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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*,¹ 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.² 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.³

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 BC\(^7\) 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 Ianicolensis 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 Ianicolensis); 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 *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*ibius *Avilio*s *V*ibii *f*ilius *V*ibius)

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*).


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 alleged Italic 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 (Pagana),\textsuperscript{27} 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 \textit{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 \textit{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

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{CIL} IX, 3523 if linked to \textit{CIL} IX, 3519 (Letta 1992, 114 n. 26).
\item \textit{CIL} X, 3772.
\item \textit{CIL} XI, 5375.
\item \textit{CIL} IX, 5814.
\item \textit{CIL} IX, 3138 (= \textit{CIL} F, 1793).
\item \textit{CIL} IX, 5814.
\item \textit{CIL} IX, 3138 (= \textit{CIL} F, 1793).
\item \textit{CIL} XI, 3195.
\item \textit{CIL} VI, 251 (= \textit{CIL} VI, 30724).
\item \textit{Genii} pagorum: \textit{CIL} V, 3915; \textit{CIL} V, 4911; \textit{CIL} V, 4909. Possibly \textit{Fides} could be added, cf. \textit{infra}.
\item 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 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.  

**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).  

![Fig. 7.1. Castel di Ieri, ground plan of the temple (adapted from CAMPANELLI 2004, 18 fig. 7).](image)

---

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. 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 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 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. The column bases have the same profile too. The temple shows a three cellae plan. It had a deep pronaos, with four columns at the front and two central columns in the second row, in line with the dividing walls of the cellae. In the cellae, mosaic floors of white tesserae were laid with a band at the edges in black tesserae. In the central cella, a meander motif was placed at the centre, again in black tesserae. Moreover, the mosaic contained a text at the entrance. It mentions two individuals who were responsible for the building, ex pagi decreto. The persons named could have been magistri who apparently acted on a decree of the pagus. The text is dated palaeographically to the mid-first century BC.

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 pagus. 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. The fact that the entrance to a space behind the central cella was blocked by the base of the cult statue at least suggests a change in plans. 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 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.

41 No height is given in CAMPANELLI 2004.
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 an “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 municipium di Superaequum, del cui territorio, entrò a far parte anche il pagus che aveva commissionato il nostro edificio.”
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.\textsuperscript{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 planimetric distribution. The three \textit{cellae} with double colonnade in the pronaos, and indeed the frontal stairs, have suggestive parallels in the \textit{Capitolia} of the colonies of Cosa and Luni, and as well in the three \textit{cellae} temple at Segni.\textsuperscript{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”.\textsuperscript{52}

\textbf{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 \textit{pagus} was involved in its construction. Is it indeed possible to relate the late second century temple to the involvement of the \textit{pagus}? At least not straightforwardly. The decree of the \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{pagus}, around the middle of the first century, restored an already existing, \textit{Capitoliun}-like temple.\textsuperscript{53} It follows that in this reconstruction, the ‘Roman’ lay-out of the temple cannot be related to the involvement of the \textit{pagus}. The \textit{pagus} would just have re-used a pre-existing three \textit{cellae} temple.

For establishing the relation between the architectural design and the \textit{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 \textit{pagus} coincided with the municipalisation of Superaequum which occurred after 49 BC.\textsuperscript{54} However, 49 BC is only a terminus post

