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Preface

The remains of monumental sanctuaries catch the eye in Central-Southern Italy, both in the areas inhabited by the various ‘Italic’ peoples and in the city of Rome itself. Especially in the third and second centuries BC, many cult places were transformed into Hellenistic-style temples. Interestingly, this *floruit* coincides with the Roman conquest and incorporation of the entire Italian peninsula. In this study, I have aimed to answer questions on both the role of sanctuaries and rituals for the ‘indigenous’ Italic peoples in Central-Southern Italy and the Roman impact on religious life in these areas. In order to do this, I have drawn upon various kinds of evidence and research methods, including architecture, survey archaeology, and historical, epigraphical and modern historiographical analysis.

I would not have been able to pursue this challenge without the support of many people. First of all I wish to thank my promotor prof. Marijke Gnade and co-promotor prof. Eric Moormann for their encouragement and continuous confidence. They have both been, in their different – and complementary – ways, my principal tutors and sources of inspiration from the moment I started studying archaeology onwards. While giving me the freedom to develop my own line of research, their knowledge, advice and most of all their enthusiasm have been invaluable. I wish to especially thank them for their readiness to comment upon various parts of this thesis even within urgent deadlines – I could always count on them. I also want to express my gratitude to prof. Herman Brijder, who supervised my project in the initial phase, for the confidence shown and careful reading of parts of the text – and perhaps most of all for enabling me to work with him on another ‘sacred landscape’; that of South-Eastern Turkey, at the Nemrud Dağ, which has been a marvelous experience. I am moreover very grateful for his invaluable editorial help in the final stage. The many stimulating discussions with prof. Emmanuele Curti, especially on the debate on ‘romanisation’, and the role of different European traditions within it, were profoundly inspiring, as was the opportunity to join in his fieldwork project on the temple of Venus at Pompeii. Prof. Peter Attema helped me in an early stage of my project to get insight into different field survey strategies that could be suitable for enquiring the ‘sacred landscape’, by enabling me to participate in his Pontine project. In the final stage of my research, prof. Harm Pinkster has generously shared his linguistic knowledge with me, and I wish to thank him warmly for his comments on linguistic and epigraphical issues. Prof. Douwe Yntema not only shared his forthcoming work, but gave me also a beautiful first edition of Salmon’s *Samnium and the Samnites*.

The encounter with Jeremia Pelgrom at the Royal Dutch Institute in Rome in 2003 has been pivotal for me: we planned and directed the field survey campaigns around the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo together and we spent a lot of time studying,
working, traveling and discussing archaeology and life. He has been an important intellectual sparring partner throughout my research. Our innumerable, often intense discussions greatly stimulated the theses put forward in this study. Leading people from the ‘SLP crew’ moreover include Ellen Thiermann and Jitte Waagen. Ellen has not only been invaluable for the project; I thank her for her support during many years of my research. I thank Jitte Waagen for his steady cooperation and perfect company throughout all field campaigns, especially for the GIS part – but also much more. Antonella Lepone’s help has been crucial on various occasions and in various ways; I especially enjoyed the endless discussions on ‘alcuni culti’. Jeltsje Stobbe has, from the moment I got to know her in Satricum as my trench leader, always remained a reference point for me, and I wish to thank her especially for her help with the study of the ceramics.

Much of this research has been carried out in Italy. The Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici del Molise has always shown the greatest interest and willingness to cooperate and has facilitated both the field work and the re-study of their excavation materials in all possible ways, which has been a great experience. I thank therefore profoundly dott.ssa Stefania Capini and dott. Mario Pagano, who respectively have been responsible as Soprintendente for our permissions, as well as dott.ssa Valeria Ceglia and dott.ssa Cristiana Terzani. In particular, I am thankful to dott.ssa Angela di Niro, responsible for the excavations of the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo and our principal contact person at the Soprintendenza, for her continuous support and generosity in sharing both ideas and data, and I am glad that our pleasant cooperation has led to a new shared project in Rotello and Larino, enabling us to continue working together. Moreover, this fieldwork could not have been done without the support of the Comune of S. Giovanni in Galdo, and I am greatly indebted to the Sindaco Mr. Eugenio Fiorilli for providing housing for the research groups on several occasions. Furthermore, I wish to express my gratitude to all inhabitants of S. Giovanni in Galdo and especially the owners of the fields we investigated, who have remained surprisingly friendly, welcoming and informative when confronted with groups of students trampling their lands, heartily giving us oil, wine and fruits from their lands.

The research was funded by the Institute of Culture and History, Faculty of Humanities, of the University of Amsterdam (ICG), and I am particularly grateful to Paul Koopman. The field projects were funded mainly with grants from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), and additionally by the ICG, Leiden University, the Stichting Philologisch Studiefonds Utrecht, and Mrs. A.M. Kalmeijer. The Royal Dutch Institute in Rome (KNIR) has facilitated my research project greatly; several grants from the Institute enabled me to work over longer periods in the libraries of Rome, and to present the results to an international audience on various occasions. Special thanks to the respective directors of Ancient Studies, dr. Nathalie de Haan and dr. Gert-Jan Burgers, as well as to Ivana Bolognese, Mohammed Boukasse, Sandra Buffoni, Angelo Coccarelli, Fernando Maggi, and Janet Mente.
Also, I wish to express my appreciation to the staff of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Rom, the British School at Rome, and the École française de Rome, as well as the Istituto Regionale per gli Studi del Molise at Campobasso.

Working in Italy has put me into contact with many dear Italian colleagues, from whose expert knowledge and generous cooperation I have profited immensely in personal discussions, presentations and exchange lectures. Besides those already mentioned, I wish to thank especially prof. Gianfranco de Benedittis, prof. Alessandro Naso, prof. Massimo Osanna, prof. Maria José Strazzulla, and prof. Gianluca Tagliamonte. In the field surveys, many people have been involved. The cooperation of Michele Roccia in the initial phase of the project has been very important, and I would like to thank him for sharing his knowledge of the local archaeology as well as Buddhism... The teams we have worked with were wonderful; I thank Antonio Bruscella, Vanessa D’Orazio, Sandra Fatica, Miko Flohr, Michele Fratino, Marie-Catherine Houkes, Rogier Kalkers, Martijn Kalkwarf, Karel-Jan Kerckhaert, Francesca Laera, Debora Lagatta, Antonella Lepone, Muriel Louwaard, Antje van Oosten, Bruno Sardella, Laura Stek, Barbara Valiante, Jolande Vos, Heleen de Vries, Jeroen Weterings, and Neelson Witte. During the study of the excavation materials, Anneke Dekker, Laura Hoff, Francesca Laera, Alma Reijling, Ilona Steijven, and Alessandra Zaccardi made up a formidable team. I am furthermore extremely grateful to Fulvio Coletti for his invaluable advice with regard to the black gloss ceramics.

Precious comments upon parts of the texts were given by Jeremia Pelgrom and Benjamin Rous, who read most of the manuscript, as well as by Antonella Lepone, Jeltsje Stobbe, Ellen Thiermann, Nicola Tien, Jetze Touber, Anne Versloot, and my parents. I thank Lisa Becking and Laura Stek for their help with several papers. Jitte Waagen produced the digital illustrations (the GIS part in Chapter 5) whereas René Reijnen took care of most of the maps and line illustrations: I wish to express my profound gratitude. The English text was patiently corrected by Heather van Tress. My colleagues in Amsterdam and Nijmegen – too many to list here – provided a both pleasant and stimulating atmosphere, and I hope I will be able to continue working with you all. I should also like to thank my students for many discussions, and the inspiration given.

Finally, I would like to thank my loving family and dear friends, who have supported me morally and practically throughout the last years, which has been very important for me. My parents have been tremendously caring; my grandparents helped me moreover in different practical ways, and my sister Laura accompanied me through all different situations. My grandparents, Heleen de Vries and Trudi Hoekert have raised my first interest in history; I feel I am greatly indebted to them. My lovely Nicola has coached and supported me wonderfully, even making me forget about my work at times: I thank you profoundly for your loving encouragement! During the last months, it has been great writing at night with next to me, in her cradle, our newborn daughter Filippa making sweet noises. I feel she really helped finishing this thesis.
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Introduction

On the eve of the decisive battle at Aquilonia, in the dire wars that were fought between Rome and Samnium in the late fourth and early third centuries BC, the Samnites formed the so-called legio linteata. Livy (10.38) describes in some detail how the elite soldiers came together in a locus consaeptus in their military camp, and were sworn into the special legion. The Samnite priest, the venerable Ovius Paccius, performed the ceremony according to a time-old rite (ex vetusta Samnitium religione), reading the sacred text from an old linen book. The initiated soldiers were forced to pledge allegiance to the Samnite cause by a terrible oath; those who had refused lay dead next to the altars, their blood mingling with that of the sacrificed animals. This rite, so colourfully described by Livy, clearly reinforced Samnite military strength, by legitimating and codifying it with a sacred rite. Also, the Samnites Pentri ritually deposited enemy weapons – amongst them Roman armour – at the central sanctuary at Pietrabbondante.

In Rome at the same time, temples were popping up, celebrating the victories over the Samnites.\(^1\) Besides commemorating the deeds of the victorious generals and their gentes, these temples boosted the morale of the Roman community in those fearful times. Some of the gods that were introduced illustrate this connection to the welfare of the state neatly: for example Salus (Safety) was vowed a temple by the consul C. Junius Bubulcus during the Samnite wars, and she received her home on the Quirinal in 302 BC.\(^2\) After the battle at Aquilonia – the Samnite oath apparently did not prevent them from losing it – T. Papirius Cursor and Sp. Carvilius Maximus returned to Rome with so much Samnite booty, that the new temple of Quirinus and the forum were too small to exhibit all of it.\(^3\)

Community and sanctuary were closely related in ancient Italy. The Italic peoples, Romans included, were well aware of this. This implies, amongst other things, that communities were vulnerable in their cult places, and this vulnerability is taken up by Roman writers in later imagination and historiography. On the mons Tifata near Capua was the sanctuary of Diana Tifatina. In myth and poetry, the sanctuary is closely connected to Capys, the heroic founder of Capua. Capys would have kept a white deer which was dedicated to Diana and lived for thousand years from the foundation of the city onwards. In 211 BC, Q. Fulvius Flaccus besieged Capua, which had defected from Rome in this critical period. Before the city was taken, the consul sacrificed the holy

\(^1\) Until 273 BC, at least eight temples were erected in honour of victories de Samnitis.
\(^2\) Liv. 9.43.25; Liv. 10.1.7-9.
\(^3\) Liv. 10.46.
deer. By doing so, the Roman general symbolically destroyed the Capuan community even before its actual military submission. Equally, gods could be summoned away from their cities, by promising them a temple in the victorious city of Rome. According to Livy (5.21–22), this had happened with Juno Regina during the capture of Veii in 396 BC. These and other references on the role of religion and sanctuaries in the conflicts between the Roman conquerors and the rest of Italy are striking, but reflect later recollection and imagination rather than contemporary observation. At the same time, they attest to a certain frame of mind placing religion and sanctuaries at the centre of war ideology. On the other hand, under the early empire Italian countryside religion is exalted in poetry and art. Images of rustic and frugalItalic religion abound, and some ancientItalic cult places, such as the Clitumnian sources, even gain in popularity under the empire: this all forms part of ‘Roman religion’ now. The process in between, however, remains tantalisingly difficult to grasp.

* Shifting our perspective from the literary sources to archaeology, the remains of innumerable sanctuaries lie dotted over the landscapes of modern Central-Southern Italy. They document a frenetic temple building activity during the last three centuries BC. Even in the non- or scarcely urbanised areas, splendid monumental complexes were erected. Most of these cult places have been studied as single objects, with an emphasis on the architecture and decoration. The phenomenon of their ubiquitous appearance has attracted less attention. Nevertheless, several theories have been proposed, linking them to economic or political structures. It should be noted however, that the floruit of Italic sanctuaries coincides strikingly with the gradual Roman incorporation of Italy. The point of departure of this study is the question of how sanctuaries and cults of Central-Southern Italy relate to changes in society, especially in light of the Roman conquest and subsequent control of Italy. This theme is, of course, closely related to the debate on the ‘romanisation’ of Italy in general. Due to several provocative contributions from different perspectives to this debate in the last ten years, I think there is room and indeed need for a (re-)analysis of some of the sacred aspects too.

From a historical perspective, there is often a pendular movement in the development of scholarly ideas. This certainly is true for the study of the Roman incorporation of Italy and its institutional and cultural consequences. Ideas on the romanisation of Italy changed under the influence of modern conceptual frameworks including nationalism, colonialism and postcolonialism. The latter half of the previous century witnessed a turn from a Romanocentric perspective, often based on the uncritical consultation of the Roman sources, to another extreme position, which puts the ‘indigenous’ perspective at the centre. Some studies have implemented this new orthodoxy in extremis, and have combined postcolonial (or, perhaps, anti-colonial) theoretical assumptions with radical ‘deconstruction’ of the literary accounts.

In the traditional conception, sovereign Italic tribes would have populated the peninsula up to the fifth or fourth centuries, until in the fourth and third centuries BC

---

these early ethnic groups were uprooted as a consequence of Roman expansion and colonisation. During the third and second centuries BC the Italic population would have been enticed to assimilate themselves to Roman standards, or did so spontaneously. Rome, however, jealously guarded the citizenship and the allies had to fight the Social War (91–88 BC) before Rome would grant it to them. ‘Roman Italy’, already long under way, was thus made official.

More recent studies in the postcolonial tradition have tried to deconstruct the idea of an already deeply romanised Italy in the third and second centuries BC. With some success. Indeed, scholars of the generation of Theodor Mommsen had been suspiciously eager to conceptualise a cultural and political convergence of Rome and Italy already from the third century BC onwards. Especially Henrik Mouritsen has shown that these ideas persist in modern scholarship. In this line, revisionist studies emphasise the cultural and political sovereignty of Italic communities prior to the definitive incorporation after the Social War. Only then, Italic communities would have lost their political and cultural independence, indeed resulting in a ‘Roman Italy’. There are several possible objections to parts of the revisionist view, especially the undervaluation of Roman impact and strategies. Indeed, the pendulum might have swung to the other extreme, but a great deal of the critique on the modern conception of a culturally ‘romanised Italy’ in the third and especially second centuries BC holds true. It is therefore precisely in this period that an interesting field of research presents itself; the changing attitudes and self-definitions of Italic communities, importantly including Rome itself, in these turbulent times.

Although the discussion about the role of cult places and religion has its own momentum and is, for various historical reasons, not directly consonant with the development of general romanisation studies, parallels can be drawn. Contrary to digressions about the heat of the battlefield as cited above, the sources are relatively silent about the post-conquest period. This dearth has suggested that Rome as a rule did not interfere in the religious affairs of the conquered territories. Certainly, Roman and Latin colonies boasted their allegiance to Rome by venerating the gods of the Urbs in their own Capitolia, but the countryside and allied territories would have remained largely unaffected. However, in the meantime undeniable and momentous changes did occur in these areas, not least of all in the sacred realm, of which the temple architecture already referred to is the most visible result. Although, as noted, no direct Roman intervention is usually presumed, Roman architectural models (or Hellenistic models, spread through mediation by Rome) are conjectured to have been adopted by the Italic communities. Also, the participation of Italic people in the Mediterranean markets, which were open to them thanks to the Roman hegemony, would have stimulated and financed these building activities. Furthermore, the organisation of Italic cults and sanctuaries sometimes betray Roman influences, but this is interpreted as the assimilation to or copying of Roman models. After the Social War, on the other

---

5 MOURITSEN 1998.
6 Cf. BRADLEY 2002; for Rome cf. Chapters 1 and 7.
hand, Roman influence on Italic sanctuaries would primarily take the form of a negative secondary effect: the Italic cult places of old would have waned and dwindled as a consequence of the new, Roman emphasis on urban centres. New, urban-based cult places and a desolate sacred countryside would represent the major outcome of the ‘religious romanisation’ of Italy, although some pre-Roman cults in the countryside persisted.

* In this study on the role of sanctuaries in society in Central-Southern Italy during the last three centuries BC, I have tried to test, and to an extent question, some of the developments that have just been sketched. To that end, I have attempted to explore some aspects at both ends of the spectrum – within the oscillation of the ‘pendulum’ so to speak – by considering, on the one hand, internal developments in a local Italic context, and, on the other, evidence for the impact of Roman religion in the Italian countryside. Previous studies have mainly been occupied with the material culture and especially the architectural aspects of sanctuaries, also in contributions relating to the romanisation discussion. As will be demonstrated with the case of Pentrian Samnium in Chapter 3 however, an approach based solely on architectural forms presents difficulties for answering these kinds of questions of cultural change and its meaning. Indeed, certain Samnite sanctuaries, even if perhaps adopting Roman / Latial / Hellenistic elements, were actually foci of Samnite resistance against Rome. Interpretation depends on context, and in order to provide a context, the point of departure in the following chapters is the role sanctuaries had within society, and more specifically within patterns of settlement. Different ideas on the functioning of sanctuaries in Italic society have been put forward, and these are discussed from a historiographical perspective in Chapter 4. An important problem in the evaluation of these ideas is that they are mostly based on an incomplete picture of the ancient Italic landscapes. Hill-forts and sanctuaries now dominate the Apennine archaeological landscapes, whereas minor settlements are almost invisible. It will be argued that this ‘emptiness’ of the landscape has influenced the functional interpretation of the apparently isolated sanctuaries. In recent years, field survey research has altered the picture considerably, but in the pursuit of different research agendas, this research often took a large scale and long term perspective, which is not particularly appropriate for the functional analysis of cult places. Therefore, in Chapter 5 a specific research approach for investigating the direct spatial context of sanctuaries is presented. It consists of intensive field surveys (2004, 2005) around the Samnite sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo (CB) and a comparison with the finds from the excavations executed by the Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici del Molise in the 1970s. The aim is to reconstruct the ancient landscape surrounding this Samnite sanctuary, and to provide it with a chronological depth. In this way, the ancient

---

7 For similar approaches based on field survey research, for Greece see RENFREW 1985 and esp. ALCOCK 1993; for Italy see ATTEMA and BOUMA 1995; cf. ATTEMA 2006.
8 Esp. BARKER 1995, concerned explicitly with the longue durée.
Introduction

‘audience’ of the monumental temple is tentatively reconstructed, which is relevant for its interpretation.

The case of Samnium highlights the importance sanctuaries could assume for Italic communities when faced with change. On the other hand, in Chapters 6–9 possible evidence for a direct Roman impact in the sacred realm in the Italian countryside is explored. The re-interpretation of the so-called pagus-vicus pattern of settlement (‘sistema pagano-vicanico’ vel sim.) takes first place here. Traditionally, this pattern made up of districts and villages is thought to have been a typical, pre-Roman Italic feature and rural sanctuaries take a prominent place in this system. Recent studies in the institutional and juridical realm by Luigi Capogrossi Colognesi and Michel Tarpin however have questioned – in different ways – both the validity of the relation laid between pagus and vicus and their pre-Roman origin. 9 After an analysis of the discussion on the ‘pagus-vicus system’ in Chapter 6, the possible consequences for the interpretation of Italic sanctuaries and cults are evaluated. Several cases, for which epigraphical and archaeological evidence is most readily available, are discussed in more detail. Finally, in Chapters 8 and 9, two festivals, the Paganalia and the Compitalia, are discussed in relation to a possible Roman religious influence in the Italian countryside.

In general, this study seeks to underscore the importance of the contextualisation of sanctuaries by analysing their role within settlement patterns and institutional structures. It is argued that only by including these patterns and structures, a meaningful interpretation of sanctuaries and cults, and, consequently, their significance for different communities, may be obtained. With this approach, it is hoped that the crucial role of sanctuaries and cults in the variegated developments which followed the Roman conquest of Italy will be demonstrated.

9 Capogrossi Colognesi 2002; Tarpin 2002.
Chapter 1

Rome and Italy: Ideas on Cultural Change

It is under the heading of ‘romanisation’ that the cultural, socio-political and economic changes in Italy from, say the fourth century BC, are often discussed. This concept of romanisation, which was first developed in the 19th and early 20th centuries, has in turn shaped modern ways of thinking about ancient Italy, and has also structured the interpretation of the historical and archaeological data. Clearly, this situation runs the risk of falling prey to circular reasoning. Romanisation has been discussed more than extensively in the last decades,¹ and only aspects that are directly relevant to the next chapters are briefly presented here.² Different traditions account for different research questions and approaches. The strong idealist and humanistic tradition in Italy has only recently found some common ground with the more theoretically oriented studies of the Anglo-Saxon world.³ Whereas New Archaeology, for instance, has had little impact on classical archaeology in Italy, post-processualism has been embraced more warmly, perhaps because – at least superficially – it fits better into the established Italian tradition emphasising ideological and culture specific aspects.⁴ Nonetheless, in the romanisation debate one of the most influential models had been adopted already earlier in both Anglo-Saxon and Italian studies: the so-called ‘ emulation model’ or ‘self-romanisation paradigm’. This theoretical explanation for the mechanism of romanisation has been developed in the latter decades of the 20th century, and has often remained implicit in studies on Italy.⁵ A rather precise conception of the cultural changes in Italy following the Roman conquest had already taken root long before: the idea of a gradual cultural and political unification of Italy under Roman guidance was established in the 19th century.⁶ The mechanism of self-romanisation can therefore be

¹ The bibliography on the debate in a provincial context is immense; see e.g. WOOLF 1996-97; DERKS 1998, 2-8; WEBSTER 2001, 210-217; MATTINGLY 2002 for overviews.
² Cf. the excellent, yet rhetorical, overview in MOURITSEN 1998, 59-86, esp. for the historiographical part; also discussed below.
³ Esp. contributions in KEAY and TERRENATO 2001; contributions in CONCEPT 2006.
⁴ Cf. D’AGOSTINO 1991; BARBANERA 1998; TERRENATO 2005. Terrenato (p. 41) warns that “post-processualism became a convenient new label to stick on the same old idealist historicism”.
⁵ Most explicitly Torelli, cf. infra.
⁶ Cf. already in 1845 Adolf Kiene, speaking of the “Annäherung … in der gesamten Denk- und Anschauungsweise” of Italic people and Romans (KIENE 1845, 120); see MOURITSEN 1998, 59.
seen as the later theoretical underpinning of a pre-existing conception of the cultural changes in Italy in the Republican period. We will therefore turn first to this conception of cultural unification and Roman cultural dominance, before discussing the later theoretical explanation for it.

**Early Roman Cultural Dominance**

In particular, Theodor Mommsen in his *Römische Geschichte* postulated that an Italic-Roman cultural fusion began as early as the third century BC.\(^7\) This framework persisted, albeit modified, long into the 20th century. Explicit ideas on the how and why of the spread of cultural models were of minor relevance to this idealist tradition: cultural convergence was presumed rather than explained.\(^8\) Since Italy was conceptualised as a unified whole, ‘Romans’ and ‘Italic people’ were by a certain time held to be interchangeable. A change or transition from ‘Italic’ to ‘Roman’ is presupposed, but the process itself was hardly questioned. Something that goes into the direction of an explanation is the idea of decline or ‘crisis’ of the Italic peoples. In this view, the ‘crisis’ would have cleared the way for the adoption of a Roman identity.\(^9\) The culturally weakened Italic peoples would have forsaken their Italic identities and became Romans. In an often cited passage, Strabo (6.1.2–3) seems to tell as much on the Samnites and affiliated peoples for a later period:

> “But the [Leucani], and the Brettii, and the Samnites themselves (the progenitors of these peoples) have so utterly deteriorated that it is difficult even to distinguish their several settlements; and the reason is that no common organisation longer endures in any one of the separate tribes; and their characteristic differences in language, armour, dress, and the like, have completely disappeared; and, besides, their settlements, severally and in detail, are wholly without repute ... The Leucani are Samnite in race ... But now they are Romans.”\(^10\)

One line preceding these, Strabo states in similar fashion that the Campani had in the meantime become interchangeable with Romans. The coming of Rome thus was at the cost of local traditions, to the extent that these could not even be recognised anymore. This conception seems to underpin modern studies.\(^11\) Arthur Keaveney, for example, defines romanisation as “that process whereby the different peoples of Italy put off their own peculiar identities and assumed that of Rome”.\(^12\) Likewise, Edward Togo Salmon presents romanisation in his otherwise rather ‘pro-Samnite’ standard work on the Samnites straightforwardly in terms of an inescapable process.\(^13\)

---

\(^7\) MOMMSEN 1854-1855, vol. 1-3. On the reasons for this early date, cf. *infra*.

\(^8\) MOURITSEN 1998, cf. *infra*.

\(^9\) E.g. DE JULIUS 1994, 44 on “la crisi delle culture indigeni e la conquista romana”. Cf. in general MASSA-PAIRAULT 1990.

\(^10\) Transl. Loeb.

\(^11\) E.g. TORELLI and LACHENAL 1992, xxvii.

\(^12\) KEAVENEY 1987, 21.

\(^13\) SALMON 1967, 316.
In this framework, empiric evidence is largely subsidiary to views on Roman supremacy. One popular view of Roman rule that resonates clearly with ideas on romanisation is the centre-periphery model: Rome would have formed the centre within a constellation of centripetal oriented communities.\(^{14}\) Especially Mario Torelli has worked out this model,\(^{15}\) putting forward an image of peninsular Italy which is made up of different cultural bands. These represent zones with different settlement patterns, accordingly presenting different cultural developments. These cultural zones are supposed to have interacted differently with Roman influence. Thus, the relative prosperity of the first zone, Oscan Campania, is explained as the consequence of a “profound social, economic and political interaction”,\(^{16}\) whereas the second zone, formed by the “peri-urban” territories, is characterised as “a peripheral and dependent area” oriented on colonies and other cities.\(^{17}\) The third zone is the Apennine area, inhabited by the ‘Sabellian’ or Samnite peoples.\(^{18}\) In this “world of non-cities”\(^{19}\) Rome would have had an “evidentissima funzione di guida” in the introduction of new architectonic forms and construction techniques.\(^{20}\) To sum up, Rome would have had a crucial role in the trend to urbanisation\(^{21}\) and cultural development in general: “the prevailing cultural models and the artistic production are those presented by the Roman world, sometimes directly by Rome and sometimes indirectly through the Latin and Roman colonies.”\(^{22}\)

**Two Objections: Historiographical Constructs and the Mechanism of Self-Romanisation**

There are at least two fundamental problems with the standard conception positing early Roman cultural dominance in the peninsula. First, this conception can be shown to rely heavily on idealist notions of the Roman empire. Second, the mechanism of cultural change which is generally presupposed has serious weaknesses. The first point has been elaborated especially by Mouritsen in his provocative book on ‘Italian unification’ in relation to the Social War.\(^{23}\) Analysing the ideological frameworks within which both ancient and modern authors constructed a positive view of the Social War, he exposes the conception of a linear development aimed at one goal: the

---

\(^{14}\) Amongst other conceptions there is e.g. the *clientela* model, in which power relations between Rome and her Italic ‘allies’ are paralleled with patron-client relationships; see BADIAN 1958. For the centre-periphery model cf. CHAMPION 1989.

\(^{15}\) E.g. Torelli 1982; TORELLI 1995.

\(^{16}\) TORELLI 1995, 3-4; thus allowing for reciprocal influences, forming “the foundation of the *koinē* Romano-Italic culture of the third and second centuries BC”.

\(^{17}\) TORELLI 1995, 9.

\(^{18}\) On ‘Sabellian’ and Samnites cf. DENCH 1995; see also my Chapter 3.

\(^{19}\) TORELLI 1995, 10.

\(^{20}\) Torelli 1982, 243, writing on the first half of the second century BC.

\(^{21}\) The emphasis on urbanisation as a result of romanisation is particularly strong in Italian scholarship. Cf. e.g. DESIDERI 1991, 583: “Oltre a questo i Romani hanno intensificato, e in quasi tutto l’Occidente e in Africa praticamente iniziato, quel processo di urbanizzazione...”

\(^{22}\) TORELLI 1995, 12.

\(^{23}\) MOURITSEN 1998; cf. also MOURITSEN 2006.
supremacy of Rome. In this teleological model Italy was subservient to Rome’s development.

In the traditional view, endorsed by the ancient sources and followed by modern historians, the main reason for the allies to revolt in 91 BC was their supposed eagerness to become official Roman citizens.24 Though it had been acknowledged that other aims may have played a role,25 Mouritsen casts doubts on the Roman narrative in a comprehensive alternative framework, in which Italic peoples fought the Social War for sovereignty, rather than citizenship. Mouritsen traces the modern ‘making of’ the Romanocentric integrative model of Roman-Italic relations back to 19th century German scholarship. Idealist and nationalist notions, suggested by the contemporaneous formation of the German nation, were projected onto the Roman Republic. This view was supported by the most detailed ancient account on the Social War, the version by Appianus, who presents it as a preparatory phase to the following bellum civile. Within the logic of this model, the cultural and political diversity of Italy formed an obstacle in the creation of a unified Italy. Moreover, it could cast doubts on the goals pursued by the Italic allies. Consequently, in order not to undermine the Romanocentric version of the Italian unification, the cultural unity of Italy before the Social War had to be emphasised. Cultural unity on the other hand did not seem self-evident at a time of political rivalry between Rome and the Italic peoples, in the period directly preceding the Social War. Paradoxically, therefore, the idea was put forward that this cultural romanisation must have predated the Hannibalic War.26 According to Mouritsen however, the actual cultural unification occurred only after the political one had been enforced by military power and bloodshed more than a century later: after the Social War.27

Several objections can be made to Mouritsen’s alternative historical reconstruction, especially with regard to the undervaluation of the profits of the Roman citizenship28 and Roman influence in general.29 But his excellent analysis of the ‘idealist’ construction of an early ‘cultural convergence’ of Italy under Rome still stands.30

---

24 The classic is BRUNT 1965.
25 E.g. BRUNT 1965, esp. 91; WALBANK 1972, 152; see discussion of various strands in the argumentation in MOURITSEN 1998.
26 MOURITSEN 1998, 59: “The idea of Italian romanisation was thus both derived from and used to explain the Social War. Therefore, as a historical fact implied by the political events, the existence of cultural romanisation was not itself dependent on evidential demonstration; the sources merely served as illustrations of this phenomenon. The main problem outstanding was how to date this unity – and here the theory of a mounting antagonism between Rome and her allies in the second century suggested that it predated the Hannibalic War.”
27 The periodisation of the major cultural change in the late Republic has also been proposed by various other authors, a.o. GABBA 1972; TORELLI 1983; TORELLI 1995, 14; TORELLI 1999, 89.
28 Cf. e.g. BRADLEY 2007, 302-306; VAN DOOREN 2008.
29 POBJOY 2000; BRADLEY 2002; ADAMS 2003, esp. 150-155 and 751-755 on linguistic aspects. Also Mouritsen’s conception of the “rapid ‘provincial’ process of romanisation” (p. 86) which he sees as “more or less spontaneous acculturation” (p. 74) which would have followed the Social War needs explanation, because here he seems to accept a direct relation between power and culture which he otherwise explicitly dismisses (e.g. p. 70).
30 Cf. also BRADLEY 2002.
The second objection is the mechanism of cultural change which is often presumed in the ‘unification’ model. This mechanism is the already mentioned concept of ‘self-romanisation’ or ‘autoromanizzazione’, developed for Italy most explicitly by Torelli. As said, to some extent this model can be seen as the later theoretical footing for the already existing idea of Roman cultural leadership, although emphasis is put on local initiatives and strategies. According to this concept, Italic peoples would have actively adopted Roman cultural models. Motives for doing so relate to a wish to gain profit from the new power balances (e.g. the joining in trade networks or the pursuit of a political career). Italic elites would also have sought the direct support of their Roman confreres. These aims are thus directed at Rome or the Roman empire at large. Alternatively, adopting the Roman way of life would have secured status within the local community; an ‘internal’ incentive. The most explicit study on self-romanisation positing an ‘internal’ logic is Martin Millett’s work on the romanisation of Britain. Native British elites would have actively adopted symbols of ‘Romanitas’ to reinforce their social position within local society. As a result of restrictions on the use and display of weapons imposed by the Roman rulers, the native social hierarchy would have been endangered. The weapons, important symbols of authority, were now replaced by power symbols from Rome. Material culture, new beliefs, language and attitudes passed down the social hierarchy through a process of emulation. In Millett’s words, “the motor for romanisation can be seen as internally driven, rather than externally imposed”. Local elites could maintain power and thereby identified their interests with those of Rome, enabling Rome again to keep control with minimal effort. Romanisation is understood as the outcome of internal social processes rather than a planned Roman ‘civilizing mission’.

In studies on Italy, with traditionally more emphasis placed on institutional structures, this mechanism would not only account for cultural but also for politico-institutional change. In the view of Emilio Gabba “the assimilation of the behaviour of the Italic elites to Roman norms, which had forged ahead at ever greater speed over the previous century, had gone beyond language and culture to affect the political systems and magistracies of the allied cities”, and indeed speaks of the “assimilation of the political structures of the allies to those of Rome”. The fundamental assumption in the self-romanisation concept is that Roman models were sought after – even if no direct political rule had been established yet. Even political structures would have been ‘affected’ by Roman influence, but without Roman force.

31 Torelli 1995; Torelli 1999, but cf. also, more implicitly, e.g. contributions in Zanker 1976 and Coarelli and La Regina 1984.
32 Millett 1990a; Millett 1990b.
33 MILLETT 1990b, 38.
34 Gabba 1994b, 109, writing on the period on the eve of the Social War. Similarly, on Bantia, Torelli 1995, 137-138 speaks of “a process of spontaneous Romanization, already under way in the full second century BC” and “a Romanization which assumes the form of an economic as well as an institutional homologation”. Cf. the discussion on the lex Osca Bantina, possibly predating the Social War; Crawford 1996, 271-292.
It is exactly against the self-romanisation paradigm that from the 1990s on much criticism has been uttered, at least in the debate in the Anglo-Saxon world – and thus against Millett’s 1990 work. First, the model places crucial emphasis on elites, whereas the rest of the population is not regarded, or is assumed to have followed suit.\textsuperscript{35} The ‘trickle-down effect’ leaves no room for the possibility that some groups may react differently to similar circumstances than others do.\textsuperscript{36} Diversity in responses to Roman dominion is an important possibility also for entire communities: it does not necessarily follow that the new order was always accepted and was possibly even resisted. Indeed, ‘self-romanisation’ still seems to operate within a ‘directional’ framework of thought;\textsuperscript{37} it offers an alternative explanation for how romanisation worked, but still seems to take its occurrence \textit{per se} for granted. In many postcolonial studies emphasis has been put on resistance, often in reaction to the earlier colonial situation and sometimes merely inversing the old colonial discourse.\textsuperscript{38} At least in academia, the militant variant of this approach has not found much support in Italy.\textsuperscript{39} The notion of plurality and diversity in response is, however, certainly important.

A second point of critique at the self-romanisation model is its use of a naïve conception of ‘Roman material culture’, which is not dissimilar from the culture-historical model it seeks to replace. It is assumed that local elites adopted Roman goods to consolidate their position within local society. These goods were, according to Millett, seen as “symbols of Romanitas”, and, for this reason, mediated power to the owner.\textsuperscript{40} But were cultural elements present and produced all over the Roman empire perceived as ‘Roman’ by their beholders? Perhaps they were just part of convenient newly available materials and structures. Meaning is given to artefacts and models; they do not carry an intrinsic ‘Romanness’ in them. Therefore, the adoption of ‘Roman’ elements in itself does not prove a desire to be (seen as) ‘Roman’.\textsuperscript{41} Especially in Anglo-Saxon theoretically driven studies, a whole spectrum of different conceptions of the adoption of material culture and cultural models has been explored, ranging from ‘silent’ or ‘symbolic’ resistance to ‘hybridisation’, ‘creolisation’, ‘métissage’, and so on.\textsuperscript{42} The possible conflictual aspect of these processes has been pointed out: what appears to be a submissive attitude of the ‘subjugated’, may in fact reflect “a complex mix of fear and desire, resistance and adaptation”.\textsuperscript{43} Of course, the main problem with these comparative conceptualisations is anachronism.

\textsuperscript{35}\textsc{Freeman} 1993.
\textsuperscript{36} Cf. \textsc{Hingley} 1996.
\textsuperscript{37} \textsc{Freeman} 1993; \textsc{Hingley} 1996; \textsc{Woolf} 1996-97.
\textsuperscript{38} Most notably, \textsc{Bénabou} 1976; \textsc{Pippidi} 1976; cf. \textsc{Mattingly} 1997a; for general critique of resistance as a model, see \textsc{Brown} 1996.
\textsuperscript{39} In contrast to popular culture, e.g. in Molise, where Samnite resistance against Rome is often exalted. Cf. in some respects \textsc{Salmon} 1967, in which romanisation was, however, always clearly the end stage.
\textsuperscript{40} On the misapplication of the term \textit{Romanitas}, first attested in Tert. \textit{Pall.} 4.1.1., see \textsc{Dench} 2005, 31 with n. 84.
\textsuperscript{41} \textsc{Freeman} 1993, esp. 444; cf. \textsc{Woolf} 1996-97.
\textsuperscript{42} See \textsc{Mattingly} 2002.
\textsuperscript{43} \textsc{Webster} 1996-97, 327.
Notwithstanding assertions to the contrary,\(^\text{44}\) one may ask if it is legitimate to discern a similar ‘discourse’ between ‘Romans’ and ‘natives’ on the one hand and a slave driver and his slaves on the other,\(^\text{45}\) or (early) modern colonial powers in Africa and the East and the local population.\(^\text{46}\) Crucially, in many of these conceptualisations more or less separate cultures before colonial contact are presupposed, which in the case of the highly interconnected Mediterranean world is absolutely untenable.\(^\text{48}\)

A third, more sophisticated point is the emphasis on ideology in a constructive, rather than oppositional sense. Partly as a reaction to processualist archaeology, especially in the Anglo-Saxon debate from the 1990s on, several studies have explored the importance of ideological frameworks. Studies have concentrated on the local (‘native’) embedding of new cultural forms, and have tried to explain regional diversity in this respect.\(^\text{49}\) For example, local communities could sometimes use new material culture to similar ends within the societal structures of old, through a process of ‘cultural bricolage’,\(^\text{50}\) or even form new communities as a consequence of a changed socio-political order.\(^\text{51}\) Cognitive aspects and ideologies are thus of utmost importance for the way in which people experience and order the (material) world, and thus in the way newly available elements or ideas are adopted. The ‘construction’ of communities needs thus not entail a choice for ‘Roman’ or for ‘native’, but this does not mean that Rome was insignificant in the process. It has convincingly been argued that a common reaction of communities to threat entails enhancing its symbolic ‘boundaries’. Historians and social anthropologists alike have demonstrated this process of symbolic enhancement, in which sometimes ‘ancestral’ traditions are evoked or invented, but also ‘new’ elements are used to model the own distinctiveness and pride.\(^\text{52}\) Often, religious or ritual institutions, such as festivals, processions and sacred meetings play an important role in this process.\(^\text{53}\) Arguably sanctuaries, the

\[^{44}\]WEBSTER 1996-97, 330: “there is a point beyond which the ‘fact’ of colonialism cannot be deconstructed, but within which the discourses of colonialism maybe subject to comparative analysis.”

\[^{45}\]E.g. FINCHAM 2002, drawing on SCOTT 1990.

\[^{46}\]Cf. DENCH 2005, 10: “to counter images of Roman cosmopolitanism and ‘do-it-yourself’ ‘Romanization’ with images of domination and discrimination, creating a nightmare world, is still to place modern dreams too much at the centre.”

\[^{47}\]Or at least their theoretical footings borrowed from the social sciences.

\[^{48}\]See HORDEN and PURCELL 2000. In this sense, the term “mediterranization” (YNTEMA 2006, 126) would be more appropriate; cf. CURTI, DENCH and PATTERSON 1996, 188 for other “–isations” as different perspectives on cultural change than ‘romanisation’. Cf. however infra on the undeniable importance of Roman agency in these processes.

\[^{49}\]E.g. METZLER, MILLET, ROY mans and SLOFSTRA 1995. N. Roymans, for example, holds “different regimes of ideas and values” (most notably “high social esteem for military virtues and animal husbandry”) responsible for macro-regional diversity in romanisation processes in the Lower Rhine populations: ROY MANS 1995; ROY MANS 1996, 8 (quote). On ritual and religion: DERKS 1998.


\[^{51}\]E.g. VAN DOMMELEN 1998; VAN DOMMELEN 2001; VAN DOMMELEN and TERRE NATO 2007.

\[^{52}\]E.g. BARTH 1969; HOBSBAWM and RANGER 1983; COHEN 1985.

\[^{53}\]Esp. COHEN 1985.
material part of some of these activities, are therefore suitable locales for investigation into processes of enhancement, or formulation, of communities.\textsuperscript{54} A last important point concerns the rehabilitation of the impact of Roman strategies, and the dismissal of the conception of ‘Rome’ as a constant factor: changing Roman attitudes will have had major implications for local and regional developments.\textsuperscript{55} The re-emphasising of Roman agency is in part a reaction to the native-oriented postcolonial approaches with a tendency to neglect Roman impact. In Italy, the importance of Roman strategies and intervention has almost never been doubted: the literary sources list colonisation, forced migration, and even genocide. Roman impact on itself has therefore hardly been underestimated in studies on the romanisation of Italy, but at the same time there has been a tendency to understand this impact as a rather constant factor, and especially to retroject it to earlier periods for which evidence is scarce or non-existent. It is important to acknowledge that Roman impact and strategies will have varied considerably over time. Quite apart still from the discussion on material culture and its limits, one should ask to what extent ‘Rome’ itself was a solid and continuous entity, and changes in self-perceptions over time and place should be taken into account.\textsuperscript{56} Recently the suggestion to speak of the ‘romanisation of Rome’ when considering the Republican period has been raised,\textsuperscript{57} and perhaps this offers some clues for the variegated character of the ‘romanisation’ of other parts of Italy too.

\textit{Conclusion: Deconstruction and New Perspectives}

To sum up, the objections against the view which posits early cultural convergence under Roman guidance are quite serious. Also, the later developed conception of the mechanism of cultural change – self-romanisation – which accommodated this view well has proved to be problematic. The common ground in both the cultural convergence and self-romanisation concept is readily discerned: its origin in an ‘idealist’ notion which presupposes Roman superiority, and consequently the superiority of Roman cultural models. Indeed, in the discourse on the romanisation of Italy generally less attention has been paid to material culture, and more to ideological, political and institutional issues. Somewhat paradoxically, empiric research has traditionally occupied an important place; but the interpretation of material culture has often been subservient to idealist conceptions.\textsuperscript{58} In romanisation studies this becomes apparent by the emphasis on political and ideological aspects, often distilled from (later) literary accounts, whereas the cultural consequences are often seen as mere illustrations or ‘proofs’ of these phenomena. The role of early and mid-Republican colonisation is a good example; little hard proof is fitted into (mostly literary) models

\textsuperscript{55} E.g. HANSON 1997; WHITTAKER 1997; HÄUSSLER 1998; WILLIAMS 2001.
\textsuperscript{56} Cf. DENCH 2005.
\textsuperscript{57} CURTI 2000, 90-91.
\textsuperscript{58} Cf. in general BARBANERA 1998; TERRENATO 2005.
of later fabrication (cf. the discussion on the religious aspects of Latin colonies treated in Chapter 2 and their urban organisation in Chapter 7). A remark made by Torelli concerning this evidential situation is revealing; he states that romanisation would often only be “detectable in its terminal stages, when productive, cultural, and political integration appears to be complete”.\(^{59}\) Apparently, the early stages exist only in the idea.

Another clear example is the way ‘hellenisation’ has been fitted into the idealist model of Roman cultural supremacy. In the course of the 20\(^{th}\) century, the conception of Rome as the centre of cultural influence, radiating new ‘Roman’ cultural forms proved to be untenable, and it became clear that rather ‘Hellenistic’ culture accounted for most of the change. Within the idealist framework, an attractive alternative could thus rise: the image of Rome as propagator of Hellenistic culture.\(^{60}\) Since evidence for this guiding role is scarce (cf. e.g. Chapter 3), here material evidence is subservient to an aprioristic model of Roman superiority.\(^{61}\)

What may be concluded is that the image of an already culturally homogeneous or strongly ‘romanising’ Italy in the third and second centuries BC, so strongly attacked by Mouritsen, can indeed be questioned since part of the basis of this conception proves to be weak. However, it is important to emphasise that these objections do not necessarily prove to the contrary: that Rome was only of minor importance in cultural respects in this period. But the above discussion at least has shown that such a role is not self-evident. This is in itself an important conclusion, as will be seen throughout this study. Furthermore, the conception of specific cultural elements as signalling ‘Romanness’ is not self-evident, as post-processual archaeologists have shown. Neither is the existence of a coherent, culturally distinctive and identifiable ‘Roman’ Rome from the early Republic to the imperial period. However, even if this ‘Rome’ was perhaps more varied, capricious and contradictory than often is supposed in regional studies, and was clearly in an important transformation process itself, the impact of this same Rome was fundamental, even solely measured by its military and political actions. In any case, we cannot afford to underestimate it. This means that the processes following the Roman conquest should not necessarily be conceptualised merely in neutral or positive terms; such as, indeed, ‘self-romanisation’, but also more recent conceptions as ‘negotiation’ or ‘becoming Roman’.\(^{62}\)

This discussion leaves us therefore with a big question mark regarding the cultural developments in the third and especially the second centuries BC. Cultural

---

59 Torelli 1999, 89.

60 Mouritsen 1998, 59-86; esp. 82-83. In the words of Salmon 1982, 100: “Hellenistic sculpture, painting and architectural details, Hellenistic writing and modes of thought came to be quickly noted and eclectically imitated at Rome, and Rome’s hegemony ensured their rapid transmission into other parts of Italy.”

61 Cf. similar observations by Gallini 1973, on hellenisation and ‘romanità’.

62 Cf. Curti 2001, 24 on the political correctness of recent conceptions of romanisation as ‘negotiation’ or ‘debate’, “sanitizing our perception of the Roman empire”, cf. also Cecconi 2006; Dench 2005, 32: “Despite modern nervousness about Romano-centric perspectives, it is hard to deny that sometimes empire was experienced or exercised as, primarily, power and domination ...”
convergence cannot be taken for granted, but neither should Rome be eliminated from these developments by overstating a laisser-faire policy. In sum, fundamental changes, yet no obvious cultural compass: a recipe for a dynamic interplay, including clashes, of various groups and currents. Therefore, this question mark should rather be seen as a challenge, than as a *non liquet*. The above discussion indicates some clear outlines for possible approaches. Especially the ideological construction and reformulation of communities in Italy after the conquest seems a promising avenue; these – fortunately – can have a material dimension. The crux is therefore to identify the locations where these ideological discourses are expressed, and to contextualise them as fully as possible. As has been seen, ‘religion’, in the communal sense, and sanctuaries as their material focus, seem such appropriate locations. In Chapter 3 this conception will indeed be proposed for Samnite sanctuaries in the second to early first centuries BC. Importantly, this approach accounts for ‘Roman’ communities as well – as will be argued in Chapters 7, 8 and 9. But first the idea of ‘religious romanisation’ will be discussed in the following chapter.
Chapter 2

‘Religious Romanisation’ and the Fate of
Italic Rural Sanctuaries

Italic and Roman Religion

When we come to speak about the religious aspects of the romanisation of Italy, it becomes clear that opinions on this matter have not developed analogously to the ideas on the ‘general’ romanisation of Italy in every respect. There are, of course, important parallels, but the subject has not been discussed as explicitly and vehemently as ‘general’ romanisation. Perhaps this is partly due to the fact that with ‘romanisation’ often implicitly themes of material culture are intended, which are the realm of archaeologists, whereas Italic and Roman religion have traditionally been the field of Religionswissenschaftler, ancient historians and especially linguists, who have been less preoccupied with the predominantly Anglo-Saxon archaeologically oriented discussion on romanisation. In any case, if the discrepancy in the development of the research agendas between studies on Italy and the provinces is already evident for the general romanisation discussion, it is unmistakable in the religious realm.\(^1\)

One might discern three tendencies in modern scholarship which have influenced ideas on the religious aspects of the romanisation of Italy. First, Italic religion has usually been studied separately from discussions on the Roman conquest and romanisation. It is seen a distinctive aspect of Italic culture, and is treated in chapters or books in which the coming of Rome figures mainly as an endpoint.\(^2\) Indeed, with the general waning of pre-Roman cultures (cf. Strabo 6.1.2), the related religions would have faded as well. This notion fits well into the traditional conception of crisis and subsequent cultural assimilation to Rome in the fourth to third centuries BC (Chapter 1).

---

\(^1\) In contrast to studies on the situation in Italy, the bibliography of explicit studies on the religious aspects of the romanisation of the provinces is huge. Cf. e.g. HENIG 1984; METZLER, MILLET, ROYMANs and SLOFSTRA 1995; WEBSTER 1995; DERKS 1998; FRANKFURTER 1998; SCHEID 1999; VAN ANDRINGA 2002; HÄUSSLER 2005; HÄUSSLER and KING 2007.

\(^2\) E.g. BOTTINI 1994.
Second, in many studies on Italic religion the basic similarities to Roman religion are pointed out. Departing from the concept of a basic ‘Italic religion’, Roman religion would be analogous to or part of it. Since direct literary evidence for Italic religion is virtually absent and it is primarily known from the material record, the literary evidence for Rome has been combined with the Italic evidence to construct a meaningful framework. Especially in studies on religion influenced by Indo-European theory a tendency to fit all evidence into one model is clear, to the effect that no meaningful difference can be made between Roman and other Italic religions even before the ‘coming of Rome’ in Italy. It is important, however, to acknowledge regional diversity within Italic religions, which may be largely hidden by a lack of evidence and indeed this tendency in scholarship to merge evidence from different contexts into one model. Perhaps it is right to underscore, with Olivier de Cazanove, that the religions of different Italic peoples are “in fact homologous religious cultures, but they do not coincide exactly”, and to account for incompatibilities as well. Even if the evidence is scarce, it seems that at least some different conceptions existed. For example, the votive formula *brateis datas* (“for given favour”), widely spread in the interior, Oscan speaking areas, seems to betray a very different conception of the relation between men and god than in the Latin formula *domon dat lubens merito* (“gives his offering willing and deservedly”): whereas the Oscan formula emphasises the favour granted by the god, the Latin formula stresses the fulfillment of the vow by the dedicator. Moreover, even if the religious systems may have been similar, this does of course not imply that Roman and other Italic religions were interchangeable, or indeed ‘open’ to everyone (cf. infra). Third, concerning a later period in time, a similar ‘merging’ of the evidence becomes apparent. General studies on Roman Italy, i.e. Italy after its incorporation into the Roman state, have almost without exception assumed that religious practices in ‘Roman Italy’ were basically identical to those known from the city of Rome. In this way, the cults, festivals and calendar from Rome have been extrapolated to the whole of Italy. These assumptions on religion in Roman Italy prove to be problematic, but more disturbing in this discussion is that the developments between the *floruit* of ‘Italic religions’ and the presence of an apparently entirely ‘Roman’ religion few centuries later disappears in the gap between disciplines. It is fair to ask what has happened in the meantime. My concern here is not so much about changing religious ideas and belief systems, which is a subject of its own, but rather about ideas on the relation between Roman political dominance and Roman and Italic religious practices and cult places.

---

3 For an overview of ideas on continuities from prehistorical (Mycenaean) times on, cf. CANCIK 2008, esp. 8-13. Cf. also RÜPKE 2007, 2.
4 Cf. esp. the works by Dumézil.
6 RIX 2000.
7 E.g. LOMAS 1996, esp. 166: “Rome itself is the best-documented city in Italy in terms of religious ritual, but the pattern of religious behaviour seems to be broadly similar elsewhere in Italy.”
8 See e.g. COOLEY 2006 for nuanced cases of Roman religious aspects outside Rome; for calendars, see RÜPKE 1995.
Ch. 2. ‘Religious Romanisation’

Rome in Italy

NON-INTERVENTION AS A POLICY AND ITS EXCEPTIONS

What was the Roman attitude to Italic religious life? With some exceptions, the general idea seems to be that Rome fostered a minimum-intervention policy with regard to religious affairs in Italy outside its territory. Rome would have been generally uninterested in what happened outside Roman territory on a religious level, and this would have changed only after the municipalisation. This idea follows from the conception of Roman religion as basically a state religion, which only had relevance for its subjects.\(^9\) Conversion or proselytism obviously has no role to play in such a model.\(^10\) The civic model of Roman religion means that Rome could only actively influence religious matters in the areas whose inhabitants had citizenship, i.e. municipia and colonies.\(^11\) This would mean that we can only speak meaningfully of the ‘religious romanisation’ of the socii after the Social War, if we define romanisation here in an active sense as incorporation into the Roman state. And even then this process should not be seen as the rude imposition of totally new cults, but rather as a reorganisation of existing cults according to Roman standards. In the incorporated communities, pre-existing cults could be perpetuated as part of the municipalia sacra, which are defined by Festus as those cults “which the peoples concerned had always observed, before receiving Roman citizenship, and which the pontiffs wanted them to continue to observe and perform in the traditional forms of old”.\(^12\) John Scheid has emphasised the fundamental importance of the local authorities and traditions in the formation of a new religious system in colonies and municipia in the Roman western provinces, and it could be argued that the situation was not very different in Italy.\(^13\) To put it briefly, from the moment that a given area became part of the Roman state, local representatives of Roman authority probably had something to say about the official cults that were celebrated and how they were to be organised, and it is in this controlling mechanism that ‘religious romanisation’ could perhaps be recognised.\(^14\)

The civic model does not, of course, preclude the possibility that Italic people adopted of their own free will aspects or elements that appear to belong to what we define Roman, in other words, self-romanisation on a religious level. As will be seen, such a process has indeed been conceptualised by some scholars. But on the whole there is a

---

9 Scheid 1985a; Scheid 1985b, 47-76. Cf. on prodigies Rosenberger 2005.
11 For a strong statement of this view: De Cazanove 2000c. On Latin colonies, with the Latin right, cf. infra.
12 Fest. 146 L.: municipalia sacra vocantur, quae ab initio habuerunt ante civitatem Romanam acceptam, quae observare eos voluerunt pontifices, et eo more facere, quo adsuissent antiquitus.
13 Even if the difference between Italian and provincial municipalities should be acknowledged. Scheid 1997, esp. 55-56; cf. also Scheid 1999; De Cazanove 2000c, 73; Frateantonio 2003, 70-73; De Cazanove 2007, 55 suggests that the cults listed in Verg. Aen. 7 may be examples of these sacra, but some of these are actually colonised cults, for which cf. infra.
14 In the words of Rüpke: “If the Romans did not export their religion, they certainly exported their concept of religion.” Rüpke 2007, 5.
consensus on the general laissez-faire attitude by Rome with regard to religious matters outside its territory before the Social War.

To this general rule of non-intervention before the Social War, two important exceptions are often highlighted. In the first place, the attempted suppression of the Bacchanalia in 186 BC by a senatusconsultum, and in the second place the colonies and their cults and rituals. Another, related topic which could be added is the (supposed) treatment of Italic sanctuaries by Rome, which will be commented upon later.

THE SENATUSCONSULTUM DE BACCHANALIBUS

In the case of the senatusconsultum de Bacchanalibus literary and epigraphical sources meet one another in the description given in Livy’s book 39 (8-19) and an inscription with, apparently, a copy of the edict found in 1640 near the Calabrian locality of Tiriolo. It appears that the Senate wished to curtail the Bacchanalia, and Livy vividly explains the circumstances around the discovery of the coniuratio. It does not seem necessary to discuss the nature of the evidence and the debate on the Bacchanalia itself, which has an immense bibliography, but I would like to highlight here only relevant points for the discussion on Roman interference within allied territory.

Livy writes on several occasions that the Bacchanalia were suppressed not only in Rome, but per totam Italiam. Thus, at first appearance it seems that Rome did, in fact, intervene in the religious affairs of the allies as well. But the concept of Italia has changed over time, and it is not to be excluded that it referred in the first place to Roman territory within the Italian peninsula, or at least was used variably, a situation which may have been misunderstood by imperial authors (such as Livy) writing in a, by then, unified Italy. The aforementioned inscription that seems to bear the senatusconsultum summarised by Livy was found in Tiriolo, ancient Bruttium. A small settlement of the third and second century BC has been excavated here.

---

17 Liv. 39.14.7; 17.4; 18.7. Livy writes (39.14.7) that the priests and priestesses of the Bacchanalia should be looked for “not only in Rome, but also in all the fora and conciliabula”, and continues that edicts should be dispatched et in urbe et per totam Italiam. It has been argued that Italia is used here as a stylistic variation on fora et conciliabula, and in this context would be synonymous with ‘Roman Italy”; i.e. those parts of Italy that held the citizenship, and therefore does not include allied territory (MOURITSEN 1998, 50-52). Liv. 39.17.4 does refer to the Italian allies, but does not mention Roman intervention, whereas 39.18.7-8 repeats the general Roma / Italia distinction; cf. DE CAZANOVE 2000b.
18 GALSTERER 1976, 37-41 (38 on the Bacchanalian affair) proposed that Italia as a legal term refers only to ager Romanus in the second century BC, cf. MOURITSEN 1998, 45 n. 25 who criticises, however, the notion of a common terminology in all sources, with further references. For a clear overview of the evidence (esp. Polyb. 6.13.4-6 and Livy 39) and the ideas on the meaning of Italia see MOURITSEN 1998, 45-58. Cf. Pailler’s reaction on Galsterer, PAILLER 1986, 330-332.
19 KAHRSTEDT 1959, 191; SPADEA 1977; SPADEA 1988, the site seems to have been abandoned at the beginning of the second century BC however (connected by DE CAZANOVE 2000b, 63 to the installation of the colony of Vibo).
document mentions the *ager Teuranus*, which probably coincides with modern Tiriolo. This area was presumably *ager publicus populi Romani*, confiscated from the Bruttians, at least from the second Punic war on.\(^{20}\) Both the locations mentioned by Livy in the context of the Bacchanalian affair, and the place of recovery of the inscription could thus possibly relate to Roman and Latin territories, not to *socii*, which has suggested that the suppression of the Bacchanalia was restricted to Roman territory.\(^{21}\) 

However, the opening lines of the inscription suggest something else. The edict regards explicitly ‘the Bacchanalia of the *foideratei*’ (lines 2-3: *de bacanalibus quei foideratei esent*). It seems that the Bacchanalia (which can indicate both the rituals and the cult places involved) of a *civitas foederata* are meant; not those on Roman territory. Mommsen has tried to resolve the discrepancy between the place and the target group by suggesting that *foideratei* indicates not a political status, but rather the sworn members of the cult.\(^{22}\) But since *foederatus* is not used in this sense elsewhere, this solution remains doubtful.\(^{23}\) Jean-Marie Pailler has proposed that *foideratei* generally refers to the inhabitants of the confiscated territory who did not have the Latin or Roman rights,\(^ {24}\) and De Cazanove has recently suggested that the ‘Latin allies’ are intended, i.e. the inhabitants of a Latin colony, perhaps Vibo Valentia, installed in 192 BC.\(^ {25}\) 

Lines 7-8 of the inscription state that neither *cives Romani, nomen latinum* nor *socii* can participate in the Bacchanalia unless special authorisation is granted by the *praetor urbanus* and the Senate. Allies are thus banned from the cult. However, it is not said that this accounts for allied territory as well: it is possible that line 7 is only an explication of the reach of the edict within Roman territory, affecting people of all legal statuses.\(^ {26}\) 

The archaeological evidence for the repression of the Bacchanalia is ambiguous too: there is dispute about the only *Bacchanal* outside Roman territory that would have


\(^{21}\) Recently, Mouritsen 1998; De Cazanove 2000c; De Cazanove 2000b (arguing for Latin territory, however, cf. *infra*).

\(^{22}\) Mommsen 1877: 1, 249, n. 3; Mommsen 1899, 875, followed by many others, amongst whom Galsterer 1976, 169 and more recently Mouritsen 1998.

\(^{23}\) Pailler 1986, 290 dismisses this interpretation. In defense of Mommsen’s thesis, Mouritsen 1998, 54 considers this counterargument “hardly cogent”, since “the source is very early and deals with an otherwise unique situation”.

\(^{24}\) Pailler 1986, 290-291.

\(^{25}\) De Cazanove 2000b, esp. 61-62, cf. Dahlheim 1968, 118 n. 19 for the consideration that relations between Latin colonies and Rome were regulated by a *foedus*; cf. Mouritsen 1998, 53 n. 46. Perhaps the *ager Teuranus* was part of the colony of Vibo; cf. Costabile 1984, 96, who suggests that it represents one of the *fora et conciliabula* mentioned by Livy, but depended on the colony. De Cazanove’s thesis is dismissed by Pfeilschifter 2006, 120 n. 26, in light of the distance between Vibo and Tiriolo, and the, ultimately, curious use of *foederati* for ‘Latin allies’. 

\(^{26}\) Mouritsen 1998, 55. This would thus constitute a useless repetition of what actually was self-evident.
been demolished as a consequence of the senatusconsultum, at Bolsena (Volsinii). De Cazanove has tried to eliminate this possible archaeological attestation of the repression by arguing that it was not a cult place but a cistern.\(^{27}\) However, the archaeological evidence seems to point indeed to a Bacchic cult place.\(^{28}\) Another example of a Bacchanal outside Roman territory apparently survived however. The Bacchic sanctuary of S. Abbondio near Pompeii, originating in the third century BC and still in use in 79 AD, would, according to the excavators, have survived the senatusconsultum because it was one of the ancient and respectable cult places exempted from persecution (Liv. 39.18.7).\(^{29}\) It is true that this reasoning strips the archaeological evidence of the possibility to test the thesis of Roman intervention outside Roman territory, but I doubt whether this evidence can be used as ‘a strong argument’ to the contrary, i.e. that the legislative reach of the edict included only ager Romanus.\(^{30}\) For example, this Dionysiac cult place could have been closed temporarily, invisible in the archaeological record, or did not have an orgiastic character,\(^{31}\) the main point of Roman concern. But we also ignore the relation between the intentions of the Roman authorities and their practical effectiveness.\(^{32}\) In order to employ archaeological data meaningfully in this discussion a larger sample size than one or two is needed.

In any case, as far as regards the reach of the senatusconsultum de Bacchanalibus, Pailler does not accept the notion that allies are included. And more recently, both Mouritsen and De Cazanove, independent from each other, came – though by different interpretations – to the conclusion that the senatusconsultum was limited to Roman territory. This might seem legitimate in light of the location, but the interpretation of foideratei remains problematic. Perhaps, it could be suggested that foideratei indeed refers to the most obvious meaning of the word, i.e. citizens of civitatis foederatae; socii, but that the inscription of Tiriolo was directed at Roman / Latin citizens. This ‘inconsistency’ could perhaps be explained if we understood better the particular process by which the inscription was constituted.\(^{33}\)

\(^{27}\) DE CAZANOVE 2000a.
\(^{28}\) JOLIVET and MARCHAND 2003.
\(^{29}\) ELIA and PUGLIESE CARRATELLI 1975, 146-153; ELIA and PUGLIESE CARRATELLI 1979.
\(^{30}\) Thus MOURITSEN 1998, 56.
\(^{32}\) Cf. the surprise of the Roman authorities at the discovery by Sp. Postumius, whilst engaged in his enquiries, that the Roman colonies of Sipontum and Buxentum, founded only 9 years before, were left by its inhabitants (Liv. 39.23.3-4).
\(^{33}\) Andreas Bendlin, during the conference held at Dresden in November 2007, argues that in theory Rome could interfere in religious affairs in allied territory, but that the senatusconsultum under study referred to “Angehörige der eigenen sozialen Schicht”. Discussion on the formation and composition of the inscription, by Roman or local authorities, or both: e.g. BERNARD 1908; FRAENKEL 1932; KEIL 1934; KRAUSE 1936; MACDONALD 1944, esp. 28-31; on the importance of the public declamation of the text cf. MARTINA 1998.
A preliminary conclusion could be that in the case of the Bacchanalia Rome indeed aspired to intervene in religious affairs outside its territory. Because of the exceptional character (and still somewhat dubious evidence) I would hesitate however to consider the Bacchanalian affair as proof for the existence of a Roman policy of religious intervention. Another argument to separate the extraordinary Bacchanalian affair from the discussion on religious romanisation is that the repression was apparently prompted by concerns on a socio-political level, not by the cult itself. The measures described in the *senatusconsultum* regard especially the organisation of the cult, which must be placed under Roman control.34

**COLONIES AND CULTS**

Perhaps the Bacchanalian affair can be, at most, described as a negative form of Roman influence in the religious sphere: repression and control, not the active spread of Roman forms of religion seems to have been the objective.35 An active spread of Roman religious ideas has been recognised relatively unequivocally, however, in relation to Roman colonisation. Not only are these newly installed communities thought to have performed rituals according to Roman customs themselves, but they are also conceptualised as strategical centres for the consequent spread of Roman culture and religion in Italy outside the colonial settlements. Indeed, colonies have been described as the “greatest tool of social and military control, and afterwards of Romanization”,36 and even as “religious staging posts of Roman expansion”.37 The foundation ritual of colonies is thought to have been ‘Roman’, including the ploughing of the *sulcus primigenius*, thereby marking the *pomerium*, and the offering of the first fruits of the earth in a ritual pit.38 Also, Roman foundation myths were used to consolidate the Roman efforts, as in the case of the Latin colony of Luceria in Daunia, where apparently an Athena Iliaus cult recalled the Trojan myth.39 Together with the installation of the new *oppidum* a political and ideological set of elements was implanted, which more or less copied the urban organisation of the mother city in synthetic form. Colonies were actually ‘small Romes’, as Aulus Gellius put it still in AD 169.40 Amongst these elements are the *auguraculum*, the *forum*, and, perhaps most important of all, the typical *Capitolium*-temple. These temples with three *cellae* are

34 But cf. NORTH 1979, 91, on the inseparability of religious and political issues: “It is obviously a relevant and important fact that the Senate should be so interested in controlling the external form and property of the Bacchic group. But it would be quite wrong to argue that this interest in organization shows that they were indifferent about the religious issue”; cf. also NIPPEL 1997 for the social / psychological motives; 72: “Eine Erklärung für das massive Zuschlagen dürfte in einem tief in der römischen politischen Kultur verwurzelten Verschwörungssyndrom liegen,” and LINKE 2000, esp. 272-273.

35 On the important mechanism of control as a factor of change, cf. *infra*.

36 TORELLI 1999, 3. Cf. SALMON 1969, 54: “the Latin colonies … were the real instrument in the romanization of Italy.”

37 DE CAZANOVE 2000c, 75.

38 Cf. e.g. the vivid accounts in BROWN 1980, 16-17 and SALMON 1969, 24; see now GARGOLA 1995.


40 Gell. 16.13.9. Cf. SALMON 1969, 18: “… although Gellius was referring to colonies of his own day (AD 169), his description is valid to a great extent also for those of the Republic.”
thought to have expressed pro urbanity and Romanness, to the effect that others in the area came to admire and eventually imitate the model. The Etrusco-Italic temple model would thus have spread as a superior symbol of Romanness and urbanity.\textsuperscript{41} A similar case has been made for the terracotta decoration of the temples and the ideological program of the depicted figures and scenes.\textsuperscript{42} Architecture and decoration forged a firm relation with the metropolis.

Similarly, the ties between the colonies were strengthened by rituals, some of which were performed in the same way as at the shrine of Diana on the Aventine: in various colonies reference is made to this sacred law set up in Rome for the regulation of the colonial cults.\textsuperscript{43} Also the dedication of black gloss cups to the gods, so-called \textit{pocola deorum}, has been interpreted as a typically colonial ritual, which would establish a link between the colonies themselves on the one hand and with Rome on the other. Not only the black gloss cups themselves are regarded as ‘Roman / Latin’ or ‘romanised’,\textsuperscript{44} but also their use, and especially the gods that are inscribed on them would relate to specifically Roman or Latin religious ideas (cf. Chapter 7).\textsuperscript{45} Other types of black gloss ceramics have similarly been related to Roman influence in colonial contexts.\textsuperscript{46} Another typical colonial practice would have formed the dedication of anatomical ex-votos of the so-called Etrusco-Latial-Campanian group of votive materials. The appearance of this specific type of terracotta dedications in the form of human body parts, probably offered in thanks or as requests for a cure, fertility or general wellbeing, has been linked geographically to Roman colonisation.\textsuperscript{47} The phenomenon would have been introduced from Greece\textsuperscript{48} to Latium, and from there the practice would have followed the stages of the Roman conquest of Italy closely, in particular the areas occupied by Latin colonies. They would have been “véritables indicateurs de

\textsuperscript{41} Torelli 1999, 127.

\textsuperscript{42} E.g. Strazzulla 1981; Torelli 1993a; cf. Guidobaldi 1995 for the \textit{ager Praetutianus}.

\textsuperscript{43} At Salona (AD 137), Narbo (AD 11) and Ariminum (first century AD). Cf. Beard, North and Price 1998, 330. Cf. e.g. the map in Torelli 1999, 123 fig. 54, with the legend: “Map of distribution of architectural terracottas of Etrusco-Italic type: hachured the original area; in grey the second-century BC diffusion as a consequence of imitation (Umbrian area) or of the influence of Roman colonization (Picene and Samnite areas)”.

\textsuperscript{44} Morel and Coarelli 1973. Cf. Franchi De Bellis 1995, 370 who states, on the relation between colonists and material culture (after citing Gellius) that especially the evidence of ceramics “delinea, nei primi anni della colonia … una continuità di gusti e stili tipicamente ‘romani’”, also with regard to the preferred forms. She links these preferences to the Latial origin of the colonists. Nonnis in Cifarelli, Ambrosini and Nonnis 2002-2003 sees the spread of the \textit{pocola} also as indicative of romanisation, just as the so-called ‘Heraklesschalen’.

\textsuperscript{45} Cf. Ortalli 2000, 503 and Franchi De Bellis 1995, 371. In Chapter 7 the so-called \textit{pocola} of Ariminum are discussed in more detail.


\textsuperscript{48} Sometimes connected, incorrectly, with the introduction of Aesculapius in Rome in 293 BC: e.g. Comella 1982-1983; De Cazano\textit{e} 2000c with the critique by Schultz in her review of De Cazano\textit{e} 2000c in BMCR (2002.06.30) and Glinister 2006, 21-23.
Thus the appearance of votives of this type in the southern Latin colonies of Luceria (314 BC) and Paestum (273 BC) has been interpreted as indicative of the link between colonisation and the spread of the model. Often a very direct connection between the ethnic or legal status of people and material culture is made: Torelli argues for example that regional differences in the content of deposits reflect differences in the make-up of the population, full Roman citizens being responsible for ‘standard’ votive deposits, and *cives sine suffragio* for anomalies. Similarly, ex-votos of this type are seen as direct indicators of the presence of Roman colonists outside the area of origin. In any case, the anatomical votives are charged with ideological weight; according to Torelli: “Latin colonisation was responsible for propagating, well beyond the original borders of central Etruria, Latium, and Campania, the use of anatomic ex-votos, with all the possible implications of such use – a striking sign of Roman superiority both in the ideological and material sphere.”

It is important to point out that, in the common opinion, the material reflections of these typical Roman colonial religious models are not restricted to the colonies and the colonists themselves. Rather, these symbols of *urbanitas* and Romaness irradiated from the colonies and affected the surrounding areas. The colonies were in every respect *propugnacula imperii* in Cicero’s *Leg. agr.* 2.73), strongholds of Roman control, and spreading Roman religion outside Rome. Temple architecture, terracotta decoration, and anatomical ex-votos have been assigned key roles as ideological-religious aspects of Roman colonisation. But at the same time these ideological-religious aspects are seen as the agents and markers of ‘religious romanisation’ beyond the colonies: they would have functioned rather as catalysts, and their beneficiary influence would have spread into the ‘indigenous’ Italic areas. Thus, especially the *Capitolium* model would have expressed urbanity and Roman ideals, an abstraction of imperial power and sophistication, and its prestige was the reason to

---


50 The diversity would reflect “the difference in treatment of the areas after the Roman conquest and the consequences of different types of population mix. Trebula and Corvaro [where votive deposits of the Latin type were found], with their more distinctly Roman cultural and religious characteristics, suggest that their territories were included in the *agri quaestorii* and were therefore lands primarily, if not exclusively inhabited by Roman citizens, while the votive deposits of Nursia and Plestia, with their mixed character, perfectly reflect the situation of the *praefecturae* … where, for time at least, *cives optimo iure* cohabited with *cives sine suffragio*”. (TORELLI 1999, 122).

51 TORELLI 1983, 241 on “le tangibili prove di questa presenza coloniale rispetto alle aree circostanti appartenenti a *socii*” and “l’impatto ‘romanizzatore’” in relation to, amongst other things, the votive deposits of Trebula Mutuesca and Carsoli. Cf. also COARELLI 2000, 200, on the votives in *Pisaurum*: “questo tipo di ex-voto è caratteristica esclusiva della cultura laziale: esso costituisce in effetti uno dei più sicuri fossili-guida per identificare la presenza, al di fuori dell’area di origine, di coloni provenienti da Roma o dal Lazio. La presenza di tali oggetti nel *lucus* pesarese attesta, senza possibilità di dubbio, la frequentazione di esso da parte di coloni viritani …”

52 TORELLI 1999, 41-42.

adopt the model for the Italic neighbours. Indeed, according to Torelli, “the superiority of the [scil. urban] model ... rendered easy and consequential the exportation of the cultural forms ingrained in that model. Amongst these cultural forms Etrusco-Italic temple building ... took first place”. This reasoning posits therefore a development from centre to periphery, with colonies as intermediary points. In this way, architectural or artistic developments in the ‘remote’ Italic areas can all be linked ultimately to Rome. For example, the Samnite three cellae temple at Pietrabbondante is thought to have been inspired by Roman models (cf. Chapter 3). While describing the general influence of Hellenistic culture through the mediation by Rome, Salmon states: “The inspiration clearly came from Rome. The many new temples, for instance, owed much to her example,” and further on, on Pentrian Samnium: “The temples were not necessarily built to Roman measurements, but in style, lay-out and decoration they owed much to Rome.”

However, this conception of the romanising role of colonies draws heavily on both a rather unilinear conception of cultural communication (cf. Chapter 1) and a narrow and specific conception of Roman colonisation, which in the last years has been attacked seriously. As to the latter, in recent studies the uniform and stable, and indeed ‘Roman’ character of colonies in especially the mid-Republican period has been problematised and to an extent undermined. Especially Michael Crawford, Elizabeth Fentress, and, in most detail, Edward Bispham have shown that much of what we thought to know on mid-Republican colonisation is actually reconstructed on the basis of late Republican and imperial evidence, reflecting to a large measure anachronistic historical and ideological frameworks. These scholars have shown how the whole edifice rests to a large extent on the Gellian conception of colonies as ‘small Romes’, whereas contemporary evidence, especially archaeological, to sustain this thesis is lacking. Especially the idea that the founding of colonies was, in the mid-Republican period, the result of a well-planned effort organised by the state authorities which entailed the implantation of a premeditated set of Roman cultural elements, is being problematised. Question marks have been placed as to the ethnicity of the colonists, and especially the influence or persistence of local elements on the formation of the colonies, including their religious dimension.

It goes without saying that with the deconstruction of the “Romanness” of Roman colonisation, the argument that precisely these colonies formed the key factors in the romanisation of Italy is weakened seriously. As far as the religious aspects of colonisation are concerned: Capitolium-temples are actually less ubiquitous than has often been assumed. Neither were they all installed directly or even soon after the

---

55 SALMON 1982, 100, 117.
57 TORELLI 1999, 3-5, 14-42, 43-88 and passim; BRADLEY 2006; BISPHAM 2006.
foundation of the colony.\textsuperscript{58} Whereas, for the Republican period, \textit{Capitolia} have been documented for the second and the first centuries BC\textsuperscript{59} the situation is quite different in earlier periods. By far the most \textit{Capitolia} date to the triumviral and imperial period.\textsuperscript{60} Especially Augustan (re-)colonisation seems to have had a crucial role.

This has led Bispham to conclude that before the second century BC, the Capitoline model, together with the ‘Gellian simulacrity’ cannot be applied,\textsuperscript{61} and Clifford Ando goes so far as to state that it was indeed especially in late Republican and imperial times that the model is to be expected to have worked, and, by inference, not earlier.\textsuperscript{62} Interestingly, it has been pointed out that the Gellian image of colonies as ‘small Romes’ is unjustified even for the imperial period, also on the religious level. Indeed, as Beard, North and Price contend, the “imitation of the religion of the capital must in practice always have been a creative process, involving adaptation and change”\textsuperscript{63} By two altars of Augustan date, where elements of Roman monuments are adapted, it is shown how the \textit{colonia} of Carthage was “expressing its own version of Roman identity”, and indeed, that “different \textit{coloniae} were Roman in very different ways”.\textsuperscript{64}

Likewise, the foundation rites of the colonies, with the ritual marking of the \textit{pomerium} are likely to have been important especially in the late Republican and Augustan periods. Ando argues that it is no coincidence that evidence for the use of plows in colonial foundations dates to the times of Caesar (Capua, Urso) and Augustus (Asia Minor).\textsuperscript{65} If, according to him, the practice of ploughing the primordial furrow in these late colonies was “notionally modelled on that at Rome, we should probably regard it as modelled on a self-understanding achieved in light of antiquarian research and no small amount of invention”.\textsuperscript{66} Thus, both the \textit{pomerium} and the proliferation of

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{58} Capua, colonised several times, apparently only received a \textit{Capitolium}-temple under Tiberius (Suet. \textit{Tib.} 40).

\textsuperscript{59} Second century: Luna, 177 BC; possibly Liternum 194 BC. The \textit{Capitolium} identified by Johnson (JOHNSON 1935, 18-41) at Minturnae built “soon after 191 BC” might not have been one: COARELLI 1989, 51-52, since it was located outside the original Roman \textit{oppidum}. First century, especially under Sulla: e.g. the conversion of the temple of Jupiter into a \textit{Capitolium} at Pompeii and perhaps Faesulae (\textit{CIL} XI, 1545) as well. BARTON 1982, 262-266. See BISPHAM 2006, 93 n. 111 with other references, and esp. 99-100 for the weak evidence for the earlier period.

\textsuperscript{60} Standard works on \textit{Capitolia} in Italy are CAGIANO DE AZEVEDO 1940; BIANCHI 1950; BARTON 1982, 259-266 and are in need of an update (cf. also TODD 1985). For Spain, cf. KEAY 1988, 117-118, 145-146: (late) second century BC.

\textsuperscript{61} BISPHAM 2006, esp. 93.

\textsuperscript{62} ANDO 2007, 431-436. Ando questions the importance of \textit{Capitolia} prior to imperial times, arguing that it is “by no means obvious that the tutelary deities of all colonies were – or could be – the same. Not surprisingly, then, \textit{Capitolia} are rather less well attested in early and mid-Republican colonies, but proliferated in the western provinces in the imperial period.”

\textsuperscript{63} BEARD, NORTH and PRICE 1998, 331.

\textsuperscript{64} BEARD, NORTH and PRICE 1998, 333, 334.

\textsuperscript{65} Capua: Dessau, \textit{ILS} 6308; Urso: \textit{lex Ursonensis} c. 73; Asia Minor: LEVICK 1967, 35-37.

\textsuperscript{66} ANDO 2007, 433.
\end{flushleft}
Capitilia are to be understood within the creation of a particular ideology situated in the late Republican and Augustan period. This deconstruction of the traditional model of continuity in ideology and physical layout of colonies is extremely important. It might not be necessary to relegate these ‘colonial’ religious and ideological elements solely to late Republican and early imperial invention: the fact that most of the evidence comes from later periods is in itself no proof that similar ideologies did not exist in previous times, and in some cases this is indeed documented. But it is important to re-dimension our views on the ‘Romanness’ of Republican colonies, and not to fill in the blanks uncritically with later evidence.

In conclusion, the importance of the Capitolium type temple as a firm symbol of Romanness for the early and mid-Republican periods is hard to document. And with it the notion of a far-reaching ‘romanising’ effect of these on the surrounding areas. But even if the early- and mid-Republican periods remain more difficult to gauge, at least from the second century BC on there is evidence for the installation of Capitolia. Perhaps they indeed formed symbols of Romanness and urbanitas by then. It should be borne in mind however, that Italy had changed profoundly in the meantime, and that the gap between the Italic “world of non-cities” and Roman cities that is often conceptualised was in most areas less impressive by then. If the temples could well represent civic or urban pride and express a certain identity for the own urban community, their ‘irradiating’ effect on the hinterland was perhaps rather limited.

Also the idea that the spread of Roman religious ideas and superiority were documented by way of the distribution of anatomical votives has been criticised seriously. Maria Donatella Gentili and Fay Glinister have recently pointed out several weaknesses in the idea that anatomical votives closely reflect Roman influence. In the first place, the conception that the distribution pattern of this type coincides neatly with Latin colonisation has been partly formed by a research bias in favour of exactly Latin / Roman areas. The correlation has therefore to be nuanced, since several other less ‘Roman’ areas yielded this type of votives too. Also, certain areas of Latin colonisation did not yield anatomicals. Another problem regards the dating of the votives, which is difficult. In any case, Etruscan votives of the type predate Roman colonisation in that area. Moreover, although Greek influence is clear, this cannot be

---

67 BISPHAM 2006, esp. 74-75; ANDO 2007, 434, on religious institutions in colonies: “As with the pomerium, so with Capitolia, it may be that practice homogenized around a particular ideal in response to cultural changes at work in Rome in the late Republic and early Principate.”

68 GLINISTER 2006; GENTILI 2005, esp. 372-373.

69 Esp. from the Apennines and the Adriatic coast: GENTILI 2005, 372 and GLINISTER 2006, 18-19, with references. One could add, e.g. Schiavi d’Abruzzo (CAMPANELLI and FAUSTOFERRI 1997) and the sanctuary at Casalbore, for which BONIFACIO 2000, 34 argues that the appearance of anatomicals found here “ricostruca al discorso degli influssi diversi subiti in questa zona per la presenza di mercenari e la notata posizione dell’area sacra in rapporto con un’importante direttrice di traffico”.

70 GENTILI 2005, 372.
equated with Roman influence (especially since the phenomenon predates the official introduction of Aesculapius in Rome, with which it erroneously has been connected)\textsuperscript{71} and local traditions may have played an important role in the development of the type.\textsuperscript{72} Thus, both in temporal and in geographical terms, the practice to dedicate anatomical terracottas seems to have been a much wider phenomenon.

More fundamentally, Glinister criticises the conceptualisation of the mechanism responsible for the spread of anatomical votives in the traditional ‘colonialist’ vein: she argues that it is hard to see a deliberate Roman strategy in this regard, and points out that their appearance can be better understood as the result of various, local processes by which people chose to adopt these elements, part of the Hellenistic cultural \textit{koiné}.\textsuperscript{73} Therefore, anatomical terracottas appear in Roman and Latin communities, but “this would represent neither a conscious Roman policy, nor the spread of a distinctively Roman religious form”.\textsuperscript{74}

In other words, even if perhaps the relation between colonisation and this type of votives cannot be entirely downplayed, it seems at least fair to ask whether anatomical votives constituted “quintessentially Roman”\textsuperscript{75} rituals, or were perceived as such. Glinister’s deconstruction effectively emasculates the ideological, ‘romanising’ aspect of anatomical terracottas, and with it their possible role in the ‘religious romanisation’ of Italy.

The argument is of course basically identical to the discussion on the role of the three \textit{cellae} temple or ‘Capitolium’. It all comes down to the inherent impossibility to read fixed meanings in certain expressions of material culture. These material expressions only gain their possible ‘Roman’, ‘urban’ or ‘superior’ quality within an ideological framework or discourse constructed for that purpose. Whereas a case can surely be made for the interplay with such a discourse in the context of \textit{Capitolia} (but especially in later periods, and much less for three \textit{cellae} temples in general), a similar framework does not seem to exist in the case of the anatomical votives – or at least not in antiquity. In sum, the image of colonies as key elements in the religious romanisation of Italy in the Republican period needs to be more nuanced, especially regarding the ‘irradiation’ of Roman religious culture outside the colony. This is not to say that religion and ritual were not important in the colonies; on the contrary, it does seem justified to believe that they were fundamental to the constitution of the new community. Indeed, amongst the scanty archaeological evidence for the earliest phases of colonies, cult sites take first place – especially when compared to domestic architecture, for instance.\textsuperscript{76} But if these rituals were in any way (conceived to be) Roman, or even meant to be spread beyond Roman territory, is an entirely different matter.

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{71} Cf. \textit{supra} n. 48.
\textsuperscript{72} TURFA 2004.
\textsuperscript{73} GLINISTER 2006, 23-27.
\textsuperscript{74} GLINISTER 2006, 25, cf. 32.
\textsuperscript{75} TORELLI 1999, 96.
\textsuperscript{76} PELGROM 2008.
\end{footnotesize}
Apart from the Bacchanalia and the colonial cults, arguably the conduct towards Italic cult places should be included when studying Roman influence in the religious realm.

**The Fate of Italic Sanctuaries. Destruction, Desolation and Colonisation**

**DID ROME CLOSE SANCTUARIES?**

The general attitude of Rome towards religious affairs outside its territory is thought to have been one of tolerance, or simply lack of interest. Perhaps apart from the exception of the Bacchanalia, Rome would have let her neighbours in peace.\(^77\) Just like Tacitus’ description on the romanising strategy applied in Britain by Agricola (21), no restrictive policies, but rather encouragement through prestige would have been the major stance: indeed, in this vision, Rome may have tried to lure Italic people with Capitolia and anatomical votives. However, although this aspect is often left out in discussions on Roman religious control,\(^78\) there is an important exception to this rule, which is, interesting enough, itself to a large measure a modern construction: the idea that Rome closed down or ‘abolished’ sanctuaries.

