

Martin BENTZ – Christoph REUSSER (Hgg.), Etruskisch-italische und römisch-republikanische Häuser. Studien zur Antiken Stadt 9. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag 2010, 304 S., 323 s/w-Abb., 5 farb. Abb.

This book presents the proceedings of a conference that was organized by the Commission for Research on Ancient Cities of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences and the Universities of Bonn and Zurich in January of 2009. A succinct foreword (pp. 7-8) summarizes the purpose, main research questions, and organization of this book. The conference aimed at stimulating a productive dialogue between two fields of research that are often kept separate, notably that on Etruscan houses of the early Iron Age and Archaic period, and that on Roman houses. Based on their own research at Marzabotto, the editors, Martin Bentz and Christoph Reusser, had devised the following research topics: an overview of the variety of house types; regional and chronological differences between 'Etruscan', 'Italic', and 'Roman' houses; the correlation of different house types with specific social groups; the function of houses for residential and other purposes; and the decoration of houses.

While these are excellent questions that are more or less standard in current research on ancient domestic architecture they are not easily answered from the 23 contributions to this volume (2 English, 5 German, and 16 Italian papers). Due to the frequently insufficient state of publication of houses, the editors focused – successfully – on providing a new material basis for future synthetic assessments of domestic architecture in Italy. Organized in three geographically defined chapters (Etruria Padana; central Etruscan heartland ["Kernland"]; central and south Italy), the majority of papers presents the results of recent, and often barely published or even unpublished research – a major asset of this book, which thus will certainly constitute a key reference work for domestic architecture in Italy. This is supported by the overall high quality of papers and numerous illustrations, including five color plates at the end of the volume, as well as the excellent copy-editing work (there are very few typos and errors). Furthermore, the timely publication of this book within a year after the conference must be emphasized.

Despite its obvious importance and merits, the book has some minor shortcomings, both in terms of presentation and content. While the balance towards site reports at the expense of synthetic approaches is understandable, some more synthetic papers could still have been included and further directions for future comprehensive assessments could have been highlighted, for example in the foreword or in an additional conclusion. More specifically,

several gaps are regrettable, mostly regarding the early periods (Archaic, early and mid-Republican) that are still far less studied than the later periods (late Republican and early Imperial), and also regarding the editors' main aim to bridge the divide between different research fields:

First, the lack of a synthetic assessment of recent research on the *atrium* house, notably its genesis, development, and socio-cultural function and context, including a reevaluation of the evidence in Archaic Rome (Palatine/Velia), which is not discussed in a separate paper. Such an assessment would have been particularly welcome because the *atrium* house obviously constituted a major focus of the conference (p. 7) and is significantly debated in the various papers (cf., for example, Prayon, p. 21, and Bentz/Reusser, p. 110, n. 12).¹

Second, the lack of a synthetic assessment of recent research on the important group of "*regiae*" /palaces/"Residenzen", including an examination of the complexes in Poggio Civitate/Murlo, to which no separate paper is dedicated. While Prayon briefly discusses this group (pp. 17-21) and several other papers refer to individual examples, a more detailed comparative investigation, critically assessing key features such as topographical-urban context, size, design, finds, and socio-cultural function and context of these complexes, would have been beneficial.

Third, the lack of a critical discussion of the labels 'Etruscan', 'Italic', and 'Roman' and their significance for the study of domestic architecture in Italy. While problems of identification and terminology are briefly acknowledged in the foreword (p. 7) and by citing these labels with quotation marks (inverted commas), this is not followed up in more detail in any of the papers.²

The book with its almost 300 densely printed pages in an oversize format (larger than A4) is not an easy quick read, and some additional measures could have been taken to facilitate its usability:

A map with all sites cited in the papers would have been helpful, as well as a table listing the GPS data of all sites and excavations, which are not always easy to identify on satellite images (google.earth). This would have facilitated future research that aims, for example, at a topographical assessment of settlement patterns.

¹ At the conference, Vincent Jolivet presented a paper on the "canonical" Roman house, which was printed in *Orizzonti* 8, 2007, 11-18, however.

² The title of the book introduces yet a different terminology: "Etruscan-Italic" and "Roman-Republican" houses.

Given the large number of contributions and the broad variety of topics, abstracts for all papers (preferably in English) would have facilitated the use of this volume (see below).

A list of contributors would have provided contact data and information about their affiliations and research interests.

While the high number and high quality of illustrations is certainly one of the major benefits of this book, some of them do not meet the standards for the publication of architecture.³ Thus, some figures lack a north arrow (north being often, but not always, at the top);⁴ more crucially, some figures lack a scale, which is not always amended by systematic mentioning of measures in the text;⁵ some figures lack labels or legends that are necessary for understanding references in the corresponding texts;⁶ some figures are printed too small so that important labels are barely readable or not at all;⁷ finally, credits for figures are often given in the captions, but not consistently.⁸

³ Even if figures are reproduced that had originally been published without scale, north arrow, legend, etc. (e.g., p. 33, fig. 3), these can nowadays easily be added with commonly available software.

