

RES III

REPORTS, EXCAVATIONS AND STUDIES OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL UNIT
OF THE UNIVERSITY G. D'ANNUNZIO OF CHIETI-PESCARA



From *Safin* to Roman

Cultural Change and Hybridization in Central Adriatic Italy

Oliva Menozzi

ARCHAEOPRESS ARCHAEOLOGY

From *Safin* to Roman

Cultural Change and Hybridization in Central Adriatic Italy

Oliva Menozzi

ARCHAEOPRESS ARCHAEOLOGY



ARCHAEOPRESS PUBLISHING LTD

Summertown Pavilion

18-24 Middle Way

Summertown

Oxford OX2 7LG

www.archaeopress.com

ISBN 978-1-80327-457-7

ISBN 978-1-80327-458-4 (eBook)

© Oliva Menozzi and Archaeopress 2024

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owners.

This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website www.archaeopress.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION A	INTRODUCTION	pag.	1
	1 Defining the Central Appenines.....	»	3
	2 Hellenization and Romanization: problems of interpretation and Hybridization.....	»	5
	3 Aims and methodologies of the research.....	»	10
SECTION B	THE LAND		13
Chapter 1	Historical Geography	»	17
	Reading the ancient topography through the sources.....	»	17
	The infrastructure of ancient communications: road-network, tratturi and ports.....	»	29
Chapter 2	The Region: Geology and Landscape	»	41
	Plates 1 - 32		47
SECTION C	THE MID-ADRIATIC APENNINES BETWEEN THE 6TH AND THE 4TH CENTURIES BC		81
Chapter 3	Ethnographic and Cultural Background between the 6th and 4th centuries BC	»	83
	From the Safin to the Sabelli.....	»	84
	The political situation.....	»	85
	Language and script of Archaic Abruzzo.....	»	86
	The Sabellians between the mid 5 th and the mid 4 th centuries BC.....	»	87
	Trade and external contacts.....	»	90
	Plates 33 - 64		95
Chapter 4	Settlement Structure	»	133
	Territorial organisation.....	»	133
	Hillforts.....	»	133
	Villages.....	»	135
	Sanctuaries.....	»	137
Chapter 5	Funerary Practices	pag.	141
	Cemeteries.....	»	141
	Funerary sculpture.....	»	144

Conclusions	The mid-Adriatic Apennines in the Archaic and Classical periods	pag.	149
Plates	Plates 65 - 96	»	151
SECTION D	THE CONVENTIONAL PERIOD OF ‘ROMANIZATION’		185
Chapter 6	The General Historical Background according to the Sources	»	187
Chapter 7	Society and Economy	»	193
	The social context	»	193
	Rural settlement and local production.....	»	197
	Coins and currency.....	»	207
Plates	Plates 97 - 128	»	219
Chapter 8	Settlement Structure	»	253
	Territorial organization.....	»	253
	Hillforts.....	»	255
	Sanctuaries.....	»	261
	Villages, vici and pagi.....	»	265
	Colonies.....	»	269
	Municipia and praefecturae.....	»	279
Chapter 9	Art and Architecture	»	289
	Public and private architecture.....	»	289
	Terracotta votive offerings.....	»	297
	Votive bronze statuettes.....	»	299
	Cemeteries and funerary equipment.....	»	301
	Sculpture and portraits.....	»	305
Plates	Plates 129 - 160	»	309
SECTION E	PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS	»	343
	ABBREVIATIONS	»	355
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	»	359
	APPENDICES	»	375
Appendix 1	Silvano Agostini	»	375
	Geoarcheologia, cambiamenti climatici e paesaggi archeologici in Abruzzo: un punto della situazione		

Appendix 2	Vincenzo d'Ercole e Oliva Menozzi	pag.	385
	Un aggiornamento sulle strutture abitative in Abruzzo		
Appendix 3	Luca Cherstich	»	419
	A diachronic overview of the S. Maria Cardetola necropolis in Crecchio (CH) (seasons 2015-2020, 2022).		
Appendix 4	Vincenzo d'Ercole	»	491
	Archeologia funeraria in Abruzzo: un aggiornamento		
Appendix 5	Eugenio Di Valerio	»	521
	Preliminary data from the investigations in the municipality of San Giovanni Lipioni (CH): the archaeological areas of Colle Vernone and Il Monte.		
Appendix 6	Maria Cristina Mancini e Oliva Menozzi	»	543
	Economia e organizzazione territoriale tra IV sec. a.C. e I d.C.: il ruolo dei 'centri minori' in area Centro-Adriatica e Appenninica		

Preface

The RES Series has been planned as collaboration between the Archaeological Unit of G. d'Annunzio University of Chieti and the publisher Archaeopress of Oxford, in order to publish the results of the projects and the researches of the different teams of Chieti working both in Italy and abroad. This third volume is dedicated to the Central Adriatic Apennines and presents the research of the author, Oliva Menozzi, which began with a DPhil Thesis in Oxford and has continued with further post-doctoral research, excavations and survey projects.

In order to keep the original organization of the main nucleus of the work, the volume is divided into two main parts: Part I with the original work that was carried out for the DPhil Thesis in Oxford and for the post-doctoral years which followed in Chieti; and Part II with appendices updating the picture with data and research from the last 15 years. For this second part, other scholars have also contributed their research. This second part is intended to function as an updated conclusion on the region.

Acknowledgements

I am indebted for this volume, *in primis*, to my supervisors for my DPhil in Oxford, who encouraged me with their advice: John A. Lloyd and Nicholas Purcell; from their expertise and insight I have enormously benefited.

A special acknowledgement goes '*alla Prof*': Emanuela Fabbriotti, for believing in this work and for supporting me in all my research, even those far from her interests.

I would like to express my thanks for their suggestions and help to Gloria Adinolfi, Sonia Antonelli, Edward Bispham, Guy Bradley, Rodolfo Carmagnola, Carmine Catenacci, Luca Cherstich, Giovanni Colonna, Michael H. Crawford, Maria Giorgia Di Antonio, Eugenio Di Valerio, Patrizio Domenicucci, Giulio Firpo, Domenico Fossataro, Anna Maria Giuntella, Fay Glinister, Susan Kane, Philip M. Kenrick, Gary R. Lock, Emma Luppino Manes, Alison MacDonald, Maria Cristina Mancini, Gina Martella, Alessandro Naso, Paul Roberts, Paolo Sommella, Patrizia Staffilani, Vienna Tordone, Massimo Vetta, all of whom provided valuable suggestions, comments and some of them even precious revisions of essays and papers.

Moreover my great acknowledgements go to the colleagues and friends of the Soprintendenza: Silvano Agostini, Adele Campanelli, Vincenzo d'Ercole, Amalia Faustoferri, Sandra Lapenna, Andrea R. Staffa for their interesting information about their excavations and researches, as well as for allowing, generously, to use some of their data, photographs and plans in this volume.

For the graphical editing I have to thank, enormously, Rocco D'Errico, without whom I would have never had such a well organized book and rich plates.

Last, but by no means least, I would like to dedicate this volume with my special thought and thanks to the late John A. Lloyd, for his support, for all the revisions, for the numerous fruitful discussions in front of a mountain of books, papers, plans, reports, drawings and an omnipresent cup of tea.

SECTION A
INTRODUCTION

Introduction

1. DEFINING THE CENTRAL APPENINES

The geographical definition of the Central Adriatic Apennines may give rise to debated interpretations without a preliminary brief discussion of the history of the studies. Whatever terminology is used in this context it represents a formal choice in order to refer to the area which was occupied in antiquity by Italic populations variously named by the scholars as ‘Sabelli’, ‘Sabellics’ or ‘Sabellians’,¹ with problematic and too subjective² transcriptions and translations of their ethnic *Safin-*. However it must be specified that the Samnites and the Piceni are not directly included in this analysis, both because they have recently been the object of several exhaustive publications,³ and because they evolved and reacted to the Roman conquest differently from their ‘central *Safin-* cousins’, although sites in boundary areas belonging to these two populations are often included within the same ethnic group, especially for early periods, because closely related to the rest of the region and because a proper evident differentiation occurred later.

The area of investigation, therefore, is roughly the modern region of Abruzzo, for which the Italian archaeological tradition uses different definitions, such as ‘Mid-Adriatic area’ or ‘Central Adriatic Apennines’, emphasizing the Adriatic position, or ‘South Picene’, which is generally used by Etruscologists in order to

give prominence to the cultural *koinè*, already in the 6th and 5th centuries BC, of the different tribes inhabiting the area, grouping them in an ‘eastern cultural and ethnical pole’ acting in Central Italy as a counterpart of the Etruscans, but without any original implication of political unity.⁴

The region has received little scholarly attention in international contexts, compared with Tyrrhenian Italy, although the last three decades have been very rich in excavations and finds, which can almost completely change the ‘traditional general picture’ of the local cultures and of the role of the Romans in the area, underestimating in general the interaction of the peoples of this region with other ethnic groups, just because it was too often thought to have been sporadic and relatively unimportant. However, most of the data is still not published or just published as brief preliminary reports, mainly only in local papers or books, reducing the possibility of a more objective and useful wider view of the general context.

For too long the region has been seen just as a mountainous and isolated ‘terra di pastori’, with uncultured shepherds living scattered and poorly organised, generalising this status, to the detriment of local culture, in an over-simplified view from prehistory to late periods and interpreting the Roman role in the area in term of ‘acculturation’, often due

¹ For discussion of these labels see Chapter 3.1-2. For a study on the meaning and the use of these names see Dench, E., *From Barbarians to new men* (Oxford 1995), pp.186-198.

² Subjective because borrowed and translated from sources which need to be contextualized before using them in a general way.

³ Among the most recent studies on these two areas: Tagliamonte, G., *I Sanniti* (Milano 1997); Naso, A., *I Piceni* (Milano 2000).