Sanctuaries have, as will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3, been seen as important political foci of the Italic peoples, especially in the non-urbanised areas. As a logical consequence of this political function, it is often assumed that sanctuaries were destroyed or closed after the incorporation in the Roman state. For Emilio Gabba, for example, it is natural that federal sanctuaries were closed down precisely for this reason\(^79\) and he argues that Pietrabbondante was “semplicemente chiuso per ragioni politici”, just as perhaps the Etruscan fanum Voltumnae in the third century BC.\(^80\) The idea is present in many studies, especially with regard to Samnite sanctuaries.\(^81\) Recently, for example, Scheid has argued that the sanctuary of Pietrabbondante would have undergone a proper damnatio memoriae.\(^82\) Adriano La Regina, on the same sanctuary, speaks of a “profanatio dei sacra publica”, and assumes as well that the cult at the sanctuary of Campochiaro was suppressed and transferred to the municipium of Bovianum.\(^83\)

---

\(^{77}\) Cf. on religious toleration e.g. FRATEANTONIO 2003, 9-16 with references.

\(^{78}\) E.g. by DE CAZANOVE 2000c and GLINISTER 2006.

\(^{79}\) GABBA 1994a (= GABBA 1972), 97. Cf. p. 98 “Sembra naturale supporre che si volesse eliminare un centro di autonomismo politico-religioso.”

\(^{80}\) GABBA 1972, 97; TORELLI 1968, 74.

\(^{81}\) Cf. e.g. DYSON 2003, 79-80: “Since the sanctuaries were the focus of elite resistance to Rome, they were attacked by the Romans, especially during the Social War in the early first century BC. Most were destroyed, but a few did remain in use under the Empire,” without giving any references; and recently ZACCARDI 2007. Cf. also the interesting reversal of this idea: the fact that sanctuaries had an important function would be proved by the consequent abandonment after the loss of independence: DENCH 1995, 139; LOMAS 1996, 171.

\(^{82}\) SCHEID 2006b, 78: “Son abandon traduit la damnatio memoriae définitive du lieu de culte aux insurgés, ainsi que les inscriptions l’attestent. Mais il s’agit là d’un cas extrême.”

\(^{83}\) COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 204. Cf. also LA REGINA 1976, 237 on “la cancellazione giuridica e la soppressione delle attività ufficiali”. More carefully on Pietrabbondante e.g. CAPINI 1991b, 114.
Although it is true that the booming times of architectural refinement and construction seem to come to an end after the Social War, it is important to emphasise that there is not a shred of evidence for this well-established idea of closure or destruction. Archaeologically, at least, it seems hard to find evidence for the official shutting down or destruction of sanctuaries: in fact, on virtually all of the Samnite cult sites activity is registered also for the post-Social War period. Not only in the most important ‘political’ sanctuary of Pietrabbondante, but also at Schiavi d’Abruzzo, and in the case of S. Giovanni in Galdo, as will be shown in more detail in Chapter 5, where the finds from the excavation are discussed. It could be objected that these archaeological remains could represent ‘private’ actions, whereas the ‘public’ aspect of the cult was abolished. A total closing or destruction can be excluded however, and since there is no positive evidence that sanctuaries underwent this kind of official restrictive measures, judgment is perhaps best suspended.

There is, of course, no doubt that sanctuaries were often the target of plunder and destruction, especially in war situations: numerous instances are listed in the literary sources. A famous example is the Proserpina sanctuary in Locri which was plundered in 205 BC by Roman soldiers after the city had defected to Hannibal (Liv. 29.8.1). In peace time, the temple of Hera Lacinia near Croton was stripped from its marble tiles by the censor Q. Fulvius Flaccus in 173 BC (Liv. 42.3), and, in a provincial context, the greed of C. Verres between 73 and 70 BC is telling. But plunder, for economic reasons, or conscious destruction, for ideological ones in the heat of the fighting (cf. infra) is something else than an official restrictive policy banning the use of these sanctuaries once the war, always won by Rome, was over. Moreover, although the above mentioned cases may represent the tip of an iceberg, it is as well to emphasise that in all of them action was undertaken to protect the affected parties. Before turning back to the position of Italic sanctuaries after the Roman conquest, it is of some interest to consider – very briefly – conceptions of the role of sanctuaries and cult in warfare.

SANCTUARY, CULT AND COMMUNITY IN WARFARE

The sanctuary of Diana Tifatina, on the Mons Tifata some three and a half miles north of Capua, was of central importance for the Capuan community. It may already have occupied a central place in the organisation of the settlement in the ninth century BC. In myth and poetry, the sanctuary is closely connected to the heroic founder of Capua, Capys. Although the genealogical position of this figure remains unclear (he is, in the

---

85 Cf. Chapters 7, 8 and esp. 9 on the problem of archaeological ‘continuity’ at sanctuaries, which may hide re-use under rather different conditions.
86 Interesting is the example of the rich sanctuary of the lucus Feroniae, plundered by Hannibal; apparently the soldiers would have scrupled to take everything out of religio (Liv. 26.11.8-10).
88 Frederiksen 1984, 118.
sources, variously great-grandfather of Rhomos, a relative of Aeneas, one of the Alban kings, or a Samnite hero), the myth may have existed as early as the fourth century BC.\(^8^9\) The story goes that Capys, from the moment that he drew the *sulcus primigenius* of the city, had a white deer that was dedicated to Diana. The deer had, from the existence of the city on, even become the *numen loci*, and lived for thousand years (Sil. *Pun.* 13.115-137). Q. Fulvius Flaccus sacrificed the holy deer before taking Capua, which had defected from Rome in 211 BC.\(^9^0\) As has been referred to in the Introduction, the Roman general thus symbolically destroyed the Capuan community. Also in Rome itself, sanctuaries formed the symbol *par excellence* for the whole community. In a society whose temples were almost by default the result of military successes,\(^9^1\) it perhaps does not surprise that conversely great fear existed that the community’s gods might fall into the hands of the enemy. During the preparations for the Gallic war in 390 BC, the hierarchy of the Roman values that are to be defended is as follows: *fana deum et coniuges et liber os* (Liv. 5.49.3); first the sanctuaries, then the family.\(^9^2\) Equally, after the Gauls had left, purifying the temples had priority (Liv. 5.50). Also in the highly rhetorical speech by Sp. Postumius Albinus after the defeat in the Caudine Forks, it appears that the greatest fear was the possibility that *hanc urbem templ a delubra fines aquas Samniti um esse* (Liv. 9.9.5), again emphasising sanctuaries by placing them at the beginning, directly after the city itself.\(^9^3\) It is clear that at least in Livy’s text, which was published in a period of religious restoration by Augustus, sanctuary and community were closely bound together.\(^9^4\)

Another recurring element in descriptions of war is the deportation of cult statues to Rome;\(^9^5\) again symbolically taking the conquered community into captivity. Often reference is made to the so-called ritual of *evocatio*; the summoning of the gods of the hostile city to leave the city and come to Rome. However, the historical cases of *evocatio* are few, and suspiciously they are especially mentioned in relation to the most imminent and critical moments in Roman history, such as the conflicts during the early Roman expansion in Italy, notably Veii, and Carthage. Indeed, the capture of Veii in 396 BC with the *evocatio* of Juno Regina has been recognised generally as the prime example.\(^9^6\) Other cases have been recognised in Volsinii (264), where Vertumnus would have been ‘evoked’ (and a relation with the *fanum Voltunnae* has
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89. FREDERIKSEN 1984, 118 n. 11 for sources. Frederiksen mentions fourth-century BC coins documenting Capys, but the editor of Frederiksen’s book, Nicholas Purcell, could not trace them; cf. HEURGON 1942, 325.

90. Cf. HEURGON 1942, 321-324 and DE FRANCIS-CIS 1956, 45-46 for the sources and the connection to the sanctuary.


92. *in conspectu habentes fana deum et coniuges et liber os et solum patriae deforme belli malis et omnia quae defendi repetique et ulisci fas sit*: “They must keep before their eyes the temples of the gods, their wives and children, and their country’s soil, disfigured by the ravages of war-everything, in a word, which it was their duty to defend, to recover or to avenge.”

93. For these examples, STEK 2004, 32-33.

94. For religion in Livy cf. LEVENE 1993, on the relation with Augustan ideology esp. 245-248.

95. E.g. the statue of Jupiter Imperator from Praeneste in 380 BC: Liv. 6.29.8.

been suggested here; cf. *infra*), in Falerii (Minerva Capta and Juno Curitis), and in Carthage (in 146 BC, Juno Caelestis). But all these cases are quite dubious, reconstructed as they are on rather late and seldom explicit historical evidence (esp. Livy, Servius and Macrobius). An inscription found at Isaura Vetus in Turkey, dating to 75 BC, has been interpreted as evidence for an *evocatio* as well, but this cannot be inferred from the actual text.

In a critical study, Gabriella Gustafsson has shown that the idea of the existence of a fixed practice or rite of *evocatio* is highly problematic, and that later mythography and historiography, and especially the intertwining of these, have (in)formed our scarce sources to such a degree that the concept of *evocatio* is hard to use for historical analysis. Indeed, it might be that accounts on the ritual of the *evocatio* are highly interesting in the context of the ideological and theological frameworks in the time that these accounts were made, but are to be used with great caution in the discussion on the religious romanisation of Italy in the Republican period.

But even if they might be in some cases historical, it should not be excluded that stories of *evocationes* were especially or even exclusively important for (a certain group of leading) citizens of Rome, and did not affect the communities that were ‘deprived’ of their gods. In any case, it remains doubtful whether the conquered communities believed that their gods had left (of their own will!) to Rome as well. In this context, it is interesting to ask what happened to the cult places after they had been robbed of their gods. Answering this simple, and perhaps somewhat naïve, question is of course difficult in light of the nature of the evidence; but it is important to remember it, also with regard to the possible intentions from Roman side.

The *evocatio* of Juno Regina from Veii is often accepted as more or less historical. The discussion on the location of the temple of Juno Regina has perhaps not yet been satisfactorily concluded and still awaits firm evidence. But at the present state, it seems that Torelli’s thesis that the temple is to be identified on the edge of the Piano di Comunità, and not, as previously thought, in the Piazza d’Armi temple, has most credits. It follows that the ‘break’ in the cult that has been recognised in the Piazza d’Armi temple has nothing to do with the *evocatio* of Juno Regina. And the cult

---

99 GUSTAFSSON 2000. Cf. the attempt by BLOMART 1997 to opt for a wider definition of *evocatio* – including e.g. the introductions of Magna Mater (204 BC) and Aesculapius (292 BC), which however only leads to the devaluation of the term.
100 Cf. e.g. FEENEY 1998.
101 E.g. RÜPKE 1990, 162-163; BEARD, NORTH and PRICE 1998, 34-35 and even the very critical GUSTAFSSON 2000, 52 admits that “it is reasonable to assume that there is at least a core of historical truth in it”.
102 TORELLI 1982, arguing that Piazza d’Armi cannot be the arx, whereas Livy 6.21.10 explicitly states that the *aedes Junonis* was located in *Veientana arce*. Followed also by COLONNA 2004. (Somewhat curiously, GUSTAFSSON 2000, 46-47 seems to suggest that the Portonaccio temple is a candidate as well).
place on the Piano di Comunità presents a rather different image: here the materials, varying from bucchero and fine wares, black gloss to Roman wares, appear to attest to continuity from the fifth century BC to the Roman imperial period. 104 Nearby, a deposit with votives dating from the fourth to second centuries BC has been revealed. Thus, the cult seems to have continued after the alleged transfer of the cult statue in 396 BC. 105

One could argue therefore, in this case of evocatio, for the existence of ‘discrepant experiences’ in Roman and local traditions. No mention is made of the duplication or continuation on the place of origin of cults in evocatio contexts, but it might be suggested that this is not accidental: for the Roman audience for which the evocatio was ‘evoked’, it was of no importance whether the cult continued in the place of origin or not.

Although a thorough analysis of the passages on the destruction of sanctuaries during warfare should be carried out, 106 an exercise which clearly reaches beyond the aims set here, one gets the impression that the above posited condition of the evocatio accounts could apply as well to the more general descriptions of sanctuaries that are being destroyed. Of course, this is not to say that Roman soldiers did not sack sanctuaries, but it seems probable that the rhetorical and ideological frameworks of the contexts in which the Roman historians worked highly influenced these accounts, and also that the factual destruction of a sanctuary could have been given a specific and differing meaning according to the different groups involved.

THE DECLINE OF RURAL SANCTUARIES AFTER THE SOCIAL WAR

Apart from the idea that Rome violently or legally suppressed Italic sanctuaries that was treated above, there is general consensus that rural sanctuaries declined after the Social War. This is most often seen as a result of the urbanisation that was a feature of the Roman municipalisation. Attention was focused on the new urban centres, and it is there that most monumental buildings arise. The survival of the Italic cult places would have depended on the extent of their integration in the new municipal structures. 107 In this sense, Kathryn Lomas, voicing a widely held view, argues that the
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104 Torelli 1982, 125. There might have been as well an Augustan reconstruction phase: 128. Excavations have been prompted by Torelli’s hypothesis: cf. Colonna 2004. Interesting to note, in Livy 5.22, before the transfer, the statue of Juno is asked to come to Rome again after the evocatio proper (although it should be remembered that the word evocatio does not appear once in the whole passage).

105 Torelli extrapolates this situation, interpreting it as a typical feature of evocationes. He argues that the rite “consisteva in effetti nella sola traslazione del signum” and adduces Falerii and Lucus Feroniae as further examples of evocationes where cult continued (Torelli 1982, 128). In these last two cases no evocatio is documented however. (On Falerii see Gustafsson 2000, 56-59. For Feronia’s alleged evocatio no sources exist, but it has been proposed to connect her cult in Rome with M. ‘Curius Dentatus’ campaign in 290 BC in the Sabine area, or the capture of the lucus Feroniae near Capena in 395 BC. Cf. Torelli 1982, 128 n. 53; Coarelli 1980, 284; Coarelli 1981b, 40-42; Coarelli 1997, 198).

106 Cf. e.g. Frateantonio 2003, 88-95. With regard to the relation between sanctuaries and warfare in esp. the Greek / Hellenistic world cf. the contributions in Sordi 1984.

107 Curti, Dench and Patterson 1996, 179. Cf. e.g. also Lomas 1996, 171.
decline of rural sanctuaries after the Social War “was symbolic of increasing Romanization” and that “emphasis shifted towards temples and shrines in the growing (and Romanized) cities”.  

Similarly, Dyson states that “In areas like Samnium this [legal restructuring] meant the development of new urban entities designed to replace the old system of pagi, vici and tribal sanctuaries. Some of the great sanctuaries like Pietrabbondante were sacked … Others continued in use, but they were subordinated to the local municipia”.  

The elaboration of this conception will be treated in greater detail in Chapter 4. It is important here to note that the development of rural sanctuaries is generally seen as antagonistic to Roman influence. Equating romanisation with urbanisation, rural sanctuaries are relegated to traditional Italic patterns of settlement. In the cases that rural sanctuaries flourish, these are explained in terms of “survival” and integration into the Roman structures. An example is the sanctuary of Hercules Curinus in Abruzzo that would have developed from an Italic pagus sanctuary to a municipal one after the installation of a municipium at Sulmo (cf. Chapter 4).  

Thus, while it might be harder to distinguish a deliberate policy in this development, Rome might have influenced Italic cults and cult places indirectly. Generally, the idea has been that the survival of sanctuaries was by chance, and depended on where they happened to end up in the new system. But Roman choices and strategies may have played an important role in some instances.

**THE INCORPORATION OF SANCTUARIES BY ROME**

No official policy of closing or banning of sanctuaries can be discerned in the historical and archaeological record. Neither is it possible to detect a systematic practice of the ‘calling out’ of the gods, or the sacking of sanctuaries during sieges, although it surely happened. Italic sanctuaries dwindled, although some managed to survive. This could suggest the conclusion that Rome simply did not care much about sanctuaries; another example of the laisser-faire politics commonly ascribed to Rome, as a consequence of toleration or lack of interest. But this might not be wholly true. It seems possible to identify a certain coherence in the treatment of certain Italic sanctuaries, but on a rather less spectacular level than evocationes and sacking. This coherence is to be distinguished in the legal statuses that were assigned to sanctuaries after the Roman conquest. In a recent article, Scheid has drawn attention to this
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110 Cf. GUARDUCCI 1981, 226. The link with the municipium would be demonstrated by an inscription of a *miles e municipio Sulmonae* and an inscription referring to an *auguratus*, “probabilmente municipale” (LETTA 1992, 116). As for the sanctuary of Hercules at S. Agata in Campo Macrano, near Castelvecchio Subequo, which would have started as a pagus sanctuary and afterwards incorporated in the centre of the municipium of Superaequum (VAN WONTERGHEM 1984, 78), the epigraphical evidence does not seem to justify such an interpretation (cf. VAN WONTERGHEM 1984, site 1, 5c).
phenomenon of incorporation, which he describes as a “politique consciente et systématique”.\footnote{Scheid 2006b, 80 (quote). Cf. e.g. also Basanoff’s interpretation of the appropriation of the fanum Voltumnae (Basanoff 1945, 59-63); Gabbia 1994a, 97 on lucus Angitiae; Whittaker 1997, 143, who points out, in relation to the evocatio of Juno from Carthage in 146 BC, that “local cults were to be colonised”; the first Roman Carthage was called colonia Junonia.}

In the last half of the first century BC and in the early empire, and of course especially under Augustus, a clear strategy of colonisation of cult places can be discerned: a method to bestow the ancient cult places, full of symbolic power, with an autonomous and by consequence Roman status. Examples are the lucus Feroniae, transformed into a colony under Augustus,\footnote{Scheid 2006b, 82-84; Coarelli 2001b. The evidence for Fanum Fortunae seems too meagre to argue for a similar case however. Cf. also the case of Monte Giove in Picenum, Chapter 7.} but also at Hispellum, Octavian apparently installed the new colony on the place of an ancient Umbrian federal or ‘ethnic’ sanctuary, and a similar case may be made for the ancient sanctuary of Cupra maritima.\footnote{Cf. Gabba 1994a, 97; Scheid 2006b, 84: “et sans doute encore par Sylla.” This is on the basis of the idea that the IIIvir of CIL IX, 3894 is actually from lucus Angitiae, and not from Alba Fucens (as argued by Letta 1972).} Also the sanctuary of Angitia, in Marsic territory, was made municipium, and this may have happened even before the mid first century BC.\footnote{Lejeune 1990.} Interestingly, in these examples important Italic cult places are transformed into Roman urban or semi-urban structures.

The appropriation of a once important federal Italic sanctuary in Roman civic structures is also attested at the famous Lucanian sanctuary of Mefitis at Rossano di Vaglio, where the cult continued under the influence of magistrates from the municipium of Potentia.\footnote{CIL X, 130-133.} Here, in the Roman town, the same Mefitis of Rossano di Vaglio was venerated as well.\footnote{Scheid 2006b, esp. 77, 80, 86.}

Scheid’s most important observation, however, is that the policy that appears from the above examples was not exclusive for the Augustan period, with its well-known program of religious restoration. Rather, Augustus was building upon and exploiting an earlier tradition in the treatment of symbolically important sanctuaries.\footnote{Liv. 8.14.2; Macrobr. Sat. 3.4.11. Scheid 2006b, 79; cf. Farney 2007, 68-70.} Early examples of an incorporation policy are the usurpation of the Latin sanctuary at Monte Cavo after the dissolving of the Latin league, or the sanctuary of Juno Sospita at Lanuvium, which was now common to both Romans and Lanuvians, and also at Lavinium rites were celebrated in common.\footnote{Plin. Ep. 8.8. Scheid 2006b, 80.} Perhaps also the sanctuary of Clitumnus, famous in imperial literature, could have been colonised already in an early stage, together with the installation of the Latin colony of Spoletium in 241 BC.\footnote{Scheid 2006b, esp. 77, 80, 86; Coarelli 2001b. The evidence for Fanum Fortunae seems too meagre to argue for a similar case however. Cf. also the case of Monte Giove in Picenum, Chapter 7.} The already mentioned sanctuary of Diana Tifatina was to have, in later times, a similar fate. After his victory on Norbanus at Mons Tifata, Sulla gave lands and salubrious sources to this sanctuary, a situation which was reaffirmed under Augustus.
and Vespasian. Moreover, the sanctuary held, at least in the imperial period, an independent status, to the like of a municipium or a praefectura. As it appears, Sulla and his successors transformed the cult place into an autonomous district, thereby retracting the sanctuary from other influences and appropriating it for Roman purposes.

In conclusion, it is clear that Rome tried to use or control the symbolic power and esteem of the ancient Italic sanctuaries for her own purposes, and although this policy is most clear in the late Republic and early empire, it can be traced earlier as well. Although Scheid has read the evidence exclusively from an ideological perspective, the rationale behind this policy was perhaps in some cases economical as well: many of the sanctuaries involved were important market places, most famously the lucus Feroniae.

Conclusion: Urbanity and the Unaffected Countryside

What conclusions can be drawn on the basis of this brief survey of ideas on the ‘religious romanisation’ of Italy? It seems that the influence of expressions of Roman religion on other Italic peoples is much harder to trace than has often been assumed, or occurred at least in different forms than often assumed.

First, religious romanisation has been interpreted in a positive sense, as the spread of Roman religious ideas in Italy. Urban centres have been seen as the key features in the propagation of these models. Latin and Roman colonies would thus have displayed urbanity and ‘Romanitas’ also by means of cults or religious representations. Especially two elements are often highlighted in this context: the Capitoline cult and associated temples, and votives of the Etrusco-Latial-Campanian type. As to the latter, Gentili and Glinister have shown that the idea that this type of votives would map the level of religious romanisation of different parts of Italy is problematic. They can certainly not simply be used as an ‘indicator’ of Roman or romanised people. Although Capitolia are perhaps less well attested than one would perhaps expect for the mid-Republican period, at least in the late Republican period these can and will indeed have conveyed an urban, ‘Roman’ ideology and pride. The ‘irradiation’ of this model, and its conception as ‘Roman’ outside the colonial territories remains a moot point however.

Second, in a restrictive sense, various ideas exist concerning the extent of Roman interference in the Italic religious realm. The standard example of the senatusconsultum de Bacchanalibus is problematic, because the addressees of the ban remain unclear. Even if it seems perhaps more reasonable to accept that Rome wanted to intervene also outside Roman territory, this must have been an exceptional case. Often a non-intervention or ‘toleration’ policy has been assumed, but this was surely

120 Vell. Pat. 2.25.4; CIL X, 3828; Dessau, ILS 3240 = AE 1894, 146.
121 SCHEID 2006b, 79: “le principe de l’initiative est transparent: il s’agissait de soustraire ce fameux sanctuaire et site à toute influence extérieure, pour le rendre autonome, autrement dit dépendant de Rome seule.”
not standard behaviour. There are many examples of the exertion of influence in the religious sphere. The forms in which this influence was exercised appear however rather different from what has been commonly assumed. Although sanctuaries were surely pillaged, during conflicts but also in peace time, there is no evidence for the systematic suppression or damnatio memoriae of Italic cult places. Although the general idea is that rural Italic cult places declined after the Roman conquest c.q. the Social War, this may not have been the result of official Roman policy. However, Scheid has recently turned the attention to the incorporation of some famous Italic cult places into Roman institutional structures, which proves that Rome at least in some cases did care about Italic cult places well before the Augustan restoration politics.

In conclusion, it appears that the influence of ‘religious romanisation’ was on the whole fairly limited. Moreover, this influence can be recognised almost exclusively in urban contexts. Perhaps religious forms irradiated from there to the countryside, but especially this aspect has been shown hard to prove. Rather, the countryside seems to have remained largely untouched, and developments there are seen as antithetic to the Roman urban forms. Thus, for the Apennine region, Cesare Letta has argued that “nei santuari rurali della regio IV la romanizzazione praticamente non tocca le tradizioni religiose locali, formatesi nei secoli precedenti ... I culti propriamente romani che vengono trapiantati nella regio IV sono introdotti nelle città, non nell’ambiente rurale.”122 In the few cases that Roman influence can be documented in Italic cult places, this involves a strategy of incorporation in the Roman state, often by ‘autonomisation’, and indeed ‘urbanising’ them.

Apparently, in the sphere of influence of ‘religious romanisation’, there is a dichotomy between urbanity and countryside: was the Italic countryside indeed left behind, and did change occur only in the new urban centres? Rural patterns of settlement, and the sanctuaries and cults within them, are indeed commonly seen as persistent and uninterrupted features of Italic life, untouched or only remotely affected by new developments. Such an idea must be carefully tested in light of the changing roles of Italic sanctuaries before and after the Social War.

122 LETTA 1992, 122.
Chapter 3

Samnium: The Sacred Construction of Community and Architectural Forms

In the preceding chapters the developments in Central Italy after the Roman conquest have been questioned from the perspective of cultural change: difficulties with the interpretation of material culture as an indicator of romanisation have been noted (Chapter 1). Also, the central importance of religion and cult places for the expression of communal identities has become clear; for example in Capua with Diana’s deer, or with the Roman Capitolia in urban centres (Chapter 2). Many of these themes of cultural change, material culture, and the role of religious places can be tested, or illustrated in the case of Pentrian Samnium. The role that sanctuaries assumed in this mountainous area during and after the Roman conquest is conspicuous, and so is their material aspect. As shown here, Pentrian Samnium forms an exquisite example of the role that sanctuaries could assume in the reinforcement of Italic identity in relation to the changed situation after the Roman conquest. Moreover, it will be argued that the adoption of different cultural elements or architectural ‘styles’ can be seen as a corollary to this specific process, rather than as an autonomous ‘spread’ of these models because of their presumed ‘intrinsic’ cultural values. In order to present this case study on the ‘sacred landscape’ of Samnium in its wider context, a short review of the research history and ideas on Samnite society will follow.

Samnium: Research History

Amongst Italy’s inland regions, Samnium has long held a privileged position in modern research, interest being stimulated early on by Livy’s vivid account of the Samnite Wars. The territory inhabited in antiquity by the Samnites Pentri, one of five subgroups considered to have made up the “Samnites”, forms the heartland of ancient Samnium. The area largely occupies modern upland Molise and part of South Abruzzo. In antiquity the mountainous landscape formed one of the most impervious and (at least from a Central-Tyrrhenian perspective) remote areas of Central Italy, hard
to access by land and with none of the limited advantages of the Adriatic coastal area, which was occupied by the Frentani. The historical sources on the Samnites Pentri are relatively abundant. In the Greek and Roman sources, the belligerent Pentri are depicted as the major obstacle on Rome’s route to absolute power over the Italian peninsula, from the fourth century to the Social War. Their geographical position and historical role have helped to create an image of the area as the ‘core-region’ of Samnite culture and resistance to the spread of Roman dominion. The Pentri are also relatively well known through the material record.

The ubiquitous hill-forts and sanctuaries have always constituted the most visible elements of the Samnite landscape and have therefore attracted – and dominated – scholarly interest. The ample archaeological knowledge on Samnium is due to a remarkable interest from Italian, regional and Anglo-Saxon side. The Soprintendenze of Abruzzo and Molise have, starting with the pioneering studies, especially those by La Regina in the 1960s and 70s, disclosed much of the archaeological material. The results have been published in various contributions and especially in a series of exhibition catalogues. Furthermore, various predominantly British field survey projects have added invaluable information about the ancient patterns of settlement.

Most famous is the Biferno Valley project directed by Graeme Barker through the 1970s, a benchmark project in Mediterranean archaeological research, and especially renowned for its application of a long term perspective. Scholarly research of Samnite culture has met modern interest in the construction of a local or regional identity for the relatively underdeveloped and depopulated region of Molise, for which purpose Samnite ‘resistance’ to the Roman hegemony has been paralleled with (desired) local attitudes to politics in Italy and the European Union. Local interest resulted in the activities of archaeological clubs and other amateurs mainly published privately or in regional journals.

The classical work *Samnium and the Samnites* by the Canadian Edward Togo Salmon is fundamental, but is to a considerable extent outmoded by recent archaeological data as well as developments in historical and historiographical research. With regard to the historical framework, the works of Marta Sordi and more recently Tim Cornell are important, since they have questioned the traditional chronologies and character of the Samnite wars. As to these, it could be asked whether the military actions actually deserve the name ‘Samnite Wars’. The usual subdivision into three or four Samnite Wars is a modern invention, dating back to Niebuhr’s *Römische Geschichte* (1833),

---

1 Cf. D’ERCOLE 2002.
2 Samnium, occupying a central place in Central-Italian research, is well represented in general studies on Central and South Italy: cf. CRAWFORD 1981 for literature up to 1981, and up to 1996 CURTI, DENCH and PATTERSON 1996. See also STEK 2006.
4 See the overview in PATTERSON 2006a, 80-82.
5 BARKER 1995.
6 DENCH 1995, 4-10; see the introduction in SIRAGO 2000.
7 SALMON 1967.
whereas ancient authors refer to one ‘Great Samnite War’ from 343 to 290 BC. Cornell suggests that the actions referred to may rather have consisted of a series of rather independent military actions.\textsuperscript{9}

But particularly archaeological knowledge has expanded tremendously since 1967. If the first systematic research starting in the 1960s did not at first permit an integrated narrative to complement Salmon’s more historical approach, the situation has changed in recent years with data coming from the Soprintendenze’s long-term and rescue excavations, as well as other projects in the wake of the general reappraisal of Italic archaeology. The most recent and comprehensive general study on Samnite history, culture and socio-political organisation is the work by Gianluca Tagliamonte entitled \textit{I Sanniti: Caudini, Irpini, Pentri, Carricini, Frentani}, carefully integrating historical, epigraphic, numismatic and archaeological material.\textsuperscript{10}

\begin{flushleft}
\textbf{MODERN AND ANCIENT VIEWS}
\end{flushleft}

The prevailing Graeco- or Romanocentric views of both ancient and modern historiographic traditions have certainly helped to establish an image of a backward Samnite culture. Salmon also generally tends to depict Samnites as a fierce, stubborn and valiant mountain tribe, and shows sympathy for their struggle against the Romans.\textsuperscript{11} Notwithstanding this partisan element, one may find that Salmon did not break free from the historical framework and preconceptions provided by Livy. He stresses the opposition between Romans and Samnites quite heavily, and in the end his Samnites are not very dissimilar from the Livian \textit{montani atque agrestes}.\textsuperscript{12} A fatalistic element in Salmon’s work, which sees the final Roman conquest as an inescapable and perhaps even a not undesirable event, has been pointed out,\textsuperscript{13} a conception that fits well into the unification paradigm outlined in Chapter 1.\textsuperscript{14}

In her important work \textit{From Barbarians to New Men} Emma Dench highlights and deconstructs these conceptualisations of the peoples of the Central Apennines and Samnium proper.\textsuperscript{15} She shows how certain preoccupations have influenced the depiction of these peoples in antiquity. The importance of portraying the enemy negatively, for instance, accounts for Livy’s somewhat contradictory assertions on both Samnite primitivism and \textit{luxuria}. Even more interesting are the changes in the Roman perception of the Italic peoples as they, once under Roman rule, were invaluable for the supply of manpower. In the case of Samnium, post-Sullan ideology

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{9} CORNELL 2004.  \\
\textsuperscript{10} TAGLIAMONTE 1997.  \\
\textsuperscript{11} As Martin Frederiksen stated in a review in 1968 (FREDERIKSEN 1968, 224): “indeed, Professor Salmon has almost changed into a Samnite himself. His heart clearly warms to the majestic landscape of the Apennines; and when he turns to write of the long struggle between Samnium and Rome, he becomes frankly and engagingly partisan.”  \\
\textsuperscript{12} DENCH 1995, 5.  \\
\textsuperscript{13} DENCH 2004.  \\
\textsuperscript{14} Interestingly, we may distinguish a certain development in Salmon’s view of Roman domination, since, departing from a ‘partisan’ position in his 1967 work, via his \textit{Nemesis of Empire} lectures, he ends up with his strongly pro-Roman \textit{The making of Roman Italy} of 1982 (SALMON 1982).  \\
\textsuperscript{15} DENCH 1995.
\end{flushright}
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seems to have structured the emphasis on abandonment and rurality after his military actions. In the late Republic and Augustan age, then, the ‘foreignness’ of Samnite culture is instrumentalised to enhance the moral excellence attributed to the Sabines by raking together both Samnites and Sabines in the neologism ‘Sabelli’.\(^\text{16}\) In this way, an ‘Italic’ ideal is invented by combining Sabine piety and Samnite bravery.

With regard to modern views, Dench has more recently shown how various factors have contributed to the ‘anti-classical’ image of Samnium.\(^\text{17}\) Livy’s account on the Samnite Wars and the archaeologically most visible mid-Republican period were most important in the evocation of an anti-Roman and anti-classical image. This view was enhanced by the disciplinary divide between archaeology and history. The lack of discussion and cross-fertilisation between Barker’s landscape research and more classical studies can for example be explained by this disciplinary divide.

**ECONOMY AND PATTERNS OF SETTLEMENT**

The general image of ‘backwardness’ discussed above has influenced ideas on the economy and patterns of settlement in Samnium. Modern studies may have over-emphasised the importance of pastoralism for Samnite economies.\(^\text{18}\) Recent studies tend to balance this pastoralist vision with evidence for risk-spreading mixed farming.\(^\text{19}\) More attention to the Iron Age communities, that apparently shared in Italic networks on a larger scale than formerly assumed, as well as an increasing interest in Greek-Hellenistic elements in Samnite culture, have contested the alleged isolation of Samnium.\(^\text{20}\) From the third century BC on, many Italic people apparently joined in the Mediterranean trade networks, and it is thought that Samnium benefited from these enterprises. Yet, there can be no question about the distinctive character of ancient Samnium, with its particularly late urban development, thereby deviating firmly from Graeco-Roman ideas of civilisation. We must not overestimate the relatively poor material culture of the Iron Age. After all, it cannot compete seriously with the Tyrrhenian or even neighbouring ‘peripheral’ Samnite regions such as internal Campania, if not understood within different societal frameworks.

The standard idea of the Samnite landscape can be summarised as ‘dispersed villages and farms around hill-forts and rural sanctuaries’ The Samnites have often been described as a tribal society, based on a *pagus-vicus* pattern of settlement, in which *pagi* (territorial districts) would include one or more *vici* (villages or hamlets).\(^\text{21}\) From an archaeological point of view the still visible hill-forts and sanctuaries have attracted most attention. Hill-forts, mostly built up in polygonal walling, are spread throughout the whole Central Apennines. Due to a lack of excavation data, often their date and

\(^{16}\) Dench 1995.

\(^{17}\) Dench 2004.

\(^{18}\) Especially the scale and forms of transhumance (the seasonal moving of the herds) have been discussed at length. Central to this discussion is the applicability of evidence of later periods (mostly Roman imperial or even early modern) to earlier times (cf. Chapter 4 for discussion).

\(^{19}\) Contributions in Barker and Lloyd 1991; Barker 1995.


\(^{21}\) Cf. Chapter 4 for a description and Chapter 6 for detailed critique of the *pagus-vicus* system.
function within the ancient pattern of settlement remains troublesome. It is not clear whether they were permanently inhabited or served only as temporary refuges for the people living in the valleys.\textsuperscript{22} The small sample of excavated hill-forts yielded evidence for at least semi-permanent habitation in all cases.\textsuperscript{23} The West-Lucanian hill-fort of Roccagloriosa has been investigated exemplarily with a combination of excavation and field survey in the territory.\textsuperscript{24} Often Roccagloriosa is evoked as a model for hill-forts within Samnite society.\textsuperscript{25} According to this model, local elites from within the walls controlled a community living dispersed in the direct territory of the hill-fort.\textsuperscript{26} Hill-forts would thus have assumed a centralising role in the formulation of institutional and political structures.\textsuperscript{27} To give weight to this central role, Gualtieri has argued for a ‘\textit{vicus-pagus-oppidum} system’, a variant of the \textit{pagus-vicus} system with more emphasis on the hill-fort or \textit{oppidum}.\textsuperscript{28}

The question remains, however, whether this West-Lucanian model may be used to complement our knowledge of the more internal zones of Samnium. Regional differences remain essential and interpretations must in first instance depend on the actual local data. Settlement developments in Lucania and Samnium differ substantially, also chronologically. The well-documented site of Roccagloriosa risks overshadowing other less investigated sites in inland Samnium, dominating the interpretation of the latter. Arguably, for other Samnite hill-forts, we should adopt the admirable \textit{methodology} applied at Roccagloriosa, rather than the actual model of settlement organisation encountered there.\textsuperscript{29}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[22] Cf. OAKLEY 1995 for discussion.
\item[26] The inclusion of hill-forts within \textit{pagi} is, however, firmly part of the traditional concept of the \textit{pagus-vicus} system, cf. e.g. KORNEMANN 1942b, 2321: “Jeder \textit{p[agus]} enthielt auch ein oder mehrere \textit{oppida}. Zum offenen Gau gehörte als Zufluchtsort die Gauburg.” Cf. KORNEMANN 1942a, 710: “Wie \textit{pagus} der Gau, so ist \textit{oppidum} in der kleinsten Form die Gauburg, in grösseren Dimensionen dagegen die Stammes- oder Volksburg. \textit{Pagus} und \textit{oppidum}, Gau und Gauburg, sind die beiden wichtigsten Glieder altitalischen Siedelns.” (note the terminology reminiscent of Nazi ideology adopted here).
\item[27] In this regard a fragment of a bronze plaque with an inscribed \textit{lex}, thought to derive from a public building near the central gate at Roccagloriosa, is relevant: it mentions magistrates, and other formulae seem reminiscent of Latin \textit{leges}. Gualtieri dates it to the first half of the third century BC (the late date around 130 BC initially proposed by TOCCO 2000, 224 must be erroneous; see GUALTIERI 2000).
\item[28] This system would have formed an “embryonic form of territorial ‘city-state’”: GUALTIERI 2004, 46.
\item[29] STEK 2006, 405-406.
\end{enumerate}
If the evidence for Samnite hill-forts is already meagre, other types of settlements have unfortunately been even less investigated. Although as noted the general image of Samnite society is one of dispersed villages and farms, and field surveys have revealed relatively high densities of rural settlements, only very few of them have been object of excavation. Amongst them are the farmsteads at Matrice and Cercemaggiore, dating to the third century BC onwards.\textsuperscript{30} The excavation and complete publication of a small Samnite village or hamlet at Capracotta by Ivan Rainini as yet stands alone.\textsuperscript{31} Relatively much attention has been paid to the sanctuaries,\textsuperscript{32} and the available evidence furnishes a fairly clear picture of these sanctuaries. In the following, the development of Samnite sanctuaries and their possible relation to developments in Samnite history and society will be roughly outlined. The sanctuaries of Pietrabbondante and S. Giovanni in Galdo will be discussed in more detail because of their status as the most ‘typical’ Samnite sanctuaries in modern literature. Whereas the first would represent the Samnite ‘federal’ or ‘state’ sanctuary, the latter allegedly represents a typical small Samnite sanctuary.

\textbf{Samnite Sanctuaries: New Forms and Tradition}  

The remains of monumental sanctuaries form the most conspicuous part of the archaeology of the Hellenistic period in Samnium, and therefore, have attracted much of the scholarly attention devoted to this region. This modern view is probably biased in favour of sanctuaries because of scholarly traditions, disproportionally preoccupied with monumental architecture. However, this situation reflects at least in part an ancient preoccupation with sacred places too. The few well excavated remains of domestic and funeral contexts of the same period appear rather poor when compared to the relatively opulent temples. Apparently in this period the ancient inhabitants of Samnium invested more readily in their sacred places than in, for instance, sumptuous funerals, houses, or profane public buildings.

In order to gauge this importance, a diachronical perspective is useful. Before the fifth century BC there is no evidence for cult places of any substance, but rich graves occupy a prominent position. Cult places become visible in the archaeological record from about the fourth century BC, and their heyday is after the Samnite Wars in the late third and second centuries BC. Graves almost disappear from sight and reveal a standardisation in grave gifts unfamiliar to the earlier period. In sum, a shift of focus away from graves to sanctuaries is evident.\textsuperscript{33} Generally, sanctuaries do not yet appear in monumentalised form until the third century. At some cult places votive objects and weapons are deposited. Weapons of

\textsuperscript{31} RAININI 1996.
\textsuperscript{32} Although the publication of the excavation data is often rather brief: primarily in short contributions in catalogues or guides. See on research on Samnite sanctuaries \textit{infra} and Chapter 4.
\textsuperscript{33} E.g. TAGLIAMONTE 2004, 104-105; cf. similar ideas on the shift of focus from different contexts in D’ERCOLE 2000.
foreign origin have been found at the sanctuary at Pietrabbondante. Part of the weaponry can be dated as early as the late fifth century BC. They have been interpreted as a communal dedication, booty being offered and displayed in the sanctuary after battle (spolia hostium, perhaps even a proper congeries armorum), but probably reflect different rituals on an individual level as well. In light of these finds, in this period Pietrabbondante may already in this period have been serving as a symbolic central place.

The Samnite Wars ended in 290 BC with an unequal treaty for the Samnites. After the Roman victory, the pattern of settlement changed dramatically: in 263 BC the Romans placed the Latin colony Aesernia in the middle of Pentrian territory, and later a praefectura was established at Venafrum, the important passage to Campania. At Aesernia in this time apparently a three cellae temple was built: perhaps indeed a Capitolium, symbolising and propagating an urban way of life and ‘Romanness’ (cf. Chapter 2). It is also during this period that Samnite cult places are structured more solidly. At the locations of sanctuaries which presumably had formerly been open-air cult places, cult buildings were erected. The best example of this development is the sanctuary at Pietrabbondante.

Excavations at Pietrabbondante began in 1857 under the Bourbons. In the 1960s and 1970s systematic research has been carried out by La Regina, which was recently resumed. The results have been published in various contributions.

In the course of the second half of the third century BC this sanctuary assumed monumental forms. To that time, the so-called ‘Ionic temple’ can be dated. It consisted of a temple and some smaller structures, judging by the architectural remains that have been found. This temple probably occupied the space later taken by the theatre-temple complex. La Regina suggests that the form of this earliest sanctuary reflected the locus consaeptus mentioned by Livy when describing a Samnite military rite performed at Aquilonia in 293 BC, in the course of the Third Samnite War (Livy

---

34 LA REGINA 1976, 226; LA REGINA 1984, 24-25.
36 Cf. infra n. 70.
37 E.g. UYTTERHOEVEN 1998-99, 244-246, interprets the building as the Capitolium of the colony; indeed it forms a crucial argument in her location of the forum. For the three cellae: VALENTE 1982, 250-251. See COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 167 (“Capitolium?”); TERZANI 1991 (cautiously, on p. 112: “il principale luogo di culto della colonia latina”) and TERZANI 1996, 149-151 with previous bibliography. Cf. now PAGANO 2005, 76 on the location of the ‘arx’ in this area, rather than the forum.
39 LA REGINA 1976, 246; COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 234-239.
40 LA REGINA 1976 suggests that the ‘Ionic temple’ replaced an earlier sanctuary, of which, apart from some material found ex situ, no trace remains, p. 226: “uno più antico [santuario], documentato della presenza di materiali, tra cui ricorderò un frammento di lamina bronzea della fine del IV secolo”; later however, La Regina sees the ‘Ionic temple’ as the earliest sanctuary, and the area sacra would consequently relate to this phase: COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 234-239, esp. 234: “questo primo santuario [scil. ‘tempio ionico’], comunque il più antico tra quelli accertati ...”
41 That is, the sanctuary preceding the ‘Ionic temple’ (LA REGINA 1976), or the phase of the ‘Ionic temple’ itself (COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984), cf. the preceding note.
This time-honoured Samnite ritual, which was central to the formation of the *legio linteata* (the elite soldiers of the Samnite army), took place in a square sacred area of 200 by 200 feet, which was boarded off and covered all over with linen cloth. According to La Regina this would match the dimensions of the theatre and the frontal alignment of the later Temple B. At the end of the third century BC the ‘Ionic temple’ was destroyed.

In the second quarter of the second century BC, a new temple (Temple A) was built. It was set on a podium (17.70 x 12.20 x 1.65 m), and was probably prostyle and tetrastyle, with a single *cella*. Several Oscan inscriptions mentioning magistrates indicate that this temple was the focus of Samnite political life during the second century BC. Parts of the building were dedicated by magistrates, and especially the *gens Staia* appears to have been active here. The most intriguing inscription is however Vetter 149, dated to the second century BC, which mentions *safinim sak*, referring to a *sakara[k]um* or in any case a sacred dedication, and thus apparently defining the sanctuary as that of the Samnites as an ethnic group (cf. *infra*).

The most grandiose architectural enterprise was the theatre-temple complex known as Temple B, which must have been built shortly before the outbreak of the Social War (fig. 3.1).

---

42 Liv. 10.38.5. La Regina 1976, 226: “E in effetti lo spazio occupato dal teatro, ed esteso fino all’allineamento frontale dei due basamenti adiacenti al tempio B, corrisponde nella forma e nelle dimensioni alla descrizione liviana.” [55m = 200 Oscan feet (0,275)].

43 La Regina 1976, 226-229; Coarelli and La Regina 1984, 234-239: according to La Regina by Hannibal.

44 Ve. 152; La Regina 1976, 233; La Regina 1989, 361.

45 *Sakara[k]um* or *sakara[t]* has been read; RIX 2002, 83 prefers *sakara[t]*. Cf. e.g. Ve. 150. Cf. also bibliography in the following note.

46 Untermann 2000, s.v.; cf. Vetter 1953 no. 149, on p. 109: “Das Wort *safinim* scheint auf die Tätigkeit des Stifters als Bundesbeamter hinzuweisen,” criticised by Lejeune 1972 who argues for an interpretation as federal Samnite sanctuary, interpreting *safinim* as an ethnic: “C’est donc le temple A qui, à la date de notre texte, est qualifié de safinim (*sabhnyom*) ‘samnite’. Cet ethnique, on le sait, fournit (concurrentement avec viteliú) la légende figurant au revers des émissions monétaires fédérales osques au temps de la Guerre Sociale (Ve. 200 G2)” (100-101). La Regina interprets the inscription as a testimony to the ‘state’ character of the sanctuary: Coarelli and La Regina 1984, 241: “Vi compare infatti menzionato il nome del Sannio (*Safinim*), che rivela esplicitamente la funzione politica e religiosa che il tempio, e quindi l’intero santuario di Pietrabbondante, svolgeva per lo stato sannitico.” Cf. pp. 171-172: “Soprattutto sull’incomprensione di questo modello (scil. the “nomen tribale dei Pentri”) si fondano ricostruzioni ingiustificate, come ad esempio una lega di città sannitiche o il carattere federale di un santuario.” On the question of ‘state’ or federal organisation, cf. n. 68 and discussion *infra*. The important point here is that in any case a connection is made between the sanctuary and the notion of a ‘Samnite’ identity.
G. Staatis L. Klar, member of an important Samnite family, seems to have been responsible for the construction of part of the podium. The tetrastyle temple, with a podium measuring 35.75 x 23.10 x 3.57 m, presents a plan with three cellae (rather than a single one with alae), and the building was flanked by two lateral porticoes. The building had a long pronaos, and in the middle of the front of the podium a flight of stairs has been made which leads up to the podium. Two altars stand in front of the podium aligned with the central and eastern cellae, and it seems legitimate to reconstruct a third one aligned with the western cella. The theatre, with impressive polygonal walls on the outside and elegantly decorated with amongst other things telamones on the inside, was built shortly before the temple, and occupies the space in front of it.

In sum, this sanctuary, where weapons were already deposited from the fifth to fourth centuries BC onwards, flourished in the period after the Roman victory in the Samnite Wars, from the third century BC right up to the Social War. It was located away from the colony at Aesernia and apparently constituted a ‘traditional Pentrian’ cult place.

---

47 Ve. 154; Pocc. 18. Cf. LA REGINA 1976, 233 with discussion on 244; COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 253-254; LA REGINA 1989, 338.
Pietrabbondante represents by far the most imposing complex in Samnium. Other sanctuaries appear to have been frequented from the fourth or third centuries BC on, with a subsequent phase of monumentality mostly dated to the second or early first centuries BC, although sometimes earlier as well. The best known examples are Schiavi d’Abruzzo, Vastogirardi, Campochiaro, S. Pietro in Cantoni, Quadri, Atessa, and S. Giovanni in Galdo.

The sanctuary at S. Giovanni in Galdo, Colle Rimontato, was frequented from the late fourth century or early third centuries BC on (cf. Chapter 5), but only monumentalised at the very end of the second or the beginning of the first century BC. A terminus post quem of 104 BC is provided by coins under the pavement of the central *sacellum*. This *sacellum* was located within a square precinct (ca. 22 x 22 m; cf. fig. 3.2).

![Fig. 3.2. The sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo (adapted from ZACCARDI 2007, 63 pl. 1).](image)

---

53 LA PENNA 1997a.
54 FABBRIOTTI 1997.
This area is protected on three sides by a retaining wall; the space between this wall and the precinct walls is about one metre at the back of the sanctuary and 1.30m at the sides. Within the precinct, two lateral porticoes were located at the West and East sides, each 4 m wide. Columns supported the porticoes whereas the back part of the porticoes may have been closed off.\footnote{COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 295; cf. ZACCARDI 2007, 95-96 proposing six columns on each side.} Against the centre of the back wall of the precinct a \textit{sacellum} was placed. It stood on a high podium (7 x 7.50 x 1.54 m) which is preserved rather well, presenting a profile typical of many Samnite sanctuaries (fig. 3.3), see for example Temple A of Pietrabbondante. The plan of the \textit{sacellum} cannot be made out anymore, but a tetrastyle reconstruction has been suggested.\footnote{See ZACCARDI 2007, 95.} The \textit{sacellum} was paved with a red \textit{signinium} floor decorated with white mosaic tesserae; the mosaic is currently exhibited in the Questura of Campobasso. Apparently no permanent stairs were foreseen for the \textit{sacellum}; the podium continues on all three sides. This feature has led La Regina to suppose that it was no real \textit{sacellum}, but rather a \textit{thesauros}, perhaps containing a statue.\footnote{COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 296-297: “probabilmente una statua o un donario importante ivi dedicato per intervento dello stato o per munificenza di qualche magistrato.” COARELLI 1996 suggests that the precinct was destined for some sacred initiation rites, and presumes that the precinct wall continued also at the front, closing off the sacred area. Here, only foundation walls on a lower level have been found however, and this reconstruction has been recently dismissed by ZACCARDI 2007, 70.}
Monumentalisation: Wealth, Politics and Architectural Forms

As noted, the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo is part of a larger phenomenon of monumentalisation of cult places in especially the second century BC. In a period during which both private and secular public buildings appear to be unostentatious or non-existent, these grand temples must have caught the eye. Why was so much invested in the Samnite cult places?

WEALTH

Different ideas have been developed to explain the widespread construction of sanctuaries in the late third and second centuries BC. Most popular (and at the same time the most generic) is the thesis that connects the construction of sanctuaries to the economic profits made by Italians within the Roman imperial system. Especially the opening of the eastern Mediterranean markets is considered to have been of great importance. Citing the Italic negotiatores or mercatores active on Delos has almost become a topos. The possibility of the Samnites participating in the Mediterranean trade network has been seen as a favour granted by the Romans, who punished the Italic groups that defected during the Hannibalic War, but rewarded those that had remained loyal. Indeed, some members of apparently the same families that were active in the construction works of the sanctuaries are attested epigraphically on Delos, although the identification is not sure. The economic prosperity of Italians abroad is often presented as an ‘explanation’ for the appearance of the lavish Samnite sanctuaries. Characteristically, in this view the architectural form of the temples would have been shipped together with the riches to Italy. It should be stressed,

59 According to La Regina, “Tale notevole fioritura edilizia … deve collegarsi all’aiuto offerto a Roma dai Samnites Pentri durante la guerra annibilica, ed ai conseguenti benefici che dovettero derivare loro, a differenza di altre popolazioni che subirono un trattamento punitivo. Sotto tale prospettiva si giustifica anche la partecipazione di Samniti alle lucrose attività commerciali e finanziarie aperte da Roma nel Mediterraneo orientale, così ben attestato a Delo”. LA REGINA 1976, 229. See also e.g. LA PENNA 1997a, 68. However, see TORELLI 1988c, 60 on building activities in general, with the idea that these in Central Italy received a “forte battuta d’arresto” by the Roman conquest in the third century, “fino alla ripresa generale dell’economia italica nella seconda metà del II secolo a.C”.
60 Staii are for example attested at Delos; LA REGINA 1976, 229-230. See GAGGIOTTI 1983, esp. 138 and 146-147 fig. 2a.
62 E.g. GAGGIOTTI 1983, 138, on ‘il Sannio pentro’: “In seguito all’apertura dei ricchi mercati orientali, in particolare Delos, cui parteciparono largamente mercatores, soprattutto laziali e campani, confluirono nelle regioni di origine ingenti capitali, parte dei quali furono impiegati nella ristrutturazione di vecchi santuari o nella costruzione di nuovi, per i quali si adottarono soluzioni architettoniche e planimetriche importate anch’esse dalle zone di tradizione culturale ellenistica nelle quali i mercatores stessi si erano trovati ad operare.” (underscore TS). This idea is echoed in PATTERSON 2006b, 611-612: “Italian communities benefited from this influx of wealth collectively … exploiting the commercial openings made possible by the Roman conquest of the Aegean. Indeed, the building of monumental sanctuaries seems to have been particularly characteristic of this period in Latium and the adjacent territories … modeled on Hellenistic sanctuaries such as those at Kos, Lindos, and Delos itself. Even the Samnite sanctuaries of the central Apennines – Pietrabbondante, S.
however, that the accumulation of wealth does not automatically lead to the erection of a temple, and also a direct architectural influence from the eastern Mediterranean is much more complicated.\textsuperscript{63}

Other economic factors have been highlighted as well; another hypothesis connects the construction of sanctuaries in Samnium to the economic profits made by large-scale transhumance instead of trade in the East.\textsuperscript{64} But wealth should in my view be seen in the first place as a \textit{conditio sine qua non}. In the process from wealth to temple there were active choices to be made. Also, it is seldom specified how the acquired wealth would have been funnelled into the construction works, i.e. through direct private investments, or rather through communal funding. It is certain that the names of a restricted group of families recur in the inscriptions found in the sanctuaries, but it is often unclear whether they acted on their own behalf or on behalf of the community as a whole in an official capacity.\textsuperscript{65} This scarcity of evidence precludes in any case all too direct comparisons with the situation in Rome, where most mid-Republican temples can be linked to competing \textit{gentes}, apparently without much state intervention.\textsuperscript{66} It should also be pointed out that in Rome a variety of public buildings for diverse political and social functions was close at hand, whereas in Samnium sanctuaries virtually form the exclusive focus of attention. Even if a decisive role for elite individuals would be accepted, the basic question remains why they chose to construct or embellish sanctuaries, and not other structures. Why was it – to remain in the economic vocabulary – profitable to invest in sanctuaries? If status is achieved by the grace of an audience, the inevitable answer is that sanctuaries apparently had an important function within society. In this way, even considering the argument that wealth was the ‘reason’ for the monumental building of sanctuaries, we end up with questions about the \textit{audience} envisioned by the rich \textit{negotiatores}, and therefore with questions about the role of the sacred place in society, also before its monumentalisation.

\textsuperscript{63} Cf. also \textit{infra}.

\textsuperscript{64} \textsc{Lloyd} 1991a, 184-185 and \textsc{Dench} 1995, 121 for this suggestion. Cf. Chapter 4 on the relation between transhumance and sanctuaries.

\textsuperscript{65} Evidence is rich for Pietrabbondante, cf. e.g. Ve. 151 mentioning the dedication of Temple A by a \textit{meddix tuticus}, but also many dedications by persons without mentioning their official capacity are found. Less abundant is the evidence for other, smaller sanctuaries, especially when brick stamps mentioning state officials are dismissed as evidence for their direct intervention in the construction (corpus in \textsc{Rix} 2002, 83-91). Cf. \textsc{Dench} 1995, 121: “it is as well to admit that we simply do not have good epigraphic evidence to answer conclusively questions about the extent to which building was actually funded by individuals or by communities as a whole,” with n. 37: “It is worth emphasizing the fact that there is little positive evidence for the funding of parts of the rural sanctuaries in Samnium by individuals.”

\textsuperscript{66} Esp. \textsc{Ziolkowski} 1992 for this view; but cf. \textsc{Orlin} 1997.
POLITICS

A more specific interpretation of the monumentalisation of sanctuaries can be found in the socio-political realm. For several large sanctuaries in Italy a political function has been posited, similar to the Latial Jupiter Albanus sanctuary and the Etruscan fanum Voltumnae.\(^{67}\) Sanctuaries have been linked directly to the supposed political organisation of theItalic peoples, which has resulted in the widely used term ‘federal’ (or even ‘state’) sanctuary.\(^{68}\) For example, the sanctuaries of Mefitis at Rossano di Vaglio, for the Lucani, and in the Val d’Ansanto for the Hirpini, as well as the sanctuary of Marica at the mouth of the Garigliano for the Aurunci, have been considered as such.\(^{69}\) That the sanctuary of Pietrabbondante also functioned as an important sanctuary for the Samnites (Pentri) has long been acknowledged.\(^{70}\) It would have constituted the political centre of the Samnites in their particular political configuration (as ‘tribal nomen’, populus, or touto; cf. Chapter 4). Here, the Samnites would have held their political meetings, the sanctuary being the focus of the people under arms.\(^{71}\)

This military and political function seems to be supported by the only deity documented at the site with certainty. On a late second century or early first century BC dedication on a bronze sheet, which perhaps can be connected to Temple B, Víkturraí or Victoria appears.\(^{72}\) She is actually a very ‘Roman’ goddess, and makes her first appearance here in Oscan territory,\(^{73}\) although she possibly reflects an Aphrodite Nikèphoros of earlier times (who, however, is not directly attested).\(^{74}\) The abundant finds of weapons from the late fifth and fourth centuries BC, as has been noted, might attest to the political and military importance of the sanctuary in earlier periods already.

Moreover, the socio-political dimension of the sanctuary is documented explicitly by the already mentioned inscription which seems to identify the sanctuary as belong to (the) safinim; a sanctuary of ‘the Samnites’, perhaps here restricted to the Pentri and reflecting a conscious appeal to their Samnite / Sabine tradition.\(^{75}\) If the earlier socio-political role of Pietrabbondante must remain somewhat hypothetic, at least in the

---

\(^{67}\) Cf. e.g. AMPOLÓ 1993; ZÉVI 1995; BRIQUEL 2003.

\(^{68}\) For discussion of the political organisation (‘federal’ or ‘statal’) of the Samnites, see Letta 1994 and the contributions by La Regina, e.g. LA REGINA 1989.


\(^{71}\) “esso è il santuario del popolo in armi”: LA REGINA 1989, 422.

\(^{72}\) Pocc. 16; Sa. 24. LA REGINA 1966, 275.

\(^{73}\) Cf. Chapter 7 on the vicus Supinum, with discussion on her ‘Romanness’.

\(^{74}\) On the cults, cf. COLONNA 1996, 121-128. The identification (cf. infra n. 90) with Cominium Tuticum = Touxion is decisive here, since from this place Q. Fabius Maximus Gurges would have transferred a statue of this goddess to Rome during the third Samnite War (Ps.-Plut. Parallela minora, 37b).

course of the second century BC the sanctuary could adopt a strong political and perhaps even ethnic connotation.

In general, one should be careful with the application of ethnicity in archaeological and historical research, and in fact many examples of so-called ‘ethnic’ or ‘tribal’ sanctuaries are exclusively defined as such by outsiders (mostly modern and sometimes ancient writers). But the recognition of an ethnic role for the sanctuary of Pietrabbondante can withstand criticism. In theoretical literature, the fundamental importance of the ethnic definition by the involved group itself (‘emic’) in this process, rather than assertions by others (‘etic’) has been highlighted.\(^\text{76}\) And this is exactly what the *safinim* inscription seems to be: a reference to the perceived old Samnite / Sabine roots by the Pentri themselves. The historical framework within which this development has to be understood can be reconstructed fairly well. It is tempting to see this process of self-assertion in relation to the antagonism between Romans and Samnites on the eve of the Social War.\(^\text{77}\)

This antagonism is best illustrated by the well-known parallel / opposition between the Roman she-wolf and the Italian calf (*viteliu* – *Italia*),\(^\text{78}\) to which, in the case of the Pentri, the association with the Samnite bull, the leading animal during the *ver sacrum* that would have led the Samnites from the Sabines to their new homeland, seems to have been added. On coins from the Italian allies minted in the period of the Social War, the Italian or Samnite bull is depicted as trampling or even raping the Roman she-wolf (fig. 3.4).\(^\text{79}\) Interestingly, an analysis of the animal bones from the sanctuary revealed a preponderance of cattle in the animal sacrifices performed at Pietrabbondante.\(^\text{80}\)

---

\(^{76}\) E.g., for archaeological applications, *Jones* 1997; and esp. *Hall* 2002 on the distinction between cultural and ethnic identity.


\(^{78}\) Hellanicus *FGrH* 4, F111 = Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.35.


\(^{80}\) *Barker* 1989, also in relation to other sanctuaries such as Campochiaro and Colle Sparanise.
This development, in which a community strengthens its symbolic boundaries at a time when the structural base of the community is threatened, is in line with the social anthropological theories referred to in the first two chapters. Moreover, in this process religion and cult places are symbolic markers par excellence. In sum, a better documented case of ‘resistance’, both cultural, political and military, to Roman power does to my mind not exist in Italy. Supported by ample historical, epigraphical and iconographical evidence, we can discard the reservations that one may have against ‘resistant’ interpretations in general, perhaps over-popular in postcolonialist theory. Once this specific connotation of the sanctuary at Pietrabbondante is accepted, as seems legitimate at least for the period leading up to and during the Social War, questions of style and substance can be posed.

**STYLE: ‘EXTERNAL’ CULTURAL ELEMENTS AND MODELS**

Is there a relation between the cultural elements or models adopted in the monumental sanctuary of Pietrabbondante and its specific function within Samnite society? Different provenances of the architectural elements of the sanctuary have been suggested, and often its ‘eclecticism’ has been stressed. As noted earlier, there exists the general (and not merely metaphorical) idea that cultural models were shipped from Delos and other places in the East together with the resources for constructing the temples. More precise commentators have emphasised the influence from Latium and especially Campania (and thereby ‘indirect’ eastern influence).

The closest parallels come from Campania: the cornice of the podium of Temple B has an almost exact parallel in the sanctuary of Fondo Patturelli near Capua, and the theatre and its decorations have parallels at Pompeii and Sarno. According to Hans Lauter, these theatres clearly belong to Great Greek theatre architecture, and this formal similarity would indicate that the Samnite theatrical performances were of

---

81 COHEN 1985; cf. also e.g. GRAVES-BROWN, JONES and GAMBLE 1996.
82 Cf. BROWN 1996; see Chapter 1.
84 E.g. GAGGIOTTI 1983, 138; PATTERSON 2006b, 611-612 (both quoted supra n. 62); cf. also CALIÒ 2003.
85 La Regina (LA REGINA 1976 and LA REGINA 1989) points to Campanian parallels, but also emphasises the originality of Temple B; TORELLI 1983, 242: “Nelle aree meno evolute, i secoli IV e III coincidono con una definitiva urbanizzazione (area umbro-picena) o con la prima monumentalizzazione delle strutture centrali – i santuari -, dell’habitat paganico (area sannitica): anche qui non si mettono in evidenza tipi edilizi particolari, dal momento che le forme architettoniche sono tutte senz’eccezione derivate dalle zone etrusco-laziali e campane.”
86 This is not the place to enter the debate, but the date of the monumental phase of the sanctuary at Kos, for example, is important in respect to the alleged influence on the construction of several Latial sanctuaries.
87 See LA REGINA 1976, 225 fig. VI. It is generally dated to the later second century BC, but without hard evidence. At the sanctuary a building inscription has been found which dates to 108 BC, but the relation to the podium is unclear (cf. COARELLI 1995a, 379).
88 LAUTER 1976, with discussion (esp. the contribution of Coarelli on pp. 422-423); LA REGINA 1976, 233; cf. in general NIELSEN 2002.
Greek tradition rather than Latial. The axially and planimetaliclay-out of the temple-theatre complex, on the other hand, recalls similar combinations of half round stairways in front of the actual temple buildings in Latial sanctuaries such as Gabii and Tivoli (fig. 3.5).

This resemblance has even been thought to recall the curia-comitium model (fig. 3.6). Perhaps most striking however, is the presence of a three cellae plan in Temple B. This feature has been generally interpreted as a ‘Roman’ or ‘Latin’ ‘influence’; the importance attributed to the model of the Capitoline temple has been discussed in Chapter 2. It has been seen there that the model is thought to have spread by way of the Roman urban centres, especially colonies, which proudly boasted Capitolia within their city walls. As noted, in the Latin colony of Aesernia installed in the Pentran territory in 263 BC a three cellae temple of the third century BC has been recognised, perhaps indeed the Capitolium of the colony. It is, in sum, not to be excluded that the three cellae model in Pietrabbondante was indeed inspired by the Roman / Latin model. Unfortunately, the deity or deities venerated at Pietrabbondante remain unknown, apart from the already mentioned dedication to Vikulturra, who need not have been one of the principal deities. In any case, no triad to fit the three cellae has been documented.

89 LAUTER 1976, 418: “Diese formale Übereinstimmung dürfte aber auch implizieren, dass die Aufführungen der Samniten nach der Art der griechischen Aufführungen ausgelegt waren, und im Gegensatz zum latinischen Brauch das Nebeneinander skenischer und thymelischer Darbietungen aufwies.”

90 COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 254; LA REGINA 1989, 303-304, 421-422; COARELLI 1996, 4-7. Related is the proposal to recognise the place Cominum or Cominium Tuticum in Pietrabbondante (LA REGINA 1989, 420-422; COLONNA 1996, 128; TAGLIAMONTE 2002-2003 (2004), 119). On the ‘Roman theatre-temple’ or ‘cultic theatre’ in general cf. HANSON 1959; NIELSEN 2002, esp. 180-196. For discussion of the problem see now TAGLIAMONTE 2007, esp. 56-57, who dismisses the connection with the curia-comitium model, but links (pp. 65-66) the scheme at least partly to Roman influence, radiated from Campanian cities such as Teanum Sidicinum and the Roman colony of Minturnae (for the three cellae temple).


92 See n. 37.

93 Although it should be emphasised that little is known about ‘traditional’ Samnite cult places. The sanctuary at Casalbore, loc. Macchia Porcara might be an example, but seems rather to consist of a central cella with alae, and here architecture and planimetry in any case do not reflect the ‘Tuscanic’ model.
Fig. 3.5. Sanctuary of Juno, Gabii (mid second century BC), plan and reconstruction (adapted from ALMAGRO GORBEA 1982, 584-585 figs. 1 and 2).

Fig. 3.6. The comitum-curia complex in Fregellae (adapted from COARELLI 1981a, 123 pl. III).

The question is what the adoption of a design scheme, such as the *comitium* model, or the ‘Capitoline’ Etrusco-Italic temple with high podium and three *cellae*, actually entailed. Regrettably, too little is known about Samnite society to establish whether these features would have been regarded as typically ‘Latial’ or ‘Roman’. If that were indeed the case, it would suggest the conscious appropriation or reinterpretation of elements perhaps perceived as ‘hostile’. Somewhat differently, the adoption of the models can be seen as an emulation strategy,⁹⁴ constructing a symbolic language

⁹⁴ Emulation of the Roman model is advocated by La Regina (COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 252, 254); cf. COARELLI 1996, 16: “Non è certo un caso se, nella sua ricostruzione immediatamente precedente la guerra sociale, il tempio principale di Pietrabbondante, ricostruito a tre celle e con tre
similar to that of Latium, including Rome, and put to use to convey a proper message. The result is in any case an original creation, not a slavish copy or clumsy hybrid.\textsuperscript{95} Both explanations, which are complementary rather than mutually exclusive, can find support in the use of other images in different realms in this period.\textsuperscript{96} I have already mentioned the well-known antagonism between Rome and Samnium expressed by the emblems of the she-wolf and the bull; the Roman imagery of the she-wolf is effectively distorted by the concurrent image of the Samnite bull goring the Roman animal.\textsuperscript{97} This interaction in symbolic language can be discerned on other occasions as well. The insurgence of the allies resulting in the Social War is described in the sources as a pernicious conspiracy, and an interplay with the famous Samnite oath of 293 BC seems probable.\textsuperscript{98} That the Italic allies indeed swore an oath is documented on a coin struck at Corfinium – in the course of the revolt renamed ‘Italica’ – where soldiers are depicted taking the oath.\textsuperscript{99}

The interesting point here is that the image recalls the oath sworn by Aeneas and Latinus, depicted on golden staters at the moment that the (Trojan) Romans needed their Latin allies very hard during the Hannibalic invasion.\textsuperscript{100} On the Social War coin, the Roman model is appropriated and used against Rome. In this context the adoption of the Roman goddess Victoria – in Oscan \textit{Víkturrai} – evoked at Pietrabbondante most probably in hope of a victory over the Romans,\textsuperscript{101} suggests the same process. Although the architectural aspects of the sanctuary are perhaps less explicit and therefore more difficult to interpret, there is no reason per se to think that the underlying processes leading to the adoption of these models was fundamentally different from that of the images just evoked. The models adopted had no intrinsic significance, but acquired this significance in the process. The only way to try to understand what significance could have been attributed to them, is by trying to reconstruct the ideological frameworks within which the building was conceived. No explicit evidence survives that informs us on Pentrian conceptions of the three \textit{cellae} temple or the \textit{comitium} model. But it appears from the ideological framework reconstructed from other sources, that the adoption of what modern authors have called ‘Roman’ or ‘Latial’ cultural models can, in the case of Pietrabbondante, demonstrably not be equated with acceptance of Roman rule or ways of life.\textsuperscript{102} A situation that with less contextual

\begin{itemize}
\item altari, si ispirò al modello del tempio capitolino”; cf. also TAGLIAMONTE 1997, 189: “evidentemente [come] esito di processi di acculturazione e di emulazione competitiva”; TAGLIAMONTE 2007, 68.
\item CF. LA REGINA 1976, 234: “il grande tempio di Pietrabbondante ... è l’unico esempio di architettura templare nel Sannio in cui, oltre a motivi formali riconducibili all’uno o all’altro ambiente da cui derivano, sia possibile riconoscere la personalità e la fantasia di un architetto nella originale elaborazione dello schema di tradizione italica.”
\item CF. STEK 2004.
\item SYDENHAM 1952 no. 628.
\item ROUVERET 1986.
\item By Q. Pompeius Silo; FELLETTI MAJ 1977, 129-130.
\item SYDENHAM 1952 nos. 69, 70; FELLETTI MAJ 1977, 129-130, 159 n. 3; BURNETT 1998, 169.
\item Thus PROSDOCIMI 1989, 540.
\item STEK 2004; STEK 2005a; STEK 2005b. Cf. also on ‘emulation’ \textit{supra} n. 94.
\end{itemize}
evidence (e.g. only the planimetry) could perhaps have appeared as rather ‘romanised’, actually hides an entirely different reality than that qualification seems to imply.

TRADITIONALISM IN SAMNITE SANCTUARIES?
Apart from these various influences from ‘outside’, elements of traditionalism have been recognised as well. As noted, La Regina has pointed out that the area occupied by the earliest sanctuary at Pietrabbondante measures probably 200 by 200 feet, thereby recalling the Samnite locus consaeptus where the legio linteata was formed according to Livy (10.38). The area later occupied by the theatre and the foremost part of the temple apparently respected these measurements, although the temple itself did not fall within this precinct. That the legio linteata is probably more than just legend seems to be supported by the discovery of a fragment of mural decoration from the area of Cumae, in which an image of the linen legion has been recognised. The painting dates to around 300 BC. Although this does not, of course, prove the reliability of the size of the sacred area Livy gives, it seems at least that he was informed. Even if it is not entirely sure that Livy actually refers to a sanctuary proper, it suggests that there indeed existed ancient traditions (ex vetusta Samnittium religione; ex libro vetere linteo) which prescribed the form of places where rituals were performed. The size and form of the sanctuary of Pietrabbondante may in this case represent more than just an analogy. In a recent study, Pietrabbondante has, on other grounds, been identified with Livy’s Aquilonia. If correct (which remains difficult to prove), this means that the traditional sanctuary at Aquilonia / Pietrabbondante was to some extent respected by the later construction phases.

At any rate, the appearance of the early sanctuary at Pietrabbondante would have been that of a sacellum in the centre with lateral porticoes, set within a precinct. This is basically the same scheme that is found in the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo. Here, a rectangular precinct encloses a small sacellum with two lateral porticoes. Apparently, this is the same model that is applied in the last construction phase at Pietrabbondante with Temple B, the temple representing the sacellum flanked by two lateral porticoes. This would thus represent “una sicura memoria degli originari santuari sannitici” of the type known from Livy, whereas the buildings and decoration would constitute “l’evoluzione del modello originario, arricchito con elementi introdotti dalla diffusione dell’ellenismo in ambiente italico”. It should be admitted

103 LA REGINA 1976, 226.
104 Cf. COARELLI 1996, who believes Livy’s description to be, in the end, a trustworthy ethnographic description.
105 VALENZA MELE 1996; CAPUTO 2000; MOORMANN in prep.
106 SISANI 2001a, but cf. LA REGINA 1989, 421.
that this hypothetical reconstruction of a traditional scheme in Samnite sanctuaries, although suggestive, rests on little evidence. Elaborations of this thesis should consequently be treated with caution. 108 But if this interpretation is correct, it could help to explain the reasons for the development of small monumental sanctuaries in the second century BC such as S. Giovanni in Galdo. Although in every single situation local circumstances will have been important, the apparent harking back to ancient ‘Samnite’ traditions may suggest that at least one of the sentiments at play was indeed the affirmation of a Samnite consciousness on the eve of the Social War, just as is documented for Pietrabbondante at this time. However, it is important to acknowledge that this possible ‘harking back’ to ancient customs is no simple traditionalism, but rather the eclectic use of traditional elements for contemporary purposes. In the words of the social anthropologist Anthony Cohen, “it is a selective construction of the past which resonates with contemporary influences”. 109

Conclusion: The Construction of Community

The example of the Samnites Pentri presents an interesting illustration of the problems involved in the interpretation of material culture as well as the role of sanctuaries within ancient society. In Samnium, a largely non-urbanised area, sanctuaries occupied a privileged position in society. The Samnites fought dire wars against Rome. Only after their surrender in the third century BC were sanctuaries embellished in monumental forms. This has been explained as a result of economic prosperity, but instead this seems to be a precondition. At least for the central sanctuary at Pietrabbondante a connection with the political and military organisation of the Samnites can be demonstrated. Widely-spread Hellenistic cultural forms, and perhaps even elements that could have been regarded as ‘Roman’ or ‘Latin’ in this context, are apparently employed to serve proper purposes and were given a new meaning, which is at direct variance with any straightforward notion of ‘romanisation’ or ‘hellenisation’.

Although one should be cautious in using terms such as cultural resistance, sometimes applied too readily, there are strong indications in the case of the Pentri to support such an approach. The ideological framework as it appears in legends and images indicates an antagonism between Rome and Samnium, communicated in a common imagery. Indeed, the adoption of what moderns call ‘Hellenistic’, ‘Latin’ and ‘Roman’ elements at Pietrabbondante are not to be interpreted as ‘self-romanisation’, but rather as the choosing of building materials for the construction of a Samnite Pentrian identity in

1997, 185). See TORELLI 1996, 41-42 on the general notion of the monumentalisation of sanctuaries as part of a “fenomeno panitalico” in both urban (the Latial sanctuaries) and more rural (Samnite, Lucanian) contexts, which he interprets in a “prospettiva di natura controacculturativa” and as “manifestazioni di resistenza alla romanizzazione”, followed by TAGLIAMONTE 1997, 188.

108 And I have to make a retraction here with regard to a paper in 2003 (STEK 2005a), in which I may have over-schematised and extrapolated the development discussed here.

specific historical circumstances. In other words, there was cultural change, but without loss of local distinctiveness. The monumentalisation of the sanctuary of Pietrabbondante on the eve of the last insurrection against Rome can be seen to represent the symbolic expression of a community that defines itself as ‘Samnite’, at the very moment that this sovereign identity is threatened by outsiders. Perhaps similar incentives played a role in the development of smaller Samnite monumental sanctuaries. Supposed ‘traditional Samnite’ elements in some sanctuaries could support such an interpretation. The enhancement of the ‘sacred landscape’ of Pentrian Samnium could thus perhaps be seen at least in part as a reaction to the changes that Roman dominance brought with it; a case of ‘constructing’ the community, strengthened by the harking back to perceived ancient proper traditions, in which cult places and religion play key roles. This ideological aspect of sanctuaries as reconstructed from epigraphical, historical and, to a lesser extent, archaeological evidence constitutes only one side of the coin however. The impact and meaning of these cult places cannot be ascertained without knowledge of the communities that actually interacted with them. Indeed, another crucial point that becomes clear is that the socio-political messages conveyed by the monumentalisation of these cult places – whether this should be ascribed to economic prosperity, to a growing ethnic consciousness, or anything else – cannot be understood without knowing who the intended audience was. Who visited these sanctuaries? For whom were they constructed or embellished? In order to further our understanding of the role that sanctuaries, large and small, fulfilled within this discourse, it is essential to understand the local functioning of the cult places. It is with these local functions that the next chapters will be concerned.
In the previous chapter, the importance that sacred places assumed in Samnium from the fourth to the beginning of the first centuries BC was discussed. Individuals of a high status invested in votives, decoration and the sacred buildings themselves, often in their capacity as political leaders. As has been seen, a presumed general economic prosperity, whether deriving from the activities of Italic negotiatores in the east or from large-scale transhumance, has been put forward as an explanation for this phenomenon. The explanation might also be sought in more acute historical and socio-political circumstances. One possibility is to think of different peer communities as competing in a more or less friendly manner, with the construction of lavish sanctuaries as one of the corollaries. This would underscore the importance of political competition within Samnite society. Also a more outward-looking interpretation is possible: ‘state intervention’ could be imagined, especially in relation to the growing ethnic consciousness outlined in the previous chapter. As has been seen, the epigraphical evidence is inconclusive on this matter (Chapter 3). In any case, none of these different explanations has to be exclusive. We may therefore generally accept that the monumentalisation of Samnite sanctuaries is influenced by socio-political developments in which the ruling elite, whose names we indeed find in inscriptions in these sanctuaries, play key roles.

Irrespective of the incentives of the initiators, the monumentalisation of the sanctuaries conveys a specific message. As noted earlier, a message is directed to an audience and is intended to communicate something to someone. This could have been ‘Samnite pride’ (in the ‘ethnic’ interpretation of the phenomenon), or ‘status’ (if general elite representation processes are favoured). But who was the intended audience? In order to answer this question we must try to reconstruct the social context within which the sanctuaries functioned.

For Pietrabbondante, the telling expression on behalf of (the) safinim (Vetter 149) is indeed only one side of the coin, as it probably represents an initiative of one or more members of the ruling elite, dedicated in the most ‘official’ sanctuary of the Samnites, which was probably not meant to be visited on a regular basis by devotees as part of
personal religious practice. Rather, the temple complex at Pietrabbondante seems to have been a supra-local sanctuary that was important for military and political meetings, as may be concluded from the large quantities of weapons found, and the expensive sacrifices, apparently mostly bulls, that were made there (Chapter 3). Unfortunately, it is not possible to tell in what spatial and social environment the sanctuary of Pietrabbondante was located. Apart from graves in località Troccola and the wall-structures on Monte Saraceno,\(^1\) structures that could indicate dense settlement in this area are lacking until now, but this could be due to the lack of systematic archaeological research in the direct environment of the complex.\(^2\) However, at this stage, there is no evidence that large numbers of average Samnite people visited this non-urban sanctuary on a regular basis.\(^3\)

Even less is known about the possible audiences of Samnite sacred places on a local level, down the hierarchy, at the smaller sanctuaries and shrines dispersed over Samnite territory. It is however of considerable importance to understand the local functions of Samnite sanctuaries: arguably, these form the very raison d’être of the sanctuaries, and determine the audience at which cultural messages might have been sent. As has been seen, especially in the third and second centuries many smaller Samnite sanctuaries are built or reconstructed in monumental forms. Often, these sacred places are generally referred to as ‘rural sanctuaries’, but their supposed ‘rurality’ cannot simply be assumed \textit{a priori} and, indeed, \textit{ex silentio}. Also, the term ‘rural’ has to be further explained: what do we mean by stating that a sanctuary is ‘rural’? The possibility of a major bias in our view of sanctuaries within the general pattern of settlement should also be taken into consideration. This bias may be the result of a scholarly tradition that, as observed earlier, pays disproportionate attention to the monumental elements of the landscape, such as hill-forts and temples, at the expense of more modest forms of settlement. Later we will return to this problem; first some current ideas with regard to the local functions ofItalic sanctuaries in relation to the spatial organisation of the landscape will be explored. Although reference will often be made to ‘Samnite’ sanctuaries proper, this analysis regards sanctuaries in Central-Southern Italy in general, including the Central Apennines (i.e. the so-called ‘Sabellian’ areas).

Until few decades ago, few studies have explicitly tried to understand why and for what specific purposes sanctuaries were actually built in antiquity. Within a culture-historical paradigm, most attention has been directed to the architecture and the aesthetic (as well as economical) value of the votive objects and adornment of the temple. Especially in the last two decades, interest has grown immensely, influenced by the post-processual focus on symbolism, cognition and experience, the realm of religion \textit{par excellence}. This development can be seen best in studies on Greek

---

\(^1\) \textit{COARELLI} and \textit{LA REGINA} 1984, 231-232.

\(^2\) Recently, excavations have been executed by La Regina that revealed a large structure, which has been interpreted as a public building. Presented during a conference in November 2006 at Isernia.

\(^3\) \textit{Contra} e.g. \textit{SCHUBERT} 1996, who assumes that the theatre at Pietrabbondante “dazu diente, grosse Zahlen der Landbevölkerung aufzunehmen, die die religiösen und öffentlichen Feiern des dortigen Heiligtums besuchten”.

---
religion and sanctuaries, for example the influential studies of Colin Renfrew, François de Polignac, Madeleine Jost, Albert Schachter, Susan Alcock, to name but few, and numerous collections of studies.\textsuperscript{4} Not surprisingly, Magna Graecia is relatively well covered too, especially as regards the Great-Greek temples themselves, but in the discussion about the relations and interaction between indigenous Italians and Greek colonists, sanctuaries have also played a special role.\textsuperscript{5} The Tyrrhenic coast is well served with studies as varied as Giovanni Colonna’s Santuari d’Etruria and Filippo Coarelli’s Santuari del Lazio, as well as Ingrid Edlund-Berry’s The gods and the place, on both Etruria and Magna Graecia.\textsuperscript{6}

For inland Italic sanctuaries, the situation is rather different, and only few attempts have been made to explain, problematise or theorise the function of sanctuaries. There are good reasons for this situation. First, the advance of archaeological research: a lot of sanctuaries have been excavated only relatively recently, and there is no firm archaeological or historical framework within which the new discoveries can be interpreted. Second, the nature of the material: the absence of written sources relating to sanctuaries (apart from a few notorious exceptions, cf. Introduction and Chapter 2) and the scarcity of epigraphic material have not invited to venture into historical interpretations. Comprehensibly, most studies on Italic sanctuaries have focused primarily on the publication of the architecture, rather than on the roles these sacred places assumed in Italic society.

In Samnium proper the situation is rather awkward: together with the remains of the walls of the hill-forts, the landscape of ancient Samnium almost appears to have existed exclusively in the presence of sanctuaries, the most visible remains of the Samnites (Chapter 3). It therefore does not come as a surprise that the cult places of Samnium are, within the Italic world, relatively well-known, and are often cited as examples of architecture outside urban centres. But detailed studies lag behind. After Cianfarani’s publication of a small booklet entitled Santuari del Sannio,\textsuperscript{7} the most influential study regarding Samnite sanctuaries has been La Regina’s contribution on Samnium in general to the seminal Göttingen congress on Hellenismus in Mittelitalien (1974), in which La Regina presented the evidence from several new (and at the time ongoing) excavations, fitting it into an integral narrative on the development of Samnium.\textsuperscript{8} In this and later contributions, La Regina pointed to the architectural features as well as the epigraphy, and the narrow ties between a few families and the fate of the sanctuaries.\textsuperscript{9} Studies that focus entirely on Samnite sanctuaries in general (as opposed to studies on single sanctuaries) are almost non-existent after Cianfarani’s

\textsuperscript{4} E.g. RENFREW 1985; DE POLIGNAC 1984; JOST 1985; SCHACHTER 1992; ALCOCK 1993; contributions in ALCOCK and OSBORNE 1994 and in MARINATOS and Hägg 1995.

\textsuperscript{5} E.g. CARTER 1994 and cf. infra.

\textsuperscript{6} COLONNA 1985; COARELLI 1987; EDLUND-BERRY 1987.

\textsuperscript{7} CIANFARANI 1960.

\textsuperscript{8} LA REGINA 1976.

\textsuperscript{9} LA REGINA 1976, and esp. LA REGINA 1989.
essay, although Samnite sanctuaries figure prominently in handbooks and standard works on classical archaeology.\textsuperscript{10} Nonetheless, several ideas regarding the function of these sanctuaries in society have been formulated. In this chapter, some conceptualisations as they appear in modern research will be identified, and it will be attempted to explain them within their different scholarly traditions. For Central-Southern Italy, it seems possible to discern three main strands in the hypotheses on the general functions of sanctuaries. These are mostly implicit, and different authors attach different values to various factors in the location and construction of sanctuaries.\textsuperscript{11} Thus, although this distinction should not be applied too rigidly, its arrangement being mine, for the sake of clarity they will be presented under different headings.

\textsuperscript{10} E.g. GROS and TORELLI 1988; FLOWER 2004; ALCOCK and OSBORNE 2007.

