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Chapter 1: Introduction

Traditionally, the idea that the Roman empire ‘declined and fell’ was considered a historical fact, not a matter for debate. The beginning of the ‘decline’ was usually dated to the 3rd or 4th century AD. The deposition of the last emperor, Romulus Augustulus, in 476 AD was regarded as the event which marked the fall of the Roman empire in the west. The post-Roman centuries were dismissed as a ‘Dark Age’ that followed the collapse of Roman civilisation, as a period of little importance. It was argued that there was a general absence of economic and social activity. This was accompanied by the disappearance of cities or their reduction to ecclesiastical and administrative centres, with a decline of their markets and the limited movement of goods directed by ‘complex chiefdoms or incipient states’ mainly for non-commercial ends. However, more recent historians have been revising this view over the last few decades, attempting to place the ‘early Middle Ages’ on an equal basis with other periods. Others have suggested that if the idea of a post-Roman ‘decline’ or ‘fall’ into the ‘Dark Ages’ is challenged and replaced with that of ‘transformation’ into the ‘early Middle Ages’, our view of the past is levelled out and is no longer dominated by a Roman peak of civilisation. They have also argued that ‘transformation’ rather than ‘fall’ is in general a better description of the historical changes between Late Antiquity and the early medieval period in the west.

In many ways it is not surprising that this period has come under intense scrutiny. This is because it has been seen by many historians as being a crucial period in the formation of the modern west. Marx argued that the fusion between the Romano-Germanic classes was necessary for the decline of urbanism and the creation of feudalism. Weber argued that the role of Christianity was fundamental in creating the demand for and patronage by wealth which were to lead eventually to the creation of the emporia and market-towns, typical of the later medieval period.

Other historians have suggested that the amount of trade generated by the emporia and market-towns was negligible and their impact on the economy of the region was minimal at best. The trade goods and patronage were merely for consumption by the urban elite and the nobility. But historians such as Banaji have argued that this is to underestimate the impact of the aristocracy. He has argued that "a new aristocracy emerged out of the expanding governing class of the 4th century, no longer merely an 'aristocracy of office", though it was always that as well, but an economically powerful and socially dominant group of businesslike landowners who dominated their respective regions". He has argued that business in Late Antiquity should be seen in terms of bankers, shipowners, traders, and mercantile houses. He stresses the role of the aristocracy, pointing to Byzantine Egypt as an
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4 W. Sombart, Der moderne Kapitalismus (Berlin, 1902), pp. 131ff.
example. Focusing on ceramic evidence for Egyptian wine, he has argued that despite the Arab invasions of the late 6th-7th centuries AD there was no real decline in Egyptian wine production, and there was actually an expansion due to aristocrats such as Flavius Strategius and the pagarch Flavius Menas. Banaji points further to the increase in the use of gold coinage beginning in the final years of the reign of Constantius II (337-361 AD). He has suggested that this was due to pressure from the late Roman bureaucracy, especially the promotion of militares. Banaji points to men such as the duces Aegypti Syrianus and Flavius Artemius who were both called clarissimi, in 356 and 360 AD respectively. The promotions from the Imperial bureaucracy over the traditional senatorial offices meant an increase in pay which led to the reform of the gold coinage as well as the system of minting. This was to entrench the dominance of gold as the main currency, through to the 9th century AD in the Byzantine Empire.

On many points Banaji is in disagreement with the view put forward by Wickham. Wickham has stressed the importance of the peasantry and the role of taxation. He has argued that the peasantry saw less change than the aristocracy. Their role as subsistence farmers continued as well as their fiscal obligations especially in Italy, at least initially. However, there is one aspect where the change between the 5th-6th century AD was especially pronounced, and that is with regard to previous legislation which tied the peasants to their land and to their respective landowners, and the weakening of the judicial apparatus necessary to enforce these laws. With regard to the role of taxation, Wickham has argued that once the tax levying of the Roman state had disappeared, it meant the peasants paid less and political power devolved to a more local level. He further stresses that this shift in power was to the detriment of the aristocracy because it meant a loss in revenue. This was to have a tremendous impact on the peasants. The tax burden on the peasants became less and proprietors did not have to surrender their surpluses to the Roman state in taxes. This was especially true of the Roman West: Italy, Spain, Gaul, Britain, Mauretania, and the Balkans. In fact Wickham goes so far as to argue that the power of the aristocracy over the peasantry was at its lowest ebb in 6th-7th century Francia, 6th-8th century Italy, 8th-9th century Spain, and Britain from the 5th-9th century AD. My thesis, however, will take a different approach from Banaji or Wickham by focusing on the typology of settlement rather than resolving the debate over the importance of the aristocracy and peasantry.
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6 Ibid. p. 159.
11 Ibid. p. 63.
13 C. Wickham, Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean, 400-800 (Oxford, 2005), pp. 519-588.
14 Ibid. p. 525.
15 Ibid. p. 529.
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18 Ibid. p. 570.
Economic patterns are nonetheless important to me. Historians such as McCormick have pointed to evidence for severe economic decline in the Mediterranean between Late Antiquity and the early medieval period.\(^{19}\) The picture which he has suggested, based on an analysis of African Red slipware and shipwrecks, is general prosperity in the 2nd century, decline in the 3rd century, revival in the 4th century, and severe decline in the 5th-6th centuries AD.\(^{20}\) He has also pointed to studies conducted on the lead levels present in tree-ring samples as evidence that smelting also declined in this period, an indication of a reduction in workshop activity. He has also argued on the basis of documentary evidence that most mines were closed and abandoned by the 5th century AD at the latest, and that this was an indication of labour shortages throughout the Roman Empire.\(^{21}\) McCormick has suggested that these labour shortages were due to severe depopulation because of plague which ravaged the empire starting with Constantinople. He has argued that this plague was particularly destructive for maritime trade because it was spread by shipping, and led to the deaths of many sailors and navigators, who were crucial to the activity. This led to the abandonment of many of the shipping routes across the Mediterranean, another important factor in the general decline of trade throughout the Roman West.\(^{22}\)

There is some truth to this pessimistic picture but the evidence is far from clear-cut, and in some ways this view has been contradicted by new discoveries. Archaeologists such as Dark have argued that long distance, large scale Mediterranean trade remained far more extensive than previously believed. As he pointed out "basic commodities such as oil, grain, pottery and building materials were produced in large quantities and transported over long distances".\(^{23}\) The scale of this trade is considerable, ranging from archaeological evidence from Berenike, on the Egyptian Red Sea coast, to pottery finds in India.\(^{24}\) The evidence from India is especially striking. Archaeology has revealed pottery, glass, gems, precious stones, and over 6,000 coins.\(^{25}\) Evidence for Roman trade has also been found in Africa as far south as the Rufiji Delta in Tanzania. The items discovered included Roman pottery, glass and beads.\(^{26}\) Archaeologists such as Fulford have argued that there were trade links between western Britain and Constantinople. He has pointed to Byzantine pottery found at Tintagel, as well as the shards from water jars belonging to Byzantine ships, as well as amphorae.\(^{27}\) What is especially striking is the strength of these links at times which have been traditionally been seen as a period of decline for Roman trade. A study of amphorae from Gujarat and Kerala in India revealed that there was constant contact with the Mediterranean between the 4th-6th century AD.\(^{28}\) Decline in African Red slipware may have been balanced by local production
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of pottery or imports from other workshops throughout the empire. Maritime trade may have declined but this may have been compensated to some extent by the discovery of new overland routes. The documentary evidence for the closure and abandonment of mines is extremely incomplete. The date of the last documentary reference to a mine cannot be taken as evidence for the date of its closure. Furthermore it is possible that the reports of depopulation may have been exaggerated, or that depopulation in some areas may have been balanced by the foundation of new towns and emporia elsewhere in the early medieval period. It should also be pointed out that the evidence presented could be interpreted in various ways. It is possible that other criteria need to be examined before a clearer picture can be seen.

Historians such as Hodges argue in any case that the significance of the emporia was not the volume of traded goods, but the creation of a new form of settlement and a new generation of urban craftsmen which was to lead to the revival of towns in the later medieval period. He has pointed to the archaeological excavations of 8th-9th century AD emporia such as Hamwic (Saxon Southampton), Dorestad, and Ribe, which reveal settlements which have been clearly organized in a grid-pattern, and include a central market-place, as well as houses for the craftsmen. It should be stressed that in all cases these new emporia were founded by royal charter. They were clearly deliberate, planned communities of a sort which had not been seen before. A possible inspiration for them could have been the Merovingian towns of Gaul. The excavations also revealed considerable infrastructure for trade. These included the remains of wharves and early medieval cranes in the port areas, especially at Dorestad. What is especially interesting is that there are signs that this development was not simply restricted to the West but could also be found in the Roman East. In the town of Scythopolis, located to the south of Lake Galilee, ceramic and linen workshops were created in what had previously been the centre of the Roman town. The fact that this phenomenon can be observed in both the west and the east is particularly significant. Clearly a reassessment of the importance of emporia is needed based on other criteria than simply the quantity of trade goods discovered.

* * *

The main objective of the thesis is to make a contribution to this debate from the point of view of a historian, by examining the transition from Late Antiquity to the early medieval period focusing on changes in Italian urban life in the region of north Etruria (Fig 1.1). The region’s boundaries are approximately as far north as Luni (near to La Spezia), as far south as Rusellae, as far east as Perusia. The towns to be examined are: Lucca, Arezzo, Chiusi, Fiesole, Pisa, Siena and Volterra. There are various reasons for selecting them.


Fig. 1.1 – Map of Roman Italy
The settlements also have many characteristics in common. Lucca, Arezzo, Pisa and Chiusi are situated in either valleys or basins. They are separated from one another by a distance of around 50-70 kilometres and located along the border of the hills. The hill settlements include Siena, Fiesole and Volterra. As Barker and Rasmussen point out “the hill settlements of Tuscany still largely retain their traditional functions as ‘agro-towns’ or ‘agro-villages’, providing homes for people who farm their land on a daily basis, returning to the settlements in the evening.”

The debate also centres on whether the very concept of 'town' is still relevant. It is not surprising that in the course of the debate historians have focused on urban life. The very form of the Roman empire was as a collection of *civitates*. These communities were responsible for the administration of the territories which they occupied. Most Roman citizens belonged to some *civitas*. With this in mind, it is understandable that the problem of what happened to Roman towns in the process of transformation from the 4th century AD onwards would assume tremendous importance in the debate. One of the most contentious issues is whether the towns in the West between the 4th-8th century AD still resembled 'cities'. Historians such as Horden and Purcell have argued that the arbitrary nature of this definition renders it useless. They point to the difficulty involved in setting up concrete parameters. If the definition is to be based on a concentration of population, how do we decide where the boundary should lie between a large village and a small town? If documentary evidence is used, how do we define the term *civitas* when it is used in reference to a city such as Milan (with extensive fortifications and a massive urban area), as well as a small settlement such as Castelseprio. Horden and Purcell have suggested that if the documentary evidence is used this would provide a definition which contemporaries would agree on. But they also point out that such a definition would exclude settlements such as the Roman fortress of Kaiseraugst and the monastery of San Vincenzo al Volturno which possessed substantial populations and considerable economic wealth in their own right. They have suggested that any study should instead focus on the 'ecology' of the settlement.

In my opinion, there is absolutely no doubt that by its very nature the concept of a town is arbitrary. But to dispense with the concept of a town creates its own problems. How is the 'ecology' or 'hinterland' of a town to be defined, if we cannot define the settlement itself? This is of course, in reference to Horden and Purcell’s view that the town and the agricultural hinterland should be viewed as one homogeneous unit. I disagree with this definition and provide my own definition further below. In many ways, some imprecision is unavoidable due to the fragmentary nature of the evidence. Furthermore, it would be extremely surprising for the topography and demographics of any settlement to remain static for a period of several hundred years, let alone settlements which were continuously fought over by several different barbarian tribes (Goths, Lombards, Franks) and an Imperial power (Byzantium). Just as there were differences between the Etruscan and Roman settlements, so there were differences between the Roman and early medieval settlements. However, the argument should not revolve around the comparison between a Roman *civitas* and an early medieval town. To do
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33 Ibid. p. 22-23.
34 I am therefore not concerned with the debate about whether Imperial interference in city government and finances 'weakened' the city in the 3rd century AD.
36 Ibid. p. 93.
so would be akin to comparing Tudor London with modern day London. The point surely is
the relative importance of the Roman and early medieval settlements in comparison with the
settlements surrounding them. If Tudor London was the dominant political and economic
settlement in the region, in its period, then surely, it has to be considered 'urban' regardless of
its population. To suggest that it was not because its population, appearance and size were
different to modern day London strikes me as absurd.

Furthermore, what is required is not a perfect definition but simply a workable one.
This definition would include settlements which Italian historians such as Carandini would
consider urban (such as Milan), as well as early medieval emporia (like Ribe) which British
historians such as Ward-Perkins would consider urban. I believe that Wickham, following
others, offers a satisfactory definition. The criterion is that a settlement has to have a
minimum of two or three of these characteristics before it can be considered urban; the
characteristics are: density of population, a strategic or central location, social class
differentiation, a marketplace, a mint, an organized ecclesiastical class, 'urban' or large
housing, a juridical status, a judicial function, defensive fortifications, and a street-plan. I
believe that this definition can be applied to all the settlements in my thesis throughout my
period. I return to this problem in Chapter 2.

All of the settlements which I have selected have been occupied for a very long time.
But I would argue that there are further good reasons for considering the settlements which I
have chosen as ‘towns’. In comparison to Kaiseraugst and San Vincenzo al Volturno, the
history of human settlement in Etruria is a great deal older. Although the archaeological
evidence is extremely limited, it is possible that humans have been living in Etruria for at
least 750,000 years. And the acropolis of Luni in South Etruria, for instance, which was
located on the Mignone river, had a history of continuous occupation from the Bronze Age to
the Etruscan period. It is true, that in comparison, the archaeological evidence for north
Etruria during 900-700 BC is not as satisfactory. In some towns, such as Arezzo, there is no
evidence of any settlement during this period. However, there was a small settlement at
Chiusi.

A further factor to consider would be that the settlements which I have chosen
became extremely important during the Etruscan period. This was especially the case with
regard to Fiesole, Volterra, Arezzo and Chiusi and this is reflected in the sheer wealth of
archaeological and documentary evidence available for this period. What is even more
striking is that the settlements chosen retained their importance throughout Late Antiquity
and the early medieval period. In all circumstances they remained the dominant settlement in their
area politically and economically, with the partial exception of Fiesole. It is difficult to
overstate this point. The settlements are chosen because of their long history which reflect
long term trends and allows us to examine what factors were transitory and what features
were permanent. Choosing these settlements were also significant because they can be
considered to be monumental compared to the settlements surrounding them. If smaller
settlements were chosen it would be difficult to examine changes in their structure as the
evidence both archaeological and documentary are limited, and the criteria chosen might
include settlements which are too small to be considered urban. Historians such as Brogiolo
have stressed the military importance of these settlements as being intimately linked with

38 C.E. Ostenberg, ‘Luni sul Mignone e problemi della preistoria d’Italia’, Acta Instituti Romani Regni
their status as *civitas*. The settlements were always garrisoned by Gothic, Byzantine, Lombard, and Frankish soldiers, and some such as Fiesole and Lucca possessed great strategic significance and were frequently fought over.

In fact, they were important settlements even before the arrival of the Romans, unlike for example, Florence, which was founded as a Roman colony (*Florentia*). What is just as significant is that these settlements have remained continuously occupied up to the modern period. Some became exceptionally wealthy and prosperous during the medieval period. Arezzo was to become the ecclesiastical capital of the dioceses of Arezzo, Siena and Chiusi. Pisa had great strategic value due to its location on the Via Aurelia. Siena was to benefit commercially from the Via Francigena, a road which traversed the whole length of Tuscany, and was an important trade and pilgrimage route throughout the Middle Ages.

The differences in the settlement patterns between north and south Etruria are still unclear. The environmental conditions in south Etruria are, in some respects, more favourable, with less high ground and more fertile soil. This led to a greater number of towns and large villages in comparison with the north. However, these towns did not sustain large populations in comparison to the north. South Etruria also had a higher number of rural settlements.\(^{39}\) Traditionally, on the basis of field surveys conducted, it has been suggested that rural depopulation began in the 5th century AD. But as Christie has argued, there are good reasons to suggest that this interpretation might not be accurate. He has pointed out that most evidence of rural habitation is based on the discovery of pottery fragments. But the weakness in this method lies in the fact that the supply of pottery which is exported inland is extremely low. Most of the pottery found is localized in coastal settlements. Without the pottery, rural occupation would be archaeologically extremely difficult to detect.\(^{40}\)

There are also examples outside Italy which suggest this might be the case. Christie has pointed out that excavations carried out on Romano-British and Romano-Saxon rural homesteads in the same period revealed evidence of continuous occupation.\(^{41}\) Excavation carried out at Monte Gelato (S. Etruria) also revealed the same pattern. In this case the settlement was also surrounded by graves which further suggest continuity.\(^{42}\) Any satisfactory explanation for these patterns will require more detailed regional study.

* * *

The early medieval remains discovered overlying the Roman towns in Italy provide a venue for this debate, and an ideal context to view different perspectives on the evidence. As

\(^{39}\) Ibid. p. 23.


\(^{41}\) Ibid. p. 274.

one historian has summarized, with regard to the 5th to 7th centuries AD: “Should they be seen as a ‘Dark Age’ of doom and gloom at the end of ‘Roman Civilisation’, or as a period of positive political, social and cultural change? Was one urban civilization (that of Rome) transformed into another (that of late medieval and modern Europe) by a process of death (followed by rebirth later in the Middle Ages), or by a process of gradual transformation within a living organism?”

Historians such as Hodges, Whitehouse and Brogiolo have stressed the reduced state of the towns, including the decay of monumental buildings, the depopulation and abandonment of town centres resulting in deserted areas. The verdict of Simeoni on the early medieval city is only the most extreme of a number of similar formulations: “Squalid buildings falling down and abandoned outside and inside the walls, the ancient monuments partly robbed, and flanked by the miserable constructions of the barbarians”. This impression is reinforced by Hodges and Whitehouse: “there is increasing archaeological evidence to show that decaying masonry buildings were either patched up or demolished and replaced by timber structures, and there is “an invaluable body of negative evidence against the continuity of towns after 600, and the case for discontinuity of urban life is very strong indeed”.

Brogiolo has pointed to archaeological evidence, especially his excavations at Via Alberto Mario in Brescia, as proof that was no continuity of ‘urbanism’. He has argued that the collapse in the physical structure of Roman Brescia was clear by the 5th century AD. The forum fell into ruins during this century and the area surrounding it had been abandoned. Despite the fact that the walls were intact, the built-up area was reduced to around a third (approximately 25 hectares). He has pointed to the rubble from collapsed, abandoned buildings which was not cleared, burials scattered in the town centre and in the space between the houses, streets covered with mud, rubbish and quantities of ‘dark earth’ which he has suggested meant the site was used for agriculture. There were also the remains of a Roman domus that was replaced by a large but more basic house during the Ostrogothic period. This house fell into disrepair and was eventually destroyed by fire. The site was covered by ‘dark earth’ by the beginning of the 7th century AD. Caution has to be exercised here. Brescia has

47 Ibid. p. 84.
50 Ibid. pp. 74-83.
been excavated quite thoroughly and it is difficult to make a judgement on whether the example is typical or an exception. However, it can be said that the other settlements share some of Brescia’s characteristics of depopulation, abandonment, as well as some signs of urban survival.

Other historians such as Ward-Perkins and Wickham have argued that despite their smaller size and dilapidated condition these settlements should still be regarded as ‘urban’.\(^{51}\) In some ways, what is striking is the resilience which some of the towns exhibited. Brogiolo has pointed to three types of destruction. Physical destruction meant damage done to the town’s buildings and walls. Material destruction meant the massacre of the town’s population such as the Gothic sack of Milan where the men were killed and the women and children enslaved. But during the Byzantine-Gothic war (535-554 AD) many towns survived the two types of destruction described. It is only the third type of destruction, institutional destruction, whereby the town’s episcopal status was removed and its lands were seized that resulted in the town’s extinction.\(^{52}\) Ward-Perkins has argued that the settlements which survived had a new function due to the rising importance of the bishops who resided in them. The increasing role which the church was to play meant patronage for builders, craftsmen and carpenters. This resulted in wealth which can be seen in the construction of charitable institutions (xenodochia) and monasteries. It also went hand in hand with the destruction and decay of certain temples and the abandonment of monumental structures such as amphitheatres and theatres.\(^{53}\)

The end of monumental building may have been due largely to cultural changes.\(^{54}\) Buildings were no longer viewed as symbols of secular power.\(^{55}\) Synthesising a great deal of earlier work, Liebeschuetz has argued that what was beginning to assume importance was no longer the architectural grandeur of the buildings but the interior itself.\(^{56}\) He has stressed the high quality of, and the wealth contributed towards, the decorations, especially the mosaics, and the use of fine cloths. Liebeschuetz has also pointed out that the construction which took place after 650 AD, although small in comparison with the monumental buildings of Late Antiquity, involved buildings which were still of considerable size. A good example would be Pope Hadrian I’s (772-795 AD) church of S. Maria in Cosmedin and the re-roofing of S. Peter’s.\(^{57}\)

Scholars such as La Rocca and Hudson have pointed to archaeological evidence to challenge the concept of a ‘Dark Age’.\(^{58}\) Excavations carried out by them at the Cortile del


\(^{56}\) Ibid. pp. 396-397.

\(^{57}\) Ibid. p. 397.

Tribunale at Verona uncovered buildings destroyed by fire in the 6th century AD and covered by ‘dark earth’ until the 10th century. But at Via Dante, which was adjacent, the street front buildings show signs of constant repairs and refurbishment from the 5th-12th century AD. One site revealed a house that by north European standards is impressive (Fig. 1.2). This structure had a rough, mortared stone façade built along the line of the street in late Roman times. It is possible that the building was in constant use between the 5th-12th centuries AD, and at least the base of the late Roman façade (the excavated portion) was maintained and visible throughout the period, although every now and then the level of the door had to be raised to accommodate the rise in street-level. The resulting structure, with a poor quality, late Roman wall, adjusted and repaired through time, is not the peak of aesthetic and structural sophistication. However, by early medieval standards it is remarkable and raises the possibility that at least several of the early medieval houses in Italy were substantially of stone and mortar. Such houses were constructed on stone foundations and had stone facades. They also re-used Roman materials which were bonded with clay.

La Rocca and Hudson have also suggested a different interpretation of the standard evidence for decay, decline and abandonment (‘dark earth’, burials and the reuse of Roman buildings). ‘Dark earth’ did not necessarily represent depopulation. Chemical analysis of ‘dark earth’ has revealed that it was sometimes composed of weathered earth bricks and decomposed timber. Brogiolo has argued that when the Goths were billeted in Brescia, they frequently evicted the inhabitants of Roman domus and then created timber partitions in these buildings. It is possible that ‘dark-earth’ may have been the remains of these structures.

* * *

Burials were indeed located within the town walls, but in areas which were no longer occupied by monumental buildings in the 7th-9th century AD. There may also have been cultural reasons for this change. The transition from cremation towards inhumation seems to have escalated during the 3rd century AD. An explanation for this phenomenon may have been the spread of eastern religions including Christianity as well as neo-Platonist philosophy. However, it has also been linked to the arrival and settlement of Germanic tribes within the empire, who practiced inhumation.

Verona, Via Dante: façade of a late Roman house. Note the doorway and threshold, raised several times as the street and city level rose.
The change, however, is often regarded as a change of fashion defying satisfactory explanation. A ‘normal’ grave during the early Principate would have consisted of a cremation, outside the town walls (extra muros) or outside the town area as a whole. The remains would have been interred with grave goods. In contrast, a burial during the early medieval period would usually mean a corpse wrapped in a shroud without any grave goods. As Dierkins and Perin have pointed out “the medieval cemetery grew up around the church, itself more often than not built in the centre of the village, or intra muros”.65 Another factor to consider was the orientation of the graves. This was on a west-east axis, with the head in the direction of the west but looking to the east. It has been argued that the "orientation could have been interpreted in the Christian sense, the more so since the parish church, itself necessarily or virtually always oriented, logically influenced the direction of graves dug around it".66 Places of particular sanctity in the cities may thus have attracted burials. The barbarian invasions which took place during the 3rd century AD may also have resulted in a smaller urban area because of the need to fortify the town with walls that were defensible; and some historians see this as an explanation for the fact that cemeteries dating from the 4th-5th century AD are not located on earlier burial grounds, but occupy deserted or destroyed parts of the actual town which date to the 1st-3rd century AD.67

However, the urban area often extended beyond the town walls. This would include cemeteries located along the main roads leading to the town walls. These cemeteries were often where the earliest Christians were buried. As a result these burials were greatly venerated. With official sanction given to Christianity in the 4th century AD, what resulted was the construction of buildings to house the burials. These included the martyrium, which was for martyrs; the confessio, for saints who were not martyrs; and the memoria, which contained relics but no graves.68 Their significance should not be underestimated. As Dierkins and Perin point out "these elaborate tomb constructions, and their associated cults, led to the rapid multiplication of inhumation burials ad sanctos; lying as close as possible to their graves or relics constituted a decided asset and a guarantee for the Day of Judgement".69 It is likely that suburban churches were built on the actual site of these sacred burials.70 Even when there were no saints buried in a local cemetery to provide a sacred place for a church, this did not prevent the construction of oratories by the Gothic and Lombard dukes, kings or nobles, in order to gain the religious benefits of a church burial. It is also possible that in some cases an increase in the size of the town (especially in the later Middle Ages) may have led to suburban cemeteries being enclosed within town walls again. Another result was that the original intra muros churches began to receive burials again.71

Some historians have questioned this interpretation by pointing out that the movement of relics from the catacombs to Roman urban churches began in the 8th century AD, during the time of Pope Paul I (757-767 AD). This was approximately two centuries later than the first urban cemeteries. They have suggested that the urban burials may have been the result of the barbarian invasions rather than for ideological reasons, the burials taking place during siege conditions and the main factor being the destruction of the town’s suburban areas
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including the cemeteries. Other historians have pointed to the exceptional nature of urban burials especially before the 6th century AD. They have argued that the burials were as a result of special privileges granted to members of the nobility. But this argument has been attacked by Cantino Wataghin. She has pointed out that urban burials were frequent outside Rome and that the city may not be a typical example. She has also suggested that urban burials may have been more frequent than previously believed. Urban burials are extremely fragile archaeologically and easily missed in an excavation. It is also possible that more legislation would have been passed prohibiting this if it was considered a serious matter in this period. Instead the only reference was in the Theodosian Code and this was later enshrined in the Justinian Code. Brogiolo has also suggested that an additional factor may have been the Lombards. In the case of the Goths and the Franks, they saw a strong need to identify themselves with Roman symbols of rule, such as aqueducts and public buildings. The Lombards preferred emphasising their social importance through the use of grave goods and burials. This was especially the case with regard to burials near an episcopal church.

* * * *

Historians such as Liebeschuetz have argued that "Late Antiquity saw the relative uniformity of classical urban civilization breaking up into regional diversity". If this is the case the benefits of studying this phenomena on a regional and city-by-city basis is clear. Firstly, it would allow us to study the evolution of the towns from Late Antiquity to the early medieval period with regard to the actual buildings involved. Secondly, although archaeology has provided a large quantity of evidence, it is still extremely difficult to form a clear general picture due to the complex nature of this transition. As has been pointed out “cities did sometimes decline catastrophically to the point of extinction; but more often an important range of urban activities continued on the site, but in a transformed environment“.

Evidence which has traditionally been interpreted as ‘decline’ may if studied in a regional context be seen as a sign of transformation. Some historians have suggested that the political control of the town was changed from that of the curia to the bishop, certain buildings which were used by the local government may have been deliberately allowed to fall into ruin. Further factors could also explain the reoccupation of abandoned Roman buildings with rudimentary houses. The Variae of Cassiodorus contains a formula known as the Formula de Competitionibus which allowed for the appropriation of abandoned public buildings by private individuals. It contains three particular examples, that of a porticus in Spoletu, a horrea somewhere in Rome, and a porticus curva near the Roman forum. It is

74 G. Cantino Wataghin, 'The ideology of urban burials', in G.P. Brogiolo & B. Ward-Perkins (eds.), The idea and ideal of the town Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages (Leiden, 1999), pp. 149-150.
75 Ibid. p. 150.
78 Ibid. p. 29.
80 Cassiodorus, T. Mommsen (ed.), Variae, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi
difficult to ascertain how effectively this Ostrogothic piece of legislation was applied but it is at least possible that the reoccupation of abandoned Roman buildings was deliberate. There is evidence from another part of the empire which provides a good example of this. In Umayyad Palmyra of the 7th century AD the Arabs constructed various souks within the porticoed main street of the city. What is remarkable is that the shops are of regular size and built to blend in with the remains of the Roman town. There is even a clay water pipe which runs behind the shops. This is clearly a case of careful and deliberate urban planning and not haphazard occupation.\(^1\) It is possible that this was not a typical example and had no parallels in the West. But we do possess one example, that of Trento where they appear to be a row of glass making workshops who reoccupied abandoned buildings.\(^2\)

Other historians have emphasized the role which Christianity may have played in the destruction of temples or patronage given to new churches, monasteries or charitable institutions such as xenodochia.\(^3\) In some cases the functions carried out by large monumental structures such as the public baths of Late Antiquity were replaced by smaller bath houses which were funded by the church.\(^4\) These questions can only be resolved by more detailed city or regional studies, because all of these processes were taking place at different periods and places within Italy. A study of the settlements chosen here should therefore be of immense value to our understanding of the urban history of Italy due to their continuous occupation and importance. It is astonishing that even recent historical research has neglected this region.\(^5\) In order to understand the history of the towns I would like to start by discussing specific problems encountered with the evidence before examining what positive approaches can be made, with the evidence that is available.

---

Chapter 2: Sources and methodology

The evidence of archaeology

It has been argued that there are good grounds for considering Italy as unique, especially when viewed from the archaeological perspective. But, within Italy, there is very little doubt that the sheer quantity of art, archaeology and architecture dating to Republican and early Imperial Rome has tended in the past to mean that Late Antiquity, and the early medieval period, has in comparison been neglected. It is true that in more recent years the balance has been somewhat redressed. But it is also important to point out that only by studying archaeological change over a considerable period, in one particular region, can the transition between Late Antiquity and the early medieval period be properly understood. Even in this period, “[Italy] was, for much of the time, the central province of the Empire and for all of the time and beyond, the religious focus of the West”.

This is reflected, for example, in the considerable numbers of early Christian churches which have survived until today, and Roman town walls. Their importance should not be underestimated. In some ways, church building was the direct successor to the monumental building and rebuilding of the Roman city, in the context of which, for example, Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa (c. 63 BC-12 BC) in the 1st century BC placed his name on the portico of the Pantheon in Rome. This building was dedicated by Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa as a temple to all the gods of Ancient Rome, but the building was later rebuilt by the emperor Hadrian (117-138 AD). Similarly, in Late Antiquity, donors of mosaic pavements in churches had their names listed on the door or floor, with the number of feet of mosaic which they had paid for. In any case, to a large extent, a town is what it is by virtue of its monuments, secular or sacred. Church building, as evidence, if used with caution, can be a general indicator of economic growth or decline. However, too few of these essential structural features have so far received satisfactory attention. In the cases where they have been examined, it has often been done with tunnel vision, churches and mosaics have been studied by art historians and architects largely in isolation from their context and it is easy for structures such as town walls to be overlooked as social monuments.

Walls gave a city identity in all senses. They often gave it its shape. Roman street-plans were often square (and often aligned with the centuriated fields of the countryside), and the rectangular layout of the walls crystallized this relationship. The two main streets often
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ran from gate to gate, usually crossing in the middle, at the forum. If the Roman walls survived there was a good probability that this arrangement would be permanent. In many Italian cities, a virtually entire square plan survives, several examples are Turin, Albenga, Piacenza, Cremona, Brescia, Verona, Trento, Bologna, and in north Etruria, Florence, and Lucca, although the list could go on.\textsuperscript{92} An example of a different kind would be the town of Ravenna where a large part of its town walls has remained intact. But as Christie has pointed out “this powerful defensive cordon remained largely unstudied until very recently, with historians and archaeologists alike vaguely attributing to the walls early 5th, mid-5th, early 6th and then later 6th century building phases, each tied very neatly to historical personages but without any attempt to analyse the walls themselves as an historico-archaeological document”.\textsuperscript{93}

There are also other problems which are encountered in examining urban areas from the period. The data tends to be fragile archaeologically, the materials used in the construction of buildings are frequently un-worked stone and timber, sometimes using clay or pebbles.\textsuperscript{94} This presents grave problems in the identification of a complex as housing unless a big enough area is excavated. This is the case even when the street-plan has remained virtually intact, for example at the town of Luni.\textsuperscript{95} Furthermore, due to the long history of stone-built domestic architecture in Italy, the tradition of building in timber has tended to receive limited attention. This is unfortunate as structures of the early medieval period are very rarely now visible above ground, with the important exception of religious buildings.

There is a further consequence of the fact that structures are also generally of an impoverished form in comparison with Roman construction techniques. They tend to be crudely built and frequently lack mortar bonding, even when the greater part of the structure is stone-built. This is largely due to a change in the building techniques used. It has been argued that this transformation took place during the 3rd century AD. During the late Republican and early Imperial period, walls had been constructed in perfectly cut blocks of square stone.\textsuperscript{96} During Late Antiquity and the early medieval period, walls begin to be built using half-finished blocks of stone. This raises the possibility that towards the end of the 3rd century some quarries were exhausted or no longer in operation. Bricks were also beginning to be re-used in this period, suggesting that they were no longer being produced in large numbers. This impression is strengthened by the fact that by the end of the 4th century AD we begin to see the construction of wooden houses in the vicinity of the largest churches. Other examples include wooden huts with pillars built in areas which had previously been occupied by a Roman domus.\textsuperscript{97} The archaeological remains of houses tend to consist of floors and the
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bases of pillars. They are usually constructed in a mix of *spolia* and wood and appear rudimentary.98

Besides blocks of stone, there is evidence that larger and more complex building materials were also beginning to be re-used. There is an act of barter from Lucca, of 821 AD, in which the cleric Alperto, with the permission of the bishop Pietro, received “*quattuor columnas petrenas*” from the rector from the church of S. Donato in exchange for a piece of land at S. Angelo in Campo.99 It should be stressed that we don’t know if these columns were used but it appears to be clear that there was a market for these items. It may even be possible that such a market existed in other periods especially in Late Antiquity. Several reasons have been put forward to explain this. One explanation is that there was a lack of new quarries. Another possible reason could be a lack of specialized craftsmen who could manufacture new columns. Sources for ready-made columns included amphitheatres which were plundered to embellish various churches. A good example of this phenomenon would be the cathedral of S. Martino in Lucca.100 It is important to stress that plundered Roman buildings were not the only source of stone available. For example, the cathedral of S. Frediano of Lucca contains newly quarried materials, specifically blocks of limestone from the Monti Pisani. This is significant because this is one of the most common stones available in the territory controlled by the town and might indicate an increasing reliance on local quarries.

Whatever the explanation, the impoverishment in building techniques minimises the survival of structures in urban contexts, although more scientific excavation procedures and the diminishing desire to look solely for rich Roman levels has begun to fill in the numerous gaps in our knowledge of early medieval settlement. However, traces of buildings are extremely elusive, an example of this is the Capitolium zone at Luni where the post-Roman habitation levels were marked only by fragmentary beaten floors, refuse pits and a few post-holes.101 In assessing post-Roman survivals, there can be considerable uncertainty as to whether absences of post-Roman settlement are ‘real’ or the result of the excavators’ underdeveloped skill in detecting earth floors and post-holes.

Yet more examples of the problems involved with interpreting archaeological evidence from early medieval Italy can be illustrated with reference to the excavations of Luni. The excavations in 1970-1971 highlighted a town with public and private buildings of considerable size during the Republican and early Imperial centuries, a large basilica, a forum square flanked by porticoes, ceremonial buildings, and at least two impressive private houses (Fig. 2.1). There was also a large range of imported articles, especially pottery and amphorae. The height of Luni’s prosperity was during the 1st century BC and the first two centuries AD, but it declined in the late Roman period and was abandoned around 1200. Archaeologists recovered from the early Middle Ages a handful of datable and half-datatable coins. The excavators deduced that the first phase of the forum’s life, “which lasts until the end of the 7th century/beginning of the 8th century AD, [was one] in which the forum square and its lateral
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Fig. 2.1 – Luni: Archaeological plan of town
porticoes were maintained, though with crumbling buildings, at their original level". This would suggest a considerable degree of continuity for one of Luni’s most important complexes. The same archaeologists in 1974, approaching the forum at a different tempo and using different techniques, discovered the remains of late 6th and early 7th century AD houses (Fig. 2.2), built mainly of wood and clay. The new excavation suggested that the whole forum was once covered in housing of this type and date, and that the Roman public buildings had fallen into decay and been substantially demolished and robbed of their marble long before 600 AD. The improved excavation techniques had turned the previous continuity of the Roman public buildings into a discontinuity, and had also discovered a considerable number of people (who were entirely invisible in 1970-1971) living over the abandoned square. The case illustrates the dangers in generalizing about the population of a settlement in Late Antiquity from the archaeological evidence. This is due to the fact that until fairly recently archaeological interest in classical cities tended to focus on ‘monumental’ architecture as well as ‘great’ art. Most sites which were excavated were simply cleared down to reveal the most impressive buildings, for example aristocratic houses (which tend to belong to the period of the early Empire) rather than artisan dwellings and workshops.

I would like at this stage to discuss the problems arising from the dating methods used. In archaeology the term *terminus post quem* (‘limit after which’) and *terminus ante quem* (‘limit before which’) are used to provide a dating bracket. The *terminus ante quem* would be the latest possible date for a building or artifact, and the *terminus post quem* the earliest. An example of this would be the discovery of coins or pottery dated to 588 and 825 AD for instance in graves. The *terminus post quem* would be established by the coin or piece of pottery from the latest period, in other words 825 AD. This would mean that the grave would be dated to after 825 AD. It is obvious that pottery or even coinage may sometimes not be precisely dateable. If a grave was found underneath a historical building and the building was dated by epigraphy to 545 AD, then it could be said that this date would be the *terminus ante quem* for the grave. The grave must have been created before this date.

A classic example of a *terminus ante quem* would be the volcanic eruption of Pompeii in 79 AD. Everything underneath the layer of volcanic ash must have been there before this date, it should be stressed that in both cases the dating may change if other evidence is found. In the case of the first grave, if another coin from a later date was found then the *terminus post quem* would shift towards a later date. Similarly the grave underneath the building may have been dug in 544 or 543 AD or an unspecified time before, all that can be said about the grave is that it was made before the building, unless for instance, further excavation produces a *terminus post quem*.

Another dating method used is radiocarbon dating (carbon-14) dating. Since all living organisms contain carbon-14 which decays at a scientifically known rate, this enables archaeologists to calculate an organic artifact’s age simply by measuring how much carbon-14 remains. However, carbon-14 dating has its own limitations with regard to inorganic artifacts, especially pottery. As a result archaeologists have to resort to other methods such as thermoluminescence dating. This has similarities to carbon-14 dating as it also relies on radioactive decay but the more common way to date inorganic material is through study of its
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Fig. 2.2 – Luni: Archaeological plan of an early medieval house
typology, comparing the artifacts which have not been dated with those from other archaeological sites which have been more securely dated. Ideally, both the *terminus ante quem* and the *terminus post quem* could be established with a great degree of chronological precision in all the towns selected by this thesis, through the use of the dating methods mentioned above, based on epigraphy, pottery, or coinage. Unfortunately, the accuracy of these dating methods is sometimes weakened due to incomplete and uneven archaeological excavation, or inadequate publication. Much of the evidence I have had to use inevitably comes from brief preliminary accounts. Furthermore, unless there is datable epigraphy, the dating of buildings still depends largely on imprecise chronologies based on mosaics or architectural styles, instead of coins or datable pottery recorded in association with different structural phases. Even if the dating evidence is adequate, it tends to relate only to a very small number of public buildings. Caution needs to be exercised in trying to reconstruct the fate of an entire town on the basis of this evidence.

It is not surprising that, due to the limitations of the data, arguments for early medieval settlement sometimes rest on indirect evidence, such as modern topographical survival. Present day street-patterns in Italy, that reproduce Roman street grids, have been used as evidence of continuous fairly dense settlement, even during centuries for which we have no direct excavated or documentary information. This is the case for many towns in Italy such as Turin. However, there is one example, that of the ancient city of Rhodes, where the street-pattern was preserved in a post-Roman rural context, by field boundaries and carttracks (Fig. 2.3).

The fact that the city plan of Rhodes could survive amongst the fields suggests that we must abandon Bryan Ward-Perkins' earlier view that "good survival of a grid-pattern, such as is often found in Italy, is only possible...if the towns were continuously fairly densely settled". Caution must be exercised. Wickham has pointed out that many sites whose street-plan had survived may have had discontinuous economic urbanism. He illustrates this point by pointing to the example of Aosta and south-east Brescia. In this case Roman *insulae* were converted to fields in the early medieval period, and were built on again at a later period, without disturbing the street-plan. Fevrier has suggested that the survival of the street-plan might not be an indication of urban survival but merely the ability of the town authorities to maintain the access and alignment of the settlement. In other words, the survival of the street-plan might indicate weak urban survival and negligible building activity, as easily as it could be a demonstration of urban vitality but with strong control by the leadership. But it remains possible that, for some of the settlements in the period (400-900 AD), what our evidence indicates may not be total abandonment, but merely our inability to recognise the evidence. It is also important to stress the limitations of archaeological evidence in finding reasons for abandonment of a town. For example, if a town was evacuated as a result of an administrative decision, there might not be any archaeological data for this.

Some archaeological phenomena are particularly pertinent. The first is the phenomenon of intramural burials. These are present in almost all of the towns that are
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Fig. 2.3 – Rhodes: Archaeological plan of the town
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included in my thesis: Arezzo, Chiusi, Fiesole, Lucca, Pisa and Volterra. Traditionally, this has been interpreted as a sign of urban ‘decline’ and ‘crisis’, as we have seen. However, an alternative explanation could be a new approach in the use of urban space due to a change in ideology. The rise of the Christian idea of ad sanctos, in which burial close to a saint would enable him to intercede on the part of the deceased, would make urban burials especially attractive. Furthermore, the fact that there are burials within the town walls could, in itself, be taken as evidence that the town remained continuously inhabited.

‘Dark-earth’, or the discovery of organic material in the town centre is another traditional indicator of depopulation and urban decay. But again, a simpler explanation could be that this material was simply used as foundation for subsequent rebuilding.

Another factor to consider is the difficulty in putting archaeological evidence into context due to the topography of the town. In the case of Siena archaeological excavation has largely only been conducted on burials in the outskirts of the town. The only excavation done in the centre is therefore unique, making dating and stratigraphic analysis extremely problematic. In the case of Pisa the problem arises due to the possibility that large sections of the medieval and present day town may have developed in a very different location to the Etruscan and Roman town. This makes urban change extremely difficult to measure. It is unsurprising that such large-scale dislocation presents numerous obstacles for archaeological investigation.

However, there are some grounds for optimism through the use of the latest modern archaeological methods. An excavation carried out by the archaeological department of the Commune of Trento has revealed impressive results. 108 These have included large and impressive houses, tableware made of pottery and glass, streets, public buildings, as well as a city wall with gates and towers, and an amphitheatre (Fig. 2.4). The southern part of the city wall is also in perfect alignment to the porta Veronensis, suggesting that Trento had preserved its Roman street grid. This impression is strengthened by the discovery of a Roman column in this part of the wall. The excavation also suggests considerable urban vitality in the second half of the 6th century. It has uncovered a church in the vicinity of S. Maria Maggiore. It has also revealed that the present day Duomo is constructed on the ruins of a basilica, constructed in the same period. What is even more remarkable was the discovery of houses, which not only were richly decorated with mosaics and frescoes, as well as supplied with hot water, but were also equipped as artisan workshops for the making of glass (Fig. 2.5). The area in which the houses were located was active from the 1st-6th century AD. However, what should be noted is that our knowledge of the city in this period before this excavation had been almost non-existent. The archaeological remains had been completely buried under the buildings constructed in the medieval and modern period and only came to light due to modern archaeological techniques.

Fig. 2.4 – Trento: Archaeological plan of the town
Fig. 2.5 – Trento: Archaeological plan of a street and houses
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Literary evidence

The literary material is also disappointing, though of course for different reasons. There is very little narrative evidence which can be used to trace the development of the north Italian city from Late Antiquity until the end of the Lombard period. As historians such as Ward-Perkins point out, "between the 550’s AD when Procopius’s histories cease…and the 11th century there is barely enough history-writing to fill a single volume". The Monumenta Germaniae Historica, the standard collection of historical sources, has texts for Merovingian Gaul filling up to eight volumes. The one volume for Italy, the Scriptores Rerum Langobardiarum et Italicarum covers the period from the 6th –10th centuries AD, and to the authors contained in it (Paul the Deacon, Agnellus, Andreas of Bergamo, Erchempert, John of Naples, and some shorter works) one could add little more than the papal biographies in the Liber Pontificalis, the Chronicon Salernitanum, and Liutprand of Cremona’s Antapodosis. Furthermore, except for the Liber Pontificalis, which deals mostly with Rome, none of these works is particularly long. There is also little informed coverage from abroad on Italy, after Procopius, except for the Frankish annals of the 8th to 9th century AD. But such documentary sources as there are provide data which are primarily concerned with religious buildings and to a lesser extent with the royal and ducal places. This allows some picture of urban life and of the topography of houses, streets and palaces. However, the gaps in our evidence are still great and much of the information is debatable or lacking in detail. For example, our information on the economic life of a town depends largely on the rare cases of persons cited in the documents with the name of their trade, and in the case of buildings, frequently, we have only a brief and vague description of their size and the material used in their construction.

There are in any case serious gaps, even in our basic narrative chronology. For example, we lack any sources which record instances of Lombard aggression, spirited Byzantine resistance, capture and recapture of forts, loss of troops, etc., for the whole period between 568 and 643 AD. However, it is likely that such events occurred. We know that in the later part of the 590’s AD the magister militum Aldio was leading his troops south-east, possibly as far as Fiesole. It is unlikely that the Lombards were passive, and they could have pierced Byzantine defences on a number of occasions, even if they only encountered limited success. Events of this kind are obviously relevant for an urban history of Italy, but our ignorance is almost total.

As we shall see, in particular in the case of Lucca, there is also a body of documentary evidence, notably private charters. Historians such as Ward-Perkins have praised the richness of the charter evidence available especially for the 8th-10th century AD. Unfortunately the earliest charters to have survived only date to the end of the 7th century AD (to be precise, shortly before 688 AD). The quantity of evidence is particularly impressive,

however, concerning church building and decoration, putting Lucca in almost the same category as Rome, Ravenna and Pavia.\textsuperscript{113} This is in contrast to towns such as Milan where the evidence of buildings from Late Antiquity, such as the circus and town walls, although more impressive, is not supported by a large quantity of epigraphic and documentary evidence. It is true that with regard to Lucca and Pavia the evidence is from a later date than that for Rome and Ravenna but the quantity is just as considerable. The private charters list numerous churches, \textit{xenodochia} and monasteries. This evidence has enabled historians such as Ward-Perkins to conclude that “in the eighth century at least, the building activity and charitable endowments was just as frenetic as in the three capitals”\textsuperscript{114}

A good example would be the bishop James who was an especially active patron from 774-825 AD.\textsuperscript{115} His epitaph (818 AD) provides evidence of numerous religious foundations.\textsuperscript{116} The evidence can also be used in other ways. It has been argued that the charter evidence show that after the 820’s AD the decline in the power of the Carolingians is reflected in the lack of patronage given to the church. The charter evidence can also be used in conjunction with the archaeological evidence. I lean towards Christie’s view that the cathedral, the mint and the royal palace were all within the confines of the Roman walls and in close proximity to the old Roman forum.\textsuperscript{117} In contrast, the location of the ducal palace was outside, as well as a third of the churches mentioned. The charter evidence indicates a possible explanation. It has been suggested that there was a movement of settlement from the town to the suburbs.\textsuperscript{118} The charters reveal the presence of merchants, craftsman and goldsmiths in the suburbs, which indicates some prosperity. It has also been argued that the transformation of the amphitheatre into a circle of houses, facing the market area, may have been in this period (7th-8th century AD).\textsuperscript{119} The charter evidence is especially useful when it is supported by epigraphic evidence. Epigraphy is an extremely valuable source of information with regard to church-building. This is especially the case with regard to the 5th-6th century AD. This is due to the tradition of donating mosaic for the floor of a church. This donation is then recorded through the use of a mosaic inscription.\textsuperscript{120} These inscriptions have been discovered at Poreč, Trieste, Aquileia, Concordia, Ravenna, Vicenza, Verona, Brescia, as well as Florence (I will discuss this at greater length later\textsuperscript{121}).