⁴ See for instance: Pallottino, M., *A History of Earliest Italy* (London 1991, Eng. trans.), pp.99-105; Cianfarani, V., *Antiche Civiltà d’Abruzzo* (Roma 1969), pp.11-14; Colonna, G., ‘Apporti etruschi all’orientalizzante piceno. Il caso della statuaria’, in *La Civiltà Picena. Nelle Marche. Studi in onore di Giovanni Annibaldi. Atti del Convegno di Ancona 1988* (Ripatransone 1992), pp. 97-127; Prosdocimi, A.L., ‘Gli Etnici’, in Franchi dell’Orto, L., *Piceni Popolo d’Europa* (Roma 1999), pp.13-18.

to the partisan spirit of the ancient sources, mostly Roman or 'pro-Roman'. The role of stock-raising itself needs to be reinterpreted, because it changed greatly from period to period and certainly did not exclude other economical resources, already in early periods. The topography of the area and the recent finds, have been able to prove that agriculture was also important for the large sub-Apennine and coastal areas, hilly but certainly not only mountainous, and that other resources were also important for the local economy, such as the exploitation of the forest and metallurgy.

The existence and the consistency of a complex local culture and organisation, moreover, can not be denied any more after the finds of inscriptions and rich tombs showing a society, hierarchically organised and politically in constant evolution, with its own language and culture and receptive to external influences.

The isolation of the region and the difficulty of travel through have often been exaggerated by sources and scholars, becoming a prominent commonplace, especially for modern historians and travellers, evidence of a catastrophic situation of the road network between the 17th and 19th centuries due to a period of political instability, which caused the abandonment of many roads and the increasing of brigandage. The only Roman roads which are considered by sources and scholars are generally the *Via Valeria - Claudia Valeria*, and as a minor route, the *Via Claudia Nova*, in a very reductive picture. However, the dense modern road network often follows step by step, with modern improvements to abbreviate the distances, the tracks of the natural routes and mountainous passes used already before the Roman conquest, as well as by the Roman roads and the medieval and later *tratturi*, which always formed a capillary road network in the area. In fact, as we will see in the next two chapters, the topography of the region offers the possibility to exploit the local natural track system, made by large valleys and upland plateaux through the Apennines,

which connect easily, the region either with the Tyrrhenian and with Apulian and North-Picene areas. Probably, Rome's interest itself in this area at the beginning aimed principally to the opportunity the region offered for a short route to the Adriatic sea, cutting out and bypassing more problematic areas as inner Samnium or northern Picene territories.

Often in the past, the comparison of the poorly published finds from this region with the rich amount of data from Tyrrhenian regions, such as Campania and Etruria, have made possible generalisations about remote and uncultured populations living in the region, over-estimating the role of Rome in the evolution of patterns of settlements and society, ignoring however not only the disparity of data but also the strong disparity in the demography of these regions. Campania or Latium, for instance, have always been more densely inhabited compared with the Adriatic Apennines, and the strong demographic pressure, together with the direct influence of the close Greek colonies in Campania, have accelerated and amplified the processes of the urban development.

However, the over-simplified view of peoples living scattered in huts, without any form of organised aggregation until the late Hellenistic period, is incompatible with the recent excavations of early cemeteries, such as Campovalano, Fossa, Bazzano, Scurcola and so on, attesting large and strongly organised necropoleis, often even having regular roads among the tombs. The lack of data from the settlements for early periods, is mainly due to the rare choice in the past of excavations of this kind of sites, preferring the funerary contexts, which are obviously richer in equipment and better preserved than the more deteriorated huts and houses. In fact, the houses and the buildings in villages and settlements were built mainly of wood, mud-bricks and other perishable building materials, so that their remains are often scanty and difficult to interpret; moreover, the strong modern

urbanization and exploitation of the soil have often obliterated or even completely destroyed these delicate remains.

Too often, therefore, through *argumenta ex silentio*, the situation has been interpreted as completely lacking of data, leading to several distortions in the historical interpretation of the local peoples and tribes, of their level of organisation and acculturation.

The topography of the region, moreover, is characterised by very different habitats, which have always and strongly influenced the processes of settling; it is therefore very restrictive to view the region as exclusively mountainous. In order to understand more clearly the mechanisms of exploitation of the territory, it is extremely important to remember the strong distinction between the inner Apennine area, mountainous but at the same time deeply characterised by important river valleys and upland plateaux cutting vertically the mountains and offering the possibility of easy connections, and the coastal sub-Apennine belt, hilly and regularly cut by horizontal and wide river valleys, guaranteeing the contacts between the coasts and the countryside. Moreover, within this general distinction there are various micro-habitats, which are extremely important to understand the mechanisms of settling in the region, favouring with their climate and fertile lands the peopling of the area since prehistory, such as the basins of Sulmona and of the Fucine, and the upland plateaux known as Navelli, le Rocche e Cinque Miglia, also used as easy places of interconnection in the inner Apennines.

Moreover, art and architecture of this region, especially in the period between the 3rd and the 1st centuries BC, has shown the complexity of the local cultures and the different influences often directly coming from Campania, Etruria, Apulia, and not only through the Roman mediation, as has been said for too

long. In fact, the artistic and architectural sources in this context are used to show how different the cultural inspirations could have been from case to case and within different artistic categories, so much so that different sources, in the same period, can prove different and at time contrasting levels of 'Hellenisation' or 'Romanisation', attesting the relativity of these concepts and the eclectic picture of Hellenistic Art and Architecture in Central Italy. The use, therefore, of one of these sources, as often happens in studies on the Romanization of the area, without any link with the main context, can be extremely dangerous if used to reconstruct the whole general picture.

The research for this work, already in its first stages of DPhil thesis, started therefore as an attempt to study the region as completely as possible and on the light of the new discoveries, analysing as much data as possible and trying to integrate 'traditional interpretations' and new evidence, in order to give a general idea of the evolution of the region before the arrival of the Romans to read then the significance of 'Romanization'⁵ in the area. However, already in the early stages of the research, a problematic question came to light: *was there 'a real and precise period of Romanization'?* Reading through the new archaeological data, in fact, it appears more and more clear how improper it is to interpret Romanization as an evolution of non-Romans toward Romanity, and to use this abstract concept, so full of meanings and facets, as a standardised process of changes due to external Roman intervention without any interaction with local situations.

2. HELLENIZATION AND ROMANIZATION: PROBLEMS OF INTERPRETATION AND HYBRIDIZATION

'Hellenization' and 'Romanization' are a very general terms, which have been hotly debated and even rejected, giving place to long

⁵ For the debated question of the meaning and mechanisms of the Romanization, and the problems of interpretation of this phenomenon see next paragraph.

discussions among scholars about the meaning of these labels.

Romanization, thanks to a long debate, has been transformed by scholars, in few years, from a standardized conceptual event into a mere conventional term with multilayer and differentiated meanings, which needs to be contextualized and specified when is used.⁶ Hellenization, for areas not directly involved with the Greek colonization, is even more problematic and less investigated. For the mid-Adriatic Apennines this phenomenon has been frequently claimed as general influence of the Greek culture upon the local tribes and peoples, but mainly on artistic bases and mostly looking at the Hellenistic period. This view has been certainly oversimplified as generic 'influences' from Greece, even if it is now clear that they may come from different cultural stimuli, interactions, exchanges, which may have very different sources, origins, mediators and may occur in very different periods. Even within an over-estimated and homogenized 'cultural koine' of the Hellenistic period, regionalisms, local differentiations, different degrees of hybridizations are now becoming more and more evident, especially thanks to new finds and researches. Moreover, even for earlier periods, the oversimplified unitary view of 'a general Greek culture', thanks to the integration of literary and historical sources with archaeological and ethno-anthropological approaches, has been transformed into an improved consciousness of numerous entities that can be called as 'Greeces', with a wide variety of regional, cultural and political aspects, which have vivaciously interacted with other cultures, often in an osmotic sense with

mutual influences. It is very interesting, in this sense, the preface of a volume by Settis⁷ (not so recent, but extremely interesting) mentioning the need to change the view of '*Grecità come serbatoio di immobili archetipi*' and start looking at it as '*laboratorio di potenzialità, talvolta mai esplorate sino in fondo e spesso condovise con altre culture*'. The volume is also important because has been one of the first, together with the volume by Horden and Purcell,⁸ and more recently the book by Broodbank,⁹ with a multiethnic and pluricultural perspective of the Mediterranean peoples which interacted with Greeks in very differentiated ways.

Concerning 'Romanization', initially, it was conventionally used by scholars referring to the whole process of 'homogenisation' of the provinces under Rome's leadership, with strong colonialist overtones. The first basic problem in this assumption is that there was never such a homogenisation and the results of Roman civilization differ from region to region, from case to case,¹⁰ and it is therefore restrictive to think that there is a general model of Romanization. It is certainly true, however, that, as asserted by S. Keay and N. Terrenato, '*it is a useful tool*' but it must '*be redefined and can be used as a convenient label that refers loosely to events involved in the creation of a new and unified political entity*'.¹¹

Moreover, the principal obstacle to any proper study of Roman Imperialism, is obviously that it can be investigated only indirectly and there will always be too many gaps in our knowledge to reconstruct a complete picture of this phenomenon.

⁶ It will be discussed below.

⁷ Cfr Settis, S., *I Greci oltre la Grecia* (Torino 2000), pp. XXXV-VI.

⁸ Horden, P., Purcell, N., *The Corrupting Sea. A Study of Mediterranean History* (Oxford 2000).

⁹ Broodbank, C., *The Making of the Middle Sea. A History of the Mediterranean from the Beginning to the Emergence of the Classical World* (London 2013).

¹⁰ See for instance the recent study of MacMullen, R., *Romanization in the Time of Augustus* (Yale-London 2000), in which the author in attempting to give a 'general and homogeneous' view of how far Romanization went in the Augustan period, organises the study in different areas and regions. Very important for a general picture in Italy is Mouritsen, H., *Italian Unification* (London 1998). For central and southern Italy cfr also: Curti, E., Dench, E., Patterson, J.K., 'The Archaeology of Central and Southern Roman Italy: recent Studies and Approaches', *JRS*, 86 (1996), pp. 170-189.

¹¹ Keay, S., Terrenato, N., 'Introduction', in *Italy and the West. Comparative issues in Romanization* (Oxford 2001), pp.1-7.