\textsuperscript{11} Cf. e.g. MENOZZI 1998, where a sanctuary near a ‘vicus’ is interpreted as a frontier sanctuary, but later connected as well to transhumance.
It has been argued repeatedly that there is a direct relationship between the location of sanctuaries and the long transhumance routes that cut through Central and Southern Italy. Along these so-called tratturi flocks moved seasonally from the lower plains to the higher pastures, e.g. from modern Puglia to Abruzzo and back. Different branches of tratturi intersected, forming a network of communication routes (cf. fig. 4.1). The sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo has been interpreted in light of a nearby branch of a tratturo, for example.

The location of these sanctuaries along or in the neighbourhood of these transhumance routes has usually been connected with the deity venerated in these sanctuaries. In some important instances, Hercules is known to have been worshipped in sanctuaries along major transport routes, most famously in Tivoli, Rome, and Alba Fucens, in his

---

13 Di Niro 1980, 269.
role as patron deity of herdsmen and trade, especially of salt.\footnote{Esp. VAN WONTERGHEM 1999. Cf. e.g. also TORELLI 1996, 36. On salt trade cf. COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 87; COARELLI 1988b; TORELLI 1993b (on Hercules Salarius in Alba Fucens in connection to the \textit{forum pecuarium}, perhaps the sanctuary at Campochiaro can be identified with the Hercules Ranus from the Tabula Peutingeriana, where Ranus would constitute the Samnite version of Salarius; cf. however CAPINI 2000). For an example of the connection of Samnite sanctuaries with transhumance \textit{without} the connection with Hercules (but rather with Mefitis) cf. BONIFACIO 2000. For an example of the connection of Samnite sanctuaries with transhumance \textit{without} the connection with Hercules (but rather with Mefitis) cf. BONIFACIO 2000.} Because the cult of Hercules was popular in Italic territory, these facts have been combined to strengthen the argument. The spread of the cult of Hercules is sometimes even seen as an \textit{indicator} of the practice of transhumance.\footnote{E.g. PASQUINUCCI 1996, 23: “La distribuzione del culto di Ercole e l’esistenza di \textit{fora pecuaria} attestano una pratica capillare della pastorizia e delle attività economiche connesse.” Cf. also MANCINI 1998, 23: “Nei pressi dei tratturi sorgevano frequentemente i templi dedicati ad Ercole … La distribuzione di questi luoghi di culto lascia intravedere la loro particolare funzione di grandi mercati, anche e soprattutto in relazione alla transumanza. La maggior parte dei santuari dedicati ad Ercole … sorgeva sempre in relazione ai punti cruciali di collegamento e di incrocio dei percorsi della transumanza e del sale ed in relazione alle sorgenti.” Cf. e.g. also COARELLI 2001a for the ‘tempio dorico’ of Pompeii.} The connection between Hercules and pastoralism is often seen as very direct. In this vision, herdsmen would have made up an important part of the clientela of the sanctuaries. Although it is admitted that other people must have formed part of the visitors of the sanctuaries, because the monumentalisation can hardly be ascribed to musty shepherds,\footnote{E.g. VAN WONTERGHEM 1999, 415: “Anche se i pastori transumanti potevano costituire una clientela regolare dei santuari, è per poco probabile che siano loro i responsabili dell’espansione monumentale che alcuni di essi conobbero” and “… i santuari situati presso una fonte … venivano senz’altri visitati anche da altri devoti e non solo dai pastori transumanti”. Cf. also the rather wishful statement on p. 427, on animal bones found in a sanctuary at Nesce: “Si tratta di sacrifici compiuti dai conduttori delle greggi per implorare la protezione di Ercole.”} the accumulation of wealth through transhumance has also been connected with the elaborate architecture.\footnote{LLOYD 1991a, 184-185; DENCH 1995, 121.}

In many cases however there is scanty if any evidence for the veneration of one specific deity, especially if we dismiss the numerous Hercules bronzes dispersed all over Italy\footnote{For these, cf. DI NIRO 1977.} as evidence for a Hercules cult, as seems wise.\footnote{Cf. Crawford 2003a, 63.} Also, inversely, Italic sanctuaries have been assigned to Hercules precisely because their presumed location along \textit{tratturi}, evidently a case of circular reasoning. The cult of Hercules is attested with certainty in fewer cases than one might think,\footnote{In many of the sanctuaries listed by VAN WONTERGHEM 1999, a study on Hercules and transhumance, the principal deity is actually unknown.} and the connection with transhumance is not always clear cut either. Perhaps one of the most famous sanctuaries in the Italic area is the sanctuary of Hercules Curinus in the territory of ancient Sulmo, modern Sulmona in Abruzzo. This sanctuary is especially well known because of its monumental rebuilding after the Social War and forms one of the few examples of non-urban sanctuaries that survive the changes in the pattern of settlement following the Roman municipalisation (cf. \textit{infra}). It is perched on a steep side of the
Monte Morrone, with a height difference of over 200m to the valley floor of the river Sagittario.

A similar situation can be seen in the major sanctuary at Campochiaro, in Samnite territory, that has been identified with the Hercules Ranus sanctuary indicated on the Tabula Peutingeriana. This sanctuary is located on a side of the high mountain range of the Matese, at a height of ca. 800m a.s.l., ca. 300m above the Boiano basin, set on a plateau. Just as the Hercules Curinus sanctuary, the Campochiaro sanctuary is not easily reached from the valley floor. It will take at least 2 hours, following steep paths. I would suggest that this location is not particularly appropriate for a sanctuary controlling the moving of flocks with a connected market function. In any case, in both situations it is difficult to imagine a forum pecuarium on the steep hill, with only relatively small plateaus for the cult buildings. Similarly, the suggestion by La Regina that the toponym Schiavi (d’Abruzzo) could be related to the Oscan word slaagid, slag[im], which could indicate a marketplace, and the inference that there is a connection between the Samnite sanctuaries attested there (dedicated to unknown deities), would result in the same situation: a steep, high hill with almost 300m of height to the valley floor. Of course, it might not be necessary to imagine the flocks themselves reaching the sanctuary proper, since business could have been done at some distance, but it is important to acknowledge that the relation between transhumance and sanctuaries was made in the first place because of the putative topographical correspondence, which is as seen however much less obvious.

Most examples of Hercules supervising market places, and especially sheep and cattle markets, actually seem to date to the Roman period, and are found mainly in Roman colonies or municipia (e.g. Alba Fucens, Herdonia, and Saepinum; fig. 4.2). Similarly, many of the cult places listed in Frank van Wonterghem’s transhumant ‘itinerary’ along Hercules sanctuaries are urban, not rural (Teanum Apulum, Larinum, Luceria, Corfinium).

21 Torelli 1993b.
22 Contra Torelli 1993b and La Regina 2000. Torelli 1993b, 117 argues that the sanctuary would constitute “una tappa cruciale dei percorsi di armenti e greggi provenienti dal cuore del Sannio”.
24 Cf. on marketplaces Gabbia 1975 (155-156 on the relation with sanctuaries); De Ligt 1993; for macella, appearing also from the second half of the second century BC, see De Ruyt 1983. One of the ‘Italic’ exceptions could perhaps be the sanctuary at Abella, known from the cippus Abellanus. The actual presence of a major tratturo is not attested here, but if slaagid ?= campus relates to a marketplace, as suggested by La Regina 2000, 219, the market place was linked to the sanctuary of Hercules. However, this would only document the presence of a generic marketplace near the sanctuary, no explicit connection between Hercules and cattle or sheep markets, and transhumance, is attested here.
Most evidence for the connection between the cult of Hercules and transhumance starts only in the second century BC, and although continuity is often presumed, this is not self-evident. Hercules was venerated in different Italic regions long before transhumance can be presumed to have been an important factor. This is not to say that Hercules was not important in the Italic world, also in his role as patron of herdsmen and merchants, but the evidence for the direct relation between Hercules and (flock) market activities for the Samnite period is less abundant than it may sometimes appear in modern accounts on Samnite economy and sanctuaries. The question is related, of course, to the discussion to what extent long-distance transhumance was practised at all on a large scale before the Roman ‘pacification’ of the Italic areas. This is not the place to enter this debate, but it must be noted that evidence for large-scale transhumance is late and often even derived from (early) modern parallels. In any case, the image of Samnite economy as being based largely on transhumance reflects, at least to some extent, clichés on the primitiveness and pastorality of Samnite society.

Even if it is true that we do not normally find Samnite ‘peak sanctuaries’ far from the inhabited landscape as in some other Italic areas, it is important to underline that

27 Bradley 2005, 139.
28 Sabattini 1977 for the idea that large-scale transhumance was the result of changes after the Hannibalic War. Cf. the discussion in Dench 1995, 111-125 and Crawford 2003a; Crawford 2005, esp. 164 with n. 12.
29 On these images, see Dench 1995.
30 Esp. in Umbria and in the Marche, cf. e.g. Bradley 1997; D’Ercole 2000, 129.
very few Samnite sanctuaries are located directly along the long tratturi. And in itself, it is not remarkable that sanctuaries are located not too far from important transportation and communication routes, and one could wonder whether analyses of the location of sanctuaries in relation to ‘normal’ roads in, say, Etruria and Lazio, would produce significantly different situations. It does not seem methodologically possible to sustain that the location (and very appearance) of sanctuaries was dictated by the presence of transhumance routes, since the last are ubiquitous in the Samnite landscape.31 For a convincing image of Samnite sanctuaries essentially functioning as road shrines or ‘caravanserais’ along the Samnite tratturi and serving primarily passing herdsmen and merchants, too little evidence is present.

**Sanctuaries as Territorial Markers**

“L’ultima categoria di ‘indicatori territoriali’ ... è quella dei santuari di confine” (D’ERCOLE 2000, 127)32

Another, quite different aspect sometimes attributed to Italic sanctuaries is their supposed function as markers of the territory of a certain community, or their establishing the boundaries between separate communities. In this view, sanctuaries define a border between ‘in’ and ‘out’, and they would accordingly have operated both as frontier markers and as places of exchange between the bordering communities. This idea has been developed in most detail for Greece and the Greek colonies, where relatively well-defined communities (poleis, colonies) have been recognised from the geometric period on. Most influential has been the thesis put forward by De Polignac, in his analysis of ‘the birth’ of the Greek city (1984). His study puts religion, ritual and thereby sanctuaries at the centre of the development of the Greek poleis in the eighth and seventh centuries BC.33 The ritually created ‘civic space’ would moreover have a bipolar structure, “où la société se reconnaît et s’organise à la fois en son centre et sur la périphérie géographiques”.34 Because the cults of the city-centre were not able to maintain control over the territory, the territorial cult was located in the extra-urban sanctuary and this would therefore constitute “le pôle de la constitution sociale de la cité”.35 By doing so, de Polignac discerns typically structuralist binary oppositions between cultivated and natural land, and the borders between the two being marked by
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31 Cf. the considerations in BRADLEY 2005, 139-140; cf. also CRAWFORD 2005, 162.
32 Cf. for full quote infra.
33 “C’est en termes cultuels que sont conçus et mis en œuvre les intégrations, entrées en dépendance, conflits et exclusions par lesquels, dans le cadre territorial délimité par la guerre, s’édifie le nouvel agencement des groupes sociaux auparavant juxtaposés : la participation aux rites garantit la reconnaissance mutuelle des statuts et scelle l’appartenance en définissant une première forme de citoyenneté. Et c’est en termes cultuels, par l’essor des rites et le début d’édification des sanctuaires autour des divinités présidant à cette mise en ordre, que la société émergente manifeste sa cohésion nouvelle et prend ses premières décisions collectives, donc politiques, à long terme; l’espace cultuel qui se dessine alors constitue le premier espace civique.” DE POLIGNAC 1984, 155.
34 DE POLIGNAC 1984, 155.
35 DE POLIGNAC 1984, 155.
extra-urban sanctuaries. These were under direct control of the major urban centre, this control being manifested and enlivened by religious ‘centrifugal’ processions, for example the pompê from Miletus to Didyma.36

REFINEMENTS OF THE CENTRAL THESIS BY DE POLIGNAC

Although the model proposed by De Polignac has significantly changed the direction of studies on the relations between Greek politics, religion and sanctuaries, his approach has appeared to be too rigid, as he himself explains in a later restatement of his central thesis.37 In this refinement, he allows for more diversity in these processes, and stresses the concepts of mediation and competition as central to the development of sanctuaries. The idea is that cult places sometimes could develop from more or less neutral central places of contact between different communities into a great rural sanctuary where the sovereignty of a city is made manifest. As an example he gives the Argive Heraion, which from a rather isolated meeting point for different communities in the ninth century BC developed into the great monumental complex relating to the city of Argos, which regained regional hegemony in the Classical period.38 He thus allows for a more complex development over time for the formation of the model. Along the same lines, however, his thesis has been criticised as to the situation he envisages for the final, ‘completed’ stage, with the extra-urban sanctuary expressing a city’s sovereignty over its territory. De Polignac’s distinction between cultivated land and non-cultivated land may be too inflexible, and would tend to regard sanctuaries as boundaries rather than as the integrative elements between hinterland and polis that they could have been.39 De Polignac treats both mainland Greece and Greek colonies in his model of the birth of the city, and in his later elaboration even sees colonies as the prêt-à-(im)porter versions of the mainland Greek evolutions: “The peculiarity of the colonial world lies more in how speedily and systematically it develops what in the Aegean world is the outcome of an evolutionary process at work since the ninth century ...”40

MAGNA GRAECIA

Studies on Magna Graecia have taken up the challenge, and indeed in several instances it seems easy to recognise De Polignac’s principles at work. As a result, the idea of extra-urban sanctuaries as territorial markers has been adopted and developed further for the Greek colonies in Southern Italy.41 Pier Giovanni Guzzo established a ‘scheme’ for the location and function of different sanctuaries in different liminal or ‘threshold’

36 DE POLIGNAC 1984. He distinguishes between sanctuaries of the city, ‘sanctuaires suburbains’ directly outside the city, and extra-urban sanctuaries.
38 DE POLIGNAC 1994, 4-5.
39 Cf. e.g. McINERNY 2006 who stresses the economic role of extra-urban sanctuaries on the border of agricultural and pastoral economies and their consequent ‘integrative’ function; cf. also POLINSKAYA 2003 for criticism on the notion of liminality.
40 DE POLIGNAC 1994, 15-16.
zones. Guzzo distinguishes three border zones in Greek colonial establishments; first the boundary between city and the cultivated countryside, second the boundary between cultivated and uncultivated countryside, and finally the frontier between territories belonging to different colonies or different ethnê. Within this system, the sanctuaries would serve primarily to formalise and normalise the contacts between different zones. In addition, especially in Magna Graecia, in the last decades there has been much interest in the contacts between colonists and the autochthonous population, where sometimes the role of the extra-urban sanctuaries as meeting point is emphasised. This emphasis has opened up a perspective wherein the extra-urban sanctuaries not exclusively serve the community of the hegemonic city, but other neighbouring communities as well.

A clear example of the apparently ‘ideal’ colonial situation is documented in the territory of the Greek colony of Metapontum by Joseph Carter. This case could illustrate both the wealth of the Great Greek evidence (Metapontum presenting perhaps the best studied choræ of all Great Greek cities), and the careful elaboration of De Polignac’s range of thoughts, substantiated by fine data. In the choræ belonging to the Greek urban centre of Metapontum that rose probably somewhere at the end of the seventh century BC, rural shrines, dating mostly from the sixth century BC onwards, are distributed regularly along the river valleys of the Basento and (to a lesser degree) the Bradano, at an interval of ca. 3 km, sometimes with smaller shrines in between. Their location seems to be the result of careful planning (cf. fig. 4.3) in light of their symmetrical position, but also because of the similarity between both the rural cults themselves and between rural and urban cults. The typology of the votive figurines for instance is strikingly uniform, and sometimes the same moulds seem to have been used. So far this would fit nicely into the picture of a colony manifesting authority over its territory. However, in the vicinity of the sanctuaries that are located in the area, surveyed intensively by Texas University, there seem to be significantly more individual family farms. From this observation Carter concludes that “the distribution of sanctuaries may have corresponded to a division of the choræ made in the sixth century into a dozen or so larger units”, accordingly organised and inhabited by different local communities. Ultimately, he compares the shrines to modern parish churches. Thus, Carter puts the emphasis more on the local significance of these rural sanctuaries, albeit the direct result of colonial planning.
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42 GUZZO 1987.
43 Cf. the contributions in MODES 1983 and STAZIO, CECCOLI and AMSELLE 1999; TORELLI 1977.
44 CARTER 1994; CARTER 2006.
ITALY

Similar ideas that link the location and function of sanctuaries with territoriality have been developed for Central and Central-Southern Italy. In the city of Rome space was religiously defined by the location of sanctuaries at ritual boundaries, for example the *pomerium* and the sanctuaries along the roads at the first or fifth and/or sixth mile.\(^46\) Especially revealing in this respect is the festival of the *Terminalia*, celebrated at the sixth mile of the *via Laurentina*, an institution attributed to the mythical king Numa, renowned for his piety.\(^47\) For Etruria comparable hypotheses have been put forward, especially by Andrea Zifferero, who discerns clear developments in the importance of different extra-urban sanctuaries over time, and links this to political developments.\(^48\) For example, he concludes that the border between the cities of Caere and Tarquinia became clear only after the (re-)organisation of the rural population beginning in the orientalising period.

---


\(^{48}\) Zifferero 1995; cf. also Zifferero 1998; Zifferero 2002.
This border followed ecologically defined lines, whereas in the sixth century a mixed frontier system came up, “a barriera interrotta” but reinforced at critical points with extra-urban sanctuaries. In the fourth century this system would have been enhanced by the divergent political developments of Caere, now more under Roman influence, and Tarquinia, expanding into internal Etruria, but was ultimately disturbed by the Roman conquest at the beginning of the third century BC.\textsuperscript{49} Zifferero’s study illustrates well the possibilities of diachronic research. The territorial character of early Etruscan colonisation in the Po basin has been tracked similarly in the religious realm by Monica Miari, who discerns “una articolata trama di segni, che scandiva ed organizzava lo spazio delineando un “paesaggio del culto”\textsuperscript{50}. Her study is also clearly influenced by De Polignac’s ideas, emphasising the expression of sovereignty through the location of cult places.

But also for the Italic inland areas efforts have been made to explain the existence and location of sanctuaries as frontiers within the pattern of settlement. Vincenzo D’Ercole is to be credited for his studies on the Abruzzo region (the areas inhabited in antiquity – partly – by the Praetutii, the coastal Vestini, Marruccini, Frentani, Carricini, Pentri, Paeligni, Marsi, Equi and inland Vestini) in which he demonstrates an explicit interest in spatial relations between different elements of the ancient landscape. His are amongst the few studies that seek to understand the function and significance of Italic sanctuaries (and, for that matter, cave sites, habitation centres and necropoleis) within the general pattern of settlement.\textsuperscript{51}

Taking a long term perspective, D’Ercole puts forward the interesting thesis that in different eras different ‘markers’ in the landscape were predominant. Put simply, whereas caves were of central importance in the Bronze Age, this position would have been taken up by the necropoleis with the conspicuous tumulus graves of the late Bronze Age to the early Iron Age, and this privilege would then, in the Hellenistic period, be passed on to sanctuaries.\textsuperscript{52} According to D’Ercole, these sanctuaries would have marked the territories of different tribes, suggesting that this would have been reflected in the choice of the venerated deities, every tribe (‘popolo’) worshipping different (characteristics of) gods.\textsuperscript{53} In his contribution to Paesaggi di potere, the proceedings of a conference held in 1996 explicitly dealing with spatial analysis, D’Ercole studies the whole modern region Abruzzo. He concludes that sanctuaries reflect the intention to express territoriality by different communities. In this place, for

\textsuperscript{49} ZIFFERERO 1995, 348.

\textsuperscript{50} MIARI 2000b, 57.


\textsuperscript{52} D’ERCOLE 2000, 121-127. On p. 146 n. 65, D’Ercole sees a ‘paradigmatic’ situation in the river Raiale (west of Gran Sasso) where a cave site (“il marker territoriale della preistoria”), necropoleis (“i markers della protostoria”) and the “caratteristico santuario di confine d’epoca storica” of Feronia at Civita di Bagno, are situated within a range of 10 km.

\textsuperscript{53} D’ERCOLE 2000, 127: “L’ultima categoria di ‘indicatori territoriali’ ... è quella dei santuari di confine. Essi sembrano rivestire in Abruzzo quel ruolo precedentemente svolto dalle sepolture a tumulo (e, forse, ancora prima dalle grotte), di marcare cioè un territorio non più attraverso il ricordo di antenati mitizzati ed eroizzati ma mediante il culto di vere e proprie divinità, formalmente definite, con caratteristiche e forse nomi, diversi a seconda dei vari popoli.”
the sake of comparability, only his work on the more properly ‘Samnite’ region of Southern Abruzzo will be considered. Here, the location of sanctuaries in relation to habitation centres and necropoleis was analysed by D’Ercole, together with Vincenza Orfanelli and Paola Riccitelli. Figure 4.4 reproduces the resulting proposal for a territorial division in Southern Abruzzo in the ‘Samnite’ period. To establish the dimensions of the different centres in the region Thiessenpolygons were used.

Fig. 4.4. Sanctuaries as frontiermarkers according to D’ERCOLE, ORFANELLI and RICCITELLI 1997, fig. on p. 23.

---

54 D’ERCOLE, ORFANELLI and RICCITELLI 1997.
55 Unfortunately nothing is said about the decision to use this model, and the exact application of it, especially with regard to included sites. This approach to the reconstruction of borders in antiquity stands in a long tradition, cf. e.g. RENFREW 1975; MORRIS and ORTON 1976.
In their analysis, all indicators of cultic activity were included: sanctuaries with structural remains, but also finds of bronze statuettes or inscriptions relating to cults. According to their reconstruction, several cult places are located along borders of ethnic groups and cities. For instance, the territory of the Marruccini would be separated from the Carricini and the Frentani by the alignment of the finds of bronze statuettes at Tollo, Crecchio, Ari and Bucchianico, and the sanctuaries of Vacri and Rapino. In the same way, the territories of the Frentani and Maruccini on the one side and that of the Carricini and the Pentri on the other would be drawn by the cult places (or rather dispersed finds of statuettes) of Orsogna, Palombaro, the sanctuary of Atessa, Furci, S. Buono and Tufillo. What’s more, the ‘hegemonic’ centres of Teate (modern Chieti, territory of the Marruccini), Histonium (modern Vasto, territory of the Frentani) and perhaps that of Iuvanum (territory of the Carricini) would express their territorial boundaries with extra-urban sanctuaries.56

PROBLEMS WITH THE FRONTIER APPROACH

Although the spatial approach to sanctuaries adopted here is highly interesting, some objections could be raised. In the first place, it remains difficult to postulate a geopolitical organisation on the basis of the archaeological record, because it relies so heavily on the very completeness of that record; if we happen to ‘miss’ one important centre, the whole picture changes. Especially if one wants to include evidence like bronze statuettes and other haphazardly found objects possibly (but not certainly) indicating cult places, there is a risk to read too much into the material, which is after all not the result of systematic archaeological research. The suggestion that there is a strong relation between the location of necropoleis and sanctuaries is highly interesting.57 According to D’Ercole the combination of funeral and religious contexts with no corresponding settlements would strengthen the idea of territorial limitation by means of these kinds of markers.58 Caution is required however, especially since it is precisely sanctuaries and necropoleis that are overrepresented in the archaeological record of Central Italy, due to the poorer visibility of (and attention to) habitation sites. Only systematic archaeological research can establish whether the correspondence is a historical one or rather the result of an observer’s bias. Intensive field survey should therefore be conducted to analyse relationships of this kind (cf. Chapter 5).

Another question regards the possibility to trace ethnic boundaries in the archaeological record. Ethnic identities will certainly have been important at some places and some specific moments in time (cf. Chapter 3), but it does not go for itself that these ethnic distinctions translated into fixed territorial ‘states’. The imposing

56 D’ERCOLE, ORFANELLI and RICCITELLI 1997, 22-23.
58 D’ERCOLE 2000, 129 on the Praetutti: “colpisce la presenza di necropoli apparentemente tutte senza abitato di riferimento. Esse sembrano proprio delimitare una fascia territoriale il cui significato di ‘confine’ appare certificato dalla presenza ... dell’unico santuario di altura in Abruzzo per le fasi orientalizzanti ed arcaiche e cioè quello di Monte Giove a Penna Sant’Andrea.”
character of ethnicity should not be overstated, and especially the possible discontinuity in its importance, or even existence, should be taken into account. Ethnicity is a social construct and depends on specific socio-historical situations, and therefore is very sensitive to historical changes. In other words, it can be seriously questioned whether there were stable ethnic boundaries during the whole Hellenistic period (D’Ercole suggests even precursors of these constellations in the pre-and protohistorical periods), precisely because this does not correspond to the very nature of ethnic feelings. Methodologically, there is the problem that we cannot easily check or falsify the proposed ethnic boundaries as signalled by cult places. There is, apart from very scarce epigraphical evidence, no possibility to establish these ethnic boundaries by other archaeological evidence, and historical evidence is problematic because of its later date and lack of precise descriptions. Even in the arguably ‘exemplary’ Greek world, recent studies have increasingly emphasised that the borders between the territories of different communities were less clear cut than has been envisioned before, both in the Greek mainland and colonies. Moreover, as to the map, a devil’s advocate could draw other lines of distinction, connecting the same dots on the map, especially if one releases the privileged position of ethnic groups over, for example, smaller local communities. In fact, it may be imprudent to see almost every non-urban sanctuary (let alone sporadic finds of statuettes) necessarily as part of a geopolitical constellation formulated along ethnic lines, in the absence of firm evidence documenting such a function.

EXCLUSION?

Of course, one may agree that certain sanctuaries functioned indeed in and as a border zone between different communities (some evidence will be discussed below). However, such a function cannot be taken for granted at the outset. D’Ercole c.s. do not explain why they think cult places functioned as frontier markers in the first place, neither do they explain what they exactly take ‘santuari di confine’ to mean. The only theoretical and methodological study which is referred to is based on the situation in rather differently organised societies: the Greek colonial situation. There is reason, however, to doubt that the situation in Apennine Central Italy was similar to the Tyrrhenian and Greek world. In many areas of Greece, a strong territorial claim would

59 Cf. in general JONES 1997; and esp. DENCH 1995 for Central Italy.
60 D’ERCOLE 2000, on the supposed link between South-Picene inscriptions and the distribution of tumulus graves, and 124-125, n. 15 on the existence of ‘proto’-peoples. For this conception, cf. also FAUSTOFERRI 2003.
61 Cf. the recently concluded project Regional pathways to complexity by the Free University Amsterdam and the Groningen Institute of Archaeology (see e.g. BURGERS 2002). Cf. the discussion on the sanctuary of Timpone della Motta, the identification of which as a Greek frontier sanctuary is dismissed by KLEIBRINK 2001, 39-42, cf. however GUZZO 2003. See LEONE 1998, esp. 11-18 and 31-35 on theories on extra-urban sanctuaries in Archaic Magna Graecia). Cf. e.g. BURGERS and CRIELAARD 2007 on Greek colonial-indigenous interactions.
62 In D’ERCOLE, ORFANELLI and RICCITELLI 1997 no reference or explication with regard to the concept of frontier sanctuaries is given at all, but in D’ERCOLE 2000 GUZZO 1987 is quoted, here discussed supra.
have existed already from the early Iron Age on, simultaneous with the rise of the poleis.\textsuperscript{63} In a highly centralised and hierarchically organised society, the fixation of boundaries makes perhaps more sense, and so do the extra-urban sanctuaries at the fringes of the city’s territory. The same goes for the Etruscan (and early Roman) forms of political organisation.\textsuperscript{64} But I would argue that we should be cautious in presuming a rigid territorial organisation with clear boundaries for the non-urban Italic world in this stage.

Even if we accept the interpretation of certain sanctuaries as boundary markers (of groups of whatever kind), the question remains what exactly happened in these border sanctuaries: Were they only visual territorial markers, or do we have to imagine processions, specific border rites, or should we perhaps think of them as places of contact between the neighbouring peoples? D’Ercole argues that, apparently in different sanctuaries, different gods appealing to different peoples would have been venerated, which underlined ethnic difference.\textsuperscript{65} This conception suggests that these cult places had an exclusive quality; that the border sanctuaries were intended for the own group, excluding others and at the same time enhancing (ethnic) group identities. Unfortunately, in most cases in the Italic world the names (let alone the specific characteristics or epithets) of the venerated deities are unknown, and any analysis on a grand scale seems therefore impossible at present. Although there certainly were exclusive cults in Italy, as for example the rather xenophobic ritual documented in the Iguvine tablets where ‘outsiders’ are formally banished might indicate, it is much less clear if this attitude corresponded to an exclusive character of territorial sanctuaries. As a matter of fact, the ‘urban’ case of Gubbio does not necessarily represent religious behaviour in the rest of Italy.\textsuperscript{66} For now, it seems unwise to transpose the specific ideas developed for differently organised areas in Greece and Magna Graecia to the Apennines.

\textsuperscript{63} But cf. de Polignac’s reservations with regard to the application of a conceptualisation of the city based on the classical Greek city for the Geometric and early Archaic periods, DE POLIGNAC 1994, 4. Without entering the debate on the Greek situation, it should be pointed out that further deconstruction of this fixed territorial idea for Greece would only strengthen my argument for the situation in Italy.

\textsuperscript{64} However, this is not to say of course that it is easy to establish the location of these boundaries: cf. the remarks in ZIFFERERO 1995, 335-336 and \textit{infra}. Incidentally, it is good to keep in mind that we know from several sources that boundaries or frontiers were considered sacred in the Etruscan and Roman societies: cf. for Rome e.g. the necessity for magistrates to retake the auspices after crossing the \textit{amnis Petronia} in the \textit{campus Martius}. For Etruria cf. ZIFFERERO 1995, 333 n. 4; cf. for the linguistic evidence LAMBRECHTS 1970, and COLONNA 1988. But apart from the intriguing example of the Iguvine Tablets, which in the end refers to an ‘urban’ reality, there is to my knowledge no evidence for the non-urbanised Italic regions that this kind of territorial conception was formulated this rigidly. Most evidence in this realm derives from (semi / proto etc.-) urban contexts, with a strong emphasis on the importance of the city walls, not territorial boundaries. For the Iguvine Tablets, cf. POULTNEY 1959; PROSDOCIMI 1984; PROSDOCIMI 1989; MALONE and STODDART 1994; SISANI 2001b; PORZIO GERNIA 2004. Cf. \textit{infra} on the \textit{cippus Abellanus}.

\textsuperscript{65} D’ERCOLE 2000, 127: “… di marcare cioè un territorio … mediante il culto di vere e proprie divinità, formalmente definite, con caratteristiche e forse nomi, diversi a seconda dei vari popoli.” (Underscore TS; see longer quote at n. 53).

\textsuperscript{66} See Chapter 2 on the problem. E.g. the contribution by PROSDOCIMI 1989 on “Le religioni degli Italici” almost exclusively treats the Iguvine tablets.
PLACES OF CONTACT

However this may be, there is evidence that sanctuaries were located sometimes in border zones between different ethnic groups or other communities. The most famous example is the *lucus Feroniae*, near Capena, which according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom. 3.32.1*) was frequented by Sabines and Latins alike, especially for markets and fairs.\(^{67}\) Apparently, the sanctuary profited from its location between different cultures. The *cippus Abellanus*, from Avella in Campania, dating to the end of the second century BC,\(^{68}\) may be the most explicit evidence for an ‘Italic border sanctuary’. In the Oscan text, the rules regarding the use of a sanctuary dedicated to Hercules are laid down. It is explicitly stated that the sanctuary served the inhabitants of the towns of Nola and the inhabitants of Abella, and in order to resolve problems of property, it seems that the terrain of the sanctuary itself was extra-territorial, in a ‘no-man’s-land’ between the two communities. This is not an ethnic border however.

Another possible example, at least according to the usual interpretation that has been given to it, should be treated with caution. At Furfo, in Vestine territory, an inscription of 58 BC has been found that relates to a sanctuary of Jupiter Liber.\(^{69}\) The inscription has been thought to mention different communities, since apart from the *vicus* of Furfo apparently another party has a say in the sacred law. It has been proposed that there were three *vici*, which together formed a *pagus*, and this would indicate that the sanctuary was located at the border of these (three) territories (cf. discussion further in this chapter, and esp. Chapter 6).\(^{70}\) But in this interpretation (which is erroneous, as we will see later) the sanctuary also belongs to one single ‘umbrella’ community: the surmised *pagus*. In any case, since the inscription dates well after the Social War, it should be kept in mind that it is questionable whether this Roman situation reflects an earlier Italic one.

In the strict sense, in these cases, the *lucus Feroniae*, the *cippus Abellanus*, and the *lex aedis Furfensis*, there seems to be evidence for sanctuaries at the borders of different communities. But the apparent function of the sanctuaries is precisely not to signal closed boundaries, demarcating one group. On the contrary, if anything, these sanctuaries seem to have served as meeting places, as places of social contact in a religious sense and possibly even more so in a commercial one (note that both

\(^{67}\)“There is a sanctuary, honoured in common by the Sabines and the Latins, that is held in the greatest reverence and is dedicated to a goddess named Feronia … To this sanctuary people used to resort from the neighbouring cities on the appointed days of festival, many of them performing vows and offering sacrifice to the goddess and many with the purpose of trafficking during the festive gathering as merchants, artisans and husbandmen; and here were held fairs more celebrated than in any other places in Italy” (transl. Loeb). Cf. also Livy 26.12.

\(^{68}\) According to LA REGINA 2000 ca. 120-110 BC.

\(^{69}\) *CIL* IX, 3513; *CIL* I², 756.

\(^{70}\) E.g. LA REGINA 1967-68, 393-396 explaining *fifeltures* as the *vici* of the *Fificulani et Taresuni*; COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 16: “Si tratta infatti della dedica di un tempio a Juppiter Liber, fatta dal magistrato e dal sacerdote di Furfo, ma nella quale vengono citate, come parti contraenti, anche gli abitanti degli altri due *vici* del *pagus*, i Fificulani e i Taresuni”; cf. also LETTA 1992, 112-114. Cf. discussion *infra*. 
epigraphical texts treat financial arrangements, and that trade is highlighted by Dionysius). Such an interpretation, which sees sanctuaries as a central functional element in the organisation of settlement and communication, rather than as a merely demarcating and confining one, sets the scene for another line of interpretation that is discussed in the following section.

**Sanctuaries and the so-called Pagus-Vicus System**


“A shrine normally belonged to a single pagus, but the shrine at Pietrabbondante was clearly supported by many pagi” (SALMON 1982, 117 n. 345).

So far, different conceptualisations of the role or functions of sanctuaries have been discussed that relate directly to ideas on territorial organisation, economy and infrastructure. The theory on sanctuaries as frontier-markers that has just been discussed has the drawback that it has to rely on presumed fixed territorial boundaries of different tribes. Since independent proof for such boundaries is scant, a risk of circular reasoning exists. This model also has the serious drawback that it has been developed for a specific type of society, and especially urbanised areas, such as Greek poleis and colonies and to a lesser degree Etruria. The interpretation of sanctuaries as road shrines along the long distance transhumance routes, on the other hand, does take into account a (at least perceived) particular feature of Italic society. As has been pointed out however, this interpretation seems to be rather one-sided and hardly stands closer scrutiny as an explanatory model. It seems attractive, however, to try to understand the placing and functioning of sanctuaries in relation to a specific Italic pattern of settlement, rather than using Greek or other models.

A third line of interpretation discernable in modern studies is indeed more directly linked to particular ideas on the organisation of Italic society. In this model sanctuaries are an integral part of a distinct pattern of settlement. This model could be called the *pagus-vicus* system, a translation of ‘il sistema pagano-vicanico’ or ‘paganico-vicano’ vel sim. often found in Italian literature, and indicating the two most important elements making up this model of settlement. The *vicus* is understood as a village, and the *pagus* is understood (mostly) as a territorial district, containing one or more *vici*. The model has been tremendously popular in both Italian and other mainland European research, as well as in Anglo-Saxon studies. The discussion on this conception of Italic pattern of settlement is complicated, not least because recently the very premises of this model have been shown to root in poor evidence. Because sanctuaries of Central-Southern Italy are often understood to have functioned within this *pagus-vicus* system, both implicitly and explicitly, it is important to address the model itself at least briefly. For more detailed discussion on the development of the model one is redirected to the thorough and recent works by
Luigi Capogrossi Colognesi and Michel Tarpin.\textsuperscript{71} Their studies, although not in all respects unanimous, are the basis for the critical reconsideration of the \textit{pagus-vicus} model and the role of sanctuaries within it, which will be returned to in more detail in Chapters 6 and 7.

First, the traditional picture of the \textit{pagus-vicus} system will be sketched in relation to general ideas on Italic patterns of settlement. Thereafter the putative role of sanctuaries within it will be discussed.

\textbf{SAMNITE SETTLEMENT AND THE \textit{PAGUS-VICUS} SYSTEM: AN ‘IMMEMORIAL ITALIC INSTITUTION’}

In general accounts and handbooks, but also in specialised studies, one will find that theItalic or Samnite peoples lived in small villages and hill-forts, besides more diffuse or scattered sites, mostly small farms. Let it be said from the outset that this image \textit{per se} seems to be well-supported by the archaeological evidence. Hill-forts are virtually the only imposing remnants in the Samnite landscape, and a lack of urban centres would, together with the idea that the population density was relatively high,\textsuperscript{72} indeed sustain such an idea. It would seem to fit as well the expressions by the ancient authors with respect to the Samnite pattern of settlement, apparently consisting of small villages. Livy 9.13.7 is classic:\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Samnites ... in montibus vicatim habitantes} – together with Strabo 5.4.12 κωμηδόν ζώσιν. These modern and ancient observations on the pattern of settlement have been conceptualised as representing a specific settlement organisation. For instance, in the chapter on the Roman conquest of Italy in the \textit{Cambridge Ancient History} Tim Cornell develops the following ideas on the nature and organisation of Samnite society:

\begin{quote}...
...

After qualifying this system again as “very simple”, Cornell links it to the general pattern of settlement in the pre-Roman period which was “one of scattered villages with associated hill-forts and rural sanctuaries”, the functional separation of which

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{71} \textit{CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002; TARPIN 2002. Esp. Capogrossi Colognesi treats the history of research in detail.}

\textsuperscript{72} Esp. on the basis of Polybius 2.24. Cf. discussion in DENCH 1995, 142.

\textsuperscript{73} Also 10.17.2. is often, improperly, cited in this context.

\textsuperscript{74} CORNELL 1989, 353-356.
would be characteristic of a non-urban or pre-urban society. This text has been cited here at some length because it neatly illustrates some general assumptions on Italic, in this case more specific Samnite patterns of settlement: An institutional hierarchy between *vicus* (village), *pagus* (here as a territorial district or canton) and *tuito* (‘tribe’: Latin *populus, civitas or nomen*) is indicated. In the traditional view, Italic tribes would thus have been subdivided into *pagi*, whereas within these *pagi* people lived in small villages (*vici*), hill-forts (Latin: *oppida*) or dispersedly over the territory. (cf. fig. 4.5).

The *oppida* are sometimes considered to be merely defensive structures of the *pagus* as a whole because few habitation structures have been found in the hill-forts, but this may to a certain degree rather represent the status quo of archaeological research than

---

75 CORNELL 1989, 356. Regarding Cornell’s general contemptuous tone as regards Italic peoples cf. Cornell on p. 292 of the same volume of *CAH* on the incursions of the fifth century BC: “At all events the rationale behind these wars was always the same. They were predatory raids by highland peoples upon the relatively prosperous and advanced settlements on the plain. The notion of ‘just war’ and the traditional claim that Rome’s wars were fought in retaliation against external aggressors, probably derived from the experiences of the fifth century,” which echoes Liv. 9.13.7 quite literally, including Livy’s qualification of the Samnites as *montani atque agrestes* (9.13.6-7).

76 The ‘translation’ of *tuito* is unclear, and depends on different conceptions of the evolution of Samnite society organisation as well (e.g. the remarks in LETTA 1994, esp. 395). Cf. thus here CORNELL 1989, 356: *populus*; TORELLI 1988b, 72: *civitas*; LA REGINA 1980: ‘tribal’ *nomen*, also followed by DENCH 1995, 136-137 and TAGLIAMONTE 1997, 180, 258. Cf. e.g. also TORELLI 1988c, 55-56 for the same hierarchical order tribe-*pagus-vicus*.

77 SALMON 1967, 79-81 (p. 80: “each *tuito* contained a number of *pagi* … When, however, a number of *pagi* agreed to cooperate closely a *tuito* was born”); La Regina has put forward his ideas in, amongst other publications, LA REGINA 1970; LA REGINA 1980; LA REGINA 1989; LA REGINA 1991; cf. also TORELLI 1988c and TORELLI 1999, 10: “this traditionally underdeveloped land organized on the village model of the *pagus* and the *vicus*.”

78 The *oppida* are sometimes considered to be merely defensive structures of the *pagus* as a whole, but this view is at least partly a consequence of the lack of habitation structures found in the hill-forts, which may however to a certain degree represent more the status quo of archaeological research than the ancient reality. Cf. e.g. LAFFI 1974, 336: “Ogni *pagus* si articolava in uno o più *vici*, che rappresentavano nuclei di stanzimento compatti, subordinati al *pagus*, nei quali si raccoglieva stabilmente parte della popolazione rurale del *pagus* stesso. *Oppida* e *castella*, ubicate per solito in posizioni elevate, assicuravano la difesa dell’intera comunità territoriale paganica.” Cf. the works by De Benedittis for the inhabited hill-fort of Montevairano: e.g. DE BENEDITTIS 1990; DE BENEDITTIS 1991; DE BENEDITTIS 2004. The well-studied Lucanian hill-fort of Roccagloriosa has been seen as an example for the Samnite situation: GUALTIERI 2004. Cf. discussion in STEK 2006.
the ancient reality (cf. Chapter 3). Especially for the peoples of the Central Apennines, La Regina has developed the model further, departing from the idea that the pagus forms a sub-tribal entity. For example, on the basis of the numbers of settlements in different areas and the tabula alimentaria of the Ligures Baebiani, he has asserted that there would have been a rather constant ratio between vici and pagi (3:1), as well as a more or less constant relation between the surface area of the respective territories of different tribes and the number of pagi in which it was divided.

Concerning the chronological dimension of this model as it appears in most studies, it is generally assumed that it stems from ‘very ancient times’. This is perhaps mostly based on the attribution of the institution of the pagus in Rome to Servius Tullius and the supposed relapse of Capua to a pagus-structure after the Roman punishments in 211 BC, as well as the occurrence of pre-Roman onomastics in proper names of some pagi. According to Salmon for example the pagus was the Samnites’ “sub-tribal entity”, and he calls it “the immemorialItalic institution”. Although there has generally been little contemplation on the chronological development of the pagus-vicus system until recently, there seems to be general consensus on the pre-Roman date, and nature, of the system. La Regina for instance dates it to the late fifth century BC, and Tagliamonte discusses the system when considering the seventh to mid sixth century.

79 e.g. Laffi 1974, 336: “Ogni pagus si articolava in uno o più vici, che rappresentavano nuclei di stanziamento compatte, sottordinati al pagus, nei quali si raccoglieva stabilmente parte della popolazione rurale del pagus stesso. Oppida e castella, ubicati per solito in posizioni elevate, assicuravano la difesa dell’intera comunità territoriale paganica.” The well-studied Lucanian hill-fort of Roccagloriosa has been seen as an example for the Samnite situation: Gualtieri 2004. Cf. discussion in Stek 2006.

80 LA REGINA 1970-1971, 444-6; the average area occupied by a pagus would have amounted to 34-36 km² and by an average vicus 11-12 km². Criticised by Capogrossi Colognesi 2002, 175 with n. 37.


82 Salmon 1967, 79-80. On p. 79: “Their sub-tribal entity was the immemorial Italic institution, the pagus; and traces of their pagus-arrangements survived into Roman times. The unmistakably Oscan character of such a name as pagus Meflanus (listed in the alimentary tables of the Ligures Baebiani et Corneliani) shows that it goes back to the touto of the Hirpini.” Cf. Kornemann 1905, 83.

Interesting for this ‘timeless’ character of this pattern of settlement is the website of the Comune di Fagnano, where is stated that: “Fagnano Alto richiama l’idea della “città diffusa.” Infatti il comune è un insieme di 10 centri abitati ... Questo sistema insediativo richiama quello italicico dei Pagus [sic], un insieme di piccoli centri facenti capo ad una comunità. Oggi, queste piccole realtà sparse nel territorio riassumono con ancor più forza questo concetto, diventando sempre più elementi naturali in un contesto territoriale in cui lo spopolamento ne caratterizza i segni visibili.” [http://www.comunefagnanoalto.it/FSFraz.htm last accessed April 30 2008].

83 But cf. e.g. Letta 1988; Letta 1991.

84 La Regina 1975, 273 (on the pagus); Tagliamonte 1994, 37, cf. infra n. 90. Cf. also Torelli 1970-1971 on Etruria and Apulia, esp. 433-435, who discerns the emergence of the Etruscan pagi and accordingly a pagus-vicus system in the seventh-sixth centuries BC; pagi which would have been subsequently ‘in crisis’ (fifth century) and partly integrated in the urbanisation processes (fourth century), but would have been disturbed or substituted by the Roman colonisation from the third century BC on. Cf. also, e.g., Dench 1995, 136.
THE SUPPOSED PERSISTENCE OF THE PAGUS-VICUS SYSTEM

But what happens after the Roman conquest? Umberto Laffi sketches a situation in which the Romans found, after the Social War, regions organised according to the pagus-vicus system, which would have been much more difficult to re-organise within the Roman system of municipalisation than the areas which already presented urban structures.85 The Romans would have had, for example, to choose which vicus was to become the seat of the new municipium and to delineate the municipal borders. Laffi’s goal is to explain how the new municipal system interfered with the pre-existing pagus-vicus system. He basically envisages a persistence of the pagus-vicus system alongside the Roman municipal system. Vici and pagi would have preserved their religious, but also administrative functions, and every pagus and every vicus would have continued to constitute an autonomous ‘respublica’, the only infringement on their autonomy being jurisdiction, to be dispensed by the municipia.86 A general Roman policy of non-intervention in the tribal structures would have been the reason for the continued existence of the pagus-vicus system in the first century BC.87 Moreover, Laffi discerns different developments in the Roman organisation before the Social War with regard to the independence of the Italic pagi and vici. The Roman praefecturae, representing only juridical power, would have had little influence on the traditional Italic structures. On the other hand, the relatively autonomous municipia would have gradually controlled the whole territory, and therefore altered the Italic patterns of settlement much more profoundly. However, vici and pagi maintained their organisational roles also during the empire, even if their powers were diminished and partly transferred to the city authorities.

It should be stressed that this conception of Italic or Samnite settlement organisation is present in virtually all studies on pre-Roman Central-Southern Italy, and is endorsed, for instance, by Ivan Rainini in his 2000 contribution on settlement forms in Samnium. Here, Rainini accepts the validity of the pagus-vicus system,88 but takes a different stance than Laffi with regard to the relation to the Roman municipal system. He sees the pagus-vicus system as a “presupposto del sistema municipale romano” rather then understanding both systems as parallel or even antithetical forms.89 This image of the

---

85 LAFFI 1974, e.g. 336: “l’imposizione dello schema del municipium esigeva in via preliminare un’ampia opera di ristrutturazione del contesto politico-amministrativo.”
86 LAFFI 1974, 337.
87 LAFFI 1974, 338.
88 RAININI 2000, 238: “come è ormai da tempo acquisito.”
89 RAININI 2000, 238; cf. on this antagonism – substrate paradox e.g. GABBA 1994a: 74 (1994): “Il processo di municipalizzazione dopo la Guerra Sociale è in stretto collegamento con il ricordato fenomeno dell’urbanizzazione dell’Italia nel corso del I sec. a.C. Credo, anzi, che il passaggio dalla fase degli insediamenti tribali, caratteristica di larga parte dell’Italia centrale e meridionale (nonché, ovviamente, della cisalpina), alla fase urbana rappresenti l’aspetto più imponente della municipalizzazione dell’Italia dopo l’89 a.C.” and on p. 97: “… i nuovi impianti urbani (scil. municipi), costruiti secondo lo schema ortogonale, cercarono di sostituire gli antichi insediamenti basati sui pagi e i vici. In molti casi, il vicus più importante in un gruppo di pagi sarà stato scelto per divenire il centro urbano del municipium.”
system as a ‘substrate’ for the later Roman institutions is well established.\textsuperscript{90} In general, the \textit{pagus-vicus} system in Roman times is described in terms of the ‘persistence’ or ‘perseverance’ of the system, despite the Roman conquest, or indeed as a sign of a ‘remarkable vitality’ of the system still in this period.\textsuperscript{91} This ‘persistence’ is sometimes formulated in almost romantic wording, Marco Buonocore for instance ends his article on the subject as follows: “Dalla fase di insediamento paganico-vicano si passò ad una fase urbano-cittadina la quale, sebbene si sia sovrapposto alla precedente, non credo mai, almeno in certe aree sabelliche, che sia riuscita ad annullarla.” After this brief sketch of the traditional conception of the \textit{pagus-vicus} system in the Italic areas, the supposed role of sanctuaries within will be discussed.

**THE ROLE OF SANCTUARIES WITHIN THE \textit{PAGUS-VICUS} SYSTEM**

“The Samnites, for instance, maintained a separation between their settlements and the various forms of communal or state activity they engaged in. They lived in villages or on farms dispersed throughout the territory (Livy 9.13.7), but each locality (\textit{pagus}) had a hill fort for defensive purposes and a religious sanctuary that acted as a focus not just for sacrifices and festivals but also for markets, legal hearings, and assemblies of the local people. These assemblies seem to have chosen magistrates to govern them in much the same way as a city was governed and to have banded together into larger political units, each known as a \textit{touto}. These in turn seem to have formed a federation, known to modern historians as the Samnite League, which had the power of declaring peace and war. A number of larger and more elaborate sanctuaries probably served as the meeting points of the \textit{touto}, and a particularly large and imposing example at Pietrabbondante has been identified as a possible headquarters of the Samnite League.”\textsuperscript{92}

\textsuperscript{90} Cf. e.g. \textsc{La Regina} 1970, 191; \textsc{Tagliamonte} 1994, 110 on pre-Roman internal Sabina and the ‘area medio-adriatica’: “L’assetto del territorio nel suo complesso resta legato al modello pagano-vicanico, che del resto sopravvivera in età romana quale sostrato del sistema municipale, come appare esemplarmente documentato, per citare un caso più noto, dalla \textit{lex Furfensis}.” Cf. also \textsc{Humbert} 1978, 238: “Il reste maintenant à se demander à quel type d’organisation les Romains et les peuples indigènes, \textit{Praetutti}, \textit{Sabini} et \textit{Picentes}, vont confier les tâches communes d’administration locale. Il est certain que ces populations ignoraient la structure unitaire de la cité; c’est soit à partir de cellules créées de toutes pièces (\textit{fora}), soit, sur le modèle qu’ont offert les \textit{Vestini}, en utilisant les structures villageoises (\textit{pagi}, \textit{vici}) préexistantes, que les Romains jettent les bases d’une organisation “municipale” élémentaire.”

\textsuperscript{91} Besides Laffi, cf. e.g. \textsc{La Regina} 1970-1971; \textsc{Frederiksen} 1976, 350; \textsc{Gaggiotti} 1983, 141, on the changes after the Social War: “sebbene la tradizionale forma insediativa paganico-vicana non venisse completamente destrutturata …”; \textsc{Letta} 1992; \textsc{Guidobaldi} 1995, 178: “l’organizzazione del territorio pretuzio al momento della conquista era essenzialmente di tipo paganico-vicano; come vedremo, essa sopravviverà in età romana quale alternativa indigena al modo di abitare cittadino introdotto dai Romani con le colonie,” and 247: “lo schema applicato [\textit{scil. da Roma}] destrutturò soltanto in parte in il precedente contesto rurale; per il resto il tipo di insediamento prevalente nel territorio continuò a essere quello paganico-vicano …”; \textsc{Franchi De Bellis} 1995, 383: “Tipica dell’Italia centrale e meridionale (con esclusione delle colonie greche), questa articolazione pagano-vicanica non è mai venuta meno in età romana,” in discussing the \textit{pagi} and \textit{vici} of the Latin colony (!) of Ariminum, documented by inscriptions relating to the colony in the late third century BC and Augustan period (cf. discussion in Chapter 7); \textsc{Dench} 1995, 140 (“remarkably persistent”); \textsc{Buonocore} 2002a; 43-45.

\textsuperscript{92} \textsc{Lomas} 2004, 201-203.
This passage from a recent handbook which would claim at least some authority, the *Cambridge Companion to the Roman Republic* published in 2004, perfectly illustrates the general consensus on the relation of the Samnite pattern of settlement and sanctuaries, and at the same time the very ambiguity of this model. Indeed, Italic sanctuaries are so often attributed a specific role within the so-called *pagus-vicus* system, that it has become a commonplace. The development of this model is the subject of this section.

One feature recurring in descriptions or conceptions of the *pagus-vicus* system is the alleged spatial separation of functions. In this respect, as has been said, the hill-forts would serve defensive purposes, separated from the *vici* and necropoleis. Sanctuaries would have occupied a specialised position as well. In the passage by Kathryn Lomas, this boils down to different sanctuaries on the level of respectively the *pagus*, the *tutto*, and the ‘Samnite League’. Often, a category further down the hierarchy is added: sanctuaries that relate to the *vicus*, which would have been a subdivision of the *pagus*. This alleged special relation between pattern of settlement and sanctuaries needs some further investigation. In the authoritative handbook on the history of urbanism by Pierre Gros and Mario Torelli, with regard to the Samnites Pentri and the Lucanians is stated:

“Di fatto perciò, i territori di queste tribù sono articolati in aree paganiche … nelle quali gravitano più *vici*, le cui *arces* sono da identificare con le cinte fortificate, e uno o più santuari gestiti tanto da uno o più *vici* quanto da uno o più *pagi* … Il *pagus* dunque vive e «funziona» come una città, il santuario principale del *pagus* ne costituisce in buona sostanza il *forum*, con tempio e mercato, sia pur periodico o stagionale, mentre gli *oppida* sulle vette montane fungono da rocche per la necessità di difesa.”

In fact, the *pagus* is conceptualised as an ‘exploded’ city: the societal functions concentrated in an urban context are here dispersed over the territory. The principal functions of sanctuaries would consequently have included political, religious and economic aspects, just as the *forum* in urban societies. This is the basic layout of the significance of sanctuaries within the *pagus-vicus* system: sanctuaries are seen as a pole of aggregation. As will be obvious, to see sanctuaries as central places within the general and directly local pattern of settlement is substantially different from their conception as frontier markers or road shrines. Within this basic conception,
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93 Cf. the quote *supra*, CORNELL 1989, 356. Interestingly, many authors are at the same time depreciatory about the functional ‘merging’ as would be apparent in the magistratures, combining sacral, juridical and military functions in one person (cf. e.g. also CORNELL 2004).

94 Cf. TAGLIAMONTE 1994, 37 (on the seventh to mid-sixth centuries BC) “La forma insediativa propria di queste genti è costituita da un ambito territoriale (*pagus*) pertinente a una comunità, provvisto di strutture diffuse con funzioni differenziati (*vici, oppida, castella*),” including structures that would sometimes have been provisional or seasonal, which Tagliamonte links to Varro’s *casae repentinae* (Rust. 2.10.6).


96 Even if, as said, none of these functions are exclusive of course, cf. *supra*. 
subdivisions have subsequently been made, discerning different types of sanctuaries with different appeals. Such divisions are reminiscent of other, more general typologies of sanctuaries. For example Helena Fracchia and Maurizio Gualtieri distinguish three types of sanctuaries in late fifth to fourth century Lucania: large ‘cantonal’, extra-urban sanctuaries such as Rossano di Vaglio, small rural sanctuaries “at crossroads”, and cult places in aristocratic houses.\(^97\) Also, the divisions made by Colonna for Etruria and by Edlund for Etruria and Magna Graecia,\(^98\) illustrate this idea of a hierarchy between different sanctuaries, whereas the idea that the different Italic tribes each had a central ‘tribal’ sanctuary is also widely popular.\(^99\)

In the case of the pagus-vicus system, however, these differing competences of sanctuaries are attached to different institutional entities: vicus, pagus, and touto / populus / nomen. An example of a differential approach to the function of sanctuaries of varying dimensions is to be found in the section on the Apennines (“l’antico cuore del sottosviluppo”) by Torelli in *Storia di Roma*.\(^100\) According to Torelli, voicing a widely accepted view, the big rural sanctuaries would constitute the gathering places on the level of the civitas or touto, whereas the smaller ones, connected with springs and ‘natural routes’, would have formed the meeting places for the pazi.\(^101\) Similarly, La Regina assigns most Samnite sanctuaries a pagus-wide reach, naming Schiavi d’Abruzzo, Vastogirardi and S. Giovanni in Galdo, whereas sanctuaries such as Campochiaro would appeal to ‘more communities’.\(^102\) The most important, even ‘national’ sanctuary would have been that of Pietrabbondante.\(^103\) This possible function of Pietrabbondante has been treated in Chapter 3, here the focus will be on the
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\(^98\) Colonna 1985; Edlund-Berry 1987.

\(^99\) E.g. the *fanum Voltumnae* for the Etruscans, Pietrabbondante for the Samnites Pentri, Rapino for the Marrucini. Cf. Chapter 3 n. 69.

\(^100\) Torelli 1988b, quote on p. 72.

\(^101\) Torelli 1988b, 72: “Alcuni grandi santuari di aperta campagna ne [il territorio di un segmento tribale; la touta] rappresentano il centro naturale e tradizionale di riunione religiosa e politica, con ovvio richiamo per fiere e mercati periodici, mentre i santuari minori, di norma connessi con sorgenti (e percorsi naturali), al pari dei maggiori, costituiscono i punti di raccolta per i pazi, articolazioni geografiche e politiche della civitas, così come i vici (e gli oppida) sono a loro volta articolazioni di un pagus.”

\(^102\) Cf. however Capini 1991a, 115, who states that “era l’area sacra alla quale facevano capo gli abitanti del pagus al quale il santuario stesso apparteneva, in questo caso quello che aveva il suo centro nell’abitato di Boiano”.

somewhat smaller sanctuaries that, in the traditional conception, would have been relevant to *vici* or *pagi*.

**AN ELABORATION OF THE MODEL: LETTA’S ‘I SANTUARI RURALI’ 1992**

By far the most elaborate study on the function of sanctuaries, especially in relation to the *pagus-vicus* system, is the 1992 article by Letta on the Central Apennines. Although Letta focuses on the first century BC, he does this “per poter evidenziare la peculiarità dei santuari rurali nella dialettica tra le strutture urbane dei municipi voluti da Roma e le strutture paganico-vicane tenacemente persistenti”\(^{104}\) that is to say, its results would have significance as well for the period preceding the municipalisation because of the persistent character of the *pagus-vicus* system. Letta departs explicitly from the idea that the *pagus-vicus* system has to form the basis for further interpretation: “è necessario sforzarsi … di utilizzare la distinzione *pagus* / *vicus* come griglia per l’inquadramento e l’interpretazione dei dati.”\(^{105}\) Therefore, the rural sanctuaries he focuses on in this article are by default within this ‘grid’. Considering the inscriptions of the Augustan *regio IV* indicating cult places outside the municipal centres, he attempts to classify the rural sanctuaries according to their function in relation to settlements.

-In the first place, Letta discerns a type of sanctuary located outside settlements, *municipia* as well as *vici*, that would relate primarily to the whole *pagus* (“tipo A”). He suggests that most sanctuaries in the areas with *pagi* can be classified as such. The finest example of this type would be the temple at Fontecchio, in the Vestine territory of Peltuinum. The podium of a temple dating to first century AD has been recognised under the modern church of S. M. della Vittoria.\(^{106}\) This represents a restoration phase; the date of the original building is unfortunately unknown.\(^{107}\) The sanctuary was dedicated to *Quirinus* (perhaps *Juppiter Quirinus*).\(^{108}\) There is an inscription mentioning magistrates, but it is unclear whether they belong to a *vicus* or a *pagus* (or yet another institution).\(^{109}\) An additional inscription re-used in the same church however mentions the settlement of Aufenginum, the actual Fagnano Alto.\(^{110}\) The influence of a *vicus* from elsewhere would document the *pagus*-wide reach of this sanctuary.\(^{111}\)

Another example of a *pagus* sanctuary would be provided by an inscription dating to the period of Sulla found near Fiamignano at S. Angelo in Cacumine, in the territory
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\(^{104}\) **LETTA** 1992, 109. Letta highlights the problems in definition of *pagi*, which he sees as a territorial unit that can comprise *vici* or isolated houses, and *vici*, villages proper.

\(^{105}\) **LETTA** 1992, 110.


\(^{107}\) **LETTA** 1992, 110 argues that it dates to the second half of the second century BC, referring to **LA REGINA** 1967-68, but here (p. 392) is only said that the type of cornice is spread “a partire dalla metà del II secolo a.C”.

\(^{108}\) If related to *AE* 1968, 154 found in another church nearby.

\(^{109}\) **CIL IX**, 3440 (= **CIL I²**, 3265).

\(^{110}\) **AE** 1968, 153.

\(^{111}\) **LETTA** 1992, 111.
of the Aequicoli. At least two people dedicated different sacred objects to an unnamed deity, which were paid for by four different groups, which would correspond to four *vici*. 

A second type of sanctuary ("tipo B") would be characterised by its pertinence to the whole *pagus*, whereas it was located within one of its *vici*. An example of this type would be the already mentioned temple of Jupiter Liber known from the so-called *lex aedis Furfensis*, dating to 58 BC. Here, apart from the *vicus Furfensis* where the temple apparently stood, possibly also the communities of the *Fittulani* and *Taresuni* are mentioned, thus representing three *vici*, which would be part of one and the same *pagus*.

The third type ("tipo C") could be recognised in sanctuaries in or in the direct neighbourhood of the *vicus*, and which, differing from the "tipo B", would exclusively serve the population of the *vicus* itself. For example, in Marsic territory there is the sanctuary of *Victoria* at Trasacco, which presents a late third or early second century BC dedication on behalf of the *vecos Supn[a]* or *vicus Supinum*. Juppiter *Trebulanus*, venerated at the sanctuary of Quadri in Samnite territory, would have taken its name from a *vicus* of the same name, thus attesting to another *vicus* sanctuary. For the territory of the Marsi Letta would not hesitate to assign all sanctuaries to the *vicus* "C" type: in Marsic territory there never seem to have existed *pagi* at all.

A last type in late-Republican sanctuaries ("tipo D") could be distinguished in the sanctuaries that are located outside the municipal urban area, but that relate firmly to the *municipium*. An example would be the sanctuary of Hercules Curinus 5 km north of the ancient city of Sulmo, modern Sulmona in Abruzzo, that would have developed from a *pagus* sanctuary to a municipal one. The sanctuary of Jupiter Stator at Alba Fucens, attested by three inscriptions, would have related to the colony of Alba from the very beginnings. One of these inscriptions, with a consular date of 168 AD, was found outside the colonial urban centre, in Antrosano, and apparently mentions the
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112 *AE* 1984, 274.
113 LETTA 1992, 112 with previous bibliography.
114 *CIL* IX 3513 (= *CIL* I², 756).
116 *CIL* IX, 3849 (= *CIL* I², 388); LETTA 1992, 115.
117 *CIL* IX, 2823 of Hadrianic date; LETTA 1992, 115.
119 Cf. GUARDUCCI 1981, 226 and *infra*. The link with the *municipium* would be demonstrated by an inscription of a *miles e municipio Sulmine* and an inscription referring to an *auguratus*, "probabilmente municipale" (LETTA 1992, 116). As for the sanctuary of Hercules at S. Agata in Campo Macrano, near Castelvecchio Subequo, which would have started as a *pagus* sanctuary and was later incorporated in the centre of the *municipium* of Superaequum (VAN WONTERGHEM 1984, 78, site 1, 5c), the epigraphical evidence does not seem to justify such an interpretation.
120 *CIL* IX, 3923; 3949; 3950.
erection of a honorific statue in a public place to a certain C. Amaredius, who was, amongst other things, curator aput Iovem Statorem.\textsuperscript{121} Letta identifies this public place with the sanctuary, which therefore would be extra-urban.\textsuperscript{122}

The division of sanctuaries in different types is only helpful inasmuch as it contributes to create clarity in otherwise undifferentiated data. Of course, every kind of division, being an analytical tool, runs the risk of oversimplification and it would be inconsequential and even unsporting to criticise it for that. However, it seems important here to look in some detail at the model, in this case the pagus-vicus system, and the data, in this case the sanctuaries attested epigraphically, and the connection between the two. It can be argued that in some aspects Letta’s interpretative ‘model’ determines the interpretation of the data, rather than vice-versa. This in the end might obscure rather than clarify what is actually known about these sanctuaries. Therefore, a brief look at the evidence for each category of sanctuary.

-The best example of a pagus sanctuary ("tipo A") would be constituted by the Fontecchio sanctuary, dedicated to (Juppiter) Quirinus. Its public character is attested by an inscription of the first century BC in which three magistrates construct cellam et culinam.\textsuperscript{123} But it is unknown what competences these magistri actually had. Therefore, on the basis of this inscription it is not possible to tell whether this sanctuary functioned in the context of a pagus, or not. Letta finds evidence in another inscription however, walled into the same church, mentioning the settlement of Aufenginum. According to him, this was a vicus, situated in the pagus to which the sanctuary would relate.\textsuperscript{124} Although a similar function of the sanctuary is not improbable, it is important to underscore that in the inscriptions of the ‘exemplary pagus-sanctuary’ of Fontecchio there is no mention of a pagus, nor of any vicus: it is only the “griglia per l’inquadramento e l’interpretazione dei dati” that has added these entities.

The evidence for another suggested pagus sanctuary in the area of the Marruccini is, to say the least, inconclusive.\textsuperscript{125} Regarding the other alleged pagus sanctuary, at S. Angelo in Cacumine near Fiamignano, in the territory of the Aequicoli, an inscription

\textsuperscript{121} CIL IX, 3950.
\textsuperscript{122} LETTA 1992, 117.
\textsuperscript{123} CIL IX, 3440 (= CIL I², 3265).
\textsuperscript{124} LETTA 1992, 111: “[Aufenginum ], che evidentemente deve essere considerato un vicus compreso nello stesso pagus.”
\textsuperscript{125} This pagus sanctuary would be attested by the first-century AD dedication to the deified river Aternus, found in the bed of the river (now called Pescara). LETTA 1992, 111 links this inscription to another one found in 1850 and now lost, mentioning a pagi Ceiani aqua. This inscription was found at a source (Fonte Almone-Limone), albeit not far from the river (LA TORRE 1989b, 133). The architectural remains of a fountain or perhaps a temple have been seen at the end of the 19th century on the other side of Scafa, at località Fosse (DE PETRA and CALORE 1900, 177-179). With the present data it seems difficult to combine the presence of a pagus-aqueduct at a natural source with a river cult in another place and architectural remains in yet another (albeit within a short range) in order to propose the existence of a pagus sanctuary, especially since the presence of tombs and funeral monuments in the neighbourhood seems to point to a nearby settlement (LA TORRE 1989b, 133).
dating to the period of Sulla tells us that at least two people dedicated different sacred objects, which were paid for by four different *iuventutes*: the *Subocr[ina]*, *Aserea, Super[afa]*, and *Far[ina]*. Letta supposes that the names of these *collegia iuvenum* reflect four different communities that would have been in charge of this sanctuary. One may doubt however the logical validity of the following conclusion: “evidentemente si tratta di quattro *vici* compresi in un unico *pagus*, e il santuario comune a tutti e quattro era appunto il santuario del *pagus*.” The evidence for *pagus* sanctuaries located outside nucleated settlements might thus disappoint (cf. however Chapters 7 and 8).

- With regard to the second type of sanctuary (“tipo B”) that would be characterised by its pertinence to the whole *pagus*, being located however in one of its *vici*, the example of Furfo remains intriguing. The *lex aedis Furfensis* from 58 BC would attest to the existence of three *vici* within one *pagus*, which had a common sanctuary at the *vicus* of Furfo. The *lex* is a dedication of a temple to Jupiter Liber, made by a magistrate and a priest of Furfo. It is dedicated *Furfone*, which can be interpreted as “in the *vicus Furfensis*”, actually mentioned some lines further. The *lex* concerns the definition of the temple area and regulations regarding alterations of the temple and the handling of objects that are donated to the sanctuary. In this context, it is stated that if someone would steal a sacred object, the aedile could determine the amount of the fine. Then a rather problematic expression follows: *idque veicus Furf[ensis] mai[or] pars, F[IFELTARES] sei apsolvere volent sive condemnare*. The incomprehensible *FIFELTARES* has been amended into *Fif[iculani] e[t] Tares[uni]*, on the basis of other inscriptions of the region (ignoring the *L* and accepting that the interpunction, otherwise present, was forgotten here). In this interpretation, the *vicus* of Furfo had apparently a privileged position in the juridical procedure, but also other parties, the *Fificulani* and the *Tares[uni]* are concerned.

La Regina, Laffi, Coarelli, and Letta have similarly interpreted these *Fificulani* and *Tares[uni]* as representing two other settlements, “che evidentemente sono da considerarsi anch’esse come *vici*, compresi nello stesso *pagus*”. In this way, the sanctuary of Furfo would represent a sanctuary that served the whole *pagus*, consisting
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126 *AE* 1984, 274.
127 LETTA 1992, 112.
128 With regard to the Paelignian area, VAN WONTERGHEM 1984, 42, generally considers sanctuaries as “nuclei religiosi di *pagi*”, and therefore sees the presence of sanctuaries as proof of the persistence of the *pagus* as principal core of the tribe down to the first century BC. In his n. 311 various sanctuaries are listed that would belong to a *pagus*. Of the nine sanctuaries mentioned, however, only one is directly linked with a *pagus* (Prezza), another one (Secinaro) possibly indirectly. See infra.
129 *CIL* IX, 3513 (= *CIL* I², 756).
130 LA REGINA 1967-68, 393-396; followed by, e.g., L’AFFI 1978; COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 16. ADAMIK 2003, 81 argues in his new reading of the inscription to interpret *fifeltares* as ‘fiduciaries’ or ‘trustees’, SCHEID 2006a, 25 reads *fifeltares* without further comment as “likely the local authority”.
of at least three vicini. The sanctuary would have been dominated however by one vicus – that of Furfo – in whose territory it was located.132 Perhaps needless to say, notwithstanding the fact that there is indeed mention of a vicus, that of Furfo, there is no direct evidence of a pagus,133 and the other two communities are actually known as iuvenes elsewhere, not as vici.134 Again, it seems that the preconception of the pagus-vicus system as a ‘given’ structure has determined the interpretation. This is of course not to say that pagi had no influence in sanctuaries. There are other epigraphically known sanctuaries where pagi had at least some sort of control, as is attested by inscriptions to the like of de pagi sententia or ex pagi decreto, or the cult of Jupiter Victor decem pagorum.135 Their relation to corresponding vici is however unclear.

-There are clear examples of sanctuaries that have yielded inscriptions mentioning only one vicus (“tipo C”). Therefore, these could be recognised as sanctuaries in or in the direct neighbourhood of the vicus. Different from the “tipo B” sanctuaries, they would have exclusively served the population of the vicus itself. The sanctuary of Victoria at Trasacco with a late third or early second century BC dedication on behalf of the vicus Supinum is a beautiful example.136 It should be pointed out however that the Jupiter Trebulanus venerated at Quadri may have taken its name from a nearby settlement, but this settlement is never qualified epigraphically as a vicus.137 For the territory of the Marsi, where pagi seem to have never existed at all, Letta would assign all sanctuaries to vici, whether inscriptions mentioning a vicus were present or not.138 In this typology as a whole, one can discern Letta’s explicit mission, stated at the beginning of his study, to interpret all the evidence within the pagus-vicus system.139 As a consequence, the sanctuaries are endowed with a significance that is not
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132 According to COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 16: “Siamo cioè di fronte a un caso perfettamente ricostruibile di organizzazione paganico-vicana, con un “pagus” diviso in tre “vici”. LETTA 1992, 112-113 goes further, and ingeniously proposes to recognise the pagus Frentanus in the pagus relating to the temple at Furfo. The reasoning is as follows: the Fificulani are also found in the form of iuvenes Fificulani Herculis cultores, found at Paganica. Now, near Paganica, at Ponte di Grotta, a sanctuary to Hercules has been identified, “evidentemente” guided by these iuvenes Fificulani Herculis cultores. A funerary inscription from elsewhere (S. Martino di Picenze) mentions a collegium Herculanum[m] Frenetium, which Letta links to the other inscriptions, which in turn would lead to the identification of the pagus comprising Furfo as the pagus Frentanus. One may or may not feel inclined to follow this reasoning, depending as it does on the conflation of different inscriptions found in different places. It seems however far from certain that from this would follow that the sanctuary at Ponte di Grotta was a pagus sanctuary of the “B or A type”, only because the collegium Herculanum Frenetium may be connected to it.

133 The relation with the pagus mentioned in CIL IX, 3521 (= CIL F, 1804), which was found near Barisciano cannot be established securely.

134 AE 1968, 152 and CIL IX, 3578.

135 CIL F, 3269; for pagi active in sanctuaries, cf. Chapters 7 and 8.


137 LETTA 1992, 115; CIL IX, 2823; the relevant part of this Hadrianic inscription reads: [...] conscrip[t]i/trebiu ob [merita]/Iovi Tre[bulano].

138 LETTA 1992, 115-116: “santuari marsi ... tutti di tipo C, cioè esclusivamente vicani, sia che nelle iscrizioni relative il vicus sia espressamente menzionato, sia che non compaia.”

139 LETTA 1992, 110.
Ch. 4. Location and Function of Italic Sanctuaries

substantiated by the evidence itself, and I would suggest that the “griglia per l’inquadramento e l’interpretazione” formed by the pagus-vicus distinction has determined to a fairly high degree the outcome of the study. It is only in presuming the existence of a hierarchical relation between pagus and vicus, that a vicus can be taken to demonstrate the existence of a not-mentioned pagus, and vice-versa. In sum, it seems fair to say that the evidential basis for Letta’s typology of sanctuaries within the pagus-vicus system is not strong. This conclusion stands to a certain degree apart from the discussion on the pre-Roman origin of pagi and vici, that will be treated later in Chapter 6.

THE RISE AND FALL OF ‘RURAL’ SANCTUARIES BETWEEN PAGUS-VICUS SYSTEM AND MUNICIPALISATION

“The fate of rural sanctuaries ... seems to have varied from place to place, depending on the extent of their integration in the municipal structures of the area. … similarly most of the vici, which had formed the core of the traditional settlement pattern seem to have lost their political importance” (CURTI, DENCH and PATTERSON 1996, 179).

In accordance with the conception of rural sanctuaries functioning within the pagus-vicus system, the idea has been developed that Roman influence in the Italic territories can be seen in the abandonment of these sanctuaries in the Roman period. Because the Italic settlement structures were ruptured, and building activities would have concentrated on the new municipal centres, the sanctuaries became obsolete. For Samnium proper, this idea is expressed as follows by Lomas: “The close association between these [Samnite] cult places and non-Roman culture and forms of government is demonstrated by their later history … The background to this is the breakup of the indigenous Samnite states and the imposition of a Romanized system of municipia.”140 But also for the other areas of Central Italy the idea has been developed that Rome had to ‘overcome’ the traditional settlement pattern of pagus and vicus, with negative consequences for the non-urban sanctuaries.141 The only way for sanctuaries to ‘survive’ would be to happen to be located favourably within the new municipal

140 LOMAS 1996, 171.
141 For the general shift of focus in the first century BC, see the classic works of TORELLI 1983; GABBA 1972 (= GABBA 1994a, 63-103). For the idea that the pagus-vicus system had to be broken by Roman administration: COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 13-14, on the Sabelli: “Una grave difficoltà dovette rappresentare per lo stato romano la situazione socio-politica dei territori conquistati, privi di città e organizzati, come tutta l’area sabellica, in ‘pagi’ (aree territoriali) entro i quali gravitavano uno o più villaggi (‘vici’). Il sistema seguito fu quello della prefettura ... Anche l’urbanizzazione di età augustea rappresentò del resto un fenomeno quasi del tutto artificiale, che modificò solo superficialmente l’organizzazione precedente, e che si dissolse quasi subito per dar luogo alla situazione originaria. Tipico ... il caso di Amiternum, ... dove permane la vecchia organizzazione per ‘vici’”. Sanctuaries in decline: e.g. LA REGINA 1970, 196; CAPINI 1991a, 119 (on Campochiaro); LOMAS 1996, 171; DENCH 1995, 139-140. Along similar lines VAN WONTERGHEM 1984, 45, “il pagus, che fino alla fine della Repubblica aveva costituito il più importante nucleo religioso ed amministrativo, a partire dall’età imperiale, sembra aver perduto ogni significato ufficiale.”
order. Actually, most studies refer to one example, which has become paradigmatic: that of the sanctuary of Hercules Curinus in Paelignian territory. One of the earliest expressions of the view that the survival of sanctuaries depends upon the integration in the new municipal system is to be found in the 1971 article on the ‘Sabellian and Samnite territories’ by La Regina, and it seems that this study has influenced subsequent research considerably. In this article, three important ideas are developed: first the idea per se of the pagus-vicus system as central organisation form, second the idea that sanctuaries served different vicus-type settlements, and third the idea that the fate of these sanctuaries in Roman times would depend entirely on their fitting in the new Roman municipal settlement organisation. Therefore, it seems worthwhile to consider La Regina’s line of reasoning.

Connecting the spread of rural settlement directly to the rise of non-urban sanctuaries, La Regina discerns one of the most important examples of the latter in the temple of Hercules Curinus. The monumental phase, reminiscent of Latial terrace sanctuaries, seen today is to be dated after the Social War, but there are the remnants of an earlier phase dating to before the beginning of the second century BC. According to La Regina, the sanctuary in this earlier phase did not belong to the city of Sulmo alone, but to the whole territory, and therefore to the rural vicus-type of settlement. Sulmo apparently did not develop enough territorial power in the period before the municipalisation to be able to exert control over the sanctuary. As to the supposed functioning within the vicus-type settlement of the early sanctuary, La Regina does not bring up evidence, apart from a comparison with the Vestine territory. There, the constellation of a pagus-vicus system would be proved by the cult of Jupiter Victor decem pagorum. In a rather rhetorical way, it is argued that the Vestine case would demonstrate “un rapporto identico, tra insediamenti e santuario, a quello già visto per i Peligni”, a relation which, it has to be remembered, was not substantiated by any evidence in the sanctuary of Hercules Curinus (and is therefore surely not ‘already seen’). Moreover, the cult practised or organised by ten Vestine pagi would point to a specific “momento del processo sinecistico” which would eventually lead to the formation of a municipality.

Turning to the sanctuary of Hercules Curinus near Sulmo, the only circumstance that changed its destiny and preserved it from abandonment, would have been its location
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143 LA REGINA 1970-1971, 444. “In stretta connessione con la vasta disseminazione dell’insediamento rurale prende consistenza il santuario non urbano.”
144 LA TORRE 1989a.
146 LA REGINA 1970-1971, 444-445: “Questa situazione è confermata dal vicino santuario di Iuppiter Victor, nei Vestini ..., con la differenza però che il santuario peligno non cade in abbandono dopo la guerra sociale ... e ciò per il semplice motivo che con l’assetto municipale esso entra nell’orbita di Sulmo.”
147 CIL I², 3269. See Chapter 8.
within the orbit of Sulmo, the new *municipium*, at a distance of 5 km. Accordingly, the monumentalisation of this sanctuary, relatively unique for extra-urban sanctuaries in the post-Social War period in Central Italy, would have to be explained within this specific adaptation to the Roman system. This image would moreover be supported by the negative evidence from the area inhabited by the Samnites (Pentri), where the abandonment of sanctuaries would correspond to the installation of *municipia* in the plains.149

Summing up, the central ideas are 1) that sanctuaries functioned within a *pagus-vicus* system and were not focused on one centre only, before the municipalisation, 2) that with the municipalisation, the sanctuaries accordingly lost their functions and were abandoned, and 3) that when sanctuaries did survive, this was due to their fortunate location within the new municipal system. Although this thesis may sound convincingly logical at face value, and indeed seems to suit much of the archaeological evidence, it is important to acknowledge the factual basis for what has become a firm interpretational model. In fact, for the case of Hercules Curinus, there is no evidence that points to its function within a *pagus-vicus* system before the municipalisation. The only argument brought forward, the presence of a cult for Jupiter Victor *decem pagorum* from the adjacent Vestini, does not prove in any way that the sanctuary of Hercules Curinus functioned within a constellation of *vicus*-like settlements. If anything, the Vestine cult of Jupiter Victor could attest to the influence of ten *pagi* in a sanctuary in Vestine territory; *vici* are not even mentioned.

A last remark regards the suggestion that the cult of the ten *pagi* would reflect a specific moment in a process of synoecism: this seems to suggest that the *pagus-vicus* system had the tendency to evolve to more nucleated or perhaps even urban forms of settlement. In another contribution, La Regina develops this idea more clearly with regard to the same sanctuary of Hercules Curinus (Quirinus) at Sulmona in combination with that of Jupiter Quirinus at the *municipium* of Superaequum, referring to the function of the Roman god Quirinus as patron of the *curiae*, the public assemblies. According to La Regina, this process of synoecism would have been, however, “in gran parte forzato”, and was not able to eliminate the *pagus-vicus* system entirely.150 Thus, in this view, the *pagus-vicus* system forms on the one hand a persistent pre-Roman, Italic, mode of settlement, but on the other would have been

---

149 LA REGINA 1970-1971, 456: “… si ha la testimonianza archeologica ed epigrafica di una eccezionale vitalità edilizia nella seconda metà del II sec. a.C., con il totale abbandono negli anni immediatamente successivi alla guerra sociale. E questi sono proprio gli anni in cui prendono vigore quegli insediamenti di pianura, come Saepinum, Bovianum, che riceveranno la costituzione municipale.”

150 COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 113 and 132. Actually, here the idea seems to have been changed somewhat (?); the sanctuary first would have been of local significance only and consequently would, after the municipalisation, have assumed the Roman epithet Quirinus, from then on constituting the “santuario tutelare del sinecismo, mediante il quale i vari *pagi* della zona furono unificati in un unica entità amministrativa, il municipio di Sulmona”. Accordingly, the sanctuary was transformed “da struttura puramente locale in un grandioso organismo a terrazze” (COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 132).
susceptible to be manipulated by the Roman administration to enforce nucleation processes.

**Conclusion: Images of Society and the Lack of Evidential Basis**

In this chapter, three main lines in the modern interpretation of sanctuaries in Central-Southern Italy have been distinguished and discussed. The idea that sanctuaries were connected to the large transhumance routes that cris-crossed Central-Southern Italy has the merit that it seeks to interpret the phenomenon within a specific Italic context, the pastoral economy. This pastoral image of the Italic peoples has however somehow become a cliché, whereas evidence for large-scale transhumance before the Roman period is rather scarce. Also, the connection between Italic sanctuaries dedicated to Hercules and the *tratturi* has clearly been overstated. There is a certain circularity in the argument, and examples of the connection between the god and marketplaces feature more often in Roman, urban contexts. Whereas a relation with economic activities such as transhumance surely will have existed in certain cases, I see no reason to regard it as a key factor in the genesis, location or monumentalisation of rural Italic sanctuaries. The theory that sees sanctuaries as frontier markers of different ethnic territories derives from studies on Greek and other areas where urban centres held a central position. The transposition of the model to the less or non-urbanised Italic world is problematic, especially because the supposed Italic ethnic groups, and especially their territorial manifestations, evade us. Sanctuaries could of course assume a border function, but the scanty evidence in regard points rather to an integrative than an exclusive quality. A function as a central meeting place, also for commercial ends, seems reasonable. The most popular conception of Italic sanctuaries is their being part of the so-called *pagus-vicus* system. In this supposedly typically Italic settlement pattern made out of small villages and farms sanctuaries would have occupied a special position. They would have served at different levels, at that of the *vicus*, at that of the *pagus* comprising more *vici*, and at that of the *civitas* or *touto*, including several *pagi*.

Romanisation is seen as antithetic to this settlement pattern: the municipalisation would have entailed the suppression of this Italic mode of living, although it sometimes shows a remarkable persistence. The municipalisation therefore explains the abandonment of Italic sanctuaries after the Social War as well. Exceptions to this rule are the sanctuaries that fitted well into the new municipal organisation. Although this model is by far the best developed in modern research, it must be admitted that the evidential basis is actually rather thin. This accounts especially for the ‘typology’ of sanctuaries according to their different competences within the *pagus-vicus* system. A more general observation on all three ‘models’ could be that the evidential basis is rather fragile. Conceptions of Italic economy and society have strongly influenced ideas on the functioning of sanctuaries, whereas factual evidence relating to the sanctuaries and their environment is scarce.
A simple, yet fundamental problem in interpreting the sanctuaries of Central-Southern Italy is the lack of knowledge about their spatial context. If we would know more about the local functioning of sanctuaries, we could perhaps better understand other processes, such as their monumentalisation (cf. Chapter 3) and their possible functions within larger political or economical structures (cf. Chapter 4), as well as possible relations between them. Usually, we define the Italic sanctuaries found dotted over the landscapes of Central-Southern Italy as ‘rural’. But what does that mean? Were sanctuaries located in isolation from domestic and other sites? Do we have to envisage long processions from the places where people lived to their sacred places? Or did the cult places rather serve the local population; and if so, where did this population actually live? In short, what groups can reasonably be expected to have visited the ‘rural’ sanctuaries of Central-Southern Italy on a regular basis? To try answering these questions, the local spatial context of these cult places should be investigated. This context is also needed, in the case of Pentrian Samnium, to formulate more precisely questions as to how – if at all – the experience of these communities of worshippers relates to the construction of a larger ‘Samnite’ entity, as documented in the temple complex of Pietrabbondante (Chapter 3). Clearly, it makes a difference if the monumental Samnite sanctuaries of the second century BC were located in isolation, or if they rooted in a local pattern of settlement.

