0.6$ | Fragment | Monte Ansciano | Context 2, XIII | MSAP | 9 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 149 n. 31 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 . 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_38 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $1.5 \times 0.8$ | Fragment | Monte Ansciano | Context 8, XXVI | MSAP | 103 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 149 n. 32 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_39 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.6 \times 1.8$ | Poor | Monte Ansciano | Context 52 | MSAP | 191 |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Malone and Stoddart } \\ 1994,149 . .25 \end{gathered}\right.$ | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_40 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.4 \times 0.9$ | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Context 6, VIII | MSAP | 40 |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Malone and Stoddart } \\ \text { 1994, } 149 \text { n. } 30 \end{gathered}\right.$ | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MtAnsc_41 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.3 \times 0.9$ | Fragment | Monte Ansciano | Context 52 | MSAP | 194 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 149 n. 28 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_42 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 0.8x0.6 | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Context 6, XVI | MSAP | 80 | A3.155 | Malone and Stoddart 1994,150 n. 49 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_43 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.9x2.6 | Poor | Monte Ansciano | Context 86 | MSAP | 405 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Malone and Stoddart } \\ & 1994,149 \text { n. } 20 \end{aligned}$ | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_44 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.3 \times 1.3$ | Fair | Monte Ansciano | NA | MSAP | 341 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 148 n. 7 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_45 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.1 \times 1.1$ | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Context 6, VIII | MSAP | 43 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 149 n. 24 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_46 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4th BCE | $2.1 \times 1$ | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Context 2, XII | MSAP | 8 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 151 n. 62 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_47 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4.7 \times 2.1$ | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Context 87 | MSAP | 399 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 148 n. 6 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 - <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_48 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3.1x1.1 | Fair | Monte Ansciano | NA | MSAP | 427 |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 149 n. 23 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_49 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 4.6x2.1 | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Context 2, XII | MSAP | NA |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 148, n. 14 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_50 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 4.8×2.4 | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Context 6, XVI | MSAP | NA |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 148, n. 10 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MtAnsc_51 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 4×2.3 | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Context 86 | MSAP | NA |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 148, n. 13 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_52 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4.3 \times 2.5$ | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Context 52 | MSAP | NA |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 148, n. 12 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_53 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 1×2 | Fragment | Monte Ansciano | Context 52 | MSAP | NA |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 150, n. 38 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_54 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2x1 | Poor | Monte Ansciano | Context 6, II | MSAP | NA |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 150, n. 39 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_55 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Context 6, VII | MSAP | NA |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 150, n. 42 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_56 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 0.5x0.3 | Fragment | Monte Ansciano | Context 87 | MSAP | NA |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 150, n. 50 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_57 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $0.6 \times 0.7$ | Fragment | Monte Ansciano | Context 86 | MSAP | NA |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 150, n. 51 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 - <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_58 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 1.6x1.2 | Poor | Monte Ansciano | Context 6, VIII | MSAP | NA |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 150, n. 54 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_59 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 1.7x1 | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Context 6, VIII | MSAP | NA |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 150, n. 47 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MtAnsc_60 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2x1 | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Context 6, VIII | MSAP | NA |  | Malone and Stoddart 1994, 150, n. 48 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MtAnsc 61 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | 3x1.4 | Fair | Monte Ansciano | Context 6, VIII | MSAP | NA |  | Malone and Stoddar <br> 1994, 150 , n. 43 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_1 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.5 \times 1.2$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MANU | 11349 | A3.175 | Cenciaioli 1991, 218 | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| MTA_2 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | Sth-4th BCE | 2x1 | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MCU | 13400 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 219 | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| MTA_3 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | Sth-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 1$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MCU | 116871 | A3.176 | Cenciaioli 1991, 219 | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. $57.5-6$ |
| MTA_4 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | Sth-4h BCE | 2x1 | Poor | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MCU | 116854 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 219 | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| MTA_5 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | Sth-4th BCE | $1.6 \times$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MC | 116 | A3.167 | Cenciaioli 1991, 217 | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| MTA_6 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3 \times 1.2$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| MTA_7 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | Sth-4th BCE | $1.6 \times 2$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| MTA_8 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | Sth-4th BCE | 3.3x1.3 | Fair | Monte Acuto | NA | MSAP | 12228 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| MTA_9 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4h BCE | $2.5 \times 1.5$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Votive pit | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTA_10 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.9$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_11 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $2 \times 1.5$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_12 | EG | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | 1.9x1.1 | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | 116847 | A3.167 | Cenciaioli 1991, 220 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_13 | NA | Extremely schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.7 \times 2.4$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_14 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4 \times 1$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MANU | 116852 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 217 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_15 | EG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.3 \times 1.8$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | 114337 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 217 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_16 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6 \times 2$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | 114348 | A3.164 | Cenciaioli 1991, 217 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_17 | EG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3 \times 1$ | Good | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | 116867 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 217 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_18 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3 \times 1.7$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | 114353 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 218 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_19 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $1.5 \times 0.3$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | 116865 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 218 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTA_20 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $2.8 \times 1.2$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | 116859 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 220 | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76;Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.5-7 |
| MTA_21 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3 \times 1.7$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU |  |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_22 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3.5 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_23 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3 \times 1.3$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_24 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $2.3 \times 0.4$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_25 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $2 \times 0.4$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_26 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3.7 \times 1.6$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MSAP | 122099 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_27 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3.5 \times 1.5$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MSAP | 122218 | A3.163 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_28 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $1.6 \times 0.4$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 - <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_29 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 2x1 | Poor | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTA_30 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $1.6 \times 0.4$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna $1970,103-105$ tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_31 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 2.5x1 | Fair | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_32 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 2.3x1.3 | Poor | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_33 | AmG | Highly schematic figure of man striding forward | 5th-4th BCE | $4.2 \times 0.9$ | Good | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MANU | 116846 | A3.178 | Cenciaioli 1991, 214 | $96,217 \text { tav. } 56.1-5$ |
| MTA_34 | AmG | Highly schematic figure of man striding forward | 5th-4th BCE | $5 \times 3$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | 114344 | A3.177 | Cenciaioli 1991, 216 | Colonna 1970, 90, 92 -95 tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-6 |
| MTA_35 | AmG | Highly schematic figure of man striding forward | 5th-4th BCE | $4.5 \times 2$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-7 |
| MTA_36 | AmG | Highly schematic figure of man striding forward | 5th-4th BCE | $3 \times 2$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-8 |
| MTA_37 | AmG | Highly schematic figure of man striding forward | 5th-4th BCE | $3.5 \times 1.5$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | 114350 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 226 | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 1995- 96,217 tav. $56.1-9$ |
| MTA_38 | AmG | Highly schematic figure of man striding forward | 5th-4th BCE | $5.5 \times 2.1$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 90, 92 -95 tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-10 |
| MTA_39 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6 \times 1.5$ | Good | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MANU | 114347 | A3.165 | Cenciaioli 1991, 215 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTA_40 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.4 \times 3$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | 114338 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 214 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_41 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.2 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | 116853 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 215 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_42 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3 \times 0.5$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | 116861 | A3.166 | Cenciaioli 1991, 215 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_43 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5 \times 2$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_44 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $9.0 \times 3.3$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_45 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $2.7 \times 1.4$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_46 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.6 \times 1.9$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 <br> tav. 58 |
| MTA_47 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3.4 \times 1.3$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 <br> tav. 58 |
| MTA_48 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 1.9x2 | Poor | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 <br> tav. 58 |
| MTA_49 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $1.7 \times 1.1$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTA_50 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $2.2 \times 0.9$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 <br> tav. 58 |
| MTA_51 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $2.1 \times 0.6$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_52 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 3.1x0.6 | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_53 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3 \times 0.7$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_54 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 2.9x0.6 | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_55 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $2.1 \times 0.4$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_56 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 1.9x0.4 | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 <br> tav. 58 |
| MTA_57 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $1 \times 0.1$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 <br> tav. 58 |
| MTA_58 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 2.9x0.5 | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MSAP | 122590 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; ; Tabone 1995-96, 218 <br> tav. 58 |
| MTA_59 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | 5th-4th BCE | $2 \times 4.5$ | Good | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MANU | 114343 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 221 | Bruschetti 1989, 121, 4.23; Bruschetti 1988, 53, n. 38. |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTA_60 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of an ox | 5th-4th BCE | $2 \times 5.8$ | Good | Monte | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MA | 114339 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 222. | Cenciaioli 1991, 222, 4.41 4.43; Falcone Amorelli $197795 f$ |
| MTA_61 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a goat | Sth-4th BCE | $3.5 \times 5$ | Good | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers / otive pit | MA | 116845 | A3.171 | Cenciaioli 1991, 223 | Bruschetti 1989, 1214.23 |
| MTA_62 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | 5th-4th BCE | \% 6.2 | Good | Monte | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MANU | 114342 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 221 | Bruschetti 1989, 121, 4.23; Bruschetti 1988, 53, n. 38. |
| MTA_63 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of an ox | Sth-4th BCE | $1.2 \times 4.1$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | NA |  |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 222, 4.41 4.43; Falcone Amorelli 1977 95f |
| MTA_64 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | Sth-4h BCE | $2.3 \times 4.2$ | Good | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | 114345 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 221 | Bruschetti 1989, 121, 4.23; Bruschetti 1988, 53, n. 38. |
| MTA_65 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | Sth-4th BCE | $1.9 \times 4.3$ | Good | Monte Actuo | Disturbed layers/ otive pit | MCU | 114346 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 221 | Bruschetti 1989, 121, 4.23; Bruschetti 1988, 53, n. 38. |
| MTA_66 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | Sth-4th BCE | $0.7 \times 3.5$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/ otive pit | MCU | NA |  |  | Bruschetti 1989, 121, 4.23; Bruschetti 1988, 53, n. 38. |
| MTA_67 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of an ox | Sth-4th BCE | $2.4 \times 5$ | Good | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/ otive pit | MCU | 116848 | A3.170 | Cenciaioli 1991, 222 | Bruschetti 1989, 20, 4.18; Falconi Amorelli, 1977, 183, 95c; Monacchi 1988, 79. |
| MTA_68 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a sheep | Sth-4th BCE | $2.3 \times 4$ | Good | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers votive pit | MCU | 114341 | A3.169 | Cenciaioli 1991, 223 | Monacchi 1988, 35e; Bruscheti 1989, 1214.23 |
| MTA_69 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of an ox | 5th-4h BCE | $4 \times 2.2$ | Fragment | Monte Actuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | 116863 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 222 | Bruschetti 1989, 20, 4.18; Falconi Amorelli, 1977, 183, 95c; Monacchi 1988, 79 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Compranda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTA_70 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of an ox | Sth-4th BCE | $2.4 \times 5$ | Good | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MCU | 114349 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 222 | Bruschetti 1989, 20, 4.18; Falconi Amorelli, 1977, 183, 95c; Monacchi 1988, 79. |
| MTA_71 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a sheep | Sth-4th BCE | $0.6 \times 1$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MCU | NA |  |  | Monacchi 1988, 35e; Bruschetti 1989, 1214.23 |
| MTA_72 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of an ox | 5th-4th BCE | $1.7 \times 1.7$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MCU | NA |  |  | Bruschetti 1989, 20, 4.18; Falconi Amorelli, 1977, 183, 95c; Monacchi 1988, 79. |
| MTA_73 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a sheep | Sth-4th BCE | $1.9 \times 4.1$ | Good | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MCU | 114340 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 224 | Monacchi 1988, 35e; Buschetti 1989, 1214.23 |
| MTA_74 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | Sth-4th BCE | $0.4 \times 3.5$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MCU | 114352 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 224 |  |
| MTA_75 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a sheep | Sth-4th BCE | $1 \times 3.2$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MCU | 114351 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 224 | Monacchi 1988, 35e; Buschetti 1989, 1214.23 |
| MTA_76 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a sheep | Sth-4th BCE | $0.8 \times 3$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | mCU | 116870 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 225 | Monacchi 1988, 35e; Bruschetti 1989, 1214.23 |
| MTA_ 77 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | Sth-4th BCE | $0.8 \times 4$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MCU | 116856 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 225 | Bruschetti 1989, 121, 4.23; Bruschetti 1988, 53, n. 38. |
| MTA_78 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a quadruped | Sth-4th BCE | $0.6 \times 2.8$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | 116860 | A3.172 | Cenciaioli 1991, 224 |  |
| MTA_79 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of an ox | 5th-4th BCE | $4 \times 6$ | Good | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MCU | NA |  |  | Bruschetti 1989, 20, 4.18; Falconi Amorelli, 1977, 183, 95c; Monacchi 1988, 79. |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | ${ }^{\text {Invent.No }}$ | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTA_80 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | Shh-4h BCE | 0.9x | Fair | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Bruschetti 1989, 121, 4.23; Bruschetti 1988, 53, n. 38. |
| MTA_ 81 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a boar | Sh-4h BCE | $0.9 \times 3$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Bruschetti 1989, 120, 4.17; Falconi Amorelli 1977, tav. 95i |
| MTA_ 82 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | Sth-4h BCE | 0.8x1.8 | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Bruschetti 1989, 120, 4.17; Falconi Amorelli 1977, tav. 95i |
| MTA_ 83 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | Sth-4th BCE | 3.3x1.1 | Fair | Monte Acuto | Votive pit | MSAP | 1222412 | A3.168 |  | Bruschetti 1989, 121, 4.23; Bruschetti 1988, 53, n. 38. |
| MTA_84 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | Sh-4h BCE | 4×2 | Fair | Monte Acuto | Votive pit (SU 26 ) | MSAP | 1222535 |  |  | Bruschetti 1989, 121, 4.23; Bruschetti 1988, 53, n. <br> 38. |
| MTA_ 85 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a pig | Sh-4th BCE | $1.1 \times 3$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Bruschetti 1989, 121, 4.23; Bruschetti 1988, 53, n. <br> 38. |
| MTA_86 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a goat | Sth-4h BCE | $1.9 \times 3.2$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Bruschetti 1989, 1214.23 |
| MTA_87 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a sheep | Sth-4h BCE | $1 \times 0.7$ | Fragment | Monte Ac | Fortuitous finding | mCU | NA |  |  | Monacchi 1988, 35e; Bruschetti 1989, 1214.23 |
| MTA_88 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a sheep | Sth-4h BCE | $1.9 \times 2.0$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Monacchi 1988, 35e; Bruschetti 1989, 1214.23 |
| MTA_89 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a sheep | Sth-4h BCE | $2.1 \times 2.2$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Monacchi 1988, 35e; Buschetti 1989, 1214.23 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTA_90 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a sheep | 5th-4th BCE | 2×2.6 | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Monacchi 1988, 35e; Bruschetti 1989, 1214.23 |
| MTA_91 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of a sheep | 5th-4th BCE | $1.2 \times 1.9$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Monacchi 1988, 35e; Bruschetti 1989, 1214.23 |
| MTA_92 | Animal | Highly schematize figure of quadruped | 5th-4th BCE | 0.7x2.8 | Fair | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  |  |
| MTA_93 | Animal | Highly schematize figure of quadruped | 5th-4th BCE | 0.3x2.5 | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MSAP | 121444 |  |  |  |
| MTA_94 | BS | Male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 2x0.7 | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MSAP | 134737 | A3.174 |  | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_95 | BS | Human figure | 5th-4th BCE | $2 \times 0.8$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_96 | BS | Human figure | 5th-4th BCE | 2x0.9 | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_97 | BS | Human figure | 5th-4th BCE | 2x0.10 | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MSAP | NA |  |  | 218 tav. 58 <br> Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76; Tabone 1995-96, |
| MTA_98 | BS | Human figure | 5th-4th BCE | 3×3 | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_99 | BS | Human figure | 5th-4th BCE | 2x0.12 | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No | Ph. No. | Bibliograph | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTA_100 | BS | Human figure | 5th-4th BCE | 2x02 | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_101 | BS | Human figure | 5th-4th BCE | 2x0.3 | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MSA | NA |  |  | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_102 | BS | Human figure | 5th-4th BCE | 2x5 | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_103 | BS | Human figure | Sth-4th BCE | 2x0.6 | Fragment | Monte Acu | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_104 | BS | Human figure | Sth-4th BCE | $2 \times 0.7$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_105 | BS | Male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $2.2 \times 1.3$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | manu | 113498 | A3.173 | Cenciaioli 1991, 220 | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTA_106 | AAnat | Bronze arm | Sth-4h BCE | $3.4 \times 6$ | Good | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/otive pit | MCU | 116872 | A3.181 | Cenciaioli 1991, 226 | Bruschetti 1989, 122, 4.28; Manca et al. 2014, 57 |
| MTA_107 | AAnat | Bronze hand | Sth-4th BCE | $1.7 \times 0.3$ | Good | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MCU | 116844 | A3. 181 | Cenciaioli 1991, 225 |  |
| MTA_108 | AH | Schematic head | 5th-4th BCE | $1.6 \times 0.6$ | Poor | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA | A3.179 |  | Bonimi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39; Falcone Amorelli 1977 tav 74 b and d |
| MTA_109 | AH | Schematic head | 5th-4th BCE | $1.11 \times 0$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA | A3.179 |  | Bonimi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39; Falcone Amorelli 1977 tav 74b and d |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTA_110 | AH | Schematic head | 5th-4th BCE | $1.3 \times 0.7$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA | A3.179 |  | Bonimi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39; Falcone Amorelli 1977 tav 74b and d |
| MTA_111 | AH | Schematic head | 5th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 1.3$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA | A3.179 |  | Bonimi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39; Falcone Amorelli 1977 tav 74b and d |
| MTA_112 | AH | Schematic head | 5th-4th BCE | $1.7 \times 1$ | Fair | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA | A3.179 |  | Bonimi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39; Falcone Amorelli 1977 tav 74b and d |
| MTA_114 | AAnat | Bronze leg | 5th-4th BCE | 3.6x0.7 | Good | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA | A3.180 |  | Gualandi 1974, 42, fig. 2. |
| MTA_115 | AAnat | Bronze leg | 5th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.6$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Gualandi 1974, 42, fig. 2. |
| MTA_116 | AAnat | Bronze leg | 5th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 0.7$ | Fragment | Monte Acuto | Fortuitous finding | MCU | NA |  |  | Gualandi 1974, 42, fig. 2. |
| MTA_117 | AAnat | Bronze leg | 5th-4th BCE | $2.6 \times 0.2$ | Good | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | MSAP | 121433 |  |  | Gualandi 1974, 42, fig. 2. |
| MTA_118 | Others | Object in the shape of a bucketsitula | 5th-4th BCE | $2.5 \times 2.1$ | Good | Monte Acuto | Disturbed layers/votive pit | Manu | 116875 |  | Cenciaioli 1991, 226 |  |
| CM_1 | AH | Terracotta head | 6th-4th BCE | $13.4 \times 13.7$ | Fragement | Colle Mori | SU 38 | MAU | 361878 | A3.187 | 189 fig. 32 | Vagnetti 1971, 32, tav. VII |
| CM_2 | Head | Terracotta head | 4th-3rd BCE | $12 \times 7$ | Good | Colle Mori | SU 38 | MAU | 361899 | A3.189 | Bonomi Ponzi 2010, | Söderlind 2000, 145-145 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CM_3 | Head | Terracotta head | 4th-3rd BCE | 10x4 | Fragment | Colle Mori | Votive pit | MAU | 364985 | A3.190 |  | Fragment is too badly preserved |
| CM_4 | HellWorsh | Schematic figure of female worshipper | 4th-3rd BCE | $7.8 \times 3.4$ | Good | Colle Mori | Votive pit | MAU | 211373 | A3.188 | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} \mathrm{De} \\ 54 \end{array}\right.$ | F. Amorelli 1977, 179c-f |
| CM_5 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $5 \times 1.6$ | Good | Colle Mori | Votive pit | MAU | 361784 | A3.183 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { De Vecchi 2002, 56. n. } \\ & 54 \end{aligned}$ | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CM_6 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4.4 \times 1.9$ | Fair | Colle Mori | Votive pit | MAU | 361876 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { De Vecchi 2002, 56. n. } \\ & 55 \end{aligned}$ | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CM_7 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $4 \times 2.1$ | Fair | Colle Mori | Votive pit | MAU | 361875 | A3.184 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CM_8 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $5.2 \times 0.9$ | Fair | Colle Mori | Votive pit | MAU | 289687 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CM_9 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $3.6 \times 1.6$ | Fair | Colle Mori | Votive pit | MAU | 88988 | A3.185 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CM_10 | FoG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 6th-4th BCE | $1.7 \times 1.6$ | Fragment | Colle Mori | Votive pit | MAU | 174766 | A3.186 |  | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| Cancelli_1 | FoG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | 6th-4th BCE | $10.2 \times 1.9$ | Fair | Cancelli | US 17 | P.zo Trinci | 637473 | A3.191 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Manca et al. 2014, } 56 \\ & \text { n. } 31 \end{aligned}$ | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| Cancelli_2 | NuG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | 6th-4th BCE | 9.5x5 | Good | Cancelli | US 17 | P.zo Trinci | 637436 | A3.197 | Manca et al. 2014, 56 n .32 | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cancelli_3 | EG | Extremely schematic figure of warrior | 6th-4th BCE | 3.6x1 | Fragment | Cancelli | US 17 | P.zo Trinci | 643123 | A3.195 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Manca et al. 2014, } 56 \\ & \text { n. } 34 \end{aligned}$ | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| Cancelli_4 | FoG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | 6th-4th BCE | NA | Good | Cancelli | NA | P.zo Trinci | NA | A3.192 | Picuti 1999, 25 n. 11 | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| Cancelli_5 | FoG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | 6th-4th BCE | NA | Fragment | Cancelli | NA | P.zo Trinci | NA | A3.192 | Picuti 1999, 25 n. 11 | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| Cancelli_6 | FoG | Highly schematic figure of warrior | 6th-4th BCE | NA | Fair | Cancelli | NA | P.zo Trinci | NA | A3.202 | Picuti 1999, 25 n. 11 | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| Cancelli_7 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 6th-4th BCE | $5.2 \times 2.3$ | Good | Cancelli | US 17 | P.zo Trinci | 637518 | A3.194 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Manca et al. 2014, } 56 \\ & \text { n. } 35 \end{aligned}$ | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| Cancelli_8 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 5.1x2 | Good | Cancelli | US 28 | P.zo Trinci | 646185 | A3.193 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Manca et al. 2014, } 56 \\ & \text { n. } 36 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| Cancelli_9 | BS | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | $10.2 \times 1.9$ | Good | Cancelli | US 17 | P.zo Trinci | 737440 | A3.198 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Manca et al. 2014, } 56 \\ & \text { n. } 37 \end{aligned}$ | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| Cancelli_10 | EC | Schematic crest with two eyes | 6th-4th BCE | 2.5x2 | Good | Cancelli | US 17 | P.zo Trinci | 637443 | A3.199 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Manca et al. 2014, } 56 \\ & \text { n. } 38 \end{aligned}\right.$ | Sisani 2013, 136 |
| Cancelli_11 | AH | Schematic head | 6th-4th BCE | 3.6x1 | Good | Cancelli | US 17 | P.zo Trinci | 637459 | A3.200 | Manca et al. 2014, 56 n. 39 | Bonimi Ponzi 2006117 fig. 9; Manca et al. 2014 57 fig. 39; Falcone Amorelli 1977 tav 74b and d |
| Cancelli_12 | AAnat | Bronze arm | 6th-4th BCE | $3 \times 4.8$ | Good | Cancelli | US 17 | P.zo Trinci | 637466 | A3.201 | Manca et al. 2014, 55 n. 41 | Bruschetti 1989, 122, 4.28; Cenciaioli 1991, 226 4.51; Manca et al. 2014, 57 fig. 41 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cancelli 13 | Animal | Schematic figure of a bull | 6th-4th BCE | $4.2 \times 6$ | Good | Cancelli | US 74 | P.zo Trinci | 67945 | 3.196 | Manca et al. 2014, 56 n. 34 | Bononi Ponzi 1989, 26 fig. 22; Monacchi 1988, tav. 35d; Cenciaioli 1989, 220, 4.40-43. |
| Cancelli 14 | Animal | Schematic figure of a bull | 6th-4th BCE | $2.2 \times 4$ | Good | Cancelli | US 1 | P. 20 Trinci | 570788 |  | Manca et al. 2014, 58 n. 43 | Bononi Ponzi 1989, 26 fig. 22; Monacchi 1988, tav. 35d; Cenciaioli 1989, 220, 4.40-43. |
| Cancelli 15 | Head | Terracota male head | 3rd-1st BCE | 5.5x6 | Poor | Cancelli | US 19 | P.zo Trinci | 43009 | A3.204 | Manca et al. 2014, 51 <br> n. 4 | Söderlind 2002, 142-145. |
| Cancelli 16 | Anat | Terracota Foot | 3rd-1st BCE | 4.5x8 | Fragment | Cancelli | SU 79 | P. 20 Trinci | 695199 | A3.203 | Manca et al. 2014, 51 <br> n. 5 | No comparanda due to state of preservation. |
| Cancelli 17 | HellWorsh | Schematic male figure of male worshipper | 4 th -rrd BCE | NA | Fair | Cancelli | NA | Lost | NA | A3.202 | Picutit 2009, 9 | Haynes 1960, 41-43. |
| CLP_1 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.680 .9 | Fair | Campo La Piana | Btw. two walls, under ashes | MANoU | NA | A3.205 | Albanesi and Picuti 2013, 23 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CLP_2 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2×1.3 | Poor | Campo La Piana | Btw. two walls, under ashes | MANoU | NA |  | Albanesi and Picuti 2013, 23 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CLP_3 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 1.9x0.7 | Poor | Campo La Piana | Btw. two walls, under ashes | MANoU | NA |  | Albanesi and Picuti 2013, 23 | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CLP_4 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 6th-4th BCE | 2.5x.05 | Poor | Campo La Piana | Btw. two walls, under ashes | MANoU | NA | A3.206 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Abanesi and Picuti } \\ & 2013,23 \end{aligned}$ | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CLP_5 | Other | Terracota head of a male wearing a tall hat | 4th BCE | 4.2x2.2 | Fair | Campo La Piana | Btw. two walls, under ashes | MANoU | NA | A3.207 | Albanesi and Picuti 2013, 23 |  |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLP_6 | Head | Bronze head | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Campo La Piana | Btw. two walls, under ashes | NA | na |  | Brizio 1891, 310 |  |
| CLP_7 | Head | Bronze head | 6th-4th BCE | NA | NA | Campo La Piana | Btw. two walls, under ashes | NA | NA |  | Brizio 1891, 310 |  |
| CLP_8 | HellWorsh | schematic female figure of female worshipper | late 4h-st BCE | NA | NA | Campo La Piana | Btw. two walls, under ashes | NA | NA |  | Brizio 1891, 310 |  |
| CLP_9 | Anat | Terracota forearm | late 4h-1st BCE | NA | NA | Campo La Piana | Btw. two walls, under ashes | NA | NA |  | Brizio 1891, 310 |  |
| CLP_10 | Anat | Terracota forearm | late 4h-sts BCE | NA | NA | Campo La Piana | Btw. two walls, under ashes | NA | NA |  | Brizio 1891, 310 |  |
| MTP_1 | BS | Highly schematic human figure | 6th-4th | 2.5x1 | Poor | Monte Pennino | Fortuitous finding | ManU | NA | A3.208 | Albanesi Picuti 2013, <br> 22 | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.5-7 |
| MTP_2 | BS | Highly schematic human figure | 6th-4th | $2 \times 0.7$ | Poor | Monte Pennino | Fortuitous finding | Manu | NA | A3.208 | Albanesi Picuti 2013, <br> 22 | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76;Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.5-7 |
| MTP_3 | BS | Highly schematic human figure | 6th-4th | NA | NA | Monte Pennino | Fortuitous finding | Priv. coll. | NA |  |  | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76;Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.5-7 |
| MTP_4 | BS | Highly schematic human figure | 6th-4th | NA | NA | Monte Pennino | Fortuitous finding | Priv. coll. | NA |  |  | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76;Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.5-7 |
| MTP_5 | BS | Highly schematic human figure | 6 6th-4th | NA | NA | Monte Pennino | Fortuitous finding | Priv. coll. | NA |  |  | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.5-7 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | h. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTP_6 | BS | Highly schematic human figure | 6th-4th | NA | NA | Monte Pennino | Fortuitous finding | Priv. coll. | NA |  |  | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.5-7 |
| MTP_7 | BS | Highly schematic human figure | 6th-4th | NA | NA | Monte Pennino | Fortuitous finding | Priv. coll. | NA |  |  | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76;Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.5-7 |
| MTP_8 | EG | Highly schematic human figure | 6th-4th | NA | NA | Monte Pennino | Fortuitous finding | Priv. coll. | NA |  |  | Colonna 1070, 107-114, tav. 76;Tabone 1995-96, $219-220$ tav. $59.5-7$ |
| MTP_9 | EG | Highly schematic human figure | 6th-4th | NA | NA | Monte Pennino | Fortuitous finding | Priv. coll. | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTP_10 | EG | Highly schematic human figure | 6th-4th | NA | NA | Monte Pennino | Fortuitous finding | Priv. coll. | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTP_11 | EG | Highly schematic human figure | 6th-4th | NA | NA | Monte Pennino | Fortuitous finding | Priv. coll. | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74 Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTP_12 | EG | Highly schematic human figure | 6th-4th | NA | NA | Monte Pennino | Fortuitous finding | Priv. coll. | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTP_13 | EG | Highly schematic human figure | 6th-4th | NA | NA | Monte Pennino | Fortuitous finding | Priv. coll. | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTP_14 | EG | Highly schematic human figure | 6 6th-4th | NA | NA | Monte Pennino | Fortuitous finding | Priv. coll. | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74 Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| MTP_15 | EG | Highly schematic human figure | 6 6th-4th | NA | NA | Monte Pennino | Fortuitous finding | Priv. coll. | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTP_16 | NuG | Schematic figure of warrior | 6th-4th | NA | NA | Monte Pennino | Fortuitous finding | Priv. coll. | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupraCF_1 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5x1.3 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANU | 721899 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_2 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.1 \times 0.5$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764013 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, <br> 219-220 tav. 59.1-4; Monacchi 1988, 35a |
| CupraCF_3 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $7.5 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANU | 721902 | A3.214 |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_4 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.8x2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | wall 11 | MANUdep | 764065 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, <br> 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_5 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6.1 \times 1.3$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763930 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_6 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.9x1.2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763989 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_7 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.7 \times 1.7$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763989 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59. 1-4. |
| CupraCF_8 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $21 \times 3.3$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MAC | 601881 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_9 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $21 \times 1.1$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MAC | 341598 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_10 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $14.6 \times 1.9$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MAC | 341596 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_11 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4x1 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANUdep | 764041 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_12 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.7 \times 1.7$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763990 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_13 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 7.5x1.4 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_14 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 7x1.5 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_15 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6.7 \times 1.4$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_16 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 7.5x1.4 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, $219-220$ tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_17 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $7 \times 1.5$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. <br> Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, |