⁴ P. 13, fig. 4; p. 22, fig. 9; p. 35, fig. 5; p. 38, fig. 10; p. 39, figs. 11-12; p. 44, fig. 1,1; p. 46, fig. 3,4; p. 48, fig. 4,1; p. 56, fig. 2; p. 59, figs. 21,1-2; p. 65, fig. 1; p. 107, fig. 2; p. 135, fig. 1; p. 139, fig. 7; p. 146, fig. 1; p. 150, fig. 14; p. 155, fig. 25; p. 161, figs. 5-6; p. 174, fig. 3; p. 187, fig. 4; p. 189, fig. 6; p. 197, fig. 1; p. 205, fig. 1; p. 208, fig. 6; p. 209, fig. 9; p. 217, fig. 1; p. 226, fig. 9; p. 241, fig. 9; p. 246, fig. 4; p. 248, figs. 6-7; p. 257, figs. 1-2; p. 273, fig. 1; p. 275, fig. 2; p. 282, fig. 1; p. 284, fig. 6.

⁵ Photos are not mentioned in this list although these should ideally also be systematically published with scales and north arrows. The quality of plans cannot be discussed further here; while the inclusion of many state plans is highly commendable, almost none of them include levels. P. 11, fig. 3; p. 13, fig. 4; p. 16, fig. 6; p. 22, fig. 9; p. 33, fig. 3; p. 38, fig. 10; p. 39, fig. 11; p. 39, fig. 12; p. 44, fig. 1,1; p. 46, figs. 3,3-3,4; p. 48, figs. 4,1-4,2; p. 52, figs. 12,2-3; p. 65, fig. 1; p. 107, fig. 2; p. 135, fig. 1; p. 146, fig. 1; p. 147, fig. 6; p. 150, figs. 13-14; p. 151, fig. 16; p. 154, fig. 24; p. 155, fig. 26; p. 160, fig. 3; p. 161, figs. 5-6; p. 173, fig. 2; p. 174, fig. 3; p. 175, fig. 5; p. 176, fig. 8; p. 179, fig. 13; p. 187, fig. 4; p. 197, fig. 1; p. 207, fig. 1; p. 208, figs. 5-6; p. 209, fig. 9; p. 217, fig. 1; p. 226, fig. 9; p. 248, figs. 6-7; p. 250, figs. 8-9; p. 257, figs. 1-2; p. 268, fig. 9; p. 273, fig. 1; p. 282, fig. 1; p. 283, figs. 2-5; p. 284, figs. 6-7; p. 285, fig. 9; Farbtafel 4,2.

⁶ P. 222, fig. 7; p. 273, fig. 1; Farbtafel 1,1; Farbtafel 2,4; Farbtafel 4,1.

⁷ P. 214, fig. 14; p. 244, fig. 2; p. 245, fig. 3; p. 248, fig. 6; p. 250, figs. 8-9; Farbtafel 1,2.

⁸ Figures without credits are too numerous to be enumerated here; credits are also often incomplete, referring only to a publication title, but not to page and figure numbers (cf., e.g., p. 203, fig. 6). Separate lists of figures – for either the entire volume or each separate contribution – are not included. One may assume that authorship and copyright of figures is commonly with the authors of articles or their affiliated institutions.

This is not the place to discuss all 23 contributions in due detail. Instead, short summaries (“abstracts”) of all articles are provided, in order to demonstrate the breadth and wealth of ideas of this book, and comments are limited to a very few remarks.

Friedhelm Prayon (*Frühetruskische Hausarchitektur – Bemerkungen zum Forschungsstand*, pp. 9-28), an acclaimed specialist on Etruscan domestic architecture, first provides a short overview of the state of research until 1985, when a groundbreaking exhibition on houses and palaces in Etruria took place in Siena. He then focuses on research since 1985, assessing new approaches and results. Central problems remain, notably the poor state of preservation of many domestic structures; the difficulty in clearly differentiating between different phases, which are commonly summarized in one single plan; and the lack of sufficiently detailed and numerous publications. Maintaining the typology that he devised in his innovative monograph from 1975 (*Frühetruskische Grab- und Hausarchitektur*, Heidelberg), he discusses new research on 1. oval and long houses; 2. broad houses; and 3. courtyard houses, subdivided into palaces (“*regiae*”) and *atrium* houses. While Archaic Greece provides a similar spectrum of house types as contemporary Etruria, Prayon is skeptical regarding immediate Greek influence on the development of Etruscan house types and also of building techniques, such as the introduction of terracotta tiled roofs. Similarly he convincingly challenges the notion of old oriental models for the Etruscan courtyard complexes (“palaces”, “*regiae*”) in sites such as Murlo, Montetosto, and Acquarossa. An illustrative, chronologically organized scale to scale comparison of these Archaic courtyard complexes (p. 18, fig. 8) shows similarities as well as remarkable differences, above all in size, but also in layout, which requires further critical research.

While Prayon’s contribution is focused on a typological assessment, Petra Amann (*Wer wohnt im Haus? Familienstruktur und Hausarchitektur als sich ergänzende Forschungsbereiche*, pp. 29-42) opts for a socio-historical approach to Etruscan houses. After some general remarks regarding the structure of Etruscan families, she attempts to link certain houses with specific types of families (nuclear family; different types of extended families; *gentes*), following the traditional developmental model of house types as outlined by Prayon. Amann acknowledges that such an enterprise is particularly difficult for early examples from the mid 7th to mid 6th centuries BC, such as the houses in San Giovenale and Acquarossa, where the identification of separate living units (notably their boundaries, plans, and equipment) is much debated (cf. her illustrative fig. 4 on p. 34, with a comparison of the different interpretations of houses A-D in zone B of Acquarossa). She claims that a systematic analysis of

house sizes in combination with a detailed assessment of their history and building phases may yield more insights into the structures of households (p. 32). This is problematic, however, because house size is not necessarily indicative of the size and structure of households, and Amann fails to provide other methodological criteria. She is on safer ground with the later courtyard/*atrium* houses (end of 6th and 5th centuries BC) which she interprets in comparison to Roman *atrium* houses.

