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Abstract

This thesis compares Umbria before and after the Roman conquest in order to assess the impact of the imposition of Roman control over this area of central Italy. There are four sections specifically on Umbria and two more general chapters of introduction and conclusion. The introductory chapter examines the most important issues for the history of the Italian regions in this period and the extent to which they are relevant to Umbria, given the type of evidence that survives. The chapter focuses on the concept of state formation, and the information about it provided by evidence for urbanisation, coinage, and the creation of treaties.

The second chapter looks at the archaeological and other available evidence for the history of Umbria before the Roman conquest, and maps the beginnings of the formation of the state through the growth in social complexity, urbanisation and the emergence of cult places. The third chapter is concerned with the Roman conquest and colonisation of this region; subjects covered include the progress of the conquest itself and the light this sheds on the pre-Roman organisation of the region, the confiscation and colonisation of land that followed the conquest, and the formation of alliances with the peoples living in Umbria.

The period after the Roman conquest until the age of Augustus is divided into two chapters, covering changes in culture and the levels of urbanism and state organisation, as well as the extent to which this is due to a process of 'Romanisation'. The concluding chapter summarises the results of the work on Umbria and compares the situation in neighbouring Picenum and in other regions. This new picture of the formation of the state, which I argue was earlier and more gradual than has been previously thought, requires a revised assessment of the impact of the Roman conquest on this part of central Italy.
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Map 1: Central Italy in the First Century BC

Notes:
1) Asisium and Perusia are transposed.
2) Plestia (modern Colfiorito) is not marked; it lies between Forum Flaminii and Camerinum.


Map 2: The Political Statuses of Communities in Northern Central Italy (91 BC)

Key:
Coastguard colonies of Roman citizens are shown thus: Castrum Novum (c.R.)

- Roman citizens *optimo iure*
- Latin colonies
- Un-annexed Prisci Latini and Hernici
- Other allies of Rome

...,..... Boundaries
----- Roads

Notes:
1) The status of Interamna should, in my opinion, be changed to that of a Latin colony.
2) Nuceria was probably an allied community before the Social War.
3) The size of the territory attributed to many of the cities should be treated with caution.
4) Carsulae and Trebiae may not have existed as full administrative centres at this period (91 BC).
5) The branch of the Via Flaminia from Narnia, through Interamnia and Spoletium to Forum Flaminii, which probably existed at this date, is not marked.

Source: A. Toynbee, Hannibal's Legacy (Oxford, 1965)
Map 3: Provenances of Umbrian Type Bronze Votives

Key:

〇 Isolated and small finds

■ Numerous finds (medium and large deposits)

● Museums holding statuettes of probable local or regional provenance


Map 4: Sanctuaries and Temples in Umbria, 600-100 BC

Maps 3 and 4: Key to Sites Listed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th></th>
<th>Site Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spilamberto</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Amelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zola Predosa</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Cesi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Calvi dell'Umbria (M. S. Pancrazio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Castello di Serravalle</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Novilara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Marzabotto</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Isola di Fano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Grizzana (Monteguragazza)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Orciano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rimini</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Castelleone di Suasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Firenzuola</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Cagli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ponte a Moriano</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Arcevia (Montefortino)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fiesole</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Castelbellino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Stia (Falterona)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Staffolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Impruneta</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>S. Fortunato di Genga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Volterra</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Sassoferrato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Arezzo</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Fabriano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chiusi</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>S. Severino Marche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Città di Castello</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pieveritorina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Perugia (Colle del Cardinal)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Penne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fratticciola Selvatica</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Montebello di Bertona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fossato di Vico</td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional sites (not in Colonna):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Gualdo Tadino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Nocera Umbra (Campo La Piana)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Assisi (M. Subasio)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bettona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Collazzone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bevagna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Foligno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Colfiorito</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Orvieto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Todi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Spoleto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Cascia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ancarano di Norcia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Cascia (Valle Fuina)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Baschi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional sites (not in Colonna):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Site Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>M. Loreto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Gubbio (Guastuglia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Gubbio (M. Ingino)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Gubbio (M. Ansciano)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>M. Acuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Arna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>M. Pennino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>M. delle Civitelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>M. Maggiore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Castel Ritaldi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Grotta Bella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>M. Torre Maggiore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Pasticcetto di Magione</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan 1: Amelia

A First, earliest phase of polygonal walling
B Later phase of polygonal walling
C Restoration of B
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THEORIES AND PROBLEMS: A METHODOLOGY FOR THE REGIONAL HISTORY OF ITALY IN THE FIRST MILLENNIUM BC.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the last fifteen years or so, the archaeological evidence for the history of Umbria¹ in the first millennium BC has, as the result of a great deal of work by Italian and other European scholars, increased enormously. New excavations have been undertaken at a wide range of sites: these include investigations on the town sites of Ameria, Spoletium, Hispellum, Mevania, Asisium, Ariminum and Pisaurum, and at the rural sanctuaries of Grotta Bella, M. Torre Maggiore, M. Acuto and M. Ansciano, to name but some. There has been important survey work, combined with excavation, around the Gubbio valley and the plateau of Colfiorito.² Other fruitful work has centred on the re-examination and reinterpretation of existing archaeological structures and old excavation reports by scholars such as Tascio and Monacchi.³ Apart from the occasional monograph (on which see below), much of this work has been recently published in either exhibition or museum catalogues, or in local history journals. Premier place amongst the former must go to the catalogues of the major *Gens antiquissima Italiae* exhibitions, held at five locations worldwide between 1988 and 1991.⁴ Although each of

¹ In this thesis, unless otherwise stated, 'Umbria' is used to mean the area occupied by the 'Umbrians' in the last three centuries of the first millennium BC, effectively the sixth Augustan region excluding the *ager Gallicus* (on map 2, marked in light blue as an area of Roman settlement between Ariminum and Picenum). The identity of the Umbrians and the meaning of this ethnic term is examined in ch. 2. Reference will be made to areas outside this historical 'core' area in the context of discussions on Umbria when there is some ancient evidence to justify it, such as the Umbrian presence in the Latin colony of Ariminum reported by Strabo, or where centres just outside the region illuminate the trends within, as with the rural sanctuaries at Pasticcetto di Magione (in Perusia's territory) and Ancarano di Norcia (Nursia).


these has the same format and introductory essays, the main bodies of the catalogues have dealt with different material. In the last six years useful catalogues have also been published of material relating to two municipia in the Valle Umbra, Urvinum Hortense and Mevania. Since 1980 the other medium for publication of archaeological material, journals of local history, have proliferated: the most useful of these are the Annali della facoltà di lettere e filosofia della Università degli studi di Perugia (AFLP), the Bollettino storico della città di Foligno (BSCF) and Le Marche. Archeologia, storia, territorio.

Nevertheless this wealth of recent work has brought some problems with it. The most recent scholarship on the region, focusing on the archaeological evidence, has contrasted strongly with earlier studies. Monographs such as Malone and Stoddart's Territory, Time and State, and Fontaine's Cités et Enceintes de L'Ombrie Antique, have portrayed the region's society as one lacking state structures and urban development certainly before the Roman conquest, and perhaps until the eve of the Social War; Umbria thus conforms to the models of decentralised 'tribal' organisation already hypothesised for the peoples of the central Appennines such as the Samnites. Earlier studies of this region, using predominantly literary and epigraphic material, such as Harris' Rome in Etruria and Umbria, have stressed the political division of Umbria into a large number of small, administratively autonomous states by the time of the Roman conquest; the single towns with their territories making up each state would appear more akin to the Etruscan model of city-states than the central Appennine 'tribes'. This latter picture is one that did not conflict with the third strand of scholarship on ancient Umbria, the long tradition of commentary on the greatest epigraphic monument of the region, the Iguvine Tables. By its very nature such work has concentrated largely on Iguvium (modern Gubbio) itself, detailing through the analysis of this text information on the topography of the settlement and the organisation of the community that the Tables are
supposed to contain.\textsuperscript{9} In effect a divide has opened up in recent work between the disciplines of (literary and inscription-based) history and philology on the one hand and archaeology on the other.

The obvious question is whether the archaeological record of Umbria can be reconciled with the literary and epigraphic evidence. The answer must lie in basing an investigation around issues to which all types of evidence can contribute: the formation of the state seems to fit these requirements, primarily because it encompasses changes in both social and political organisation. Taking this as the central theme is not enough by itself. It remains crucial to approach the material free of preconceptions about the value of one type of evidence above another.

The aim of this particular chapter is to outline the issues that I believe are important in the study of Umbria and other regions in central Italy. In the first two sections I want to examine the concepts of the formation of the state and urbanisation, and to discuss their application to the study of central Italy in the first millennium BC.\textsuperscript{10} In looking at these issues I have been able to use a wide variety of general and theoretical literature. Nevertheless I am particularly concerned with grounding my discussion in the realities of ancient Italy, with the intention of avoiding false generalisations from different situations in other ancient societies and from modern preconceptions of what a state should be like.

The last two sections of this chapter deal with coinage and treaties. I include these topics because they illustrate the potential for applying theories of state formation, and because they are relevant to the study of central Italy as a whole.

2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF STATES

The issues I want to examine can be illustrated by an example. The term 'Samnites' was used to describe a group of four Italic tribes, the Hirpini, Caudini, Pentri and Carricini, who occupied a large part of what is now Molise in southern central Italy. They are famous for the three prolonged wars they fought with the Romans for control of central Italy in the second half of the fourth and early third centuries BC. They were clearly capable of organising the effective levying of troops over a wide geographical area to form large armies under a unified command; during the third and second centuries they could mobilise the labour required for large building projects such as the

\textsuperscript{9} For a recent (and outspoken) critique of this tradition see J. Wilkins in Territory, Time and State 157-8.
\textsuperscript{10} Literacy will be dealt with (at shorter length) in ch. 4 section 9.
theatre complex of Pietrabbondante; in the fourth and early third centuries they formed treaties with Rome, and forged alliances with other peoples in Italy for mutual defence; finally, we know from inscriptions and from Roman literary sources that they had a range of governmental institutions in which power was invested, such as the meddix tuticus (the magistrate of the people), a senate, and so on.\(^1\)

Yet the area of Samnium was often regarded in an unflattering light by Roman and Greek writers, for whom the inhabitants were on the whole village dwellers, ignorant of the civilised benefits of city life.\(^2\) This attitude is echoed in many modern works, and further confused by the theme of the noble savage. Salmon epitomises this school of thought: 'the Samnites were more backward than the Campanians. In their mountains their life was one of the hardest simplicity. Their rugged land \ldots{} etc.'\(^3\) This approach places the Samnites and other central Italian peoples near the bottom of an evolutionary scale of political organisation, with the city-states of the Greeks and Etruscans at the top.\(^4\)

For me what is important is that the Samnites clearly have the organisational capabilities of an emerging state, yet are constructed on decidedly different lines to the urbanised states of neighbouring Latium and Campania. Looking at the formation of the state gives us a more complex view of early Italy, without some of the distortions of the ancient sources.\(^5\) As this is an approach common to the study of other societies, it allows us to compare the changes that occur with those in other places. It also encapsulates changes that occur in a number of different fields: literacy, urbanisation and ethnicity to name a few.

The importance of the growth of the state has been recognised in studies of archaic Greece for some time.\(^6\) Archaic Greece often features in comparative literature as an example of the rise of the state within the ancient Mediterranean, with the focus

---

\(^2\) Strabo 5.4.2: 'These peoples live in villages, generally speaking, but they also have cities'; Livy 9.13.7.
\(^3\) Strabo 5.4.2: 'These peoples live in villages, generally speaking, but they also have cities'; Livy 9.13.7.
\(^4\) Salmon, *Samnium* 79: 'The Samnites were in that pre-urban stage in which the tribal community formed the basis of political organisation.' On Salmon's preconceptions see E. Dench, *From Barbarians to New Men. Greek, Roman and Modern Perceptions of Peoples of the Central Apennines* (Oxford, 1995) 5, and in general on this whole (complex) theme, briefly summarised here.
\(^5\) The phrase 'formation of the state' describes a long term process, on which see section 2 (a).
usually on the *polis*, because there is less evidence for the formation of the *ethnos* type of Greek state. But there is a danger that the peculiarities of the *polis* within ancient society are ignored. Morris has recently stressed how the mass participation of the citizens of the *polis* in political life held back the development of strong state institutions. I think that there is enough evidence to examine this issue in central Italy, providing a further, and in some ways more typical, example of the formation of the state in the Mediterranean world.

Few studies of ancient Italy show an awareness of state formation as an issue. Work instead has focused on urbanisation, which is only one possible manifestation of a state society. This is unsurprising, if not forgivable, for Etruria, Latium (apart from Rome) and Campania, where archaeological evidence is all that we have for the crucial period from the ninth to the sixth centuries. But for the areas of central Italy that do not develop city-states at an early date, such as Samnium and Umbria, we have the literary evidence left by the narrative of the Roman conquest, as well as archaeology. In this chapter I will try to give each type of evidence the weight it deserves, bearing in mind the inherent problems of each, and to make the most use possible of them.

I want to try to examine the concept of the growth of the state in a general way and work out what my aims and methods should be when examining this topic in central Italy. (The various manifestations of state formation in central Italy will be examined in subsequent sections.)

(a) Conceptions of the 'state'

For the Greeks the most important element of the *polis* was its citizen body, not the physical urban structure. This is stated clearly by Thucydides in a speech given to Nicias: 'It is men who make the *polis*, and not walls or ships with no men inside them'. Sparta lacked an elaborately monumentalised urban centre, but was recognised nonetheless as a *polis*. The concept of *polis* as a form of human association is integral to Aristotle's *Politics*. In addition, the word *polis* means city, although, unlike *astu*, it

17 E.g. A. Snodgrass, 'Interaction by design: the Greek city state', in *Peer Polity Interaction* 47-59.
18 Morris, 'Early polis' 24-57.
19 The main exception to this is work on early Rome: e.g. C. Ampolo, 'La formazione della città nel Lazio: Periodo IV B', *DdA* 2 (1980) 165-192; T. J. Cornell, *The Beginnings of Rome* (London, 1995) 97-103. Of course there is a large literature on the institutions of states in ancient Italy, works such as A. Rosenberg, *Der Staat der alten Italiker* (Berlin, 1913); what I am concerned with is the formation and accumulation of such institutions.
20 7.77.7: διόνυσθε γιὰ τὸ πόλις, καὶ οὐ τέχει οὐδὲς νῆς ἄνδραν κεναῖ. This is an extraordinary situation, but the sentiment is widely echoed in other works (see p. 158, n. 1 of Loeb edition (vol. 4)). If a rhetorical commonplace, it remains expressive of an attitude.
could also mean the urban centre together with its territory. Aristotle was aware of the confusion this could cause (Politics 3.1276a 17-24). We can gain a sense of how the emphasis had changed by the second century AD from Pausanias (10.4.1):

From Chaeroneia it is 20 stades to Panopeus, a polis of the Phocians, if one can give the name of a polis to those who possess no government buildings (ἀρχές), no gymnasium, no theatre, no market-place, no water descending to a fountain, but live in bare shelters just like mountain cabins, right on a ravine. Nevertheless they have boundaries with their neighbours, and even send delegates to the Phocian assembly. [He goes on to estimate the 'ancient circuit' of Panopeus to be around 7 stades.]

Clearly buildings had become an almost universal feature of poleis in the Roman Empire, and their absence was unusual. Nevertheless, Pausanias, despite his doubts, does regard Panopeus as a polis; political organisation is still the only essential requirement. Classical Greek thinking about 'the state' concentrated on the polis-type: this was considered the best form of human association by those whose writings on the subject survive to our day. Of course they were aware of other types of organisation, both outside and inside Greece. Aristotle himself came from Stagira, on the periphery of an area, Macedon, where the dominant political form was not the polis but the ethnê.21 Yet, writing in Athens, he mentions Macedonia only a few times in the Politics. The domination of the polis in the conceptual sphere is further demonstrated by colonisation. The only model used for the new foundations was the polis: all colonies sent out from Archaic Greece (and later by Republican Rome) were single urban centres with their own territories.22 This even applies to the Greek colonies sent out by ethnê such as Locris and Achaia.

In the Roman world people owed allegiance to the res publica, which had from

---

21 The difference between these two terms, essential to their definition, is examined below in section 3 (b).
22 There were, of course, other types of 'colonisation': the sacred spring myth of the 'Italic' peoples may stem from population movements that resulted in a different type of settlement pattern. This seems to be a typical pre-state reaction to 'stress'. According to Ronald Cohen, all political systems except true states break up into similar units as part of their normal process of political activity. Hunting bands, locally autonomous food producers, and chieftaincies each build up the polity to some critical point and then send off subordinate segments to found new units or split because of conflict over succession, land shortage, failure by one segment to support another in intergroup competition or hostilities, or for some other reason. These new units grow in their turn, then split again. The state is a system specifically designed to restrain such tendencies ... one that can expand without splitting.

early in its history ceased to resemble a *polis* in the territorial sense (it had citizens who were much too far away to visit the centre), but retained the institutions of a 'city-state'. The other Latin word, *civitas*, could also, like *polis*, mean city in the physical sense as well.²³

The modern concept of the 'state' arose in the Renaissance. In the medieval period the term was used in the sense of the ruler 'maintaining his state', meaning his own position. By the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries the word had come to embody the sense of the legal and political order, which the ruler had to uphold and which took over from his or her person as the object of the citizens' allegiance.²⁴ It is this abstract concept that modern social scientists and historians have applied to a type of social organisation reached by communities as they increase in complexity, and which is characteristic of almost all of human society today. Radcliffe-Brown defined it as

> a collection of individual human beings connected by a complex system of relations. Within that organisation different individuals have different roles, and some are in possession of special power or authority.²⁵

Other, more specific, definitions have been produced in the years subsequent to Radcliffe-Brown's definition,²⁶ but these are less useful for my purposes than the characteristics that have been found in states. This is because the concept of the state is not one whose edges can be scientifically defined: scholars continue to fail to agree on a universally applicable definition. Any definition that succeeds in covering the huge variety of state types within human society, like Radcliffe-Brown's, tends to be too general to enable sharp classification into state or pre-state of the individual communities being studied.

As a result the best methodology for investigating the formation of states in particular regions of ancient Italy would seem to be to form an idea of the general processes that occurred and the features common to these states, using historical information generated later in their development, and comparative material. This is attempted in the next section. We should be aware, however, that there is a danger of circularity in the arguments here. The characteristics of states are generally drawn up by observers looking at a variety of societies which they have already defined as of

---

²⁶ See for example Claessen and Skalnik's own definition in *The Early State* 21; they survey work before 1978.
state-level organisation. But to classify a society as a state or not requires a definition. As I have noted these definitions are often imprecise and/or disputed. In consequence a list of the characteristics of states can only be a guide based on an assumption, rather than a means of proving whether a society is a state or not. More positively speaking, the assumption that 'the state' can be generally defined is supported by the correlations evident in different societies as they become more complex. Clearly this methodology cannot be applied in a negative way: that is, if a society lacks one of these characteristics, this does not prove that it is not a state.

The term 'state formation' should not obscure the length of the (on-going) process by which a developed state emerges from a non-state society. An example of this is the debate over the formation of the state in Archaic Greece, in which Morris has recently re-emphasised both the complexity of society in the so-called 'Dark Age', and the weakness of the Greek polis down to Hellenistic times. He suggests that in democratic poleis it was in the interest of the mass of the citizenry to resist attempts by the aristocracy to extend state power into more areas of their lives; as a consequence the state in, for example, Athens, can only be said to have slowly developed from the Dark Age to the Hellenistic period, retarded by the large citizen body of the classical polis.

Morris seems to take a fairly negative view of the state when placed against the spectrum of other approaches, seeing it as an oppressive tool to maintain social inequality. It is certainly possible to take a more positive approach, regarding the state as an organisation which binds together increasingly differentiated social classes, and which succeeds by allowing greater association and cooperation between its members. Not every aspect of a strengthening state was a disadvantage to the ruled: it is difficult, for example to see the codification of laws or the influx of revenue from conquest in this light. Liturgies, for Morris a symbol of the weakness of the classical polis, continue (in a different form) in the Hellenistic and Roman period, and yet for Morris this is when the
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27 Cohen, 'Introduction' 3 seems overly negative about this sort of approach, but this seems to be what every 'definition' basically comes down to in the end anyway.

28 Cohen, for instance, in his very reasonable survey of the problems of definition ('Introduction' 5), claims that states have 'a state religion focused on the central ruler'; my impression is that this is rarely the case in early Italic states.

29 Morris, 'Early polis' 24-57. His work seems to be a reaction against the strong emphasis of his one-time teacher Snodgrass on the transformation of Greek society around the end of the eighth century BC; see, for instance, Snodgrass's essay in the same volume.

30 For a survey of the possible positions see E. Service, Origins of the State and Civilization (New York, 1975). He stresses the advantages of the state.

31 Claessen and Skalnik, The Early State 644.
ancient state becomes most fully developed. This is, of course, a problem in which personal politics are often an influential factor. Whether we agree with Morris’ approach or not, his stress on the length of the time in which a state is formed is surely correct.

It is also fair to say that the process has no real end point. The power of the state in the ancient world never approached the scope of modern states, and the latter cannot be used as any sort of yardstick. Designating late Republican Rome or classical Athens as the ‘full development’ of the ancient state does not make much sense either. Herman has demonstrated, for instance, how Greek poleis of the fifth century BC still relied heavily on the personal links between aristocrats for the conduct of foreign relations. In addition ancient states tended to be dynamic entities; ‘state formation’ was in reality part of an on-going process of change.

Our methodology must take this into account: dividing societies in ancient Italy into states or non-states is not particularly meaningful when such organisation only slowly develops. It is more important to look for signs of the processes by which the state is formed. When in ancient Umbria, for example, mountain-top sanctuaries appear in the late sixth century (a phenomenon that has been associated with the rise of the state elsewhere, e.g. in Crete), we should not disregard this development, as Stoddart and Whitley do, because it is not accompanied by dramatic urban growth. By doing so they assume not only that urbanisation is a pre-requisite of state formation, which it is not (see below), but also that all the various manifestations of state formation ought to appear at the same time. In some societies many such manifestations do emerge contemporaneously, for example in late eighth century BC Greece, but considering the likely length of the process of state formation, this does not have to happen in an overnight transformation.
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32 Morris, ‘Early polis’ 44-6. The collection and redistribution of an agricultural surplus seems less central to the state in Greece and Rome than to many other ancient states, particularly those in the Near East (see Service, Origins of the State).

33 In the current political climate liberals tend to take a more benign view of the state than conservatives.

34 Supported by Claessen and Skalnik, The Early State 20-1.


36 Our information on ancient non-state societies is usually limited compared with states, which generated their own written records. We have to rely on archaeology and the descriptions of outsiders, who tended to oversimplify and misunderstand. Comparisons with ‘chieftancies’ and other non-state societies studied by anthropologists could be misleading: these might be divergent developments, i.e. alternatives to states, rather than their linear precursors (J. Gledhill, ‘Introduction’ in J. Gledhill, B. Bender, M. Larsen (eds.), State and Society (London, 1988) 15).

37 In Territory, Time and State 144.

38 Cf. Morris on Greece, discussed above.
In fact, as we shall see, such elements do seem to be separated by some distance of time in Umbria. A first possible symptom of change here might be the separation of an aristocracy from the rest of society, visible through the deposition of goods in graves from the seventh century onwards. The second possible indicator, the appearance of sanctuaries in the landscape, occurs in the late sixth and fifth centuries BC. It is only from the fourth century onwards that we have evidence for any type of urban development (the building of temples), and in the late fourth and early third century that the formation of treaties and the emission of coinage provide confirmation of the process.

(b) The process of state development

What general elements make up a state? The answers to this question will give us features for which we can search in our evidence. In putting forward suggested features of the state I base my picture on both general comparative work and on the structure of the societies of ancient Italy as we know them in their earliest phases. My assumption is that the communities in Umbria will display features similar to those of other societies (especially within Italy) undergoing state formation. The rise of the state, as the definition cited above implies, involves a greater complexity in human social organisation. There is an increase both in communality, with larger groups and more interactions between their members, and in the complexity of control over these inter-relations. These changes can be broken down into two major areas.