| CupraCF_18 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 7.5x1.3 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_19 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.5 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Surface find | MANUdep | 764057 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_20 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3.1 \times 0.5$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763972 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_21 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6.5x1.7 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Surface find | MANUdep | 763968 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_22 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6.8x2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 76033 | A3.213 |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_23 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4x1 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764033 | A3.213 |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_24 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.2x1.2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764033 | A3.213 |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_25 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6.1x1.2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76310 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_26 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.5x1.8 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76361 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_27 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6.112.5 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76306 |  |  | 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. <br> Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, |
| CupraCF_28 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6.5x1.3 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76291 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_29 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.5x0.8 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76341 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_30 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 3.6x0.9 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76298 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_31 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6.6x3.1 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76370 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_32 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.2 \times 0.7$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76301 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_33 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.3x2.4 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76364 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, } \\ & 219-220 \text { tav. 59.1-4. } \end{aligned}$ |
| CupraCF_34 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3 \times 0.6$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76366 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, $219-220$ tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_35 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.6x1.4 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 7634 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, $219-220$ tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_36 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.2x1.8 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76448 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, $219-220$ tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_37 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4 \times 0.9$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76345 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, $219-220$ tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_38 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6.9x1.4 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76334 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_39 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.7 \times 2.4$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76337 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, $219-220$ tav. 59.1-4. |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_40 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6.2 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76298 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_41 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.9x2.5 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76290 |  |  | 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_42 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6.1x1.6 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76305 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_43 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6x1.6 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76308 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_44 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6.4x1.3 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 3300 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_45 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4 \times 1.1$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76340 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_46 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.3x1.6 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76925 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, <br> 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_47 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6.3 \times 1.7$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76335 |  |  | 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. <br> Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, |
| CupraCF_48 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.6x2.1 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76328 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_49 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6.8×2.1 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76339 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_50 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.1 \times 2.8$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76356 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_51 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6.2 \times 1.6$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76294 |  |  | 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_52 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6x2.2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76336 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_53 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.5x2.4 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76324 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_54 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6.2 \times 1.8$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 7293 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_5 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.9x2.2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76331 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_56 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.8x1.9 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76286 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, <br> 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_57 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.5x2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76332 |  |  | 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. <br> Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, |
| CupraCF_58 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6x1.9 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76347 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_59 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6.7 \times 1.6$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 7633 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, <br> 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_60 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6.1 \times 1.8$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76288 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_61 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $8.2 \times 1.9$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Scatered in area | MAC | 602031 |  |  | 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_62 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 3.6x1.3 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 602034 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_63 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.1x1.4 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 341611 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_64 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.9x1.5 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 361872 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_65 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.9x1.6 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | A734 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_66 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 3.8x0.7 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | A735 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, $219-220$ tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_67 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $8.4 \times 2$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | A 737 |  |  | 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. <br> Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, |
| CupraCF_68 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6.1x2 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | A743 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_69 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5x1.4 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | A744 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_70 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6.4 \times 1.2$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | A 1734 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_71 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.4 \times 1.9$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | A1733 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_72 | BS | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 3.8x1.1 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | A1734 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 107-114 tav. 77; Tabone 1995-96, 219-220 tav. 59.1-4. |
| CupraCF_73 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.1×2.2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76345 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_74 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.9x1.6 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Strato 14 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_75 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.5x2.3 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76319 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_76 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.7x2.1 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76346 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_77 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4 \times 2.1$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76345 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_78 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 3.9x2.1 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76363 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_79 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.4 \times 1.6$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76315 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_80 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.6 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76330 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_81 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.5 \times 2$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANU | 721900 | A3.211 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_82 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.7x2.3 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764079 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_83 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.3x1.8 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Old square H5 stratoC2 | MANUdep | 763954 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_84 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.6x2.5 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANUdep | 764101 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_85 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.7 \times 2.5$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763988 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_86 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6.3 \times 1.8$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763988 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_87 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.8×2.5 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Old square H5 strato D | MANUdep | 764092 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_88 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.7x2.1 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Distrurbed by looters | MANUdep | 764074 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_89 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.9x2.3 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Distrurbed by looters | MANUdep | 764032 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_90 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.3 \times 2.8$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Distrurbed by looters | MANUdep | 763998 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_91 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.2x2.6 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Distrurbed by looters | MANUdep | 763998 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_92 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.2x2.2 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Distrurbed by looters | MANUdep | 764006 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_93 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.2x2 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Distrurbed by looters | MANUdep | 764006 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_94 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.2x2.4 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Distrurbed by looters | MANUdep | 764006 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_95 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.2 \times 1.6$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 75362 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_96 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.6x2.4 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | A1723 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_97 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.1 \times 3$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | 361868 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_98 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4 \times 3$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 601894 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_99 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.1x2.4 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | A732 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_100 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.3x3 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | A731 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_101 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.6x2.2 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | A733 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_102 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.6x2.2 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | 361866 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_103 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.1x2.2 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | 361867 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_104 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3.8 \times 1.9$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | 361871 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_105 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.5x2.6 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76354 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_106 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.8 \times 2.8$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76352 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_107 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.7 \times 2.5$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76353 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_108 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.3x2.2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76321 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_109 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6 \times 3.6$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | A1708 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_110 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.8×2.2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76287 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_111 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3.8 \times 2.9$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76316 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_112 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 76307 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_113 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.4 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76329 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_114 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5 \times 2.6$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76295 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_115 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.4 \times 1.6$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76320 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_116 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4 \times 2.5$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76357 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_117 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.3 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76312 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_118 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5 \times 1.4$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANU | 721905 | A3.210 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_119 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $2.3 \times 1.3$ | Fragement | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764102 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_120 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.7x2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764103 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_121 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 3.9x2.3 | Two fragments | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764103 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_122 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $2.4 \times 1.5$ | Fragment | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764031 | A3.209 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_123 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.5x2.6 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764031 | A3.209 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_124 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.2 \times 2.2$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764012 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_125 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5 \times 2$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764012 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_126 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.7 \times 2.3$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764012 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_127 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.3 \times 2.8$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764012 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_128 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.3x2.3 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764012 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_129 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.2 \times 2.7$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764012 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_130 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.6 \times 1.8$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Old square H5 strato D | MANUdep | 764091 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_131 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5 \times 2$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_132 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 3.9x2.7 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763956 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_133 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.1x1.4 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763956 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_134 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3.6 \times 2.2$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763956 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_135 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5 \times 3.2$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_136 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4×2.1 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_137 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.3×2.1 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_138 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.6 \times 3.2$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_139 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.4 \times 1.9$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_140 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.2x2.3 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_141 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.8 \times 3.7$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_142 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5 \times 2$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763918 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_143 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.5 \times 1.8$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763918 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_144 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.2 \times 2.3$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763918 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_145 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.5 \times 1.7$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763918 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_146 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.8x2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763918 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_147 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3.2 \times 2$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANUdep | 764037 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_148 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 3.5x2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANUdep | 764037 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_149 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.6x2.1 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764052 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_150 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.7x2.2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764052 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_151 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.2 \times 2.2$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76322 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_152 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.4 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76317 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_153 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.9x2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76314 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_154 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5 \times 2.3$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76349 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_155 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5 \times 2.1$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_156 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.9x1.5 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_157 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3.8 \times 1.9$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_158 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 3.5x2.7 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764074 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_159 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.9x1.3 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764074 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_160 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3.5 \times 2.1$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764074 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_161 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $1.5 \times 1.3$ | Fragment | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764074 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_162 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.8×3.2 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 341617 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_163 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.3 \times 1.5$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 601917 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_164 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6.9x2.9 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 341615 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_165 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.7x2 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 601889 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_166 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.2x2.6 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 601898 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_167 | EG | Highly schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.8×2.5 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 988109 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_168 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 2.8x2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764012 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58; Monacchi 1988 35a |
| CupraCF_169 | EG | Extremely schematic male figure | 5th-4th BCE | 2.8x2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANUdep | 764042 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_170 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.2 \times 2.2$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76327 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_171 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.6 \times 4.8$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANU | 721903 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_172 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.5 \times 1.9$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANUdep | 764046 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_173 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5 \times 3$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764035 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_174 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.2 \times 2.8$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763930 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_175 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5 \times 2.1$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763930 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_176 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.5 \times 1.5$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763930 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_177 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5x2.3 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763930 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_178 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.2 \times 2.3$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763930 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_179 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.5 \times 2.8$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANUdep | 763919 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_180 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5x2.3 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANUdep | 763919 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, $215-$ 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_181 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.3 \times 1.8$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANUdep | 763919 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_182 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.1 \times 3$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764025 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_183 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.3x0.5 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764015 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_184 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5 \times 1$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764015 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_185 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.5 \times 1.4$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764015 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_186 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.9x2.2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763930 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_187 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.7 \times 2.1$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763930 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_188 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.8x2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANUdep | 763973 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_189 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.6 \times 1.8$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANUdep | 763973 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_190 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5,2x2.3 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763930 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_191 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6.7 \times 2.6$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763932 | A3.212 |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; <br> Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215- <br> 217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_192 | EG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 7.7x 3.3 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 341603 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 103-105 tav. 70-71, 73-74; Bruschetti 1989, 118-119; Cenciaioli 1991, 215217; Tabone 1995-96, 218 tav. 58 |
| CupraCF_193 | NuG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 7.6x4.3 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 341592 | A3.217 |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |
| CupraCF_194 | NuG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5×2 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763932 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |
| CupraCF_195 | NuG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6 \times 2.2$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763932 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |
| CupracF_196 | NuG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.5x1.6 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763932 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |
| CupraCF_197 | NuG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6x3 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANUdep | 764040 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |
| CupraCF_198 | NuG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.5x2.6 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANUdep | 764040 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |
| CupraCF_199 | NuG | Highly schematic female figure | 5th-4th BCE | 5.9x2.8 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANUdep | 764040 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cuprač_200 | NuG | Highly schematic female figure | Sth-4th BCE | $6.7 \times 2.6$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763932 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |
| Cuprack 201 | NuG | Highy schematic female figure | Sth-4th BCE | $6.7 \times 2.6$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763932 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |
| Cuprac_ 202 | NuG | Highy schematic female figure | Sth-4th BCE | $5.4 \times 2.3$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763932 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |
| CupracF_203 | NuG | Highly schematic female figure | Sth-4th BCE | $5.7 \times 2.5$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763932 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |
| Cuprac_ 204 | NuG | Highly schematic female figure | Sth-4th BCE | $6.7 \times 2.6$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763932 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |
| CupracF_205 | NuG | Highy schematic female figure | Sth-4th BCE | $11 \times 2.4$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | manu | 721901 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |
| Cuprack 206 | NuG | Highy schematic female figure | Sth-4th BCE | $6.3 \times 2.3$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | A1719 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |
| CupracF_207 | NuG | Highy schematic female figure | Sth-4th BCE | 9.4x5.1 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scatered in area | mac | 341593 | ${ }^{\text {A3.216 }}$ |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |
| Cuprack_208 | NuG | Highy schematic female figure | Sth-4th BCE | 7.5x3.8 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scatered in area | MAC | 601919 | A3.215 |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |
| Cuprack_209 | NuG | Highy schematic female figure | Sth-4th BCE | $3 \times 2.1$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scatered in area | MAC | 602023 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 101-102 tav. 71-72 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cuprač_210 | FoG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | 7.88 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 34 | 23 | Colonna 1970, 96 n . 264. | Colonna 1970, 96-99 tav. 69-70; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.1-3. |
| Cuprač_211 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $8.7 \times 4.9$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 341638 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| Cuprač_212 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | Sth-4th BCE | $6.5 \times 4.5$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in rea | MAC | 601909 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| Cuprač_213 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | Sth-4th BCE | $7.6 \times 2.1$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 341633 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| Cuprač_214 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | Sth-4h BCE | 4.5x1.8 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 60882 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| Cuprač_215 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | Sth-4th BCE | $7.4 \times 2.5$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 601901 |  |  | 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupracF_216 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | Sth-4th BCE | $7.2 \times 2.9$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 341599 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57. .5-6 |
| CupracF_217 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | Sth-4th BCE | 8.9x3.6 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 601915 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupracF_218 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | Sth-4th BCE | $10 \times 3.4$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 601906 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupracF_219 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4h BCE | $1.6 \times 2.9$ | Fragment | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76355 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_220 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.8x1.1 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76358 |  |  | 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 <br> Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupraCF_221 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | 4.9x2.3 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764031 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupraCF_222 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $7 \times 2.8$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANU | 721897 |  |  | 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 <br> Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone |
| CupraCF_223 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $7 \times 3$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANU | 721898 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. $57.5-6$ |
| CupraCF_224 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.2 \times 2.1$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANU | 721909 |  |  | 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 <br> Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone |
| CupraCF_225 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $8 \times 3.2$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANU | 721908 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupraCF_226 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3 \times 2.1$ | Fragment | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76318 | A3.218 |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupraCF_227 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | 7.6x4.4 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76313 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupraCF_228 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6.5x4.4 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANUdep | 764084 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupraCF_229 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.5 \times 3.8$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763940 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_230 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $10.5 \times 4.6$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763931 |  |  | 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 <br> Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupraCF_231 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | 7.7x3.3 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763955 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupraCF_232 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $6.7 \times 2.6$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763931 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupraCF_233 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $8 \times 3.3$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANU | 721910 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. $57.5-6$ |
| CupraCF_234 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $4.2 \times 2.1$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANUdep | 76099 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupraCF_235 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $8.6 \times 3.7$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 763984 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupraCF_236 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $7.5 \times 3.5$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANU | 721904 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupraCF_237 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $5.6 \times 4.8$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANU | 721907 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupraCF_238 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | 9.9x2.4 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 601923 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupraCF_239 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $3.3 \times 1.7$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No. | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupraCF_240 | NuG | Highly schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | 6.9x2.9 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14 | MSAP | A1748 | A3.217 |  | Colonna 1970, 100-101 tav. 72-73, 75; Tabone 1995-96, 217 tav. 57.5-6 |
| CupraCF_241 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | 5th-4th BCE | $7 \times 4.9$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MANU | 721906 | A3.220 |  | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-5 |
| CupraCF_242 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | 5th-4th BCE | 6.5x3.4 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 763026 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-6 |
| CupraCF_243 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | 5th-4th BCE | $4 \times 3.5$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 760357 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 90, 92-95 tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-7 |
| CupraCF_244 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | 5th-4th BCE | 6.8×5.2 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 341612 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-8 |
| CupraCF_245 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | 5th-4th BCE | 7.3x5 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 602028 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-9 |
| CupraCF_246 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | 5th-4th BCE | 6.9x5.3 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 601918 | A3.219 |  | Colonna 1970, 90, $92-95$ tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-10 |
| CupraCF_247 | AmG | Schematic figure of striding male | 5th-4th BCE | 5.9x2.3 | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 14, layer C | MAC | 361870 |  |  | Colonna 1970, 90, 92-95 tav. 66,67; Tabone 199596, 217 tav. 56.1-11 |
| CupraCF_248 | FaG | Schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $14 \times 6$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 354776 | A3.224 |  | Colonna 1970, $30-40$ tav. 14 and 15 |
| CupraCF_249 | FoVG | Schematic warrior figure | 5th-4th BCE | $18 \times 4.5$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 351595 | A3.225 |  | Colonna 1970, 42-45 tav. 17-19 |