\textsuperscript{50} CAMPANELLI 2004, 22, 28.
\textsuperscript{51} CAMPANELLI 2004, 27; see for ‘\textit{Capitoliun}-temples’, Chapter 2.
\textsuperscript{52} CAMPANELLI 2004, 27-28.
\textsuperscript{53} This conception seems to follow from Buonocore’s analysis: BUONOCORE 2004, 288-290.
\textsuperscript{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 IIIviri 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 IIIIviri 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.64 I have already pointed out that the cult of Jupiter was popular within *pagus* contexts (cf. the first century BC *Iuppiter Victor decem paagorum* of Carpineto della Nora,65 or the *Juppiter Compagus* of Capua in 94 BC).66 Moreover, the temple has a clear three *cellae* plan: in this case the alternative interpretation as a central *cella* with *alae* can be excluded since all *cellae* are of equal size.67 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.68 And it should be emphasised that the evidence on which grounds most ‘established’ *Capitolia* have been recognised as such is seldom any richer.69 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 *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 *pagi* for the Republican period, there are additional indications of the religious contexts in which *pagi* exerted influence. This is not restricted to sanctuaries, but extends to rituals which regard the *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 *pagi* of the Latin colony of Ariminum, and the *lustratio pagi*. The case of Ariminum, involving *vici* too, is discussed below in the discussion on Latin colonies. The *lustratio pagi* is considered in Chapter 8 on the *Paganalia*. Now first attention is turned to the epigraphical evidence regarding the institution of the *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 *vici* and sanctuaries is often less straightforward than has been assumed in previous scholarship.70 But, just

---

64 VAN WONTERTHEM 1984, 107: “Entrambi i frammenti sembrano provenire da un santuario di Giove, da situarsi probabilmente nei dintorni di Castel di Ieri”; and cf. after the discovery, in 1987, Buonocore in *Suppl. It.* n.s. V, 97, who mentions the temple but does not discuss the implications. The stamps might date to the second century AD.


66 *CIL* X, 3772. Cf. also the *Juppiter Paganicus* from Assisi (*CIL* XI, 5375).

67 Cf. for *Capitolia* and temples with *alae*: GROS 2001 (1996), 136-140.

68 On the epithet *curinus*, cf. VAN WONTERTHEM 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.

69 Cf. BARTON 1982 and discussion in Chapter 2.

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).

\(^{77}\) *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.\(^{79}\) Another early dedication from Marsic territory again was made by the Aninus vecus (vicus Aninus) to Valetudo, dated to the early first century BC.\(^{80}\) 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.\(^{81}\)

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.

**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. ROMAN URBAN ‘MIMIC’?\(^{82}\) THE ROMAN URBAN MODEL COPIED IN COLONIAL URBAN CENTRES

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

---

\(^{79}\) AE 1987, 321.

\(^{80}\) CIL IX, 3813 (= CIL I², 391).

\(^{81}\) See supra n. 76.

\(^{82}\) Cf. BISPHAM 2000b.

\(^{83}\) Antiochia: 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 (*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) vego 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.

---

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 éttaient 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 I², 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 repartizione 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”. 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). 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. As has been seen, Tarpin has argued that these rural vici were ‘extensions’ of the urban centres in the countryside. 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.

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. 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.\(^\text{102}\) 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.\(^\text{103}\) 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.\(^\text{104}\) These nuclei, then, could perhaps reflect extra-urban vici.\(^\text{105}\)

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.\(^\text{106}\)

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 Calemus.\(^\text{107}\)

\(^\text{102}\) MINGAZZINI 1958. Although one could object that such distinctions as vici could have served electoral purposes.
\(^\text{103}\) GARNSEY 1979.
\(^\text{104}\) PELGROM 2008.
\(^\text{105}\) 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.
\(^\text{106}\) Cf. infra on the vicus Palatius of Cales; and also infra on pagi (and possibly rural vici) represented in the urban centre of Ariminum.
\(^\text{107}\) GUADAGNO 1993, 432.
Interestingly, the inscription had been found within the urban area of Cales. 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. 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 urbec 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) veqo 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. First, it is important to point out that the place of original deposition is unknown. It has even been suggested that the cup was actually produced in Rome, on the Esquiline, where potters are known to have been active. According to Paolino Mingazzini, this would explain the specification Calebus; indicating the potter’s place of origin would make sense only ‘abroad’. However, if it is accepted that Kaeso Serponios worked at Cales, 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. 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. Canoleius and the Gabinii are attested much better, often specifying Calenos or Calebus, 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 named vases from Kaeso 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 coexistence 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 Arinate *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. 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. 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 facetted 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 *poculum (= poculum)* painted on it before firing (cf. figs. 7.2 and 7.3).