The article by Claudio Calastri, Caterina Cornelio, Renata Curina, Paola Desantis, Daniela Locatelli, Luigi Malnati, and Monica Miari (*L'architettura domestica in Cispadana tra VII e II secolo a. C. Una rassegna alla luce delle nuove scoperte*, pp. 43-63) focuses on recent discoveries of domestic architecture in Cispadana from the 7th to 2nd centuries BC. The authors argue that the basic developmental model as outlined by Prayon and then again Giovanni Colonna in 1986,⁹ is confirmed by recent research. In chronological order they present numerous new examples, with particular focus on building material: buildings made of perishable material (wood, earth) versus solidly built structures ("edifici a carattere stabile") with foundations made of pebbles. The simple building techniques, combined with an oval shape, were much longer used than often assumed, for example, still in a 3rd century BC settlement in Cesena (località Garampo). Similarly, a traditional semi-interred elliptical structure in Spilamberto was probably built in the second half of the 3rd century BC, but replaced by a Roman-Republican building in the 2nd century BC. Thus, in these cases (and others cited by the authors) building techniques and types clearly reflect significant socio-cultural changes (such as Roman conquest and "Romanization").

Given the important varied material presented here, the reader would have benefitted from a map showing the location of all sites, and probably also from a table that provides a convenient quick overview of majors sites, building types/shapes, building material, and dates. In important cases, such as the Viale Aldini excavation in Bologna, the strict chronological organization of the article hinders understanding: discussed in different places throughout the article, it is difficult to follow the sequence of phases and particularly their significance and interpretation, notably how and why the layout and function of structures changed.

Maurizio Harari and Silvia Paltineri (*Edilizia etrusca nella chora di Adria*, pp. 65-73) present the results of 11 excavation campaigns by the University of Padua in San Cassiano di Crespino, an Etruscan site in the chora of Adria. The structures

⁹ G. Colonna, *Urbanistica ed architettura*, in: M. Pallotino (ed.), *Rasenna. Storia e civiltà degli Etruschi* (Milano 1986) 369-530.

discovered so far include a complex of four buildings that differ significantly in size, shape, layout, and most likely function (“*oikos*”, oval hut, building with one room, “edificio della cortina”); a round built structure; and a series of four parallel drainage ditches. The authors focus on the building technique (stone socles with superstructure of perishable material, probably prefabricated panels of dried clay, set between few vertical wooden posts; terracotta tiled roofs) and the general layout of the site. All structures share the same orientation and belong to one single master plan, which, according to ceramic finds, was realized at the end of the 6th century BC. While the predominance of ceramics of domestic use (“*vasellame di uso domestico*”, p. 67) and the lack of conclusive cultic finds suggest that this complex was not a sanctuary, its precise function currently remains unknown. The authors briefly mention the possible use of some structures (p. 68: “*oikos*” as kitchen for a larger community than the nuclear family and workspace for textile production; oval hut and building with one room as modest accessory spaces; “edificio della cortina” probably used for more prestigious purposes because of its refined architectural decoration; round structure as altar), but do not attempt (at this stage of their research) a more detailed socio-historical assessment and contextualization, also in comparison to other extraurban complexes, such as, for example, the complex outside Felsina (see below).

Jacopo Ortalli (*Case dell’agro di Felsina: un modello edilizio per il governo del territorio*, pp. 75-87) presents an intriguing comprehensive assessment of a complex excavated in Via Andrea Costa in Bologna. While three different large phases can be discerned (“fase prefelsina”, 7th/6th century BC; “fase Felsina”, 6th/5th century BC; “fase celtica”, 4th/3rd century BC), focus is on an assessment of the most monumental second phase. The complex was situated outside and to the west of Etruscan Felsina, at the intersection of major roads and on terrain that was surrounded by rivers on three sides. Built on a roughly square lot of 45 x 48 m and surrounded by drainage ditches on all four sides, the complex included a monumental access from a street in the north; a wooden watch tower immediately behind the entrance; a curved access track for carriages, defined by stones; a solidly built long rectangular building with portico (39 x 8 m) for various residential and service activities; several other, less solidly made structures for multiple purposes (stables, storage, etc.). Further structures were located outside this square complex. Finds include about 10 bronze ingots (*aes rude*) and ceramics, predominated by (high quality) table ware, pointing to the high social status of the inhabitants, whereas evidence for intensive agricultural production and storage is conspicuously absent. According to Ortalli, the many idiosyncrasies of this complex, which can best be compared with the nearby site of Casalecchio di Reno (Zona “A”),

suggest that this complex served as the residence of a high official (“*presidio fiscale*”, p. 85) from Felsina who controlled the circulation of persons and merchandise in the city’s hinterland, imposed taxes, and maybe temporarily housed merchants and their animals and wares.

Ortalli’s paper is complemented by Cristian Tassinari’s (*I materiali di scavo della casa etrusca di via A. Costa a Bologna*, pp. 89-103) comprehensive assessment of finds from the Etruscan phases of the complex, which focuses not on traditional typologies, but on general characteristics, quantity, and quality of finds, emphasizing their significance for the functional, economic, social, and chronological interpretation of the context. For example, refining the chronology of the “*fase Felsina*”, Tassinari shows that already in a first non-monumental phase at the end of the 6th or beginning of the 5th centuries BC, the high social status of the inhabitants is obvious from finds such as imported Attic black-figured vases and fibulae. This tendency continues in the phase of constructional monumentalization from the early 5th to mid 4th centuries BC, which is represented by finds such as Attic red-figured imports and standardized local table ware.