Research Approach and Methodology

To investigate the local context of sanctuaries, in the first place detailed knowledge of the surrounding pattern of settlement is required. This could shed light on the relationship between sanctuaries and other elements in the cultural landscape on a small scale, such as settlements, necropoleis and roads. This ‘landscape of the sacred’ can help understanding the changing functions and cultural meanings of the sanctuaries. Fortunately, our knowledge of Italic patterns of settlement has increased.
considerably in recent decades with topographical studies and field surveys. Most notable is the large-scale survey project in Samnium directed by Graeme Barker, which filled to an extent the gaping blanks in the landscape between the well visible remains of hill-forts and monumental sanctuaries (cf. Chapter 3). The issue of settlement patterns has never been specifically addressed from a wish to understand the functioning ofItalic sanctuaries within it however. Consequently, research strategies have not been designed to answer the more limited, but also more specific questions we would like to ask in this context.

In the second place, the archaeology of the pattern of settlement should be related as directly as possible to the archaeology of the sanctuary itself. Modern research has often focused on the monumental phases of sanctuaries (cf. Chapter 3), but attention to the small finds of all periods from these sites is important: this should enable a comparison with the material from the surroundings, and is obviously crucial for establishing the period during which the cult site was frequented.

With these ‘ideal’ requirements, but also clear limits to time and money in mind, a research strategy has been developed for the small Samnite sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo, located in the higher part of the Tappino valley. This strategy consists of small-scale intensive field survey research in the area around the sanctuary, including the sanctuary site itself, in combination with a study of the excavation data of the sanctuary, which was explored in the 1970s by the Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici del Molise under the direction of dott.ssa Angela Di Niro.

CHOOSING THE SANCTUARY OF S. GIOVANNI IN GALDO AND PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The choice to investigate the sanctuary at località Colle Rimontato (709m a.s.l.) near the village of S. Giovanni in Galdo (Campobasso) has been made on several grounds (fig. 5.1).

Fig. 5.1. Location of the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo, Colle Rimontato.
In the first place, the sanctuary is generally considered as a typical small ‘rural’ sanctuary and is often cited as such in modern literature. More specifically, the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo represents one of the best dated examples of the cult places that were monumentalised at the end of the second century or beginning of the first century BC; coins under the pavement of the shrine allow dating its construction to after 104 BC. It reflects moreover the ground plan found in Temple B of Pietrabbondante, which would be, according to some, reminiscent of the Livian description of the place where a Samnite sacred oath was sworn in 293 BC (cf. Chapter 3). As the small counterpart of the sanctuary complex at Pietrabbondante and with its relatively well preserved remains, this sanctuary has come to constitute almost a canonical site when speaking ofItalic or Samnite sanctuaries.

Additional reasons for choosing the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo had a more practical and methodological character. During a ‘pilot scouting’ of severalItalic sanctuaries from Abruzzo to Lucania together with Jeremia Pelgrom in spring 2003, this part of the Tappino valley appeared as a largely agricultural landscape, with relatively many cultivated fields and few woodlands, promising relatively good field survey conditions. Moreover, at the other side of the valley, at 9 km distance, another Samnite sanctuary has been identified at località Cupa (Gildone), which seemed to allow comparison of two sanctuary sites within a small geographical distance. This area has been subject of the 2004 and 2005 surveys as well, but will not be treated here. Additional attractive feature is that the Biferno Valley Project, directed and published by Barker, covers an area adjacent to the one under study here (cf. fig. 5.28). Since the project presented here has a relatively limited geographical focus, the possibility of comparison with the patterns of settlement on a larger scale seemed important.

The sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo had been known locally long before it was object of private excavation by the proprietor of the land, sig. Marini, in the 1930s, who uncovered part of the podium and the pavement. Objects found at the site, amongst which coins and statuettes, were sometimes taken home by inhabitants of S. Giovanni in Galdo, and some of them were later punished by the Carabinieri. The sanctuary has thus been susceptible to disturbances for a long time before systematic excavations were undertaken in 1974 (cf. infra on the excavation data). Previous research has concentrated on the physical remains of the sanctuary itself, the area directly surrounding it being formerly unknown except for some isolated finds. A
more general topographical study on the Alta Valle del Tappino provides a larger framework for both the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo and that of loc. Cupa, Gildone.\textsuperscript{5}


In view of the relatively narrow research aim, both in chronological and spatial terms, a focused approach rather than a macroscopic view of a large part of territory seemed most appropriate. The research aims also required a relatively high resolution in order to try to reconstruct the ancient landscape as detailed as possible and minimising the risk of missing sites. The relatively short period that is directly relevant to the research question, the Hellenistic-Roman period, and the aim to understand the pattern of settlement on this small scale as well as possible, demanded relatively intensive study of the sites that were found, including several revisits of all sites and geophysical research at some representative sites. This problem-oriented research on a modest scale differs fundamentally from, for example, the large-scale surveys conducted by Barker, who was interested especially in developments of a whole valley in the *longue durée*, from prehistory to the early modern period.

Through the kind permission by and collaboration of the *Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici del Molise*,\textsuperscript{6} research could be carried out during two field campaigns in October – November 2004 and February-March 2005, along with several smaller campaigns directed at additional site analysis, study of the survey data and geophysical research through 2004, 2005 and 2006.\textsuperscript{7} The first survey results have been published in

\textsuperscript{5} Di Niro and Petrone 1993.

\textsuperscript{6} Most notably in the persons of Mario Pagano, Stefania Capini, Angela Di Niro, and Cristiana Terzani.

\textsuperscript{7} The field projects were funded mainly by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research, The Hague (NWO), and additionally by the Institute of Culture and History, Faculty of Humanities, of the University of Amsterdam, Leiden University, the Stichting Philologisch Studiefonds Utrecht and Mrs. A. M. Kalmeijer, Rijswijk. The project has been co-directed by Jeremia Pelgrom from Leiden University / VU University Amsterdam. GIS analysis and other technical applications have been the responsibility of Jitte Waagen, University of Amsterdam. The 2004 survey was moreover co-organised by Michele Roccia; his knowledge of the topography and the local finds was invaluable. The team consisted of mostly Dutch and Italian archaeologists and students from several universities. Teams in the field were led by a.o. Jeremia Pelgrom, Michele Roccia (2004), Jeroen Weterings (2004, 2005) and Neelson Witte (2005), whereas the material has been studied during the campaigns by especially Francesca Laera (2005), Muriel Louwaard (2005), Michele Roccia (2004), Ellen Thiemann (2004, 2005), and the present author. Other members of the team were: Vanessa D’Orazio, Sandra Fatica, Michele Fratino, Marie-Catherine Houkes, Martijn Kalkwarf, Debora Lagatta, Bruno Sardella, Barbara Valiante, and in 2005 in addition: Antonio Bruscella, Miko Flohr, Rogier Kalkers, Karel-Jan Kerckaert, Antonella Lepone, Antje van Oosten, Laura Stek, Jolande Vos, and Heleen de Vries. Housing was kindly provided by signora Domenica Luciani during the 2004 campaign, and in 2005 and 2006 by the Comune of S. Giovanni in Galdo; we are most grateful.
2005, the final publication of the survey data is in preparation in the form of another article together with co-director Jeremia Pelgrom. The aim of the 2004 and 2005 surveys has thus been to shed light on the relationship of the sanctuaries of S. Giovanni in Galdo and loc. Cupa, Gildone with their direct environment, which was formerly virtually unknown. This has been done by trying to establish the pattern of settlement into which the respective sanctuaries were inserted.

**SURVEY METHODOLOGY**

In order to find answers to the questions posed above, an area of ca. 1.5 square km around each sanctuary was investigated, cutting through different geomorphological features such as hilltops, slopes, river valleys and terraces (fig. 5.2).

Both sample areas were surveyed in units of approximately 50 by 100 m (0.5 ha) at 10 m intervals between participants (~20% coverage) (fig. 5.3). All the archaeological

---

8 STEK and PELGROM 2005. Also, an internal report (schedatura) for the Soprintendenza was compiled in 2004. Cf. also STEK 2005b.
9 Cf. STEK and PELGROM 2005.
10 The modern centre of S. Giovanni in Galdo, a village of medieval origin, could of course not be surveyed. Private excavations and construction works have – as far as I know – not yielded Hellenistic and Roman archaeological remains of any importance.
material encountered was collected, washed and studied. If there were too many tiles to collect, they were counted in small sample areas of 1 m², enabling a rough estimate of the overall quantity. For each unit the land-use, noted erosion processes, tillage and various visibility factors (stones, shade, vegetation, soil humidity, presence of recent material) were recorded. Combined, these visibility factors determined the final visibility (cf. fig. 5.4).

All find concentrations of more than five artefacts per square metre (‘sites’) were subjected to closer examination. After a first standard sampling as described above with a 20% coverage, all sites were re-sampled in order to quantify the density of material at various locations within a concentration (also with a a 20% coverage strategy), as well as to collect more diagnostic material for dating and functional analysis (sometimes through an additional ‘diagnostic sample’). A handheld GPS was used to establish the coordinates and contours of the encountered find concentrations. During the 2005 survey PDA computers with a connected GPS were used in the field for both navigation and data input, with a software application that was designed for this purpose in collaboration with the SpinLAB of the VU University Amsterdam.

11 The applied survey methodology was originally developed within the framework of the Regional Pathways to Complexity Project: BURGERS 2002; BURGERS, ATTEMA and VAN LEUSEN 1998; VAN LEUSEN 2002.
Both survey unit boundaries and site contours were mapped on 1:10000 maps of the region.

Fig. 5.4. Research area around the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo, with indication of the visibility (1: low, 5: high).
Whereas the 20% coverage strategy appeared to work for establishing patterns of settlement, a more detailed strategy was applied at the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo and its immediate surroundings. This area has been sampled with an intensive site-survey method. The area directly around the sanctuary was surveyed in units of 10 by 10 m (0,1 ha) at 2 m intervals (~100% coverage; see fig. 5.5).\textsuperscript{12}

In the first place, the objective of this time-consuming strategy was to make an artefact density contour map of the area around the visible remains of the sanctuary. The detailed data thus acquired were expected to permit hypotheses on the possible existence of other structures near the temple. Secondly, the aim was to form an image of the sanctuary site and its associated finds as complete as possible, also in order to enhance the possibilities of comparison with the excavation data.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig5.5}
\caption{Site survey of the sanctuary with indication of the find densities (detail from 5.6).}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{12} After BURGERS 1998.
RESULTS

The contextualisation of the Samnite sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo is of primary concern here, and the focus will therefore be on the results broadly concerning the Hellenistic (ca. fourth to first centuries BC) and Roman (imperial) periods. Reference will be made also to the situation in the Iron Age, here defined as ca. ninth-fifth centuries BC. In general, the survey detected fairly high find densities, and about 22 distinct sites that can be dated to the Iron Age, Hellenistic and Roman imperial periods have been recognised in the area of S. Giovanni in Galdo (figs. 5.6 and 5.7).

As to the finds that were retrieved in the entire research area, the following can be said on the Hellenistic and Roman periods. The black gloss ware is clearly distinguishable from Campanian or Latial production centres by its rather soft, often powdery fabric and pale or beige colour. The gloss is usually matt and black or brownish in colour. Although detailed fabric analysis in a regional perspective should be executed to be sure, the repertoire of forms, which has best parallels in other sites in the area, suggests regional or local production. Only few plain wares and sigillata were found, and the latter point to a rather restricted repertoire. Few Italian sigillata was found, a.o. forms Ettlinger 10 and 34; of African red slip Hayes forms 8, 9 especially and, to a lesser extent, 61 appear to have been distributed well.

The sanctuary site (G9) was clearly distinguishable as such (and yielded, to give an impression, ca. 3200 finds) but without clearly defined concentrations within this site (fig. 5.8). Magnetometer prospection was carried out in the fields to the south and east of the sanctuary. No clear structures have been identified, which seems to support the hypothesis that the collected materials are related to the sanctuary itself. Here a small selection of the most common and diagnostic finds is illustrated (fig. 5.9). Amongst the finds are black gloss ceramics dating from the third to first centuries BC (e.g. G9-10: Morel 2978c; G9-6: Morel 2652; G9-12: Morel 2984), including fragments of more particular forms such as unguentaria (G9-11). Also tiles (of the common type illustrated here for G9-49) and some Roman imperial wares (e.g. G9-3: Italian sigillata and G9-1: Hayes 8a) were collected. No ceramics predating the fourth century BC have been found.

---

13 The data from the previous and later periods will be published in the final survey report. For this periodisation cf. BARKER 1995, but here the more common (but neither neutral) periodisation ‘Hellenistic’ is adopted rather than ‘Samnite’.
14 Cf. infra on the excavation finds.
Fig. 5.6. Find densities of the Hellenistic and Roman periods in the area around the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo, quantities per ha.
Fig. 5.7. Sites from the Iron Age, Hellenistic and Roman imperial periods discovered during the 2004 and 2005 surveys. The black dots represent probable subsoil archaeological remains, from which the surface material presumably (at least in part) derives.
Ch. 5. Landscapes of the Sacred

Fig. 5.8. The site of the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo as it appeared in the survey.

Fig. 5.9. Selection of finds from site G9 (sanctuary).
Within the wider environment, Iron Age sites yielding large amounts of fine impasto have been recognised to the east of the sanctuary. A nucleation of settlement in the area east of the sanctuary has been distinguished (fig. 5.10). For the Hellenistic period, a fairly dense pattern of settlement was encountered. Within the sample area, 16 sites of this period were recognised. Also in this period, most sites are located to the east of the sanctuary (fig. 5.11). At some of these sites Iron Age materials have been attested as well (G3, G5, G19-G22), which may suggest continuity, but the ceramics of the protohistoric period are notoriously hard to date accurately, and more primary research into the ceramics would be needed in order to answer this question. The so-called Ingiuno area (to the east of the sanctuary) appears most densely inhabited. This area is rich in natural springs and terraces, and is delimited to the east and south by very steep slopes, descending in the east to the Vallone Visciglieto and in the south to the Torrente Fiumarello. In the centre of this panoramic plateau, at little more than 500 m from the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo, a considerably large concentration of archaeological material has been identified, consisting of large quantities of different coarse wares, tiles and some fine wares (site G2; fig. 5.12 and fig. 5.15 for the finds).

The presence of woodland makes the precise dimensions of this site difficult to establish, but it covers an area of at least 10 ha. Concentrated around this nucleus various smaller sites have been detected (G3, G17-21). These consist of limited concentrations of mostly tiles, coarse and plain wares. It seems possible to interpret the whole agglomeration as a village with various buildings with spaces in between. This image of various nuclei appears to be sustained by electric resistivity prospection that was executed in a sample area (figs. 5.13 and 5.14).

15 G3, G5, G19-22. Quality and dimensions of the materials suggest for some sites – at least until recently – rather good archaeological preservation.
16 G1-5, G9, G12, G15-23.
17 The results will be published by Karel-Jan Kerckhaert.
Fig. 5.10. Iron Age sites, with indication of the future sanctuary site.
Fig. 5.11. Hellenistic sites.
Fig. 5.12. Site G2, interpreted in combination with G3, G17-21 as a village. In black higher surface find densities are indicated.

Fig. 5.13. Electric resistivity research at the site (photo J. Pelgrom).

Fig. 5.14. Electric resistivity results at site G3 (village), with indication of the higher find densities recognised in the field survey.
The chronology of most of these sites (or nuclei belonging to one single ‘site’) ranges from the Iron Age well into the Roman period. Amongst the finds from the supposed village, a selection of which is seen in fig. 5.15, are black gloss forms dating from the late fourth or rather third century BC (for example G2-8: Morel 2430; G2-9: Morel 7112 and G2-10: Morel 2770-2780) to the second and first centuries BC (for example G2-6: Morel 2252; G2-7: Morel 2286; G3-3 Morel 2974a). Coarse wares which are difficult to date (e.g. G2-19) and tiles (e.g. G2-54) make up the largest part of the finds. Whereas ceramics securely datable to the late Republican and early imperial period are generally scarce (cf. *infra*), imperial period occupation is attested by red slip wares (e.g. G3-2: Hayes 8b, of the second century AD and G2-1: Hayes 61a, of the fourth century AD). Not far and downhill from this site complex is site G22, which can be interpreted as a burial area, with finds from the Iron Age and Hellenistic periods. Other Hellenistic sites are characterised by small, often relatively well definable nuclei of tiles, coarse wares and few fine wares (G1, G4-5, G12, G15-16 and probably G23).
The dimensions of these various sites are largely comparable, and appear to represent small farms. In G4, a typical example of such a small site, for instance some black gloss sherds (e.g. G4-2), coarse wares (e.g. G4-4) and tiles (G4-10) were found (fig. 5.16). In spite of the limited extension of this site, resistivity prospection has revealed a quasi square feature of ca. 20 x 20 m (fig. 5.17).\(^\text{18}\)

---

\(^\text{18}\) Cf. preceding note.
The Roman period witnesses both change and continuity. A major problem affecting research is the absence of clearly datable ceramics for the period of the last century of the Republic and the early empire; the quantity of Italian sigillata that has been collected was very low, but it remains unclear to what extent this is due to a historical ‘crisis’ or to the archaeological visibility, or changed economic patterns without necessarily implying abandonment. In any case, a comparable number of sites as for the Hellenistic period have been attested for the Roman imperial period (about 13; fig. 5.18).19

Many new sites appear in the previously uninhabited area to the northwest of the sanctuary, some of them showing remains of *opus spicatum* floors. Most conspicuously, to the north of the Colle Rimontato, a large *villa* of the imperial and late Roman period has been recognised (G7), with several building materials still visible on the surface and a vaulted well that is preserved. The abundant ceramic materials of this site have direct parallels in the excavated *villa* of nearby Matrice.20

---

On the other hand, in some sites continuity with the Hellenistic period might be assumed (e.g. G2, G3, G9, G12, G18, G19, G20), namely, in some presumable farm sites, the sanctuary site, and the cluster of sites in the Ingiuno area that might be interpreted as a village. Interestingly, the dimensions of the sites in the Roman period are more heterogeneous than in the previous period, which might indicate a different and perhaps more hierarchical use of the landscape.

The Excavation Data (Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici del Molise, 1974-1976)

In order to establish the chronological range of the cult site, and to try relating the results of the survey to the development of the sanctuary itself, the excavation data of the sanctuary have been studied. The excavations of the 1970s, which had the character of a rescue project, have only been published summarily.21 Precise documentation of the excavation is not available. The areas around the temple and the shrine itself were first excavated, whereas in the successive campaigns the two lateral porticoes, a large deposit of ceramics directly behind the temple, and the front area of the precinct were uncovered.22 The ground plan and a section of the podium could thus be drawn (cf. Chapter 3, figs. 3.2 and 3.3),23 and some of the architectural elements were restored. The beginnings of cult activity have been dated to the second century BC24 or the end of the third-beginning of the second centuries BC.25 Angela Di Niro from the Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici del Molise, who was responsible for the excavation, has kindly permitted the study of the unpublished materials. In spring 2006, that part of the material which had not been published or studied has been examined with a small team.26 The final results of this research will be presented together with Angela Di Niro in a joint publication that also includes the material that she has studied already, but not yet published.

The majority of the material was found in the back chambers of the porticoes, and in the space behind the precinct walls. Here the concentration of ceramics and other finds such as animal bones was so high that Di Niro interprets it as a deposit or dump of votive materials from the sanctuary.27

The finds from the excavations of the sanctuary have been stacked in the deposit of the Soprintendenza at Campobasso. As has been said, documentation of the excavations is not available, so any analysis of the finds with regard to the exact provenance within the excavation and especially quantification will remain conjectural, if not simply

---

21 DI NIRO 1978a; DI NIRO 1980.
22 DI NIRO 1980, 269.
24 DI NIRO 1978a, 503, describes the black gloss finds as dating to the second and first centuries BC, followed by a “quasi totale assenza di materiale” until the second half of the first century AD.
26 Anneke Dekker, Laura Hoff, Francesca Laera, Alma Reijling, Ilona Steijven, and Alessandra Zaccardi, in addition to the author.
27 DI NIRO 1978a, 502.
impossible. For the present goal however, primarily concerned with establishing the chronological range and the general comparison of the finds with those from the survey, this limitation is not insurmountable.

The finds that are preserved in the depots of the Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici del Molise can be roughly divided into three groups, one that has been studied and catalogued already by the Soprintendenza, contemporaneously with or shortly after the excavations, part of which has been drawn as well, a second group that has been catalogued but not studied or drawn, and a group that has not been studied altogether. Both the finds and the documentation (‘schede’ and drawings) of the first group studied by the Soprintendenza were accessible for comparative use, and have been checked and entered into a database. The last two groups of unstudied material were obviously of primary concern. These have been studied and consequently numbered and labelled according to a new system, in accordance with the database that was used for the 2004 and 2005 survey campaigns. From these two groups, a total of 1326 items has been studied and entered into another (yet compatible) database. Type, fabric, colour, position of the fragment if applicable, diameter, provenance / stratigraphical information if indicated, and so on were administrated, along with

28 I have nevertheless attempted to reconstruct the most likely course of events and selection processes as far as it seemed reasonable: almost all finds have been labelled by way of the inclusion of small notes with a summarily stratigraphical or topographical indication, often accompanied by a sketch of the position within the sanctuary complex. Also, the fact that virtually all groups of material (including modern glazed wares, for example), very small fragments and a very large amount of non-diagnostic fragments have been collected and preserved suggests that the data set could be fairly representative – also in a quantitative respect – of the material encountered during excavation. At least, no severe selection process seems to distort the overall picture.

29 As seems to be indicated by the bibliographical references given, that predate 1980.

30 The selection criteria on the base of which the group was compiled that was studied already by the Soprintendenza do not appear to have been especially discriminate; they rather seem to have constituted the start of a project that aimed at full study of all excavation materials. The ratio between different categories seems roughly comparable to the material that was not studied yet. The ratio between black gloss and coarse wares is for example similar.

31 The original administration was preserved as well. E.g. SLP06_S145-T2: Sacred Landscape Project 2006, S(acco)145, T[=drawingselection] 1. When a Soprintendenza catalogue number was present, this has been preserved and integrated e.g. SLP06_SG_75-107: Sacred Landscape Project 2006, and then the excavator’s administration number SG75/107.

32 The total amount of ceramic finds in this group is 910. Although, as has been stated, quantification makes little sense in the light of the sample and unclear documentation. For the general impression some numbers are given here: 325 sherds or entire shapes of coarse ware, corresponding to about 212 individual pots, of which 62 have been drawn. 258 sherds or entire shapes of black gloss, relating to ca. 180 individual pots, of which 59 have been drawn; 39 sherds or entire shapes of Italian terra sigillata, corresponding to 18 individual pots (9 drawn); 32 sherds or entire shapes of African red slip corresponding to 13 individuals (6 drawn); 76 sherds or entire shapes of plain ware, relating to apparently 40 individual pots (14 drawn); 152 fragments or completely preserved lamps, corresponding to 33 lamps (6 drawn); 3 grey gloss items corresponding to 3 different individual pots (1 drawn); 21 items of glazed wares, corresponding to approximately 18 individual pots (none drawn). The total of the metal finds is 109, which corresponds to about 40 individual objects (9 drawn). Other finds include very small ceramic categories, small pieces of stucco (red / white decoration) and animal bones, mostly in a poor state of preservation.
possible bibliographical references. About 170 significant or frequently appearing forms of this group have been drawn. A selection of the previously unstudied material is presented here as part of the general contextualisation of the sanctuary.

BLACK GLOSS

The black gloss pottery from the excavated materials of the sanctuary under study here, numbering 258 items (about 30% of the total, and corresponding to approximately 180 individual forms) is made in a fabric that is not very hard, often powdery, and mostly pale, greyish or beige in colour. The gloss is usually matt, lacking the bluish shine of Campanian wares, and black or brownish in colour. A comparatively restricted range of forms has been recognised, predominantly cups and dishes / plates in about equal quantities. Several pyxides were found, and few sherds from skyphoi. A fairly representative sample of the material encountered during the depot work is presented here with drawings. Besides the most common cups and plates, almost all differing forms are covered in this selection. Few specimens have exact parallels in Morel’s typology, and local parallels, for example from Campochiaro,\(^{33}\) Montevairano\(^{34}\) and Capracotta,\(^{35}\) are often far better, but these unfortunately lack independent chronological fixation as well. Not surprisingly, some fine parallels can be found too in the more internal Campanian areas.\(^{36}\) These characteristics suggest a regional or local production, although as said only detailed regional fabric analysis can be conclusive on the matter. Only two sherds\(^ {37}\) could possibly belong to Campana A, but a regional origin cannot be excluded. I present the forms according to Morel’s typology.

Amongst the plates and dishes (fig. 5.19), Morel F1312-1315 are common, generically dated to the second century BC (cf. SLP06_S10-T3 and SLP06_S22-T3). Also F1443 (SLP06_S84-T5) can be dated to the (second half of) the second century BC. A relatively early form may be represented by F1331 (SLP06_S22-T4 and SLP06_S2-T2), still datable to the (second half of) third century BC. A somewhat less represented form in the context of S. Giovanni in Galdo is what appears to be a local variant of F1122 (SLP06_S22-T2). This shape is found in both Attic and Campana A workshops, and consequently there is a huge difference between the dates (Attic: second half fourth century BC; Campana A: around 200 BC).

\(^{33}\) CAMPOCHIARO 1982; CAPINI 1984.
\(^{34}\) DE BENEDITTIS 1980.
\(^{35}\) RAININI 1996.
\(^{36}\) E.g. PEDRONI 1986; PEDRONI 1990.
\(^{37}\) SLP06_S90T1 and SLP06_S91T1.
Ch. 5. Landscapes of the Sacred

Fig. 5.19. Black gloss plates / dishes from the sanctuary excavations, Morel F1100-1400.

Fairly well represented is a group of cups (fig. 5.20) that seem to be inspired by F2420-2424 (SLP06_S10-T1; SLP06_S1-T1\(^{38}\); SLP06_SG_75-100-898; SLP06_SG_75-311). These forms are generically dated to the late fourth or the beginnings of the third centuries BC.\(^{39}\) Good parallels have been found at the sanctuary of Campochiaro, scarico A, dated to the late fourth-beginnings of the third century BC\(^{40}\) and the foundation layer of the South gate of Monte Vairano,\(^{41}\) dated to the late fourth century BC. Other relatively early forms are F2783-2784 (SLP06_S10-T4; SLP06_S2-T6; SLP06_SG_75-103), mostly dated to the late fourth or first decennia of the third centuries BC.\(^{42}\)

Later forms (fig. 5.21) are represented by F2610 (SLP06_SG_75-92)\(^{43}\) and F2650 (SLP06_S22-T6), both of the second-first centuries BC (compare SLP06_S2-T9 – 2654 or 2653- and SLP06_S90-T2 -2654a2, first century BC). Another late cup might be represented by F2983 (SLP06_S90-T4), presumably datable to the beginnings of the first century BC.

\(^{38}\) It may, however, belong as well to F2534, dated to the second century BC.
\(^{39}\) Cf. for the type, dated to the fourth century BC, in Campanian graves, BENASSAI 2004.
\(^{40}\) CAMPOCHIARO 1982, 35-36, esp. no. 30. Cf. for the type also the specimen published by Di Niro in SANNIO 1980, pl. 51 no. 2.
\(^{41}\) DE BENEDITTIS 1980, 329, no. 5.
\(^{42}\) Note that there are two production centres of F2784; in Central Italy (Sabine / Latium / APE) at the beginning of the third century BC, and a Campanian A in the second century BC.
\(^{43}\) It resembles F2621b too, dated earlier, that is, in the first half of the third century BC.
Only three skyphoi have been recognised, the specimen reproduced here in figure 5.22 (SLP06_S92-T1) does not fit easily into Morel’s typology (generically, F4300), presumably due to its local or regional production. Its date may be quite early however, from the late fourth or beginnings of the third centuries BC.\footnote{Cf. e.g. CAPINI 1984, 29-32, nos. 67-68.} Furthermore several pyxides were encountered, which are generically dated to the third–first
centuries BC, but mostly to the second and first centuries: F7513a1 (SLP06_S10-T6); F7511-7514 (SLP06_S22-T1\textsuperscript{45}); F7544 (SLP06_S2-T1 and SLP06_S4-T4); F7530-7550 (SLP06_S5-T4).

Further forms that were encountered (fig. 5.23) include apode forms, F2150 (SLP06_S11-T4 -F2153 or 2154-; SLP06_S18-T1 and SLP06_S22-T7), and a goblet of the F7222 series (SLP06_S4-T6\textsuperscript{46}), which could be dated to the third or second century BC. Only one clear stamped specimen was recognised in this sample (SLP06_S22-T9), and this may date to the third century BC.\textsuperscript{47} A particular handle of the “anses bifides en double boudin” type, apparently relating to F3121, could be recognised as well (SLP06_SG_75-112-905).\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{45} 7512a1 comes closest, dated to the first half of the second century BC.

\textsuperscript{46} Cf. PEDRONI 1986, 699: probably local production from Cales, third to second centuries BC.

\textsuperscript{47} BERNARDINI 1986, 198, nos. 26-27.

\textsuperscript{48} Cf. also, PEDRONI 1986, 55, 457-459, locally produced at Cales, and dated to the third to second centuries BC.
ITALIAN TERRA SIGILLATA

The Italian sigillata forms (fig. 5.24) present amongst the excavation finds are not abundant, but neither non-existent (about 39 items corresponding to 18 individuals). Recognisable forms are Ettlinger 8.1 (SLP06_S61-T1), Ettlinger 26.2 (SLP06_S67-T1), Ettlinger 29.1 (SLP06_S128-T4), Ettlinger 33.1 (SLP06_S33-T1), Ettlinger 34 (SLP06_S54-T1) and Ettlinger 37.1 (SLP06_S130-T2).\(^\text{49}\) Whereas Ettlinger 8, 26 and 33 generally date from the Augustan period to the first half of the first century AD, Ettlinger 29, 34 and 37 can be dated in the first century AD, especially from the middle of the century onwards.

\(^{49}\) ETTLINGER et.al. 1990.
AFRICAN RED SLIP

The African Red Slip (ARS) wares that were encountered during the study in the deposits all relate to forms commonly dating to the second century AD (fig. 5.25). These comprise Hayes 3c (SLP06_S68-T5), dated to the mid second century AD, Hayes 5b (SLP06_S41-T2) which dates to the late first to early second century AD. The forms Hayes 9b (SLP06_S22-T11) and Hayes 8b (not illustrated, cf. fig. 5.15, G3-2), both of the second half of the second century (or even early third) AD\textsuperscript{50} were most frequent.

\textsuperscript{50} HAYES 1972; HAYES 1980, 515.
OTHER FINDS

Many coarse wares were attested, some of them decorated with incision lines or imprinting (cf. resp. SLP06_S26-T1 and SLP06_S12-T2). Although most forms recur, amongst other places, in the excavations at Capracotta (e.g. SLP06_S7-T2 and SLP06_S47-T1), they are too generic to be dated on the basis of typology (fig. 5.26).

Fig. 5.26. Coarse wares from the excavations of the sanctuary.

Moreover, several lamps are part of the excavation finds (fig. 5.27). Especially fragments and specimens of lamps dating to the first or second centuries AD have been recognised (e.g. SLP06_S55T1: a ‘Warzenlampe’, form Deneauve V D; here fig. 5.27a). Another type (SLP06_SG74-283), recognisable as Deneauve V G (fig. 5.27b), has been found as well in the sanctuary of Campochiaro and dates to the (first half of the) first century AD.

Fig. 5.27a and b. Lamps (SLP06_S55T1 and SLP06_SG74-283) from the excavations of the sanctuary (photo A. Dekker).

51 RAININI 1996.
52 DENEAUVE 1969, 158-159; CAMPOCHIARO 1982, 73, no. 142.
Conclusion: A Rural Community around the Sanctuary

The finds from the excavation of the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo seem to indicate that the cult place was frequented already from the late fourth or very beginnings of the third century BC onwards. A significant Roman phase of the sanctuary becomes clear from the finds as well. This is best attested for the first and second centuries AD, later finds were not noted. If the sanctuary declined strongly after the Social War until the first half of the first century AD, as has been suggested,\(^53\) is however difficult to say on the basis of the available data, and the character of these data; more quantitative analysis would be needed for such an assessment. Better dating of the late black gloss materials of the sanctuary, perhaps continuing well into the first century BC, could prove valuable for this question (cf. also \textit{infra} on the survey data). Also, a change to ritual practices with a lower archaeological visibility cannot be excluded. The 10 x 10 m site survey of the sanctuary yielded finds that can be related to the sanctuary itself, and no significant differences in periodisation, forms or fabric were found with respect to the excavation data (except perhaps for the presence of tiles, which were apparently not preserved by the excavators). The survey did not reveal distinct sites around the sanctuary, and neither did magnetometric prospection reveal secondary structures.\(^54\)

The field survey in the broader environment of the sanctuary did however record, as we have seen, a relatively high density of sites for both the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Most conspicuous was the discovery, at around 500m from the sanctuary, of the site complex consisting of G2, G3 and G17-21, which seems to represent a village or at least a fairly large agglomeration. This site existed already in the Iron Age, and continuity from this period onwards could be surmised, but in order to answer this question more satisfactorily our knowledge of the local chronology of the ceramics (especially impasto wares) should be enhanced. For the Hellenistic and Roman periods, of primary concern here, the image is clear however. Together with the nearby burial area downhill (G22) and several farms dispersed over the territory, an image of a rather ‘complete’ though spatially differentiated non-urban community arises. Although as has been said some sites present Iron Age finds as well, the structuration of this pattern of settlement in the area as a whole seems to date especially to the fourth and third centuries BC. This period of reorganisation of the landscape coincides with the first signs of cult activity on Colle Rimontato. It therefore seems legitimate to conclude that the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo was not located in isolation, but within a thriving pattern of settlement that emerges in the archaeological record from the fourth to third centuries BC. On this basis, it seems reasonable to assume that the sanctuary was part of this very pattern of settlement. An observation that could support this hypothesis, is that no finds belonging to the sanctuary could be positively identified as other than regionally produced; in any case it does not differ from the

\(^{53}\) D\textsc{i} N\textsc{iro} 1978a, 503-504; D\textsc{i} N\textsc{iro} 1978a, 274, speaking of a “mancanza pressochè totale di materiali databili alla seconda metà del I secolo a.C. e ai primi anni dell’impero”.

\(^{54}\) With one possible exception, but further research – that is to say especially excavation – is necessary to establish the character of this possible site.
finds of the surrounding sites recognised in the survey. The black gloss pottery definitely seems to relate to the same local or regional production in form repertoire. Also for the Roman period, basically the same repertoire is encountered in the excavation and in the survey data, with the exception that the sanctuary finds do not postdate the second century AD. Interestingly, a similar ‘gap’ in the first century BC and early imperial period as for the excavation data is attested for the whole area covered by the survey. This suggests that if the sanctuary was indeed subject to a strong decline in the first century BC, this cannot have been the result of selective abandonment or closure of the sanctuary within an otherwise unaffected pattern of settlement. The idea of a general crisis resonates not only with Strabo (5.4.11; 6.1.2), but also with the results of the Biferno valley project, where a drop in sites of over 40% has been noted.\(^55\) As said however, a bias from the poor distribution of guide fossils for this period might distort the picture.\(^56\)

The relatively high site density encountered in the survey around the sanctuary gives food for thought. The Biferno valley survey, for example, recorded for the nearby area around Matrice only a fraction of the number of sites found at S. Giovanni in Galdo in the Hellenistic period (see fig. 5.28). A similar situation is found for the Roman period.\(^57\)

This contrast could be explained by the differing experimental designs applied, viz. the intensity of the survey. However, although the research area around S. Giovanni in Galdo should be extended in order to be sure, the impression rises that human activity as a whole was concentrated in a limited area around the sanctuary, especially if one regards the fact that the area further south and east of the sanctuary is delimited by steep slopes. The further away one sampled from the sanctuary, the less material was encountered (cf. fig. 5.6). The sanctuary seems to have functioned as a pole of attraction, or the other way around – the sanctuary was inserted into a relatively densely inhabited area. Comparison with another area surveyed in the context of the Biferno valley project is suggestive, and could perhaps scale down the bias effect of different survey strategies in this discussion. At site C36, Colle Sparanise, a small Samnite sanctuary has been recognised that has been compared to that of S. Giovanni in Galdo (see fig. 5.28).\(^58\) Around the sanctuary, a dense cluster of sites was found – similar to the density encountered at S. Giovanni in Galdo – and has even been interpreted by John Lloyd and Graeme Barker as a single substantial village rather than a cluster of farmsteads.\(^59\) This parallel perhaps supports the interpretation of this type of sanctuaries as socio-religious centres for local communities, placed at the centre, rather than at the fringes of society.

\(^{55}\) Barker 1995, 224.
\(^{56}\) Cf. Barker 1995, esp. 215 and in general e.g. the discussion in Patterson 2006a, 17-19, with bibliography.
\(^{58}\) Barker 1995, 49-50 with fig. 24, 192, 223.
\(^{59}\) Lloyd 1991a, 182: “in figure 1, the cluster of finds around the sanctuary site C36 is provisionally interpreted as an associated village or hamlet, and in figure 5 the cluster has been treated as a single site”.
In conclusion, the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo seems to have served a local community, and that for the entire period of existence of the cult place – at least no major discrepancies between pattern of settlement and sanctuary could be noted until the third century AD when the sanctuary was apparently abandoned. This local embedding does not exclude a priori different functions, for instance as territorial marker, but it could suggest at least that this was not the original nor principal function (and it should be underscored that there is no evidence whatsoever to suggest a territorial function). The same goes for the connection to the transhumance routes crossing the landscape. A relation cannot be excluded, but the finds of the sanctuary do not offer clues in this direction. In any case, the mostly regionally produced ceramics do not differ from the finds of the domestic and burial sites in the survey. Crucially, it should be remembered that the very idea of the connection of rural sanctuaries with transhumance or ethnic borders has been prompted by a perplexity risen when confronted with isolated temples in an otherwise empty landscape (Chapter 4). This presumption of isolation, which also applied to the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo, is challenged by the discovery of a village and other sites in the direct environment of the cult place during the surveys. Indeed, it is in the context of a complete and dense, if
perhaps locally oriented community that the monumentalisation of the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo has to be understood. At the time of this monumentalisation, at the turn of the second century BC, the cult place was already in existence for about two centuries. Questions of assignment or commissioning of the monumental temple cannot be answered with this experimental design – only epigraphical evidence could provide conclusive information.\footnote{Apart from some characters carved into ceramic materials, neither inscriptions nor brick stamps have been found. Cf. for the sanctuary Di Niro 1978b.} But whether the monumentalisation just before the Social War was centrally coordinated,\footnote{As suggested, for example, by Coarelli and La Regina 1984, 296-297; cf. Chapter 3.} or a local initiative; the intended audience seems to have been the local community of farmers and villagers reflected in the surveydata.
Chapter 6

Roman Sacred Landscapes? The Pagus-Vicus System Revised

“è proprio sicuro che l’unica chiave di lettura sia quella che vede nel pagus un sistema integrato in cui convivono oppida, vici e santuari? (LETTA 1997b, 313).

This cautious question posed in 1997 by Letta, himself one of the most influential advocates of the pagus-vicus system, indicates a growing discomfort with the system. It can be answered now, and it must be negatively. As will be shown in this chapter, there are strong reasons to abandon the traditional scheme. The consequences of the ‘deconstruction’ of the pagus-vicus system are manifold. First, its application, ubiquitous in modern studies, on sanctuaries in virtually all areas of Italy lacking strong urban development, should be abandoned. The expression has been used more often than not for situations lacking actual epigraphical evidence for a vicus or pagus (let alone both!), and here the problem is limited to wrong terminology. This is for example the case for the sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo, which in the past by some authors has been seen as functioning within a pagus-vicus system (cf. Chapter 5). But, second, there are sanctuaries in Central Italy which do yield epigraphical evidence for the involvement of a vicus or a pagus. The implications of the problems with the pagus-vicus system entail much more than mere terminology here, and ultimately have important consequences for ideas on the romanisation, religious and not, of Italy.¹

The interpretation of the function and meaning of sanctuaries within the pagus-vicus system relies, by definition, on the acknowledgement of this very system as the most important structure in organising the territory. In Chapter 4, weaknesses in the attempts to interpret sanctuaries exclusively within the pagus-vicus system already have been pointed out. But these weaknesses could be demonstrated ‘internally’; that is without discarding the whole framework of the pagus-vicus system, which basic notion is that several vici were contained by one pagus. It has been shown in Chapter 4 that in many modern studies it is an assumption that such a configuration existed (e.g. Letta’s ‘griglia per l’inquadramento e l’interpretazione dei dati’), whereby a vicus

¹ See also STEK forthcoming.
necessarily implies the presence of a *pagus* and vice-versa, and this notion persists in very recent scholarship.²

As will be made clear, positive evidence for this hierarchical relation between *pagus* and *vicus* is thin, and probably *vicus* and *pagus* should rather be seen as autonomous or complementary institutions. This implies that the hierarchical relation between overarching *pagus* sanctuaries and minor *vicus* sanctuaries cannot stand up. There is, however, a more fundamental challenge to the interpretation of sanctuaries within a *pagus-vicus* system. This concerns the origin and status of the institutions of both the *pagus* and the *vicus*, apart from one another. Especially the *pagus* is traditionally considered to be an ancient, typical Italic institution, that later, under Roman dominion, continued to exist. The standard account on the *vicus* is similar, depending as it is on the traditional interpretation of the *pagus*. Recently, two different and important studies, that by Tarpin and that by Capogrossi Colognesi, have treated the subject.³ Although their conclusions are not identical (or even compatible), they agree in questioning the traditional conception of the nature and development of both *pagus* and *vicus*. If the arguments of these scholars are correct, this will influence the interpretation of the administration and pattern of settlement substantially. As will be made clear, both *vicus* and *pagus* can probably be understood as Roman, rather than Italic institutions. As a matter of fact, they may ultimately provide insight into the commonly underplayed impact of Roman religion in the Italian countryside. In Chapter 7, it is shown how these new theses would affect the interpretation of Italic sanctuaries and, in the end, the ‘romanisation’ of Italy; but first the debate on *pagi* and *vici* is briefly discussed in the present chapter.

*The Pagus: “die uritalische Siedlungsform”?*

It has been noted earlier that according to Salmon, writing in 1967, the *pagus* would represent an “immemorial Italic institution”.⁴ This notion is part of a long tradition; going back further, Ernst Kornemann described the *pagus* already in 1905 as “die uritalische Siedlungsform”.⁵ This idea is usual in most of modern scholarship on pre-Roman Italy, where *pagi* have been recognised from the ca. seventh to the fifth century BC in the central Italian areas.⁶ Moreover, this system would have persisted as a ‘substrate’ for the municipal system.⁷ In this way, a paradigm has been formed which basically discerns continutiy from a pre-Roman *pagus* to a Romano-Italic *pagus*. Capogrossi Colognesi has shown that the origins of this paradigm can already be found in the work of Adolf Schulten and can be placed in a specific historiographic tradition in Germany at the end of the 19th century, which for politico-ideological

---

² LETTA 1992, 110, cf. Charter 4. See e.g. Bispham 2007, who states on p. 195 that “the model [scil. pagus-vicus system] has held up well”.
⁴ SALMON 1967, 79.
⁵ KORNEMANN 1905, 83.
⁷ See discussion in Chapter 4.
reasons did not leave room for the structural existence of the village in Italy. Since it is clear that the pagus played a role in Roman administration in the empire (there are, for example, pagi attested in various provinces, such as Roman Africa), a model of diachronical evolution from a pre-Roman structure to a Roman one was conceived. The evidence for such an early date of origin and consequent evolution is poor. In the first place, we are naturally dealing with a Latin term, and therefore basically with Roman terminology, as has been carefully acknowledged by some scholars. 

Yet this has not prevented modern scholarship from applying this Roman term to pre-Roman Italic society, implicating that the Roman term translates or reflects a pre-Roman entity. Actually, the ancient authors never describe the allies or independent peoples of Italy as living in pagi. Other arguments in favour of the pre-Roman character of the pagus have been put forth, the validity of which will be discussed here. Arguably, the presumed age-old pre-Roman origin of the pagus has been constructed along three main ‘threads’: the early pagi of the archaic Urbs, the changing status of Capua in the Republic, and the conceivably ‘traditional’ names of some pagi.

Rome
It is for the city of Rome itself that the literary tradition points indeed to a very ancient date of origin. Dionysius of Halicarnassus attributes the institution of the pagus in

8 SCHULTEN 1894, 656-671; KORNEMANN 1905, 78-84; CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, esp. 117-122.
9 For which, see TEUTSCH 1962; MAURIN 1995.
10 Exceptions are RUDOLPH 1935, 50-51 and FREDERIKSEN 1976, 344; the latter distinguishes two parallel types of pagi: “And while in some cases it is clear that these pagi of the Roman census were the old tribal pagi taken over and transformed into part of the new system, in other cases it seems certain that the pagi were new institutions.” Frederiksen, moreover, concludes that during the late Republican pagi were “grouped together to form new municipia or were joined to old ones, or were created afresh wherever they did not exist”. He thinks that this process was already under way in the late second century BC, but was only systematised under Augustus in his procedures for census taking (p. 352).
11 E.g. SCHULTEN 1894, 634 on the different application of the Roman term of pagus on various pre-existing situations: “Damit ist nicht gesagt dass nicht etwa pagus ein einer grösseren Gruppe von Italikern gemeinsames Wort und ein gemeinsames Landtheilungselement sein könne. So lange aber das Wort in keiner der anderen italischen Sprachen nachgewiesen ist, kennen wir den pagus nur als den römischen Flurbezirk”. LAFFI 1974, 336 cautiously says: “ampie zone dell’Italia centro-meridionale ... si presentavano strutturate secondo un sistema di insediamenti che aveva nel pagus, o meglio in quello che i Romani chiameranno pagus, la sua fondamentale unità territoriale e amministrativa,” but propagates all the same the view that the pagus-vicus system is basically a pre-Roman feature, parallel to the Roman municipal system. The connection with the Greek pagos (“hill”) by Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 4.15.2 is misinformed, although deriving from the same root pag- “fix” as pointed out by Page in the Loeb edition of 1939.
12 Cf. on the connection with the Oscan touto, e.g. LETTA 1994; LETTA 1997b, 313: “si può riconoscere un nesso tra la touta italica ... e il pagus attestato in queste aree in età romana?”.
13 TARPIN 2002, 37.
14 These pagi would, apparently, to some represent a later development of the “pagus der Urzeit”; KORNEMANN 1905, 82: “Dem pagus der Urzeit stehen noch näher manche pagi bei den italischen Bergvölkern des Innern, wo sie noch nicht zu Flurbezirken von Städten, wie in Gegenden mit einer stärker fortgeschrittenen Entwicklung, z. B. in Latium, herabgesunken sind, sondern noch neben den Stadtgemeinden in einer gewissen Selbständigkeit sich erhalten haben.”
Rome to the mythical kings Numa and Servius Tullius. The historicity of his account is notoriously hard to establish, just as it is to what extent the Greek author described what he observed first-hand in the late first century BC, and what could possibly refer to previous realities. As a matter of fact, in this passage Dionysius quotes some of his sources (4.15.1). The late third-second century BC Fabius Pictor and Cato, and the somewhat obscure late second century BC writer Vennonius are named as sources for the division of Rome’s territory into *tribus* (which were, according to Dionysius, subdivided into *pagi*). It has been argued that many of the ‘Servian’ institutions (the *census* and the *tribus* division, and by consequence the terminus post quem of the *pagus* division) reflect ideological constructions of the fourth century BC. In Dionysius the central role of the *pagi* is administrative; they are in fact subordinated to the regulation of citizens and the collection of taxes and the festival of the *Paganalia* is portrayed as a consequence of this function. The importance of *pagi* for taking the *census*, however, seems best documented from the Augustan age on. Nonetheless, it might seem reasonable to conclude with Charlotte Schubert that, on the basis of Dionysius’ sources, the relation between *pagus* and some form of territorial organisation must go back to at least the second century BC. In any case, the first epigraphical evidence from Roman *pagi* is dated to the end of the second, beginnings of the first centuries BC.

CAPUA

An often cited argument in favour of the pre-Roman nature of the *pagus* regards Capua. An inscription has been found in its neighbourhood documenting a decree of the *pagus Herculaneus*. The inscription mentions magistrates of Jupiter Compages and is provided with a consular date of 94 BC. According to the decree the *magistri* are allowed to spend their money not, as was usual, on games, but on the restoration of a *porticus pagana*. As a reward the *magistri* are allowed to take their seats in the theatre at the games “as if they had given the games”.

---

16 Dionysius cites Fabius Pictor, Vennonius and Cato for the new division in *tribus* (4.15.1) and Piso (4.15.5) for the installation of a city register which is paralleled with the function he ascribes to the *Paganalia*. However, he never refers directly to these sources writing on *pagi*. According to FREDERIKSEN 1976, 345, “Dionysius seems here to be combining information taken from some antiquarian source with other items deriving from his own observation or contemporary knowledge”. He continues, however: “Of course, the *pagi* had for centuries had religious functions.”
18 Cf. the discussion in Chapter 8.
20 SCHUBERT 1996, 100.
21 *CIL* VI, 2219 and 2220.
22 *CIL* X, 3772. The inscription could belong to Capua, but also to Calatia: cf. GUADAGNO 1993, 409 n. 46.
The *pagus* dates to the period before the Social War, in a period in which Capua had no city rights. Capua, *civitas sine suffragio* since 338 BC,\(^{23}\) had been punished by the Romans after their defection in the Hanniballic War. After its recapture in 211 BC, senators were executed, people sold in slavery, and Capua was deprived of its city status (Liv. 26.16). According to some authors, notably Ernst Kornemann and Jacques Heurgon, the epigraphically attested *pagus* would thus betray a ‘relapse’ of Capua to an ancient and pre-existing tribal *pagus* structure as a consequence of the Roman punishments.\(^ {24}\) However, as Martin Frederiksen has pointed out, the terminology of the inscription seems quite Roman, especially the consular dating. He concludes that this *pagus* may well be a result of “the Roman census, for we know that in 189 BC the Campani were included in the Roman census and subjected directly to the censors from Rome (Liv. 38.28.4)”.\(^ {25}\) Indeed, the appearance of the *pagus Herculanus* in this context seems to make much more sense as a way of Roman control, than as the re-emergence of a putative tribal Italic institution in Campania, which had been urbanised as early as the eighth century BC.\(^ {26}\)

**WHAT’S IN A NAME: PRE-ROMAN NAMES OF PAGI**

Yet another argument that has often been put forth in favour of a pre-Roman origin of the *pagus*, is the appearance of names of *pagi* that apparently originate in indigenous, pre-Roman contexts. For Schulten this was indeed decisive for recognising a pre-Roman origin for the *pagus*.\(^ {27}\) It is true that in some texts listing a number of *pagi*, the *tabulae alimentariae* of Beneventum in Hirpinic territory and of Veleia in Liguria, pre-Roman names are present.\(^ {28}\) Especially those of Veleia would prove the pre-Roman


\(^{24}\) So e.g. KORNEMANN 1905, 81-82: “Die unterste administrative Einheit ist auf italischem Boden in der vorstädtischen Zeit der *pagus*. Wenn später in der Epoche der Städte Rom einer italischen Gemeinde das Stadtrecht entzieht, wie z. B. Capua im hannibalischen Krieg, so treten die *pagi* wieder zu Tage und übernehmen ... die Pflichten der städtischen Verwaltung”; HEURGON 1942, 117-118, speaking of “les instincts plus profonds des populations”. Cf. discussion in FREDERIKSEN 1976, 350-351 and TARPIN 2002, 40-43. CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, 162-163 demonstrates that Heurgon and Kornemann reflect a tradition presupposing some sort of in-born Italic propensity to revert to rurality, linked to the idea that all that is urban must be Roman.

\(^{25}\) FREDERIKSEN 1976, 351.

\(^{26}\) RUDOLPH 1935, 51; FREDERIKSEN 1976, 351; FREDERIKSEN 1984, 266-268; POBIOY 1998, esp. questioning the Oscan character of Capuan administration; TARPIN 2002, 40-43. Heurgon’s argument indeed relies on the premise that there was a *pagus-vicus* system before the urbanisation of Capua, evidence for which is absent, or it should have been imported by the Samnites when they took Capua in 423 BC (Liv. 4.37.1). However, it is only generically said by Strabo (5.4.12) that the Samnites live *komedon*. As CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, 163 points out, this is to be translated with *vicatim*, not *pagatim* (cf. discussion infra). Heurgon therefore had to assume that a *vicus* implies the presence of a *pagus*...

\(^{27}\) SCHULTEN 1894, 632, on the fact that “auch in den mittelitalischen Landschaften die römischen Inschriften *pagi* nennen. Diese Thatsache allein würde nun nichts beweisen, da die *pagi* mit der Anlage der römischen Colonien oder (seit 90) mit der Verwandlung der unterthänigen Orte in Municipien erst geschaffen sein könnten; aber entscheidend sind die Namen der *pagi*, welche uns die Alimentartafel von Veleia kennen lernt, und die zum guten Theile unrömisc sind”.

\(^{28}\) CIL XI, 1147; CIL IX, 1455.
date of these pagi. However, in these documents of Trajanic date only a very small number of pagi present such a name. In Beneventum only the pagus Meflanus seems to reflect a really non-Latin name. In Veleia, most pagi seem to bear gentilicial (Domitius, Iulius, Valerius, etc.) or theophoric names (Apollinaris, Cerealis, Dianius, Venerius, Martius, Iunoni, Mercurialis, etc.). In the end, only three pagi seem to bear real indigenous names: Eboreus, Moninas, and Luras. Similarly, for Volcei, Ulubrae and Beneventum mostly localities and Latin gentilicial names, along Roman theophoric ones, are present. Therefore, in general the names of the pagi, even those using pre-existing names, cannot attest to a pre-Roman origin. In conclusion, in Capogrossi’s words: “Quanto all’onomastica autoctona di certi pagi sembra abbastanza evidente che, in sé, un nome indigeno non possa attestare la preesistenza del pagus in quanto tale. A maggior ragione se immaginato come una precisa struttura costituente di una unità etnico-politica. Esso può semplicemente richiamare una preesistenza di popolazioni e di insediamenti, non anche la loro forma specifica.”

What’s in a name: in any case not the proof for the pre-Roman pagus.

The Pagus: A Roman Invention?

For the city of Rome it could be argued – if Dionysius of Halicarnassus is to be trusted when quoting his sources – that the first pagi have a terminus ante quem of the second century BC. For Italy outside Rome it is even harder to put a date on the appearance of the pagus. Besides the arguments just discussed, the traditional assumption of an early ‘Sabellian’ or ‘Samnite’ pagus rests on some indications given by the ancient authors. To be honest, these are rather scarce as a result of a general lack of interest in the Italian countryside. In any case, ancient authors describe the settlement pattern of rural Italy as vicatim (most famously Livy 9.13.7), or as organised in komai or komedon as runs the often quoted expression of Strabo 5.4.11 and 12. But as Capogrossi Colognesi emphasises, vicatim (and komedon) cannot be equalled with

29 SCHULTEN 1894, 632-633; cf. supra n. 27.
30 VEYNE 1957, 92.
31 CIL XI 1147; VEYNE 1957, 91-93; FREDERIKSEN 1976, 344. Only the pagus Bagiennus seems to take its name from the Celtic background, but the first may refer to the city of Augusta Bagiennorum: TARPIN 2002, 38.
33 FREDERIKSEN 1976, 344.
34 Possibly, pre-Roman names are indicative in some way, but of what precisely is hard to say: CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, 180: “al massimo qualche nome preromano di un pagus può aprirci qualche scorcio su realtà preromane”; cf. also TARPIN 2002, 230 on a “fond indigène encore vivace” on which pagi were superposed.
36 As does SCHUBERT 1996, 100; cf. supra. In any case CIL VI, 2219 and 2220 attest to pagi at the end of the second / beginning of the first centuries BC (cf. e.g. NONNIS 2003, 40).
38 But Strabo’s point in 5.4.11 is precisely to indicate the way in which Roman intervention had altered the countryside, from wealth and urbanity to village-like structures! CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, 170.
This is only possible by assuming a fixed hierarchical relation between *pagus* and *vicus*, which cannot be proved for Central Italy. So even if these early imperial definitions of territorial structures were applicable to earlier periods, this would attest to the existence of *vici*, not *pagi* in the Italian countryside. As to the epigraphical evidence, besides the already mentioned Capuan inscription from 94 BC there are few early attestations of the *pagus*. Actually, the only other examples of inscriptions mentioning a *pagus* in Italy dated before the Social War come from Ariminum (second half of the third century BC) and Cupra montana (second century BC). In this context, Tarpin points out that Capua seems at that time under Roman control (cf. *supra*), Ariminum is a Latin colony and Cupra montana is located on *ager Romanus*. On the basis of the epigraphical evidence, he concludes, it is difficult to consider the *pagus* as an Italic ‘indigenous’ structure. After the Social War the *pagus* appears more often in Italy, which is by then wholly under Roman control. This cannot be explained merely as a result of the increased epigraphical habit. The conclusion seems, therefore, almost inescapable: the *pagus* is a corollary of Roman control of the territory.

Although one may allow for some pre-Roman echoes in the Roman *pagi* – especially in the nomenclature, convincing evidence for a pre-Roman origin or continuity into the Roman period is simply absent. It is, however, only from the reorganisation of the *census* by Augustus onwards that the *pagus* surfaces frequently in the official record. From then on references to *pagi* are often found in financial contexts. It is now that lands are indicated by their location within certain *pagi*, and the process of municipalisation seems to run synchronous with the division *per pagos*, even if the borders of the *pagi* do not always correspond to the municipal borders.

In sum, the evidence suggests that the *pagus* was mainly devised as an instrument of Roman control, in order to administrate people and property. Pagì existed in Italy at least from the second half of the third century BC onwards (in the Latin colony of Ariminum), but their financial and administrative function can be clearly distinguished only from the time of the Augustan reforms on. The *pagus* was thus surely a rural structure in Italy (cf. also Chapter 4), but it depended on Roman, and urban, forms of government.

---

39 Cf. also *infra*.
40 *CIL* I², 2897a and b; *CIL* IX, 5699. Cf. discussion in Chapter 7.
43 Cf. *supra* n. 34. There is a tendency to admit some pre-Roman reflections in the Roman *pagi*. Frederiksen 1984, 47 n. 22 states that the seven *pagi* of Nola “are probably Roman creations for administrative purposes, but probably reflect pre-existing settlement patterns to a certain extent”. CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, 180 thinks that the pre-Roman names of *pagi* are in some way testimony of pre-Roman situations. Cf. TARPIN 2002, esp. 220-232 for the idea that marginal groups could express themselves “à travers le *pagus*” in the course of the process of statutory redefinition.
45 CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, 203.
47 CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, 227: “appare abbastanza evidente la fisionomia del *pagus* come un sistema insediativo di carattere rurale in rapporto di subordinazione funzionale con l’assetto municipale romano.”
The Pre-Roman or Roman Vicus

THE EVIDENCE

Traditionally, *vici* are considered to have formed an integral part of pre-Roman society, as single hamlets or clusters of hamlets located within the territorial district of the *pagus*. Three types of evidence have been evoked to demonstrate the pre-Roman origin and character of the *vicus*.

To begin with, inscriptions mentioning *vici* dating as early as the third century BC have been found in Central Italy. Here, reference will be made to this type of evidence, but a more detailed discussion follows in Chapter 7.

Second, the literary sources: these are, as opposed to the situation for the *pagus*, rather explicit, but at the same time enigmatic. The principal text is the damaged lemma by Festus (502, 508 L). The text seems to indicate that the *vicus* was the typical mode of settlement in the backward areas of the Marsi and Paeligni. This specific Italic location seems to point to the pre-Roman, Italic origin of the *vicus*. The third type of evidence adduced, archaeology, is actually not appropriate for answering this question.

ARCHAEOLOGY

The presence of both pre-Roman and Roman village-like settlements or clusters of settlements – omnipresent in Italic archaeology – have induced researchers to term them generically *vici*, even in the absence of epigraphical or other evidence justifying such a specific identification. This has resulted in the situation that a clustered settlement that is not an *oppidum* is, in archaeological and ancient historical jargon, recognised as a *vicus*. Obviously, archaeology in itself is sometimes able to distinguish different types of settlement, with different sizes and perhaps functions, but is by definition not able to recognise the statutory or juridical status of such a settlement. Once it is admitted that the term *vicus* relates to something more precise than, generically, ‘village’, archaeological evidence cannot prove nor falsify the existence of a *vicus*, and we will leave it out of the discussion here.

LITERARY SOURCES: FESTUS 502-508L

Festus’ statement in his *de verborum significatu* on the Marsic and Paelignian *vici* forms an extremely difficult passage because it is fragmented, and the topic is hotly debated currently from different points of view. It is relevant here to point out only some of the problems that have emerged, and especially the consequences they could have for ideas on the origin of the *vicus*.

---

48 In addition to the ubiquitous but confusing interference with the *pagus* (according to the false logic *pagus* implies *vicus* and vice-versa, cf. *infra*).

49 This application is ubiquitous. Cf. e.g. the *CIL* volumes or the *Forma Italiae* series (e.g. VAN WONTERGHEM 1984; DE FELICE 1994).

50 Cf. the considerations in CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, 176-182.

Ch. 6. Roman Sacred Landscapes?

The text reads, in Lindsay’s edition of 1913:

(502 L) <vici> ... cipiunt ex agris, qui ibi villas non habent, ut Marsi aut Paeligni. Sed ex vic[t]is
partim habent rempublicam et ius dicitur, partim nihil eorum et tamen ibi nundinae aguntur negoti
gerendi causa, et magistri vici, item magistri pagi quotannis fiunt. Altero, cum id genus aedificiorum<rum
definitur, quae continentia sunt his oppidis, quae ... itineribus regionibusque distributa inter se
distant, nominibusque dissimilibus discriminis causa (508 L) sunt dispartita. Tertio, cum id genus
aedificiorum definitur, quae in oppido privi in suo quisque loco proprio ita aedifica<n>t, ut in eo
aedificio pervium sit, quo itinere habitatores ad suam quisque habitationem habeant accessum. Qui
non dicuntur vicani, sicut hi, qui aut in oppidi vicis, aut hi, qui in agris sint vicani appellantur.

Apparently, three types of vici are envisaged, one rural, one (peri-)urban,\(^52\) and one as a
certain type of urban building. The first part on the ‘rural vicus’ is of most interest
here. In Festus’ passage, there seems to be a division between land use oriented
towards villa-type settlements and land use oriented towards vicus-type settlements,
the last of which would be typical for the Marsi and Paeligni.

\textit{vici appellari incipiunt?}

According to the integration by Mueller (371), based on codex Vaticanus Latinus
3369,\(^53\) we should read the beginning as \textit{<vici appellari in>cipiunt}; in other words,
“one starts calling \textit{vici} the settlements in those areas which have no \textit{villae}, such as
amongst the Marsi and the Paeligni”. With this chronological interpretation of
\textit{>cipiunt}, the conception of an ancient rural \textit{vicus} as opposed to urban ones is
confirmed.\(^54\) Torelli, for instance, uses this interpretation of Festus in arguing for a
watershed between landscapes organised according to the \textit{villa}, and those according to
the \textit{pagus-vicus} system, which he calls the “world of non-cities” (cf. Chapter 1).\(^55\)
Tarpin accepts Mueller’s reading, but not the traditional interpretation.\(^56\) According to
him, Festus’ indication of the territories of the Marsi and Paeligni as the first regions
where the \textit{vicus} was to appear, could be nothing more than a general stereotype of
these peoples as being culturally backward. The fact that \textit{vici} would have appeared
here first is no evidence for their indigenous origin: it may be here that the first \textit{vici}
were conceptualised as such because of special circumstances.\(^57\) Also, the opposition
between a landscape with \textit{villae} and a village-landscape, which has been followed to
an extent by modern scholars, can certainly not be accepted at face value, and has been

\(^52\) Cf. the emendation by TODISCO 2006, 610: \textit{quae continentia sunt his oppidis quae [eis finiuntur]}:
“che si sviluppano in continuità a queste città che li assumono come confini”; cf. LETTA 2005b, 93.
\(^53\) MUELLER 1839.
\(^54\) Cf. TARPIN 2002, 55.
\(^55\) TORELLI 1995, 10: “The hill-fort fortified enclosures, the small farm scattered in the countryside ... ,
and the series of country sanctuaries perform the functions otherwise and elsewhere performed by the
city. As a consequence, the rural villas for agricultural production are completely absent, as indeed is
noted by the ancient sources [citing Festus].”
\(^56\) TARPIN 2002, 53-54, 82.
\(^57\) TARPIN 2002, 62, 82-83; cf. infra, and on these circumstances also esp. Chapter 7.
proved to be over-simplistic. More specifically, the *vicus* appears quite often in combination with the *villa*, and also Varro’s assertion that the *vicus* served as a provisioning centre for *villae* would underscore an interdependency between *vicus* and *villa*.  

It is, however, possible to reconstruct the first line of the lemma differently. The codex Vaticanus Latinus 3369 does not form an independent tradition, but is rather a tentative reconstruction of the mutilated principal Farnesian codex, and Mueller’s integration based on Vat.Lat. 3369 is therefore actually less more than an educated guess. Alternatively, Elisabetta Todisco and Letta have (independently) recently proposed to read something like *[Vicus ter modis intelligetur. Uno, cum id genus aedificiorum definitur ad quae se re]cipiunt ex agris, qui ibi villas non habent etc.,* which eliminates the ‘chronological’ value of *incipiunt* in favour of a verb of movement (“that type of buildings where those who have no villas congregate coming from the fields”). In this reading, the Marsi and Paeligni would still function as a mere example of backwardness, but not necessarily indicate an ancient local (and indeed pre-Roman) origin.

Both the interpretation of the traditional Muellerian text by Tarpin and the new reconstruction of the first phrase by Todisco and Letta would thus weaken the momentum of Festus as an argument for the pre-Roman character of the *vicus*.

*Different integrations and consequent interpretations: the place of the pagus in Festus*

Since Festus mentions *magistri pagi*, it has seemed plausible to some authors that *pagi* originally formed in some way part of Festus’ lemma on *vici*. In his discussion of the relation between *pagus* and *vicus*, Capogrossi Colognesi suggests that at the mutilated beginning of the lemma possibly *pagi* were mentioned, as the unit containing the *villae*. This reconstruction would imply a dichotomy between *pagus* and *vicus* landscapes: the first corresponding to a new Roman ‘economical’ land use, based on the *villa*, the second to a more ‘traditional’ pattern of small villages economically based on, one supposes, mixed farming and pastoralism.

The notion that *vici* and *pagi* were possibly complementary has been elaborated by some authors, pointing to the regional diversity in the distribution of *pagi* and *vici*. Letta has underscored that the Marsi did not have *pagi* at all, whereas the Paelignian territory has not yielded even one *vicus*, and Tarpin has demonstrated an uneven distribution of *pagi* and *vici* for *Germania*. In a recent contribution to the debate, Letta has proposed yet another reading of Festus’ lemma. His reconstruction results in a similar distinction, not between *pagi* and *vici* landscapes but rather between landscapes made up of *pagi* and *vici* on the one hand, and landscapes exclusively provided with *vici* on the other. As noted, Letta comes to a solution equivalent to

---

59 Cf. LINDSAY 1913, xi-xvii; LETTA 2005b, esp. 81; TODISCO 2006, 606 n. 4.
60 TODISCO 2006, 607-608; similarly LETTA 2005b, 83.
61 CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, 190.
62 LETTA 1993; cf. also GUADAGNO 1993.
63 TARPIN 1993.
Todisco’s for the initial phrase of the lemma, but he is ready to reconstruct and reorder more of the rest of the text. Letta emphasises the apparent distinction between two different types of rural vici in the lemma, one with and one without respublica. According to him, these would correspond respectively to vici with their own magistri vici, and those without their own magistri, consequently supervised by magistri pagi.\footnote{LETTA 2005b, 89: “Si potrebbe pensare che la parte finale, con la menzione dei magistri vici e dei magistri pagi, intendesse riprendere la bipartizione iniziale tra vici con respublica e vici che ne sono privi, per precisare che, mentre i primi eleggevano ogni anno dei propri magistrati (magistri vici), gli altri, non avendone di propri, facevano capo ai magistri pagi, cioè ai magistrati eletti dalla popolazione di un distretto rurale più ampio in cui era compreso il vicus.” His translation of Festus’ first vicus type would be (97-96) : “I vici possono intendersi in tre modi diversi. S’intendono nel primo modo quando così si definisce quel tipo di edifici in cui si ritirano di ritorno dai campi coloro che non hanno fattorie nei campi stessi, come i Marsi o i Peligni. Ma tra questi vici alcuni hanno proprie istituzioni e in essi si amministra la giustizia, altri non hanno nulla di tutto questo, tuttavia in essi si tengono giorni di mercato per esercitare il commercio, e come (negli uni) si eleggono ogni anno dei magistri del vicus, allo stesso modo (negli altri) si eleggono quelli del pagus.”}

In sum, this would mean that some areas presented only vici and other areas vici within pagi.

The role of the pagus, and especially the contingent idea of ‘dichotomised’ landscapes suggested in different ways by Capogrossi Colognesi and Letta, must remain hypothetic as far as regards Festus’ text. However, the important implication would be that whereas pagi relate to a new ‘Roman’ organisation, autonomous vici could indeed be seen as ‘non-Roman’ indigenous elements.

In conclusion, already in the interpretation of the principal literary source different ideas on the character of the vicus appear. Beyond the distinction between an ‘urban’ and a ‘rural’ vicus, two alternative views could be elaborated: one that seeks to underscore the character of the vicus as a typical traditional Italic phenomenon, and another that connects its invention to Roman times and influence. The elaboration of these different strands will now be sketched and evaluated.

**THE VICUS AS ‘ANTI-URBAN’ AND NON-ROMAN INSTITUTION (CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI)**

Capogrossi Colognesi emphatically leaves open the possibility that the institution of the pagus formed an alternative settlement system with respect to the vicus: the presence of the one would be at the cost of the other (which would also explain the scarcity of inscriptions mentioning both pagus and vicus).\footnote{CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, e.g. 190; cf. TARPIN 1993.} This view enables the detachment of the origin of the vicus from that of the pagus. There is, as seen, basically a consensus on the Roman character of the pagus by both Capogrossi Colognesi and Tarpin. The interpretation of the vicus is more complex however. Whereas Tarpin, as will be shown, recognises the vicus as an entirely Roman and intrinsically urban feature, Capogrossi Colognesi is, amongst others, more reticent.

Notably, Capogrossi Colognesi raises the possibility that vici were actually of pre-Roman origin, but consequently took on functions similar to those of the pagus for administrative purposes. This idea has been developed also for other regions than Italy.
In his study on Roman Spain, Leonard Curchin argues that *vici* appeared especially in the “relatively unromanised zones of central, western and northwestern Iberia – none in Baetica or in eastern Spain – and that most of them bear non-Latin names”, which according to him indicates that they were indigenous centres which may have existed since pre-Roman times.\textsuperscript{66} Interestingly, according to Curchin, *pagi* were located “almost exclusively in the highly romanised province of Baetica”, and always in areas where the agrarian space was regulated firmly, linked to the large-scale production of olive oil and the presence of colonies.\textsuperscript{67} Moreover, *pagi* would bear, as opposed to the *vici*, largely Latin names (*Augustus*, *Suburbanus*), indicating at times the town to which the *pagus* was attributed, sometimes a topographical or functional indication, e.g. *pagus Carbulensis* (Carbula), *pagus rivi Larensis* (river Larensis), *pagus Marmorarius* (from an area with marble quarries).\textsuperscript{68} Thus, according to Curchin, in Spain *pagi* would evidently be a creation of the Roman administration, whereas *vici* would “perpetuate pre-Roman villages”.\textsuperscript{69} This idea of dichotomisation between rural and perhaps more autonomous, indigenous *vici* versus Roman *pagi* would be confirmed by Curchin’s observation that “*vici* are most often attested making religious dedications to indigenous gods, a function unrecorded for the *pagi*”.\textsuperscript{70}

More generally, it can be said that the territorial role of *vici* is far less certain than that of *pagi*: it is not clear what their competence was over the surrounding countryside.\textsuperscript{71} Because of the frequent mention of *magistri* (*vici*) a relative autonomy of the *vici* has been posited.\textsuperscript{72} Related to this, different ideas on the relation between urban centre and *vicus* can be formulated: Tarpin distinguishes (acknowledging a certain level of self-government) a direct relation of *vici* with cities and Roman administration in general (cf. *infra*), while Capogrossi Colognesi opts for a different interpretation. Whereas *pagi* obviously depended on the urban centres, according to him *vici* retained an alternative non-urban character.\textsuperscript{73}

The line of his argument unfolds itself along the general evolution of the village in the long term, from pre-Roman times to the medieval period. In the first place, Capogrossi Colognesi holds that the village was important already in the pre-Roman period. In the Roman period, the *vicus* could constitute some ‘alternative’ to the city-based pattern of settlement. Since the Romans – he argues – did ultimately not want to stimulate a village-like pattern of settlement, but rather an urban way of life, they did not organise the countryside according to *vici*, but according to the municipal system.\textsuperscript{74} Apart from some *vici* that happened to be favoured by the new Roman pattern of settlement, for

---

\textsuperscript{67} CURCHIN 1991, 125.
\textsuperscript{68} CURCHIN 1985, 338-342 (with previous bibliography).
\textsuperscript{69} CURCHIN 1985, 342-343.
\textsuperscript{70} CURCHIN 1985, 343. The religious role of *vici* and *pagi* will be discussed in detail in Chapters 7-9.
\textsuperscript{71} Cf. Cod. Justin. 6.25.9.1 for the category of *vici qui proprios fines habent*, cf. TARPIN 2002, 262-263.
\textsuperscript{72} CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, 228.
\textsuperscript{73} CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, e.g. 228-230.
\textsuperscript{74} Sometimes *vici* were upgraded to *municipia*; CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, 229.
example along roads, *vici* would have been “più tollerati che ulteriormente valorizzati”. The structure of pre-existing villages would thus survive, more despite of than thanks to the Roman settlement organisation. It is in this way that the *vicus* appears to take on a slumbering existence during the Roman period, only to re-emerge in the medieval period: for it would be the “duplice aspetto – il radicamento preromano e la sua estraneità o marginalità al modello ‘urbanocentrico’ romano” that explains the revival of the *vicus* exactly in the period that Roman control waned and hierarchical city-countryside relations deteriorated. Antagonistically, the *pagus* was doomed to go under together with the municipal system, on which it depended.

**THE VICOUS AS ROMAN, URBAN FEATURE (TARPIN)**

As has been announced, a radically different approach with respect to the *vicus* has been developed as well. Apart from the problematic lemma by Festus, epigraphical evidence seems to be most authoritative with regard to this issue. In the territory of the Marsi, around the Fucine lake (*lacus Fucinus*) inscriptions mentioning *vici* can be dated as early as the end of the third century BC (detailed discussion follows in Chapter 7). At first this would seem a corroboration of Festus’ text, or indeed an ‘Italic’ origin.

Tarpin thinks however that the *vicus*, a basically Roman word, was also basically a Roman institution. The *vicus*-communities at the Fucine lake would not have been Marsic groups, but rather groups of Latin or Roman citizens. The names, arguably of ‘Sabellian’ origin, are written down according to Latin norms, and Tarpin would also see the appearance of magistracies such as *quaestor* as an indication of Roman administration, not as the local adaptation of Roman examples. Tarpin connects the difference between the Paelignian and Marsic territories – the first yielding no *vici*, but *pagi*, the latter *vici*, but no *pagi* – to different relations of these peoples with the Romans: whereas the Marsi would have been befriended, and supplied troops for Rome in 225 BC, the Paeligni did not, the community being incorporated already in 305 BC. In light of the date and location of the epigraphical evidence a Roman origin

---

75 CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, 231.
77 CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, 235.
78 *Vicus* can etymologically be related to the form *wik* or *weik*, and stems from the same family as the Greek *oikos*, and can be interpreted to have designated ‘units of several families’, between Latin *domus* and *gens* (TARPIN 2002, 11-14). It is in origin Indo-European, but is not attested in the Osco-Umbrian languages (contra Devoto; cf. TARPIN 2002, 10). Therefore, *vicus* seems to be a rather isolated word, and consequently a “concept proprement romain” (TARPIN 2002, 11).
79 An additional argument is that *vicus* apparently designates a ‘community’ as well as the structure of a village (as becomes clear from dedications in the name of the *vicus* – instead of the *vicani* -, cf. e.g. TODISCO 2004a). According to TARPIN (2002, 57) this meaning is at odds with the idea of an ‘indigenous’ Marsic *vicus*; in this view, the appearance of *vici* would indicate the falling apart of the Marsic community into different groups in a time for which other evidence seems to point to a growing tribal cohesion (exemplified by the communal coinage).
80 TARPIN 2002, 57.
81 TARPIN 2002, 57; *contra* Letta, cf. Chapter 7 for more detailed discussion.
of the *vicus* could well be defended. Moreover, Tarpin links the location of *vici*, often along roads and in the neighbourhood of colonies, and therefore in Roman territory, to the identification of *vici* as groups of Roman or Latin citizens.\(^{83}\) In other words, *vici* would constitute a general term for non-founded agglomerations of Roman citizens, without proper jurisdiction.\(^{84}\) This leads Tarpin to another tentative interpretation of Festus’ lemma (in the Muellerian reading): in fact, the words *incipiunt appellari* could be understood as ‘*vici* are for the first time named as such in the territories of the Marsi and the Paeligni’, whereas in other regions other names existed for the same or similar institution (such as *forum* or *conciliabulum*). Tarpin observes that there are no *fora* and *conciliabula* attested in Marsic territory, which proves the equivalence of the terms in his view.\(^{85}\) The specific situation of the Fucine area, moreover, without major roads, would explain the application of the ‘urban’ term *vicus* for a group of citizens instead of *forum* or *conciliabulum*, which would have been rather linked to virilane colonisation and road construction.\(^{86}\)

According to Tarpin, the question is not so much one of traditional Italic patterns of settlement, but rather one of Roman legal vocabulary. And rather than envisaging a development from rural to urban *vici*, Tarpin concludes that “il est sans doute plus simple de retourner le discours traditionnel et de penser que l’on a dupliqué hors de Rome la structure fondamentale de la ville”.\(^{87}\)

In conclusion, Tarpin sees *vici* as a corollary of Roman control and urban development. Importantly, he underlines the specific *urban* connotation the *vicus* had, as opposed to the ‘rural’ or non-urban *pagus*. The evidence for *vici* in the context of colonies can be seen to fit into this scheme. Supposing that the division of the city in colonies copied the division of the city of Rome, inscriptions mentioning *vici* found in colonies (for example in Ariminum and Caless) would refer to the urban centres of these colonies, and not to villages in the territory.\(^{88}\) Burgeoning from this urban start situation, it is imaginable that the originally urban term was over time applied more widely to groups of citizens outside the walls as well. The case of the *coloni Caediciani*, who were located in a *vicus* outside Sinuessa, would illustrate the meaning of *vicus* as an indication of an agglomeration outside, but dependent on, the colony. As Tarpin puts it: “un morceau de ville à la campagne.”\(^{89}\)

---

**EVALUATION I: THE VICUS AS ROMAN, URBAN FEATURE (TARPIN)**

It is important to briefly evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the views of Capogrossi Colognesi / Letta on the one hand and Tarpin on the other. I start with

---

\(^{83}\) TARPIN 2002, esp. 83-86.

\(^{84}\) TARPIN 2002, 72-81.

\(^{85}\) TARPIN 2002, 82-83.

\(^{86}\) TARPIN 2002, 85.

\(^{87}\) TARPIN 2002, 83, 85 (quote).

\(^{88}\) TORELLI 1990; TARPIN 2002, 63; 243. This and other views are discussed in more detail in the section on the character of early colonial settlement in Chapter 7.

\(^{89}\) Plin. *HN* 14.62 with *CIL* X, 4727 (= *CIL* I², 1578); TARPIN 2002, 243 (quote); 70-72.
Tarpin’s thesis. As Tarpin shows, it seems fairly plausible that the term *vicus* was indeed applied within specifically Roman contexts, as opposed to indigenous pre-Roman contexts. While I am inclined to follow the main lines of his argument, it is because of the drastic consequences of his thesis for the interpretation of Roman influence in Italy in general, and, in this study, the role of sanctuaries in particular, that it is important to point out that not all arguments are equally strong or unambiguous. In fact, some of the evidence could be read differently.\(^90\) Many of the used arguments (especially the use of Latin, titles, onomastics) could be turned over to prove varying, and diametrically contradictory conclusions, if viewed from a different perspective. The relationship between the Marsi and Romans, which according to Tarpin was good, is an example. The implication that *vici* were placed more on ‘friendly’ territory than otherwise is not self-evident: colonies were not placed exclusively in territory of befriended groups either; sometimes on the contrary.\(^91\) Also the contingent idea, that confiscated enemy territory (here that of the Paeligni) was more apt to be divided into *pagi*, needs more elaboration. And in fact, the relation between Marsi and Romans has been described as anything but friendly by other authors.\(^92\) In the end, the character of this relationship is perhaps too difficult to establish in order to use it as an independent argument in the present discussion. The most crucial point however is the use of Latin onomastics and titles. Tarpin interprets the appearance of a *quaestor* as an indication of Roman presence. The discussion on the argument could be infinite, but it is important to point out that an opposite argument could be based on the same evidence: i.e. that these magistracies were local adaptations of Roman examples, or even just the adaptation of the Roman names, without necessarily the corresponding functions: in other words ‘self-romanisation’ with varying ‘depths’.\(^93\) In conclusion, different perspectives lead to rather different interpretations of the same evidence.

I believe these perspectives are ultimately determined by basic assumptions on the character of Roman control in Italy. Even if one admits – with Tarpin – a Roman origin for the institution of the *vicus*, it is still questionable whether the *vicus*-structure was imposed ‘from above’, involving only Roman or Latin citizens, or that this title was adopted or even sought after by the indigenous population, that became enfranchised in the process.\(^94\)

---

\(^90\) For example, it does not automatically follow that the apparent designation of a community with the word *vicus* runs counter to the formation or existence of a larger tribal community (TARPIN 2002, 57; cf. here n. 79): the existence of ‘layered’ group identities is a well-known phenomenon. Also, there is discussion about the status of the territory of Aveia as *civitas sine suffragio*, as Tarpin himself admits (TARPIN 2002, 58 n. 21) which would undermine the argument that the *vicus* was on Roman territory. On the appearance of the Roman goddess Victoria cf. Chapters 3 and esp. 7.

\(^91\) Cf. e.g. COARELLI 1992.


\(^93\) As in LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, no. 128 (192-201); cf. discussion in Chapter 7.

\(^94\) Cf. the remarks by CURCHIN 2005.
Let us consider then the opposite view, which sees the *vicus* as a rural structure, developing preferably away from Roman influence. It may be clear that the picture that arises from the Spanish situation is (at least apparently) exactly the opposite of what has been argued for the Marsic *vici*, whose appearance has been explained by the relative early romanisation and friendly relationship with Rome. In the first place, it should be underscored that it is not at all self-evident that the application or significance of the terms *vicus* and *pagus* were identical throughout the empire, as Curchin stresses rightly:95 in fact the contrary would seem true. However, for Spain there could be indicated some circumstances which would soften the sharpness of the dichotomy between rural pre-Roman *vicus* and urbanised Roman *pagus*. For instance, at least one *vicus* demonstrably depends directly on a larger town, Clunia;96 and although the etymology of the names may be largely indigenous, it would be equally possible to stress the ‘Romanness’ of many inscriptions. With regard to dedications to indigenous gods, for example, it is in the first place noticeable that more dedications by *vicani* are made to *Iuppiter Optimus Maximus* (four)97 than to various local deities (three). This could simply be explained with presumptions on Jupiter’s character “whose name probably disguises a native deity”, but one could perhaps as well be struck by the undeniably Roman(-ised) aspect of the dedications.98 Moreover, it should be stressed that also in Spain there is the familiar use of *vicis* as urban subdivisions parallel to their use for rural villages, as the *vicus Forensis* and *vicus Hispanus* from Corduba prove.99 In conclusion, the apparent contradiction between the indigenous Spanish rural *vicus* and the idea of the *vicus* as a Roman invention should perhaps not be overstated. This is especially true if one allows for the possibility that some pre-Roman centres were granted the legal status of *vicus* later on, or simply for the relatively large amount of ‘indigenous’ people included in new *vici*. As to Capogrossi Colognesi’s elegant explanation in the *longue durée*, it is more difficult to decide which arguments should be given precedence. Whereas his argument is well sustained, by underscoring the importance of the village structure in pre-Roman Italy as well as in late antiquity and Medieval times, one could wonder whether the explanation of the decline and re-emergence of the *vicus* and the contemporaneous rise and fall of the *pagus*, is not, as far as regards the *vicus*, more relevant to structural elements than to the names given to these structures. That is to say: I would suggest that Capogrossi Colognesi’s argument perhaps holds true for the

---

95 Curchin 1985, 328.
96 Curchin 1985, 335; ILER 3492: Dercinoassedenses, vicani Cluniensum
97 Curchin 1985, 330-332; nos. 4, 6, 8, 14; no. 6 mentions only Jupiter, the other nos. (Optimus) Maximus.
98 Quote: Curchin 1985, 335.
role of the village as a structure of settlement in Italy, which however does not necessarily coincide with the term vicus.100

Both the interpretation of the vicus as a rural ‘anti-urban’ structure, and the opposite one, that the vicus as a Roman invention of control based on urban structures, have their merits since both give coherence to historical processes, but in different ways. Perhaps one could say that in Capogrossi Colognesi’s account coherence in the development of the vicus is attained by viewing the historical development of the village (as a structure) over time. Tarpin on the other hand creates coherence on a different level, on that of terminology, in a historical development from stadrömischer vicus to extensions of this onto the countryside – but always related to urban structures.