---

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. 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 pocola in the course of the third century BC after the deduction of the colony in 268 BC. However, imported pocola were also found.

Most pocola are dated to the third century BC, especially in the first half. 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. The now most commonly accepted interpretation is that the pocola were made and painted by order of the sanctuaries of the deities mentioned in the inscriptions. The visitors of these sanctuaries bought the 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 property of the god, in

---

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.
125 MOREL and COARELLI 1973, 57.
The genitive, points perhaps to its function for libation, both in public and in private contexts.126

The *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 *pocolum*.

For ‘sovradipinta’ 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.127 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 *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 *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 infra). Five, or possibly six, vases of this group mention *pagi* (two) and *vici* (three; one inscription could relate to a *pagus* or a *vicus*, cf. infra), and these are usually called *pocola* as well.

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

This is in line with the context in which the *pagi* and *vici* inscriptions were found: not in funerary and domestic contexts, but, as far as we know, only in public and/or sacral contexts.

---

126 CIFARELLI, AMBROSINI and NONNIS 2002-2003, 293.
127 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 *pocolum* that was ‘personalised’ in such a way, found in Segni: CIFARELLI, AMBROSINI and NONNIS 2002-2003, esp. 268-273.
Fig. 7.4. One of the Ariminate vici inscriptions
(ORTALLI 2000, 510 fig. 180b).

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: 128
1. CIL I², 2897a pagi. fid[ei, –elis or -idenatum?]
2. CIL I², 2897b pa[gi?---]
3. CIL I², 2899a veici [---]
4. CIL I², 2899b veic[---]
5. CIL I², 2899c [v]eic[i---]
and possibly
6. CIL I², 2898 [!]i. vesuini

I give the texts of the pocola and vases on which a theonym might be read as well: 129
7. CIL I², 2885 [Ven]erus. poclom
8. CIL I², 2886 ?Dian]ai, pocol[om]
9. CIL I², 2887 [---] poc[olom]
10. CIL I², 2894 [Ap]ole[ni]
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[j]pollo or poclo
15. Minak b Vu[j]lca[nus]

128 One new ‘poculum’ published by MINAK 2006b and discussed by BRACCESI 2006 could be reconstructed as [v]ect(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[ei], which could also be reconstructed as a proper name of the pagus (e.g. Fidenatium vel sim.).

Another 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[ei] 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’ pecola, 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. 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.

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, \(^{139}\) 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). \(^{140}\) Such forms, cups or paterae, are even more closely associated with libations and similar rituals, especially in the public realm. \(^{141}\) 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. \(^{142}\) The dedication of the patera itself in a sanctuary is also attested in texts. \(^{143}\) 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). \(^{144}\)

\(^{139}\) 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).

\(^{142}\) Varro, Ling. 5.122: Praeterea in poculis erant paterae, ab eo quod late patent ita dictae. Hisce etiam nunc in publico convivio antiquitatis retinendae causa, cum magistri fiunt, potio circumfertur, et in sacrificando dei hoc pociul magistratus dat deo vinum.

\(^{143}\) 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.
would present itself, since Fides is associated closely with the festival of boundaries.\textsuperscript{148} A temple to \textit{Fides publica} or \textit{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.\textsuperscript{149} At this temple, copies of treaties and decrees were exhibited.\textsuperscript{150} This interest may moreover be reflected in a passage of Agathocles’ \textit{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.\textsuperscript{151} 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 \textit{pagi} and \textit{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 \textit{vici} (which could be both rural and urban) and \textit{pagi} in question, as a means of consolidating both territoriality and allegiance to the urban centre. Alternatively, we could imagine representatives of the \textit{vici} and \textit{pagi} dedicating the cups in the cult place, on behalf of their communities, but without a preceding \textit{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 \textit{vici} and the rural \textit{pagi}. Second, the stressing of the relation between these \textit{vicus}- and \textit{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 \textit{vici} and \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{par excellence} for new founders in both Greek and Roman contexts.\textsuperscript{152} His presence is especially appropriate in rituals connected with the foundation of the colony.\textsuperscript{153} It would perhaps