| Cat. No. | Type | Short description | Date | Meas. | Condition | Site name | Within Site | Loc. | Invent.No | Ph. No. | Bibliography | Comparanda |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CupracF_250 | Animal | Highly schematic figur of an ox | Shh-4h BCE | $4.6 \times 1.4$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scatered in area | MANU | 7218 | A3.222 |  | Bruschetti 1989, 20, 4.18; Falconi Amorelli, 1977, 183, 95c; Monacchi 1988, 79. |
| CupracF_251 | Anin | Highly schematic figure of a horse | Sh-4h BCE | 5.4x4.2 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Disturbed by looters | MANUdep | 764006 | A3.221 |  | Bruschetti 1989, 120, 4.17; Falconi Amorelli 1977 tav. 95 i |
| CupracF_252 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of an ox | Sh-4h BCE | $1.6 \times 3.5$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Saggio 15 | MSAP | NA |  |  | Bruschetti 1989, 20, 4.18; Falconi Amorelli, 1977, 183, 95c; Monacchi 1988, 79. |
| CupracF_253 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of an ox | Sth-4th BCE | $3 \times 6.5$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scatered in area | MAC | 601903 |  |  | Bruschetti 1989, 20, 4.18; Falconi Amorelli, 1977, 183, 95c; Monacchi 1988, 79. |
| CupracF_254 | Animal | Highly schematic figure of an horse | Sh-4h BCE | $2.4 \times 3.7$ | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Scattered in area | MAC | 341597 |  |  | Bruschetti 1989, 120, 4.17; Falconi Amorelli 1977, tav. 95 i |
| Cuprack_25 | O | Zoomorphic figurine resembling a bird | Sth-4h BCE | 4.9x | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Surface find | MANUdep | 764 | A3.229 |  |  |
| CupracF_256 | Other | Zoomorphic figurine resembling a bird | Sth-4th BCE | 4.1x3 | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76323 |  |  |  |
| CupracF_257 | or | Zoomorphic figurine resembling a bird | Sth-4h BCE | $4.5 \times 2.5$ | Fair | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 76350 | A3.228 |  |  |
| Cuprack_258 | Other | Zoomorphic figurine resembling a bird | Sth-4h BCE | $5.8 \times 2.6$ | Poor | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | Pzo Trinci | 763525 |  |  |  |
| CupracF_259 | Other | Zoomorphic figurine resembling a bird | Sth-4h BCE | 4.9x2.7 | Good | Cupra sanctuary | Votive deposit | MSAP | A1732 | A3.227 |  |  |