Martin Bentz and Christoph Reusser (*Das Haus der Hippokampen in Marzabotto [IV 1,2]*, pp. 105-116) provide a brief summary of their excavation and re-examination (from 2002 to 2007) of one of the largest houses in Marzabotto, called House of the Hippocampi after reliefs on the wellhead of the house. While explored at three different periods, namely in 1952, 1960, and 1981, this house suffered the same fate as most other houses in Marzabotto: no detailed state plan or phase plans had ever been provided; the finds had not been comprehensively studied and published; and no stratigraphic excavations below the last stratum of use had ever been carried out. The new research yielded five different phases. In the late Bronze Age, the area of the house was still occupied by a river. The first evidence of settlement dates to the period after the mid 6th century BC and consists of a simple hut, made of perishable material, but already respecting the orientation and boundaries of later houses. In a third phase, dated by a kantharos that was found in situ in a wall to the first half of the 5th century BC, two rectangular structures (houses) were built in the frontal eastern part of the house, including foundations of pebbles. The regularly designed *atrium* house with a surface of about 600 sqm, which made this house famous, belongs only to the second half of the 5th century BC; it includes an *impluvium*, but not yet the complex roof construction of a Tuscan *atrium*. In a last phase, about 400 BC, the house was slightly enlarged.

While Bentz does not discuss the much debated development of the *atrium* house, he argues that, according to the evidence from Marzabotto, the “canonical” *atrium* house was not developed before the 5th century BC and that it served the elite: in Marzabotto, *atrium* houses were only found in one insula (IV 1) that is located close to the city’s main sanctuary and *forum* and provides lots twice the size (500-700 sqm) of lots in other insulae. The finds from this house, discussed by Reusser, can only be fully evaluated from the 1981 and most recent excavations. They include mainly local coarse and fine ware that cannot be closely dated in the period from the 6th to 4th centuries BC and only few Attic imports and bucchero, which were used for dating.

Vedia Izzet (*New Approaches to Etruscan cities: the case of Spina*, pp. 117-121) presents the results of a geophysical survey carried out at the settlement site of Spina in 2008 as part of the systematic investigation of the city, recently initiated by Luigi Malnati and Christoph Reusser. The alluvial terrain is very suited to magnetometer work, which yielded intriguing insights: remains of 5 insulae of a strictly orthogonal grid plan could be identified; while equal in size and shape, the internal arrangements of insulae does not seem to follow an overarching pattern. The city may have had a strange triangular shape, because of a southeast-northwest running river at the eastern border of the settlement, the age of which (ancient or later?) currently cannot be safely determined, however. Based on these preliminary results, Izzet cautiously argues that the city plan may reflect cultural interaction: the gridded layout may be due to close contact of the harbor city Spina with Greeks (whose influence on Spina is obvious from Greek inscriptions and numerous imported vases), but the triangular shape may betray adherence to traditional Etruscan practices, notably an adaptation of the city plan to local topography. The intriguing assessment is not easy to follow because the crucial Farbtafel 1,2 (which provides the interpretation of the survey results that are presented in fig. 1 on p. 119) is printed so small that reference numbers are hard to decipher. One would also have appreciated a clear numbering of the insulae on this Farbtafel, or a simplified reconstructed plan. The current ongoing excavations (in the center of the surveyed area) are briefly referred to once (p. 120), but one would have liked to know in more detail whether they confirm the survey results.

Gabriella Poggesi, Luigi Donati, Elisabetta Bocci, Giovanni Millemaci, and Lucia Pagnini (*Gonfienti: un insediamento tardo-arcaico fra Arno e Bisenzio*, pp. 123-133) present the important remains of an Etruscan urban settlement at Gonfienti/Pra-to, constructed in the second half of the 6th century BC, of which some 17 ha have been explored, but the original extension of which is not yet known. The

settlement was established in a strategically important location, obviously with an urban master plan similar to that of Marzabotto. This included an orthogonal layout, a system of drainage channels both in the city as well as in its hinterland, and homogenously oriented and built houses. The best known house, in lot 14, covers an impressive surface area of over 1400 sqm (p. 127), has a rectangular shape, is surrounded by drainage channels on at least three sides, and is almost symmetrically organized around a central courtyard with porticoes; the central entrance is flanked by large independent rooms that open to the street ("shops"). Finds suggest the identification of a kitchen and storage rooms to the west and banquet rooms to the north of the courtyard. Dated to the end of the 6th century BC (?), this building is impressive in size and design, and one would have appreciated a more detailed comparative assessment of these features and of the socio-historical context. This building is only briefly referred to as a "palace" in Prayon's paper (pp. 19-20: the German term "Residenz" is used),¹⁰ but the authors here suggest (p. 131) that lot 14 is not unique in the local context. Full understanding of this important settlement is impeded by the scarce illustrations: a general plan of the site and its excavated parts and more plans of excavated houses would have been helpful (only one state plan of the house in lot 14 is provided, p. 128, fig. 6, on which the labeling of rooms is almost illegible, however).