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{148} For the reading of \textit{Fid[ei]} in \textit{CIL} F, 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, \textit{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. \textit{Ant. Rom.} 2.75.3; Plut. \textit{Num.} 16.1.70.
\item \textsuperscript{149} Cic. \textit{Off.} 3.104. Cf. also Pisauro (CRESCI MARRONE and MENNELLA 1984, 95) where a \textit{cippus} was erected for \textit{Fides} at the end of the third century BC. On the temple on the Capitol: REUSSER 1993; on \textit{Fides}: PICCALUGA 1981; FREYBURGER 1986, esp. 229-317. Cf. also the \textit{magistri} documented at Capua, who in 110 BC constructed a wall for Spes, Fides and Fortuna. \textit{CIL} X, 3775 (= \textit{CIL} F, 674).
\item \textsuperscript{150} E.g. \textit{CIL} F, 587 and \textit{CIL} F, 589. Cf. MOMMSEN 1858.
\item \textsuperscript{151} Fest. 328 L = \textit{FGrH} 472 F5; cf. ARONEN 1995.
\item \textsuperscript{152} Cf. the discussion on the early Latin dedications to Apollo in the Marsic area and the \textit{ager Praetutianus}, n. 197. On Apollo and colonisation cf. e.g. MALKIN 1986; MALKIN 1998.
\item \textsuperscript{153} SUSINI 1965, 148; cf. ORTALLI 2000, 503, according to whom the \textit{pocola} were related to rituals associated with migration and foundation.
\end{itemize}
go too far to recognise a ‘Roman pantheon’ 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. Some *pocola* that were brought from other places in Italy and were deposited here could support this thesis. 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.

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.

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.


\(^{161}\) 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. STRAZZULLA 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 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 which 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 museus 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 all’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. Ocilius Rufus son of Caius may have been family to a L. Ocilius 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 caementicum / 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.  

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 GUIDOBALEDI 1995, 272.
just as it is for the site of S. Rustico, widely accepted. 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, 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. 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. 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.

---

192 CIL IX, 5048 (= CIL I², 1899).
194 IACULLI 1993.
195 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.  

Fig. 7.9. *Vici* in the *ager* Praetutianus (adapted from GUIDOBALDI 1995, 248 fig. 5).

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 *par excellence*, in archaic Latin in this area. 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.

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”. In this respect, she seems to adopt a centre-periphery perspective, in stating that the sites near the centre of

---

196 GUIDOBALDI 1995, 186.  
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 Praetuti 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

---

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 provening 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 *IIIvir* apparait 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.206

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.207 Another village, the vicus Petinus is documented in the act of dedicating a statue to an unknown deity.208 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.209 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.210 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 comfortable 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 F, 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 F, 388).
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 / Valetudn[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: “Ille siècle av. J.-C.”

\(^{213}\) *AE* 1978, 00286 = *AE* 1996, 00513.

\(^{214}\) *CIL* IX, 3812 (= *CIL* F, 390); Letta 2001, 151.