The relativity of the concept of Romanization is beyond doubt and it may depend on several motives, both objective and subjective, which have been widely discussed in specific studies.¹² A first general distinction must be made between the Romanization of Italy and of the provinces, because the latter was strongly influenced by the results of the former, and Rome itself was completely transformed at the end of the conquest of the Italian peninsula, so much so that this process has paradoxically been called a sort of 'Romanization of Rome'.¹³ In this sense, more and more scholars are proposing an interesting new view of a Rome which seems characterised by a polyethnic identity and poly-cultural complexity, which strongly influenced the conquests and the colonisations of the Italian peninsula and was influenced by them.¹⁴

Moreover, the processes of Romanization in Italy in the past have been often limited to the short period between the end of the 2nd and the middle of the 1st centuries BC; however, this was probably only the conclusive and most spectacular moment of a long and pluri-stratified process of interactions, which started long before, at least from the early contacts in the 4th century BC.¹⁵

It has to be emphasized that it was a dynamic process which involved changes of different aspects (such as cultural, political, social,

economic, and so on) in the peoples involved. They did not occur necessarily in the same moment, on the contrary, they took place, frequently, in very different, and even distant, periods; and their resulting changes may be different from region to region and even from site to site. It might be possible, therefore, to investigate one by one these aspects, but it should be stated that they can not be used as the only interpretation of the whole process. Moreover, the data of different researches can be compared only if they are looking at the same aspects and in similar contexts, otherwise the results of a forced comparison could be completely distorted and their interpretation would necessarily remain controversial.

In addition, the relativity of this concept is also due to the subjective point of view of the scholars, who are strongly influenced by their interests, vocational training and historical context. Thus, a Romanist will look at the process from an opposite point of view from other scholars, such as archaeologists working on Pre-Roman cultures; and their cultural background can influence their conclusions. Moreover, there is often a large gap between historical and archaeological approaches, the former often investigating the political events of Romanization, through literary and epigraphic sources, and the latter looking particularly at the resulting effects

¹² Torelli, M., 'Problemi di Romanizzazione', *II Congresso Nazionale Etrusco* (Roma 1989), pp.393-403; Reece, R., 'Romanization: a point of view', in *Early Roman Empire in the West* (Oxford 1990), pp.30-34; Millett, M., 'Romanization: historical issues and archaeological interpretation', in Blagg, T., Millett, M., *The Early Roman Empire in the West* (Oxford 1990), pp.35-41; Gabba, E., *Italia Romana* (Como 1994), pp.237-246; David, J.M., *The Roman conquest of Italy* (Oxford 1996), pp.1-7; Mattingly, D.J., *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism*. JRA (Portsmouth 1997); Keay, S., Terrenato, N., *Italy and the West. Comparative issues in Romanization* (Oxford 2001).

¹³ Keay, Terrenato, 'Introduction', p.1.

¹⁴ Bradley, G., *Ancient Umbria: state, culture and identity in central Italy from the Iron Age to the Augustan era* (Oxford 2000); Bispham, E., 'Coloniam deducere: how Roman was Roman colonization during the Middle Republic?', in Bradley, G. J. and Wilson, J.-P. (eds.), *Greek and Roman colonization: origins, ideologies and interactions* (Swansea 2006), pp. 73-160; Bradley, G. J., 'Colonization and identity in republican Italy', in Bradley, G. J. and Wilson, J.-P. (eds.), *Greek and Roman colonization: origins, ideologies and interactions* (Swansea 2006), pp. 161-187; Bradley, G. J., 'Romanization. The end of the peoples of Italy?', in Bradley, G. J., E Isayev and C. Riva (eds.), *Ancient Italy. Regions without boundaries* (Exeter 2007) pp. 295-322; De Ligt, L. and S. J. Northwood (eds.), *People, land, and politics. Demographic developments and the transformation of Italy, 300 BC-AD 14* (Leiden 2008); Gagliardi, L., *Mobilità e integrazione delle persone nei centri cittadini romani. Aspetti giuridici I: la classificazione degli incolae* (Milano 2006); Roselar, S., 'Colonies and processes of integration in the Roman Republic', *MEFRA* 123-2 (2011), pp.527-555; Farney G. and Bradley, G., *The Peoples of Ancient Italy* (Berlin 2017).

¹⁵ Torelli, M., 'Aspetti materiali e ideologici della Romanizzazione della Daunia', *DialA* 10, 1-2 (1992), pp.47-65, in part.47.

of historical and political events, and often without a complete view of public and private sphere. As strongly asserted by Torelli,¹⁶ research would probably be more successful if the two points of view could interact more homogeneously. Even the historical background of the scholars can influence the results of their research. Torelli, in his introduction to the Romanization of Italy, gives examples of scholars strongly involved in the analysis of the mechanisms of Romanization and seeing the whole process as related in some way to the events that they were living.¹⁷ One of them is the historian A. Lombardi who, together with contemporary scholars, living between the end of the 18th and the middle of the 19th centuries, interpreted the Italic culture as the foundation of a 'national history' and the Romans as 'invaders', associating the rebellious Italici of the Social War with the patriots of the Italian Risorgimento.¹⁸

The methodology of research is very important and it should be based on the combination of different sources in order to have a general picture as variegated as possible. One of the main problems in this perspective is that the data from local excavations and studies are often not available or only briefly published. Unfortunately, detailed regional studies, dealing with the Romanization of individual communities, are only recently beginning to be undertaken.¹⁹ Even the smallest information

and minor sites are important for the general reconstruction of the evolution of an area. Carandini, in the study of the Romanization of the area of Vulci, confirms how important the help of 'micro-historical' data, as he defines them, can be.²⁰ Studies of the last ten years are now providing new information from regional contexts, which can complete and, at times, even change the theoretical view of Romanization.²¹ However, the archaeological approach investigating local contexts often shows a large gap between 'landscape archaeology' and the study of urbanization, with the risk of oversimplification which derives from looking only at specific aspects. In this sense the combination of field survey and excavation can provide interesting information in reconstructing cultural changes, which we call 'mechanisms of Romanization', often not available from other sources.²² As Millet has clearly specified, although field survey data can be very useful for reconstructing changes in territorial organization and rural settlements, it should be supported also by archaeological research and historical and epigraphic sources.²³ In fact, surface survey, if isolated, is prone to methodological mistakes in interpreting the data, both in quantity and quality, since it depends mainly on visibility of the sites on the surface.

More and more studies are now using different approaches²⁴ looking at Romanization as

¹⁶ Torelli, 'Problemi di Romanizzazione', pp.393-403.

¹⁷ Torelli, M., 'The Romanization of Italy', *Tota Italia* (Oxford 1999), 1-13.

¹⁸ Momigliano, A., 'Ancient history and the Antiquarian', *JWI* 13 (1950), pp.285-298.

¹⁹ A recent example of one of this study can be Bradley, G., *Ancient Umbria* (Oxford 2001).

²⁰ Carandini, A., *La romanizzazione dell'Etruria: il territorio di Vulci* (Milano 1985), pp.21-27.

²¹ Blagg, Millett, *The Early Roman Empire*; Mertens, J., *Comunità indigene e problemi della Romanizzazione nell'Italia centro-meridionale, IV-III sec.a.C.. Actes du Colloque International. Rome 1er-3m février 1990* (Bruxelles 1991); Wood, M., Queiroga, F., *Current Research on the Romanization of Western Provinces. BAR Int.S.575* (Oxford 1992). New data have been presented, moreover, at the Conferences on Romanization at Ravenna 1997 and L'Aquila 1999: the former edited by Keay, S., Terrenato, N., *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization* (Oxford 2001); and the latter by Strazzulla, M.J., *L'Archeologia delle Popolazioni Italiche tra Formazione delle Identità etniche e Romanizzazione. Celano-L'Aquila 16-18 Dicembre 1999* (forthcoming).

²² Torelli, M., 'The creation of Roman Italy: the contribution of Archaeology', in Torelli, M., *Studies in the Romanization of Italy* (Alberta 1995), edited and translated by Fracchia, H., Gualtieri, M., pp.1-15.

²³ Millet, M., 'Rural Integration in the Roman West: an introductory essay', in Wood - Queiroga, *Current Research*, pp.1-8.

²⁴ Bradley, G. J. and Wilson, J.-P. (eds.), *Greek and Roman colonization: origins, ideologies and interactions* (Swansea 2006); Bradley, G. J. , E Isayev and C. Riva (eds.), *Ancient Italy. Regions without boundaries* (Exeter 2007); Curchin, L.A., *The Romanization of Central Spain: Complexity, Diversity, and Change in a Provincial Hinterland* (Oxford 2003); De Ligt, L. and S. J. Northwood (eds.), *People, land, and politics. Demographic developments and the transformation of Italy, 300 BC-AD 14*

a combination of complex and long processes due to a combination of political events, military conquests, cultural and economic interactions, which produced very different cultural and social changes and levels of hybridization, because dealing with peoples, regionalisms and local situations the results can be different and even contrasting from place to place, from period to period. Moreover, because these ‘polyhedral results’ depend on the interaction between Rome, Romans army (which can be characterised also by non strictly Roman soldiers) and local substratum, it is therefore always essential a close analysis of local cultures before and during the processes of the Roman conquest, before studying its effects. It can be, in this sense, very effective to use even an ‘indigenous-centric’ approach in examining local pre-Roman cultures, as suggested for instance by Curchin.²⁵

There was a tendency among the scholars working on Romanization before the 90s to underplay the role of local communities and their ethnic and cultural identity. Therefore, they have attempted to give generalized historical accounts of the Roman conquest, without any deep insight into the mechanisms of the process and the local response.²⁶ This may be attributed to the initial exclusive use of literary sources, which are almost always written from a ‘Romanocentric’ perspective and which tend to give to the Roman conquest the meaning of ‘acculturation’ or ‘civilization’ of ‘semi-barbarian’ people.²⁷ Tacitus, for instance, discussing the Roman conquest of Britain, says that “one must remember that we are dealing with barbarians”;²⁸ and Strabo refers to Romanization as the “civilizing process” or

the “Roman way to civilization”, and he considers the use of the force by the Romans as “justified because it aids the road of civilization”.²⁹ Moreover, the local response to Romanization is rarely mentioned by literary sources and has often been underrated by the scholars. Certainly, the impact of Roman territorial reorganization could have been even traumatic in some cases, if a pro-Roman author such as Virgil gives us an echo of the local discontent through Meliboeus’ words discussing with Tityrus the Roman redistribution of ‘their’ lands. However, rural archaeology, that is the study of the changes in the patterns of settlement in rural contexts during Romanization, is not very well known.³⁰

Romanization needs to be seen, then, as a long process in dialectical changes, rather than just a one way imposition of an alleged ‘Romanity’. Roman culture, however, interacted with local cultures, so much so that Millet defines it as a *two-way process of acculturation producing the synthesis which is called ‘Romanized’*: it was basically the result of the interaction of two cultures operating essentially at localized levels.³¹

Therefore, in order to get a more complete picture on the whole process, it is necessary also to look at the ‘Barbarization’ on Roman troops and citizens dealing with local communities, analysing different aspects of daily life of these hybridised communities, and not only at the political results.