Table A2.1. Tabulated catalog of Umbrian figurative votive offerings.

## Appendix 3

## Catalog of Umbrian Figurative Votive Offerings

This appendix contains the photos of the figurative votive offerings discussed in this dissertation and catalogued in Appendix 2. They are divided by location and votive type (described in Appendix 1) and presented in the same order as they appear in the description of Umbrian sanctuaries in Chapter 5. In order to facilitate the link between Appendices 2 and 3, each photo is complemented by the number assigned to the object in the tabulated catalog. Not all the objects have a figure. Given the repetition of most of the objects' types, a selection of exemplificative photo for each sanctuary context is presented.

If not otherwise specified, all the pictures have been taken by the author on kind permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria and of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria.

## Grotta Bella

## Esquiline Group

GB_1


Figure A3.1. Schematic representation of a man (inv. n. 41; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.2. Schematic representation of a man (inv. N. 50306; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.3. Schematic representation of a man (inv. N. 50709; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.4. Schematic representation of a man (inv. N. 50351; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.5. Schematic representation of a female figure (inv. N. 50709; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.6. Schematic representation of a warrior (inv. N. 50227; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria ).


Figure A3.7. Schematic representation of a warrior (inv. N. 50744; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.8. Schematic representation of a female figure (inv. N. 50311; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure. A3.9. Schematic representation of a female figure (inv. N. 50309; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.10. Schematic representation of a female figure (inv. N. 50707; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Animals



Figure A3.11. Schematic representation of a bovine (inv. N. 50770; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.12. Schematic representation of an ox (inv. N. 50417; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.13. Schematic representation of a sheep (inv. N. 50419; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.14. Schematic representation of unidentifiable animal, likely a ferret (inv. N. 50724; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Nocera Umbra Group



Figure A3.15. Schematic representation of a warrior (inv. N. N/A; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.16. Schematic representation of a warrior (inv. N.50785; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Archaic anatomicals



Figure A3.17. Bronze leg (inv. N. NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


GB_276

Figure A3.18. Bronze arm (inv. N. NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.19. Bronze leg (inv. N. NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.20. Bronze foot (inv. N. 114336; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Archaic heads



Figure A3.21. Schematic head (inv. N. 50425; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.22 (left) and A3.23 (right). Schematic heads (inv. N. 50423;50424; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).

## Other



Figure A3.24. Lead schematic representation of a warrior (inv. N.50436; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.25. Lead schematic representation of a warrior (inv. N.50430; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.26. Lead schematic representation of a female (inv. N.50704; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.27. Lead schematic representation of a female (inv. N.50431; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.28. Lead schematic representation of a female (inv. N.50433; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.29. Lead episema. One side represents an arm fastened to the shield, the other three men under tree (inv. N.50435; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.30. Lead episema. One side represents an arm fastened to the shield, the other side depicts three men under tree (inv. N.50437; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria). Below: drawing of the side of the shield with the three men.


## GB 27



Figure A3.31. Lead episema. One side represents an arm fastened to the shield, the other side depicts three men under tree (inv. N. 50440; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.32. Lead episema with gorgoneion (after Monacchi 1988, tav. 36 inv. N.108773).


Figure A3.33. Lead episema. One side represents an arm fastened to the shield, the other a radiating sun (inv. N. 50440; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).

## Anatomical terracottas



Figure A3.34. Terracotta breast (inv. N. NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.35. Terracotta breast (after Monacchi 1988, tav.36; inv. N. NA).

## Hellenistic worshipper



Figure A3.36. Worshipper holding a patera and standing on a base (inv. N. 3038; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.37. Worshipper holding a patera (inv. N. 50225; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.38. Worshipper with outstretched arms (inv. N. 50304; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Pantanelli

## Other



Figure A3.39. Lead schematic representation of a warrior (inv. N. NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.40. Fragment of a lead figurine representing a human figure (inv. N. NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## PNT_3



Figure A3.41. Lead episema with gorgoneion (inv. N. NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.42. Lead episema with zigzag and knobs motif (inv. N. NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).

## Anatomical terracottas



Figure A3.43. Terracotta foot (inv. N. 124019; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Monte San Pancrazio

## Esquiline Group

MSP I


MSP_3


Figure A3.44. Highly schematic male figures (from left to right inv. .N. 721816, 721817, 721818; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.45. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. 721836; by permission of the Polo Museale dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.46. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N. 721862; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.47. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N. 721863; by permission of the Polo Museale dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.48. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N. 721861; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.49. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N. 721860; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Archaic anatomicals



Figure A3.50. Schematic representation of a leg (from left to right: inv. N. 721864 and 721865; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.51. Schematic representation of an arm (inv. N.721820; by permission of the Polo Museale dell’Umbria)


Figure A3.52. Schematic representation of an arm (inv. N. 721821; by permission of the Polo Museale dell’Umbria).

Archaic heads

MSP_13
MSP_14
MSP_15
MSP_16
MSP_17


Figure A3.53. Schematic heads (from left to right inv. N.721875-79; by permission of the Polo Museale dell’Umbria).

## Eyed crests



Figure A3.54. Schematic crests with eyes (from left to right inv. N.721872-74; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Foligno Group



Figure A3.55. Highly schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 721867; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Todi Group



Figure A3.56. Schematic warrior figure (after Colonna 1970, tav.LII-LIII).

## Bronze sheets



Figure A3.57. Schematic figure turned sideways (inv. N. 721871; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Animals



Figure A3.58. Schematic figure of an ox (inv. N.721819; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Terracotta heads



Figure A3.59. Terracotta half-head (inv. N.721815; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Monte Torre Maggiore

## Esquiline Group



Figure A3.60. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.61. Extremely schematic male figure (inv. N. NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.62. Extremely schematic male figure (from left to right inv. N. 209173, 209133; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.63. Extremely schematic warrior figures (from left to right inv. N. 209173, 209133; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

MSP_22


Figure A3.64. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N. 721809; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.65. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N. 721809; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Amelia Group



Figure A3.66. Schematic figure of a striding male (inv. N.721805; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.67. Schematic figure of a striding man (inv. N. 721808; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.68. .Highly schematic figure of warrior (inv .N.721807; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Archaic heads



Figure A3.69 (left) and A3. 70 (right). Schematic heads (MTM_63: inv. N.721806; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria. MTM_64: inv. N.NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.71. Bronze hand (inv .N.273867; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).

MTM_68


Figure A3.72. Schematic representation of a foot (inv .N.313; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Nocera Umbra Group



Figure A3.73. Schematic representation of a warrior (inv .N.94422; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.74. Schematic representation of a warrior (inv .N.209104; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.75. Schematic representation of a warrior (inv. .N.113484; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.75b. Schematic representation of a warrior (inv. N.94420; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Eyed crests



Figure A3.76. Schematic crest with eyes (inv. N.113414; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Animals



Figure A3.77. Schematic head of a bull (inv. N. 338233; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.78. Schematic head of a bull (inv. N. 94429; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Hellenistic worshippers



Figure A3.79. Male worshipper holding a patera (inv. N. 721804; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.80. Male worshipper holding a patera. Still visible underneath the figurine's feet are the traces of the cubic travertine small base that supported the figurine (inv. N. 209160; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.81. Female worshipper holding an acerra (inv. N. 212196; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Anatomical terracottas



Figure A3.82. Hand wearing a ring (inv. N. NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.83. Fragments of a foot (modified after Bononi Ponzi 1989, 26 fig. 21).

## Terracotta heads



Figure 3.84. Fragments of a male head (inv. N. 341470; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure 3.85. Fragments of a female head (inv. N. 209163; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).

## Esquiline Group



Figure A3.86. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. 183026; by permission of the Polo Museale dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.87. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. 230054; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.88. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. 230054; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Eyed crests



Figures A3.89 (left) and A3.90 (right). Schematic crests with two eyes (from left to right: inv. N. 183031 and 183034; by permission of the Polo Museale dell’Umbria).

## Foligno Group



Figure A3.91. Highly schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 230034; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Animals



Figure A3.92. Schematic figure of a horse (inv. N. 230045; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.93. Schematic figure of an ox (inv. N. 230023; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Archaic heads



Figure A3.94. Schematic head (inv. N. 230026; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Anatomical terracottas



Figure A3.95. Fragment of a uterus (inv. N.232367; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.96. Schematic head (inv. N. 232368; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.97. Fragment of a right hand (inv. N. 232345; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.98. Fragment of a left hand (inv. N. 183019; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.99. Fragment of a nose (inv. N. 232369; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.100. Fragment of a foot (inv. N. 232376; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.101. Fragment of male genitalia (inv. N. 232374; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Terracotta heads



Figure A3.102. Fragment of male head (inv. N. 232366; by permission of the Polo Museale dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.103. Fragment of male head (inv. N. 232375; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.104. Fragment of hairdo of a veiled head (inv. N.232373; by permission of the Polo Museale dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.105. Base of terracotta head (inv. N. 232370; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Monte Santo

## Amelia Group



Figure A3.106. Highly schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 342; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.107. Schematic figure of striding man (inv. N. 358; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.108. Schematic figure of striding man (inv. N. 348; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.109. Schematic figure of striding man (inv. N. 325; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Esquiline Group



Figure A3.110. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. 349; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.111. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. 356; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.112. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N. 382; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.113. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N. 382; by permission of the Polo Museale dell’Umbria).

## Foligno Group



Figure A3.114. Schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 332; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.115. Schematic warrior figure (Inv. N. 334; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.116. Schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 333; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Nocera Umbra Group



Figure A3.117. Schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 330; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.118. Schematic figure of a warrior (inv. N .322; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.119. Schematic female figure (inv. N. 380; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Monte Santo Group



Figure A3.120. Schematic female figure (inv. N. 337; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.121. Schematic female figure (inv. N.302; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Animals



Figure A3.122. Schematic figure of a bull (inv. N. 392; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.123. Schematic figure of a horse (inv. N. 396; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Archaic heads



Figure A3.124. Schematic head (inv. N. 385; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).

```
MTS_73
```



Figure A3.125. Schematic head (inv. N. 310; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.126. Schematic head (inv. N. 319; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Other



Figure A3.127. Schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 303; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.128. Schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 308; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.129. Schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 307; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.130. Schematic Heracles (inv. N. 304; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).

## La Rocca

## Esquiline Group



Figure A3.131. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. 109558; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.132. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. CS1729; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.133. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. CS1728; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Foligno Group



Figure A3.134. Highly schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 109578; by permission of the Polo Museale dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.135. Highly schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 109559; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Nocera Umbra Group



Figure A3.136. Highly schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 337381; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.137.Schematic figure of a striding man (inv. N. 305069; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Amelia Group



Figure A3.138. Schematic figure of a striding man (inv. N. CS172; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Archaic anatomicals



Figure A3.139. Bronze arm (inv. N.305671; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Anatomical terracottas



Figure A3.140. Fragments of feet, toes and fingers (inv. NN 305628, 305631- feet-; 305626, 305627- toes; 305629, 305630- fingers; after Pani 2011, fig. 23).


Figure A3.141. Fragments of two uteri (inv. NN. 305645 and 305645).


Figure A3.142. Fragment of male genitalia (inv. N. 275102).


Figure A3.143. Fragment of a head (left) and veiled head (right) (inv. NN. 305632 and 305652).

## Animals



Figure A3.144. Fragment of a terracotta bovine (inv. N.305623).

## Monte Subasio

## Esquiline Group



Figure A3.145. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. 10; after Monacchi 1986, tav. 38b).

## Amelia Group



Figure A3.146. Schematic figure of a striding male (inv. N. NA; after Monacchi 1986, tav. 38b).

## Other



Figure A3.147. Schematic figure of a warrior with situla (inv. N. 1; after Monacchi 1986, tav. 38a).


Figure A3.148. Dancing figure (inv. N. 18; after Monacchi 1986, tav. 39c).

## CSRufino_3



Figure A3.149. Pendant in the shape of a quadruped (inv. N. 12; after Monacchi 1986, tav. 38d).

## Hellenistic worshipper



Figure A3.150. Schematic figure of female worshipper (left and center) and arm of worshipper with patera (right) (inv. NN. 10, 13, and 18; Monacchi 1986, tav. 39a-c).

## Monte Ansciano

## Esquiline Group



MtAnsc_7


MAAS_


Figure A3.151. Highly schematic male figures (inv. NN from left to right: 625958, 625959, 625960; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.152. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. 41; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.153. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N.93; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.154. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N.146; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


MtAnsc_42


Figure A3.155. Extremely schematic warrior figure (inv. N.80; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

MtAnsc_3


Figure A3.156. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N.625955; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

MtAnsc_2


Figure A3.157. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N.625954; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.158. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N.65; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Nocera Umbra Group



Figure A3.159. Highly schematic warrior figure (inv. N.44; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.160. Extremely schematic warrior figure (inv. N.46; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).

## Archaic heads

MtAnsc_10


Figure A3.161. Fragment of terracotta head (inv. N.625969; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Hellenistic worshipper

MtAnsc_19


Figure A3.162. Hand holding a patera dell’Umbria).

## Monte Acuto

## Esquiline Group



Figure A3.163. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. 122218; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.164. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. 122218; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.165. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N. 114347; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.166. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N.11686; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.167. Highly schematic warrior figures (inv. NN. 116864 and 116847; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).

## Animals



Figure A3.168. Highly schematic figure of a pig (inv. N. 1222412; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.169. Highly schematic figure of a sheep (inv. N.114341; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.170. Highly schematic figure of an ox (inv. N. 116848; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.171. Highly schematic figure of a goat (inv. N.116845; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## MTA 78



Figure A3.172. Highly schematic figure of a quadruped (inv. N.116845; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).

## Bronze Sheets



Figure A3.173. Schematic male figure (inv. N. 113498; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.174. Schematic male figure (inv. N. 113498; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Nocera Umbra Group



Figure A3.175. Highly schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 113499; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.176. Highly schematic warrior figure (inv. N.116871; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Amelia Group



Figure A3.177. Highly schematic figure of man striding forward (inv. N.114344; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.178. Highly schematic figure of man striding forward (inv. N.116846; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Archaic heads



Figure A3.179. Bronze heads (inv. NN. NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Archaic anatomicals



Figure A3.180. Bronze leg (inv. N. NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.181. Bronze arm (inv. N. 116872; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.182. Bronze hand (inv. N. 116844; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

Colle Mori

CM_5


Figure A3.183. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N.361784; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.184. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. 361875; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.185. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. 88988; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).

## Foligno Group

CM_10


Figure A3.186. Highly schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 174766; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Archaic heads

> CM_1


Figure A3.187. Lower half of terracotta head (inv. N. 361878; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Hellenistic worshippers



Figure A3.188. Female worshipper holding a patera (inv. N. 211373; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Terracotta heads



Figure A3.189. Terracotta head (inv. N. 361899; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.190. Terracotta head (inv. N. 364985; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Cancelli

## Foligno Group



Figure
Figure A3.191. Highly schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 637473; modified after Manca et al. 2014, 56 n.31).


Figure A3.192. Highly schematic warrior figures (inv. NN. NA; modified after Manca et al. 2014, 56 n.31).

## Esquiline Group



Figure A3.193. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. 646185; after Manca et al. 2014, 56 n.36).


Figure A3.194. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N. 637518; after Manca et al. 2014, 56 n.35).


Figure A3.195. Highly schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 643123; after Manca et al. 2014, 56 n.34).