\textbf{The definition of a town}

I should like now to return to this problem in the light of my discussions on the archaeological and literary evidence. The problem exists, as we have seen, largely because of the extreme subjectivity involved. As Ward-Perkins points out, ‘within these remains scholars can see and emphasize slightly different things: comfortably spaced houses, or “scattered huts”; a large cathedral, or ruinous \textit{thermae}, a surviving street-pattern, or the abandoned
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Roman paving beneath; the continued use of a Roman wall-circuit, or the failure to build a new one; constructive and pragmatic reuse, or the desperate grubbing out and adaptation of earlier structures.\textsuperscript{122} They will all examine the evidence in a different way, a process characteristic of the work of a historian but fraught with danger where the evidence has the characteristics described above.

One of the most serious consequences of the lack of narrative evidence for this period is the divide between historians and archaeologists on the ‘urban’ status of settlements. Historians tend to approach the post-Roman towns of northern Italy through contemporary texts, and discover numerous, generic, references to ‘civitates’, and to a ‘civitas’-based ecclesiastical and secular administration.\textsuperscript{123} The trend therefore is to assume that, if what is excavated does not look very ‘urban’, then it is our expectation of a town that has to change: as Ward-Perkins summarises, ‘who are we to gainsay the opinion of contemporaries?’\textsuperscript{124}

Both Ward-Perkins and Wickham have argued that despite their smaller size and dilapidated condition the towns still carried out activities which meant that they were to all intents and purposes ‘urban’.\textsuperscript{125} They retained their role as centres of administration. Gothic and Lombard kings and dukes (duces) continued to live in them. Taxes were still collected on a city basis. Military conflicts still involved the capture of strategic cities. Furthermore the cities had a new function due to the rising importance of the bishops who resided in them. The increasing role which the church was to play meant patronage for builders, craftsmen and carpenters. This resulted in wealth which can be seen in the construction of charitable institutions (xenodochia) and monasteries. It also went hand in hand with the destruction and decay of certain temples and the abandonment of monumental structures such as amphitheatres and theatres.

However, there are several difficulties with this position. The contemporary references to settlements, that refer to them as ‘towns’, can be deceiving. The Roman and early medieval definition of towns seems to have been almost exclusively in administrative terms, whether a settlement was or was not a ‘civitas’ (in the Latin West) or a ‘polis’ (in the Greek East) was determined not by its size, but whether it was the seat of a bishopric and/or a centre of secular administration. An example of this is Luni which was still the main seat of ecclesiastical and secular power of the Lunigiana in the 10\textsuperscript{th} century, despite a much reduced demographic and economic level which had already overtaken by the nearby town of Sarzana: its cathedral was transferred as late as 1204.\textsuperscript{126} In 5\textsuperscript{th} and 6\textsuperscript{th} century AD Gaul, the populous settlement of Dijon was a ‘castrum’, because it was not a formal centre of the secular or ecclesiastical administration, while the smaller bishop’s seat of Senez was a ‘civitas’.\textsuperscript{127}

\textsuperscript{123} J. Jamut & Gasparri, Societa e Storia XLVI (1989), D. Harrison, The Early State and the Towns. Forms of Integration in Lombard Italy, AD 68-74 (Lund, 1993), Ch. 5-6.
\textsuperscript{126} J.B. Ward Perkins, Roman Imperial Architecture (Harmondsworth, 1981), pp. 91-98.
\textsuperscript{127} Gregory of Tours, Histories, W. Arndt & B. Krusch (eds.), Gregorii Turonensis Opera (Monumenta
It is also important to stress that the nature and size of the capitals of the *civitates* were very different from one another. Those in the east such as Athens and Antioch were of considerable size and antiquity with a substantial population. Others were settlements with an exceptionally poor agricultural hinterland, for example, in Apennine Italy. Therefore it is difficult to know from the texts whether a ‘town’ was a flourishing economic and demographic centre or only a ‘village’ with a ducal palace or a cathedral. Furthermore, the written sources on which we depend, on such as charters dealing with ecclesiastical and aristocratic land-holding, as well as chronicles concerning affairs of church and state, tend to be illuminating only on the aristocratic aspects and administrative functions of the town. Literary references to public amenities, regardless of whether they were still functioning or abandoned, are extremely rare, and only in a very few cases has archaeology been meticulous and detailed enough to give us precise dates of abandonment or adaptation for new functions. Archaeologists tend to be more trusting of materials or objects as evidence. The words and sentiments of ancient and medieval sources are seen as ideological constructs designed to deceive as much as inform, much less reliable than hard evidence from the soil. To an extent there is also a divide on the basis of nationality. Italian historians such as Carandini tend to measure post-Roman towns against a Roman benchmark and it is not surprising that they fare poorly in comparison. This is in direct contrast to British historians.

Thus, it is possible that in Britain only Canterbury or London had any continuous history as an important settlement, and even these cases need to be considered with caution. As a result, British historians are familiar with an image of a range of towns: as they re-emerge in the 8th-9th centuries AD, constructed mainly in wood, their appearance tends to be squalid in appearance and chaotic in arrangement. The viewpoint of Italian historians such as Carandini is very different, who has identified several symptoms in the decline of Italian towns in the post-Roman period, an uncontrolled and rapid build-up of the habitation levels, a lack of public buildings and sophisticated services, houses of wooden construction and poor rubbish disposal, as well as the presence of cultivated areas and scattered burials within the urban area. These are not elements typical of a Roman town. However, with the possible exception of the scattered burials, all might feature in a description of an 8th-9th century Saxon town in Britain.

The reconstruction drawings of small wooden houses built over an abandoned Roman *domus*, such as at Brescia (Fig. 2.6), will stress the differences in building style and sophistication between the houses of these two eras, but British historians will also see in the early medieval houses images similar to those offered by northern towns such as Hamwic (Saxon Southampton 8th-9th century AD- Fig. 2.7). Furthermore, 6th-7th century AD Brescia possessed a functioning Roman city-wall, a large late Roman cathedral, a ducal palace and possibly a significant number of late Roman and early medieval churches. Therefore, it is
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likely that British historians will conclude that early medieval Brescia was a town. The problem essentially is that of definition. Towns are defined in terms of size, official status, function (a distinctive non-rural administrative or economic role?), buildings and plan (market squares, distinctive ‘urban’ house-types, or defensive walls?), and in terms of history (are they traditionally ‘towns’?). The criteria are vague and sometimes, in the case of small towns, they can contradict each other.

For the purposes of this thesis a ‘town’ is to be defined in terms of population, size and function. Only if a substantial number of people live in a settlement can we be satisfied that it is a true ‘town’. It is accepted that this criterion has uncertain parameters. It is difficult to be precise as to the exact point where such a settlement becomes too small and slides into the category of ‘large village’. Similarly, at the top of the scale, there is an equally uncertain boundary between ‘towns’ and settlements termed ‘cities’. Because population numbers and settlement patterns are always changing, it follows that a settlement of given size might look like a village in one region or one period and a town in another. If the total population of Italy fell (as it may have done in the 6th-7th centuries AD), even a decrepit Roman town could still look large and ‘town-like’ in the contemporary rural landscape.

A variety of functions is probably the most important factor to consider. Settlements should be considered towns if they carried out activities which meant that they were to all intents and purposes ‘urban’. This would obviously be a subjective judgement and open to debate but it would include a role as a centre of administration usually meaning that Gothic and Lombard kings and dukes (duces) resided in them. It would also mean that they still collected taxes. Function would exclude from our usage some large settlements that are too focused in their primary purpose to be true ‘towns’. This would include Roman fortresses such as Kaiseraugst or medieval monasteries like San Vincenzo al Volturno which could house large numbers of people, and could function within their local agricultural communities in ways that are comparable to ‘towns’, for example, serving as administrative centres and as the focus of local loyalties, and acting as centres for specialised economic activity. However, unless their primary specialised function (as military or monastic centres) became subsumed into this broader and vaguer range of functions, the preferred definitions would be ‘fortress’ or ‘monastery’. As far as the towns chosen for this thesis are concerned, however, the detailed discussions below argues that they remained without exceptions towns in the period concerned, on any definition of the term.
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Fig. 2.6 - Archaeological plan of an early medieval house built upon on the ruins of a Roman domus
Chapter 3: The historical background

The end of Roman Italy

The impression given by the restoration of Roman imperial rule by Valentinian III (419-455 AD) in 425 AD was the return of Italy as the centre of government after two years of disorder. But as historians such as Humphries have argued “the system was in reality falling apart, with the relationship between Italy and the rest of western Europe becoming strained”.130 In Britain, the local nobility were using Angle and Saxon mercenaries for their defence instead of the Roman legions. The north-west part of Gaul remained politically divided. The south-west was settled by the Visigoths around 416-418 AD. The eastern part of Gaul was constantly threatened by the power and ambition of the Alemanni, and the Burgundians, as well as the Franks.131 These groups were particularly dangerous when they supported usurpers against the emperor. A good example would be their support of Jovinus (411-413 AD) against Honorius (393-395 AD).132 It was a similar situation with regard to Iberia. It had been divided between the Alans, the Suevi and the Vandals who had crossed into the peninsula in 409 AD. The Vandals were successful in conquering Seville, and Carthaginensis, and made an incursion into Mauretania. It has been argued that the Vandal invasion of Africa was the ‘crucial catalyst’ which resulted in Italy becoming economically and militarily isolated from the rest of the empire.133 The effects were two-fold: the increasing dependence of Rome on the resources available to it from Italy; and the possibility of a barbarian attack against Italy from the south as well as the north.

The situation was made more dangerous by the arrival of the Huns. As historians such as Heather have pointed out, their sheer numbers meant that conciliation was the only course of action available.134 But what was worse was the creation of forces that had not existed before. This included tribes from outside the empire such as the Burgundians, Franks and Alemanni, as well as those who had migrated within it, for example the Vandals, Alans and Goths. Although there is still much disagreement as to the causes of these migrations, it has been argued that a major factor was the actions of the Huns.135 They had driven the Goths from the Danube in 376 AD and they had invaded Hungary by 425 AD. It was this pressure which may have pushed the Vandals, Alans, Suevi, Burgundians and Goths into the Roman empire during the 5th century AD.136

One of the consequences of these migrations was to complicate politics within the empire. Initially the barbarian tribes seem to have recognized the existence of the Roman empire. As historians have pointed out “they sought Roman commands and dignities, married

132 J.F. Matthews, Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court AD 364-425 (Oxford, 1975), Ch. 12.
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Fig. 2.7 – Hamwic (Saxon Southampton) 8\textsuperscript{th}-9\textsuperscript{th} century AD
into the imperial family (Galla Placidia’s first husband was Alaric’s successor, Athaulf (410-415 AD), or sponsored usurpations, rather than attempting to carve out their own entirely independent states.” However, with the passage of time, central imperial control began to unravel and increasingly the barbarians began to act in a manner unrestrained by any lingering respect for Rome. This was an extremely dangerous trend for the empire. For example, the Visigothic king Theoderic II’s (453-466 AD) Gothic troops on the orders of Avitus were sent to defeat the Suevi in Spain. What resulted was the pillage of the Roman citizens living there. As Heather points out "there is no indication that Roman administration and taxation were restored by their actions to any lost territories". In fact the Goths were to be rewarded for their support of Libius Severus (461-465 AD) in the 460’s AD. They received the town of Narbonne as well as its territory, depriving the empire of another valuable resource. The attacks were to be carried out with increasing frequency. The Goths of Aquitaine besieged Arles in 426 AD. Four years later another invasion erupted, led by a Gothic nobleman who was called Anaolsus. The Suevi attacked the Romans in Gallaecia during 430 and 431 AD. The Romans attacked the Franks in 428 as well as 432 AD. The Alemanni were to conduct raids against the Romans in 430 and 431 AD.

It is not surprising that these forces were eventually to create serious problems within the western Roman empire. Loss of land almost always translated into the loss of revenue for the imperial army. No less important was the blow to imperial prestige. It has been suggested that the local political elite supported the empire and gave its loyalty because of the protection and patronage which it offered. However, once this protection was removed, it is not surprising that their loyalties shifted to whichever barbarian overlord was in charge. We can see that this shift could occur at times with great speed. A good example was the support given to Athaulf by the Gallic landowners in the 410’s AD. Just as serious was the possibility that the local elites themselves would be tempted to go for autonomy. This would begin with responsibility for their own defence.

Humphries has also pointed to the increasing need for the emperors to placate the local Italian elites. This may have included the execution of Aetius (magister militum) in 454 AD for suggesting that the emperor should abandon Italy. Valentinian was murdered the year after by two of Aetius’ friends. He was succeeded by Petronius Maximus (c. 396-455 AD). However, his reign was not long and he was replaced by Avitus (455-456 AD), who was a Gallic nobleman. Avitus was defeated by two generals, Ricimer (c. 405-472 AD) and Majorian (457-461 AD), at Piacenza in 456 AD. Avitus was succeeded by Majorian. Majorian was captured by Gaiseric (428-477 AD) and executed by Ricimer in 461. Ricimer’s choice for emperor was Libius Severus, who was Lucanian. It has been suggested that this appointment is indicative of the political support which Ricimer needed from the local Italian
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elite. Severus died in 465 AD but he was not replaced and Ricimer ruled for two years without rival.

It was the intervention of the eastern Roman emperor, Leo I (457-474 AD) which was to lead to the appointment of a new Augustus, namely Anthemius in 472 AD. However, Anthemius (467-472 AD) was deposed and he was succeeded by Olybrius (March(?) /July(?)-November 472 AD). This is further evidence that Ricimer was trying to gain support from the Italians.\textsuperscript{145} It is also possible that Ricimer was formulating his own foreign policy with regard to the Vandals because of this factor.\textsuperscript{146} Ultimately this did not lead to a solution to the Vandal problem but only served to increase the rift between the eastern emperors and Italy and vice versa. Olybrius did not have the approval of Leo I. Leo’s preferred candidate was Julius Nepos. Julius Nepos (June 474-August 475 AD/ 475-480 AD) was the nephew of Marcellinus, commander of the Roman armies in Dalmatia. However, Julius Nepos was deposed by Orestes (his \textit{magister militum}), who elevated his own son, Romulus (475-476 AD), to the throne. After Orestes’ murder, and the retirement of Romulus in 476 AD, Odoacer (476-493 AD) became king. This not only meant de facto independence from Constantinople, but also the end of any hopes of restoring the empire peacefully.\textsuperscript{147}

The sixth century AD, however, was no more peaceful than the third or the fifth. Humphries has argued “that after 535, war became a basic fact of life for many communities”\textsuperscript{148} He has pointed to the narrative evidence of Procopius, Paul the Deacon and Gregory the Great (590-604 AD), which contain numerous references to the construction of fortifications, and sieges. It is true that a certain amount of caution needs to be exercised. For example, Procopius lists various fortifications constructed and renovated by Justinian (527-565 AD). But archaeological evidence reveals that his claims are frequently exaggerated.\textsuperscript{149} The same applies to the claims made by Cassiodorus with regard to Theoderic (493-526 AD).\textsuperscript{150} However, archaeology has confirmed that the fortifications of Verona were strengthened considerably during his reign.\textsuperscript{151} It is therefore also possible that renovations carried out by Justinian and Theoderic may be undetected. On a far larger scale were the defences created to protect the capital cities of Rome, Milan and Ravenna. Christie has argued that the fortifications revealed a strategy; “an initial panic response (Rome), followed by reasoned planning with a shift in the capital to allow for closer imperial oversight (Milan), to a regression in strategy”.\textsuperscript{152}
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Not surprisingly, it has been argued that “between the mid fifth and the early seventh century, the cities of Italy underwent a profound transformation”.\textsuperscript{153} I will not at this stage analyse this ‘transformation’ in comprehensive detail, but will provide a rough sketch of the general view, and illustrate the variability and range of evidence available. It seems to be the case that some cities experienced severe depopulation. Large towns such as Canosa gradually lost their status and began to rely on other communities for the administration of the region.\textsuperscript{154} In the case of Aquileia, its harbour gradually fell into disuse due to the silting of the river Natiso, in the course of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century AD.\textsuperscript{155} Luni, which was located on the coast in Liguria, may have begun its decline, for similar reasons, even earlier.\textsuperscript{156} In the Biferno valley, located in Samnium, there was a process that began with decline, and finished with abandonment.\textsuperscript{157} Many abandoned settlements were located in Liguria, western Aemilia, Venetia, as well as Picenum.\textsuperscript{158} The survival rate was also poor with regard to south Italy. Wickham has pointed out that less than fifty percent of the cities survived the 5th-6th centuries. \textsuperscript{159} This trend is also reflected in rural settlements. The end of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century AD saw the abandonment of numerous villas.\textsuperscript{160}

In contrast, survival rates were good with regard to settlements in parts of north Italy and Tuscany. Of one hundred Roman municipia, it is estimated that three-quarters were still present in 1000 (Fig. 2.8).\textsuperscript{161} In many cases there was also a continuation of urban functions, but in a completely changed topography. As Liebeschuetz has pointed out: “Abandonment or downgrading of buildings may not reflect deurbanization, but only a transformation of the character of urban life, as for instance the change from government by the curia to government by notables, or the rise of the bishop”.\textsuperscript{162} In some cases, of course, public buildings were neglected, and their stone and mosaics plundered. For example, archaeological study of Brescia has revealed the destruction of the forum and surrounding areas during the 5\textsuperscript{th} century AD.\textsuperscript{163} The public buildings were also sometimes converted into churches or shops. The very concept of public space was being transformed.\textsuperscript{164} It became increasingly common to find houses occupying the forum or shops built among the pillars of a public building. The very centre of Milan was occupied by wooden houses during the 6\textsuperscript{th}-7\textsuperscript{th} centuries AD.\textsuperscript{165} To summarise: “the typical picture of the Late Roman town in Italy is one of
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Fig. 2.8 – Map of Roman towns and new towns in northern Italy (c. 300-800 AD)
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a fortified enclosure, with a system of roads on to which shops open; Houses are grouped in clusters surrounded by a lot of open space; civic buildings there are few or none; in the course of time some are adapted to new uses’.  

One element of continuity was the church. It is important to stress that church building continued throughout the 4th-6th centuries AD. It is also vital to point to the impact of Christianity on secular patronage. The rise of powerful bishops, such as Ambrose of Milan, meant that wealth was increasingly directed towards the endowment of religious buildings. There would have been an added motivation for the secular elite to endow religious buildings for the benefit of their soul. Although the change was not from secular patronage to religious patronage, church building revived the tradition of public building which had weakened in the 4th century AD. The crisis of the 3rd century AD perhaps meant that resources meant for public buildings were increasingly diverted towards security. For example, though this may not yet have been typical, materials for the construction of a theatre at Sirmium were instead used to strengthen fortifications (374 AD). Italy’s division into provinces under the control of an imperial governor further undermined civic pride and private patronage. As Ward-Perkins summarises: “The creation of the imperial civic magistracies, which carried no duties to spend, combined with the power of the provincial governors and the realization that local office was not worth the sacrifices it involved, caused a dramatic decline in the popularity and status of the older “spending” magistracies”. The result was that only three groups could carry out public building: the imperial governors, imperial government and the senators. Patronage by the rulers was given for the construction of buildings in the main capital cities such as Rome, Ravenna and Pavia. The role of religious buildings became increasingly important to the topography of the city, but there were also buildings constructed for public entertainment, as well as basic infrastructure including warehouses. Palaces were built in Verona, Pavia, Milan and Monza. 

It is also extremely important to stress that conditions varied considerably from region to region. The fear of an invasion by the Vandals was to lead to the fortification of towns like Terracina and Naples. Some towns, especially in Venetia, abandoned their sites and migrated to islands in the lagoons. The other response was to seek high ground and construct fortresses (incastellamento). Examples include Castelseprio as well as Invillino in Friuli. In the areas controlled by the Byzantines we see the development of military camps or castra,
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which at times held a large civilian population.\textsuperscript{176} In contrast, entire areas of Sicily appear to have remained relatively intact throughout Late Antiquity and up to the early medieval period.\textsuperscript{177}

This is also true of some rural areas. We have narrative evidence that southern Italy prospered during this period.\textsuperscript{178} We also possess archaeological evidence from sites such as S. Giovanni di Ruoti. This includes the discovery of pig bones as well as the discovery of amphorae which attests to the local wine industry.\textsuperscript{179} This picture of local prosperity would also apply to another part of Italy, namely Histria.\textsuperscript{180} The eventual decline was to occur as the result of the Gothic-Byzantine war. The Byzantine invasion (535 AD) was to lead to the destruction of the lands of Lucania and Bruttium. The archaeological evidence in this area suggests that there was a significant decline in rural settlement dating from the mid 6th century.\textsuperscript{181}

It is difficult to estimate the impact of the changes which took place between the 5th-6th centuries AD. While it seems that Britain, Spain, and Gaul all experienced chaos during the 5th century AD, with a return to some stability in the 6th century AD, the situation was very different with regard to Italy.\textsuperscript{182} Historians have pointed out that the deposition of Romulus Augustulus (the last Roman emperor in the West) attracted little attention from contemporaries.\textsuperscript{183} It has been suggested that there was considerable continuity under the Ostrogoths but it was “Justinian’s reconquest [which] set in motion a sequence of events that caused the structures of the Roman state to collapse and the peninsula to disintegrate into separate regions”.\textsuperscript{184} The conflict became especially severe in the later 6th century AD between the Lombards and the Byzantines. The 7th century AD reality was that Italy’s importance was declining due to the increase in power of Constantinople in comparison with Ravenna. This did not prevent of course Byzantine attempts to reconquer Italy; but these ended with the death of Constans in 668 AD. This was followed by the loss of Byzantine held areas to the Lombards during the course of the 7th century AD. This included the duchy of Calabria which was captured by Romuald of Benevento (671-687 AD) and the duchy of


\textsuperscript{178} Cassiodorus: T. Mommsen (ed.), \textit{Variae, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi} XI (Hannover, 1894), VIII, 33.3.


\textsuperscript{180} Cassiodorus: T. Mommsen (ed.), \textit{Variae, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi} XI (Hannover, 1894), XII, 22.3; XII, 26.2-3.


Genoa and Venetia, taken by king Rothar (636-652 AD). Despite some Byzantine influence remaining, the bulk of Italy remained outside the empire, and it is to a brief narrative of this period that I now turn.

The Ostrogoths

What I intend to do here is to provide a brief narrative of the various barbarian invasions that took place in Italy during this period. This will be merely a simple sketch of the historical events and I will follow this with a short assessment of the impact of the invasions on Italy, before reaching the main body of my thesis. The background for the Ostrogothic invasion of Italy is presented in our sources as a conflict between an ‘ancient’ and ‘legitimate’ Amal dynasty and ‘upstarts’ such as Theoderic Strabo (died 471 AD) and his son Recitach. It was the murder of Theoderic Strabo (arranged by Theoderic the Amal at the behest of the emperor Zeno (c. 425-491 AD), and his son’s failure in holding the loyalty of their supporters, that supposedly united the various barbarian groups under one leader. The failure to obtain imperial patronage then led Theoderic to invade Italy in an attempt to dispossess Odoacer (435-493 AD). An estimate given for the numbers involved suggests a figure of around 25,000 (including dependants). If this estimate is accurate then the likelihood would be that such a large population would require land to settle as opposed to simply tax allocations, a problem to which I shall return. This view is supported by literary, archaeological as well as toponomastic evidence, which indicate the presence of Goths throughout Italy but especially around Ravenna, the upper Po valley and Picenum. The invasion ended with the murder of Odoacer and his family in 493 AD. Initially there are signs that Theoderic’s victory was marked by a great deal of continuity. On the whole individuals as well as families seem to have carried on in the offices which they had held under Odoacer. Theoderic could assume a ‘Roman’ identity. He frequently called himself ‘rex’ (like Odoacer) although we do have an inscription which called him ‘king Theoderic, forever Augustus’ (‘rex Theodericus semper Augustus’). It is also likely that Theoderic actively encouraged such imagery at his court by drawing on imperial ceremonial. Furthermore, after three embassies to Constantinople, the emperor Anastasius I recognised Theoderic as ruler of Italy in 497 AD.

However, Theoderic faced grave problems concerning the succession due to his lack of a son. His solution was the marriage of his daughter Amalasuntha to Eucharis (who belonged to the Amal dynasty living in Spain). However, the death of Eucharis and the fact that Theoderic’s grandson was only ten led to severe divisions among the Ostrogoths. Amalasuntha proceeded to murder her opponents, but the death of her son meant that she had no choice but to surrender the crown to a nephew of Theoderic, Theodahad, in 534 AD. This was eventually to lead to her murder. The murder was then used as an excuse for the intervention of the Byzantine army firstly from Africa to Sicily and then to Italy itself.
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The Byzantines

To a large extent it can be argued that the main focus of the emperor Justinian (483-565 AD) was the eastern frontier against the Sassanid Persians and the northern frontier against the Avars. But the emperor certainly profited from the instability and weakness of the Vandals and the Goths. However, the numbers involved were not large. In total the numbers estimated for the African campaign is around 15,000, and probably not more than 30,000 for the entire Italian campaign. Initially, the Byzantines were successful. The expedition was commanded by the general Belisarius who may have gained this position because of his role in crushing the Nika riots (532 AD). The Vandals were defeated in Africa between 533-534 AD. They suffered particularly heavy losses at the battle of Ad Decimum (533 AD), not far from Carthage. Belisarius proceeded to capture Sicily, Naples, and then Rome in 536 AD. The capture of Naples was to lead to the downfall of Theodahad and his murder by his successor, Vitigis (536-539 AD). Belisarius was successful in defending Rome against a Gothic siege and advanced to capture Milan. The Goths were driven from their capital Ravenna in 540 AD. The Gothic king Vitigis was taken into captivity. When Vitigis was surrounded at Ravenna he surrendered and was taken into captivity. His successor Ildibad was murdered and was eventually replaced by Totila in 541 AD. Belisarius was sent to the eastern frontier against the Sassanids but returned in 544 AD. Belisarius proceeded to recapture Rome, which had been lost in his absence, but his command was eventually given to the eunuch general Narses in 548 AD. Narses defeated Baduila at the battle of Busta Gallorum (552 AD). Baduila was to die from his injuries. In 553 AD Narses achieved another victory against the Goths at the battle of Mons Lactarius. Totila’s successor Teias (July 552-October 552 AD) was killed in this battle. No Ostrogothic kings were appointed after this debacle.

In assessing the success of the Byzantines it is important to note that Ravenna remained in their hands for almost 200 years after the Lombard king Alboin’s (562-572 AD) invasion in 568 AD. It was only conquered in 751 AD. Byzantine territory was particularly large around the late 6th century AD. It included Apulia and Calabria, the coastline from Istria and the Venetian lagoon, as well as the western coast up to Liguria. Up to the beginning of the 8th century AD, political control was maintained through the use of an exarch and a system of officials. But it is important to stress that there was no ‘Byzantine’ identity. The Byzantines called themselves ‘Romans’ (Rhomaioi). As Byzantine power waned, so the power of the cities increased. The most important was Rome. Ultimately, the inability of the Byzantines to impose themselves more strongly in Italy was to lead to another barbarian invasion.
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The Lombards

The Lombards had migrated to the north of the Danube after the elimination of the Rugi by the Ostrogoths in 488 AD. Justinian encouraged their emigration into western Pannonia, his motive being concern over the Franks. The Lombards were partners with the Gepids who were based around Sirmium. However, because Justin II (520-578 AD) did not follow the Justinian practice of favouring the Lombards over the Gepids, this led to an alliance between the Lombards and the Avars. The defeat of the Gepids by the Avars in 567 AD was followed by the decision of the Lombards to move to Italy. Initially they were successful and by the end of 569 AD had conquered most of the Po valley. The only resistance was around Ravenna, Genoa and the coast of Venetia (Map 2). However, unlike the Ostrogoths, they were unable to conquer all of Italy and failed to capture either Rome or Ravenna. The Lombards also lacked political cohesion. Nor did king Alboin enjoy unchallenged leadership.

Things went from bad to worse with the murder of king Alboin in 572 AD and then of his successor Cleph (572-574 AD). The result was that there was no king for ten years. This led to the emergence of the dukes. In fact as early as 570 AD a Lombard such as Zotto had already proclaimed himself as the duke of Benevento, and it is not entirely clear whether he had support from Alboin. A Lombard duchy also developed at Spoleto. The vacuum created by the lack of a central authority meant that, although the dukes were in theory royal appointees as regional military commanders, in practice they were effectively independent rulers. It is likely that it was only the threat from the Franks in the 580’s AD that led to the appointment of Authari as king (584-590 AD). It has been argued that it was the territorially smaller and more numerous northern duchies that cooperated with the monarchy as opposed to the two large southern and central duchies of Benevento and Spoleto. The latter were also geographically a lot further from the Lombard capital of Pavia. It is likely that it was not until the reign of Agilulf (590-616 AD) that the south truly came at any rate in part under royal authority. Agilulf managed to restore complete unity to the Lombard possessions with respect to the Po valley, but Benevento and Spoleto remained largely independent with Tuscany under the control of semi-independent dukes. The exarch of Ravenna, Smaragdus, made peace with Agilulf and concluded further treaties to recognise his kingdom. The emperor Phocas (602-610 AD) ratified these agreements (605 AD) ending Byzantine attempts to reconquer Italy until Constans II (641-668 AD) in 662 AD. The death of Constans in 668 and another peace treaty in c. 680 AD finally brought the Byzantines’ imperial ambitions to an end.

I come to this series of events in greater detail below.
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The Franks

The role of the Franks was crucial in eroding and finally destroying the power of the Lombards in 774 AD. Historians have also stressed that the Franks were in another respect also distinctive in comparison with the Goths and the Vandals. The Goths and the Vandals were perceived by the Romans to have favoured the use of cavalry in battle. They would have been viewed as similar to the nomads of the eastern steppes. Because they were thought to have come from beyond the Danube, they were not called or perceived as Germans. The Franks were considered to be German because their origins were from beyond the Rhine. They were considered different because they fought as infantry. The Franks were thought to have emerged during the course of the 3rd century AD. This was at a time when tribes such as the Cherusci, which had previously been known to the Romans seem to have either been subsumed or disappeared. During the period of Gothic expansion and migration through the Roman Empire during the 5th century AD, the Franks were still largely disunited and governed by various leaders. The emergence of Clovis as king of the Franks around 500 AD was to result in victory over the Alemanni as well as the establishment of the Merovingian dynasty through the elimination of his rivals.

One of the earliest incidents that we hear of concerning the Franks in Italy was in connection with the invasion of Venetia under Theudebert (533-548 AD) in 539 AD. This was to lead to the sack of Pavia and the defeat of a Gothic and then Roman army. However, they were to succumb to dysentery and eventually left Italy. Despite this initial setback, they were to make steady progress. In 545 AD the Franks apparently had control of ‘the largest part of Venetia’. During the following year Theudebert had acquired ‘some parts of Liguria and the Cottian Alps and most of Venetia’. Theudebert died in 548 AD and he was succeeded by Theudebald (548-555 AD). An attempt by Justinian to gain an alliance with the Franks failed because Theudebald considered the territory he had seized as being in the possession of the Goths and not the Byzantines. Subsequently, at the siege of Verona (552 AD), a Byzantine general who had Frankish troops was prevented from capturing it for the emperor on the basis that, since the fortresses in northern Italy were already in Frankish hands, the territory also belonged to them. The Franks also participated in a campaign led by the Byzantine general Baduarius (576 AD). They had occupied the fortress of Anagnis (Nanno) and had been defeated by the Lombard count Ragilo and later by Duke Ewin of Trento. Historians such as Christie have suggested that this incident was recorded by Gregory of Tours. Christie has also argued that the invasion by Childebert in 584 AD was because of the failure of the earlier one. It has been suggested that this invasion was supported by the emperor Maurice (582-602 AD). However, the invasion failed due to stiff resistance.
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from the Lombards. Another invasion in 590 AD met with more success as the Franks eroded the Byzantines, to seize Mantua and Altino as well as Modena. The Byzantines were supported by twenty dukes who were sent by Childebert II (575-595 AD).

There is an interesting possibility that the Franks “subjected to King Childebert’s authority those parts which his father (Sigibert) had held before him”. It has been argued that Sigibert may have inherited the kingdom of Theudebert (his cousin) in addition to conquests made by Theudebert in Italy in the period 540-550 AD. It has also been suggested that the Lombards became vassals to the Franks. During the war against the Slavs in the course of the 620’s AD a Lombard army assisted the Franks, as well as an army of Alemanni. The Byzantines also benefited from the defection of the Lombard dukes of Piacenza, Reggio and Parma as well as the rebellion of Gauidulf of Bergamo and Mimulf of S. Giulio d’Orta. The Lombard duke of Friuli was replaced by Gisulf who supported the Byzantines. However, the Lombards under Duke Ewin of Trento were protected by the fortress of Verruca and resolved to bribery to deal with the Franks. This proved to be an effective tactic and was used on several occasions.

The Lombards did have several strategic advantages. The Lombard duchy of Spoleto meant that the Via Flaminia was in their hands. Tuscany was eventually controlled by the Lombard dukes of Lucca and Chiusi. As Christie points out, this meant the isolation of regions such as Liguria and towns like Pisa from Rome. The Lombards were eventually able to recapture the towns of Mantua, Brescia, Cremona, Monselice and Padua during 601-602 AD. This was followed by the capture of Genoa, Albenga, Varigotti, Savona, Oderzo and Luni under king Rothari (636-652 AD). The capture of Oderzo had a great significance from a strategic point of view. The Byzantines could no longer threaten Lombard communications in the north-east. The Lombard offensive culminated with an attack on the Byzantines at the river Scultenna, which led to the death of the exarch Isaac. It has been suggested that the reason why the Lombards did not follow up this victory was because they had also suffered heavy casualties. A further factor to consider was the increasing difficulty which the Byzantines were facing in providing support to Italy because of the invasions of the Avars, Bulgars, Persians and Arabs. Byzantine Palestine faced Arab attacks in 663-664 AD, Damascus was seized in 635 AD and the Byzantines were also defeated decisively at the river Yarmuk (636 AD). This was followed by the capture of Jerusalem in 638 AD and at the death of the emperor Heraclius (c. 601-641 AD), the empire was in some danger of collapse.

The return of the Byzantines to Italy was in 662 AD during the reign of Constans II.
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(641-668 AD). It has been argued that the Frankish invasion of northern Italy may have been organised by Constans II in order to create a diversion.\textsuperscript{221} The attack was defeated by the Lombard king Grimoald (662-671 AD) somewhere near Asti. Grimoald was also successful in preventing Constans II from mounting further attacks against the duchy of Benevento. Grimoald had gained power through his defeat of the sons of the late king, Aripert. However, he also faced a revolt. This was led by Duke Lupus of Cividale. The Lombards continued their offensive with the seizure of the Byzantine town of Forlimpopoli.\textsuperscript{222} Grimoald died in 671 AD and was succeeded by Percarit in 672 AD. Percarit reigned for sixteen years and was assisted by his son Cuncipert (688-700 AD). Although we have few details a peace treaty was concluded between the Lombards and the Byzantines in 680 AD.

Percarit was succeeded by Cuncipert. However, Cuncipert did not face an easy beginning to his reign. Faced with a revolt which had the potential to become serious, Cuncipert took offensive action against Vicenza and Treviso and defeated duke Alahis of Brescia in a campaign which lasted from 689-690 AD. The Lombards were also successful in capturing Taranto and Brindisi from the Byzantines as well as the fortresses of Arce, Sora and Arpino. Strategically this was to create a barrier between Naples and Rome. Cuncipert was succeeded by Liutprand in 712 AD. The 720’s were marked by further Lombard offensives against the Byzantines. Attacks were carried out against Ravenna and Classe; Osimo and Bologna were captured as well as Sutri (although in this case the conquest was only temporary). However, Liutprand (712-744 AD) was faced with problems of his own. His removal of Thransamund from control over the duchy of Spoleto was to lead to a rebellion with help from Rome. Liutprand defeated and exiled Thransamund to a monastery. But the Romans had decided that since their attempts at gaining support from Spoleto had failed, the time was right to seek an alliance with the Franks. Recognition from the papacy for the Carolingians as kings of the Franks was given in 752 AD.

Liutprand died in 744 AD and he was succeeded by Ratchis (744-749 AD). The emphasis of his legislation in 746 AD was in increasing the power of the crown against that of the various gastalds and dukes.\textsuperscript{223} Ratchis retired to the monastery of Monte Cassino in 749 AD. He was succeeded by Aistulf (749-756 AD). His legislation seems to have emphasized the military obligations of the Lombards. It has been argued that like Ratchis before him, the reason for this was the possibility of an invasion by the Franks. Ratchis also began several attacks. Ravenna was captured and also a line of fortresses leading up to Rome. This was to lead to a Frankish invasion under their king Pepin III (751-768 AD) in 754 AD. Aistulf was defeated and had to give up the newly captured towns and territories to Rome.\textsuperscript{224} When Aistulf tried another attack on Rome in 756 AD, he was again defeated by the Franks. With his death in the same year, he was succeeded by Ratchis who was brought out of retirement. However, his reign was brief as he was deposed in 757 AD and replaced by Desiderius who was the duke of Tuscia. Desiderius (756-774 AD) was also successful in gaining support from Benevento and Spoleto. He was also allied to the Franks through the marriage of his daughter to Charlemagne (768-814 AD). But this alliance was ended with the rejection of his daughter
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in 771 AD. Desiderius’ response was to attack Rome the following year. Pope Hadrian I (772-795 AD) decided to call on aid from the Franks and this was to lead to the siege of Pavia and Verona during 773-774 AD. Desiderius was defeated and exiled in 774 AD.225

All of northern Italy now lay in Frankish hands but in the south the duchy of Benevento remained outside their control. The duke of Benevento, Arichis II, was the son in law of Desiderius. Hadrian appealed for Frankish action against the duchy and this was to lead to a Frankish attack in 787 AD. With the death of Arichis, he was succeeded by his son Grimoald with support from Charlemagne. In the beginning he seems to have been loyal, defeating the Byzantines in their efforts to make Adalchis the king. Eventually he took an increasingly independent line. This included attacks on Charlemagne’s sons. Grimoald did not possess an heir and on his death he was replaced by Grimoald IV in 806 AD. After Grimoald IV’s murder in 817 AD, he was replaced by Sico. Sico proceeded to attack Naples but the invasion was a failure. His death led to the succession of his son Sicard. The murder of Sicard in 839 AD was to lead to civil war.

The war eventually crystallized into a conflict between Siconulf (Sicard’s brother), in his capacity as prince of Salerno, against Radelchis of Benevento. Peace was eventually secured through the intervention of Louis II (850-875 AD), but the death of Siconulf as well as further Arab invasions were to ensure that the Franks had to make repeated incursions in the future. This was to culminate in the occupation of Benevento by Louis II from 866-871 AD. However, this was to end in the capture of the emperor and his expulsion. The emperor’s return in 872-873 AD was not successful due to an alliance between Naples, Spoleto, Benevento as well as Salerno. The next alliance which the Lombards made was with the Byzantines. The result was that by 900 AD, Apulia was in Byzantine hands, as well as the ports of Bari and Trani. In addition the Byzantines were now in control of Calabria as well as Lucania.226

Assessments of the impact which the Franks made have varied. It has been argued that on the whole the majority of the Lombards were allowed to keep their positions with the condition that they accept Frankish control. Furthermore there seems to have been little evidence for large scale migrations to Italy on the part of the Franks.227 With the death of Louis II (844-875 AD) the kingdom fell into disunity and was fought over by Frankish counts and kings. Magyar and Arab invasions added to the chaos. But Benevento was to remain autonomous until 1077 AD, when it was to fall to Norman adventurers. This conquest was preceded by the capture of Bari in April 1071 AD, by Robert Guiscard (invested by Pope Nicholas II (1059-1061 AD) with the title of duke of Apulia in 1059 AD), as well as much of southern Italy and Sicily. This capture meant the completion of Norman control over Byzantine territories in Italy. The end of this narrative marks the beginnings of the political situation which was to characterise Italy for much of the later medieval period. This was a

nebulous, fragmented, patchwork of different kingdoms and territories marked by a succession of foreign invaders who had captured Sicily and southern Italy including the Normans mentioned above, as well as the Angevins and Aragonese. The north was to see the rise of powerful, wealthy independent city states, such as Venice. Others such as Florence, Milan, Genoa and Siena were also destined for great prosperity, and northern Italy by the 15th century, was to become the most cultured and economically successful region in western Europe.

The barbarian settlements: the evidence

I would like at this stage to consider the barbarian settlements in more detail. I will begin with a discussion of the available evidence, and then proceed to characterise the various views of modern historians on the nature of the barbarian settlements. Our knowledge of the barbarian peoples is defective: we are hardly ever able to penetrate into the minds and attitudes of the peoples whom we are trying to understand. In the earlier centuries of the Roman Empire, they were illiterate or ‘preliterate’, and when they did learn to write (other than in runes) late in the 4th century AD they composed only a few books, and fewer still have survived into the modern world.228 We do possess some information from Greek and Roman historians. But caution has to be exercised in using these sources. The Romans were primarily interested in the relationship between Germanic tribes and the empire. There is very little information on Germanic society and almost no detail is given on tribes which lived beyond the frontier. Furthermore, Roman historians expected the barbarians to embody certain characteristics and behave in stereotyped ways. Much of their narrative is dedicated to proving this point. We do not possess any first hand account from inside the Germanic world to correct this impression.229

In the medieval period it is unlikely that someone would have taken the trouble to copy out and preserve a book written by a heretic in an incomprehensible language, the old, forgotten language of the Goths and the Vandals. We have to be content with the accidental survival of books written when the barbarian kingdoms still existed and they are extremely rare. We do not possess a single word written in their native tongue in this period, the 4th, 5th and 6th centuries AD, by a Vandal, Burgundian or Frank. For the Goths, apart from fragments of Bishop Ulfila’s translation of the bible, preserved because of their beauty - they are written in gold on purple-we have only sixteen pages of a commentary on St. John’s Gospel, together with a few other shreds and scraps of Gothic, which tend to be ecclesiastical in nature, almost all of them written in Italy in the first half of the 6th century AD. The commentary naturally does not tell us anything about settlement or society.

We do possess a short chronicle written in Latin soon after the year 590 AD by John of Biclarum. However, if St. Isidore of Seville had not mentioned that John was a Goth, we would not have doubted that he was as Roman as Isidore or his contemporaries, Gregory the Great and Gregory of Tours. John never mentioned his origins. He was highly educated in Latin and Greek, and it is not certain that he even knew Gothic. Even when we have the work of a Goth, the work tells us little or nothing about him as a Goth. To us he is a Goth only in
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name. We possess a history of the Goths (or what passes as history) compiled by a Goth called Jordanes in the middle of the 6th century AD. He was proud of being a Goth, and so he translated into Latin a few folk tales or songs, which the Goths of his day sang. But the various barbarian law-codes, which have survived, are written in Latin, and may for the most part have been composed by Romans.

This means that to a large extent our perspective of these ‘barbarians’ is from the outside, an interpretatio Romana.230 It is extremely difficult not to see them as the Romans saw them and the Romans had no desire to enter into their minds or to understand their outlook. For an educated Roman to learn a Germanic language was rare. A 6th century AD Italian, Cyprianus, brought up his sons to speak Gothic as well as Latin. However, a more likely attitude may be that which was demonstrated by Sidonius Apollinaris. When he heard that a certain Syrius had learned Burgundian, he said the barbarian will now be afraid to commit a barbarism in his own language.231

We do possess some archaeological investigation to supplement the literary evidence, for example Gothic material culture, which can be traced from around the 1st-2nd century AD, when the Goths occupied the lands around what is now Poland, to the time of their entry into the Roman Empire. However, the difficulty lies in differentiating the ethnic groups sharing essentially the same material culture, quite apart from the generally problematic matter of the relationship between material culture and ethnicity. This makes it extremely difficult to assess the scale of the barbarian invasions and settlements. For example, an estimate of the Tervingi and their successors in the Balkans, has suggested a figure of around 10,000 to 20,000 soldiers.232 Jerome puts the number of Burgundians at 80,000 during the reign of Valentinian I, before they were defeated by Aetius.233 Orosius gives the same figure as Jerome but states that these were soldiers.234

Our problem lies in the fact that there is no way to verify the accuracy of these figures. The fluidity in the composition of the barbarian tribes is also an important factor to consider. For example Procopius states that the number of Vandals who had crossed to Africa was 80,000.235 However, Procopius’ figure of 80,000 probably includes some Alans as well.236 It is also possible that it includes some Goths.237 The likelihood is that this type of confederation was relatively common. Our sources give the impression that they are recording the movements and fortunes of coherent units. The reality was that the composition of the tribes was probably constantly changing. For the argument of this thesis, however, it is necessary to enquire what, if any, the role of the barbarians may have been in the changing
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fortunes of the late Roman city or the case in which I am concerned. And for that some understanding of the nature of barbarian settlements in Italy is necessary. I shall try at any rate to establish some limits of plausibility.

The barbarian settlements: their scale and significance

Historians such as Pohl have argued that the role of the barbarians, in ensuring the end of Late Antiquity and the beginning of the early medieval period, may have been exaggerated.\textsuperscript{238} He has pointed out that other factors such as “the division of labour, long distance trade, the distribution of agrarian supplies, urban administration, education and mentalities may have contributed more to the changes in question than was at stake on the famous battlefields at Adrianople, the Catalaunian Fields, Vouille or the Busta Gallorum”.\textsuperscript{239} However, other historians, while examining factors such as “biological decay, social tensions, economic decline, change of mentality or moral decadence” have stressed the role of the barbarians by pointing out that all those weaknesses had always been present in Roman society.\textsuperscript{240} This view is supported by A.H.M. Jones who argued that “the internal weaknesses of the Empire cannot have been a major factor in its decline”.\textsuperscript{241}

As we have already seen, the Germanic peoples had been in motion since the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC. Periodic mass migrations had pressed the northern tribes down upon earlier emigrants to the south, with increasingly disruptive effect on the Roman frontier, which impeded the migrants’ progress for several centuries and was massively breached around 400 AD. The Germanic ‘masses’ surged forward and halted in imperial territory.\textsuperscript{242} However, this final step may have been remarkably modest, with those involved a mere handful of peoples numbering at the most in the low tens of thousands; and many of them were perhaps accommodated within the Roman provinces without dispossessing or overturning indigenous society. It is likely that the barbarians who dealt with the Roman Empire in the 4\textsuperscript{th}-6\textsuperscript{th} centuries AD, and the earliest successor kingdoms of the West, were deficient in numbers, cohesion, assertiveness, and skills, a disappointment when juxtaposed with the long and massive migrations that are thought to characterize their past.\textsuperscript{243}

This did not necessarily mean that they were peaceful and passive. There was fighting against the Goths in the area to the north of the Danube. The Saxons and the Franks also
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carried out incursions into Gallia Belgica, as well as Germania. However, they could be contained through the use of military force as well as diplomacy. For example the Roman army was used against the Saxons and the Franks, while diplomacy persuaded the Burgundians to support Rome against the Alemanni. The factor which changed this balance was the arrival of the Huns. They had already destroyed the Gothic kingdom of Ermenaric (died 376 AD) and they proceeded to do the same to the Tervingian state under Athanaric (died 381 AD). It was for this reason that the majority of the Tervingian Goths decided to abandon their homelands. The Gothic leaders Alavivus and Fritigern petitioned in order to cross the Danube and enter the Roman Empire. This crossing and the officially approved settlement of the Tervingian Goths in the Balkans (376 AD) marks the traditional beginning of most narratives on the barbarian invasions and settlements.