Once the interchangeability of the structure of the village and the term vicus is abandoned, the argument in favour of a Roman origin of the concept of vicus is most convincing. The term vicus appears to be intrinsically Roman, and a village or conglomeration indicated as such depended, therefore, on a Roman system of administration. It should be stressed, however, that if the status of vicus is documented for a village, this status does not preclude a pre-Roman origin of this village. Indeed, a legal status does not tell all about the character and the social reality of the vicus. I have stated that preconceptions concerning the Roman conquest and control steer interpretations of the character of the vicus. Even if an entirely autochthonous interpretation of the vicus seems now to be ruled out, there is still left an ample range of interpretations between local and ‘Roman’ aspects of the vicus. Are we dealing with a community of ‘ex-pats’; imported Roman (or Latin) citizens, or rather with an ‘indigenous’ village with (largely) ‘indigenous’ inhabitants upgraded to a specific status? In Chapter 7 this question will be treated in more detail in relation to the religious role of the vicus.

In any event, it seems clear that if vici are explicitly mentioned in epigraphy, this does not refer to pre-Roman Italic structures, but to a specific status within a Roman administrative system. This means that conceptualisations of vici as a constitutive element of pre-Roman settlement organisation are erroneous. This revision applies to the model of the pagus-vicus system as a pre-Roman feature, as has become already clear from the conclusion that the pagus was a Roman instrument, but also to other variants101 or conceptions, such as a model which envisages the Oscan touto to be constituted by vici.102

---

100 As a matter of fact, Capogrossi Colognesi often speaks of the role of the ‘villaggio’ instead of that of the vicus proper. He is very aware of the limits of archaeology and the impossibility of the recognition of legal or hierarchical statuses other than in epigraphical sources (cf. CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, 176-182). However, his general argument (the supposed marginal role in Roman times and consequent re-emergence afterwards, as well as the presumed pre-Roman character of the vicus underscored at times) seems, at least sometimes, to conflate vicus and village.

101 E.g. the pagus-vicus-oppidum system, promoted by GALTIÉRI 2004, and in this respect uncritically reviewed by the present author (STEK 2006).

102 Cf. supra n. 12.
THE RELATION BETWEEN PAGUS AND VICUS

The conclusions of the preceding sections have paved the way for the observations to be made here, and can therefore remain brief. Since the publications of Tarpin and Capogrossi Colognesi in 2002, the general inappropriateness of the term pagus-vicus system (‘sistema paganico-vicano’) has become clear. The exact relation between pagus and vicus remains obscure however. It could be that it varied from place to place. Perhaps there was indeed a hierarchical relation between a tribal pagus and vicus north of Italy – at least for the Roman eye – as indicated by Caesar for the Helvetii. Inscriptions mentioning pagus and vicus together are however scanty, and in Samnium proper, they have not been found at all. As noted, it is possible that pagus and vicus actually constituted parallel or even ‘competing’ institutions. Capogrossi Colognesi would stress the independence of pagus and vicus: according to him, a pagus could include vici, but not necessarily, as they existed often alternatively, not complementarily. Tarpin would even develop, on the basis of his thesis, that the vicus is essentially an urban feature, whereas the pagus denotes non-urbanity, the logic that they are exactly for that reason seldom found together.

Conclusion: New Perspectives on Pagus and Vicus

The pre-Roman origin of the pagus has been demystified successfully by the studies of Capogrossi Colognesi and Tarpin: it seems clear now that the pagus was essentially a territorial district, in function of a Roman administrative system. The role and origin of the vicus is less clear, and debatable, but the term and its application point in the first place to Roman contexts. An origin in the city of Rome and its consequent application to designate ‘pieces of city / clusters of citizens’ in the conquered Italic countryside, as envisioned by Tarpin, seems most sensible. Tarpin would see both institutions of pagus and vicus as instruments of Roman control. While admitting some echoes of pre-Roman structures, and the presence of ‘indigenous’ people in the vici, he stresses that pagi and vici were not envisaged at all to secure continuity from the pre-Roman past. “Leur rôle, bien au contraire, est de formaliser la possession du sol et l’intégration des individus dans un ensemble administratif et culturel fondé sur la suprématie de Rome.” Nonetheless, the character of the community indicated by the word vicus remains, within these legal boundaries, open to debate, and probably varied from place to place (and as well over time).

104 The Helvetii were divided into four pagi; Caes. B Gall. 1.12.4-5.
105 Amongst which near Rome CIL VI, 2221 which was found “in fundo agri Romani”, mentioning mag(i)stri de duobus pageis et vicei sulpicii, and CIL IX, 3521 on an aquaduct at Furfo, where mag(i)stri pagi built something de v.s.f., which could be an abbreviation for de vici sententia faciundum. See CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI 2002, 181 n. 51.
107 TARPIN 2002, 244: “L’élément déterminant de la nature des uici, … , est le caractère urbain”; whereas pagi and pagani would be defined negatively as “extérieurs à quelque chose”.
In the end, how does this discussion on *pagi* and *vici* inform us regarding Italy in the Republican period? It is necessary to try to translate these archaeological, epigraphical and literary observations into an image of the historical situation as tangible as possible: a reconstruction demonstrates most clearly what we do not know. For the *vici*, tentatively, one could imagine clusters of Roman or Latin citizens from Rome and other places of Italy (especially as hamlets outside the urban centres of the colonies), as well as the installation of groups of autochthonous people (perhaps enfranchised in the process) in new conglomerations, and finally pre-existing Italic villages that were granted a new, Roman, status. The *vicus*, indicating a legal status, therefore is distinct from the ‘village’ as a form of settlement, which seems to have been quite ubiquitous in Central-Southern Italy. This means that, before the Social War, a landscape could be imagined dotted with, apart from some towns and hill-forts, villages, some of which had a different status, which was indicated by the name *vicus*. If *vici* indeed had some territorial sovereignty as well, these borders were probably not readily ‘visible’ in the physical landscape. Equally invisible, but nonetheless extant, were *pagi* that divided the countryside into administrative units, depending on the municipal centre. *Pagii* could comprise only lands, some houses and perhaps sometimes a conglomeration indicated as *vicus* (but it is possible as well that the *vicus* had its own territory apart from the *pagus*). It can be assumed that when it seemed practical the divisions of *pagi* followed already existing boundaries of the land, but when it did not, the pre-Roman situation had by no means to be respected. Both *vici* and *pagi* were Roman instruments devised to administrate people and property. Besides that, the *pagi* and *vici* became the organisational units of religious activity.

Even if *pagi* and the possible territories of *vici* were ‘invisible’ in the landscape, since they defined territories by imagined boundaries, there were means to construct these boundaries and make them indeed visible and ‘tangible’. To these means will be turned in Chapters 8 and 9. First, however, the consequences of this ‘deconstruction’ of the *pagus-vicus* system for the interpretation of ‘Italic’ sanctuaries have to be discussed.

---

109 If one excludes, of course, the general territorial boundaries (field boundaries, roads, rivers) along which the *pagus* most probably was defined.
Chapter 7

Pagi, Vici and Sanctuaries:
The Evidence and Four Case Studies

How does the ‘deconstruction’ of the pagus-vicus system, shown in the preceding Chapter 6, affect the role of sanctuaries within the pagus-vicus system? It has been seen in Chapter 4 how the functioning of sanctuaries was derived from preconceptions on the settlement organisation of the Italic peoples. Following the basic notion of an ethnic or national group (nomen, populus, or touto) subdivided into pagi that in turn were made up of several vici, it was assumed that sanctuaries served these different organisational levels accordingly. This general framework is basically characterised by continuity: it is im- or explicitly assumed that this organisation existed from ‘times immemorial’ and represents some sort of typical Italic in-born feature. The (presupposed) functioning of sanctuaries within this system is often quoted as ‘proof’ for the persistence of pre-Roman structures. Some problems with the elaboration of this model were demonstrated already in Chapter 4. These regarded especially the factual data for the identification of sanctuaries as belonging to a hierarchical structure of vici and pagi. Indeed, only few inscriptions could possibly be interpreted as indicating such. More fundamentally, we have seen in the preceding Chapter 6 that according to recent research in the juridical-historical realm both pagus and vicus were probably Roman inventions, rather than fossils of a pre-Roman reality. However, there is no doubt that pagi and vici indeed sometimes exerted influence in the sanctuaries of Central Italy. Only the translation of these indications to a specific, ‘Italic’, hierarchical structure seems now to be misguided. Neither does it seem convincing to interpret all sanctuaries as belonging to the one or the other, irrespective of the epigraphical evidence.

1 E.g. LOMAS 2004
2 E.g. GROSSI 1980, 148 in his conclusion on the pre-Roman Marsic area: “Si è così delineato un territorio dai confini ben precisi, organizzato con fortificazioni (“oppida”), villaggi (“vici”) e santuari, e che solo con l’arrivo dei Romani sarà in parte ridotto, ma non sconvolto, nella sua unità più intima.”
3 Cf. LETTA 1992, 115-116 who interprets all Marsic sanctuaries as vicus-sanctuaries; VAN WONTERGHEM 1984, 42, considers sanctuaries generally as belonging to pagi, and sees the presence of sanctuaries as proof of the persistence of the pagus; see Chapter 4.
At this point, with the provisional conclusions of the discussion on the pre-Roman or Roman character of pagi and vici at hand, it is important to return to the evidence for sanctuaries. For if vici and pagi indeed are basically Roman inventions, what does this imply for the ‘Italic’ sanctuaries? Were the sanctuaries in which a vicus or a pagus was involved pre-Roman sacred places that took on new functions within a Roman administration of the land? Or were they rather new sanctuaries, corresponding to or following the new division of the land (and perhaps new inhabitants as well)? In order to try to answer these questions, which could in my view have fundamental consequences for general ideas on Roman intervention in the religious realm – and indeed the so-called religious romanisation of Italy – it will be necessary to re-evaluate the epigraphical and archaeological evidence.

In the following chapter, four case-studies are presented. First the evidence for the involvement of the pagus in the sacred realm is evaluated. The epigraphical record linking sacred actions and pagi can indeed be related to areas which were under Roman control, i.e. areas with the Latin or (partial) Roman right. In Case 1, the excavated sanctuary at Castel di Ieri near Superaequum will be presented as an example of such a pagus sanctuary. Then the evidence for the connection between vici and sanctuaries and cults is reviewed. A certain correlation between Roman territory and sanctuaries and cults related to vici is evident also in this case, but establishing its precise character is complicated.

The section on vici and sanctuaries is divided broadly into three arguments. The first is concerned with Latin colonisation, the other two regard two different areas which yielded explicit evidence for rural vici. In Case 2, the evidence for rural vici and their possible relation to colonisation is discussed. The earliest vici are often found in the context of Latin colonies, or near them. The evidence for early vici in Latin colonies is reviewed, and their possible location within or outside the urban centre is evaluated. It will be shown that this discussion may contribute to the reformulation of the usual view of Latin colonisation. As a hypothetical example the case of the Latin colony of Ariminum (modern Rimini) will be presented, suggesting how relations between the territorial divisions of both pagi and vici on the one hand and the colonial centre on the other may have been constructed.

In Case 3, rural vici in the ager Praetutianus are discussed. Here, the epigraphical evidence for vici can be complemented by archaeological data of related cult places and settlements. This evidence leads back to the relation between rural vici and colonisation, which seems to exist but is not clear-cut. It can be shown that conceptions of settlement development change considerably by distinguishing settlements with vicus-status from those without, instead of treating all settlements as one corpus. For the ager Praetutianus, the idea of a general decline of rural settlements in the Republican period must now be corrected: at the same time the installation and flourishing of new vici – a development in the opposite direction – may be distinguished.

In Case 4, the area of the Marsi at the Fucine lake (lacus Fucinus) is discussed. The epigraphical evidence for this area is extraordinarily rich, and invites reflection in
some detail on the character of the vici and their cults attested here. Earlier scholarship has emphasised the indigenous character of these vici, and has related almost all ‘foreign’ elements to direct contact with Greek / Etruscan culture, i.e. without Roman mediation. The use of Latin and the appearance of some undeniable Roman or Latin characteristics has at the same time been interpreted as a ‘precocious romanisation’ of the indigenous Marsi. Especially Letta has voiced this view in various publications.\(^4\) It will be shown that parts of this argumentation display weaknesses or inconsistencies. Elaborating on the findings by Tarpin with regard to the Roman institutional character of the vici,\(^5\) I will review the evidence and various arguments in some detail, and conclude that the rural vici in the area of the Fucine lake indeed seem to betray ‘Roman’ influence, rather than the persistence of indigenous institutions. I shall argue that it is possible to distinguish also on a cultural level more direct influence from Roman or Latin contexts, and that cults had an important role to play in the cultural self-definition of these communities. However, it will be argued that the cultural processes at work were more complex than a dichotomy between ‘Italic’ versus ‘Roman’ allows for.

Rather than proposing that these vici were entirely ‘Roman’ enclaves, I shall argue that they should be seen as ‘new communities’ within a new organisational structure – but definitely as a result of Roman influence in the region. These new communities worshipped gods that were previously unknown in this region. Some of these cults might have been imported from various other regions in Italy, but others can hardly be seen as anything other than expressing ‘Romanness’.

This interpretation has substantial consequences for the general conception of the ‘romanisation’ of this area of Central Italy. Instead of considering all evidence for this region as documenting the steady evolution of this area from indigenous to ‘romanised’, I shall argue that it is methodologically more correct to separate the evidence belonging to vici from the corpus for the Marsi as a whole. This differentiation might enable us to distinguish between different contemporaneous lines of development. In practice, this means that possibly only small, new communities were ‘romanising’ (or simply ‘Roman’ in a juridical and, arguably, cultural sense), at an early stage, whereas other groups in the same area were not, or were even moving in opposite directions. In other words, instead of speaking of general ‘precocious romanisation’ of the entire area I will highlight the possibility of a very partial and differentiated character of these processes.

\(^4\) Starting with LETTA 1972, see the bibliography.

\(^5\) TARPIN 2002, esp. 56-57.
The Pagus in Sanctuaries and Cults

“Die Zweckbestimmung ist zunächst eine sakrale” (MOMMSEN 1877 iii, 117 on the pagus)6

The involvement of the pagus in sanctuaries is less straightforward than sometimes has been assumed. The temple at Fontecchio, in Vestine territory, would for example constitute a typical example of a pagus-sanctuary. As has been demonstrated however, there is neither direct reference in the inscriptions to a pagus, nor to a vicus, for this sanctuary (Chapter 4). The archaeological evidence found there of a temple of the second half of the second century BC7 cannot therefore help us further with regard to pagus or vicus sanctuaries. Neither is a pagus mentioned in the lex aedis Furfensis of 58 BC; but its pertinence to a pagus has nevertheless been deduced from the supposed involvement of several vici (only one is mentioned). Equally problematic is the evidence for a supposed sanctuary for Aternus, to which an inscription mentioning an aqueduct (pagi Ceiani aqua) could perhaps be linked.8 If, for the sake of the argument, the relation between both inscriptions is accepted, the evidence (i.e. the aqueduct with pagus inscription) would attest to a sanctuary of the late-Republican period, whereas the inscription mentioning Aternus is dated to the first century AD.9 The evidential basis for these ‘typical’ examples of pagus sanctuaries is thus rather disappointing. But there are several instances of pagi involved in sanctuaries attested elsewhere. There is a large group of inscriptions commemorating the involvement of (officials of) pagi in various building activities, which obviously regarded also sacred buildings. Sometimes they take the form of a decree made by a pagus (e.g., ex pagi decreto) which is for instance often found in Paelignian territory.10 I have listed some thirty-odd inscriptions attesting pagi that (probably) refer to sanctuaries and/or cults within Italy. The evidence from the city of Rome can be summarised as follows: five inscriptions out of seven that mention activities related to a pagus are connected to a sanctuary or cult.11 The earliest inscriptions are from the pagus Ianicolenis and date to the end of

---

6 See the comment on this quote by FREDERIKSEN 1976, 245: “and there is no need to cast doubt in this.” Cf. also SALMON 1967, 80: “The pagus was a semi-independent country district, concerned with social, agricultural and especially religious matters.” Cf. also KORNEMANN 1942b, 2319: “Er [der pagus] hat keine agrimensorische Bedeutung, sondern ursprünglich eigentlich nur oder wenigstens vor allem eine sakrale.” Cf. SCHULTEN 1894, 635.

7 Subsequently reconstructed in the Flavian period: LA REGINA 1967-68, 387ff.; cf. COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 30-31, where only a “rifacimento” is mentioned.

8 Cf. Chapter 4, esp. n. 125.

9 For Aternus: LA TORRE 1989b; For the pagi Ceiani aqua: LETTA 1992, 111 (“iscrizione tardo-repubblicana”). The supposed pagus-sanctuary of S. Angelo in Cacumine (inscription dated to the Sullan period) does not present inscriptions mentioning vicus or pagus.

10 See the index by TARPIN 2002: five times attested (but referring to three different sites). A variant l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) p(agi) seems to abound in France, whereas the expression de pagi sententia is attested both in Central Italy (twice) and in Rome (twice); ex pagi scitu in Central Italy (once) and Campania (once).

11 CIL VI, 251 (= CIL VI, 30724) from the via Appia (27 AD); CIL VI, 2219 (= CIL F, 1000) and CIL VI, 2220 (= CIL F, 1001) (from S. Maria dell’Orto, the pagus Ianicolenis); CIL VI, 2221 (= CIL VI,
the second century or the beginning of the first century BC. Around two dozen inscriptions likely attest to a relation between pagi and a cult or sanctuary in the Italian regions outside Rome. This relation is usually some formal decision taken by the pagus and/or action undertaken by its officials. Most inscriptions record the building or restoration of (elements of) temples, or are simply a dedication to the venerated deity (cf. infra on the characteristics of the venerated gods).\(^{12}\)

The date of the inscriptions is not always clear, but the following can be said with some confidence. Two vessels with painted texts from Ariminum (so-called pocula or pocola deorum; cf. infra) can probably be related to some sort of sacred dedication, and therefore attest to pagi religiously active by the second half of the third century BC. A bronze patera from the second century BC found in Cupra montana, Picenum (CIL IX, 5699) with an enigmatic text (V(ibi)us A(vilio)s V(ibii) f(ilius) V(ibi)us)

32452 = CIL I, 1002) (8 miles from Rome); CIL VI, 3823 (= CIL VI, 31577 = CIL I, 591) (gardens of Maecenas, near the ‘arch of Gallienus’, the so-called S.C. de pago Montano).

\(^{12}\) Here a list is given of inscriptions commemorating the activity of a pagus or its officials within the religious realm. This list is not exhaustive but may represent the situation fairly well. For Rome, cf. preceding note, the rest of Italy proper has been included here (Regiones I–XI):


II: 4. CIL IX, 1618 from Beneventum (cf. Chapter 8 on the lastratio pagi).


VI: 14. CIL XI 5375 from Asisium (dedication to Jupiter Paganicus).


VIII: 18. AE 1965, 280b, two inscriptions on so-called pocula from Ariminum, third century BC. Cf. discussion infra; 19. CIL V, 762ab from Aquileia, second century AD. (BRUSIN 1991 no. 159 and 166).


XI: 26. CIL V, 5112, from Bergomum.
Alfieno(s) Po(blii) f(ilius) pagi veheia) cannot, as it seems, readily be related to the religious realm, but anyhow indicates the presence of pagi elsewhere in this early period. Besides this patera and the Ariminate pocola, the already mentioned inscription of Capua of 94 BC is the only document firmly dated to the period before the Social War (cf. Chapter 6). As seen already in Chapter 6, the inscriptions on the vases from Ariminum of the second half of the third century BC were found within the territory of the Latin colony founded in 268 BC. The patera from Cupra montana dated to the second century BC was located in territory that apparently had held the status of civitas sine suffragio from 268 BC and had probably received the optimum ius by the time the patera was made. Capua was still sine suffragio in 94 BC. In conclusion, there is no evidence for the presence of pagi that are involved in religious matters outside territory which was in some way under Roman control, which is of course in line with Tarpin’s and Capogrossi’s more general conclusions. The bulk of the evidence dates to the last century BC: almost half of the datable inscriptions belongs to this period. Few are the inscriptions dated to the first century AD. This number does not increase significantly in the later imperial age (second to fourth centuries AD), but several undated inscriptions seem best placed in the imperial period because of formulas used, the objects of the dedications or the palaeography. In conclusion, a considerable number of inscriptions set up by officials of a pagus or on a decree by a pagus document involvement in religious (building) activities. Probably Mommsen was right in recognising the ‘sacral’ function of the pagus as an essential one, in the quote at the beginning of this section. This conception is deeply rooted in modern scholarship. As will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 8, the allegedItalic origin of the pagus has suggested that this religious aspect had an ancient and agricultural – indeed ‘Italic’ – character. Since it has become clear, in Chapter 6, that the pagus was a Roman, not an Italic institution, it follows that the religious aspects of the pagus should be affronted anew, rather than mistaken a priori for forms of ‘indigenous Italic’ cult. Of course, it is not ruled out that Italic cults were involved, but Roman influence should not be excluded beforehand.

A brief overview of the deities that were worshipped in pagus contexts is clarifying. Generally speaking, the involved deities cannot be defined as specifically ‘indigenous Italic’ gods: Jupiter features most prominently (in many guises: Victor, Optimus

---

13 Therefore, it is not inserted in n. 12. Cf. TARPIN 2002, V.7.21, for bibliography.
14 Cf. infra on the possible specific ritual role of paterae however.
15 HUMBERT 1978, 349-354; cf. however MOURITSEN 2007 for a general critique of the concept of the civitas sine suffragio as a provisional status which inevitably leads to the grant of suffragium, and especially the scarcity of evidence for the upgrading of cives sine suffragio.
17 Whether it really was the “Zweckbestimmung” is more difficult to say, especially since this conception presupposes a neat distinction between the religious and other realms (cf. Chapter 10).
19 On the problem with recognising differences within a same, Indo-European, basic system, cf. Chapter 2.
20 CIL I², 3269.
Maximus,\textsuperscript{21} Compagus,\textsuperscript{22} Paganicus\textsuperscript{23}). Also, we know of cults of Mars,\textsuperscript{24} Iuno (Regina),\textsuperscript{25} Gaura\textsuperscript{26}, Bona Dea\textsuperscript{27} (Pagana),\textsuperscript{28} Hercules Victor,\textsuperscript{29} Minerva,\textsuperscript{30} Laverna,\textsuperscript{31} Ceres (‘augusta mater agrorum’),\textsuperscript{32} Nymphae,\textsuperscript{33} and the (genius of) the emperor.\textsuperscript{34}

Interestingly, the deity is often invoked as the tutelary god of the pagus; for example Juppiter Paganicus, Juppiter Compagus, Bona Dea Pagana, and the Genii pagorum.\textsuperscript{35}

If the dedication to Aternus could be connected securely to an inscription mentioning a pagus (cf. the considerations in Chapter 4 and supra), which is now not the case, this would be an example of a local(ised) deity.\textsuperscript{36}

No deity can be associated specifically to an ‘Italic’ context (in contrast to, for instance, Vesuna or Mefitis etc.). This general image does not change if only the Republican dedications are taken into consideration: a bias by ‘completed romanisation’ in the imperial period can thus be excluded. Although most gods venerated in the context of pagi do not appear to be specifically ‘local’ or ‘Italic’, it is of course not to be excluded either that these Latin names veil such ‘original’ deities.\textsuperscript{37}

But in any case, knowledge of the Roman pantheon and the ability and willingness to accept Roman theonyms becomes clear.

It seems legitimate to suggest that sanctuaries related to a pagus functioned as a sacral centre of the district, thereby at the same time stating the authority of the pagus by divine association. It could be imagined that, following the installation of a new pagus, sanctuaries were built ex novo, or that, alternatively, pre-existing sanctuaries were re-used. To understand these processes better, a combination of archaeological and epigraphical evidence would be required. Unfortunately, very few inscriptions mentioning the involvement of a pagus can be related to clear and datable

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21} CIL IX, 3523 if linked to CIL IX, 3519 (LETTA 1992, 114 n. 26).
\item \textsuperscript{22} CIL X, 3772.
\item \textsuperscript{23} CIL XI, 5375.
\item \textsuperscript{24} AE 1989, 150 (not directly attested; the construction of the theatre at Minturnae is financed \textit{ex pecunia Martis} and by the pagus Vescinus).
\item \textsuperscript{25} CIL XI, 2921 (= CIL F, 1993).
\item \textsuperscript{26} CIL X, 3783 (= CIL F, 686).
\item \textsuperscript{27} CIL IX, 3138 (= CIL F, 1793).
\item \textsuperscript{28} CIL V, 762ab.
\item \textsuperscript{29} CIL F, 3254; cf. the pagus Herculaneus of CIL X, 3772 (= CIL F, 682).
\item \textsuperscript{30} CIL IX, 5814.
\item \textsuperscript{31} CIL IX, 3138 (= CIL F, 1793).
\item \textsuperscript{32} CIL XI, 3196.
\item \textsuperscript{33} CIL V, 3915.
\item \textsuperscript{34} CIL VI, 251 (= CIL VI, 30724).
\item \textsuperscript{35} Genii pagorum: CIL V, 3915; CIL V, 4911; CIL V, 4909. Possibly \textit{Fides} could be added, cf. infra.
\item \textsuperscript{36} This is, however, despite a late-Republican attestation of the deity in Vestine dialect (Vetter 227) not necessarily an inherently ‘Italic’ name: it is a \textit{local} toponym.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Not wanting to deny the possibility of indigenous substrates and complex processes of \textit{interpretatio} etc., I have my doubts, from a methodological point of view, about the often encountered idea of a Roman ‘veneer’ that would actually hide an ‘intrinsic’ indigenous continuity: especially because it is impossible to prove or falsify. See e.g. LETTA 1992, 118-120 for an explicit plea for the mere ‘superficial’ and ‘formal’ romanisation of cults that would in reality and substance ‘root’ in Italic traditions.
\end{itemize}
archaeological remains of a sanctuary. In most cases the inscription itself is the only attestation of the sacred place. Also, it is not clear to what extent the Roman pagi respected previous land divisions and religious administration, and the inscriptions alone, both mentioning constructions *ex novo* and restorations, are (almost by definition) not conclusive.38

**Case 1. Pagus and Sanctuary at Castel di Ieri**

There is, to my knowledge, at present one striking exception to this absence of combined epigraphical and archaeological evidence: the sanctuary discovered in 1987 during the building of a house at località Madonna del Soccorso in the municipality of Castel di Ieri. Here, in the area of ancient Superaequum, the remains of a late Republican temple have been excavated under the direction of Adele Campanelli (fig. 7.1).39

---


The sanctuary site was frequented already before the late Republican monumental temple. This is attested by votives, amongst which anatomical terracotta’s, and the remains of an older sanctuary have been found.\(^{40}\) The full-blown monumental phase of the temple is dated to the end of the second century BC. Its high podium measuring 15.12 x 19.8 m\(^{41}\) was built in polygonal masonry lined with stone slabs, and it was preceded by a flight of stairs. The cornice of the podium is of the \textit{cyma recta} type, which has a good parallel in the sanctuary at Navelli (S. Maria in Cerulis) in Vestine territory, also dated to the second century BC.\(^{42}\) The column bases have the same profile too.\(^{43}\) The temple shows a three \textit{cellae} plan. It had a deep pronao, with four columns at the front and two central columns in the second row, in line with the dividing walls of the \textit{cellae}. In the \textit{cellae}, mosaic floors of white \textit{tesserae} were laid with a band at the edges in black \textit{tesserae}. In the central \textit{cella}, a meander motif was placed at the centre, again in black \textit{tesserae}. Moreover, the mosaic contained a text at the entrance. It mentions two individuals who were responsible for the building, \textit{ex pagi decreto}.\(^{44}\) The persons named could have been \textit{magistri} who apparently acted on a decree of the \textit{pagus}. The text is dated palaeographically to the mid-first century BC.\(^{45}\)

The monumental building project, begun at the end of the second century BC, was apparently finished only around the mid-first century BC by the \textit{pagus}.\(^{46}\) It is not sure whether two separate phases can be distinguished, or if we are rather dealing with the completion of one single project over longer time.\(^{47}\) The fact that the entrance to a space behind the central \textit{cella} was blocked by the base of the cult statue at least suggests a change in plans.\(^{48}\) Remains of a marble statue which was twice life-size have been found scattered over the temple area. This presumable cult statue has in light of the \textit{aegis} been identified as Minerva. Some remains could perhaps point to a cult of Hercules too, but the evidence does not seem to be compelling.\(^{49}\) Various finds

\(^{40}\) “caratterizzato da uno zoccolo in pietra ed alzato in terra cruda” (CAMPANELLI 2004, 24).

\(^{41}\) No height is given in CAMPANELLI 2004.


\(^{43}\) CAMPANELLI 2004, 16-18.

\(^{44}\) C. [Vib]idius C.f. Ser(gia) Decr(ianus) L. P[et]i[edius V. [f. / ae]de(m) fac(iendum) ex pag(i) de[cr(eto)] c(uraverunt) eid(em)q(ue) [p(robaverunt)]. \textit{AE} 2004, 489 = BUONOCORE 2004, 288-290 for the correction into two \textit{magistri} rather than three, proposed in BUONOCORE 2002, 41, 45. The names recur in, amongst other places, Superaequum and Sulmo.


\(^{46}\) CAMPANELLI 2004, 28.

\(^{47}\) Cf. BUONOCORE 2004, 288 who mentions a “prima fase di monumentalizzazione al II sec. a.C.” and a “seconda fase di ricostruzione” after the Social War, whereas CAMPANELLI 2004, 28 seems less sure, since she speaks of a “impianto templare” of the end of the second century but continues: “Tuttavia il tempio ebbe la sua fase realizzativa, ricordata nella epigrafe dedicatoria, durante la metà del I secolo a.C. in concomitanza con gli eventi seguenti la guerra sociale, quando nell’area fu istituito il \textit{municipium} di Superaequum, del cui territorio, entrò a far parte anche il \textit{pagus} che aveva commissionato il nostro edificio.”

\(^{48}\) CAMPANELLI 2004, 20, 27 for photographs.

\(^{49}\) That is, “un sedile in calcare locale decorato con finte rocce” which could belong to a statue of a sitting Hercules, as well as a “bronzetto arcaico”, thus CAMPANELLI 2004, 22, 26.
were retrieved, amongst which coins and lamps. Fragments of italic sigillata and thin-walled wares as well as some of the coins indicate that the temple continued to be used into the imperial period. Antefixes have been found of the type representing a winged Victoria, holding a wreath, and of a naked youth with a cloak.\(^\text{50}\)  

As a whole, the complex fits into the general Hellenistic-Italic architectural traditions typical of this period, but there are some distinct details as well, such as the broad frontal stairs. In particular, influences from Latin and Roman contexts seem present. For example the column bases are very similar to those of the S. Pietro temple (dedicated to Apollo) in the Latin colony of Alba Fucens. Even more striking is the planimetrical distribution. The three cellae with double colonnade in the pronaos, and indeed the frontal stairs, have suggestive parallels in the Capitolia of the colonies of Cosa and Luni, and as well in the three cellae temple at Segni.\(^\text{51}\)

The excavator expresses astonishment as to this Roman aspect of the ‘tempio italico’. In fact, compared to cult buildings in the surrounding areas of the same period, the temple of Castel di Ieri would represent “uno straordinario esempio della volontà di autoromanizzazione delle élite locali che preferiscono a scelte conservatrici di tipologie indigine ... l’enfatizzazione della loro istanza politica con una architettura di grande impegno”.\(^\text{52}\)

**PAGUS AND TEMPLE**

In this context, I would like to evaluate the possibility that this strikingly ‘Roman’ aspect of the temple was in some way connected to the fact that a pagus was involved in its construction. Is it indeed possible to relate the late second century temple to the involvement of the pagus? At least not straightforwardly. The decree of the pagus can only be associated firmly to the mid-first century completion, or reconstruction, of the temple. At that moment, the realisation of the mosaic and the decree text in it were accompanied by the decoration of the walls with painted stucco and the terracotta decoration of the elevation, and the placement of a large cult statue. However, the basic layout, including the three cellae, existed already and belongs to the first phase, of the late second century BC. One possible reconstruction of the course of events is therefore that a pagus, around the middle of the first century, restored an already existing, Capitolium-like temple.\(^\text{53}\) It follows that in this reconstruction, the ‘Roman’ lay-out of the temple cannot be related to the involvement of the pagus. The pagus would just have re-used a pre-existing three cellae temple. For establishing the relation between the architectural design and the pagus, the date of the installation of the latter is thus important: if it postdates the second century phase of the temple, it can evidently not have been responsible for its design. In theory, it is possible that the installation of the pagus coincided with the municipalisation of Superaequum which occurred after 49 BC.\(^\text{54}\) However, 49 BC is only a terminus post

---

\(^\text{50}\) Campanelli 2004, 22, 28.

\(^\text{51}\) Campanelli 2004, 27; see for ‘Capitolium-temples’, Chapter 2.


\(^\text{53}\) This conception seems to follow from Buonocore’s analysis: Buonocore 2004, 288-290.

\(^\text{54}\) Castel di Ieri clearly falls in its municipal territory.
quem. Most authors agree that actually Superaequum became municipium only in the Augustan period, which would be in line with the few literary indications and the chronology of the archaeological remains. The hypothesis of the installation of a pagus together with the installation of the municipium of Superaequum – which resulted in a rebuilding phase of the temple at Castel di Ieri – already in the middle of the first century BC would press the evidence and is not necessarily attractive. In short, there is no reason to assume that the pagus involved in the construction activities of the temple around the middle of the first century BC was a new institution in the area. Once it is accepted that the pagus was in existence already before the municipalisation of Superaequum, it follows that at least possibly also the earlier construction phase of the temple, at the end of the second century BC, was begun by this pagus. The presence of an early pagus in the area seems not improbable beforehand since the area may have already been early under Roman control and part of it was annexed as early as 305 BC. This would also explain the early latinisation of the area.

A ‘CAPITOLIUM’?

Whether the construction of the temple indeed began in the second century BC on instigation of the pagus or not is thus open to debate. In any case, an architectural complex with quite ‘Roman’ connotations was installed at the place of an earlier sanctuary. The similarity to the second century Capitolia of colonies has been referred to already. As has been said, the scattered remains of a statue of Minerva have been found, especially in the central cella but also around it, and Campanelli suggests that the temple was dedicated to this goddess. A quite ‘Roman’ cult, perhaps in line with the architectural make up. I would however cautiously suggest that perhaps Minerva was not the principal deity venerated in the temple. At the end of the 19th century two brick stamps have been found near the area of the temple. One reads [io]vi quirin[o], the other mentions iovi cyrin[o] and C. Tatius Maximus, apparently the producer of the bricks. Even

---

55 On the basis of the presence of IIviri in Superaequum (CIL IX, 3307; 3309; 3310; 3313; Suppl.It. n.s. V, 111 no. 7): after this date the Caesarian reform seems to have replaced IIIviri with IIviri in municipia founded from then onward.
56 Ovid. Amor. 2.16.1, probably dating to 4 BC, is the first, though indirect, proof of existence of the municipium. As to its earlier aspect, Strabo, citing Artemidoros of Ephesos of the late second century BC for this part of his text, for example omits Superaequum altogether, cf. VAN WONTERGHEM 1984, 77; COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 117; Buonocore in Suppl.It. n.s. V, 92. Cf. also BUONOCORE 1990 for a floruit dated to the Augustan period.
57 This seems to be the scenario envisioned by Campanelli: cf. n. 47.
58 Diod. Sic. 20.90.3. COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 117, but cf. discussion in HUMBERT 1978, 227 esp. n. 80. Other pagi in this area are attested at least for the early imperial period: CIL IX, 3305 (pagus Vecellanus), 3311 (pagus Boedinus).
59 COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 117.
60 CAMPANELLI 2004, 21-22.
61 The temple is generally indicated as località Madonna del Soccorso; the stamp comes from the adjacent località Cese Piane: cf. the map in VAN WONTERGHEM 1984, site 32.
62 CIL IX, 3303b.
63 CIL IX, 3303a.
before the discovery in 1987 of the temple at località Madonna del Soccorso, these inscriptions have been interpreted as indicating a sanctuary of Jupiter in the area of Castel di Ieri.\footnote{VAN WONTERGHEM 1984, 107: “Entrambi i frammenti sembrano provenire da un santuario di Giove, da situarsi probabilmente nei dintorni di Castel di Ieri”;} I have already pointed out that the cult of Jupiter was popular within pagus contexts (cf. the first century BC \textit{Iuppiter Victor decem paagorum} of Carpineto della Nora,\footnote{CIL X, 3772. Cf. also the \textit{Juppiter Paganicus} from Assisi (CIL XI, 5375).} or the \textit{Juppiter Compagus} of Capua in 94 BC).\footnote{Cf. for Capitolia and temples with \textit{alae}: GROS 2001 (1996), 136-140.} Moreover, the temple has a clear three cellae plan: in this case the alternative interpretation as a central \textit{cella} with \textit{alae} can be excluded since all \textit{cellae} are of equal size.\footnote{On the epithet \textit{curinus}, cf. VAN WONTERGHEM 1984, 107 with previous literature. For possible evidence for the cult of Hercules cf. n. 49. It should be pointed out that in fact in few Capitolia the ‘ideal’ type of Capitoline triad is attested. Cf. following note.} In this light it might seem tempting to interpret this three cellae temple, for which evidence for the cult of Minerva, and thus most probably also Jupiter, exists, as a typical cult place of the Capitoline type – even if we should allow for local variations on the theme.\footnote{Cf. Barton 1982 and discussion in Chapter 2.} And it should be emphasised that the evidence on which grounds most ‘established’ Capitolia have been recognised as such is seldom any richer.\footnote{Esp. Letta 1992.} It is to be regretted that Castel di Ieri appears to be the only case in which epigraphical and archaeological evidence can be integrated in order to furnish a more contextualised image of what cult places related to \textit{pagi} looked like. At the same time, it is striking and perhaps somewhat disturbing that in the only case that this opportunity presents itself, the evidence breathes a rather ‘Roman’ or ‘romanising’ atmosphere. Even if there are, at least to my knowledge, no other clear architectural remains that can be linked to epigraphically attested \textit{pagi} for the Republican period, there are additional indications of the religious contexts in which \textit{pagi} exerted influence. This is not restricted to sanctuaries, but extends to rituals which regard the \textit{pagus} as an institution, as the definition of a group of people, and as a territorial entity. The clearest examples are the rituals related to the \textit{pagi} of the Latin colony of Ariminum, and the \textit{lustratio pagi}. The case of Ariminum, involving \textit{vici} too, is discussed below in the discussion on Latin colonies. The \textit{lustratio pagi} is considered in Chapter 8 on the \textit{Paganalia}. Now first attention is turned to the epigraphical evidence regarding the institution of the \textit{vicus} in relation to cults and sanctuaries.

### The Vicus in Sanctuaries and Cults

As has been made clear in Chapters 4 and 6, the relation between \textit{vici} and sanctuaries is often less straightforward than has been assumed in previous scholarship.\footnote{Esp. Letta 1992.} But, just
as for the *pagi*, in many instances *vici* and its officials are undeniably documented engaging in the management of sacred places and cults. *Magistri* and *magistriae vici*, or *cultores* active within or on behalf of a *vicus* made dedications or boasted their involvement in the embellishment of sanctuaries.

In Rome, a large number of inscriptions attest to the involvement of *vici* in cults and cult places.\(^{71}\) Most inscriptions are Augustan or later. The earliest datable (not necessarily ‘religious’) inscriptions relating to *vici* in Rome are a Sullan base from the Quirinal (83–80 BC)\(^{72}\) and a column mentioning *magistri veici* dated to the central years of the first century BC.\(^{73}\) However, the existence of a *vicus* already at the end of the third century BC in Rome is attested by Plautus, in describing indecent things going on in the city.\(^{74}\) The earliest unequivocal evidence for involvement in the religious realm is the rebuilding of an *aediculam vici Salutaris* in 33 BC.\(^{75}\)

Taking into consideration only inscriptions that can be connected to religious affairs, for Italy outside Rome somewhat more than a dozen examples remain.\(^{76}\) Within this group, most inscriptions that can be dated are from the Republican period. The so-called *pocola deorum* from the Latin colony of Ariminum mentioning *vici* and a dedication of a statue to Victoria on behalf of the *vecos* Supinas (*vicus Supinum*) in Marsic territory date to the second half of the third or the beginnings of the second century BC.\(^{77}\) To the same period might date a similar dedication of a statue, presumably to a deity, on behalf of the *vicus Petinus*.\(^{78}\)

---

\(^{71}\) For the complete record of *vicus* inscriptions (85 in total), both religious and non-religious, for the city of Rome, see the catalogue in TARPIN 2002, 307-326.

\(^{72}\) *CIL* VI, 1297 (= *CIL* I², 721).

\(^{73}\) *CIL* VI, 1324 (= *CIL* I², 2514).

\(^{74}\) Plaut. *Curc.* 482: *in Tusco vico ibi sunt homines qui ipsi sese venditant.*

\(^{75}\) *CIL* VI, 31270.

\(^{76}\) This list is not exhaustive but may represent the situation fairly well. Inscriptions relating to *vicani* have been omitted (cf. for these, TODISCO 2001).


V: 10. *CIL* IX, 5052 (= *CIL* I², 765), from near Montorio al Vomano, 55 BC.

VI: 11. *CIL* XI, 4744 from S. Maria in Pantano, *vicus Martis Tudertium*.


IX: 13. InsctIt IX-1, 59 from Bastia (Bastia).


\(^{77}\) *AE* 1965, 280c and *CIL* IX, 3849 (= *CIL* I², 388).

\(^{78}\) *AE* 1953, 218.
A dedication dated to the second century BC was made within the territory of the Aequicoli to the otherwise unknown god Nensinus, by decree of a vicus.\textsuperscript{79} Another early dedication from Marsic territory again was made by the Aninus vecus (vicus Aninus) to Valetudo, dated to the early first century BC.\textsuperscript{80} Several sacred activities involving a vicus are recorded for the first century BC, from Central, Central-Southern (Pompeii) and Northern Italy, and some for the imperial period.\textsuperscript{81}

Whereas the diffusion of the pagi (even if based on a necessarily small sample) coincided neatly with Roman or Roman-controlled territory, this differs somewhat for the early appearance of the vicus. Of course, Cales, in Campania, and Ariminum, in Emilia Romagna, are both Latin colonies, and the Central-Italian occurrences in Trebula Mutuesca and Vestine and Aequicolan territory also fall within the area with (full or limited) Roman rights. However, the early dedications in Marsic territory are more problematic. The Marsi were not yet incorporated within the Roman civitas, but held the status of socii. They would therefore contest the idea that vici represent Roman institutions. Possible explanations for this particular situation will be discussed below. Now, three different areas will be discussed in more detail: the Latin colonies (especially those of Cales and Ariminum), the ager Praetutianus, and the Fucine area.

\textbf{Case 2. Urban and Extra-Urban Vici and Colonies: Models and Evidence}

It is worthwhile to briefly consider the relation between vici and colonisation. A review of existing data and ideas on this relation could possibly advance our understanding of the character of vici in general, and in particular of the vici in the Praetutian and Marsic areas, examined in the subsequent sections. Vici are epigraphically attested in the Latin colonies of Ariminum and Cales. Usually it is assumed that these vici were urban subdivisions of the colony, but their location within the urban centre can be questioned. For the present study, it is important to evaluate the possibility that colonies or other centres controlled extra-urban vici, since this could shed light on the religious aspects of the countryside, and the influence of Roman religion outside urban structures. It seems possible to discern different strands in the debate on vici and colonisation. I treat them here in different sections.

1. \textbf{ROMAN URBAN ‘MIMIC’:\textsuperscript{82} THE ROMAN URBAN MODEL COPIED IN COLONIAL URBAN CENTRES}

The vici attested for Latin colonies sometimes bear suggestive names, such as a \textit{vicus Esquilinus} in Cales, and, for the imperial period, the \textit{vicus Velabrus}, \textit{Cermalus}, \textit{Aventinus}, etc. in Ariminum. Also in other colonies Roman toponyms were copied.\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{79} AE 1987, 321.
\textsuperscript{80} CIL IX, 3813 (= CIL I\textsuperscript{2}, 391).
\textsuperscript{81} See supra n. 76.
\textsuperscript{82} Cf. BISPHAM 2000b.
\textsuperscript{83} Antiochia: \textit{CIL} III, 6811-6812, 6835-6837, of Augustan date. In the Caesarian colony of Corinth sculptured bases have been found with inscriptions mentioning the different Roman hills (\textit{Capitolinus}}
This has often been adduced in support of the ‘Gellian’ view of colonies as small copies of Rome. That is, the colonies would have been, from the moment of the foundation on, *effigies parvae simulacraque Romae*. The idea is that the colonies were divided in urban *vici* in a conscious imitation of Rome’s topography, establishing an ideological relation with the metropolis. Ariminum and Cales are especially important for this discussion, because here, as has been said, early inscriptions of *vici* have been documented on black gloss vases. In Ariminum, unnamed *vici* are thus documented for the third century BC, whereas in Cales, the earliest Latin colony (334 BC), an early black gloss vase has been found with a signature by the potter: *K(aeso) Serponio(s) Caleb(us) fece(t) veqo Esqelino C S*, thus mentioning a *vicus Esquilinus*. In connection with another inscription from Cales mentioning a *vicus Palatius*, the impression is created that Roman models were copied in a colonial context. Most importantly, this apparently already happened at an early date, since the *vicus Esquilinus* inscription can be dated to the first half of the third century BC.

From this perspective, for example, Coarelli argues strongly for the exportation and copying of an (idealised) Roman urban model. According to him, the number of *vici* echoed the number of Roman urban divisions. So the ancient colony of Norba had three *vici*, which would reflect the Romulean city with three regions. Colonies of the fourth century would have had five *vici*, whereas in the third century seven *vici* would have been the norm. The model thus proposed is basically one of mimic: the Roman urban situation would have been copied or transposed directly to the urban divisions of Latin colonies.

---

*mons etc.* but no *vici*; cf. MERRITT 1927, 452. Therefore, I do not see why the hills “rende[no] inevitabile l’identificazione di questi simulacri con rappresentazioni simboliche dei *vici* della colonia cesariana” (COARELLI 1995b, 176). Cf. TORELLI 1988a, 66, also on the important role of Augustan or Julio-Claudian ideology. Cf. the evidence of Roman toponymy for Beneventum and Puteoli, dating to the imperial period. The Puteolan material seems to reflect an Augustan reorganisation of the colony: BISPHAM 2006, 90 n. 91.

84 Gell. NA 16.13.9; e.g. TORELLI 1990 esp. 53; COARELLI 1995b esp. 180: “La definizione gelliana (e adrianea) delle colonie, come “effigies parvae simulacraque” di Roma non descrive dunque una realtà contemporanea, medio-imperiale ma – coerentemente con la cultura retrospettiva dello scrittore – la stessa struttura originaria delle colonie latine.” Cf. ANDO 2007, 431-432 for a reading of Gellius in its wider textual context.

85 Cf. also MOREL 1988, 60: “vici [de Rimini], qui étaient les frères de ceux de Rome.”

86 For the so-called *pocola* cf. infra. Similar epigraphical evidence comes from Puteoli and Beneventum. Almost all evidence is imperial.

87 The solution C(ai) S ervus or c(um) s(uis) (in CIL X, 416) is not sure, the letters may have been added later: see ILLRP 1217.

88 CIL X, 4641.


90 COARELLI 1995b; cf. COARELLI 1992 for a ‘statist’ conception of colonisation, assuming basic continuity from Archaic times onwards.

91 Coarelli mentions Alba Fucens and Fregellae, citing TORELLI 1991 for Alba Fucens. Torelli, however, does not mention the word *vicus* once in this publication. For Fregellae no reference is given.
2. PROBLEMS WITH THE ROMAN URBAN MIMIC

If presented as above, the case for the copying of Roman topography from early times on might appear convincing. When regarded in more detail however, questions rise. To start with, there is little evidence for Coarelli’s elaborate thesis distinguishing a direct relation between urbs and colonial urban divisions, and the development he recognises. In Ariminum, the Roman urban toponyms date to the imperial period. It is therefore not evident, as Coarelli suggests,92 that the division documented for the imperial period can be attributed to the moment of the foundation of the colony, in 268 BC.

In Norba moreover no vicus is documented at all, not even for the imperial period. The Norban vici are actually presupposed by recognising the topography of Rome in that of the colony by ‘cultic association’ (i.e. the association of the cults of Norba – Juno Moneta, Diana, Juno Lucina – with the Roman Arx, Aventine and Esquiline respectively).93 This point of departure is not really unbiased, as will be clear; but more importantly, it does not prove in any way the existence of vici. The only unequivocal evidence for the possible copying of Roman toponymy in Latin colonies before the late Republican / imperial period remains the third century BC vicus Esquilinus from Cales.

In the end, the main question with regard to the copying of a Roman urban layout in colonies is then whether one accepts basic continuity from the Republican period to the better documented imperial period, or not. In the first scenario, the documentation for the Republican urban vici would be just a result of the scarcity of epigraphical data.94 In the second scenario, the possibility of change in urban development and ideas of ‘Romanness’ and urbanity taking place from the mid-Republican to the late-Republican and imperial period is left open. In this place, I would like to explore the second option somewhat further.

Before continuing, it is important to make two specifications with regard to the ‘copying’ of Roman urban toponymy. First: as has been seen, the use of Roman toponymy is best documented for the early imperial period, in which it also fits well ideologically. For example the toponyms of the Ariminate vici can be related to the Augustan re-colonisation.95 Second, it is of some importance to point out, with Bispham, that the colonial toponyms do not slavishly copy the Roman names of

---

92 “la divisione in vici di Ariminum, nella forma che ci è nota attraverso le iscrizioni di età imperiale, sembra da attribuire alle origini stesse della colonia, al 268 a.C.”: COARELLI 1995b, 177; equally e.g. ORTALLI 2000, 503: “le iscrizioni vascolari attestano l’originaria ripartizione della città in vici, destinata ad essere riconfermata in età augustea.”

93 Proposed by Torelli 1988c, 134.

94 Cf. Bispham 2006, 87, on the Calene vicus Esquilinus: “It must, I think, be admitted, that were our evidence for the middle Republic better, we would probably have similar examples from elsewhere.” Cf. also Daniel Gargola, at a conference in Dresden in November 2007, who holds that the inscriptions document urban divisions that existed since long.

95 Already Mommsen suggested that the toponyms from Ariminum should be related to the installation of the Colonia Augusta Ariminensis (CIL XI p. 76), followed by Bispham 2006, 90 n. 91; cf. n. 83. (Sanesi 1978, 76 n. 15 raises the same possibility for Cales). Cf. Ando 2007 for 431-436 for triumviral and Augustan ideology in relation to colonies.
Roman urban divisions, but form rather a “re-application of placenames from Rome to colonial geography to produce new toponyms … Our colonial toponyms are Romanizing, not Roman”.96 This observation is important, as it gives insight into the probable process of naming, by the instigation of colonists; a creative process, and not a rigid transposition of some presupposed fixed ‘urban system’. The implication is of course that the use of ‘Roman’ toponyms does not automatically mean that they were used for ‘similar’ – or indeed urban – realities.

3. THE POSSIBILITY OF EARLY RURAL ROMAN VICI NEAR LATIN COLONIES

Almost all reconstructions of vici in colonies are dominated by the idea that the Roman urban model was transposed to the urban division of the colony. However, since there is no firm evidence that the early colonial vici (i.e. in Cales and Ariminum) were indeed urban, the possibility that they were located outside the city walls should not be discarded a priori. Indeed, the imperial vicus Palatius seems actually to have been extra-urban, and there is evidence that the early vicus Esquilinus might have been extra-urban too (cf. infra).97 Ariminum will be treated in more detail below. Here it suffices to emphasise that, although the cups with vici inscriptions were found in the urban centre, this does not preclude the possibility that the vici themselves were located outside the centre.

For later periods, rural vici (i.e. hamlets that are located outside urban centres) are documented, mostly only in epigraphy, but there seems to be no reason to suppose that urban vici deposited dedications in stone in diverse locations in the countryside.98 As has been seen, Tarpin has argued that these rural vici were ‘extensions’ of the urban centres in the countryside.99 In this view, the originally urban term was applied more widely to groups of citizens outside the walls as well. As seen in Chapter 6, the coloni Caedicianei for example could be located in a vicus six miles outside Sinuessa.100

In this perspective vici would have been part of an urban development, and the eventual spread of vici in the countryside would have formed a development later in time. Schematically, the ‘spread’ of the vicus started from the centre of Rome to the centre of other Roman urban realities, and they were subsequently disseminated in some cases to the countryside. In fact, Tarpin argues for an urban origin of the vici, for Rome as for the early colonies.101 The most important part of Tarpin’s thesis is however the ‘Romanness’ and juridical / administrative aspect of the institution of the vicus; i.e. its relation to an urban centre and organisation rather than its physical

---

96 BISPHAM 2006, 92. Colonial vici were thus not necessarily “les frères de ceux de Rome” (MOREL 1988, 60, cf. supra n. 85), but rather, if anything, namesakes.
97 GUADAGNO 1993, 430-434.
98 Theoretically this is not to be excluded, e.g. if the inhabitants of an urban vicus would have had responsibility for part of the territory, or an ‘extra-urban’ sanctuary located there. But localised names and/or the abundance of inscriptions, as well as the presence of graves, precludes at least in some cases such an interpretation, and at least for the late Republican period some epigraphically attested vici can be related to archaeological remains of a settlement. Cf. infra for the archaeological evidence.
99 TARPIN 2002, passim, e.g. 84-85.
100 Plin. HN 14.62 with CIL X, 4727 (= CIL I², 1578).
101 TARPIN 2002, 87, 243; but cf. e.g. 85 for caution (“sur le territoire de colonies latines”).
position in the urban centre. It seems therefore possible, at least in theory, to suggest that the installation of vici in the countryside was contemporaneous with the installation of an urban centre, on which they depended.

The ‘urbanity’ of this ‘urban’ centre, moreover, should not be exaggerated. It has been pointed out that the urban centres or oppida of colonies were rather small and perhaps did not need any further subdivision of the urban space in vici.\textsuperscript{102} Actually, evidence for densely populated urban areas in mid-Republican colonies is scarce. A well-known problem is that the urban centres of mid-Republican Latin colonies can not have physically accommodated within their walls the number of people which the ancient sources attribute to them.\textsuperscript{103} Part of the population must have lived outside the urban centre. The idea that every single plot of assigned land would correspond to a single colonist’s farm is problematic as well. Field surveys in the territories of Latin colonies have revealed, instead of a regular pattern of dispersed sites, a rather uneven and nucleated pattern of settlement.\textsuperscript{104} These nuclei, then, could perhaps reflect extra-urban vici.\textsuperscript{105}

As has been said, it seems unreasonable to relate the dedications, mostly in stone, found in the countryside to actions undertaken by urban vici. Inversely, however, it is quite possible to question the presupposed urban status of some of the dedications of vici within the urban centres. One could well imagine that rural vici located somewhere in the territory of the urban centre brought dedications to the administrative or socio-political centre they depended on. This phenomenon is indeed documented at least in one case, as will be seen.\textsuperscript{106}

What has proved to be the ‘strongest’ – and sole contemporary – evidence for the copying of Roman toponymy in vici in early colonial contexts, the vicus Esquilinus of Cales, is actually more complicated than it is often presented in discussions of colonisation in the ‘Gellian view’. At first sight the presence of both a vicus Palatius and a vicus Esquilinus suggests surely an urban organisation in a Roman mould. But the relation between the two vici is not straightforward in view of the different dates and contexts in which the inscriptions were produced. Moreover, the urban location of the vici is contested. Giuseppe Guadagno shows, on the basis of a medieval source mentioning a location “in vico qui Palaczu dicitur” that the vicus Palatius was probably extra-urban and located at the west end of the ager Calenus.\textsuperscript{107}

\textsuperscript{102} MINGAZZINI 1958. Although one could object that such distinctions as vici could have served electoral purposes.

\textsuperscript{103} GARNSEY 1979.

\textsuperscript{104} PELGROM 2008.

\textsuperscript{105} Cf. PELGROM 2008, although until now no epigraphical evidence dating to the first phase of the colonies and provening without doubt from within the territory of the colony can be related to such archaeologically attested nuclei. Cf. infra on the relation between the Marsic vici and Alba Fucens, and vici in the ager Praetutianus and Hatria.

\textsuperscript{106} Cf. infra on the vicus Palatius of Cales; and also infra on pagi (and possibly rural vici) represented in the urban centre of Ariminum.

\textsuperscript{107} GUADAGNO 1993, 432.
Interestingly, the inscription had been found within the urban area of Cales.\(^ {108}\) The imperial inscription, engraved on a large marble slab, commemorates a gratulatory dedication of the *vicus* to the *patronus* of the city, L. Aufellius Rufus. The dedication was, thus, erected in the urban centre, on which the extra-urban *vicus* apparently depended.\(^ {109}\) This is not only an eloquent document of the dependence of an extra-urban *vicus* on an urban centre; the fact that a *vicus Palatius* could be located *extra urbe* significantly weakens the ‘urban mimic’ thesis.

Perhaps the *vicus Esquilinus* is not as strong a proof for the urban thesis as the name may at first suggest either. The text (*K(aeso) Serponio(s) Caleb(us) fece(t) vego Esqelino CS*) was applied in relief on a black gloss *patera* (‘Omphalosschale’) together with its decoration of flying Erotes holding wreaths in their hands between floral motifs.\(^ {110}\) First, it is important to point out that the place of original deposition is unknown.\(^ {111}\) It has even been suggested that the cup was actually produced in Rome, on the Esquiline, where potters are known to have been active.\(^ {112}\) According to Paolino Mingazzini, this would explain the specification *Calebus*; indicating the potter’s place of origin would make sense only ‘abroad’.\(^ {113}\) However, if it is accepted that Kaeo Serponios worked at Cales,\(^ {114}\) it is still not sure that the text refers to an urban *vicus*. Lucia Sanesi, refuting Mingazzini’s idea that the *patera* was made in Rome, and arguing for a Calene production centre instead, indeed thinks that the *vicus Esquilinus* might have been located outside the urban centre.\(^ {115}\) Guadagno argues that the name does not so much reflect a Roman toponym, but is rather applied because of the literal significance of the word. According to him, *esquilinus* would have been meant as an

\(^{108}\) Guadagno 1993, 431 with n. 87. An extra-urban location had been suggested before, but on incorrect grounds.

\(^{109}\) Guadagno 1993, 432. The inscription can be dated to the second half of the first century AD, cf. p. 430, n. 82.

\(^{110}\) Pagenstecher 1909, pl. 13.

\(^{111}\) The vase ended up in the museum of Naples. Even if categorised under ‘Calenische Reliefkeramik’ by Pagenstecher 1909 (where ‘Calenisch’ is used as a conventional term rather than as place of origin), it seems that the attribution of the find to the territory of Cales is based solely on the *Caleb(us)* text, which per se is not conclusive.

\(^{112}\) Varro, *Ling.* 5.50. For other potters from Cales cf. Pagenstecher 1909, 147-149. K. Serponios is attested only once, while e.g. the potters L. Canoleios and the Gabinii are attested much better, often specifying *Calenos* or *Caleb*, but never mentioning *vici*.

\(^{113}\) And thus, as well L. Canoleius and the Gabinii would have been working outside Cales according to Mingazzini 1958, 224-226.

\(^{114}\) Sanesi 1978 for example rejects Mingazzini’s idea, basing herself on the imperial *vicus Palatius* (which is however problematic, cf. supra) and the presence of kiln sites at Cales. Cf. n. 112: no other confirmed vases from Kaeo Serponios have been found at Cales (cf. Pagenstecher 1909, who also states at p. 157 that Serponios’ style was different (‘altertümlicher’) from the other Calene potters and that he “keinen Nachfolger gefunden [hat]”); a Calene production place is accepted by Pedroni 2001 109-110, who however does not adduce further arguments (such as fabric analysis), but refers a.o. to Coarelli 1995b, thus closing the circle of reasoning (cf. Pedroni 1993, 226 proposing, on rather poor grounds – the location of a temple of Juno Lucina that is far from sure, and the association of this cult with the Esquiline in Rome –, that the *vicus Esquilinus* might have been located at loc. Ponte delle Monache).

\(^{115}\) Sanesi 1978.
opposition to _inquilinus_; i.e. ‘the _vicus_ outside the city’.

This etymology might not convince everyone however, and perhaps we should admit that we simply ignore the location of the _vicus Esquilinus_ – which means that it cannot be adduced as proof for an urban nor for a rural _vicus_.

4. A DEVELOPMENT FROM URBAN TO RURAL?

Even if we can be fairly certain about the _extra urbem_ location of the _vicus Palatius_, for the _vicus Esquilinus_ the evidence remains equivocal. In any case, it is significant that a _vicus_ with a Roman urban toponym (_Palatius_) could be applied to an extra-urban reality, a situation which seems to support the idea that toponymy was used in a creative way (cf. _supra_). It follows that urban names do not necessarily reflect an urban pattern. But just how different was the colonial situation from Rome itself?

As has been seen, most popular is the view that envisages a development of urban Roman _vici_ transposed to the urban centres of the colonies, in what would be a conscious imitation of the Roman urban topography. Moreover, in an elaboration of this scenario it is possible to see, in a secondary moment, the extension of this urban scheme into the territory of the colony, thus accounting for the rural _vici_. This ‘Roman urban – colonial urban – rural development thesis’ is the one adopted by Tarpin, and fits well into the general ‘Gellian’ picture of colonies as small copies of Rome, voiced most forcefully by Torelli and Coarelli.

The alternative view, which is perhaps just as compatible with the evidence and the conception of the _vicus_ as a Roman development, is that the colonial _vici_, although clearly institutions adapted from Rome also, were located (as well) outside the urban centre of the colony. This conception might seem to run counter to the Gellian view of colonisation, as it seems to presuppose the application of the same term (_vicus_) to a radically different pattern of settlement (rural) than that of Rome (urban).

It can be argued that this difference is to some extent only apparent, and may not have been understood that way in antiquity either. If the _oppida_ of the colonies did not contain intramural urban subdivisions, but rather controlled _vici_ outside the colonial centre, this could perhaps answer to ideas of Roman ‘urbanity’ as well; the _vici_ depended still on a political centre. Not much is known about the layout of domestic quarters in Rome itself in the period that the first Latin colonies were founded. But it has been suggested that Rome was made up of different clusters of habitation (‘a macchia di leopardo’), and such a layout seems plausible at least for the earlier periods. It should not be excluded that colonists could associate their own pattern of settlement with an _idea_ of the layout of Rome itself, at least to a higher degree than we may imagine nowadays. Thus, the idea of colonies with extra-urban _vici_ (_nota bene_ that the word _colonia_ refers to the whole territory of the new foundation, or the group

---

116 GUADAGNO 1993, esp. 433-4

117 Tarpin points out that a _vicus Esquilinus_ thus understood seems to imply a _vicus Inquilinus_ as well: TARPIN 2002: 84, n. 145, on the etymology cf. ibid. 87, n. 2. But it should be underscored that the co-existence of urban and extra-urban _vici_ is not problematic per se.

118 Cf. in general GROS and TORELLI 1988; on the poor representation of the early and mid-Republican levels in urban excavation cf. RICCI and TERRENATO 1999.
of people involved, not just to the urban centre) as ‘small copies’ of Rome must not have been that absurd, with *Roma quadrata*, or the Capitol, perhaps echoed in the colonial centre or *oppidum*, and the Roman urban divisions reflected in villages, *vici*, dispersed over the territory. This idea must for now remain hypothetical, but could perhaps suggest some reconciliation between ideological aspects of colonisation (à la Torelli / Coarelli) and the archaeological evidence for urban development.

In sum, there is no conclusive evidence to ascertain the extra-urban or urban status of the early *vici* documented for Cales or Ariminum. Anyhow, the evidence for the ‘imitation’ of the topography of the city of Rome attested by Arminate *vici* with the names *Aventinus*, *Germalus*, *Velabrensis* (and, for that matter, the less direct *vici Dianensis* and *For(tunae)*) can be related to the Augustan re-colonisation, and not to the original colonisation in 268 BC. The suggestive names of these *vici* can therefore not be used to prove the urban status of the earlier *vici* of the colony. I have explored the validity of an alternative ‘rural’ thesis for the early period. Arguably, such a conception fits the evidence equally well, but no decisive conclusions can as yet be drawn. In any case, the dichotomy between a ‘rural’ and an ‘urban’ thesis might be less severe if one regards the (idea of the) layout of the city of Rome itself in early times. The ritual relation between urban centre and territory can be exemplified for the Latin colony of Ariminum; in its urban centre black gloss cups mentioning both *pagi* and *vici* have been found. This phenomenon will be the subject of the next section.

**A HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLE: POCOLA DEORUM AND THE ARIMINATE VICI AND PAGI**

The early *vici* of Ariminum are documented three times on fragments of black gloss ceramics.\(^{119}\) Moreover, *pagi* are mentioned as well on two other fragments. These data have until now been used almost exclusively as evidence for the existence of *vici* (and, to a lesser extent, *pagi*) as such.\(^ {120}\) I believe, however, that the medium on which the texts were written provides precious information too. By including the objects themselves in the historical analysis of the *vici* and *pagi* of Ariminum, a more faceted and contextual interpretation seems possible. In what follows I shall explore the possibilities for a reconstruction of the rituals connected to the *vici* and *pagi* documented on the black gloss ceramics, by taking these objects as a starting point.

The black gloss ceramics on which *vici* and *pagi* are written are generally identified as *pocola deorum*. This is the definition of a specific group of different black glazed forms presenting a theonym in the genitive and the word *pocolum* (= *poculum*) painted on it before firing (cf. figs. 7.2 and 7.3).\(^ {121}\)

---

\(^{119}\) Perhaps four, cf. *infra*.

\(^{120}\) For the interpretation by *Franchi De Bellis* 1995 cf. *infra*.

The area of production is in most cases Rome and surroundings, since some of the vases belong to the ‘Atelier des Petites Estampilles’. In general, they relate to ‘Roman’ or Latin contexts as is suggested by the use of the Latin language and the gods that are mentioned.\textsuperscript{122} Also their geographical appearance seems to be confined to the Latial and Etruscan areas and territories that were affected by Roman colonisation. The Latin colony of Ariminum would constitute a local production centre making its own \textit{pocola} in the course of the third century BC after the deduction of the colony in 268 BC. However, imported \textit{pocola} were also found.

Most \textit{pocola} are dated to the third century BC, especially in the first half.\textsuperscript{123} \textit{Pocola} have been found in different contexts; in funerary (esp. in Etruria) and domestic realms as well as in cult places. This has led to various hypotheses regarding their function.\textsuperscript{124} The now most commonly accepted interpretation is that the \textit{pocola} were made and painted by order of the sanctuaries of the deities mentioned in the inscriptions.\textsuperscript{125} The visitors of these sanctuaries bought the \textit{pocola} there, and could offer them instantly in the sanctuary, or take them home as a souvenir; hence the different contexts in which they are found. The fact that the vase is actually indicated as \textit{property} of the god, in

\begin{footnotes}
\item[122] CIFARELLI, AMBROSINI and NONNIS 2002-2003, 281.
\item[123] Cf. the catalogue in CIFARELLI, AMBROSINI and NONNIS 2002-2003.
\item[124] They would have functioned in the cult of the death, or rather as ex-voto’s: see CIFARELLI, AMBROSINI and NONNIS 2002-2003, 285 for different contexts, 290-293 with bibliography on hypotheses regarding the function.
\item[125] MOREL and COARELLI 1973, 57.
\end{footnotes}
Ch. 7. Pagi, Vici and Sanctuaries

the genitive, points perhaps to its function for libation, both in public and in private contexts.\footnote{CIFARELLI, AMBROSINI and NONNIS 2002-2003, 293.}
The \textit{pocolom} could apparently have a rather ‘personal’ function, since it could be bought and dedicated – or taken home – by individual visitors. But it was prefabricated, and no direct ‘personalisation’ of the cup seems to be intended: anyone passing by could buy a \textit{pocolum}.

For ‘sovradiipinta’ black gloss forms in general, it was also possible to order more specified texts. Sometimes the ‘personal’ aspect was emphasised by adding the name of the dedicant / commissioner that thus was painted on the vase before firing.\footnote{Alternatively, one could fire the vase a second time for ‘fixing’ the painted elements. Cf. discussion in CIFARELLI, AMBROSINI and NONNIS 2002-2003, 269-273. There is perhaps an example of a \textit{pocolum} that was ‘personalised’ in such a way, found in Segni: CIFARELLI, AMBROSINI and NONNIS 2002-2003, esp. 268-273.} This means that in such cases of ‘specified’ texts the party that ordered the text must have communicated with the potter / painter before production. Alternatively, the text was so generic and widely applicable that it could be made ‘en masse’. It is this last scenario that is envisaged for the standard \textit{pocola} mentioning the name of the god, produced for a market of pilgrims or other visitors of the sanctuary.

The area of the Palazzo Battaglini in the urban centre of the colony of Ariminum has yielded various ceramic materials, amongst which vases defined explicitly as \textit{pocola} (one dedicated to Venus, another possibly to Diana, a third one unknown), and vases on which only the name of the god survives (Apollo, Hercules) (see list \textit{infra}). Five, or possibly six, vases of this group mention \textit{pagi} (two) and \textit{vici} (three; one inscription could relate to a \textit{pagus} or a \textit{vicus}, cf. \textit{infra}), and these are usually called \textit{pocola} as well.

In light of the above, we should actually refrain from referring to the vases mentioning \textit{pagi} and \textit{vici} as \textit{pocola}: first of course because the most significant identifying element is lacking, the \textit{pocolum} text. But more fundamentally, because the function of the \textit{pagi} and \textit{vici} vases does not seem to be in accordance with that of the standard \textit{pocola}. Is seems illogical to suppose that anyone passing by could or would buy a cup with the indication of the rather specific administrative entities of \textit{pagus} or \textit{vicus} on it, unless one was in some way related to these entities.

This is in line with the context in which the \textit{pagi} and \textit{vici} inscriptions were found: not in funerary and domestic contexts, but, as far as we know, only in public and/or sacral contexts.
In order to understand the character of the dedications involving the *pagi* and *vici* of Ariminum it is useful to look briefly at the possible interpretations of the texts themselves.

The texts are:\(^\text{128}\)

1. *CIL* I², 2897a *pagi. *fid[ei, –elis or -idenatium?]*
2. *CIL* I², 2897b *pa[gi?---]*
3. *CIL* I², 2899a *veici [---]*
4. *CIL* I², 2899b *veic[---]*
5. *CIL* I², 2899c *[v]eic[i---]*
6. *CIL* I², 2898 *ji. vesuini*

and possibly

7. *CIL* I², 2885 *[Ven]erus. poclom*
8. *CIL* I², 2886 *?Dian|ai. pocol[om]*
9. *CIL* I², 2887 *[---] poc[olom]*
11. *CIL* I², 2895 *Apol[eni]*
12. *CIL* I², 2896a *h(er)c(ules) or h(ercules) c(ustos) vel sim.*
13. *CIL* I², 2896b-f *h(ercules)*
14. *Minak* a *A[pollo] or poclo*
15. *Minak* b *Vu|lca[nus]*

---

\(^{128}\) One new ‘*poculum*’ published by *MINAK* 2006b and discussed by *BRACCESI* 2006 could be reconstructed as *[v]eic(os) rai[ and thus constitute another *vicus* inscription (significantly with a proper name as it would seem), but Braccesi dismisses this reading in favour of a dedication to *Daeira*. Cf. n. 156.

\(^{129}\) *Minak* refers to *MINAK* 2006b, 43, as yet unedited in the usual corpora.
The question is whether *vici* and *pagi* are nominative plural or genitive singular, which changes the meaning significantly. In the last case, one is directed at an interpretation of the texts as dedications from distinctive *vici* and *pagi*, i.e. ‘from vicus x’ or ‘from pagus y’. In this scenario, we will have to admit that in most cases the distinctive name of the *vici* and *pagi* are accidentally lost, apart perhaps from the *pagi* Fid[ ], which could also be reconstructed as a proper name of the *pagus* (e.g. *Fidenatium* vel sim.). An example of a ‘specified’ *vicus* or *pagus* could be formed by the *-i vesuini* inscription in which the –i could perhaps be reconstructed as [pag]i or [vic]i. Perhaps, *vesuini* reflects a proper name of the *pagus* or *vicus*. It has even been suggested that it refers to the origin of the colonists, *i.e.* from the Vesuvian area. In the genitive singular interpretation, the texts of *pagi* and *vici* appear to have been the result of a specific order to the potter / painter. This interpretation goes naturally well with the specific *vici* known from the imperial period (*Aventinus*, *Germalus* etc.).

Reasoning from hindsight is a risk here – but as we have seen, at least one *vicus* had a proper name already in the third century BC: the Calene *vicus Esquilinus*.

If the *pagi* and *vici* texts are nominative plural rather than genitive singular, this would mean that specific proper names of *pagi* and *vici* were absent. Annalisa Franchi De Bellis would thus interpret the texts rather as “una dedica collettiva da parte dei *pagi* e dei *vici* riminesi”. The letters *Fid[ ]* should, according to Franchi De Bellis, be understood as an indication of the deity that was honoured: *pagi* Fid[ei] > ‘the *pagi* to the goddess Fides’. The text *-i vesuini* would in her vision not indicate the origin of the colonists from the Vesuvian area but would rather be part of an onomastic formula in the genitive. Not wanting to ‘write history from square brackets’, in the *vesuini*-case judgment is perhaps best suspended.

Where does this discussion leave us? For both scenarios it is clear that different parts of (the territory of) the colony dedicated the objects in one central place in the urban centre, where apparently also other more specific ‘religious’ dedications were brought (the ‘real’ *pocola*, and the dedications to Apollo and Hercules). This place could therefore, with some probability, be recognised as a cult place, or at least as a politico-religious central place. Essentially, it makes no difference if it is defined as a ‘cult place’ or not. The important thing is that rituals involving socio-political entities were performed there.

---

130 ZUFFA 1962, 99-103; SUSINI 1965, 150-151.
132 FRANCHI DE BELLIS 1995, 383; followed e.g. by FONTEMAGGI and PIOLANTI 2000.
133 FRANCHI DE BELLIS 1995, 385.
134 And neither a dedication to Vesuna: ZUFFA 1962, 103; SUSINI 1965, 146-147.
136 The provenance of the finds is indicated as ‘scavi di Palazzo Battaglini’, which is not specific, but a relation can be – and without exception has been – surmised.
Differently from the ‘real’ *pocola*, an order must have been placed beforehand at the potter / painter. This will have been the case in both the interpretation as nominative plural and as genitive singular: the institutions of *pagus* and *vicus* are too specific to be produced just like that, counting on the law of supply and demand. Although in the nominative plural interpretation the *pagi* and *vici* are admittedly less specific, it is still hard to imagine that a potter / painter would prefabricate vases with *vici* and *pagi* texts, if not on an explicit order or at least for some specific occasion.

The differences between the grammatical interpretations consist in the emphasis put on the ‘own’ identity of specific *vici* and *pagi* (genitive singular, plus proper distinctive names), or rather on their unity as a whole (nominative plural without specification). In both cases however a strong ‘construction’ of unity becomes apparent, since the *vici* and *pagi* were united ritually in the urban centre.

The *pagi* were beyond doubt located outside the city. As has been seen (Chapters 4 and 6), the *pagus* was an institution that was surely located in the countryside. Therefore, the vases with *pagi* texts must reflect dedications *in* the urban centre by communities from *outside* the urban centre. The *vici* appearing on the same type of vases in the same context could reflect urban or rural *vici*, or a combination of both. The fact that (the representatives of) other extra-urban communities – the *pagi* – dedicated in the central urban centre indicates that this specific dedicatory action was at least not the privilege of urban entities.

If indeed some of these *vici* were extra-urban, this type of *vicus* would then be an agglomeration outside, but dependent on the urban centre of the colony. Around Ariminum several sites have been recognised. However, none of them until now have yielded explicit epigraphical evidence for their possible status of *vicus*, although medieval sources locate a *vicus Popilius* at the site of S. Lorenzo in Strada.\(^{137}\) Here, a sanctuary is attested by architectural terracotta’s dating between the second half of the second century BC and the first century BC, and also other sites in the territory of the colony could point to the colonists’ influence outside the urban centre.\(^{138}\)

Be that as it may, what we can say with some certainty about Ariminum is that parts of the territory of the colony, *pagi*, and (either rural or urban) *vici*, dedicated black gloss vessels in the urban centre, presumably in a sacral-political place. But by what ritual

---

\(^{137}\) Cf. FONTEMAGGI and PIOLANTI 1995, 538.

\(^{138}\) FONTEMAGGI and PIOLANTI 1995, 557 with previous bibliography. Interesting with regard to other sites is the Covignano area, which was frequented from pre-Roman times on (cf. CRISTOFANI 1995), but which yielded also a consistent corpus of Roman period materials. Fontemaggi and Piolanti date the “maggiore sviluppo” of the settlement in the early imperial period, but also early black gloss pottery produced in Ariminum are present (FONTEMAGGI and PIOLANTI 1995, esp. 542-545). In this area, also several cult places have been recognised, which seem to have been reused or taken over and even monumentalised after the foundation of the colony. At least one monumental temple is attested by column drums later reused in a parish church and Italic-Corinthian capitals (belonging to a different building than the column drums: cf. MARINI CALVANI 2000). Two marble statues, one of Minerva with *aegis* and helmet, one possibly of Fortuna (cf. MARINI CALVANI 2000, 52) can best be dated somewhere in the second half of the third century BC, that is directly after the foundation of Ariminum (LIPPOLIS 2000). For the occupation of the territory in Roman times, cf. FONTEMAGGI and PIOLANTI 1995.
action were the vessels offered, and why these ephemeral ceramics, and not, for instance, stone *stelai*? Since there is no other supporting evidence for the interpretation of this ritual (which perhaps neither can be expected for this kind of questions), all suggestions must remain hypothetical. But it is tempting to relate the form of the dedicated objects to their possible function. As said, in general *pocola deorum* are thought to have been used in libation rituals. Whereas *pocola deorum* in general are produced in varied forms, both open and closed, such as cups, jugs, and plates, the Ariminate vessels with *pagi* and *vici* inscriptions are exclusively open forms. The inscriptions were without exception applied on the inside of the vessel (cf. fig. 7.4).

Such forms, cups or *paterae*, are even more closely associated with libations and similar rituals, especially in the public realm. Especially *paterae* are known to have been used for public libations, sacrifices (for sprinkling the animal, the serving of the *mola salsa*, the receiving of the blood), and as drinking vessels during ritual meals. Interestingly, they also figure in rituals with an explicit political component. In the time of Varro, for the installation of *magistri* the *patera* was used because of its traditional value, and the magistrates offer wine to the gods from a *patera*. The dedication of the *patera* itself in a sanctuary is also attested in texts. Their use in rituals is illustrated by the common type of small bronze statues of sacrificants, holding a *patera* in one hand, here for example from a votive deposit of the second half of the third–beginning of the second century BC in Sarsina (cf. fig. 7.5).

---

139 See the catalogues in CIFARELLI, AMBROSINI and NONNIS 2002-2003.
140 See the catalogue in CIFARELLI, AMBROSINI and NONNIS 2002-2003. The precise forms of the cups cannot be found in the existing literature: unfortunately, a work from 1982 by C. Giovagnetti and O. Piolanti with a catalogue of all inscriptions and pottery, remains unpublished (cf. FRANCHI DE BELLIS 1995, 372). Cf. RICCIONI 1965, 117-119, who defines all cups with *pagi* / *vici* texts (including the *pagi fid* inscription) as “ciotola ad orlo rientrante”, just as most *pocola* with the names of deities (*Apollo* and *Jerus*). The piece with the *vesuini* text is described as a “ciotola ad orlo pendente”, the forms of those with personal names differ sometimes as well. Cf. FRANCHI DE BELLIS 1995, 371: “coppe, ciotole o patere.”

141 A dedication of a *pagus* from Cupra montana was also made on a *patera* but the character of this inscription is quite difficult to establish (CIL IX, 5699; cf. supra).
143 Liv. 6.4.3; Plin. *HN* 12.42; cf. in general VON SCHAEWEN 1940, 24-32; SIEBERT 1999, 40-44.
144 MIARI 2000a, with the ‘schede’ on pp. 331-332. The statuettes were found at the NW corner of the *forum*.
For what it is worth, *paterae* feature prominently in the iconography related to the activities of the *magistri vici* in the imperial period (fig. 7.6), and indeed the *Lares Compitales*, central to the *vicus* cult (cf. Chapter 9), are commonly depicted with *rhyton* and *patera* (cf. Chapter 9, fig. 9.7). Admittedly, rituals involving *paterae* might have been rather general, but the above may provide an idea of the context in which the Ariminate vessels could have been used.

The entities that are indicated as the dedicants of the cups, *vici* and especially *pagi*, are basically territorial divisions. The form of the objects and the very dedication itself suggest a sacred rite of some sort. Now, it could be asked what kind of rite would be appropriate in this context, and I would suggest that the sacred rite expressing territoriality *par excellence* is the *lustratio*. During a *lustratio* the boundaries of a given parcel are ritually cleansed, redefined, and symbolically strengthened. At the same time, a certain space and a certain *group* could be defined. Moreover, if the inscription reading *pagi Fid*[ (CIL I², 2897a, here no. 1) indeed reflects a dedication to the goddess Fides on behalf of the Ariminate *pagi*, a parallel with the *Terminalia*

---

146 Cf. HANO 1986; see also Chapter 9 on the iconography of the Lares Compitales.
147 Cf. FLESS 2005, 54: “Beide Rituale (scil. das Ritual des *sulcus primigenius* und die *lustratio*) dienen der Definition und Konstituierung eines Raumes oder einer Gruppe von Menschen, die sich in diesem Raum aufhält.” For *vicus* in the sense of a community rather than a territorial entity, cf. *infra* on CIL IX, 3813 (= CIL I², 391); LETTA 2001, 151.
Ch. 7. Pagi, Vici and Sanctuaries

would present itself, since Fides is associated closely with the festival of boundaries. A temple to *Fides publica* or *Fides populi Romani* was built on the Capitol, close to the temple of Jupiter between 258 and 247 BC, suggesting that the goddess was of particular interest in Rome at that time. At this temple, copies of treaties and decrees were exhibited. This interest may moreover be reflected in a passage of Agathocles’ *Peri Kyzikou* of the third century BC, handed down by Festus. Here, Rhome, the granddaughter of Aeneas, is told to have dedicated the first temple to Fides on the Palatine. This does of course not necessarily prove an ancient origin of this myth and cult; but it does illustrate the conception of the goddess and its strong connection to ‘Rome’ in the third century BC – precisely the period that the Ariminate *pagi* and *vici* performed their dedication.

It could be imagined that the Ariminate vases were deposited in the urban centre, after having been carried around the boundaries of the *vici* (which could be both rural and urban) and *pagi* in question, as a means of consolidating both territoriality and allegiance to the urban centre. Alternatively, we could imagine representatives of the *vici* and *pagi* dedicating the cups in the cult place, on behalf of their communities, but without a preceding *lustratio* of the territories. In both cases a centripetal procession could be imagined, thus ‘materialising’ the physical distance and at the same time the bond between centre and community.

Schematically, three different levels of ritual action can be surmised. First, the ritual enhancement of the boundaries of the rural and/or urban *vici* and the rural *pagi*. Second, the stressing of the relation between these *vicus*- and *pagus*-communities on the one hand and the urban cult place on the other. And obviously, in this case a link between the various dedicating *vici* and *pagi* was created as well. The third level would be represented by the possible wider ideological link with ‘Romanness’ or ‘Latinity’, expressed by the dedication in the same place of the proper *pocola* and cups dedicated to gods. Especially the presence of the god Apollo, apparently named on two cups, is typical for a ‘colonial’ cult, since Apollo can be seen as the god *par excellence* for new founders in both Greek and Roman contexts.

---

148 For the reading of *Fid[ei]* in *CIL* I², 2897a: FRANCHI DE BELLIS 1995, 385. I have doubts however as to the typical ‘Sabine’ nature of this goddess: Franchi De Bellis seems wanting to connect this ethnic connotation (Varro, *Ling.* 5.74) to the origin of the colonists. But Fides was thought to be a very ancient Roman goddess, perhaps pre-dating Numa (Fest. 328 L.), for a date in the time of Numa: Liv. 1.21.4; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.75.3; Plut. *Num.* 16.1.70.


150 E.g. *CIL* I², 587 and *CIL* I², 589. Cf. MÖMMSEN 1858.

151 Fest. 328 L = *FGrH* 472 F5; cf. ARONEN 1995.

152 Cf. the discussion on the early Latin dedications to Apollo in the Marsic area and the *ager Praetutianus*, n. 197. On Apollo and colonisation cf. e.g. MALKIN 1986; MALKIN 1998.

153 SUSINI 1965, 148; cf. ORTALLI 2000, 503, according to whom the *pocola* were related to rituals associated with migration and foundation.
go too far to recognise a ‘Roman pantheon’ \(^{154}\) in the gods that are venerated. But at least a strong significance of the cult place for the colony as a new foundation becomes clear, in which Roman and/or Latin elements played an important role. By dedicating their vases in the same place that was thus associated with the foundation of the colony, the *vici* and *pagi* perhaps emphasised the ideological construction of the colony and its territory. This place would have connected the diverse elements that were part of the colonial foundation to one another; and perhaps also connected these in turn to Rome – or rather to a more general idea of Romanness or Latinity.\(^ {155}\) Some *pocola* that were brought from other places in Italy and were deposited here could support this thesis.\(^ {156}\) In this respect, a locally produced black gloss cup impressed with a Roman *uncia* with a naval prow and the legend *Roma* is especially suggestive.\(^ {157}\)

It is possible, though certainly not necessary, that these ritual ‘levels’ were interrelated, and it should be underscored that only the second level (and arguably the third) is documented securely for Ariminum.