## Animals

## Cancelli_13



Figure A3.196. Schematic figure of a bull (inv. N. 679455; after Manca et al. 2014, 56 n.34).

## Nocera Umbra Group



Figure A3.197. Highly schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 637436, after Manca et al. 2014, 56 n.32).

## Bronze sheets



Figure A3.198. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. 737440; after Manca et al. 2014, 56 n.37).

## Eyed crests



Figure A3.199. Schematic crest with eyes (inv. N. 637443; after Manca et al. 2014, 56 n.38).

## Archaic heads



Figure A3.200. Schematic head (inv. N. 637459; after Manca et al. 2014, 56 n.39).

## Archaic anatomicals



Figure A3.201. Schematic representation of an arm (inv. N. 637466; after Manca et al. 2014, 56 n.39).

## Hellenistic worshippers



Figure A3.202. Drawing of Hellenistic worshipper figure (Picuti 2009, 9).

## Anatomical Terracottas



Figure A3.203. Fragment of a foot (inv. N. 695199; after Manca et al. 2014, 51 n.5).

## Terracotta heads



Figure A3.204. Fragment of the upper half portion of a male head (inv. N. 643009; after Manca et al. 2014, 51 n .4 ).

## Campo la Piana

## Esquiline Group

CPL_1


Figure A3.205. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N.NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## CPL 4



Figure A3.206. Highly schematic figure of man striding forward (inv. N.NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Other



Figure A3.207. Terracotta head of a male wearing a tall hat (inv. N.NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

Monte Pennino


Figure A3.208. Highly schematic human figures (inv. NN. NA; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.209. Highly schematic male figures (inv. N. 764031; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.210. Highly schematic male figure (inv. N. 721905; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.211. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N. 721900; by permission of the Polo Museale dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.212. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N. 763932; by permission of the Polo Museale dell’Umbria).

## Bronze sheets



Figure A3.213. Extremely schematic male figures (inv. N. 764033; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.214. Extremely schematic male figure (inv. N. 721902; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Nocera Umbra Group



Figure A3.215. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N. 601919; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.216. Highly schematic female figure (inv. N.341593; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.217. Highly schematic warrior figure (inv. N. A1748; by permission of the Polo Museale dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.218. Highly schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 76318; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Amelia Group



Figure A3.219. Schematic figure of striding male (inv. N. 601918; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.220. Schematic figure of striding male (inv. N. 721906; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Animals



Figure A3.221. Highly schematic figure of a horse (inv. N. 764006; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.222. Highly schematic figure of an ox (inv. N. 721896; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).

## Foligno Group



Figure A3.223. Highly schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 341637; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Fabriano Group



Figure A3.224. Schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 354776; by permission of the by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Fossato di Vico Group



Figure A3.225. Schematic warrior figure (inv. N. 351595; by permission of the by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Archaic Anatomicals



Figure A3.226. Schematic representation of a foot (inv. N.601896; by permission of the by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Others



Figure A3.227. Schematic figure with bird-like features (inv. N. A1732; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.228. Schematic figure with bird-like features (inv. N. 76350; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).


Figure A3.229. Schematic figure with bird-like features (inv. N. 764035; by permission of the Polo Museale dell'Umbria).


Figure A3.230. Schematic figure with monkey-like features (inv. N. 601926; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Anatomical terracottas



Figure A3.231. Terracotta foot (inv. N. 601922by permission of the by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria).

## Tanagra figurines



CupraCF_264


Figure A3.232. Tanagra figurines (inv. NN. 602018 and 602016; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell’Umbria).

## Other



Figure A3.233. Schematic figure of Heracles (inv. N. 341601; by permission of the Soprintendenza ABAP dell'Umbria)
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    ${ }^{278}$ Bradley (2000, 129-138) argues that Interamna was a Latin colony, but see Fora (2002) and Sisani (2007, 165-168) for arguments against this interpretation. Sisani suggests that Inernamna Nahars was born as a praefectura in coincidence with viritane deductions in the area, which he believes are dated to the third century BCE (2007, 146150). The only juridical difference between the two statuses was the right to vote. While the inhabitants of a praefectura were all Roman citizens and thus could vote in Rome, those of Latin colonies could vote for one tribe in Rome if they lived in the city at the time of the election: Carlà-Uhink 2017, 348. In either of these two instances, what seems to be certain is the foundation of Interamna did not erase all indigenous elements but should instead be seen as an addition to the existing situation. The presence of local people after the Roman conquest has been convincingly demonstrated by Bradley. As he points out $(2000,133)$, the presence of an imperial inscription recording the

[^81]:    foundation of the city 704 years earlier, shows that the memory that the city foundation pre-dated the arrival of settlers survived at least until the imperial period. This awareness could suggest that the pre-existing Umbrian community was incorporated into the city, regardless of its status as Latin colony or as a Roman praefectura.
    ${ }^{279}$ For the colonies: Liv., Per. 20; Vell. Pat., 1.14.8. For Forum Flaminii: Strab., 5.2.10. Fora were typically new foundations created by a Roman magistrate (Flaminius in this case) in connection with the construction of a road along which the forum was situated. Forum Flaminii almost certainly owed its existence to the building of the Via Flaminia. Here, in fact, the two branches of the Flaminia met again to cross the Apennines on their way to the Adriatic.
    ${ }^{280}$ Liv. Epitom. 15.
    ${ }^{281}$ Dionysus of Halicarnassus is the only source that mentions a third road, the via Curia. Although its exact path remains unclear, scholars agree that it passed through Reate and connected the Sabine territory (conquered in 290 BCE) with Ineramna Nahrs in Umbria: Sisani 2006, 122.
    ${ }^{282}$ Frederiksen and Ward Perkins 1957 give detailed description of this Roman road. Etruscan and Roman Roads in Southern Etruria
    ${ }^{283}$ Potter 1979, 102-104.
    ${ }^{284}$ Not for nothing Ray Laurence argues that this road created a "Rome-centered" geography, which enabled Latin colonies and allied communities to be linked among themselves and to Rome: Laurence 1999, 23.

[^82]:    ${ }^{285}$ The fact that the Umbrians are recorded as socii when they provided troops to Rome in 279 BCE against Pyrrhus of Epirus, and in 225 BCE and 205 BCE against the Gauls, may suggest that the Romans concluded foedera with the Umbrian peoples after the victory at Sentinum in 292 BCE: Sisani 2006, 100-115.
    ${ }^{286}$ Cic., Balb. 46-47. With regard to the foedus with Iguvium, see Sisani 2001, 225-230.
    ${ }^{287}$ Sisenn., 111 P.
    ${ }^{288}$ For a list of these inscriptions, see Sisani 2006, 101, footnote 10.
    
    
    ${ }^{290}$ Bradley (2000, 121-122) adds fourteen more Umbrian centers to the list of the cities with a well-known treaty with Rome.

[^83]:    ${ }^{291}$ Badian 1958, 25-28.
    ${ }^{292}$ The fact that Iguvium and Todi could mint their own coinage is another indication of their local sovereignty. For coinage as a sign of political organization see Bradley 2000, chapter 4, s. 6. With respect to the clauses of the foedera between Roman and the Umbrian peoples, the only exception seems to be the foedus with Camerinum, which had a greater freedom in choosing whether to send troops to help Rome or not. Liv., 38, 45, 13.
    ${ }^{293}$ The measures contained in this document are not clear as there are no sources that elucidates them. In the lex agraria of 111 BCE is mentioned that "all allies or members of the Latin name, from whom Romans are accustomed to demand soldiers in the land of Italy ex formula togatorum; see Erdkamp 2007, 116-117. As mentioned above in this chapter, communities' ability to conduct the levy is also considered by Bradley as a further sign of the organization of the region into a city-state communal structure by the time of the conquest.
    ${ }^{294}$ Liv., 32, 6-7.
    ${ }^{295}$ This law entailed the redistribution of public land and its adsegnatio to new owners. The nature of this measure is explained by Appian (BCiv. I.10). For the foundation of the colony of Pisaurum, see Liv., 39, 44, 10.
    ${ }^{296}$ Cic., Balb. 46; 48; Val. Max., 5.2.8; Plut., Mor. 202C-D. For a discussion on the different ways to acquire Roman citizenship see Harris 1971, 192-201.

[^84]:    ${ }^{297}$ App., BCiv. 1.36.162. See also the critical reading by Crawford 2012, 737 and 2014, 209-211. Umbrians and Etruscans were the only two groups who opposed both the lex agraria and the rogatio de sociis. On these issues, see Asdrubali Pentiti 1981-1982.
    ${ }^{298}$ App., BCiv. 1.35.
    ${ }^{299}$ App., BCiv. 1.36.164.
    ${ }^{300}$ For an extensive treatment on the municipalization of Italy see: Bisham 2007, 205-404; Dart 2015. The latter also assesses the repercussions of the Social War, investigating the legacy of the insurgency during the civil wars, and considers its role in reshaping Roman and Italian identity on the peninsula in the last decades of the Republic. For the strategy of urban renewal after the Social War, see Gabba 1994.
    ${ }^{301}$ App., BCiv 36.162-164. For a discussion on Umbria's participation to the War, see Harris 1971, 212-229.
    ${ }^{302}$ As Harris $(1970,230)$ suggests, it is reasonable to hypothesize that a senatus consultum was passes to enfranchise the towns that remains in arms during the War.

[^85]:    ${ }^{303}$ Due to the lack of excavation data, the date and function of Samnite hillforts has been largely overlooked. However, ongoing studies in the modern region of Lucania and Campania are revealing new information not only on the function of hillforts but also on their organization; see Hoer 2020. For hillforts in Britain and Gaul see Harding 2012; Oswald et al .2013 with previous bibliography.

[^86]:    ${ }^{304}$ As mentioned in the first chapter, in the past two decades the process of Roman colonization as an acculturation process and of colonies as medium for this process has been strongly criticized by scholars working mainly in Latium, Etruria, and Samnium. For a more general overview on Roman colonization and its impact on italic territories, see Bradley 2006, Stek and Pelgrom 2014, Scopacasa 2015 with previous bibliography. For a discussion of Roman colonization and its effects on the sacred sphere see Chapter 2.
    ${ }^{305}$ Harris 1971, 170.
    ${ }^{306}$ Bonomi Ponzi 2006, 66.

[^87]:    ${ }^{307}$ Sisani 2006.
    ${ }^{308}$ Sisani 2006, 151-152; Bonomi Ponzi 2006, 65.
    ${ }^{309}$ Mommsen 1869, 474.
    ${ }^{310}$ Most of these contributions are mentioned in Chapter 2 in the discussion of cultural change. For a more general discussion of the latest developments see Pelgrom and Stek 2014 and the several contributions to the Companion to Roman Italy in Cooley 2016.

[^88]:    ${ }^{315}$ Terrenato 2014, 45-60. The new ongoing project "Non-Roman Elites: Tracking persistence and change in central Italy through the Roman conquest", of which I am part, has the potential to shed further light on the role of individual elite members during the period of Roman expansion. By focusing on two bodies of evidence - burial evidence for local elites and onomastic evidence from regional epigraphy relating to elite family groups, some of which can be reconstructed in stemmatic lineages - in central Italy, this project explores new models for understating the negotiations as Rome expanded and incorporated new elites into her imperial project. Early results of this research group were presented in January 2019 at the AIA conference in San Diego.

[^89]:    ${ }^{316}$ Terrenato 2008, 240.
    ${ }^{317}$ For a discussion, see Cornell 2004; Stek 2015, 6-8; Terrenato 2014.

[^90]:    ${ }^{318}$ Cornell 2004, 115-131.
    ${ }^{319}$ Bradley 2014, 60-73.
    ${ }^{320} \mathrm{He}$ is echoed by Amann 2011.

[^91]:    ${ }^{321}$ All votive types are explained in Appendix 1. In this chapter, they are always described after their first mention. The votive offerings whose rendering can noticeably vary, such as terracotta heads and anatomical votives, or those that are unique of certain sites, will be described on a case-to case basis. The chronology, if not specified, is the one assigned to the objects by the archaeologists who studied/excavated the material. When this is unknown, I use comparanda from other sites in order to establish a plausible chronological framework. Comparanda are also used if they serve to better define the chronology proposed by the excavators.

[^92]:    ${ }^{322}$ See Chapter 2 on this topic.

[^93]:    ${ }^{323}$ For more information on the settlement history of the Ameria territory, see below, paragraph 5.1.2 Pantanelli.
    ${ }^{324}$ A preliminary archaeological report of this excavation was published by Arena (1975-1976) and a detailed overview of its materials has been presented by Monacchi (1988).

[^94]:    ${ }^{325}$ Lead slugs found in the cave are likely related to the production in loco of the lead figurines: Monacchi 1988, 44.

[^95]:    ${ }^{326}$ Females: GB_41 GB_48 GB_49 GB_50 GB_51 GB_52 GB_53 GB_145 GB_152 GB_163 GB_164 GB_165 GB_166 GB_167 GB_168 GB_169 GB_170 GB_171 GB_205 GB_241 GB_8 GB_9 GB_292 GB_293 GB_294 GB_295. Males: GB_10 GB_ 47 GB_54 GB_55 GB_56 GB_58 GB_59 GB_60 GB_61 GB_62 GB_63 GB_64 GB_65 GB_66 GB_67 GB_70 GB_71 GB_72 GB_73 GB_74 GB_75 GB_76 GB_77 GB_78 GB_79 GB_80 GB_81 GB_82 GB_ 83 GB_ 84 GB_ 85 GB_ 86 GB_ 87 GB_ 88 GB_ 89 GB_ 90 GB_91 GB_92 GB_93 GB_94 GB_95 GB_96 GB_97 GB_98 GB_99 GB_100 GB_101 GB_102 GB_103 GB_104 GB_105 GB_106 GB_107 GB_108 GB_109 GB_110 GB_111 GB_112 GB_113 GB_114 GB_115 GB_116 GB_117 GB_118 GB_119 GB_120 GB_121 GB_122 GB_123 GB_124 GB_125 GB_126 GB_127 GB_128 GB_129 GB_130 GB_131 GB_132 GB_133 GB_134 GB_135 GB_136 GB_137 GB_138 GB_139 GB_140 GB_141 GB_142 GB_143 GB_146 GB_186 GB_187 GB_188 GB_189 GB_190 GB_191 GB_192 GB_193 GB_194 GB_195 GB_196 GB_197 GB_198 GB_200 GB_201 GB_203 GB_204 GB_206 GB_207 GB_208 GB_209 GB_210 GB_211 GB_212 GB_213 GB_214 GB_215 GB_216 GB_217 GB_218 GB_220 GB_221 GB_222 GB_223 GB_224 GB_225 GB_226 GB_227 GB_228 GB_229 GB_230 GB_231 GB_232 GB_233 GB_234 GB_235 GB_236 GB_237 GB_238 GB_239 GB_240 GB_4 GB_37 GB_38 GB_39 GB_40 GB_57 GB_144 GB_147 GB_148 GB_149 GB_150 GB_151 GB_153 GB_156 GB_161 GB_162 GB_183 GB_184 GB_185 GB_199 GB_202 GB_1 GB_2 GB_3 GB_5 GB_13 GB_14 GB_15 GB_16 GB_19 GB_20 GB_21 GB_22 GB_23 GB_24 GB_25 GB_26 GB_28 GB_29 GB_30 GB_31 GB_32 GB_43 GB_44 GB_296 GB_297 GB_298 GB_299 GB_300 GB_301 GB_302 GB_303 GB_304 GB_305 GB_306 GB_307 GB_308 GB_309 GB_310 GB_311 GB_312 GB_313 ${ }^{326}$ GB_6 GB_7 GB_11 GB_12 GB_17 GB_27 GB_33 GB_34 GB_35 GB_36 GB_42 GB_45 GB_46 GB_68 GB_69 GB_154 GB_155 GB_157 GB_158 GB_159 GB_160 GB_172 GB_173 GB_174 GB_175 GB_176 GB_177 GB_178 GB_179 GB_180 GB_181 GB_182 GB_314 GB_315. Warriors: GB_6 GB_7 GB_11 GB_12 GB_17 GB_27 GB_33 GB_34 GB_35 GB_36 GB_42 GB_45 GB_46 GB_68 GB_69 GB_154 GB_155 GB_157 GB_158 GB_159 GB_160 GB_172 GB_173 GB_174 GB_175 GB_176 GB_177 GB_178 GB_179 GB_180 GB_181 GB_182 GB_314 GB_315. ${ }^{327}$ GB_242 GB_243 GB_244 GB_245 GB_246 GB_247 GB_248 GB_249 GB_250 GB_251

[^96]:    ${ }^{328}$ GB_252 GB_253
    ${ }^{329}$ GB_242 GB_243 GB_244 GB_246 GB_248 GB_249 GB_250 GB_247 GB_287 GB_288 GB_289 GB_290 GB_245 GB_291 GB_251. GB_287-290 and GB_291 were recorded by Monacchi $(1988,79)$ but I was not able to locate these pieces.
    ${ }^{330}$ Heads: GB_279 GB_280 GB_281. Foot: GB_278. Legs: GB_275 GB_277. Arm: GB_276

[^97]:    ${ }^{331}$ Females: GB_258 GB_259 GB_260 GB_261 GB_263 GB_263.Warriors GB_262 GB_264 GB_265GB_255 GB_256 GB_257Shields: GB_266 GB_267 GB_268 GB_269 GB_270 GB_271 GB_272 GB_273 GB_274
    ${ }^{332}$ Monacchi 1988.