The combination of results could vary from case to case in form and degree of changes, depending on different factors as pre-existing social and political organization, the nature,

(Leiden 2008); Gagliardi, L., *Mobilità e integrazione delle persone nei centri cittadini romani. Aspetti giuridici I: la classificazione degli incolae* (Milano 2006); Roselar, S., ‘Colonies and processes of integration in the Roman Republic’, *MEFRA* 123-2 (2011), pp.527-555; Farney G. and Bradley, G., *The Peoples of Ancient Italy* (Berlin 2017).

²⁵ Curchin, L.A., *The Romanization of Central Spain: Complexity, Diversity, and Change in a Provincial Hinterland* (Oxford 2003), p.23 and p.117.

²⁶ Todd, M., ‘Foreword’, in Wood, Queiroga, *Current Research*, p.vi.

²⁷ Millet, ‘Romanization: historical issues’, pp.35-41.

²⁸ Tacitus, *Agricola*, 21.

²⁹ Strabo, 3,3-5

³⁰ MacMullen, R., ‘Rural Romanization’, *Phoenix* 22 (1968), pp.337-341.

³¹ Millet, M., *The Romanization of Britain* (Cambridge 1990), pp.1-8.

if any, of pre-conquest acculturation, political environment and even the morphological features of the region.³² Therefore, the examination of native cultures through detailed regional studies is essential in order to understand the progress of Romanization. The studies edited by Slofstra and Brand, which give more emphasis to native cultures and local responses through an anthropological approach, are of interest here.³³ According to Slofstra, 'acculturation theory', which is used in anthropology, could be of great help in investigating the processes of socio-cultural changes in local communities during the Roman conquest.³⁴ Large-scale research into local settlements and cemeteries is therefore necessary, in order to have more information about social differentiation, demographic developments, and standard of life of native communities and to understand the impact of the Roman conquest on them. Epigraphy is often used by the scholars as an indicator of levels of Romanization in native communities. However, as K. Lomas has shown, within an area, epigraphic sources often attest different levels of Romanization, which had generally a larger impact on urban élites and upper classes than on lower social and economic groups.³⁵

As Millet and Saddington have said, it is also crucial to look at the ways and the periods in which peoples were incorporated into the Roman system.³⁶ In fact, the early and 'almost peaceful' Romanization of the Sabini and Vestini, for instance, was very different from the long process of military and political

conquest of the Marsi or the Samnites, although they took place in similar geographic and cultural contexts. Moreover, the territories annexed before the *Leges Iulia* and *Papiria* were Romanized on totally different political bases compared with later conquests, in which communities were directly annexed to the Roman state, without passing through the early phase of 'Latin Colonization'.³⁷ It must be considered, when dealing with colonization, that often our uniform view of this phenomenon is directly due to the 'filter' of the late Republican and, even more, Augustan ideological matrices, which have uniformed and in some way reduced the original more differentiated pictures of causes and effects of Roman colonization through times. Moreover, as Mouritsen, has stressed clearly in his study, there are also large differences between the conquest of Italy and of the provinces, which were mainly due to the different interaction of Rome with the allies.³⁸ Obviously the aims of the Roman conquest changed completely during the Imperial period, gaining more and more imperialistic meanings.

3. AIMS AND METHODOLOGIES OF THE RESEARCH

The approaches and the methodologies in the study of the process of Romanization and its mechanisms are, therefore, extremely various and should explore all its aspects, including public and private responses of local communities, literary and epigraphic sources, changes in rural and urban patterns of settlement, cultural and artistic evolution, social and

³² Haselgrove, C.C., 'Romanization before the conquest: Gaulish precedents and British consequences', in Blagg, T.F.C., King, A.C., *Military and Civilian in Roman Britain*, BAR Int.S.136 (Oxford 1984), pp.5-63; Haselgrove, C.C., Scull, C., 'The Romanization and de-Romanization of Belgic Gaul: the rural settlement evidence', in Wood, Queiroga, *Current Research*, pp.9-15.

³³ Brandt, R., Slofstra, J., *Roman and Native in the Low Countries*. BAR Int.S.184 (Oxford 1992).

³⁴ Slofstra, J., 'An Anthropological approach to the study of Romanization processes', in Brandt, Slofstra, *Roman and Native*, pp.71-104.

³⁵ Lomas, K., 'Local identity and cultural imperialism: epigraphy and the diffusion of Romanization in Italy', *PIA IV* (London 1990), pp.231-239.

³⁶ Millet, 'Romanization: historical issues', pp.35-41; Saddington, D.B., 'The parameters of Romanization', in *Roman Frontier Studies 1989* (Exeter 1991), pp.413-418.

³⁷ As also clear already in Humbert, M., *Municipium et Civitas sine suffragio* (Roma 1978); Torelli, M., 'Aspetti ideologici della colonizzazione romana più antica', *Dialoghi di Archeologia* III,6.2 (1988), pp.65-72. And in more recent studies: Bispham, E., 'Coloniae deducere: how Roman was Roman colonization during the Middle Republic?', in Bradley, G. J. and Wilson, J.-P. (eds.), *Greek and Roman colonization: origins, ideologies and interactions* (Swansea 2006), pp. 73-160;

³⁸ Mouritsen, H., *Italian Unification* (London 1998).

economic differentiation. Moreover, all these aspects are often symptoms of different levels of Romanization, which occurred within an area whether in different moments or in different social and cultural contexts.

It is not conceivable, therefore, to use a single model of Romanization of the provinces, unless it is very general, and in this case less effective for the study of this process in specific territories. However, general models, which have been proposed by some scholars³⁹ can easily be adapted to local contexts, creating in this way more detailed regional models, which might change remarkably from area to area. These local models, moreover, become more and more important in having a general idea of the polyhedric situation and of the necessity of more detailed local studies.

The aim of this study, therefore, is to explore how the local cultures change and evolve, without any suggestion of a 'good formula' for a new methodology or a new model in the study of Romanization, but simply analysing and attempting an interpretation of different archaeological data which characterize the local situations. For this purpose it has been necessary to look primarily at the peoples living in the region before any significant contacts with the Romans, that is in the period between the 6th and the first half of the 5th century BC, in order to understand more properly and gradually the signals of changes or continuity.

Moreover, numerous recent excavations have been able to produce new important evidence for the period between the 6th and the 4th centuries BC and there is a considerable scope for a synthesis.

The period between the Samnite Wars and municipalisation, however, is certainly the most problematic. Most of the finds, in fact, date to the early Imperial period, that is to the urban reorganization started by Augustus and completed in the Claudian period, which often in this region destroyed or obliterated almost totally previous situations. However, sporadic excavations and finds are now providing a new picture of this debated period, with interesting witness of early forms of proto-urbanization.

Such a large area, rich in archaeological sites and in historical events, obviously poses serious challenges to historians and archaeologists and, above all, poses interesting key questions: were the indigenous settlements unable to compete with Roman cities? How and in which sense was Mid-Adriatic Apennines urbanised? What was the role of the local peoples in the process of urbanization? How the territorial organization changed or adapted in Roman times?

The book has an organization both chronological (with the Samnite Wars representing a moment of *caesura*) and thematic, analysing different aspects in order to reconstruct a general picture of the area as complete as possible. Certainly all these aspects may need more detailed and specific studies, which could represent next steps for further studies and volumes.

Moreover, some of these aspects have been used, in this context, only in combination with other data or questions, and not specifically investigated, mainly when already published in studies as specific topics. In particular, epigraphy has been used in this volume as evidence in different contexts, but has not been analysed in a specific section as a choice, because the volumes by M. Buonocore and

³⁹ Gozzoli, S., 'Fondamenti ideali e pratica politica del processo di Romanizzazione nelle province', *Atheneum* 65 (1987), pp.81-108; Millet, 'Romanization: historical issues', pp.35-41.

G.Firpo⁴⁰ and the recent *CIL IX Supplementa* by M.Buonocore,⁴¹ about sources and epigraphy of the region, with their social and historical implications, are certainly exhaustive, and make superfluous any attempt of synthesis.

The analysis of the archaeological data is introduced by a geographical and geological description of the territory, both as it appears

today and trying to reconstruct the situation from antiquity through different kind of sources, in order to give a general idea of the topography in its continuous evolution; the first chapter also provide an ethnographic introduction about the populations inhabiting the area, to facilitate a general view of the local cultures.

⁴⁰ Buonocore, M., Firpo, G., *Fonti Latine e Greche per la Storia dell'Abruzzo antico*, Deputazione Abruzzese di Storia Patria, vol.I (Padova-Perugia 1991), Vol.II,1-2 (L'Aquila 1998).

⁴¹ Buonocore, M., *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum. Inscriptiones Calabriae Apuliae Samnii Sabinorum Piceni Latinae. Regio Quarta. Supplementum. Fasciculus secundus. Marrucini - Paeligni - Vestini -CIL IX 6974-7638* (Berlin 2019); Buonocore, M. (ed), *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum. Inscriptiones Calabriae Apuliae Samnii Sabinorum Piceni Latinae. Regio Quarta. Supplementum. Fasciculus tertius. Marsi - Aequi -CIL IX 7639-8187-* (Berlin 2020).