\(^{215}\) On the basis of the apographs, cf. Letta 1997a, 332.
Adele Campanelli recognised the cult place of Valetudo in the sanctuary that she excavated near Lecce dei Marsi, along the river Tavana.\footnote{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}.\footnote{217} Slabs of calcareous stone, tuscanic capitals and column drums are documented here, and Grossi locates the \textit{vicus Aninus} in this place.\footnote{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.\footnote{219} The \textit{vicus} possibly took its name from the gens name \textit{Annius}, i.e. ‘the \textit{vicus} of the \textit{Annii}’.\footnote{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.\footnote{221}

2. The \textit{vicus Petinus}

A dedication of a statue to an unknown deity was “trouvée en 1878 au \textit{lac Fucin}”,\footnote{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.\footnote{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}
\item \textsuperscript{216} Campanelli 1991.
\item \textsuperscript{217} Grossi 1988, 120, 124 = no. 19 with n. 44 and no. 20.
\item \textsuperscript{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 modeste, circa un ettaro, dato che le necropoli sembrano circondarlo …”. 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 hill-fort 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.
\item \textsuperscript{219} Cf. Letta 1997a, 333 n. 41; for the rural sanctuary also Grossi 1988, 124 = no. 20.
\item \textsuperscript{220} Letta and D’Amato 1975, 165.
\item \textsuperscript{221} Cf. on the date of the inscription \textit{supra} n. 212.
\item \textsuperscript{222} AE 1953, 218. Quote: Froehner (in Letta and D’Amato 1975, 321).
\item \textsuperscript{223} Letta and D’Amato 1975 no. 188, p. 321-328.
\item \textsuperscript{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*.” 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 nomina*). 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[vir]i*. 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”. 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.

The name *Setmius (= Septimius)* is common but may originate from Latium. This is the first appearance of the name in the Marsic area. Later *Septimii* are recorded in the area at S. Benedetto, in Marruvium, and, three times, in Alba Fucens. 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*.

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. 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.
226 Pe- praenomen, Cesieus – nomen Vett(us?) – cognomen. This use is documented in LETTA and D’AMATO 1975 nos. 108 and 189. For E = patronymic formula: Degrassi in *ILLRP* 303.
227 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 196.
228 LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 196, commenting on the *queistores* of the *vicus Supinum*, see the *duoviri* of the *vecos petinus* even as “una conferma delle radici locali di questa magistratura (sic! dei queistores del vecos supinas)”. FRANCHI DE BELLIS 1995, 382, on a *T. Setmis* who appears on a pocolum from Ariminum (377, no. 16). LETTA and D’AMATO 1975: “equivalente di un latino Se(p)t(i)mius.”
230 *CIL* IX, 3947, 4026, 4030.
231 *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.).\textsuperscript{235} 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.\textsuperscript{236} 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,\textsuperscript{237} i.e. probably another vicus, whereas a Fistanus appears in Interamna (Teramo).\textsuperscript{238} The late date of the epigraphical evidence precludes, in spite of the Hellenistic archaeological material, secured conclusions on the Republican situation.\textsuperscript{259}

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.\textsuperscript{240} 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).\textsuperscript{241} 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.\textsuperscript{242} Grossi argues that two other inscriptions found in the territory of Trasacco in the 19th century belong to this sanctuary. One inscription mentions mag(isti) He(rculis) restoring elements of a theatre and organising ludi scaenici,\textsuperscript{243}

\textsuperscript{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)).

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{237} CIL IX, 3542: possibly from the vicus Furfensis.

\textsuperscript{238} CIL I², 1905; cf. the origin of other similar names in the Sabine and Campanian areas in LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 219.

\textsuperscript{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”).

\textsuperscript{240} GROSSI 1988, 113 with n. 26.

\textsuperscript{241} CIL IX, 3856: possibly from the vicus Furtensis.

\textsuperscript{242} CIL I², 1905; cf. the origin of other similar names in the Sabine and Campanian areas in LETTA and D’AMATO 1975, 219.

\textsuperscript{243} GROSSI 1988, 113 with n. 26.

\textsuperscript{244} LETTA and D’AMATO 1975 no. 137: loc. Colle Mariano or Maioran (= CIL I², 2873b).

\textsuperscript{245} GROSSI 1988, 113 n. 26: “Si tratta di un grande santuario dedicato ad Ercole con insediamento italic-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, statuine femminili ed animali, piattelli e coppette a vernice nera di III sec. a.C.”