[^98]:    ${ }^{333}$ Cavanagh and Laxton 1984, Muskett 2014, Boos 2000.

[^99]:    ${ }^{334}$ The term "prow series" was used by Crawford $(1975,42)$ to designate Roman asses that show on the reverse the bow of a ship. Generally, this motif is interpreted as a proclamation of Rome's awareness of her position as a naval power and accordingly these coins are dated from the first Punic war, or soon after it in concomitance with the introduction of the quadrigatus.
    ${ }^{335}$ Feet: GB_283 GB_284 GB_317. Breast: GB_282.

[^100]:    ${ }^{336}$ GB_285 GB_286 GB_318.

[^101]:    ${ }^{337}$ Eroli 1860, 118-122; Eroli 1864, 56-59; Eroli 1867, 169-172; Monacchi 1997, 167-194. For an overview on the settlement of Ameria from the Bronze Age to the Roman period, see Matteini Chiari 1996, also with sections on the

[^102]:    surviving materials from the Pantanelli necropolis, and Bravi and Monacchi (2017). The latter publication provides also with a short summary of the nineteenth century discovery and suggests a more precise dating for the votive offerings than that of Eroli.

[^103]:    ${ }^{338}$ Figurines: PNT_1 PNT_2. Shields: PNT_3 PNT_4 PNT_5 PNT_6 PNT_7
    ${ }^{339}$ Monacchi (1997) has grouped the Pantanelli revetment plaques into six types. In the first one, a floral-form ornament, or anthemion, consists of one pair of palmettes separated by two volutes. The second is characterized by four palmettes with lanceolate leaves positioned at the four corners of the slab and connected by spirals and smaller palmettes oriented in the opposite direction; buds and berries branch off from the stems. The third type of revetment slab has two rows of palmettes connected by lines of horizontal spirals. In the fourth type there is an alternation of palmettes and lotus forms, which in the sixth type is organized in three rows. The only decorative motif recognizable in the revetment plaques of the fifth type is a large palmette's leaf.

[^104]:    ${ }^{340}$ Picuti 2006, 205; Strazulla 1981.

[^105]:    ${ }^{341}$ Ciotti 1964, 111. See also Bonomi Ponzi 1985, 48.
    ${ }^{342}$ Males: MSP_1 MSP_2 MSP_3 MSP_4 MSP_5. Females: MSP_6 MSP_7 MSP_8 MSP_9. For the description of types already introduced in this chapter, see Appendix 1.
    ${ }^{343}$ Heads: MSP_13; MSP_16 and MSP_17; without the band: MSP_14 and MSP_15. Legs: 18 MSP_19. Arms: MSP_20 MSP_21.

[^106]:    ${ }^{344}$ MSP_23 MSP_24 MSP_25
    ${ }^{345}$ FoG: MSP_10. ToG: MSP_11.
    ${ }^{346}$ MSP_12; MSP_26.

[^107]:    ${ }^{347}$ The material is unpublished. This dating is suggested on the display at the MANU.

[^108]:    ${ }^{348}$ Söderlind 2002, 62;60.

[^109]:    ${ }^{349}$ The settlement of Maratta Bassa was used from the eight century BCE to the fourth century BCE. Excavations carried out in the historic center of Terni (ancient Interamna) have showed that a settlement existed here as early as the seventh BCE (Angelelli and Bonomi Ponzi 200,11-12). The urbanistic development of Interamna occurred in the third century BCE, with the construction of walls and the definition of an urban street grid.
    ${ }^{350}$ Bonomi Ponzi 1988; Bonomi Ponzi 1989; Angelelli and Bonomi Ponzi 2006, 118-130. The latter publication fully summarizes the results of these excavation seasons.

[^110]:    ${ }^{351}$ Bonomi Ponzi et. al. $(1995,47)$ have suggested that this object may either have been deposited as fulgur conditum, or buried lightning-struck object, or connected to Iuppiter Fulgurator, whose presence is attested at Interamna Nahrs during the Roman period. However, the excavation has not yielded other indications of the burial of the fulgur conditum or of the deity to whom the sanctuary was dedicated. For the difficulty in identifing the incumbent deities on the basis of the ex-votos is Italian sanctuaries see: Comella 1981, 717-803.

[^111]:    ${ }^{352}$ Males: MTM_73 MTM_74 MTM_75 MTM_76 MTM_77 MTM_84 MTM_85 MTM_98 MTM_99 MTM_100 MTM_101 MTM_104 MTM_105 MTM_109 MTM_112 MTM_113 MTM_114 MTM_115 MTM_116 MTM_117 MTM_118 MTM_120 MTM_121 MTM_123 MTM_124 MTM_125 MTM_126 MTM_127 MTM_128 MTM_135 MTM_137 MTM_139 MTM_145 MTM_146 MTM_147 MTM_148 MTM_149 MTM_150 MTM_151 MTM_152 MTM_153 MTM_154 MTM_156 MTM_157 MTM_158 MTM_163 MTM_164 MTM_166 MTM_168 MTM_172 MTM_173 MTM_174 MTM_175 MTM_178 MTM_179 MTM_180 MTM_182 MTM_183 MTM_185 MTM_190 MTM_191 MTM_192 MTM_193 MTM_194 MTM_195 MTM_196. Females: MTM_141 MTM_170 MTM_184 MTM_80 MTM_21 MTM_22. Warriors: MTM_78 MTM_81 MTM_91 MTM_92 MTM_102 MTM_103 MTM_106 MTM_107 MTM_108 MTM_110 MTM_111 MTM_119 MTM_122 MTM_129 MTM_130 MTM_131 MTM_132 MTM_133 MTM_134 MTM_136 MTM_138 MTM_140 MTM_142 MTM_143 MTM_144 MTM_155 MTM_159 MTM_160 MTM_161 MTM_162 MTM_167 MTM_169 MTM_171 MTM_197 MTM_198 MTM_23 MTM_24 MTM_25 MTM_26 MTM_27 MTM_28 MTM_29 MTM_30 MTM_97.
    ${ }^{353}$ Striding men: MTM_16 MTM_17 MTM_18 MTM_19 MTM_20. Warrior: MTM_59.
    ${ }^{354}$ Heads: MTM_63 MTM_64 MTM_72 MTM_66 MTM_67. Anatomical parts: MTM_65 MTM_68

[^112]:    ${ }^{355}$ MTM_95 MTM_82 MTM_83 MTM_93
    ${ }^{356}$ MTM_57 MTM_58 MTM_199 MTM_94
    ${ }^{357}$ Eyed crest: MTM_79. Animal: MTM_60
    ${ }^{358}$ For an overall study of Etrusco-Italic temple architecture temples, see Colonna 1985 and 2006. For a general overview of Hellenistic temple architecture, see Winter and Fedak 2016, 5-34.

[^113]:    ${ }^{359}$ Males: MTM_1 MTM_6 MTM_7 MTM_8 MTM_9 MTM_10 MTM_11 MTM_12 MTM_14 MTM_15. Female: MTM_13. Fragments with patera: MTM_2 MTM_3 MTM_4 MTM_5
    ${ }^{360}$ Hand: MTM_69. Foot: MTM_70.

[^114]:    ${ }^{361}$ Söderlind 2002, 70-71.
    ${ }^{362}$ Söderlind 2002, 180.

[^115]:    ${ }^{363}$ The results of the excavations are summarized by Sisani (2013, 132-134) in his latest publication on the ager Nursinus. The first season of excavations is published in: Costamagna 2002, 22-23. The report of the archaeological campaigns can be consulted in the Archivio della Soprintendenza Archeologia Belle Arti e Paesaggio dell'Umbria.

[^116]:    ${ }^{364}$ While Sisani $(2013,133)$ argues that no pottery of this period has been found on the excavation and casts doubts even on the chronology of the bronze figurines, the excavation reports I found in the Soprintendenza archive confirms the presence, although scant, of archaeological material of the fifth/fourth century BCE. On the basis of this evidence, I see no reason to doubt the existence of a sacred area on the summit during this period

[^117]:     FoG: MM_1 MM_2. Horse: MM_16, ox: MM_17. Head: MM_15.

[^118]:    ${ }^{366}$ See infra for the other material found in the pit.
    ${ }^{367}$ Uteri: MM23 MM24. Hand without palm: MM 21. Hand with palm: MM_22. Nose: MM_25. Foot: MM_19. Testicles: MM_26. The dating of both the anatomicals and the heads proposed by Sisani (2013, 137-140) suggests that their deposition may have pre-date the monumentalization of the area.

[^119]:    ${ }^{368}$ MM_18 MM_19 MM_20 MM_28.

[^120]:    ${ }^{369}$ See Chapter 4 for the pre-Roman necropoleis of Todi.
    ${ }^{370}$ Bruschetti $(2001,155)$ briefly notes that black gloss pottery and architectural fragments were found on the hill's summit by the Soprintendenza Archeologica per l'Umbria. He does not provide any additional information, and, to my knowledge, these findings are neither displayed nor available in the archival records of the Soprintendenza.
    ${ }^{371}$ For an overview and detailed summary of the finding of the statue and the Mars, see Roncalli 1973, 197. For an examination of the inscription carved on the statue, see Rocca 1996, 142 and Rix 2002, Um 1. The votive bronzes are published in Falcone Amorelli 1977 but without an historical contextualization of the sanctuary site.

[^121]:    ${ }^{372}$ For sanctuaries at Todi, see Tascio 1989, 66-67.

[^122]:    ${ }^{373}$ AmG warrior: MTS_10 MTS_11 MTS_12, AmG striding man: MTS_26 MTS_27 MTS_28 MTS_29 MTS_30 MTS_31 MTS_32 MTS_33 MTS_34 MTS_35 MTS_44. EG males: MTS_38 MTS_39 MTS_40 MTS_41 MTS_42 MTS_43; EG females: MTS_46 MTS_48. FoG warriors: MTS_8 MTS_9 MTS_13 MTS_14 MTS_15 MTS_16 MTS_17. NoG warriors: MTS_18 MTS_19 MTS_20 MTS_21 MTS_22; NoG woman: MTS_47. MSG: MTS_3 MTS_4 MTS_5 MTS_6 MTS_25. Bulls: MTS_49 MTS_50 MTS_53; horses: MTS_51 MTS_52. Heads: MTS_72 MTS_73 MTS_75. ToG: MTS_2.

[^123]:    ${ }^{374}$ Colonna 1970, 137-140.
    ${ }^{375}$ Colonna 1970, 87-88.
    ${ }^{376}$ Compared with other regions of central Italy, such as Etruria, Latium and Samnium, representations of Heracles are scarce in ancient Umbria, only two out of the 16 sanctuaries analyzed in this dissertation have yielded votive offerings representing Heracles (Monte Santo and the sanctuary of Cupra at Colfiorito). See Bradley 2005, 129-143 for a discussion on the cult of Hercules in Central Italy.
    ${ }^{377}$ Colonna 1970, 145-146.
    ${ }^{378}$ The column has been studied by Roncalli (1973). It consists of an attic base with two inscriptions and a 20 m high grooved shaft. The inscriptions preserved on the base of the column indicate that it was an honorary monument to the duoviri quinquennales of the colony: the patronus coloniae Q . Caecilius Atticus and C. Attius Bucina (CIL 11.4653a, 4652).

[^124]:    ${ }^{379}$ The analysis of the pottery typologies found on La Rocca shows that the area was only scarcely frequented in the Imperial and the Early Medieval period; pottery fragments drop from more than 2000 pieces in the fourth-first century BCE to fewer than 50 in the first-fourth century CE: Pani 2011, 44. The first excavations' results are published in Bruni et al. 1983 and De Angelis 1994. Pani et al. (2011) summarize all excavation seasons from 1993 to 2007. The sanctuary on La Rocca may have not been the only pre-Roman sanctuary. In 1986, a votive bronze figurine (inv. n. 390939), was found near the church of S. Niccolò'. It remains unpublished but is displayed at the Museo Archaeolgico Nazionale di Spoleto. Its discovery opens up the possibility that another cult place existed in the area of the future Roman colony. For the earliest phases of occupation of the hill see also De Angelis 1994, 221-247. For the necropolis, see Museo Archeologico di Spoleto 2008, 11-15. For an overview on the colony of Spoletium, see Sisani 2007, 92-97 with previous bibliography.

[^125]:    ${ }^{380}$ Several fragments of pottery, such as impasto, black gloss, and bucchero, have been found during the excavation at La Rocca but have not been associated with the sacred area.
    ${ }^{381}$ EG: Rocca_4 Rocca_5 Rocca_6 Rocca_7. FoG: Rocca_1 Rocca_2 Rocca_3. NuG: Rocca_8 Rocca_9. AmG: Rocca_10. Anatomical: Rocca_11.

[^126]:    ${ }^{382}$ For this type of revetment slabs, see supra 5.1.2 Pantanelli.
    ${ }^{383}$ This type, known as classicizing, is widespread both in colonial and not colonial areas of the peninsula. A list of sanctuaries with type of antefix decoration is in Comella 1993, 66-67; Känel 2001, 35-36; Faustoferri and Lapenna 2014, 127.

[^127]:    384 Feet: Rocca_13, Rocca_12. Fingers: Rocca_16, Rocca_21. Uterus: Rocca_18, Rocca_19. Male genitalia: Rocca_17. I was not allowed to view the anatomicals and the heads outside the case where they are displayed. The measurements of these objects and their inventory numbers, contained in Appendix 2, have been kindly provided to me by Anna Riva, from the Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Spoleto.

[^128]:    ${ }^{385}$ Rocca_22, Rocca_20.

[^129]:    ${ }^{386}$ In particular with the heads from the Temple of Minerva Medica in Rome and Ariccia. Comella 1981, 783, fig. 19. In another publication $(1982,27)$, the author notes that, starting from the third century BCE, the type of hairdo with long ringlets framing the head is replaced by the one where the hair is gathered on the top.
    ${ }^{387}$ Söderlind 2000, 58-68.
    ${ }^{388}$ Comella 1981, 767. On votive offerings of terracotta animals in central Italy, see: Söderlind 2004. According to Comella 1981, this category of votive offerings is part of the Etrusco-Latial-Campanian (E-L-C) phenomenon. For this class of material, see also Appendix 1.

[^130]:    ${ }^{389}$ The findings are published in Monacchi 1984. The objects viewed by Monacchi are today missing. For the $19^{\text {th }}$ century excavations, see Helbig 1880, 249 and Archivio Storico di Perugia: Assisi I-6.