To a large extent immigration into the Roman Empire was not something new. Barbarians had served with the Roman army. In 300 AD the Roman emperors had resettled thousands of Dacian Carpi in communities from the Black Sea to Hungary. It has been argued that some would have been recruited into the Roman army and the rest would have been distributed across the empire as tax paying farmers. A similar example would have been the settlement between Constantius II (337-361 AD) and the Sarmatian Limigantes (359 AD). But there is some indication that the Gothic settlement of 376 AD had unusual features. Traditionally, the place of settlement was at the complete discretion of the Roman emperor and the communities were kept dispersed. In 376 AD the Tervingi actually chose to be settled in Thrace. Although the evidence is unclear, they may also have been allowed to group together in a way which allowed them to keep their political and cultural identity. There is also some evidence to suggest that the peace settlement of 382 AD was similarly ground-breaking. The Goths were given land grants in ownership and did not need to farm for others as tenant farmers. With regard to Italy the debate has centred on whether the Goths who garrisoned the towns received allocations from land or whether they received it from tax revenues. The consensus seems to be that the Goths were initially supported from tax revenues, but eventually acquired landed property.

It has been argued that “city organization had been the foundation of the structure of the administration of the Roman empire from the beginning”. With this in mind it is not surprising that historians have assumed that the city would have an absolutely crucial role to play in the settlement of the barbarians. Durliat has suggested that the role of the decurions was now as tax-collectors. The principals, under the auspices of the bishop, would have
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given a third to the army, a third to the imperial court, and the rest was for the city.\textsuperscript{251} Durliat has suggested that this method was used to accommodate the barbarians who wanted to reside in the empire. The result was that the cities did not pay their two thirds to the army or imperial court but instead the money was used in paying the barbarians. This was on the basis that from now on it was the barbarians who were going to carry out the roles which previously were undertaken by the army and the imperial court. The rest of the money was used by the town for its own expenses.

It has often been assumed that the Code of Euric, dated to the period between 466 and 485 AD, refers to a Roman tertiae.\textsuperscript{252} Therefore the Goths held two such tertiae for every one held by the Romans. However, caution needs to be exercised. The notion of a third also appears in other contexts. The Liber Constitutionum which was issued by the Burgundian king Sigismund (516-524 AD) in 517 AD also refers to a partition into thirds.\textsuperscript{253} However, it is more specific, stating that the Burgundians were given one-third of the slaves and two-thirds of the land. The problem is that our sources do not actually state that these clauses defined the first stage of settlement and it is also likely that this type of settlement changed over time. Clause 54 of the Liber Constitutionum suggests that there had been prior allocations of land made by the king to his followers, the implication being that the grant of tertiae was only to those who had not benefited from these earlier allocations. This meant that the grant was not part of the original settlement of the Burgundians. It is dangerous therefore to assume that the evidence from the late 5\textsuperscript{th} and early 6\textsuperscript{th} century AD gives an entirely accurate picture of arrangements made in the early 5\textsuperscript{th} century AD.

It has been argued that the word ‘sors’ (Liber Constitutionum XIV, 5) seems to refer to land which is held under a particular title (‘ius sortis’) and that this is also the meaning of the term in the Code of Euric.\textsuperscript{254} However, there is another possibility. Walter Goffart has argued that the word may have related to an allocation of tax revenue due from an estate rather than to the land itself.\textsuperscript{255} This would have been extremely attractive from the Roman point of view. Firstly, the redistribution of fiscal income would not have been too difficult for Roman tax officials. Secondly, the barbarians would not have been a drain on private resources and would not have been too much of an economic burden for the provincials. Finally, the decline in revenue would have been balanced by the availability of Germanic soldiers for the emperor.\textsuperscript{256}

Other historians have disagreed. Heather has argued that Goffart’s interpretation is based on an incorrect reading of the text. What is referred to here is the division of actual estates, parts of which were to be given to the Burgundian freeman, property rather than taxation from it. He has argued that the Burgundian freemen had their own dependants, who
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included freemen and slaves. This was the reason that they received a smaller share of the labour force. Furthermore, later Burgundian legislation dealt with matters that changed the value of one of the partners' shares in the joint estate. This included forest clearance or the planting of vineyards. This legislation would make much more sense if it was in relation to actual landed property rather than taxation derived from it.257 This interpretation relies on the notion that the law only applied to Burgundians who had not already been granted slaves or land. The evidence is also unclear whether all the Roman estate-owners were affected or whether this depended on a decision from the king. Initially it does not look like an appealing deal for the Romans. However, it should be noted that there is no mention of taxation in later Burgundian legislation. If this was the case it might signify that in return for the Roman landowner giving up two-thirds of his land, he was able to keep one third and was exempted from paying any tax from it.258

Liebeschuetz has suggested that the towns did not receive a third of the imperial taxes but rather a third of the income of their own confiscated endowments and customs.259 As he points out, “the ‘third’ of their revenue retained by the cities and the ‘third’ retained by the Romans in the accommodation of Visigoths and Burgundians (two thirds in the case of the Ostrogoths) can have nothing to do with each other at all”.260 He has also argued that the role of the bishop may have been more limited than Durliat has suggested.261 In his view the finances of the church and town were kept separate. As he concludes “as long as the civic organization was functioning, the bishop’s active responsibility for the distribution of finances was restricted to ecclesiastical funds”.262 Another point to consider is the possibility that the arrangements may have varied considerably from place to place and from time to time. A distinction has to be made from an arrangement which was intended as an ad hoc solution towards a possible military emergency in the event of an attack by a group of barbarian soldiers, as opposed to a settlement of a barbarian tribe which was meant to last.263 It is also possible that at least some of the settlements, for example with the Visigoths (418 AD), Burgundians (443 AD) and the Ostrogoths (493 AD), were intended from the start to have been permanent but failed because there were no guarantees.264

Historians such as Goffart have argued that this guarantee would come if the barbarian collected taxation directly from the landlord himself.265 This arrangement would have given some form of security for the barbarian. The way it would have functioned was that a third of the estate would be liable to provide a sors for a barbarian. This would have been the so-called tertia.266 The owner of the land would therefore pay the barbarians as opposed to the local town tax collectors. But, as we have seen, much is uncertain in Goffart's reconstruction.
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There was also another method which was used, namely billeting. There is a reference to soldiers who were given one-third, or even a half, of a house.\(^{267}\) It has been argued that this may also have been the precedent for the \textit{tertiae} given to the barbarians.\(^{268}\) Among the words used in the \textit{Liber Constitutionem} to describe this obligation is ‘\textit{hospitalitas}'.\(^{269}\) However, the way in which the word is used implies that ‘\textit{ius hospitalitatis}' and ‘\textit{ius sorts}' were synonymous.\(^{270}\) If this is the case, then the word ‘\textit{hospitalitas}' may have meant more in the context of the barbarian settlements of the late 5\textsuperscript{th}-early 6\textsuperscript{th} centuries AD than it did over the accommodation of Imperial soldiers. Therefore ‘\textit{hospitalitas}' may have been a practice much extended from its Roman origins.\(^{271}\)

Our evidence seems to suggest that a considerable variety of policies were used in the settlement and accommodation of the early barbarians. This ranged from billeting and diversion of financial revenue to allocation of proportions of estates. It has been argued that the earliest beneficiaries tended to be the closest followers of the barbarian king. It has also been pointed out that the techniques of accommodation were probably being continuously developed in this period.\(^{272}\) It is difficult not to agree that “the evidence is not well suited to answering precise questions relating to the chronology, scale and nature of the barbarian settlements”.\(^{273}\)

Evidence for the impact of the Lombards on the urban history of Italy presents us with its own further problems. Any study of Lombard settlements which focused exclusively on the evidence from cemeteries, toponyms and the \textit{Historia Langobardorum} may not provide us with an accurate picture. It has frequently been urban archaeology which has filled in some of the gaps in our knowledge. The first capital chosen by the Lombards was Verona. It has been argued that this may have due to the fact that, in the 560’s AD, it was the last focus of Ostrogothic military struggle against the Byzantines.\(^{274}\) It possessed several advantages. From a strategic point of view it was well protected by a strong set of fortifications which was constructed in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD. The town itself was relatively intact, with large public buildings, including the palace which had been renovated under Theodoric. It is highly significant that from the outset the Lombards chose a city based administration.\(^{275}\) We can see this trend continuing with the transfer of the capital to Milan. Milan arguably had even greater strategic significance. The capital was moved again in the 620’s AD to Monza. It is unfortunate that before the 8\textsuperscript{th} century AD our knowledge of Lombard building is limited. We know documented evidence of building work in Monza and an Arian Episcopal church at Pavia under Rothari. But this picture changed in the 8\textsuperscript{th} century with royal and aristocratic patronage given to a whole series of churches, monasteries and \textit{xenodochia}. The palace at Pavia was enlarged. This may reflect signs of economic prosperity due to the end of military action against the Byzantines.
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Lombard law codes provide some information on Lombard society. They were written in Latin and were issued between 643-755 AD. Much of the legislation was drafted under Rothari who endorsed 388 laws (643 AD), 9 laws were enacted under Grimoald (668 AD), and 153 under Liutprand (713-735 AD). Laws were also passed by Ratchis and Aistulf. Rothari’s edict seemed to have been intended to be comprehensive. However, there were some differences between the legislation put forward by Rothari and Liutprand. Rothari emphasized the role of the judges and the assembly of freeborn Lombards. There was only a brief reference to God. However, Liutprand very much stresses the role of ‘divine sanction’. It has been argued that a possible explanation lies in changes in political structure within the kingdom. If the 8th century AD is seen as a time when the crown increasingly faced opposition from dukes and even the gastaldii (gastalds), a solution would have been the use of men who had sworn an oath of loyalty (the fideles or gastindii).

It has been argued that “one basic principle was the solidarity of the king with the freemen who constituted the political body of the kingdom”. This principle was expressed in several ways. Firstly, with regard to assemblies, they consisted of royal fideles and judges, in their capacity of representing the Lombard people. The judges would have been chosen from town based dukes or gastalds. At times they would have shared the same palace. This was reinforced by Liutprand’s laws which frequently identified the free born Lombard with the exercitatis who performed military duties in the service of the state. These military duties also included the maintenance of law and order throughout the Lombard kingdom. Their loyalty was secured by means of an oath to the king. However, there is another model which needs to be considered. The picture given to us by Liutprand’s laws is the division of his kingdom into various judicial districts (judiciariae). The judiciaria usually referred to the territory of a town. The purpose was for the administration of justice by officials who possessed various levels of power and authority for administering justice. This included a saltarius or decanus in each settlement. The lowest ranking official was the sculdhais who executed the orders of a decanus. If the case exceeded the jurisdiction of the sculdhais, the case would be transferred to the index in charge of the judiciaria. If the index was unable to settle the case, it would be decided by the royal court at Pavia. It would be judged by the final arbiter, the king himself. As has been pointed out “power within the kingdom was thus thought of as jurisdiction, and made dependent on the king’s authority”.

However, the situation in practice may have been more complex than this. Lombard power and jurisdiction varied within Italy. Trentino and Friuli, as well as the Po valley and, south of the Appennines, Tuscia were under Lombard control. However, the Exarchate, the Pentapolis and the Venetiae remained in Byzantine hands. The duchies of Benevento and Spoleto also retained some autonomy. This was due to the varying levels of loyalty shown by the dukes towards the king. This varied from region to region. The most loyal were those
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of northern Italy especially at the end of the 6th century AD. However, they never became mere subjects. The dukes came from great families which formed the Lombard nobility. Even the king himself came from a ducal family. The dukes had considerable prestige and fame and were not necessarily dependent on the favour of the king. It was within the power of the king to appoint a duke to a duchy. However, it was extremely difficult for the king to dismiss a duke without the use of military force.\(^{283}\) It is true that the situation changed during the 8th century. The king had more power in relation to the duke, due to an increase in his military and economic resources. But the power of the king may have been limited by the distance between the royal capital and the duchies. It has been argued that this may explain the apparent autonomy of duchies such as Benevento, Spoleto and even Friuli and Trento.\(^{284}\)

One group who were in theory dependent on the king were the gastalds. These were public officials who were responsible for the fiscal resources of the kingdom. Their importance should not be underestimated as they were in charge of the economic prosperity of the royal treasury. Furthermore, they frequently performed military and administrative functions in areas which were not under ducal control. Because they did not come from ducal families, they could also be dismissed with very little risk to the king.\(^{285}\) They were an extremely valuable asset for the administration of the kingdom because it meant the possibility of governing without resorting to the dukes. In fact the gastalds had replaced the dukes in almost all of the administrative centres by the 8th century AD. The exception were the large ducal centres of Benevento, Cividale, Brescia and Spoleto.\(^{286}\) It is also important to stress that with regard to the duchies of Benevento and Spoleto, the gastalds were accountable to their respective dukes and not the king.\(^{287}\) Their effectiveness is also difficult to assess. In many cases it is likely that what happened was the replacement of a disobedient duke with a gastald who in time became just as rebellious.

Most significant of all may still have been the role of the towns themselves as perhaps also under the Goths. The beginning of the 8th century AD saw a rise in their importance especially in Tuscany and the Po valley.\(^{288}\) They had residents who were involved in the administration of the region as well as major landowners. It is possible that the trade carried out would have involved the exchange of some long distance goods as well as locally produced wares. This would have included items such as salt from Comacchio and silver from Friisa. The town could now participate and guard its affairs and interests. This could include military action as well as opposing the \textit{judices}.\(^{289}\) The \textit{judices} could also be opposed by clients. The clients were a Germanic tradition which was mentioned by King Rothari in his Edict of 643 AD.\(^{290}\) It should be pointed out that by the 8th century AD this tradition had been weakened due the fact that its original military purpose had fallen out of use. The Lombards clients may also have differed from the vassalage which existed under the Franks. However, they were still a political and social force that could not be ignored. Even the king himself had his following of \textit{fideles}.\(^{291}\) They were useful in upholding the power of the king even though they did not possess a strictly defined administrative role. The same principle applied to the bishops. The conversion of the Lombards meant that the church increasingly began to
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interfere in secular affairs. An example is the support which they were obliged to give to the military. In many ways this was not a surprise as the churches were extremely important landowners. The conversion may also have helped in assimilating the Lombards with the native population. Luitprand’s laws stated that Lombard women who married Romans had to abide by Roman law.\footnote{Ibid. p. 120.} This implies the coexistence of Lombard and Roman law side by side. Lombard laws also reveal the influence of Roman law especially with regard to property. The implication is the survival of Roman methods of land management and farming.\footnote{Ibid. p. 121.} However, it goes further than this. As historians such as Christie have pointed out “for the Longobards to occupy Roman urban centres must have required the survival and maintenance of Roman infrastructures”\footnote{N. Christie, The Lombards (Oxford, 1995), p. 121; C. Wickham, Early Medieval Italy. Central Power and Local Society, 400-1000 (London, 1981), pp. 64-71; A. Cavanna, ‘Diritto e societa nei regni ostrogoto e longobardo’, in M.G. Arcamone (ed.), Magistra Barbarius (Milan, 1984), pp. 363-364.}

We see a similar phenomenon with regard to the Franks. It has been argued that the Merovingians may have been descended from the most successful Frankish generals rather than a particular family.\footnote{E. James, The Franks (Oxford, 1988), p. 163.} If this is the case, then it is possible that they took the Roman title ‘rex’ in response to the desire by the Romans to gain military support. Even the ceremonial that the Merovingians used may have derived from the Roman military. The tradition of Frankish kings being acclaimed, by being raised on a shield, could have originated from the German soldiers in the Roman army in the 4th century AD. As some historians have argued “trying to separate ‘Roman’ from ‘Germanic’ in Merovingian culture may be a time-honoured procedure for early medieval historians and archaeologists alike, but ultimately it is a misconceived and futile one”.\footnote{Ibid. p. 163.} It is likely that the Franks depended on the Romans especially with regard to administration and taxation. It is also likely that “for the bulk of his subjects, who were Roman by birth and tradition, the Merovingian king held a position not unlike the Roman Emperor: war leader, judge, a potential source of patronage, and an object of awe and fear.”\footnote{Ibid. p. 164.} However, administrative problems remained. Communications remained slow and accurate intelligence was difficult to come by. A solution was to constantly travel across the empire. However, Merovingian kings did not tend to travel far. Chilperic very rarely went further than Rouen, Paris and Soissons. They preferred to rely on counts, dukes and bishops for information.\footnote{Ibid. p. 164.}

The Merovingian kings also had considerable power over the church. Clovis could summon bishops to Orleans (511 AD), in order to point out matters of concern. Punishment could be inflicted on bishops like Desiderius of Vienne or Nicetius of Trier who disobeyed the king.\footnote{Ibid. p. 163.} Bishops were sometimes appointed by the king, for example Gregory of Tours. Others were given this title as a reward for services rendered. They must have provided invaluable assistance. The 7th century AD saw the appointment of royal civil servants to extremely important bishoprics such as Noyon, Cahors and Rouen.\footnote{Ibid. p. 164.} The implication is that they were fulfilling an important administrative function. Bishops were also powerful figures in their own right whether in the maintenance of town fortifications or in a judicial capacity. They could also report on the activities of the local nobility. The bishops themselves were,
however, supervised by the *comes* (count). The counts like the bishops had a judicial capacity. They also had a military function, responsible for the recruitment of locals into the Frankish army and the collection of royal taxes. The counts were usually appointed by the local nobility.  

The most powerful position was that of duke. It was originally a military appointment with power over the soldiers of a locality. The word *dux* could also mean the leader of a German tribe. The majority of counts appear to have been Romans, whereas the dukes predominantly appear to be Franks. Although this was initially a military post, by the 7th century AD the dukes appear to have both civil and military functions. There also had a judicial function in addition to their responsibility in the collection of taxes for the king. There were divided into those who were allocated control over a territory and those who were part of the Royal household. It is difficult to know in detail the activities of the bureaucracy which supported the Frankish kings. However, with the passage of time and especially in the 7th century it seems to have adopted Roman methods. Liberating slaves in honour of the king’s birthday originated from a Roman custom. So was the idea of swearing an oath of loyalty and a will in which property could be allocated to the church or to an individual. This adoption of Roman legal rules was especially strong in the 6th-7th century AD. However, it is important to stress that there were limits to how successful this process was. The Franks found it extremely difficult to create effective new taxes and Roman taxes which survived such as the land tax were undermined by royal grants of immunity from taxation. During the 6th century this increasingly meant a shift from financial payment towards the state towards the concept of military or civil service to the king. The forms of taxation inherited from the Romans that survived better were in the shape of fines, customs and tolls. However, the main problem is in trying to calculate how exactly this was applied from our limited documentary sources. I would like now to return to the main focus of the thesis, namely the issue of the settlements.
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Chapter 4: The model of Lucca

Introduction to the case studies

The aim of this thesis, then, is to contribute to the debate on the transition from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages (see pp. 1-13) by examining written and archaeological evidence from settlements in north Tuscany between the period 400-900 AD. The focus of the debate is on the interpretation of the physical changes to the fabric of urban buildings within towns. Traditionally, the abandonment of monumental buildings, depopulation of the town centre, and intramural burials, have all been taken to be signs of ‘decline’. Others, such as Ward-Perkins have argued that these are signs of ‘transformation’ rather than ‘decline. Buildings which were abandoned may have been readapted for a new purpose and counterbalanced by the construction of new churches and basilicas. The abandonment of monumental public baths may have been replaced by more practical bath-houses attached to a church or xenodochion. If the town became the residence of a bishop, this would add considerable wealth and employment. Historians have stressed that the settlements continued in their role as financial/administrative centres. They point out that justice was still administered by judges who resided in the towns. Taxation was levied on the towns and coinage was minted in the towns.

The only way to test this debate is to focus on physical aspects of urban change within settlements. As Ward-Perkins has pointed out “the history of Italy’s buildings is not just a story of bricks and mortar, but also a mirror of vital changes in Italian society in a difficult and little known period” 305. The chronology selected encompasses not only Late Antiquity but part of the early medieval period. It includes the arrival of the Goths, the Lombards, as well as the Franks. There is a case to be made that the thesis should also have covered south Etruria or the adjoining regions such as Umbria or Lazio for a better comparison. However, it is arguable that settlements in south Etruria and regions such as southern Umbria and Lazio are to some extent distorted because of their proximity to Rome, an exceptionally large imperial capital. This is in comparison to towns in north Etruria which form a coherent whole due to their long history of settlement dating back to Etruscan times and even earlier. There is also both a geographical and political reality to the boundary between the towns of north Tuscany. It is true that this boundary fluctuated due to the respective economic and political fortunes of the various towns but there is enough functionality for us to view the boundaries as being relevant. As I have already argued, given the shift from uniformity to diversity in Late Antiquity, it is precisely regional study of this kind that offers the possibility of progress.

The settlements chosen, for the reasons just given, are Arezzo, Chiusi, Siena, Fiesole, Pisa and Volterra. The approach is to examine and compare evidence from these settlements with the town of Lucca, which will be used as a model. There are various reasons why Lucca is a suitable candidate. This is a town which has shown all the traditional signs of ‘decline’ during and after the 3rd century including: the abandonment of the forum and monumental buildings, large amounts of ‘dark-earth’ developing in the very heart of the Roman city (the possible site of the forum), replacement of stone houses with poorly constructed wooden huts, expansion of the cemeteries from outside the town centre extending into the very heart of the

town, as well as depopulation of previously inhabited areas forming deserted areas in the middle of the town. However, the same evidence can be, and has been interpreted in other ways, some of which I have already outlined above. Furthermore, additional evidence can also be used to paint a very different picture than previously suspected.

Signs of urban decay need to be counter-balanced by the very extensive evidence available for considerable prosperity and continuity between Late Antiquity and the early medieval period. The abandonment of the forum may have been the result of a reorganization of urban space, with a new town centre developing in the south-east quarter, in the vicinity of SS. Giovanni e Reparata (Fig. 3.1).\textsuperscript{306} The city cathedral may have been founded in the vicinity of SS. Giovanni e Reparata not much later than the mid-4\textsuperscript{th} century AD.\textsuperscript{307} The building itself is an impressive structure with a nave and two aisles. It also has a floor richly decorated with mosaics.\textsuperscript{308} There are also other buildings to the south of the cathedral. These are in Piazza San Giusto (Fig. 3.2) and are also decorated with mosaics, a strong indication of urban vitality.\textsuperscript{309} This trend is also strongly reflected in Lucca’s charter evidence for church building and decorations. The charters that have survived start at the beginning of the 8\textsuperscript{th} century AD and go to c.1000. It is the richness of the charter evidence which puts Lucca almost in the same category as Rome, Ravenna and Pavia.\textsuperscript{310}

It is also in contrast to cities such as Milan, where the buildings from Late Antiquity, such as the circus and town walls, although more impressive, are not supported by a large quantity of epigraphic and documentary evidence. It is true that the evidence for Lucca is from a later date than that for Rome and Ravenna but the quantity is just as considerable. The private charters for the period c.720-774 AD list numerous churches, \textit{xenodochia}, and monasteries (Appendix A). The bishop James is a good example of a patron who was especially active from 774 AD onwards. His epitaph (818 AD) provides evidence of numerous religious foundations.\textsuperscript{311} This evidence allows historians such as Ward-Perkins to conclude that “in the eighth century at least, the building activity and charitable endowment
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Fig. 3.1 – Lucca: Map of the churches and monumental buildings
was just as frenetic as in the three capitals” and “that such activity was also widespread in provincial centres in the late antique period”.312

Various explanations can also be given for the presence of graves within the urban area. The urban cemeteries may have been meant for use only as a temporary emergency measure at a time of great crisis such as during the Gothic-Byzantine wars of the 6th century AD.313 It is possible that there was a reduction in the habitable area of the town or that the new cemetery may have occupied a monumental building that had been abandoned.314 If a grave was that of a saint, it may have developed into a shrine for Christian worship. As Cantino Wataghin concludes “the desire for a burial ad sanctos is the main factor in determining the structure and hierarchy of suburban cemeteries”.315 The idea that the sacred corpse could act as an intermediary between heaven and earth gave the burial immense power and prestige. It is doubtful that the burials are a sign of urban ‘decline’ rather they represent a shift in ideology, of not separating the living from the dead.316 I have already touched on the reorganization of urban space. The cemeteries may have represented another aspect of this. This is characterized by the abandonment of the forum to be replaced by a church. It has been argued that “while the symbolic and scenographic focus of the Roman town loses its meaning,…ecclesia, martyria and funerary basilicae become the new poles of the town.”317

The evidence can also be used to show the continuation of at least some of the activities that the city in Late Antiquity enjoyed. The charter evidence points to the existence of charitable baths in Lucca under the Lombards and Carolingians. It is true that these ecclesiastical baths were not identical to the classical public baths. They were meant for charity and were used by just the clergy and the poor instead of the entire city. As Ward-Perkins points out “this represents a radical change from classical public baths, which were intended for the enjoyment and cleanliness of the whole town”.318 However, there were still some similarities between the public baths of Late Antiquity and their early medieval ecclesiastical counterparts. It has been argued that this link is especially strong as “the gifts of free soap echo the gifts of oil for washing in the classical period”.319 An examination of the charter evidence also suggests that baths were available in at least some of the large houses. For example, a house which was granted to the church of SS. Pietro e Gregorio in 783 AD, ‘a dwelling-house, which has two floors (‘que est solario’), near the church, along with its surrounding land (‘cum fundamento’), courtyard, well, barn, and bath…”320

The charter evidence can also be used in conjunction with the archaeological evidence to reveal new interpretations. Christie points out that the cathedral, the mint and the
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royal palace were all within the confines of the Roman walls and in close proximity to the old Roman forum. In contrast, the location of the ducal palace was outside, as well as a third of the churches mentioned. The charter evidence indicates a possible explanation: a movement of settlement from the towns to the suburbs, which indicates some prosperity. Christie has suggested that the transformation of the amphitheatre into a circle of houses, facing the market area, may have been in this period (7th-8th century AD).  

As I have tried to suggest above, the idea of ‘prosperity’ during Late Antiquity followed by an intervening ‘decline’ during the early medieval period and then a return to ‘prosperity’ in the later medieval period may not be the best model with which to understand the changes which the settlements underwent from 400-900 AD. As Gelichi points out “the use of such terms as ‘decline’, ‘rebirth’ or ‘reconstruction’ in describing the developments concerned means that the theoretical categories being applied are a long way from those of the modern anthropological doctrine that hold all cultures to be equal and thus denies the application of ‘decline’ or ‘progress’ to describe what is simply ‘change’.”  

It has been argued that the idea of an ‘ideal classical city’ should not be exclusively identified with the Roman city which developed during the early Principate, anymore than the ‘ideal early medieval town’ can be defined by a single example. It cannot be denied that some of the cities which survived from Late Antiquity into the early medieval period possessed substantial populations and considerable power. This was especially true of Milan, Ravenna and Pavia.

Milan, Ravenna and Pavia were extremely important imperial and royal capitals with considerable political and economic strength. These capitals possessed the strongest fortifications and the benefits of powerful patronage. Buildings such as S. Apollinare Nuovo and S. Vitale in Ravenna are good examples. Ward-Perkins has pointed out that the scale of the circus and town walls in Milan indicate that the patronage must have been imperial. He also points to the various buildings listed in the 4th century AD by Ausonius, which included the circus, temples, palace, mint, baths, statues, porticoes and theatre.  

Ravenna also possessed a palace and town walls. It also had an aqueduct which was restored by Theoderic and later by Maurice Tiberius (600 AD), as well as public gardens. Theoderic also restored the amphitheatre, baths, walls and palace at Pavia.

Despite the decrease in Rome’s importance due to the rise of towns such as Milan and Trier, it still retained much of its prestige. As Ward-Perkins has pointed out “Ausonius, although his political life in the late fourth century revolved around Trier and Milan, can have no hesitation in listing it first in his Order of Noble Cities: ‘the first of all cities, home of the gods, is golden Rome’.” Patronage also continued in the fourth and even early 5th century. Baths were constructed under Dioecletian (284-305 AD) and Constantine (306-337 AD). Maxentius (306-312 AD) constructed a circus on the Via Appia and a basilica in the Forum.
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Constantius II erected an obelisk in the Circus Maximus. Both Valentinian I (364-375 AD) and Theodosius (378-395 AD) rebuilt bridges and Honorius (393-423 AD) extended the city walls. However, what should be stressed is that “this was imperial and royal patronage on a scale not remotely reached in lesser towns, which were not the rulers’ residences”.  

With regard to north Tuscany, although none of the towns inhabited during the Roman (and Etruscan) period were imperial or royal capitals, in the case of some there are features which mark them out from the general run of towns. Arezzo was to become the ecclesiastical capital of the dioceses of Arezzo, Siena and Chiusi. Pisa had great strategic value due to its location on the Via Aurelia. Siena was to benefit commercially from the Via Francigena, a road which traversed the whole length of Tuscany, and was an important trade and pilgrimage route throughout the Middle Ages. However, despite this, none of these settlements can be considered to be of the same status as Milan, Ravenna, Pavia and Rome. The capitals cannot be considered ‘typical’, especially in comparison with the majority of settlements in north Tuscany. In this respect, Lucca is probably a closer match and the best candidate for a model. It remained supreme in Tuscany throughout Late Antiquity and the early medieval period. Under the Lombards, it was to be the capital of Tuscia and was also the capital of the Frankish Margravate (774 AD). However, as Ward-Perkins points out “Lucca, was a much more ordinary provincial centre: the seat of an important, but not exceptional dukedom and bishopric” lying on a scale between Milan, Ravenna, Pavia, Rome and the other towns. It is for this reason that Lucca is likely to serve well as a model.  

The settlements that I have chosen are interconnected in various ways. Geographically, they are located in northern Tuscany and are in close proximity to one another. Most of them had been Etruscan towns of some significance. Many of them enjoyed a strong natural position which made them ideal for defence. Almost all of them are situated on or near strategic routes. Fiesole is located on a hill above Florence in the central Arno valley. Volterra is situated on a plateau in the hills of north Tuscany. Chiusi is located on the Val di Chiana. Arezzo is situated on the intersection of four fertile valleys, the Casentino, Valdichiana, Valdarno and Valtiberina. Lucca was on a crossroads of a route to the Roman Empire’s northern provinces. Like Siena it was to benefit immensely from its proximity to the Via Francigena, as well as maritime trade due to its closeness to Pisa. Fiesole and Volterra had good defensive advantages due to their hill top sites. Possession of Lucca also meant control of the Apennine routes along the Serchio valley. Four of the settlements, Arezzo, Lucca, Pisa and Siena were to become extremely rich and powerful towns during the later Middle Ages. Lucca was to become the largest town in Tuscany by 1000. It also possessed the only royal mint in Tuscany until the 11th century. It was to become extremely wealthy from control of the wool and silk trade. Arezzo’s golden age was to come in the 1200’s. After 1269, Siena was to become prosperous because of its merchants and bankers. Commercial relations with countries as far away as England and France were to assist in the creation of an extremely profitable wool trade.

There is also considerable evidence that what was occurring in Lucca was far from unique. Ward-Perkins has pointed to a considerable number of towns where the same kind of  
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building activity was taking place during the 4-6th centuries AD: Parenzo, Trieste, Grado, Concordia, Ancona, Vicenza, Verona, Brescia, Castelseprio, Vercelli, Albenga, Luni, Florence, Perugia, Spoleto, Nola, S. Maria di Capua Vetere, Nocera Inferiore and Naples.\textsuperscript{332} The evidence is collected from various sources, archaeologically, from the large number of churches in the towns mentioned above. It is true that the charter evidence from these towns is not as rich as Lucca. But at towns such as Grado, Parenzo and Aquileia, we do possess epigraphic and narrative sources for the patronage of bishops from the 5th-6th century AD.\textsuperscript{333} There is also epigraphic evidence in the form of marble mosaic inscriptions for Trieste, Concordia, Vicenza, Verona, Brescia and Florence.\textsuperscript{334} Nor is the evidence limited to these towns. There is a considerable amount of evidence for church building elsewhere. What these inscriptions reveal is also the range of patrons involved. The monastery of S. Pietro was constructed outside Benevento in the 680’s AD, by Theuderata, who was the wife of Duke Romuald. The church of S. Sophia was constructed in Benevento by Duke Arechis II (758-787 AD) and he also constructed the church of SS. Pietro e Paolo at Salerno.\textsuperscript{335} Epigraphic evidence at the monastery of S. Pietro at Ferentillo (Duchy of Spoleto) exists for a gift by Duke Hilderic and his wife Dagileopa. At Spoleto, the duke Lupo, and his wife Ermelinda, were responsible for the foundation of the monastery of S. Giorgio (located near to Rieti).\textsuperscript{336} The gastald of Vicenza, Radoald, provided a font for the cathedral during the late 7th and early 8th century AD.\textsuperscript{337} Duke Ratchis donated an altar to the church of S. Giovanni (Cividale) before 744 AD.\textsuperscript{338}

There is no reason to assume that a similar approach would not yield results with regard to the settlements which I have chosen. In fact there is every indication that this phenomenon had taken place. There is evidence that Duke Gregory of Chiusi and his wife Austrecunda had replaced the wooden ciborium of S. Mustiola with one made of marble (729 AD).\textsuperscript{339} The gastald Alchis was responsible for an altar dedicated to S. Giusto at Volterra around 688-700 AD.\textsuperscript{340} With regard to Siena, the gastald Warnefred had founded and endowed a monastery in 730 AD. Another gastald, Radoald, donated a font to the cathedral
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sometime during the late 7th or early 8th century AD.\textsuperscript{341}

Another reason for selecting Lucca as a model lies in the quantity of evidence which exists for secular buildings. Some of the evidence for the churches, for example, mentions the use of the monumental decorations that had once adorned public secular monumental buildings. Some churches were provided with porticoed roads. For example, Lucca’s cathedral in the 9th century AD was surrounded by a porticalia.\textsuperscript{342} Lucca’s charters reveal the use of the vaults (grottae) of the amphitheatre at the end of the 10th century. This allows us some insight into the early stages of their transformation. Houses (casae) are not mentioned, so the likely function of the vaults would be as storage areas. However, at some stage, perhaps the 9th century AD, as we have seen, the amphitheatre was converted to the circle of houses which exist today. In Lucca from the 9th century AD, the custom began of mentioning in records of judgements, the location in the building where these sessions took place. In 853 AD, our sources refer to the ground floor hall (“sala illa terrestile”). There is also a reference to a heated room (“caminata”).\textsuperscript{343} This would imply a structure of considerable sophistication. However, without further details, it is difficult to visualize the dimensions and almost impossible to estimate a date with any degree of accuracy. As we have seen, the importance of Lucca lies in the richness of its documentary record as well as the archaeology. But before we proceed to an analysis of the documentary evidence, we need to consider the early history of Lucca.


\textsuperscript{342} D. Barsocchini (ed.), \textit{Raccolta di documenti per servire alla storia ecclesiastica Lucchese} (Lucca, 1837-1844), no. 519.

Lucca

Lucca is located on the eastern plain of the Serchio, a little to the east of the bottleneck of Filotelle where the mountain range of the Monti Pisani with the summit of Monte Serra almost touches the southern spur of the Apuan Alps which descend to the river-bed of the Serchio. From the very beginning it possessed strategic importance due to its position near the border between the territory controlled by the Etruscans and the Apuan Ligurians.\footnote{J.A. Quirós Castillo (ed.), R. Ricci, G. Zanchetta, R. Canova, ‘Lucca e il suo territorio nell’altomedioevo’, Modì di costruire Lucca nell’altomedioevo: una lettura di archeologia dell’architettura (Florence, 2002), p. 1.} For our present purposes, it is enough to observe that Lucca probably produced coins as an Etruscan city from the early third century BC. The numismatic evidence consists of an issue of silver didrachms with an engraved male head with the value five.\footnote{N.K. Rutter (ed.), Historia Numorum Italy (London, 2001), nos. 95-103.} However, most of the archaeological evidence from the Etruscan period is restricted to a few graves with pottery dated to the 5th-4th century BC.\footnote{A. Neppi Modona (ed.), Edizione Archeologica della Carta d’Italia al 100.000. Foglio 105 (Lucca) (Florence, 1958), p. 21ff.} It acquired the status of a Latin colony in 180 BC, and gained the status of a municipium in 89 BC.\footnote{Livy, 40:43; C.F. Giuliani & P. Sommella, La pianta di Lucca romana, Quaderni dell’Istituto di topografia antica dell’Università di Roma, Vol. VII, (Rome, 1974), pp. 7-9.} It was where the triumvirate was renewed between Julius Caesar, Pompey Magnus and Crassus in 56 BC. Our evidence indicates that Roman Lucca was a town of considerable importance within north Etruria. One estimate given for the population, based on the size of its late Republican walls, is around 12,000. The walls included an area of approximately 40 hectares.\footnote{J.A. Quirós Castillo (ed.), R. Ricci, G. Zanchetta, R. Canova, ‘Lucca e il suo territorio nell’altomedioevo’, Modì di costruire Lucca nell’altomedioevo: una lettura di archeologia dell’architettura (Florence, 2002), p. 1.} There is still some dispute about the extent of the territory given to the municipium after the reforms of the 1st century. One possibility is that it encompassed the whole of the Serchio valley, as far south as the Arno, and as far east as the Valdinievole.\footnote{Ibid. p. 1.} After the end of the western empire, Lucca was occupied by a series of rulers. Initially, it was controlled by the Goths but it was reconquered by the Byzantines under Narses in 553 AD. It was held by the Byzantines until their defeat by the Lombards in 570 AD.
The town possessed several advantages. It was in an ideal location for iron-working due to the accessibility of the mines of Elba. Late Antique Lucca is listed in the Notitia Dignitatum as being a centre for the production of swords. What seems to be remarkable is that despite the various invasions which the town suffered, metal-working which began in Late Antiquity was to continue throughout the whole of the early medieval period. It has been argued that the desire to control these mines was one of the factors which explain the Lombard expansion into the Maremma. It was to lead to the creation of an outpost of Lucca in Populonia at this time. This is especially significant bearing in mind the considerable distance between the two settlements. Lucca’s importance was actually increased in the early medieval period due to its location at the base of the Appenines and near the coast. In order to explain this, it is necessary to turn our focus to the issue of communications which was to play a crucial role in Lucca’s development.

In the Roman period, Lucca’s value as an important hub of the road network was to some extent marginalized, because it lay at some distance from where a branch of the Via Cassia joined the Via Aurelia at Pisa. However, this was to change in the early medieval period and it was to become one of the most strategic towns in Italy due to the development of the Via Francigena. The Via Francigena came into existence over a period of several centuries. The main reason for its existence was the military situation in Tuscany during the 6th–8th century AD. As I have mentioned above, the first half of the 6th century AD was a period of conflict between the Byzantines and the Goths. The Lombards from around 568 AD began attacks on Byzantine territory. However, their conquests were not uniform and consisted of thrusts southwards from the northern cities (the capital being Pavia) which they controlled. The Byzantine strategy was the construction of forts along strategic routes. Among these routes were the numerous Appenine passes which kept Tuscany in contact with the Po plain. The main reason for this situation was that many of the Roman roads were now blocked. For example, the only route available between Pavia and Lucca was the Cisa pass (in Lunigiana). Because of this a secondary road (already used during the Roman period) from Parma to Lucca began to be used. It was known during the early medieval period as ‘Via di Monte Bardone’. This may have been a derivation of ‘Mons Longobardorum’. In time royal abbeys (‘badie regie’) began to emerge along this road. They were invaluable for travellers as they also functioned as hospices and hospitals. The road was eventually to become the main route between Rome, the Po valley, and central Europe. It was for this reason that the ‘Monte Bardone’ road began to be known as the ‘Via Romea’ or ‘Via Francigena’.

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of Lucca to the Lombards. It was to serve as the stronghold from which they were to conquer the rest of Tuscany. It was also a springboard for military action against the Byzantines in the south, the frontier lying between the Lago di Bolsena and the sea. Lucca’s importance was also enhanced through its control of the strategic forts which controlled the natural routes along the coast and across the Serchio. This included Castiglione, Uffi, Aghinolfi, Carfaniana, Castelnuovo and possibly Controne. Its position as the capital of Tuscia was already confirmed in the second half of
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the 6th century AD and it was also to become the episcopal capital. Lucca’s supremacy can be seen by the fact that *iudicaria* (legal judgements) were issued to the neighbouring towns of Pisa, Pistoia, Luni and Volterra in the course of the 6th-7th century AD. It is also reflected in the wealth and size of its diocese.

Lucca’s diocese was the second most extensive in Tuscany and controlled an area measuring about 1,710 square kilometers. In terms of economic strength, the bishopric of Lucca was probably one of the wealthiest in Tuscany. It is also likely that the bishop would have been one of the greatest landowners for the whole of the Lombard and Carolingian period down to the 10th century. The wealth of the bishopric increased rapidly especially between the 720’s and 820’s AD. The likely source would have been through donations by the local rural nobility who lived in the villages as well as the urban elite. However, the early medieval rural and urban nobility did not possess wealth of the same order as Late Antique Roman landowners. Neither did they possess estates on the same scale. Wickham has pointed out that these estates comprised vast tracts of land not only in Italy or Africa but in other provinces in the western empire as well. He has argued that since 600 AD, the nobility tended to be localised to a single “city-territory” or “one central territory and its immediate neighbours”. It was the local and rural nobility who were the main source for donations to urban churches especially during the 8th-9th century AD. It is important to stress that their wealth varied considerably. For example, Gaidoald who served as doctor to the Lombard kings donated six estates to the monastery of S. Bartolomeo which was located outside Pistoia. All the estates were in the hinterland of Pistoia. This may have represented half of his entire holdings. Taido of Bergamo made his will in 774 AD. He was a royal retainer (gasindio regis). His property consisted of ten houses and eight estates. They were all located between Verona and Bergamo.

The disparity between the wealth of these nobles and the Frankish nobility of the 9th century AD is particularly striking. Frankish magnates such as Wido III of Spoletto and Eberhard of Friuli possessed vast estates in Francia as well as Italy. Their only ‘rivals’ would have been great monasteries such as S. Vincenzo a Volturno, S. Ambrogio in Milan, S. Sofia in Benevento, Bobbio, Nonantola, Farfa and Monte Cassino. In contrast, although bishops were just as wealthy, their wealth was often based on a single diocese. What should be stressed is the broad cross-section of medium and small landowners between the richest Frankish magnates and the peasants. It has been argued that whereas cities such as Milan could effectively control the rural areas because of the sheer number of urban landowners that possessed large tracts of the agricultural hinterland, such cities were exceptions rather than the rule. The main problem was that the land which belonged to members of the Roman elite tended to be dispersed over a wide area. It was extremely rare that the urban nobility actually owned an entire village.

356 Ibid. p. 122, 126.
359 Ibid. p. 124.
This was to have several implications. It meant greater political autonomy for the villages. As Wickham has pointed out “the lands and powers of outside owners were an important element in social action, but they only circumscribed, rather than determined, the activities of peasant owners and the rural elite.”\(^{360}\) This was important with regard to local political control of the village and church. If we turn to Lucca, we can see the desire of the rural and urban elite to enter into the bishop’s political circle.\(^{361}\) It should be stressed that in this period the bishops once again came from the most important families of the urban nobility. But here again it is likely that once the rural and urban nobility had entered the bishop’s political circle, they would use this political advantage for their own motives, namely leasing episcopal land (often the same land that their families had given) on profitable long term leases.\(^{362}\) If this is the case then the relationship between town and countryside would have been symbiotic. The rural elite would have controlled their territories simply by taking the episcopal land on lease. The result was that the bishop of Lucca simply did not have as much political control over the countryside in comparison to a bishop of a city like Milan. There are various reasons for this. Wickham has argued that because “Lucca was also the centre of the marquise of Tuscany; one result of that was, in fact, that he [the bishop] did not have as much control over his tenurial dependents”.\(^{363}\) Wickham has also stressed that by the late 10th-11th centuries the bishop’s lease had effectively become an inheritance for the rural elite.\(^{364}\)

Caution has to be exercised. Other parts of Italy were not as centred on the city as dioceses of Lucca and Milan. Examples include Sirmione which was a castrum located on Lake Garda. Large monasteries such as Nonantola located ten kilometres from Modena and regions which were not as urbanised. Among them would be the Abruzzo dominated by monasteries such as S. Vincenzo al Volturno and S. Clemente di Casauria. However, none of the settlements in the Abruzzo, which include towns such as Corfino, Penne and Chieti were of the same importance as Lucca. The scale of these towns were very small. This explains their weakness relative to the towns of north Etruria which were become a focus for wealthy landowners to reside in. In the south most towns were on the same scale as large villages.

Lucca was to retain its supremacy in Tuscany throughout the entire early medieval period. The mint at Lucca was the most important in Tuscany and continued to manufacture gold coins up to the end of the 8th century AD.\(^{365}\) Lombard rule was to endure till the 9th century when the town was to fall under the control of the Carolingians. It has been argued that the Frankish occupation did not bring about significant changes to the town itself.\(^{366}\) Initially, the Franks settled outside the town, in the vicinity of Santa Maria a Monte. Afterwards they were increasingly integrated into Luccan society and began to occupy public offices. The real change to Lucca was the loss of their control of the territory surrounding Populonia. This was to deny them the control of the rich mines in the area. However, these
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changes do not seem to have affected Lucca’s position as the dominant town of Tuscany. It has been argued that the decline of the Frankish Margrave of Lucca began with the death of Mathilda of Canossa in 1115. Her death was followed by the formation of the commune of Lucca in 1119. Although the commune was to remain among the richest in Tuscany, Lucca’s golden age was over.

**Documentary evidence**

Let us now examine the documentary evidence. Much of our information is derived from Lucca’s rich collection of private charters which begins before 700 AD, earlier than those of any other major archive in Italy with the possible exception of Ravenna; and to a large extent they are unmatched in quantity by those of any other archive before 1000. In fact one estimate is that the archives of the Luccan diocese and cathedral account for almost two thirds of all the documents that have survived from 8th century AD Italy. The rest are scattered throughout Italy and include Milan, Piacenza, Pisa and the monastery of S. Salvatore al Monte Amiata. Other important documents were located in Asti, Bergamo, Pavia, Pistoia and Verona, as well as the monasteries of Cava dei Tirreni, near Naples and Salerno. However, there are limits to the material. The oldest document which we have in the Archbishop’s archive dates from 685 AD. We do not possess any other written evidence during the first century of the Lombard settlement in Lucca. The last written attestation which we have of a Lombard dux is in a document of barter dated to 773 AD. I would like at this point to discuss the nature of these charters in further detail.