(I) Group definition.
The individuals that make up the state are categorised according to the groups to which they belong. Many of these aggregations transcend kinship organisation. Groupings arise at different levels of organisation. The largest category within the early Italian context is probably the *nomen*, such as the *nomen Latinum*. This can be equal to the state or, more commonly, larger than it, uniting a group of states. The state itself forms a group with a defined membership: citizenship was a crucial concept in ancient states. Having said this, its permeability to outsiders varied: movement into the citizen body was always easier at Rome, particularly in the archaic period, than in the Greek *polis*. The members of a state could be defined in various ways. De Polignac has suggested that

---

39 This term is further discussed in ch. 2 section 1 (b).
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participation in shared cults initially played this role in archaic Greece. Claessen and Skalník consider it characteristic of 'early states' (those not yet full states in their definition) that citizenship is determined by birth or residency in the state's territory. The demarcation of a 'territory' is clearly important, and is likely to be something that occurs as the state develops and a sharp division becomes necessary between those within and those without. The identification and distancing of outsiders is clearly a part of this process, as in the Iguvine Tables from Gubbio where members of neighbouring ethnic groups and polities are cursed and banished from the Iguvine citizen body before its lustration (lb 17). Citizenship at Rome, as in Greece, became defined by law at an early date, as the state accumulated a body of legal rules and procedures which controlled the holding of this status.

Divisions within the citizen body allowing its articulated use were also important to the functioning of the state in ancient Italy and presumably increased as the state became more complex. These divisions governed duties of the citizen such as serving in the army, voting and participating in religious rituals.

(ii) Central authority.

The second major area of change which marks the appearance of the state is that of central authority. In ancient Italy this tended to be embodied in various power-holding offices and positions such as magistracies and priesthoods, or even kingship. There were also group decision-making bodies, such as senates and assemblies, which could regulate the life of the community through laws. Claessen and Skalník as well as Runciman stress the importance of the means by which the decisions of the central authority can be enforced. In fact Max Weber famously defined the state in these terms, as that agency within society which possesses the monopoly of legitimate violence. This ability is clearly vital, but judging by the necessity of even late Republican Roman magistrates to use their personal attendants and followers for protection and administration, we should not expect signs of 'police forces' or bureaucracies in the emerging states of early Italy (though equivalents to the Roman lictors or to public slaves might be found). Raising an army seems, however, to have been a very important
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41 *The Early State* 639.
42 See ch. 2 section 1 (b).
43 Compare Claessen and Skalník, *The Early State* 639 (c), and Runciman, 'Origins of states' 351.
function of early Italian state authorities. In their survey of previous work, Claessen and Skalnik identify the ability to prevent internal fission and defend against outside attack (even if with limited effectiveness) as characteristic of the governments of 'early states'. This ability must have enhanced the legitimacy of a government in the eyes of the state's citizens. The position of the rulers is often bolstered by an ideology which helps maintain the stratification of society. Another important feature of a state's central authority is its permanency. Is it able to survive changes of regime, for instance? The origin of our modern concept of the state, discussed above, is grounded in a sense of stability. I do not think, however, that a state has to be fully independent. States can exist in a meaningful sense within associations, such as federations or even empires, which constrain their actions (primarily in foreign relations) to varying degrees.

The way we investigate the growth of central authority is naturally governed by our sources. The only literary accounts of the early history of an Italian state we have are those of Rome. This prevents us from following the progressive creation of institutions outside Rome itself. Occasionally we obtain information on the institutions of government from inscriptions, but this is rarely full enough to enable any sort of institutional history to be written. A less comprehensive picture, however, is achievable. Various types of evidence are manifestations of central authorities in early Italy, such as the production of coinage, the formation of treaties, the standardisation of weights and measures, and the existence of communal calendars. An urban centre may be developed to house governmental institutions. The ideology of the state's authority has often been sought in the building of sanctuaries. These are places of communal assembly where the ruling class is able to express its power, for instance by the embellishment of the building and by the display of extravagant dedications or captive weapons.

At this point we can proceed to look closely at the actual implications of these types of evidence.
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45 M. Finley, *Politics in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, 1983) 18 notes that the citizen militia armies typical of classical Athens and Republican Rome were not available for policing activities because they were only assembled to fight external wars.

46 'Models and reality' in *The Early State*.

47 Runciman, 'Origins of states' 356 places great importance on this; cf. Cohen, 'Introduction' 4. We must distinguish here between governments, which change, and states, which 'represent structures of political offices that are occupied by government agents' (D. Kurtz, 'Cultural identity, politics and legitimation in state formation', in M. van Bakel, R. Hagesteijn, P. van de Velde, *Pivot Politics. Changing Cultural Identities in Early State Formation Processes* (Amsterdam, 1994) 31 n. 1) and are thus more durable entities.

48 E.g. by Cherry, 'Polities and palaces' 29-32.
3. URBANISATION

The most abundant type of evidence for the existence of state organisation in early Italy is that relating to urbanisation. This type of evidence is almost wholly archaeological. Yet the methodological problems with using this category of archaeological evidence are often ignored, and the implications of urbanisation for social organisation are rarely questioned.

(a) Urbanisation and state formation

Urbanisation is an important index of state organisation, as it is a physical manifestation of the increasing communality that the state involves. Social and economic centralisation of an area of land (the territory) around a town can be seen as a facilitator or a consequence of the growth of central authority. The sheer fact of a group of people living together is important: the larger the size of the group, the more likely that the group develops a complex hierarchy and requires representatives in order to work together. Morris argues that 'where there are permanent settlements of 500 or more people, constituted offices begin to emerge ... [and] an agrarian community starts to take on the features of peasant society, including the division into socially stratified groups.'

In economic terms the agglomeration of wealth from a town's territory shows the control exerted by the ruling class over this hinterland. Urban centres often had public (including religious) spaces and buildings. Their presence suggests that the community had a stable central authority which needed an official 'house', and that its members came together for ceremonies and communal decision making. But to see the creation of public buildings as the required proof of the permanency of the community's institutions and central authority is too simplistic. Ideology and propaganda often played a vital causative role: those rulers in the least secure positions, such as tyrants, were often those most in need of the prestige of monumental building projects.

The symbolism of substantial urban structures remained very important in Italy down to and throughout the Roman Empire, when writers such as Strabo and Pausanias saw them as a sign of a civil and well-ordered society. Tacitus expresses this in a

49 Morris, 'Early polis' 42. But the 'typical' early polis was not much larger than this size, having a population of between approximately 625 and 1250, a territory of c. 50 to 100 sq. km and an army of a few hundred fighting men according to Starr, Individual and Community 46 (using work based on modern rural population densities). The variation in size and resources of polis masked by this sort of average figure is stressed by Nixon and Price in The Greek City.

50 For the urbano-centricity of Roman and Greek writers see P. Garnsey, R. Sailer (eds.), The Roman Empire (London, 1987) 12-19.
famous passage of the *Agricola* (21):

The following winter was spent on health promoting schemes. Agricola had to deal with people living in isolation and ignorance, and therefore prone to fight; and his object was to accustom them to a life of peace and quiet by the provision of amenities. He therefore gave private encouragement and official assistance to the building of temples, public squares, and good houses ... and so the population was gradually led into the demoralising temptations of arcades, baths, and sumptuous banquets. The unsuspecting Britons spoke of such novelties as 'civilisation', when in fact they were only a feature of their enslavement.®

But it is necessary to ask whether this conception of urban and political order as reliant on one another reflects the variety of the societies that grew up in the ancient Mediterranean. In essence, what is important for my purposes is the extent to which the creation of a political community is truly mirrored by urbanisation.

Urbanisation is probably the most commonly used index of development in studies of first millennium BC Italy. There is a wide range of books and articles on the subject in the context both of single regions and of Italy as a whole, yet the full social and political implications of urbanisation are almost never discussed.® But in my view urbanisation is merely one possible manifestation of the formation of the state; the absence of urbanisation (or of course simply the absence of evidence for it) does not necessarily make a society undeveloped. Other indices of state organisation may be available. Its dominance as an issue is strikingly displayed in an interesting article by Moscatelli, where he examines the changes occurring in pre-Roman Picenum during the so-called fourth phase of the Picene culture (590/580-c. 525 BC).® He notes the roughly contemporaneous appearance of the following features:

1) family groupings of graves separated from others in the same cemetery;

---

® Translation slightly adapted from that of H. Mattingly and S. Handford (1970). *Sequens hiems saluberrimis consillis absumptra. Namque ut homines dispersi ac rudes eoque in bella faciles quieti et otio per voluptates aduescerent, hortari privatim, adiuovere publice, ut templia fora domos extruerent ... paulatimque discessum ad delenimenta vitiorum, porticus et balinea et conviviorum vocabatur, cum pars servitutis esset.*

®® Stoddart and Malone's book on Umbria touches on the issue without attempting to define the terminology used (*Territory, Time and State* 177). W. V. Harris thinks that the evidence is too poor to discuss Etruscan state formation, because we lack evidence as to when 'the inhabitants of early Veii, Tarquinii or Vulci started to believe that their cities had some extension or continuity beyond particular families': see 'Invisible cities: the beginning of Etruscan urbanisation', in *Secondo Congresso Internazionale Etrusco* 1. Congress: Florence, 1985 (Rome, 1989) 377. Yet self-awareness of statehood is only one possible element of the formation of the state and this seems a very narrow way in which to approach the issue.

ii) monuments inscribed with the south Picene script;
iii) sanctuaries in the countryside where material was left as votive offerings;
iv) monumental sculpture such as the Capestrano warrior;
v) the larger scale production of pottery by specialist craftsmen using the wheel.

Although what he has assembled is convincing evidence for the beginning of state formation, because it coincides with a reduction in the number of known sites, Moscatelli concludes that he has demonstrated the start of urbanisation. The assumption that seems to lie behind this article, but is never spelt out, is that the social change suggested by these categories of evidence must inevitably lead to urbanisation.

Some attempts have been made to justify the theory that urbanisation is the crucial index of development. Gordon Childe identified ten factors crucial to what he called the 'Urban Revolution', and Guidi has attempted to apply this approach to early Rome. But this method has been widely criticised: not only are there examples of non-urbanised state societies, which undermines the general validity of this theory, but also it is an idiosyncratic way to look at urbanisation. Some of the requirements now seem to be of little relevance to the existence of cities, such as 'naturalistic', i.e. representational, art, and in general Gordon Childe seems to have been working not from real examples but from an ideal type of city, loosely based on the Mesopotamian model.

The over-emphasis on urbanisation in studies of early Italy is reinforced by the nature of the evidence. Societies do not usually produce written records of epigraphic, numismatic or, even more so, literary nature, until state formation is quite well progressed. Thus archaeology tends to be the only type of evidence contemporary with the beginning of state formation. In central Italy it is focused on town sites (although the percentage of area investigated is usually very small). These often provide the most spectacular results and greatest interest (from the point of view of archaeologists, reinforcing this tendency). The importance of examining the countryside through survey has only been realised relatively recently, and few areas of central Italy have been investigated in this way (only two restricted areas in Umbria, for example). Survey has its own problems, but provides a picture (if usually extremely partial) of the whole
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54 Problema dell'urbanizzazione' 194: 'Essi sono importanti in quanto spie della presenza di uno stadio di vita protourbano.'
settlement pattern, not just the towns. But the availability of archaeological evidence for urbanisation is not the only reason why it is often the sole index of state formation taken into account. Other categories of evidence become available, if not at the beginning of state formation, at least while the process is still occurring (epigraphy, numismatics); valuable information can also be preserved in the records of other societies that come into contact with those under investigation, as happened during the conquest of central Italy by the Romans. This information, however, is often ignored because the implications of archaeological evidence appear more straightforward to interpret than those of, for instance, the production of coinage.

Working out the implications of archaeological evidence for urbanisation is more difficult than is often assumed. The major factor here is the need to take the limitations of the evidence into account. Arguments from silence are extremely dangerous in the context of early Italian urbanisation. The evidence we have is extremely fragmentary, and this is particularly true of Umbria, where a large proportion of the archaeological sites have been built over since ancient times. Excavation has only been possible on extremely restricted sites, for instance beneath disused buildings. Much excavation that has been carried out remains unpublished; much excavation that has been published was undertaken in the nineteenth century or earlier, when rudimentary techniques and summary records were the norm.

(b) The diversity of urbanism and its definition.

Some states in ancient Italy and Greece arose along different lines to the classical polis. In Italy we can point to the contrast between the regions along the Tyrrhenian and southern Adriatic coast (Etruria, Latium, Campania and Magna Grecia), and the upland areas of Samnium and the central Appennines. In the former, city-states on the model of the Greek polis became the dominant social organisation: autonomous urban centres with demarcated territories, in which there were no other equivalent settlements. In the latter regions, less centralised settlements, with no clear urban centres, were the norm until the second century BC or later. The dichotomy in Greece between the polis and ethnos type of state seems an obvious parallel to the two systems in Italy. The actual nature of the ethne in Greece is disputed, as is that of the central Appennine tribes. The Greek dichotomy is an ancient categorisation based more on the nature of governmental
authority than on centralisation or urbanisation. The centralised states of Macedon and Epirus were classed by the Greeks as *ethnos*, as were areas with a number of towns within them, such as Arcadia, Achaia or Boeotia.58 Furthermore, Greek authors were not always consistent in the use of the category.59 In essence the *ethnos* seems to have been a negative classification: an area not solely controlled by a single city-state. Nevertheless it is clear that both Italy and Greece had states that did not conform to the ideal of the classical city-state: that is, not all states in these areas needed a single urban centre, dominant within its own territory.

The nature of the distinction between the two different models of settlement pattern in Italy and Greece is important for defining urbanisation. The situation is more complex, however, than a simple division into two types: in fact there is a spectrum across which states could vary, from full city-state to federations of small towns (each with their own territories), to a diffuse settlement pattern with centres no larger than villages. This varied over time, as individual cities often tended to develop within 'non-urban' states, and could break off to form independent city-states. The standard model of settlement in the central Appennines is that proposed by La Regina, who sees it as functionally differentiated from city-based settlement.60 Cities in ancient Italy performed a variety of functions for the people living in or near them, providing physical structures and designated spaces for most of the following:61

i) residence;
ii) burial;62
iii) protection from attack, using either fortifications or its natural position;
iv) religious rituals;
v) commerce, through a market or a port, for example;
vi) political interaction and administration.

The spaces and structures of ancient cities - cemeteries, houses, walls etc. - can be traced from the evidence of archaeology, (and to a lesser extent) literature and

58 Arist., *Politics* 1261a: 'This sort of difference can be observed as between a *polis* and an *ethnos* where the people are not scattered in villages, but are like the Arkadians.'
60 See A. La Regina 'Note sulla formazione dei centri urbani in area sabellica', in *La città etrusca e età italica preromana*. Congress (Bologna, 1970) 191 ff.; 'Introduzione b. Dalle guerre sannitiche alla romanizzazione', in *Sannio. Pentri e Frentani dal VI al I sec. a. C.* (Rome, 1980) 29-42; on the territory around Monte Vairano in Samnium in *Abruzzo Molise. Guida archeologica Laterza* (Rome-Bari, 1984) 280. This model is often known as 'paganico-vicano', i.e. based around *pagi* (districts) and *vici* (villages). For a critical assessment of these terms see ch. 2 section 3 (a).
62 The problems of identifying the relationship between cemeteries and settlements is addressed in ch. 2.
epigraphy. The number of different functions that need performing depends on how
developed the state itself is, increasing as the state becomes more complex. The
central Appennine areas differ from the more urbanised Tyrrhenian coastal regions
because each community used a variety of different sites for different purposes, living
in villages, withdrawing to hillforts for protection, and meeting at sanctuaries for religious
and probably political activities.63

The limitations of this model should be realised: the division is rough rather than
precise. The separation of functions was probably never total and depended on local
conditions. Hillforts often show traces of habitation and commercial activities.64 Burial
is unlikely to be distant from the place of residence. In a similar vein, ancient cities were
usually not the exclusive providers of these services within their territories. Rural
sanctuaries were a vital component of religious life in Latium and Etruria as well as
Samnium. In addition, areas of Italy previously considered to exemplify the functionally
separated model have provided increasing evidence of urbanisation, especially in the two
centuries between the conquest of Italy and the Social War.65 The model has most
validity before the Roman conquest, for areas such as that around Colfiorito in Umbria,
with its complex system of separated hillforts and cemeteries, and a sanctuary. In more
lowland areas of Umbria, we can define the development of urbanism by tracing the
gradual accumulation of functions at the sites of future municipia.66

Greek ethnē and central Appennine tribal states should probably not be seen as
the 'primitive' ancestors of a more evolved city-state organisation of society. In fact, the
city-state seems to have emerged as a form no later, and perhaps earlier, than the
alternative 'non city-state' types in both Italy and Greece. The differences between the
possible state forms are probably better explained as adaptations to different geographic
and economic environments. Thus we can see the Greek ethnē and, I think, the central
Appennine states in Italy, as alternative types of state that reached this level of social
organisation by different routes to that of the classical city-state.

The validity of the distinction is reinforced by the institutional differences between
the polis and its alternatives. It has been demonstrated that the 'tribes' of Greek city-

63 The determinants of this type of settlement pattern must lie partly in the geographical
differences between the regions, as well as being influenced by political and religious factors (e.g.
whether sites were chosen when other peoples were exerting military pressure). Urbanisation in
Greece was affected by the preceding Mycenaean civilisation (Snodgrass, Archaic Greece 44 and
fig. 8; Morris, 'Early polis').
64 Monte Vairano: G. Barker, A Mediterranean Valley. Landscape archaeology and Annales
65 Barker, Mediterranean Valley 207-12.
66 Other definitions of urbanism are possible (and legion), but the simplicity and effective
applicability of this theory to central Italy is my reason for choosing it.
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states, such as the *phylai* of Athens, are not the remnant of an earlier ‘tribal’ system represented by *ethnē* because, as Ampolo writes, ‘gli stati etnici non erano organizzati in tribù, ma in parti, distrettì (*mere*), mentre solo le *poleis* avevano le tribù.’

This also distinguished Rome from at least some of the Italic peoples. It is well known that Roman territory was divided into tribes, part of the reforms associated with Servius Tullius according to Ampolo. Tribes amongst the Umbrians seem to designate the whole of the community in its territorial sense, not a division of it. If the *pars* *Peltuinatium* of CIL IX 3420 and 3430, like the Umbrian tribe, means all the community, in this case the *municipium* of Peltuinium, then we may have some justification for believing the Umbrian sense of tribe to be applicable to all the Italic peoples (apart from the Romans).

(c) Summary
In this discussion I hope to have provided a balanced evaluation of the importance of urbanisation. In my opinion more emphasis should be placed on social complexity than on urbanisation as a way of classifying change. In looking at the form of states in ancient Italy and Greece it is clear that urbanisation is not a necessary manifestation of state organisation. This picture receives support from comparative work. In his survey of studies of state formation in specific societies, Claessen concluded that, although states typically have some sort of governmental centre at one time (mobile or fixed), 'the existence of the state ... does not depend on urbanisation.' The varying levels of urbanism in emerging ancient states has, according to Runciman, clear parallels with pre-Inca Peru, where the population of the northern part of the region was organised into 'functionally equivalent dispersed communities focused on ceremonial centres.'

This fundamentally negative argument should not detract from the fact that urbanisation can be one important positive indication of social organisation. The presence of urban centres is a physical manifestation of the centralisation of population. Urban centres have not to my knowledge been produced by societies at a pre-state
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68 See the pairing of *totar tarsinater* and *trifor tarsinater*, the Tadinate people and Tadinate tribe in the Iguvine Tables VI 53-4 (see ch. 2 section 1 (b)).
69 As Morris and Snodgrass have done in studies of archaic Greece (*City and Country* xii).
70 Although his examples of unurbanised states, e.g. Tahiti, Volta, seem of a very different nature from early Italian peoples.
level. It is an approximate rule that the larger the group of people living together, the more complex their organisation needs to be. In short, urbanism is good positive evidence for state structures.

4. WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, AND COINAGE

In this and the next section I want to try to demonstrate how we can trace the development of state organisation using numismatic, epigraphic and literary evidence. As with urbanisation, the principles laid down here will be applied specifically to Umbria in subsequent chapters.

We can gather some information on central authorities from weights and measures, and from coinage. Cast and struck bronze coinage was issued by a wide range of peoples in third century Italy. It was often a means of paying soldiers for military service. The mass of bronze coinage produced in allied and Latin centres in the third century, such as Tuderc in Umbria, seems to have been created for this purpose: most issues only circulated locally. All of these coin-issuing communities were bound to Rome by treaties which allowed, and indeed required, a large measure of local self-government. Coinage in Republican Italy is a good index of political organisation and local independence, although we should perhaps not expect ancient societies to look on it in the same light.

Coins were usually marked with the name of the community that issued them, e.g. ves on the coins of the Vestini, fir on those of Firmum. Such marks show that the issuing authority had the power to represent the community. The weight of the coinage was based on a variety of different standards. Some were based on the Roman standard, others were restricted to their local area, such as that of 350-400 g used by the Vestini and by the communities of Ariminum and Hadria along the Adriatic coast. Such weight standards clearly had to be set by the authority that commissioned or organised production, and presumably governed the way that all weights were judged in these societies. Basalt blocks corresponding to the standard were made, against
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72 Communities allied to Rome had to pay for the contingents they levied to fight alongside the Roman army: see Polybius 6.21.5.

73 Compare Letta, 'Dali' "oppidum" al "nomen", 401, where he takes the coinage of Aquilonia and Allifae to suggest that they are sovereign states rather than centres within a unitary Samnite state; K. Lomas, 'The city in south-east Italy', Accordia Research Papers 4 (1993) 70 sees the silver and bronze coinage produced by Apulian towns in the early third century as evidence of their 'distinct consciousness of separate civic identity'. But T. R. Martin, Sovereignty and Coinage in Classical Greece (Princeton, 1986) shows that Hellenistic monarchs did not themselves see coinage as a political symbol.
which other weights could be checked.

The non-Roman communities of Italy not only formed their own standards for weights; they also formalised measurements of distance and time. They have evidence that Oscan communities used a foot and a measurement of land called the *vorsus* (shared with the Umbrians) which differed from their Roman equivalents. There was a distinct Lucanian unit of capacity. The Umbrians had their own way of measuring a day, starting from noon rather than from midnight. As with the designation of uniform weights, these standards imply the existence of a central authority with recognised power. Although all the evidence dates from well after the Roman conquest, the fact that these systems differed from that of Rome probably indicates that they were formed before these societies submitted to Roman control in the fourth and early third centuries BC.

We can draw further conclusions from the production of coinage. In analysing the purpose of coinage in Greece, Colin Kraay notes that neither external trade nor commerce within the state was likely to be the impetus. The circulation of most issues remained too localised for the former, and the coins produced were of too large denominations to be really useful for the latter. He concludes that it was created, instead, to provide a 'standard medium for the purposes of the state'. It could have been used to make payments for out-goings such as mercenaries, officials' salaries and building work, and to receive incoming payments such as taxes. It provided a form in which the wealth of the state could be conveniently stored, and was almost always (in the Greek case) stamped with the mark and name of the state to whom it belonged. This argument is equally relevant to coinage in Italy, where the limited range of denominations do not seem to have been created with trade in mind. The coinage of the Italic regions is different from Greek coinage, however, in that it had a clear precursor in the coinage emitted by the Greeks and (especially) the Romans in Italy. The idea of producing coinage came to the Italic communities in imitation of this, rather than spontaneously. But if we are correct in following Kraay's conclusions about the purpose of coinage, then Italic issues must reflect the needs of a central authority,

---

75 See ch. 4 section 8.
76 Crawford, Coinage and Money 1: Greek colonists who settled on the coast of Italy from the eighth century BC brought with them the notion of standard weights fixed by the community; Servius Tullius may have been responsible for the creation of similar units in sixth century Rome.
78 See Crawford, Coinage and Money 37.
particularly that of paying for army contingents. This would tie in with the fact that governmental structures were probably required for the production process itself.

5. TREATIES

The second field we can investigate concerns the agreements formed between the representatives of the various peoples of Italy. Livy provides us with a valuable record of the accords reached between these ethnic groups and the Romans, and amongst themselves. Only one type of agreement, however, the Roman treaty (foedus), is really useful in this investigation, as it always had an official character. We also have some idea of the terms of Roman treaties, whereas we are completely in the dark about agreements between the other Italian peoples. The Romans formed treaties with a large number of societies during and in the immediate aftermath of the conquest of Italy. When their dominance was complete, these treaties formed the basis of their control over those parts of Italy that had not been absorbed directly into the Roman state.

For it to be worth the Romans forming such agreements, it would seem necessary for the other party to have a certain level of communal organisation and centralised authority: that is, be something approximating to a state. If the contracting entity (presumably the representatives or other leaders of the community) had little control over its population, why formalise their agreement in a foedus? This impression is reinforced by the religious and legal procedure the Romans went through to form a treaty, which Livy records during the reign of Tullus Hostilius (1.24). The Romans displayed many of their treaties in the form of bronze inscriptions: Polybius, for example, reports seeing the treaties between Rome and Carthage in the Treasury of the Aediles beside the Capitoline temple. We can imagine the other parties to pacts with Rome similarly displaying inscribed treaties, but such agreements need not have been written down.