[^131]:    ${ }^{390}$ EG: CSRufino_2. AmG: CSRufino_8. Other: CSRufino_1 CSRufino_7 CSRufino_3. The measurements in Appendix 2 for the offerings from Colle S.Rufino are those, often incomplete, noted by Monacchi. The inventory numbers for these objects reference the numbers given to them by Monacchi.
    ${ }^{391}$ Colonna 1970, 48.
    ${ }^{392}$ According to Cato (Agr. 141. 1-2), part of the formula for purifying the land was: "Mars pater, te precor quaesoque uti sies volens propitius mihi domo familiaeque nostrae, quoius re ergo agrum terram fundumque meum suovitaurilia circumagi iussi, uti tu morbos visos invisosque, viduertatem vastitudinemque, calamitates intemperiasque prohibessis defendas averruncesque; utique tu fruges, frumenta, vineta virgultaque grandire beneque evenire siris, pastores pecuaque salva servassis duisque bonam salutem valetudinemque mihi domo familiaeque nostrae".

[^132]:    ${ }^{393}$ Maetzke 1957, 511; Richardson 1983, plate 193 figs. 562-563.
    ${ }^{394}$ Monacchi 1984, 85-86, esp. footnote 50 for similar objects in Picene necropoleis.
    ${ }^{395}$ CSRufino_4, CSRufino_5; arm with patera: CSRufino_6.

[^133]:    ${ }^{396}$ Stoddart and Whitley 1988, Stoddart and Malone 1994, Stoddart 2010, cfr. Stoddart et al. 2012a and 2012b. The Gubbio valley may have hosted more than one sacred area. One bronze figurine was found on the Monte Ingino (Schippa 1987, 93) and two sporadic surface finds, published by Colonna (1970, 87; 105), come from Monte Loreto and Fratticciola Selvatica, on the northern and southern edges of the valley.

[^134]:    ${ }^{397}$ The pottery is unpublished and remains to date unstudied. One hundred and sixty-nine nails have been associated by the excavators with this phase.
    ${ }^{398}$ EG males: MtAnsc_23 MtAnsc_24 MtAnsc_8 MtAnsc_9 MtAnsc_11 MtAnsc_4 MtAnsc_5 MtAnsc_6 MtAnsc_7 MtAnsc_14 MtAnsc_20 MtAnsc_21 MtAnsc_22 MtAnsc_26 MtAnsc_28 MtAnsc_29 MtAnsc_30 MtAnsc_33 MtAnsc_34 MtAnsc_35 MtAnsc_36 MtAnsc_37 MtAnsc_38 MtAnsc_39 MtAnsc_40 MtAnsc_41 MtAnsc_43 MtAnsc_44 MtAnsc_45 MtAnsc_47 MtAnsc_48 MtAnsc_49 MtAnsc_50 MtAnsc_51 MtAnsc_52.; EG warriors: MtAnsc_42 MtAnsc_53 MtAnsc_54 MtAnsc_55 MtAnsc_56 MtAnsc_57 MtAnsc_58 MtAnsc_59 MtAnsc_60 MtAnsc_61 MtAnsc_12 MtAnsc_13; EG females: MtAnsc_1 MtAnsc_2 MtAnsc_3 MtAnsc_18 MtAnsc_27 MtAnsc_31 MtAnsc_32 MtAnsc_46. NoG: MtAnsc_15 MtAnsc_16 MtAnsc_17. Head: MtAnsc_10

[^135]:    ${ }^{399}$ Comparisons can be made in particular with the female head AII classified by Lucia Vagnetti (1971, 33; tav. V)
    ${ }^{400}$ MtAnsc_19.

[^136]:    ${ }^{401}$ For topographic framework of the sanctuary and the excavation's results, see Cenciaioli 1992, 1998.

[^137]:    ${ }^{402}$ EG males: MTA_21 MTA_22 MTA_23 MTA_24 MTA_25 MTA_26 MTA_27 MTA_28 MTA_29 MTA_30 MTA_31 MTA_32 MTA_39 MTA_40 MTA_41 MTA_42 MTA_43 MTA_44 MTA_45 MTA_46; EG female: MTA_10MTA_11MTA_12MTA_14MTA_15MTA_16 (extremely schematic); MTA_47 MTA_48 MTA_49 MTA_50 MTA_51 MTA_52MTA_53 MTA_54 MTA_55 MTA_56; EG warriors MTA_17 MTA_18 MTA_19 MTA_56 MTA_57 MTA_58. Animals: MTA_59 MTA_60 MTA_61 MTA_62 MTA_63 MTA_64 MTA_65 MTA_66 MTA_67 MTA_68 MTA_69 MTA_70 MTA_71 MTA_72 MTA_73 MTA_74 MTA_75 MTA_76 MTA_77 MTA_78 MTA_79 MTA_80 MTA_81 MTA_82 MTA_83 MTA_84 MTA_85 MTA_86MTA_87MTA_88 MTA_89 MTA_90 MTA_91 MTA_92 MTA_93. NoG: MTA_1 MTA_2 MTA_3 MTA_4 MTA_5 MTA_6 MTA_7 MTA_8 MTA_9. BS: MTA_94 MTA_95 MTA_96 MTA_97 MTA_98 MTA_99 MTA_100 MTA_101 MTA_102 MTA_103 MTA_104 MTA_105. AmG: MTA_33 MTA_34 MTA_35MTA_36 MTA_37MTA_38. Heads: MTA_108 MTA_109 MTA_110 MTA_111 MTA_112 MTA_113. Arm: MTA_106; hand: MTA_107; legs MTA_114 MTA_115 MTA_116 MTA_117.
    ${ }^{403}$ Colonna 1970, 48.

[^138]:    ${ }^{404}$ For this settlement, see also Chapter 4.
    ${ }^{405}$ The cemetery of San Facondino was used from the seventh century until the medieval period. It includes simple inhumation tombs and "cappuccina tombs" for a total of 20 burials. These tombs were arranged around an elite tomb of the first half of the seventh century, built as a tumulus surrounded by a circle of stones. Under the tumulus were found a female inhumation and associated discs and rings. The cemetery of Malpasso was used from the fifth to the third century and includes inhumation graves, some of which are characterized by the presence of a military panoply arranged in a systematic manner: helmets at the feet of the body, sword on the left side and arrows and javelin either to the left or to the right of the body. Finally, the Cartiere necropolis was used from the seventh to the first century BCE. It comprises 129 tombs, between simple inhumation graves and capuccina graves. Here, the bodies were buried in a wooden coffin and laid on the side. Among the grave goods of the richest tombs there are helmets, shields, "Samnite" belts, kyathoi and strigils.
    ${ }^{406}$ The inscription, published by Rix (2002, Um 201) was found in 1996 on the slopes of the Colle Mori. It reads tarina/ ei tuce st[ahu] (I-stand (here) in-public/publicly for-the-Tadinates) and has been interpreted as the boundary marker of the settlement that occupied the summit of the hill. It attests that, at least in the fourth century, the Umbrians living on the hill referred to their settlement with a name and offers a confirmation of the later mention of this community in Table I of the Iguvine Tables. The inscription is examined in Agostiniani et al. 2011, 54-55.

[^139]:    ${ }^{407}$ Stefani's excavation results are published in Stefani 1935. Some of the findings from the Soprintendenza's excavation, mainly related to the settlements and the necropolis are summarized in: De Vecchi 2002, Bonomi Ponzi 2010, Micozzi 2014 (on the necropoleis only), Manconi 2017, 620-621. Unfortunately, the unpublished reports of the excavation season are absent from the archive of the Soprintendenza.

[^140]:    ${ }^{408}$ EG: CM_5 CM_6 CM 7 CM_8 CM_9; FoG: CM_10_
    ${ }^{409}$ CM_1. Bonomi Ponzi $(2010,187)$ tentatively interprets the object as an acroterion. To be placed on roofs, however, statues in the round had to be attached to bases, and the bottom of the CM_1 is smoothly finished with no trace of having been attached to anything.
    ${ }^{410}$ Vagnetti 1971, 32, tav. VII.

[^141]:    ${ }^{411}$ Hellenistic worshipper: CM_4; Heads: CM_2 CM_3
    ${ }^{412}$ Söderlind 2000, 145-145.

[^142]:    ${ }^{413}$ Michele Faloci Pulignani published a report in 1890 where he mentions the fortuitous findings of some bronze votive offerings in the area of the modern Cancelli cemetery: Faloci Pulignani 1890, 315.

[^143]:    ${ }^{414}$ Manca et al. 2014.

[^144]:    ${ }^{415}$ FoG: Cancelli_3 Cancelli_9 Cancelli_12. NoG: Cancelli_13 Cancelli_14 Cancelli_16Animal: Cancelli_11 Cancelli 15; BS: Cancelli_1; Eyed crest: Cancelli_4; Head: Cancelli_5; Anatomical: Cancelli_6

[^145]:    ${ }^{416}$ Picuti 2006, 205. A second antefix from Cancelli depicts a head between felines and can be attributed to the JulioClaudian period.

[^146]:    ${ }^{417}$ Cancelli_17 Cancelli 2.
    ${ }^{418}$ It is worth mentioning that the excavators do not provide a clear interpretation for these objects. In particular, they suggest that the head may be interpreted as an antefix but do not present any comparisons to make this interpretation sound.

[^147]:    ${ }^{419}$ Söderlind 2002, 142-145.

[^148]:    ${ }^{420}$ Brizio 1891, 308-313. More in general on the Nuceria territory and tbe necropoleis, see Bonomi Ponzi 1985 and Albanesi and Picuti 2013.

[^149]:    ${ }^{421}$ CLP_1 CLP_2 CLP_3 CLP_4; other: CPL_5.
    ${ }^{422}$ The hats had similar importance in the presentation of Roman flamines. For an extensive analysis of priestly dress and attributes in Etruria, see De Grummond 2006, 35-38; Gleba and Becker 2009, 184-191.
    ${ }^{423}$ Information on the function and role of these priests during the Roman period comes from literary (Cic., Div. 1.92) and epigraphic sources (the well-known Constantine inscription from Spello of the fourth CE). In Roman sources, the haruspices appear as interpreters of fulgura (thunderbolts), ostenta (unusual happenings), and above all exta (entrails, especially liver). Iconographically, scholars have identified features of the costume of the haruspex in a bronze statuette of the fourth century BCE dedicated by Vel Sveitus and displayed in the Vatican Museums. It represents a clean-shaven figure wrapped in a fringed mantle fastened with a fibula wearing a tall hat, tied under the chin, that broadens into a fitted cap with a slight brim: Gleba and Becker 2009, 183-193 and 283 fig. 50; Turfa 2013, 539-556. Another depiction of a haruspex occurs on a mirror from Tuscania, dating to the third BCE. In the scene represented here and interpreted as a sort of lesson in haruspicy where a beardless man wears a similar apical hat with a cord at the neck. For a discussion on this bronze mirror, see Turfa 2013, 540-541. See also Jannot 2005, 125-126; De, Grummond 2006, 27-28
    ${ }^{424}$ A funerary epitaph (ET Um 1.7; CIL 11.6363) inscribed on a marble plaque dated to the last quarter of the first century BCE was found at Pesaro. The inscription, in Latin and Etruscan, recalls the role of the Etruscan native Cafate who, with his part-Latin genealogy, was both haruspex and interpreter of thunderbolts. Another inscription (CIL 1.3378) found in Maevania (Bevagna) and dated to the Late Republican period mentions that the local senate had

[^150]:    decreed the posting of this inscription in honor of Aulus Rubrius, a haruspex from Volsinii. Bonomi Ponzi (Feruglio et al. 1991, 86-87) notices that the name Rubrius appears in other inscriptions from Maevania but not in Volsinii. She therefore proposes that the haruspex came from Mevania but had been instructed in the art of haruspicy at Volsinii and Haack $(2002,128)$ adds that this is the earliest known source that shows an Etruscan office translating to an Italian/Roman position.

[^151]:    ${ }^{425}$ CLP_8 CLP_9 CLP_10

[^152]:    ${ }^{426}$ Sigismondi 2009, 44-45.

[^153]:    ${ }^{427}$ Unfortunately, however, only two are currently visible. The remaining part is own by the Staderini family and not available to be studied.
    ${ }^{428}$ BS: MTP_1 MTP_2 MTP_3 MTP_4 MTP_5 MTP_6 MTP_7; EG: MTP_8 MTP_9 MTP_10 MTP_11 MTP_12 MTP_13 MTP_14 MTP_15; NoG: MTP_16

[^154]:    ${ }^{429}$ The focus of this settlement system seems to have been the hillfort identified on Monte Orve. Here a $1,300 \mathrm{~m}$. long wall circuit in polygonal masonry surrounds a series of terraces and a higher citadel. Beside the mention by Bonomi

[^155]:    also Bomoni Ponzi 1982; 1998, 9-19; 2010,73-79. On settlement of Plestia and the Roman municipium see Perna et al. 2011 and Manca and Menichelli 2014, 34-37.
    ${ }^{433}$ On the significance of this inscription as an indication of local identity, see Chapter 4. In general, on this goddess, see Betts 2013 with previous bibliography.

[^156]:    ${ }^{434}$ BS: CupraCF_2 CupraCF_3 CupraCF_4 CupraCF_5 CupraCF_6 CupraCF_7 CupraCF_8 CupraCF_9 CupraCF_10 CupraCF_11 CupraCF_12 CupraCF_13 CupraCF_14 CupraCF_15 CupraCF_16CupraCF_17 CupraCF_18 CupraCF_19 CupraCF_20 CupraCF_21 CupraCF_22CupraCF_23CupraCF_24CupraCF_25 CupraCF_26 CupraCF_27 CupraCF_28 CupraCF_29 CupraCF_30 CupraCF_31 CupraCF_32 CupraCF_33 CupraCF_34 CupraCF_35 CupraCF_36 CupraCF_37 CupraCF_38 CupraCF_39 CupraCF_40CupraCF_41 CupraCF_42 CupraCF_4 3 CupraCF_44CupraCF_45CupraCF_46 CupraCF_47 CupraCF_48 CupraCF_49 CupraCF_50 CupraCF_51 CupraCF_52 CupraCF_5 CupraCF_54 CupraCF_55 CupraCF_56 CupraCF_57 CupraCF_58 CupraCF_59 CupraCF_60 CupraCF_61 CupraCF_62 CupraCF_63 CupraCF_64 CupraCF_65 CupraCF_66 CupraCF_67 CupraCF_68 CupraCF_69 CupraCF_70 CupraCF_71 CupraCF_72. EG females: CupraCF_73 CupraCF_74 CupraCF_75 CupraCF_76 CupraCF_77 CupraCF_78 CupraCF_79 CupraCF_80 CupraCF_81 CupraCF_82 CupraCF_83 CupraCF_84 CupraCF_85 CupraCF_86 CupraCF_87 CupraCF_88 CupraCF_89 CupraCF_90 CupraCF_91 CupraCF_92 CupraCF_93 CupraCF_94 CupraCF_95 CupraCF_96 CupraCF_97 CupraCF_98 CupraCF_109 CupraCF_170 CupraCF_171 CupraCF_172 CupraCF_173
    CupraCF_174 CupraCF_175 CupraCF_176 CupraCF_177 CupraCF_178 CupraCF_179 CupraCF_180
    CupraCF_181 CupraCF_182 CupraCF_183 CupraCF_184 CupraCF_185 CupraCF_186 CupraCF_187 CupraCF_188
    CupraCF_189 CupraCF_190 CupraCF_191 CupraCF_192. EG males: CupraCF_1 CupraCF_99
    CupraCF_100 CupraCF_101 CupraCF_102 CupraCF_103 CupraCF_104 CupraCF_105 CupraCF_106 CupraCF_107
    CupraCF_108 CupraCF_110 CupraCF_111 CupraCF_112 CupraCF_113 CupraCF_114 CupraCF_115 CupraCF_1 16
    CupraCF_117 CupraCF_118 CupraCF_119 CupraCF_120 CupraCF_121 CupraCF_122 CupraCF_123 CupraCF_124
    CupraCF_125 CupraCF_126 CupraCF_127 CupraCF_128 CupraCF_129 CupraCF_130 CupraCF_131 CupraCF_132
    CupraCF_133 CupraCF_134 CupraCF_135 CupraCF_136 CupraCF_137 CupraCF_138 CupraCF_139 CupraCF_140
    CupraCF_141 CupraCF_142 CupraCF_143 CupraCF_144 CupraCF_145 CupraCF_146 CupraCF_147 CupraCF_148
    CupraCF_149 CupraCF_150 CupraCF_151 CupraCF_152 CupraCF_153 CupraCF_154 CupraCF_155 CupraCF_156
    CupraCF_157 CupraCF_158 CupraCF_159 CupraCF_160 CupraCF_161 CupraCF_162 CupraCF_163 CupraCF_164
    CupraCF_165 CupraCF_166 CupraCF_167. NuG: CupraCF_193 CupraCF_194 CupraCF_195 CupraCF_196
    CupraCF_197 CupraCF_198 CupraCF_199 CupraCF_200 CupraCF_201 CupraCF_202 CupraCF_203 CupraCF_204
    CupraCF_205 CupraCF_206 CupraCF_207 CupraCF_208 CupraCF_209 CupraCF_211 CupraCF_212 CupraCF_213
    CupraCF_214 CupraCF_215 CupraCF_216 CupraCF_217 CupraCF_218 CupraCF_219CupraCF_220 CupraCF_221
    CupraCF_222CupraCF_223 CupraCF_224 CupraCF_225 CupraCF_226 CupraCF_227 CupraCF_228 CupraCF_229
    CupraCF_230 CupraCF_231 CupraCF_232 CupraCF_233 CupraCF_234 CupraCF_235 CupraCF_236 CupraCF_237
    CupraCF_238CupraCF_239 CupraCF_240. FoG: CupraCF_210. FaG: CupraCF_248 FoVG: CupraCF_249. Anatomical: CupraCF_266.