Historians have pointed out that although the original meaning of ‘cartula’ or ‘charta’ was just a piece of parchment, by the 8th-12th century it had acquired a different meaning. During the Lombard period it acquired a more formal definition as the main document in dealing with property transfers including donations, wills and sales. It is difficult to overestimate their importance. It has been argued that early medieval Italy is exceptional in the sheer quantity of documents which have survived. Part of the reason for this is due to a political decision undertaken by the Lombards. After their entry into Italy between 568-569 AD, writing began to assume a tremendous importance within Lombard society. In this context the Edict of Rothari (643 AD) played a crucial role in stressing the importance of written documents over an oral tradition. The charters were strengthened during the 7th-8th century largely because they became modelled on the Justinian code. They also gained considerable impetus from the Franks due to their wide use. In fact the charters were to remain important until the 12th century and even further especially in the south of
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There is another form of evidence which can be used, namely church dedications. In many ways this is not surprising. The bulk of our documentary evidence comes from ecclesiastical institutions. Furthermore there were strong links between laymen and the church in early medieval Italy. Donations from the nobility also meant a great increase in the property of the church. The richness of Lucca’s archives has meant that a list such as Appendix A can be constructed. It is important to state that the list only includes churches which can be dated with a reasonable degree of accuracy to the early medieval period, those with foundation charters, and those which are referred to by the name of their founder. There are cases where the latter can be dated approximately, for example Duke Allo’s foundation of c.783 AD, although in other cases the name of the founder only confirms that the church is early medieval and does not date from Late Antiquity. Several points have to be stressed in an analysis of this list.

Firstly, very little is known of churches which date to Late Antiquity, though it is generally thought that the intramural cathedral SS Giovanni e Reparata (Fig. 3.1) and the extramural S. Frediano (Fig. 3.1) were of this date. It is also important to note that not all the churches cited in the documents of the same name are necessarily the same church (for example the various churches named of S. Maria), as well as the uncertain nature of some of the foundations. It is also possible that in some cases the original dedications of the churches are not those which remain now. For example, the church dedication of S. Michele in Foro (Fig. 3.1) is in the style of the Lombard period, but instead the church was founded not long after 915 AD. We can only suggest that the churches founded before the Lombard conquest were S. Frediano (Fig. 3.1), S. Pietro Maggiore, S. Donato (Fig. 3.1), SS. Gervasio and Protasio, SS. Giovanni e Reparata (Fig. 3.1), and possibly S. Romano. The most recent study of the monastery of S. Ponziano has concluded that this was not the original dedication to the saint. The first dedication was to S. Bartolomeo and the monastery was called "in Silice", a name which probably originates from the wall, built from the east to the south to protect the city from the river Serchio. It was only in 1474, when the body of S. Ponziano was placed here, that the monastery was renamed after the martyr.

The patrons included men of great importance such as James, an archdeacon and bishop of Lucca (800-818 AD), the founder of the monastery of S. Ponziano. A transcription of the epitaph of Bishop James (ob. 818 AD) sets out his building achievements. We also have a good example of a burial church from the same epitaph. It begins, “Bishop James, who was the founder of this same church of the Resurrection and of the Holy Cross of the Mount of Olives, from which our Lord ascended into heaven…” The text as a whole is:
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It is likely that this church (*ecclesia*) was of a small chapel next to S. Frediano and its dedication proves that it was built specifically as James’s burial place. It is possible that there was an element of competition for prestige and fame after death in the building of the churches and monasteries in 8th or 9th century AD Lucca. We have some examples which suggest that rivalry existed not only between religious communities of the same sect but also of different towns. In the late 8th and 9th centuries AD a new trend of building crypts in churches swept through Italy and northern Europe. Bishop John of Lucca in 780 AD translated the relics of S. Regolo to his cathedral and built a crypt to house them, which has been described as being modelled on the *confessio* of St. Peter’s in Rome, and the explicit statement that Bishop John, who built the crypt of the cathedral, ‘made the beautiful rails (*cancelli*) around the Holy of Holies, on which he had inscribed the fact that he had done those things which we had described’. At some date, very likely later, the cathedral of nearby and rival Luni was provided with an identical crypt. It is not possible to prove that the bishop of Luni was responding to developments in Lucca, but it is at least plausible. It is important to point out that there is no evidence to suggest that this development led to the eclipse of the established cemetery-churches, since these often contained more famous corpses than those available for translation, and jealously held on to them, which in the case of Lucca was the church of S. Frediano (Fig. 3.1), S. Giulia (Fig. 3.1) and S. Maria Forisportam (Fig. 3.1).

This competition for religious patronage may also be reflected in the way that several of these foundations acquired the names of their Lombard founders, although we do not know for certain whether this was intended by their patrons, in the case of Lucca, the extramural S. Maria ‘Ursimanni’ (outside of the town by the gates of S. Donato and S. Pietro, near the church of S. Donato (Fig. 3.1), S. Pietro ‘Somaldi’ (Fig. 3.1) and S. Pietro ‘Bellerifonsi’. This is not to deny that religious motivation played a role side by side with other motives. In 685 it
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was stipulated that the monks of Fausto’s restored monastery of S. Frediano could enjoy the property he had given them, but with the condition that ‘you must pray for the soul and the family of Fausto, both you monks of the present time and those who succeed you’.  

Ward-Perkins has argued that the epitaph of the bishop James is extremely interesting due to the sheer breadth and different motivations behind the foundations. He put forward the view that the “ECCLESIAR RESURRECTIONIS” was James’s actual burial-chapel, the church of S. Pietro ad Vincula was in all likelihood an urban church, and the monastery of SS. Giacomo e Filippo, to which he moved the body of S. Ponziano, was in all probability a female monastery with an attached xenodochium. He has suggested that it was dedicated in part to James’s patron saint; and introduced to Lucca a new dedication and festival which was originally from Rome; the church of S. Maria ad Praesepe would have been part of the cathedral complex. Ward-Perkins has argued that, James had endowed it for the celebration of mass “AESTIVO TEMPORE...SICUT IN HYEME”. Furthermore, “that before this particular endowment a nascent double cathedral of the type known in Pavia, Brescia and Milan, with the ‘winter’ church dedicated to S. Maria”.  

Ward-Perkins has also noted that this ‘winter’ church in Lucca is not cited in the literature on double cathedrals. A possible explanation is that because of James’s close attachment to Rome, he deliberately endowed the church for the celebration of mass throughout the year in order to end a practice distinctive of northern Italy or more accurately Lombard northern Italy. We also have examples of other churches founded such as S. Silvestro in Placule and of S. Michele in Cipriano (in the 720’s AD), as well as SS. Secondo, Gaudenzio, Colombano (730 AD), S. Dalmazio (in 776 and 819 AD), SS. Pietro & Gregorio (783 AD), S. Nazario (787 AD), S. Giorgio (796 AD), the church Domini et Salvatoris near the cathedral (797, 827, 857 AD), SS. Gemignano, Paolo & Andrea (799 AD), as well as S. Lucia (818 AD).

To an extent the dedications can also give us some idea of the morphology of the settlement as a whole. For example, modern buildings clearly cover the Roman walls, such as in the western part of the city. This is especially true of the zone facing Baluardo S. Donato (Fig. 3.2). But because of the charter evidence we at least have some idea of the extent of the wall. In a document dated to 790 AD we read that the Deacon Jacopo after having refounded, ‘Eccles. in onore Dei et beati S. Vitali...in proprio territorio suo loco Placule prope muro hujus civitatis lucanee fonda e dota in proprio territorio...ad fundamentis...Ecles. in honore domini nostri...et SS. Jacopi et Filippi hic prope muro istius civitatis in iam dicto loco Placule’. There are also several other pieces of evidence which might give an indication of the extent of the Roman wall. We have a charter dated to 823 AD which states that the monastery of S. Maria Ursimanni was, ‘sito prope porta S. Donati’ There is also another charter dated to 820 AD which gives us another indication, ‘...Monast. S. Marie q.d.”
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Fig. 3.2 – Lucca: Street plan

Lucca - Key areas & streets

1 Piazza S. Giusto
2 Baluardo S. Donato
3 Gate of S. Donato
4 Via Vittorio Veneto
5 Via Streghi
6 Via Fillungo
7 Palazzo Bernardi
8 Via Buia
9 Piazza S. Anastasio
10 Via della Rosa
11 Via dell’Angelo Custode
12 Via Antonio Mordini
13 Via degli Angeli
14 Via degli Asili
15 Via Galli Tassi
16 Via S. Domenico
17 Gate of S. Frediano
18 Via Garibaldi
19 Via Pelleria
20 Baluardo S. Croce
The monastery in question was along the road on the outer boundary of the town on the extension of Via S. Paolina, near the city walls and in particular the gate of S. Donato (Fig. 3.2), which corresponds to the western gate of the Roman fortification. However, the difficulty is that the religious buildings are not the most typical component in the town.

A more complex problem is to identify the types, the positions, the density, and the development of the buildings that were used for habitation. The charters of Lucca do include some non-religious buildings and their locations. The documentary evidence for non-religious buildings is largely in the form of records of donations, barter and acquisitions. The charters of 747, 757 and 787 AD all suggest houses constructed completely or partially of stone. The house recorded in 787 AD which is located in the central zone of the city, near S. Nazario in 1064, ‘a Puteo Aturilde’, is described ‘cum fundamento suo, curte et fenile, una cum omni edificio suo, et petris que in edificio misse non sunt’. We have two leases dated to 890 AD which show us a row of five houses, all fronting directly onto the street, in the city centre. The descriptions given in our documentary evidence of houses almost always mention gardens, granaries, barns, open spaces like a courtyard and in some cases even trees. It is the case that for a majority of the towns, the documentary evidence for the bishops’ palaces (‘episcopia’ or ‘domus episcopi’) can only be seen when the charter-material has survived, and we only have an idea of their appearance when records of judgements held in them from the 9th century and later have survived. In the case of Lucca, the bishop’s palace is first recorded in 700 AD, but not until 904 AD, when a ‘laubia’ is mentioned, do we find any details about this building.

There is also charter evidence that there were charitable baths in connection with Easter Week in Lucca. There is a Lucchese charter of 720 AD which records laymen endowing a xenodochium with baths for the ‘welcoming of pilgrims and consolation of poor people, widows, orphans’. In the same year a xenodochium granted to the church of S. Silvestro had a bath attached, and in 790 AD we have an example of another xenodochium with a bath which had the specific duty, ‘that always in Easter week the priest of that xenodochium shall have the bath heated, so that the poor can be washed there all week’. It is also striking that private baths are occasionally referred to in Lucca’s charters when
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particularly large and elaborate houses are described. We have an example of a house which was granted to the church of SS. Pietro e Gregorio in 783 AD, “a dwelling-house, which has two floors (‘que est solario’), near the church, along with its surrounding land (‘cum fundamento’), courtyard, well, barn, and bath…”400.

It is clear that Lucca’s charters contain a considerable amount of information. But caution needs to be exercised. It is clear that the charters represent only a small amount of what had existed before. As a comparison from another country, Michael Clanchy has provided an estimate that the documents which survived from medieval England account for only one percent of the total which had been produced.401 The situation is probably not as dire as this with regard to early medieval Italy. Bartoli Langeli has estimated that around five hundred documents have survived from the 5th-8th century AD. But it is likely that much has been lost. The ecclesiastical documents are a small fraction from the many which existed. What is worse is the poor survival of royal or documents from the nobility. Unless they were related to ecclesiastical matters or were preserved in their archives their survival is extremely unlikely. As has been argued “political rulers in the early Middle Ages did not possess an ‘archival consciousness’, an understanding of the relationship between archival records and the functioning of the institution”.402 Because of this our documentary evidence is almost exclusively ecclesiastical.

Archaeological evidence

In examining the archaeological evidence for Roman, early Principate, Late Antique and early medieval Lucca, caution has to be exercised. The scarcity of excavated sites needs to be stressed. One calculation has suggested that the area excavated probably amounts to just one percent of the territory enclosed by the walls of Roman Lucca.403 This is barely adequate for the Late Republic, early Principate, and Late Antiquity. However, the archaeological evidence for Lombard and Frankish Lucca is even more disappointing. Among the problems faced in any study of Lucca’s buildings is that of chronology. It is extremely difficult to date precisely early medieval buildings due to our ignorance of building techniques from this period. We are perhaps more fortunate with regard to Roman Lucca. The majority of buildings dated to this period are constructed from large blocks of travertine. One argument put forward is that these stones were imported from Lazio.404 Civil and religious buildings constructed from this stone can be seen in Via del Poggio and Via Vittorio Veneto (Fig. 3.2).405 It should be noted that this is despite what seems to be almost constant plundering of these stones in Late Antiquity for their use in the construction of new buildings.406

400 Bertini (ed.), Memorie e documenti per servire all’istoria del ducato di Lucca (Lucca, 1816-1841) I, no. 92.
An analysis of building construction carried out during the Principate has revealed remarkable uniformity in terms of the materials used. Carandini has put forward the view that this was because of the existence of slave based building production workshops. These workshops were very active in central Italy especially between the 2nd century BC and the 2nd century AD. ⁴⁰⁷ It was these workshops which were responsible for the large quantities of cement needed for the construction of grand public buildings such as the amphitheatre and theatre. The likely source of the monumental blocks was limestone quarried from Monti Pisani. ⁴⁰⁸ The bricks are of a similar type to those found in Pisa and Florence in the late Republican period. There seems to have been in a change in building construction from the 2nd century AD. This was characterized by the abandonment in the construction of large scale public buildings typical of the late Republic. In this matter I lean towards Patterson’s interpretation that “the trends add up,…not to a generalized decline of the cities, so much as the process of civic transformation, as the priorities of benefactors and communities changed across time, reflecting changing social and economic structures”. ⁴⁰⁹ I am also in agreement with Jouffrey’s argument that part of the reason for the changing priorities of benefactors was due to finance, namely the increasing reliance on private benefactions as opposed to civic funds for public building. ⁴¹⁰

The next transition occurred in the 4th century AD. This period was marked by an urban renewal and large scale building activity. Examples of this include the remains of a building found in a cellar located on the corner of Via Streghi (Fig. 3.2) and Via Fillungo (Fig. 3.2). It has been dated to between the 4th-5th century AD. This structure had been constructed using materials taken from buildings from the Roman Republican period. The base of the structure was made from fragments of travertine which had been taken from the Republican town wall, pebbles taken from a river and also brick fragments, all held together by abundant quantities of white mortar. ⁴¹¹ Similar structures were discovered at Palazzo Boccella and Palazzo Bernardi (Fig. 3.2), in this case, the reused building materials were held together by large amounts of white mortar, which was mixed with rough river sand. ⁴¹² It is however, almost impossible to determine what functions these structures served. The rest of the archaeological evidence for this period (5th-6th century AD) consists of ditches and pits in Via Buia (Fig. 3.2), a trench filled with spolia at Via S. Pierino and various graves filled with goods dated to the Roman period at Via Fillungo (Fig. 3.2) and Piazza S. Anastasio (Fig. 3.2). ⁴¹³ The only exception to this is a structure found at Palazzo Lippi, at Piazza S. Anastasio (Fig. 3.2). The structure, which is constructed from perishable materials is dated to after the
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6th century but before the 10th-11th century. It has been identified as a palisade.

It is difficult to reconcile some of the archaeological evidence for the Lombard period with the charter evidence which points to various buildings being constructed for the veneration of the saints. One of the structures excavated which would fit this description was uncovered under Ospedale Galli Tassi. It had previously been the site of the church of S. Giustina. The church was founded in 783 AD by Duke Allo (774-785 AD) but in time it was known as S. Giustina. The excavation, which was carried out underneath the buildings of the former hospital, revealed that after the abandonment of some structures in the area during the middle Principate, the area was reoccupied by several structures that have not been identified dated to the 6th-7th century. There are also the remains of walls constructed in the Carolingian period from materials taken from Roman buildings. These include blocks of limestone, bricks, a fragment from a column, pebbles from the Serchio river, and grey mortar. The use of stone from the river is particularly significant as it became prevalent at the end of the 8th century AD. This stone was used in the churches of S. Giustina, S. Martino in Ducentola, SS. Giovanni e Reparata (Fig. 3.1) and also public buildings constructed in the early medieval period.

I would like to begin with a discussion of Roman Lucca’s town walls. The walls are dated to the late Republican period and remained in use till the 12th century. According to G. Matraria, the wall ran from Via della Rosa (Fig. 3.2) up Via dell’Angelo Custode (Fig. 3.2) to the point where it connects to Via Antonio Mordini (Fig. 3.2). It then continued down Via Antonio Mordini (Fig. 3.2) through Via degli Angeli (Fig. 3.2) up to Via degli Asili (Fig. 3.2), and to the monastery of S. Giorgio, which is now a public prison and located to the north-west of Piazza de Carceri. It then continues down Via Galli Tassi (Fig. 3.2) and Via S. Domenico (Fig. 3.2) down to Via Garibaldi. It then continues up to Via della Rosa (Fig. 3.2). The area enclosed by the walls would have been around 750 by 580 metres. The square was entered by four gates, S. Frediano (3.2), S. Pietro, S. Donato, and SS. Gervasio e Protasio. One explanation given for the irregularity of the northern and western side is that this was due to the presence of a river. We also have examples of the material from the walls being used in other buildings. In the sacristy of the church of S. Girolamo, the blocks used are similar in size and construction to those of the Roman wall. We also have traces of the original wall in various parts of the city such as in the cellar owned by a certain Barsanti, at Via Garibaldi (Fig. 3.2), its height around 4.3 metres.
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There are traces of this wall in the western part of the Arch bishop’s palace, in the Piazzetta della Rosa where it meets with the Via Garibaldi (Fig. 3.2). Some parts of the wall are also concealed, the archbishop’s palace was founded on the south-eastern part of the Roman wall. There are also traces of the wall east of the Arch bishop’s palace as well as north of the Arch bishop’s garden, located in the south and north, measuring 10.2 and 4.7 metres in length. The paving stones surrounding the amphitheatre have been dated to either Late Antiquity or the early medieval period. There are also traces of the Roman wall underneath the palazzo De’Nobili (now the Banca d’Italia), and examples of the Roman wall along the Via S. Domenico (now Via Galli Tassi), in the cellars of the houses located south of Via Pelleria (Fig. 3.2). There are also fortifications dating from the 2nd century situated immediately to the east of Baluardo S. Croce (Fig. 3.2).

In the case of Lucca, there is clearly a strong connection between the Roman walls and streets and the topography of the town at present. The Roman constructions can still be used as topographical reference points. We can use the amphitheatre, or the town walls, or the buildings of the forum. The oval piazza, north of the northeast corner of the Roman town, is the site of the amphitheatre which is now a marketplace, the Piazza del Mercato. The amphitheatre was originally constructed at the expense of a member of the equestrian order. Unfortunately the date of its construction is still disputed, some suggesting the reign of the emperor Claudius (41-54 AD), others suggesting the second half of the 1st century or the first half of the 2nd century AD.\(^\text{420}\) It was abandoned around the 6th century AD and became a source for building materials. During the medieval period the ground surrounding the amphitheatre was raised approximately 2.5 to 3 metres. The remains of the amphitheatre were converted into a complex of separate buildings.

At Lucca, it is likely that the Roman forum was on the site of the large square around the church of S. Michele in Foro (Fig. 3.1).\(^\text{421}\) The decumanus was from Via S. Paolino, and the cardo would have been formed by Via S. Girolamo (Fig. 3.2), Via Beccheria (Fig. 3.2), Via S. Lucia up to Via del Moro (Fig. 3.2).\(^\text{422}\) The archaeological evidence indicates that the forum underwent structural changes between the 2nd to the 3rd century AD. The area was covered by considerable quantities of ‘dark earth’, more so than in the surrounding areas or the suburbs. The ‘dark earth’ is composed mainly of organic materials and pieces of pottery, which enables us to date it to the end of the 2nd century and the beginning of the 3rd century AD.\(^\text{423}\) It has been suggested that this is evidence of abandonment. However, the forum also contains evidence of reused building materials, mainly spolia. This may be evidence that there was some habitation, although one relying mainly on rudimentary and discarded building materials.

Ciampoltrini has argued that the Severan period (193-235 AD) signalled a `turning
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point’ in the urban history of Lucca. He has suggested that the town experienced an urban ‘crisis’ in the 2nd century.424 This period was characterised by the abandonment of large public buildings and the appearance of rudimentary buildings made of wood.425 It should be noted that this urban ‘decline’ was unusually early in comparison to other towns in north Etruria. But Ciampoltrini has disagreed with the traditional view of Lucca remaining in urban ‘crisis’ for the whole of the 3rd century. He has argued that evidence for Lucca’s urban ‘revival’ can be found as early as the reign of Probus (276-282 AD). Ciampoltrini has pointed to repairs carried out on the town walls, as well as the beginning in the manufacture of swords.426 The evidence is mainly in the form of epigraphy suggesting that the restoration work was carried out mainly by equestrians for the emperor.427 However, caution has to be exercised here. The only archaeological evidence we have consists of the remains of a Roman wall dated to between the 4th-5th century on the basis of fragments of pottery found in an excavation carried out in 1988 in a cellar where Via Streghi meets Via Fillungo. Ciampoltrini has argued that the function of this ‘new’ Lucca was as a ‘fortress-city’ as well as an important Imperial arms production centre.428 This new role may have continued up to the time of Diocletian (284-305 AD). If this was the case then it would suggest that the Imperial sword production centre may have been an especially significant one.

Other historians have suggested that the very urban fabric had been changed. It has been suggested that Severan Lucca was in many respects similar to early medieval Lucca. Population became dispersed within the town and concentrations of populations developed irrespective of the urban centre. These new population centres may have functioned as independent villages.429 There were buildings dated as early as the 2nd century around the site of what was to be the cathedral of SS. Giovanni e Reparata (Fig. 3.1). This may be because despite some signs of habitation the forum had remained largely abandoned between the 2nd-3rd century AD. Ciampoltrini points to two dedications dated to the 4th century, one for Constantine and Licinius (308-324 AD), the other for Julian (360-363 AD).430 These dedications were discovered in the south-east part of Lucca. It has been suggested that this is evidence of the formation of a new ‘urban’ centre.431 This argument is obviously open for debate as it is not based on archaeological evidence. But I would argue that these new ‘urban’ centres tended to congregate around large public buildings. There may also be a link between these new ‘urban’ centres and cemeteries.

428 Ibid. p. 616.
431 Ibid. p. 116.
Archaeological evidence from early medieval Lucca tends to be in the form of burials. Intramural cemeteries begin around the 5th century AD, though extramural cemeteries continued in use, located near the town gates as well as on important roads. By the 6th century AD one of the most important of the population centres was located in the south-eastern part of the town. This was the location where the cathedral and the baptistery were eventually constructed. The south-eastern part was to be main site for some of the biggest buildings in Lucca. This included the cathedral of S. Martino (Fig. 3.1) in 724 AD, and the king’s court (referred to in the charter evidence for the first time in 745 AD) as well as the bishops’ palace and an annex to the royal mint. Other possible urban centres include the churches of S. Giorgio, S. Tommaso as well as Pulia, Placule, Silice and S. Frediano (Fig. 3.1). It is possible that many of these early settlements have since been built over by these churches. The new churches and religious foundations which were founded in the 8th century AD were to last throughout the 9th and part of the 10th century. The 10th-11th centuries were marked by urban growth in the area surrounding S. Tommaso (a suburb of S. Frediano) and S. Michele in Cipriano. But the sources do not mention any new ecclesiastical foundations during the Carolingian period and the whole of the 10th century.

SS. Giovanni e Reparata (Fig. 3.1) is considered the first urban cathedral constructed in Lucca. From evidence gathered from other towns in north Italy, it has been argued that the construction of this cathedral was promoted by the bishop and supported by the ecclesiastical and lay nobility. Epigraphy from the mosaic floor of the church indicates that one of the patrons involved was the deacon Valerius Severus (see Appendix C). The floor has only partially survived so we are unable to discover the other patrons, as Valerius Severus is just the first name on the list. It was common for the finance of the churches in Late Antiquity to be shared by several patrons. S. Reparata in Florence is a good example. The second major ecclesiastical building constructed in Lucca was the basilica of S. Frediano (Fig. 3.1). The church was founded at the end of the 4th century or the beginning of the 5th century AD. It is located in the northern suburb of Lucca. It was constructed on a cemetery which was already in use during Roman times. Ciampoltrini and Notini have pointed to the discovery of early medieval cemeteries to argue that S. Frediano’s (Fig. 3.1) original purpose was as a funerary basilica.

We also see the large scale reuse of Roman building materials in this period. The main source appears to have been the late Republican town wall. The wall appears to have been used as a quarry throughout the early medieval period up to the end of the 12th century. The building materials reused consist of blocks of travertine stone which were used in the construction of the cathedral of SS. Giovanni e Reparata (Fig. 3.1), the Piazza del Vescovado, the Porta di San Donato and numerous other buildings. The original source of the stones is still disputed. Historians such as Canova and Zanchetta have suggested a local source,
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possibly a quarry in the vicinity of Mulino di Quosa. Another possibility is a regional source. The Serchio would have been used as the principal means of transporting these stones. Ciampoltrini has suggested on the basis of his excavations that some of the Republican Roman buildings in Lucca had used large blocks of limestone but that this was discontinued in the first years of the Principate. He has pointed out that the likely source would have been quarries at Monti Pisani and Camaiorese. It has been argued that if the material excavated by Ciampoltrini was actually travertine instead of limestone and that they were used throughout the entire Roman republican period, this would suggest a local origin for the building materials. However, the matter is still unresolved.

To summarise, the pattern which seems to emerge is of sophisticated building techniques and materials used during the late Republic and early years of the Principate. A change came about during the middle years of the Principate. There seems to have been a trend towards using simpler construction techniques and more rudimentary building materials. Most of the building activities seem to have focused on the construction of walls. The building materials used were Roman spolia. This was to continue until the 5th-6th century AD. This period was to see a shift towards the building of extremely rudimentary structures constructed of perishable materials. This was to continue until the end of the 6th century AD when building techniques went back to reusing Roman spolia with the novelty of rocks taken from the Serchio river. I would now like to discuss the archaeological evidence with regard to ecclesiastical buildings in more detail.

---

Ecclesiastical buildings

The City

Christianity was supposedly brought to Lucca by Paulinus, a bishop of Antioch and a disciple of St Peter. Tradition states that the first church was constructed in the 6th century AD by Frigdanius (Fredianus). He was said to be of Irish origin and became the patron saint of the town. The origin of this local legend is almost impossible to date and very little is actually known about the introduction of Christianity to Lucca.\textsuperscript{440} Lucca’s churches were distributed fairly evenly across the face of the town and there were no large areas without them. The numbers are considerable, fifty-seven churches are recorded before 900 AD.\textsuperscript{441} Some of them were also extremely old. However, it should be stressed that there are very few churches from this period which are still standing now. One of the problems with early medieval, as opposed to churches dating from Late Antiquity, is their small size, which has meant that very few of them survive today, since they have almost entirely disappeared due to constant rebuilding, whereas the more imposing late antique churches are often still standing, or have proved hard to miss in excavations. It is likely that this decrease in size was in part due to changes in their function, it was not necessary for the chapels of small monasteries and xenodochia to be large.

Belli-Barsali has argued that SS. Giovanni e Reparata may have been the first cathedral constructed in Lucca (Fig. 3.1).\textsuperscript{442} From an archaeological and historical point of view this church is extremely important because of the insight which it gives us into construction methods from Late Antiquity to the later medieval period. It is located within the circuit of the late Republican town walls and to the south-east of the Roman forum. It should be stressed that this building was located in an extremely strategic part of late antique and early medieval Lucca. It has also been pointed out that the cathedral’s location (away from the forum) is unusual in contrast to other towns in Tuscany. However, a recent interpretation has argued that the first church in Lucca with episcopal status was S. Pietro Maggiore which has not survived.\textsuperscript{443} It was only in the 7th-8th century AD that episcopal status was transferred to the cathedral of S. Martino (Fig. 3.1) which is located near the church of SS. Giovanni e Reparata (Fig. 3.1).

This argument is based on the absence of any archaeological evidence for an episcopal cathedral on the foundations of SS. Giovanni e Reparata (Fig. 3.1). Instead it has been argued that the archaeological evidence indicates the remains of a cathedral near the baptistery. In my opinion the argument for SS. Giovanni e Reparata being the first cathedral


constructed in Lucca is still a matter for debate as the archaeological evidence at this point
does not support conclusively the presence or absence of an early medieval cathedral. The
charter evidence indicates that the first mention of this church was in 754 AD. It was called
the church of S. Reparata. This was to change in the 9th century AD where it was referred to
as S. Giovanni Battista and finally in the 10th century AD, SS. Giovanni Battista e Reparata di
Lucca. The first excavation was carried out in 1714 underneath the main altar. It uncovered
a funerary urn with the remains of S. Pantaleone as well as part of an early medieval crypt.
Another excavation carried out at the end of the 19th century revealed a medieval font.
However, the most recent excavation was carried out in 1969-1977.

The oldest foundations of the church was a building dated to the Republican period.
This was followed by a bath house which dates back to the beginning of the 2nd century AD.
This bath house remained in use until the construction of the episcopal building. The bath-
house was constructed largely through reused Roman building materials. This included roof
tiles and bricks, as well as quarried marble and cobbles, held together by white mortar.
The first church was constructed in Late Antiquity. Angelis d’Ossat suggests a date at the end
of the 4th century AD and the beginning of the 5th based on his date for the mosaic floor.
These dates are open for debate as dating on stylistic grounds is problematic. Ciampoltrini has
put forward a date around the time of Theodosius in the 4th century AD. The dimensions
parallel the church of the 12th century in almost every aspect. However, interpretations of the
archaeological evidence vary considerably.

Angelis d’Ossat has argued that this is a standard building shaped like a cross. It had
one nave with a transept and an apse. The pillars within the nave serve as supports for the
lamps without any structural purpose. This has been disputed by Pani Ermini who has
suggested that the pillars had an important structural purpose. They divided the hall into three
naves although she puts forward the view that they were added some time after the late
antique building was constructed. Ciampoltrini has an alternative interpretation. He has
argued the building was founded with three naves installed and the mosaic floor. It was
designed to imitate the ‘classical’ basilica with one apse. It was deliberately modeled on
Constantinian buildings constructed in Rome. It was after this that the crucifix shaped
iconography was adopted as well as the central pillars. The mosaic floor was raised by 20
centimetres through the construction of a new floor. These renovations would have been
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carried out in the latter half of the 6th and the beginning of the 7th century AD.\textsuperscript{453} The central pillars are made from large blocks of travertine stone dated to the late Republican period. The likely source would have been the town wall. The rest of the pillars are made of bricks. All the pillars are constructed from plundered Roman building materials in a fashion typical of Late Antique Lucca. The same blocks of travertine stone as the pillars are also found in the apse especially at the point where it connects to the transept. The presbytery is also constructed from reused Roman bricks, its floor is paved with marble slabs and reused travertine stone.

Attempting to analyse archaeological evidence from Late Antique and early medieval churches is extremely problematic. The evidence consists largely of burials. However, exact dating for these graves is almost impossible due to the difficulty in placing the graves in their proper stratigraphic sequence. Most historians favour a date of around the 5th-6th century AD on the basis that this was when intramural burials began.\textsuperscript{454} This date is based on a needle for a belt buckle found in a grave in Via Buia which has been dated to between the 6th-7th century AD.\textsuperscript{455} This has been disputed by other historians.\textsuperscript{456} However, the only graves which we can safely date to this period are those which are cut into the mosaic floor. It is more than likely that SS. Giovanni e Reparata (Fig. 3.1) never lost its function as a centre for sacred burials. De Marinis has conducted an excavation of the area surrounding the baptistery and around Palazzo Bernardi (Fig. 3.2). This has revealed a vast early medieval cemetery extending to the outside of the building.\textsuperscript{457}

With regard to the church, the outer walls of the nave and a new floor, as well as some renovations of the area surrounding the presbytery, have been dated to the early medieval period. The floors of the nave, the presbytery and the south transept are constructed in limestone. Some parts of the nave’s floor is made from marble (opus sectile). The floor of the presbytery had also been raised covering some of the Late Antique mosaics. There is also a wall constructed in the presbytery made of reused materials especially bricks. We also have a fragment from a slab inscribed with a cross dated to the 6th century AD which is similar to one used in the construction of an altar in the cathedral of S. Martino (Fig. 3.1) at the time of bishop S. Frediano.\textsuperscript{458} Unfortunately, the only detail that we have is with regard to its distinctive decorative pattern of flowers surrounding a cross. The date of the renovation is based on similar decorative elements found at the church of S. Michele extra moenia.\textsuperscript{459} Admittedly, this matter is still open for debate. Therefore the possibility exists that the


\textsuperscript{458} G. Ciampoltrini, ‘Rilievi del 6 secolo in Toscana’, Prospettiva LXI (1992), p. 44.

\textsuperscript{459} G. Ciampoltrini, ‘Marmorai lucchesi d’età longobarda’, Prospettiva XIX (1991), P. 44.
renovation done on the nave and presbytery was under the bishop S. Frediano. This would fit in with the charter evidence which suggests that this was a period of great building activity during the 6th century. Archaeological evidence for the 7th century AD consists of a grave with gold cross dated to this period. The grave is covered by reused Roman bricks. The archaeological evidence for the 8th century AD consists of renovations carried out in the area surrounding the presbytery and the southern transept. This is mainly floors constructed of limestone. There also seems to have been walls made from flakes of laterite and also fragments of Roman bricks. A date for this renovation seems to have been around the 8th century AD.

The church of S. Donnino is in some ways an exception. It is one of a small number of Luccan buildings that have retained its early medieval walls. The church has also managed to remain at almost the same ground level that it had during the early medieval period. This is despite many parts of Lucca having been raised by around 30 to 200 centimetres. The church is mentioned for the first time as being part of the monastery of S. Maria in a list, but the date which this entry refers to is still disputed. One suggestion put forward is a date around 800 AD although this has been disputed by a few decades. The oldest part of the wall is divided into two parts. The wall is made of pebbles and fragments from Roman bricks and large quantities of mortar. Unfortunately, a definitive date for its foundation still eludes us. The best estimate based on the similarities in materials and construction techniques of S. Donnino with the nearby church of S. Giovanni, is a date around the end of the 8th and beginning of the 9th century AD. This date would correspond well with the church’s mention in the written sources. This would also fit with in the new building activity which took place near the end of Lombard Lucca and the beginning of the Carolingian period.

Among the ecclesiastical buildings in Lucca, S. Michele in Foro (Fig. 3.1) would rank as one of the most impressive in terms of size. Its structure in the early medieval period is still preserved within its crypt. The written sources attest to various churches in Lucca during the 8th century which were dedicated to S. Michele in Foro (Fig. 3.1). The most secure reference (according to Ridolfi) is an entry which mentions a S. Michele in Foro (Fig. 3.1) in 795 AD. The written sources do not indicate that the church was particularly important during the 8th century. This part of Lucca also seems to have lacked urban vitality especially in

contrast with the south-east sector of the town. The church was held by some of the most powerful Carolingians, such as Count Agnano in 845 AD, but it was only in 1027 AD that the church acquired a great patrimony from one of the major members of the nobility Berardo (also known as Benzo). The patrimony included various castles and farms.\footnote{G. Ghiarducci (ed.), \textit{Carte dell’XI secolo, Archivio Arcivescovile di Lucca (1018-1031)}, vol. II (Lucca, 1990), p. 215.}

With regard to the archaeological evidence the oldest part are the northern walls of the apse within the crypt. It lies on an east-west axis and is only partially preserved. This is because the apse has been renovated several times and the original walls have been damaged. The base is composed of pebbles with large quantities of mortar. The ‘undercoat’ of the wall reuses largely the same materials as the first level. This includes pebbles with large amounts of mortar arranged in parallel as well as horizontally. The wall itself is stylistically unique in early medieval Lucca and Tuscany. It is constructed from large blocks of newly quarried grey limestone. These blocks are arranged in parallel and horizontally. The wall is covered with decorated plaster. It is important not to underestimate the importance of the relatively scarce early medieval remains. The fact that the wall is particular to Lucca and found nowhere else in Tuscany indicates the presence of highly skilled and specialized craftsmen. Their existence is confirmed by the written sources at the end of the 8\textsuperscript{th} and the beginning of the 9\textsuperscript{th} century AD.\footnote{J.A. Quiros Castillo (ed.), R. Ricci, G. Zanchetta, R. Canova, ‘I contesti’, \textit{Modi di costruire Lucca nell’altomedioevo: una lettura di archeologia dell’architettura} (Florence, 2002), p. 22.}

The basilica of S. Frediano (Fig. 3.1) is located outside the Roman walls. What should be noted is that this area had not previously been urbanized. It was near an area of Lucca where craftsmen lived and near a road network. However, the area had been abandoned in Late Antiquity.\footnote{G. Ciampoltrini & P. Notini, ‘Lucca tardoantica e altomedievale: nuovi contributi archeologici’, \textit{Archeologia Medievale} 17 (1990), p. 578.} Luccan tradition stated that the church had been founded in the 6\textsuperscript{th} century AD by the bishop of Lucca, S. Frediano. However, this tradition is not supported by any written evidence.\footnote{I. Belli Barsali, ‘La toponomastica di Lucca nei secoli VIII-X’, \textit{Atti del 5\textsuperscript{o} Congresso Internazionale di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo} (Spoleto, 1973), p. 465.} The first reference that appears in the written evidence is in 686 AD. It is mentioned initially as S. Vincenzo (Fig. 3.1) and was known as such in the early medieval period. It was only later called S. Frediano. The charter states that the monastery was rebuilt by the \textit{maior domus} of king Cunipert, a certain Faulo.\footnote{A. Quiros Castillo (ed.), R. Ricci, G. Zanchetta, R. Canova, ‘I contesti’, \textit{Modi di costruire Lucca nell’altomedioevo: una lettura di archeologia dell’architettura} (Florence, 2002), p. 22.} The archeological evidence indicates that the oldest remains lies underneath the basilica. It is part of the apse of the church of S. Vincenzo (Fig. 3.1) as well as part of the northern transept of the church. The apse is oriented to the east. There are also some marble pillars which Ciampoltrini has suggested may have been the foundations of a series of large arches.\footnote{G. Ciampoltrini & P. Notini, ‘Lucca tardoantica e altomedievale: nuovi contributi archeologici’, \textit{Archeologia Medievale} XVII (1990), pp. 574; G. Ciampoltrini, ‘Rilievi del VI secolo in Toscana’, \textit{Prospettiva} LXV (1992), p. 45.}

The first phase of construction was the wall of the apse, constructed from irregular blocks of limestone which has been identified as originating from the quarries of the Monti Pisani. The second phase of construction has left a wall without any traces of plaster. There
also seems very little evidence of reused *spolia* except at the corners. These seem to have been constructed of finely cut blocks of marble. The third phase of construction consists of a semi-circular structure which is located in the centre of the apse. The structure is constructed of reused Roman building materials. These include marble blocks and bricks. A possible function for the structure is as a base for a Roman column drum. It would have served as a base for an altar. It has been suggested that the materials for the structure may have been taken from the original church. Historians generally agree that these are the remains of the church of S. Vincenzo (Fig. 3.1) which tradition holds was founded by bishop Frediano in the 6\textsuperscript{th} century. These materials, by now twice re-used, have been assigned an original date to the end of the 4\textsuperscript{th} and the first half of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century AD.

It is possible that the church was abandoned at some stage. The next phase has revealed a layer of deposits, formed on some parts of the structure, and one of the pillars exhibits signs of damage. However, at this stage it is impossible to know for certain whether the church was abandoned or simply filled with earth as a foundation before new construction could proceed. This new construction included the construction of a wall and a pillar inside the church. There was also a tomb and a wall constructed outside from the same period. All these new structures are composed of the same limestone as the preceding level. The probability is that they were taken from the preceding level. There is also a new base constructed which may have been an altar. The tomb is constructed from reused Roman bricks. It is within the apse which suggests an important personage. The wall outside is constructed from reused blocks of Roman marble, bricks and limestone. However, at this moment, a date cannot be estimated.

The next period of construction was extremely important. This consisted of a renovation of the church focusing on the border of the apse and transept. The building materials used, particularly limestone, are almost identical to that which was used at S. Maria del Giudice. The limestone was held by ample quantities of grey mortar. It was covered by grey plaster which has only partially been preserved. Like the previous stage of construction, there are no accurate dates available for this period. One suggestion put forward, based on an analysis of the brickwork and written evidence, for a restoration carried out by Faulo, is the end of the 7\textsuperscript{th} century AD.\footnote{G. Ciampiltrini & P. Notini, ‘Luca tardoantica e altomedievale: nuovi contributi archeologici’, \textit{Archeologia Medievale} XVII (1990), p. 578; Faulo: see footnote 315.} However, it is just as possible to place a date anywhere between the 5\textsuperscript{th} to the 6\textsuperscript{th} century AD. The next phase of construction consisted of a new wall made from sandstone pebbles binded together with white mortar. This wall is perpendicular to the transept. To summarise, the earliest phases in the construction of S. Vincenzo (Fig. 3.1) appears to have used quarried building materials and does not seem to have involved any reused Roman building materials. What should be stressed is the absence of blocks of travertine stone from the Roman Republican town wall. This was the principal building material for structures constructed during this period. The later phases of construction involved pebbles and building techniques typical of the later Lombard and Carolingian period, especially the use of rhythmical ornamental arches known as a Lombard band.
The Countryside

The church of S. Martino in Duecentola is located in the vicinity of Marlia. In the early medieval period the toponym Marlia referred to a large part of the Lucanian plain. The territory is at the base of Pizzorne, where it borders Lammari and Segromigno. The settlement of Marlia was formed from many small villages. Duecentola is one of these villages. The earliest reference to Duecentola dates back to the 9th century AD. The written evidence states that there were eight churches at Marlia. Wickham has argued convincingly that these churches played a crucial role in the formation of the seven communes during the 12th-13th century AD. In many cases the toponyms of the churches were used to name the new villages. As a result of this the churches were often renovated, reconstructed or destroyed. From an archaeological point of view this means the destruction of the early medieval structure. S. Martino in Duecentola is exceptional, in that it is one of a small number of rural churches which has actually preserved its early medieval structure.

The church is located among a small number of houses. Unfortunately, the houses have not been excavated or dated. The structure is small and consists of one apse and one nave. It also has a belfry hidden behind the nave near the apse. An archaeological survey carried out near the church has revealed a small number of finds dating back to the Roman period. The possibility arises that there was a village nearby dating to the Imperial period. S. Martino in Duecentola is referred to for the first time on a piece of parchment dated to 893 AD. The bishop Gherardo refers to two houses “in loco Ducentula prope Ecclesia Sancti Martini” (see Appendix B). The archeological investigation of the church was limited to the exterior. This is because the interior had been completely covered by plaster. Fortunately, the apse was not covered and during a restoration the early medieval structure was uncovered. The earliest part of the building has survived and consists of the façade and part of the nave. The southern side consists of reused building materials which are built into a wall. This includes sandstone pebbles and limestone. The reused building materials also include Roman bricks. The facing is constructed from sandstone pebbles as well as Roman bricks. There are also sandstone blocks held together by white mortar. A window has been preserved as well as part of another window on the southern side. There are also other windows which have been constructed from Roman bricks.

The chronology of this church is still disputed and it is difficult to date precisely. The best estimate of the experts whose work I have used is that this church was constructed during the Carolingian period, around the end of the 8th or during the 9th century AD. This would mean that the foundation would have taken place during a period where the building activity was especially intense. This would suggest that the patrons are the Lombard or the Frankish nobility. Unfortunately there is no written evidence on who founded or owned the church during this period. It is possible that the church was to stay in their possession until the 10th century
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Badia di Cantignano is located approximately ten kilometres south-east of Lucca. It is part of the municipality of Capannori and is in the vicinity of the Monti Pisani. There are very few houses in the area. It is one of the largest rural buildings on the Luccan plain. Among the most prominent buildings are those attached to the church of S. Salvatore. The earliest reference to S. Salvatore appears in 914 AD but it only appears as a monastery during the course of the 11th century.\(^{477}\) It has been argued that this was a family monastery founded by an aristocratic family from Vorno.\(^{478}\) It is possible that this family was related to a certain judge Leo. He was the owner of the castle of Vorno and was one of the most important citizens of Lucca in the 11th century. The structure excavated are the remains of a rural Roman building which has mosaic floors. It is aligned to the centuriation of the plain of Lucca. The remains are surrounded by an early medieval cemetery which began to be used around the 6th-7th century AD.\(^{479}\) The best explanation for the building is that it was originally an early Imperial villa but was later used as a necropolis. The ecclesiastical buildings are part of an impressive complex. The complex is organized around a porticoed courtyard. The complex is part of the monastery which is attached to the church.

The archaeological evidence for the earliest building phase of the church consists of the walls which formed the base of the apse. It also includes some parts of the transept, especially the southern side. The apse and the transept appear to be built from reused blocks and pebbles with large quantities of mortar. The southern part of the transept also includes reused Roman bricks. What is striking is the size of the structure which indicates a church of some importance. Belli-Barsali’s estimate of when this construction started (based on an analysis of the sculptural reliefs excavated and the mosaics found in the northern transept is the beginning of the 8th century AD.\(^{480}\) This would fit with the large scale building activity going on in Lucca at this time.

This church is located on the Luccan plain in the parish of S. Maria Caipira is one of the villages of Marlia whose identity is defined by its relationship with the church. This church is considered to be one of the oldest in this region and perhaps in the whole of Tuscany.\(^{481}\) It is of small dimensions and has one nave and apse with a roof typical of a rural hut. The only remains which have survived from the earliest phase of construction consists of the sides of the nave. The paraments are constructed from sandstone pebbles and blocks, held together with mortar. It is impossible to know if the walls were covered with plaster. The first reference to the church appears for the year 987 AD.\(^{482}\) The apse contains a reused window

---

\(^{477}\) D. Barsocchini (ed.), Memorie e documenti per servire all’istoria del ducato di Lucca (Lucca, 1837-1841), V/3, no.1154.


\(^{480}\) I. Belli Barsali, La Diocesi di Lucca, Corpus della scultura altomedievale, I (Spoleto, 1959), p. 20 ff.


\(^{482}\) D. Barsocchini (ed.), Memorie e documenti per servire all’istoria del ducato di Lucca (Lucca, 1837-1841), V/3, no. 1619.
arch which has been dated to the 8th-9th century AD. However, since this is only a terminus post quem, a precise date still eludes us. Stylistically the building appears to belong to the end of the Lombard period and the beginning of the Carolingian period. The closest architectural parallel would be Badia di Cantignano, SS. Giovanni e Reparata (Fig. 3.1) or S. Martino a Duecentola. If this is the case then like S. Martino a Duecentola the likelihood is that it was founded as a family church. There is evidence that the church underwent constant renovations throughout its history but most of the work tends to be maintenance. Its relative unimportance and its distance from major town and road networks was to lead to its eventual abandonment. The church is unknown even to the majority of inhabitants in Marlia.

The church is located on the right side of the Lima river valley. It is in a mountainous area. Controneria is one of the “fines” which marks the boundary of the Lombard territories. It is referred to in early medieval sources as having an administrative capacity. Usually an administrative centre would consist of a fortress or castle with a parish church attached. Examples can be found in the territory of Castelnuovo or Carfianiana. In this territory the administrative centre was Piazza al Serchio. The buildings consist of an early medieval fortress and the parish church of S. Pietro. In Controne there are the remains of a castle on the hill of “Castello”. This castle is located above the parish church of S. Giovanni. Although it is difficult to be precise with the chronology, it is likely that the castle remained in use until the later medieval period. This territory also consists of a concentration of rural settlements which may have been under the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical authorities from at least the 8th century. The rural settlements may have been founded by the local nobility. S. Cassiano is referred to for the first time in our sources for the year 772 AD. It is possible that it was a private foundation. Unfortunately the earliest part of the building which has survived only dates to the 9th century AD. The various dates proposed for the present building include the 9th-10th century, the first half of the 12th century or the 11th century AD. The church is at the centre of the district of Controne. Controne consists of various small settlements located on a terrace which overlooks the valley of the river Luna. The building consists of three naves and an apse. It is also attached to a bell tower. All the evidence indicates that like other churches which served rural districts, this church played a central role in the formation of the district. There are approximately seven rural settlements and in all cases they took the toponym of the church.