ARCHAEOPRESS PUBLISHING LTD

Summertown Pavilion

18-24 Middle Way

Summertown

Oxford OX2 7LG

www.archaeopress.com

ISBN 978-1-80327-457-7

ISBN 978-1-80327-458-4 (eBook)

© Oliva Menozzi and Archaeopress 2024

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owners.

This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website www.archaeopress.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION A	INTRODUCTION	pag.	1
	1 Defining the Central Appenines.....	»	3
	2 Hellenization and Romanization: problems of interpretation and Hybridization.....	»	5
	3 Aims and methodologies of the research.....	»	10
SECTION B	THE LAND		13
Chapter 1	Historical Geography	»	17
	Reading the ancient topography through the sources.....	»	17
	The infrastructure of ancient communications: road-network, tratturi and ports.....	»	29
Chapter 2	The Region: Geology and Landscape	»	41
	Plates 1 - 32		47
SECTION C	THE MID-ADRIATIC APENNINES BETWEEN THE 6TH AND THE 4TH CENTURIES BC		81
Chapter 3	Ethnographic and Cultural Background between the 6th and 4th centuries BC	»	83
	From the Safin to the Sabelli.....	»	84
	The political situation.....	»	85
	Language and script of Archaic Abruzzo.....	»	86
	The Sabellians between the mid 5 th and the mid 4 th centuries BC.....	»	87
	Trade and external contacts.....	»	90
	Plates 33 - 64		95
Chapter 4	Settlement Structure	»	133
	Territorial organisation.....	»	133
	Hillforts.....	»	133
	Villages.....	»	135
	Sanctuaries.....	»	137
Chapter 5	Funerary Practices	pag.	141
	Cemeteries.....	»	141
	Funerary sculpture.....	»	144

Conclusions	The mid-Adriatic Apennines in the Archaic and Classical periods	pag.	149
Plates	Plates 65 - 96	»	151
SECTION D	THE CONVENTIONAL PERIOD OF ‘ROMANIZATION’		185
Chapter 6	The General Historical Background according to the Sources	»	187
Chapter 7	Society and Economy	»	193
	The social context	»	193
	Rural settlement and local production.....	»	197
	Coins and currency.....	»	207
Plates	Plates 97 - 128	»	219
Chapter 8	Settlement Structure	»	253
	Territorial organization.....	»	253
	Hillforts.....	»	255
	Sanctuaries.....	»	261
	Villages, vici and pagi.....	»	265
	Colonies.....	»	269
	Municipia and praefecturae.....	»	279
Chapter 9	Art and Architecture	»	289
	Public and private architecture.....	»	289
	Terracotta votive offerings.....	»	297
	Votive bronze statuettes.....	»	299
	Cemeteries and funerary equipment.....	»	301
	Sculpture and portraits.....	»	305
Plates	Plates 129 - 160	»	309
SECTION E	PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS	»	343
	ABBREVIATIONS	»	355
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	»	359
	APPENDICES	»	375
Appendix 1	Silvano Agostini	»	375
	Geoarcheologia, cambiamenti climatici e paesaggi archeologici in Abruzzo: un punto della situazione		

Appendix 2	Vincenzo d'Ercole e Oliva Menozzi	pag.	385
	Un aggiornamento sulle strutture abitative in Abruzzo		
Appendix 3	Luca Cherstich	»	419
	A diachronic overview of the S. Maria Cardetola necropolis in Crecchio (CH) (seasons 2015-2020, 2022).		
Appendix 4	Vincenzo d'Ercole	»	491
	Archeologia funeraria in Abruzzo: un aggiornamento		
Appendix 5	Eugenio Di Valerio	»	521
	Preliminary data from the investigations in the municipality of San Giovanni Lipioni (CH): the archaeological areas of Colle Vernone and Il Monte.		
Appendix 6	Maria Cristina Mancini e Oliva Menozzi	»	543
	Economia e organizzazione territoriale tra IV sec. a.C. e I d.C.: il ruolo dei 'centri minori' in area Centro-Adriatica e Appenninica		

Preface

The RES Series has been planned as collaboration between the Archaeological Unit of G. d'Annunzio University of Chieti and the publisher Archaeopress of Oxford, in order to publish the results of the projects and the researches of the different teams of Chieti working both in Italy and abroad. This third volume is dedicated to the Central Adriatic Apennines and presents the research of the author, Oliva Menozzi, which began with a DPhil Thesis in Oxford and has continued with further post-doctoral research, excavations and survey projects.

In order to keep the original organization of the main nucleus of the work, the volume is divided into two main parts: Part I with the original work that was carried out for the DPhil Thesis in Oxford and for the post-doctoral years which followed in Chieti; and Part II with appendices updating the picture with data and research from the last 15 years. For this second part, other scholars have also contributed their research. This second part is intended to function as an updated conclusion on the region.

Acknowledgements

I am indebted for this volume, *in primis*, to my supervisors for my DPhil in Oxford, who encouraged me with their advice: John A. Lloyd and Nicholas Purcell; from their expertise and insight I have enormously benefited.

A special acknowledgement goes '*alla Prof*': Emanuela Fabbrocotti, for believing in this work and for supporting me in all my research, even those far from her interests.

I would like to express my thanks for their suggestions and help to Gloria Adinolfi, Sonia Antonelli, Edward Bispham, Guy Bradley, Rodolfo Carmagnola, Carmine Catenacci, Luca Cherstich, Giovanni Colonna, Michael H. Crawford, Maria Giorgia Di Antonio, Eugenio Di Valerio, Patrizio Domenicucci, Giulio Firpo, Domenico Fossataro, Anna Maria Giuntella, Fay Glinister, Susan Kane, Philip M. Kenrick, Gary R. Lock, Emma Luppino Manes, Alison MacDonald, Maria Cristina Mancini, Gina Martella, Alessandro Naso, Paul Roberts, Paolo Sommella, Patrizia Staffilani, Vienna Tordone, Massimo Vetta, all of whom provided valuable suggestions, comments and some of them even precious revisions of essays and papers.

Moreover my great acknowledgements go to the colleagues and friends of the Soprintendenza: Silvano Agostini, Adele Campanelli, Vincenzo d'Ercole, Amalia Faustoferri, Sandra Lapenna, Andrea R. Staffa for their interesting information about their excavations and researches, as well as for allowing, generously, to use some of their data, photographs and plans in this volume.

For the graphical editing I have to thank, enormously, Rocco D'Errico, without whom I would have never had such a well organized book and rich plates.

Last, but by no means least, I would like to dedicate this volume with my special thought and thanks to the late John A. Lloyd, for his support, for all the revisions, for the numerous fruitful discussions in front of a mountain of books, papers, plans, reports, drawings and an omnipresent cup of tea.

SECTION A
INTRODUCTION

Introduction

1. DEFINING THE CENTRAL APENNINES

The geographical definition of the Central Adriatic Apennines may give rise to debated interpretations without a preliminary brief discussion of the history of the studies. Whatever terminology is used in this context it represents a formal choice in order to refer to the area which was occupied in antiquity by Italic populations variously named by the scholars as ‘Sabelli’, ‘Sabellics’ or ‘Sabellians’,¹ with problematic and too subjective² transcriptions and translations of their ethnic *Safin-*. However it must be specified that the Samnites and the Piceni are not directly included in this analysis, both because they have recently been the object of several exhaustive publications,³ and because they evolved and reacted to the Roman conquest differently from their ‘central *Safin-* cousins’, although sites in boundary areas belonging to these two populations are often included within the same ethnic group, especially for early periods, because closely related to the rest of the region and because a proper evident differentiation occurred later.

The area of investigation, therefore, is roughly the modern region of Abruzzo, for which the Italian archaeological tradition uses different definitions, such as ‘Mid-Adriatic area’ or ‘Central Adriatic Apennines’, emphasizing the Adriatic position, or ‘South Picene’, which is generally used by Etruscologists in order to

give prominence to the cultural *koinè*, already in the 6th and 5th centuries BC, of the different tribes inhabiting the area, grouping them in an ‘eastern cultural and ethnical pole’ acting in Central Italy as a counterpart of the Etruscans, but without any original implication of political unity.⁴

The region has received little scholarly attention in international contexts, compared with Tyrrhenian Italy, although the last three decades have been very rich in excavations and finds, which can almost completely change the ‘traditional general picture’ of the local cultures and of the role of the Romans in the area, underestimating in general the interaction of the peoples of this region with other ethnic groups, just because it was too often thought to have been sporadic and relatively unimportant. However, most of the data is still not published or just published as brief preliminary reports, mainly only in local papers or books, reducing the possibility of a more objective and useful wider view of the general context.

For too long the region has been seen just as a mountainous and isolated ‘terra di pastori’, with uncultured shepherds living scattered and poorly organised, generalising this status, to the detriment of local culture, in an over-simplified view from prehistory to late periods and interpreting the Roman role in the area in term of ‘acculturation’, often due

¹ For discussion of these labels see Chapter 3.1-2. For a study on the meaning and the use of these names see Dench, E., *From Barbarians to new men* (Oxford 1995), pp.186-198.

² Subjective because borrowed and translated from sources which need to be contextualized before using them in a general way.

³ Among the most recent studies on these two areas: Tagliamonte, G., *I Sanniti* (Milano 1997); Naso, A., *I Piceni* (Milano 2000).