[^157]:    ${ }^{435}$ Bird-like figurines: CupraCF_255 CupraCF_256 CupraCF_257 CupraCF_258 CupraCF_259; monkey-like figurines: CupraCF_260CupraCF_261.
    ${ }^{436}$ Karageorghis 2012, 146.
    ${ }^{437}$ Depictions of human figures wearing masks were common from proto-historic Near East. Masks are exaggerated into an unrealistic size or shape or resemble human heads. Unlike the depiction of human heads, where anatomical details are not represented, masks are characterized by eyes and open mouths: Renfrew et al. 2018, 153.
    ${ }^{438}$ On Etrusco-Italic revetment slabs and antefixes with human head see supra in this chapter.

[^158]:    ${ }^{439}$ These fragments are briefly mentioned by Manca and Menichelli (2014, 26-27) but not elsewhere published or displayed.

[^159]:    ${ }^{440}$ CupraCF_267
    ${ }^{441}$ CupraCF_262 CupraCF_263 CupraCF_264 CupraCF_265
    ${ }^{442}$ CupraCF_268

[^160]:    ${ }^{443}$ Turfa 2004 359-36; Comella 1981, 767; cfr. Appendix 1.

[^161]:    ${ }^{444}$ Bradley's argument is explained in Chapter 2.

[^162]:    ${ }^{445}$ Scopacasa 2015b, 9.
    ${ }^{446}$ Glinister 2006a, 23-7.

[^163]:    ${ }^{447}$ It is important to note, however, that, unlike White's model, where interactions between Algonquian tribes of the Great Lakes and French settlers happened ex novo, Romans and Umbrians were close neighbors who had shared similar material culture since the Orientalizing period.

[^164]:    ${ }^{448}$ On the importance of the presence of water in Umbrian and Etruscan sanctuaries see Giontella 2006. For the religious significance of water in the selection of Roman and Greek sacred spaces, see R. Bradley, 2000. As Moser $(2019,48)$ rightly points out, water had also a very practical use as integral component of the ritual connected to the purification before and after the sacrificial slaughter of animals.
    ${ }^{449}$ It is difficult, however, to draw conclusions about the topographic relationship between sacred spaces and hilltop centers, for the latter have scarcely been investigated and their internal organization is not well known; on this respect, see Chapter 4.
    ${ }^{450}$ Bradley 1987, 114; Bradley 2000a, 63; Stoddart 1994, 152.
    ${ }^{451}$ Van Dyke and Alcock 2008, 98
    ${ }^{452}$ Sommella 1971-72, 47-74; Nijboer 2001, 81.

[^165]:    ${ }^{453}$ The sanctuaries of La Rocca, Pantanelli, Monte San Pancrazio, Campo La Piana, Colle San Rufino, Monte Santo, and Monte Pennino, have been only partially investigated and never or only roughly recorded. We cannot therefore exclude entirely the possibility that they may have had permanent architectural features during the archaic period. ${ }^{454} \mathrm{~A}$ list of open air rural Italic shrine is in Bradley and Glinister 2013.

[^166]:    ${ }^{455}$ It is of course possible that dry-stone precincts may have weathered down and thus become unrecognizable by archaeologists. Clandestine and inadequately documented excavations also contribute to the difficulties of reconstructing the earliest layout of Umbrian cult places.
    ${ }^{456}$ As Bradley notes (1987, 114), the natural cave setting at Grotta Bella may have rendered the presence of handmade structure superfluous.
    ${ }^{457}$ A pit is also mentioned by Staderini on Monte Pennino. See Chapter 5.
    ${ }^{458}$ Potts 2015, 45.

[^167]:    ${ }^{459}$ See Chapter 2.

[^168]:    ${ }^{460}$ Bradely 2000a, 67.
    ${ }^{461}$ See Chapter 5.

[^169]:    ${ }^{462}$ Monacchi 1988, 82.

[^170]:    ${ }^{463}$ Bradley 2000a, 24-25, who adds how coins bearing the name ikuvins are further evidence of ethnic community in third century BCE.

[^171]:    ${ }^{464}$ The scholarly claim that shared religion promotes social cohesion traces back to Emile Durkheim and, with respect to ancient Greece, N. D. Fustel. For a recent overview on the idea that religious communities existed prior to the formation of particular political groups, with the former having an impact in the creation of the latter, see: Mackil 2016, 242-257.

[^172]:    ${ }^{465}$ These groups comprise the figurines from all the Umbrian sanctuaries presented and belonging to the typologies described in Appendix 1.

[^173]:    ${ }^{466}$ Chapter 2, 29-30; Chapter 5, 196-197.
    ${ }^{467}$ Glinister 2006b, 93.

[^174]:    ${ }^{468}$ Turfa 1994; De Grummond and Simons 2006, 90-115; Hughes 2017.

[^175]:    ${ }^{469}$ Gell 1988.
    ${ }^{470}$ Sigismondi 1979, 48
    ${ }^{471}$ Fowler 2004; Graham 2017. Personhood, as defined by Fowler $(2004,4)$ is "the condition or state of being a person, as it is understood in any specific context. Persons are constituted, de-constituted, maintained and altered in social practices through life and after death. This process can be described as the ongoing attainment of personhood. Personhood is frequently understood as a condition that involves constant change, and key transformations to the person occur throughout life and death. People may pass from one state or stage of personhood to another. Personhood is attained and maintained through relationships not only with other human beings but with things, places, animals and the spiritual features of the cosmos. Some of these may also emerge as persons through this engagement. People's own social interpretations of personhood and of the social practices through which personhood is realized shape their interactions in a reflexive way, but personhood remains a mutually constituted condition".

[^176]:    ${ }^{472}$ Graham 2017, 51.
    ${ }^{473}$ Gosden 2005.
    ${ }^{474}$ Glinister 2006b, 94.

[^177]:    ${ }^{475}$ For the full English translation of this text, see Poultney 1958.
    ${ }^{476}$ Bradley 2000a, 75.

[^178]:    ${ }^{477}$ Bradely 2000a, 72.
    ${ }^{478}$ Malone and Stoddart $(1994,145)$ suggests that the nails were used to attach the offerings directly to the wooden plank. I agree with Bradley $(1987,199)$ that this interpretation does not seem likely, because most of the bronze votives do not show any possible nail holes.
    ${ }^{479}$ A few examples of the same type from Satricum and Segni (near Rome) present also small hole similar to the specimen from Monte San Pancrazio: Colonna 1970, tav. 46-47.

[^179]:    ${ }^{480}$ Ohnefalsch-Richter 1893, 257.
    ${ }^{481}$ Larson 2007, 82; Bradley and Glinister 2013, 178. For votives found in wells and cisterns in Italy, see Glinister (2000) with respect to Falerii and Heldring (2007) for Satricum.

[^180]:    ${ }^{482}$ Bradley 2000a, 176-177.

[^181]:    ${ }^{483}$ Stoddart 2013, 111.
    ${ }^{484}$ Bradley 2000a, 173.

[^182]:    ${ }^{485}$ Perego and Scopacasa 2016, 35.

[^183]:    ${ }^{486}$ Most noticeably put forth by Glinister 2006a and 2006b.
    ${ }^{487}$ See figures A3.171 (Monte Ansciano) and A3.179 (Colle Mori) in Appendix 3.
    ${ }^{488}$ Turfa 2004, 359-36; Comella 1981, 767.

[^184]:    ${ }^{489}$ Kyriakidis 2007, 9-23.
    ${ }^{490}$ Stek and Burgers 2015, 97-113.

[^185]:    ${ }^{491}$ Cohen 1985, 87.
    ${ }^{492}$ Renfrew 2007, 109-123.
    ${ }^{493}$ Bispham, 2006, 91 ; Bradley 2006a; Coles 2009; Glinister 2015 (esp. footnote 39 on the incorporation of the existing population, also as magistrates, in the colonies); Scopacasa 201, 47-50. Coles (2009, 167-168), in particular, has examined how cult and sacred spaces aided the integration of diverse social and ethnic groups in newly founded colonies. At Fregellae, for example, the placement of extra-urban sanctuaries along the via Latina helped define community cohesion and boundaries.

[^186]:    ${ }^{494}$ Fenelli, 1975a, Comella, 1981.
    ${ }^{495}$ Scopacasa 2015b, 7.
    ${ }^{496}$ Freeman 1993, 444.
    ${ }^{497}$ See the discussion in Chapter 2.

[^187]:    ${ }^{498}$ Glinister 2006b, 12.
    ${ }^{499}$ We should also conside the possibility that the choice of a votive form was limited by the availability of votive offerings on sale at a given sanctuary.
    ${ }^{500}$ Glinister 2006b, 26.

[^188]:    ${ }^{501}$ This material represents the only evidence at our disposal to hypothesize the level of cult activity on site. As Bradley has rightly warned (2000a, 124), it is possible that ritual activity continued on site without leaving archaeologically visible traces.
    ${ }^{502}$ I found no records of this excavation in the Archaeological Archives of the region and in the depot of the Soprintendenza Archeologia Belle Arti e Paesaggio dell'Umbria.

[^189]:    ${ }^{503}$ Bradley 1987, 122.
    ${ }^{504}$ Sisani 2001, 42; Strazzulla 1981, 186.

[^190]:    ${ }^{505}$ Although the few surviving votive offerings at Monte Subasio (near Assisium) in the third century BCE may not be representative of the original votive corpus, Bradley $(1987,125)$ hypothesizes a similar trend for this sanctuary. At Assisium, like Iguvium, there is evidence of the development of a temple within the settlement.
    ${ }^{506}$ Bonomi Ponzi 1989, 23. A similar phenomenon is observed in Samnium by Battiloro 2018, 165-168.

[^191]:    ${ }^{507}$ Stek 2017, Perna 2013.
    ${ }^{508}$ Stek 2017, 286.

[^192]:    ${ }^{509}$ Glinister 2015, 154.
    ${ }^{510}$ See footnote 493 for references on the inclusion of locals and foreigners in a new colony.
    ${ }^{511}$ Architectural decorations were found also at Civitalba, near Sentinum in the modern Le Marche region. Although this area lies outside the area covered by this dissertation, it still belonged to the ancient region of Umbria.

[^193]:    ${ }^{512}$ For a discussion of the dates of these building constructions, see Bradley 2000a, 158-170.
    ${ }^{513}$ Bradley 2000a, 158.

[^194]:    ${ }^{514}$ For Latin and Faliscan examples, see Andren 1940; for Samnium, Scopacasa 2015a, 265.

[^195]:    515 Battiloro 2018, 203-207; Scopacasa 2015, 115-119 and 262-270; Bianchi Bandinelli 1970, 11. For an overall picture of Italic Hellenism in Italy see Haumesser 2017, 645-665; Coarelli 1970-71, 254-255; Torelli 1983; La Rocca 1996; Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 99. For Samnium see also: La Regina 1976; Tagliamonte 2005, 189-201.
    ${ }^{516}$ For a discussion of the architecture of these sanctuaries see Battiloro 2018, 188-196; Scopacasa 2015a, 262-270.

[^196]:    ${ }^{517}$ Terrenato 2014 and 2019.
    ${ }^{518}$ Terrenato 2014, 55.

[^197]:    519 Terrenato (2014 and 2019) provides a lengthy and accurate review of central Italian examples of elite private agendas in the context of Roman expansion. Among the most noteworthy cases, we can mention the involvement of some members of the Latin family of the Plautii with the rebellion at Privernum and long-distance aristocratic connections between Rome and local elites from Arezzo (the Cilnii for example) or from Capua.
    ${ }^{520}$ As reported by Livy (9.36.2-4), in the fourth century members of the Fabii, attested at Caere since the late seventh century BCE, were educated here to learn the Etruscan language. Furthermore, in the same century a Latin woman who resettled in Rome and held important political offices married a member of the powerful family of the Matuna in Caere: Terrenato 2018, 121.
    ${ }^{521}$ Colivicchi 2015.
    ${ }^{522}$ Coles 2009.

[^198]:    ${ }^{523}$ Lyons and Papadopoulos 2002, 158.

[^199]:    ${ }^{524}$ Colonna 1970.
    ${ }^{525}$ The acnonyms within parentheses refer to the abbreviation of the votive types used both in Chapter 5 and in Appendix 2. The figure number within parentheses refers to the photo catalogue in Appenix 3.
    ${ }^{526}$ Colonna 1970, 39-40

[^200]:    ${ }^{527}$ Colonna 1970, 39 n. 48.
    ${ }^{528}$ Colonna 1970, 39 n. 47.
    ${ }^{529}$ Colonna 1970, 42-48.
    ${ }^{530}$ Colonna 1970, 43 n. 61.
    ${ }^{531}$ Colonna 1970, 76-79.

[^201]:    ${ }^{532}$ Colonna 1970, 80.
    ${ }_{533}$ Colonna 1970, 77 n. 176 and 177.
    ${ }^{534}$ Colonna 1970, 78 n. 180 (Calvi dell’Umbria); Colonna 1970, 78-79, n. 181 (Todi).
    ${ }^{535}$ Colonna 1970, 90-93.
    ${ }^{536}$ Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 90 i/l.
    ${ }^{537}$ Cenciaioli 1991, 214, 216, and 226.
    ${ }^{538}$ Monacchi 1986, tav. 39d-e.
    ${ }^{539}$ Colonna 1970, 94 n. 253.

[^202]:    ${ }^{540}$ Colonna 1970, 93 n. 247 (Ancarano); Colonna 1970, 93 n. 245 (Fiesole); Colonna 1970, 93 n. 244 (Rome).
    ${ }^{541}$ Tabone 1995-1996, 217.
    ${ }^{542}$ Colonna 1970, 96-97.
    ${ }^{543}$ Bonomi Ponzi 1989, 20 fig. 4.
    ${ }^{544}$ Sisani 2013, 134 n. 32.
    ${ }^{545}$ Falcone Amorelli 1977, tav. 90 a/h.
    ${ }^{546}$ Colonna 1970, 99 n. 280.
    ${ }^{547}$ Manca et al. 2014, 55. n. 31 (Cancelli); Colonna 1970, 96 n. 264 (Sanctuary of Cupra).
    ${ }^{548}$ Colonna Tabone G.P. 1995-1996, 217 (Altino and Aquileia); Colonna 1970, 99 n. 281(Ampurias).

[^203]:    ${ }^{549}$ Colonna 1970, 100-103.
    ${ }^{550}$ Arena 1981-82, tav. 18; Monacchi 1988, tav.35c.
    ${ }^{551}$ Falcone Amorelli 1977, 171 e and g/i.
    ${ }_{552}$ Cenciaioli 1991, 217-219
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