Giulio Ciampoltrini (*Edilizia rurale tra Valdarno e Valle del Serchio: la colonizzazione etrusca tra VI e V secolo a. C. e le deduzioni coloniali d'età tardorepubblicana*, pp. 135-143) discusses rural settlements in the chora of Pisa and Lucca in the Archaic through Hellenistic periods. Aerial photos from the 1950s allowed reconstructing the topography of this area in antiquity, notably the course of rivers. Thus, settlements, which today seem to be distributed without any recognizable pattern, can clearly be linked to rivers, either located in the plain next to rivers or on hills surrounding rivers. Recent investigation of some of these settlements, notably at Montacchita, Bonifica di Bientina, Le Melorie, and Tempagnano, yielded evidence of various houses from the 7th to 5th centuries BC. Particularly revealing is the evidence from Le Melorie, with three phases that allow for the reconstruction of domestic architecture in this region: first, a large elliptical house (?) or workspace from 560-520 BC was constructed; this was replaced, after destruction by fire, by a large rectangular building with portico around 500 BC, which is compared to a new monumental "palatial" building type that would have slowly spread from central to northern Etruria; finally, after another fire, a large rectangular building was constructed in the

¹⁰ Bentz and Reusser refer to this as a Peristyle house of the 5th century BC (p. 7); Amann calls it an Archaic complex with central courtyard of the late 6th/early 5th century BC with a surface area of 1270 sqm (p. 37).

first half of 5th century BC. This last building was subdivided into three functional areas or spaces, according to finds, which also suggest that the building did not significantly change its overall function, at least between the second and third phase. In the Hellenistic period, the settlements on hilltops were much preferred and developed at the expense of the settlements in the plain. Excavations at Fossa Nera have yielded a simple *atrium* house of the 2nd century BC, which shows that this was a polyvalent house type, well compatible with agricultural production and processing.

Giovannangelo Camporeale (*Sistemi di regimazione delle acque piovane nell'abitato dell'Accesa [Massa Marittima]*, pp. 145-156) examines the management of rain water in Accesa. Located in a hilly terrain with a soil rich in clay, rain water in this small settlement had to be carefully drained to prevent damage from flooding and landslides. Five residential quarters have been found so far, which consist of at most ten houses and are linked to specific areas of mineral exploitation. In all quarters a variety of measures for efficient drainage of rain water was accomplished, including: walls or large narrow vestibules in front of house entrances that face the hillside; an intricate system of terrace and retaining walls that were reused from predecessor structures or purpose-built together with the houses; foundation works; channels from the interior of houses and along house facades; dry wells in front of houses to collect rain water from hills; and finally one single cistern. While most of these features were obviously the responsibility of individual house owners, some long terrace and retaining walls seem to go back to public initiative and thus testify to the existence of some urban planning and corresponding concepts and institutions.

Luigi Donati and Luca Cappuccini (*Roselle, Poggio Civitella, Santa Teresa di Gavorrano: realtà abitative a confronto*, pp. 157-172) compare the domestic architecture in three settlements that are located close together, but differ in size and function. After a brief overview of the urban development of the city of Rosellae, Donati focuses on an assessment of the important so-called Casa dell'Impluvium which is located on the northern of the two settlement hills and developed in three phases. In the most important third phase, dated to the mid 6th century BC, the well-known *atrium* house with a surface area of about 300 sqm was installed. Donati emphasizes the three innovations manifest in this building, notably the square plan that allows for a more rational layout of the roof; the *atrium* with its underlying cistern that is fed by water from the surrounding roofs; and the presence of a broad variety of rooms with specialized functions. Furthermore, finds suggest that this house was an autonomous unit, producing what the household needed. The house was abandoned dur-

ing Etruria's demographic crisis in the 6th century BC when the settlement was transferred to the southern hill of the city and developed there in the Classical and Hellenistic periods, for the first time with an orthogonal street plan.

In contrast to the evidence from Rosellae, the houses of the hilltop settlement Poggio Civitella and the rural site Santa Teresa di Gavorrana were much more modest, though contemporaneous with the so-called Casa dell'Impluvium. Cappuccini summarizes the results of recent fieldwork in Poggio Civitella, which yielded two different house types: a simple rectangular one-room house of the early 6th century BC and several more sophisticated houses with two rooms that were built in the mid 6th century BC and possibly shared communal (public?) features such as a storeroom and cistern. Research in Santa Teresa Gavorrana brought to light a necropolis, used from the mid 7th to the end of the 6th centuries BC; between the tombs, five areas showed a high concentration of tile fragments and domestic ceramics but no walls of houses.

Mario Cygielman (*Case a Vetulonia*, pp. 173-181) discusses the houses of Vetulonia, excavated at various points within the city walls. Best known is the quarter explored at Poggiarello Renzetti in the late 19th century and again recently. This was obviously planned with a regular network of streets and insulae that were, however, adapted to the topography and thus not strictly orthogonal. The prevailing house type was the *atrium* house, often in a simple version without side rooms and *tablinum*. Astonishingly, these (small?) houses, most notably the so-called Casa di Medea, were still provided with a rich terracotta decoration that can now be assigned to the *atria*, in comparison with the houses at Fregellae. While the houses at Poggiarello Renzetti and in another quarter, namely Costa Murata, were built during the heyday of the city in the 2nd century BC and destroyed probably under Sulla, recent excavation in Via Garibaldi for the first time yielded a stratigraphic sequence from the 1st to 3rd centuries AD. Among the remains is a room, currently isolated, decorated with an *opus signinum* pavement and wall painting in advanced Third Pompeian Style. An assessment of these important houses is impeded by the lack of scale on all plans (figs. 2, 3, 5, 8, 13) and of systematic mention of measurements and sizes in the text. Furthermore, the so-called Casa di Medea is not easily identifiable in its plan and size from the schematic plan (p. 176, fig. 8) and if the main entrances were in the east (to Via Ripicia, through rooms D4 and F), as seemingly suggested by the plans (p. 173, fig. 2; pl. 176, fig. 8) and text, the layout would have been highly unusual for an *atrium* house (cf. the *atrium* house in Ferento, see below).