\textsuperscript{246} 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 vici.

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(ati) f(ilius) / Pac(is) Anaiedio(s) St(ati) [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

---

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.


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 F, 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 F, on page 818, cf. also CIL F, 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...
archaeological data, and together with additional topographical indications by amongst others Giuseppe Grossi it seems possible to outline some options for an explanation.\textsuperscript{258}

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).\textsuperscript{259}

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.\textsuperscript{260} Elaborating on the ideas put forward by Tarpin,\textsuperscript{261} 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 (\textit{CIL IX}, 3849 = \textit{I²} 388) are in the nominative. According to Letta they are nevertheless to be understood as eponymous, since no \textit{faciundum curaverunt} or \textit{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:\textsuperscript{262} here, the word \textit{questur} is followed by three names. Letta discerns an eponymous use of the two \textit{q(ua)estur(es?)}, that would refer to the two first names: \textit{V(ibius) Salv[i(os)]} and \textit{M(arcus) Paci(os)}. The last person, who is separated from the remainder of the text by a blank line, would have dedicated the object.\textsuperscript{263}

\textsuperscript{258} LETTA and D’AMATO 1975; GROSSI 1988.

\textsuperscript{259} LETTA and D’AMATO 1975 \textit{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.”

\textsuperscript{260} ‘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.

\textsuperscript{261} TARPIN 2002, 56-63.

\textsuperscript{262} LETTA 1979; \textit{CIL I}, 2873d: \textit{Q(ua)estur(es?) / V(ibius) Salv[i(os)] / M(arcus) Paci(os) / Pe(tro) C(e)rvil(os)}.

\textsuperscript{263} 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

---

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 Ι, 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 indigini 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.

267 Cf. esp. GROSSI 1988; GROSSI 1991 for this notion of interdependence.

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 incompatibile con la tradizione linguistica osco-umbra per la presenza della labiovelare qu-), sia nelle attribuzioni principalmente finanziarie.”
a local, Marsic political system, who only borrowed their title from Rome: a case of “mimesi culturale” according to Letta.  

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. The cetur could thus have been mentioned in this dedication in the sense of “in the presence of cetur C. Cominius”.  

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 qestur > 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 queistrates 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, 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 queistrates form an unequivocal ‘indigenous element’ or ‘survival’ 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 magistratuali 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 kvaíssturs 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. \textit{Salvius} is a praenomen that is common in Central Italy, not specifically the Marsic region.\textsuperscript{279} Also the praenomen \textit{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)[filius]}, was, according to Letta, an autochthonous Marsic person. The praenomen \textit{Pacius} is common in Central Italy, but the gentilician \textit{Anaiedio(s) > Annaedius} 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.

\textsuperscript{274} \textsc{Letta} and \textsc{D’Amato 1975 no. 134 = CIL IX, 3847 (= CIL I\textsuperscript{1}, 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. \textsc{Tarpin 2002, 57 n. 17.}

\textsuperscript{276} Cf. already \textsc{Perozzi 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: \textsc{Salmon 1969, 86.}

\textsuperscript{278} Cf. \textsc{Guadagnolo 2005 for a similar deconstruction of \textit{duoviri} in an Italic context.}

\textsuperscript{279} Cf. \textsc{Letta and D’Amato 1975, no. 37 (S. Benedetto); cf. pp. 47-48, examples from Vestine, Marrucine, Paeldignon and Umbrian areas, cf. also on the archaic abbreviation \textit{Sa}.}

\textsuperscript{280} Marsic area: three times attested in Supinum (the other two: \textsc{Letta and D’Amato 1975 no. 129 and 134) and once in Collelongo (funerary inscription): \textsc{Letta and D’Amato 1975 no. 160.}

\textsuperscript{281} \textsc{Letta and D’Amato 1975, 200; \textsc{Schulze 1933.}

\textsuperscript{282} An inscription from S. Benedetto, [----\textit{anna[edius]?-----}] could be reconstructed this way (\textsc{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 \textit{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 *Apline* 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 Hercules can be accounted for by Greek-Etruscan, rather than Roman influence, because in one of the inscriptions the form *Herclo Io(vio?)* 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 Wonerghem 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.