---
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Summary

Lucca is an extremely important example with regard to any debate on the nature of towns in early medieval Italy. Partly this is due to the amount of charter evidence which is available. It is often argued that Lucca is an important example for proponents of urban continuity in the early medieval period. Historians tend to point to three aspects, namely the survival of its Roman street-plan, Roman town walls and also the impression given of a thriving community by the charter evidence. Other historians have suggested a different urban model. Ciampoltrini has suggested that Lucca operated as a fragmented town which was centred around a series of autonomous intramural and extramural villages. Each of these villages in turn had as its centre a church. What I intend to do is to place Lucca into a context with other towns in north Etruria. I believe that this approach would be of great value with regard to gaining more insight into this period (400-900 AD): Lucca encapsulates a whole range of problems and dilemmas.

Lusuardi Siena and Sannazzaro have cited Luni. They point to the similarities in the construction techniques used and chronology between S. Maria in Luni and SS. Giovanni e Reparata (Fig. 3.1) in Lucca. In both cases it is extremely difficult to find archaeological remains of houses dated to the 6th century AD especially those which would indicate an area which had a dense population. The difficulty in finding remains could also indicate that houses were built from rudimentary materials and also a lack of skilled urban artisans. This is because the 6th century AD is traditionally seen as the height of the urban ‘crisis’ in the town and the end of the model of the ‘classical’ city. This has been linked to the last phase of the Byzantine-Gothic war which led to destruction in the countryside and the formation of settlements which were to form the basis of medieval villages.

It has been suggested that there is a link between the two. The urban ‘crisis’ coincides with the appearance of a series of forts in the Lucchesia. The forts only appear in our documentary evidence from the 8th century AD but the possibility exists that they could have been constructed earlier. The forts appear to have been located at strategic points. This includes the Serchio valley, Lima and Versilia. What is significant is that they may have functioned as autonomous administrative units separate from Lucca itself. This may have meant a loss of administrative control of the countryside by the town and is perhaps a factor in the urban ‘crisis’. How serious this ‘crisis’ was has been disputed. What seems to be unusual with regard to Lucca is that our documentary sources indicate that there was intense building activity by the bishop during the second half of the 6th century AD. Bishop Frediano (560?-588 AD) was supposedly responsible not only for restoring the most important urban

churches in Lucca such as S. Frediano (Fig. 3.1) and S. Martino (Fig. 3.1) but also the construction of twenty-eight rural churches, one for every year of his bishopric. The church of S. Macario was also established during the reign of bishop Geminiano in the second half of the 7th century by the Byzantine comes Funso (see Appendix B & C). The evidence is still largely incomplete but this is an indication that the Byzantine-Gothic War may have not curtailed the building activity of the clergy. The absence of the nobility also appears to have been striking. All the patronage appears to have been by the church. This was to change in the 7th century AD. But during the 7th-8th century AD patronage from the Lombard nobility meant the use of increasingly expensive materials and the return of specialised artisans. It is clear that churches such as S. Michele in Foro (Fig. 3.1) were indeed buildings on an impressive scale. What also seems likely is that patronage from the Lombard nobility was of great financial benefit to the local artisans.

In any analysis of religious buildings several factors need to be stressed. Religious buildings may not necessarily follow strict economic logic. The construction of a church is not always an indication of widespread wealth and prosperity. The motivation involved in patronage may include a desire to promote the social standing of a patron as well as political and religious factors. It could also serve as a demonstration of the political power of the patron for the purposes of propaganda. In this sense it would be similar to the construction of monumental buildings during the Roman period.\textsuperscript{494} Other historians have pointed to studies carried out in the Piedmont region with regard to the foundation of rural churches by the Lombards during the 7th century AD. They have argued that this may have been an attempt by the Lombard nobility to assimilate themselves with the local ruling classes.\textsuperscript{495}

Wickham has suggested another explanation. The lack of control which the Lombard nobility had in controlling the rents exacted by landowners meant the necessity of establishing a network of ‘clients’. It also meant the Lombard nobles acted as patrons for the rural communities.\textsuperscript{496} The endowment of these church foundations acted as a guarantee for the ‘clients’. I would like to illustrate these trends further. A good example would be Gundualdo who lived at Campori in the 8th century AD. Campori is located in the Serchio valley. What is interesting about this example is that he does not appear to be aristocratic. However, Gundualdo did have a position of some importance within the village. His foundation of the church of S. Maria in 761 AD confirmed his social importance. The church was to remain in his family’s hands until the 10th century. Eventually it was given to the bishop of Lucca. The patronage of the Christian rural elites enabled them to establish a social relationship with the urban nobility that increased their power.\textsuperscript{497}

There was also the added benefit that the church could be a source of income. This could take place in the form of donations which would be supervised by the family who had founded the church.\textsuperscript{498} La Rocca has focused on the change involved in the funeral rites. She

\textsuperscript{494} C. Wickham, \textit{Early Medieval Italy: Central Power and Local Society 400-1000} (London, 1981), pp. 113-114.
\textsuperscript{497} Ibid. pp. 166-167.
\textsuperscript{498} G. Tabacco, \textit{Egemonie sociali e strutture del potere nel medioevo italiano} (Torino, 1979), p. 207.
has argued that in this period there was a change from the emphasis of burial with grave goods to donations and the foundation of the ecclesiastical buildings for the benefit of the soul. Degasperi has pointed to the rise of the funerary basilica, such as S. Frediano (Fig. 3.1) in the 7th century AD as an example of this change.

Other historians have attempted to analyse Lucca by examining the non-ecclesiastical buildings. G.P. Brogiolo and S. Gelichi have tended to focus on buildings meant for habitation (mainly houses) in their analysis of social and economic trends. What is striking about the archaeological and charter record is the presence of houses made of good quality materials alongside those which were rudimentary and made of wood. Belli-Barsali gives us the example of a ‘house’ belonging to Teuspert. Teuspert was the father of bishop Giovanni I and Jacopo. This ‘house’ was a complex consisting of several houses and bath-houses. Houses constructed of stone are frequently mentioned in our documentary evidence. Unfortunately our knowledge of these buildings with regard to Lucca is still incomplete and the few houses excavated do not yet provide enough evidence for a comprehensive conclusion. Lucca’s churches therefore remain our best source of evidence.

In my opinion, it is difficult to overestimate the importance of Lucca as a model for the rest of the settlements in my thesis. It is the town with the best documentary evidence in Tuscany, especially in the 8th century AD. This provides us with valuable information regarding church building, occupations and economic activity, allowing us to make comparisons with other settlements. Ciampoltrini's model of a complex of fragmented urban 'villages' within the town walls is also a valuable topographical point of reference when it comes to analysing other settlements, and ultimately as I hope to show, will provide us with valuable insight in understanding the apparent contradiction between the archaeological and documentary evidence.

I would like to point out at this stage that it is necessary to divide the the appendices below into two sections, as they are taken from two historians who have taken different approaches. Abella’s list is derived from Belli-Barsali and divides the archaeological evidence into religious buildings within the city walls and those that are outside. Ward-Perkins’s list is also based on Barsali but arranged chronologically. Furthermore, there is an omission of church building for a century in Ward-Perkins’s list due to the way it is organized.

---


## Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>688 AD</td>
<td>Shortly before 688 AD, Fausto, <em>maior domus</em> of King Cunicpert, restores the monastery of S. Frediano</td>
<td>Bruhl, CDL 3.1.no.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720 AD</td>
<td>A group of people found the church and <em>xenodochium</em> of S. Silvestro</td>
<td>Schiaparelli, CDL, no. 24 (Belli-Barsali, 532 no. 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720 AD</td>
<td>Pertaudi founds the church and monastery of S. Michele Arcangelo</td>
<td>Schiaparelli, CDL, no. 28 (Belli-Barsali, 532 no. 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722 AD</td>
<td>Ursus endows the church and female monastery of S. Maria</td>
<td>Schiaparelli, CDL, no. 30 (Belli-Barsali, 533 no.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730 AD</td>
<td>A group of people found the church and <em>xenodochium</em> of S. Colombano</td>
<td>Schiaparelli, CDL, no. 48 (Belli-Barsali, 533 no. 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757 AD</td>
<td>Three priests endow a <em>xenodochium</em> near the foundation of SS. Gemignano, Paolo e Andrea</td>
<td>Schiaparelli, CDL, no. 127 (Belli-Barsali, 528 no. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 759 AD</td>
<td>First reference to S. Michele de Scragio</td>
<td>Schiaparelli, CDL, no. 136 (Belli-Barsali, 535 no. 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 763 AD</td>
<td>First reference to Sumuald’s foundation foundation of S. Pietro Somaldi</td>
<td>Schiaparelli, CDL, no. 170 (Belli-Barsali, 533-4 no. 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764 AD</td>
<td>Ansprand organizes his church and female monastery of S. Maria</td>
<td>Schiaparelli, CDL, no. 175 (Belli-Barsali 528 no. 8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>764 AD</td>
<td>Teutprand endows his church and female monastery of S. Michele Arcangelo</td>
<td>Schiaparelli, CDL, no. 178 (Belli-Barsali 528 no. 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765 AD</td>
<td>Risolf endows his father’s church and monastery of S. Maria e S. Donato</td>
<td>Schiaparelli, CDL, no. 194 (Belli-Barsali 536 no. 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 771 AD</td>
<td>First reference to Fridulus’ foundation of the church and monastery of S. Maria e S. Donato</td>
<td>Schiaparelli, CDL, no. 256 (Belli-Barsali 528 no. 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 776 AD</td>
<td>First reference to John’s foundation of S. Pietro</td>
<td>Bars. No. 162 (Belli-Barsali, 535 no. 37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780 AD</td>
<td>Bishop John builds the crypt of S. Regolo in Lucca cathedral (S. Martino)</td>
<td>Bert. I. pp. 387-90 (Belli-Barsali, 526 no. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.780 AD</td>
<td>Bishop John a crypt in S. Frediano</td>
<td>Belli-Barsali, 525 no.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>783 AD</td>
<td>Teudipert and Asperta found the church and monastery of SS. Pietro e Gregorio</td>
<td>Bert. i. no. 9 (Belli-Barsali, 528-9 no. 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 783 AD</td>
<td>Duke Allo founds a monastery inside Lucca</td>
<td>MGH, Dipl. Karol.3.266 (Belli-Barsali, 531 no. 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>786 AD</td>
<td>Aliseus endows his church of SS. Salvatore Simplicio</td>
<td>Bert. 1. no. 98 (Belli-Barsali, 529 no. 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 790 AD</td>
<td>First reference to Sichipert’s church and <em>xenodochium</em> of S. Vitale</td>
<td>Bars. No 231 (Belli-Barsali 535 no. 38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790 AD</td>
<td>James (later bishop) founds the church and female monastery of SS. Giacomo e Filippo</td>
<td>Bars. No. 231 (Belli-Barsali, 535 no. 39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 797 AD</td>
<td>First reference to bishop John’s ‘<em>ecclesia Domini et Salvatoris et S. Petri</em>’</td>
<td>Bars. No. 261 (Belli-Barsali, 529 no.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 800 AD</td>
<td>First reference to Bellerifonsus’ church of S. Pietro Bellerifonsi</td>
<td>Bars. No.293 (Belli-Barsali 530, no.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805 AD</td>
<td>Natalis endows his church of S. Maria e S. Pietro</td>
<td>Bert. 2. No.6 (Belli-Barsali, 536 no. 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortly before 818 AD</td>
<td>Bishop James’s epitaph mentions his foundation of S. Pietro ad Vincula</td>
<td>Bars. No.1759 (Belli-Barsali, 537 no. 46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortly before 818 AD</td>
<td>Bishop James’s epitaph mentions his restoration of S. Maria ad Praesepe</td>
<td>Bars. No 1759 (Belli-Barsali, 530 no.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortly before 818 AD</td>
<td>Bishop James’s epitaph mentions his foundation of the ‘<em>ecclesia Resurrectiones et S. Cruces</em>’</td>
<td>Bars. No.1759 (Belli-Barsali, 538 no. 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 820 AD</td>
<td>First reference to Teuderad’s church and monastery of S. Lucia</td>
<td>Bert. 2. no.18 (Belli-Barsali, 537 no.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 823 AD</td>
<td>First reference to Prandulus and Teudipert’s church and monastery of SS. Benedetto e Scolastica</td>
<td>Bert. 2. Appendix no. 25 (Belli-Barsali 538-9 no. 56)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

According to the documentary evidence around 80 churches were constructed between the 8th-11th century AD both intramural and extramural. The 8th century AD charters refer to 43 churches. 38 can be identified, 22 intramural and 16 extramural

Intramural churches
1. SS. Giovanni e Reparata (Fig. 3.1), dating back to the 5th century AD
2. S. Vicenzo (S. Frediano, Fig. 3.1), dating back to the 5th century AD
3. S. Martino, founded 724 AD
4. S. Giulia, mentioned in charters of 760-763 AD
5. S. Romano, mentioned in 792 AD
6. S. Giorgio, near Porta S. Donato, mentioned in 738 AD
7. SS. Gemignano, Paolo, Andrea, mentioned in 757 AD, with a a xenodochion
8. S. Maria in Via, founded in 771 AD
9. S. Michele in Foro (Fig. 3.1), mentioned in 795-796 AD
10. S. Dalmazio, mentioned in 771 AD
11. SS Pietro e Gregorio (the name was later changed to S. Gregorio Magno), with a monastery built by Teudipert and Aspera in 738 AD
12. SS Salvatore e Simplicio, endowed in 786 AD
13. S. Nazario, mentioned in charters of 787 AD
14. S. Michele, endowed in 764 AD, by Teutprand and his wife Gumpranda
15. S. Pietro, mentioned in 797 AD
16. S. Maria ad Praesepe, mentioned in 805 AD
17. S. Genesio, mentioned in 839 AD
18. S. Donnino, mentioned in 839 AD
19. S. Pietro Bellerofonti, mentioned in 874 AD
20. S. Stefano, mentioned in charters of 8th century AD

This list has been compiled from E. Abela, 'Lucca', in E. Abela, A. Alberti, M. Baldassarri, F. Bandini, M.C. Favilla, S. Gelichi, R. Mirandola, C. Negrelli, C. Rizzitelli, Archeologia urbana in Toscana: la città altomedievale (Mantua, 1999), pp. 39-40.
21. S. Paolo (the name was later changed to the Church of the Rose), 8th century AD

22. S. Salvatore in Mustiola, mentioned in charters of 8th century AD

Hypothetically enlarged in the early medieval period

23. S. Salvatore in Brisciano (the name was later changed to S. Giustina), mentioned in 783 as ‘infra civitatem urbe Luca’ in 1002

24. S. Tommaso, mentioned in 785 AD as ‘infra civitatem urbe Luca’

Eastern suburb

25. S. Michele in Cipriano (the name was later changed to S. Micheletto), endowed in 720 AD by Pertuald, with a connecting xenodochion

26. SS. Gervasio e Protasi, mentioned in 739 AD

27. S. Maria Forisportam (Fig. 3.1), mentioned in the 8th century AD

Southern suburb

28. SS. Secondo, Gaudenzio, Colombano in Pulia, endowed in 730 AD by Sigismund

29. S. Michele di Scragio, endowed in 759 AD

30. S. Pietro Maggiore, mentioned in 740 AD

31. SS. Giacomo e Filippo in Placule, endowed in 790 AD

32. S. Salvatore in Silice, mentioned in 897 AD

33. S. Silvestro in Placule, mentioned in 790 AD, with xenodochion

34. S. Vitale in Placule, mentioned in 790 AD

Western suburb

35. S. Maria Ursimanni, endowed in 722 AD with a monastery by Urso

36. S. Donato (Fig. 3.1), mentioned in 760 AD

Northern suburb

37. S. Pietro Somaldi (Fig. 3.1), given by King Astulf to Auripert in 756 AD

38. S. Salvatore in muro, mentioned in the 8th century AD
Appendix C

These inscriptions refers to building activity from Late Antiquity and the early Medieval period in Lucca. The list is far from complete and in some cases has been transcribed in the 18th century AD by scholars. The originals in some cases have been destroyed.

S. Giovanni e Reparata (Fig. 3.1)

These inscriptions have not survived intact and are fragmentary. They were inscribed on the floor of the church of S. Giovanni e Reparata (Fig. 3.1). It has been dated to the 4th century. This inscription consists of a list of donors who have contributed mosaics and the number of square feet which they have paid for. It begins with the deacon Valerius Severianus.505

[VAL]ERIV[S] 
[SE]VERIAN[VS] 
[DIA]C. CV[M.SVIS] 
[FE]C P[EDES...]

Altar of S. Stefano in S. Martino (Fig. 3.1)

This inscription is transcribed from a slab which refers to an altar set up by the presbyter Valerianus. It has been dated to the time of the bishop S. Frediano (died 588 AD). In all likelihood the slab came from the church of S. Martino (Fig. 3.1) where it had remained up to the 18th century. The slab was also decorated with a gem encrusted cross. From a stylistic point of view it has been dated to the 6th century AD. This is based on other examples which have been found in the territory of Lucca such as the church of S. Giovanni di Lucca, at Aquileia. Unfortunately the slab has not survived. Our knowledge comes from a transcription by the scholar Bernardi Baroni in the 18th century.506

DISPONENTE EPISCO[PO] FRYGIANO 
VALERIANUS PRESBYER ALTARE 
CVM COLVMELLIS SVIS FECIT

Inscription on the tomb of S. Frediano

The inscription has been partially worn away. It was inscribed on a slab which had


103
covered the tomb of bishop Frediano. The slab is located in the left nave of the cathedral of S. Frediano. It refers to a funerary monument constructed on behalf of a certain Johannes.

+HOC S[AN]C[T]I TUMULUM FRIGIANI [FE]CIT IN AULAM
PRES[.........]E]CCE IOHANNES
S[AN]C[T]I CUIUS SIGNA [.........]

Unfortunately the chronology is still disputed. The majority of historians refer to the Carolingian period. They argue that the context of this inscription refers to the building activity carried out by the bishop Giovanni I (780-801 AD). However, other historians such as Belli-Barsali and Ciampoltrini have suggested that it belonged to the 6th century AD.507

Inscription from S. Macario in Monte

There are two versions of this inscription. It was transcribed in the 17th century. Ciampoltrini has argued the inscription was originally on a stone slab. The date which he has proposed is the 6th century AD. He has also suggested that it came from a certain Funso a ‘comes bizantino’. In all likelihood he came from Lucca and this dedication refers to the foundation of a church. The church was founded on Luccan territory under bishop Gemignano.508

EP[IS]COPI I FUNSO COMES FECIT

Version B: + TEMPORE GEMINIANI EPISCOPI FUNSO
COMES FECIT

S. Pietro a Vico

This inscription was probably carved on an architrave or on the tympanum of a ciborium.509 It refers to a reconstruction of the church by Hildebrand and his wife Ferialpa. This reconstruction is also mentioned in our written evidence for the year 740 AD (CDL 1, no. 73). Hildebrand is an extremely important figure in Lucchane history as he came from the famous Aldobrandeschi family. Opinion regarding the date appear to be almost uniform in suggesting a date around 800 AD.510

DE DONIS DEI ET BEATI / PETRI A[POSTO]LI EGO

509 I. Belli Barsali, La Diocesi di Lucca, Corpus della scultura altomedievale I (Spoleto, 1959), pp. 49ff, no. 28b.
510 Bertini (ed.), Memorie e documenti per servire all’istoria del ducato di Lucca (Lucca, 1816-1836), IV/1, no. 415.
Chapter 5: The towns

Arezzo

Turning from Lucca to the first of the other towns, Arezzo is located on the intersection of four valleys, the Valdichiana, Valtiberina, Valdarno and the Casentino. This was to give the settlement considerable strategic advantages. Because it was situated between the Valdichiana to the south and Valdarno-Casentino to the north there was the possibility of communications with Florence, Montefeltro and eastern Emilia-Romagna. Arezzo was especially well placed as a connection point between northern and central Italy. In the Roman period this was to mean access to the Via Cassia, and the Via Flaminia, as well as the route to Ariminum. The urban topography of Arezzo consists of the two hills of S. Donato and S. Pietro separated by a ravine which is called Prato. The hill of S. Pionta which was to become important at the end of Late Antiquity and the beginning of the early medieval period is located to the south at a distance of a kilometre from the urban centre of Arezzo. The hill of Sole is located to the south-west of the town. It had an ancient cemetery. It has been suggested that Arezzo originally consisted of various hilltop settlements which became economically and politically preeminent at the beginning of the 5th century BC. However, it is difficult to find evidence for Etruscan Arezzo in our written sources. It is primarily referred to with reference to its contacts with Rome.

Arezzo’s importance during the Hellenistic period was as a manufacturing centre especially for metals and pottery. Arezzo’s pottery is commonly referred to as terra sigillata (stamped clay). This is because of the reliefs used to decorate the vases. These are formed by the use of moulds. The reliefs are created through the use of punches which enable the artist to use various designs, such as decorative borders and figures. The punches are used on the inside of the mould. The mould is then fired before it can be used. The vases are placed inside the mould and the designs are impressed on the sides of the vessel in the form of reliefs. Initially the pottery had a black glaze but eventually this was to be replaced by a red glaze. Arezzo’s pottery was to become famous and was to spread throughout the Roman Empire and beyond. The pottery can be found in Spain and in Africa, as well as the towns of southern Gaul. This includes Narbonne and Nîmes. However, their distribution in Germany and Britain was limited. The exception was the potter Aetius. He was especially active during the Augustan period and his products were distributed as far as Egypt and the Rhine. Aetius has been studied because it has been suggested that he operated in the period in which the dominance of Arezzo’s pottery was being supplaned by the workshops of Gaul. The earliest workshops in Gaul appears to have been located in the south-west. These appear to have been located at Aveyron, at Montans in Tarn, and at Banassac in Lozère. Later workshops were constructed at Auvergne, Lezoux and the valley of the Allier. Judging from the archaeological evidence production in Gaul began around the second half of 1st century AD. This is of some

significance because a common theory for the ‘decline’ of Arezzo in the 2nd century AD is due to the cessation in the production of *terra sigillata*. I will discuss this at greater length below.

Archaeological evidence of buildings from the pre-Roman era is scarce. There appear to be remains of walls constructed of stone on the southern and western sides of the town but the exact date that they were erected is still uncertain. The remains are approximately parallel to Via Colcitrone (Fig. 4.1), Via Pescioni (Fig. 4.1) and Via Borgunto (Fig. 4.1). Based on the evidence from the most recent excavation carried out in Piazzetta S. Niccolò (Fig. 4.1), it is estimated that they were built around the 4th century BC. The walls surround the two hills of S. Pietro and S. Donato, as well as the area in between known as Passeggio del Prato (Fig. 4.1). They are constructed of irregular blocks of local sandstone. Each block measures approximately 100 by 60 centimetres. The physical evidence would suggest that the perimeter of the settlement was not large (around 21 hectares) and was exceeded by the construction of other buildings outside it in a very short period after the walls were erected. The second set of walls excavated archaeologically was constructed of bricks. The date of this wall is uncertain but it was probably constructed around the 3rd century BC. The perimeter encloses an area of approximately 46 hectares. But it is likely that a great part of the town eventually exceeded the limits of this wall also. It has been argued that this zone extended from the two hills of S. Donato and S. Pietro to the south as far as Castro, to the east up to the axis of Viale Sansovino (Fig. 4.1), to the west up to the church of S. Maria in Gradi (Fig. 4.2) in Piazza della Badia (Fig. 4.1), and as far north as the Renaissance walls. There is also evidence of Etruscan settlement to the north of the present day zone of Catona. However, this area was abandoned amidst signs of destruction dated to the Sullan period. There do not seem to be any signs of further repopulation during the entire Roman imperial period and it became a waste ground for Arezzo’s workshops.

It is likely that the first contact between Rome and Arezzo took place around the 4th-3rd century BC. Arezzo became a *municipium* after the Social War. It was also to be colonised by L. Cornelius Sulla and Julius Caesar. It is difficult to overestimate Arezzo’s importance to the Romans. It had an important military role with regard to the campaigns against the Gauls. It has been suggested that further urban expansion took place at the height of Arezzo’s economic and political prosperity when the production of its pottery was at its height and when many of its families of equestrian rank rose to the Senate. A good example of this

Fig. 4.1 – Arezzo: Street plan

Arezzo - Key areas & streets

1. Via Colcitrone
2. Via Pescioni
3. Via Borgunto
4. Piazzetta S. Niccolo
5. Passeggi del Prato
6. Viale Sansovino
7. Piazza della Badia
8. Via Guido Gunicelli
9. Viale Bruno Buozzi
10. Via Ricasoli
11. Via Plaggia di Murello
12. Via S. Lorentino
13. Via Gagiarde
14. Via Fontanella
15. Via Plaggia di S. Lorenzo
16. Via Pelliceria
17. Via Pietramela
18. Via Vittorio Veneto
19. Piazza Porta Crucifera
20. Porta S. Clemente
21. ?
22. ?
23. Via Cavour
24. Canto dei Bacci
25. Porta S. Andrea
26. Borgo di S. Croce
27. Corso Italia
28. Via Pescaia
29. Via Porta Buia
30. Via Venti Settembre
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Fig. 4.2 - Arezzo: Map of the churches and monumental buildings

1 S Maria in Gradi
2 Ampitheatre
3 Fortezza Medicea
4 S. Maria della Pieve
5 Duomo Vecchio
6 S. Donato
7 S. Francesco
8 Sacro Cuore e S. Margherita
would be the rise of Gaius Maecenas (702-8 BC) who became a political advisor to the emperor Octavian. He was a member of the Arretine elite and claimed descent from the Etruscan house of the Cilnii.

This economic prosperity must have contributed to its expansion under the Romans around the first century AD. This urban expansion took place especially towards the south and north-west of the Etruscan town. This included the amphitheatre (Fig. 4.2) and the area of S. Clemente, the latter perhaps arising because of the road leading to the Casentino. In all likelihood the *decumanus* of the Roman town was Via Guido Gunicelli (Fig. 4.1) and Viale Bruno Buozzi (Fig. 4.1) to the east and Via Ricasoli (Fig. 4.1), Via Piaggio di Murello (Fig. 4.1) and Via S. Lorentino (Fig. 4.1) to the west. The centre of the town was probably occupied by what is now the Fortezza Medicea (Fig. 4.2) and the Passeggi del Prato (Fig. 4.1). The *cardo* was on Via Gagliarde (Fig. 4.1), Via Fontanella (Fig. 4.1), Via Piaggio di S. Lorenzo (Fig. 4.1), and Via Pelliceria (Fig. 4.1), and it extends beyond Passeggi del Prato (Fig. 4.1) to Via Pietramela (Fig. 4.1). Many of the town’s streets led to the most important Roman roads. For example, Arezzo’s *cardo* was to lead to the road for Ariminum. What is now Via Vittorio Veneto (Fig. 4.1) is constructed on part of the Via Cassia that entered the city from the south. Archaeological evidence of Arezzo’s Roman roads have tended to be discovered outside the town centre in suburban areas. This includes cemeteries which provide further clues to the location of the roads. In fact actual archaeological evidence for the town centre is restricted to the *cardo* on Via Pelliceria (Fig. 4.1) and the crossroads near the church of S. Maria della Pieve (Fig. 4.2) although it has been suggested that the crossroads date to the Etruscan period.

Despite these difficulties, archaeological clues exist which gives us some indication of the urban plan. Some idea of the *decumanus* is due to the so-called cistern of Prato which I will discuss in further detail later. The topography of the eastern zone based on the axis of
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Via Fontanella (Fig. 4.1) and Via Pellicceria (Fig. 4.1) is deduced by the orientation of the domus of S. Lorenzo.\textsuperscript{531} This topography can also be seen with regard to the remains of monumental Roman public buildings. This consists of the public baths, the amphitheatre (Fig. 4.2) and the forum, all of which date to the Augustan and Julio-Claudian period.\textsuperscript{532} I would like to discuss the monumental public buildings in more detail. These buildings were located to the south of the Fortezza Medicea (Fig. 4.1) and some parts are still visible today. During Roman times they would have covered the whole area to the north of the piazza Porta Cruciferà (Fig. 4.1). This would have been the case during the early years of the Principiate.\textsuperscript{533} The most recent coinage discovered in the amphitheatre (in a sewer shaft under the stage) dates to Constantine and this is also the case for most of the other objects found nearby.\textsuperscript{534} This would suggest that the amphitheatre (Fig. 4.2) remained in use up to Late Antiquity, and went out of use sometime thereafter.

The amphitheatre (Fig. 4.2) has been dated to the 1\textsuperscript{st}-2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD.\textsuperscript{535} It has survived to the present day.\textsuperscript{536} Traditionally, the construction of the Roman amphitheatre (Fig. 4.2) has been divided into two phases. The first phase would have been between the end of the Julio-Claudian period and the beginning of the Flavian. The second phase would have been between the end of the first century AD and the beginning of the second.\textsuperscript{537} The amphitheatre (Fig. 4.2) became a cemetery during the early medieval period and part of its structure was included in the urban fortifications.\textsuperscript{538} The cavea of the Roman amphitheatre (Fig. 4.2), similarly, was to remain in use until the end of the Renaissance as a defensive structure.

The remains of two other public bath buildings have also been located to the east of the amphitheatre and outside Porta S. Clemente (Fig. 4.1).\textsuperscript{539} Possible archaeological evidence of the infrastructure for the public baths has also been discovered. This includes the remains of what has been interpreted as a cistern (castellum aquae) which was discovered at Prato. It has been dated to the 1\textsuperscript{st} century AD.\textsuperscript{540} A possible explanation is that the cistern was
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\textsuperscript{533} Ibid. pp. 431-490.

\textsuperscript{534} Ibid. p. 439.

\textsuperscript{535} A. Cherici, ‘Materiali per una forma urbis di Arezzo antica’, Annali Arentini I (Florence 1993), cat. N. 19, p. 25.


\textsuperscript{537} J. Golvin, L’ amphitheatre romain. Essai sur la theorisation de sa forme et de ses fonctions (1988), p. 169 and 196 (pl. 21, 7)


connected by a pipe to an aqueduct located on the hill of Poti. This would explain the toponym 'S. Michele in Arachalis' which might refer to a series of arches. A document dated to 876 AD referred to as the Preceptum Karoli de foro civitatis mentions an area known as the “forum”. This area was to be given to the bishop for the construction of a cathedral within the walls. If, as has been argued, this area was located at Passeggi del Prato (Fig. 4.1), the reference to “forum” might be intended as a reference to the antiquity of the area. It may also have been possible that remains from monumental Roman public buildings were still visible there. The document also refers to an “orrum”. This may have been a reference to the cistern mentioned above. In all likelihood it was reused from Late Antiquity as a granary. It would seem that public buildings at Arezzo were concentrated mainly in two areas: on the hills of S. Pietro and S. Donato, Prato, the area occupied by the forum, and public baths, as well as the area surrounding the amphitheatre (Fig. 4.2).

The 2nd century AD is often viewed as the beginning of a slow ‘decline’ or transformation for Arezzo. However, the extent and reasons for this ‘decline’ is still debated. The argument that Arezzo’s ‘decline’ was entirely due to the cessation of terra sigillata does not adequately explain the prosperity of the Etruscan town. Others have argued more plausibly that part of the reason was the construction of a new stretch of the Via Cassia which meant that journeys did not have to go through Arezzo. This took place under the emperor Hadrian. This meant that Arezzo was left out of the route which joined central and northern Italy. Archaeological excavations have not been conducted in enough detail to describe Arezzo’s transformation from Late Antiquity to the early medieval period in great detail. In many ways it can be argued that we have a better knowledge of Arezzo during the Principate rather than for the early medieval period. However, we do possess some possible reference points.

The first area to consider is the zone surrounding the amphitheatre (Fig. 4.2). This area contains burials. The exact date of these burials are uncertain but it has been suggested that they took place in the late medieval period. It is more than probable that this area was rebuilt during the early medieval period. There is some evidence from other parts of the town to support this. An early medieval wall appears to have been built from travertine and materials taken from Roman buildings to the southwest of the Fortezza Medicea (Fig. 4.2). The circuit appear to have been bounded by the Via Colcitrone (Fig. 4.1), Via Pescioni (Fig. 4.1), and Via Borgunto (Fig. 4.1). An excavation carried out near Piazzetta S. Niccolò (Fig. 4.1) has also revealed traces of a wall dated to the 4th century BC. Based on the evidence it has been argued that the early medieval wall was not newly created but was rebuilt on the remains of the Etruscan wall. There was also an early medieval wall discovered in the area surrounding the amphitheatre (Fig. 4.2). This wall utilized the cavea of the Roman theatre. It

542 U. Pasqui, Documenti per la storia della città di Arezzo nel Medioevo (Florence, 1937), pp. 61-63.
is possible that the amphitheatre (Fig. 4.2) operated as a ‘mini citadel’ but this is still debated. This wall remained standing till the Renaissance. As in Lucca and other towns of north Tuscany a common characteristic is the reuse of any Roman monumental buildings which are left.

Another point to consider is a residential building which was excavated in Piazza S. Francesco (Fig. 4.1). The building is dated to the Principate. There appear to be signs of a fire followed by abandonment at the end of the 3rd century AD. It was never reoccupied during Late Antiquity and the beginning of the early medieval period, despite the fact that Piazza S. Francesco (Fig. 4.1) was where the Via Cassia entered the town. A large part of Late Antique and early medieval Arezzo was located on the highest areas of the Etruscan town. As with Lucca the impression given is of abandonment and disuse of some of the town’s monumental buildings such as the amphitheatre. The amphitheatre was abandoned around the 2nd-3rd century AD in Lucca and probably after the 3rd century AD for Arezzo. In Lucca it was covered by ‘dark earth’, and in Arezzo it was converted into a cemetery. However, despite these similarities there does seem to have been important differences as well.

In Lucca the evidence suggests that the population became dispersed and concentrations of population developed irrespective of the Roman town centre. These new population centres may have functioned as independent villages. They also tended to be centred around cathedrals such as SS. Giovanni e Reparata (Fig. 3.1), S. Giorgio, S. Tommaso, S. Michele in Cipriano, and S. Frediano (Fig. 3.1). This does not seem to have been the case with Arezzo. There seems to have been continuous habitation of the hills of S. Pietro and S. Donato, which had been occupied since the Etruscan period, perhaps because the hills are militarily easy to defend. Unlike Lucca an additional factor to consider is the redrawing of urban space within new defensive fortifications. Partly this probably has something to do with the topography of Arezzo which because it is dominated by the two hills of S. Pietro and S. Donato is easily defensible. With this in mind it is tempting to see this as a sign of abandonment and depopulation of other parts of the town. However, caution needs to be exercised. Our knowledge of structures dating to the 4th-5th century AD is far from complete. There are, however, also some signs of urban prosperity. This is mainly in the form of inscriptions from the church of SS Stefano e Donato which provide evidence of economic activity as a result of links between the local nobility and the imperial court.

Before that I would like to discuss the Late Antique and early medieval fortifications in more detail. To a large extent the fortifications are based on the Etruscan circuit of walls. They consist of large irregular shaped square slabs and blocks of local sandstone. The walls were used to protect the hills of the town, specifically S. Donato and the saddle between them, Passeggi del Prato (Fig. 4.1). Let us turn in greater detail to the fortifications. It has been

549 U. Pasqui, Documenti per la storia della città di Arezzo nel Medioevo (Florence, 1937), pp. 61-63.
551 U. Pasqui, Documenti per la storia della città di Arezzo nel Medioevo (Florence, 1937), p. 62; G.
suggested that all of the area to the east of Viale Sansovino (Fig. 4.1) and Vicolo delle Terme (Fig. 4.1) was protected by fortifications. The date they were constructed is unknown, but it has been hypothesized that it was between Late Antiquity and the early medieval period. Archaeological information on the area originally surrounded the Etruscan walls is still limited for the early medieval period. However, some documentary evidence does exist. The Preceptum Karoli de foro civitatis states that the “forum...muro adiacet” and also that one of the boundaries was the “muri civitatis”. It is possible that the early medieval wall may have included most of the highest parts of the town. The implication must be that the area of Etruscan Arezzo remained continuously inhabited throughout the Roman period. One hypothesis is that the zone surrounding the theatre became the core of a fortified citadel. This would have been located on the hill of S. Donato. Judging from the size of the early medieval wall compared to the Roman wall, there appears to have been a considerable reduction in the urban area of Arezzo in comparison with the later Principate although the chronology is still far from clear. The archaeological evidence is extremely difficult to interpret and is open for debate.

Fatucchi has suggested that Arezzo became a ‘city-fortress’ and part of a defensive line. If this was the case then Arezzo could be considered to be an example not dissimilar to Late Antique Bologna. The problem arises, should Arezzo be considered ‘urban’ or instead as simply a ‘fortress’? An important factor to consider is the area which was enclosed by the wall. This included the acropolis, a large part of the spaces which held public buildings, as well as some of the residential areas. It is clear that there was a contraction in the size of the urban area, but it is important to realise that the size of the urban wall alone cannot sufficiently describe the condition of the Late Antique town. It is possible that the fortifications did not necessarily mean an economic decline but a practical decision motivated by military necessity. If this was the case it is likely that the area outside the contracted wall remained inhabited during Late Antiquity. It is not beyond the realms of possibility that this area retained economic vitality. Arezzo was to be a stronghold under the Byzantines and a strategically important town under the Lombards. The area within the early medieval walls


553 The actual passage is “…Ad quod opus (the construction of a cathedral within Arezzo) compendiums sancto Donato eiusque rectori venerabili Ioanni ac eius successoribus forum, quod muro adiacet, intra terminus: ex uno latere dominus, quae diciture orrea: ex altero ecclesia quondam beati Benedicti, a tertio latere est murus civitatis, a quarto vero latere est terra sancti Petri et via publica…”.


555 Ibid. p. 316.


functioned as a citadel. In this scenario the suburbs and the areas outside the wall retained some prosperity and performed the functions of an urban community.\(^{559}\)

There is also other evidence that may indicate continuous habitation in Arezzo throughout Late Antiquity and the early medieval period. The survival of the street-plan can be seen in documentary evidence from the early medieval and later medieval period. For example, they refer to a “*ruga mastra*” which can be identified as the *decumanus* and a “*via magio*” which it has been suggested was the *cardo*. This is now the Via Pelliccerie (Fig. 4.1).\(^{560}\) Although, it should be pointed out that that survival of the street-plan only indicates the survival of property boundaries. There are also other indications of urban continuity. The Via Cassia which entered the town from the south seems to have remained in function throughout this period. However, there do appear to be signs of discontinuity with regard to some of the minor roads of the Roman town which may not have survived. An alternative explanation could be our ignorance in not recognising the original Roman road which has been overlaid by a later medieval road. However, it should be pointed out that the medieval buildings surrounding S. Francesco are built on a lower terrace in comparison with their Roman counterparts. We may cautiously suggest that this zone may have been abandoned and rebuilt during the later medieval period and included in the medieval town circuit. It should be pointed out that this phenomenon is paralleled in Lucca. Although in this case the ground surrounding the amphitheatre was raised 2.5-3 metres during the medieval period. But what is striking is that the rebuilding in both cases are deliberate. This is indicative of urban planning during the medieval period.

To summarise, although there is evidence of a contraction in Arezzo’s urban area and also of some abandonment, the survival of large parts of the street-plan would suggest that urban activity continued during the early medieval period. The survival meant that the roads were still being used. It is true that Arezzo probably ‘suffered’ to some extent from the opening of a branch off the Via Cassia which bypassed Arezzo under Hadrian.\(^{561}\) But this can be debated. Arezzo was still in communication with Rome and more importantly with Ravenna.\(^{562}\) In fact it has been argued that from 402 AD Arezzo’s importance might actually have increased.\(^{563}\) This was due to several factors. Firstly, Arezzo’s strategic position with regard to the control of the road between Rome and Ravenna. This was despite the growing
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significance of north-west Tuscany and Lucca with regard to communications with the north: Arezzo’s relevance was never diminished. Secondly, it possessed great military value. At the beginning of the 7th century AD it was of great significance to the Lombards due to its position near the frontier with regard to the Byzantines. The Lombards had captured the town around the end of the 6th century AD. The archaeological evidence they left behind is mainly in the form of burials. It has been suggested that the Lombards were concentrated mainly on the north-east and eastern side of the hill of S. Donato. This is because of a document dated to 714 AD which mentions a “curte domno regis” which has been identified as being on the hill. This was the Etruscan acropolis and it is possible that it was fortified. Ciampoltrini has argued that Arezzo, Chiusi, and Fiesole all share a common trait “la conservazione delle antiche mura si combina con la possibilità di adattare l’antica acropolis a castellum...” However, this interpretation has been challenged by other historians. Delumeau has suggested that the “castellum” must have been a later development. The problem is that neither of these two suggestions is backed by archaeological evidence. It is possible that the fortifications were more of the nature of a “castrum” rather than “castellum”.

From a military point of view it is difficult to deny the importance of Arezzo to the Lombards due to its strategic location. But its political importance is more difficult to assess. There does not seem to have been a gastald unlike in Siena. Delumeau and Tafì have argued on the basis of a study on the disputes between the diocese of Arezzo and Siena. The bishop of Arezzo appealed directly to the court of the king at Pavia against the power of the gastald in Siena. They have also suggested that the leading Roman elites had little power against the strong Lombard exercitales.

Archaeologically, there are serious obstacles to studying the town. Because some parts are located on a slope it is difficult to examine the stratigraphy accurately. The area occupied by monumental buildings such as the theatre, forum and public baths is not surprisingly more conspicuous than other areas which may have been as important but are now built over by medieval fortifications. A possible candidate for this is the residential area

---


567 Ibid. p. 599;


to the west of the monumental buildings.\textsuperscript{571} Other areas which still need more intensive investigation include Via Cavour (Fig. 4.1) and Canto dei Bacci (Fig. 4.1).\textsuperscript{572} With regard to Late Antique and early medieval graves, they are located near monumental buildings. This includes the area surrounding the forum, amphitheatre and public baths. It is possible that they were other graves but these were built over by Late Antique fortifications. Other graves were located on the margins or in the suburban areas. This would include Via Sangallo and Viale Bruno Buozzi (Fig. 4.1), Porta S. Andrea (Fig. 4.1), Borgo di S. Croce (Fig. 4.1) and Via Veneto (Fig. 4.1), as well as the hill of S. Pionta. It should be stressed that the evidence points to continuous use of the cemetery between Late Antiquity and the early medieval period. The suburban areas are \textit{ad sanctos}. They were dedicated to the cult of S. Donato. According to tradition, he was the bishop of the diocese of Arezzo and was martyred under the rule of Julian the Apostle (355-363 AD).

The original cathedral of Arezzo was also suburban. It is now known as the Duomo Vecchio (Fig. 4.2). It is located on the hill of Pionta at a distance of approximately a kilometre to the south of the town. Like other churches in the diocese of Arezzo and the rest of north Tuscany, it is on a Roman road the Via \textit{Cassia vetus}. It was the seat of the bishopric until the end of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century. In the 13\textsuperscript{th} century the seat of the bishopric was transferred inside the town. The cathedral was abandoned and the original building was destroyed during the Renaissance.\textsuperscript{573} An excavation was carried out in the 1970’s in order to provide information on the origins of the church, Christianity in Arezzo, the beginning of the cathedral, and the presence of the bishop, who was supposed to have begun residing there in 840 AD. The archaeological evidence has revealed that the oldest building is dated to before the 4\textsuperscript{th}-5\textsuperscript{th} century AD. During the 4\textsuperscript{th}-5\textsuperscript{th} century AD this building was destroyed. On the next level there is a cemetery. Based on a date from one of the graves it has been dated to the first half of the 7\textsuperscript{th} century AD. Two earrings were also found.\textsuperscript{574} A successive building was constructed with three apses. This building is dated to the 8\textsuperscript{th} century AD on the basis of a document in which the church was referred to as the cathedral of S. Maria.\textsuperscript{575} The sources also refer to a “\textit{parvum oratorium}”. This was supposedly located near the grave of S. Donato. The evidence for the existence of a cult of S. Donato can be found on the basis of epigraphy at the Duomo Nuovo on the hill of S. Pietro.\textsuperscript{576}

It has been argued that the building with three apses was the original cathedral of Arezzo.\textsuperscript{577} If this was the case then this building must have been a later development of the

\textsuperscript{571} A. Cherici, ‘Materiali per una forma urbis di Arezzo antica’, \textit{Annali Aretini} 1 (Florence, 1993), p. 43.
\textsuperscript{572} Ibid. p. 26.
“oratorium”. However, there is still some debate. This is because the 8th century AD documents mention an “ecclesia” and there is only one reference to a rectory in 840 AD. However, it has been argued that it is more than likely that the episcopal seat was located near the grave of a martyr. An alternative explanation is that at the beginning of the 9th century AD, a new church was specifically dedicated to S. Donato, and it was only in 1036 that the church was called the Duomo Vecchio. This new church was built near the original cathedral. The matter is still unresolved. There is one clear difference between Arezzo and the other towns in north Tuscany such as Lucca. Arezzo’s original cathedral is located outside the town walls. The reasons for this are still unclear. One argument suggests that its status as cathedral of Arezzo was relatively new and that it was transferred from an earlier church within the town walls. The move would have been made to a holy ground, a location known as a place for the veneration of the saints (ad sanctos). Others argue that since the early sources did not mention the existence of a cathedral within this town, it is more likely that the choice of the location was not determined. The bishop was therefore free to move it to a holy cemetery. What seems especially clear is that the power of the bishop seems to have been confirmed by the beginning of the Carolingian period and the paramount importance of the diocese over others in Tuscany even before the 9th century AD. I would now like to examine the archaeological detail of the churches of the diocese in more detail.

The Churches of the Diocese of Arezzo

The oldest written evidence concerning Christianity in the diocese of Arezzo is an inscription on a marble slab which was used as an altar table in the crypt of the abbey of S. Antimo (Fig. 4.3) dated to 347 AD. The left part of the inscription is missing. It features a monogram of Christ and the final part of a masculine name ending in VINO wishing him to rest in peace with Christ. It has been argued on the basis of the material used, the quality of the inscription and the monogram that the person belonged to a family of high social standing. This is probably the oldest Christian inscription in Tuscany and suggests that Christianity had arrived in Arezzo at a very early date. Let us examine the evidence for the churches in more detail.

583 CIL, XI, 2599.
Fig. 4.3 – Arezzo: Map of the churches in the diocese

- S. Marino
- Montalcino
- Montepulciano
- Pienza
- Chianciano
- S. S. Maria Maddalena a Sietina
- S. Maria a Corsano
- S. Maria d'Asso
- S. Giovanni d'Asso
- S. Maria di Altaserra
- S. Giovanni di Asciano
- S. Ippolito di Asciano
- S. Giovanni a Campvane
- S. Maria a Farneta
- S. Paolo
- S. Cassiano a Campvane
- Montalcino
- S. Maria a Bulano
- S. Maria Assunta alla Chiassa Superiore
- S. Donato a Bibbianello a Pienza
- S. Vincenti
- S. Antimo
- S. Mustiola a Quarto
- Pieve di Sinalunga
- Chiusi
- Bagno di Romagna
There is considerable information on the churches in the Regesto di Camaldoli, Regesto di Coltibuono and the Cartulario della Berardenga, compiled in the 10th to 11th centuries.\footnote{L. Schiaparelli (ed.), F. Baldasseroni, Regesto di Camaldoli (Rome, 1907-1922), L. Pagliai (ed.), Regesto di Coltibuono (Rome, 1909), E. Casanova (ed.), Cartulario della Berardenga, (Siena, 1929).} We also possess a list of all the parish churches, monasteries and rectories of the medieval diocese of Arezzo for the years 1274-1275, 1275-1276, 1278-1279 and 1302-1303 in the Rationes Decimarum.\footnote{P. Guidi (ed.), Rationes Decimarum Italice, Tuscia, I. Le decime degli anni 1274-1280 (Vatican, 1932), M. Giusti (ed.) & P. Guidi, Rationes Decimarum Italice, Tuscia, II. Le decime degli anni 1295-1304 (Vatican, 1942).}. The Rationes Decimarum of 1278-1279 listed twenty-three churches of which twelve dated from 714-715 AD. It seems that seven were lost or had their status reduced (so that they were no longer listed). Nine were added or succeeded the older churches. The biggest variations were in the period between 715 to the 11th century AD. Therefore caution has to be exercised in assigning an early medieval origin to a church which is only documented in the 11th century. However, in the case of sixty-seven churches in the Rationes Decimarum of the 13th to 14th century, archaeological evidence has revealed that almost fifty are located on a Roman settlement.\footnote{A. Fattucchi, ‘Aspetti della cristianizzazione delle campagne della Toscana nord-orientale’, Atti e Memorie della Accademia Petrarca di Lettere e Scienze (Arezzo, 1988), p. 58.} This is an important piece of evidence because it is more than likely that many churches thought to have been constructed in the medieval period may have actually been built during the Roman period. Unless detailed archaeological investigation is carried out, it is extremely easy to make this mistake.