This is probably rather simplistic. The actual level of organisation implied by the formation of a treaty might vary according to the treaty's terms and implementation. It could, for instance, only require very limited action on the part of the central authority of the ally, or only affect a part of the people in the territory of the group that formed the treaty. Despite the ritual through which the Romans went in order to form a treaty, there is little sign of any principle governing their use of treaties: they were not concluded with

---

79 For a list of treaties explicitly attested by ancient sources, see appendix 4.
80 The antiquity the Romans ascribed to this process is a sign of the importance they invested in it.
city-states alone, for example. In fact the opposite to this sort of policy seems true. Livy describes how individual Etruscan city-states sought to make treaties with Rome on many occasions, but usually had to settle for truces (e.g. 9.37.12). Most probably received their treaties in the latter years of the conquest of Italy, between 290 and 260 BC, a period for which we only have epitomes of Livy's text. By contrast, 'tribes' such as the Gallic peoples and the Samnites, who were supposedly more alien to the city-dwelling Romans, were regularly granted treaties in the course of the conquest of Italy. Thus in Italy the Romans seem to have made treaties with virtually all types of society with which they came into contact, and they must have looked for allies wherever they could.

However, this does not mean that treaties are useless in helping to identify state organisation. The key is in their provisions. We know that treaties bound Italian peoples to Rome by the stipulation for them to provide troop contingents to serve with the Roman army. The allies (those with treaties) had to supply Rome with a list of all their available manpower, from which the Romans could draw whatever forces they considered necessary. The obligation to provide troops suggests that an allied government must have had control over most, and probably all, of the population within its territory, and must have been able to compel them to turn out when required. A government had to know how many of its population were of fighting age and also whether they had enough property to be able to equip themselves for military service. The Roman army of the middle Republic was reputedly divided into six categories according to wealth (although there may have been fewer), and even if the system for constructing an allied army was much less complex, a distinction would still have been necessary between those who could afford to serve and those who could not. It is also likely that the authority bound by a treaty would have had to gather resources to pay those who had served (Polybius 6.21.5). These implications suggest that the peoples of Italy who formed treaties with Rome had effective central authorities. Since Rome used treaties as a way of controlling the areas of Italy which were not given Roman citizenship, it follows that all these regions were organised into states by the time of the conquest (in the late fourth and early third century BC). This conclusion relies on three assumptions, which I hope I can justify:

---

81 Harris, *Etruria and Umbria* 85-98.
82 Brunt, *Manpower* 545-8, convincingly argues that the Romans could call up all the citizens of an ally who were able to serve, but generally requested only a small proportion at a number fixed by the so-called formula togatorum. Polybius (2.23.9) records a Roman decision to require the allies to provide lists of their available manpower in 225 BC; he gives the breakdown of the figures in 2.24. On this list with its problems see ch. 3 section 7.
1. All the treaties formed by Rome with the peoples of Italy always required the ally to supply troops to Rome. This would be expected in the context of the conquest of Italy and indeed features in the record of the foedus Cassianum of 493 BC between the Romans and the Latins, the likely model for most later treaties. By 111 BC the Lex Agraria could refer to the allies or members of the Latin name 'from whom they are accustomed to demand troops in the land of Italy according to the formula togatorum'.

More caution is necessary with regard to treaties formed with communities outside Italy. It is difficult, for instance, to envisage the clause being included in the treaty formed with the Gallic Boii in 284 BC, given the fear the Gauls induced in the Roman psyche.

2. Most treaties binding the Italian allies to Rome were formed around the time of the conquest. Admittedly only a small number of treaties are recorded in Livy's narrative, our main source. But Livy is not systematic and does not mention every treaty that was arranged. We know that most treaties were in place by 225 BC because Polybius (2.24) records the numbers of the allied contingents in the levy to meet the Gallic invasion of that year; the majority were probably formed in the latter years of the conquest, the 280s-260s, but the Livian narrative is lost from 292 BC.

3. The Italian entities with whom the treaties were formed were already capable of raising troop contingents, and did not form into states under pressure from Rome. That all the future allies had the capability to organise an army is demonstrated by the record of their resistance to Rome. Obviously some peoples, such as the Samnites, were better at this than others. I would not want to deny, however, that the levy for the Roman army after the conquest may have strengthened the pre-existing communal structures of the Italian allies.

6. CONCLUSION

The approach outlined in this chapter gives a central place to the formation of the state. This provides, I think, a new perspective on the development of political, social and economic complexity in the various Italian regions. By reassessing the importance of urbanisation for our picture of early Italy we avoid minimising the sophistication of central

---

84 F. Millar, 'The last century of the Roman Republic', JRS 85 (1995) 242 draws attention to Cic., Verr. 2.5.25/60, which implies that allies inside and outside Italy had similar requirements, which might also extend to cities without foedera.
85 Harris, Etruria and Umbria 85-98.
86 M. H. Crawford, 'Italy and Rome', JRS 71 (1981) 156 attributes the recovery of Lucania after the Hannibalic War partly to the need to provide contingents for the Roman army.
Italian peoples, such as the Samnites, who were not organised into city-states on the classical Greek model. In this way we can escape from the urbano-centric viewpoint of the ancient literary sources. This new framework also allows us to make a more balanced evaluation of all the different types of available source material. Far from being merely supplements to the archaeological evidence, to be used only occasionally, the numismatic, epigraphic and literary sources hold information vital to the history of the Italian regions in the first millennium BC, information that is rarely exploited to its full potential. When various types of evidence actually give a conflicting impression, we should not automatically jettison the non-archaeological material because of preconceptions about its inferiority, but instead should give each datum the weight it deserves. The perspective on central Italy we obtain from archaeology is in fact more problematic than is often assumed. Its quality varies dramatically from region to region, depending both on the extent of recent investigation and on the conditions for the survival of archaeological remains. Umbria, for instance, compares unfavourably with Samnium on both these counts.\(^\text{87}\)

Two notes of caution need stressing. Firstly, this emphasis on the formation of the state should not lead us to assume that there was a linear progression in Umbria from the simple Bronze Age communities (judging by archaeology) to the more complex societies visible on the eve of the Social War.\(^\text{88}\) There are likely to have been slower and faster periods of change, not all of which have to be in the direction of greater sophistication. Complex societies can and often do 'collapse': Mycenaean civilisation provides an obvious example. In short it is important not to take too 'evolutionist' an approach and thereby prejudge the changes that occur.\(^\text{89}\) Secondly, focussing on the state can lead to an over-emphasis on political change at the expense of economic and social factors: these should not be ignored.

---

\(^{87}\) This is examined more fully in ch. 4, section 1.

\(^{88}\) The society of Bronze Age Italy is discussed by G. Barker, *Landscape and society: Prehistoric central Italy* (London, 1981) 188-97.

\(^{89}\) The problems associated with this are discussed by Gledhill, 'Introduction', in *State and Society* 2-3 and J. Oosten, P. van de Velde, 'Constructing the early state', in *Pivot Politics* 7-21.
UMBRIA BEFORE THE ROMAN CONQUEST

1. ETHNICITY

There are two main types of evidence for ethnic identity in Umbria: the views of Greek and Roman writers, and epigraphic attestations of the name of the inhabitants of this region. The ethnic is first recorded in the fifth century BC and from this point references to the Umbrians multiply. This substantial body of evidence is examined below; I want to begin, however, by discussing the importance of ethnicity in general, and outlining why I believe it is a subject worth studying in the context of archaic Italy.

First we must ask what exactly an ethnic group was in the context of the first millennium BC. Modern misconceptions of ethnicity abound. Language groups, material cultures or states are all often assumed to be identical to ethnic groups. But the evidence of ancient societies shows that ethnicity only occasionally coincided with these other categories. The real essence of the term is the sense of identity possessed by social groups in relation to outsiders, an identity that can be expressed in various symbols, such as elements of their material culture, and in shared beliefs. A. D. Smith has attempted to identify the common characteristics of historical ethnic communities as the following:

i) a common name;
ii) a common myth of descent;
iii) a shared history;
iv) a distinctive shared culture;

v) an association with a specific territory;
vi) a sense of solidarity.

Nevertheless, as with defining other abstract concepts which are generalisations about complex realities, it is impossible to specify what features an ethnic group must

---

1 Only certain parts of the material culture in particular circumstances express ethnicity; ethnic groups cannot usually be equated with the full 'regional cultures' identified by archaeologists (Morgan, 'Ethnicity and Early Greek States' 133-4).

2 Smith, Ethnic Origins 26: 'The most common shared and distinctive traits are those of language and religion; but customs, institutions, laws, folklore, architecture, dress, food, music and the arts, even colour and physique, may augment the differences or take their place' (cf. previous note).
possess. Ethnicity varies in its manifestations: some communities can have a strong sense of self-identity, others only a very weak one. Groups categorised as ethnic unities by outsiders may not have a conscious group identity; the strength of a group's ethnic identity can change over time. Furthermore, in the pre-modern world a range of possible identities were usually available to an individual. Gellner has contrasted this with the 'unambiguous, categorical self-characterization such as is nowadays associated with a putative nation, aspiring to internal homogeneity and external autonomy'. The identity emphasised by or given to an individual in the eras before nationalism depended on the particular context. In ancient Greece and Rome there were a plethora of such identities on different scales: Greeks, Dorians, Spartans, Latins, Praenestines and so on. Different levels of these, such as the Praenestines who form part of the Latins, could be regarded as ethnic groups.

The emergence of states, often within ethnic conglomerations, will have had complex effects on ethnicity. This process clearly involved the firming of boundaries between states, and the identification of their members: new state identities may have had some ethnic connotations of their own, and could become more important to their citizens than a wider identification with a pre-existing ethnic group. Other factors may have encouraged ethnic identity, however. Effective defence against outside aggressors in the more intense warfare that came with the development of the state must have encouraged cooperation: the Umbrians banded together against the Romans, for instance, and may have done so earlier against other Italian peoples. Secondly, the rise of the state is often associated with an upsurge in (archaeologically traceable) religious activity: this could transcend state barriers and encourage a common identity. The ethnic unity of a people could be formalised by alliances of mutual rights, such as those attested between the Latins. Furthermore, literacy allowed the myths and histories that are essential to ethnic identity to be written down, standardised and circulated. Another

---

3 This is why definitions that aim to be inclusive are very general. Take for example this commonly used definition of ethnicity: 'that condition wherein certain members of a society, in a given social context, choose to emphasize as their most meaningful basis of primary, extrafamilial identity certain assumed cultural, national, or somatic traits' (O. Patterson, 'Context and choice in ethnic allegiance: a theoretical framework and Caribbean case-study', in N. Glazer, D. Moynihan (eds.), Ethnicity: Theory and Experience (Cambridge, Mass., 1975) 308).

4 As Renfrew points out in relation to some African peoples who do not have a collective name for themselves (Peer Polity Interaction 158).


6 A. Khazanov, 'Ethnicity and ethnic groups in early states', in Pivot Politics 70-2 looks at this topic without really enlightening us.

7 Smith, Ethnic Origins 32-41.

8 E. Van der Vliet, 'Poetry and the emergence of the polis', in Pivot Politics 97.
change that the state could bring was the creation of new, large-scale identites with the political incorporation of groups into empires such as that of Rome. In summary, the rise of states is likely to have had significant effects on ethnicity, which we have some chance of following in the literary and epigraphic record.

(a) Umbrian ethnic identity
When we turn to look at the specific evidence for the ethnic identity of the Umbrians, we are faced with a variety of potential sources spread over a considerable time span: I will focus here on the period before the conquest. The ethnic identity of the peoples living in Umbria is important to their history in the first millennium BC. The homogeneity of the area before the Social War is likely to depend at least in part on their common ethnic consciousness. Secondly, the absorption of this region into the Roman state is usually portrayed as going hand in hand with a shift in identity. It is widely assumed that the allied inhabitants of the Italian regions gradually came to consider themselves at least in some senses Roman in the last three centuries BC, even if not wholly forgetting their earlier ethnic groups, and that this played a causative role in the Social War. But in order to trace this hypothetical shift we need to establish the ways in which the 'Umbrians' thought of themselves before this shift took place.

A serious difficulty arises in the context of the 'Umbrians' because the major part of our evidence for ethnicity comes from references in literary works written by Greeks and Romans looking at the region from an external perspective. The image of the 'Umbrians' in such works is interesting for the light it sheds upon those observers themselves; but when we are concerned with the self-perception of the people they are writing about, there is a serious danger of misrepresentation. In most cases we cannot be sure that they drew information directly from the peoples about whom they wrote; the written results of their 'investigations' will naturally reflect their own preconceptions and prejudices, as they look through what Emma Dench calls their 'cultural grid'. In addition many of the literary accounts we have date from a much later period, giving their authors far greater opportunities for misunderstanding the situation in earlier and often obscure times, which might be interpreted in the wholly different circumstances of their own day. We are often able to gain a better perspective on an internal sense of identity from the writings of the peoples themselves surviving not in literature, but as epigraphy. The ethnic designations people give themselves are far more useful for our purposes than

---

9 Cato is a notable exception here.
10 *Barbarians* 177.
the indirect testimony of outsiders, but unfortunately this evidence is much rarer.\(^\text{11}\)

The evidence of material cultures within central Italy as signs of ethnic divisions is much more problematic. It is often assumed that distinctive material cultures can be equated with ethnic groups.\(^\text{12}\) One difficulty with this is that archaeological remains are frequently interpreted by archaeologists in the light of literary attestations of ethnic groups and may only appear distinct because of this; there is also the problem that the literary evidence for ethnic groups is on the whole much later, and can misrepresent the earlier ethnic situation.\(^\text{13}\) Archaeological evidence in reality provides no precise means of defining an 'Umbrian region'. For instance, Colonna's worthwhile attempt to attribute sixth and fifth century BC tombs in the south-eastern zone of the Po valley to the Umbrians rather than the Gauls has to be predominantly based on the lack of transalpine or transpadane archaeological material in them and on the literary attestations of an Umbrian presence here.\(^\text{14}\) The tombs were surrounded by stone circles (as at Numana, Monteleone di Spoleto, Terni, Gubbio, Spello, Alfedena and other central Italian sites) and contained bronze arms made in Etruria, impasto pottery based on Etruscan forms and bronze votives of 'Umbrian' and of Etruscan types: in other words a culture with elements common to all central Italy rather than a specifically Umbrian one. This mixture of elements is typical of the funerary material found in the historical 'Umbrian heartland' between the Nera, Tiber and Esino rivers. The distribution of the most distinctive product of 'Umbrian culture' in the pre-conquest period, small bronze votive statuettes, does concentrate on what was later the sixth Augustan region; nevertheless they were also used (if on a less dramatic scale) in ritual contexts across central Italy.\(^\text{15}\)

(b) Characteristics of the image of the Umbrians in the pre-conquest period

When we turn to examine the image of the Umbrians in our sources, the earliest and

---

\(^{11}\) Some caution is required with this evidence: we are usually unaware of why an ethnic is used on an inscription. Ethnic designations do not seem common in early Latin epigraphy: note nos. 7, 133, 676, 780 and 912 in ILLRP.

\(^{12}\) E.g. Pallottino, 'Etnogenesi uguale poleogenesi', in La città etrusca e italic preromana. Congress (Bologna, 1970) 75 talks of 'culture regional della età del ferro (atestina, villanoviana, picena, laziale, apula, sicula ecc.) approssimativamente corrispondenti - e presumibilmente referibili - ai nuclei etnici in formazione'. Recent, more sophisticated approaches have tried to use specific elements of the archaeological evidence in this way: C. Morgan, 'Ethnicity and early Greek states: historical and material perspectives', PCPS 37 (1991) 131-63; J. Hall, 'Approaches to ethnicity in the Early Iron Age of Greece', in N. Spencer (ed.), Time, Tradition and Society in Greek Archaeology (London, 1995) 6-17.

\(^{13}\) Discussed by Dench, Barbarians 186-9.


\(^{15}\) See Map 3. Note the strong Picene influence at Colfiorito and Etruscan influence at (above all) Todi, examined below.
overridding impression is of a very ancient 'indigenous' people in the Italian peninsula, who occupied a much more extended area of central Italy than their historical seat between the Nera, the Tiber and the Adriatic slopes of the Appennines. In the fifth century BC Herodotus wrote (4.49) that rivers flowed into the Ister (the Danube) from τῆς κατάπερθε καρπεί Ομβρικῶν (the most northern part of the country of the Umbrians), implying that their territory went up to the Alps. He also recorded that the Etruscans first came to the area of the Umbrians when they migrated from Lydia (1.94). Both these original holdings of the Umbrians (the Po valley in Herodotus' time and Etruria in mythical prehistory) are also recorded by other authors. Strabo has the most detailed account of the Umbrian presence in the Po valley (5.1.10), where he presents them as having struggled with the Etruscans for supremacy in the area; he records (following an earlier source?) that Ariminum and Ravenna still had recognisable Umbrian elements (5.1.7, 5.1.11). The tradition that the Etruscans took land from the Umbrians is also found in Pliny's Natural History (3.50, 3.113). Other reputed conflicts of the Umbrians in the mythical past were with the Sicels (Philistus, probably early fourth century BC, quoted in Dion. Hal. 1.22.4), with the Aborigines (Dion. Hal. 1.13.3, 1.16.1), with the Pelasgians (Dion. Hal. 1.19.1, 1.20.4, 2.49.1), with the Ligurians (Dion. Hal. 1.22.5) and with the Sabines (Strabo 5.4.12).

The Greek geographers Eudoxus of Cnidus (Periplus 319) and Pseudo-Scylax (Periplus 16), probably writing in the first half of the fourth century BC, record that the Umbrians occupied the Adriatic seaboard, a notice which correlates with those recording their occupation of the south-eastern Po valley around Ravenna. Theopompus adds that, like the Lydians, they enjoyed a luxurious lifestyle and were effeminate in custom. The Umbrians also came to the notice of Aristotle (Meteorologica 359a) by c. 340 BC, who reports a method they used of obtaining salt by putting the ashes of reeds into water.

These early references to 'the Umbrians' must be largely the result of Greek sailors and merchants coming into contact with them when travelling up the Adriatic to

---

17 Cf. Dion. Hal. 1.27.4. In this connection we can also note the toponyms in Etruria suggestive of Umbrian links: the river Umbro and the tractus Umbriae recorded by Pliny N.H. 3.51. Lycofryn may also refer to Etruscan-Umbrian conflict (Alexandra 1359-80).
18 Jacoby, FGrH 2 B 115; a theme later repeated by Pseudo-Scyllinus 220-1 Müller and the Pseudo-Aristotelian De mirabilibus Ausculatationibus (80). The identity of the Κόσσαλις Ὀμβρικῆ that Ctesias (c. 400 BC) mentions, according to Stephanus Byz. (FGrH 3C 688 fr. 59), is unclear.
19 Also recorded by his successor at the Athenian Lyceum, Theophrastus (in Pliny N.H. 31.83.8).
Spina and the Po valley. All the geographical references to the Umbrians relate to their occupation of the Po valley and Adriatic coast, which is unsurprising given their distance from the Tyrrenian coast (at least in historical times); even Herodotus' picture of the Umbrians occupying the land the Etruscans came to from Lydia is unlikely to stem from contact with the Umbrians themselves via the Tyrrenian coast. In general the picture becomes more detailed in the fourth century, and with Philistus we can note the first sign of Sicilian interest in this people in the early part of the century, just as the Syracusan colony of Ancona was founded (Strabo 5.4.241). Pseudo-Scylax places this polis in Umbrian territory, but it is probably soon after he wrote that the Gauls made their first appearance in this area.

Our question must now be whether these images of an Umbrian people before the Roman conquest reflect any sort of historical ethnic reality. We must allow for the possibility that the ethnic name is one used by the Greeks to categorise a population with little self-identity, a situation that could be read into the tradition that they 'were designated as Ombroi by the Greeks on the grounds of their having survived the rains after the flood' (Pliny N.H. 3.112). We are not in a position to say exactly where the early references in Greek sources to this presumed group stem from, that is, whether the information comes from the people(s) themselves. An inscription on a bronze bracelet, however, shows that this ethnic was already being used by some inhabitants of central Italy as early as the fifth century BC. The provenance of this object, found in 1979 and now in the Museo Nazionale at Chieti, is only specified generally as the central Abruzzo region, and the object is in itself easily moveable; Marinetti and La Regina classify the language of the text incised on it as South Picene. In La Regina's interpretation, part of the text reads ombriren acren which he takes to mean 'in Umbrian territory', although Morandi has doubted this. If the reading is correct, it is unclear to which

20 In parallel to this we can note the appearance of Magna Graecia and Sicilian pottery within early fourth century archaeological contexts documented at Ariminum, Numana, Ancona, Spina and Adria (Riccioni, 'Antefatti della colonizzazione di Ariminum' 270).
21 Livy 5.35.2; Pliny N.H. 3.112.
22 This tradition could go back at least to Marcus Antonius (Gripho) in early first century BC. See Servius, Aen. 12.753: sane Vmbros Gallorum veterum propaginem esse Marcus Antonius refert: hos eosdem, quod tempore aquosae cladis imbribus superfuerunt, Ombros cognominatos ('Indeed Marcus Antonius reports that the Umbrians were an off-spring of the ancient Gauls; and that this same people, because they survived the rains in a time of watery disaster, were called the Ombroi').
24 A. Morandi, 'Cippo con iscrizione sabina arcaica dal territorio di Cures', DdA 5 (1987) 11, questioning 'acren'.
territory this might refer: the overall meaning of the inscription is obscure and it would, for instance, be dangerous even to assert that the area of its discovery was not 'Umbrian territory' and so this was an 'outside' use of the ethnic like that of Greek authors. Its importance lies simply in the use of this ethnic in the fifth century BC (according to La Regina's dating), perhaps our only contemporary attestation of the name before the Social War.

In the fourth and third centuries comes the first evidence from the historical area of Umbria of the names of groups within the Umbrians as a whole. Two fourth century inscriptions on pieces of bronze were found together with votive material at Colfiorito recording the (dative) ethnic pletinas, which must relate to the Roman town name of Plestia. A bronze helmet found in Bologna and dated to c. 350-280 by Heurgon might record that of Nuceria, nuvkri (Po 1). Tuder and Iguvium issued bronze coinage in the third century marked with their ethnics (Ve 238), and three lead coins marked with amer and ameri could record that of Ameria. There is also the Roman literary evidence, not however contemporary, that records the roles in the conquest of various Umbrian peoples and the formation of treaties with some of them soon afterwards.

Our other potentially important source of information for Umbrian ethnics in this period is the Iguvine Tables, inscribed in the second century BC or a few decades either side but recording elements that must originate much earlier. Throughout the tables reference is made to the Iguvine community (totar iiuinar); in several sections, usually interpreted as banishment of aliens, several other ethnics are mentioned:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ib 16-17} & \quad \text{tuta ta} \text{ninate trifu/ ta} \text{ninate turskum naharkum numen iapuzkum numem} \\
\text{Vib 53-4} & \quad \text{totar/ tarsinater trifor tarsinater tuscer naharcer iabucer nomner.}
\end{align*}
\]

This is usually translated as 'the community of Tadinum, the tribe of Tadinum, the Etruscan, Narcan and Iapudic names'. Tadinum is a neighbouring Umbrian people to the south. The Etruscans of Perusia and perhaps Cortona were also neighbours of the

---

25 La Regina's conclusion (132) that this was an "agro umbro" locale' on the basis of the (not particularly close) association in the Iguvine Tables (Vb 8-18) between posti acnu (= yearly?) and the agre tlatie and agre casiler (which may be the lands of decuriae, see Poultney, Bronze Tables 225) seems pretty unconvincing to me.

26 Radke thinks that the oldest occurrence is ομπρικός next to a representation of a slave on a sixth century(?) Corinthian krater from Caere (s.v. 'Umbri', RE suppl. 9 (1962) col. 1746); the word seems to be ομπρικόμ. This is clearly a name, but there is no certainty that it is an ethnic.

27 Po 2; for this, and subsequent inscriptions, see appendix 2.

28 Monacchi, 'Grotta Bella' 87 n. 150, if they are not fakes.

29 The peoples mentioned are the Camertes, the plaga of Materina, the Ocriculani, the Umbrian centre of Nequinum; Livy also mentions Mevania as a geographical point, and of course the Umbrians in general. These attestations are dealt with more fully in ch. 2.

30 The meaning of the technical terms is dealt with in ch. 4, section 7.
Iguvines; the reference to the Etruscan *nomen* presumably means all the peoples of Etruria. The Narcan name is probably best seen as a substantial grouping around the Nera river (the ancient Nar), whose name became incorporated into that of the *muncipium* Interamna Nahars. The identification of the *lapuzkum/labuscer* with the lapudes of Pliny *N.H.* 3.127 living at the head of the Adriatic or with the lapyges of Pliny, *N.H.* 3.102 in Apulia is obviously much more problematic. The situation in which these peoples were specified for expulsion clearly suggests a date for the formation (or completion) of the formula from before the Roman conquest, because after this the foreign relations of such peoples became governed by Rome. A more precise date is elusive.