289 Letta and D’Amato 1975, 222-224 no. 134; Letta 2001, 149-150.

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). 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. 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. 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.

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. 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. 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”.
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Republican period.\textsuperscript{297} The \textit{Dei Consentes} can perhaps better be related to Roman influence too.\textsuperscript{298}

Most clarifying in this discussion is Victoria, to whom the \textit{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).\textsuperscript{299} 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.\textsuperscript{300} Victoria can therefore surely best be understood as a ‘Roman’ introduction.\textsuperscript{301} 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 \textit{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.\textsuperscript{302} This goddess takes her name from the same root as the word \textit{vicus}, according to Aldo Prosdocimi.\textsuperscript{303} It is, then, not to be excluded that Victoria – Vica Pota had a specific meaning for the institution of the \textit{vicus}. Suggestive in this regard is that in the Republican \textit{Fasti Antiiates maiores} the festival of Vica Pota falls on January fifth, the last day of the \textit{Compitalia}, the most important festival associated with the \textit{vici} (cf. Chapter 9).\textsuperscript{304}

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.\textsuperscript{305} Confer, for example, the cult of \textit{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,

\textsuperscript{297} \textit{AE} 1988, 465 with \textit{LETTA} 1997a, 333.
\textsuperscript{298} Even if adopting the Etruscan / Greek gods, the name and conception as such is very Roman: \textit{LONG} 1987, 235-243.
\textsuperscript{299} Interestingly, by then, \textit{Vikturrai} seems to assume a strong anti-Roman connotation. \textit{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.
\textsuperscript{300} \textit{Liv.} 10.33.9; cf. \textit{HÖLSCHER} 1967 for the special Roman character and the relation with Nike.
\textsuperscript{301} According to \textit{LUSCHI} 1988 Victoria would actually hide a local Vacuna / Vesuna, through a process of \textit{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” (\textit{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: \textit{LETTA} and \textit{D'AMATO} 1975, 204; cf. \textit{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 \textit{vicus} itself (cf. discussion infra).
\textsuperscript{302} Vica Pota: \textit{vincendi atque potiundi: Cic. Leg.} 2.28; \textit{CARANDINI} 1997, 207-211.
\textsuperscript{303} \textit{PROSDOCIMI} 1989, 491.
\textsuperscript{304} \textit{Inscr. Ital.} XIII.2, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{305} See e.g. \textit{HÖLSCHER} 1967; \textit{FEARS} 1981a; in general \textit{FEARS} 1981b and now \textit{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 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 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 vicus Aninus, the Roman value of ‘Victory’ was venerated as a deity in the vicus Supinum.

To sum up, some of the supposedly ‘indigenous’ characteristics related to the Fucine inscriptions and especially the vicus Supinum can be questioned. The 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 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 vici, such as Victoria and Valetudo belong to rather ‘Roman’ contexts. This begs the question of the nature of the relation between the Fucine vici and Alba Fucens. A direct relation between colony and vici is hard to sustain with the present evidence: the 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 ager Romanus or within the territory of the Latin colony.

307 Liv. 9.43.25.
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. 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 *Fucens*, and inscriptions mentioning the Alban *tribus Fabia* at Cese and south of Avezzano would indicate that it continued up to there. An inscription found at Lucus Angitiae would indicate that this was Marsic territory, since the *tribus Sergia* is mentioned. At least some inhabitants of the *vicus Supinum* were inscribed in the *tribus Sergia* too, and it has been concluded that the *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 *vicus Supinum* was placed in the same *tribus* as the Marsic and Paelignian territories, at the moment that the inhabitants of the Fucine area were divided in *tribus*, that is, after the Social War. 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. Although I hesitate to make an affirmative statement in this regard, it follows at least that the original territory of the colony might have included the *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.