The locations of the oldest churches also tend to be along important Roman routes. This is particularly so for all the churches founded between the 5th and 6th century AD such as S. Mustiola a Quarto (Fig. 4.3) and S. Martino di Galognano by the road leading to Fiesole and Florence. However, only S. Martino a Galognano is located by the actual road, S. Mustiola a Quarto (Fig. 4.3) is actually a little distance away from the road. There are also a series of churches which are on a line from Sinalunga (Fig. 4.3) to Montalcino (Fig. 4.3). In a document dated to 714 AD all of them are called sancta mater ecclesia.\footnote{U. Pasqui, Documenti per la storia della città di Arezzo nel medioevo I (Florence, 1899), p. 6.} These are S. Pietro ad Mensulas (also known as Pieve di Sinalunga (Fig. 4.3)), S. Ippolito di Asciano (Fig. 4.3), S. Maria di Cosona, S. Pietro di Pava and S. Maria di Mattiachese which is near Montalcino (Fig. 4.3). It is likely that this is a phenomenon which we have seen before with regard to Lucca. The basilica of S. Frediano (Fig. 3.1) is also located near a Roman road. In all likelihood these were suburban churches which were constructed on the location of sacred burials. The sacred burials were where the earliest Christians were buried. Later these became cemeteries and when Christianity received official sanction in the 4th century AD, buildings were built in order to house the burials.

I list here some churches which are mentioned in documents which date to approximately the same period and where no remains of construction dating to Late Antiquity have been found. The church of S. Agata ad Asciano (Fig. 4.3) is mentioned for the first time in a document dated to 714 AD in a dispute between the bishops of Siena and Arezzo. The church style is in a transition between the Romanesque and the Gothic. The church of S. Donato a Bibbianello is first mentioned in the same document as above in 714 AD. The church has not survived but was probably located near S. Giovanni d’Asso (Fig. 4.3, 6), near to Palazzo Massaini. The church of S. Maria a Cosona is also in this document. In the 8th century AD there is also a mention of a college of priests. St Maria di Altaserra (Fig. 4.3) is recorded for the first time in a document dated to 20th June 715 AD concerning a dispute between Luperziano bishop of Arezzo and Adeodato bishop of Siena. The interior has been
almost completely plastered over but we do have a small piece showing on one of the pillars which is of the same composition as the oldest parts of the exterior of the church which suggest that much of the original structure is hidden underneath the plaster. Below I have listed churches which have clearly reused building materials from the Roman period.

**Spolia**

The re-use of Roman materials in the construction of churches and monasteries in the diocese of Arezzo can be illustrated by numerous examples (see Appendix D). The church of S. Marcellino in Chianti is first recorded in a document dated to 945 AD. It appears again in a dispute between the bishops of Siena and Arezzo in 998 AD. Inside the church some of the columns with capitals of the Corinthian order are clearly taken from Roman buildings. There are also other Roman columns and classical capitals in the rectory and in the immediate vicinity of the church.\(^{588}\) The church of S. Mustiola a Quarto (Fig. 4.3) is first listed in a document dated to 955 AD whereby the Lombards of Torrita donated land to the monastery of S. Fiore. In the facing piazza are three sections of Roman columns which are made out of travertine.\(^{589}\)

The first mention of the church of S. Maria Maddalena a Sietina (Fig. 4.3) is in a document dated to 1022. The façade is of relatively recent origin, the central window is dated to 1720. However, within the building, to the right of the main door, there is a shaft of a Roman column, that at one time supported a Corinthian capital (which has now been stolen) used to hold holy water. There was also a considerable amount of material which went towards the construction of the cathedral of S. Donato (Fig. 4.2). Two fragments from a column of Egyptian porphyry were used in the side entrance with very few changes, without even any attempts to repair the cracks.\(^{590}\) In the case of the church of S. Maria della Pieve (Fig. 4.2) we find six columns used in its façade which because of their similarity in the materials used and dimensions must have been part of the *spolia* of the same building, though we do not know its location.

It should be pointed out that in the examples above some of the materials reused are extremely fragmentary. However, we do have some cases where the reuse of Roman building materials is on a more substantial basis. We have the example of the church of S. Maria at Corsano (Fig. 4.3) which is mentioned in a Papal bull of Innocent III of 1198. The arch is formed from a block of sandstone alternated with Roman bricks.\(^{591}\) The church of S. Vincenti (Fig. 4.3) is on the south-western limit of Chianti (on the slope of Valdambra) on the border between Arezzo and Siena. It is mentioned for the first time in 715 AD and part of the church is constructed from Roman bricks.\(^{592}\)

---

589 Ibid. p. 158.
591 Ibid. p. 203.
In other cases what we find is that the church itself is built over the remains of Roman buildings. The church of S. Maria a Buiano (Fig. 4.3) is such an example. It is first recorded in the *Regesto di Camaldoli* in the year 1001.\(^{593}\) Underneath the floor of the church finds from various periods have been discovered and there appear to be traces of a Roman bath house.\(^{594}\) A similar example appears to be the church of S. Maria Assunta alla Chiassa Superiore (Fig. 4.3). It is first mentioned in a document dated to December 1026 in which the bishop Theodald increased the donations of his predecessors Elempert and Adalbert to the architect Maginard who was responsible for the church of S. Donato a Bibbianello, Pienza (Fig. 4.3) and buildings at Piona (Fig. 4.3). Excavations have revealed underneath the floor of the church evidence of a previous building, identified as the remains of the bath house of a Roman villa.\(^{595}\)

We have a similar example in the case of the church of S. Paolo (Fig. 4.3). The church is recorded for the first time in 1031 in the *Annali Camaldolesi*.\(^{596}\) The building was constructed on the slope of the hill of S. Polo. This is located to the northeast of the town of Arezzo. It was in a strategic position, being placed close to a junction of the Arezzo-Rimini road as well as the road for Sovara. The building is in the vicinity of a small settlement and built on the actual remains of a rich Roman villa dated to the imperial period. The church has used the Roman building materials extensively. The evidence for this is the discovery in the area surrounding the church of coinage dating to the imperial period and the use of Corinthian style capitals made of travertine stone and granite columns in the architecture of the church.

These building materials are in extremely good condition. A good example would be the Corinthian columns which are in a rare state of preservation with even the foliage almost completely intact. The actual dating of these columns is debated. The base of the capitals and the style in which the foliage is done would suggest the Flavian period but the vivacity of the carvings can also be attributed to the Severan period. To a large extent the capitals of the church of S. Paolo (Fig. 4.3) are similar to those found at the church of S. Maria Maddalena a Sietina (Fig. 4.3). This would suggest that if the capitals of S. Maria a Sietina (Fig. 4.3) had not been transported from the church of S. Paolo (Fig. 4.3) then it is likely that the two Roman villas near the churches had been served by the same workshop. There was also a Roman sarcophagus in green marble in the garden. The church also has four Corinthian columns dated to the Roman period in the presbytery. It is not clear if they remain in their original positions or were taken and then reused in the first Christian church on the site. The columns are placed on a travertine base which is worn out at the corners as if from continuous pounding or treading which suggests that the floor is of a similar date to the base. The composition of the floor also suggests that it may date from the Roman period. It is possible that the presbytery used or reused the remains as well as the outline of a Roman villa and the rest of the building was erected at the same time as the first Christian church on the site.


\(^{595}\) Ibid. p. 145.

\(^{596}\) *Annali Camaldolesi*, Archivio di Arezzo (1834), a. 1031, row 12, Matter 16.
The church of S. Cassiano a Campavane (Fig. 4.3) is situated on the outskirts of Laterina. It remained a church until the end of the 12th century when it was abandoned and replaced by a church dedicated to SS. Hippolito e Cassiano. The building was reused by farmers and is in an extremely poor state of conservation. In the immediate vicinity of the church archaeological excavations suggest the remains of a Roman villa. Between the two buildings is a mosaic floor dated to the 4th century AD. At present the mosaic floor is placed at the side of the church of SS Hippollito e Cassiano. We also have many examples of monasteries and abbeys which re-use Roman materials. The Benedictine monastery of S. Maria a Farneta (Fig. 4.3) was famous for its wealth and its abbey was one of the most powerful in Italy. According to W. Kurze its foundation was at the beginning of the 11th century. However, P.F. Kehr has suggested the end of the 10th century to be the more likely date. The roof of the monastery is supported by columns taken from a Roman building site. The walls of the church consist of small rough sandstone blocks and irregularly placed bricks. Many of the bricks in the wall are Roman and the container for holy water is formed from two classical capitals. There are also two Roman columns made of granite placed in the façade.

This reuse of material also seems to have gone on for a considerable period of time. One of the best examples is the use of Roman and Etruscan funerary urns to hold holy water. We have a case recorded in the 1500’s of one being used in the church of S. Lazzo (Fig. 4.3), there is one still in use at the present day in the basilica of S. Francesco (Fig. 4.2) and a similar urn was restored in the church of Sacro Cuore e S. Margherita Redi (Fig. 4.2). The funerary urn reused at the entrance of the basilica of S. Francesco (Fig. 4.2) is mounted on a small column which is possibly taken from a destroyed cloister.

The abbey of S. Antimo (Fig. 4.3) incorporates fragments from a Roman marble sculpture in the northern side of the church wall, representing a human figure with a cornucopia (horn of plenty), a fertility symbol most likely taken from a sarcophagus. The location of the abbey is on top of the remains of a Roman villa. The materials recovered include the remains of seven columns measuring two Roman feet in diameter (58 cm) and a height slightly higher than a metre. There are also fragments of the same material as these Roman columns in a wall constructed to the north of the abbey. There is also a fragment of a travertine column measuring a foot in diameter (29 cm) and seventy-eight centimetres in length.

The chapel of Ciuccio Tarlati (Fig. 4.2), located in the Duomo of Arezzo contains an early Christian sarcophagus made of marble. It was supposedly transferred from the Roman catacombs to the care of bishop Agostino Albergotti. The sarcophagus is dated to the

---

4th century AD. It is not always so easy to ascertain the origins of other Roman sarcophagi. The sarcophagus which contained the remains of the saint Benedetto Sinigardi is likely to have been manufactured in a town. However, it is impossible to be sure that it was made in Arezzo due to the fact that it is the only find of this type in its zone. We do have several marble fragments of sarcophagi in the collection at the museum at Arezzo but unfortunately we can only be sure that one of them is of local origin. The other is too badly destroyed by a bulldozer to give us any useful detail.

From both the documentary and the archaeological evidence it appears that Arezzo, like Lucca, represents an example of the continuity of urban life in north Tuscany. It is true that caution needs to be exercised. The archaeological evidence is still limited. In comparison with Lucca the documentary evidence is also less. However, despite this it seems clear that there was continuous habitation in the town from Late Antiquity to the early medieval period. There is very little doubt that the population density appears to have been less in the early medieval period. It is also likely that some parts of the town was abandoned. But other areas appear to have remained populated especially the two hills of S. Donato and S. Pietro, which was the centre of the Etruscan town. Traditionally, Arezzo’s ‘crisis’ was supposed to have occurred by the end of the 3rd century AD. But the evidence would indicate that Late Antique Arezzo retained some economic prosperity. Its relevance as a strategic town was due to its position as a nexus between the north and south of Italy. It is also likely that the ruling classes had some links with the imperial court. There seems very little doubt that the urban space within the town did contract between Late Antiquity and the early medieval period, possibly as a result of depopulation. But this did not necessarily mean the cessation of urban activities.

Our knowledge of the extramural (outside the Etruscan circuit of walls) areas of early medieval Arezzo is still limited. This is especially true with regard to the population density and economic activity of Arezzo’s suburbs. In Lucca’s case the extramural areas such as Pulia, Placule, Silice saw urban activity (such as the construction of new houses), and became the core of new population centres. This also happened around extramural ecclesiastical buildings such as the cathedral of S. Martino (Fig. 3.1), and the churches of S. Giorgio, S. Tommaso, as well as S. Frediano (Fig. 3.1), during the early medieval period. It is unclear whether the same thing happened with regard to Arezzo. But there does seem to be some evidence of urban planning. The reuse of the Etruscan circuit of walls in the 4th-5th century AD, and the construction of new walls during the early medieval period is one example. Further evidence is the construction of medieval buildings on a lower level than the Roman ones around S. Francesco. One explanation given for this urban activity (despite evidence of a reduction in the urban space on the town), was the continuing strategic importance of Arezzo. It has been suggested that there was a Lombard presence on the eastern side of the hill of S. Donato. The evidence is mainly in the form of graves with Lombard weapons in the eastern suburbs outside the walls. To summarise, although the archaeological and documentary evidence is not as generous as at Lucca, a reasonable case can be made for continuing habitation and urban activity in early medieval Arezzo.

602 Ibid. p. 42, n. 61.
Appendix D, Part 1, The town

I list here the principal Roman buildings in Arezzo and how they were used in the medieval period and also a list of how the materials were reused.

VIALE BRUNO BUOZZI (Fig. 4.1)

Roman Theatre: Cherici has argued that it was reused in the medieval period possibly as an assembly place and was later incorporated in the fortifications of the citadel.606

CATHEDRAL (Fig. 4.2)

1. a) The left pulpit: nine columns consisting of granite of various qualities and grain. Height 1.48-1.50m; diameter 0.19m. Marble balustrade.

b) The right pulpit: six columns consisting of (starting from the left) onion marble, red veronese marble, African marble, pavonazzetto, onion marble, pavonazzetto, in part restored with blocks of granite and ritornite. Height 1.48-1.50m; diameter 0.19m. Marble from Luni, pavonazzetto, onion marble, red Egyptian porphyry on the stairs and on the balustrade.

c) The left nave: ‘Column of S. Donato’: Fragments of the column in granite. Height 0.90m; diameter 0.44m.

2. Chapel of Ciuccio Tarlati (Fig. 4.2)

a) Four octagonal fragments of African marble.

b) Paleo-Christian sarcophagus in Apuan marble; 2 x 0.63m x 0.59 height.

3. Cenotaph of Gregory X

a) Four cylindrical columns of African marble,

b) One fragment of column in African marble,

c) Two fragments of columns in Apuan marble,

d) Four marble slabs of red Veronese marble,

e) The other columns are of granite.

4. Chapel of Madonna del Conforto:

Single elements which have been reused are no longer easily identifiable in the Baroque structure. However, the documents in the archive suggest that many of the materials are constructed from Roman building materials taken from the surrounding districts.

---

605 This list has been derived from A. Cherici, ‘Indagini su Arezzo antica, II. Strutture, materiali architettonici, singoli reperti antichi reimpiegati nella città e dintorni’, Atti e Memorie dell’Accademia Petrarca di Lettere, Arti e Scienze CI (Arezzo, 1989), pp. 32-50.
606 Ibid. p. 32.
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a) The right entrance, Holy water stoup

b) The fragment of an upper part of a column made of red Egyptian porphyry.

c) The side portal

Consists of two fragments of red Egyptian porphyry.

**VIA COLCITRONE (Fig. 4.1)**

1. Tower-House at the corner of Via Pelliceria (Fig. 4.1)

   a) Eight fragments of column made of travertine stone

   b) Six blocks of travertine stone.

**PIAZZA CRUCIFERA (Fig. 4.1)**

The parapet around the well is made of granite and there are traces of a rectangular cover. Three large Roman letters are readable on the outside surface at the beginning of this century.

**SS. STEFANO E DONATO (Fig. 4.2)**

1. There is an undetermined number of Roman marble columns, capitals and bases which have been reused in the episcopal building.

2. Early medieval cemetery

There are three paleochristian funerary inscriptions, on slabs of bardiglio and Apuan marble, dated to between 407 to 447 AD. They were reused as covers, at the sides and front of the tombs in the necropolis and then as seals between the second half of the 7th and the first half of the 8th centuries AD in the construction of the cathedral. 607

3. Building demolished in 1911

A Roman funerary urn constructed of marble from Luni (measuring 0.55 x 0.25 x 0.51m height). Reused in a wall of an old factory demolished in 1911.

**FONTE VENEZIANA**

It partially uses the remains of a Roman aqueduct to supply the medieval fountain.

**FORTEZZA MEDICEA (Fig. 4.2)**

1. Porta di Tramontana

Sections of the columns made of sandstone are used in the lower parts.

2. Early Medieval Citadel

Constructed from the wall of the *cavea* of the Roman theatre and then reused as fortifications.

---

CORSO ITALIA (Fig. 4.1)

1. Palazzo Aliotti (Circolo Artistico)
A Roman granite column in a garden. It is now located in Florence in via Ripoli as a monument at ‘Canto di Arezzo’.

VIA PESCAIA (Fig. 4.1)
Building at the corner of Via Mazzini: It is likely to be the remains of a Roman cistern and now it forms the foundation of the building.

PIA CASA
Reuses the foundations (facing via S. Clemente) of a large vault made of sandstone

ST MARIA DELLA PIEVE (Fig. 4.2)
a) The left pillar between the nave and transept is topped by a large Roman capital in marble.
b) Six columns of granite and other columns made of travertine stone and also three circular sections of column places horizontally on the wall of then façade.

VIA PORTA BUIA (Fig. 4.1)
Roman mosaic in a geometric black and white pattern.

PRATO (Fig. 4.1)
A Roman cistern reused in the early medieval period as a granary.

PIAGGIA S. BARTOLOMEO
1. Palazzo Girateschi
Consists of regular, square, blocks of sandstone and travertine on the façade of the building.

ROMAN AMPHITHEATRE (Fig. 4.2)
The Roman amphitheatre (3, Map 10) was used as a place of assembly, a place for defence, as well as a quarry for materials which was used to construct part of the monastery of S. Bernardo. This monastery is now the Archaeological Museum Gaio Cilnio Mecenate.

CHURCH OF SACRO CUORE & S. MARGHERITA REDI (PIAZZA GIOTTO- Fig. 4.2)
A Roman funerary urn made of Luni marble measuring 0.31 x 0.25 x 0.28m height is used as bowl for holy water and is identical to an urn found in the church of S. Francesco suggesting it comes from the same source. It is possible that this was an example of *spolia* that may been traded between different churches in Tuscany.

CHURCH OF S. FRANCESCO (Fig. 4.2)
1. The tomb of the saint Benedetto Sinigardi
a) A Roman sarcophagus (1.80 x 0.45 x 0.41m height) made of Luni marble.

b) The holy water stoup

A Roman funerary urn made of Luni marble is used to hold the holy water.

**CHURCH OF S. LORENTINO & PERGENTINO**

There is an incomplete inscription in a piece of Luni marble embedded in a pillar. The surviving inscription reads: […] *ROSIO*

**VICOLO DI SAN LORENZO**

a) Fragment of a relief (measuring 0.25 x 0.36 x 0.12m) made of marble from Luni.

1. House between the lane and the church (abandoned at the beginning of the 20th century AD)

   a) What was recovered from the ruins consisted of blocks of travertine stone, fragments of marble, splinters of granite columns and the remains of the mosaics were almost completely destroyed.

   2. Casa Gialluca

   a) A block of limestone which used to be part of a funerary monument and which is now reused as part of the wall.

**VICOLO DELLE TERME (Fig. 4.1)**

Driveway to the gardens of Villa Gianni

There is a capital of the Doric order, a bordered base and fragments made of sandstone. The column consists of four cylindrical fragments of different heights.

**PIAZZA VASARI**

Palazzo Brizzolari

The cisterns are being reused as a cellar.

**VIA VENTI SETTEMBRE (Fig. 4.1)**

The Roman structures are constructed in cement.
Part 2. The countryside

BAGNAIA

Farmhouse

A rectangular Roman cistern used as a buttress. Dated to the first years of the Imperial period.

BAGNORO

1. Church of S. Eugenia

a) Two columns made of marble from Luni in the central nave.

The base of one of the columns is made of Apuan marble in the Attic style.

b) A fragment of a fluted column made of travertine. It forms the base of the baptismal basin.

c) A water decantation basin made of travertine.

CASTELSECCO

Medieval settlement

Part of the structures of the theater of the sanctuary is used as the foundation. The rest is partially restored for defensive purposes.

MONTOTO

1. Remains of a chapel in a castle

a) Roman funerary urn made of Apuan marble (measuring 0.45 x 0.38 x 0.40m height). The front is divided into two sections:

\[ \begin{array}{cc}
   ANICA & CI \\
   TER & IULIA
\end{array} \]

It was most likely reused as a holy-water stoup (it is now located near the Palazzo Vescovile of Arezzo).

MUGLIANO

A pair of columns (dissimilar to each other) with collarino, in granite, at the sides of the entrance.

PENETO

Church of S. Maria

Roman inscription in the wall of the façade (CIL 11, 1844). The structure is made of blocks of travertine.

S. MARIA MADDALENA A SIETINA (Fig. 4.3)

1. Pieve
a) The capital of the column is made of Apuan marble in the Corinthian style. Eight of the foliage is of the first and second order. The capital is mounted on a fragment of a granite column. The capital is being reused as a holy-water stoup.

PONTE BURIANO (Fig. 4.3)

1. Bridge

a) The Roman pillars are incorporated in the medieval pillars of the bridge.

2. Church of S. Nicola

a) A column made of granite near the door.

b) A capital in the Corinthian style made of Apuan marble

S. FIRENZE

Church of S. Giovanni Battista

Roman inscription in the wall of the façade (CIL 11, 1873) which is now in the Accademia Etrusca of Cortona.

S. POLO (Fig. 4.3)

1. Church of S. Paolo

a) Four columns of granite

Four bases made of Apuan marble in the Attic style.

Four capitals made of Apuan marble in the Corinthian style.

2. Reused building materials in the presbytery.

a) A capital made of Apuan marble which is reused as baptismal font.

b) A fragment of a capital made of Apuan marble in the anta Corinthian style.

c) A fragment of a capital made of Apuan marble in the Corinthian style.

d) Fragments of seven different molded cornices made of Apuan marble.

3. The outside of the church

a) A sarcophagus of smooth green granite. It has been reused as a small water storage tank in the garden.

b) Blocks of sandstone which have been reused in the bell tower.

VIA SETTE PONTI

The country road to Pascione
Two granite columns mark the entrance of the road.

**VITIANO**

In a clearing along the road between Vitiano and Vitiano Vecchio, a fragment of a granite column reused as the base of a cross.
Chapter 6: The towns

Siena

Our next town, Siena, is located to the south of Fiesole, to the west of Arezzo, and to the east of Volterra. It is on the hills which separate the basin of the Arbia from that of the Elsa, at a height of 322 metres. In all probability its location was determined by the fact that a hill-site is more easily defended than a lowland one. Siena was constructed along the curves of three ranges of hills separated by ravines and valleys. Like the other Etruscan towns to the north of Rome, it is likely that it acquired the Roman citizenship around 90 BC and soon afterwards became a Roman municipium. In the second half of the 1st century BC it became a military colony called Sena Iulia. It has been suggested that Sena Iulia was not located where Siena is now but was on the site of a preexisting Etruscan settlement and a Gallic settlement (the Senones). Historians such as G. Cecchini have argued this on the basis of the analogy of the toponym with Senigallia (Sena Gallica) and also on the presence of other toponyms which seem to have retained their Gallic origins in the area surrounding the village of Rosia (such as Brenna, Senna and Merse). He has pointed to archaeological finds from the last century which revealed ancient Gallic remains in the immediate surroundings of Siena. There is a hill named Poggio di Siena Vecchia with some evidence that there was a castle on it. There is also information in the archives of Siena which indicate that the village of Rosia was preceded by a castle whose foundations rested on the remains of a destroyed town. However, Cecchini’s argument has been undermined by more recent archaeological evidence.

The truth is that our knowledge of Roman Siena is extremely limited. It has been suggested that its importance may have been minor in comparison to Arezzo, Volterra and Chiusi, due to the fact that it is not located on any of the major consular roads such as the Via Aurelia and the Via Cassia. The change in the town’s importance was due to the gradual abandonment of the Via Aurelia and Via Cassia in favour of the Via Francigena which was the link between Rome and the Lombard possessions in the north. During the Lombard period, urban Siena probably consisted of nothing more than the hill where the Duomo (the cathedral of S. Maria Assunta- Fig. 5.1) and Ospedale di S. Maria della Scala (Fig. 5.1) stands, as well as the crag of Castelvecchio (Fig. 5.2). Furthermore, the urban topography is extremely irregular due to geographical constraints. The Campo (Fig. 5.2) was probably constructed on one of the valleys chosen due to its central location.

---

612 Ibid. p. 3.
614 Ibid. p. 35.
Fig. 5.2- Siena: Street plan

1 Castelvecchio
2 Il Campo
3 Piazza del Duomo
Traditionally the archaeological finds from Roman Siena have been limited to fragments of inscriptions, sarcophagi, pottery and some tombs.\textsuperscript{615} It would be easy to hypothesize from this that the urban centre was relatively unimportant however, the truth is that we are still poorly informed on Roman Siena. The only archaeological excavation of the town centre was carried out between February and May 1988 by the Medieval Archaeology Department of the University of Siena. The area excavated was approximately 160 square metres, adjacent to the Ospedale di S. Maria della Scala (Fig. 5.1), in front of the façade of the Duomo (Fig. 5.1). The stratigraphy was divided into ten layers from the 3\textsuperscript{rd} to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC, the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC, 6\textsuperscript{th} to 7\textsuperscript{th} century AD, from 1257-1290, the first half of the 14\textsuperscript{th} century, the second half of the 14\textsuperscript{th} century, 1471-1485, 1600-1721, 18\textsuperscript{th} century and the 19\textsuperscript{th} century.

The materials found in the first layer (3\textsuperscript{rd} to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC) came from a refuse ditch near the remains of a wooden hut. It consisted of pottery of local and Volterrano origin. It is not easy to date this hut but a date not before the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC has been proposed.\textsuperscript{616} It is difficult to assess the development of buildings in the Piazza del Duomo (Fig. 5.2) as the only studies done for this period are the graves at the margin of the town.\textsuperscript{617} There is nothing mentioned on the existence of buildings or houses in the area surrounding the Piazza del Duomo (Fig. 5.2). It should be pointed out that these pre-Augustan remains have a different orientation to successive buildings and the façade of the present day Ospedale di S. Maria della Scala (Fig. 5.1).\textsuperscript{618}

The second layer (1\textsuperscript{st} century BC) revealed a wall oriented towards an east-west axis, and on the same orientation as the Ospedale di S. Maria della Scala (Fig. 5.1). It is impossible to determine what the function of the original structure was. The wall is constructed of blocks of limestone with foundations of concrete and mortar as well as pieces of stone and fragments of brick. On the same layer as the wall, there are fragments of terra sigillata, pottery and amphorae from various places such as Spain, North Africa and the eastern Mediterranean dated to the first half of the Augustan age.\textsuperscript{619} It is likely that this is one of the actual structures of the military colony of Sena Itilia.\textsuperscript{620} The difference between the engineering quality of the wall and the wooden hut is striking. The wall may have been part of a public building. Between the second layer (1\textsuperscript{st} century BC) and the third (6\textsuperscript{th}–7\textsuperscript{th} centuries AD), we have a gap of around six centuries. There is spolia taken from the wall in the previous layer (1\textsuperscript{st} century BC), a ditch,\textsuperscript{621} and the remains of a dwelling with three walls.\textsuperscript{622} The dwelling’s foundation

\textsuperscript{615} M. Cristofani, Siena: le origini. Testimonianze e siti archeologici (Florence, 1979), p. 97.
\textsuperscript{619} R. Francovich, ‘A proposito dello scavo archeologico sul fronte dello Spedale di Santa Maria della Scala in Siena’, Prospettiva LIII-LVI (1988-1989), Fig. 13.
\textsuperscript{620} M. Cristofani, Siena: le origini. Testimonianze e siti archeologici (1979), p. 113.
\textsuperscript{621} R. Francovich, ‘A proposito dello scavo archeologico sul fronte dello Spedale di Santa Maria della Scala in Siena’, Prospettiva LIII-LVI (1988-1989), Fig. 5.
\textsuperscript{622} R. Francovich, ‘A proposito dello scavo archeologico sul fronte dello Spedale di Santa Maria della
consisted of pieces of stone, with lime and sand. It has been suggested that this building was used on a regular basis. Within the perimeter delineated by the walls, there is a hearth and an amphora fixed in the earth for holding grain. The evidence for its destruction is in the form of layers of baked clay and traces of burnt material which is indicative of a fire. The amphora came from the eastern Mediterranean. The early medieval date for this layer comes from pottery dated to the 6th century AD and from a jug dated to the 7th century AD. It has been argued that a possible cause for the destruction may have been a result of the Byzantine-Gothic war (535-554 AD), as well as the struggle for military control of Arezzo and Siena by the Lombards. On the other hand it may have been destroyed by an accidental fire.

The bishopric was to remain vacant up to the rule of Rothari (636-652 AD). But the destruction should not be exaggerated. It has been argued that by 730 AD the Lombards were not only the most politically powerful group within the town but had also developed some semblance of civic pride being identified as ‘populus Senensis’. Our knowledge of Late Antique and early medieval Siena is still very limited. It should also be pointed out that in fact we do possess other forms of evidence that suggests that Siena experienced some economic growth during this period. For example pottery finds during this period indicate considerable evidence that Siena maintained its commercial links during this period.

It has been pointed out that after 550 AD, ARS is extremely difficult to find in Tuscany with the exception of coastal settlements. But in Siena, ARS can be found into the 7th century AD. What is striking is also that the quantities of semi-fine wares locally produced are considerable, and can be found in rural areas as late as the 9th century AD, although paint and slip ceased after 800 AD.

The Churches of the Diocese of Siena

We are fortunate to have information on legal disputes concerning the boundaries of the diocese of Siena and Arezzo. It is difficult to overestimate the importance of this evidence. It allows us to partially reconstruct the topographic layout of the territory within the diocese of Siena. The diocese of Siena is located between that of Volterra and Arezzo and it has been suggested that its territorial organisation is more recent than that of Chiusi and Arezzo. It follows a line extending from north to south between the valleys of the Merse and Arbia up to where they meet in the Ombrone. Then the line extends from the Ombrone up to the Orcia. The legal disputes also allows us a glimpse into the workings of the Lombard kingdom from the late seventh century. It has been argued that it reveals the considerable
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The significance of the diocese (for Siena) is difficult to overestimate. Most historians have argued that the importance of the bishops meant that the towns were the leading foci of ideology without any real competition from other institutions.\footnote{D. Harrison, The Early state and the towns (Lund, 1993), p. 75.} As Hook has pointed out "the bishopric of Siena was rich and powerful and the bishop was therefore the most important force in civic life".\footnote{J. Hook, Siena (London, 1979), p. 8.} Documents dating from the 710’s AD suggests the existence of a rich nobility with a landed power base but with permanent habitations within the town walls.\footnote{G. Tabacco, 'Arezzo, Siena, Chiusi nell’alto medioevo', Atti del 5º congresso internazionale di studi longobardi (Spoleto, 1973).} Again, it is difficult to overstress this point because of its similarities to the model of Lucca. It has been argued that it is particularly striking that all five bishops from Lucca between 713-818 AD were members of the local landowning elite. There are other examples, Walpert, the father of bishop Walprand of Lucca was previously the duke of the town. It has also been suggested that the exercitus Senensium civitatis referred to in a document in 730 AD in Siena is an example of the city as a focus for local military identity. As Wickham has argued "the infrastructure of the Lombard kingdom was much more concentrated on the city than that of many parts of the early medieval West: institutions and officials were all essentially in the same place, and were as a result much easier to reach".\footnote{C. Wickham, Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean, 400-800 (Oxford, 2005), p. 212; L. Schiaparelli (ed.), Codice diplomatico longobardo, Vol. I & II (Rome, 1929-1933), no. 50.}

This impression is strengthened by evidence of civic and religious patronage under the Lombards. In the vicinity of the town, a gastald named Warnefred constructed and endowed the monastery of S. Eugenio in 730 AD. Another gastald Gauspert erected an altar to S. Amsano in the vicinity of the town in 749-752 AD.\footnote{G. Tabacco, 'Arezzo, Siena, Chiusi nell’alto medievo', Atti del 5º congresso internazionale di studi longobardi (Spoleto, 1973).} In 867 AD the count of Siena Winigis and his wife Richilda created a monastery for women.\footnote{Warnefred: L. Schiaparelli (ed.), Codice diplomatico longobardo, Vol. I & II (Rome, 1929-1933), no. 50; Gauspert: C. Troya (ed.), Codice diplomatico longobardo, Vol. III (Naples, 1852-1855), no. 661.} The reason for these constructions must have been religious motivation. As historians such as Ward-Perkins have pointed out "church-building was a pious act that benefitted the soul, something that no classical secular building, nor indeed any pagan temple had been able to do".\footnote{G. Tabacco, ‘Arezzo, Siena, Chiusi nell’alto medievo’, Atti del 5º congresso internazionale di studi longobardi (1973), p. 169.} It could

\footnote{B. Ward-Perkins, From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages: Urban Building in Northern and Central Italy AD 300-850 (Oxford, 1984), p. 71.}
provide salvation for a whole family. Warnefred (who is mentioned above) specifically stated that his monastery was done for “for the redemption of the souls of my father and mother, and for the benefit of our own souls and of our relations, both those dead and those to come”.

The bishops (from the 8th century AD) also attempted to extend their influence in the countryside, in the border areas between the various dioceses as well as resisting similar attempts by other neighbouring bishops. For example, we learn of a dispute between Adeodato who was the bishop of Siena, and Godipert who was a judge of Siena regarding a dispute against the church of Arezzo. What is striking with regard to the evidence is the importance of the city even to rural inhabitants. It has been argued that the dispute between Siena and Arezzo regarding the boundaries of the respective dioceses (714-715 AD) reveals that members of the rural community living some distance from the town were concerned with the location of the boundary of Arezzo. They also appealed to the gastald of Siena on a regular basis, although they did not agree with his decision to place them under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Siena. We even have evidence of a Lucchese peasant giving evidence in Siena (715 AD) ‘It is fifty years since I moved here [to the Senese] from the city of Lucca, and I dwell on the land of the late Zotto; I know that the churches of S. Pietro and S. Vincenzo, where Bishop Deodatus [of Siena] has just built a font, are under the church of S. Maria Alteserra, and that church was, from the day of its foundation, in the diocese of S. Donato [Arezzo] and still is’.

This statement is striking for several reasons. The peasant who made this statement ‘Gaudiosus, an old free man’ actually lived 120km from Siena, and yet he seemed to reveal a great deal of awareness with regard to the jurisdiction of the churches. Alteserra, now called Monte Benichi, is located in Chianti and was under the jurisdiction of Siena with regard to secular matters and was under the jurisdiction of Arezzo on ecclesiastical affairs. Gaudiosus was a tenant of Zotto, who was the son of a former gastald of Siena. Yet Gaudiosus was confident enough to testify in support of the diocese of Arezzo. Furthermore, he is not the only example. It has been pointed out that seventy-five men in 715 AD also ruled in favour of the bishop of Arezzo, in the face of opposition from Warnefrid, the gastald of Siena. The power relationship between the rural inhabitants and members of the ecclesiastical and secular elite residing in the towns clearly enabled even peasants to make choices with regard to their allegiances. With the passage of time the diocese of Siena may have gained some ascendancy over Arezzo. The Via Aurelia and the Via Cassia, which was exposed to Byzantine raids, were gradually abandoned in favour of the Via Francigena which passed through Siena (bypassing Arezzo) and linked the northern Lombard possessions with

641 C. Wickham, Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean, 400-800 (Oxford, 2005), pp. 392-393.
644 C. Wickham, Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean, 400-800 (Oxford, 2005), p. 393.
Rome. It is also possible that the Lombards who settled in Siena promoted the expansion of Sienese territory at the expense of Arezzo.\textsuperscript{645} This may explain its severe boundary conflict with Arezzo, which some historians have argued also reflected the importance of the local town/diocese as a means of identification for the people, as well as the consequences, namely a more developed centralisation.\textsuperscript{646} It is not unlikely that it was in these boundary disputes that the Sienese first revealed their sense of corporate identity or civic purpose although it was not until 1167 that the communes declared independence from episcopal control.

In many ways the documentary and archaeological evidence for Siena is a great deal more limited in comparison with Lucca. This could simply be the result of the lack of documentary and archaeological evidence that we have for Siena. Siena's topography, especially the lay-out of the town spread over several hills and ravines, may also have had an effect, as well as the importance of the Via Francigena in dividing the town into three quarters, the so-called 'terzieri' imprinted in the shape of a central Y, consisting of the Banchi di Sopra, Banchi di Sotto, and Via di Città. But there are several important similarities. The limited archaeological record reveals that commercial contacts with regard to pottery is maintained throughout this period. The documentary evidence also reveals an aristocracy that is actively building and endowing churches similar to that of Lucca, and which is very much urban based. I now turn to another of the towns under the jurisdiction of the diocese of Arezzo, namely Chiusi.

\textsuperscript{645} P. Torriti, \textit{Siena: History and Masterpieces} (Florence, 1954), p. 3.
Chapter 7: The towns

Chiussi

Chiussi is located to the south-east of Siena on the watershed between the Orcia river valley and the Valdigiana. To be more precise the town is located between the river Chiana and its tributary, the Astrone. Geographically, Chiussi’s territory consists of the Valdigiana and the heights of Chianti-Monte di Cetona and the Dorsale-Monti. The town itself is located on high ground which reaches a maximum height of 398 metres. In terms of accessibility, the slopes to the east and south are less severe in comparison to those to the north and west. This is because the northern and western slopes are formed by the heights of Monte San Paolo-Montevergine.647 It has been argued that there are traces of Roman fortifications constructed to the north of the town.648 The severity of the north-east slope meant that it was a natural defensive barrier. The slopes to the south are less steep and this was the route of what was to be the Via Cassia.649 It is generally accepted that the centre of the Etruscan and Roman town was located in the Piazza XX Settembre (Fig. 6.1). It was the location of an Etruscan religious sanctuary and the site of the Roman forum. Furthermore the site had natural geographical advantages. It occupies the highest point of the town.650

The references to Chiussi in our literary evidence are abundant.651 The mythical origins of the town are referred to in Virgil’s Aeneid.652 Pliny the Elder, Livy and Cassius Dio speak of the Etruscan king Lars Porsenna.653 We also have information regarding Chiussi’s involvement with the Gauls and later with the Etruscans during their first war with Rome.654 Chiussi’s aid given to Scipio Africanus in 205 BC is also mentioned.655 It has been suggested that during this period the town already had a treaty with Rome.656 There is also a reference in Pliny to “Chusini veteres” and “novi”.657 The meaning of this distinction is still unclear. Perhaps, as has been suggested, this points to the entry of Sullan veterans or members of a neighbouring community into Chiussi.658 Strabo refers to the trade between

---

655 Livy: B.O. Foster, ab urbe condita (Harvard, 1989), XXVIII, 45.
Fig. 6.1 – Chiusi: Street plan

1 Piazza XX Settembre
2 Piazza del Duomo
3 Via della Pietriccia
4 ‘Labyrinth of Porsenna’
5 Via delle Torri
6 Via Bassa Cimino
7 Via Arunte
Chiusi and Rome using the river Clainis as a means of communication. He also points to hunting and the growing of peaches and reed for papyrus. There are also references to Chiusi’s wheat, spelt, olive oil and wine. Horace mentions the existence of thermal springs. We also have references in our sources to Chiusi’s role in the Byzantine-Gothic war. Vitiges during his march to Ravenna garrisoned the town with 10,000 men under the command of Gibimera.

Chiusi’s epigraphic record is also impressive. It is especially generous with regard to the Etruscan period. The earliest Latin epigraphic record is around the 3rd century BC and the latest dates to the 6th century AD. Some of the epigraphy was recovered in the area between Chiusi’s cathedral (S. Secondiano- Fig. 6.2) and the bishop’s residence. Others were discovered in the Piazza del Duomo (Fig. 6.1) and the magistrate court. There was also a fragment recovered from the wall of the archbishop’s residence and another from the Via della Pietriccia (Fig. 6.2). The inscription from the Via della Pietriccia (Fig. 6.1) mentions the construction or rebuilding of a street and the floor of a portico by the quattuorvir Q. Considius. This is an important indication of urban vitality and patronage. The dedications also provide valuable evidence. There is a dedication to Pompey Magnus (106-48 BC) found near the Rocca and one to L. Cornelius Sulla (c.138-78 BC) in Via Gervasio. The excavation of the Duomo (Fig. 6.2) revealed two pieces of epigraphy. The first is dedicated to Gordian III (238-244 AD) and the other is probably to another emperor but he has not been positively identified. In the 16th century there was a statue base dedicated to Septimius Severus (193-211 AD) in the church of S. Francesco (Fig. 6.2). The excavation of the Ospedale Vecchio also revealed two dedications, one to Victory and the other to Concordia Augustororum.

Chiusi has also an abundant quantity of inscriptions after the arrival of Christianity. Many of them have been found in the catacombs of S. Mustiola (Fig. 6.2) and S. Caterina (Fig. 6.2). These inscriptions are striking because they reveal that Chiusi was an episcopal seat from at least the 4th century AD. This is an indication of Chiusi’s continued urban
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665 CIL XI, 7123
666 CIL XI, 2104; CIL XI, 2102.
668 CIL XI, 2098. The dedication is dated to 194 AD.
Fig. 6.2 – Chiusi: Map of the churches and monumental buildings

1 S. Secondiano  3 S. Mustiola
2 S. Francesco  4 S. Caterina
vitality during Late Antiquity and the early medieval period. There are other inscriptions which support this view, in particular those which refer to specialised occupations. There is mention of a “nauphegus”. It has been suggested that this is evidence that the Chiana was navigable. Other inscriptions which suggest building activity include an “architectus”, a “pinctor” and a “purpurarius”. Despite the richness of Chiusi’s documentary and epigraphic evidence, severe difficulties still exist in trying to trace the development of the town from the Roman to the early medieval period. Much of the epigraphy has been recovered from excavations which have not been well documented and from dispersed locations. It is for this reason that we also have to examine the archaeological evidence.

Chiusi’s Duomo (Fig. 6.2) was excavated between 1969-1970 and also in 1976. The area excavated was near the apse and the presbytery. It revealed the remains of a Roman building and an early Christian basilica which preceded the present day cathedral. A floor made of beaten earth with marble wedges was discovered underneath the apse. It has been dated to the late Roman Republic. The layer above this consists of another building. The foundations are made of rectangular pieces of travertine, and appear to have supported some columns. The whole may have been a portico of some sort. However, it has not been dated accurately. The most likely estimate is that it was constructed during the Principate, possibly in several stages. It has been argued that it may have been a residence.

The excavation also revealed two fragments from a mosaic floor laid out in a geometric pattern. The first is composed of black and white tiles measuring 2 centimetres square. The other consists of a more ornate pattern, a mixture of white stripes on a black background and black flower petals on a white background. Both mosaics are dated to the Severan period. Another mosaic has also been discovered. The surface is composed of irregular shaped tiles of various colours, black, white, yellow and red. There is also an inscription written on the mosaic. The inscription reads “Parthenii Macarii”. It is written with black letters on a white background. The date of this mosaic is still disputed. Opinion is divided as to whether it belongs to a Roman building or an early Christian basilica. Paolucci has argued that it belongs to a Late Imperial domus. This is based on Zazzaretta’s estimate of the date of the two fragments mentioned above. This has been disputed. Bersotti suggests that the mosaic belongs to the first Christian basilica which he estimates was constructed before 555-560 AD.

It has been argued that 555-560 AD is the date when the present day cathedral was constructed by the bishop Fiorentino. The inscription perhaps refers to the person whose donation made the mosaic possible.680 Maetzke supports a date of around the end of the 4th century or the beginning of the 5th century AD with regard to the construction of the first basilica.681 However, Cipollone maintains that the mosaics are part of a Late Imperial domus.682 Borghi has argued that because the name inscribed is in the genitive case, it cannot be dated beyond the 4th century AD. He considers it likely that the genitive of the name refers to the person who donated the mosaic but does not discount the possibility that it may refer to the craftsman responsible for laying it out.683 But Borghi also points to the first basilica’s probable antiquity and suggests that it is still possible that the mosaic may have belonged to this building. In my opinion, this matter is still open for debate.684

Chiusi’s Duomo (Fig. 6.1) is constructed of blocks of local travertine. Those inside the building are plastered.685 There is a basement in the southern end of the cathedral. It is on the same level as the Roman building dating to the Imperial period. It has been argued that this may have become part of the Christian basilica.686 On some of the building blocks there is evidence of reused public dedications inscribed. They are dedicated to Mercury and Hercules Tutamus.687 There are also references to a “pontifex”, a “quinquennalis centonariorum”, a dedication to Gordian III (238-244 AD), and a grave dated to Late Antiquity which belonged to a “Parthenius”.688 On the basis of these dedications it has been argued that this was an important public area.689 It has also been suggested that a large part of the present day cathedral must have been part of the late 4th-early 5th century AD Christian basilica.690 Borghi has suggested that there may have been a Roman building on the site which became a domus ecclesiae.691 This was replaced by the basilica and then the cathedral. What should also be stressed is the amount of material which has been reused in the construction of the cathedral. It has been pointed out that the materials re-used include statue bases, columns and capitals.692 Some columns have been dated to the Augustan period but the chronology extends to the 4th century.693 In my opinion, the sheer quantity of spolia used in the cathedral certainly lends
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688 Ibid. pp. 21, 32, 35, 46.
690 Ibid. p. 76; G. Bersotti, Chiùsi. Guida storico-artistica della città e dintorni (Chiùsi, 1974), pp. 75-76.
692 Ibid. p. 31.
weight to the argument that the basilica dates to the 4th-5th century AD. The building material available for re-use also reinforces the idea of Chiusi’s urban vitality from the 1st-4th century AD.694 Graves have also been discovered under and around the Duomo (Fig. 6.1), to which I will come to in more detail later.

The Piazza del Duomo (Fig. 6.1) surrounding the cathedral was excavated in 1830. It revealed broken columns, a wall made of travertine and fragments of decorated marble. It has been argued that this could be part of the remains of a building discovered during another excavation in 1900. The building was identified as Roman. The area between the Campanile (Fig. 6.2) and the pronao was also excavated. It revealed a flight of stairs which may have belonged to a large building. There is also a large underground cistern. It has been suggested that this building may have been dedicated to a cult.695 The cistern has been dated by Levi to the 2nd century BC on stylistic grounds. This is because its construction is similar to those found in Etruscan tombs. This has been disputed by Rastrelli who has suggested a date of the 1st century BC.696 The matter is still unresolved. The north of the cathedral revealed a beam made of travertine. It is inscribed and is a dedication to the quaestor and aedile “Venidius Kalenus”. It was dated to the Augustan period.697 It has been argued that the fragment must have belonged to a public building of some importance. To the west of the cathedral is the garden of the archbishop, the so-called ‘Labyrinth of Porsenna’ (Fig. 6.1). Excavations in 1985-1988 revealed the remains of a large defensive wall connected to an underground passage.698 This passage leads to a series of tunnels which connect to the cistern which I have mentioned above. Archaeological investigation of the passage has suggested that is was used in the Hellenistic period, the second half of the 2nd century BC, to supply water. It was probably constructed in the first half of the 2nd century BC.699 This is on the basis of an analysis of the materials found in the tunnel. Although its original purpose was to supply water, it may have been modified due to climatic changes for drainage purposes.700

The defensive wall which I have referred to above incorporated building materials from the Etruscan, Roman and medieval period.701 The oldest materials found in the area date from the 4th-3rd century BC. A stretch of wall running east to west is still visible. It is built in the Etruscan fashion with imperfectly cut blocks of travertine and is asymmetrical.702 On top of the Etruscan wall there are the remains of a medieval house. The medieval house contains a
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square hole which has been interpreted as a cistern. Other parts of the wall are dated to the Roman period. On top of this is a later medieval tower which has been built from reused blocks of travertine. Next to this Roman wall is a structure which has been dated to the end of the 4th century and the beginning of the 3rd century BC. It is constructed with blocks of travertine but its purpose is still unknown.