The overall impression gained from a survey of the epigraphy generated within Umbria in the fourth and third centuries BC is one of particularism. This obviously contrasts with the image of the Umbrians as an unified ethnic group gained from Greek writers in the fifth and fourth centuries. A seductive explanation for this could be put forward which sees the earlier references as reflecting a undifferentiated ethnic group, which became divided by the time of the Roman conquest, through a process of state formation, into a number of smaller units retaining only vestiges of their earlier unity. The difference is more likely, though, to be due to the different nature of the evidence. People setting up inscriptions within the area of the ethnic group have little reason to mention the wider ethnic group to which they belong. Outsiders briefly mentioning this ethnic group are apt to generalise about it as a whole (even assuming that they understand its internal articulation). In the fifth and fourth centuries we have both fairly secure attestations of local identities through epigraphy, such as Plestine, and the less secure testimony of Greek authors and a south Picene inscription for an Umbrian identity. Some support for the Greek view comes from the institutions and religious habits shared by these communities, although we have to be cautious with this type of evidence. What the origins of this historical situation were, if in a monolithic ethnic group for instance, can only be guessed at. In the centuries following we find Umbrian communities joining together for defence against a Roman invasion, and fighting as a
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31 A consequence of Iguvine/Umbrian contact with the lapudes when there was an Umbrian presence in the Po valley?
32 This would accord with the image presented by La Regina in his work on the meaning of the *toua* in different areas of Italy, e.g. 'Centri in area sabellica' 203, 'Entità etniche' 130. He sees the *toua* in tribal areas as being equivalent to the largest ethnic group, the *nomen*, as with the *toua marouca* (the *toua* of the Marrucini rather than of Teate) of the Rapino law (Ve 218). With urbanisation these monolithic ethnic groups were divided into smaller individual centres each forming their own *toua* within the larger *nomen*, such as the *toua ilioueina* at Iguvium. This picture has been recently questioned by Letta, 'Dall“oppidum” al "nomen“' 387-406.
'national army' - if their sense of common identity was not strong beforehand, this must have impacted upon it.\textsuperscript{33}

2. GEOGRAPHY

The area under consideration comprises a wide variety of terrain.\textsuperscript{34} Firstly there are large tracts of mountainous areas. The largest block of this upland area is formed by the main Appennine chain running from the south east to north west, through the middle of this region.\textsuperscript{35} Most of this land is over 500 m high, with peaks reaching 1,000 to 1,500 m. It forms a continuous block with the Appennine areas further south that run through modern Abruzzo and Molise. The Umbrian section of the Appennines between Foligno (Fulginiae) and Gubbio (Iguvium), although mountainous, is the one of the easiest to cross in Central Italy. There are a number of low passes in this zone, for example the Bocca Serriola (730 m) linking the upper Tiber valley to the Metauro (Metaurus) valley running down to the Adriatic; the Scheggia (575 m), used in the Roman period by the Via Flaminia, between Gubbio and Sassoferrato (Sentinum); the Vállico di Colfiontò (821 m) between Foligno in the Valle Umbra and Camerino (Camerinum) in the Chienti valley (ancient Flusor); and the Passo dei Fornaci (815 m) between the Valnerina and the Chienti again, linking Terni (Interamna Nahars) to Camerino.\textsuperscript{36} The important Via Flaminia route, which was almost certainly used before the creation of the road in 220 BC, was not the only itinerary to take advantage of these passes.\textsuperscript{37} Umbria saw substantial trade between Etruria and Picenum and the Adriatic coast using routes through Tuder, while other cross-routes went through Asisium and Arna (modern Civitella d'Arno).\textsuperscript{38}

To the west of the Spoletine branch of the Via Flaminia, the sub-Appennine area, the mountain blocks are more isolated. Much of this area is under 500 m in height. There are several large basins and valleys in this area providing high quality agricultural

\textsuperscript{33} See ch. 3 section 3 and ch. 5 section 1 for further discussion of the sense of an Umbrian identity and its importance in the history of this people.

\textsuperscript{34} See Map 1.

\textsuperscript{35} By upland area I mean above 500 m in height. By the sub-Appennine area I mean that area of Umbria west of the Via Flaminia (Spoletium branch, marked on Map 1 by the figure 2), including those centres on this road. Conversely the Appennine area is that to the east of the Flaminia.

\textsuperscript{36} Proximity to the Scheggia was advantageous to Iguvium.


Much of this land was marshy in ancient times, although the Romans initiated schemes to improve its potential. That these were not wholly successful is evident from ancient references to lakes in these basins. The problems must have been even greater in pre-Roman times. Such difficulties were not confined to the low-lying basins: the upland plateau of Colfiorito was not drained until the fifteenth century. Many of the massifs that bound and separate these basins are nevertheless substantial barriers: the Monti Amerini rising to 994 m in the south-west; M. San Pancrazio (1027 m), M. Macchialunga (1105 m) and M. Torre Maggiore (1121 m) around the Conca Ternana; M. Acetella (1016 m) and M. Fiochi (1337 m) force the Via Flaminia to climb to 646 m before entering the Valle Umbra. Around that valley the M. Martani (1096 m) and the range from M. Subasio (1290 m) to M. Maggiore (1428 m), pierced by the Topino valley, provide a towering backdrop.

Although the southern half of the region is land-locked, rivers could be exploited for transport: in his account of the region Strabo (5.2.10) notes the navigability of the Nar (the modern Nera) and the Teneas (the modern Topino), if only for small boats. The river into which they flow, the Tiber, provided a more substantial means of transport towards Rome, although Pliny (N.H. 3.53) notes the uneven nature of its flow. The region had some natural resources, particularly those associated with uncultivated land, such as timber and other products of woodland. There were limited mineral veins, for example the sources of iron near to Gualdo Tadino, Colfiorito and Monteleone di Spoleto.

Perhaps the most significant factor in the economy of the region in the period before the Roman conquest was the availability of large tracts of summer pasturage, which is likely to have led to the development of transhumance. This is the seasonal movement of grazing stock, especially flocks of sheep, between the high summer pastures in the Appennines and those lower areas suitable for winter pasturage. The need to control the summer pastures explains why peoples such as the Umbrians and Sabines spread over both sides of the Appennine watershed. From this viewpoint the great mountain ranges spread between groups sharing the same language are uniting...
rather than dividing factors. Short scale movements up and down the sides of Umbrian mountains such as M. Subasio and M. Torre Maggiore must have taken place as long as there were grazing animals to feed. What is more difficult to ascertain is whether really long distance transhumance, for example between the Etruscan coastal plains and the mountain pastures of the Umbrian Appennines, could have predated the Roman conquest. Although these movements take the best possible advantage of the enviromental variations in central Italy, they require at least in theory several preconditions: long distance movements presuppose a fairly specialized concentration on (above all) sheep rearing, which in turn would need an effective market system to dispose of the produce; the pasturage would have to be available to those who needed it through some sort of communal ownership or leasing arrangement; in addition, to allow this free movement there would have to be at least an absence of hostility between the various areas through which the animals had to pass. That it would not necessarily be any easier to move within an ethnic area, for example down to the (pre-Gallic) 'Umbrian' coastal plains on the Adriatic, than to enter another ethnic area, such as the coastal region of Etruria, is suggested by the list of those banished in the Iguvine Tables: there was as much hostility towards Umbrian Tadinum as towards the Etruscan *nomen* (assuming the interpretation is correct).  

Nevertheless, the discovery of Etruscan goods in Umbrian tombs provides some evidence for links between lowland Etruria and the Appennine regions of Umbria. For example, Etruscan bronzes from Volsinii and Vulci are found at Monteleone di Spoleto and Colfiorito. Bonomi Ponzi takes this to be a sign that transhumance stimulated trade by creating well trodden routes that could be used by commercial traffic, rather than that the trade enabled transhumance; but there is no certainty here.

The centres that arose around the great valleys and basins in Umbria south-west of the Appennine watershed share certain geographical features. Their position in relation to the landscape has important implications for the reasons these sites were 'chosen'. All are situated below the 500 m contour mark. They are almost all on the borders between rich agricultural plains and higher ground that provides forestry resources and pasturage. Defence was not always an important consideration. This is particularly obvious with Interamna, Mevania (Bevagna) and Iguvium, although the first two enjoyed some protection from rivers. More vital were the communication routes to which all the city sites are related. These routes are largely determined by the prevailing
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44 See section 1 (b) above.
45 Bonomi Ponzi, 'Dorsale appenninica' 138.
geographical conditions, but are also shaped by movements of trade, for example from the Adriatic to Etruria, or by transhumance. The cities tend to be situated where these routes cross each other or a river.

To the north-east of the Appennine watershed the land has a very different aspect, consisting in the main of roughly parallel river valleys running towards the Adriatic. The contrasts in this landscape between the mountains, hills and valleys is much less marked than in southern Umbria; there are few wide open valleys or basins away from the coast, and even here the hills often stretch right to the sea. The Roman towns (and in many cases their pre-Roman antecedents) tend to be situated on the tops or slopes of the valleys. Although most of the country is made up of rolling hills (of decreasing height as they near the coast), there is a substantial swath of upland mountain territory separating the zone between Camerinum and Sentinum from the gentler coastal districts. This upland area runs from the Monti Sibillini in the south virtually to the Furlo gorge in the north, which is followed by the Via Flaminia; in the south it marks the border between Augustan Umbria and Picenum.

3. PATTERNS OF SETTLEMENT

Two basic models of settlement patterns are offered by previous work on the regions of Italy that we can use to categorise the situation in Umbria before the Roman conquest: pagus and vicus settlement, and the city-state or polis system.

(a) Pagi and vici

The most developed exposition of the model of pagus and vicus settlement is in the work of La Regina on the areas of the central Appennines, and especially Samnium, the best known part of this region. The archaeological records for this area show a pattern of settlement based around sanctuaries, hillforts (sometimes called castella or, confusingly, oppida) and villages (often called vici). These separated establishments are seen as performing a variety of functions for the inhabitants, functions which a city would perform in a more urbanised area. La Regina has also employed epigraphic evidence from the region to show how it was institutionally different from urbanised areas, with the touta
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47 This topic is dealt with in ch. 1, section 3 (b). We should also note that vici are known largely from the evidence of cemeteries.
here perhaps being equivalent to the whole ethnic group, the nomen, rather than a
division of it.\textsuperscript{48}

The terminology of pagus and vicus applied to this archaeological picture is of
course Latin and not the native Oscan actually spoken in this region. Vicus is a
standard term in late Republican Latin for a small nucleated settlement; pagus is not
used in late Republican legislative documents, but in other examples of Latin epigraphy
refers to local territorial divisions of a 'tribe', and as such must be a Latinisation of
(presumably) a variety of local institutions.\textsuperscript{49} These terms have become widely used in
Italian archaeological writing as 'pagano-vicano' or its variants. The problem with this
phrase is that this is not usually fully defined, and derives from Latin terms that refer to
a wide range of (probably different) situations. There is also some confusion about how
this type of settlement relates to an urban 'system'. Tribal states, of which pagi formed
a part, are normally seen as the predecessors of city-states,\textsuperscript{50} but some scholars see
pagi as characteristic of an intermediate stage between tribes and cities.\textsuperscript{51} In fact the
system in its fully developed form can only be documented in Samnium for the period
from the fourth century onwards, and I have argued in the first chapter that if anything
the polis system, for which we have evidence at a much earlier date, should probably
be seen as a parallel development to tribal states (whether in Greece or Italy) rather than
their 'natural' successors.

In essence I think that the archaeological picture built up by La Regina and others
working on the mountainous areas of central Italy is one that can be usefully applied as
a model to other areas including, as we shall see, that of upland Umbria. The terms
pagus and vicus, however, should be used with caution (and properly defined),
especially when there is so little justification for their use in the epigraphy of Umbria.\textsuperscript{52}

The most obvious traces of this type of settlement would seem to be hillforts.
Considerable numbers of them have been identified throughout the mountainous areas
of Umbria by topographical study - the investigation of likely sites through the study of
the landscape pattern, combined with observation on the ground - allied with aerial

\textsuperscript{48} See p. 46 above.
\textsuperscript{49} M. Frederiksen, 'Changes in the patterns of settlement', in Hellenismus in Mittelitalien
343. This is further complicated by the new meaning, as a division of the territory of a town,
that pagus adopted in the late Republic and early Empire.
\textsuperscript{50} Frederiksen, 'Patterns of settlement' 343.
\textsuperscript{51} Bonomi Ponzi, 'Dorsale appenninica' 139.
\textsuperscript{52} The term pagus is attested at Cesi (C. Buettner, 'L'abitato umbro di Cesi e il santuario di
S. Erasmo', AFLP 25 (1987-1988) 55, perhaps relating to Carsulae); a tr(ibunus) (CIL I\textsuperscript{2}
2106=ILLRP 668) from the territory of Spoleto was in the opinion of Degrassi (ILLRP 2 p. 117)
a magistrate of a pagus or vicus.
photography. This comparatively recent work has identified a dense network in three main areas of Umbria: the upland regions centering around the plateau of Colfiorito, the Valnerina (the valley of the Nera river) and the Conca Eugubina (the basin of Gubbio). Unpublished work has also identified these structures in the territory of Camerino on the Adriatic side of the Appennines, the Monti Martani overlooking the Valle Umbra and the territory of Amelia in the south-east of the region. Research has focused on these mountainous areas as they have been subject to little environmental change and so preserve traces of hillforts that are no longer evident in more accessible zones.

In terms of structure, hillforts are usually made up of a ditch (four to five m wide in the zone of Colfiorito) and a bank of earth or stone (up to four m high) around the highest points in the landscape (generally 600-1,200 m and most commonly 800-1,000 m). The stone sometimes shows evidence of shaping so as to be fitted together rather than simply being piled up, but the action of weathering often makes such features undiscernible. The area enclosed is usually restricted, although some of the largest circuits reach 1,300 m in length. Material indicating habitation is frequently found on the surface of these sites, including tiles and coarse ware (basic undecorated pottery for common use). At sites around Colfiorito this material could be dated only imprecisely to the pre-Roman period.

Cemeteries are more useful in this respect. Excavations at Monteleone di Spoleto and Colfiorito show that many hillforts have corresponding cemeteries at the base of the mountain they occupy. Judging by their cemeteries, and their positions, M. Orve near Colfiorito and Colle del Capitano near Monteleone di Spoleto were probably the most important hillforts within their territorial areas. Other more minor hillforts such
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54 See Figure 3, taken from Bonomi Ponzi, 'Dorsale appenninic' 141; for the territory of Gubbio see Matteini Chiari, 'La ricognizione per un'ipotesi di definizione territoriale: il territorio eugubino in età preromana' 211-22.

55 Bonomi Ponzi, 'Gli Umbri: territorio, cultura e società', in Antichità dall'Umbria a Budapest 42.

56 For instance, M. Orve near Colfiorito: Bonomi Ponzi, 'Topographic survey' 212.

57 Bonomi Ponzi, 'Topographic survey' 207.

58 For details of these see below under individual sites.

59 Hillforts seem often to be organised in groups in which minor centres gravitate around one more complex central site. These latter tend to be on the highest of a series of peaks and may have more than one circuit of walling (for example M. Orve) and traces of buildings (for example at Col di Mori near Gualdo Tadino, M. Orve) (Matteini Chiari, 'La ricognizione per un'ipotesi di definizione territoriale: il territorio eugubino in età preromana' 219). This
as M. di Franca and M. Trelia in the zone of Colfiorito had correspondingly less rich
cemeteries in the valley below. The presence of such cemeteries might suggest that
hillforts were permanently occupied centres and not just fortified places of refuge or
structures in summer pastures associated with transhumance. But these cemeteries
might also relate to villages (which have mostly left no permanent trace) and which
would also presumably be positioned near hillforts for refuge. And in fact at Colfiorito
hut foundations have been found through archaeological investigation under the Roman
municipium of Plestia and as a result of agricultural work in several areas close by.

In the regions in which they have been identified, the function of hillforts seems
to be predominantly defensive. They are usually sited in relation to communication
routes, often being placed in pairs either side of a valley or other itinerary. In addition
they are usually linked visually with each other. Another possible factor in their position
might be the protection of territorial borders, which might explain the line of hillforts on
the mountain ridge to the south-west of the Colfiorito plateau. This sort of function is
facilitated by mountainous terrain. In the area of Colfiorito the upland plateau is
enclosed on all sides by mountains through which there are only narrow gaps for access.
Such gaps are very easy to control.

In the sub-Appennine parts of Umbria the terrain is much more open, with the
major ranges generally isolated rather than interlocking, and so these areas seem much
less suited to such a system of control and defence. In addition although many hillforts
have been identified outside the Appennine zone, we have no clear chronology for them
(unlike the situation around Monteleone and Colfiorito) because the corresponding
cemeteries are not known. Only one of these hillforts in the sub-Appennine zones, M.
Ansciano near Gubbio, has itself been properly excavated and published. The results
show it was inhabited in the Bronze Age but then abandoned around 950 BC when the
‘whole population collected on the slopes below the mountains of M. Ingino and M.

90 Bonomi Ponzi, ‘Topographic survey’ 212.
91 Antichità dall’Umbria in Vaticano 55: Bonomi Ponzi assumes that these are traces of
several small villages that were abandoned in favour of the hillforts in the sixth century BC
(probably because this is when the first cemetery evidence appears below them) but offers no
evidence for the date of the huts.
92 Schmiedt, ‘Contributo della foto-interpretazione alla conoscenza della rete stradale
dell’Umbria nell’alto medioevo’ 177-210, thinks this line may have the purpose of controlling
transhumance movements from the Valle Umbra.
93 Territory, Time and State chs. 4 and 5.
Ansciano’ (where the Roman town was sited). The other supposedly integral part of the pagus and vicus settlement pattern, places of cult, are only testified in Umbria by evidence from (at the earliest) the late sixth century. The recent excavations at Gubbio have shown that the hilltop fortifications here were re-occupied for cult purposes some three centuries after the end of their use for habitation. In fact it is only at Colfiorito, whose exceptional geographical position has been stressed above, that we can document the use of a cult site in the same period as a network of hillforts. The chronological pattern at Gubbio is surely more likely to be representative of the sub-Appennine parts of Umbria, where (as we shall see) many of the later town sites began to be occupied in the first few centuries of the first millennium BC, than the pattern visible at Colfiorito.

(i) Colfiorito (Plestia)

Around the plateau of Colfiorito, extensive, if not systematic, surveys and excavations have over the last 35 years identified a pattern of settlement with hillforts, villages and sanctuaries that seems to conform closely to the model of settlement outlined above. The plateau lies on the modern border between Umbria and the Marche, at a height of 750 m. It is surrounded by very high peaks of between 800 and 1100 m. It has probably always constituted an important through route to Picenum and the Adriatic from the Valle Umbra. The plain is also crossed by other paths running along the Appennine chain to Nocera Umbra and Gualdo Tadino in one direction and Monteleone, Norcia and Sabine and Samnite territory to the south. Although part of the plateau was covered by a lake, which was not drained until the fifteenth century, it must also have provided important summer pastures for transhuming flocks. As befitting its geographical position, the culture that developed here shows a mixture of influences. Three small inscriptions found in the 1960s on the site of a sanctuary have been taken to be Umbrian. The major necropolis found here has been ascribed to the Picene culture, but also shows strong Latial/Sabine influences for the early period (ninth to seventh
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64 Territory, Time and State 113. The mountain top sites were reoccupied for cult purposes in the sixth to third centuries BC.
65 This evidence examined further in section (b) (x) below.
66 Not marked on Map 1 (between Fulginiae and Camerinum); no. 27 on Map 4.
67 For survey see n. 53 above.
68 For trade between Etruria and Picenum, see Lollini in Popoli e Civiltà dell'Italia antica 5 160-1.
century) and Etruscan influences for the period from the sixth to the third century BC. 248 tombs in all have been found in excavations since 1962 at the north-western foot of M. Orvete. It seems probable that the corresponding settlement was on top of this mountain, where an encircling wall and traces of building have been discerned.

The necropolis shows four different chronological phases. In the first, from the ninth to the seventh century BC, the locally produced tomb furnishings are extremely basic, usually consisting of one impasto vase and a few clothing-related objects, such as fibulae. The material, culturally close to that found in contemporary burials at Terni and in Latium, suggests that the society was not strongly stratified. In the second phase, during the seventh century BC, the burials have new types of furnishing, such as iron weapons and bronze dishes. The third phase, from the sixth to the first half of the fourth century sees an increase in the number of tombs, and in the overall quantity and quality of grave goods. Some graves contain bronze equipment for dining, characteristic aristocratic accoutrements in the archaic Mediterranean world, imported Greek red and black figure vases, and large quantities of impasto pottery. The concentration of the highest quality furnishings in some of the graves seems to show the increasing stratification of the society through the rise of an aristocratic class. The last phase of the Colfiorito cemetery, from the second half of the fourth century to the end of the third century BC, sees a decline in the quality of the grave goods. If this reflects the wealth of the community, rather than a change in funerary custom, it could be the result of the extension of Roman power into this area of central Italy and the interruption of the trade routes which this community controlled. The burials cease in this cemetery in the third century BC; the minor cemeteries found in the surrounding territory are generally datable from the late sixth to the fourth century BC.

The ending of burials can probably be linked to the creation of the Roman centre (later a municipium) of Plestia near to the sanctuary site (and perhaps on the shores of the lake).
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70 Guida Laterza 104.
71 See Bonomi Ponzi, 'Dorsale appenninica' 137-142; Bonomi Ponzi, 'Cultura e società del territorio plestino in età protostorica', in Antichità dell'Umbria in Vaticano 54-5 and in Antichità dell'Umbria a Budapest 76-88. I have not seen L. Bonomi Ponzi, La necropoli plestina di Colfiorito di Foligno ('Collana di studi di storia e archeologia dell'Umbria antica' 2).
72 Discussed above.
73 E.g. Tomb 6, published in Antichità dell'Umbria a Budapest 76. The bronze material from this phase is mostly from Volsinii or Vulci, but there are some bronze and ceramic objects of Picene type.
74 These are less differentiated in character than those in the central Colfiorito cemetery. See Bonomi Ponzi, 'Dorsale appenninica' 142.
75 Bonomi Ponzi, 'Topographic survey' 233. Plestia was probably a community of Roman citizens before the Social War, see ch. 3, section 5 (b); no cemetery of it has yet been discovered.
Two other cemeteries relate to areas with similar settlement patterns.

(ii) Monteleone di Spoleto

There is a well known pre-Roman cemetery near Monteleone di Spoleto west of the Valnerina. The cemetery, corresponding to the hillfort of Colle del Capitano, contains material from the Final Bronze Age (c. 1,000-900 BC) to the sixth century BC. Excavations were carried out at the start of the twentieth century, when the famous chariot burial (now in New York) was found, and recently in 1978-1980. The latter excavations unearthed 26 tombs in the cemetery. Of these, 20 are of the Final Bronze Age, and like most of the tombs discovered in earlier excavations they were cremations with cylindrical, globular and biconical cremation urns. Two tombs date from the early Iron Age. One is an inhumation and has pottery comparable with Latial types. The other is a cremation in a metal ossuary. Finally there are four tombs from the sixth century BC of which three form part of a circular structure. All have richer grave goods than the earlier tombs. These amplify the picture gained from the chariot burial (found in a chamber tomb) of a newly emergent and very wealthy aristocracy. The chariot itself can be dated to around 550 BC by its style and the rest of the extravagant tomb equipment. It has bronze panels decorated with scenes from the life of Achilles, according to the interpretation of Brendel. No tombs are known from after this date.

(iii) Gualdo Tadino (Tadinum)

About 3 km north of Gualdo Tadino, near the church of S. Facondino, a cemetery was discovered that began to be used in the fifth century BC. It is situated below the hill of Col di Mori on which there are traces both of a fortified circuit and a small sanctuary building. The use of the cemetery continues throughout the Republican era, although
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76 Between Nursia and Interamna on Map 1.
77 This is probably within Sabine territory but can profitably be discussed together with the closely related Umbrian centres in the Appennines.
79 For the chamber tomb, see Minto in BPI 44 (1924) 145 ff.
80 O. Brendel, Etruscan Art (Harmondsworth, 1978) 151. He thinks it is a local work, perhaps made by immigrant craftsmen. M. Torelli sees the bronze panels as Volscian in origin: Todi. Verso un museo della città (Todi, 1982) 55.
81 No. 20 on Map 4.
whether the corresponding settlement was actually on Col di Mori is unknown.\footnote{Guida Laterza 172.} Another cemetery was found in the Malpasso district 2 km south of the Roman town in 1935 had four late fourth century graves of which one was a double burial containing (amongst other things) two bronze strigils, two iron lance heads and several red figure cups.

(b) Early settlement sites in sub-Appennine areas.