⁴ See for instance: Pallottino, M., *A History of Earliest Italy* (London 1991, Eng. trans.), pp.99-105; Cianfarani, V., *Antiche Civiltà d’Abruzzo* (Roma 1969), pp.11-14; Colonna, G., ‘Apporti etruschi all’orientalizzante piceno. Il caso della statuaria’, in *La Civiltà Picena. Nelle Marche. Studi in onore di Giovanni Annibaldi. Atti del Convegno di Ancona 1988* (Ripatransone 1992), pp. 97-127; Prosdocimi, A.L., ‘Gli Etnici’, in Franchi dell’Orto, L., *Piceni Popolo d’Europa* (Roma 1999), pp.13-18.

to the partisan spirit of the ancient sources, mostly Roman or 'pro-Roman'. The role of stock-raising itself needs to be reinterpreted, because it changed greatly from period to period and certainly did not exclude other economical resources, already in early periods. The topography of the area and the recent finds, have been able to prove that agriculture was also important for the large sub-Apennine and coastal areas, hilly but certainly not only mountainous, and that other resources were also important for the local economy, such as the exploitation of the forest and metallurgy.

The existence and the consistency of a complex local culture and organisation, moreover, can not be denied any more after the finds of inscriptions and rich tombs showing a society, hierarchically organised and politically in constant evolution, with its own language and culture and receptive to external influences.

The isolation of the region and the difficulty of travel through have often been exaggerated by sources and scholars, becoming a prominent commonplace, especially for modern historians and travellers, evidence of a catastrophic situation of the road network between the 17th and 19th centuries due to a period of political instability, which caused the abandonment of many roads and the increasing of brigandage. The only Roman roads which are considered by sources and scholars are generally the *Via Valeria - Claudia Valeria*, and as a minor route, the *Via Claudia Nova*, in a very reductive picture. However, the dense modern road network often follows step by step, with modern improvements to abbreviate the distances, the tracks of the natural routes and mountainous passes used already before the Roman conquest, as well as by the Roman roads and the medieval and later *tratturi*, which always formed a capillary road network in the area. In fact, as we will see in the next two chapters, the topography of the region offers the possibility to exploit the local natural track system, made by large valleys and upland plateaux through the Apennines,

which connect easily, the region either with the Tyrrhenian and with Apulian and North-Picene areas. Probably, Rome's interest itself in this area at the beginning aimed principally to the opportunity the region offered for a short route to the Adriatic sea, cutting out and bypassing more problematic areas as inner Samnium or northern Picene territories.

Often in the past, the comparison of the poorly published finds from this region with the rich amount of data from Tyrrhenian regions, such as Campania and Etruria, have made possible generalisations about remote and uncultured populations living in the region, over-estimating the role of Rome in the evolution of patterns of settlements and society, ignoring however not only the disparity of data but also the strong disparity in the demography of these regions. Campania or Latium, for instance, have always been more densely inhabited compared with the Adriatic Apennines, and the strong demographic pressure, together with the direct influence of the close Greek colonies in Campania, have accelerated and amplified the processes of the urban development.

However, the over-simplified view of peoples living scattered in huts, without any form of organised aggregation until the late Hellenistic period, is incompatible with the recent excavations of early cemeteries, such as Campovalano, Fossa, Bazzano, Scurcola and so on, attesting large and strongly organised necropoleis, often even having regular roads among the tombs. The lack of data from the settlements for early periods, is mainly due to the rare choice in the past of excavations of this kind of sites, preferring the funerary contexts, which are obviously richer in equipment and better preserved than the more deteriorated huts and houses. In fact, the houses and the buildings in villages and settlements were built mainly of wood, mud-bricks and other perishable building materials, so that their remains are often scanty and difficult to interpret; moreover, the strong modern

urbanization and exploitation of the soil have often obliterated or even completely destroyed these delicate remains.

Too often, therefore, through *argumenta ex silentio*, the situation has been interpreted as completely lacking of data, leading to several distortions in the historical interpretation of the local peoples and tribes, of their level of organisation and acculturation.

The topography of the region, moreover, is characterised by very different habitats, which have always and strongly influenced the processes of settling; it is therefore very restrictive to view the region as exclusively mountainous. In order to understand more clearly the mechanisms of exploitation of the territory, it is extremely important to remember the strong distinction between the inner Apennine area, mountainous but at the same time deeply characterised by important river valleys and upland plateaux cutting vertically the mountains and offering the possibility of easy connections, and the coastal sub-Apennine belt, hilly and regularly cut by horizontal and wide river valleys, guaranteeing the contacts between the coasts and the countryside. Moreover, within this general distinction there are various micro-habitats, which are extremely important to understand the mechanisms of settling in the region, favouring with their climate and fertile lands the peopling of the area since prehistory, such as the basins of Sulmona and of the Fucine, and the upland plateaux known as Navelli, le Rocche e Cinque Miglia, also used as easy places of interconnection in the inner Apennines.

Moreover, art and architecture of this region, especially in the period between the 3rd and the 1st centuries BC, has shown the complexity of the local cultures and the different influences often directly coming from Campania, Etruria, Apulia, and not only through the Roman mediation, as has been said for too

long. In fact, the artistic and architectural sources in this context are used to show how different the cultural inspirations could have been from case to case and within different artistic categories, so much so that different sources, in the same period, can prove different and at time contrasting levels of 'Hellenisation' or 'Romanisation', attesting the relativity of these concepts and the eclectic picture of Hellenistic Art and Architecture in Central Italy. The use, therefore, of one of these sources, as often happens in studies on the Romanization of the area, without any link with the main context, can be extremely dangerous if used to reconstruct the whole general picture.

The research for this work, already in its first stages of DPhil thesis, started therefore as an attempt to study the region as completely as possible and on the light of the new discoveries, analysing as much data as possible and trying to integrate 'traditional interpretations' and new evidence, in order to give a general idea of the evolution of the region before the arrival of the Romans to read then the significance of 'Romanization'⁵ in the area. However, already in the early stages of the research, a problematic question came to light: *was there 'a real and precise period of Romanization'?* Reading through the new archaeological data, in fact, it appears more and more clear how improper it is to interpret Romanization as an evolution of non-Romans toward Romanity, and to use this abstract concept, so full of meanings and facets, as a standardised process of changes due to external Roman intervention without any interaction with local situations.

2. HELLENIZATION AND ROMANIZATION: PROBLEMS OF INTERPRETATION AND HYBRIDIZATION

'Hellenization' and 'Romanization' are a very general terms, which have been hotly debated and even rejected, giving place to long

⁵ For the debated question of the meaning and mechanisms of the Romanization, and the problems of interpretation of this phenomenon see next paragraph.

discussions among scholars about the meaning of these labels.

Romanization, thanks to a long debate, has been transformed by scholars, in few years, from a standardized conceptual event into a mere conventional term with multilayer and differentiated meanings, which needs to be contextualized and specified when is used.⁶ Hellenization, for areas not directly involved with the Greek colonization, is even more problematic and less investigated. For the mid-Adriatic Apennines this phenomenon has been frequently claimed as general influence of the Greek culture upon the local tribes and peoples, but mainly on artistic bases and mostly looking at the Hellenistic period. This view has been certainly oversimplified as generic 'influences' from Greece, even if it is now clear that they may come from different cultural stimuli, interactions, exchanges, which may have very different sources, origins, mediators and may occur in very different periods. Even within an over-estimated and homogenized 'cultural koine' of the Hellenistic period, regionalisms, local differentiations, different degrees of hybridizations are now becoming more and more evident, especially thanks to new finds and researches. Moreover, even for earlier periods, the oversimplified unitary view of 'a general Greek culture', thanks to the integration of literary and historical sources with archaeological and ethno-anthropological approaches, has been transformed into an improved consciousness of numerous entities that can be called as 'Greeces', with a wide variety of regional, cultural and political aspects, which have vivaciously interacted with other cultures, often in an osmotic sense with

mutual influences. It is very interesting, in this sense, the preface of a volume by Settis⁷ (not so recent, but extremely interesting) mentioning the need to change the view of '*Grecità come serbatoio di immobili archetipi*' and start looking at it as '*laboratorio di potenzialità, talvolta mai esplorate sino in fondo e spesso condovise con altre culture*'. The volume is also important because has been one of the first, together with the volume by Horden and Purcell,⁸ and more recently the book by Broodbank,⁹ with a multiethnic and pluricultural perspective of the Mediterranean peoples which interacted with Greeks in very differentiated ways.

Concerning 'Romanization', initially, it was conventionally used by scholars referring to the whole process of 'homogenisation' of the provinces under Rome's leadership, with strong colonialist overtones. The first basic problem in this assumption is that there was never such a homogenisation and the results of Roman civilization differ from region to region, from case to case,¹⁰ and it is therefore restrictive to think that there is a general model of Romanization. It is certainly true, however, that, as asserted by S. Keay and N. Terrenato, '*it is a useful tool*' but it must '*be redefined and can be used as a convenient label that refers loosely to events involved in the creation of a new and unified political entity*'.¹¹

Moreover, the principal obstacle to any proper study of Roman Imperialism, is obviously that it can be investigated only indirectly and there will always be too many gaps in our knowledge to reconstruct a complete picture of this phenomenon.

⁶ It will be discussed below.

⁷ Cfr Settis, S., *I Greci oltre la Grecia* (Torino 2000), pp. XXXV-VI.

⁸ Horden, P., Purcell, N., *The Corrupting Sea. A Study of Mediterranean History* (Oxford 2000).

⁹ Broodbank, C., *The Making of the Middle Sea. A History of the Mediterranean from the Beginning to the Emergence of the Classical World* (London 2013).

¹⁰ See for instance the recent study of MacMullen, R., *Romanization in the Time of Augustus* (Yale-London 2000), in which the author in attempting to give a 'general and homogeneous' view of how far Romanization went in the Augustan period, organises the study in different areas and regions. Very important for a general picture in Italy is Mouritsen, H., *Italian Unification* (London 1998). For central and southern Italy cfr also: Curti, E., Dench, E., Patterson, J.K., 'The Archaeology of Central and Southern Roman Italy: recent Studies and Approaches', *JRS*, 86 (1996), pp. 170-189.

¹¹ Keay, S., Terrenato, N., 'Introduction', in *Italy and the West. Comparative issues in Romanization* (Oxford 2001), pp.1-7.