In this discussion, the difference between rural and urban *vici* is of little importance: the rituals enhanced the bond between both rural units (the *pagi* and perhaps the *vici* - if it could be proved that they were rural) and urban units (urban *vici* – if it could be proved that they were urban) on the one hand and a central place on the other. This bond transcended the ambit of both rural and urban units, and was physically located outside their boundaries.

The religious role of the *pagus* and the *vicus* is discussed in more detail in Chapters 8 and 9 on the two festivals that were associated with the *pagus* and *vicus*, respectively the *Paganalia* and the *Compitalia*. These festivals present important characteristics of the *lustratio* concept. It will become clear that the ‘first level’ of ritual action, which was focused above all on the *vicus* or *pagus* community itself, can be demonstrated in other contexts quite convincingly. Evidence for the sacred relation of these communities to the urban centre (the ‘second level’) is less abundant, but as we have seen, this level is securely attested for an early period already in Ariminum.

---

155 Cf. CIL I², 40 (*c. manlio aci / cosol / pro poplo arimenesi*), which was dedicated in the sanctuary of Diana in Nemi, and CIL VI, 133 from Rome (*dianae sanctai ariminenses*), attesting to the religious and ideological connection of the Ariminates to Roman and Latin cult places of Diana (cf. CICALA 1995).
156 Some of the *pocola* found in Ariminum can be distinguished by fabric and form to be of non-local origin: amongst others CIL I², 2885; CIL I², 2887 (MINAK 2006b, esp. 43) just as the probable dedication to Vulcanus (MINAK 2006a). If the diffusion of these *pocola* dedicated to gods can indeed be related to individual actions of the ‘souvenir’ type, this would document the connection between diverse Latin / Roman centres also on a ritual level. Francesca Minak imagines this connection in a direct manner, in which colonists would take *pocola* from their homecities to the newly founded colony (MINAK 2006a). All black gloss vases mentioning a *vicus* or *pagus* were, as it seems, locally produced. According to this logic, the reading *[v]ec(os) rai*[ of the problematic new ‘*poculum*’, of local production, would not be impossible (published by MINAK 2006b and discussed by BRACCESI 2006, who ultimately prefers reading a dedication to *Daeira*). In this way, the patterns of import versus local production would echo the constructions of group feelings both on Latin and local levels.
157 ZUFFA 1962; cf. MOREL 1988 esp. 60.
Now, two areas presenting rural *vici* will be discussed: the *ager Praetutianus* and the Fucine area. After an evaluation of the evidence from these areas, the discussion on the relation between (rural) *vici* and colonisation will be taken up.

**Case 3. Rural Vici and Sanctuaries in the Ager Praetutianus**

In the *ager Praetutianus*, along the Adriatic coast, rural *vici* have been recognised and studied extensively. The relation to sanctuaries is documented relatively well. This situation could be specific for the historical development and consequent patterns of settlement in this area. In itself, this is not problematic because the example of the *ager Praetutianus* is in its own right relevant to the discussion of sanctuaries and the so-called *pagus-vicus* system. It might also be, however, that the relatively abundant Praetutian image is partly due to the intensity of research on the territory.\(^ {158} \)

Rome conquered the area that they consequently called the *ager Praetutianus* in the early third century BC, and it was assigned to *Regio V* (Picenum) under Augustus.\(^ {159} \) Before the conquest, people who apparently defined themselves as (some sort of) Sabines populated the area.\(^ {160} \) After the conquest by M.’ Curius Dentatus in 290 BC and the foundation of the Latin colony of Hatria between 289 and 286 BC the autochthonous Praetutii probably received the *civitas sine suffragio*, which was upgraded to the full citizenship in 241 BC.\(^ {161} \) The important sanctuary of Monte Giove (Cermignano), which would have been of central importance to (a section of) the Praetutii, was possibly taken over by the colonists.\(^ {162} \) Furthermore, the Roman colony of Castrum Novum was founded in the same time, and a *conciliabulum*, where a *praefectura iure dicundo* was also installed, was located at Interamna Praetutiorum.

**(ALLEGED) VICI AND SANCTUARIES**

Several sites in this area present sanctuaries related directly to settlements. Some of these settlements can be recognised as *vici* by epigraphical evidence. In her 1995 study, Maria Paola Guidobaldi has dedicated a chapter to ‘*vici e santuari’*, listing 17 sites. On the basis of this dataset, she draws conclusions on the organisation of the territory. Before I will discuss her conclusions the dataset will be briefly reviewed and where possible amended. The evidence for some sites that Guidobaldi interprets as

---

\(^ {158} \) Especially thanks to the publications by A. Staffa, G. Messineo, L. Franchi Dell’Orto in the Documenti dell’Abruzzo Teramano series. Moreover, GUIDOBALDI 1995 develops a specific interest in the relation between colonisation, territory, and sanctuaries and *vici* in her excellent study on the colony of Hatria and the romanisation of the *ager Praetutianus*.

\(^ {159} \) Cf. DELPLACE 1993, esp. 11-34.

\(^ {160} \) On the formation of the *ethnos*, cf. GUIDOBALDI 1995, 48, 53-59, 177-179.

\(^ {161} \) HUMBERT 1978, 238-421, 378 n. 66 and 386-390; cf. however the general critique on the conception of the *civitas sine suffragio* by MOURITSEN 2007.

\(^ {162} \) GUIDOBALDI 1995, 50-52: an archaic Latin inscription mentions the *tribus* of the dedicants, and another inscription found in the neighbourhood, dated 10 BC, commemorates a dedication to a *patronus* of the colony. Cf. my Chapter 2 on the Roman habit to incorporate important sanctuaries. Cf. STRAZZULÀ 2006, 85-87.
sanctuaries relating to *vici*, does not allow this identification in my opinion. Nevertheless, they have been included here in order to furnish a better context.¹⁶³

1. Località Piano Vomano – Colle del Vento

Although defined ‘santuario di confine’ by Guidobaldi, the archaeological complex at Colle del Vento, examined by Luisa Franchi dell’Orto and Andrea Staffa, seems to consist of a hill-fort and a sanctuary, possibly in combination with a settlement, dating to the period after the Roman conquest.¹⁶⁴ However, since there is no epigraphic (or toponymic) evidence to suggest that the status of this possible settlement was that of a *vicus*, Colle del Vento cannot be used for our current discussion. Guidobaldi’s interpretation of the site as a Roman territorial sanctuary beside which a *vicus* subsequently developed must remain hypothetic.

2. Località Case Lanciotti-Masseria Nisii (Comune di Montorio al Vomano)

In 1865 the ruins of a temple were found.¹⁶⁵ The possibly double *cella* had a mosaic with inscription, providing a consular date of 55 BC and the deity that was venerated,

¹⁶³ Only the sites with direct relevance to the subject have been included; in Guidobaldi’s Chapter ‘*vici* e santuari’ also sites that are neither Hellenistic sanctuary nor *vicus* have been listed, or the remains are too scarce to refer to them as such. Therefore her sites 3 (archaic Latin inscription to Mania or nymph), 4 (some finds relating to a cult place), 5 (funeral inscription), 7 (remains of wall), 8 (archaic Latin inscription to Apollo), 12 (the ‘ethnic’ sanctuary of the Praetutii at Monte Giove, re-used or even usurped in Roman times, but not related to a *vicus*), 16 (altar), 17 (an apparently late dedication to Victoria) are not treated here. The correspondence between the sites listed here and respectively those of Guidobaldi is 1 ~ 1; 2 ~ 2; 3 ~ 6; 4 ~ 9; 5 ~10; 6 ~ 11; 7 ~ 13; 8 ~ 14; 9 ~ 15. Cf. also the recently excavated sanctuary at loc. Madonna della Cona, ca. 3 km from Interamna: STRAZZULLA 2006, 91, to be published by Vincenzo Torrieri.

¹⁶⁴ Polygonal walls enclose an area of ca. 1200 m², within which the foundations in *opus quadratum* of a temple of the Roman period have been recognised under medieval remains of a church and a related settlement. Apart from an autopsy by Luisa Franchi dell’Orto and Andrea Staffa no systematic excavation or survey has been undertaken and the site has been plundered. Although there seems to be no hard evidence for the presence of an ancient settlement, this seems to be at least presupposed (the title of the contribution of Franchi dell’Orto and Staffa reads: L’insediamento italic o di Colle del Vento) in basis of the area enclosed; FRANCHI DELL’ORTO and STAFFA 1991, 173: “A Colle del Vento abbiamo un’altura fortificata con al centro una struttura templare. L’area delimitata dal perimetro delle mura poligonali è di circa 1200 mq., una misura che ben si addice all’*arx* munita di un piccolo insediamento.” The provenance within the complex of the ceramic material which is published in FRANCHI DELL’ORTO and STAFFA 1991 is unfortunately unknown. Behind the walled enclosure on the hill-top is an area wich yielded many ceramic materials, above all medieval, but also earlier, and this is where Franchi dell’Orto and Staffa think the ancient *vicus* was located (FRANCHI DELL’ORTO and STAFFA 1991, 174: part of the ceramics that are published appear to come from this area as well). Whereas Dell’Orto and Staffa previously recognised a pre-Roman hill-fort in these remains, Guidobaldi points out that all materials can be dated after the beginnings of the third century BC and may be related to Roman intervention. An interesting point however is that the Oscan foot (0.275 m) was employed for the construction of the temple, which measures 8.5 m x 4.5 m, i.e. 30 x 10 feet (FRANCHI DELL’ORTO and STAFFA 1991, 173-174. However, these measures seem to be rather approximative). The location of the apparently new construction in the Roman period in relation to the construction of the *via Caecilia* at the beginning of the third century BC is suggestive (GUIDOBALDI 1995, 250).

¹⁶⁵ STAFFA 1991, 202-204.
Hercules. The musive inscription records three *magistri* who saw *d(e) v(ici) s(ententia)* to the construction of the temple and the painting of its walls. Remains of a marble club were found in the *cella*. Staffa suggests that some finds could indicate an earlier date of the cult place, associating it with second to early first century sanctuaries in Abruzzo and Molise. Since a *magistra veneris* is documented as well, Guidobaldi proposes a double cult of Hercules and Venus. The *vicus* mentioned could be recognised in the area of present Montorio al Vomano, which is the only area in the environment of the sanctuary where “elementi di una certa consistenza” have been found. This area is some 2 km further east along the river basin. Thus, although a *vicus* is attested by the inscription in the sanctuary, the *vicus* itself cannot be located with certainty.

3. Pagliaroli (Comune di Cortino)

At this site, the remains of a sanctuary of the second century BC have been found. Some elements of the rich architectural decoration seem to relate to the Latin colony of Hatria in style and production. There is no epigraphical evidence to prove this connection, nor a connection to a *vicus*. Nevertheless, a settlement is presupposed on the basis of other “resti antichi” found in the area. For the analysis here of *vici* and sanctuaries, Pagliaroli should be left out.

4. Collina di S. Berardino

Votive material consisting of early black gloss and Italian sigillata was found at Collina di S. Berardino. According to Guidobaldi the sanctuary could represent “uno dei primi atti di appropriazione del territorio da parte dei Romani insediatisi nell’agro pretuzio dell’indomani della fulminea campagna di conquista di Manio Curio Dentato”. The relation with a probable settlement, possibly with the status of *vicus*, near Campovalano is not clear. Clearly, this evidence cannot be used in the present discussion.

---

166 *CIL* IX, 5052 (= *CIL* I², 765).
167 One *magister*, Q. Ofillius Rufus son of Caius may have been family to a L. Ofillius Rufus, son of Lucius, in the Latin colony of Aesernia, who saw to the construction of a street there in about the same period (*CIL* IX, 2667): *Staffa* 1991, 203.
170 *CIL* IX, 5055. There are however many instances of *magistri / ae* identified with certain deities that are active in sanctuaries of other deities, and it is not clear whether this has to imply a cult for the name-giving deities in that place as well. (cf. e.g. *CIL* IX, 3138: … *magistri laverneis murum caementicium / portam porticum / templum bonae deae* …).
171 *Staffa* 1991, 200, 203, followed by *Guidobaldi* 1995, 250-253. However, nearer to the sanctuary, north and uphill, are the sites 36 and 38 (resp. Roseto and Rodiano-Campitello: *Staffa* 1991, 201) which yielded some late Republican and imperial material.
174 On the basis of *CIL* IX, 5136, recording a dedication to Divus Julius, perhaps to be connected with the installation of statues to Caesar in the municipia and perhaps also *vici* of Italy: *Guidobaldi* 1995, 262.
5. The *vicus Strament(arius)* or *Strament(icius)*

In the Comune of Sant’Omero firm evidence has been found of both a temple dedicated to Hercules and a *vicus*-settlement.\(^{175}\) During the construction of a house next to the pre-Romanic church of S. Maria a Vico (sic!) in 1885 an inscription was found in secondary deposition (used as a tombstone), and can now be seen walled into the church. The inscription, mentioning *cultores Herculis*, dates to the Trajanic period and is written in two columns, between which the club of Hercules is depicted.\(^{176}\) The text sanctions the obligation to hold a yearly funerary banquet in memory of a certain Tiberius Claudius Himerius, son of Claudia Hedonia, in all probability members of the same college.\(^{177}\) The phrase *in templo Herculis* documents the temple, whereas a *vicus Strament(arius)* or *Strament(icius)* is mentioned in the last part of the inscription. The settlement can be recognised in the rich archaeological material found in the area where later the medieval church of S. Maria a Vico was built, possibly directly on the foundations of the Hercules temple. The settlement seems to have flourished from the late Republican period well into the imperial period, although earlier ceramics could attest to continuity from prehistorical times on.\(^{178}\) Guidobaldi dates the formation of the settlement in the course of the second century BC.\(^{179}\) In sum, at least for the imperial period a *vicus* with sanctuary is attested. Although the inscriptions do not allow for a secure Republican datation of the *vicus* (and sanctuary), the archaeological remains could suggest it.

6. Contrada S. Rustico (Comune di Basciano)

In 1928 the remains of a temple have been excavated, and research in the 1970s revealed both epigraphical and architectural evidence of this sanctuary, to be dated in the second century BC, and of a settlement that dates slightly later, from the middle of the first century BC continuing into the late imperial period (figs. 7.7 and 7.8).

---

176 The *cultores Herculis universi iurati per I(ovem) O(ptimum) M(aximum) Geniumque Imp(eratoris) / Caesaris Nervae Traiani Aug(usti) / Ger(manici)* stand in some way under the protection of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and the *Genius* of Trajan; cf. DELPLACE 1993, 243-244.
177 Dessau, *ILS*, 7215.
179 GUIDOBALDI 1995, 264.
Fig. 7.7. Basciano, località S. Rustico. Settlement with temple (T) (adapted from MESSINEO 1986, 138 fig. 47).

Fig. 7.8. Basciano, località S. Rustico. Temple, plan, reconstructed plan and reconstructed section (adapted from MESSINEO 1986, 160 figs. 82 and 83).
The temple was apparently repaired in the imperial period, but can be dated to the second century BC because of the symmetrical podium cornice which has parallels in S. Giovanni in Galdo, Fontecchio, Pietrabondante A and the large temple at Schiavi d’Abruzzo. This date is confirmed by the architectural terracotta’s. The temple was apparently re-paired in the imperial period, but can be dated to the second century BC because of the symmetrical podium cornice which has parallels in S. Giovanni in Galdo, Fontecchio, Pietrabondante A and the large temple at Schiavi d’Abruzzo. This date is confirmed by the architectural terracotta’s. Underneath one of the buildings of the settlement (N3) a votive deposit was found, with amongst other things black gloss ceramics dating between the middle of the second and the middle of the first century BC, this forms the most important dating element of the ‘structuration’ of the settlement complex as a whole, even if the relation between the building and the deposit is not clear. The oldest buildings seem to be S29 and S29a, which are made in the same technique as the podium of the temple. The settlement consists of two nuclei with an open space in between, maybe some sort of forum. A burial area has some tombs dating from the Archaic period. Tombs which seem contemporary with the settlement in the Roman period were found, but also tombs probably postdating the settlement. Because the relation between burials and settlement is not straightforward, it does not seem possible to date the settlement earlier in light of the presence of the Archaic tombs.

Two inscriptions remembering construction works (an altar, walls, base, stairs) mention magistri, and another inscription with a dedication to Hercules reveals the venerated deity. It seems thus clear that a temple to Hercules was installed here, around the second half of the second century BC, with a contingent settlement. Although the magistri could relate to magistri vici and thus indicate the status of vicus of the settlement, this is by no means certain.

7. Cellino Vecchio, loc. Valviano, Case Carnevale (Comune di Cellino Attanasio)
Here an inscription dated to the second century BC was found, mentioning the construction by two magistri of aras crepidine(m) colu(mnas), clearly a sanctuary. Some black gloss ceramics were retrieved in the environment, and Guidobaldi proposes to recognise “in questo sito un vicus retto da magistri, che nel corso del II secolo a.C. si fanno promotori della costruzione di altari, della crepidine e delle colonne di un edificio di culto”. The interpretation of the settlement as a vicus is,

---

180 MESSINEO 1986.
182 MESSINEO 1986, 149-154. Although Morel 2830 could be dated earlier (2831b is dated to the mid third century BC, whereas the date of 2831a is uncertain: MOREL 1981, 230.
183 MESSINEO 1986, esp. 144, 149; PELLEGRINO and MESSINEO 1991.
184 MESSINEO 1986, 144.
186 MESSINEO 1986, 154-158.
187 CIL IX, 5047 and CIL F, 3295. Generally, these are thought to be magistri vici (e.g. recently STRAZZULLA 2006, 89) but there is no explicit evidence to suggest so.
188 CIL F, 3294.
189 CIL F, 1898.
190 GUIDOBALDI 1995, 272.
just as it is for the site of S. Rustico, widely accepted.\(^1\) This indeed seems possible, but there is no conclusive proof since the word *vicus* is not mentioned in the inscription. The *magistreis* could therefore also be *magistri* of a *pagus* or yet another college under the protection of a deity (cf. *magistri herculis, martis* etc.). Just as the previous site therefore, we cannot surely link this sanctuary to a *vicus*.

8. Vico-Ornano (Comune di Colledara)
An early first century BC inscription,\(^2\) walled into a church, bears three names, interpreted by Guidobaldi as *magistri vici* and would according to her attest to the presence of a *vicus* in this area.\(^3\) Two Roman columns with Doric capitals have been documented here, now only one drum survives. Apart from the modern toponym – which is suggestive – there is no hard proof that the settlement had the status of *vicus*.

9. Colle S. Giorgio (Comune di Castiglione Messer Raimondo)
A sanctuary is attested here by the remains of a podium and architectural terracotta’s. The material can be dated to the late Hellenistic period.\(^4\) There is no epigraphical evidence, and nothing is known about a possible settlement related to it.

**EVALUATION**

In conclusion, only sites 2 and 5 can securely be used as examples of a *vicus* with a related sanctuary. Sites 6, 7 and 8 could have been related to a *vicus*, but this cannot be established with certainty. In general, furthermore, it is remarkable how a series of small settlements, almost all dating from the late Republican to imperial period, can be related to sanctuaries. How should we interpret these *vici* or non-specified settlements and related sanctuaries? In the following, I have two aims. First I will show that the traditional interpretation of these *vici* as continuations of a pre-Roman pattern of settlement is difficult to uphold on archaeological grounds. Second, I shall argue that the attested *vici* can be interpreted as new installations as a result of Roman influence, but that a possible relation to the colony of Hatria, or other administrative centres, is not straightforward either.

1) In her study of the territory, Guidobaldi argues that the *vici* are to be understood as survivals from the pre-Roman period. Equally, she argues that the *pagus-vicus* system was a pre-Roman feature, but was in some way tolerated as an alternative ‘indigenous’ way of living.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Cf. for example MENOZZI 1998, 42; GRUE 1998, 13; STAFFA and MOSCETTA 1986, 194.
\(^2\) CIL IX, 5048 (= CIL I², 1899).
\(^3\) GUIDOBALDI 1995, 273.
\(^4\) IACULLI 1993.
\(^5\) Cf. GUIDOBALDI 1995, 178: “l’organizzazione del territorio pretuzio al momento della conquista era essenzialmente di tipo paganico-vicano; come vedremo, essa sopravviverà in età romana quale alternativa indigena al modo di abitare cittadino introdotto dai Romani con le colonie.”
As to the geographical dispersion of the sites in the area (cf. fig. 7.9), Guidobaldi argues that the territory of the colony of Hatria was free of vici, and that in turn the concentration of vici is highest in the mountainous area (established by Thiessenpolygons) around Interamna.\textsuperscript{196}

The better arable area to the east however is free of vici again, which would point to the assignment of these areas to Roman colonists. This would be confirmed by the location of a dedication to Apollo, a colonial god \textit{par excellence}, in archaic Latin in this area.\textsuperscript{197} In short: the mountainous, internal areas would have been left to the indigenous Praetutii, whereas the Roman colonists took the plains, and thus the better parts.\textsuperscript{198}

Guidobaldi thinks that the survival and even flourishing of some (pre-Roman) vici in Roman times in contrast to others can be related to individual agency and the “carattere non univoco del processo di romanizzazione”.\textsuperscript{199} In this respect, she seems to adopt a centre-periphery perspective, in stating that the sites near the centre of

---

\textsuperscript{196} GUIDOBALDI 1995, 186.  
\textsuperscript{197} \textit{CIL} I\textsuperscript{2}, 384. Cf. SUSINI 1965-66.  
\textsuperscript{198} GUIDOBALDI 1995, 187, 249.  
\textsuperscript{199} GUIDOBALDI 1995, 247.
Interamna were most heavily hit by the Roman viritim assignations, whereas further away in the hinterland these sites could continue. Campovalano, where a Praetutian settlement ceases to exist in the course of the second century BC, would be an example.

This last settlement however was, as far as we know, not a vicus in the strict sense. The two securely attested vici in this area on the other hand do not present themselves as pre-Roman settlements: on the contrary. For site 2 (Località Case Lanciotti-Masseria Nisii) the inscription gives a date of 55 BC, the materials could date some earlier, back to the second century BC, and not earlier. The other site (5), the vicus Stramentarius, has yielded some pre-Roman materials but the formation of the settlement proper is dated to the second century BC. Even the inclusion of sites 6, 7, and 8 that could represent vici in spite of the lack of decisive evidence, does not change the picture: these date to the Republican period as well, especially the second and early first centuries BC. The image of these vici as the remnants of pre-Roman settlement can thus be seriously questioned; it seems much more probable that the vici represent the outcome of processes that started after the Roman interference.

2) The question is, what kind of processes? Once the idea of vici as pre-Roman survivals is discarded, we should ask ourselves what these vici represented. Were they related to the colonisation of the ager Praetutianus, and if so, in what way? Were they connected to the Latin colony of Hatria, founded 289–286 BC, and largely made up of colonists? Or should we rather see these vici as late installations (second to first centuries BC, and later), associated with different organisational actions? After all, at least theoretically, one could see the vici also as the restructuration of the autochthonous population in a different form (e.g. forced migration).

It is here that Guidobaldi’s observation with regard to the perceived location outside the territory of the colony of Hatria of the vici deserves attention. As we have seen, it does not seem possible to consider this spatial configuration as a proof of the persistence of pre-Roman settlements: they were all of Roman date. Also the idea that these persisting autonomous vici depended juridically on the praefectura of Interamna cannot be accepted without scruple, even if we admit that the sites were ‘Roman’ instead of ‘indigenous’.

---

200 Immediately after the Roman conquest, Interamna would have been made conciliabulum, “un luogo di riunione dei Romani cives optimo iure, assegnatari di lotti individuali sulle terre confiscate ai Pretuzi”. The Praetutti would have received partial rights (sine suffragio) in change for the confiscations, but already with the installation of the tribus Velina in 241 BC they received the civitas optimo iure (GUIDOBALDI 1995, 219; cf. HUMBERT 1978, 238-421, 378 n. 66, and 386-390).

201 Cf. M.G. Celuzza in CARANDINI, CAMBI, CELUZZA and FENTRESS 2002, 108-110, for this suggestion for the territory of Cosa.

202 GUIDOBALDI 1995, 247. On the Roman installation of Interamna cf. HUMBERT 1978, 239, who states that an urbanisation process can be discerned in the installation of Interamna. “Le nom d’Interamnia, typiquement latin, prouve qu’il s’agit, dans un milieu rattaché au groupe linguistique du Sud-Picenum, d’une creation juridique romaine. Une allusion de Frontin le confirme : hoc conciliabulum fuisse fertur et postea in municipii ius relatum (De contr. p. 19L); on peut donc suivre L. Ross Taylor qui fait naître le conciliabulum de l’installation romaine” (citing TAYLOR 1960, 84).
First of all, the relation between the *vici* and the colony: it is true that the sites interpreted as *vici* by Guidobaldi are largely located in the area further west of Hatria, in the inlands. The two certain *vici* lay indeed outside the territory of Hatria as indicated by Guidobaldi. But the *vicus Stramentarius* (site 5) seems to be located within the possible territories of Truentum (according to Guidobaldi), or the Roman colony (290–286 BC) of Castrum Novum (according to Toynbee). If we moreover accept that sites 6 (Contrada S. Rustico) and 7 (Cellino Vecchio), where in both cases *magistri* were active, indeed represent *vici*, at least site 7 seems to have been located within the territory of Hatria, and site 6 could have been as well. The problem here is that the exact territory of Hatria in the Republican period is unknown, and has been reconstructed on the basis of various indirect indications, or alternatively with the use of Thiessenpolygons. Thus, even site 8, Vico-Ornano (Comune di Colledara) would according to Humbert fall within the territory of Hatria. Here, the three names, presumably belonging to officials, and the toponym could suggest (but not prove) the presence of a *vicus* as well.

A direct relation between the *vici* (sites 2, 5 and perhaps 6, 7) and the *praefectura* at Interamna can therefore not be established for all sites; only site 2 lies undeniably in Interamna’s territory, and perhaps site 6 as well. I would argue that on the basis of this dataset it is not possible to determine a distinct pattern of settlement of *vici* surrounding the *praefectura* on which they would have depended as opposed to the territories occupied by the colonies. At the same time, it seems impossible to establish a direct relation between *vici* and the colony of Hatria, apart perhaps from site 7, which could be a *vicus* of the second century BC, and to a lesser extent the uncertain *vici* of sites 6 and 8.

Therefore, we may conclude that the data now at hand on the *vici* in the *ager Praetutianus* cannot be associated with one particular and exclusive organisational structure. It is possible that the *vici* actually acted quite autonomously, and had their own responsibilities and/or territorial authority on some administrative or juridical level, but were at the same time on other levels tied to one or more centres. Because of the unclarity in this respect, it becomes even harder to guess who the actual inhabitants were.

---

203 According to Strazzulla 2006, 89 for example the site would be “da situarsi nel territorio di Hatria”.

204 The extension of the territory of the colony is established by Guidobaldi by using Thiessenpolygons, which obviously leaves space for interpretation (cf. the remarks on Thiessenpolygons in Chapter 4). On the basis of the map of Toynbee, site 6 would be located just over the edge of the colonial territory (apparently the river Mavone). The territories of colonies are mostly established by the inferences of ancient descriptions and inscriptions with *tribus* indications. In the case of Hatria, Plinius states (*HN* 3.110) that the river Vomanus forms the north boundary. *CIL* IX, 5051 proving from Basciano, on the right bank of the river, mentions the hatrianic *tribus Maecia*, but further upstream Interamna’s territory would “ohne Zweifel auf das rechte Ufer hinübergegriffen [haben], wie auch die heutige Diöcese” (Beloch 1926, 555-556). However, Pliny seems to be mistaken on the southern boundary, which weakens his general credibility or accuracy. In any case, these are all fairly late testimonia, and do not necessarily reflect the extension of the territory in the Republican period.

205 Humbert 1978, 239 n. 131, writing on *CIL* IX, 5048 (from Vico-Ornano): “Sur le territoire de la colonie latine d’Hadria, un collège de *IIIviri* apparaît également à la tête d’un *vicus*. ”
of these *vici* were. However, the conclusion we may draw with some confidence is that the *vici* of the *ager Praetutianus* represented new institutions, installed after the Roman conquest. Moreover, the distinction between *vici stricto sensu* and undefined villages may help to better explain differences in the changing pattern of settlement, for example the decline of some sites and the flourishing of others – i.e. the new *vici*.  

**Case 4. The Rural *Vici* near the Fucine Lake**

In the Abruzzese mountains of Central Italy there are other examples of rural *vici*, documented as early as the end of the third and the second century BC. Although the archaeology is generally less rich than in the *ager Praetutianus*, the epigraphical record is instead especially revealing – or at least tantalising.

In modern Abruzzo, at the southern shores of the Fucine lake, rural *vici* demonstrate self-consciousness by their proper names, magistrates and cult places. The character of these *vici* is hinted at by the titles and names of their magistrates, and moreover by the identity of their gods. The *vici* are often coined ‘Marsic’ because of their alleged location within Marsic territory. Indeed, the Fucine *vici* are the only ones that at least in the traditional reconstruction of the territories in Italy lay outside Roman or Latin territory. The Latin colony of Alba Fucens lies to the northwest of the lake (fig. 7.10).

An *Aninus vecus* (*vicus Aninus*) is known to us by a dedication to *Valetudo* made by this *vicus* in the early first century BC. Another village, the *vicus Petinus* is documented in the act of dedicating a statue to an unknown deity. This should have taken place already at the end of the third century BC. For a later period moreover, a *vicus F(i)staniensis* is recorded. There is evidence to suggest yet another *vicus* at Colle Mariano – Spineto, although this cannot be established with certainty. The most impressive evidence comes from the *vecos Supinas* or *vicus Supinum* however. A dedication of a statue to Victoria on behalf of this *vecos Supinas* documents both the *vicus* and a sanctuary of Victoria as early as the end of the third century BC. Moreover, the officials are indicated with name and title: *queistores*. Perhaps epigraphical evidence of other cults found in this area can be related to this *vicus* too.

---

206 It has to be said that only thanks to Guidobaldi’s excellent work, it is possible to criticise the general framework. Moreover, it should be underscored that although predating Tarpin’s book, her work in some respects paves the way for the deconstruction of the traditional conception of the so-called *pagus-vicus* system. It may indeed seem that her data and interpretations fit much more comfortably within a ‘Roman’ perspective on *vici*: actually Guidobaldi is prone to explain the installation of sanctuaries and villages in light of Roman influence, cf. e.g. GUIDOBALDI 1995, 249, 261, 276, and the perhaps somewhat uncomfortable combination, on p. 210, of colonial production of temple-decoration related to indigenous *vici*: “documenti archeologici ... consentono infine di ritenere di produzione atriana almeno la decorazione accessoria dei templi che tra il II e la prima metà del I secolo a.C. sorgono nel territorio pretuzio al di fuori di veri e propri centri urbanizzati e spesso in rapporto con *vici*, la più vistosa sopravvivenza del tipo di popolamento indigeno.”

207 *CIL* IX, 3813 (*CIL* I², 391); Ve. 228; LETTA and D’AMATO 1975 no. 111; cf. LETTA 2001, 151.

208 *AE* 1953, 218.

209 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, no. 131 (pp. 218-220).

210 *CIL* IX, 3849 (*CIL* I², 388).
Fig. 7.10. Location of the vici south of the Fucine lake (the location of the vicus Petinus is unclear).

1. The Aninus vecus or vicus Aninus

A *vicus Aninus* is recorded by an inscription on a basis found in the 19th century at Castelluccio, now part of the village of Lecce dei Marsi. The text reads *Aninus vecus / Valetud[e] / donum / dant.* 211 The dedication to the goddess Valetudo seems to date to the second or beginnings of the first century BC. 212 The existence of the *vicus* under Tiberius is attested by a dedication to its inhabitants called *vicales Annini.* 213 Moreover, together with the *Aninus vecus* inscription an earlier dedication to Valetudo was found. 214 This inscription, now lost, was according to Mommsen written with ‘litteris vetustissimis’, and may date at least as early as the second century BC. 215

211 *CIL* IX, 3813 (= *CIL* F, 391); Ve. 228; LETTA and D’AMATO 1975 no. 111. An interesting element of the text is that *vecus* is the subject of the plural *dant*, which underscores the meaning of *vicus* as a designation of the community of inhabitants: LETTA 2001, 151.

212 LETTA 2001, 151; according to TARPIN 2002, IV.22.1: “IIe siècle av. J.-C.”


214 *CIL* IX, 3812 (= *CIL* F, 390); LETTA 2001, 151.

Ch. 7. Pagi, Vici and Sanctuaries

Adele Campanelli recognised the cult place of Valetudo in the sanctuary that she excavated near Lecce dei Marsi, along the river Tavana.\textsuperscript{216} This is indeed the place where the Tiberian dedication on behalf of the \textit{vicales Annini} was found, but the dedications to Valetudo were retrieved in Lecce itself, in the quarter Castelluccio, in a place corresponding to the remains of the \textit{Sancti Martini in Agne} church, which preserves the name of the \textit{vicus}.\textsuperscript{217} Slabs of calcareous stone, tuscanic capitals and column drums are documented here, and Grossi locates the \textit{vicus Aninus} in this place.\textsuperscript{218} The cult place excavated by Campanelli might thus have been a rural cult place related to the \textit{vicus Aninus}, but was probably not dedicated to Valetudo, who was venerated in the \textit{vicus} itself.\textsuperscript{219} The \textit{vicus} possibly took its name from the gens name \textit{Annius}, i.e. ‘the \textit{vicus} of the \textit{Annii}’.\textsuperscript{220} This name is quite common and cannot attest to a Marsic origin of the family. Although it might seem reasonable to assume, it is not sure that the \textit{vicus} already existed as such before the Social War.\textsuperscript{221}

2. The \textit{vicus Petinus}

A dedication of a statue to an unknown deity was “trouvée en 1878 au lac Fucin”,\textsuperscript{222} and can be dated to the late third century BC. The inscription was made on a bronze sheet with a hole in it, and was apparently meant to be attached to something, perhaps the base of a small ex-voto.\textsuperscript{223} The dedication of a statue (\textit{seino > signum}) documents a situation similar to that of the \textit{vicus Supinum} (cf. infra).

The (reconstructed) text reads:

\begin{verbatim}
\end{verbatim}

The reconstruction of the text is not easy, but according to Letta text A and text B (on the other side) were similar: perhaps text B was not considered good enough by the epigrapher. According to Letta “il significato generale dell’unica dedica contenuta nei

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{216} Campanelli 1991.
\footnote{217} Grossi 1988, 120, 124 = no. 19 with n. 44 and no. 20.
\footnote{218} Grossi 1988, 120 n. 44, estimating a rather small area for the settlement, about one hectare. Apparently, however, on the basis of the location of necropoleis around it, which date to the late Republican / imperial period: “Il \textit{vicus} era di dimensioni moderate, circa un ettaro, dato che le necropoli sembrano circondirlo …”. For the location: “Il \textit{vicus Aninus} era posizionato sul sito dell’attuale quartiere di Castelluccio di Lecce dei Marsi fra i torrenti Tavana e S. Emma, alla base del colle di Cirmo.” Grossi thinks that the \textit{vicus Aninus} in the third and second centuries BC was linked to the hillfort of Cirmo (where black gloss ceramics attest to Hellenistic presence), which he recognises as the “Ocre di Cirmo (Ocri anninas?)” in map VI on p. 125, a suggestion to be treated with caution.
\footnote{220} Cf. Letta 1997a, 333 n. 41; for the rural sanctuary also Grossi 1988, 124 = no. 20.
\footnote{221} Cf. on the date of the inscription supra n. 212.
\footnote{223} Letta and D’Amato 1975 no. 188, p. 321-328.
\footnote{224} Letta and D’Amato 1975 no. 188, 321-328 (on the basis of the idea that sides A and side B were similar).
\end{footnotes}
due testi appare abbastanza chiaro: si tratta dell’erezione di un signum a una divinità da parte di due magistrati del vecus Petinus.”225 The two upright strokes (II) at the end of B line 2, where the sheet is broken, seem to refer to a number, rather than to an E of the praenomen of the patronymic formula (that would thus be located after the tria nominia).226 Between the names of the (supposed) magistrates and the genitive veci Petini one would expect the title of the magistrates: the II would thus refer to the function the persons mentioned fulfilled: II[viri]. A parallel for these duumviri would, according to Letta, be represented by the queistores mentioned in a dedication from the vicus Supinum (cf. infra). These queistores would only be Latin in title, but not in function, whereas here in the vicus Petinus “l’adeguamento ai modelli romani appare più completo”, perhaps due to a slightly later date of the inscription or different developments and local reactions to “l’influsso romano”.227 The duumviri attested here would thus have been local magistrates of the Marsic vicus, inspired by Roman titles. The credibility of this suggestion will be discussed below.228

The name Setmius (= Septimius) is common but may originate from Latium.229 This is the first appearance of the name in the Marsic area. Later Septimii are recorded in the area at S. Benedetto,230 in Marruvium,231 and, three times, in Alba Fucens.232 Caisius or Ceisius is attested in only one other inscription in the area, found not far from Trasacco, perhaps dating to the first half of the second century BC and mentioning a liberta.233

The name Petinus is difficult to explain, but may refer to a gentilician name (cf. supra on the vicus Aninus). Letta proposes to resolve Consentes for Cosn indicating the deities to which the statue was dedicated.234 Because the precise find spot of the inscription is unknown, no archaeology can be related to it.

3. The vicus F(i)staniensis

From a place between Trasacco and Luco comes a funerary inscription, apparently dating to the imperial period (d M s / C. Mario Placido lega / to vic i Fstanien / sis.Maria Fortu / nata.coniuci incom / parabili cum quo vi / xit.annis.XXX.et C.Mari /

---

225 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 325.
227 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 326.
228 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 196, commenting on the queistores of the vicus Supinum, see the duoviri of the vecus petinus even as “una conferma delle radici locali di questa magistratura (scil. dei queistores del vecos supinas)”.
230 CIL IX, 3748.
232 CIL IX, 3947, 4026, 4030.
233 CIL IX, 3817 = LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 328-330 no. 189, found near Trasacco (“loc. Mole Secche, al confine con Collelongo”). Cf. LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 233 no. 139, for the form Caesianus.
234 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 326.
us Placidus.patri pi / entissimo.b m.pi.r.) Letta locates the vicus at contrada Passarano, at the border between the modern municipalities of Trasacco and Luco. Here, amongst other things, votive materials were found and black gloss wares indicate that the area was frequented in the Hellenistic period. As to the name Fistaniensis or Estaniensis (the reading is not sure); this does not seem to refer to Marsic local toponymy or onomastics either. An Estanius is known from Vestine Furfo, i.e. probably another vicus, whereas a Fistanus appears in Interamna (Teramo). The late date of the epigraphical evidence precludes, in spite of the Hellenistic archaeological material, secured conclusions on the Republican situation.

4. The ‘vicus’ of Colle Mariano – Spineto

Although there is no epigraphical evidence for a proper vicus, the archaeological / epigraphical complex found at Colle Mariano – Spineto, not far from Supinum, could be relevant. Two and a half km SSW from Trasacco, a dedication to Hercules was found that can be dated to the end of the third or the beginning of the second century BC. It reads C(aius) Atieius / T(iti) f(ilius) Hercol(e). Grossi recognises a ‘vicus’ and a sanctuary here; remains of the podium and column bases have been found. Black gloss ceramics dating to the third century were retrieved. Furthermore, anatomical ex-voto’s were found. Grossi argues that two other inscriptions found in the territory of Trasacco in the 19th century belong to this sanctuary. One inscription mentions mag(istri) He(rculis) restoring elements of a theatre and organising ludi scaenici.

---

235 CIL IX, 3856; LETTA and D’AMATO 1975 no. 131. (b m.pi.r is unclear, perhaps an error by the epigraphist for b(ene) m(erenti) p(osu)<e=I>r(unt)).
236 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 220 n. 7; also an archaic bronze statuette was found. Cf. GROSSI 1991, 215 n. 41 for “resti pavimentali in cocciopesto decorato da tessere di calcare, numerosi frammenti di ceramica a vernice nera”. Grossi suggests that the vicus had an internal cult area that was perhaps dedicated to Hercules, but it is unclear on what grounds. Cf. GROSSI 1980, 136 for “resti di un fondo di capanna” and impasto ceramics.
237 CIL IX, 3542: possibly from the vicus Furfensis.
238 CIL I², 1905; cf. the origin of other similar names in the Sabine and Campanian areas in LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 219.
239 The fact that apparently a legatus vici is attested is confusing, since normally legati are documented only for colonies and municipia, and this case has been explained as an exception: LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 219 (“forse in relazione ad eventi straordinari”).
241 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975 no. 137: loc. Colle Mariano or Maiorano (= CIL I², 2873b).
242 GROSSI 1988, 113 n. 26: “Si tratta di un grande santuario dedicato ad Ercole con insediamento italico-romano affiancato, situato ai fianchi di una strada antica posta sul versante est del Rio Carnello (ora detta ‘Via Pecorale’) e che metteva in comunicazione il santuario col vicus Fistaniensis. Alla necropoli relativa alla strada appartengono due stele sepolcrali ... Del santuario sono visibili resti di podio in opera quadrata, lastre modanate, basi di colonne in calcare ed una grande cisterna circolare ... A nord della cisterna, su un’area di 0,5 ettari, si rinvennero numerosi ex-voto fittili relativi a parti anatomiche, statue femminili ed animali, piattelli e coppette a vernice nera di III sec. a.C.”
243 CIL IX, 3857.
whereas another records *ma(gistri)* involved in the painting of a *scaenam*. Yet another dedication to Hercules (*Herclo I[ovio?]*) was found on Colle S. Martino, but this should, according to Grossi, not be related to a possible sanctuary on that Colle but rather to the sanctuary at Spineto, just as the other inscriptions. This epigraphical-archaeological complex should, of course, not be listed under the attested *vici*. However, if the early Latin inscription indeed originates from the same complex where black gloss ceramics and anatomical ex-voto’s were found, then it cannot be excluded, in view of the later attested *magistri*, that this village also had the status of *vicus*.

5. The *vecos supinas* or *vicus Supinum* and its sanctuaries

Near modern Trasacco, “vicino al lago di Fucino”, an inscription was found that records a dedication of a *seinom > signum* to Victoria by a *vecos Supinas*. The text, inscribed in a parallelepipedal block with a height of 0.875 m reads: *vecos Sup(i)n[a(s) / Victorie seinom(m) / dono dedet / lub(en)s mereto / queistores / Sa(lvius) Magio(s) St(atti) f(ilius) / Pac(ios) Anaiedio(s) St(filius) [f(ilius)]*. The characters date to the late third century BC or the beginning of the second century BC. The origin of the name of the *vicus* is not clear. It is possible to argue that it developed from a local toponym, or from a *gens* name (for example *Supni* and *Supnai* are attested at Volterra) or the Latin word *supinus*. The *vicus* has been convincingly recognised in the modern centre of Trasacco, where in front of the modern Municipio remains of a settlement have been found, amongst which a column drum and a capital.

*Victoria*

Several cult places are attested for this *vicus*, located in or near the *vicus*, probably near the shore of the lake, where the inscriptions have been found. In the first place a sanctuary to Victoria, which is not only attested by the already mentioned dedication of a statue, but also by another inscription of later date, probably the second half of the
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244 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975 no. 143; according to Letta this must refer to the Republican period, not later than the mid first century BC. For the relation to the ‘*vicus*’ at Colle Mariano – Spineto, see also LETTA 2001, 152.

245 *Titus* Vareci[o(s)] / Herclo / I[ovio(?)] / donom [ded(et?)] / [lub(en)s / mereto / queistores / Sa(lvius) Magio(s) St(atti) f(ilius) / Pac(ios) Anaiedio(s) St(filius) [f(ilius)]. LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 224-228 no. 135: Loc. La Mária, c.q. Colle S. Martino (= CIL I², 2873c).

246 GROSSI 1988, 113 n. 26 (rejecting Letta’s [LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 225] earlier proposal for location of the sanctuary at the hilltop).

247 Rossi cited in LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 192.

248 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975 no. 128. Cf. supra for a *seinom* (LETTA and D’AMATO 1975 no.188), in a dedication from the *vicus Petinus*, also dating to the end of the third century BC.

249 CIL IX, 3849 (= CIL I, 388). It reads *seinq(nom)* or *seinom(m);* see LETTA 1979, 404-405, for the former but cf. LETTA 2005a, 55-58, who now does not exclude *seinom(m).* For the dative in –e see the index in CIL I, on page 818, cf. also CIL I, 2631 from Veii. See for monophtongisation of –ai / ae now ADAMS 2007, 78-88.

250 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 198-199 (Letta prefers a local toponym).

251 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 205.

252 Although in secondary deposition, reused in a stable. LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 204-205.
second century BC. In this inscription the dedication of a donum to Victoria by one or two persons is recorded, who may have been magistrates but may also have acted on personal instigation (on this inscription cf. infra). The cult of Victoria is the only one that can be related to the vicus Supinum with certainty; in the other inscriptions found in the territory of Trasacco no mention of a vicus is made. However, even if the other cults cannot be related to the vicus with confidence, they could be relevant for the discussion as well.

Apollo

Also from the territory of Trasacco (loc. Madonella) comes a votive basis with an inscription that reads C. Cisiedio(s) / Aplone / ded(et). On the basis of the characters the inscription can be dated to the end of the third century BC. The dedication is the first appearance of the cult of Apollo in the Marsic area.

Fucinus, Hercules

In the territory of Trasacco, i.e. not far from the vicus Supinum other cults are documented as well. A Latin inscription from loc. Pretaritta or Polaritti of the late third century BC lists three men who dedicate an altar to the deified lake, Fucinus. (St(atios) Staiedi(os) / V(ibios).Salviedi(os) / Pe(tro) Pagio(s) / Fougno / aram). Possibly, this is a private dedication, rather than a formal public action. A cult related to the Fucinus is attested for later periods too. Also from the territory of Trasacco, but possibly belonging to the ‘vicus’ in the territory of Trasacco at Colle Mariano – Spineto are the (also early) dedications to Hercules (cf. supra).


The appearance of this set of early Latin inscriptions at the Fucine lake is as striking as the interpretation is complicated. A precise understanding of the dedications is rendered difficult by a variety of circumstances. First there is of course discussion on the reading and interpretation of the texts on an epigraphical and linguistic level. But also the relation between the texts is difficult to establish, especially since the precise places of origin of most inscriptions are unknown, and we have to rely on often rather approximative testimonies. After the first commentary on (part of) the group by Emilio Peruzzi, Cesare Letta has edited and interpreted the texts in relation to historical and
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253 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975 no. 129 = CIL IX, 3848 (= CIL F, 387).
254 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975 no. 129bis = CIL F, 2873a.
255 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975 no. 134 = CIL IX, 3847 (= CIL F, 389).
256 CIL IX, 3656; and CIL, IX 3887: Onesimus Aug(usti) lib(ertus) / proc(urator) / fecit imaginibus et / Laribus cultoribus / Fucini; cf. LETTA 2001, 150 for the interpretation ‘… and for the Lares that protect the Fucinus’.
257 PERUZZI 1962.
archaeological data, and together with additional topographical indications by amongst others Giuseppe Grossi it seems possible to outline some options for an explanation.\footnote{LETTA and D’AMATO 1975; GROSSI 1988.}

Letta, who already started publishing on the texts in the early 1970s, has furnished more wide-reaching interpretations of the texts as a group too. Especially his contention that they would form an indication of the ‘precocious’ romanisation of the Marsi is of importance here. In the course of the years Letta has revised or adapted some of his original ideas. In general though, Letta’s work is characterised by the notion that romanisation in the Marsic area, even if precocious, did not affect local Italic institutions at all levels, and often did so only in name, not in substance. As to the cults documented by epigraphy, he argues that almost none can be linked to Roman influence: they would rather relate to indigenous Italic roots, or direct Greek or Etruscan influence (esp. from Campania).\footnote{LETTA and D’AMATO 1975 passim, LETTA 2001, 145: “A questa rapida e precoce romanizzazione culturale sul piano linguistico, onomastico, istituzionale e militare non sembra corrispondere un processo analogo sul piano religioso. Al contrario, la nutrita serie di dediche a varie divinità databili ad età anteriore alla Guerra Sociale tradisce la presenza di forti influenze greche, per le quali nella maggior parte dei casi si può escludere una mediazione romana.”}

Indeed there are often indications of Greek / Etruscan / Campanian influence rather than a direct ‘Roman’ role in the process. Moreover, a non-Roman emphasis is also justified in the context of the Romanocentric academic discourse which has dominated the writing of Roman history. But it might be that, also in light of specifications subsequently made by the Abruzzese scholar himself, in some instances possible ‘direct’ Roman influence has been downplayed.\footnote{‘Direct’ is used here as indicating the presence of new institutions and/or people connected to Latin / Roman colonisation / rule, in opposition to the idea of ‘self-romanisation’ of indigenous Marsi.} Elaborating on the ideas put forward by Tarpin,\footnote{TARPIN 2002, 56-63.} here questions of magistrature, onomastics and especially the cults will be reviewed.

Mimic or Roman magistrates? The *queistores* of the *vicus Supinum*

The magistrates named in the dedication to Victoria on behalf of the *vicus Supinum* (*CIL* IX, 3849 = I² 388) are in the nominative. According to Letta they are nevertheless to be understood as eponymous, since no *faciundum curaverunt* or *locaverunt* follows their names.

Letta sees a parallel in an inscription also found at Trasacco that dates somewhat earlier, in the second half of the third century BC.\footnote{LETTA 1979; *CIL* I², 2873d: *Q(ua)estur*es? / *V(ibius)* *S*alv[i(os)] / *M(arcus)* *Paci(os) / P*et[ro] *C(e)rvi(os).} Here, the word *qestur* is followed by three names. Letta discerns an eponymous use of the two *q(ua)estur(es?)*, that would refer to the two first names: *V*ibios) *Salv*[i(os)] and *M*arcos) *Paci(os) The last person, who is separated from the remainder of the text by a blank line, would have dedicated the object.\footnote{LETTA 1979, 406-410.}
Another parallel would be the third century BC sheet from Antinum (Vetter 223), where one or probably two meddices are recorded dedicating to Vesuna. Here, a cetur > censor (or quaestor or even centurio) perhaps figures in the same eponymous sense (pa.ui.pacuies.medis / vesune.dunom.ded / ca.cumnios cetur).

This eponymous interpretation of the Supinate queistores, being a nominative, has important consequences: Letta argues that it testifies to a ‘survival of indigenous models in the first phases of romanisation’, because meddices are used in the Italic world in an eponymous sense in the nominative. In other words, the queistores would be Roman in title, but actually hide Italic institutions, perhaps indeed a college of meddices, as Letta suggests.

In a later publication, Letta opts for a slightly different interpretation, but still emphasises the Marsic or Italic character of the magistrates. In his view, the sheet of Antinum and the Supinum inscription would neatly reflect the Marsic political organisation: Letta recognises in the cetur a magistrate on the level of the nomen. The centurio or *centuriator (in the sense of centuriare, dividing the people in arms in centuriae) would have adopted his title from Roman models, but actually be the supreme magistrate of the Marsic federation. This federation was made up, according to Letta, of oppida governed by meddices; the latter are also mentioned in the Antinum sheet.

One step lower in this Marsic hierarchy are the vici. Subordinated to the oppida, they had their own minor magistrates, the queistores, who are recorded at the vicus Supinum. The vici, although formally still under the jurisdiction of the oppida, would however demonstrate a search for some sort of autonomy. This would be indicated by the eponymous use of the quaestores, and the very fact that they chose to imitate such a typical Roman institution. In short, the queistores would have been magistrates of
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264 Cf. Letta 1997a and more general Letta 2005a, 48-54 with bibliography, in which Letta revises the ‘Italic’ aspects of the Caso Cantovios sheet from the sanctuary of Angitia at Luco (Ve. 228a = CIL I², 5); a dedication to the Dioscuri and Jupiter (Ve. 224), and the Antinum sheet in favour of a more Latin aspect.

265 Letta and D’Amato 1975, 195 n. 7. The inscriptions of Antinum and Supinum would reveal “una sopravvivenza di modelli indigeni nelle prime fasi della romanizzazione tra le guerre sannitiche e la Guerra Sociale: come ad Antinum l’eponimo è il censore (magistrato con denominazione forse romana), ma accanto ad esso figura ancora la magistratura italica del medis, così a Supinum vediamo dei queistores che, se sono romani nel nome, non sembrano esserlo nelle attribuzioni, giacché figurano non come semplici magistrati finanziari, ma come magistrati supremi ed eponimi.” Letta and D’Amato 1975, 195, referring also to the Iguvine Tablets, where in the third century “la moda romaneggianti” would have led to calling kvestur a local eponymous leader (but in Letta 1979, 410 n. 29 this eponymous interpretation is discarded). Cf. also Letta and D’Amato 1975, 326: “i queistores sembrano latini solo nel nome e nel carattere di collegialità uguale, ma non del tutto nelle attribuzioni.” See Campanile 1995 for a college of meddices attested at Messina.

266 Letta 2001, 144.


268 Letta 2001, 144-145. On 145: “appare sintomatico di una volontà di assimilazione culturale al modello romano, il fatto che per i vici si adottasse una magistratura squisitamente romana, sia nel nome (che è incompatible con la tradizione linguistica osco-umbra per la presenza della labiovelare qu-), sia nelle attribuzioni principalmente finanziarie.”
Ch. 7. Pagi, Vici and Sanctuaries

A local, Marsic political system, who only borrowed their title from Rome: a case of “mimesi culturale” according to Letta.269

Although this proposal is ingeniously constructed, a different interpretation seems possible. First, the identification of the cetur mentioned in the Antinum sheet as a Marsic federal leader is not certain. The appearance of this function does not need to be interpreted as a Marsic military grade ‘influenced’ by Rome. It seems possible that the cetur himself was actually part of a Roman intervention, controlling in some way the Marsic community still ruled by meddices. The fact that the name of the cetur, Cominius, is not found locally, but does appear in Rome and Campania, strengthens this thesis.270 The cetur could thus have been mentioned in this dedication in the sense of “in the presence of cetur C. Cominius”.271

Since the ‘Marsic’ inscriptions do not necessarily form a consistent group, this ‘Roman’ interpretation of the Antinum sheet would not necessarily mean that the vicus Supinum inscription has to be read in a ‘Roman’ light as well. But it would in any case mean that the cetur could not have had an eponymous function: he was no magistrate.

The other inscription from Trasacco with queistur > q(ua)estur(es?) (CIL I², 2873d) does not provide independent evidence for an eponymous use, and seems rather to have been interpreted as such in light of the Supinate inscription here under discussion (the endings of both names and title fail).

This means that the queistores in their supposed eponymous function are alone in Marsic territory. As a matter of fact, an eponymous function in the nominative is not documented elsewhere in Latin, neither in the Marsic area nor elsewhere. Only the eponymous Oscan meddices of the Samnites Pentri would form a parallel,272 but these seem not only geographically, but also culturally and institutionally remote from the vicus Supinum. I would suggest that the idea that the eponymous queistores form an unequivocal ‘indigenous element’ or ‘survival’273 is thus weakened significantly. Perhaps we should reconsider the possibility that a curaverunt vel sim. is omitted. In the dedication to Fougno found nearby and also dated to the late third century BC the

269 LETTA 1979, 410: at Supinum would thus be proved “l’esistenza, già verso la metà del III sec. a.C., di un collegio di magistrati supremi ed eponimi che ha preso a prestito il nome della magistratura ausiliaria romana dei questori, ha mutato cioè dalla cultura egemone un titolo, ma non le funzioni magistruali corrispondenti. Un esempio evidente di mimesi culturale ...”. For the view that the application of Roman titles is decisive in itself, see TARPIN 2002, 57: “Le titre même de questeur ne peut renvoyer qu’à une institution romaine.” This needs explanation however; the idea that Italic peoples adopted Roman magistratural titles in itself is generally accepted, cf. Chapter 1, and few will doubt that the kvaissturs and kenszurs mentioned in Oscan epigraphy functioned at least in some cases in Italic contexts.

270 LETTA 1997a, 324-325, suggesting the possibility of a Roman temporary garrison, or a special mission, perhaps linked to the taking of a census and/or the levy. Apparently Letta rejected this idea later in favour of the Marsic federal leader thesis (LETTA 2001, 144).

271 LETTA 1997a, 325.


273 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 194 n. 3: “a particolarità locale”, and some further, on p. 197 a “sopravvivenza indigena”.
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verb misses as well.\textsuperscript{274} If this is true, the \textit{queistores} could have had some role in the dedication in their function of controlling public money.\textsuperscript{275} Alternatively, they could have been mentioned in the same sense as the \textit{cetur} in Antinum may have been: ‘the \textit{queistores} saw to / were present at the dedication of a statue to Victoria by the \textit{vicus Supinum}.’\textsuperscript{276} Neither is it to be excluded that the \textit{queistores} were not magistrates of the \textit{vicus} but of another centre.\textsuperscript{277}

It should be underscored that a same case could be made for the \textit{vicus Petinus} where \textit{duumviri} are attested.\textsuperscript{278} It is not necessary to explain these \textit{a priori} as indigenous Marsic people aping only the titles from the Roman system. Indeed, the name \textit{Septimius} makes its first appearance in the Marsic area here, and it may originate in Latium.

The names of the inhabitants of the \textit{vicus Supinum}, and especially the \textit{queistores}, even if their exact role cannot be understood fully, could also shed further light on the \textit{vicus} and its context. Salvius is a praenomen that is common in Central Italy, not specifically the Marsic region.\textsuperscript{279} Also the praenomen Statius is quite generic in Central Italy, especially in the Oscan areas, and for the Marsic area is best attested at Supinum itself, and once outside the \textit{vicus} in nearby Collelongo.\textsuperscript{280} The gentilician name \textit{Magios} however seems to originate in Campania.\textsuperscript{281} The other \textit{queistor}, \textit{Pac(ios) Anaiedio(s) St(ati) [f(ilius)]}, was, according to Letta, an autochthonous Marsic person.

The praenomen Pacius is common in Central Italy, but the gentilician \textit{Anaedius} would be typically Marsic. However, the other attestation in Marsic territory is not certain,\textsuperscript{282} and the appearance of an \textit{Annaedius} in the so-called \textit{pagus Fificulanus} in the Vestine area cannot be used to stress the Marsic origin of the name.\textsuperscript{283} In conclusion, it may have been that at least one of the \textit{queistores} was not of Marsic origin.

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{274} Letta and D’Amato 1975 no. 134 = CIL IX, 3847 (= CIL I², 389), but it must be admitted that this is a different situation because in the Supinum inscription a verb is already present (\textit{dedet}).
\textsuperscript{275} Cf. Tarpin 2002, 57 n. 17.
\textsuperscript{276} Cf. already Peruzzi 1962, 129: “… è appunto per la solennità dell’occasione che questo titolo pubblico reca menzione dei questori.”
\textsuperscript{277} In the nearby Latin colony of Alba Fucens different \textit{quaestores} are attested for the imperial period. In general, it seems that the function (and number) of \textit{quaestores} in Latin colonies was not standardized: Salmon 1969, 86.
\textsuperscript{278} Cf. Guadagn o 2005 for a similar deconstruction of \textit{duoviri} in an Italic context.
\textsuperscript{279} Cf. Letta and D’Amato 1975, no. 37 (S. Benedetto); cf. pp. 47-48, examples from Vestine, Marrucine, Paelignian and Umbrian areas, cf. also on the archaic abbreviation \textit{Sa}.
\textsuperscript{280} Marsic area: three times attested in Supinum (the other two: Letta and D’Amato 1975 no. 129 and 134) and once in Collelongo (funerary inscription): Letta and D’Amato 1975 no. 160.
\textsuperscript{281} Letta and D’Amato 1975, 200; Schulze 1933.
\textsuperscript{282} An inscription from S. Benedetto, [--]anna[edius?]------ could be reconstructed this way (Letta and D’Amato 1975 no. 84).
\textsuperscript{283} Even if this place was no \textit{pagus} but perhaps rather a \textit{vicus}... CIL IX, 3572 (Paganica): apart from the suggestive toponym, no \textit{pagus} is attested here, a \textit{vicus} is however mentioned in CIL IX, 3574, which may come from this area.
A relation between the *vicus* and Alba Fucens is documented by the appearance of the same names. Especially the explicit mention of *Herennii Supinates* in or near the colony is striking and proves that there were direct contacts between the *vicus* and the colony.²⁸⁴

**Cults**

An important element that could help to assess the character of the *vici* on the shores of the Fucine lake regards the cults. As said, Letta argues that almost all cults attested in the early epigraphy from the Fucine area can be deduced to Campanian / Greek / Etruscan influences rather than direct Roman influence. In the dedication to Apollo, for instance, the syncopatic form *Aplone* instead of *Apolone*, which in Latin would have been normal, would indicate that the cult was adopted directly from the Greek / Etruscan sphere, especially Cuma, rather than from Rome. Letta indeed sees in this otherwise Latin inscription, a proof that the cult was not “una recente innovazione (cultuale e linguistica) romana, ma al contrario è un tratto conservativo, una sopravvivenza di culti già radicati nell’uso e nella lingua locali da più generazioni”.²⁸⁵

Equally, Letta argues that the cult of Hercules²⁸⁶ can be accounted for by Greek-Etruscan, rather than Roman influence, because in one of the inscriptions the form *Herclo I(ovio?)* appears, that could be explained only by Etruscan mediation.²⁸⁷

Indeed, according to Letta, “[q]uesto prova che la diffusione del culto di Ercole nella regione non fu dovuta a una mediazione culturale romana, ma si deve riportare, ... a contatti diretti stabiliti dalla transumanza con la Campania greco-etrusca”.²⁸⁸ Even the local god Fucinus appears to have been, in a secondary moment, reformulated or interpreted in a Greek sense.²⁸⁹

An analysis of the validity of the linguistic argumentation exceeds by far my competences, and therefore these observations will be accepted.²⁹⁰ I limit myself to

²⁸⁴ *CIL* IX, 3906, for an overview of the gens *Herennia* in relation to Alba Fucens cf. DEVIJVER and VAN WONTERGHEM 1981, cf. now DONDERER 1994 for the interpretation as a ‘Werbeschild’ for a stoncutters-workshop rather than a funerary or votive relief. Cf. also four other inscriptions in the territory of Alba (*CIL* IX, 3992-3994 and *Not. Scav.* 1911, 378), but also in Marruvium: *CIL* IX, 3717, 3728-3729, 3748). For other possibly Marsic families (Atiedii, Vettii, Pacuvii, Novii) attested in Alba, cf. LETTA 1972, 102-103. It can well be imagined that local Marsic people were included in the colony (cf. in general BRADLEY 2006, 171-177). On the other hand: one has inversely to be careful with stating that ‘autochthonous’ people were living in Latin colonies if the evidence for these families comes predominantly from (possible) *vici*... Indeed, it is not to be excluded that the analysis of onomastics and conclusions about their origins are in fact biased by the (often implicit) preconception that inscriptions found outside urban centres must relate to indigenous people.

²⁸⁵ LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 208. Letta suggests that Apollo was adopted amongst the Marsi “non più tardi del IV sec. a.C., provenendo da Cuma” (213).

²⁸⁶ Perhaps relating rather to the unknown ‘*vicus*’ at Colle Mariano – Spineto than to Supinum, cf. supra.

²⁸⁷ LETTA 2001, 152 : “spiegabile solo con una mediazione etrusca”.

²⁸⁸ LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 226.

²⁹⁰ Cf. CRAWFORD 1981 (reviewing a.o. LETTA and D’AMATO 1975), 158, who remarks that “the arguments used are fragile in the extreme” on the idea of Greek influence rather than Roman, esp. for Apollo.
some more general remarks on the conclusions that have been drawn on the outcome of the linguistic evidence. It is important to underscore that the processes of cultural change in Central Italy were complex, and that Greek and Etruscan or more generally Campanian influences were undoubtedly important. But this complexity should take into account the role of the Roman conquest of, and presence in, this area as well. In other words, ‘Roman’ influence in the political, military or administrative sense need not always look ‘Roman’ in a cultural sense. Roman influence may have been characterised often by the moving of different elements – and people – in different regions, more then by diffusing ‘Roman culture’, which is difficult to circumscribe, especially in this early period (but cf. infra).291 This means that the sudden appearance of new cults, even if ‘originally’ from other regions of Italy than Rome, could in some cases still have been related to ‘Roman’ influence.

For example, the Aplone dedication is the first attestation of the cult of Apollo in Marsic territory. Interestingly, Apollo was also venerated in Alba Fucens, in the temple of S. Pietro, which is dated to the second century BC.292 I think it would not be overadventurous to think that the cult of Apollo, associated with colonisation, made its appearance in this area together with the foundation of the colony of Alba Fucens in 303 BC. Indeed, the cult of Apollo was associated in Greek and Roman (or perhaps rather: Mediterranean) thought with colonisation.293 Moreover, the importance of the fact that the Aplone inscription is essentially in Latin should not be overlooked, even if the commissioner or the stone-cutter was not a native speaker of Latin, and/or knew Aplo from elsewhere than Rome.294 Apollo, surely not an exclusively Roman god, could in this context thus well have been related in some way to Roman influence in the area. What is more, in other cults of the Marsic area, a forthright Roman connotation might be recognised. Valetudo, to whom the vicus Aninus dedicated a sanctuary, has been regarded as a typical ‘Italic’ goddess by Letta.295 Giuseppina Prosperi Valenti has however argued – independently from the vicus discussion – that Valetudo should be understood as a typical Roman goddess – indeed in the same vein of the ‘divine virtues’ or ‘qualities’ of the third century in Rome.296 Valetudo is attested in Alba Fucens as well, albeit not for the

291 On the diffusion of material culture, cf. e.g. FREEMAN 1993 and here Chapter 1; on population movement SCHEIDEL 2004.
293 Cf. supra and following note.
294 See the dedication to Apollo found in the ager Praetutianus in archaic Latin, dated to the third / second centuries BC, made by a libertus (L. Opio C. l. / Apolene dono ded / mereto; CIL I², 384), and interpreted as a Roman colonial cult by GUIDOBALDI 1995, 186-187, 260; see also the pocola deorum discussed supra.
295 LETTA 1997a.
296 PROSPERI VALENTI 1998, esp. 61-75 on origins; according to whom, on p. 75, the goddess “sia da annoverare tra le numerose divinità del pantheon strettamente romano”.
Republican period. The *Dei Consentes* can perhaps better be related to Roman influence too.

Most clarifying in this discussion is Victoria, to whom the *vicus Supinum* made official dedications. Indeed, Victoria is extraneous to the Osco-Umbran pantheon, and appears only late in the second century BC or even at the beginning of the first century BC in the context of the Social War in Central Italy: in Oscan, Victoria is first attested at Pietrabondante (cf. Chapter 3). In Rome, the cult of Victoria is already established at least in the early third century BC on, when L. Postumius Megellus dedicates a temple to her on the Palatine during the Samnite Wars, in 294 BC.

Victoria can therefore surely best be understood as a ‘Roman’ introduction. At the same time, her appearance should not be seen as the straightforward exportation of a fixed, pre-existing Roman cult. Rather, the manifestation of Victoria should be understood against the background of both contemporary developments in Italy and local concerns of the *vicus Supinum* on the shores of the Fucine lake. On the one hand: her rise may have been inspired by earlier deities who were associated with her, like Vica Pota. This goddess takes her name from the same root as the word *vicus*, according to Aldo Prosdocimi. It is, then, not to be excluded that Victoria – Vica Pota had a specific meaning for the institution of the *vicus*. Suggestive in this regard is that in the Republican *Fasti Antiiates maiores* the festival of Vica Pota falls on January fifth, the last day of the *Compitalia*, the most important festival associated with the *vici* (cf. Chapter 9).

On the other hand, the concept / deity of Victoria seems to have been a very specific outcome of socio-political processes in Rome itself at the end of the fourth and the third centuries BC, leading to the popularity and indeed invention of divine qualities in this period. Confer, for example, the cult of *Salus* (Safety), to whom a temple was built too in this period. The dictator C. Junius Bubulcus dedicated this temple on the Quirinal in 302 BC, returning in triumph just eight days after the defeat of the Aequi.

-----

298 Even if adopting the Etruscan / Greek gods, the name and conception as such is very Roman: Long 1987, 235-243.
299 Interestingly, by then, *Víkturrai* seems to assume a strong anti-Roman connotation. La Regina 1966, 275 points out that the diffusion of the cult could have been facilitated by the spread of Romano-Campanian coin-types of the third century BC.
300 Liv. 10.33.9; cf. Hölscher 1967 for the special Roman character and the relation with Nike.
301 According to Luschi 1988 Victoria would actually hide a local Vacuna / Vesuna, through a process of *interpretatio*, but this suggestion can be discarded since no strong arguments are presented. Letta admits the Roman character of the deity, but explains the existence of “il santuario marso di Victoria” (LeTTA 1992, 115) as a result of the “alto grado di romanizzazione raggiunto già in quest’epoca dai Marsi”; the goddess would have been introduced in the wake of the Hannibalic War: Letta and D’Amato 1975, 204; cf. Letta 2005a, 54-55. If this is intended as a uniform process of ‘romanisation’ of the autochthonous Marsi, one may disagree: this could rather be a very local phenomenon, perhaps indeed restricted to the *vicus* itself (cf. discussion infra).
302 Vica Pota: *vincendi atque potiundi*: Cic. Leg. 2.28; Carandini 1997, 207-211.
303 PROSDOCIMI 1989, 491.
305 See e.g. Hölscher 1967; Fears 1981a; in general Fears 1981b and now Clark 2007.
who had revolted because the colony of Alba Fucens had been established within their borders in 303 BC.\textsuperscript{306} The temple had been vowed during the Samnite Wars,\textsuperscript{307} but an ideological link between the divine quality and the confiscation and colonisation of parts of the territories of the Aequi and the Marsi in this period could have been present. Interestingly, the specific ideological value of both Victoria and Salus appears from a passage in Livy (26.33.8). After the recapture of Capua in 211 BC only two people were found who had supported the Roman case: a certain Cluvia Pacula had secretly supplied food to the starving prisoners and another woman, Vestia Oppia of Atella, had proved her loyalty by sacrificing daily to the Salus and Victoria \textit{populi Romani}. The historicity of Livy’s account is of course hard to evaluate, but if it indeed goes back to the end of the third century BC, this explicit statement about the ideological value of both goddesses would be contemporary with the Supinate dedication to Victoria. Although an association with the possible ‘tutelary deity’ of the \textit{vicus} Vica Pota should not be excluded,\textsuperscript{308} I think in conclusion that the appearance of Victoria here should be seen primarily in the context of the new ‘divine virtues’ thriving in Rome at that time. In other words, just as Valetudo – ‘Health’ was venerated by the \textit{vicus Aninus}, the Roman value of ‘Victory’ was venerated as a deity in the \textit{vicus Supinum}.

To sum up, some of the supposedly ‘indigenous’ characteristics related to the Fucine inscriptions and especially the \textit{vicus Supinum} can be questioned. The \textit{queistores}, even if their precise role remains somewhat unclear, might seem better understandable as functionaries of a Roman / Latin political system than as those of a Marsic federation. It seems unnecessary to understand their presence in the dedication to Victoria in an eponymous sense, and this was the most important argument for an ‘indigenous’ character. Relations between Alba Fucens and the \textit{vicus Supinum} (and its environment) are documented by the recurrence of the same names in inscriptions. A relation with Alba Fucens is perhaps attested by the cults too. The early Latin dedication to the god Apollo, associated with colonisation, may be understood in this way. Other gods venerated in the \textit{vici}, such as Victoria and Valetudo belong to rather ‘Roman’ contexts. This begs the question of the nature of the relation between the Fucine \textit{vici} and Alba Fucens. A direct relation between colony and \textit{vici} is hard to sustain with the present evidence: the \textit{vici} are conventionally located on Marsic, i.e. allied territory that was incorporated in the Roman citizen body only after the Social War, and not on \textit{ager Romanus} or within the territory of the Latin colony.

\textsuperscript{307} Liv. 9.43.25.  
\textsuperscript{308} Cf. in general HÖLSCHER 1967, 137, and esp. 179, estimating the influence of Vica Pota on Victoria as minimal.
It should be borne in mind, however, that the factual evidence for reconstructing the territory of the colony, especially to the south, should not be overrated.\textsuperscript{309} Karl Julius Beloch, on whose efforts most scholars build, argues that the territory of Alba Fucens must have reached to the Fucine lake because of its name \textit{Fucens}, and inscriptions mentioning the Alban \textit{tribus Fabia} at Cese and south of Avezzano would indicate that it continued up to there.\textsuperscript{310} An inscription found at Lucus Angitia would indicate that this was Marsic territory, since the \textit{tribus Sergia} is mentioned.\textsuperscript{311} At least some inhabitants of the \textit{vicus Supinum} were inscribed in the \textit{tribus Sergia} too,\textsuperscript{312} and it has been concluded that the \textit{vici} were part of Marsic territory. However, this conclusion is less self-evident than it may appear. First, I would specify that at the most it indicates that the \textit{vicus Supinum} was placed in the same \textit{tribus} as the Marsic and Paelignian territories, at the moment that the inhabitants of the Fucine area were divided in \textit{tribus}, that is, after the Social War.\textsuperscript{313} In other words, it is difficult to imagine an ‘ethnic’ principle lying at the basis of this administrative distribution – in any way it cannot be used inversely to establish the ethnicity or original affiliation of certain places in an earlier period.\textsuperscript{314} Although I hesitate to make an affirmative statement in this regard, it follows at least that the original territory of the colony \textit{might} have included the \textit{vici} at the southern shores of the Fucine lake. In any case, their modern representation on maps within ‘Marsic territory’ does not reflect any factual juridical and historical evidence for the pre-Social War situation.

\textbf{The \textit{vicus} as a ‘new’ community}

The old Latin inscriptions around the Fucine lake have often been seen as evidence for the early romanisation of the area. Indeed Letta discerns a “processo inarrestabile di romanizzazione” which could, according to him, be distinguished in the gradual changes documented in epigraphy: the inscription of Antinum still presents the Marsic

\textsuperscript{309} The northern boundary is documented by inscribed stones mentioning explicitly the \textit{Albensium fines}: \textit{CIL IX}, 3929-3930, but these can probably be related to a new organisation of the territory in Hadrianic times, cf. \textsc{liberatore} 2001, 187 with further references.

\textsuperscript{310} BELOCH 1926, 552. \textit{CIL IX}, 3933 ("alla Cese"); \textit{CIL IX}, 3922: funerary inscription, found “ad viam consularem M p. ab Avezzano Lucum versus al sito Cerrito prope S. Mariam de Loreto”.

\textsuperscript{311} \textit{CIL IX}, 3894. On the use of \textit{tribus} indications for establishing territories cf. \textsc{van wonterghem} 1984, 28-29 (with map of the Marsic / Paelignian area); the maps of KIEPERT 1901 are based on the same principle, on which cf. \textsc{castagnoli} 1958, 37.

\textsuperscript{312} \textit{CIL IX}, 3906 (= \textit{CIL I²}, 1814).

\textsuperscript{313} Even the assertion that the \textit{tribus} indication in e.g. \textit{CIL IX}, 3906 relates to the \textit{vicus Supinum} proper is unjustified: as Giuseppe Forni has underscored, the \textit{tribus} did not belong to a city, but to the Roman citizens that were inscribed in it (Forni 1982). People belonging to different \textit{tribus} could and did live in the same place, and there are examples of different generations belonging to different \textit{tribus}; see \textsc{buonocore} 2003 with n. 22 (\textit{AE} 1964, 15-33; \textit{CIL IX}, 4967, with a father in the \textit{Collina} and a son in the \textit{Quirina}).

\textsuperscript{314} Rather, the division could perhaps be seen as a practical and ad hoc act undertaken in the wake of political and/or military developments, which sometimes coincided with ‘ethnic groups’. The grouping together of the Paeligni and Marsi in the same \textit{tribus} is seen by Mommsen as a punishment because this would restrict their electoral weight (Mommsen 1887, 105), but Taylor 1960, 113 thinks that the Romans respected (presumed) ethnic affiliations between Paeligni and Marsi.
language and onomastics, and a medis, but also already the Latin alphabet and the Roman name of cetur > censor.\footnote{LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 196-197. Following SALMON 1967, 90 with n. 3, that the censor is originally a Roman institution.} An intermediate stage would be formed by the inscription of the vicus Petinus (cf. supra), where the Latin onomastic system is applied, but the language would still have been fundamentally Marsic.\footnote{Cf. LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, no. 188.} Then, some 50 years later than the example of Antinum, Supinum would attest to the Latin language and the Latin onomastic system, as well as the Roman titles of the magistrates, who would however have functioned in the way ‘indigenous’ magistrates did rather than as Roman quaestores.\footnote{LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 196-197.}

It has been demonstrated, however, that one may problematise this reconstruction of a Marsic politico-juridical system. First, the inscriptions found around the Fucine lake do not need to form a homogeneous group, representing a uniform political system. Second, the reconstruction of parts of it is questionable. Especially, the interpretation of the cetur of the Antinum sheet as a Marsic federal leader can be challenged, as has been seen. Indeed, this person, bearing a non-local name, could be understood tentatively as a Roman magistrate who controlled or supervised the Marsic community.

This would also mean that the cetur was not used in an eponymous sense, which weakens the hypothesis that the queistores of the vicus Supinum were used as such. Indeed, as has been seen, it seems even possible that the queistores fulfilled a similar role as the Roman cetur from Antinum. Neither is it to be excluded that the queistores came from another (Roman or Latin) centre. Similarly, the possible duumviri of the vicus Petinus can just as well be related to Roman influence as to the adoption of Roman titles by indigenous Marsi.

In general, the idea that Roman magistratural titles were adopted by ‘indigenous’ peoples suspiciously reflects an idea of ‘self-romanisation’ or ‘emulation’ in which Roman culture is seen as superior and therefore adopted straightforwardly by ‘indigenous’ populations (cf. Chapter 1). However, it seems not logical in itself that the Italic peoples did adopt Roman titles already in the third century BC if there was no political need to do so.

As we saw in Chapter 6, Tarpin suggests that the institution of the vicus may have consisted of a small group of (Latin or Roman) citizens. In this respect the Marsic vici are especially problematic because they are located outside Roman / Latin territory, just south of the (perceived) territory of the Latin colony of Alba Fucens. Tarpin resolves the problem by arguing that there may have been a large portion of citizens there, and by positing at the same time a far-reaching romanisation of the Marsi (“romanisation rapide et intense”).\footnote{TARPIN 2002, 62. Cf. also p. 57: “les relations entre les élites marses et romaines semblent avoir été étroites et précoces.”} In this conception he follows Letta, who has
emphasised the ‘precocious romanisation’ of the Marsic area in many publications, as has been seen.\footnote{Cf. \textsc{letta} 1972, 101, talking of “la rapida e totale integrazione dei Marsi nel mondo romano”.
} Additionally, Tarpin seeks to resolve the problem by stressing that there might have existed good political relations between Marsi and Romans, which runs counter to Letta’s ideas.\footnote{\textit{Contra} \textsc{letta} 1972, e.g. 77, whom Tarpin accuses of not presenting solid evidence for a Roman-Marsic opposition (\textsc{tarpin} 2002, 60). I would however not be sure whether Appianus and Diodorus are more credible than Livy and the \textit{Fasti Triumphales Capitolini}.} Apparently, Tarpin tries to combine the romanisation of ‘indigenous’ Marsi with the placing of small groups of Latin or Roman citizens.\footnote{\textsc{tarpin} 2002, 62: “Qu’il ait eu romanisation rapide et intense, ne serait-ce que des élites, ou implantation de petites communautés romaines n’a guère d’importance : ce qui compte est que l’élément indigène n’apparaît que peu dans le contexte des \textit{vici} marses.” On the contrary, I think that, at least in the discussion under study here, this difference is highly important and interesting, but it may be that the (type of) evidence to prove one option or the other is simply not available to us.} But it is important to underscore that the two scenarios need not be interrelated: political relations must not have been intimate at the end of the fourth and first half of the third centuries BC, or elites must not have been ‘romanised’ thoroughly, before a community of Latin or Roman citizens could be installed.\footnote{This depends of course of the significance of the term ‘romanised’ (cf. Chapter 2), which seems to be used here as the adaptation to Roman customs at the expense of the own cultural traditions.} There is indeed evidence that the Marsic cohesion in this period was quite strong, as is documented for instance by their communal mint.\footnote{\textsc{la regina} 1970, 204.} But this does not preclude a situation in which a small group of Latin or Roman citizens was installed, or installed itself, in an area otherwise inhabited by sound indigenous (but admittedly not too belligerous) Marsi.

Therefore, I would argue that Marsic resistance and Roman influence need not be mutually exclusive – rather, I would say, on the contrary, which would reflect a common phenomenon in all historical periods.

In conclusion, what do we have at hand for establishing the character of the \textit{vici} around the Fucine lake? The magistrates found epigraphically indicate Roman models. In theory, this can be interpreted as indigenous Marsi adopting Roman forms, but perhaps more comprehensively as actions undertaken by Roman / Latin magistrates in or on behalf of these \textit{vici}. The language used is Latin, but apparently at least some of the stone-cutters / commissioners did not master this language well, or were influenced by regional or local influences.\footnote{On these processes, cf. \textsc{adams} 2007.} The names recurring on the Fucine inscriptions can only partly be connected to local families with some confidence. Some of the attested cults do not betray any ‘direct’ Roman influence, and point rather to different regions from Italy, whereas others relate clearly to Roman concepts. What image can be made of this heterogeneous dataset? Does it mean that Roman influence was minimal? Perhaps not. The point is that the effect of ‘Roman influence’ could just have consisted of that: the mixing of different Italian traditions as a consequence of the re-ordering and administration of the population of the Italian peninsula.
In a situation like this, I think most weight should be given to the ‘intentions’ or ‘aspirations’ that become clear from the record. In other words, we should perhaps not look for failures in ‘being Roman’, such as grammatical ‘errors’, but rather consider the fact that the people of these vici were apparently willing to appear ‘Roman’. At the same time however, it should be asked why these people were ‘assimilating’ to Roman or Latin culture. It does not seem reasonable to assume that Italic peoples in general were willing to assimilate if there was no political need to do so (cf. Chapter 1). In this context, I would propose considering the vici as new Roman / Latin communities that were ‘romanising’, just as Rome itself was ‘romanising’ in this period. These intentions come to the fore most clearly in the cults, and Victoria is exemplary. She was indeed quite ‘Roman’ with overtly political and military associations, which are documented firmly for the same period that the Supinate dedication was made. The installation of a cult to Victoria will have had heavy ideological connotations, especially in an area which was otherwise not yet ager Romanus.\(^325\) In fact, the evidence does not preclude the possibility that the vicus Supinum was a new foundation with new inhabitants, whilst autochthonous people may have been part of the newly installed vicus. If so, they may have functioned in the context of a new community, which had little relation to Marsic roots other than, perhaps, onomastics. This community, proudly boasting its own distinctive name, must, of course, not have been ‘Roman’ either; but the act of the installation of people, from different regions of Italy, perhaps including local people, who consequently (try to) write Latin and worship Victoria, is related to Roman control and strategies of dominion. I would therefore suggest that the vicus Supinum is best understood as a new, rather than ‘Roman’ or ‘Marsic’ community, that appeared, however, as a consequence of Roman imperialism. A similar case could be made for the vicus Aninus venerating Valetudo – indeed a goddess for whom, despite the scarcity of the sources, a connection to the same ideological context as Victoria does not seem preposterous.\(^326\)

If this ‘romanising’ interpretation of the ‘Marsic’ vici would prove true, this has implications for ideas on Roman control, colonisation and conceptions of the romanisation of Central Italy. Crucially, this would mean that Roman / Latin influence was not confined to (colonial) urban areas, but extended to rural areas as well, perhaps, as has been seen, even outside the swathes of incorporated land and colonial territories usually presumed.\(^327\)

\(^{325}\) Cf. BISPHAM 2000a, 10, on Victoria at Rome: “The worship of Victory becomes a key element in the religious identity of Rome; it shows Roman confidence, an appreciation of the fundamental changes being effected in the Italian peninsula by Roman arms.”

\(^{326}\) For example, Valetudo seems to be connected to Hygieia (CIL III, 7279, Athens: Aesculapio et Valetudini) and Salus (RRC no. 442), as well as Victoria (Mattingly-Sydenham, RIC, 1, no. 151): WEINSTOCK 1955, 267.

\(^{327}\) Cf. in this context the remarks by MOURITSEN 2007 on the civitas sine suffragio, but actually questioning (p. 158) the whole “visual conceptualisation of Roman expansion”, reflecting a combination of legal formalism and “a modern territorial concept of power”.  

---

**Ch. 7. Pagi, Vici and Sanctuaries**
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One of the most important results of this discussion on *vici*, in my opinion, is that we need not regard the whole corpus of archaeoalogical and epigraphical evidence as indicative of one roughly unitary development. As has been seen for the Marsic area, Letta posits a development from ‘early’ or ‘precocious’ romanisation and Latinisation in the third century BC, whereas a ‘rivendicazione’ of the indigenous Marsic roots is attested for the second century BC.\(^{328}\) Even if Letta carefully allows for local variations, on the whole the entire epigraphical corpus is thus fitted into one model. If it is accepted however that the *vici* represent rather isolated entities, possibly made up partly by foreigners, and probably incorporating some of the local population, but ‘Roman’ in constitution and administrative structure, this part of the epigraphical corpus has to be seen apart from the evidence from the rest of the Marsic territory. Instead of a unitary development, one could hypothesise separate or parallel developments. In this case an ‘early romanisation’ of some very small pockets on the shores of the Fucine lake could be envisaged, in contrast to ‘indigenous’ traditions elsewhere in the Marsic area. In this sense, the re-affirmation of ‘Marsic identity’ in the second century BC should be considered with caution as well, since this inscription could belong to a different line of development.\(^{329}\) It is perhaps to be regretted that in this view the ‘really indigenous’ developments in Central Italy are even more difficult to grasp: in the proposed above a significant part of the epigraphical corpus is relegated to the ‘Roman’ or at least ‘contaminated’ realm, and thus stripped away from the ‘Italic’ record.