In this section I catalogue the evidence for settlement before the conquest of the region around 300 BC on the sites in sub-Appennine areas that became \textit{municipia} in the Roman period.\footnote{This was generally in the first century BC, and in most cases soon after the Social War (see ch. 5).} The designation of centres with municipal status by the Roman authorities implies they recognised the urban consistency of these centres, although it is hard to be specific about what exact standards they applied. In fact the archaeological evidence strongly suggests that those centres made \textit{municipia} in the later period were already the most important settlements in the pre-Roman period; although remains have been found at several minor sites, such as Campello near Spoletium, none has a level of evidence comparable to those catalogued below.\footnote{For Campello see \textit{Spoleto. Da villaggio a città}.} The separation of these sites from those with a village and hillfort system of settlement discussed above is, of course, an artificial one, but it is only partially based on hindsight. Most of the centres catalogued below have more than one type of evidence for settlement and several show traces of performing a variety of functions for the people living there and in the territory around, proposed as an index of urbanisation in chapter one.\footnote{Section 3 (b).}

(i) Otricoli (Ocricum)\footnote{For this and subsequent sites see Map 1.}

Otricoli is a small centre on an elevated spur 100 m above the Tiber valley. It has several short sections of ancient walling around which the medieval town wall is built.\footnote{M. Cipollone, E. Lippolis, 'Le mura di Otricoli', \textit{Nuovi Quaderni dell'Istituto di Archeologia dell'Università di Perugia} 1 (1979) 59-64; better: Fontaine, \textit{Cités} 57-68.} Some parts seem to be still \textit{in situ} and so help us to determine the perimeter. The measurements of the blocks may be based on modules of the Attic foot, as at Veii and Falerni Veteres. Also the pattern in which the stone blocks are laid is identical with the arrangement at Tarquinii and clearly distinct from early Roman examples such as the \textit{castrum} of Ostia. On the basis of these criteria, and comparisons with similarly sized centres built up in the neighbouring Faliscan and southern Etruscan environment,
Fontaine has dated the fortifications of Otricoli to between the mid fifth and mid fourth centuries.  

This conclusion accords with funerary evidence of early settlement on this site. About twenty chamber tombs, mostly of the seventh century BC, have been found in the vicinity of the hilltop town site at Colle Rampo, S. Nicola and elsewhere. Material in them shows a strong Faliscan influence on the site, which is unsurprising given its position, adjacent to Faliscan territory. Burials later than the seventh century, down to the mid sixth century BC, are indicated only by the remains of some later Etrusco-Corinthian vases. The dating of the fortifications shows that the centre was not deserted from the sixth century despite the great reduction in the material discovered in graves. Further confirmation of the importance of this settlement is provided by Livy (9.41.20) who records that in 308 BC the Ocriculani were received into friendship with a sponsio, a promise.

An architectural terracotta was found in a farm along the track running from modern Otricoli (where pre-Roman fortifications have been found) to the Tiber. It is part of a temple frieze representing mounted cavalrymen in low relief. Parallels have been drawn with contemporary friezes from Velitrae (by C. Pietrangeli) and with two examples from Veii dating from 600-575 BC (by G. Dareggi). It is impossible to say whether the temple or other monumental building of which this formed part was situated on the actual find spot, suggesting a link with trade along the Tiber, or in the fortified centre above. It is clear evidence, though, of Otricoli's links with the cultural koiné in the sixth century BC covering the major centres of southern Etruria and Latium, in one of which the terracotta was probably made.

(ii) Amelia (Amerla)

At Amelia a variety of evidence from the period before the Roman conquest has been found, including funerary material, a votive deposit, and possibly fortifications around the

---

89 Fontaine, Cités 65.
90 E. Stefani, 'Otricoli. Avanzi di età romana scoperti a Colle Rampo e nelle località Palombara e Civitella', NSc 32 (1909) 278-91; C. Pietrangeli, Oriculum (Rome, 1943) 23-7; P. Santoro, 'Le necropoli della Sabina tiberina da Colle del Forno a Otricoli', Dda 3 (1985) 67-75. Part of the material from these tombs is now in the Villa Giulia.
92 Florus' mention of 'Ocricolum' amongst the conquests of Tarquinius Superbus 'in Latium' (1.1.7) might possibly refer to this centre, but is in a list with other towns much closer to Rome.
The votive deposit, like the funerary material, was discovered in the Pantanelli district just to the west of the city site. There were around 170 bronze and a few lead figurines of the fifth and fourth centuries BC as well as other material post-dating the Roman conquest, including a large number of coins and 18 terracotta votives of heads and anatomic parts. The discovery of chamber tombs in the same area shows that there was a cemetery here which must relate to a settlement on the city site. These tombs were constructed of large rectangular tufa blocks with vaulted roofs; they contained rich furnishings of the fifth and fourth centuries, including Attic pottery and Etruscan bronze dishes, utensils and arms. Casual finds during agricultural work of bronze strigils and more Attic red figure pottery (c. 500-480 BC) also in this area must also have come from this cemetery. An Umbrian inscription perhaps dating to around 300 BC was found in the territory of Amelia, but the exact find spot is unclear.

At least one part of the imposing and substantial sections of city wall that remain around the site may date to before the Roman conquest. There are three different varieties of walling using closely fitted polygonal blocks of up to three metres across: one of the phases is probably a medieval restoration; the other two are ancient. Of these latter the first phase of walling (as identified by Fontaine) is more roughly finished than the second phase, which itself is akin to the walls found at fourth and third century BC Latin colonies in central Italy, such as Cosa and Alba Fucens. The position of this first section higher up the slope than the rest of the fortification (A on plan 1) suggests that it belongs to a small nucleated settlement that developed before the Roman conquest, and we could relate this to the funerary evidence discussed above.

A useful fragment of information about the community here is preserved by Pliny the Elder (N.H. 3.114) who writes that 'Ameria is stated by Cato to have been founded 963 years before the war with Perseus'. Cato is known to have used local sources for the Origines, and this notice, together with that of Festus recording the name of its

---

93 Curious lead coinage that might be of votive function could also be from here, judging from the legend amer or ameri, although it would probably date to the third century (Monacchi, 'Grotta Bella' 97 n. 150).
94 G. Eroli, Bullettino dell'Instituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica (1860) 118-21, (1864) 56-9, (1887) 169-72; Monacchi, 'Grotta Bella' 81, 84 n. 47.
95 Colonna no. XII (unclassifiable series) for bronze figurines (some warriors, others worshippers). The implications of the later material is examined in ch. 4 section 6.
96 Guida Laterza 19.
97 Brief reports by G. Eroli, Bullettino dell'Instituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica (1860) 118-21, (1864) 56-9, (1881) 216-21; Monacchi, 'Grotta Bella' 96 n. 146.
98 Ve 229 (see appendix two).
99 Fontaine, Cités 72-81. See Plan 1 for the layout of the walls (taken from Fontaine).
100 Date of the earliest walling: Fontaine, Cités 80.
101 Cato fr. 49 Peter. The war with Perseus was in 171-167 BC.
founder, Amirus, suggests that there was a local tradition that recognised/proclaimed that city had an origin well before the Roman conquest (and in fact well before that of Rome).\footnote{Sources: Chassignet, Caton xxvii-xxviii. Paulus-Festus 19L: *Ameria urbs in Umbria ab Amiro sic appellata.*}

(iii) Terni (Interamna Nahars)

On a lowland site surrounded by on three sides by water Terni (ancient Interamna Nahars) has in its vicinity Umbria's most substantial Final Bronze Age/early Iron Age cemeteries.\footnote{For the site Varro, L.L. 5.28 and Paulus-Festus 16L s.v. Amneses; Fontaine, Cité 116-117. The number of graves in the Acciaierie cemetery was estimated by the excavators at 2,500, of which 300 were found in the 19th century (Grassini (BDSPU (1947) 34-8). See also L. Lanzì, 'Scoperte varie nell'Acciaieria, nell'intorno della città e nel suburbio', NSc (1901) 176-81; L. Lanzì, A. Pasqui. 'Scoperte nell'antica necropoli presso le Acciaierie', NSc (1907) 595f.; L. Lanzì, E. Stefani, 'Scoperte di antichità in contrada S. Pietro in Campo, Acciaierie e Cascata delle Marmore', NSc (1914) 3-68; E. Stefani, 'Scoperta di antichi sepolcri nella contrada S. Pietro in Campo', NSc (1916) 191-228; Antichità dall'Umbria in Vaticano 43-54.}

As apparently the most important site in the Nera valley, we could tentatively link its inhabitants to the people of the *nomen Naharkum* mentioned in the Iguvine Tables.\footnote{See above under ethnicity, section 1 (b).} The burials are conventionally divided into three phases. In the first phase (tenth century BC), both inhumation and cremation burials appeared in the eastern zone of the Acciaierie cemetery, discovered in 1875 at a site 1.5 km. outside the Roman city.\footnote{Unfortunately the stratigraphy had been disturbed by the building here (NSc (1916) 208).} In the cremations the ashes were placed in ceramic urns which were buried in pits. The inhumation burials were in trenches covered with pebble tumuli and surrounded by stone circles.\footnote{A similar rite was used in the Po valley and Appennine areas of Italy, see above, section 1 (a).} In phase two, in the eighth century BC, inhumation burials predominated. In the third phase of the cemetery (seventh century), cremation burials disappeared altogether and subsequently only inhumation was used. Another cemetery at S. Pietro in Campo on the northern periphery of the Roman city began to be used from the seventh century, with the Acciaierie site becoming less important.

No pattern in the distribution of the burials was discerned by the excavators. Much of the ceramic material in the graves is of local production, especially in the earlier phases; there were also many bronze and some ivory objects. In general the grave goods show influences from a wide range of different areas: southern Etruria, Latium and the Adriatic.\footnote{Guida Laterza (1980) 8.} The S. Pietro cemetery seems to fall out of use before the Roman period, but the precise date is controversial. Several inundations interrupted the burials, leaving
thick layers of sediment. The Accaierie cemetery seems to have continued in use.

A brief notice in the Antichità dall’Umbria in Vaticano exhibition catalogue records the discovery in 1988 of unspecified remains found in the Clai quarter of the city centre, dating to the seventh and sixth centuries BC, that probably relate to the corresponding settlement. In addition, an early imperial inscription from Terni that may have come from a public altar intriguingly records its erection in the year AD 32, '704 years after the foundation of Interamna' (671 BC), which would take us back precisely to the period of the beginning of the S. Pietro cemetery. As with the record in Cato of Ameria's ancient foundation, I would not want to put too much emphasis on the actual date; nevertheless, this strongly suggests that the inhabitants believed in the site's continuity from before the Roman conquest, even though there was probably a substantial influx of Latin and Roman settlers here in the third century.

(iv) Todi (Tuder)

Todi is positioned on a hill controlling one of the easiest mid Tiber fords. It has long been a crossroads for traffic both along the Tiber valley and between Etruria and central Umbria. It is striking that, out of the centres bordering with Etruria, Attic vase imports

---

108 Fontaine, Cités 113 thinks there is a hiatus in the evidence between the seventh century - which is the latest date given to the tombs by Stefani, 'Scoperta di antichi sepolcri nella contrada S. Pietro in Campo', NSc (1916) 191-226 - and the Roman period. A gap in the funerary evidence could of course be due to a change in funerary customs rather than a break in the occupation of the site.

109 According to De Angelis, Antichità dall’Umbria in Vaticano 44, the cemetery is commonly dated from the tenth to the fourth centuries BC (cf. U. Ciotti, s.v. 'Interamna Nahars', in PECS (Princeton, 1976) 411). There is no published information to my knowledge on Roman graves of the Republican era, but tombs of the second century AD were discovered in 1943 on the Accaierie site (Grassini, BDSPU (1947) 34-8; a sign of uninterrupted use?).

110 Antichità dall’Umbria in Vaticano 50. A stone block with high relief found in 1901 three m below the modern street level with Roman material (L. Lanzi, 'Scoperte varie nell’Acciaieria, nell’intorno della città e nel suburbio', NSc (1901) 176) has been dated by Roncalli to the fifth century BC (Antichità dall’Umbria a Leningrado 192-3), but its crude quality makes any chronological conclusions uncertain.

111 CIL XI 4170=ILS 157: Saluti perpetuae Augustae / libertatis publicae / populi Romani / Genio municipi anno post / Interamnam conditam / DCCIII ad Cn. Domitium / Ahenobarbum / ... / ... cos. / Providentiae Ti. Caesaris Augusti nati ad aeternitatem / Romani nominis, sublato hoste permiciassimo p.R./ Faustus Titius Liberalis VI vir Aug. iter. / p.s.f.c. (AD 32). It should not be connected with the amphitheatre according to G. L. Gregori, 'Amphitheatralia I', MEFR 96 (1984) 961-85. Note the possible continuity at the Accaierie site.

112 The inhabitants of Interamna may have frequented a sanctuary on the peak of M. Torre Maggiore, which towers above the Conca Ternana, and which shows signs of activity from the fifth century (votive deposit with bronze figurines) to the first century BC (monumental temple complex). This has been recently excavated but only short notices have as yet been published: see Ciotti, 'Nuove conoscenze' 111; Guida Laterza 128-9; L. Bonomi Ponzi in M. Piccio (ed.), Martani Trekking (Milan, 1992) 48; I have not been able to see L. Bonomi Ponzi, 'Il territorio di Cesi in età protostorica', in Cesi. Cultura e ambiente di una terra antica (Todi, 1989). See further on the possible continuity of population at Interamna in ch. 3 section 4.
are concentrated at Todi. Todi must have been the primary trade conduit from Etruria to places in the Umbrian Appennines such as Colfiorito, Gualdo Tadino and Nocera Umbra, where substantial traces of Greek imports are also found. Inscriptions in Umbrian, Etruscan and even a bilingual Latin and Celtic example have been found here belonging to the period down to the Social War (after which Latin became predominant). Although the Etruscan inscriptions are by far the most numerous, the only 'official' use of language, the legend on the centre's third century coinage, is significantly taken to be Umbrian. This legend, *tutere* in its full form, may signify border or confines.

The cemeteries of Todi have been excavated since the eighteenth century. Well over 200 graves are known to have been discovered in the Peschiera, S. Raffaele and Le Logge areas on the southern slope of the hill. The long history of excavation, of which most was undertaken by individuals in an unofficial capacity, combined with the frequency of landslides on the southern side of the hill, means that while there is an abundance of material it is often impossible to relate this to specific tombs. Only the material in the Villa Giulia and Florence archaeological museum that came from tombs found between 1886 and 1915 and the contents of the storerooms of the local Todi museum have been preserved. Nevertheless, some conclusions are possible from these collections. The burials date from the late seventh century to the third century BC. The largest number of graves are inhumations, usually in trenches but with a few chamber tombs, although some cremation urns have been found, particularly from the early period. Tombs of the sixth and fifth century come from the Le Logge and S. Raffaele localities. In the late fifth century the Peschiera cemetery begins to be used and this continues until the third century.

---

113 Some material may also have come from the Adriatic coast.
115 Etruscan material: G. Buonamici, 'Brevi osservazioni su alcune epigrafi etrusche provenienti da Todi, conservate nel museo di Pesaro', SE 13 (1939) 415-26; three Umbrian inscriptions: appendix two; coin legend: Catalli in Antichità dall'Umbria a Budapest 141.
116 The word *tuder* in the Iguvine Tables is taken by most commentators to mean boundary or limit, from which the Roman era name Tuder presumably comes. *Tutere* is nevertheless very close to the Umbrian word *totar* or *tutas* meaning community or people in the Tables (see the index of Poultney's *Bronze Tables*).
118 See Antichità dall'Umbria a Leningrado 327-9 for the history of the excavations.
119 The discoveries between these dates were partially recorded in Notizie degli Scavi (the mass of references are collected in Tascio, *Todi* 13 n. 3).
In the sixth and fifth centuries there is only a restricted number of graves, although many have very rich equipment. The material in the sixth century includes some Faliscan and Etruscan vases, Etruscan bronzes, a few Attic black figure vases and some panels from a bronze chariot, attributed by Torelli to Volsinian workshops.\textsuperscript{120} This material, particularly the chariot burial, points towards the presence of a powerful aristocracy capable of concentrating wealth in its own hands. This class seems to be consolidated in the fifth century when imports of Attic red figure vases steadily increase to a peak around 450 BC.\textsuperscript{121} Such developments are typified by a magnificent tomb at S. Raffaele of 450-425 BC. This contained iron and bronze arms, bronze symposium equipment, and about 60 Attic vases stretching over a chronological period of about a century.

In the second half of the fifth century the Peschiera cemetery enters into use. The tombs in this cemetery are less rich in equipment but much more numerous than those of the S. Raffaele and Le Logge cemeteries, and seem to show that a wider spectrum of the society is burying its dead here with items of value. This presumably is a sign that a new social structure has developed with a larger aristocracy able to share in the increased wealth of the community.\textsuperscript{122} During the fifth century a new use for accumulated wealth seems to have emerged here, as in other areas of Umbria, in the spending of money on donatives to communal cult sites; by the late fifth century these donatives could be extremely valuable works of art, judging by the most costly example of those that survive, the so-called Mars of Todi. This exceptional bronze statue was left at what is assumed to be a sanctuary on Monte Santo, 500 m west of the town centre, by a local(?) aristocrat whose name suggests they (or their ancestors) had a Celtic origin.\textsuperscript{123} Perhaps of more significance for communal organisation is the financing of monumental buildings, which are first attested at some point in the second half of the fourth century at Todi by architectural terracottas found in 1925 in the Porta Catena area.\textsuperscript{124} These terracottas probably relate to the erection of a temple in what was then just outside the south-east corner of the ancient city. This evidence of urbanisation corresponds to the most intense period of use of the Peschiera cemetery, from the mid fourth to the early third century BC, when large numbers of imported Faliscan and

\textsuperscript{120} Torelli, \textit{Todi. Verso un museo} 55.
\textsuperscript{121} P. Tamburini in \textit{Todi. Verso un museo} 52.
\textsuperscript{122} Torelli in \textit{Todi. Verso un museo} 56. We do not have to envisage any diminution of the richest members of the elite's wealth, however, only a change in how they disposed of it.
\textsuperscript{123} Ve 230; Roncalli, 'Il "Marte" di Todi', \textit{Atti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia} 2.2; \textit{Antichità dall'Umbria in Vaticano} 64. For the inscription see appendix 2.
\textsuperscript{124} They are of probable Volsinian or Faliscan production; for details see appendix 1.
Etruscan vases are found. Use of the cemetery declines after this point, and ends after the third century BC.\footnote{125}

At Todi we also have evidence for the presence of a body of artisans in the fifth century, producing imitations of imported pottery types and small bronze statuettes for votive purposes.\footnote{126} The presence of workshops has been surmised from the centering on Todi of the distribution of several stylistic groups of these votive statues, such as Colonna’s ‘Amelia group’.\footnote{127} Their production was probably restricted to the period between the late sixth century and the early fourth century BC. This tradition of local production continues after the conquest with the production of black slip pottery in the third century and beyond.\footnote{128}

\textbf{(v) Spoleto (Spoletium)}

The first evidence for the occupation of Spoleto relates to habitation in the Final Bronze Age (c. 1000-900 BC). An archaeological sample within the walls of the Rocca, the city’s medieval fortress, has identified artificial shelving of the ground, interpreted by the excavators as either the lower part of a hut or the base on which it would rest.\footnote{129} It has been dated by a section through it to the end of the Final Bronze Age (late tenth to ninth century BC).\footnote{130} Further down the western slope of the Rocca, under the church of SS. Simone e Guida, a layer of brown earth containing Final Bronze Age material was found. This related to a habitation, containing clay products made for domestic use and evidence of artisanal and agricultural activity. The proximity of this site to the Rocca makes it likely that it belonged to the same village as the hut found there, which would therefore have spread over at least the western slope of the Rocca.

The first funerary evidence dates from the seventh century BC. Inhumation tombs containing impasto vases have been discovered under the Duomo, on the Rocca and on the slopes of the hill on which the Rocca stands.\footnote{131} At Piazza d’Armi, a seventh century trench tomb with rich bronze and fictile equipment was found. The equipment is similar to that found close by in the Valle Umbra at Campello (where there is an Iron Age cemetery), and at Bevagna's Boccolini cemetery. According to de Angelis, the

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{125} The coinage of Todi is examined in ch. 4, section 8.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{126} Tamburini, \textit{Todi. Verso un museo} 54; Colonna, \textit{Bronzi votivi} 205 (for references).}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{127} Colonna, \textit{Bronzi votivi}. Amelia group distribution: Monacchi, ‘I resti della stipe votiva del Monte Subasio di Assisi (Colle S. Rufino)’ 77ff.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{128} Todi. Verso un museo 107.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{129} Spoleto. \textit{Da villaggio a città} 14.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{130} Spoleto. \textit{Da villaggio a città} 11.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{131} C. Pietrangeli, \textit{Spoletium} 19, 71; L. Bonomi Ponzi et al., \textit{Spoleto. Da villaggio a città}; Spoleto. \textit{Il colle della Rocca}.}
Piazza d'Armi tomb probably formed part of a larger cemetery, as sporadic finds were made here in the late nineteenth century. The recent discovery of three bronze votive figurines on the western side of the Rocca can be joined with four similarly schematic examples found by Sordini in the nineteenth century to indicate the presence of a cult site here in the fifth century BC. The site seems to have still had a cult function as the arx of the colony after its foundation in 241 BC, when a temple with architectural terracottas was set up, and offerings of terracotta models were left, to be placed at some point in a votive deposit. The deposition of graves, which during the Iron Age occurred within the perimeter of the future Roman city, seems to have come to an end in the late fourth century BC.

(vi) Bevagna (Mevania)

The occupation of the territory later pertaining to Bevagna is documented by twenty-two items of the Bronze and early Iron Age in the Bellucci collection, now in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale at Perugia. This includes a Final Bronze Age lance point (c. 1,000-900 BC) from Bevagna itself, presumably coming from a tomb there, but it is not until the seventh century BC that there is substantial evidence for the permanent occupation of the site. Two cemeteries in the near vicinity of the centre date to this century, and there are also contemporary remains of habitation from within the area of the later Roman city. One cemetery was found in the nineteenth century 500 m outside the Porta Foligno along the Via Flaminia (in the Boccolini vineyard). The tombs contained fibulae, amber necklaces and iron lance points. Material in the Guardabassi and Bellucci collections, found in 1876 a little along the Todi road, probably relate to another cemetery: one tomb yielded a knife blade and two bronze discs of the seventh century BC, characteristic of female Orientalizing tombs in Umbrian and Picene areas. There is also pottery without an exact provenance in the Bellucci collection with similar decoration to examples from Campello sul Clitunno and Spolet.

---

134 *Spolet. Il colle della Rocca* 48. For the city walls, probably of colonial date, see ch. 4, section 3.
135 Catalogued in *Mevania* 30-36.
In 1980-1982 the remains of a seventh to sixth century BC dwelling were discovered at Viale Properzio, an area outside the medieval town walls but possibly within the ancient city boundary. This structure was built over in the mid (and then late) Republic and in consequence there are only exiguous remains: these may extend under the modern road to the south (where excavation was not possible). What originally stood here seems to have been a 'hut' with dry-stone walls or wall foundations. Associated with the dwelling was a kiln, signalled by collapsed impasto tiles. Fragments of impasto ceramics in the habitation layers included an acroterion of feline form similar to those of the archaic Etruscan site at Murlo (Poggio Civitate), indicating some architectural elaboration. Some loom weights were also found, similar to others that were present in contemporary tombs found in the pre-conquest cemeteries (one of which is only 500 m away), to which this structure must be related.

The lack of further archaeological data makes it hazardous to draw firm conclusions about the centre in this period, beyond noting that there is no other centre within this territory with similar levels of evidence for permanent settlement before the Roman conquest. In the fourth century, however, there is evidence of a monumental temple in the north of the city centre, suggesting the beginnings of urbanisation at this site: in 1884 the foundations of a rectangular building were found in the Parco Silvestri, to which can be linked fragments of fourth century architectural terracottas recently discovered in the same area. Such a building would support the notion of continuity of habitation from the seventh and sixth centuries, attested by the cemetery and habitation evidence.