There is another structure on a north-south orientation constructed of travertine. This structure is dated to the end of the 2nd century BC and the beginning of the 1st century BC. But this structure is in poor condition and we are ignorant of its function. However, it seems to have been standing for only a short time. It has been argued on the basis of this that the structure may have been demolished during Chiusi’s expansion between the end of the 2nd century and the 1st century BC, as part of a restructuring of the town’s defensive circuit towards the south. If this was the case it would have been part of the fortifications. It should be pointed out that the brief span of the structure is an exception rather than the rule. Most of the archaeological evidence in this area points to continuous occupation between the 4th century BC and Late Antiquity (3rd century AD). This includes finds of grey bucchero, Attic pottery, Arretine and African terra sigillata. A statue of Augustus was discovered in the archbishop’s garden (Fig. 6.1) as well as bronze and terracotta vases. The sculpture is made of very fine white marble and the craftsmanship is of high quality. It was made some time after 12 BC, because Augustus appears in the robes of the Pontifex Maximus. There was also the remains of a portico. It was constructed of travertine and its columns were of Egyptian granite.

The grounds of the magistrates court are adjacent to the garden of the archbishop (Fig. 6.1). In 1895 the remains of a wall made of fragmented marble was discovered. The marble is inscribed with several Latin inscriptions. One of them is a dedication of a temple. This is another case of building materials which have been re-used, in all likelihood from a nearby structure. There is another inscription which is more fragmented but contains the terms “porticus” and “schola”. The suggestion is that this portico may have been connected to the columns discovered in the Archbishop’s garden (Fig. 6.1). The “schola” could therefore refer to a nearby collegium of centonarii. In approximately the same area a wall made of travertine and painted plaster was found in 1987. It has been argued that this is the remains of
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Unfortunately this cannot be confirmed as the excavation is still unpublished.\(^{716}\) To summarise, the earliest signs of urban development in the archbishop’s garden dates to the end of the 4th century BC. This would fit with the building of Chiusi’s first town wall and the creation of the drainage tunnels. It has been suggested that the sculpture of Augustus and the columns found in the archbishop’s garden (Fig. 6.1) is an indication that the area is near the Domus of the Augustales.\(^{717}\) In any case the area is one of regular building and redevelopment through and after the Imperial period.

To the south-east of the archbishop’s garden (Fig. 6.1), to the south of the Communal Hospital a stretch of wall was discovered in 1983. It was constructed of large blocks of travertine. There is also the remains of a floor constructed of opus signinum and painted plaster. But it is too badly preserved to allow accurate dating.\(^{718}\) An estimate given due to the lack of an Etruscan level is around the 1st century BC.\(^{719}\) But it is impossible to decide its function. Underneath the Communal Hospital the remains of walls were discovered in 1986.\(^{720}\) There are two lines on a north-south orientation. The floor is of crushed earth. The walls are constructed of travertine and sandstone. There are still traces of coloured plaster on the walls.\(^{721}\) The earliest stage of the walls is dated to the reign of Augustus. The latest layer is dated to the time of Hadrian. Borghi has suggested that this structure may have been part of a bath complex.\(^{722}\) A walled structure was excavated to the south-east of the Communal Hospital between 1996-1997.\(^{723}\) It is constructed of square blocks of travertine and its shape is irregular. There is a cistern on the eastern side constructed from blocks of travertine with cement and bricks. The bottom layer of the west side of the cistern is constructed from fragments of bricks, pieces from columns, pebbles and travertine. The eastern side of the cistern is constructed in sandstone and pebbles. The floor is made of three blocks of travertine. A poorly preserved coin was found with the inscription “SC”. It has been suggested that this structure was a *castellum aquae*. It would have been connected to a reservoir. However, no trace of any tunnels have been discovered to confirm this theory. It has been suggested on the basis of the coin discovered and construction style of the cistern that it was made in the Roman imperial period. However, the possibility that in origin it was much older cannot be discounted.

I would now like to discuss Chiusi’s other monumental structures. Gamurrini
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\(^{723}\) The excavation has not been published. See R. Borghi, *Chiusi* (Rome, 2002), p. 55.
mentioned the remains of an Etruscan gate, a wall which he has dated to the Lombard or early medieval period and also a Roman bridge, the Ponte S. Silvestro. However, the location of these structures is still debated. It has been suggested that the gate was located at the crossroads between Via della Pietriccia (Fig. 6.1) and Via dei Forti. Others have pointed to the end of Via della Pietriccia (Fig. 6.1) and where it crosses Via Torri del Fornello. A similar problem is faced with regard to the bridge because no trace has survived. One opinion is that it was on the Via della Pietriccia (Fig. 6.1) near the basilica of S. Mustiola (Fig. 6.2). At the end of the 19th century mosaics were discovered in the area in front of the town hall. The mosaics were found near a fountain in Piazza del Pretorio. They are in a poor state of preservation and the dating is problematic. But one estimate is the 1st century BC. In 1915 other fragments were found in the basement of the town hall. They are dated to the later Republican period. In 1948 the remains of a Roman road was found underneath the Palazzo Communale. It is on a north-south orientation and is considered a minor road.

In the 1980’s during construction work done on the Ospedale Vecchio archaeological remains were discovered in the basement. The Ospedale Vecchio was located on the Via Moret (Fig. 6.1), next to the church of S. Maria della Misericordia facing the Piazza Municipio. The remains are tentatively dated to the beginning of the Imperial period. On these remains was founded the early medieval church of S. Maria della Misericordia. The Ospedale Vecchio was constructed in 1621 on the left nave of the church. The remains consist of two walls constructed of large square blocks of travertine. Between the two walls is a beaten earth floor with evidence of fire. There are also materials that probably belong to the destruction of another building dated to the first decades of the 1st century AD. The materials consists of fragments of beaten earth, bricks, painted plaster, and roofing tiles. A wall was also discovered under the northern part of the church. The wall served as a foundation for the colonnade of the left aisle of the church. The right wall is made of blocks of travertine. To the west of the Ospedale Vecchio is a cemetery. There also are the remains of a wall which is almost completely destroyed. The wall is made of blocks of travertine, sandstone and pebbles. It has been estimated that the structure is dated to the beginning of the Imperial period. The left nave of the church contains the base of a statue. There are two
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inscriptions. One is dedicated to Victory and is dated to the Later Republican period or the beginning of the Principate. However, the inscription on the back indicates that it was reused in the 3rd century AD for a statue of Concordia Augustorunum.\footnote{A. Rastrelli, ‘Chiusi’, in Enciclopedia dell’arte antica, classica e orientale (Rome, 1994), pp. 559-560.}

I would now like to turn to evidence of urban change between Late Antiquity and the early medieval period by focusing on intramural burials. They appear to have begun between the end of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th century AD. It is important to note them because they may indicate the abandonment of various buildings.\footnote{R. Borghi, Chiusi (Rome, 2002), p. 112.} In the area to the north of Piazza XX Settembre (Fig. 6.1) is the remains of a Roman building that had once been supplied with water. It has been suggested that it may have been a pool but this is not conclusive.\footnote{Ibid. p. 71.} Within its ruins is an early medieval grave, unfortunately no precise date is given.\footnote{Ibid. p. 70.} It is located in the Via Bassa Cimino (Fig. 6.1), in the Orto Golini. The building was excavated in the 1970’s.\footnote{C. Laviosa, ‘Provincia di Siena. Chiusi’, Studi Etruschi XXXIII (1965), p. 422.} It had a large room and was decorated with mosaics. The mosaics are black and white and are arranged in a geometrical pattern. On stylistic grounds they have been dated to the 2nd or 3rd century AD. This is on the basis of comparisons on stylistic grounds with two mosaics from Ostia.\footnote{M.E. Blake, ‘Roman Mosaics of the Second Century in Italy’, Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome XIII (1936), p. 89; G. Becatti, Scavi di Ostia IV. Mosaici e pavimenti marmorei (Rome, 1961), tav. 36, n. 325.} The grave discovered above the mosaics was dated to the 4th-5th century AD.\footnote{G. Paolucci, ‘Dalla monografia di Bianchi Bandinelli al progetto Carta Archeologica della Val di Chiana’, in G. Paolucci (ed.), Archeologia in Valdichiana (Rome, 1988), pp. 43-44.}

An excavation underneath the apse of Chiusi’s Duomo (Fig. 6.2) revealed two graves of Capuchin friars, early medieval sculpture and some graves belonging to the nobility dating to the 16th century AD.\footnote{G. Paolucci, ‘Repertorio degli scavi e scoperte archeologiche nei Comuni della Val di Chiana’, in G. Paolucci (ed.), Archeologia in Valdichiana (Rome, 1988), p. 62; G. Maetzke, ‘Chiusi’, Actes du Xle Congrès International d’archéologie chrétienne (Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Geneva, Aosta, 1989), p. 22; G. Bersotti, ‘Chiusi: scavi archeologici e lavori di sistemizn g nell’abside e presbitero della cattedrale di S. Secondiano’, Bollettino Diocesano VII-VIII (1972), p. 131.} The Capuchin graves are dated to the early years of the 6th century AD.\footnote{R. Borghi, Chiusi (Rome, 2002), p. 30; G. Maetzke, ‘Chiusi’, Actes du Xle Congrès International d’archéologie chrétienne (Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Geneva, Aosta, 1989), p. 22.} An excavation of the exterior of Chiusi’s Duomo (Fig. 6.2) in 1976, revealed three graves along the northern wall.\footnote{G. Maetzke, ‘Tombe longobardic medievaie di Chiusi’, Archeologia Medievale XII (1985), p. 701.} The first two belong to the Lombard period and the other is later medieval. The fact that the graves were found adjacent to the outside wall of the cathedral would suggest that they were Lombards of some importance. The graves are dated to the second half of the 7th century AD on the basis of the grave goods discovered.\footnote{Ibid. pp. 701-707.} The grave goods include a sword, a decorated bronze sheet, small knives, and a bronze buckle.\footnote{Ibid. pp. 703-704.} The excavation of the Piazza del Duomo (Fig. 6.1) in 1911 revealed a grave with the remains of a left hand which was dated to the Lombard period. The slab was a piece of reused travertine. There was an inscription on the slab which is dated to the end of the Republican or
the Augustan period.748

Lombard graves were also discovered near the church of S. Apollinare.749 The church is located on Via Arunte (Fig. 6.1) in the western part of Chiusi. There are five of them at a depth of 1.45 metres. Underneath these graves at a depth of 3 metres there are three other graves. In contrast to the ones above (which are without any grave goods) these graves contain goblets made of glass and jewels. The grave goods have been dated to the 4th-5th century AD. Further down at a depth of 3.70 metres there are the remains of mosaics, a fragment of a travertine column and two bronze coins. The coins are of Drusus and of Nero. It has been suggested that the site was that of a Roman temple which was destroyed under the laws of Theodosius in 391 AD. Another possibility could be that the remains belonged to a late Republican domus which had been destroyed during the civil wars.750 It was then used as a cemetery during the Imperial period. The date of the mosaics is still uncertain. The presence of the coins indicate a date around the 1st century AD. But if the mosaics are compared to those of Ostia, a date around the 2nd century is not unlikely. One solution put forward would be to assume the existence of a building on the site before the 3rd century AD. The mosaics would have been installed in the 3rd century AD and the graves are dated to the 4th-5th century AD.751 In 1930 an excavation between Via della Villetta and Via Ascario Dei revealed a cemetery of considerable size.752 There are approximately fifteen graves but there is no evidence of precious items, although we do possess some grave goods, as there are some signs that the graves have been plundered. However, two Roman funerary stelae were discovered.753 It is estimated on the basis of the grave goods found that the graves date from the beginning of the 7th to the end of the 8th century AD. It has been suggested that these graves should be considered the latest evidence of a Lombard presence in Chiusi.754

Extramural burials have also been discovered. At Campo Boario five skulls were discovered as well as bronze earrings. The earrings are not considered to be of Italic manufacture.755 But the evidence is not conclusive. Lombard graves have also been discovered in the locality of Portonaccio, near the hill of Arcisa. The graves were excavated between 1913-1914.756 The graves are numbered from one to ten. Grave 6 contained, among other things, a sword, the remains of a spear, an iron knife, the remains of a belt decorated with silver, and the tongue of a bronze belt buckle and the remains of a shield.757 Grave 7 was
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found with the remains of a blade belonging to a knife, a cone-shaped piece of metal which was part of a spear, and other fragments of metal which may have been part of the same spear although this is not conclusive. On stylistic grounds it has been argued that the decorative pattern on the belt is a typical Byzantine scheme. Grave 9 contained fragments of a small goblet made of glass, a bronze earring, and a bronze buckle. The goblet is of a type which was diffused throughout early medieval Tuscany. A bronze buckle was discovered in grave 10. All the materials from graves 6-10 are dated to the last decade of the 6th century AD. The large quantity of weapons found would suggest that these were soldiers. The belt discovered in grave 8 indicates that they were in contact with the Byzantines. The likely explanation would be that these were Lombard soldiers who had previously been in the service of the Byzantines. The presence of artifacts found in the graves are of German and Byzantine manufacture suggests that it is possible that Arcisa may have been a Byzantine fort similar to those found at Sadovec and the Lower Danube.

To summarise, the evidence for urban vitality in Chiusi is considerable. It has been suggested that this prosperity may have been due to an enlargement of the Via Cassia by Trajan (98-117 AD) and Hadrian. It is certainly possible. The 2nd century AD was a time when some towns in Italy were constructing domus which were not as refined as before. This does not seem to be the case with regard to Chiusi. The mosaics discovered in Orto Golini are of very high quality. The same is the case with regard to the Roman capitals which were reused in Chiusi’s Duomo (Fig. 6.2). Epigraphic evidence such as the dedication of Septimius Severus (found in the church of S. Francesco (Fig. 6.2) also gives some indication of Chiusi’s importance.

The 4th-5th century AD appears to have been a crucial period with regard to urban change in Chiusi. The 4th-5th century AD also saw the first intramural graves which must have been due to the increasing power and influence of Christianity during this period. It is possible that the early Christian basilica which preceded the cathedral, was constructed at the end of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th century AD. This is not to deny that Chiusi did experience some ‘decline’. The intramural graves clearly indicate that there was some depopulation within the Roman urban area and the abandonment of public buildings. This would have been around the 5th-6th century AD. But the extent of the ‘decline’ should not be exaggerated. Chiusi’s cathedral was constructed by the bishop Fiorentino during this period (more specifically 555-560 AD) by utilising and renovating the earlier Christian basilica.
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Intramural burials also provide evidence of some affluence. The graves excavated in Via Arunte dating to the 5th-6th century AD contained jewellery. Furthermore, there is also evidence of renewed urban vitality with the arrival of the Lombards. Ciampoltrini has pointed out that, from 570 AD, Chiusi possessed strategic importance due to its position on the Rome-Ravenna road axis. It would have acted firstly as a Byzantine fortress and later as a stronghold for the Lombards. The wealth of the Lombard burials also needs to be stressed. This is especially the case with regard to the Lombard grave goods found at Arcisa, showing links with Byzantium in the final decades of the 6th century AD. The Lombards in this case would have been in the service of the Byzantines contesting the use of the road with the Lombard king in Pavia. In short it can been argued that the construction of the cathedral and the intramural burials should be taken as evidence of Chiusi’s urban strength especially as this took place in the background of the final years of the war between the Byzantines and the Goths.
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Chapter 8: The towns

Fiesole

The town is spread out between and on the two hills of S. Francesco and S.Apollinare. The earliest settlements are located on the hills and date as far back as the early Iron Age. The Etruscan and Hellenistic acropolis was located on the hill of S. Francesco and dates back to at least the 5th century BC. There is also evidence of an Etruscan temple. The town walls appear to have been built around the 3rd century BC. The best preserved stretch is north-east of the archaeological zone, along the Via delle Mura Etrusche. The architectural zone is north-east of Piazza Mino da Fiesole (Fig. 7.1). The walls measure around 4 to 5 metres in height. With regard to the Roman period, the greatest impact on the town appears to have been from the Sullan colonists during the 1st century BC. Fiesole was perhaps an enemy of Rome during the Social War (91-87 BC) and had fought in support of Gaius Marius (c.157-86 BC) against L. Cornelius Sulla (c.138-78 BC). As punishment they were compelled to accept Sullan veterans who participated in the destruction of many of the previous structures, including the Etruscan temple. In the Augustan period the temple was rebuilt utilizing much of the previous building. Public baths and a theatre (Fig. 7.2) were also constructed. These can still be seen in the archaeological zone. I will refer to them in greater detail later. I would like at this stage to discuss the relationship between Fiesole and Florence.

Unlike Fiesole, which was an Etruscan town, Florence was founded by Julius Caesar (c. 100 or 102-44 BC) as a settlement for discharged Roman soldiers in 59 BC. Unfortunately our knowledge of Roman Florence is extremely limited. This is one of the reasons why it is not one of the towns selected for this thesis. Florence was located on the Via Cassia, which was the main route between Rome and northern Italy. This was a strategic position which meant that Florence had great commercial value. The town’s importance was further increased when it was made the capital of Tuscia under the emperor Diocletian (284-305 AD). It is possible that in these years Florence’s rapid economic and political growth would have been at Fiesole’s expense. Florence became a bishopric around the 4th century AD. It was subsequently to fall under Byzantine, Gothic and Lombard rule in the 6th century AD. It was conquered by the Franks in 774 AD. Florence was to become part of the duchy of
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Fig. 7.1 – Fiesole: Street plan
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Tuscany with Lucca as the capital. In 854 AD both Florence and Fiesole became part of the same duchy. But one fact has to be stressed above all. Fiesole was to remain an independent town for several centuries afterwards. This was despite being overshadowed by Florence, especially after the Margrave Hugo (961-1001) chose Florence for his residency instead of Lucca around 1000. This situation was to remain until Fiesole was conquered by Florence in 1125 after a long siege. The town was sacked and its walls were destroyed. The bishop’s seat was transferred to Florence in 1228 and there was no bishop at Fiesole until 1874. Fiesole’s status as an autonomous town had ended. I will now return to a discussion of the evidence available for Roman Fiesole.

De Marinis has pointed to epigraphy which points to the existence in Fiesole of a Capitoline. The inscription is a dedication to a Capitoline triad on the base of a cippus. De Marinis has also identified the remains of its walls during an excavation of the crypt in the cathedral of Fiesole (S. Romulus- Fig. 7.2).775 It has been suggested that this would have been a plausible site for the temple due to its location on the major cross-roads of the town. If this was the case then the implication would have been that the Roman street-plan must have survived to a large extent.776 A stretch of Roman road on a north-south axis was found near the crypt of the cathedral. Another stretch was found in the archaeological zone.777 It has been argued that the Roman forum was located in what is now Piazza Mino da Fiesole (Fig. 7.1). This is on the basis of the proximity of the Piazza to the Capitoline, as well as its location on the major crossroads of the town.778 The evidence also points to a temple on the hill of S. Francesco. This would have been on the site of the Etruscan acropolis. Archaeological evidence for this has been recovered from a cistern near the convent of S. Domenico (Fig. 7.2). It includes an inscription dedicated to Dionysius, a fragment of a Roman capital, a fragment from a column, and other building materials.779

The public baths in the archaeological zone remained in use for the whole of the 4th century AD.780 However, there is another bath facility which is part of a building. The building was located in Piazza Mino da Fiesole (Fig. 7.1). It is still unknown whether the building was private or public. The bath facility (Fig. 7.2) was constructed during the Imperial period. It remained in use for the whole duration of the 5th and also the beginning of the 6th century AD.781 The monumental buildings of Roman Fiesole appear to have been

780 For a more detailed analysis of the evidence with regard to dating, please see A. Aleardi, C. Chiatti, M. de Marco, A. Guliani, C. Salvianti, Fiesole. Alle origini della città. La costruzione della Carta Archeologica (Fiesole, 1990), no. 13.
Fig. 7.2 – Fiesole: Map of the churches and monumental buildings
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concentrated in the north-west of the settlement.\textsuperscript{782} This can be debated. It is important to stress the serious limitations with regard to the archaeological evidence. The excavations carried out during the 19\textsuperscript{th} century tend to be poorly documented. It has been estimated that intramural Fiesole occupies an area of approximately 29 hectares. If this was the case, the excavations carried out in the 1980’s to the 1990’s, which only examined around 506 square metres, would have covered approximately 0.1% of the town. However, if the archaeological zone is also included the explored figure only rises to 3.9%.\textsuperscript{783} The north-west is also the best excavated area. However, it is still likely that the north-west was the most important area. This area which is within the town walls and is near the Etruscan acropolis. Based on this, it appears that Fiesole’s earliest cemetery was extramural. The cemetery is located in Via Matteotti. It was in use as early as the Etruscan and the Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{784} There are also burials of cremated remains which have been dated to the Augustan period. Other burials have also been found. There is one burial dated to the 2\textsuperscript{nd}-3\textsuperscript{rd} century and another to the 3\textsuperscript{rd}-4\textsuperscript{th} century AD. It has been argued that the cemetery remained in use from the Hellenistic period to Late Antiquity.\textsuperscript{785}

It has been suggested that Roman Fiesole was relatively prosperous due to its proximity to Arezzo and the territory of Pisa.\textsuperscript{786} From the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD goods from Africa have been found. Fiesole was also important as a centre for the production of wine.\textsuperscript{787} There appears to be some evidence of urban change between the 3\textsuperscript{rd}-4\textsuperscript{th} century. Archaeological excavations of Via Marini (Fig. 7.1) and Via Portigianii have revealed signs of abandonment and rubble.\textsuperscript{788} Intramural burials begin at the end of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century AD. In 1879 two graves were excavated in the archaeological zone which contained bronze coins dated to Theodosius I.\textsuperscript{789} The public baths (Fig. 7.2) in the archaeological area were abandoned at the end of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century. Burials of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century AD were found among the rubble.\textsuperscript{790} However, despite the evidence of abandonment, Fiesole’s importance in the early Middle Ages should not be underrated. Procopius stresses its strategic value in the Byzantine-Gothic war (535-554 AD). He points to the town’s natural defences and suggests that it was only a lack of provisions which ultimately led to the surrender of the Goths within.\textsuperscript{791} During the 5\textsuperscript{th}-6\textsuperscript{th} century AD the city would have functioned as a crucial stronghold, not unlike Chiusi. The abandonment and depopulation would have been due to the repeated sieges and capture which the town endured during the Byzantine-Gothic war. I would now like to turn to the role of the church.

\textsuperscript{783} Ibid. p. 45-46.
\textsuperscript{790} A. Aleardi, C. Chiappi, M. de Marco, A. Guliani, C. Salvianti, Fiesole. Alle origini della città. La costruzione della Carta Archeologica (Fiesole, 1990), p. 43.
Traditionally, the first bishop of Fiesole was St. Romulus who was martyred in the 1st century AD. According to 11th-13th century manuscripts, St. Romulus was chosen by St. Peter himself, became the first bishop and was responsible for the conversion of Fiesole. It was also where he was supposedly martyred.\(^{792}\) However, a more plausible view would be to assume that Christianity arrived around the 3rd-4th century AD in common with the other towns of Tuscany. A text dated to the 4th century AD inscribed on a tombstone in the crypt of the cathedral does refer to someone called “Romulus”. It also provides some information on the religious appointments which he held. But it is fragmentary so we are ignorant on what positions he held after deacon and are unable to confirm whether he became bishop.\(^{793}\) In all likelihood, the tradition of St. Romulus was invented to compensate for the lack of information regarding the early Christian community in Fiesole.\(^{794}\) The earliest document which refers to a bishop in Fiesole dates to 496 AD. This reference is in a letter which was sent by pope Gelasius I (492-496 AD) to Hildespius (496-?) AD bishop of Volterra. Unfortunately the name of the bishop of Fiesole is not mentioned. The earliest name which we have is bishop Rusticus who was an envoy of pope Agapetus I (535-536 AD) at the Council of Constantinople in 535 AD.\(^{795}\)

Our other knowledge of early medieval Fiesole is limited. There is a document dated to 539 AD which refers to a donation of 20 solidi by Venantius the bishop of Luni (594-603 AD). This was done on the orders of pope Gregory I (590-604 AD) for the purpose of repairing the churches of Fiesole, which was said to be in ruins.\(^{796}\) There are also various Lombard cemeteries within the town walls. These were located within the ruins of abandoned Roman buildings. The graves tend to be concentrated in certain areas of the town. One group of them were found in the cella of a Roman temple. It is likely that by this time the building was used as a church. The graves are usually on an east-west axis. They are made from stone slabs which are taken from Roman buildings. The grave goods are dated to the end of the 6th and the whole of the 7th century AD.\(^{797}\) In the male graves there are fragments of bronze and iron which belong to weapons and belt buckles.\(^{798}\) There are also the remains of pottery in the only grave which has been securely identified as belonging to a female.\(^{799}\) But only one of the graves contained valuable items. Namely three gold artefacts decorated with pearls, amethysts and gilded iron.\(^{800}\) Other graves have also been discovered in the excavation of the public baths (Fig. 7.2) in the 19th century. However, the graves were not properly documented. It is difficult to estimate the numbers involved. De Marco and Nenci have suggested that there were graves between the temple and the theatre (Fig. 7.2).\(^{801}\) Del Rosso has suggested that there were two graves located in the theatre (Fig. 7.2) with rich grave goods.\(^{802}\) Also in


\(^{793}\) A. Falci, Le origini del Cristianesimo nell Etruria romana (Florence, 1953), p. 54.


\(^{795}\) P.F. Kehr, Italia Pontificia (Berlin, 1907), pp. 73-74.

\(^{796}\) Ibid. p. 73; R. Davidson, Forschungen zur älteren geschichte von Florenz (Berlin, 1896), p. 104.


\(^{799}\) Grave 5, ibid. p. 65.

\(^{800}\) Grave 22, ibid. p. 69 (“tre castoni d’oro con ametiste e perla al centro e altri elementi in oro e un frammento di ferro dorato”).


\(^{802}\) For Del Rosso, see C. Nenci, ‘La necropoli altomedievale’, in L. Marino & C. Nenci (ed.), L’area
the 19th century there was an excavation of the churchyard of S. Alessandro (Fig. 7.2). Eleven graves were discovered. The graves were cut into the rock and covered with stone slabs. But no grave goods were recovered except for a cross covered with gold leaf. The cross is dated to the 7th century AD. The graves are dated to the 6th-7th century AD.

Other graves were discovered in Piazza Mino da Fiesole (Fig. 7.1) during excavations between 1879-1882. However, the graves were destroyed and it is difficult to determine their exact location. Grave goods were recovered from four of the graves. They include globular or cylindrical shaped bottles decorated with parallel or wavy lines, a knife, spear tips, small bronzes, and a belt buckle. In 1892 another grave was found in the southern part of the Piazza. The grave goods included a glass goblet, a decorated bottle (similar to the one found in the previous excavation), and fragments from a decorated belt dated to the 7th century AD. In 1907 another grave was discovered next to the park of Villa Marchi. This was also located along the southern part of the Piazza. The grave was discovered in front of a building with two rooms. One room had a floor constructed of opus signinum. The grave goods included two silver hair pins. They are stylistically similar to those found in the cemeteries of Castel Trosino and Nocera Umbra. The Lombard necropoleis of Castel Trosino and Nocera Umbra are both dated to the second half of the 6th-7th century AD. This is based on glass, pottery, jewellery, armour, helmets, swords, spears, arrow heads, earrings, belt buckles, and amulets found.

It is interesting to note that all these cemeteries appear in the north-west part of the town. A likely explanation could be that this was the best fortified and most secure part of Fiesole. It has been suggested that the graves found in the Piazza Mino da Fiesole (Fig. 7.1) may have belonged to the Lombard nobility. This is based on the value of the grave goods. The other graves may have belonged to the non-Lombards. However, this argument is inconclusive. What can be done with the evidence is to try to determine which religious buildings were active at this period. The graves discovered in the church-yard of S. Alessandro (Fig. 7.2) would suggest that the building was already being used during Lombard period. 16th century documents suggest that the church was named S. Alessandro (Fig. 7.2) in honour of a Fiesolan saint at the end of the 8th century and the beginning of the 9th century AD. Originally the church was known as S. Pietro in Gerusalemme.
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It is true that much of our evidence for Late Antiquity and early medieval Fiesole is in the form of burials. But even this evidence shows a significant and not impoverished population. And more recent excavations in Piazza Mino da Fiesole (Fig. 7.1) have offered new insights into the Carolingian period. There appear to have been the remains of two large wooden buildings.\textsuperscript{813} An excavation carried out in 1979-1982 has also revealed two or more wells. In one of them were found loom weights, pottery, numerous jugs, and wooden buckets. It has been suggested that the objects were thrown in the well in order to hide them. This has been argued on the basis of their chronological homogeneity, as well as similar finds in the wells of Emilia-Romagna.\textsuperscript{814} A more likely explanation would be that these are the remains of items which were used to draw water from the well. The remains of the wooden buildings have been dated to the 9th-11th century on the basis of the objects found. What is important to stress is that although parts of the Piazza appear to have been depopulated in Late Antiquity, and was used as a cemetery in the Lombard period, the Piazza on the whole remained inhabited, in use, and new buildings were actually constructed under the Franks.\textsuperscript{815}

Chapter 9: The towns

Pisa

Pisa is located at the confluence of two rivers, the Arno and the Serchio. Who founded Pisa is a matter of debate. It has been suggested that the town was founded by Greeks in the 7th century BC. Another suggestion is that it may have been founded by Ligurians and later settled by Etruscans.816 Pisa came into Roman control around 230 BC, became a municipium, as a consequence of the Social War in 91-89 BC and became a colony under the triumvirate of Octavian between 41 BC and 27 BC. It was renamed Julia Obsequens. We have some idea of the importance of the city from two decrees conserved in the Camposanto (Fig. 8.1).817 These two decrees are dated from 2 and 4 AD, with which the administrators responsible for the town established commemorative rites in honour of the two adopted sons of Augustus. The first decree mentions the forum of Pisa and the group of magistrates responsible for the town, the theatre shows, the games at the circus, the temples, the baths and the monuments. It was discovered in the precincts of the Duomo (Fig. 8.1) after the fire of 1595. The second decree was found a little after this date, in the church of S. Maria della Spina (Fig. 8.1) where it was used as the altar table. The second decree suggests that most of the structures were already standing in the first years of the 1st century AD. It has also been suggested that these buildings were still standing in the 5th century AD when Rutilius Namazianus saw the statue of his father, consularis Tusciae et Umbriae.818

However, caution needs to be exercised. It is important to stress the difficulty involved in trying reconstruct a map of Roman Pisa. In contrast to the other settlements which we have examined here, Pisa does not possess a large quantity of monumental buildings which have survived from the Roman period. The situation is not helped by the lack of systematic archaeological investigation of periods after the age of Augustus.819 To a large extent all that we possess are imprecise archaeological excavations and it is necessary only to point to an archaeological plan of Pisa to see the serious gaps in our knowledge. The most important study done on the topography of Pisa in the Roman period that of A. Neppi-
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Fig. 8.1 – Pisa: Map of the churches and monumental buildings
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Modona as well as the monograph by L. Banti, both argue the existence at Piazz dei Cavalieri (Fig. 8.2) of a forum or an amphitheatre. During the medieval period the square came to be known as the Piazza delle Sette Vie. This was because it stood at the crossroads of seven major roads.

The consensus view of Biagio Pace, Nello Toscanelli, A. Neppi-Modona, L. Banti, C. Di Spigno, Piera Bocci and Guido Achille Mansuelli is that the Piazza di S. Sisto in Corte Vecchia (in Piazza dei Cavalieri- Fig. 8.2) was the heart of the Roman town. This is where they have located the crossroads of the decumanus maximus and the cardo maximus. It certainly does appear that the area surrounding the Piazza had been inhabited at a very early stage. An excavation carried out in 1994 in Via Sant’Apollonia (Fig. 8.2), (located close to Piazza dei Cavalieri- Fig. 8.2) revealed the remains of a building dated to 640 BC. The building is constructed of stone and wood and is of ample proportions. The building was also decorated with ridge tiles made in the form of a rams-head. A wooden box was also recovered underneath the floor which contained the skull of a horse and a pig. The most likely explanation would be that these were sacrificial victims. In fact there is a similar example which was discovered in Civita di Tarquinia underneath walls dated to the end of the 8th century AD and the beginning of the 7th century BC. The choice of a pig is part of Etruscan and Roman religious ritual and is considered the most noble victim for private rituals by antiqui reges ac sublimes viri. The occasion may have been a marriage as mentioned in Varro (De re rustica II, IV, 9). The sacrifice of a horse is also connected to rituals in Rome with regard to the foundation of some houses near the Via Sacra in the 6th century BC.

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of the Piazza dei Cavalieri (Fig. 8.2) in the history of Pisa. There is also very little doubt of its administrative and political significance during the later Middle Ages. This can be seen in the construction of the church of S. Sisto (Fig. 8.1) as well as the building of the Palazzo del Popolo and degli Anziani (Fig. 8.1) which was the seat of the Republic, followed by the Palazzo del Capitano del Popolo. In the 14th century it was the Piazza where public executions were held and under Cosimo I
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Fig. 8.2 – Pisa: Street plan

1 Piazza dei Cavalieri
2 Via S. Apollonia
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7 Via Ulisse Dini
8 Via S. Martino
9 Piazza del Duomo
(1537-1574) it became the seat for the Order of the Knights of S. Stefano. In spite of this the location of the forum is still debatable. Historians such as Tolaini have suggested that, “della tradizione che il foro fosse dove è ora la piazza dei Cavalieri non esistono le prove”. Massetti has suggested the Piazza dell’Arcivescovado (Fig. 8.2) as an alternative location for the Roman forum.

An excavation carried out in Piazza Dante Alighieri (Fig. 8.2) in 1991 revealed that the idea of the axis of Via dell’Ulivo (Fig. 8.2), and Via Pasquale Paoli (Fig. 8.2) as the decumanus maximus is simply untrue. It was created only in the 8th-10th century and was built over the remains of a domus built in the Augustan age. The idea of a Roman theatre in Piazza dei Cavalieri (Fig. 8.2) is also untenable. What seems striking is the degree in which the town’s topography seems to have been transformed in the medieval period and the degree in which the earlier Roman and Etruscan town seems to have been largely but not completely destroyed, with a few exceptions, as well as fragments which have been reused in medieval buildings especially those of the 11th century. It is for this reason, in my opinion, that is difficult to establish with any degree of certainty where exactly the location of the Roman forum was. The identification of Roman temples on the basis of present day churches is extremely problematic. For example, the remains of the destroyed church of SS. Felice e Regolo (located to the right of Piazza dei Cavalieri- Fig. 8.2, in Via Ulisse Dini- Fig. 8.2) was erroneously identified as a temple of Serapis, simply on the basis of some reused Roman columns and capitals.

The bulk of the archaeological evidence which has survived is in the form of reused building materials and burials. These building materials have been reused to decorate churches, houses, in Pisa, as well as in the surrounding countryside. For example, Palazzo Gambacorti (Fig. 8.1) was built for a member of the nobility between 1370-1380. The remains of reused Roman columns are clearly visible in the inner courtyard of this mansion. Palazzo Gambacorti (Fig. 8.1) is now the Pisan city hall. Reused building materials can also be found elsewhere. They include; the capitals and columns of the church S. Piero a Grado, as well as an urn from the sacristy, epigraphy in the Duomo (Fig. 8.1), S. Frediano (Fig. 8.1), the abbey of San Zeno (Fig. 8.1), and S. Michele in Borgo (Fig. 8.1). Roman sarcophagi have been reused in S. Pierino (Fig. 8.1) and S. Paolo a Ripa d’Arno (Fig. 8.1). Some sculpture such as the ‘Chinzica’ in Via S. Martino (Fig. 8.2) was carved from a fragment of a Roman sarcophagus in the medieval period. Small fragments were also built into the walls of some churches such as the abbey of S. Zeno (Fig. 8.1). There is also a whole Roman sarcophagus built into the wall of the Duomo (Fig. 8.1) near Porta di Bonanno. There are two examples located at the Camposanto (Fig. 8.1) which are considered of great artistic value. One of them is decorated with scenes from the myth of Phedra. It is dated to the 2nd century AD.

833 E. Tolaini, Studi di topografia pisana antica e medievale, Quaderni di cultura e storia di Pisa (Pisa, 1987), pp. 2-3.
835 I will discuss this building in more detail on page 167.
is the so-called sarcophagus of the Muses which is dated to the 3rd century AD.\textsuperscript{838} Originally, the Roman sarcophagi were scattered around the Camposanto (Fig. 8.1), near the Duomo (Fig. 8.1). They were placed in the Camposanto (Fig. 8.1, 1) in the 19th century.\textsuperscript{839} Other reused building material include a head of Ares which was in the Duomo (Fig. 8.1), two urns from the church of S. Lorenzo, which has now been destroyed, a capital from the convent of S. Caterina (Fig. 8.1), a satyr’s head from the bell tower and a bust of a Roman matron from the church S. Martino (Fig. 8.1).

One of the main problems is in deciding the provenance of the building materials. It is relatively unimportant (for the purpose of this thesis), in establishing from which particular building, the materials originally belonged to. What is more important is in deciding whether it may have been imported, as this is an important indicator of commercial contacts between Pisa and other parts of Italy and the Mediterranean during Late Antiquity and the early medieval period. It is also extremely problematic establishing whether the building materials, especially columns and capitals were brought to Pisa in an unfinished condition, partially reworked, or fully made. Our knowledge of Roman marble is largely from studies made on shipwrecks. The oldest dating to the Republican period and the latest from the Byzantine period (5-6th century AD).\textsuperscript{840} In the first two centuries of the Principate the marble that was transported from the eastern Mediterranean to Rome was generally in an unfinished state. It was only later that the marble was carved.\textsuperscript{841} During the first thirty years of the 3rd century AD some of the marble had already been carved in a cubic form suitable for capitals and pillar bases.\textsuperscript{842} It was only at the end of the 3rd century AD that capitals were transported in a completed state.

There are several possibilities. The capitals may have arrived in Pisa in an unfinished state and then were carved at the beginning of the 3rd century AD. Grisanti has argued that although some of Pisa’s medieval buildings are built by spolia in the early medieval period, it is difficult to be certain in other cases due to a lack of systematic excavation of Roman Pisa which would provide an archaeological context. What is especially problematic is in deciding whether a particular column or capital had been imported specifically for building material, or whether it was simply ship-ballast, or constructed in Pisa during the Roman period.\textsuperscript{843} Because of this it is extremely difficult to determine the date these imported building materials arrived in Pisa. One possible explanation is that these materials arrived in Pisa between the 7th-11th century AD.\textsuperscript{844} This was at a time when Pisa organized numerous naval expeditions against the Arabs, especially along the north African coast of the Mediterranean, the spolia coming from the former Roman towns of north Africa. Another possibility is that Pisa, especially during the 11-13th century, became a commercial centre for marble from Rome and Ostia.\textsuperscript{845} Let me illustrate this by pointing to a few examples.

\textsuperscript{838} C. Pescio, \textit{Pisa} (Florence, 2003), p. 58.
\textsuperscript{839} Ibid. p. 58.
\textsuperscript{841} Ibid. pp. 321-322.
\textsuperscript{842} Ibid. p. 335.
\textsuperscript{845} S. Settis, ‘Introduzione’, in S. Settis (ed.), in E. Tolaini, G. Grisanti Tedeschi, S. Bruni, P. Palleccchi,
One method which can be used in establishing the provenance of building materials is on the basis of microscopic analysis. The chemical composition of the building material allows us to determine its origin with great accuracy.\textsuperscript{846} Materials which have been imported include a capital from Greece in the church of S. Piero a Grado and part of a grey granite architrave from Olbia, in Sardinia, which was built into the wall of the Duomo (Fig. 8.1) at the time of its construction. It is now at the Camposanto (Fig. 8.1).\textsuperscript{847} S. Piero a Grado is located approximately seven kilometres from Pisa. It was constructed in the middle of the 11\textsuperscript{th} century but it was built over an earlier 6\textsuperscript{th} century AD basilica.\textsuperscript{848} There are also other examples from this church. A capital decorated with sphinxes with a poorly preserved twin in Rome. Microscopic analysis has determined that it came from the auditorium of Maecenas on the Esquiline.\textsuperscript{849} It has been dated to the last decades of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC. It was originally made in Greece and imported to Pisa from Rome in the medieval period. This is extremely significant because it is a clear indication of commercial contacts between the two cities during this period. The architrave is inscribed with the name of ‘\textit{CERERI SACRVM’}. Like the capital, it also reached Pisa during the medieval period and was originally from a temple dedicated to Ceres by Nero Acte.\textsuperscript{850}

I would like to point to some other examples to illustrate that these commercial contacts between Pisa and other towns in the Mediterranean in the medieval period may have been more widespread than previously believed. I refer to the Roman columns and capitals which are now part of the Cassa di Risparmio building in Via Ulisse Dini (Fig. 8.2).\textsuperscript{851} This building was constructed at the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. This site had previously been occupied by the church of SS. Felice and Regolo. The date of the church’s foundation is unknown but it is first mentioned in a document dated to 1092.\textsuperscript{852} It was closed on the 19\textsuperscript{th} October 1785 under the orders of the Archduke Pietro Leopoldo of Tuscany. It was then used as an archive for the Cathedral Vestry Board. It was later sold to the Cassa di Risparmio di Pisa, which adopted it as its central branch in 1864.\textsuperscript{853} The two relevant capitals are of similar dimensions and style. But each capital also has the same number of deities (Jupiter, Mercury, Minerva and Juno for one capital; Harpocretes, Isis, Serapis and Ceres for the other).\textsuperscript{854} The capitals have been dated on stylistic grounds to the first twenty years of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD.\textsuperscript{855} Based on microscopic analysis it has been determined that the marble was quarried from the island of Proconnesus in the sea of Marmara. It has been argued that the marble used was imported and then carved at the beginning of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD, but it is possible that they may have

\textsuperscript{851} Ibid. p. 49.
\textsuperscript{853} Ibid. p. 49.
\textsuperscript{854} Ibid. pp. 51-56.
\textsuperscript{855} Ibid. p. 64.
been brought from elsewhere at a later date.\textsuperscript{856} One of the columns was quarried from red granite from Aswan and the other was from pink granite from Capo Testa in Gallura (Sardinia).\textsuperscript{857}

Grisanti has suggested a hypothesis. There is an inscription on a white marble funerary urn, now in the Camposanto but originally from the abbey of S. Zeno (Fig. 8.1) which refers to a \textit{IVLIA ISLAS}.\textsuperscript{858} The other piece of evidence is a stone tablet found during restoration work in the same abbey in 1970. The tablet is inscribed with symbols of the Alexandrian triad. There is also a dedicatory inscription in Greek letters, but in Latin (from) \textit{T. Flavius Farnutianus Rufus}, addressed to “the gods that listen”. Cristofani has suggested that \textit{Farnutianus} is an eastern Greek, Bithynian name. The nomen \textit{Flavius} would mean a descendant of a freedman of the Flavians.\textsuperscript{859} Grisanti has argued that this is evidence of \textit{spolia} from another town that arrived in the early medieval period, or that this is evidence for the existence of a local Pisan cult dedicated to the Alexandrian deities. She has pointed out that on stylistic grounds the only match for the capitals of the Cassa di Risparmio building is that of Rome in the Severan period (193-235 AD). There also does not seem to be a stylistic match at Ostia or the northern African towns. It is also unlikely that a funerary urn or a stone tablet would be used as ballast. On this basis Grisanti argues that the \textit{spolia} was probably imported as raw marble and then carved in Pisa during the Roman period. She does not however, rule out the possibility that it may have been a finished import specifically for use as building material.\textsuperscript{860}

It has been argued that the proximity of Pisa to Rome, and the similarity between the Pisan capitals and the Roman Severan capitals may be an indication that craftsmen from Rome may have travelled there.\textsuperscript{861} In 1965, in Via S. Zeno (Fig. 8.1), not far from the abbey of S. Zeno, a large quantity of discarded pottery was found. The chronological span is broad. The dates span from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD. One period is particularly significant. Between 15 to 20-30 AD, a large portion came from a Pisan workshop of Arretine pottery. The names of the workers \textit{Maes, Zoilus} may indicate that they were of Greek origin.\textsuperscript{862} Grisanti has argued that the presence of Greek workmen is another indication that there existed a Pisan cult dedicated to the Alexandrian deities.\textsuperscript{863} This is supported by Malaise who has suggested that Pisa may have been an important centre for the diffusion of the cult of Isis.\textsuperscript{864}

\textsuperscript{856} Ibid. p. 60.
\textsuperscript{858} CIL, XI, 1476.
\textsuperscript{861} Ibid. p. 62.
\textsuperscript{864} M. Malaise, \textit{Le conditions de penetration et de diffusion des cultes egyptiens en Italie} (Leiden, 1972), p. 354.
I find this argument unconvincing due to the lack of evidence. The argument that the *spolia* could have been ship ballast is also highly improbable due to the peculiarity of the building materials used (for example, capitals, urns, columns…etc). Based on the evidence of other towns in Tuscany (especially Arezzo), I do not find it unlikely that the reused building materials is evidence of commercial contacts with other towns and the importation of *spolia* to decorate specific buildings. In fact it is not impossible that these pieces were deliberately chosen for their antiquity. The intention being to glorify Pisa by linking its religious buildings to the glory of ancient Rome but reinterpreted to give it a religious symbolic meaning. A good example of this phenomenon would be the capitals in Via Ulisse Dini. (Fig. 8.2). The figures carrying a crown of laurel wreath may have been interpreted as angels sanctifying a saint. There is another example. A slab which was used as a screen to the presbytery in the Duomo (Fig. 8.1) up to 1300. It is now in the Museum of the Duomo. It is decorated with dolphins, tridents and sea-shells, and was originally part of the basilica of Neptune, which was located behind the Pantheon in Rome. It has been suggested that the ‘dolphins’ and ‘tridents’ may have been interpreted as symbols of the crucifixion.

There is also other evidence to suggest urban activity and commercial contacts between Pisa and other parts of Italy during the early medieval period. I would like to speak at this stage regarding the Piazza del Duomo (Fig. 8.2). The Piazza del Duomo (Fig. 8.2) is rich in archaeological evidence from the Etruscan, Roman period, as well as Late Antiquity. Excavations carried out in March 1998 also revealed new structures dating from Antiquity and the medieval period. The area excavated was approximately 125 square metres. It included the area between the apse of the cathedral, as well as the Tower of Pisa, located to the south. The chronological sweep of the archaeological evidence is broad. The Piazza appears to have been a place of worship during the Etruscan period, a residential area during the Roman period, and a cemetery in Late Antiquity and the early medieval period. The area appears to be of importance especially with regard to religious buildings from as early as the end of the 5th century BC. The 5th-6th century AD revealed traces of residential buildings, albeit with burials in certain areas. But by the 7th century AD the area had been transformed into a necropolis.