**Conclusion: *Vici, Pagi, Sanctuaries and ‘New Communities’***

The consequences of the revision of the *pagus-vicus* system for the interpretation of sanctuaries in Central Italy are substantial. The relation between *pagus* and *vicus* was not hierarchical, and thus ideas on a supposed hierarchy of sanctuaries based upon this relation must be revised. Also the idea that every sanctuary must have belonged to the one or the other institution should be abandoned. This actually forms the most elementary observation, enabling the following reassessments. The idea that *pagi* and *vici* were installed along with Roman control defies the common interpretation of sanctuaries related to a *pagus* or a *vicus* as pre- or non-Roman features. All inscriptions relating to cults or sanctuaries documenting a *pagus* or a *vicus* were found in contexts that were by then under Roman control, i.e. areas where the (partial) Roman or Latin right had been granted, with the possible exception of the ‘Marsic’ *vici*. This means that the cult places administrated by *pagi* and *vici* functioned in all probability in a (new) Roman ordering of the land and its people. This

\(^{328}\) LETTA 2005a, 53 on Ve. 225, dated to the end of the second or the beginning of the first century BC.

\(^{329}\) Interestingly, the gods to whom the dedication is made seem to be fairly ‘Roman’ (cf. *CIL* XI, 6298 = CIL I\(^2\), 375 for the *novensides* on *cippi* of *Pisaurum* [a Roman colony of 184 BC] dating earlier than the Marsic inscription cf. CRESCI MARRONE and MENNELLA 1984, 115-120; on the date cf. COARELLI 2000). This different developmental line is of course not to be considered as isolated from other developments. Different ‘lines’ will on the contrary have influenced one another in a dynamic process.
institutional relation to Roman control does \textit{a priori} not preclude that Italic people and Italic cults were involved. An analysis shows, however, that the cults associated with \textit{pagi} and \textit{vici} do not appear specifically or exclusively local or ‘Italic’; mostly they seem to conform to Roman standards. Only in very few cases is it possible to connect architectural and other archaeological remains of sanctuaries to epigraphically attested \textit{pagi} or \textit{vici}. More such evidence could illuminate questions regarding the re-use or establishment \textit{ex novo} of these cult places, and to possibly divergent aspects of these sanctuaries in comparison to others that were not related to \textit{vici} or \textit{pagi}.

Such evidence does exist in the case of the temple at Castel di Ieri, which has been interpreted by the excavator as an ‘Italic’ temple. However, I have proposed to reconstruct it as a ‘Capitoline’ temple associated with the influence of a \textit{pagus}. No such clear architectural cases can be found for sanctuaries that functioned in a \textit{vicus} context, although if it could be proved that Contrada S. Rustico (Basciano) in the \textit{ager Praetutianus} did indeed have \textit{vicus} status, this would be a case in point. On the other hand, the cultural context of \textit{vici} and their cult places could in general be better reconstructed than for the \textit{pagi}. This is especially true for the Fucine area. Here, the evidence for the \textit{vicus Supinum} reveals a Latin writing community that venerated the Roman goddess Victoria, just as the \textit{vicus Aninus} worshipped Valetudo. Since there is no substantial evidence to suggest ‘indigenous’ cults or practices relating to \textit{pagi} or \textit{vici}, a correlation between sanctuaries associated with \textit{vici} and \textit{pagi} and Roman influence thus becomes manifest.

I have also tried to establish the nature of the relation between \textit{pagi}, \textit{vici} and Roman control in the cases under study in more detail. The exact relations remain, however, mostly unclear and do not seem to have been uniform. At the Latin colony of Ariminum, \textit{vici} and \textit{pagi} depended clearly on their urban centre. This is exemplified already for the third century BC by the so-called \textit{pocola}. In what was presumably an urban cult place \textit{pagi} and \textit{vici} dedicated black gloss vessels. It is unclear (and in part depending on the reading of the inscriptions as genitive singular or nominative plural) to what extent these \textit{vici} and \textit{pagi} had their own distinctive identity, and whether they wished to express this in the urban cult place.

Around the Fucine lake, the expression of an independent identity is documented for the certainly rural \textit{vici} in Marsic territory demonstrating proper names (\textit{vicus Aninus}, \textit{Supinum}, \textit{Petinus} etc.). It could be imagined that to these \textit{vici}, apparently outside Roman or Latin territory, this own identity, expressed through a proper name, was especially important.\textsuperscript{330} The relation of the ‘Marsic’ \textit{vici} with the colony of Alba Fucens is perhaps stronger than previously thought, although by no means unequivocal. The same goes for the \textit{vici} in the \textit{ager Praetutianus}, apparently not restricted to the territory of the colony of Hatria.\textsuperscript{331} It seems, however, impossible to

\textsuperscript{330} Cf. BARTH 1969, and my Chapters 1 and 3 on the ‘construction of community’.

\textsuperscript{331} If one wishes to retain a connection to Latin colonisation, we might surmise that the people belonging to colonies sometimes lived in villages outside the urban centre, and that these represent the
relate the *vici* of the *ager Praetutianus* alternatively to the *praefectura* of Interamna, and thus to a different category of Roman control again, the *civitas sine suffragio*. Therefore, at present it does not seem possible to relate the institution of *vici* in these areas to one specific category of government or administration of the territory. A substantial problem in establishing such a relation is that many of these categories are modern conceptualisations of a probably much more complex historical situation. Nothwithstanding this *caveat*, perhaps it is indeed more appropriate to interpret *vici* as a convenient legal category that could be applied to different situations, in the sense Tarpin has done. To what degree the indigenous population was involved in the new *vici* remains hard to establish. It does not seem necessary to assume that the inhabitants of the *vici* were all of local origin, as previously has generally been assumed. Although it is possible that pre-existing settlements were ‘upgraded’ to the status of *vicus*, a continuity in population cannot be assumed beforehand. The onomastic evidence is poor or non-existent, except for the Marsic *vici*, where perhaps both local and ‘foreign’ people were settled. Archaeology is unable to answer questions of ethnicity in this respect. We should bear in mind however, that an image of peoples merging and living happily together is not necessarily historical. Relations between colonists and autochthonous people need not to have been all peaceful. Livy relates that the Aequi revolted against the installation of Alba Fucens, and the Marsi against the colony of Carseoli, and in some cases genocide is mentioned as well. In general, the evidence for the *vici* does point to ‘Roman influence’, but also to other influences – perhaps local people, but in all probability Italic people from other regions as well. Instead of conceptualising *vici*, as a reaction to previous scholarship, as entirely ‘Roman’ elements, we could perhaps rather think of them as communities of mixed origins. Conveniently, we could designate these *vici* as ‘new communities’, and *pagi*, perhaps to a lesser extent, as well. In some cases at least, these ‘new communities’ aspired clearly to join in a Roman ideology. It is in this sense that the possible ‘*Capitolium*’ of a Paelignian *pagus* could be explained, just as the appearance of the ‘divine qualities’ Victoria and Valetudo on the shores of the Fucine lake. To my mind, this apparent willingness to construct a Roman ideology is most crucial in the discussion.

---

*vici* that we find epigraphically (cf. discussion *supra*). If such pockets of citizens, dependent on the colony, could be placed as well outside the direct ‘territory’ of the colony – inasmuch such a territory is reconstructable at all, cf. *supra* on Alba and Hatria – this would be a possible explanation for the Marsic *vici*. However, this must remain hypothetical.

332 Indeed, one of the collateral, but important, outcomes of the review of the evidence for *vici* is that territorial divisions can be problematised for the Republican period; cf. n. 327.

333 TARPIN 2002. Tarpin actually underscores the specificity of the term, but argues that this term could be used correctly in different (legal) situations. He does not discuss the possible relation with Latin colonisation in detail since he accepts the ‘urban’ view: cf. *supra*.

334 Liv. 10.1.7; 10.3.2. Cf. BRADLEY 2006, 171-177.
Furthermore, it has been argued that in Ariminum these new communities ritually enhanced their bond with the urban administrative centre. Special festivals and rituals seem to have existed as well in order to celebrate and define their own territorial boundaries and institutional character. Perhaps, also these communities sacrificed for a divine quality – that of Fides. The festivals of the *Paganalia* and the *Compitalia*, examples of such festivals, are the subject of the next chapters.
Chapter 8

Roman Ritual in the Italian Countryside?
The *Paganalia* and the *Lustratio Pagi*

*The Religious Role of the Pagus and the Vicus in Roman times*

Notwithstanding the difficulties with the *pagus-vicus* system outlined above, it is clear that both *pagus* and *vicus* were at least in some period of importance for the organisation of the territory. To summarise, the main problems with the *pagus-vicus* system were:

1) the supposed pre-Roman date and ‘Italic’ nature of both institutions in Italy outside Rome, which are difficult to support;

2) the relation between *pagus* and *vicus*, since the evidence does not seem to allow a hierarchical relationship, viz. a *pagus* containing one or more *vici*.

It is clear from epigraphical and literary sources that both *vicus* and *pagus* performed specific specialised functions at least in some contexts and periods. Amongst these functions the religious aspect is particularly conspicuous. The *pagus*, for example, had its own *sacra*.\(^1\) In the following chapters the main religious activities that were performed in or overseen by *pagi* and *vici* will be discussed.

I shall argue that the religious dimension of both *vicus* and *pagus* was of considerable importance, not for the pre-Roman situation – *pagi* and *vici* did not exist then – but precisely for the new Roman situation. *Vicus* and *pagus* seem to have performed religious functions in specific ‘Roman’ contexts: i.e. in Rome, and in parts of Italy after their incorporation by Rome during the Republican period, and presumably in large parts of Italy after the Social War. Indeed, I think this religious dimension was fundamental for the creation and definition of the new communities that found themselves in the Italian landscape as a result of colonisation and/or the reorganisation of the territory and its population.

In modern literature on Roman religion the romantic aspect of the ‘rustic’ rituals associated with the rural *vicus* and the *pagus* are often highlighted. Most important of these were the religious festival of the *pagi*, the *Paganalia*, and that of the *vici*, the

Compitalia. But were they truly rural, harmless rituals of olden days? I shall argue that the extant evidence points us in a different direction, and that the festivals could have been related to Roman administrative control. In this way, the rituals connected to the *vicus* and the *pagus* appear as important elements for the definition of the newly formed groups, and at the same time as vehicles for the making and controlling of Roman Italy.
Pagus and Paganalia: Between Rusticity and Administrative Control

pagus agat festum: pagum lustrate, coloni (Ov. Fast. 1.669)

Fig. 8.1. Wall-painting with ‘sacro-idyllic’ landscape from Boscotrecase, Red Room, North wall (VON BLANCKENHAGEN and ALEXANDER 1990, pl. 24).

Elements of rustic cult abound in Augustan literature, poetry, and art, such as the wall painting from Boscotrecase illustrated here (fig. 8.1). Both vicus and pagus are often explicitly linked to it. Most often the pagus seems to have been predilected as a means to situate a cultic scene by association in a ‘rural’ context. This rustic image of pagus religion has found fertile ground in modern scholarship. For example Horace’s Ode 3.18, in which a pagus seems to constitute the background for the celebration of a festival in honour of Faunus, has provoked lyrical reactions by modern scholars because it would give us insight into ‘true country religion’.

Faune, Nympharum fugientum amator,  
per meos finis et aprica rura  
lenis incedas abeasque parvis  
aequus alumnis;  
si tener pleno cedit haedus anno  
larga nec desunt Veneris sodali  
vina craterae, vetus ara multo  
fumat odore.  

ludit herboso pecus omne campo  
cum bove pagus,  
inter audacis lupus errat agnos,  
spargit agrestis tibi silva frondes,  
gaudet invisam pepulisse fossor  
ter pede terram

‘Faunus, lustful pursuer of the fleeing Nymphs, come gently onto my land with its sunny acres, and as you depart look kindly on my little nurslings, seeing that a tender kid is sacrificed to you at the end of the year, plenty of wine is available for the mixing bowl (Venus’ companion), and the old altar smokes with lots of incense. The whole flock gambols in the grassy meadow when your day comes round on the fifth of December. The village in festive mood is on holiday in the fields along with the oxen, which are also resting. The wolf wanders among the lambs, and they feel no fear. The forest sheds its woodland leaves in your honour. The digger enjoys beating with his feet in triple time his old enemy, the earth.’ (translation Loeb)
According to William Warde Fowler, “no picture could be choicer or neater than this … We are for a moment let into the heart and mind of ancient Italy, as they showed themselves on a winter holiday”. Even more poetically, Howard Scullard writes on the poem (as usual closely following Fowler):

“There we have the essence of true Roman country religion: the appeal to the vague and possibly dangerous spirit that guards the flocks to be present, but not to linger too long; the smoking altar of earth; the simple offering of wine and kid; the gambolling sheep; the quiet relaxation after the year’s toil, and the dance on the hated land which had demanded so much labour. Horace knew the conventions of pastoral poetry, but here he is surely depicting what he himself had seen and perhaps shared in. This annual festival was held in the pagi and not in Rome, so that it is not registered in the calendars, but it is included here [scil. in Roman festivals] because it must have played a significant part in the lives of many Romans, especially in early days.”

As discussed in Chapter 6, the rural pagus has often been seen as a typically Italic institution, existing from times ‘immemorial’. The religious role of the pagus has also been emphasised in modern literature, if not taken for granted. The above cited examples attest to a general attitude to religion associated with the pagus, which is essentially one of rusticity and rurality. This rusticity is implicitly or explicitly equated with a supposed ancient, or perhaps better said ‘timeless’ character of this religious aspect of the pagus. The image of the foremost religious aspect of the pagus, the festival of the Paganalia evoked by modern interpretators of ancient texts seems to fit well into this rustic, agricultural ideal. But a brief reassessment of the sources shows that this image is more complex than usually assumed; the main source even tells us a quite different story. Indeed, both the incentive behind the creation of the festival and the actions undertaken during the festival appear to have been quite pragmatic and functional for the Roman administrative system.

**PAGANALIA, SEMENTIVAE AND LUSTRATIO PAGI**

Only few references to the Paganalia are known to us. Modern scholarship has attempted to supplement our knowledge about the festival by equating the Paganalia to other rituals and festivals, especially the lustratio pagi and the Sementivae. This rather confusing amalgamation of evidence has consequently been used to identify the character of the Paganalia. Therefore, it is useful to go briefly through the relationship of Paganalia, Sementivae, and lustratio pagi.

---

2 Fowler 1925, 257.
3 Scullard 1981, 201.
4 Of course, Horace comes from the Italic region Lucania; but it should be remembered that it is in the same Odes (3.2.13) that the famous line dulce et decorum est pro patria mori appears... On the ambiguous relation of Roman poets and writers with regard to their background, see Gasser 1999. Cf. also Yntema forthcoming on Ennius.
5 Cf. Todisco 2004a for the image of vici and pagi in the sources.
The discussion is prompted by a description of the winter festival of the *Sementivae* in Ovid’s *Fasti* (1.657-696). In this context, at line 1.699, Ovid recalls a *lustratio pagi*. Some have equated it with the *Paganalia*: especially the triple repetition of *pagus*, *pagum*, *paganis* has suggested to many that actually the *Paganalia* are meant, which has led to the assumption that the *Paganalia* can be equated with the *Sementivae*.\(^6\)

Particularly popular has been the suggestion that the *Sementivae* represented the official ‘state’ festival, whereas the *Paganalia* would represent its rural equivalent.\(^7\) Others, amongst whom Georg Wissowa, are inclined to distinguish the *Paganalia* from the *lustratio pagi*, as if they were two equal and separate entities.\(^8\) But a *lustratio* seems to have been a common element, not an equivalent, of certain festivals.\(^9\) In fact, it does not seem improbable that Ovid compared and blended details from different festivals, which is in line with the representation of religious rites in a Callimachean tradition.\(^10\) It is thus possible to dismiss the idea that Ovid’s *lustratio pagi* relates to the *Paganalia* proper, whilst retaining the possibility that during the *Paganalia* a *lustratio* was held.\(^11\)

Ultimately, this non-exclusive relation seems to be proved by the fact that a *lustratio pagi* is known epigraphically for June 5, another for May or March 11; but not winter, which would be the period of the *Sementivae*.\(^12\)

Another short passage has been adduced as well to sustain the connection between *Paganalia* and *Sementivae*. Varro speaks of the *Paganicae* after having treated the *Sementivae*, and considers both festivals as agricultural feasts.\(^13\) Most scholars have understood *Paganicae* as a synonym for *Paganalia*. However, the possibility that *Paganicae* does not relate to the *Paganalia*, but rather to another ritual or festival held in the *pagus*, from which it takes its name, should perhaps be considered, especially

---

6 E.g. SCULLARD 1981, 68; Fowler 1925, 294, n. 3: “But the distinction is perhaps only of place; or if of time also, yet not of object and meaning.” Cf. also following note.
7 E.g. Fowler 1925 who assumes that the *Sementivae* were celebrated under the “less technical” name of the *Paganalia* in “the country” (294, cf. also preceding note), and Bailey 1932, 147. Other bibliography in Delatte 1937, 104-105. Recently, the argument has been restated by Baudy 1998, 186-187, who sees the *Paganalia* as “ein eigenständiges ländliches Äquivalent [zum staatsrömischem Aussaatfest]” (however not citing the previous and similar conclusions by e.g. Fowler and Bailey, nor the criticisms by Delatte).
8 Ov. *Fast.* 1.669 would refer to the *lustratio*. Rohde 1942, 2294: “… die *lustratio pagi*, die als besonderes Fest neben den *P.[aganalia]* anzumerken ist”; Wissowa 1912, 143 and 439 n. 7 (“Erwähnt von Varro, Ling. 6.26 unter dem Namen *paganicae* (feriae) … Sie sind ein agrarisches Fest … verschieden sowohl von den Feriae Sementivae, mit denen sie oft zusammengeworfen werden, wie von der *lustratio pagi*.” The elegy on a rustic festival from Tib. 2.1, which inspired Ovid’s lines, does not consider the *Paganalia* either. Cf. Maltby 2002, 359: “Many of the individual details crop up again in Ovid’s description of the January festival of the *Paganalia* or the *Feriae Sementivae* (*Fast.*1.657ff.). But the fact that Ovid was imitating T.[bllus] does not prove that T.[bllus] was describing the *Paganalia.*” Cf. on Tibullus’ elegy, Baudy 1998, 127-147.
9 And other occasions: cf. infra.
13 Varro, Ling. 6.26. According to him, the *Paganicae* were *agricultrae causa susceptae*; i.e. their date would be established according to the agricultural calendar.
since Varro uses the word *Paganalia* two lines earlier (in an apparently unrelated context).\(^\text{14}\) In any case Varro does not equate the *Sementivae* and the *Paganicae* (*Paganalia*); he rather compares them on the basis of the connection with agriculture and their status as *feriae conceptivae*.\(^\text{15}\)

Now that the relationship between *Paganalia* and other festivals, and the *iuslustratio pagi* has been defined more precisely, it becomes clear that explicit evidence in the literary sources that the *Paganalia* were in the outset an *agricultural* festival is actually rather poor. Especially once it is admitted that the *Paganalia* and the *Sementivae* *feriae* are not identical, and therefore references to the latter cannot be used to clarify the character of the former.\(^\text{16}\) Of course festivals could perform different roles within society, and attempts to try to pin down ‘the character’ of the *Paganalia* would be in vain. Notwithstanding this general multiformity or malleability, it seems legitimate to question the typically agricultural character of the *Paganalia* that has been accepted almost unanimously in studies on the *Paganalia*.\(^\text{17}\)

Ovid’s text stages a general *iuslustratio pagi* in the context of the *Sementivae*, and Macrobius states that the *Paganalia* were *feriae conceptivae* (i.e. a mobile feast and not part of the *feriae stativae*, the fixed public calendar), listing the festival together with the *Latinae*, *Sementivae*, and the *Compitalia*.\(^\text{18}\) But even if it were true that many agricultural festivals were *feriae conceptivae*, it would be perverse to turn the argument around and state that the *Paganalia* were an agricultural festival because they are *feriae conceptivae*. Clearly, the *feriae Latinae* in honour of *Juppiter Latiaris*, announced on the mons Albanus by the new consuls, cannot be considered agricultural, and neither can, as I will argue in the next chapter, the *Compitalia*. The only text possibly linking the festival explicitly to agriculture seems to be Varro, who states that the date of the *Paganicae* was established according to the agricultural

---

\(^\text{14}\) Baudy 1998, 187 argues in defence of the equation *Paganicae = Paganalia* that in this context (*Ling. 6.26*) an intended (*feriae*) *Paganicae*, in consonance with the *feriae Sementivae*, would explain the difference. Varro, *Ling. 6.24*: *Dies Septimontium nominatus ab his septem montibus, in quis sita Urbs est; feriae non populi, sed montanorum modo, ut Paganalibus, qui sunt alicuius pagi*. Varro, *Ling. 6.26*: *Sementivae Feriae dies is, qui a pontificibus dictus, appellatus a semente, quod sationis causa susceptae. Paganicae eiusdem agriculturae causa susceptae, ut haberent in agris omnis pagus, unde Paganicae dictae.*

\(^\text{15}\) Cf. also Macrobr. *Sat.* 1.16.6, where the *Sementivae* and *Paganalia* are listed apart from one another. Cf. Miller 1991, 117 n. 23 on the comparative character of the statements in Varro and Ovid.


\(^\text{17}\) Although Delatte points out with clarity that Dionysius is the main source, he still recognises an agricultural aspect to the *Paganalia*: “… aux yeux de Denys … les *Paganalia* sont une fête de la vie agricole” (Delatte 1937, 106). Cf. Baudy 1998, esp. 188-189 and 190: “Die Paganalia hatten also nicht nur eine agrarische, sondern zugleich eine wichtige soziale Bedeutung,” consequently stating that Dionysius did not consider the former but was only interested in the latter. Tarpin 2002 treats Dionysius’ account in detail, but his study is not concerned with the character of the festival in general, and in light of the other sources.

\(^\text{18}\) Macrobr. *Sat.* 1.16.6: *conceptionis sunt quae quotannis a magistratibus vel sacerdotibus concipiuntur in dies vel certos vel etiam incertos, ut sunt Latinae Sementivae Paganalia Compitalia.*
However, as mentioned earlier one should be careful in identifying the *Paganicae* with the *Paganalia*, and we should therefore refrain from reading too much into the passage of Varro. The only pertinent texts that relate securely to the *Paganalia* proper do not give the slightest hint of an agricultural function or character of the festival, as the following will show.

THE *PAGANALIA* ACCORDING TO DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

In his *Roman Antiquities* (4.14-15), Dionysius of Halicarnassus provides the only detailed narrative of the festival of the *Paganalia* available to us. He informs us that the *Paganalia*, just as the *Compitalia* that will be considered in the next chapter, were instigated by king Servius Tullius (trad. 578 to 535 BC) while making the new *tribus* division of Rome.\(^{20}\) Dionysius tells us that Servius Tullius extended the division of the city proper to four instead of three urban *tribus*, and divided the countryside in an unknown number of rural *tribus*. *Pagi* would have constituted the subdivisions of these rural tribes. All *pagi* would have had altars (βωμούς) for the celebration of the *Paganalia*. His description contains of course little historicity,\(^{21}\) but may echo a historical situation in some way and is of importance for the understanding of the religious role of the *pagus*.\(^{22}\) Some general important features in Dionysius’ account

---

20 In 2.76.1, Dionysius attributes the installation of *pagi* to king Numa, also in this passage an administrative function becomes clear. In the passage on Servius this is much more elaborated, and the relation with the *tribus* and the *Paganalia* is made.
21 Cf. THOMSEN 1980, 251-252, who dismisses the idea that Servius installed the *pagi* and *Paganalia*, arguing that these were much older…
22 Loeb translation of Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.15 (see for 4.14 Chapter 9): “Tullius also divided the country as a whole into twenty-six parts, according to Fabius, who calls these divisions tribes also and, adding the four city tribes to them, says that there were thirty tribes in all under Tullius. But according to Vennonius he divided the country into thirty-one parts, so that with the four city tribes the number was rounded out to the thirty-five tribes that exist down to our day. However, Cato, who is more worthy of credence than either of these authors, does not specify the number of the parts into which the country was divided. After Tullius, therefore, had divided the country into a certain number of parts, whatever that number was, he built places of refuge upon such lofty eminences as could afford ample security for the husbandmen, and called them by a Greek name, *pagi* or “hills”. Thither all the inhabitants fled from the fields whenever a raid was made by enemies, and generally passed the night there. These places also had their governors (archontes), whose duty it was to know not only the names of all the husbandmen who belonged to the same district but also the lands which afforded them their livelihood. And whenever there was occasion to summon the countrymen to take arms or to collect the taxes that were assessed against each of them, these governors assembled the men together and collected the money. And in order that the number of these husbandmen might not be hard to ascertain, but might be easy to compute and be known at once, he ordered them to erect altars to the gods who presided over and were guardians of the district, and directed them to assemble every year and honour these gods with public sacrifices. This occasion also he made one of the most solemn festivals, calling it the *Paganalia*; and he drew up laws concerning these sacrifices, which the Romans still observe. Towards the expense of this sacrifice and of this assembling he ordered all those of the same district to contribute each of them a certain piece of money, the men paying one kind, the women another and the children a third kind. When these pieces of money were counted by those who presided over the sacrifices, the number of people, distinguished by their sex and age, became known. And wishing also, as Lucius Piso writes in the first book of his *Annals*, to know the number of the inhabitants of the city, and of all who were born and died and arrived at the age of manhood, he
can be pointed out. First of all, Dionysius connects the installation of the Paganalia from the outset to the administrative division of Rome, and in this case its peri-urban area. Indeed, this passage (4.14-15) is part of a description of Servius’ res gestae, which culminates in the installation of the census (4.16).

Related to the numbering procedures described by Dionysius, there seems to be a hierarchy in the sequence of actions. First a division is made, both of the urban and the rural area, and then magistrates are appointed to ascertain the number of inhabitants, and their land property. This, as is explicitly stated, serves the military levy and the taxation. Only then, in order to facilitate the counting procedure both the festival of the Compitalia (4.14) and the Paganalia (4.15) were created. With regard to the Paganalia, Dionysius states that in order to establish the number of inhabitants of the pagi easily (“…but might be easy to compute and be known at once”), these were ordered to erect altars, upon which yearly sacrifices were to be made. This yearly festival was consequently established under the name of Paganalia.

Dionysius then proceeds to explain how the counting was facilitated by the creation of the festival; every man, woman and child had to offer a different type of coin. In this way, “those who presided over the sacrifices” could establish the population numbers distinguished by sex and age. In the arrangement of his general narrative, Dionysius of Halicarnassus establishes a dichotomy between the urban and the rural population, since he first considers in 4.14 the rituals of the Compitalia, also instigated by Servius Tullius, in relation to the division of the city of Rome in four tribus. The next section, cited here (4.15), is explicitly devoted to the countryside directly outside the city (τήν χώραν ἀπασάν), and it is in this context that the Paganalia are treated. In this way, a distinction between urban and non-urban is made, because the Compitalia would perform functions for the urban tribes and the Paganalia accordingly for the rural tribes.

---

24 Cf. however THOMSEN 1980, 210-211 according to whom Dionysius’ description of the offering of different coins “bears the stamp of legend”.
25 Another example of this distinction is the idea that the festivals were not listed in the Roman calendar: cf. FOWLER 1925, 16 who argues that all rites which did not concern the state as a whole but only parts of it, such as pagi, could not be included in the state calendar. One of the central ideas in
As has become clear, in modern scholarship on Roman religion the romantic aspects of the ‘rustic’ rituals of the *pagus* and the *Paganalia* are often highlighted, citing Dionysius’ text together with the Odes by Horace and other ‘rusticising’ idealised descriptions of simple, frugal cult activity.\(^\text{26}\) Similarly, the conflation of evidence for what are actually distinct rituals and festivals has favoured an agricultural interpretation. These traditions have formed and image of the *Paganalia* festival as an agricultural, rustic feast of vetust origins. Reading the relevant lines of Dionysius of Halicarnassus in their broader context however, the conclusion must inevitably be that, at least from Dionysius’ point of view, the *Paganalia* were basically a ritualisation of the administration of the rural population on behalf of the Roman state.\(^\text{27}\) For the city of Rome, this administrative aspect has long been recognised by modern scholarship; especially the creation of the *pagi* themselves and their relation to the ‘Servian reform’ of the *tribus* have received due attention.\(^\text{28}\) But the consequences of this specific administrative character of the religious festivals of both *Paganalia* and, as we will see, *Compitalia*, for the rural *pagi* and *vici* in the rest of Italy are yet to be evaluated. Tarpin has discussed the administrative character of both festivals in the city of Rome in relation to the creation of *pagi* and *vici* and has drawn important conclusions on the character of *pagi* and *vici* in the western Mediterranean world. Within this new framework, however, the role of festivals and religion in general in the *pagi* and *vici* outside Rome remains to be studied.

---

\(^{26}\) Or Dionysius is even omitted altogether; e.g. Scullard 1981, 68.

\(^{27}\) This observation, of course, does not favour an ‘instrumentalist’ view of the festival, or religion in general: this administrative ‘function’ could have been embedded deeply in ‘religious’ behaviour. Cf. Pieri 1968, 28 who argues: “Cette méthode de dénombrement par le truchement d’offrandes apportées à un culte ou au cours d’une fête religieuse … trouve peut-être son explication dans la croyance assez répandue chez les peuples anciens que le dénombrement d’une population était une opération impie et fort dangereuse qui nécessitait par là-même une cérémonie de purification.”

\(^{28}\) On the *stadträumische pagi* and their relation to the Servian reforms and/or *census* cf. e.g. Last 1945, 38-42; Pieri 1968, 23-34; Thomsen 1980 (who thinks the *Paganalia* existed much earlier, 251-252); Fraschetti 1990, 148-160; Gabba 1991, 181-185; Humm 2001; Schubert 1996, 99-100, who thinks that the *census* function is Augustan, but states: “Die religiösen Funktionen der *pagi* sind unbestritten und weisen auf ein hohes Alter dieser Einrichtung hin” (99). Cf. Chapter 6.
Ch. 8. The Paganalia

**Lustratio Pagi and Paganalia in Italy outside Rome**

As to the supposed origin and character of the festival in archaic Rome, it is impossible to be certain – and it is not of direct interest to the present discussion. But with regard to Italy outside the Archaic city-state of Rome, it seems to me highly improbable that the *Paganalia* and *Compitalia* existed there before the installation of *pagi* and *vici*. If the festivals were being performed in the ‘Italic’ countryside as well, could it be that they had a similar administrative incentive, or at least aspect, to them, as described in Dionysius for the *chora* of Rome? If the evidence for Rome itself was already meagre, it will perhaps not come as a surprise that the evidential situation for theItalic areas is even worse. In this section therefore more questions will be posed than answered, but with the hope that these will stimulate the discussion.

In the first place, we should acknowledge that there is no direct (epigraphical) evidence that the *Paganalia* proper were indeed celebrated in the Italian countryside.\(^{29}\) But it should be noted that this is neither the case for Rome itself. Therefore, all arguments are by necessity more or less derivative. I think, however, that there is reason to suppose that the *Paganalia* were celebrated in the *pagi* in the Central-Italian, ‘Italic’ areas. It is true that Dionysius’ account relates to the mythical regal period, but apparently he describes at least in part a later or contemporary situation,\(^ {30}\) and also explicitly states (4.15.3) that the laws, according to which the *Paganalia* are to be performed, are still observed in his time, i.e. early imperial Rome. Since *pagi* are by definition located outside urban areas, and the *Paganalia* are also located in the countryside by Varro (*Ling.* 6.24; in opposition to the urban *Septimontium*), it is certain that the festival was celebrated in the later *pagi* in ‘a’ countryside. Even if the evidence does not specify the location of the celebration within Italy (or rather: precisely *because* it does not), it seems implausible to me that the celebration of the *Paganalia* was confined to the old peri-urban *pagi* of Rome.\(^ {31}\) In conclusion, I think it would be hypercritical to refrain from the conclusion that probably the *Paganalia* were celebrated in the *pagi* of Italy, wherever they were installed.

**THE LOCATION OF THE FESTIVAL**

The question that presents itself subsequently, concerns the location of the celebration of the *Paganalia*. What we can say, on the basis of Dionysius’ narrative, is that the *Paganalia* seem to have consisted, for the inhabitants of the *pagi*, in the coming together of the people (*σύνοδον*; 4.15.4), the payment of the apposite coins (*νόμισμα*;\(^ {29}\) If the solution *paganic[s]* in *CIL V*, 4148 (from Perdegnaga, Brescia, of the late Republican period) is dismissed as a reference to the *Paganicae* (*feriae*). Discussion in *TODISCO* 2004b, 189-196. On the relation between the *lustratio pagi*, attested epigraphically in various places in Italy, and the *Paganalia* cf. infra.\(^ {30}\) There are various anachronisms; cf. SCHUBERT 1996, 99-100.\(^ {31}\) On these *pagi* (the *pagus Saccusanus*, *pagus Montanus*, and those of the Aventine, Janiculum, and *ss. Quattro Coronati* (*pagus Caelemontanus*), all apparently one time outside the city borders), see FRASCHETTI 1990, 148-160.)
4.15.4), and a communal sacrifice (θυσίαις κοιναίς; 4.15.3). This may seem self-evident, but the location is nowhere explicitly indicated nor is it qualified as a sanctuary, since Dionysius talks only of “altars” (βωμούς; 4.15.3) for each pagus. The description in Dolabella (L 302.1) of an intriguing field sanctuary with four open sides would, according to Louis Delatte, deal with such a pagus sanctuary, but this seems unfounded because there is no reference to the Paganalia nor to a pagus (cf. also the discussion on compitum sanctuaries in Chapter 9). Perhaps it is not too far-fetched to suppose that the sanctuaries where magistri pagi were active, or where the influence of pagi is otherwise attested (de pagi sententia vel sim.), indeed formed the appropriate places for some of the rituals connected to the Paganalia, but this is not documented.

LUSTRATIO PAGI

It has been suggested that a lustratio pagi could be part of the Paganalia, even if Dionysius does not mention it directly in his description. But also the fact in itself that there existed such a thing as the lustratio pagi is highly important; it attests to the ritual definition of territory and territoriality. At the same time, the group of people living within it was defined. Importantly, we are certain that the lustratio pagi was performed in the pagi of Italy: Siculus Flaccus, who was a land surveyor active in the second century AD, comments in his de condicionibus agrorum (9-10), on the importance of the lustratio pagi. He even asserts that the extent of the territory of the pagus could be deduced from the area that was covered by this ritual. According to Siculus, the lustratio would be performed by the magistri pagorum. Lustrationes pagi are also attested epigraphically in the pagi in the Italic areas. However, their relation to the Paganalia remains unclear, since, as has been seen,

---

32 FRASCHETTI 1990, 160 suggests moreover that the ludi mentioned in CIL VI, 30888 = CIL F, 984 (first century BC) might have been part of the Paganalia as well, and, referring to CIL VI, 2219 = CIL F, 1000 (around 100 BC) “non è improbabile che, sempre nel corso dei Paganalia, i pagani del Gianicolo banchettassero insieme, utilizzando anche a questo scopo la culina fatta approntare da un loro magister” (ibid.).


34 Unless they are to be understood as a pars pro toto of course.

35 DELATTE 1937, 109-110; cf. WISSOWA 1901b, 793, who considers this a compitum; both theories are regarded suspiciously by ROHDE 1942, 2294.

36 Cf. evt. Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 2.76.1 on the installation of pagi by Numa, where the magistrates of the pagi make their rounds in order to establish the condition of the fields.

37 See BAUDY 1998 on the role of the lustratio. Cf. esp., e.g. 96-99, seeing ‘römische Umgangsriten’ as ‘symbolische Reviermarkierung’.

38 Grom. Lat. L 164.64. magistri pagorum quod pagos lustrare soliti sint, uti trahamus quatenus lustrarent. It does not seem possible to establish whether the archontes, organisers of the Paganalia, mentioned by Dionysius (4.15.3) can be equated with magistri or rather praefecti pagi (nonetheless: DELATTE 1937, 106; cf. on the titles TARPIN 2002, 188, 196-197 and in general on the officials of the pagus 285-290).

39 For the sources, cf. WISSOWA 1912, 143 n. 2; BÖHM 1927, 2032-2033; LATTE 1960, 41 n. 2.
lus rationes could also be performed on other occasions, as attested by CIL IX, 1618 from Beneventum.

In a problematic inscription found between Castelvecchio Subequo and Secinaro in Pa lignian territory, a lustratio pagi has been recognised by some. The inscription, dated to the first century BC, mentions three magistri pagi who iter / paganicam fac(iunda/um) / ex p(agi) s(citu) c(uraverunt) e(idemq)ue p(robaverunt). The discussion has centered on the interpretation of iter and paganicam, and their relation. Some read iter paganicam, i.e. some sort of road of the pagus or in the direction of a Paganica, others are inclined to integrate iter(um) as referring to the office-holding magistri and think paganicam is an adjective to an omitted substantive (lustrationem, ara, aedes, vel sim.). Depending on the accepted solution, a relation with the rituals connected to the pagus is not to be excluded, but a proper lustratio pagi or the celebration of the Paganalia is not attested.

In Picene territory another example of a true lustratio is documented. A small bronze tablet (13.5 x 13 cm), which was perforated for the purpose of hanging it, was found in the area of Tolentinum. The text, which can be dated to the third century AD, reads: tesseram paganicam L(ucius) Vera/tius Feliciissi/mus pat ronus / paganis pagi / Tolentine(nis) hos/tias lustr(um) et tesser(as) / aer(eas) ex voto l(ibens) d(onum) d(edit) / V Id(us) Ma(rtia, -ia)s felicit(er), which could be translated as “tessera of the pagus. Lucius Veratius Felicissimus, patron, offered to the inhabitants of the pagus of

---

40 LA REGINA 1967-68, 433.
41 AE 1914, 270 = CIL I², 3255.
42 The editor, PERSICHE TTI 1914, 131, read iter Paganicam (scil. versus), i.e. a road leading to Paganica, a modern place name in the area which according to him was identical in antiquity (followed by LA REGINA 1967-68, 376). LATTE 1960, 42 n. 2. however recognised a lustratio pagi, reading paganicam (scil. lustrationem), and iter as iter(um), i.e. ‘again, a second time’ and relating to the lustratio. In other words, the magistri would have cared for the lustratio pagi [that was held] again. Latte’s reading is refuted by van Wonterghem, who favours an interpretation of iter paganicam as road again; according to him a ‘tratturo’ would have been meant, which would explain the use of the word iter rather than via vel sim. (VAN WONTERGHEM 1984, 98-99). Buonocore on the other hand has suggested to interpret iter as iter(um), but according to him this would relate to the office held again by the three magistri, and he proposes to amend a forgotten object paganicam (aedem vel sim.). Thus, three magistri pagi who were in office for the second time, would have cared for the construction of an ara paganica, aedes paganica, aedicula paganica or porticus paganica (in Suppl. It. n.s. V, 116; BUONOCORE 1993, 52 = BUONOCORE 2002a, 34). On his turn, Letta thinks that the magistri constructed an iter paganicum: “cioè una strada che attraversava tutto il territorio del pagus, collegando i vari vici tra loro e col santuario comune”; LETTA 1993, 37. In fact, both solutions, iter or iterum, require the acceptance of grammatical inconsistencies: iter paganicam instead of correctly paganicum on the one hand (LETTA 1993, 37 explains the female paganicam instead of neutrum paganicum with mental association with via) or the omission of a substantive where paganicam relates to (BUONOCORE 1993, 52 = BUONOCORE 2002a, 34 suggests that paganica is perhaps an otherwise unknown substantive). An additional problem is that the integration iter(um) would implicate a recurrence of the board of three magistri pagi, which seems improbable to LETTA 1993, 37. TODISCO 2004b, 186-189 suggests that the magistri saw to the construction of both a road and an object defined paganicam (aedes vel sim.).
43 CIL IX, 5565.
Tolentinum the sacrificial animals, the lustration, and the bronze tesserae, as a result of a vow, with pleasure. 11 March / May, auspiciously.” 44

Although there has been discussion on the object of dedication, it seems now accepted that a lustratio pagi is meant here, during which sacrificial animals were led around the pagus.45 The form and size of the tessera resembles a tessera frumentaria, and therefore probably also this tessera paganica served personal purposes rather than as commemorative tabula. Probably these tesserae were used as tokens to indicate the membership of the pagus. In the context of the festivities of the pagus Tolentinensis, it might therefore seem that Veratius not only paid for the animals and the lustratio, but also for the admission tickets of the pagani to the celebration.46

THE PAYMENT FOR THE RITUALS AND THESAURI

Another element which might shed light on the rituals and usages of the members of the pagus is an inscribed thesaurus that has been found at Carpineto della Nora, in the Vestine area (fig. 8.2). The conserved calcareous block (h. 44 x l. 86 x w. 60 cm) is hollowed out in order to contain the coins that were to be thrown into the thesaurus.

The inscription dates to the first century BC and mentions four people who restored the object and dedicated it to Juppiter Victor decem pagorum.47

Fig. 8.2. CIL I², 3269, thesaurus from Carpineto della Nora (DEGRASSI, Imagines, 213, no. 299).

---

44 Following CANCRINI, DELPLACE and MARENGO 2001, 123-125.
45 CANCRINI, DELPLACE and MARENGO 2001, 123-125 with previous literature, e.g. SCHEID 1990, 449.
47 CIL I², 3269; ILLRP 1271c. La Regina has interpreted the apparent meeting of different pagi in one sanctuary as part of a structuration process, a “normale processo sinecistico”, whereas the ‘final stage’ of municipium was never reached here (LA REGINA 1967-68, 414; cf. also the description of the sanctuary of Hercules Curinus as the “santuario tutelare del sinecismo”: COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 132). The notion of an evolutionary development from single pagi to municipium can now however be dismissed, cf. Chapter 6.
The appearance of *thesauri* in Italy is a relatively late phenomenon that seems to start only at the beginning of the second century BC. Most Italian *thesauri* date to the end of the second and the first centuries BC. The inscriptions sometimes bear just the names of the instigators, as in Carpineto and Ferentillo, but in other cases the titles reveal actions undertaken by *duoviri*, such as in Luna, *praetores* in Anagnia, and *magistri*, such as in Hatria. In the territory of Pausulae, a *municipium* in the Picene area, a *thesaurus* was found together with ca. 5000 Republican silver denarii. The inscription, a dedication to Apollo, can be dated to the second half of the second century BC.

I think that the date of introduction, in the second century BC, the Latin language used, and the magistrates and the gods involved (Jupiter Victor, Apollo, Fortuna, Minerva, Vesta, Hercules and possibly Venus) could suggest that these *thesauri* are a new phenomenon in the Italic areas, apparently in some way related to Roman/Latin influence. The geographical distribution of the *thesauri* seems to sustain this impression. Fregellae (second century BC), Beneventum (second century BC), Hatria (second-first centuries BC) and Luna (end second century BC) are colonies. The Hernician city Anagnia was under Roman control since 306 BC, whereas the *thesaurus* can be dated to the second half of the second century BC. The Picene area, where the second century BC *thesaurus* dedicated to Apollo comes from, was already

---

48 KAMINSKI 1991, 106.
50 Ferentillo (first half first century BC): *CIL* XI, 4988. According to LA REGINA 1967-68, 414 the people mentioned in the Carpineto *thesaurus* are “dei semplici *magistri Iovis Victoris*, addetti all’amministrazione del culto” and not *magistri pagi*. LETTA 1993, 43 n. 44 dismisses this idea and thinks rather of individuals acting on their own behalf.
51 *CIL* XI, 1343, cf. CIAMPOLTRINI 1993, dating it to the end of the second or rather the beginning of the first century BC.
53 *CIL* I, 3293, dated to the second century BC by TORELLI 2005, 355, but see NONNIS 2003, 48 for a first century BC date.
54 The inscription comes from località S. Lucia, between S. Claudio al Chienti and Morrovalle.
56 *CIL* XIV, 2854 from Praeneste and *CIL* XI, 6307 from *Pisaurum*.
57 *AE* 1985, 266 from Sora (79-40 BC).
58 *AE* 1904, 210 from Beneventum (second century BC).
59 LA TORRE 1989a, 140, from the sanctuary of Hercules Curinus near Sulmona.
60 In Anagni, since *pecunia Venerus* has been used, cf. NONNIS 1994-1995, 164.
61 *Thesauri* appear in some Latial sanctuaries, but these are quite late. Cf. Praeneste: *CIL* XIV, 2854 (Caligula) (but cf. criticism by CRAWFORD 2003b, 76); Lanuvium (*CIL* XIV, 4177) (end first century BC).
63 The Latin colony of Sora (303 BC) could be added, but this *thesaurus* is dated to the first half of the first century BC (CATALLI and SCHEID 1994).
64 HUMBERT 1978, 214. The city was possibly made *praefectura* in that year.
in the third century BC incorporated by Rome. 65 In Arpinum, under Roman control since 305 BC, a second century BC thesaurus was found. 66 If a block with a dedication to Valetudo, dating at least as early as the second century BC, which apparently came from the vicus Aninus was indeed a thesaurus, this would be another example. 67 Few are the exceptions to this connection with Roman or Latin influence, and the evidence remains, furthermore, somewhat suspicious. A thesaurus found in the sanctuary of Hercules Curinus at Sulmona could possibly form an example of a thesaurus in allied territory, but only if it dates before the municipalisation of Sulmo, which does not seem probable. 68 A thesaurus is, however, mentioned in line 29 of side B of the late second century BC treaty between Abella and Nola, otherwise written in the Oscan language. 69 Another possible exception of a thesaurus in an ‘indigenous’ context is formed by a block revealed in a sanctuary of the second to first centuries BC at Pescosansonesco in the Vestine area. 70 The rectangular calcareous block presents an iron ring on top, and an inscription in the Vestine or a Vestine-Latin language, which reads: T. Vetis C. f.t.cule t. p. Letta suggests that the block was the lid of a thesaurus and reconstructs \( \text{thesaurum} \ p(\text{osuit}) \). 71 However, both the identification of the object and the interpretation of the text in this way do not appear to be compelling, as Letta himself admits.

There remains the question of what this apparent correspondence between Roman political influence and the appearance of thesauri means. Torelli connects their appearance in time and place to the “definitiva ellenizzazione delle architetture religiose e profane di Roma e dei socii italiani”, 72 which may indeed seem attractive since the phenomenon is well known in earlier Greek contexts. At the same time it is somehow strange that the earliest Italian thesauri seem to be restricted to areas where Roman political influence was strong, whereas the hellenisation of Italy does not seem

65 Humbert 1978, 237-244. An inscribed thesaurus comes from the Umbrian town Amelia, which may have retained allied status until the Social War (Bradley 2000, 120-122), but the thesaurus is dated to the first century BC; the same goes for the first century thesaurus from Ferentillo. The thesaurus of Pettino near Amiterum (CIL IX, 4325 = CIL F, 1856) is not dated, but appears in ILLRP, no. 532. At Collepietro, near Superaequum, a thesaurus was found with coins, including one reading Diovis / stipe (CIL F, 2484). The lid of a possible thesaurus was found in a votive deposit at S. Pietro in Cantoni: Matteini Chiari 2000, 284.

66 For the thesaurus Sogliano 1896, 370, according to whom the thesaurus had “l’aspetto di un enorme uovo” and Hülsen 1907, 237 n. 1 with fig. 1. on p. 239. Apparently a Roman praefectura was installed in 305 BC, it became municipium in 90 BC.

67 CIL IX 3812 (= CIL F, 390; cf. CIL IX, 3813), now lost. Catalli and Scheid 1994, no. 12, marked ‘uncertain’ by Crawford 2003b, 79.

68 Cf. Coarelli and La Regina 1984, 127-129 and La Torre 1989a (on the thesaurus: 140 and 143 fig. 55). An earlier incorporation of the entire area is however not excluded. On the status of the Paeligni see Coarelli and La Regina 1984, 113: in 305 BC part of their territory was apparently annexed by Rome (Diod. Sic. 20.90.3), probably the area around Superaequum. See also Chapter 7.

69 Ve. 1. According to La Regina 2000, post-Gracchan.

70 The status of this area is not clear in all respects, but it was conquered already in 290 BC (Humbert 1978, 226-233). The thesaurus of Carpineto della Nora, only ca. 10 km distant from Pescosansonesco, also belongs to this territory.

71 Letta 2004.

72 Torelli 2005, 355.
to have been linked directly to Roman influence. Perhaps another suggestion of Torelli, that the phenomenon may have been linked to the “sostanziale monetizzazione del regime delle offerte”, in the second half of the second century BC, could be better related to Roman influence, but it is still striking that the evidence is restricted to particular areas of Central Italy.

In any case, the appearance of a thesaurus in a sanctuary to ‘Jupiter Victor of the ten pagi’ taps into a new fashion which seems in one way or another related to Roman influence. Generally, these thesauri will have served as receptacles for the contributions of the participants of the cult, which were to be used, amongst other things, to finance the festivals and associated ludi. This calls to mind the above quoted assertion of Dionysius (4.15.4) that for the funding of the activities during the Paganalia all inhabitants of the pagus had to throw in their apposite νόμισμα (“Towards the expense of this sacrifice and of this assemblage he ordered all those of the same district to contribute each of them a certain piece of money, the men paying one kind, the women another and the children a third kind”). Whether the second suggestion by Dionysius that “When these pieces of money were counted by those who presided over the sacrifices, the number of people, distinguished by their sex and age, became known” is also true, remains impossible to prove.

**Conclusion: The Ritual Definition of New Communities**

To sum up, we have seen that in modern literature on ancient religion the pagus is often evoked as a locale of rusticity and rurality. This is partly justified by a similar attitude in early imperial poetry, where the countryside is being exalted as a part of Augustan ideology. Along the same lines, the most important religious festival associated with the pagus, the Paganalia, has been conceptualised as an agricultural feast of great antiquity. Yet, this image is not backed up by the evidence. The sources tell us little else than that the Paganalia involved a specific group located in the countryside, and that the festival was designed for administrative purposes.

Part of the Paganalia was probably a lustratio of the pagus. Such a lustratio was however not exclusively performed on the occasion of the Paganalia. During the lustrationes the inhabitants of the pagus made a circumambulation around their territory, and thereby ritually enhanced its borders. At the same time the group that was included within this territory was being redefined by this ritual. The lustratio will have had an important integrative function for the community. By re-emphasising or constructing the community ritually, previous relations and boundaries will have been erased, and the new community will have established and augmented its authority by divine legitimisation. This process of group formation also becomes apparent in the archaeological and epigraphical record, in the form of tesserae paganicae which express the affiliation of individuals to the pagus, and the communal sanctuaries installed ex pagi decreto vel sim., where the inhabitants of the pagus probably also paid their contributions to the festivities.

---

73 TORELLI 2005, 355.
It should not be excluded that these group formation processes, and perhaps related administrative purposes, informed the main rituals celebrated in the countryside pagi, albeit concealed behind general references to rusticity by early imperial poetry, and not the least modern interpretation. Indeed, we should try to put images of rustic and frugal cult into perspective, just as in the case of the ‘sacro-idyllic’ landscape shown at the beginning of this chapter. The image has to be understood within a new, very Roman decorative scheme belonging to a villa of the last decade BC, the ensemble being typical for the Augustan age (fig. 8.3).

Fig. 8.3. Wall-painting with ‘sacro-idyllic’ landscape within decorative scheme from the villa of Agrippa Postumus at Boscotrecase, Red Room, North wall (VON BLANCKENHAGEN and ALEXANDER 1990, pl. 21).
Chapter 9

Roman Ritual in the Italian Countryside?
The Compitalia and the Shrines of the Lares Compitales

“the separation between city cult and family or farm cult should not be exaggerated” (BEARD, NORTH and PRICE 1998, 50).

What the Paganalia were to the pagi, were the Compitalia to the vici of Rome. The festival is the clearest religious aspect connected to the institution of the vicus and therefore will be discussed in some detail. The religious festival of the Compitalia or ‘cross-roads festival’¹ was celebrated in both city and countryside. Even if clearly a Roman festival and best known from urban contexts, it is usually assumed that it originated as a rural cult which was later incorporated in the city, where it became the principal festival of the vici or urban quarters. Arguably, this conception of a rural origin resonates with the idea of the pagus-vicus system as an ‘immemorial’ Italic institution, discussed in Chapter 6. In this chapter, it will be argued that the spread of the Compitalia might have been in the opposite direction; in this view the Compitalia, a Roman urban festival with administrative aspects, was spread outside Rome alongside Roman influence – just as the Paganalia which have been discussed previously. It is argued, moreover, that the festival could have been important for the definition and enhancement of groups participating in it. Although the precise relation between the rural vici of Italy and the Compitalia is difficult to establish, there is clear evidence that the Compitalia were indeed celebrated in the countryside. It will be suggested that in some cases ancient Italic sanctuaries could have been re-used for celebrating the Roman rite of the Compitalia, apparently by now functioning within a Roman administrative and religious system.²

THE COMPITALIA: A PARADOXICAL PICTURE
At the end of a letter to Atticus (2.3), Cicero writes, probably from his country house, after having referred to the political situation in Rome and Cicero’s own position within it: sed haec ambulationibus Compitaliciis reservemus. Tu pridie Compitalia

¹ From compitum = ‘crossroads’, cf. infra.
² The main content of this chapter has been published in a slightly different form in STEK 2008.
memento. Balineum calfieri iubebo. Et Pomponiam Terentia rogat; matrem adiungemus (‘But this point must be reserved for our strolls at the Compitalia. Do you remember the day before the festival: I will order the bath to be heated, and Terentia is going to invite Pomponia. We will make your mother one of the party’). In this way, Cicero informs us on how he imagines spending the Compitalia or cross-roads festival, writing as it seems in December of the year 60 BC. The impression that arises, on a private level, is that of a relaxed holiday, with time for family and friends alike.

At the same time, the moveable feast of the Compitalia constituted the most important religious festival associated with the vici or wards of Rome. According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, writing in the Augustan period, the festival was installed together with the urban vici as a means of administrative control, in order to be able to count the inhabitants of Rome. Other evidence confirms this public or civic character of the festival. Apparently, the Compitalia were relevant both to what we would define the ‘private’ and to the ‘public’ domain.

Another paradoxical aspect regards the location of the Compitalia. The festival is often associated with the urban plebs, and therefore placed in an urban setting. On the other hand, passages in Roman authors refer to a rustic setting of the Compitalia. Modern historiography has subsequently translated this situation in various ways. Most popular is the conception of the Compitalia as a festival of agricultural or rural origin which was only later incorporated in the city. Not much attention has been paid to the celebration of the Compitalia in the countryside however. Most disturbingly, it is actually not known in what places the festival was celebrated in the countryside.

The aim of this chapter is to delineate an historical development of the Compitalia and to shed light on its rural cult places, by reviewing these apparent oppositions of public vs. private and urban vs. rural. The conception of this development proposed here may have consequences for current ideas on the ‘religious romanisation’ of Italy and especially the countryside, the very existence of which, as has been seen in Chapter 2, tends to be minimised in recent studies.

After a short introduction of the Compitalia the attention will be focused on three main aspects.

In the first place, the character of the community that participated in the cult will be discussed. Often, the Compitalia are seen as “very much a family-affair”. On the other hand there seems to be a strong civic or public aspect to the festival. The relevant textual evidence will be discussed, and it will be argued that this ‘double’ image of public and private emerges from the archaeological record as well. It will be suggested that it is precisely this all-embracing quality of the Compitalia, cutting through these distinctions and including all inhabitants, that distinguishes it from other festivals.

Secondly, the location of the celebration of the Compitalia as indicated in literature and epigraphy will be considered. The situation for both city and countryside will be surveyed. Here, the issue of the presumed rural origin of the Compitalia comes up. It will be shown that the evidence for a development from an agricultural, rural cult to an

---

3 2.3.5, translation Loeb (E.O. Winstedt).
4 SCULLARD 1981, 60.
urban Roman cult is meagre. As regards the evidence for the spread of the *Compitalia* in Italy at least, a development in the opposite direction is proposed: the *Compitalia* could have been exported from Rome to other areas influenced or inhabited by Romans at least as early as the second half of the second century BC. In the third place, the argument on the location of the *Compitalia* will be directed further to the cult places themselves: what exactly constituted a *compitum* shrine, and where were they located? Several urban *compitum* shrines have been unearthed, and their different architectural forms will be discussed briefly. The rural cult places where the *Compitalia* were celebrated in the countryside have never been identified however. It will be suggested that the problematic description in a scholion on Persius has distracted scholarly research on the shrines of the *Lares Compitales* from the question of where the *Compitalia* were actually celebrated. Tentatively, it will be argued that ancient rural sanctuaries built by ‘Italic’ peoples were suitable sacred places to be reused later within a Roman religious, social and political system. There is evidence to suggest that some of the resumed or continued religious activities in ancient ‘Italic’ sanctuaries related to the *Compitalia*.

**THE FESTIVAL OF THE COMPITALIA**

The *Compitalia* consisted of sacrifices at *compita* (cross-roads and by extension the shrines placed there; from *competere* or ‘coming together’ cf. *infra*) and games, the *ludi Compitalicii*. Certainly, meals were part of the festival, and, as has been seen, Cicero muses on strolls. The *Compitalia* were part of the *feriae conceptivae*; that is the festivals that had no fixed date but were to be established anew each year. At least in the late Republic, they were announced eight days beforehand, in December, by the *praetor*. Normally, the *Compitalia* were celebrated some days after the *Saturnalia* (17 December), probably most often at the very end of December or the beginning of January.

As to the cult personnel, *magistri* who were allowed to wear the *toga praetexta* presided over the *Compitalia*. For the rustic environment, Cato (Agr. 5.3) informs us

---

5 Cf. the alternative etymology from ‘conpotando, id est simul bibendo’ in schol. Pers. 4.28.
6 Cic. *Att.* 2.3.4. Dr. L. B. van der Meer suggests (pers. comm.) that with the *ambulatio* the *lustratio* may be meant, rather than ‘strolls’.
7 Gell. 10.24.3.
9 Cic. *Pis.* 8; Liv. 34.7.2; Asc. p. 7. C. There has been much discussion on the date and character of the *magistri vici*; cf. FLAMBARD 1977, FLAMBARD 1981; FRASCHETTI 1990; TARPIN 2002; BERT LOTT 2004. On the date: it is clear that at least from the middle of the first century BC on *magistri vici* did exist (*contra* Fraschetti): cf. *CIL* IV, 60 which lists magistrates for a Pompeian *vicus* for 47-46 BC, and *CIL* VI, 1324 (= *CIL* I², 2514), a column from Rome, datable to around the 50s BC, that mentions *magistri veici* (TARPIN 2002, 133-134, also for other examples). Liv. 34.7.2 mentions *magistri vicorum* for 195 BC. Cf. also BERT LOTT 2004, esp. 41-44 who argues that *magistri vici* were already in action by the time of the second Punic War. On their character: the image that arises of the *magister vici* is not one of splendour. Juvenal (10.103) calls him a *pannosus aedilis*: an aedile in tatters. The office came to be associated mostly with the lower classes of society (Liv. 34.7.2: *infimum genus* for 195 BC), which has been seen as a ground to underscore the essentially popular character of the main
on the modus operandi at the ideal villa: the bailiff (vilicus) of the agricultural enterprise could assume the presiding role over the activities on behalf of his master.\footnote{CIL V, 7739 from Liguria seems to confirm this privilege: here, a vilicus dedicates a comp(itum) [et] aram to the Lares.}

In the literary tradition, the origin of the Compitalia is connected to the creation of the four urban regions by King Servius Tullius (cf. \textit{infra}). Historically on some firmer ground, it appears that colleges of magistri that organised the Compitalia in Rome became a focus of popular political activity around the middle of the last century BC. Fear for ‘subversive’ political activities and riots of the collegia that were made up mainly of freedmen and slaves explains the suppression of the collegia and the connected \textit{ludi Compitalicii} in 64 BC by the Senate.\footnote{Cf. on the subject: FLAMBARD 1977, 1981; FRASCHETTI 1990, 204-273; BERT LOTT 2004, esp. 54-55, who concludes that the \textit{ludi} were curtailed, but the \textit{Compitalia} (“a public ritual of the state religion”) themselves not.}

The consequent attempts, not always successful, to re-establish them attest to the political struggles of this period. It was exactly this political connotation, and association with the plebs, that made the cult at the compita of each vicus an attractive focus of attention for Augustus.\footnote{Cf. e.g. ALFÖLDI 1973; FRASCHETTI 1990, 204-273.}

Between 12 and 7 BC Augustus restructured the city into fourteen urban regions and an unknown number of vici.\footnote{Suet. \textit{Aug.} 30.}

A number of 265 vici becomes clear from the \textit{census} of 73 AD.\footnote{Plin. \textit{HN} 3.66. Cf. also the \textit{maxima ter centum totam delubra per urbem} installed by Augustus according to Verg. \textit{Aen.} 8.716, explained by Servius ad loc. as \textit{compita}, but the word \textit{maxima} is maybe not fitting this interpretation. Cf. TARPIN 2002, 124, n. 89.}

The objects of veneration were two Lares who are now associated with the \textit{Genius Augusti}.\footnote{For altars and \textit{aediculae}: ALFÖLDI 1973, 31-36; HANO 1986.}

The objects of veneration were two Lares who are now associated with the \textit{Genius Augusti}.\footnote{Cf. \textit{infra}.}

In this way, the compita were effectively used to disseminate the emperor cult over a wide and specifically popular audience. It is often assumed that Augustus deliberately revived and promoted the \textit{Compitalia} in order to bring the emperor cult (in the form of the \textit{Genius}) amongst the people also in the realest sense: absorbing him, as it were, between the ancestors.\footnote{Cf. BEARD, NORTH and PRICE 1998, 185; GRADEL 2002, esp. 116-130. The issue is complex: the Lares are seen by some as the spirits of the dead. In this view, the revival of the Lares-cult at the compita associated with the emperor would therefore reflect the dissemination of the private cult of the house of Augustus over the \textit{vici} of the city. Cf. \textit{infra}.}
Ch. 9. The Compitalia

Lares in summa Sacra Via. The Augustan reform is important here, because all evidence dating after 12-7 BC may have been influenced by it. Having introduced the Compitalia, a festival with possibly archaic origins, which was organised by magistri (vici) and centred upon compita, the cult places of the vici, now we turn to some specific elements of the ritual and the festival.

Private and Public: An Integrative Cult

For any analysis of its social and political significance, it is of central importance to ask to which group in society the Compitalia catered. Delineating the ‘community of cult’ is also pivotal for the question in what type of cult places the Compitalia could be celebrated. Although some sources direct us towards a conception of the Compitalia as a largely family-oriented festival, other evidence suggests a wider audience. Sometimes, these different locales have been interpreted as indicative of a distinction between a public and a private cult.

‘PRIVATE’: A FAMILY AFFAIR?

Let us first briefly review the argument for the Compitalia as a family cult. At least in later times it seems that the Lares Compitales were assimilated with deified souls of the dead, or gods of the underworld, as Festus says. To some, it has appeared that this aspect of veneration of the dead should be linked to an ancestor cult. In this way, the Compitalia would come close to a cult that is centred on the family. Other arguments have been brought to the fore as well to sustain the thesis that the Compitalia were essentially a family occasion: The presence of altars to the Lares and mural paintings documenting scenes associated with the Compitalia inside some houses on Delos may at first sight corroborate such an interpretation (but cf. infra).

Drawing broad comparisons (“as our New Year’s day follows Christmas, so a short time after the Saturnalia the Romans enjoyed a second period of feasting and goodwill”), Scullard emphasises that the Compitalia “still remained very much a

---

18 Fest. p. 108 L. laneae effigies compitalibus noctu dabantur in compita, quod Lares, quorum is erat dies festus, animae putabantur esse hominem redactae in numerum deorum; p. 273 L.: pilae et effigies viriles et muliebres ex lana Compitalibus suspendebantur in compitis quod hunc diem festum esse deorum inferorum quos vocant Lares putarent quibus tot pilae quot capita servorum tot effigies quot essent liberi ponebantur ut vivis parcerent et essent his pilis et simulacris contenti. cf. Macrobi. Sat. 1.7.34-35, describing the hanging of dolls from the compita during the festival. There has been much discussion on the credibility of the interpretation of the dolls (and the Lares in general) as indicating an ancestor cult (as Festus suggests) or even as a substitute for human sacrifices: Macrobius (as cited) mentions the practice of human sacrifice, apparently instigated by Tarquinius Superbus after a response of an oracle, which was subsequently abolished by – significantly – the founder of the Republic, Iunius Brutus, who replaced the real heads for ‘dummies’.
19 The discussion on the origin of the Lares, protective deities of the fields (Wissowa) or rather linked to the dead / ancestors (Samter), started with Wissowa 1897, Wissowa 1902, 166-177 and Samter 1901, 105-123; Samter 1907; Laing 1921; Tabeling 1932. See now scheid 1990, 587-598; Coarelli 1983, 265-282.
family affair”. In order to lend weight to his argument, Scullard points out that Cicero did not want to disturb Pompey at his Alban villa during the Compitalia. Cicero indeed declares that he wanted to arrive one day later because he did not want to intrude in family affairs (ne molestus familiae veniam). This argument might not be valid. First, reference is made here to a social group that in all probability did not define itself primarily through neighbourhood connections, as is in fact already pointed out by Pompey’s leisure in his villa in the country during the Compitalia. Second, Cicero is known to have been extremely attentive not to disturb his hosts. For example, he was ridiculed for his preference to use deversoria, his own small inns, where he rested during his travel to his villae, instead of staying at befriended elite people in the countryside – as was common practice according to the custom of capitalising personal hospitia. But Cicero insisted – in almost literally the same words – because he would rather avoid in this way to disturb his hosts “ne semper hospiti molestus sim”. Leaving this last, rather anecdotal, argument aside, we may however conclude that the evidence for a ‘familial’ aspect, although present, is not very strong, and this aspect had in any case no exclusive character. There are indications to regard the principal group involved in the Compitalia as a somewhat larger unit.

‘PUBLIC’: THE ORIGIN OF THE COMPITALIA ACCORDING TO DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

Indeed, there is evidence that the Compitalia had a public character. In the first place, the fact that a praetor announced the festival underscores its public and civic pertinence. However, the most important source for the apparently ‘public’ character of the Compitalia is Dionysius of Halicarnassus. According to this Greek author writing in the Augustan period, the Compitalia were closely bound up with the administration of inhabitants in the city. King Servius Tullius (trad. 578-535 BC) is evoked as the instigator of the festival that actually resulted as a corollary of the division of the city into four regions.

“And he ordered that the citizens inhabiting each of the four regions should, like persons living in villages, neither take up another abode nor be enrolled elsewhere; and the levies of troops, the collection of taxes for military purposes, and the other services which every citizen was bound to offer to the commonwealth, he no longer based upon the three national tribes, as aforetime, but upon the four local tribes established by himself. And over each region he appointed commanders, like heads of

20 SCULLARD 1981, 59, 60.
21 It seems certain that the villa of Pompey, not Cicero’s own villa, is intended, as e.g. LATTE 1960, 91-92 assumes (to strengthen a similar argument; that the city-based owners did not interfere with the ritual on their own estates, which were instead presided by their vilici).
23 Cic. Fam. 7.23.3.
24 Gell. 10.24.3.
25 Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 4.14.2-4, translation adapted from Loeb; for the connection with slaves also present in Dionysius’ account cf. supra n. 9.
tribes or villages, whom he ordered to know what house each man lived in. After this he commanded that there should be erected in every street (στενωπούς) by the inhabitants of the neighbourhood chapels (καλιάδας) to heroes whose statues stood in front of the houses (‘ήρωσι προνοπίοις), and he made a law that sacrifices should be performed to them every year, each family contributing a honey-cake ... This festival the Romans still continued to celebrate even in my day in the most solemn and sumptuous manner a few days after the Saturnalia, calling it the Compitalia, after the streets (στενωπών); for compita is their name for streets.”

Analogous to the discussion of the Paganalia, the sequence Dionysius employs is worthy of attention: King Servius begins with the establishment of four regions (or tribes), in which people are obliged to be enlisted for the military levy and the collection of taxes. Then the king proceeds by establishing ‘commanders’ who administered the whereabouts of the population. Only after this, Servius turns to the religious component of his reform: the erection of shrines in every street and the institution of a yearly ritual, the Compitalia. According to Dionysius therefore – and this is of central importance – the Compitalia were devised as a means to establish cohesion between the people who had happened to end up in the same administrative units.

At the same time the Compitalia appear as a means to count the inhabitants of each district. This could be distilled from the already mentioned account by Festus, in which it is described that during the night before the Compitalia woollen dolls were suspended from the compita. Each member of the compitum community had to be represented: the free men and women with male and female woollen dolls (effigies) and woollen balls (pilae) for slaves.26 Leaving aside questions on the rather shadowy origins of this rite,27 the significance of the rite as a possible means to register the number of inhabitants is clear. For just as in the Paganalia, where people, according to Dionysius, could be recognised by the donation of different coins, the pilae and effigies (as well as the cakes) of the Compitalia could serve well as an indication of the number of people living in each unit. The presence of a similar rite in the two festivals, which are both linked to the administration of the Roman population, can be no coincidence.28

This possible administrative aspect mentioned by Festus and Macrobius can perhaps be traced in the material record.29 In Pompeii, representations of dolls hanging from the altars are indeed documented (figs. 9.1a and b).30

---

27 Cf. supra n. 19.
29 SPINAZZOLA 1953, 179-180, figs. 215-218 for dolls. In fig. 218 the thread from which the doll is hanging can be seen. It should be noted that the rite could as well be related to the offering of the dolls to the Lares by girls reaching adulthood: Pseudoacronis Schol. on Hor. Sat. 1.5.65-66 (cf. also the three asses offered by a nubile woman, infra n. 41). The intimate link between rites de passage and Compitalia becomes clear as well from a fragment from Varro’s Menippeae (Varro, Sat. Men. fr. 463 Buech. = Non. Marc. p. 538) from which can be deduced that apart from balls and/or dolls also hair nets (reticula) and breast bands (stróphia) were offered, which are the same gifts offered by maidens.
On stylistic grounds Thomas Fröhlich assigns none of these particular paintings to before the Augustan period. However, one painting showing dolls is dated to the early Augustan period, around 20 BC. If Fröhlich’s date is trustworthy this is significant, since it would attest to the practice of hanging dolls prior to the Augustan reforms, otherwise only known from fairly late writers.

Fig. 9.1a. Painted compitum with hanging dolls from altar, Pompeii, (Via dell’Abbondanza, SW corner of Ins. IX, 11) (SPINAZZOLA 1953, 178 fig. 216).

before wedding to the Lares, Venus, and Fortuna Virgo (SAMTER 1907, 379-380; cf. TORELLI 1984, 97).


L29, late second style, dated to the around 20 BC (FRÖHLICH 1991, 70-72). The first phase of F66 is similarly dated, but the paintings on which the dolls appear are from later phases (FRÖHLICH 1991, 337).

Festus (late second century AD; the possible influence of earlier sources [Varro?] cannot be proved) and Macrobius (late fourth / fifth centuries AD). It should be stressed that it is in no way clear that this practice goes indeed back to archaic times, as often seems to be assumed, apparently on the grounds that it appears as a very ancient custom, also present in other Indo-European cultures (cf. DUMÉZIL 1961). Delos can apparently not help to stretch the chronology back to before 69 BC: to my knowledge this type of depiction of an altar with schematic dolls does not appear at the painted altars from Delos (based on a cursory examination of the illustrations in BULARD 1926a, BRUNEAU 1970, BEZERRA DE MENESES and SARIAN 1973, and HASENOHR 2003 (on the altar depicted at wall Γ/1 [BEZERRA DE MENESES and SARIAN 1973, figs. 21-22] is a stroke, but this does not seem to represent a doll). But of course, this absence of evidence cannot conversely attest to the absence of an administrative aspect of the Compitalia in this period, and could be explained by the particular political status of Delos.
Whether or not the origin of this festival may be traced so far back as the time of Servius Tullius is a question to which no satisfactory answer can be expected,34 but the point to be made here is that religious rituals could play an explicit role in consolidating administrative control. Dionysius could apparently understand the installation of a cult and festival rather straightforwardly as a deliberate means to integrate people.

**VICUS AND COMPITUM**

Certainly, the *Compitalia* brought the people from a defined neighbourhood together. The *Compitalia* are generally considered to be the festival *par excellence* that was celebrated in the *vici* and was organised *vicatim*. The connection with the *vicus* becomes clear from the associations in texts and the context of the relevant passages, and is stated explicitly by Asconius when he assigns a role to *magistri vicorum* in the organisation of the *ludi Compitalicii*.35 The passage by Pliny the Elder commenting on the division of the city sustains this connection: *ipsa dividitur in regiones XIII, compita Larum CCLXV*.36 Apparently, *compita* could be used as a metaphor or rather as a *pars pro toto* for the urban *vici*. At Pompeii a *collegium* of *magistri vici et compiti* is documented by a text painted on a tufa block and dated to 47 and 46 BC.37 This juxtaposition seems to indicate that the tasks of a *magister vici* included, or could

---

34 It may seem rather arbitrary from a historical point of view, even if ideologically, and therefore historiographically, it indeed makes sense: many administrative institutions are ascribed to this king who was himself believed to be the son of a *Lar* (Plin. *HN* 36.204). The strong connection between the institutions of Servius Tullius and the counting of citizens is thus clear, and has since long been appreciated: e.g. FLAMBARD 1981, 156; TARPIN 2002, 106-111; *contra* BERT LOTT 2004, 36, who limits himself to the statement that the “meaning of this enigmatic ceremony [scil. hanging dolls] is unclear”. FRASCHETTI 1990, 208 does not think either that a form of *census* is intended, pointing to the other ways of counting inhabitants mentioned in Dion. *Ant. Rom.* 4.15: the offering of coins for newborns to Juno Lucina, for dead to Libitina, for youth becoming men Juventas. All these measures appear however in row in Dionysius (first *Compitalia*, then *Paganalia*, then Lucina-Libitina-Juventas) leading up to “the wisest of all measures”: the first *census*, which suggests a relation. Cf. Chapter 8.

35 Asc. p. 7 C. Cf. *supra* n. 9. For the problems with different readings on the basis of the different interpunctuation that can be applied, cf. FRASCHETTI 1990, 228. 

36 Plin *HN* 3.66.

37 *CIL* IV, 60; cf. *CIL* VI, 14180 for Augustan Rome.
include, the maintenance of the *compitum*. In Dionysius’ account, the ambiguity of the terms becomes clear as well: he states that ‘κομπίτους γάρ τούς στενωπούς καλούσι’; ‘for they call *στενωπούς* *compita*’; *στενωπός* is the normal Greek translation of Latin *vicus*.

### ‘PRIVATE’ AND ‘PUBLIC’ IN CITY AND COUNTRYSIDE

Thus, for the city the connection between the organisation of the festival and the urban *vicus* is clear; it were *magistri* of these territorial districts that organised and presided over the event. It would be peculiar to assume that a ‘family’ cult was supervised by (semi)-officials, if not expressly to forge a connection between the (members of the) family and a larger entity. Therefore, without rejecting the ‘familial’ aspect, which is undeniably present, it is perhaps better to understand the organisation of the *Compitalia* as an attempt to integrate family and society and to strengthen the ties between private and civic life, already intertwined so deeply. The situation in the countryside may seem different at first sight: in the *villa* imagined by Cato the *vilicus* took care of the extended household, of which the bailiff himself was part. Here then, it seems at first glance that the *Compitalia* indeed involved the household, or extended family, and not a larger group. Leaving the problems and degree of credibility of the Catonian *villa* for what they are, there are other reasons to doubt the ‘family’ character of the *Compitalia* at the *villa*. In the first place one could be inclined, at least from the late Republican period on, to regard the community of a large *villa*, both in population quantities, dimensions and maybe also in structural character, rather as a small *village* than as what one normally associates with the word *villa*. It is possible that this community was physically more or less self-contained, and that therefore further inclusion or integration with other civic structures was simply not feasible. For an archaeological view on the questions around public and private, we now turn to the island of Delos.

---

38 The explicit mentioning of both elements could, though, attest to the situation that these functions were not exactly synonymous or interchangeable, but perhaps the commissioners of the text (in all probability the *magistri* themselves) wanted to boast as many aspects of their function as possible, therefore including a facet of their profession that was actually taken for granted.

39 MASON 1974, 85. HASENOHR 2003, 193 thinks that the confusion is due to the co-existence of the Lares’ epiteths *Compitales* and *Viales*, and that their cult was sometimes celebrated in the streets, sometimes at the cross-roads.

40 This would indeed be possible, of course, if one accepts the function of the *collegia* as a kind of mock-officials, or as a ‘propédeutique civique’ in order to give slaves something similar to the ‘real world’ to do, thereby reinforcing the existing power structures. I do not think this vision can be upheld however, in light of the undeniable public and administrative aspects. cf. infra n. 69.

41 Other rites performed at the *compitum* than the *Compitalia* proper underline this function: Varro *apud* Non. 531 M mentions the custom for a bride to offer three *asses*: one to give the bridegroom, one to offer in *foco larium familiarum*, and one in *conpito vicinale*. Cf. the observations by PICCALUGA 1961, 90: “l’offerta fatta in occasione di un matrimonio univa in un tutto unico e le divinità legate alla casa e al focolare, e quelle venerate al crocivia.”

42 Cf. further in this chapter on Cato.
Delos

The best material evidence with regard to the *Compitalia* in the Republican period is not to be found in Italy but on Delos. From the third century BC onward this commercial centre, part of the Cyclades, was frequented by Romans and other people from Italy and flourished especially after 166 BC, when it was declared a free harbour and put under the administration of Athens. Notwithstanding its specificity, it is in this context of a community of merchants from Italy that settled on the island that the *Compitalia* come best in focus.

Wall-paintings in and on houses and chapels show sacrificial scenes and other aspects of the cult, and inscriptions in Greek mention the existence of a college of *kompetaliastai*. At the so-called ‘agora des compétaliastes’, a temple was probably dedicated to the *Lares Compitales*. The people that feature in these inscriptions are slaves and freedmen, mostly from the Eastern Mediterranean. The people who are depicted are clearly Italians: they wear toga’s (white and sometimes the purple-banded *praetexta*) and *calcei* at their feet. Moreover, they sacrifice *ritu romano* with veiled head (figs. 9.2a and b). The most plausible interpretation is therefore that the Greek and Eastern slaves and freedmen of the inscriptions were servants to Italian families.

Figs. 9.2a and b. Delos, painted altar indicating a sacrifice *ritu romano* (BULARD 1926b, pls. XVII and XXIV).

---

43 In the context of Delos, the term ‘Italians’ will be used to indicate both ‘Romans’ and other peoples provenant from Italy.
44 The inscriptions are normally found on bases of statues and include dedications to the *theoi*, perhaps to be identified with the *Lares Compitales*: *Inscriptions de Délos* 1760-1766, 1768-1771. Other deities do not fail however: Heracles, Zeus Eleutherios, Dionysos, Pistis, and Roma feature as well.
Because the paintings are located both in and outside the houses, the connection between the archaeological evidence and the epigraphical attestation of the Compitalia is not straightforward. Exemplary for the debate on the Compitalia, the paintings were first interpreted as a domestic cult of the Lares Familiares, for, as the argument ran, the Compitalia were rather to be expected at cross-roads. Later this attribution was revised and the festival depicted at the doors was identified as the Compitalia, and its entirely public character stressed.

Recently, Claire Hasenohr has opted for a more sophisticated solution, and concludes that the Compitalia on Delos were celebrated both on a ‘private’ level at the shrines near and in houses and on a more ‘official’ level at the temple of the Lares in the agora. At this temple, the kompetaliastai would have made an official, communal sacrifice on behalf of the Italian community during the Compitalia. This “double célébration” could be explained by the particular socio-political conditions on Delos; the Compitalia would even have become a means of self-affirmation of the Italian community. Apparently, the expatriated Romans and other Italians used the Compitalia in order to secure or re-affirm social relations, and it is presumable that this ‘constructing’ of the community by ritual was even more pronounced in this alien context.

There is evidence to suggest that this ‘double’ nature of the Compitalia does not apply to Delos alone. Also in Pompeii a distinction between domestic lararia and the shrines outside the houses (and especially on the crossroads) has suggested a separation between the domestic cult of the Lares Familiares, and the public cult of the Lares Compitales linked with the administrative organisation of the city. In light of the Delian evidence however, Hasenohr questions this neat distinction. There are rather many altars – also in the same street – to be maintained by the magistri, and sometimes they seem to be related directly to the more important Pompeian domus. She suggests that at least some of the shrines outside the houses were put up by the inhabitants of these houses, rather than by the city administration.

Also the literary sources indicate a varied location of the cult: whereas Festus states that the dolls were suspended from the compita, Macrobius locates them ‘at every door’. One passage of Cato may possibly be related to this diversification of location.

47 BULARD 1926b.  
49 HASENOHR 2003, 170, 214.  
50 HASENOHR 2003, 214-218.  
51 Cf., e.g. COHEN 1985, for anthropological examples; see Chapter 1.  
52 For lararia cf. FRÖHLICH 1991 with TYBOUT 1996; for Compitalia and administrative aspects CIL IV, 60; CIL I², 2984; VAN ANDRINGA 2000, 73-75.  
53 HASENOHR 2003, 192.  
54 Fest. p. 108 L; Macrobr. Sat. 1.7.35; cf. Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 4.14.3: προνωπίοις. According to Hasenohr, this would indicate that the Lares were not only venerated at the crossroads as Lares Compitales, but also in the streets (as Lares Viales) and on the walls of the houses (she avoids to attach a name to these last Lares) (HASENOHR 2003, 194). In this way, cross-roads, streets and houses are all present. It is perhaps not necessary to see the location of the Lares in such a structured way (cf.
even more directly. In prescribing the responsibilities and duties of the vilicus, the bailiff, Cato states that he \textit{rem divinam nisi compitalibus in compito aut in foco ne faciat}. Most often, this is interpreted to mean something like: “the vilicus must not partake in religious rituals, if not at the crossroads during the \textit{Compitalia}, or at the domestic hearth.”

But if we may understand that both \textit{in compito} and \textit{in foco} refer to \textit{compitalibus}, which seems possible to me, in this passage both aspects of the same cult, that of the family hearth and of the \textit{compitum} community, are present. A possible translation would then be: “the vilicus must not partake in religious rituals, if not during the \textit{Compitalia}, [which he can perform] at the crossroads or at the domestic hearth.” Then, the ‘twofold’ character of the \textit{Compitalia} could not be summarised better; partly to be celebrated at the domestic hearth, partly at the local \textit{compitum}, where the congregated community was somewhat larger, probably consisting of more family units together.

\section*{‘Public’ and ‘Private’, or Integration of Both?}

In conclusion, it is tempting to suppose that the \textit{Compitalia} were celebrated in Italy in similarly diverse locales as documented for Delos. Still, one has to remain cautious with the division in and distinction of ‘public’ or ‘official’ and ‘private’ or ‘domestic’ locales, which might seem to suggest the existence of two parallel but isolated worlds. I would therefore hesitate to define the diversity of the contexts in which the \textit{Compitalia} were apparently celebrated as ‘double’. It is important to underscore that in no literary source on the \textit{Compitalia} a distinction between location (\textit{in compito, in foco, in compitis, in foribus}) is equated explicitly with public versus private contexts. Ultimately, the matter is much too problematic to decide to which degree liturgical paintings in the atrium of a \textit{domus}, or altars against the façade are to be considered private and to what extent a \textit{collegium} or club of freedmen and slaves, certainly of the

\textit{infra}, but the main line of reasoning is convincing. Hasenohr uses the Italian evidence for both Delos and Italy (esp. Pompeii), but also emphasises the specificity of Delos.

\footnote{Cato \textit{Agr.} 5.3.}

\footnote{Loeb [1934] gives: “He must perform no religious rites, except on the occasion of the \textit{Compitalia} at the cross-roads, or before the hearth.”}

\footnote{Maybe better than understanding \textit{in compito} as referring alone to \textit{compitalibus} and \textit{in foco} instead referring directly back to \textit{rem divinam}. \textit{In compito} would not add any further information to \textit{compitalibus} if not used in some way to distinguish it from \textit{in foco}: apparently this did not speak for itself and a specification had to be made. I thank Dr. V. Hunink for advise on this issue.}

\footnote{Thus also the translation by GOUJARD 1975, 15: “qu’il ne fasse pas de sacrifice, sinon lors de la fête des carrefours, au carrefour ou au foyer, sans ordre du maître.”}

\footnote{BAKKER 1994 includes the \textit{compita} (just as \textit{mithraea}) in his work on private religion in Ostia, defining ‘private’ as restricted versus ‘public’ = unrestricted, the cult at the \textit{compitum} being restricted to the neighbourhood (cf. also review by R. Laurence, \textit{CLR} 48, 2 [1998], 444-445). But then, the definition of the \textit{compita} could maybe better be ‘compartimentalised’ \textit{vel sim.}, since every citizen ended up at a \textit{compitum} at some place.}
same houses, can be regarded ‘public’ or ‘official’, with the risk of projecting modern ideas of public and private upon probably different ancient realities.\(^{60}\) This is not to say that we have to leave the subject in aporia. Let us shift focus from the question of public and private to what actually seems to have happened: a festival being celebrated both in the open air, at open places, on the corners, in the streets and inside houses; the same rituals being performed both at a temple at the agora\(^{61}\) and in front of the houses. What appears is a clear image of a ritual of integration: the ramification of the same rituals in diverse contexts engineers the integration of these contexts in one festival; and it seems that this constitutes the pointe in our dossier on the Compitalia. The already mentioned practice of hanging dolls and balls to represent every inhabitant on the compita and doors ties in with this integrative competence of the Compitalia. As has been underscored, these objects could serve as an indication of the number of people living in each unit. And as Dionysius informs us, this was – in his opinion – the very intention of the Compitalia. Again, the formation of a community becomes clear from this practice, a community that transcends, or more correctly includes, the level of the family.\(^{62}\)

If the peculiarity of the Delian Compitalia lies not so much in their presence in different social contexts, it may be in two other, interrelated, aspects. In the first place, it is striking that a festival bound up intrinsically with the administrative division in vici, as becomes clear from the Italian evidence, is present in a context that evidently lacked such an administration. The decision of the Italians to take the festival with them to Delos was therefore in all probability a voluntary one. Apparently the festival was popular enough amongst and ‘internalised’ in many of the Italians by the time they came to Delos. The second striking aspect is the relatively early appearance in the archaeological record of this phenomenon: the Compitalia were already celebrated by the third quarter of the second century BC.\(^{63}\)

---

\(^{60}\) Inasmuch as a division in public and private is tenable at all in this context; this should not coincide neatly with spatial divisions.