The relativity of the concept of Romanization is beyond doubt and it may depend on several motives, both objective and subjective, which have been widely discussed in specific studies.¹² A first general distinction must be made between the Romanization of Italy and of the provinces, because the latter was strongly influenced by the results of the former, and Rome itself was completely transformed at the end of the conquest of the Italian peninsula, so much so that this process has paradoxically been called a sort of ‘Romanization of Rome’.¹³ In this sense, more and more scholars are proposing an interesting new view of a Rome which seems characterised by a polyethnic identity and poly-cultural complexity, which strongly influenced the conquests and the colonisations of the Italian peninsula and was influenced by them.¹⁴

Moreover, the processes of Romanization in Italy in the past have been often limited to the short period between the end of the 2nd and the middle of the 1st centuries BC; however, this was probably only the conclusive and most spectacular moment of a long and pluri-stratified process of interactions, which started long before, at least from the early contacts in the 4th century BC.¹⁵

It has to be emphasized that it was a dynamic process which involved changes of different aspects (such as cultural, political, social,

economic, and so on) in the peoples involved. They did not occur necessarily in the same moment, on the contrary, they took place, frequently, in very different, and even distant, periods; and their resulting changes may be different from region to region and even from site to site. It might be possible, therefore, to investigate one by one these aspects, but it should be stated that they can not be used as the only interpretation of the whole process. Moreover, the data of different researches can be compared only if they are looking at the same aspects and in similar contexts, otherwise the results of a forced comparison could be completely distorted and their interpretation would necessarily remain controversial.

In addition, the relativity of this concept is also due to the subjective point of view of the scholars, who are strongly influenced by their interests, vocational training and historical context. Thus, a Romanist will look at the process from an opposite point of view from other scholars, such as archaeologists working on Pre-Roman cultures; and their cultural background can influence their conclusions. Moreover, there is often a large gap between historical and archaeological approaches, the former often investigating the political events of Romanization, through literary and epigraphic sources, and the latter looking particularly at the resulting effects

¹² Torelli, M., ‘Problemi di Romanizzazione’, *II Congresso Nazionale Etrusco* (Roma 1989), pp.393-403; Reece, R., ‘Romanization: a point of view’, in *Early Roman Empire in the West* (Oxford 1990), pp.30-34; Millett, M., ‘Romanization: historical issues and archaeological interpretation’, in Blagg, T., Millett, M., *The Early Roman Empire in the West* (Oxford 1990), pp.35-41; Gabba, E., *Italia Romana* (Como 1994), pp.237-246; David, J.M., *The Roman conquest of Italy* (Oxford 1996), pp.1-7; Mattingly, D.J., *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism*. JRA (Portsmouth 1997); Keay, S., Terrenato, N., *Italy and the West. Comparative issues in Romanization* (Oxford 2001).

¹³ Keay, Terrenato, ‘Introduction’, p.1.

¹⁴ Bradley, G., *Ancient Umbria: state, culture and identity in central Italy from the Iron Age to the Augustan era* (Oxford 2000); Bispham, E., ‘*Coloniam deducere: how Roman was Roman colonization during the Middle Republic?*’, in Bradley, G. J. and Wilson, J.-P. (eds.), *Greek and Roman colonization: origins, ideologies and interactions* (Swansea 2006), pp. 73-160; Bradley, G. J., ‘*Colonization and identity in republican Italy*’, in Bradley, G. J. and Wilson, J.-P. (eds.), *Greek and Roman colonization: origins, ideologies and interactions* (Swansea 2006), pp. 161-187; Bradley, G. J., ‘*Romanization. The end of the peoples of Italy?*’, in Bradley, G. J., E Isayev and C. Riva (eds.), *Ancient Italy. Regions without boundaries* (Exeter 2007) pp. 295-322; De Ligt, L. and S. J. Northwood (eds.), *People, land, and politics. Demographic developments and the transformation of Italy, 300 BC-AD 14* (Leiden 2008); Gagliardi, L., *Mobilità e integrazione delle persone nei centri cittadini romani. Aspetti giuridici I: la classificazione degli incolae* (Milano 2006); Roselar, S., ‘Colonies and processes of integration in the Roman Republic’, *MEFRA* 123-2 (2011), pp.527-555; Farney G. and Bradley, G., *The Peoples of Ancient Italy* (Berlin 2017).

¹⁵ Torelli, M., ‘Aspetti materiali e ideologici della Romanizzazione della Daunia’, *DialA* 10, 1-2 (1992), pp.47-65, in part.47.

of historical and political events, and often without a complete view of public and private sphere. As strongly asserted by Torelli,¹⁶ research would probably be more successful if the two points of view could interact more homogeneously. Even the historical background of the scholars can influence the results of their research. Torelli, in his introduction to the Romanization of Italy, gives examples of scholars strongly involved in the analysis of the mechanisms of Romanization and seeing the whole process as related in some way to the events that they were living.¹⁷ One of them is the historian A. Lombardi who, together with contemporary scholars, living between the end of the 18th and the middle of the 19th centuries, interpreted the Italic culture as the foundation of a 'national history' and the Romans as 'invaders', associating the rebellious Italici of the Social War with the patriots of the Italian Risorgimento.¹⁸

The methodology of research is very important and it should be based on the combination of different sources in order to have a general picture as variegated as possible. One of the main problems in this perspective is that the data from local excavations and studies are often not available or only briefly published. Unfortunately, detailed regional studies, dealing with the Romanization of individual communities, are only recently beginning to be undertaken.¹⁹ Even the smallest information

and minor sites are important for the general reconstruction of the evolution of an area. Carandini, in the study of the Romanization of the area of Vulci, confirms how important the help of 'micro-historical' data, as he defines them, can be.²⁰ Studies of the last ten years are now providing new information from regional contexts, which can complete and, at times, even change the theoretical view of Romanization.²¹ However, the archaeological approach investigating local contexts often shows a large gap between 'landscape archaeology' and the study of urbanization, with the risk of oversimplification which derives from looking only at specific aspects. In this sense the combination of field survey and excavation can provide interesting information in reconstructing cultural changes, which we call 'mechanisms of Romanization', often not available from other sources.²² As Millet has clearly specified, although field survey data can be very useful for reconstructing changes in territorial organization and rural settlements, it should be supported also by archaeological research and historical and epigraphic sources.²³ In fact, surface survey, if isolated, is prone to methodological mistakes in interpreting the data, both in quantity and quality, since it depends mainly on visibility of the sites on the surface.

More and more studies are now using different approaches²⁴ looking at Romanization as

¹⁶ Torelli, 'Problemi di Romanizzazione', pp.393-403.

¹⁷ Torelli, M., 'The Romanization of Italy', *Tota Italia* (Oxford 1999), 1-13.

¹⁸ Momigliano, A., 'Ancient history and the Antiquarian', *JWI* 13 (1950), pp.285-298.

¹⁹ A recent example of one of this study can be Bradley, G., *Ancient Umbria* (Oxford 2001).

²⁰ Carandini, A., *La romanizzazione dell'Etruria: il territorio di Vulci* (Milano 1985), pp.21-27.

²¹ Blagg, Millett, *The Early Roman Empire*; Mertens, J., *Comunità idigene e problemi della Romanizzazione nell'Italia centro-meridionale, IV-III sec.a.C.. Actes du Colloque International. Rome 1er-3m février 1990* (Bruxelles 1991); Wood, M., Queiroga, F., *Current Research on the Romanization of Western Provinces. BAR Int.S.575* (Oxford 1992). New data have been presented, moreover, at the Conferences on Romanization at Ravenna 1997 and L'Aquila 1999: the former edited by Keay, S., Terrenato, N., *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization* (Oxford 2001); and the latter by Strazzulla, M.J., *L'Archeologia delle Popolazioni Italiane tra Formazione delle Identità etniche e Romanizzazione. Celano-L'Aquila 16-18 Dicembre 1999* (forthcoming).

²² Torelli, M., 'The creation of Roman Italy: the contribution of Archaeology', in Torelli, M., *Studies in the Romanization of Italy* (Alberta 1995), edited and translated by Fracchia, H., Gualtieri, M., pp.1-15.

²³ Millet, M., 'Rural Integration in the Roman West: an introductory essay', in Wood - Queiroga, *Current Research*, pp.1-8.

²⁴ Bradley, G. J. and Wilson, J.-P. (eds.), *Greek and Roman colonization: origins, ideologies and interactions* (Swansea 2006); Bradley, G. J. , E Isayev and C. Riva (eds.), *Ancient Italy. Regions without boundaries* (Exeter 2007); Curchin, L.A., *The Romanization of Central Spain: Complexity, Diversity, and Change in a Provincial Hinterland* (Oxford 2003); De Ligt, L. and S. J. Northwood (eds.), *People, land, and politics. Demographic developments and the transformation of Italy, 300 BC-AD 14*

a combination of complex and long processes due to a combination of political events, military conquests, cultural and economic interactions, which produced very different cultural and social changes and levels of hybridization, because dealing with peoples, regionalisms and local situations the results can be different and even contrasting from place to place, from period to period. Moreover, because these ‘polyhedric results’ depend on the interaction between Rome, Romans army (which can be characterised also by non strictly Roman soldiers) and local substratum, it is therefore always essential a close analysis of local cultures before and during the processes of the Roman conquest, before studying its effects. It can be, in this sense, very effective to use even an ‘indigenous-centric’ approach in examining local pre-Roman cultures, as suggested for instance by Curchin.²⁵

There was a tendency among the scholars working on Romanization before the 90s to underplay the role of local communities and their ethnic and cultural identity. Therefore, they have attempted to give generalized historical accounts of the Roman conquest, without any deep insight into the mechanisms of the process and the local response.²⁶ This may be attributed to the initial exclusive use of literary sources, which are almost always written from a ‘Romanocentric’ perspective and which tend to give to the Roman conquest the meaning of ‘acculturation’ or ‘civilization’ of ‘semi-barbarian’ people.²⁷ Tacitus, for instance, discussing the Roman conquest of Britain, says that “one must remember that we are dealing with barbarians”;²⁸ and Strabo refers to Romanization as the “civilizing process” or

the “Roman way to civilization”, and he considers the use of the force by the Romans as “justified because it aids the road of civilization”.²⁹ Moreover, the local response to Romanization is rarely mentioned by literary sources and has often been underrated by the scholars. Certainly, the impact of Roman territorial reorganization could have been even traumatic in some cases, if a pro-Roman author such as Virgil gives us an echo of the local discontent through Meliboeus’ words discussing with Tityrus the Roman redistribution of ‘their’ lands. However, rural archaeology, that is the study of the changes in the patterns of settlement in rural contexts during Romanization, is not very well known.³⁰

Romanization needs to be seen, then, as a long process in dialectical changes, rather than just a one way imposition of an alleged ‘Romanity’. Roman culture, however, interacted with local cultures, so much so that Millet defines it as a *two-way process of acculturation producing the synthesis which is called ‘Romanized’*: it was basically the result of the interaction of two cultures operating essentially at localized levels.³¹

Therefore, in order to get a more complete picture on the whole process, it is necessary also to look at the ‘Barbarization’ on Roman troops and citizens dealing with local communities, analysing different aspects of daily life of these hybridised communities, and not only at the political results.