(vii) Spello (Hispellum)

In 1977 and 1979 parts of a large cemetery were excavated in the Portonaccio district on the southern periphery of the ancient and medieval centre of Spello. It contained inhumation tombs covered by stones, three of which were published in the Antichità

---

139 For the excavations see L. Bonomi Ponzi, 'Nuove conoscenze sull'antica Bevagna', BSCF 10 (1986) 481-487; L. Bonomi Ponzi in Mevania 39. For the city boundaries see C. Pietrangeli in the same volume, 13ff.
140 For details of this sima see appendix 1.
141 Using the catalogues of material from the surrounding territory in D. Manconi, 'Il territorio di Bevagna. Inquadramento storico-topografico', AFLP 21 (1983-1984) 115-125 and Mevania 32-9; Bonomi Ponzi (Mevania 28) sees the situation in the seventh century as one of 'paganico-vicano' settlement gradually shifting, by the time of the Roman conquest, towards urban organisation.
142 Pietrangeli, Mevania 92; Mevania 134.
143 Only a brief survey so far in D. Manconi, 'Spello', in Antichità dall'Umbria a Leningrado 152-92. One tomb was 200 m away under a Roman villa in Via Baldini, but in the opinion of the excavators was part of the same cemetery.
The material found within the cemetery ranges from the late seventh century BC (a sporadic find of a bronze fibula) to the first century AD (a 'cappuccina' tomb), although the oldest tomb yet found dates from the late fourth or early third century BC. This inhumation tomb was found in 1979 inside a circle of stones, similar to those of an earlier date found in the cemeteries of Terni, containing imported pottery from Falerii and Orvieto, locally produced pottery, and a strigil (a sign of Greek influence). Large amounts of black slip pottery, mostly of local production, were found in Tomb 1 of the cemetery, which dates to the late third century BC.

The settlement corresponding to this cemetery is very poorly known, with the only traces being the rectangular foundations of a building constructed with irregular stones (laid without cement), and a stratigraphic layer containing impasto and buccheroid pottery of the pre-conquest period.  

(viii) Civitella d'Amo (Ama) and Bettona (Vettona)

Two important cemeteries have been found associated with small centres across the Tiber from Etruscan Perugia. Civitella d'Arno is almost certainly the site of ancient Arna; Bettona is ancient Vettona. Both are strongly linked to Etruscan territory. Nevertheless both also have inhumation tombs covered by stone or terracotta slabs, a tomb type that is common elsewhere in Umbria (for example, at Todi), beginning in the fourth century BC. Cremation tombs using travertine and sandstone urns dating to the third or second century BC are also found at Bettona's Colle cemetery, which continues in use through to the Imperial period. At Arna, funerary material from subsequent centuries has been discovered, but because of the casual nature of the finds, these items cannot be localised to a particular cemetery.

At Bettona several small stretches of ancient walling are visible within the settlement. On strigils in Umbrian graves, see Torelli, 'Romanizzazione' 82.

The structure is dated to the start of the third century (Manconi in Antichità dall'Umbria a Leningrado 152: no further details); the pottery has been found at three sites at Spello (Manconi, 'Il territorio di Bevagna' 118 n. 5).


Both by funerary material; Vettona also by the presence of Etruscan inscriptions on urns and an Etruscan boundary cippus: Antichità dall'Umbria a Budapest e Cracovia 163; Livy implies that Arna is in Etruscan territory (10.25.4)
encircling medieval fortification. This fortification is made of large rectangular blocks of irregular size fitted together without mortar. The closest parallel to the technique used here is that found in the city walls of Cortona, but these unfortunately cannot be precisely dated. We are thus reliant on the topographical indications collected by Fontaine. The tiny size of the site, its distance from any of the major Roman routes through the region, and the pre-Hellenistic nature of the fortification layout, all suggest a date in the fourth century. An earlier date is possible, but must be considered unlikely until material earlier than this period is discovered in the cemetery.

At both centres there is evidence of religious activity dating to the pre-conquest period. A large collection of mostly schematic votives in the Bellucci collection (in Perugia archaeological museum probably) all comes from the same votive deposit at the foot of the slope on which Bettona stands. They are generically dated by Colonna to the fifth and early fourth centuries BC. Scarpignato has suggested that the Fosso del Colle near the ancient cemetery, in which votive material has been found recently, was the source for the earlier material. At Arna, an architectural terracotta strongly suggests that there was a temple on this site from the fourth century BC.

(ix) Assisi (Asisium)

In the territory of Assisi, sporadic finds of Final Bronze and early Iron Age material (tenth to sixth centuries BC) have been made, of which parts are now in the Bellucci collection at Perugia and the archaeological museum at Florence. In at least two instances the finds may relate to tombs, but there is no evidence as yet for the cemeteries of Asisium before the Roman conquest. From the fifth century to around the end of the third century a cult site was frequented on Colle San Rufino, one of the summits of M. Subasio, as is clear from the discovery of bronze votives here in the nineteenth century. Our only evidence for the occupation of the future Roman city site in this period consists of a large ceramic deposit. This was discovered in a recent excavation in Via dell'Arco dei Priori, just downhill from the piazza in front of the so-called 'Temple

---

149 Fontaine, Cités 312-313.
150 Colonna, Bronzi votivi III (unclassifiable series).
152 See appendix 1.
153 A. L. Milani, Il r. museo archeologico di Firenze (Florence, 1923), 298; Strazzulla, 'Problemi urbanistici' 152; Monacchi, 'Monte Subasio' 81; Strazzula, Assisi Romana 9-10.
of Minerva. The earliest elements in this find are fragments of archaic impasto and buccheroid impasto pottery from the sixth to the fourth century BC. This particular dump has been firmly identified as being connected with a cult place on the basis of the presence of (later) miniaturist black slip pottery and fragments with related graffiti. The deposit shows the greatest level of deposition in the third to second centuries BC, from which period date most of the roughly 2,000 black slip ceramic fragments; it comes to end in the first century BC.

(x) Gubbio (Iguvium)
The city site of Gubbio was probably continuously occupied from c. 950 BC when the local population abandoned the settlements on the top of M. Ingino and M. Ansciano. The geological conditions of the lower settlement position, on (in the words of Malone and Stoddart) 'unstable colluvial slopes subject to sheet wash', has meant that most of the remains from the earliest era of its occupation were probably destroyed - the recent survey of the valley found fragments of Iron Age pottery around the base of M. Ansciano. At the foot of M. Ingino, where the presence of modern buildings makes investigation difficult, an excavation in the Vescovado area (in the top part of the medieval town) again found Iron Age pottery fragments in colluvial deposits.

Funerary evidence for the inhabitation of the city site begins in the sixth century BC. Two cemeteries have been discovered in the vicinity of the modern (and Roman) city, dating from the pre-conquest period. In the Fontevole cemetery roughly 500 m to the west, a sixth century BC tomb has recently been discovered (the earliest yet), containing the remains of a chariot, and impasto vases. Although the cemetery has only been investigated in an unsystematic way, its continuing use can be documented by sporadic finds of Etruscan and Greek red figure vase fragments from the first half of the fourth century, pieces of a late second or early first century BC bronze *kline* (dining couch) excavated in 1982 and tombs of the imperial era. Judging by the material
found within it, a part of the other cemetery, in the Vittorina locality about 300 m to the south, seems to have been used from the second half of the fourth century to the end of the first century BC. An adjacent part of the cemetery was used in the first and second centuries AD.

In the Guastuglia quarter (below the medieval city and near the Roman theatre) what was probably a huge refuse dump has been excavated.\(^\text{161}\) It contained a jumbled mix of fragments of pottery, three bronze votive figurines, and a few Roman coins. The majority of the ceramic material was locally produced coarse ware; there was much black slip pottery, of both Etruscan and local production, and fifteen fragments of Attic and Etruscan figured ware.\(^\text{162}\) The earliest elements dated from the eighth century BC (such as a fibula), but most of the material dates from between the late fourth century and the end of the second century BC.\(^\text{163}\) As the material was found in fourteen chronologically mixed layers, spread over an area 200 m across, it appears to have been moved from another point and deposited here in a short space of time, probably around 100 BC.

In my opinion the archaeological evidence at Gubbio provides a much more positive picture than that in *Territory, Time and State*, provided that we realise the limitations on our knowledge.\(^\text{164}\) The habitation evidence and pottery dump show that this centre was established at a comparatively early date, in which (judging by the chariot burial) an aristocracy had emerged by the sixth century. The resources of such a class allowed them to purchase expensive prestige goods such as Greek and Etruscan figurative pottery: it is worth pointing out in this context the proximity of the centre to Perugia, lying on the route from there to the Adriatic coast. By the time of the Roman conquest a considerable amount of imported and local pottery was being used (and disposed of), although curiously little of this turned up in the recent survey of the surrounding countryside.\(^\text{165}\) If not the result of the survey's geological problems, we could perhaps envisage a population living only in the (small?) nucleated centre and walking out to their fields each day. That the community had by the mid third century a centralised political organisation is suggested by the emission of coinage (marked with


\(^{162}\) The proportions are probably not representative of all the pottery in circulation: expensive prestige material is much less likely to end up in a dump than everyday pottery.

\(^{163}\) Roncalli, 'Gli Umbri' 402 says that the dump includes numerous seventh century impasto pottery fragments, but this is not confirmed by the much more detailed report in *SE* (1983).

\(^{164}\) *Territory, Time and State* 142; for a different view see Roncalli, 'Gli Umbri' 402. None of the material found is likely to be a representative sample: the cemeteries have not been systematically investigated and the dump is bound to have more common pottery, as noted above. Of course we are not talking about a great city-state on the scale of Perugia, etc.

\(^{165}\) *Territory, Time and State* 144 and fig. 5.10.
the ethnic of the community) and by the bilateral treaty it had with Rome.¹⁶⁶

(xi) Rimini (Ariminum)

Finds associated with the pre-Roman period have been made in the immediate hinterland of the city; the material, dating from the sixth century on, includes small Etruscan bronzes and Attic pottery.¹⁶⁷ Closer to the sea, in the area of the later colony, pre-Roman material has been found beneath houses of the Roman period. Excavations undertaken by the Soprintendenza in 1964-65 in the area of the new covered market (near the Tempio Malatestiano) discovered many fragments of imported pottery, including Attic material from around 400 BC, and Apulian and Campanian pottery from the fourth and early third centuries. The fragments of Apulian and Campanian pottery are especially numerous. These pre-Roman ceramic finds indicate the existence of contacts between the Rimini area and traders from both Attic Greece and Magna Graecia.

(xii) Other sites

Besides these major sites for which there is a considerable level of evidence from the pre-conquest period, there are also a number of other less well attested settlements. From the area of modern Foligno, next to the present day Via Po, a small group of tombs with material from the sixth and fifth centuries, including impasto vases, bronze plate and bronze clothing objects, has been excavated in the early 1980s.¹⁶⁸ Nearby at S. Maria in Campis, where a large Roman cemetery and the remains of the Roman city have been identified, six inhumation tombs in trenches were found, with impasto vases and metal equipment such as iron arms and a bronze fibula similar to the Certosa type. Eleven bronze votive statuettes catalogued in Colonna's *Bronzi votivi* are attributed to Foligno, with at least some coming from a votive deposit in the Cancelli district.¹⁶⁹ Further north along Topino the valley that would later be followed by the Via Flaminia are found various pre-Roman cemeteries around the site of Nocera Umbra, ancient Nuceria.¹⁷⁰ Only the Portone necropolis to the north-west of the city has been

¹⁶⁶ See ch. 3, section 3.
¹⁶⁷ G. Riccioni, 'Antefatti della colonizzazione di Ariminum alla luce delle nuove scoperte', in *La città etrusca e italica preromana* 263-73.
¹⁶⁸ Bonomi Ponzi, 'Dorsale appenninica' 140. These tombs are unpublished.
¹⁶⁹ Colonna, *Bronzi votivi* nos. 163, 182, 264, 269, 277, 324 (all of unspecified exact provenance): 275-6, 308 (from the Cancelli votive deposit).
regularly excavated. Eight inhumation tombs of the late eighth to late seventh century were found here with very basic equipment. From the other cemeteries we have only material from casual finds. These finds consist of personal ornaments, iron arms and impasto, and red figure and black slip pottery datable to between the seventh century and the second century BC. Both these centres show, like the Colfiorito cemetery, strong Etruscan and Picene contacts in the sixth and fifth centuries, with Attic imports peaking in the fifth century BC.\textsuperscript{171}

Several sites on the Adriatic side of the Appennine watershed have evidence for early habitation: traces of huts and pre-conquest habitation layers have been recently excavated on the sites of Forum Sempronii (modern Fossombrone), Montedoro near Sena Gallica, Pesaro and Sarsina.\textsuperscript{172}

(c) Summary

It is worth pointing out that, where excavation has taken place within a centre that has associated Iron Age cemeteries in the vicinity, material has almost always been found to demonstrate the presence of habitation on the site. Generally, however, the structures found have been of a modest and perhaps temporary nature, i.e. huts.\textsuperscript{173} Signs of monumental buildings are much rarer, although the lack of excavation on the still-occupied city sites means that many more are likely to have existed than are currently known.

Secondly, many of the cemeteries near to settlements do seem to continue in use right through to the post-conquest period, and it would be hazardous to link any gaps in the evidence to an abandonment of a site. At Bevagna, for example, although there is only funerary evidence for the occupation of the site in the seventh century, the erection of a temple here in the fourth century surely indicates that the population had continued to live here from the earlier period (and perhaps that it had expanded). Similarly, at Otricoli the mid fifth to mid fourth century fortification dates to a period poorly attested by funerary evidence. Other explanations are possible here, especially in the light of the similar (but much more widespread) disappearance of funerary evidence in Latium. Studies of this material have proposed a change in funerary practice being reflected by

\textsuperscript{171} Bonomi Ponzi, 'Dorsale appenninica' 142.


\textsuperscript{173} Manconi, 'Il territorio di Bevagna' 118 n. 5 records the presence of pre-Roman pottery within stratigraphic layers at Spoleto, Assisi, Spello, Gubbio and Bevagna.
the decline in the cemetery record in the early sixth century BC: there is evidence in the XII Tables that the resources of the aristocracy were increasingly being spent on the public ceremonies associated with funerals rather than on the private accumulation of prestige goods (some of which would be put into the grave); the elite also began to make extravagant dedications at communal sanctuaries.\textsuperscript{174}

Such a development is at least possible in those centres of Umbria where there is only funerary evidence for the earlier rather than later part of the Iron Age (c. 900-300 BC). Furthermore, the distribution of such sites, Ocricum, Interamna, Spoletium and Mevania, is striking in comparison with sites that do have considerable funerary evidence in the fifth and fourth centuries, such as Ameria, Tuder, Vettona, Arna and Gubbio. All the latter border on the territories of Etruscan states (probably demarcated by the Tiber), where there was no diminution in funerary evidence in the fifth and fourth centuries. The archaeological material itself demonstrates that the centres bordering Etruria had strong trade links with their Etruscan counterparts, and also that this link gave them access to prestigious Greek material. Linking the four former sites is more speculative. Although not directly linked to Latium, they are all on or extremely near to the ancient route that was later followed by one branch of the Via Flaminia.\textsuperscript{175} Their archaeological material, however, shows that they were not exactly isolated from Etruria (at least for the periods in which we have evidence), and only Interamna and Ocricum show some signs of Latial influence.\textsuperscript{176} This theory must thus remain unconfirmed at present.

4. SANCTUARIES

(a) Sources

The greatest difficulty faced by those investigating cult sites in this part of central Italy is the lack of documented excavation. Archaeological work in the last 15 years has improved the situation considerably, with the publication of the results of excavations at M. Ansciano, M. Acuto, Grotta Bella, Magione and Ancarano, but at all of these sites the stratigraphy had been damaged by the activity of 'clandestini' (particularly at Ancarano, first excavated in 1873). Most of our information comes from casual finds or from earlier excavations. The latter go back as far as the eighteenth century, and are on the whole poorly documented; the material found was on most occasions dispersed,


\textsuperscript{175} Bonomi Ponzi, 'Dorsale appenninica' 138 for the link of the Flaminia with transhumance.

\textsuperscript{176} Interamna: the forms of funerary material; Ocricum: the architectural terracotta.
going into private collections (some of which subsequently entered museums), and onto the open market.

Most sanctuaries are only identified through the presence of votive material, especially that of bronze figurines. The sanctuaries themselves were usually of dry-stone construction which tends to be weathered to invisibility; dating can normally only be established through the typology of the associated material. Where excavation has taken place, the associated votive material is usually found either scattered across the enclosure or buried in votive deposits. Much other material has been discovered casually on the surface or dug up by agricultural and other work. These finds tend to be small in number: they could indicate the presence of significant amounts of other votive material, or they could be merely isolated pieces. (Individual bronze figurines have been found in graves.) The fortuitous circumstances of most discoveries, combined with the lack of provenance for most of the votive material preserved in museums and collections, must mean that the cult sites of which we know represent only a selection of those that once existed.

Epigraphic evidence is extremely sparse for cult activity in this period. Only a small number of votive objects with Umbrian inscriptions have been found. In the early 1960s three bronze plates were discovered in association with votive material scattered across the sanctuary site at Colfiorito, which recorded dedications to the goddess Cupra. At Monte Santo (Todi) the 'Mars of Todi' had the name of its dedicator inscribed on it in Umbrian; another smaller bronze statuette, also associated with the sanctuary of Monte Santo, has what appears to be another short Umbrian inscription on it. Beside these few examples, the absence of written material within the mass of votive deposits known to us is quite striking. A few other Umbrian inscriptions of the third and second centuries contain what are probably dedications in the context of cults, but whose provenance cannot be firmly linked to sanctuary sites: these include another dedication to Cupra from Fossato di Vico (Ve 233) and a dedication to 'lovia' from near Amelia, speculatively connected to the remains of a temple at S. Maria in Canale near Amelia by Ciotti.

These are, of course, dwarfed by the Iguvine Tables, which provide us with a

---

177 Po 2 (see appendix 2).
178 Mars of Todi: Ve 230 and above section 3 (b) (iv); Colonna, Bronzi votivi n. 188 on the Monte Santo figurine; for both inscriptions see appendix 2.
179 This strongly contrasts with the prominence of written dedications in the shrines at the sources of the Clitumnus recorded by Pliny, Letters 8.8 in the Imperial period.
detailed account of rituals carried out for the state of Iguvium (Gubbio) and in association with the 'Atiedian Brotherhood'. The Tables were probably inscribed between the late third and early first centuries BC, but this is only a terminus ante quem for the rituals they record. Unfortunately it is extremely difficult to relate the rites of the Tables, which probably centre around the sacrifice of animals with numerous supplementary offerings of wine, cakes and other foodstuffs, to the archaeological evidence we have of cult practice in this region.\(^{181}\) In fact I do not think that we should automatically assume that the two sets of rituals are closely connected; we may, for instance, be dealing with a dichotomy similar to that which there seems to be between the 'state' religion known through the Roman literary tradition and the popular deposition of terracotta votives in the Roman countryside.\(^{182}\)

(b) The evidence

Cult sites in Umbria are found in a variety of positions before the Roman conquest. Most are related to features of the landscape. The commonest settings are mountain peaks. These might be the highest points in their vicinity, such as M. Pennino, M. Torre Maggiore, M. Maggiore and M. San Pancrazio.\(^{183}\) Others are on slightly lower peaks, still generally around 1,000 m in height, such as M. Ansciano, M. Ingino, M. Acuto and Colle San Rufino (a spur of M. Subasio).\(^{184}\) Other natural features had cult places associated with them, including the cave at Grotta Bella and the edge of a (now drained) lake at Colfiorito, on a major pass over the Appennines into the Picene region.\(^{185}\) Some sanctuaries were on hills or in less obvious positions in or near to settlement sites (whose occupation can be traced through funerary evidence): this category includes the Rocca at Spoleto, Monte Santo at Todi, Foligno, Amelia, Bettona (where it was near to the cemetery), and possibly Assisi.

---

\(^{181}\) Previous works on these archaic sanctuaries have not mentioned organic material.


\(^{183}\) M. Pennino: Bonomi Ponzi et al., *Il territorio nocerino tra protostoria e altomedioevo* 32; M. Maggiore: L. Bonomi Ponzi et al., *Spoleto. Da villaggio a città* 1; For M. San Pancrazio see below and for M. Torre Maggiore see section 3 (b) (iii) above.

\(^{184}\) M. Ansciano, M. Ingino: Territory, *Time and State* ch. 5; M. Acuto: L. Cenciaioli, 'Il santuario di Monte Acuto di Umbertide', in *Antichità dall'Umbria a New York* 211-26; Colle San Rufino: Monacchi, 'Monte Subasio'.

\(^{185}\) Intriguingly, Livy notes Roman action in 303 BC against a group using a cave in Umbria as a military base (10.1.4-5: *quod nuntiabatur ex spelunca quadam excursiones armatorum in agros fieri*); a function reminiscent of the role of sanctuaries such as Pietrabbondante in the commemoration of military victories (La Regina, 'Aspetti istituzionali' 22; Dench, *Barbarians* 138-40). For the sanctuaries see Monacchi, 'Grotta Bella'; L. Bonomi Ponzi, 'Cultura e società del territorio plestino in età protostorica', in *Antichità dall'Umbria in Vaticano* 54-5 and other works cited in section 3 (a) (i) above.
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As I have noted above, the structures of archaic sanctuaries are only known from a few excavations. All are simple in construction and form, with little architectural elaboration. They range from a basic dry-stone platform at M. Ansciano to (foundations of) small sacella at M. Acuto and at Col di Mori near Gualdo Tadino. The most elaborate is that at Pasticcetto di Magione where the remains of a small structure, probably created to receive the water of a spring, have recently been excavated. The presence of architectural terracottas and tiles suggests that this basin was covered with a small wooden building. Whether all 'sanctuaries' where votive deposits were created had a man-made physical structure is uncertain. Sanctuary structures were found in connection with concentrations of votive material at all the most recent excavations except that of Grotta Bella, where the natural cave setting seems to have rendered this superfluous.

Sanctuaries were often positioned within areas of earlier frequentation: there were traces of (previous?) fortifications at M. Acuto, Col di Mori (Gualdo Tadino), M. Subasio and Ancarano di Norcia and of Bronze Age habitation at the Rocca of Spoleto, M. Ansciano and Grotta Bella. It is tempting here to draw parallels with the re-use of Bronze age sites in Greece during the eighth century BC, where the antiquity of Mycenaean tombs was apparently used to legitimate actions several hundred years later, as well as with the re-use of an archaic tumulus tomb as the 'heroon of Aeneas' at Lavinium in the fourth century BC.

A range of different types of votive were left at these sanctuaries in the archaic period. Small human and animal figurines in bronze, rarely over 30 cm in height and usually under 10 cm, were always by far the largest component of votive material.

The most common representations are of warriors (called the 'Mars in Assault' type by Colonna) and what are conventionally called 'oranti', or worshippers (male and female

---

186 P. Bruschetti, 'Il santuario di Pasticcetto di Magione e i votivi in bronzo', in Antichità dall'Umbria a Budapest e Cracovia 113-23.
187 It is of course much more difficult to recognise cult sites archaeologically as such if they only have a small amount of votive material and no physical structures.
188 The fortifications are themselves undated, but are known to be connected to Bronze Age material at M. Ansciano, and archaic cemeteries at Colfiorito. For Bronze Age frequentation see M. C. de Angelis, D. Manconi, 'I ritrovamenti archeologici sul Colle S. Elia', in La Rocca di Spoleto. Studi per la storia e la rinascita (Spoleto, 1983) 19; Monacchi, 'Grotta Bella', 76; Territory, Time and State (on Gubbio).
189 Territory, Time and State 152.
191 On all the types of these figures see Colonna, Bronzi votivi. He has categorised the votives into groups according to their stylistic affinities, and labelled the groups with one of its constituent's find sites, even if this is not always their likely place of manufacture (e.g. the 'Esquiline' group was probably produced in southern Umbria). The dating of these pieces is discussed in ch. 4 section 6.
figures with outstretched arms).\textsuperscript{192} Other types include figures identified as 'Hercules', walking figures, 'dancers', and 'offerers'; besides these are found representations of parts of the body, usually limbs, and of animals, including pigs, oxen, goats and sheep. The figurines are almost exclusively made from bronze; the few lead figures known from Grotta Bella probably belong to a later phase of Umbrian production for which there is no evidence outside the territory of Amelia. The execution of bronze figurines is always stylized, and seems mostly to derive from earlier Etruscan types.\textsuperscript{193} The representations vary from refined works to pieces of extreme simplicity: the dominance of schematic figurines in votive deposits is characteristic of sites in and bordering on the Umbrian region. These were produced in huge numbers (e.g. the 1600 examples found at M. Acuto) by a process of casting and then filing, and probably originate in workshops throughout Umbria. Anatomic details such as eyes, nipples, hands and so on were depicted by punched circles or incised grooves. Less commonly, schematic figurines are found made from sheets of bronze cut into representative shapes.\textsuperscript{194}

The typology of the votives used may offer some clues as to the nature of the cult. Why were certain forms reproduced by Umbrian workshops and chosen by those using the sanctuary to leave there? Monacchi has suggested that bronzes of animals, found widely in votive deposits of the Appennine areas of central Italy, are substitutes for sacrificial animals, as well as being thank-offerings for the protection of the donor's herd.\textsuperscript{195} They are also a clear manifestation of the interest of this society in stock-raising. Importance is often attached to representations of warriors in an attacking pose, usually interpreted as representing Mars, a god who (as is well known) has strong agricultural and pastoral, as well as martial, associations. It is possible that these warrior types were chosen by visitors to the sanctuaries as representing themselves, in the same way that the worshipper types (typified by the 'Esquiline' group) seem to do. Votives of anatomic parts could have health-giving connotations, as is thought to be the case with anatomical terracottas, but this might not have any implications for the nature of the sanctuary in which they are found; they usually make up only a small proportion of the votive material.