\(^{61}\) For Pompeii, the so-called ‘Tempio dei Lari pubblici’ (VII 9.3) in the forum would have represented a similar situation, but this identification is actually based on no evidence (cf. FRÖHLICH 1991, 37). The identification is from MAU 1896, esp. 299-301; also rejected by e.g. COARELLI, LA ROCCA, DE VOS and DE VOS 1997, 163-165.

\(^{62}\) Cf. the observations by PICCALUGA 1961, esp. 89-90 on the Lares. A very direct statement on the all-embracing ambit of the Compitalia is made in Festus, if we accept the identification of the Laralia with the Compitalia, as Wissowa suggests (WISSOWA 1912, 149): (Fest. 253 L) popularia sacra sunt, ut ait Labeo, quae omnes cives faciunt, nec certis familias attributa sunt: Fornacalia, Parilia, Laralia, Porca pressidanea.

\(^{63}\) The liturgical paintings were regularly renewed, and Bruneau has on the basis of technical research calculated that for the house opposite the Maison de la Colline the first painting may originate from around 120 BC (BRUNEAU 1970, 619-620), not much later, at least at the end of the second century BC, a collegium of kompetaiastai was in action (615). Although the literary sources indicate a relatively early date, in Italy most archaeological evidence does not. Sources: Naevius, third century BC; Cato, first half second century BC, also Lucilius (6.252-253 WARMINGTON 1938, second century BC) probably refers to the Compitalia when speaking of “that slaves festival which cannot be expressed in hexameters”: PALMER 1976, 167-168. For what it is worth, Livy (4.30.10) mentions vicis
These considerations leave us with two options for a conclusion: if we believe Dionysius, the Compitalia, part and parcel of the administrative organisation of the city of Rome from their early beginnings on – possibly in the archaic period, or the fourth century BC, in relation with other administrative reforms – had by then been rooted so firmly in the annual cycle of festivals that they were celebrated independently from their administrative function. If, on the other hand, we hold that Dionysius’ account reflects merely the reality at the time he was writing, and that his statement on the antiquity of the institution is just an example of the (unintentional) invention of tradition, one has to suppose that the Compitalia were originally just a popular festival that only later – perhaps in the first century BC, under Caesar, and surely with Augustus – acquired its administrative aspect (possibly together with its ‘tradition’).  

In conclusion, the following can be said on the character of the community of cult of the Compitalia. The often expressed argument, that the Compitalia were largely a family feast, might miss the point. Neither is it necessary to regard them exclusively as an official cult, extraneous to domestic cult. The Delian evidence testifies to the celebration of the Compitalia in both contexts, as Hasenohr has made clear. The evidence from Italy, and the Catonian passage, may indicate that the Delian situation was not exceptional in this respect. At least in Rome and in Pompeii the Compitalia were associated with administrative and/or political concerns. However, it is not clear if this politico-administrative connection was present from the very beginnings, as Dionysius would have it, or was added at a later point in time. The evidence does not lead us further back than Caesar. Whereas its politico-administrative dimension for this period remains obscure, it is certain that the Compitalia were already part of Romano-Italic society in the second century BC. The festival could by then be used to consolidate and ‘construct’ the Romano-Italic community. The Compitalia were essentially an integrative cult, inclusive rather than exclusive in character, being an official festival.
The Development of the Compitalia: From the Countryside to the City or vice versa?

“Das Fest trägt einen ländlichen Character,” Wissowa stated in 1901.70 In both ancient and modern texts on the Compitalia, a contradictory image arises with regard to the locale of the Compitalia. On the one hand, rustic elements are emphasised, whereas on the other an urban setting is attested by both the rioting in the 60s and 50s BC and the association with the urban plebs, as well as the association with the administrative division of the city. In order to make sense of this situation, presumably in combination with the assumption that the Compitalia rituals are of very ancient origin,71 modern research has tended to conceptualise a development over time of the festival. This development would have encompassed the implementation or adaptation of a rural festival celebrated by agricultural communities in an urban context. Along these lines Scullard states: “thus the state, as so often, developed its urban counterpart of what had originally been a country festival.”72

Timothy Potter follows this idea, and seems to imagine the introduction of the Compitalia in the city in a rather straightforward manner as a result of migration: “It [scil. the Compitalia] was in origin an agricultural ceremony to propitiate the lar, or spirit that presided over each farm, and it is striking to see how the traditions of the countryside became incorporated into the life of the towns, to which so many rural folk migrated.”73

Although this conception of the development of the Compitalia is often present in studies on the subject, for instance in the most recent exhaustive treatment of the Roman vici and their rituals,74 actual evidence for such a development from rural to urban is absent.

---

70 WISSOWA 1901a, 791.
71 SCULLARD 1981, 58: “Their [scil. Compitalia] history spans a thousand years, from primitive agricultural beginnings, through the solemn and sumptuous’ celebrations which Dionysius witnessed in Augustan Rome, and on to the late Empire”; WISSOWA 1897, 1872: “seit unvordenklicher Zeit.” Cf. also FLAMBARD 1981, 146, who sees the “cérémonie immémoriale” of the Argei as the predecessor of the Compitalia, since Varro (Ling. 5.45-54) states that the sacraria Argeorum were connected to the division of the city, just as the Compitalia were later. Latte argues that the festival was older than the institution of the praetorship (LATTE 1960, 91 n. 1).
72 SCULLARD 1981, 59 (= FOWLER 1925, 294).
73 POTTER 1987, 173.
74 BERT LOTT 2004, 38: “it is unclear when the probably earlier agricultural Compitalia was first adapted to an urban setting and focused on neighborhoods rather than farms, but it must have been early in Roman history,” and further on vici: “Indeed the replication of rural districts in imagined subdivisions of the urban space with local voluntary associations like the vici in Rome is a common phenomenon in societies making the transition from a non-urban to an urban existence,” but cf. TARPIN 2002 and infra. Similar ideas on the development from agricultural to urban in e.g. GRADEL
It should be stressed that nowhere is explicit mention made of the Compitalia as an exclusively rustic cult. Festivals that are indeed clearly connected with the countryside are the festivals of the Robigalia (in order to protect the crops from blight), the Fordicidia (the sacrifice of a pregnant cow to Tellus), the Cerialia and Vinalia. The Ambarvalia (lustration of the fields) and the Sementivae (the sowing of the seed) seem to have catered even more exclusively to the countryside. In my view however, the Compitalia do not belong to this group.75

Of course there are instances of a rustic setting of the Compitalia (for example in Cicero, who documents the custom of some of the happy few to escape from the city during the Compitalia, and in Cato for the rituals at his ideal villa), which confirm that the Compitalia were celebrated outside the city as well. But they do not prove an antiquity of supposedly ‘rural Compitalia’ with respect to a later urban variant.76

75 Contra BEARD, NORTH and PRICE 1998, 50 who list as “quite specifically rural festivals” Ambarvalia, Sementivae and Compitalia (strangely, because specifying that they were celebrated “both in Rome and in the countryside”) together because they would be “outside the civic structure of the city”, being feriae conceptivae (not at a fixed date). Most mobile festivals have indeed an agricultural character (“quasi tutte” DUMÉZIL, 1974 (1977), 480), but this circumstance cannot vice versa serve as a proof. It is true that the Compitalia could assume the character of a yearly celebration of the end of the agricultural season: according to a scholion at Persius (4.28; cf. infra n. 120 for text) the Compitalia were celebrated finita agricultura, but this – by the way rather late – assertion does obviously not attest to the origin of the Compitalia as an agricultural festival. On the problems with clear-cut definitions of festivals, cf. in general BEARD, NORTH and PRICE 1998, 47.

76 Commenting quite explicitly on the relation between city and countryside is the scholion on Persius 4.28: vel compita sunt non solum in urbe loca, sed etiam viae publicae ac diverticulae aliquorum confinium ..., which, if anything, seems to attest to the urban setting as the more ‘natural’ one rather than the rural setting, although in the context the agricultural aspect is highlighted. An overview of the principal literary sources: 1) Cato Agr. 57.1; Plin. HN 19.114; Prop. 4.1.23; Festus p. 108 L, 273 L; Auson. De feris Romanis, 17-18 do not specify. Equally, Varro, Ling. 6.25 does not specify if the roads are outside the city, but one may suppose it. Suet. Aug. 31 mentions the Compitalia together with the Lupercalia and the Ludi saeculares, all restored by the princeps, but a specification of the locale is absent. 2) For an urban context: Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 4.14; the references by Cicero on Clodius relate to a deeply urban-plebejan context, cf. FLAMBARD 1977; FLAMBARD 1981. The statement by Aulus Gellius (10.24.3) that the Compitalia were announced by the praetor locates them in the city. Ovid. Fast. 5.145-146 and Macrobr. Sat. 1.7.34 relates to the city. If the maxima ter centum totam delubra per urbem installed by Augustus according to Verg. Aen. 8.716 do relate to compita (but cf. supra n. 14) this is another case in point. 3) For a non-urban (which is not as the same rural) setting: Pers. 4.26-30, with the scholion ad loc. (cf. infra n. 120). Dolabella apparently also refers to a rural setting, but it is unclear if this text refers to a compitum: cf. infra n. 123. Cic. Leg. 2.19 contrasts the Larum sedes in agris with the urban delubra, and WISSOWA 1901b, 793 thinks that with the first the sacella at the compita are meant (cf. Cic. Leg. 2.27). Maybe not surprisingly Verg. G. 2.382 refers to a rural context. The description by Philargyrius on this passage of the compita can be related to the countryside because it is specified that pagani agrestes go there (Philarg. Verg. G. 2.382). Cf. Hor. Epist. 1.1.49-51. Macrobr. Sat. 1.16.6: mentions the Compitalia as one group together with the ‘rural’ festivals of the Sementivae and the Paganalia, being all feriae conceptivae. BERT LOTT 2004, 33 n. 34, sees two passages of Cicero as referring to “the rural Compitalia” once for 59 BC at a villa in Antium (Att. 2.3), and once for 50 BC at a villa of Pompey (Att. 7.7.3). But these villae relate clearly more to an urban way of life with rich urban people enjoying their otium than to countryside religion.
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The archaeological evidence cannot prove a transition from rural to urban either. *Compitum* shrines have been found exclusively in urban contexts in Rome, Delos, Pompeii and Ostia, the earliest dating to the second century BC. The identification of one extra-urban *compitum* at Tor de’ Cenci that would even go back as far as the seventh century BC is not very convincing, since this interpretation seems actually to rely on the sole fact that ritual remains (especially animal bones) and burials were found in connection with a cross-roads. I do not deny that such places could have had religious and/or ritual importance from early times on, but the existence of a *compitum* with the associated *Compitalia* is not attested here.

So the earliest archaeological evidence for the *Compitalia* relates to an urban setting, and this urban connotation is secured for the last century of the Republic, and emphasised by Augustus. Neither were the *Compitalia* an exclusively stadtrömisches festival however, since there is clear evidence that the *Compitalia* were celebrated in the countryside as well. At the same time it should be emphasised that all evidence relating to the *Compitalia* from outside the city of Rome is located without exception, both in time and space, in Roman contexts or in contexts strongly influenced by Rome. Cato’s passage, for example, cannot be related to traditionalItalic countryside ritual: rather, he refers to a specific Roman situation in the countryside, the villa. Many aspects of the *Compitalia* are actually best attested for ‘romanised’ Campania, and for Delos, equally under strong Roman influence. Thus, the *Compitalia* were also celebrated outside the city of Rome, and also in areas with a large Italic component of the population, but influenced strongly, at least politically and apparently culturally, by Rome.

To sum up, on the basis of direct archaeological or textual evidence it is impossible to argue that the *Compitalia* evolved from a rural to an urban cult. There is, in my view, Augustinian relations that the shameful cult of Liber was celebrated at the *compita* in the countryside, but the festival significantly includes the city as the worshippers move from the rural shrines into the city: *De civ. D.* 7.21.

77 For a clear overview of Rome, Pompeii and Ostia see *Bakker 1994, 118-133; for Pompeii, cf. Van Andringa 2000.*

78 *Bedini 1990* apparently tries to connect the burials with the interpretation of the *Lares* as the *Manes* of the dead (Samters interpretation: cf. *supra* n. 19): “presso di essi era infatti usanza seppellire i morti dei vici confinanti, rappresentando il Compitum un luogo di confine, una ‘soglia critica’ come il limite fra i due mondi dei vivi e dei morti” (122).

79 At Delos. It does not seem possible to distinguish whether the location of the scene described by Naevius is rural or urban; Naevius ap. Festus 230 M.

80 Cf. *Phillips III 1988*, who thinks that it was especially in the rural areas that the festival persisted in late Roman times: “In its rural guise it would of course find favour with the pagans who still populated the countryside. In its urban manifestation of *genius*-worship of a pagan emperor it would irritate Christians” (384). *Bakker 1994, 195* thinks that from the period of the Soldier emperors onwards the cult declined.

81 *Johnson 1933, esp. 118-123; Van Andringa 2000.*

82 *Bruno 1970, 586-589.* On the Delian *rhoomaioi* and *italikoi* cf. *e.g.* *Brunt 1971, 205-214; and esp. *Adams 2002; Mavrogiannis 1995* sees a very strong Roman influence on Delos (and even assumes the presence of *vici* there, without presenting any evidence however).

83 The discussion on the character and origin of the *Lares* is of course intimately related to this question, as Wissowa and others would like to interpret them as protection gods of the fields (cf.
The Compitalia were intrinsically associated with the institution of the *vicus*, one could propose that the development of the *Compitalia* was parallel to that of the *vicus*. As we have seen in Chapter 6, the development of the *vicus* was essentially an urban Roman one, and the subsequent spread of this Roman institution in the Roman territory therefore basically depended on the urban model as well. What is to be made of the *Compitalia*, keeping the administrative aspect of the *Compitalia* in mind? Could it be possible that the *Compitalia* were not so much a harmless agricultural festival of the olden days, but were rather exported along with a new Roman administration of the conquered territories?

**The Compitum Shrines: Form and Location in City and Countryside**

It is time to take a look at the sacred place and its possible architectural elaboration itself. First the evidence for the actual physical location of the *compita* will be surveyed, and subsequently their different physical aspects.

‘CROSSROADS’ AND SHRINES

Some evidence regarding the location of the *compitum* has already been presented in the preceding analysis of the context of the *Compitalia* and will not be repeated here. It has become clear that the shrines where the festival was held were located both in the city of Rome and in the rest of Italy, and sometimes clearly outside urban structures. Usually, one speaks of the *Compitalia* as the festival of the ‘crossroads’. The actual location however, is not unequivocal. The *OLD* gives as the meaning of *compitum* “a

---

supra). But I believe it is more correct to separate this discussion from the evaluation of the contexts of the festival of the *Compitalia*, involving the *Lares Compitales*. Anyhow, some myths link the *Lares Compitales* directly to the city of Rome, such as Ovid. *Fast.* 2.610-616 (nymph Lara, daughter of Tiber, mother of *Lares Compitales*).

84 In such a way see LAURENCE 1994 and VAN ANDRINGA 2000 the introduction of the *vici* and *Compitalia* as following the installation of the Roman colony at Pompeii. The institution of the *Compitalia*, including the dedication of altars, accompanied the division of the city of Pompeii in *vici* with the founding of the Roman colony by Sulla (LAURENCE 1994, 39; VAN ANDRINGA 2000, 72-73: states “De toute évidence, les fêtes compitalices organisées dans la cité vesuvienne étaient calquées sur le modèle romain. Les cultes de carrefour furent vraisemblablement institués lors de l’establissement de la colonie, initiant alors une réorganisation de l’espace urbain”). Put simply, this would mean that the *vicus*-division and the *Compitalia* were exported from Rome to other cities. I see no reason to think that this was different in other areas, and especially, in non-urban contexts.

85 TARPIN 2002.
place where three or more roads meet” (cf. fig. 9.3). In almost every standard study on Roman religion the idea recurs that ‘the Romans’ believed every crossroads to be charged with spiritual energy, and this seems to derive from this specific understanding of *compitum*.

A more precise definition of *compitum* specifies this ‘crossroads’ meaning however, in that it constitutes the place where different territories (*partes*) meet, which means that the shrines should not by definition be located at (a conjunction of) roads. In any case, they were located at a central point, and they served as a meeting place for the inhabitants of a local group of people. As has been seen this was the case in the cities, but this basic principle will not have been different in the countryside. For example, Cicero tells us that the farmers and their dependants met at shrines *in fundi villaeque conspectu*. It becomes clear that people of the land aggregated (*rustici celebrabant*; *ubi pagani agrestes bucina convocati solent inire concilia*) at these shrines, which underscores their communal function. I believe it is difficult to arrive at a more precise identification of the places where the *Compitalia* were celebrated in the countryside on the basis of the cited sources. Therefore, I will first discuss the much richer evidence

---

**Fig. 9.3.** A Pompeian painting showing a *compitum* with shrines (Casa della Fontana Piccola) (Dar.-Sag. II, 1429 fig. 1887).

---

86 Cf. schol. Pers. 4.28: *Compita sunt loca in quadrivinis…*
87 Philarg. on Verg. G. 2.382: *compita, ut Trebatio placet, locus ex pluribus partibus ex se vel in eadem partes ex se vias atque itinera dirigens, sive is cum ara sive sine ara, sive sub tecto sive sub divo sit.*
89 schol. Pers. 4.28.
90 Philarg. on Verg. G. 2.382. Fowler (1925, 279, n. 2): “no doubt discussion about agricultural matters.”
91 According to WISSOWA 1901b, 793, *CIL* VI, 29784 (*Via quae ducit / per agrum / Noniamum / a m(illiario) XX devertic(ulo) / sinistrosus / per compitum / secus piscinam / in fundo / Decimiano / Thalamiano / iunctis debetur / ita uti hodie / in uso est*) would prove that the *compitum* is “ein Heiligtum des ländlichen *pagus*”. Apart from the somewhat confusing introduction of a *pagus* in this context, which is not mentioned, this inscription (found ‘*sub Aventino*’) does to my mind only indicate
of the urban contexts, and the physical forms the *compitum* shrines could assume there. In light of the conclusions on the urban contexts, we will return to the problem of the countryside shrines.

### The location of compita in the city

Many _compitum_ shrines located in urban contexts have been identified, but they were not always, as the modern _vulgata_ would have it, located at crossroads. The _compita_ found in Rome were located on streets and squares, the only certain _compitum_ of Ostia stands on a square, and in Delos shrines were located both in streets outside of houses and on a square.⁹² _Compita_ at Pompeii are located on streets and crossroads.⁹⁴ Whereas at Rome the _compitum_ would constitute the cult centre for each _vicus_, this situation may have been different in Pompeii because the number of altars there is too high, and it has been suggested that the altars formed boundary markers of the _vicus_.⁹⁵ The idea exists that before the Augustan reform the number of _compitum_ shrines was much larger, and that Augustus reduced their number in order to avoid the uprisings associated with their personnel in the mid-first century BC.⁹⁶ This could mean that the equalling of _vicus = compitum_ by Pliny might represent the centralisation of the cult under Augustus.⁹⁷

### Architecture

Apart from its indicating a location, the word _compitum_ could also mean the sacred structure sometimes present at this location.⁹⁸ Whereas some ancient written sources are rather enigmatic with respect to the physical appearance of the _compitum_ shrines, from archaeology a rather familiar image arises. The archaeological remains that can

---

⁹⁴ A surmised shrine of the _Lares_ on the _forum_ can be dismissed however: cf. _supra_ n. 61.  
⁹⁵ _LAURENCE_ 1994, 41. _BAKKER_ 1994, 197: “ Apparently the _compita_ were here, [scil. at Pompeii] contrary to Rome, as numerous as in the Republican period and still meant for the _geitones_. Consequently the relation between the shrines and the _vici_ was different from that in Rome: the Pompeian _vici_ could have more than one shrine.” Van Andringa seems to think that the shrines included a larger entity than the _vicus_ (regiones?): “De toute évidence, et le constat est au moins valable pour l’époque impériale, les sanctuaires de carrefour délimitent et définissent des circonscriptions administratives plus larges, englobant le réseau des _vici_” (2000, 75).  
⁹⁶ E.g. _BAKKER_ 1994, 196: “If the number of shrines was smaller, the amount of officials was smaller, and thus control easier,” and _LAURENCE_ 1994, cf. also preceding note.  
⁹⁷ This does, of course, not undermine the existing connection, which must not be 1:1, between _compitum_ and _vicus_. _LAURENCE_ 1994, 42 detects this process as well in Pompeii: “the identity of the inhabitants of each _vicus_ became concentrated upon the centralised shrine of the _Lares Augusti_ rather than the altars of the _Lares Compitales_ that marked the boundaries of the pre-Augustan _vici_ of their ancestors.” It should be noted however that for Rome there is no evidence that there were more _compitum_ shrines in one _vicus_ before 73 AD.  
⁹⁸ One could suspect that structures could sometimes, by extension, also be called _compitum_ by association because of their function and/or appearance, even if they lacked a ‘formal’ location at a _compitum_ = crossroads / border point, but this is impossible to prove.
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securely be identified as *compita* (by inscriptions and/or images of *Compitalia*-rites) do all point to rather ‘normal’ shrines. Interestingly, there is a plethora of different forms of these *compitum* shrines. In Pompeii most shrines that can be interpreted as a *compitum* consist of painted façades and/or masonry altars. Delos also presents altars and/or paintings, and there is one central *compitum shrine* on the ‘agora des compétaliastes’, which had the aspect of a small round temple.

In Rome some *compitum* shrines have been unearthed. One likely *compitum* shrine has been identified in Via di S. Martino ai Monti. It presents two phases, the most recent of which is dated by an inscription to the Augustan period. The scarce remains of the pre-Augustan phase, not dated more precisely, consisted of a square structure of travertine blocks, possibly an altar. The Augustan phase presents a podium of tufa blocks lined with marble slabs and a flight of marble steps. Behind the podium was a large base, with another base or *cippus* on top, with the inscription. Although not much is known, the absence of evidence for a superstructure could suggest an open-air (*sub divo*) shrine.

The *Compitum Acilium*, identified by an inscription from 5 BC mentioning *mag(istri) vici compiti Acili*, was found during the construction of the Via dei Fori Imperiali (figs. 9.4a and b). Its architectural form is known quite well: a podium (2.80 x 2.38 x 1.40 m) lined with travertine slabs was accessible by a flight of four steps. On the rear part of the podium was a *cella*, in front two columns supported a roof. In short, the aspect of this *compitum* shrine is very much that of a small temple, although no altar was found in front of it.

---

100 Hasenohr 2003.
102 For an overview of the Pompeian, Ostian and Roman evidence see Bakker 1994, 124-132, which is used here together with information in the relevant entries of *LTUR*, Dondin-Payre 1987, Pisani Sartorio 1988, Van Andringa 2000. Pisani Sartorio (esp. 31-32) identifies several mostly small rectangular structures on the *Forma Urbis Romae* as *compita*. Although sometimes suggestive, I do not consider these here since their status as *compitum* can not be proved and they can not add much to our architectural knowledge.
103 Gatti 1888.
104 Dated 10 BC, recording the erection of a statue to Mercurius, which can be related to the distribution of statues *vicatim* by Augustus: Suet. Aug. 57; this forms the basis for the identification as a *compitum*.
105 AE 1964, 74. Dondin-Payre 1987; Coarelli 1983, 39-40, fig. 8 for location.
106 Bakker 1994, 125.
An inscription mentioning the reconstruction of an *aedicula reg(ionis) VIII Vico Vestae* from AD 233 has been connected to a structure built against the *Atrium Vestae* on the *forum*\textsuperscript{107}. The structure consists of a podium with two columns supporting a superstructure: indeed an *aedicula* or ‘small temple’\textsuperscript{108}. During the excavations led by Andrea Carandini on the Palatine, near the cross-roads of the *clivus Palatinus* and the *sacra via* some remains of *opus caementicium* have been identified as a *compitum* shrine\textsuperscript{109} similar to the *compitum Acilium*, although one should bear in mind that its beautiful full-colour reconstruction drawings rely rather on this last mentioned.

\textsuperscript{107} *CIL VI, 30960*. LANCIANI 1882, 229-231; COARELLI 1983, 265-270.

\textsuperscript{108} Another *compitum* shrine with a similar rectangular plan has been noticed near the temples of Mater Matuta and Fortuna, at the *vicus Iugarius*, but almost nothing has been published: COARELLI 1988a, 244; for location, cf. 235 fig. 48.

compitum than on the remains actually found. On the basis of a rather direct association with the textual sources on the repression of the collegia, the construction of the compitum is ascribed to Clodius himself (!) “per ingraziarsi il favore della plebe”, and would therefore date to 58-53 BC. In Ostia inscriptions attest to the existence of compitum shrines there, but the only architectural remains which can be related securely to a compitum shrine consist of the marble altar at the Piazza dei Lari. The round altar was dedicated to the Lares Vicinales by a magister or magistri. Directly south of the altar is a basin, north of the altar is a building with several entrances (some closed off in later periods). Jan Theo Bakker thinks this building behind the altar is connected with the altar (fig. 9.5), and that the ensemble would form a compitum shrine or building, relating the entrances to the somewhat enigmatic qualifications in ancient authors of compita as ‘pervia’ or ‘pertusa’. In this respect, Bakker follows Laura Holland in her interpretation of Persius’ story of a miser who, celebrating the Compitalia, iugum pertusa ad compita figit. The scholiast on Persius explains that it was the custom that farmers fixed broken yokes to the compitum as a sign of completed agricultural labour, or because the instrument was considered sacred. Holland points out that a yoke does not break easily, and that something else is meant: that the iugum refers to a sacred structure that was fixed in the ground, perhaps two uprights and a crossbeam, forming some sort of symbolic sacred gate. Bakker thinks that the structure north of the altar on the Piazza dei Lari at Ostia “with its many wide entrances, is actually to be understood as consisting of six gates, and that it belongs to the class of the pervia compita”. This would correspond to the description of the scholiast on Persius, who emphasises that compita could be accessible from all four sides, and that they were quasi turres; ‘almost towers’. 

110 Actually only a rectangular structure in opus caementicium, and another small piece of this opus in front of it was found; no trace of the roof or the columns has been found, not even the original height of the ‘podium’. 
111 In any case, the structure was destroyed some time between the time of Caesar and 7 BC. M.L. Gualandi in: CARANDINI and PAPI 1999 (2005), 126. 
113 The structure on the Bivio del Castrum, at a major crossroads, cannot be connected firmly to the relevant inscriptions: BAKKER 1994, 121-122. 
114 CIL XIV, 4298. 
116 schol. Pers. 4.28; cf. infra n. 120 for text. 
117 HOLLAND 1937. 
118 BAKKER 1994, 200. 
119 Cf. e.g. LEE and BARR 1987, 125. 
120 schol. Pers. 4.28: Qui quotiens diem festum aratro fixo in compitis celebrat, timens seriolam vini aperire, acetum potat. Compita sunt loca in quadriviiis, quasi turres, ubi sacrificia finita agricultura rustici celebrant. Merito pertusa, quia per omnes quattuor partes pateant, vel vetusta. Aut compita propria a conpotando, id est simul bibendo, pertusa autem, quia pervius transitus est viris et feminis. Vel compita sunt non solum in urbe loca, sed etiam viae publicae ac diverticulae aliquorum confinium, ubi aediculae consecratur patentes, ideo pertusa ad compita; in his fracta iuga ab agricolis ponuntur velut emergiti et elaborati operis indicium, sive quod omne instrumentum existiment
A suggestive description by Dolabella, in the course of an explanation on how to establish boundaries within his general guidelines for land surveyors has often been related to *compita*:

“Boundaries relating to shrines ought to be examined in the following way. If the shrine is positioned where four boundaries meet and establishes the boundary for four properties, look for four altars; moreover the shrine has four entrances so that anyone can enter through his own land to conduct a sacrifice…Now, if the shrine is between three properties, it has three entrances, if between two, then it has two entrances.”\(^{121}\)

In a manuscript dating to the late ninth century AD (Gud. lat. 105) an illustration of this quadrilateral sanctuary is given (fig. 9.6). This illustration cannot be dated with certainty. The Gudianus manuscript is a copy of a copy of an illustrated manuscript of the early ninth century (Pal. lat. 1564). Although it seems plausible that some illustrations to the gromatic texts served a didactic purpose, and may date to the period of the writers collected in the *Corpus Agrimensorum Romanorum*, it is impossible to determine the date of the illustrations with any precision. In any case, they will probably have been altered in the process of copying.\(^{122}\)

---

\(^{121}\) L 302.1: *Fines templares sic quaeris ut si in quadrifinio est positus et quattuor possessionibus finem faciet. Quattuor aras quaeris, et aedes quattuor ingressus habet ideo ut ad sacrificium quisquis per agrum suum intraret. Quod si desertum fuerit templum, aras sic quaeris. Longe a templo quaeris pedibus XV, et invenis velut fundamenta aliqua. Quod se inter tres, tria ingressa habet: inter duos dua ingressa habet templum.*

\(^{122}\) Cf. the discussion in CAMPBELL 2000, xxi-xxvi.
Wissowa thought Dolabella’s text described a *compitum*: “An diesen Compitalsacella wird alljährlich die Festfeier der Compitalia abgehalten, aber auch sonst bilden sie für die umwohnenden Landleute den sacralen Mittelpunkt.” However, nowhere in Dolabella’s text is stated explicitly that a *compitum* is meant; rather, it is surprising that the word is not mentioned.\(^{123}\) Perhaps with the exception of Ostia, a structure fitting the descriptions of Persius’ scholiast and Dolabella has never been attested archaeologically. Moreover, one has to be careful not to read too much into the scholion on Persius. The word *pertusa* used by Persius could also have been used to indicate the ‘shabbiness’ of the structure: *pertusa* in the sense of ‘rotten’ or ‘perforated’: such is the interpretation by Walter Kissel, who states that the interpretation of the scholiast of *pertusa* (*quia per omnes quattuor partes pateant*) is “weder sprachlich noch sachlich akzeptabel: Für *pertundere* bzw. *pertusus* lässt sich nirgendwo die wertneutrale Bedeutung *offen* nachweisen ... Richtiger wird man *pertusa* daher in seiner gängigen Bedeutung *‘durchlöchert’* fassen ... und auf den ruinösen Zustand des *sacellum* beziehen.”\(^{124}\) Actually, the scholiast gives this option himself: “*pertusa*; because it is open on all four sides or because it is old”: *vel vetusta*.\(^{125}\) The interpretation of *pertusa* as indicating the shabbiness rather than the architecture of the structure would also fit quite well in the context of Persius’ satirical description of a pinchpenny.\(^{126}\) Although, then, the explicit explanation of ‘open on all four sides’ could be dismissed, the Calpurnian *compita pervia* remain.\(^{127}\) Calpurnius does not describe unequivocally the shrines however; he could have used *compitum*.

\(^{123}\) SAMTER 1907, 369-371; cf. LAING 1921, 135; BÖHM 1925, 808.  
\(^{124}\) KISSEL 1990, 537, who also thinks (in n. 113) that *pertusa* is a conscious *imitatio* von the Calpurnian *pervia*. The interpretation in HOLLAND 1937 is qualified as “völlig verfehlt”: 538, n. 114.  
\(^{125}\) KISSEL 1990, 537, n. 111, see n. 120 for text. The scholia on Persius are hard to date; the earliest manuscript dates to the 11th century; cf. ZETZEL 2005.  
\(^{126}\) Cf. HARVEY 1981, 116 (on lines 29-32): “The wretched picture contrasts with the traditional lavishness of the Compitalia.”  
\(^{127}\) Calp. Ecl. 4.126.
here in the sense of ‘cross-roads’, and if indeed a shrine is intended, *pervia* could just indicate an association with the *location* of the shrine. Maybe it is best here, in the absence of conclusive archaeological and textual evidence, to leave the ‘class of the *pervia compita*’ for what it is.

Indeed, from other literary evidence, it becomes clear that the discrepancy between the shrines found in archaeology on the one hand and in texts on the other need not to be so impressive in the end. From both inscriptions and texts appears that a *compitum* could be called *sacellum*, a freestanding altar with an enclosure (*saeptum*), or *aedicula*. An *aedicula* is literally a ‘small temple’, but can designate also other sacred structures or realities, such as a chapel containing a statue.

The variety of architectural forms apparent from the archaeological evidence finds direct confirmation in the description of *compita* by Philargyrius on Vergil’s *Georgics* 2.382: *compita ... sive is cum ara sive sine ara, sive sub tecto sive sub di(v)o sit*: ‘be it with or without (permanent) altar, with or without roof.’ It is this freedom in the choice of what structure or place to use to celebrate the *Compitalia* that I would like to stress here: for above all, both archaeological and literary sources suggest that the *compitum* shrine had no uniform architectural form. Apparently, the physical appearance did not matter very much, as long as the place could fulfil its ritual functions. This observation is important for the following.

The absence of *compita* in the countryside

From both the literary and the epigraphical evidence it has become clear that the *Compitalia* were also celebrated in the countryside of Italy, and that there were indeed *compitum* shrines. However, in the whole of Italy none has been found.

In one of the few studies on agricultural cults in the countryside, Claudia Lega notes this discrepancy between the literary sources mentioning various rural and agricultural cults, and the silence from archaeology. In a situation like this, two options are usually put forward; the first is that archaeology has not yet provided, or is in general unable to provide, positive evidence of the rural or agricultural cults. The other is that the textual sources are wrong. Without doubt, the most logical conclusion in this case is to blame the poor state of archaeological knowledge or even its fundamental inability to furnish this evidence. Thus, according to Lega, these rites are just archaeologically invisible, because probably “si svolgessero su un altare provvisorio innalzato presso i campi e [che] le offerte fossero unicamente doni in natura. Questo spiegherebbe la perdita totale delle testimonianze archeologiche. Gli stessi *compita*, dove, come si è detto, gli abitanti delle zone agricole circostanti si recavano a celebrare
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129 Cf. Gell. 7.12.5.
130 Cf. MENICHETTI 2005.
131 Cf. supra esp. n. 76 for literary sources, infra for inscriptions.
132 Rejecting the identification of a structure at Tor de’ Cenci as a *compitum*, cf. supra n. 78.
133 LEGA 1995, 124.
la fine del raccolto, dovevano essere per la maggior parte strutture in materiale deperibile o piccole costruzioni andate completamente distrutte” (underscore TS).\textsuperscript{134}

It is indeed perfectly possible that the absence of archaeological evidence indicates that these cults did not leave traces. Maybe it is fairer to say that there might still be some archaeological remains, but that until now nothing was found. That not even one rural \textit{compitum} shrine has been found, should then be explained as coincidental. Still, it is somewhat surprising that a rite that apparently was celebrated by the whole population of Roman Italy did not leave any material trace.

This is odd, especially because inscriptions from Italy record elements that clearly do not belong to perishable constructions: apart from the rather explicit inscription mentioning \textit{compitum ex saxo fecere},\textsuperscript{135} an inscription dated 1 BC from Verona mentions the rebuilding of a \textit{compitum} with a \textit{tectum, parietes, valvas and limen}.\textsuperscript{136}

Another inscription, from Picenum, records the building of a \textit{crepidinem circum cumpitum tectum pertextum}: a podium or sidewalk (\textit{crepido}) around a \textit{compitum} and the roof of the \textit{compitum} from the end of the second century or the beginning of the first century BC.\textsuperscript{137} From Beneventum comes an inscription recording the building of a \textit{porticum cum apparatorio et compitum}.\textsuperscript{138} At least the first two seem to suggest the form of a small temple. Although it is impossible to be sure about the urban or extra-urban location of these examples (maybe the \textit{compitum} from Picenum could be extra-urban, but this is not sure, whereas the \textit{compitum} from Beneventum seems, because of its relation with a \textit{lustratio} of a \textit{pagus}, definitely extra-urban), it shows at least that \textit{compitum} shrines in different areas of Italy were not inferior to those of Rome as regards architectural elaboration. Just to put things in perspective: most ‘normal’ temples in Italy do not yield any, let alone more elaborate inscriptions than the ones just cited.

Now, as has been said above, normally the solution to a discrepancy between archaeology and literary sources is to blame one of the two of ‘being wrong’. But maybe there is a third option, and that is to ask whether we are looking for the right model, or rather: for the right structures. The (literary) discussion on the scholion on Persius with its fascinating ‘\textit{turres}’ and multiple entrances, and the consequent quest to retrieve this structure archaeologically may have attracted too much attention, without leaving room for other possibilities.

There is of course a danger in reasoning from silence. But we could ask ourselves what places were most eligible for the celebration of the \textit{Compitalia}, or, as Philargyrius states, the places \textit{ubi pagani agrestes bucina convocati solent inire concilia}; the places

\textsuperscript{134} \textit{LEGA} \textit{1995, 124}. Cf. also \textit{KISSEL} \textit{1990, 537}, who thinks they were mostly made of wood.

\textsuperscript{135} \textit{CIL} V, 844 from Aquileia. \textit{KISSEL 1990} sees the stone construction conversely as a “besonders hervorzuhebende Ausnahme” (537), proving that normally they were not made of durable materials, but cf. the other inscriptions I mention here. The fact that diverse inscriptions mention a rebuilding of \textit{compita} (537, n. 112) proves nothing: most temple complexes have been rebuilt as well, but were not, therefore, made previously of perishable materials.

\textsuperscript{136} \textit{CIL} V, 3257.

\textsuperscript{137} \textit{CIL} F, 3078; \textit{CANCINI, DELPLACE and MARENGO} \textit{2001, 154-156}.

\textsuperscript{138} \textit{CIL} IX, 1618.
‘where the rural population, called together by a horn, used to meet’. 139 Once one is not looking for a tower-like structure with multiple entrances, but accepts that virtually all known bigger compitum shrines bore close resemblance to, or simply were, small temples, another option comes into view. Although as yet no conclusive evidence can be presented, I would make the cautious suggestion that the Compitalia could have been, in part, celebrated at the ‘Italic’ sanctuaries dispersed over the Italian countryside.

This type of sanctuary – often of modest dimensions – formed, as has been argued in the previous chapters, the meeting place of old for the rural population. One could imagine that at least some of the pre-existing sanctuaries could have been adapted to serve this new purpose for the community, together with smaller altars or shrines of which virtually no trace has been left. It is also possible that new sanctuaries were erected if necessary: we should not exclude that some sanctuaries that have been regarded as ‘Italic’ are actually new constructions within the new Roman organisation of the landscape, as has been discussed in Chapter 7.

Perhaps strengthening this suggestion of re-use is the fact that in some ‘Italic’ temples evidence for a later Lares-cult has been found. In the Italian sanctuary at Torre di Satriano which flourished in the fourth to third centuries BC in Lucanian territory for instance, a statuette of a Lar and the introduction of oil lamps in the sanctuary have been connected with a cult of the Lares and/or Mater Larum in Roman times. 140 The oil lamps would be explained by the fact that the Lares cult was held noctu, as Festus states. The statuette, dated to the second or third quarter of the first century AD, indeed follows the iconography of a Lar Compitalis, dancing and with a rhyton in one hand, a patera in the other (fig. 9.7). 141 Suggestive in this regard is that also in many other ‘Italic’ sanctuaries oil lamps of especially the Roman period have been found. 142
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139 Phil. Verg. G. 2.382.
140 S. De Vincenzo in: OSANNA and SICA 2005, 452-457. Lararia have been found in the temple of Venus at Pompeii (wall paintings in the substruction rooms of the terraces). Cf. the contributions by Emmanuele Curti and Antonella Lepone on the “giornata di studi sul tempio di Venere a Pompei”, D.A.I. Rom, 4-5-2006, which will be published.
142 E.g. as well at Campochiaro: CAMPOCHIARO 1982, 72-75, and at San Giovanni in Galdo, cf. Chapter 5. But this could of course — as the scale of the phenomenon may suggest — reflect a more general change in ritual as well, or refer to other rites held noctu.
Although archaeological research has tended to neglect the later phases of Italic sanctuaries (which are often not even or only summarily published), a large number of these sanctuaries were frequented in the Roman period as well. This has been seen in the present study in the case of S. Giovanni in Galdo, where a substantial Roman phase is documented, as well (cf. Chapter 5). The character of this use in Roman times is poorly understood. If the suggestion is right that the ‘rural’ Compitalia could have been celebrated here at least in some cases, the interpretation of the re-use or even revival of Italic sanctuaries in the Roman period would become more faceted.

An inscription from Atina perhaps commemorating a dedication to the typical Italic goddess Mefitis and the Lares would be especially interesting as an illustration of the complexity of the processes at work. Aspects of the discussion on continuity and change between pre-Roman and Roman period would come to mind: for example, the shift to oil lamps in the Roman period attests to different cult practices, whereas continuity could be seen in the place of worship.

**Vicus and sanctuary**

Perhaps, the strong relationship attested between some sanctuaries and rural vici could suggest that the festival associated with the institution of the *vicus par excellence* was celebrated there. As has been seen in Chapters 4 and 7, sanctuaries in the internal Italic regions have often been described as ‘vicus’ (here in the meaning of ‘village’ rather than urban ward) or ‘pagus’ sanctuaries, and interpreted as part of a ‘typically Italic’ rural system, the so-called *pagus-vicus* system. However, as has been made clear, it
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143 *CIL X*, 5048; *CALISTI* 2006, 267.
seems in fact probable that both *pagus* and *vicus* were rather Roman institutions related to the administration of the conquered territory (cf. Chapter 6). This implies that the sanctuaries related to *vici*, that are documented already for the third century BC, served ‘Roman’ (or ‘romanised’) communities rather than ‘indigenous Italic’ groups, as has been argued in Chapter 7. In the previous chapter, it has been shown that, as to the *pagus*, one could have little doubt that in accordance with the installation of one or more *paggi* the *Paganalia* were instigated. Similarly, it could be suggested that the *Compitalia* were celebrated in the Roman rural *vici* in the Italian countryside. One could imagine how in this way a Roman rite served to enhance and reformulate the small new ‘Roman’ community; a situation which may not have been so different from that documented for Delos.

**Conclusion: Roman Institutions and Ritual in the Italian Countryside**

The *Compitalia* were the most important festival associated with the *vici*. Dionysius of Halicarnassus says that the festival was installed together with the *vici* in the regal period, as a means of administration and control of the urban population. It has often been regarded as a family or slave festival, but actually it involved all inhabitants of the *vicus*, and in the city of Rome the festival was announced by the *praetor*. This suggests an ambit that both exceeds and includes the private or personal sphere. The archaeological evidence supports this all-encapsulating characteristic of the festival: liturgical paintings and shrines related to the *Compitalia* are found in both domestic (houses) and public (temples on squares) contexts.

Evidence for the hypothesis that the *Compitalia* festival had agricultural or rural origins and was only later incorporated in or transferred to the city is meagre. Of course, it is possible that the Roman urban cult originated as a Roman agricultural ritual, but this must then have been in a period beyond our vision. From the moment that we are able to recognise the *Compitalia* as such its development rather seems to have taken the opposite direction, i.e. from the city of Rome outwards to other cities, and the countryside. The *Compitalia* seem indeed to be associated strongly with urban contexts, where they appear in our record first. Interestingly, their appearance is quite early: contemporary literary passages indicate that the *Compitalia* existed in Rome at least by the third century BC, and the archaeological and epigraphical evidence, especially from Delos, but also from Picenum, shows that it is possible to identify the *Compitalia* being celebrated at least by the second half of the second century BC outside Rome. It is therefore possible that the *Compitalia* were disseminated along with Roman control, perhaps in accordance with the institution of the *vicus*. This reading is in some way in line with Dionysius’ account.

In the urban centres of Rome, Pompeii, Ostia and Delos diverse *compita* (i.e. *compitum* shrines) have been identified. The literary evidence on the physical aspect of *compitum* shrines is equally diverse. Leaving out the discussion on the *compita pervia*,
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144 Although, admittedly, it is for the early and mid-Republican periods less easy to be sure whether the *Compitalia* were already bound up so closely with the institution of the *vicus*. 
enigmatic buildings with multiple entrances, but perhaps based on a wrong understanding of Persius by his scholiast, it can be concluded from both archaeology and literary sources that almost every sacred structure would do for the celebration of the *Compitalia*. The more elaborate *compitum* shrines, as those excavated in Rome and some attested epigraphically elsewhere, actually had the aspect of small temples. Despite the fact that the *Compitalia* were clearly celebrated also outside urban structures, *compitum* shrines have never been found in the countryside. It is possible that this is due to a lack of archaeological research or poor visibility, if it is assumed that these structures were constructed of perishable materials. It may also be suggested that some ‘Italic’ sanctuaries served as the structures were the Roman festival of the *Compitalia* was celebrated. Especially sanctuaries that epigraphically demonstrate an intimate link with one or more rural *vici* could be possible candidates, which would explain the references to the rural *Compitalia* and its Roman urban origin at the same time.
Chapter 10

Summary and Conclusions

Central-Southern Italy faced immense changes in the last three centuries BC. The area was conquered and subsequently incorporated by Rome, and local communities had to accommodate Roman rule. In this period of conflict and change, cult places played an important role. Italic sanctuaries are evoked by Roman historians as loci for resistance or ideological combat during the various wars resulting in the conquest of Italy. The Samnites swear secret oaths against Roman power and Rome summons the tutelary deities of enemy cities. Once Italy was conquered, Roman attention shifted to other areas and we hear little or nothing about what happened subsequently to Italic sanctuaries and religion. The literary information we do have, from the early imperial period onwards, relates to a by then ‘pacified’ peninsula. Especially in the Augustan period, Italian countryside religion is highlighted in poetry and art. A rustic, timeless image of honest, frugal cult is exalted. What happened in the period between the conquest and nostalgic romanticism?

The changing religious landscape of Central-Southern Italy in the crucial period of the last three centuries BC is poorly understood. What we do know is that monumental temples lay dotted over the scarcely urbanised Italic landscapes. They are the result of a frenetic building activity in the religious realm in the third and second centuries BC especially, which is unparalleled by contemporaneous developments in civic or domestic architecture. The question of how sanctuaries and cults relate to changes in society following the Roman conquest has been central to this study. Previous studies on sanctuaries and their relation to cultural and political developments have usually focused on the architecture and decoration of single sites. This is a useful approach in its own right, but does not take into account the full scale of specific social and political contexts within which the cult places functioned in antiquity. In addition, the interpretation of cultural models and elements (e.g. ‘Roman’, ‘Latial’, ‘Hellenistic’) depends on the specific ideological climate present in the ancient communities that built them. When addressing questions on larger socio-political developments, the ‘landscape’, in the broadest sense of the word, surrounding a sanctuary is arguably
more revealing than its physical appearance alone. A contextual approach has therefore been pursued in this study, in an attempt to understand the interaction between sanctuaries and patterns of settlement and institutional structures. The applied methods include historiographical and epigraphical research, and field survey and analysis of excavation finds in a case study. Different perspectives have been adopted, yet they share the aim of contextualisation. In this way, ideological (Pietrabbondante), spatial (San Giovanni in Galdo), and institutional (pagi and vici) contexts have tentatively been reconstructed, and I have tried to demonstrate how important these contexts are for our ideas about sanctuaries and the society they were part of. In these concluding remarks, I shall summarise the main results and try to draw together the threads of the preceding approaches and arguments.

*R*

**Rome and Italy: Ideas on Cultural Change and Religious Romanisation**

The issue of sanctuaries and society in the Republican period is connected to the general debate on the character of Roman control and supremacy over Italy (Chapter 1). Related ideas on cultural change are usually studied under the heading of ‘romanisation’. In the 19th century the idea took root that, from the third century BC onwards, Italy and Rome underwent a process of gradual cultural convergence under Roman guidance. Over time, Italic peoples would have assimilated themselves increasingly in language, customs and political institutions to Roman standards. This conception relies to an extent on idealist and teleological notions, the historiographical roots of which have been traced by Henrik Mouritsen. The mechanism of cultural change which is usually presupposed in this ‘idealistic’ conception is that of ‘self-romanisation’, according to which Italic peoples would have voluntarily adopted Roman culture out of a wish to become Roman. This concept has been attacked from the 1990s onwards in Anglo-Saxon studies, pointing out the complexity of the interpretation of ‘Roman’ material culture and the underlying frame of thought, which takes the superiority of Roman culture for granted. Crucial points to learn from these critiques are that the adoption of Roman culture should not be seen as a self-evident, natural process, and that the meaning attributed to cultural elements by the ancient audience is not stable, but depends on the overall context. At the same time however, this current of studies inspired by postcolonial theory has often underestimated Roman impact and strategies, and has tended to overemphasise ‘native’ agency.

The debate on Roman influence in the religious realm in Italy has different disciplinary backgrounds in mainland Europe linguistic and religion studies (Chapter 2). In these traditions, ‘Italic religion’ and Roman religion have been studied either in separation, or as basically one and the same system. Studies into aspects of what has been called ‘religious romanisation’ are therefore of relatively recent date. One trend in the debate with strong parallels in the general romanisation discussion has put emphasis on the spread of Roman religious models in Italy such as Capitolium-temples
and anatomical votive terracottas. This spread is conceived of in two ways: first as
documenting ‘Romans or Latins abroad’ reproducing Roman religious models;
especially in the case of colonial contexts. Second, these models would have been
copied by the Italic allies, inspired by the ‘superiority’ of Roman religious culture: the
spread in Italy of anatomical votives for instance has been described by Mario Torelli
as “a striking sign of Roman superiority”\(^1\) while a similar case has been made for
Capitolium-style temples. However, evidence for this spread of Roman religious
models as a consequence of their ‘superiority’ has been shown to be problematic, with
exception of the religious symbols of the Urbs par excellence, the Capitolia. These are
actually less well attested for the early phases of colonies than is often assumed, but at
least from the second century BC onwards they will – in Roman contexts – indeed
have expressed allegiance to the Roman model.

With regard to direct Roman intervention in religious affairs outside Roman territory,
Rome is usually thought to have adopted a laissez-faire policy. The senatusconsultum
de bacchanalibus of 186 BC could be an exception to this rule if it extended to areas
outside ager Romanus, which remains unclear. Be that as it may, the primary Roman
concern seems to have been the possible political dimension of the cult organisation,
not the cult itself. Direct Roman intervention has been recognised in the destruction or
closing down of other cult places too. However, this aspect has been overemphasised
in modern research: no coherent policy of the kind can be discerned in the Republican
period. The real Roman impact would have consisted of an emphasis on urban development,
rather than on countryside cult places. This shift of attention would have lead to the
gradual abandonment of the latter. Sometimes, the ancient cult places continued,
remaining largely unaffected by Roman influence. In an influential article, Cesare
Letta expresses this view lucidly for the Apennine area: “nei santuari rurali ... la
romanizzazione praticamente non tocca le tradizioni religiose locali, formatesi nei
secoli precedenti ... I culti propriamente romani che vengono trapiantati ... sono
introdotti nelle città, non nell’ambiente rurale.”\(^2\) These considerations on romanisation
and its religious pendant form the background to the subsequent chapters.

\*  

The Ideological Context: Material Culture and Meaning in Samnite Sanctuaries
The importance of the ideological context is shown in a case study on Samnite
sanctuaries (Chapter 3). Here, the limits of an isolated architecture-oriented
perspective are pointed out by demonstrating the problematic relation between cultural
models or elements and ideology.
At the sanctuary of Pietrabondante, in the heartland of ancient Pentrian Samnium, a
monumental temple-theatre complex, Temple B, was erected at the end of the second

\(^1\) Torelli 1999, 42.  
\(^2\) Letta 1992, 122.
century BC. In the architectural model, Roman influence has been recognised by modern scholars. The combination of theatre and temple would recall the *comitium-curia* scheme, whereas the three *cellae* of the temple would mimic the Capitoline model. However, weaponry and Oscan epigraphy found here demonstrate that this sanctuary functioned as an important focus of Samnite military and political power – which was frequently directed against Rome. Especially the explicit mention of *safinim* in an inscription found in the sanctuary, designating it as belonging to the ethnic group of the Samnites, is suggestive. The rich contextual evidence for the case of Pietrabbondante makes clear that in this period a common symbolic language was available to both Roman and Samnite communities, which could be used actively and creatively for different purposes. This symbolic language can be discerned in coinage: an exceptional Samnite coin struck in the period of the Social War represents the Samnite bull goring the Roman she-wolf (Chapter 3, fig. 3.4). Arguably, architectural models were used in a similar way in antiquity; that is, through active appropriation. ‘Traditional’ elements have been recognised in the ground plan of the sanctuary, which might recall the Livian description (10.38) of the *locus consaeptus* where Samnite elite soldiers swore their oath before the battle at Aquilona in 293 BC. Whether this ‘traditionalising’ interpretation holds true or not, in any case a particular and original complex was constructed, which was moreover echoed in the contemporaneous smaller sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo.

In conclusion, although at Pietrabbondante elements that appear as ‘Latin’ or ‘Roman’ were adopted, this cannot simply be interpreted as the acceptance of Roman rule or the wish to ‘become Roman’. Rather, it can be seen as the choosing of ‘building materials’ for the construction of a Samnite Pentrian identity at the end of the second century BC. Despite my general reservations about the facile adoption of similar terms, I think that in this case it is legitimate to speak of ‘cultural resistance’. Yet it is important not to equate this with cultural continuity. Indeed, there *was* cultural change, but without loss of local distinctiveness.

*The Spatial Context: Theories on the Audiences of Sanctuaries*

As noted, monumental sanctuaries appear throughout the Central-Southern Italian landscapes in especially the third and the second centuries BC. The interpretation of this phenomenon is equivocal: it has been linked to, amongst other things, economic prosperity, elite competition, and a growing ethnic or cultural consciousness (cf. *supra*). Epigraphical and archaeological evidence is scarce and inconclusive. Trying to provide a context for the interpretation of these sanctuaries, I have attempted to reconstruct the probable functions of the cult places within Italic society on a ‘practical’ level: their place within patterns of settlement and institutional structures. This approach is not aimed directly at solving the question of monumentalisation, but seeks to offer a basic background against which these processes might be understood.
At the same time, it complements the discussion by providing an important, yet usually neglected facet of monumentality: the intended audience of these sanctuaries. Regardless of the specific reasons for their construction (economic affluence, cultural resistance, competing gentes, a combination of all, or something else), a message was conveyed by constructing these monumental temples. But to whom was this message addressed? Who saw and visited the cult places on a regular basis? The reasons for embellishing and monumentalising sacred places must be sought in the first place in the role these sanctuaries fulfilled within society.

Explicit attempts to establish a relation between sanctuaries and patterns of settlement or institutional structures are not numerous, but three different conceptions can be distinguished in the existing literature (Chapter 4). Transhumance economy has been linked to Italic sanctuaries of the Apennine and Samnite areas. Cult places would have been located as staging posts along the tratturi intersecting the Apennines, providing shelter for herdsmen and offering a safe place for trade. Wealth accumulated by transhumance would have been employed for the monumentalisation of the sanctuaries. The popularity of Hercules, as patron deity of herdsmen and trade, in the Apennine areas has been interpreted as evidence supporting this theory. However, the relation between sanctuaries and tratturi is less clear than has been suggested, and an association of the cult of Hercules with trade is actually best documented for urban contexts, not for rural Italic sanctuaries.

Alternatively, Italic sanctuaries and their associated cults have been interpreted as boundary markers of ethnic groups. Since ethnic groups are by their very nature fluid and elusive, and supporting evidence is absent, this conception is impossible to test. The model of territorial shrines derives from Greek (and to a lesser extent Tyrrhenian) contexts, with presumably very different spatial and hierarchical structures. Without hard evidence, it is perhaps better not to apply this model to the inland Italic situation.

A model which does take into account a specific Italic context is the so-called pagus-vicus system. In this system, pagi (territorial districts) and villages (vici), would together make up the Italic tutto or nomen. A related hierarchy of sanctuaries belonging to respectively tutto, pagi and vici has been particularly popular in modern studies.

Before going into the problems related to this last conception (cf. Chapter 6), it is important to point out that all three models have virtually no evidential basis in archaeology or historical sources. Especially the first two models rely heavily on preconceptions about Italic economy and spatial organisation. Arguably, the formation of these models has been influenced by the visual impression of the archaeological landscapes of Central Italy, which until recently was basically one of ‘emptiness’. Only the most visible remains of hill-forts and sanctuaries have traditionally attracted attention, whereas minor and dispersed rural settlements are seriously underrepresented, or simply absent in this image. At least to some degree, the apparent ‘isolation’ of monumental sanctuaries might have suggested that larger economic or political structures (transhumance; frontiers of ethnic tribes) determined the presence of sanctuaries. For the pagus-vicus system – in fact emphasising rural settlement – the
discussion is different, because it roots in modern interpretations of ancient literary traditions rather than in economic and geopolitical models.

The Spatial Context: Problem-Oriented Field Survey around a Samnite Sanctuary

Since evidence for the spatial context of Italic sanctuaries is mostly absent, and at the same time its influence on interpretation is significant, a research approach for dealing with this issue has been developed and has been tested on the Samnite sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo (Chapter 5). This small temple, monumentalised around the end of the second century BC and reflecting the ground plan of Temple B at Pietrabbondante, was until recently located in an ‘empty’ landscape as evoked above: the pattern of settlement in this area was almost completely unknown. The small temple has previously been interpreted in light of transhumance, or alternatively as part of a *pagus-vicus* system, but has above all been seen as a prime example of an isolated and rural Italic sanctuary.

Research has consisted of intensive field survey in an area with a radius of ca. 1.5 km around the sanctuary. It has been combined with a study of the finds from the excavation of the sanctuary executed by the *Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici del Molise* in the 1970s. The survey revealed for the Iron Age a nucleated pattern of settlement to the east of the sanctuary. For the Hellenistic period, a particularly high density of sites in the area around the sanctuary has been documented, amongst which several farms and a burial area. Most importantly, at about 500m from the temple, a major site, which can be interpreted as a village, was found. Inhabited from the Iron Age onwards, it was apparently enlarged in the Hellenistic period, when it reached an extension of at least 10ha, and it continued well into the Roman period.

As for the sanctuary, the excavation finds as well as the survey data indicate that the beginnings of the cult place can be dated to the end of the fourth or early third century BC. Many finds dating to the imperial period document its use in this period as well. The complex of village, farms, burial area and sanctuary might reflect a rather ‘complete’ Samnite community, established already in the early Hellenistic period. This community apparently formed the audience for a traditionalising, yet fashionable monumental sanctuary that echoed the central political sanctuary at Pietrabbondante, constructed just before the Social War (91-88 BC) broke out. In the absence of epigraphical evidence, guessing is all we can do as to the identity of the initiators of the monumentalisation project. If it was ‘state intervention’, aimed at winning the hearts of the local population for the Samnite cause, or rather a local initiative, aimed at joining in with this development, remains a tantalising question. Even if the monumentalisation of the sanctuary may relate to larger societal structures or developments, the functioning of the cult place can be understood within the local community of farmers and villagers that the survey has revealed.
Moreover, the site density recorded in the field survey for the Hellenistic and Roman periods is considerable, and attests to anything but an ‘empty’ landscape. This high density of sites in the research area must not reflect an overall high site density in this part of Samnium. Perhaps it can indeed be related to the presence of the cult place, as a comparison with a sanctuary recorded in the Biferno Valley survey, equally located within a dense pattern of settlement, could indicate. This suggests that at least these ‘rural’ sanctuaries for which the spatial context has been object of research were not located at the periphery, but rather at the centre of society.

*  

The Institutional Context: Sanctuaries and the So-called Pagus-Vicus System

A pattern of settlement characterised by dispersed farms and villages is commonly indicated as the already mentioned pagus-vicus system. This would have been a specifically Italic system of ancient times. However, this conception has proved to be fundamentally problematic. Recent studies in the legal and institutional realm by Luigi Capogrossi Colognesi and Michel Tarpin have attacked the basis of the system (Chapter 6). Rather than representing “die uritalische Siedlungsform”, the pagus was in all probability a Roman administrative division of the land. The opinions on the vicus are more diverse. Whereas Capogrossi Colognesi maintains that the vicus represents an ancient Italic reality, Tarpin has – in my opinion convincingly – argued to the contrary. According to him, also the vicus was a Roman legal or administrative category. In sum, pagi might be ‘Roman’ territorial divisions, and vici small ‘Roman’ villages – ‘Roman’ here meaning ‘the result of Roman intervention’. Moreover, the presumed hierarchical relation between pagus and vicus can be dismissed.

The implications are twofold: first, the ubiquitous adoption of the term pagus-vicus system for pre-Roman and non-urban settlement organisation should be abandoned. In numerous cases, the term has been applied while actual epigraphical documentation of pagi or vici is absent. In these instances, this misinformed (and misleading) terminology can easily be replaced with less determinative terms such as ‘dispersed settlement organisation’ or ‘village-farm pattern of settlement’.

Second, for the areas which do yield epigraphical evidence for a vicus or a pagus, the consequences exceed sheer terminology and are more fundamental. Here, the revision of pagus and vicus from an institutional perspective has significant implications for ideas on the cultural ‘romanisation’ of Italy. Until now, these implications have barely been touched upon. In Chapters 7 to 9, an attempt is made to explore aspects of these cultural implications in relation to sanctuaries and cults. One of the crucial questions concerns the identity of the inhabitants of pagi and vici: the fact that the institutions they happened to be part of were the result of Roman intervention, does not automatically imply that they were ‘Roman’ too. Despite the complexity of the issue, I have argued that the discussion on pagi and vici may be the key to the recognition of
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Roman religious influence in the countryside, which is usually believed to be minimal or absent.

To this end, the epigraphical evidence for the involvement of *pagi* and *vici* in sanctuaries in Italy has been surveyed, and four cases with the best contextual evidence have been examined in more detail (Chapter 7). In the traditional conception, sanctuaries in which *pagi* and *vici* were involved would have functioned within an Italic system. This assumption has to an extent determined the interpretation of the related cults and sanctuaries, often stressing their ‘pre-Roman’ or ‘Italic’ character. I have asserted that the factual arguments for several cases are weak. Even if there would of course be no point in overstating the possible ‘Roman’ elements in turn, I believe there are striking aspects that suggest allegiance to Roman religious ideas and models.

For instance, the recently excavated sanctuary at Castel di Ieri in the Central Apennines, dating to the end of the second century BC, was (re-)constructed *ex pagi decreto*. It has been interpreted by the excavator as an ‘Italic temple’ dedicated to Minerva. As I have shown, there is evidence to suggest that it was actually a *Capitolum*-temple, a situation which could attest to a ‘romanising’ attitude of this *pagus*.

A second case explores the connection of *pagi* and *vici* to Latin colonies. The possibility of extra-urban *vici* depending on the colonial urban centre is examined. It is argued that the prevalent image of mid-Republican Latin colonisation is strongly influenced by hindsight. There is no conclusive evidence for the location of colonial *vici* outside the urban centre from the foundation of the colony on (but neither for the opposite argument, that they were exclusively urban). At least in later periods such extra-urban *vici* existed.

In the Latin colony of Ariminum (Rimini), black gloss vases with inscriptions mentioning *pagi* and *vici* have been found. The value of this evidence exceeds that of mere epigraphical documentation; the objects themselves provide important information. Tentatively, I have reconstructed a ritual designed to enhance cohesion between the different communities belonging to the colony, both within and outside the city walls. Arguably, *pagi* and *vici* communities expressed allegiance to Rome too by dedicating to the divine virtue of Fides, in a cult place which also seems associated with other Roman gods.

The third case examines the *vici* and sanctuaries found in the *ager Praetutianus*, at the Adriatic coast. *Vici* and related sanctuaries appear to be a relatively late phenomenon, from the second century BC onwards and thus postdating the Roman conquest. The differentiation between *vici stricto sensu* and other villages changes the general picture of decline in the settlement evolution in this area.

The fourth case regards the *vici* which are documented along the Fucine lake, in Marsic territory. These *vici* are amongst the most complex and interesting manifestations, because of their early date (third to second centuries BC) and rich epigraphical evidence for cults. The *vici* and their cults have usually been interpreted as ‘indigenous’ Marsic elements. This argument cannot be supported, but it would be...
equally incautious to regard them instead as entirely ‘Roman’ enclaves. Closer examination points to a more complex reality, in which possibly both native people and foreigners functioned within a new Roman institution. It is argued that these ‘new communities’ were oriented on ‘Roman’ ideological models, and constructed their own ‘Romanness’ by writing in Latin and, especially, venerating gods like Victoria and Valetudo, popular ideological concepts in this period in Rome. In sum, in these institutionally Roman contexts of pagus and vicus, religion was central to the construction of community as well.

* * *

Roman Rituals in the Italian Countryside? The Paganalia and the Compitalia

These considerations have prompted research into other religious aspects related to pagi and vici, and more specifically into the festivals of the Paganalia and the Compitalia (Chapters 8 and 9). The pagus features in early imperial poetry as the rustic locale for religion par excellence. This rusticity evokes an ancient or ‘immemorial’ image, and modern authors have accepted and perhaps even amplified this image. On closer analysis, however, the evidence for the most prominent religious aspect of the pagus, the festival of the Paganalia, reveals a quite different reality. An agricultural association is actually poorly attested, and, for what it is worth, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Ant. Rom. 4.14-15) connects the festival plainly to the taxation of the inhabitants of the pagus. On firmer ground, both epigraphy and literary sources document the lustratio pagi: a circumambulation by the inhabitants of the pagus around their territory. The possible impact of the installation of the Roman pagi in the Italian countryside comes into focus: the ritual act will have erased pre-existing divisions and boundaries from the landscape or have ‘overwritten’ them. At the same time, the ‘new community’ constituting the pagus confirmed and legitimised its position and territory ritually.

The festival of the Compitalia or ‘crossroads festival’ is best known from its association with the urban plebs and social unrest in late Republican Rome, leading to the suppression of the organising collegia, and the restructuring of the festival under Augustus. The festival is usually thought to have originated as a rural cult of immemorial antiquity (“seit unvordenklicher Zeit”) which was later incorporated in or transferred to the city, where it became the principal festival of the vici or urban quarters of Rome. There is clear evidence for the celebration of the Compitalia in the countryside, but I have argued that the development was the other way around: spreading from Rome to the countryside. Evidence from Delos and Picenum suggests that this spread predated the Social War, and was underway in the second century BC already. The Compitalia had, just as the Paganalia, a strong integrative potential, defining the community of the vicus by celebrating together and, again, circumambulation of its territorial borders. Less clear are the actual cult places of the

4 WISSOWA 1897, 1872.
Lares Compitales in the countryside: compitum shrines have been found in, but never outside, urban contexts. Dismissing an erudite, yet quite implausible tradition in modern research on the special appearance of rural compitum shrines (based on Dolabella L 302.1 and a scholiion on Persius 4.28), it has been suggested that possibly ancient Italic sanctuaries were reused for the purpose. In that case, the ritual may have again contributed to the creation of a new reality and community of cult – under the guise of continuity.

* 

Conclusion

The arguments presented in this study have above all pointed out the importance of religion and cult places for the affirmation of different groups in Central-Southern Italy in the last centuries BC. This process does not appear to have been limited to Italic groups, but also applies to colonies and other new ‘Roman’ communities installed in the Italian landscape. In this last section, I would like to try confronting this main conclusion with usual conceptions of cultural change in Italy (‘romanisation’) and its more specific religious aspect (‘religious romanisation’).

As has become clear in Chapter 1, in the ‘traditional’ conception of romanisation a linear and gradual development of cultural convergence is envisaged. Clearly, the evidence presented in this study tends to undermine any notion of a general and gradual development towards unity. Rather, it seems to indicate a competitive atmosphere, which is geographically differentiated. To recognise differentiation in romanisation processes is of course not new, but it is often thought of in regional terms. The recognition of the Roman institutions of pagi and vici could to some extent complicate this regional approach, and suggests an even more pronounced and fragmented differentiation for especially Central Italy. As the vici at the Fucine lake seem to indicate, differentiation could be very local in nature. This means that generating a history of Italy in regional terms can lead to a biased picture in some cases. This effect of differentiation has been demonstrated for the ager Praetutianus for conceptions of settlement developments. This could also apply to the area of the Marsi, who are usually thought to be ‘precociously’ romanised. However, once the vici on the shores of the Fucine lake are left out, ‘the Marsi’ might appear much less romanised. Increasing the resolution, much sharper variation within regions, and perhaps the distinction of different communities, can come to light.

An overly rigid distinction between ‘urban’ and ‘rural’ has also proved to be complicated. This is indicated by the tight relations between the two, also on a religious level, as has been argued for Ariminum, where rural communities are symbolically bound to the urban centre. Arguably, one of the most interesting outcomes is that Roman religious influence was not limited to towns, as is usually
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thought, but applied to specific rural communities in the countryside as well, i.e. *pagi* and *vici*.

The ‘traditional’ conception of a linear and gradual convergence is thus complicated by differentiation. But the arguments put forward in this study do not comply with some important notions of the postcolonial critique of the traditional conception either. Especially the tendency to minimise Roman impact, often present in studies of the postcolonial current, is countered by the arguments presented in this study. On the contrary, in the processes under discussion, Roman influence was considerable. As noted, Roman religious influence has tentatively been discerned in the countryside. Moreover, processes witnessed in ‘Italic’ contexts cannot be seen in isolation from Roman impact.

Temple B at Pietrabbondante is a clear example: as argued, no ‘Roman’ meaning can be attached to the cultural models adopted in this temple complex. But this ‘Samnite’ phenomenon should not be disconnected from Roman impact altogether: the necessity to affirm Samnite sentiments was prompted by changes that were to a large extent brought about by Roman dominion.

Dynamic processes of religious self-affirmation are actually documented for various ‘Roman’ and ‘Italic’ communities; and a connection or interplay on some level may be suspected. Especially in the second century BC evidence for religious expressions of communal pride abounds: Samnium has been mentioned, and from the second century BC onwards *Capitolia* become prominent in Roman contexts – they are hard to trace for earlier periods. The first evidence for cults related to *pagi* and *vici* date to the late third and second centuries BC. I do not suggest a direct relation or ‘confrontational’ interaction between these phenomena, although I would not exclude it either. Nonetheless, it appears that the expression of communal identities through religious aspects is important especially in this period, and it is tempting to relate this to a general climate of change, competition, and search for new self-definitions.

The fundamental contribution by the revisionist critique inspired by postcolonial thought, is the ‘deconstruction’ of metanarratives in historiography (Chapter 1). Revisionists have warned against writing history from hindsight. But the deconstruction of traditional frameworks does not automatically imply that we should abandon also the ‘traditional’ recognition of Roman impact and influence. Yet, it is important to acknowledge that this undeniable influence was not self-evident, and we should ask how and why cultural change occurred: arguably, the ‘deconstruction’ of modern frameworks has cleared the way for the recognition of the role of ‘construction’ in antiquity. Indeed, the key to understanding the processes under consideration seems to be the constructive character of communities. It is here that religion takes first place: in the establishment or redefining of new groups that were formed as a consequence of the Roman conquest. Throughout this study, the constructive aspect of the processes under way has been demonstrated. Most clearly, this is seen in Samnium. If the Samnite temples were perhaps traditionalising in some senses, they were in no way immutable fossils of ancient times: fashionable models
were adopted and remoulded in creative ways to fit the specific situation of the day. This phenomenon should therefore certainly not be seen as attesting ‘continuity’ or lingering traditions, but as a basically new construct designed for a specific moment in time. Cult places became the focus for the affirmation of a new community. Interestingly, a similar process might be recognised in ‘Roman’ contexts. The ‘Romanness’ in the ‘new communities’ of *pagi* and *vici* was not inherent to the institutions themselves: it was consciously forged. The clearest example is the *vicus Supinum*, possibly made up, at least in part, by Marsic locals, who put their public dedication to *Victoria* in Latin. The relation between *pagi*, *vici* and urban centre that was symbolically affirmed by dedicating cups in the colony of Ariminum is another case. The rituals of the *Compitalia* and the *Paganalia*, with their explicit preoccupation with the defining of both territory and included community, also stress this point.

These conclusions on the constructive aspect of these cultural processes tap into ideas on continuity. The importance of the ‘moment’ and the relative unimportance of ‘real’ tradition has been stressed for the Samnite case. Another, more tangible argument in this direction regards the Roman phases of Italic sanctuaries. A chronological continuity in the archaeological material is often implicitly equated with continuity of practice. Perhaps this is also connected to modern ideas on the ‘persistence’ of (especially countryside) religion and cult places, which may betray romantic notions. Although such a scenario of immutable practices is possible, radical changes, both in ritual and the community involved, should not be excluded *a priori* either. As shown for the rituals and festivals connected to *pagi* and *vici*, notions of ‘timelessness’ and great antiquity are to a large extent based upon Augustan and later sources, and should be critically regarded.

The constructive aspect of religion and religious rituals emphasised above should not be mistaken for liberty of action and choice. The character of the Roman religious influence which I have tentatively discerned in the Italian countryside, especially with the festivals of the *Compitalia* and the *Paganalia*, seems defined primarily as a consequence of administrative organisation. Arguably, it is precisely in this realm – institutional organisation – that we might be able to recognise ‘Roman religion’ at work. The ‘embeddedness’ of religion in ancient society is well-known, yet we should face the full scale of its consequences. It not only means that notions of proselytism are anachronistic (cf. Chapter 2), but also that ‘religious toleration’ probably had its limits within this same ‘embeddedness’. Being part of a community, or administrative institution, plainly meant joining in its rituals and was probably not a matter of choice. Conceptions of sanctuaries and cults as facultative and separate domains, primarily pertinent to personal religious experience, are likely to reflect modern attitudes more than ancient reality. Ultimately, these observations might again underscore the importance of the ideological, spatial, and institutional contexts within which sanctuaries functioned.
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Door de Romeinse verovering veranderde Italië in de Republikeinse periode van een lappendeken van verschillende Italische gemeenschappen in één Romeins Italië. De Italische gemeenschappen waren gedwongen op één of andere manier om te gaan met de nieuwe machtsverhoudingen, en omgekeerd moest Rome strategieën bedenken om controle uit te oefenen. In deze tijd van grote veranderingen en conflicten speelden heiligdommen een belangrijke rol. Dit lijkt bijvoorbeeld naar voren te komen uit de latere Romeinse beeldvorming: enerzijds beschrijven Romeinse historici Italische heiligdommen als plaatsen van verzet tegen de Romeinse macht, anderzijds zouden de Romeinse legers voor de inname van vijandelijke steden de stadsgoden opgeroepen hebben om naar Rome over te lopen. Van het religieuze leven in Italië na de militaire campagnes vernemen we uit de bronnen echter weinig meer. Wel ontstaat er aan het eind van de eerste eeuw v.Chr., onder Augustus, een sterk geïdealiseerd en rustiek beeld van Italische heiligdommen en religie. Wat gebeurde er in de periode tussen de Romeinse verovering en Augusteïsche nostalgie?

Zo spaarzaam als de schriftelijke bronnen hierover zijn, zo rijk is de archeologie: juist in de derde tot eerste eeuw v.Chr. verrijzen overal in de Italische gebieden kostbare monumentale tempels. Hun functie en raison d’être zijn echter niet eenduidig. In dit proefschrift wordt de rol van heiligdommen in Midden- en Zuid-Italië onderzocht in het licht van de grote politieke en maatschappelijke veranderingen in deze periode. De studie wil bijdragen aan het felle debat over de ‘romanisering’ van Italië, en het belang van heiligdommen en religieuze rituelen in dit proces aantonen. Tot nu toe is de wetenschappelijke aandacht voornamelijk uitgegaan naar de architectuur en decoratie van heiligdommen op zichzelf. Deze benadering heeft echter het nadeel dat de sociale en politieke context waarbinnen het heiligdom functioneerde buiten beschouwing blijft. Conclusies die op basis alleén van de uiterlijke verschijning van het heiligdom getrokken worden, kunnen sterk vertekend zijn. In deze studie wordt betoogd dat juist de ruimtelijke context en inbedding van heiligdommen in nederzettingssystemen en politieke structuren significant zijn voor hun maatschappelijke betekenis. Deze ruimtelijke en institutionele aspecten worden hier in een literatuurstudie onderzocht. Voor de ruimtelijke contextualisering wordt bovendien een onderzoeksstrategie voor in het veld gepresenteerd.

Lang heeft het idee bestaan dat er al vroeg een sterke culturele invloed van Rome op Italië was (Hoofdstuk 1). Dit is veelal gezien als een gradueel en onontkoombaar proces van romanisering, waarbij inheemse Italische volkeren langzamerhand hun eigen identiteiten aflegden en ‘Romeins’ werden. Zowel de theoretische uitgangspunten als het feitelijke bewijsmateriaal voor een vroege culturele integratie
onder Romeinse leiding zijn echter problematisch. In recente provocatieve bijdragen aan het debat is betoogd dat de Romeinse invloed zowel politiek als cultureel gezien juist beperkt was tot aan de Bondgenotenoorlog (91–89 v.Chr.). Op belangrijke punten lijkt die kritiek op de traditionele visie terecht – met name het terugprojecteren van latere ontwikkelingen naar de Republikeinse periode is met recht aangevallen. Soms lijkt het beeld echter weer te ver door te slaan in de andere richting: de politieke en militaire invloed van Rome mag zeker niet ondergewaardeerd worden. De culturele aspecten zijn echter lastiger grijpbaar, en hier ligt dan ook een interessant onderzoeksveld open.


In het traditionele beeld is overigens wel ruimte voor indirecte of zelfs ‘onbedoelde’ Romeinse invloed. Zo wordt de opkomst van monumentale Italische heiligdommen vaak geïnterpreteerd als een indirect gevolg van de Romeinse overheersing en culturele superioriteit (‘zelf-romanisering’). In Hoofdstuk 3 wordt betoogd dat de betekenis van de overname van zogenoemde ‘Romeinse’ elementen echter niet eenduidig is en dat deze betekenis alleen door de specifieke locale context bepaald werd. Dit wordt gedemonstreerd aan de hand van het Samnitische tempelcomplex van Pietrabondante. Hoewel het bepaalde, mogelijk als ‘Romeins’ te bestempelen, elementen bevatte, had dit heiligdom een zeer duidelijke anti-Romeinse connotatie: het
fungeerde als sacraal militair centrum voor de Samnieten in hun verzet tegen Rome. Bepaalde heiligdommen lijken inderdaad een belangrijke rol te hebben gespeeld in de formering en consolidatie van Italische groepen, waarschijnlijk onder meer in reactie op de Romeinse druk: een voorbeeld van verzet of ‘counter acculturation’ in plaats van ‘romanisering’ in de traditionele zin van het woord. Dit kan ook deels de opkomst of de monumentalisering – in plaats van het verdwijnen – van veel heiligdommen aan het einde van de tweede eeuw v.Chr. verklaren.

Heiligdommen konden dus politiek-maatschappelijke foci worden. Maar om hun impact te bepalen is kennis van het beoogde publiek noodzakelijk. Wat was de functie van het heiligdom in de Italische samenlevingen, wie bouwde het en wie bezocht het? In de moderne literatuur bestaan hierover verschillende theorieën, waarin drie modellen kunnen worden onderscheiden (Hoofdstuk 4): ten eerste het idee dat heiligdommen in verband staan met transhumance-economie, ten tweede het idee dat heiligdommen als territoriale bakens van verschillende (etnische) groepen functioneerden, en ten derde dat ze deel uitmaakten van een typisch Italisch nederzettingsmodel, het zogenaamde pagus-vicus systeem. Betoogd wordt dat de feitelijke basis voor deze modellen zwak is, en dat zij in belangrijke mate door uiteenlopende stereotype ideeën over Italische samenlevingen bepaald zijn.

Een strategie om de locale context van heiligdommen te reconstrueren wordt voorgesteld voor het typisch Samnitische heiligdom van S. Giovanni in Galdo in Molise (Hoofdstuk 5). Hierin wordt fieldsurvey (2004, 2005) in de directe omgeving van het heiligdom gecombineerd met een studie (2006) van het opgegraven materiaal van de tempel zelf. Dit ‘rurale’ heiligdom werd aan het eind van de tweede eeuw v.Chr. gemonumentaliseerd en is in verband gebracht met transhumance. Met de survey rond het heiligdom is echter een dicht patroon ontdekt van verschillende kleine sites (waarschijnlijk boerderijen), een grafveld en bovenal een grotere nederzetting: een dorp of gehucht. Uit het onderzoek rijst een beeld van een ‘complete’ locale gemeenschap, die reeds lang voor de monumentalisering van de cultusplaats vorm kreeg. Het aardewerk afkomstig van het heiligdom en de sites eromheen toont aan dat dit structuratieproces rond het einde van de vierde of begin van de derde eeuw v.Chr. gedateerd kan worden – ongeveer tweeënhonderd jaar voor de monumentale fase. De resultaten wijzen in het geval van S. Giovanni in Galdo derhalve op een sterke inbedding in een locale gemeenschap. Hoewel territoriale of economische (transhumance) functies op (supra-)regionaal niveau niet uit te sluiten zijn, is het belangrijk te bedenken dat deze modellen ontsproten aan een ‘leeg’ beeld van het landschap waarin de heiligdommen geheel geïsoleerd leken te liggen.

Naast dit Italisch-‘inheemse’ perspectief wordt de mogelijke directe Romeinse invloed nader beschouwd. Vanuit het gezichtspunt in deze studie was de Romeinse impact, ook in religieuze zin, op de veroverde rurale gebieden aanzienlijk groter dan voorheen werd aangenomen. Een nadere beschouwing van het zogenaamde pagus-vicus systeem leidt tot deze conclusie. Hoewel sinds de 19de eeuw het idee post heeft gevast dat dit een typisch pre-Romeins, Italisch nederzettingssysteem is, lijkt recent onderzoek in de juridische en institutionele hoek aannemelijk te maken dat zowel pagi als vici juist
Romeinse instellingen waren (Hoofdstuk 6). *Pagus*- en *vicus*-heiligdommen (en de bijbehorende culten) werden gewoonlijk als deel van een traditioneel Italisch systeem gezien, maar functioneerden daarentegen dus waarschijnlijk binnen een nieuwe *Romeinse* indeling van het land. De gevolgen voor de interpretatie van Italische heiligdommen en rituelen worden in Hoofdstuk 7 onderzocht voor drie gebieden waar relatief veel materiaal voorhanden is: in de Latijnse kolonie Ariminum (Emilia Romagna), de *ager Praetutianus* aan de Adriatische kust en het gebied rond de *lacus Fucinus* in de Appenijnen (Abruzzo). Betoogd wordt dat heiligdommen waarin *pagi* of *vici* betrokken waren symbolische ankers vormden voor de nieuwe gemeenschappen die door de Romeinse verovering ontstonden. Bovendien konden de nieuw gevormde groepen religieus en territoriaal gedefinieerd worden door het vieren van de Romeinse festivals van de *Paganalia* (Hoofdstuk 8) en de *Compitalia* (Hoofdstuk 9). Deze festivals zijn gewoonlijk als oeroude, traditionele feesten met agrarische oorsprong beschouwd. Dit beeld is echter in belangrijke mate gevormd door latere (vooral Augusteïsche) ideologie, en kan – zo wordt betoogd – radicale sociale en religieuze veranderingen als gevolg van de nieuwe indeling van land en inwoners maskeren.

Het idee dat de invloed van de Romeinse verovering op religieus vlak minimaal was kan aldus worden weerlegd. Deze invloed moet echter niet zozeer gezocht worden in een ‘religieuze politiek’, maar veeleer in de ‘inherentie’ van religie in maatschappelijke structuren in de oudheid: deel uitmaken van een groep betekent deelnemen in gezamenlijke culten en rituelen. Bovendien kan deze ‘Romeinse invloed’ niet als een constante en externe factor gezien worden. In veel gevallen moeten we eerder denken aan de locale constructie van ideologieën, waarvan men wist of dacht dat die in overeenstemming waren met contemporaine Romeinse ideeën.

*Capitolium*-tempels in kolonies vanaf in ieder geval de tweede eeuw v.Chr. zijn een voorbeeld, maar ook de laat derde-eeuwse wijding van een *vicus* hoog in de Appenijnen aan de Romeinse godin Victoria. Daarnaast blijkt een rigide scheiding van platteland en stad, en de impliciete gelijktijdigheid van deze met respectievelijk ‘Italisch’ en ‘Romeins’ onhoudbaar. Samenvattend kan gesteld worden dat heiligdommen en religie een cruciale rol speelden in de Romeinse incorporatie van Italië: niet alleen voor de nieuwe ‘Romeinse’ gemeenschappen in zowel stad als land, maar ook voor sommige groepen in Italië die zich juist beriepen op (vermeende) oude Italische tradities. Daarbij moet niet zozeer gedacht worden aan een tweedeling tussen Italisch atavisme en een imperialistische Romeinse religieuze politiek, maar eerder aan de maatschappelijk-religieuze definiëring van verschillende nieuwe groepen die ontstonden in deze periode van verandering. Opmerkelijk is bovendien dat de geschetste ontwikkelingen voor een deel contemporain zijn: waar traditioneel een beeld is geschapen van geleidelijk verval van Italische groepen ten gunste van een progressieve ‘romanisering’, lijken sterk uiteenlopende processen van groepsvorming juist gelijktijdig in verschillende (micro)regio’s op te treden. Het is in deze dynamische historische context dat de heiligdommen waarvan de ruïnes nu verspreid over het Italiaanse landschap liggen begrepen moeten worden.