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Chapter 5

Landscapes of the Sacred:
Contextualising the Samnite Sanctuary of S. Giovanni in Galdo (CB)

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 of Italic 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).
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 Pietrabondante, 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 Pietrabondante and with its relatively well preserved remains, this sanctuary has come to constitute almost a canonical site when speaking of Italic 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 several Italic 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.1 Another 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).2 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.3 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.4 A

---

1 The first results of the survey around the sanctuary of loc. Cupa at Gildone are published in STEK and PELGROM 2005; final publication of the survey data is planned by Michele Roccia.
2 BARKER 1995.
3 As was discussed at the ‘convegno’ on the sanctuary organised by the Comune of S. Giovanni in Galdo in August 2007.
4 Cf. Di NIRO 1980, 271, RIZZI 1855. Di Niro, loc.cit., assumes dispersed rural settlement and mentions a “necropoli, coeva al primo periodo di vita del santuario” on the eastern slope of the Colle Rimontato, but no material is presented. A Roman funeral inscription has been found on the Colle Rimontato, now in the Soprintendenza’s deposit (n. inv. 51412, mentioning a (C)apicius or Apicius:...
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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.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*,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 2006.7 The first survey results have been published in


5 DI NIRO and PETRONE 1993.

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

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 Thiermann (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 Kerckhaert, 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).

Fig. 5.2. A 3D reconstruction of the Alta valle del Tappino, with indication of the survey areas (left S. Giovanni in Galdo, Colle Rimontato; right Gildone, loc. Cupa).

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). \(^{12}\)

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.

Fig. 5.5. Site survey of the sanctuary with indication of the find densities (detail from 5.6).

\(^{12}\) 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.
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).\footnote{G3, G5, G19-22. Quality and dimensions of the materials suggest for some sites – at least until recently – rather good archaeological preservation.} For the Hellenistic period, a fairly dense pattern of settlement was encountered. Within the sample area, 16 sites\footnote{G1-5, G9, G12, G15-23.} 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 Ingiono 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).\footnote{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).\(^{18}\)

---

\(^{18}\) 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).

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.

---

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. 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. The ground plan and a section of the podium could thus be drawn (cf. Chapter 3, figs. 3.2 and 3.3), and some of the architectural elements were restored. The beginnings of cult activity have been dated to the second century BC or the end of the third-beginning of the second centuries BC. 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. 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.

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.\textsuperscript{28} 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 \textit{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,\textsuperscript{29} 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.\textsuperscript{30}

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.\textsuperscript{31} From these two groups, a total of 1326 items has been studied and entered into another (yet compatible) database.\textsuperscript{32} Type, fabric, colour, position of the fragment if applicable, diameter, provenance / stratigraphical information if indicated, and so on were administrated, along with

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{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.
  \item \textsuperscript{29} As seems to be indicated by the bibliographical references given, that predate 1980.
  \item \textsuperscript{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.
  \item \textsuperscript{31} The original administration was preserved as well. E.g. SLP06_S145-T2: Sacred Landscape Project 2006, S(acc)0145, 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.
  \item \textsuperscript{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.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
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, Montevairano and Capracotta, 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. 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 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).

---

34 DE BENEDITTIS 1980.
35 RAININI 1996.
36 E.g. PEDRONI 1986; PEDRONI 1990.
37 SLP06_S90T1 and SLP06_S91T1.
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-T138; 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 BC40 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 CAMPOCHIARIO 1982, 35-36, esp. no. 30. Cf. for the type also the specimen published by Di Niro in SANNOIO 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.\(^{44}\) Furthermore several pyxides were encountered, which are generically dated to the third–first

\(^{44}\) Cf. e.g. CAPINI 1984, 29-32, nos. 67-68.
centuries BC, but mostly to the second and first centuries: F7513a1 (SLP06_S10-T6); F7511-7514 (SLP06_S22-T1); 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), 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.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).48

---

45 7512a1 comes closest, dated to the first half of the second century BC.
46 Cf. PEDRONI 1986, 699: probably local production from Cales, third to second centuries BC.
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).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.
Ch. 5. Landscapes of the Sacred

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) AD⁵⁰ were most frequent.

---

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_S57T1: 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, 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 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.

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 Di Niro 1978a, 503-504; Di Niro 1978a, 274, speaking of a “mancanza pressoché 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. As said however, a bias from the poor distribution of guide fossils for this period might distort the picture.

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.

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). 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. 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.
57 For the Roman period, cf. BARKER 1995, 216, 237 figs. 80, 91.
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. But whether the monumentalisation just before the Social War was centrally coordinated, or a local initiative; the intended audience seems to have been the local community of farmers and villagers reflected in the surveydata.

60 Apart from some characters carved into ceramic materials, neither inscriptions nor brick stamps have been found. Cf. for the sanctuary Di Niro 1978b.

61 As suggested, for example, by COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 296-297; cf. Chapter 3.