Paola Rendini and Marco Firmati (*Le case di Ghiaccio Forte, centro fortificato etrusco nella Valle dell'Albegna*, pp. 183-195) examine the domestic architecture of Ghiaccio Forte, a hill top site that accommodated a sanctuary from the late Archaic period to the late 4th/early 3rd century BC when it was transformed into the fortified residence of the *gens* Statie. This residence was in turn destroyed by fire around 280 BC. After a brief assessment of the fortification wall, the authors focus on a large residential complex, first explored in the 1970s and again recently (1999-2001). Located on a saddle between two hills, the complex (called a palace by the authors) covers a surface area of about 660 sqm and is organized around one or two courtyards. Based on finds, the function of the different rooms is determined in more detail. Thus, the 12 labeled rooms comprise a separately located room for the storage of food (K); rooms for the preparation of food (A, B); a kitchen-bath-complex (E, F); a suite with another room for food storage (H) and a room for domestic, notably female, work (I); and a courtyard (D); in contrast, the function of rooms M, L, and C (courtyard?) currently must remain open; terrain to the north of the vast complex included a cistern/well ("pozzo-cisterna") for the collection of rain-water from the two flanking hills. On the eastern hill, several simple structures were partially revealed that were probably used by clients or servants of the "palace" residents for living and working, among others metal working. The remaining, non-built terrain within the fortification could have been used to temporarily house and protect cattle and people from surrounding settlements in cases of emergency. The design and technique of the fortification wall as well as the kitchen-bath complex would suggest inspiration by Greek models (such as the *pastas* houses in Olynthus, although no *pastas* is visible in Ghiaccio Forte) and a specialized workforce, which would have been available to elite groups only.

The predominance of rooms for the storage and preparation of food in the "palace" complex is remarkable; while the existence of a separate small bathroom clearly suggests a sophisticated lifestyle, rooms for dining and the reception of guests are strangely absent (or have not yet been safely identified).

Carlo Pavolini (*Una domus ad atrio di Ferento come esempio della persistenza di tipologie architettoniche e di tecniche edilizie repubblicane nella prima età imperiale*, pp. 197-206) presents the results of fieldwork carried out in an *atrium* house (saggio III) at Ferento since 2001. So far the only fully explored house in the city, this building is prominently located to the west of the theater and a large public cistern, opening to the *decumanus* of the city. Stratigraphic evidence suggests a construction date in the early Imperial period when public buildings of Ferento were also monumentalized. Pavolini briefly discusses the de-

sign and possible function of each room (*tabernae, cella ostiaria, triclinium, atrium, cubicula, staircase, etc.*) and emphasizes that rooms in the rear, notably a *tablinum* and also *alae*, are conspicuously absent here. While such a “non-canonical” form is not without parallels, for example in the Vesuvian cities, it is usually motivated by a lack of space. Since the latter is hard to claim for Ferento, reasons for the abnormal form of the *atrium* house currently must remain open.

Laura Ambrosini and Barbara Beelli Marchesini (*Etruscan and Roman houses in Veii. The example of Piano di Comunità*, pp. 207-216) offer a brief overview of domestic architecture in Veii. After a survey of houses from the Mid Bronze Age through Archaic period in early British (1957-58) and recent excavations, provided by Ambrosini, Marchesini discusses in more detail the results of the ongoing Veii project by the La Sapienza University of Rome. This projects focuses on the development and organization of the Etruscan city and Roman *municipium* and so far has yielded the following finds: remains of Iron Age huts; terracotta roof fragments of Archaic houses; evidence of several kilns that were abandoned around the middle of the 6th century BC; remains of a large *opus quadratum* retaining wall connected with an Archaic road; possibly some underground buildings; and a huge rectangular cistern with staircase. Best known is a monumental building, a *domus*, that was first discovered by Rodolfo Lanciani in 1889 and fully excavated by the Veii project. Built in the 2nd century BC, this *domus* belongs to a complete reorganization of the summit area after 396 BC and was used well into the Imperial period, when it was provided with a bath complex and large cistern. The building is compared to mid and late Republican villas in the outskirts of Rome (scale to scale comparison in fig. 14 on p. 214; it would have been helpful to include the Veian *domus* in this figure, which is almost illegible due to its small size) that were erected in dominant topographical locations.