It is difficult to be precise about the exact proportions of the schematic to the

\textsuperscript{192} The presumed male figures generally have projections representing their sexual organs, the presumed female figures wear long clothing of some sort.
\textsuperscript{193} Colonna, \textit{Bronzi votivi} 23-4.
\textsuperscript{194} Colonna, \textit{Bronzi votivi} 105: this technique was used in Latium and the figures turn up in Umbria; cast bronze figurines of the Esquiline group probably passed in the other direction, from Latium to Umbria.
\textsuperscript{195} 'Grotta Bella' 80-81.
more refined figurines deposited, because all the sites were plundered before being fully excavated, and the pieces of higher artistic quality will have been much more attractive and obvious (given that they were generally larger) to 'clandestini'. Nevertheless, from the limited data available it is clear that the more sophisticated figurines usually made up an extremely small percentage of the total numbers discovered. At Grotta Bella, for instance, there was one slightly more elaborate Mars figure of Colonna's 'Nocera Umbra' group with 280 extremely simple figurines of the 'Esquiline' group, and fifteen small animal bronzes of similar workmanship. The 65 figurines found in a scatter across the stone platform of M. Ansciano were all of types classified as schematic by Colonna, made up almost totally of the basic 'Esquiline' group, with only three more sophisticated 'Mars' figurines of the 'Foligno' and 'Nocera Umbra' groups. The huge numbers of schematic figures and the scarcity of the more refined bronzes is widely assumed to be a sign of mass participation in the cult. The schematic works were on this interpretation left by those of limited economic means, whereas the higher quality figures were designed for a small elite, with much greater disposable wealth. It is also possible, however, that all the votives were made for aristocratic use, with individuals leaving many votives each.

Besides the ubiquitous bronze figurines some other types of material occur in the votive deposits of this region during the period before the Roman conquest. Large amounts of unworked bronze have been found at some sanctuaries, most notably the 40 kilograms from Ancarano di Norcia. That excavated at Grotta Bella included two pieces marked with a lunar crescent and a star, which must represent an early attempt to create a standardised sign of value, although who was responsible, whether a private individual or a representative of the state remains uncertain. Archaic fictile material was also found at some cult sites, although it is less common than might be expected. This could be because its presence has gone unremarked at many sites. References from old excavations, such as Helbig's description of the ceramic finds at M. Subasio, are often difficult to precisely identify.

At M. Ansciano, a few pieces of decorated terracotta, including one representing a head, were found along with bronze votives, and

---

196 Territory, Time and State 145-52.
197 E.g. P. Bruschetti in Antichità dall’Umbria a Budapest 114.
198 An elite is visible in Umbria from the seventh century BC, as we have seen.
199 Monacchi, 'Grotta Bella', 96, noting the intrinsic value of the metal used for the votive figurines, as well as the unworked bronze.
201 Bull. Inst. (1880) 249-50: 'frammenti di vasi lavorati senza tornio in argilla brunasta'.
may have served the same purpose, according to the excavators. Nevertheless, even bearing in mind possible biases in our information, the preference of the users of Umbrian sanctuaries for locally produced bronze figures (surely designed for this purpose) over goods made from other materials and/or imports, is striking.

It is difficult to reconstruct how this votive material was used at these cult sites without a good idea of what form the structures created there took. The votives themselves seem often to have been designed for fixing onto a surface for display. Higher quality figurines have downward pointing spurs from their feet (or the lower surface of anatomic pieces without feet); in simpler examples the legs end in spikes with no attempt to represent feet. Some votives consist merely of heads with spikes projecting below. Stoddart and Whitley have suggested that the 169 nails found in a 'broadly similar' distribution to the bronze and terracotta votives across the stone platform at M. Ansciano were used to attach the figurines and fictile pieces to a wooden screen or the trees of a natural grove. This seems unlikely for all the votive figurines, given the complete absence of possible nail holes in some of them. Direct fixing of the votives into the wood must be more probable; the nails could have instead been used for creating some sort of frame into which the votives could be stuck.

The excavators of M. Ansciano have also attempted to estimate the level of activity at this site by placing the number of votives (65) against the minimum 200 year usage of the sanctuary in the archaic period, surmising that if the number of figurines excavated was 'approximately representative', the rate of activity was 'very low'. The votives were found, however, scattered across the stone platform, which implies they were those which had fallen off the screen at some point and failed to be recovered during the subsequent use of the site. The number of votives would not in this scenario be representative of the overall frequention of the site. Sites where material is found buried in votive deposits may give a better impression: these regularly contain hundreds of figurines (1600 were found at M. Acuto, in spite of earlier illegal excavations). Nevertheless, we still do not know what these accumulations really represent, whether they were portions of the votive material once present, or all of it;

---

202 Stoddart, Whitley, Territory, Time and State 145.
203 That imports, e.g. Greek and Etruscan pottery and bronzes, were available is clear from funerary evidence; see Bonomi Ponzi in Antichità dall’Umbria a Budapest 40.
204 For a definition of why this should be regarded as 'ritual' behaviour, see Stoddart, Whitley, Territory, Time and State, 142-3; they emphasise the repetitive nature of votive deposition, the use of distinctive bronze figurines and the demarcation of the cult area. We can also note the association of figurines with the inscribed dedication to the deity Cupra at Colfiorito.
205 Stoddart, Whitley, Territory, Time and State, 145. How any screen or grove related to the stone platform is unclear; no dateable post holes were found.
206 This continued sporadically until the Late Imperial period.
material collected over a short space of time or a long period of years; and so on. In
fact, any sort of conclusion based on absolute numbers of votives appears fragile, given
the circumstances of their recovery.

(c) Sanctuaries and settlement
In working out the possible role of sanctuaries within this society, we can draw on the
typology of the votives and on the topographical position of the sanctuaries, but should
also consider the settlement pattern within the region. Several different interpretations
have been put forward. Bonomi Ponzi suggests that the forms of the votives and
position of the sanctuaries are strongly linked to aristocratic ideology and self-
justification. In working out the possible role of sanctuaries within this society, we can draw on the
typology of the votives and on the topographical position of the sanctuaries, but should
also consider the settlement pattern within the region. Several different interpretations
have been put forward. Bonomi Ponzi suggests that the forms of the votives and
position of the sanctuaries are strongly linked to aristocratic ideology and self-
justification. 207 The sanctuaries provided political and economic centres in the absence
of urban agglomerations. For Monacchi, M. Subasio is typical of the sanctuaries of the
Umbrian Appennines in providing a meeting point between the stable population in the
area and transhumant groups, within a society that is 'based prevalently on a pastoral
economy. 208 Two wider assumptions are common to most approaches to these
sanctuaries: firstly, that their position is conditioned by communications routes, which
supposedly run close to all cult sites; secondly, that the votive typology, simple structures
and rural positions of these sanctuaries is indicative of a 'pagano-vicano' type of
settlement. 209

In my opinion, however, this picture of Umbrian society and the sanctuaries it
produced tends to be an oversimplification of a more complex situation. As we have
seen, Umbria itself is a varied region in geographical terms, including both high mountain
areas analogous to other stretches of the Appennines to the north and south, as well as
the less elevated hills, valleys and plains of the pre-Appennines. In the full Appennine
zone, the well investigated settlement system based around the upland basin at Colfiorito
does indeed show clear parallels with the situation elsewhere in the Appennines. The
sanctuary here, in which a dedication to Cupra was found (Po 2), was situated on the
shores of a lake (now drained) and was on a major route from Umbria to Picenum 210

Other sanctuaries were clearly sited according to different priorities. The clearest
contrast is offered by the presence of cult sites in or next to settlement centres at Todi,
Spoleto, Amelia, Foligno and possibly Assisi. 211 The presence of early votive deposits

207 Antichità dall’Umbria a Budapest 42-3. She sees the warrior figurines as symbolic of an
aristocratic military ethos, and animals as symbolic of the ultimate basis of elite wealth.
208 Monacchi, 'I resti della stipe votiva del Monte Subasio di Assisi (Colle S. Rufino)' 81.
209 For the meaning of this term, see section 3 (a) above.
210 Bonomi Ponzi, 'Topographic survey' 201-38.
211 For references see section 3 (b) above.
implies that these sites already had a religious function in the archaic period. At Gubbio use of the sanctuary on M. Ansciano by the community centred on the later Roman city site has been documented above, and post-dates the use of hillforts by at least 300 years. The close proximity of a mountain sanctuary to an early lowland settlement is also apparent at Assisi, where the cult site of M. Subasio is on the nearest peak of the massif to the settlement. Other possible pairings could include M. San Pancrazio and Otricoli, and M. Torre Maggiore and Terni.212 The centrality of the ocar/ukar (Latin arx) within the rituals of the Iguvine Tables could be speculatively invoked here, although it remains uncertain whether this refers to a mountain or simply a high point within the settlement.213 In the tables the ocar fisio is continually paired with the Iguvine tota, usually in the formula ocriper fisio totaper iouina, roughly translatable as 'for the Fisian Mount, for the Iguvine community'. I would not want to claim that this pairing was the fundamental pattern of settlement and sanctuary, but would simply stress that there were a variety of possibilities in this region, due to the variety of settlement organisations.

(d) Sanctuaries and the 'state'

Studies of the development of social complexity in areas of the eastern Mediterranean have highlighted the importance of the beginning of ritual activity in sanctuaries.214 The appearance of sanctuaries implies the designation of spaces for ritual activity. Involvement in rituals helps to form and bind, as well as define, groups. Thus sanctuaries can be a clear sign of increasing communal organisation. They may also express the ideology of the ruling class. Such ideologies may be needed to justify elite control over the rest of society, a control they gained from the growing power of new state institutions.215 The power of the ruler(s) could be legitimated by their prominent part in, and perhaps control over, religious rites.

The question I want to pose here is: what implications does the creation of sanctuaries have for Umbrian society? There are at least three ancient societies where state formation has been identified as the impetus for the creation of sanctuaries: Crete

---

212 For M. San Pancrazio sites see R. Paribeni, in Scritti in onore di B. Nogara (1937) 359-63; Ciotti, 'Nuove conoscenze' 110-11; for M. Torre Maggiore see section 3 (b) (iii) above.


215 The degree to which the elite enjoyed a redistributive role varied in the ancient world. It was much commoner in the Near East, on whose societies many sanctuary-ideology models are based: see for instance, L. Mumford, The City in History (London, 1961) 40-51.
in the early second millennium BC, eighth and seventh century Greece, and Latium in the seventh and sixth centuries BC. The suggestive parallel between the peak sanctuaries of Crete and Umbria has already been discussed by Stoddart and Whitley in a study of Gubbio.\footnote{S. Stoddart, J. Whitley, *Territory, Time and State* 142-152.} In Crete rural sanctuaries of the Middle Minoan period were generally situated on the summits of mountains, were of a simple structure, and contained deposits of clay votive figurines representing people, animals and human limbs. The creation of these sanctuary spaces coincides with the decline in the use of large tholos tombs as sites for rituals (probably based around clan organisation), and with the growth of larger palatial and urban settlement centres. The social implications of this change are fairly obvious: peak sanctuaries are here connected with the development of regional groupings, with a communal identity beyond that provided by clan or family relations.\footnote{A. Peatfield, 'Minoan peak sanctuaries: history and society', *Opuscula Atheniensia* 17 (1990) 117-31.}

But can we use these ideas when we turn to examine the rural sanctuaries of fifth century BC Umbria? In particular, should the widespread creation of cult sites be taken as evidence of the beginnings of state formation? Stoddart and Whitley have rejected any such connection, drawing attention to the work of Peatfield on the sanctuaries' chronology. For Peatfield, the appearance of the peak sanctuaries as a group probably predates the building of palaces on Crete by several generations.\footnote{A. Peatfield, 'After the 'Big Bang' - what? or Minoan symbols and shrines beyond the palatial collapse' in *Placing the Gods* 23. This is strongly disputed by Cherry who states that 'attempts to push back the history of peak sanctuaries into the pre-palatial period ... involve stretching the defining criteria to an unacceptable degree' ('Polities and palaces', in *Peer Polity Interaction* 19-45).} In consequence he does not accept Cherry's view of the peak sanctuaries as the creation of the elites who built the palaces. By contrast, Peatfield identifies two phases in the development of the peak sanctuaries. The first was characterised by the creation of at least 25 sites in the Early Minoan period; in the second phase all but eight fell into disuse. Peatfield has argued that this is the point at which the sanctuaries came directly under the control of the elite of the palatial centres, and were used by the palatial elite as part of a new centralised religious system. Stoddart and Whitley conclude from this that the kind of society that produces peak sanctuaries, such as those that appear around Gubbio in the sixth century BC, must have an organisation that transcends kinship but 'lack[s] any centre of state power'.\footnote{Stoddart, Whitley, *Territory, Time and State* 144.}

Unfortunately the archaeological evidence for Umbrian sanctuaries is simply too
poor to enable us to distinguish separate phases of usage before the Roman conquest. The next verifiable development in the topography of Umbrian religious practice is the erection of sacred buildings in settlement sites (positioned on valley bottoms and smaller hills) from the fourth century BC onwards. Nevertheless I would argue that the actual creation of archaic rural sanctuaries in Umbria is given substantial importance by the Minoan evidence, even if we cannot link it explicitly to centralised states. Instead, their appearance is a first symptom of the process that will lead to such states on Crete. For Peatfield they represent the ‘religious dimension to this growth of a larger community identity’, as

small independent settlements of the Prepalatial period gave way, in the Palatial period, to larger regions of economically and politically interactive settlements focused on the palatial and urban centres.\(^{220}\)

The beginning of the movement towards more complex societies, which we know from hindsight must have occurred in Umbria as well as in Crete, is significant: the development of the state in the classical world was a long, gradual process. Stoddart and Whitley’s minimising of this evidence depends on a very narrow definition of state formation, on which they do not elaborate. In fact, we might suspect that there is a hidden agenda here. Their work is a part of a project that has centred around survey archaeology conducted in the valley below Gubbio; this turned up little material from the Archaic period or the third and second centuries BC. From these results Stoddart surmises that Gubbio was a ‘modest population centre ... that cannot be called a state’.\(^{221}\) Anything that conflicts with this image causes obvious difficulties.\(^{222}\)

5. CONCLUSION

Two distinctive features of Umbria in the period from c. 1,000 to 300 BC stand out in comparison with others areas of Italy at this time. Firstly, there is an extraordinarily dense network of cult sites scattered across the landscape, many of them with very large numbers of votives - overwhelmingly the small bronze figurines made in this region. If Colonna’s dating of these figurines is correct, then it would appear that there was a veritable explosion of this type of activity in the fifth century BC. Although ritual behaviour in the preceding period is very obscure, the new evidence strongly suggests

\(^{220}\) Peatfield, ‘Minoan peak sanctuaries’ 125.
\(^{221}\) Stoddart, Territory, Time and State 177.
\(^{222}\) The significance of the Iguvine Tables and the locally produced coinage of the third century BC are similarly down-played.
that important changes were occurring at this time. Unfortunately, it is extremely difficult to draw conclusions about the users of these sanctuaries or the cult activity that took place there: a few directions have been explored above.

The second distinctive feature of this era to which I would like to draw attention is the density of individual settlements in this region. It is clear that at least some of them are occupied from the Final Bronze Age. At least one of these, Iguvium, this corresponded to the abandonment of the nearest hillforts. In other more mountainous areas, such as those around modern Colfiorito and Monteleone di Spoleto, settlement systems incorporating hillforts seem just to be developing. By the definition proposed in the first chapter, urbanisation can only be said to be beginning when the settlement centres take on new functions, for example as a fortified point (Otricoli, Bettona, Amelia and possibly Spoleto) or as a cult place (Otricoli, Todi, Spoleto, Foligno, Bevagna, Arna and perhaps Gubbio). All of these centres are in the lowland areas of the sub-Appennine zone. This evidence first appears in the fifth century; in the fourth century several monumental buildings, probably temples, are erected at Todi, Arna and Bevagna. The limited excavation of these centres and their cemeteries makes it difficult even to estimate their size: the Accaierie cemetery at Terni is probably the largest of those known, with several thousand tombs, but this may not actually relate to the settlement on the site of Roman Interamna. The areas enclosed by the fortifications at Otricoli, Bettona and probably Amelia are equivalent only to the smallest centres in Faliscan and Etruscan areas.\textsuperscript{223}

Even the stabilising of populations on a particular site from an early date is of some importance. It would allow the opportunity for institutions, a central authority and group definition to develop - these are only verifiable from the time of the conquest, with the greater detail of written sources, both literary or epigraphic, but surely begin to appear before. One aspect of the changes to a community that can be documented with archaeological evidence is the rise of an aristocracy.\textsuperscript{224} Burials full of prestige items reach a peak in the sixth and fifth centuries BC. The most elaborate contain valuable imported goods such as Greek figurative pottery and Etruscan bronzes, and objects expressing aristocratic status and power, such as chariots and weaponry. The main areas affected by these developments seem to be those within easy reach of Etruria, such as Todi and Amelia, or the centres in the Appennine areas, such as Colfiorito and Monteleone. The aristocrats of the latter were probably able to monitor and control

\textsuperscript{223} Fontaine, \textit{Cités} 65 (Otricoli's encloses 3 ha).
\textsuperscript{224} Territory, \textit{Time and State} 175.
movement through their areas using complex networks of hillforts, whose creation they presumably initiated. The wealth they could accrue through their organisation of these societies is visible in the cemetery at Colfiorito; some also ended up in the sanctuary at the centre of the territory here. The system was probably no less complex or wealthy than that of the lowlands - it represents instead a chronologically parallel adaptation to a different environment. It perhaps declined from the fourth century as the long distance trade routes on which it depended, such as that from Volsinii to Picenum through Colfiorito, were interrupted.

By the time of the Roman conquest, many of the lowland centres and the territorial upland communities had become politically organised into states. The new imposition of Roman control must have prevented the stronger states from (further) agglomerating their territory at the expense of the weaker. The result was the dense pattern of very small municipia known from the period after the Social War.
THE ROMAN CONQUEST AND COLONISATION OF UMBRIA

1. SOURCES

This chapter deals with the Roman conquest and organisation of Umbria in the late fourth and third centuries BC and the involvement of Umbria in the Hannibalic War. Much still remains opaque about the development - in fields such as urbanism and social organisation - of the region conquered by Rome. It is clear, however, that settlement had begun on many of the later city sites by the time of the conquest, and in most cases went back for several centuries. Some conclusions about the social structure of the groups that lived there have been put drawn from the evidence of archaeology. With the conquest we get our first detailed literary picture of Umbria, and in the next two centuries substantial epigraphic documents. These allow us to more fully document the political dimension to these changes. In fact some important implications can be drawn about the pre-Roman organisation of Umbria from the Livian account of the Roman conquest of the region. This chapter aims to examine how the conquest of Umbria proceeded, how the Romans made the control won by military victory into a hard and lasting institutional framework, and what criteria governed the different ways in which various areas were treated.

Several types of ancient source material are available to us, including literary sources, archaeology, epigraphy and numismatics. The literary sources for the Roman conquest and colonisation of Umbria are dominated by the histories of Livy and Polybius, with some supplementary information given by Diodorus, Appian and Cassius Dio. All are of course heavily Romano-centric, only touching on Umbria when there is Roman involvement or interest in this region. The interests of ancient historians such as Livy and Polybius mean that their accounts are detailed on the build up to, and course of, hostilities, but largely neglectful of the organisational and institutional consequences after the Romans had won the battles, such as treaties or virtane settlement. Although Livy and in particular Polybius provide useful snippets of information on the Roman organisation of Umbria, no weight at all should be placed on their silences on such matters.
Livy provides the dominant narrative down to 293 BC, but we can correct some of his details from the information (but not the silences) in Polybius and Diodorus. For the period after 293, however, when we only have brief and unreliable epitomes of Livy, the quantity of our information is hugely decreased. Polybius covers part of this period in a useful account of Roman hostilities against the Gauls (2.14-35), but ignores anything that was not connected with Gallic invasions. Moreover, this digression is not part of his main narrative and is in consequence cursory by comparison. Diodorus and Cassius Dio are both fragmentary for the early third century, leaving us with extremely poor coverage of what was probably the crucial period in the Roman organisation of conquered Umbria. Nevertheless we are able to establish the main outlines of this process by supplementing the literary evidence with other sources of information. In particular epigraphy provides important information on the institutional organisation of Roman Umbria. Umbrian and Latin inscriptions are useful in this context: both provide contemporary evidence for Roman arrangements in the third and second centuries. In addition much can be deduced from the aspects of the region’s organisation that survive in the period after the Social War, from when the bulk of Latin epigraphy dates.

Archaeology gives us some help with mapping the physical aspects of the Roman intervention in Umbria in the third century, and this provides some useful new perspectives in a field which has hitherto been heavily reliant on the institutional evidence in literary and epigraphic sources. The archaeological coverage of this region by survey, something which we could expect to be extremely useful in mapping the effects of colonisation, is fragmentary: two investigations have been conducted in Umbria to date, in the areas around Iguvium and Colfiorito. The only centuriation found within Umbria, to my knowledge, is that around Spello, where a veteran colony was founded in the triumviral period.

2. THE ROMAN CONQUEST

The assertion of Roman control in Umbria occurred in the late fourth and early third centuries BC and was achieved by a combination of war and diplomacy. The Romans seem only to have fought a couple of substantial battles against the Umbrians. Only one

1 See the discussions of Interamna Nahars and Plesia in sections 4 and 5(b) (below).
2 The 'provisional results' of the Gubbio survey have been published in Territory, Time and State. For a discussion of this work see ch. 5. The important survey work around Colfiorito conducted by the Umbrian soprintendenza has not been as systematic as the above, and has only been published in a summarised form: see Bonomi Ponzi, 'Topographic survey' 201-38. The latter alone has provided a perspective on the subject of this chapter.
suo siege is recorded as having taken place, that of Nequinum. As a part of this process quite a large part of Umbria was annexed and then made subject to Roman or Latin settlement. The Umbrian communities that did not suffer this fate were controlled until the Social War by treaties, which will be examined separately in the section that follows.

The first Roman contact with an Umbrian community of which we have any record is the expedition through the Ciminian forest to Camerinum on the Adriatic side of the Appennines in 310 BC (Livy 9.36.1-8). In 311 BC an Etruscan force besieged the Latin colony of Sutrium, the first move mentioned by Livy in the war between Rome and the Etruscans and the Umbrians from 311 to 308 BC. The consul of 310 BC, Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus, defeated this force, the survivors of which withdrew into the Ciminian forest. A brother of the consul went through the forest on a reconnaissance expedition, reaching the Umbrian Camertes, with whose 'senate' he formed an agreement of friendship and alliance (de societate amicitiaque) in the name of the consul. This agreement appears to be the famous equal treaty attested by several sources later in antiquity.

The veracity of this passage has been questioned. Camerinum, on the other side of the Appennines, is a surprisingly remote destination for a spying mission through the Ciminian forest. The special nature of the treaty and the fact that there was a Roman defeat here in 295 BC has been used to suggest that the 310 episode, with its problems, was an invention and that the real date of the treaty was 295. Some critics have also explained this passage as originating in a reference to Clusium, a city much nearer to the Ciminian forest, which was once called Camars according to Livy (10.25.11). These objections to the Livian account are not decisive, though. Documents such as treaties are likely to have been preserved at Rome in some way.

---

3 In the context of an earlier digression on whether Alexander the Great could have defeated Rome, Livy talks of Roman armies fighting the Gauls in Umbria 'when all the Latin allies were in revolt' (9.19.2-3) and says that Alexander would have found that 'part of Umbria ... [consisted of] either powerful friends of the Romans or their defeated enemies'. This passage also includes, however, the Picentes and the western coast of Magna Graecia as allies or defeated enemies of Rome and so does not seem accurately to reflect the extent of Roman control in Italy at a specific time. It cannot therefore be used as evidence.

4 The text concerning the identification of the consul's brother is corrupt according to R. M. Ogilvie, 'Notes on Livy IX', Yale Classical Studies 23 (1973) 166 and should be emended to consulis frater - (?eum) Fabium Caesonem alii, C. Claudium quidam, matre eadem qua consulem genitum, tradunt, i.e. not mentioning M. Fabius. Ogilvie's reasons - there are no parallels for Livy writing A, B alii, C quidam - do not seem uncontestable, and he does have an axe to grind.