The *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

---

309 The northern boundary is documented by inscribed stones mentioning explicitly the *Albensium fines*: *CIL* IX, 3929-3930, but these can probably be related to a new organisation of the territory in Hadrianic times, cf. *LIBERATORE* 2001, 187 with further references.

310 BELOCH 1926, 552. *CIL* IX, 3933 (“alla Cese”); *CIL* IX, 3922: funerary inscription, found “ad viam consularem M p. ab Avezzano Lucum versus al sito Cerrito prope S. Mariam de Loreto”.

311 *CIL* IX, 3894. On the use of *tribus* indications for establishing territories cf. 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. CASTAGNOLI 1958, 37.

312 *CIL* IX, 3906 (= *CIL* I², 1814).

313 Even the assertion that the *tribus* indication in e.g. *CIL* IX, 3906 relates to the *vicus Supinum* proper is unjustified: as Giuseppe Forni has underscored, the *tribus* did not belong to a city, but to the Roman citizens that were inscribed in it (FORNI 1982). People belonging to different *tribus* could and did live in the same place, and there are examples of different generations belonging to different *tribus*; see BUONOCORE 2003 with n. 22 (*AE* 1964, 15-33; *CIL* IX, 4967, with a father in the *Collina* and a son in the *Quirina*).

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 *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*.\(^{315}\) 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.\(^ {316}\) Then, some 50 years later than the example of Antinium, 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*.\(^ {317}\)

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 Antinium 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 *quaestores* of the *vicus Supinum* were used as such. Indeed, as has been seen, it seems even possible that the *quaestores* fulfilled a similar role as the Roman *cetur* from Antinium. Neither is it to be excluded that the *quaestores* 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”).\(^ {318}\) In this conception he follows Letta, who has

\(^{315}\) Letta and D’Amato 1975, 196-197. Following Salmon 1967, 90 with n. 3, that the *censor* is originally a Roman institution.

\(^{316}\) Cf. Letta and D’Amato 1975, no. 188.

\(^{317}\) Letta and D’Amato 1975, 196-197.

\(^{318}\) Tarpin 2002, 62. Cf. also p. 57: “les relations entre les élites marsees et romaines semblent avoir été étroites et précoces.”
emphasised the ‘precocious romanisation’ of the Marsic area in many publications, as has been seen.\(^{319}\)

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.\(^{320}\) Apparently, Tarpin tries to combine the romanisation of ‘indigenous’ Marsi with the placing of small groups of Latin or Roman citizens.\(^{321}\) 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.\(^{322}\) There is indeed evidence that the Marsic cohesion in this period was quite strong, as is documented for instance by their communal mint.\(^{323}\) 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 *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 comprehensibly as actions undertaken by Roman / Latin magistrates in or on behalf of these *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.\(^{324}\) 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.

\(^{319}\) Cf. Letta 1972, 101, talking of “la rapida e totale integrazione dei Marsi nel mondo romano”.

\(^{320}\) *Contra* Letta 1972, e.g. 77, whom Tarpin accuses of not presenting solid evidence for a Roman-Marsic opposition (Tarpin 2002, 60). I would however not be sure whether Appianus and Diodorus are more credible than Livy and the *Fasti Triumphales Capitolini*.

\(^{321}\) 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 *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.

\(^{322}\) 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.

\(^{323}\) La Regina 1970, 204.

\(^{324}\) On these processes, cf. Adams 2007.
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. 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.

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.

---

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”.
One of the most important results of this discussion on *vici*, in my opinion, is that we need not regard the whole corpus of archaeological 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 MANNELLA 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.
in 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.\footnote{Cf. BARTH 1969, and my Chapters 1 and 3 on the ‘construction of community’.} 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.\footnote{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.\(^{332}\) 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.\(^{333}\)

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.\(^{334}\)

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.

\(^{332}\) 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.