Giovanna Battaglini (*Le domus di Fregellae: case aristocratiche di ambito coloniale*, pp. 217-226) provides a summary of research on the important houses from the Latin colony Fregellae, founded 328/313 BC and destroyed 125 BC. Focus is on the 13 best preserved houses along the *decumanus maximus*, which all show three phases of use that correspond with similar phases in public buildings and can be linked with important events in the history of the city. While houses of the first phase can generally be assigned to the 3rd century BC, it remains open how soon after the foundation or refoundation of the colony they were built. The only example that is sufficiently known (Domus 7) consists of a “canonical”, well-appointed *atrium* house, which was most likely inhabited by the local elite. This house type also prevailed in the second phase, dated to the first half of the 2nd century BC, notably after the Second Punic

War, which seems to have seen the heyday of the city. In this phase, houses were completely newly built on a higher level (c. 1 m above the phase 1 houses), but it is not discussed here (or known) whether they respected boundaries of their predecessors or whether the second phase entailed a significant reorganization of lot sizes. Two different groups of houses can be distinguished, based on size and the presence of vestibules, as well as lateral rooms on the *atria*. The better appointed houses with surface areas of about 350 sqm are all situated close to the *forum* and served the local elite, which is suggested by their vestibules (for waiting clients) and lavish decoration with pavements, stucco, and, above all, terracotta friezes. The smaller houses (surface areas of 200-300 sqm) still share many similarities with their larger equivalents, among them *atria*, vestibules (in some cases), and lavish decoration. Since the city had a surface area of c. 80 ha, of which only a small part close to the *forum* has been excavated, the repertoire of house types and sizes cannot be fully assessed, and the “small” *atrium* houses may still have ranked high in the hierarchy of domestic architecture in Fregellae. The third phase, 150-125 BC, resulted from major migration processes, the local elite emigrating to Rome, and Samnites and Pelgini immigrating to Fregellae. This significant social change is reflected in a devaluating transformation of the houses, which were provided with artisanal installations, probably for the (large-scale?) processing of wool.

The houses are important and well-known for many aspects, among them also well-preserved and unique building techniques, briefly discussed here by Francesca Diosono (pp. 226-229). Notable is first a wall of phase 2 in Domus 7 that is made in a technique so far unique in mid-Republican architecture: built entirely of fired bricks, made locally and solely for this purpose; and second, well-preserved walls of phase 1 in the same house, made of earth on foundations of broken tiles that are identified as representative of *opus formaceum*.

While many earlier publications treat different aspects of the houses of Fregellae and can thus complement the excellent succinct overview here, one would still have appreciated a brief discussion of several questions: what precisely motivated the substantial rebuilding of houses in phase 2; whether houses (in all phases) were provided with upper stories; and whether the relative chronology or building sequence of the houses, all built in a row with communal partition walls, can be reconstructed. Since the important Domus 7 figures prominently in this contribution, complete phase plans should have been included (fig. 7 on p. 222 shows only the northeast part of the phase 2 house).

Norba was destroyed in 81 BC and then never substantially reoccupied. While thus offering ideal conditions to study a 1st century BC town, the city has for a long time been rather neglected, except for its impressive city wall in polygonal masonry. Paola Carfora, Stefania Ferrante, and Stefania Quilici Gigli (*Edilizia privata nell'urbanistica di Norba tra la fine del III e l'inizio del I secolo a.C.*, pp. 233-242) provide a first assessment of the domestic architecture of the city, which is based on topographical surveys, several soundings, and the excavation of two complete houses that are located on the main east-west oriented street, near the small Acropolis. Five long rectangular insulae are reconstructed to the south of this main street, in the lower half of the city that was less exposed to winds but that still required extensive terracing works (p. 234, fig. 1). Since the main purpose of the excavation project was to recover the ancient street network, no stratigraphic soundings below the level of rooms of the two houses were carried out. The twin or double houses, obviously built together with a communal partition wall and a communal terrace wall of polygonal masonry, are "canonical" *atrium* houses, of which several pavements, but no other finds were preserved. The better preserved house was later enlarged, using a vaulted double corridor made of *opus incertum*. Despite the lack of stratigraphic data, the authors argue (convincingly) that the houses were most likely built in the 2nd century BC, when the city saw a major monumentalization and transformation of the urban plan and cityscape that was most likely supported and influenced by Rome.

Fabrizio Pesando (*La domus pompeiana in età sannitica: nuove acquisizioni dalla Regio VI*, pp. 243-253) provides a synthesis of the important research project in Pompeii, initiated in 2001 by the Universities of Perugia, Venice, Siena and Naples East, the purpose of which was to explore the little known history of *Regio VI* (and partially also *Regio VII*). While substantial remains of the Archaic period were revealed all over this region, the focus is here on houses from the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC, notably the mid-Samnitic period. Three large *atrium* houses of similar size and design could be identified that were all built in the 3rd century BC, probably modeled after aristocratic *domus* in Rome, and included impressive facades in limestone ashlar masonry. Other, simpler house types of the 3rd century BC could also be identified, among them double or twin houses similar to the ones excavated in Norba (see above). Among the numerous innovative results, which certainly have a major impact on the reconstruction of the much debated development of domestic architecture in Pompeii, is the recognition that mid-sized houses were already provided with peristyle courtyards in the mid 2nd century BC (Casa del Granduca Michele). The 2nd century BC (probably after 146 BC when the Sanctuary of Apollo at Pompeii received a donation by Lucius Mummius) can be recognized as the

golden age of the city when the smaller modest 3rd century BC houses were either remodeled and embellished or substituted by larger houses (mostly with Tuscan *atrium*) and vacant building lots were quickly filled. The important map (p. 245, fig. 3), which shows the distribution of Archaic and 3rd century BC structures in the western part of the city, is unfortunately not very legible, and it would have been even more illustrative if the different 3rd century BC house types had been marked to better understand possible distribution patterns.