The combination of results could vary from case to case in form and degree of changes, depending on different factors as pre-existing social and political organization, the nature,

(Leiden 2008); Gagliardi, L., *Mobilità e integrazione delle persone nei centri cittadini romani. Aspetti giuridici I: la classificazione degli incolae* (Milano 2006); Roselar, S., ‘Colonies and processes of integration in the Roman Republic’, *MEFRA* 123-2 (2011), pp.527-555; Farney G. and Bradley, G., *The Peoples of Ancient Italy* (Berlin 2017).

²⁵ Curchin, L.A., *The Romanization of Central Spain: Complexity, Diversity, and Change in a Provincial Hinterland* (Oxford 2003), p.23 and p.117.

²⁶ Todd, M., ‘Foreword’, in Wood, Queiroga, *Current Research*, p.vi.

²⁷ Millet, ‘Romanization: historical issues’, pp.35-41.

²⁸ Tacitus, *Agricola*, 21.

²⁹ Strabo, 3,3-5

³⁰ MacMullen, R., ‘Rural Romanization’, *Phoenix* 22 (1968), pp.337-341.

³¹ Millet, M., *The Romanization of Britain* (Cambridge 1990), pp.1-8.

if any, of pre-conquest acculturation, political environment and even the morphological features of the region.³² Therefore, the examination of native cultures through detailed regional studies is essential in order to understand the progress of Romanization. The studies edited by Slofstra and Brand, which give more emphasis to native cultures and local responses through an anthropological approach, are of interest here.³³ According to Slofstra, 'acculturation theory', which is used in anthropology, could be of great help in investigating the processes of socio-cultural changes in local communities during the Roman conquest.³⁴ Large-scale research into local settlements and cemeteries is therefore necessary, in order to have more information about social differentiation, demographic developments, and standard of life of native communities and to understand the impact of the Roman conquest on them. Epigraphy is often used by the scholars as an indicator of levels of Romanization in native communities. However, as K. Lomas has shown, within an area, epigraphic sources often attest different levels of Romanization, which had generally a larger impact on urban élites and upper classes than on lower social and economic groups.³⁵

As Millet and Saddington have said, it is also crucial to look at the ways and the periods in which peoples were incorporated into the Roman system.³⁶ In fact, the early and 'almost peaceful' Romanization of the Sabini and Vestini, for instance, was very different from the long process of military and political

conquest of the Marsi or the Samnites, although they took place in similar geographic and cultural contexts. Moreover, the territories annexed before the *Leges Iulia* and *Papiria* were Romanized on totally different political bases compared with later conquests, in which communities were directly annexed to the Roman state, without passing through the early phase of 'Latin Colonization'.³⁷ It must be considered, when dealing with colonization, that often our uniform view of this phenomenon is directly due to the 'filter' of the late Republican and, even more, Augustan ideological matrices, which have uniformed and in some way reduced the original more differentiated pictures of causes and effects of Roman colonization through times. Moreover, as Mouritsen, has stressed clearly in his study, there are also large differences between the conquest of Italy and of the provinces, which were mainly due to the different interaction of Rome with the allies.³⁸ Obviously the aims of the Roman conquest changed completely during the Imperial period, gaining more and more imperialistic meanings.

3. AIMS AND METHODOLOGIES OF THE RESEARCH

The approaches and the methodologies in the study of the process of Romanization and its mechanisms are, therefore, extremely various and should explore all its aspects, including public and private responses of local communities, literary and epigraphic sources, changes in rural and urban patterns of settlement, cultural and artistic evolution, social and

³² Haselgrove, C.C., 'Romanization before the conquest: Gaulish precedents and British consequences', in Blagg, T.F.C., King, A.C., *Military and Civilian in Roman Britain*, BAR Int.S.136 (Oxford 1984), pp.5-63; Haselgrove, C.C., Scull, C., 'The Romanization and de-Romanization of Belgic Gaul: the rural settlement evidence', in Wood, Queiroga, *Current Research*, pp.9-15.

³³ Brandt, R., Slofstra, J., *Roman and Native in the Low Countries*. BAR Int.S.184 (Oxford 1992).

³⁴ Slofstra, J., 'An Anthropological approach to the study of Romanization processes', in Brandt, Slofstra, *Roman and Native*, pp.71-104.

³⁵ Lomas, K., 'Local identity and cultural imperialism: epigraphy and the diffusion of Romanization in Italy', *PIA IV* (London 1990), pp.231-239.

³⁶ Millet, 'Romanization: historical issues', pp.35-41; Saddington, D.B., 'The parameters of Romanization', in *Roman Frontier Studies 1989* (Exeter 1991), pp.413-418.

³⁷ As also clear already in Humbert, M., *Municipium et Civitas sine suffragio* (Roma 1978); Torelli, M., 'Aspetti ideologici della colonizzazione romana più antica', *Dialoghi di Archeologia* III,6.2 (1988), pp.65-72. And in more recent studies: Bispham, E., 'Coloniae deducere: how Roman was Roman colonization during the Middle Republic?', in Bradley, G. J. and Wilson, J.-P. (eds.), *Greek and Roman colonization: origins, ideologies and interactions* (Swansea 2006), pp. 73-160;

³⁸ Mouritsen, H., *Italian Unification* (London 1998).

economic differentiation. Moreover, all these aspects are often symptoms of different levels of Romanization, which occurred within an area whether in different moments or in different social and cultural contexts.

It is not conceivable, therefore, to use a single model of Romanization of the provinces, unless it is very general, and in this case less effective for the study of this process in specific territories. However, general models, which have been proposed by some scholars³⁹ can easily be adapted to local contexts, creating in this way more detailed regional models, which might change remarkably from area to area. These local models, moreover, become more and more important in having a general idea of the polyhedric situation and of the necessity of more detailed local studies.

The aim of this study, therefore, is to explore how the local cultures change and evolve, without any suggestion of a 'good formula' for a new methodology or a new model in the study of Romanization, but simply analysing and attempting an interpretation of different archaeological data which characterize the local situations. For this purpose it has been necessary to look primarily at the peoples living in the region before any significant contacts with the Romans, that is in the period between the 6th and the first half of the 5th century BC, in order to understand more properly and gradually the signals of changes or continuity.

Moreover, numerous recent excavations have been able to produce new important evidence for the period between the 6th and the 4th centuries BC and there is a considerable scope for a synthesis.

The period between the Samnite Wars and municipalisation, however, is certainly the most problematic. Most of the finds, in fact, date to the early Imperial period, that is to the urban reorganization started by Augustus and completed in the Claudian period, which often in this region destroyed or obliterated almost totally previous situations. However, sporadic excavations and finds are now providing a new picture of this debated period, with interesting witness of early forms of proto-urbanization.

Such a large area, rich in archaeological sites and in historical events, obviously poses serious challenges to historians and archaeologists and, above all, poses interesting key questions: were the indigenous settlements unable to compete with Roman cities? How and in which sense was Mid-Adriatic Apennines urbanised? What was the role of the local peoples in the process of urbanization? How the territorial organization changed or adapted in Roman times?

The book has an organization both chronological (with the Samnite Wars representing a moment of *caesura*) and thematic, analysing different aspects in order to reconstruct a general picture of the area as complete as possible. Certainly all these aspects may need more detailed and specific studies, which could represent next steps for further studies and volumes.

Moreover, some of these aspects have been used, in this context, only in combination with other data or questions, and not specifically investigated, mainly when already published in studies as specific topics. In particular, epigraphy has been used in this volume as evidence in different contexts, but has not been analysed in a specific section as a choice, because the volumes by M. Buonocore and

³⁹ Gozzoli, S., 'Fondamenti ideali e pratica politica del processo di Romanizzazione nelle province', *Atheneum* 65 (1987), pp.81-108; Millet, 'Romanization: historical issues', pp.35-41.

G.Firpo⁴⁰ and the recent *CIL IX Supplementa* by M.Buonocore,⁴¹ about sources and epigraphy of the region, with their social and historical implications, are certainly exhaustive, and make superfluous any attempt of synthesis.

The analysis of the archaeological data is introduced by a geographical and geological description of the territory, both as it appears

today and trying to reconstruct the situation from antiquity through different kind of sources, in order to give a general idea of the topography in its continuous evolution; the first chapter also provide an ethnographic introduction about the populations inhabiting the area, to facilitate a general view of the local cultures.

⁴⁰ Buonocore, M., Firpo, G., *Fonti Latine e Greche per la Storia dell'Abruzzo antico*, Deputazione Abruzzese di Storia Patria, vol.I (Padova-Perugia 1991), Vol.II,1-2 (L'Aquila 1998).

⁴¹ Buonocore, M., *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum. Inscriptiones Calabriae Apuliae Samnii Sabinorum Piceni Latinae. Regio Quarta. Supplementum. Fasciculus secundus. Marrucini – Paeligni – Vestini -CIL IX 6974-7638* (Berlin 2019); Buonocore, M. (ed), *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum. Inscriptiones Calabriae Apuliae Samnii Sabinorum Piceni Latinae. Regio Quarta. Supplementum. Fasciculus tertius. Marsi – Aequi -CIL IX 7639-8187-* (Berlin 2020).