The Lombard graves reveal grave goods dated to the beginning and the end of the 7th century AD. The Lombard burials were filled with fragments of brick and pottery. One of the burials was located to the north of the Duomo (Fig. 8.1). This burial was filled with grave
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866 Which I discussed previously on page 130.
goods.\textsuperscript{873} The burials appear to have a clear relationship with the location of the early medieval cathedral. It is possible that these burials were actually located beneath the Duomo (Fig. 8.1). There is an important distinction to be made. Lombard burials found in close proximity to the \textit{ecclesia maior} had rich grave goods. But the graves found behind the actual apse only had a few items of personal use.\textsuperscript{874} The grave goods include a comb and bronze buckles which must have part of a sword belt. The style suggests Byzantine manufacture. The buckles are dated to around 630-660 AD. There are also rings and a coin dated to Justinian and one belonging to Constantine IV (674-685 AD).\textsuperscript{875} This is another important indication of commercial contacts between Pisa and the rest of Italy in the early medieval period. The coins are identified as having originated from a mint in Rome and were still in circulation in the late 7th century. Its discovery so far from Rome suggests that it may have belonged to an individual who despite being a resident of Pisa clearly had travelled to Rome perhaps on a regular basis. It also raises the possibility of commercial contacts between the Byzantine south and the Lombard controlled areas even after the reign of Heraclius (610-641 AD).\textsuperscript{876} It should be noted that Forum ware was discovered at Pisa, as well as Campanian Red Painted ware which was still available as late as the 8th century AD. There was also evidence of continuity in metallurgical techniques from the 7th century AD found in the Piazza dei Cavalieri (Fig. 8.2), which fits the model of Lucca especially with regard to the documentary evidence which refers to artisans working in Lucca beginning around the 730's AD.\textsuperscript{877}

\textsuperscript{875} Ibid. p. 22.
Chapter 10: The towns

Volterra

Traditionally, the archaeological research carried out in Volterra has been restricted to the study of Etruscan funerary urns and grave goods from extramural cemeteries such as Badia-Montebradoni and Ulimeto. More recently, the focus has shifted towards the Roman theatre (Fig. 9.1) and the Etruscan acropolis (Fig. 9.2). To a large extent, it would not be unfair to say that our knowledge of early medieval Volterra is extremely limited.878 With the exception of studies done on early medieval cemeteries, most of our knowledge is focused on the Etruscan and Roman period. Even the work done on cemeteries is limited in its scope and detail. Volterra covers an area of approximately 26 hectares, 4 hectares more if we include the area outside the town walls which consists of the Roman theatre, the baths, and the various domus. The area excavated so far is around 3-4 percent of the urban area. It is understandable that caution needs to be exercised in making generalisations.879

The Etruscan acropolis (Fig. 9.2) appears to have been the oldest part of the town. There are traces of levelled earth which may have been the foundation of a hut. This has been dated to the 6th century BC. There are also two Hellenistic houses dated to the 4th century BC.880 This would suggest that a residential area lay on the acropolis almost to the end of the 4th century. From the 3rd century BC, the acropolis (Fig. 9.2) became a sacred area with the successive construction of two temples. The first temple was constructed around the 3rd century BC and the second during the 2nd century BC. It appears that there were a series of restorations and reconstructions which indicated that the area remained occupied for the entire Roman period.881 Archaeological evidence has confirmed Cristofani’s hypothesis that the area surrounding the acropolis and the Etruscan temple remained occupied up to the end of the 3rd century AD.882 There is some indication that the acropolis (Fig. 9.2) gained a defensive character in the Hellenistic period. Large cisterns (Fig. 9.1) were constructed on the hill of the acropolis.883 The town wall appears to have been constructed in the 4th century BC. The implication would be that this marked the beginning of residential areas constructed below the

879 Ibid. p. 73.
Fig. 9.1 - Volterra: Map of the churches and monumental buildings

1 Roman Theatre
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Fig. 9.2 – Volterra: Street plan
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3 Via Matteotti
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5 Via Gramsci
6 Via Sarti
hill of the acropolis (Fig. 9.2). There are other archaeological markers to indicate this. There seems to have been an artisan’s quarter near what was to become the Roman theatre (Fig. 9.1). This is dated to the 2nd century BC. There are numerous cisterns dated from this period which have survived. Two were covered over at the end of the 3rd century AD.

Volterra acquired the appearance of a Roman town in the Augustan and Julio-Claudian period with the construction of a theatre (Fig. 9.1) in the locality of Vallevuona. The Roman town appears to have developed within the earlier historical centre, with the addition of an area to the north of the theatre (Fig. 9.1). It is important to stress that it is extremely difficult to assess any individual changes to the urban structure especially between the 2nd and the first half of the 3rd century AD. We still do not recognise many of the urban structures from the Imperial period and many of these structures have also not been sufficiently excavated for an understanding of the exact chronology of the Roman town and its lay-out. The street-plan appears to have remained roughly the same and so does the wall. The *cardo maximus* is on a north-south axis and runs through Via Porta all’Arco (Fig. 9.2), Via Matteotti (Fig. 9.2) and Via Guarnacci (Fig. 9.2). The two Etruscan gates Porta all’Arco (Fig. 9.1) and Porta Diana are included in the communal city walls. Archaeological excavation has also revealed traces of antique paving stones and the remains of the drainage system. However, the Roman forum has not been discovered archaeologically. But some clues do exist to indicate its location. By following the *cardo maximus* and the *decumanus* the crossroads can be found where the church of S. Michele Arcangelo (Fig. 9.1) is located today. The fact that the church has the toponym ‘in foro’ is another indication. The toponym has clearly survived into the early medieval period.

The 3rd-4th and the 6th century AD are extremely important turning points in the history of Volterra. The 3rd-4th century AD seems to mark a revival in large-scale monumental buildings at a time when other parts of the urban fabric were showing signs of decay. Monumental public building appears to have restarted during the 3rd century with the construction of two public baths, one at S. Felice and the other at Vallevuona. S. Felice is located in a southern suburb of Volterra. It is dated to the 3rd century, based on an analysis of the structure, a study of its mosaics, as well as an incomplete inscription which refers to Commodus (180-192 AD) or Gordian III (238-244 AD). The public baths of Vallevuona were constructed within the *porticus pone scaenam* of the Roman theatre (Fig. 9.2). From an analysis of the architecture and the mosaics, it has been dated to the second half of the 3rd century and the beginning of the 4th century AD. This second phase is on the basis of coinage discovered dated to Constantius II (337-361 AD) and Valentinian I (364-375 AD).
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However, there is still some debate regarding the stratigraphic level where the coins were discovered in the building. One suggestion based on a re-examination of the coins and the theatre and porticus, is that part of the theatre was in ruins towards the end of the 3rd century AD. If this was the case, it would mean that collapse had occurred during or only a little after the public baths were constructed, the implication however, being that part of the theatre may have still remained in use. In fact, there is some evidence to suggest that there was continuous habitation in the area. To the west of the theatre (Fig. 9.1), near the postern of S. Lino, a section of wall was constructed using the spolia from the public baths of Valletbuona. The wall has been tentatively dated to the 6-10th century AD. This would suggest that the zone near the public baths may have been transformed into a residential area in the early medieval period. However, caution needs to be exercised. There does not seem to have been any evidence of post holes or structures made from perishable material which would indicate the presence of houses. But such evidence would be extremely difficult to detect archaeologically.

It is important to stress that the building activity either side of 300 AD took place at about the same time that ‘dark earth’ began appearing. This is particularly significant because ‘dark-earth’ has traditionally been interpreted as a sign of urban abandonment and depopulation. ‘Dark earth’ deposits were discovered in Via Gramsci (Fig. 9.2) and in Piazza XX Settembre (Fig. 9.3). The deposits are dated to the 3rd century AD. Traditionally, there have been three explanations for ‘dark-earth’. The first is that these deposits are the remains of soil (organic material) which was used to grow food in the city. Second, that they may have been the remains of wooden huts. And thirdly, that they are the remains of rubbish tips. In my opinion, a more likely explanation could be that ‘dark earth’ was material brought into the city to be used as the foundation for new buildings. I favour this explanation because the ‘dark-earth’ has been dated to the 3rd century AD and it was at a time when monumental building seems to have started again.

However, there also seem to be some signs of urban decline towards the end of the 3rd century. Two large Etruscan cisterns, one located under the eastern side of the temple on the acropolis, the other located in the cellar of Palazzo Incontri Viti (Fig. 9.1) in Via Sarti (Fig. 9.2), were both filled with rubble. The rubble consists of African sigillata A and C, as well as a large quantity of red slipware pottery generically dated to Late Antiquity. The latter is considered to be of local or regional production. There is also a coin of Gordion III (238-244 AD) dated to 241 AD (which is used to date the disuse of the cistern), the type A sigillata is dated to the 2nd-3rd century AD and some amphorae are dated to the 3rd-4th century AD, indicating the length of time over which the cistern was filled with rubble. The abandonment of the public baths at Valletbuona is dated to the second half of the 4th century AD. There does not seem to have been any monumental building construction after this point. ‘Dark earth’ dated by the excavators to the 6th century also began to appear to the
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west of the Roman theatre (Fig. 9.1) not far from where the early medieval wall which I have mentioned earlier was found.

It was also during this period that burials started to appear within the town walls. The abandonment of monumental Roman buildings led to cemeteries being dug in the centre of the town, even if for the whole of Late Antiquity the extramural cemeteries of Ulimento-Poggio alle Croci, Ripaia (Fig. 9.3) and Portone and Badia-Montebradoni as well as two other cemeteries which were found without artifacts in the locality of Pinzanone, remained in use. Two inscriptions were found at Badia-Montebradoni near the church of S. Giusto. One is dated to the second half of the 4th century and the beginning of the 5th century, and the other between the 5th-6th century AD. The necropolis of Ripaia (Fig. 9.3) contained a grave with an early medieval coffin and grave goods. There were also five other similar graves which were discovered in the same cemetery, although these were without grave goods. There was another grave consisting of a cavalryman with arms and a horse found in the locality of Le Cetine. The intramural graves were found in Piazza XX Settembre (Fig. 9.3). The grave goods consisted of a bronze fibula. It is possible that the ancient cemetery of Badia-Montebradoni was transformed during the 4th to the 5th century AD into a Christian cemetery. Again, the presence of these substantial cemeteries is a good indicator that despite the abandonment of monumental Roman buildings, these areas remained inhabited throughout the early medieval period.

At this stage the evidence is still inconclusive. But an argument can be made that the Lombard settlement was part of the reorganisation of the town by the ecclesiastical authorities. In other words, as at Lucca, urban space was being reorganised into concentrations of population surrounding a cathedral, rectory or abbey, and the activity of the populace was structured within the framework of the bishop and diocese. There is some documentary evidence to suggest a period of building activity at the end of the 6th century AD. The documents refer to the existence of a fortification in the Badia di S. Giusto. In medieval documents it is identified with the toponym ‘Prato Marzio’. It has been suggested that this was a reference to a gathering place for Roman military officials, others have suggested that this was in reference to the fact that this area had a military function in Late Antiquity. The first reference to this toponym is in a document dated to 1034, which refers to the foundation of the abbey of SS. Giusto Clemente and provides some information regarding the location of this fortification. The bishop “donavit atque concessit Prato Martio cum casis et casinis et omnia que supra et infra se habentes sicut mura et signa et termini positi sunt in loco qui vocatur Castello Albuini” to the abbey of S. Giusto.
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A document dated to 1005 mentions the presence of a citadel but there is no reference to its location, “Actum Voliterre ubi dicitur Castello Albuini”. There are also numerous references to the continuity of the use of the toponym ‘Prato Marzio’. In a document dated to 1061 the bishop Wido left to Andrea, the abbot of S. Giusto, the property of Monte Nibio in exchange for two pieces of land, one near the monastery, the other in Volterra itself, in a location called Prato Marzio.\footnote{F. Schneider, Regestum Volaterranum (Rome, 1907), no. 126, p. 46.} In a document dated to 1076 the priest Prando gave to the abbey of SS. Giusto e Clemente his lands including land at Fasciano and Prato Marzio. In another document dated to 1178 there was a pledge by the priest Hugo, of the rectory of S. Maria, of two pieces of land in Prato Marzio “ius cursu vie”.\footnote{M. Cavallini & M. Bocci, ‘Vescovi volterrani fino al 1100. Esame del Regestum Volterranaum, con appendice di pergamate trascurate da Fedor Schneider’, Rassegna Volterrana LVIII (1982), no. 113, p. 95.} In a document dated to 1182 a sale was registered to the same Hugo, of a piece of land outside of Volterra “prope porta de Prato Marzio”.\footnote{Ibid. no. 130, p. 101.} And in a document dated to 1218 the podesta of Volterra used the designations “provisoris et rectoris burgi s. Marie, rectoris de Pratomarzo, rectoris Porta Silicis, rectoris s. Ioannis”.\footnote{F. Schneider, Regestum Volaterranum (Rome, 1907), no. 355, p. 82.} If this fortification was located near the area surrounding Prato Marzio and in the vicinity of the abbey of S. Giusto, it is possible that this was a Lombard settlement or even the seat of the gastald, Alboin. The hypothesis here, and I think it is plausible, is that there was a Lombard quarter within Volterra, located in the western part of the town, and with the fall of the Lombard kingdom, this area fell under the control of the local bishop.\footnote{A. Alberti, ‘Volterra’, in E. Abela, A. Alberti, M. Baldassarri, F. Bandini, M.C. Favilla, S. Gelichi, R. Mirandola, C. Negrelli, C. Rizzitelli, Archeologia urbana in Toscana. La città allomedievale (Mantua, 1999), p. 81.} Another document dated to 1279 provides a possible location for this citadel. With reference to a barter of a house in the vicinity of Prato Marzio, the document mentions that it borders a “grotta de Castrovecchio”.\footnote{M. Ducci, ‘La badia dei Santi Gusto e Clemente a Volterra dalla fondazione agli inizi del XIII secolo’, Tesi di Laurea, Dipartimento di Medievistica, Università degli Studi di Pisa, Prof. Relatore G. Rossetti (1992-1993), p. 38.} In fact there appear to have been two fortified ‘villages’ and population centres behind Volterra’s Roman walls, the so-called “castellum Albuini” located on the western spur of the town and the other, the “castellum civitatis” located in the central-eastern part of the town. “Castellum Albuini” is especially significant because it is near the cemetery of Badia-Montebradoni. This may have been the location of the first episcopal seat and the first cathedral.\footnote{P. Giuliani Bocci, G. Di Simone, F. Alessandro Lessi (eds.), U. Bavoni, C. Caciagli, P. La Porta, M.T. Lazzarini, E. Veracini, Chiese di Volterra Vol. II (Florence, 2003), p. 25.} I will discuss this at greater length below but would first like to focus on the history of the diocese as an institution.

**Diocese of Volterra**

The diocese of Volterra covered a substantial area. The boundary is approximately to the north of Valdera and Valdelsa, it included the interior of the Valdicheca up to the Colline Metallifere and territory formerly belonging to the diocese of Siena.\footnote{G. Dell’Aiuto, A. Furiesi, C. Nenzi, ‘Introduzione’, in M. Buresi & A. Caleca (eds.), Medioevo a Volterra: Arte nell’antica Diocesi fino al Duecento (Pisa, 2002), p. 17.} The presence of the bishop of Volterra is first attested in two letters dated to the 5th century AD, one which is dated to 492 and the other to 496. The letters are by Pope Gelasius I (492-496 AD) in which there is a reference to a bishop of Volterra, Eucharistus. He was condemned and deposed for
squandering the wealth of the church and replaced by Helpidius in 496 AD. There is also a reference in the letters to two previous bishops but there is no information regarding their identity or any dates given. Because of this the only safe conclusion would be to assume that Volterra had episcopal status during the second half of the 5th century AD even if Etruria probably had an ecclesiastical structure as early as before the edict of Constantine of 313 AD. The documentary evidence attests to the presence of sixty bishops at the regional council of 251 AD. It has been argued that the forty-four years of peace which the church enjoyed between 259-303 AD probably enabled it to give episcopal status and place bishops in all of the major citivates and municipia in areas which were not too distant from Rome. But there is no information regarding the location or even existence of an episcopal church dating from this period. Some have suggested that the town’s first cathedral was the church of S. Maria where the present day Duomo (Fig. 9.1) is located. One of the earliest references to a church dedicated to S. Maria is in the context of an oath of fealty which Charlemagne received and his subsequent gift to king Desiderius (756-c.786 AD) and his son Pippin (c.769-811 AD) “...ut divae Mariae templum augustum parunque exornatum ad maiorem formam et magnificentiam rehedicandum curare...” There is also another document dated to 801 AD in which Charlemagne confirmed privileges given to bishop Pietro and states “...sub nostri mundiburdi perpetua tutela...pro Dei summo amore et intermeratae genitrices eius competentis veneratione sub cuius honore episcopi structura prepoller”. Others have suggested the basilica of S. Pietro which was located at Poggetto. This building was destroyed by the artillery of Montefeltro in 1472. But we do possess a clue to its location. There is a diploma from the emperor Louis II (850-875 AD) dated to the 23rd May 851 AD “...in curte eiusdem sedis que dicitur Camporise ad basilicam que est constructa in honorem beati Petri apostolorum principis...” However, the evidence is far from conclusive.

With regard to S. Maria, there is a clue to its location in a document dated to the 9th century AD. It refers to the transfer of priests from S. Giusto to S. Maria, and mentions that the church is located near the baptistry of S. Giovanni (Fig. 9.1) “...ubi fons baptismalis est...” There is another reference to S. Maria with regard to two diplomas issued by Louis I (814-840 AD) on 27th October 821 AD and one diploma issued by Lothar I (840-855 AD) on 30th December 845 AD. We also have a diploma dated to 851 by Louis II (850-875 AD) to
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the bishop Andrea, allowing two markets to celebrate the feast of S. Maria and S. Ottaviano. The first market was to be located near the bishop’s church. The other was near the bishop’s
curtis of Camporisa, near the basilica of S. Pietro (Fig. 9.4).920 At the end of the 9th century
AD, we begin to find some indication of a church with episcopal status in the town. The
episopal church is also mentioned in a document of 905 AD “domo Sancte Marie
eiscopatui voloterrensi”.921 More information is given in a document dated to 992 AD,
“ecclesia Sancte Mariae fra muro civitate volaterrensis” and…actum loco prope ecclesia et
canonica et domo episcopatui s. Marie voloterrensis”.922

Despite the considerable documentary evidence, it should be stressed that the
archaeological evidence for the early medieval church of S. Maria is extremely scarce. A
possible factor could be an earthquake which destroyed the previous church on the site in
1117. The present cathedral was rebuilt after this. It was also extensively renovated in the 15th
and 18th century.923 It was consecrated by Pope Callistus II (1119-1124) on 20th May 1120.
But it does show considerable signs of the re-use of building materials from the Roman
period. The marble columns were probably taken from the Roman theatre (Fig. 9.2) at
Vallebuona. A capital used in the Duomo (Fig. 9.1) is identical to the group of columns which
made up the porticus post scaenam of the Roman theatre (Fig. 9.1).924 The Roman
sarcophagus of a bishop on stylistic grounds has been dated to between the 3rd to the first half
of the 4th century AD. Etruscan and Roman funerary urns have also been reused to hold the
relics of the saints.925 There are fragments of Roman marble inserted haphazardly in the walls
and the foundations. The altaritave is decorated with a carving of flowers and at the centre, a
deer attacked by two griffins. It has been dated to the 1st century AD. Some of the door
frames also show signs of being built of reused Roman building materials. But some of the
decorative elements suggest that it was re-worked in the Lombard period.926

Unfortunately the archaeological record for other churches is extremely
disappointing. Despite considerable evidence of the large scale re-use of building materials
from the Roman period, there are few traces of any buildings from the 5th century AD.927
There is also very little evidence of the Byzantine occupation of the town. One possible
exception could be the name of one of the churches, S. Vitale, and the oratory of Casazano
which was dedicated to S. Margherita. She was an eastern martyr and the oratory is located on
the north slope of Volterra.928 The first mention of S. Vitale is in a document dated to 980 AD
that mentions “Hae tres petiae pertinent de ecclesia nostra S. Vitalis quod est sub regime
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episcopatui volaterrense”. There are also many Late Antique burials in the area of Cetine, therefore the existence of S. Vitale may also have been a reference to the Byzantine occupation of the town. From the second half of the 7th century AD we have some evidence with regard to the Lombards. The church of S. Giusto al Botro was founded around 690 AD by the gastald Alchis. It is located near the edge of the cliff of Balze. It contained the graves of S. Giusto and S. Clemente. Previously the remains had been located at small chapels on the slopes of the Campo Marzio. But by the 1600’s the gradient of the cliff of Balze had increased and the church had started to fall into ruin. By 1614 the eastern side and façade had collapsed and by 1627 the only parts which remained intact were the main altar and the walls of the sacristy and the bell-tower. However, this also collapsed in 1648 and the church was reduced to rubble. The present church has therefore been extensively rebuilt and renovated in 1685, 1775, 1778 and 1800.

Despite this there does seem to be some physical evidence of the early medieval church. This includes lion heads which have been inserted into the façade, the remains of three Etruscan funerary urns, and a slab from an altar table built into a wall near the chancel. The slab has a dedicatory inscription engraved at its side: “[...In hon]ore S(an)e(t)ii Iusti Alchis ill(ustris) Gastaldii /us fieri iusset tempore /dom(i)n(i) Cunicpert regi ei Gaudentiiano episcopo a[nnno]...” The names appear to refer to the Lombard king of the 8th century AD, Cunipert, the gastald Alchis and the bishop Gaudentius. The style of the epigraphy has been identified as typical of the 7th-8th century AD. This is obviously a powerful piece of evidence for the early medieval church. Unfortunately almost nothing else is known about Alchis and Gaudentius. There is a reference to a “vicus Alahis” in the area between Luni and Lucca, but whether this is a direct reference to the Alchis of Volterra remains a hypothesis. There is another reference in a will compiles probably between the 11th-12th century by a certain Blindermanno which has an interesting annotation “Interea index civitatis, nomine Alchis, dum vidit miracula,...constructxit ecclesiam, ad laudem et honorem Dei, super corpora Sanctorum Justi et Clementi”.

In the church of S. Giusto al Botro, there are also two Roman sarcophagi. The sarcophagi are an allusion to the presence of the bodies of S. Giusto and S. Clemente. We also possess a text dated to the 11th-12th century AD which mentions that Alchis had built two churches called S. Giusto and S. Clemente. Based on this text, two oratories were also constructed near the tomb of the saints around 561 AD in the northern suburb of the town which was at the time occupied by the Late Antique cemetery of Badia-Montebradoni. Another slab from the same period, is located in the abbey of Monteverdi, in the locality of Palazzuolo. It was founded by the abbot Valfredo della
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Gherardesca in 754 AD.  

The earliest mention of the baptistery of S. Giovanni (Fig. 9.1) is in 989 AD. It was in reference to an award of a perpetual lease by the archbishop of the diocese to the baptismal church of S. Giovanni “Actum...ad ecclesiam, que est in onore beati S. Joannis batista ubi fontem baptismalis qui est iuxta predicto domo (episcopo) et ecclesia s. Ottabian...”939 But the date of its foundation has been debated. The present octagonal structure and the massive vaults are dated to the Carolingian period.940 Documentary evidence indicates that the location of the baptistery of 1161 is the same location as today.941 But there is some indication that the building was actually constructed at the end of the 7th or the beginning of the 8th century AD.942 This is based on the likelihood that the baptistery reused pre-existing building materials especially the columns during the 6th-7th century AD. The columns themselves are stylistically similar to the column bases in the ruins of the church of S. Giovanni a Monte Voltraio.943

The church of S. Michele Arcangelo (Fig. 9.1) is located in Via Guarnacci. It is possible that it was founded in the Lombard period, but the earliest reference in our documentary evidence is dated to 14th August 987 AD.944 The present building was constructed in the 13th century. The document describes the church’s location as “...in loco a foro”.945 This would suggest that it was located in the Roman forum and on the crossroads of the cardo and decumanus. There is also some evidence from the territory of Volterra. Approximately three kilometres to the south-east of Monteverdi Marittimo, a town which is located to the south-west of Volterra, is the ruins of the Benedictine monastery of S. Pietro. Its foundation is dated to 754 AD.946 There is also another candidate. On the borders between Siena and Grosseto is the church of S. Paolo di Montieri. It is now in ruins. It is one of the most distant of the churches in the diocese of Volterra. Vatti has argued that it was founded by a noble of Lombard ancestry who became bishop in the 9th century AD. 947 Unfortunately our information regarding these churches is extremely limited. For a better analysis, we will have to wait, here as elsewhere, for more detailed archaeological investigation to be carried out.
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Conclusion

The purpose of this thesis was to examine documentary and archaeological evidence with regard to towns in northern Tuscany, in order to understand the transition between Late Antiquity and the early medieval period in greater detail. The period to be covered was around 400-900 AD. This involved examining the Gothic, Lombard, Byzantine and Frankish invasions and their impact on the towns. Lucca was to be used as a model for examining this process in detail and as a comparison with the other towns involved. It was hoped that the similarities or differences involved would reveal insights into the debate between those who view the process as being a catastrophic and destructive decline for these towns, or those who would argue for a positive transformation. The wish was for a contribution to the ongoing debate regarding the state of settlements in Tuscany and whether they can still be regarded as 'urban'. I would like at this stage to discuss settlements in the Roman Empire within a general context.

Historians such as Wickham have argued that despite large regional differences some patterns do emerge.  

The latest historical research appears to indicate good urban survival in north Africa, the Roman East (Syria and Palestine), Andalucia, and poor urban survival in the Byzantine provinces of Asia Minor, northern Spain, and Gaul. The evidence indicates that abandonment of the forum took place especially early in the towns of north Africa at around 450 AD. But there is also evidence which indicates that events such as the Vandal invasion did not have the devastating impact which historians had previously thought. For example, the port areas of Carthage remained continuously inhabited throughout this period. It is true that the aqueduct appears to have fallen into disuse at the time of the Vandal invasion, and cisterns were dug in the town. However, this could be a sign of continuous habitation. Another piece of evidence which seems to suggest this is encroachment of the street-plan near the port area by houses. In other towns urban basilicas were built in the 6th century AD, there was also the reuse of Roman buildings for other functions. Shops were created among the colonnades of the buildings in the forum. Amphitheatres were converted into urban fortresses and became part of the fortifications.

What was even more striking with regard to the towns of north Africa was the process of urban fragmentation or città ad isole, whereby new population centres began forming outside what was once the urban centre but frequently within the town walls. This phenomenon took place within the context of the abandonment of the forum of the Roman town. The Byzantine invasion of the 6th century AD was to lead to an attempt to reinforce or 'anchor' the forum areas by the creation of a fortress. Ironically, the Byzantine urban fortress frequently reinforced and solidified the città ad isole, by cutting off roads which had previously led to the forum. Something similar takes place in the towns of Syria and Palestine. In Scythopolis shops begin to encroach on the forum areas, and in this case we have epigraphic evidence that the curia attempted to stop this process by fining the shops involved. It appears that at some point the curia could no longer enforce this rule, and shops began to
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appear in the forum areas. Ceramic and fabric workshops also began to appear in the centre of the town. But there does seem to be a difference between this region and north Africa, namely the urban decline which appears to have affected the coastal cities, especially the towns such as Antioch which relied heavily on maritime trade. This is not to say that towns further inland were not also affected. An earthquake in 583 AD led to the abandonment of some of the inland towns and in many cases their urban revival only came about under the Arabs. But most of the towns appear to have survived.

The situation again appears slightly different with regard to the towns of Andalucia. In this case our archaeological record is not as good as for the towns of Syria and Palestine. But with regard to Valencia the picture seems to have been that of a settlement where urban survival was considerable. The forum appears to have maintained its monumentality into the 6th century AD. The Curia was rebuilt at this time, and one other large building was also left standing. There does appear to be some evidence of disuse and abandonment. The portico around the forum was filled with reused material, the possibility being that this was for shops (although the dating is uncertain). The macellum was abandoned around 450 AD and was converted into a cemetery. In the 6th-7th century an ecclesiastical building was built on the cemetery, and this may have formed the basis for the cathedral. In the case of Tarragona, it became a città ad isole, but even here in the 5th-6th century AD a church was constructed within the amphitheatre which remained in use until the 7th century AD. Furthermore, the port area also remained occupied well into the 7th century, which suggests that Tarragona retained some of its wealth and prosperity.

The areas which I have mentioned stand in direct contrast to the settlements of Byzantine Asia Minor, northern Spain, and Gaul, where there seems to have been poor urban survival. But why this should be so is extremely difficult to answer. One argument suggested is the pull of Constantinople on the nobility residing in the Byzantine towns of Asia Minor. The fact that the Eastern imperial administration still retained considerable power, in contrast to the emperor in the West may have been another factor. It is also difficult to underestimate the impact of the Persian invasions of the early 7th century AD. Archaeological investigation of islands such as Crete and Rhodes which were relatively unaffected by the invasions reveal a great deal more continuity in contrast to those on the mainland. In the case of Spain much more extensive regional investigation has to be conducted to explain the differences between the poor urban survival of Cartagena in contrast to Valencia. At present our understanding is still very incomplete. With regard to Gaul, a possible explanation may have been the choices made by the Frankish nobility. Unlike in Gothic and Lombard Italy, the Frankish nobility appear to have resided in rural areas. This almost certainly played a crucial role with regard to the patronage available for the towns, especially since the Frankish nobility appear to have been a great deal wealthier than their Gothic and Lombard counterparts. In this case it appears that a cultural choice decided the
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economic fate of a settlement.  

What seems to be common to both east and west is the abandonment and restructuring of the Roman forum. One possible reason for this is the weakness of the curia. In the case of Roman Palestine it seems to be clear that the curia at some stage could no longer prevent the encroachment of shops into the forum area. It has to be stressed that this is in no way a reflection of the economic weakness of a settlement. In some cases the abandonment of the forum took place simultaneously with the construction of a church or basilica. This is clearly a case of political and cultural changes. Wickham has suggested that the weakness of the curia is linked to a rise in the power of the ecclesiastical, and to some extent imperial authorities. Whereas before the local elite would have participated in the curia, now the church and the emperor offered more opportunity for advancement. The construction of churches is a new expression of the monumental building programmes which had taken place in the Roman period. Most historians would argue that the towns of Italy had relatively good urban survival immediately following the last emperor of the west (475-476 AD). In this case the closest parallel would be the towns of north Africa. This prosperity continued into the Ostrogothic period. But when decline came, it was extremely rapid, and the catalyst appears to be the Byzantine-Gothic war (535-552 AD). In almost all cases towns appear to exhibit all symptoms of decline in this period (abandonment of the forum and monumental buildings, depopulation, 'dark-earth', urban cemeteries, città ad isole, and a general decline in material evidence).

Before coming to what can now be said about the area studied in this thesis, it is important to stress again the documentary and archaeological limitations present in our evidence. It is a sobering thought that Lucca, which is the best documented town examined, due to the survival of its rich charters, has only had 1% of its area excavated. The other towns cannot be studied in equal detail. In the case of Arezzo and Chiusi, the evidence approaches, but does not equal Lucca, in the case of Siena and Fiesole, much less so. This weakness is also apparent in our documentary evidence. Even in the case of Lucca, our knowledge of its urban topography during the Roman period, especially the locations of some buildings, and the foundations of other new ones, remains fragmentary. It is true that the charters do provide some evidence for their geographical location in the medieval period, but even so an accurate reconstruction remains problematic. The difficulty is even more apparent in some of the other towns.

The evidence from Roman Siena is especially disappointing and the epigraphy recovered from the Roman period in CIL amounts to less than four pages. In other towns, despite buildings being described in some detail in church and charter records, locating them proves almost impossible. This is particularly the case with Arezzo, which being the largest diocese in Tuscany has many churches in rural areas. The difficulty is also increased by the possibility that whereas some of the urban topography now is based on buildings and streets which may have developed in the later medieval period, they may have been in a different location from that of the Roman period. This is especially the case with regard to Pisa and Siena. In the case of Pisa, the location of the medieval town may have been different to that of the Roman due to the relocation of the port, and in the case of Siena, the medieval town was
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affected by the development of the Via Francigena during the later medieval period.

Archaeologically, there are also many problems with the evidence. Early medieval buildings are extremely difficult to detect. Very often the evidence that does exist consists of potholes and the remains of the foundations: unlike Roman buildings which tend to be constructed of bricks and blocks of limestone, many early medieval buildings are built of wood, clay, pebbles and spolia. This makes dating very difficult and it is extremely easy to miss their remains. A good example would be the church of S. Giusto al Botro at Volterra which had been extensively rebuilt several times in its history due to subsidence and collapse. The only indication of the original early medieval building happened to be a piece of epigraphy from the altar table which had been rebuilt into the chancel. By coincidence this was the dedicatory inscription of the church’s foundation by the gastald Alchis. If this had been missing we would have assumed that this church was a later medieval foundation. In other cases such as the remains of early medieval structures excavated near the Ospedale in Siena, we have absolutely no idea as to what the function of these buildings may have been.

Taking Lucca as the model, we can see that there are several features which emerge, and can be seen as being common to all or many of the towns throughout the Roman empire and Tuscany. In all of them the evidence for depopulation, urban burials, ‘dark-earth’, abandonment of monumental buildings, and a general contraction in the urban topography between 400-900 AD is reasonably clear. That there is also a change in the materials being used cannot be denied. In general the depopulation is reflected in new town walls being put up occupying a smaller urban area than the Roman town, or simply a reoccupation of the Etruscan walls. In many cases urban burials also begin to appear at this time, and ‘dark-earth’ begins to appear in many parts of the town. Many of the new buildings constructed in this period consist of wood, clay, pebbles and spolia, instead of Roman bricks or large blocks of stone. The buildings also appear to be not as ornate as during the Roman period and their dimensions reduced. The fact that increasingly spolia are used instead of newly made bricks, the re-use of Roman columns taken from Roman buildings, the taking of building materials from the remains of monumental buildings, all of this is an indication that either kilns were not producing as many bricks as before, or of difficulty in finding the kiln-masters and stone-masons necessary, or of lack of wealth to construct on a monumental scale.

It is also clear that some parts of the Roman towns were being depopulated at this period. Many monumental buildings were abandoned such as the public baths and theatre at Arezzo, the amphitheatre at Lucca, and the public baths at Volterra. Urban burials also appear in many of these depopulated places such as the Camposanto in Pisa, the area near the
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public baths in Fiesole and also in the area surrounding the cathedral at Chiusi. It is also at
this period that ‘dark-earth’ begins to appear sometimes in the middle of what was the Roman
forum such as at Lucca, and sometimes inside the buildings themselves such as at Volterra.
On the whole, it would not be unreasonable to view the early medieval settlements as
consisting of a smaller population in comparison with the Roman town; and the buildings and
walls constructed would appear less monumental and ornate compared to their Roman
counterparts, certain areas such as the forum would appear more dilapidated and less
impressive and the abandonment of the Roman monumental buildings would leave certain
public buildings looking empty and abandoned. On the basis of this could these settlements
still be considered urban or even as towns? I would argue that the answer is yes.

The first aspect to consider is the status of these towns themselves. Lucca was to
become one of the most important of the Lombard cities along with Pavia. It was one of the
few towns which contained a royal mint, and it operated as a springboard for Lombard
expansion in Tuscany, due to its strategic position. Arezzo was to become the town of the
biggest diocese in Tuscany, and an extremely wealthy town famous for its goldsmiths during
the later medieval period. Siena, though very little is known about its Roman past, was to
develop into an extremely rich town because of pilgrims using the Via Francigena. Pisa’s
prosperity was to become legendary due to its naval trade. Chiusi was to remain an important
bishopric and diocese, and together with Siena and Arezzo, was one of the biggest dioceses in
Tuscany. Both Fiesole and Volterra were to remain important and substantial towns in
Tuscany during the early medieval period. This is shown by the efforts made by the Lombards
to seize Fiesole and the stationing of a Lombard garrison and gastald in Volterra.

The main difference between these settlements as opposed to one such as Luni is their
status. In none of these examples did they lose their status as a bishopric. What is striking in
the case of Luni is the transfer of the bishopric to Sarzana in 1204. In all the towns which I
have looked at above one aspect seems to be constant. All of them remained the centre for
political, ecclesiastical, and economic power in the region. If the documentary and
archaeological evidence is examined (however incomplete), there are indications that this
period (400-900 AD) should be seen as one of transition and transformation, from the model
of classical Roman towns as being parasitic and dependent on the wealth of their territories
and of the Empire, to the model of productive economic and wealth producing centres in their
own right.

There is striking evidence from outside Tuscany that suggests adopting such an
approach. In an excavation recently undertaken in Trento various glass producing workshops
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were uncovered in houses, which indicate that these were factories in houses which had previously been large residences.\textsuperscript{967} If an example outside Italy is needed we can see a similar phenomenon going on in the Roman East and also N. Africa. In many cases when the Arabs invaded, they simply constructed their bazaars and marketplaces within the colonnades of Roman monumental buildings and occupied what had been the forum. This reorganization of urban space can also be seen in the towns which I have looked at. In some cases such as Arezzo, Chiusi and Fiesole, the reorganization appears to have been dominated by the need for defence. With regard to Lucca, Siena, Pisa, and Volterra, the motives appear to have been different. In Lucca, the formation of new population nuclei took place away from the Roman forum, and around early medieval ecclesiastical buildings. Siena’s early medieval topography was dominated by the Via Francigena, whose increasing importance was to lead to the division of the town into three parts, the ‘terzieri’. Natural disaster was the catalyst for urban change in Pisa and Volterra, namely flooding in Pisa, and an earthquake in Volterra.

With regard to Arezzo, Fiesole and Siena, the reoccupation of the Etruscan acropolis, the construction of new walls and the strengthening of the Etruscan walls is logical. In a time when these cities were facing siege due to the Byzantine-Gothic War and at the same time facing depopulation, reoccupying the old urban centre would make perfect sense. The areas of the Etruscan towns are usually on high ground and are easily defensible. At no point does our evidence support a view that the towns themselves became completely abandoned. Signs of depopulation are undeniable but never complete abandonment. Furthermore the traditional signs of decline can themselves be interpreted as evidence of occupation. Let us examine these signs once again.

A chemical analysis of ‘dark-earth’ samples taken from the urban area of Roman London has revealed that they are composed of brick-earth and clay derived from the wall or the floors of an early medieval building.\textsuperscript{968} This building may have been greatly inferior in construction compared to the great houses of Late Antiquity. But it is at least an indication that some of the ‘dark-earth’ discovered in Italian towns may have been the remains of early medieval houses, indicating continuous occupation. In fact, if our documentary evidence is examined this is precisely the impression that we get. Records of donations, barter and acquisitions from Lucca indicate that some of the early medieval houses were constructed completely or partially with stone, and an attached bath-house.\textsuperscript{969} There is some indication from Pisa that marble capitals and columns may even have been transported from as far as Rome or N. Africa to adorn new buildings.\textsuperscript{970} In the diocese of Arezzo, almost all of the now abandoned early medieval churches are built upon the ruins of Roman villas or bath-houses.\textsuperscript{971} Lombard burials discovered in Chiusi are adorned with gold, jewels, and precious gems.\textsuperscript{972}
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\textsuperscript{972} P. Nardi Dei, ‘Chiusi. Nota dell’ispettore cav. P. Nardi Dei’, \textit{Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità} (1887),
This is also the case with Lombard burials in Fiesole. Furthermore the phenomenon of urban burials themselves do not necessarily indicate abandonment. The fact the cemetery is there can actually be argued as evidence for the presence of continuous habitation. The desire for the deceased to be buried close to the body of a saint buried in town may have been linked with the rise of the idea of ad sanctos, the possibility of the saint intervening in the afterlife.

The evidence that we have is not restricted to archaeology. Documentary evidence from the diocese of Arezzo, especially the Rationes Decimarum, indicates that in the vast majority of cases, based on the survival of the toponym, the late Roman villages and churches largely survived into the early medieval period. The documentary evidence in Lucca mentions churches which were founded in the 6th century AD, a time when traditionally the picture is of desolation and destruction because of the Byzantine-Gothic Wars. An examination of documents in Pisa indicates that columns and capitals were being traded between the churches, suggesting that there may have been a market for these items. There is also evidence of various occupations which existed at Pisa at this time. Terms such as “architectus”, “pinctor” and “purpurarius” indicate the existence of specialised craftsmen and tradesmen. For example we hear of the presence of a goldsmith Justus in Lucca from a will. He lived near the Porta S. Gervasio. Clearly there was building work going on, based on the presence of these craftsmen. Even in years when no new building work appears in our evidence, these churches still needed to be maintained and repaired. This also applies to other structures such as walls, palaces and courthouses. And this brings us to the other aspect of the redrawing of the urban topography.

Ciampoltrini has argued that the best way to understand the urban topography of early medieval Lucca would to view it as a series of large villages. In the case of Lucca we can see the formation of new population centres during the early medieval period, coalescing around important buildings such as the cathedral and other ecclesiastical buildings. I would argue that this is part of the città ad isole process which occurred in other parts of the empire, and especially in the towns of north Africa. Historians such as Wickham have expressed serious doubts regarding the città ad isole concept with regard to Lucca by pointing to the general density of churches in the 8th century AD. He has also suggested that unlike the towns of north Africa, Lucca was not fragmented to the same extent. I would argue that the città ad isole phenomenon would explain one of the biggest problems which we face, the lack of archaeological evidence for early medieval houses. The charter evidence specifically mentions the presence of stone-built, two storey houses. This would imply the presence of
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wooden one storey houses. It is possible that these wooden houses may have built over during the early medieval period if they were situated around churches, although at the moment we cannot be certain. But with regard to the general density, it should be noted that Lucca does not possess the same urban area as the towns of north Africa. Città ad isole in this case would result in much smaller gaps in the urban topography. But it is true that this term is extremely subjective, and may be simply be due to the fragmentary nature of our archaeological evidence. However, this is a matter which can only be resolved if the entire town is excavated, I obviously stand by the città ad isole model for the towns which I have analyzed in this thesis.

In the case of Fiesole we can see population concentrations forming approximately where the two hills of the original Etruscan settlement were located. The same can be said of Arezzo, Chiusi and Volterra, namely a fragmentation of the population which had occupied the Roman town, into a series of new population centres surrounding new churches. Caution has to be exercised and the limits of this model have to be stressed. In the case of Lucca the new population centres are to some extent located in the suburbs and sometimes outside the original Roman town walls. In the other towns which I have examined fragmentation is occurring within the Roman town walls. But in both cases there are a series of large ‘villages’ occupying various parts of the town. In between are depopulated areas or the ruins of monumental buildings. This phenomenon can be explained in several ways.

The arrival of the Lombards and the Franks, the desire for patronage of the church and good-works based on the foundation of new churches and religious foundations led to new buildings being constructed and so a demand for craftsmen and architects. It is probably not a coincidence that the Porta S. Gervasio in Lucca, the craftsmen’s quarter, is near an important church of Lucca, SS. Gervasio e Protasio. Another important quarter in medieval Lucca was Piazza S. Martino. This is around the Duomo. I would argue that what one is seeing here is the formation of new population centres based on the economic activity involved in the construction of, and afterwards in patronage of, the church by the bishop and the Lombard gastalds and Frankish governors. The reason why these early medieval villages are so difficult to detect archaeologically is simply because they are occupying parts of Lucca that remained inhabited throughout the medieval to the modern period, making excavation impossible. This explanation is satisfying on several levels. The debate between Italian and British historians on the state of settlements in Italy frequently revolves around the evidence being used. A crude summary of this argument would be to say that historians such as Carandini emphasise the destruction of the Roman city, the poor state of the early medieval archaeological remains, the clear evidence of depopulation, the abandonment of monumental Roman buildings, and argue against the idea that these settlement were urban.979 British historians such as Ward-Perkins (perhaps only until recently) would emphasise the charter evidence for the continuation of certain aspects of urban life such as public-baths, the epigraphic evidence for church foundations and xenodochia, the patronage given towards repairing and maintaining the town wall, and argue that these settlements should be considered urban.980
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The advantage of my model would be to reconcile both these arguments. The archaeological evidence for abandonment can be seen in excavations of the areas between the various early medieval population centres, the documentary evidence indicating the urban activity being carried in these new population centres. Clearly there are some weaknesses in the argument, the main one being that it cannot at present be tested archaeologically because the areas which these early medieval ‘villages’ occupy are inhabited. However, I would point to the evidence from the diocese of Arezzo. In all the abandoned early medieval churches in the diocese, excavation revealed that they had been built directly over the remains of Roman buildings. It is also extremely difficult to estimate if the Roman building had been abandoned for some time before the early medieval building had been built over them. What is striking in some ways is the opposite of decline, namely the urban activity which was being carried on even at the height of the Byzantine-Gothic war. In the case of Lucca twenty-three churches constructed in the diocese, and in the case of Chiusi the construction of its cathedral. Clearly much work still needs to be done in this important period.

It is important at this stage to discuss the institutions of government involved. During the Roman period the towns were administered by the curiales in contact with the emperor. In the period that we are concerned with power had shifted to the Gothic governor, the Byzantine exarch, the Lombard gastald, and the Frankish dux under the jurisdiction of the king or the Byzantine emperor. It is important at this stage to point also to the rise of the institution of the bishop. The evidence that we have at our disposal is fragmentary and incomplete. But all indications are of a partnership between the local barbarian governor and bishop. Perhaps the evidence is imbalanced due to the fact that most of the documentary evidence that has survived is in the ecclesiastical archives. But the patronage of churches and xenodochia by the Goths, Lombards, Byzantines and Franks appears to have been a consistent feature in the period covered by the thesis.

The central feature appears to be the importance of the bishop in the administration, the fact that increasingly judicial disputes between the churches are referred to the bishop for adjudication especially over the property owned by the church. There are also indications of the patronage given by the bishop to the local community by the formation of new population centres around a new church, or even in the suburbs outside the Roman town wall. From the charters we learn that the church was also involved in the purchase of building materials from former Roman buildings to adorn the new churches being constructed. There is also evidence of churches being built outside the towns and in the dioceses. If the implication is of patronage by the Gothic or Lombard governor to the bishop for the creation of churches within the towns, it is not unfeasible that some of the patronage given for the construction of churches in the countryside is by the rural elites. The pattern again is of a complex network between the ecclesiastical authorities and the urban and rural governing classes. But there is another important point which needs to be stressed.

Power had clearly devolved from the curiales to the local barbarian governor and bishop. But this accommodation does not appear to have resulted in anarchy or a power-vacuum within the administration of the town. Some historians have argued against the model
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of a peaceful accommodation by arguing that the process was a great deal more traumatic and violent than the revisionist historians have suggested.\textsuperscript{982} In my opinion there would have been very few illusions left to the inhabitants of the town. The fact that the town was frequently garrisoned by Gothic, Byzantine, Lombard and Frankish troops would leave little doubt as to where the power resided. But the point that needs to be stressed is that, neither the depopulation of certain areas of the town, nor the appearance of ‘dark earth’ or urban burials, nor the formation of new population centres around new churches appear to have been accompanied by a breakdown in the administration. Admittedly, the evidence is incomplete but all indications are that even in periods when no new churches were constructed, the mere survival of the previous ones indicate that maintenance and repairs were still being carried out. This is an example of the continuing administration even in periods as uncertain and violent as the Byzantine-Gothic war.

I would like to end by pointing to an example outside Italy. In the town of Roskilde which was founded around the beginning of the 10\textsuperscript{th} century, and was to become the royal capital of Denmark until the 15\textsuperscript{th} century, the town’s topography is centred around the cathedral which is located on a hill, that dominates the landscape and is also connected by a road to the fjords. Archaeological evidence indicates that the earliest settlements were founded simultaneously, one located on the hill which was to be the site of the cathedral and the other founded at the mouth of the fjord. Now the question arises, is it possible that the Vikings who founded the town were inspired by an example that they had seen somewhere else? Unfortunately the answer lies outside the scope of this thesis.
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