Alessandro Naso (*Sulla diffusione delle tegole fittili nell'Italia preromana*, pp. 255-261) discusses the diffusion of terracotta tiled roofs in pre-Roman Italy, which marked the transformation of huts to houses, requiring rectangular plans and double-sloped roofs. While these innovative roofs would have been introduced in southern Etruria around 650 BC (challenging some theories that pre-date this event for about 100 years), a brief catalog of evidence from north-eastern Italy (central and northern Adriatic coast) shows a different picture: currently, only 10 sites provide evidence of terracotta tiled roofs that all date to the 6th and 5th centuries BC.

Rudolf Känel (*Bemerkungen zum Terrakotta-Bauschmuck hellenistischer Wohnhäuser in Mittelitalien*, pp. 263-271) discusses decorative terracotta elements of Hellenistic houses in central Italy, a topic that has been barely examined because lavish terracotta decoration was for a long time exclusively linked with sacred architecture. However, the important excavations at Fregellae since 1978 yielded rich evidence of terracotta decoration that was found in domestic contexts and is safely dated to the period between 328 and 125 BC. Känel, who is responsible for the final publication of this important material, briefly presents the four different decoration types, which mainly belonged to the decoration of *compluvia* and possibly also to the borders of other roofs: 1. revetment plaques with nail holes; 2. two different types of simas with mostly false water spouts, since water was only collected and drained in the corners of *compluvia*; 3. two types of crowning plaques, namely a pierced version and the famous figurative friezes (from House 2 and the Casa del fregio dorico), which had commonly been reconstructed in the walls of *atria* or *tablina*, similar to painted figurative friezes of the masonry wall painting style; and 4. antefixes. The use of the different architectural terracotta types is vividly illustrated in the reconstruction of the *compluvium*-revetment of House 2 (p. 268, fig. 9, and cover of the book). Känel emphasizes that the repertoire of Fregellae is limited and cites several possible reasons for this phenomenon: the relatively homogeneous social status of the inhabitants (colonists); the imitation of sacred architecture and, consequently, the scarcity of more individualized decoration patterns; and the limited time period of production of the

terracotta decoration, which was mostly made during the first half of the 2nd century BC, notably the heyday of the city. Känel concludes with a brief discussion of domestic terracotta decoration from five other sites and the convincing request that this important material, which gives evidence of the social status and cultural interests of house owners, deserves more attention in scholarship.

Jens-Arne Dickmann (*Die Umwandlung von Wohn- in Verkaufsraum in spätrepublikanischen domus*, pp. 273-280) investigates the transformation of domestic (“living”) space into commercially usable space in Pompeian houses. Based on a close reading of a few examples, he challenges the common notion that this phenomenon belonged mainly to a “devaluating” phase in the life of the city after the earthquake of AD 62. The house with the *fullonica* of M. Vesonius Primus (VI 14, 21. 22) comprised rentable *tabernae* already in the 1st century BC. When a *fullonica* was inserted into this house after AD 62, large parts of the house continued to be used for residential purposes; thus the close coexistence of workshop and luxurious rooms on the peristyle courtyard were obviously not considered disturbing or incompatible. In the Casa delle Nozze d’argento (V 2, i) two *cubicula* were transformed into *tabernae* around 40 BC; these remained connected to the house through doors and thus were most likely used by members of the household. In the Casa di Caesius Blandus (VII 1, 40-43) a *triclinium*, built most likely in the late Republican period and located in the northwest corner of the house and thus at an important street crossing, was transformed into a *taberna* at an unknown date. Thus, the use of domestic space as a source of income – either by renting separately accessible rooms or by installing small household businesses in the house or in *tabernae* connected to the house – was obviously much more popular than hitherto assumed and is well attested before AD 62.

Alfonsina Russo (*Edilizia privata e società presso le genti indigene dell’Italia meridionale fra età arcaica ed ellenistica*, pp. 281-292) provides an overview of the development of domestic architecture in indigenous settlements in south Italy from the Archaic through Hellenistic periods. She discusses a broad variety of houses of different types and sizes that often coexisted in the same settlement (see the useful tables I-II, listing the repertoire of domestic architecture in three different sites). When elite groups emerged in the 6th century BC they adopted “forme del potere” derived from Greek models, and built monumental complexes with long rectangular structures, richly decorated terracotta roofs and figured terracotta friezes. In the 5th and 4th centuries BC, the increasing stratification of Lucanian society and a general rise of lifestyle are manifested in the appearance of mid-sized “middle class” houses, most notably *pastas* houses. Particularly revealing is the development of rural complexes such as

the recently excavated building in Località Masseria Nigro (Viaggiano). Built in the first half of the 4th century BC, it included a series of long rectangular rooms similar to those in Archaic elite residences. In the mid 4th century BC, this was transformed into a monumental complex with a 1200 sqm surface that included smaller rooms grouped around a central peristyle courtyard. In contrast, in the 3rd century BC, the complex was again reduced in size and the large peristyle courtyard was abandoned, probably as a result of changed socio-political conditions that may also have led to the building's final abandonment at the end of the 3rd century BC.

To summarize, this is an excellent, rich book that should be standard literature for studies on domestic architecture in Italy and, more generally, in the ancient Mediterranean. Demonstrating the importance of extensive fieldwork and detailed site reports, it will hopefully stimulate the continuation and even intensification of both, and it will certainly provide an indispensable basis for future synthetic approaches and assessments of ancient houses in Italy.

Monika Trümper
Associate Professor of Classical Archaeology
Department of Classics
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
CB #3145, 212 Murphey Hall
US-Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3145
E-Mail: truemper@email.unc.edu