5 See the section on treaties, below.

6 Discussed by Harris, Etruria and Umbria 55-6 and 99.

7 K. J. Beloch, Römischen Geschichte bis zum Beginn der punischen Kriege (Berlin-Leipzig, 1926) 443.

8 M. Sordi, Roma e i sanniti nel IV secolo (Bologna, 1969) 96-7; G. De Sanctis, Storia di Romani 2 (Turin, 1907; second ed., Florence, 1980) 331 n. 103 rejects this idea.
and these documents may have been available to historians, as seems evident from Polybius' record of the Carthage treaties, engraved on bronze tablets in the treasury of the aediles (3.26.1). The date of the formation of treaties was important and was probably entered into the regular yearly records, perhaps the Annales Maximi, that lay behind the annalistic tradition. The fact that the Camerinum treaty was famously favourable to the Umbrian community fits with the uniqueness of the situation recorded by Livy: it was formed at a time when the Camertes and the Romans first came into contact, not after a military defeat (which seems to have been the usual situation). In addition the treaty could have been the result of mutual concern on the part of both parties about the threat posed by the Gauls. The Roman spies, by reaching Camerinum, must have traversed much of Umbria. Their reconnaissance was followed in the next two years by a phase of heavy Roman involvement in the area.

The first phase of Roman activity here may have led to a defeat of the Umbrians later in this year referred to by Livy (9.39.4). There are problems with this reference; for instance, it seems to be contradicted by the description of the Umbrians in 9.41.8 as 'a people untouched by the disasters of war, except when their land had suffered the passage of an army through it'. Some editions of Livy's text leave it out altogether. It comes just before an Etruscan defeat at Lake Vadimon, widely taken to be a fabricated duplication of a victory over the Etruscans at the same site in 283 BC reported by Polybius in 2.20.2-3. Despite the doubts the text should not be emended. The Umbrian defeat is separate from the dubious Vadimon victory. According to Ogilvie a typically elaborated non-engagement, it may not have been any sort of 'disaster of war' for the Umbrians, hence the 9.41.8 notice. This episode may indeed be what Diodorus is referring to in 20.44.9, when the Roman consuls are said to have crossed Umbria into Etruria.

In the next year, 308 BC, there was the most substantial Roman intervention yet in the area (Livy 9.41.8-20). Livy says that the Umbrians raised an army, induced many Etruscans to rebel and threatened to attack Rome. The consul then operating in Etruria, P. Decius Mus, retreated to defend the city and his colleague, Q. Fabius Maximus,

---

9 See for example Cic., Pro Balbo 46.
10 De Sanctis, Storia dei romani 2 334, followed by Harris, Etruria and Umbria 56, 59.
11 310 and 308 BC, 309 BC being a 'dictator year'.
12 Ogilvie, 'Notes on Livy' 159-168.
14 De Sanctis, Storia dei Romani 2 331; Harris, Etruria and Umbria 56, because the site is the same, although this does not seem conclusive to me.
15 See Ogilvie, 'Notes on Livy' 167.
marched from Samnium and engaged the Umbrian forces near Mevania. On the arrival of the Roman army at Mevania most of the Umbrians wanted to withdraw into their fortified cities (urbes munitas) or surrender, but they were carried into battle by the district (plaga) of Materina. The Romans of course win the battle, beating the Umbrians with their bare hands in a typical piece of rhetorical elaboration. The advocates of war (presumably Materina) were the first to surrender, followed by the rest of the Umbrian peoples over the next few days; the Oriculani 'were received into friendship with a promise' (sponsione in amicitiam).

Despite the preposterous details of the battle there are no substantial grounds for rejecting the historicity of the campaign itself. The archaeological record, and the comparatively small numbers of the Umbrian contingent raised for the Gallic War of 225 BC (Polybius 2.24), would suggest that Roman fears of an invasion were rather groundless. This could, however, be a authentic reflection of the sort of paranoia that makes 'defensively' inclined imperial powers so aggressive. The strategic incentive for Roman action in the area of Mevania is clear: the Valle Umbra was an important route to Perugia and the rest of the north-eastern Etruscan states, the major opponents of Rome in the 311-308 BC war. This was the central hub of Umbria, and seems to have had the highest concentration of settlement sites. All these settlements are likely to have been involved in a military engagement with the Romans here. The district of Materina is not known from any other source, and its obscurity is further evidence against the invention of the passage.

The agreement of friendship with a promise (sponsio) secured with the Oriculani, whose settlement on the site of modern Otricoli dominates a stretch of the Tiber valley, also suggests that the Romans were interested in securing this route to the north. It should be noted that Livy is using the term sponsio in a loose rather than a technical sense, as such an agreement was only binding in Roman law if contracted between Roman citizens, a status which the Oriculani had almost certainly not obtained. It seems likely, if not proven, that this agreement was formalised later as a treaty. A treaty

---

16 'The consul's arrival ita exterruit Umbros ut alii recedendum ad urbes munitas, quidam omittendum bellum censerent: this passage could be taken to mean that some of the Umbrians had urbes munitae and wanted to withdraw into them, others lacking such protection wanted to surrender. Nevertheless the mention of urbes munitae cannot be taken literally as evidence of urbanisation, particularly as Livy also uses the term when talking about the largely un-urbanised Marsi (10.3.5).

17 See Harris, Etruria and Umbria 56-7; more generally Cornell in CAH 7.2 374.

18 De Sanctis, Storia dei romani 2 348 n. 10 suggests an identification with Matelica. The annalistic tradition thus preserved information that was probably meaningless in a late Republican context.

that controlled the hostile military potential posed by their fortified centre must have existed before the siege and colonisation of Nequinum in 300-299 BC, which was further up the Nera valley. Furthermore we have seen that Livy used the phrase ‘friendship and alliance’ to describe the treaty formed between Rome and Camerinum (9.36.7), and the reception of the Ocriculani into Roman ‘friendship’ (9.41.20) may have led to the same result. It is widely assumed that this would have been an ‘equal treaty’ (foedus aequum) because the Ocriculani had not taken part in any fighting, as they would otherwise not have been received into Roman friendship. This seems reasonable, despite the Livian notice that the agreement was formed after a defeat of the ‘other peoples of the Umbri [besides Materina]’ (ceteri Umbrorum populi).

None of the other Umbrian peoples are said to have entered agreements with Rome, and the Roman sources do not claim that they were breaking any treaties when they fought Rome as a collective force in the Sentinum campaign (295 BC). The formation of treaties with the majority of Umbrian states thus may not have occurred until after Sentinum.

After this important episode, no further contact between the Romans and Umbrians is mentioned until 303 BC, when the Roman consuls conducted a minor expedition into Umbria to destroy a raiding party operating from a cave (Livy 10.1.4). Livy states that the expedition was mounted ‘so that the year should not pass without any warlike activity’ and this has tentatively been suggested to reflect contemporary Roman expectations of yearly warfare. The area itself remains unidentified and the strangeness of the report makes it unlikely that it was a later invention, supporting the authenticity of the annalistic record.

In 300 BC Roman forces led by the consul Q. Apuleius Pansa began the siege of Nequinum (Narni) (Livy 10.9.8-9). This was a site of vital strategic significance, dominating the most important route into central Umbria via the gorge of the Nera river.

---

20 Cf. G. Vitucci, ‘A proposito dei primi contatti fra Umbri e Romani’ in I problemi di storia e archeologia dell’Umbria 300; Harris, Etruria and Umbria 57. The city walls, still partially extant today, probably date from the fifth or fourth century BC: see Fontaine, Cité s 65, discussed in ch. 2.
22 Note, however, that various Etruscan peoples sought Roman friendship after being defeated in 308 BC (Livy 9.40.20).
23 Tamen ne prorsus imbeliem agerent annum, parva expeditio in Umbriam facta est, quod nuntiabatur ex spelunca quadem excursiones armatorum in agros fieri. The idea that this could conceivably be linked with the sanctuary in a cave at Grotta Bella between Ameria and Tuder is floated in ch. 2.
The two branches of the Via Flaminia running northwards from Rome joined here in later times. Nequinum fell to the Romans in 299 BC when, according to Livy (10.10.1-5), two of the townsmen let a small Roman force into the city by treachery. Such an apparently catastrophic action can be explained in the light of the help sometimes given to the Romans by the local aristocrats of other Italian towns, for example at Naples in 326 BC (Livy 8.25-27). These towns were frequently divided on class lines, and as the Romans usually entrusted the management of conquered towns to their local elites, submitting to Roman hegemony might have been an attractive prospect. It seems at least possible that such people may have been enrolled in the Latin colony that was sent here, named Narnia after the river Nar (Nera). Livy describes it as being created 'against the Umbrians' (contra Umbros), which may indicate that its purpose was as much to guard against a repeat of the threatened Umbrian invasion of 308 BC as it was to secure the route to the north.

The development of the Umbrian community that preceded the colony is uncertain. Its siege was clearly a difficult operation for the Romans, taking more than one campaign season and resulting in a triumph for the victorious Roman commander, even though the centre was eventually betrayed by deserters. Furthermore the army is said to have returned to Rome enriched with spoil, implying that the Nequinates had collected considerable resources here. This supports the impression gained of an occupied settlement (Livy mentions houses built up against town walls) rather than a purely defensive hillfort.

The battle of Sentinum in 295 BC probably marks the swan-song of united Umbrian resistance. An alliance between the Samnites, Etruscans, Gauls and Umbrians was formed in 296 BC, according to Livy, under the moving spirit of the Samnite general Gellius Egnatius (10.18.2). In the following year there seems to have been considerable military activity in Umbria. At the start of 295 BC the camp of the praetor Appius

25 See Cornell in CAH 7.2^ 387.
26 This is further examined in section 4 below.
28 Fontaine, Cités 425 thinks that it could just as likely be 'la place fortifiée d'un état territorial (pagus) as an urbs in the strictest sense of the term (defined 422), but neither extreme seems accurate to me. He dates the few vestiges of polygonal walling to the start of the colonial period on the basis of the high quality workmanship (101), but the remains are so exiguous that this seems pretty arbitrary. Tombs without grave goods found near the duomo in 1936 which had been considered eighth century BC (P. Dorelo, 'Una necropoli umbra entro la città di Narni') have recently been re-dated to the late Roman period by L. Pani Ermini, 'Note sulla città di Narni nell'altomedioevo'. The building of houses so that their outer walls formed a protective circuit for the community is recorded by Aristotle, Politics 1330-1 and Plato, Laws 6.778-80 as a traditional technique of fortification.
Claudius Caecus was placed near the town of Ahama (Livy 10.25.4), probably Arna (modern Civitella d'Arno) just across the Tiber from Perugia into Umbria. After his army was taken over by the consul Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus at the start of the military season, it was defeated near Camerinum (Polybius 2.19.5). The enemy is variously reported as the Samnites and Gauls (Polybius), the Senonian Gauls or the Umbrians (Livy 10.26.12, who gives alternative versions). Livy claims this battle was fought in Etruria at Clusium (10.25.11), 'which used to be called Camars', but he is clearly mistaking the correct location, reported by Polybius, which is also much more topographically likely in the context of the campaign as a whole. The subsequent references to Clusium in the campaign should probably not be emended to Camerinum, however: the Clusine deserters (Livy 10.27.4) at Sentinum are perfectly plausible; Clusium was a better target for the diversionary Roman attack than Camerinum (Livy 10.27.5), being twice the distance away on the other side of the Appennines. It therefore appears likely that the part later played by Clusium in the campaign inspired Livy (or one of the earlier annalists) to change the site of the Roman defeat to Clusium, knowing that its earlier name was close to that of Camerinum.

The Roman strategy of diverting the Umbrians and Etruscans to the defence of Clusium seems to have worked. They had joined forces with each other before the battle (Livy 10.27.3), and neither Polybius nor Livy mentions them in their accounts of the battle. In fact Livy implies in 10.27.11 that neither the Umbrians nor the Etruscans were present. Whether or not they were defeated with the Perusini and Clusini in Etruria by the Roman diversionary force (Livy 10.30.1-2), this seems to have been the final blow to Umbrian independence. It was probably now that they were bound to Rome with treaties, and confiscations of Umbrian territory used to create *ager publicus*.29

From this period onwards our sources deteriorate considerably. Livy's complete narrative ends with the activity in 293 BC, and until 218 BC we must rely on the brief and mistake-ridden *Epitomes*. Polybius, in his recap of the Roman wars against the Gauls, covers the major events involving these peoples, for example their defeat at Lake Vadimon with the Etruscans in 283 BC, but mentions no further hostilities with the Umbrians. Diodorus Siculus and Cassius Dio are both preserved only in fragments for this period, and as a consequence are merely occasionally useful.

It may have been around the time of M. Curius Dentatus' conquest of Sabinum in 290 BC (Livy, *Per.* 11) that Fulginiae (Foligno) and Plestia (Colfiorito) were

---

29 Cf. De Sanctis *Storia del romani* 2 358-9, who thinks this is when Fulginiae and Spoletium were incorporated into the Roman state, but see section 4 below.
incorporated into the Roman state and given *civitas sine suffragio*.\(^{30}\) We next have a brief notice in a fragment of Dio (for 282? BC): he says that when the Tarentines prepared for war against the Romans they sent men 'to the Etruscans, Umbrians and Gaurs and so caused a number of them to secede, some immediately and some a little later' (book 9, frag. 39 ed. E. Cary).\(^{31}\) No further information on Umbrian involvement in this episode is available.

The Roman conquest of Umbria was probably concluded in the 260s. A triumph of D. Iunius Pera and N. Fabius Pictor *de Sassinatibus* is recorded for 266 BC. In addition the *Epitome* of Livy book 15 has the following notice, probably referring to 268-265 BC: 'Umbri et Sallentini victi in deditionem accepti sunt'.\(^{32}\) The combination of these two pieces of information must mean that the Sassinates (centred around Sarsina on the northern slopes of the Appennines) and perhaps the Sallentini were the last of the Umbrians to be conquered, being the most northerly.\(^{33}\) That the Sassinates were a powerful military force is clear from the triumph awarded to their conqueror and their mention separately from the rest of the Umbrians by Polybius (2.24). The cause of their war with the Romans is unclear. De Sanctis plausibly suggests that they had joined the insurrection of the Picentes, sharing their concern at the foundation of Ariminum in 268 BC which boxed them in to the north.\(^{34}\)

**Summary**

Umbria first came into contact with the Roman army in 310 BC in the context of Rome's war with the Etruscans between 311 and 308 BC. Although this year only saw a Roman reconnaissance mission to Camerinum, in the next year (308) the combined forces of the Umbrians were defeated by the Roman army. The Roman annalistic tradition typically presented this as a defensive operation against Umbrian aggression but the fact that the battle took place in the Valle Umbra at the centre of the region suggests Rome had taken the offensive. The alliance formed with the Osruculani safeguarded the Tiber valley and the route into Umbria later followed by the Via Flaminia for the future passage of Roman forces. No significant hostilities occurred in the region again until eight years later when the Romans began the siege of Nequinum. This apparent act of aggression

\(^{30}\) If we accept Humbert, *Municipium* 221-6; the evidence is examined in section 5.

\(^{31}\) This reading depends on the emendation of δυμβρισκούς to δυμβρικούς.

\(^{32}\) See also Harris, *Etruria and Umbria* 84.

\(^{33}\) It is not clear whether the Sallentini mentioned in the *Epitome* should be equated with the Umbrian people called the Dolates cognomine Sallentini recorded by Pliny *N.H.* 3.113 rather than the people of the south eastern peninsula of Italy. Sarsina and the Sassinates are listed as Umbrian by Strabo (5.2.10) and Pliny (*N.H.* 3.114).

\(^{34}\) De Sanctis, *Storia dei romani* 2 422-3.
suggests that a decision was taken in that year to put Umbria more firmly under Roman control. The foundation of Narnia in 299 BC both secured the most important route connecting central Umbria with Rome and enabled the prime land of the Conca Ternana to be distributed. In 295 the fate of Umbria and of Italy as a whole was sealed by the defeat of the anti-Roman coalition at Sentinum. The aftermath of this battle seems the most plausible occasion for the formation of treaties between the various Umbrian states and Rome. It is possible that there was some sedition in Umbria against Roman control solicited by the Tarentines in 282, but we are very badly informed on this. Finally the Sassinates, perhaps the last independent Umbrian tribe, submitted to Roman control in 266.

3. TREATIES AND UMBRIAN UNITY

The treaty (foedus) must have been the main mechanism controlling the relations of the Umbrian states that were not of Roman or Latin status with Rome. Unfortunately we are poorly informed on both their formation and their content. Most treaties with Umbrian states were probably 'unequal'. Only in the cases of Camerinum and Ocriculum do we have indication that their treaties were equal, and these treaties were both formed in special circumstances, that is without these states being involved in hostilities with Rome. The contents of equal or unequal treaties remain opaque. It is uncertain, for instance, whether unequal treaties with Italian states were characterised by the inclusion of the clause, recorded by Cicero, Pro Balbo 35, saying 'let them uphold the greatness of the Roman people in a friendly way' (maiestatem populi Romani comiter conservanto), an explicit recognition, that is, of Rome's superiority. It seems clear, however, that equal treaties differed from unequal ones in that they only formally required the allied state to provide military forces to help defend the other party, Rome, when it was attacked: a 'defensive alliance of equal partners' in the words of Sherwin-White. Unfortunately one of our most interesting pieces of evidence for equal treaties, Livy's record of the contributions to Scipio's African expedition of 205 BC, is ambiguous in this respect.

35 Called iniquum by many writers, a term that only appears in Livy 35.46.10 and which does not seem to be an ancient technical term.
36 Cicero himself says that not all treaties included this clause, which is only attested in treaties with states outside Italy. These types of treaties are discussed by (amongst others) H. Horn, Foederati (Frankfurt am Main, 1930), Toynbee, Hannibal's Legacy 1 258-66, Harris, Etruria and Umbria 98-113, Sherwin-White, Roman Citizenship ch. 4, Salmon, Roman Italy 66-8.
37 Sherwin-White, Roman Citizenship 121.
38 Livy 28.45.13-21.
First the Etruscan communities promised that they would aid the consul, each according to its own resources. The communities of Umbria and in addition Nursia and Reate and Amitemina and the whole Sabine district promised soldiers. Marsians, Paelignians and Marrucini in large numbers gave in their names as volunteers for the fleet. The people of Camerinum, although it had an equal treaty with Rome, sent an armed cohort of six hundred men.

That the Camertes 'decided' to contribute troops on this occasion, and probably on many prior unrecorded occasions, is to be expected. Their treaty might theoretically allow them to withhold military contributions when other allies were required to contribute, but they are unlikely to have exploited this freedom, which would imply they considered Roman actions aggressive rather than defensive, for fear of jeopardising their privileged position.

We have specific evidence for treaties with two Umbrian states: Camerinum and Iguvium. The prestige of the Camertes' treaty was such that over 500 years later, when it had lost all legal meaning, they applied to Septimius Severus for its renewal. Ocrriculum probably had a treaty with Rome by 300 BC. There is further evidence that two other Umbrian peoples, the Tudertines and the Amerini, were not Roman citizens before the Social War, and thus will have almost certainly been of allied status.

---

39 The last line could also be read as 'Camerinum, since it had an equal treaty ...', with the implication that this treaty involved some special reason for their commitment here (Toynbee, *Hannibal's Legacy* 264-5), but this seems to involve undue complications.
40 See Brunt, *Manpower* 548 n. 3.
41 Cicero, *Pro Balbo* 47 (discussing the enfranchisements of Marius): *neque Iguvinatium neque Camertium foedere esse exceptum, quo minus eorum civibus a populo Romano praemia virtutis tribuerentur* ('Neither in the treaty neither with Iguvium nor with Camerinum was there any saving clause stipulating that rewards of valour should not be bestowed upon their citizens by the Roman people'). Also see Livy above for Camerinum.
42 CIL XI 5631=ILS 432 (AD 210). Cicero, *Pro Balbo* 46 describes the treaty as *omnia foederum sanctissimum atque aequissimum*.
43 See previous section.
44 Sisenna fr. 119P, from Book 4 dealing with the Social War period, says that the (or some) Tudertines were given citizenship by a decision of the senate; the allied status of Ameria has been deduced by L. Ross Taylor from the relationship of *hospitium* formed by Roman aristocrats and the elder Sextus Roscius, who if Cicero was using the word in its legal sense, must have been a non-Roman citizen. See Taylor, *Voting Districts* 85 n. 18, followed by Harris, *Etruria and Umbria* 100.
Following the arguments concerning the implications of Roman foedera in chapter one, we seem justified in taking this as testimony of the effective political organisation of at least Camerinum, Iguvium and Ocriculum; the evidence does not necessarily imply that Tuder and Ameria were autonomous communities which had their own bilateral treaties with Rome, but it is interesting to note that these five together include the two Umbrian centres (Iguvium and Tuder) that produce their own coinage, another index of central authority. The main problem here is to decide how many other Umbrian states had individual treaties with Rome. Working on the assumption that the Romans formed treaties with the smallest administrative units possible as they had an interest in keeping the allies divided, we need to know how many Umbrian states existed as independent entities at the time of the conquest. Was the area outside the territories of Camerinum, Iguvium and Ocriculum made up of other small independent states, as we know existed in the imperial period, each with a treaty with Rome? Or was the rest of Umbria dominated by a 'tribal confederation', perhaps on the lines of the Samnites and other peoples to the south east, and hence given a collective treaty.

The archaeological dimension to this has been examined in chapter two where I have outlined what I see as a distinct difference between the upland zones of the region, with a settlement system comparable to that of in Samnium, and the lowland areas characterised by small nucleated centres that also performed some religious and defensive functions for their inhabitants. The only serious attempt in my knowledge, however, to argue that the Umbrians were organised in a league, that of Coli, compares

45 Contra Stoddart in Territory, Time and State 177. Pallottino, Earliest Italy 135 sees truces as more of a recognition of a state's independence than treaties because they don't restrict that state's foreign policy; but this does not explain why the Etruscans seek treaties rather than truces (e.g. Livy 9.40.6). Truces are employed by the Romans when further hostilities are envisaged.

46 See ch. 4.

47 As suggested by Harris, Etruria and Umbria 100-101, who lists the following states, in addition to Ameria, Camerinum, Iguvium, Ocriculum and Tuder, as likely to have 'a separate administrative existence': Arna, Asisium, Attidium, Fulginiae, Hispellum, Matilica, Mevania, Mevaniola, Pitinum Mergens and Pisaurense, Sarsina, Sentinum, Sestinum, Tifernum Metaurense and Tiberinum, Trebiae, Tuficum, Urvinum Hortense and Metaurense, and Vettona. Toynbee, Hannibal's Legacy took a similar line, although rightly stressing that the exact number of Umbrian allies was an 'unknown quantity': see 107, 258 n. 3. The almost total lack of archaeological evidence in the third and second centuries for many centres to the east of the Appennine watershed - particularly Matilica, Pitinum Mergens and Pisaurense and Tuficum - leaves it open to question whether these were administratively separate at the time of the conquest. Nuceria should perhaps be added to Harris' list; Fulginiae was incorporated into the Roman state and so was not an ally. This would leave a total of 21 Umbrian allies, for what it is worth.

48 A possibility suggested by Fontaine, Cités 34: 'Ainsi la soumission groupée de populi à Mevania en 308 a-t-elle sans doute été négociée avec une hiérarchie "tribale", habilitée à traiter en leur nom commun'. Cf. Manconi and Whitehead's assumption in Territory, Time and State (178) that 'the Umbrians were probably no less unified than the Samnites'. For treaties with the other peoples of Italy see appendix 4.
the situation with the better attested and much discussed Etruscan league rather with the
central Appennines.\textsuperscript{49} It is certainly true that the Umbrians united for military purposes;
this is attested at Cumae alongside the Etruscans in the later sixth century (Dion. Hal.
7.3),\textsuperscript{50} against Rome in the wars of 308 and 295 BC, and against the Gauls under
Roman command in 225 BC (Polybius 2.24), which may well be a continuation of a pre­
conquest arrangement. Quite what the nature of this arrangement was, whether formal
league or association of convenience, is unclear. \textit{Contra} Coli there is no indication of
Umbrian unity in the Iguvine Tables.\textsuperscript{51} There is no reason why the peoples cursed in VIb
58-9 (assuming this is the correct interpretation) should be enemies of the Umbrians as
a whole rather than of just the Iguvine people: the Tadinates and Etruscans (of Perugia?)
were probably neighbours of the Iguvines, and those of the 'Narcan name' are as likely
to have been Umbrian as (in the picture of Coli) Sabine. In addition there is no
guarantee that the Umbrian association described in the Hispellum rescript of the fourth
century AD (ILS 705) predates the Augustan epoch, let alone the Roman conquest; it
could be substantially later than Augustus. The coming together for defence was
common to many other Italian peoples; even some Etruscan cities came together to
make the odds more even when fighting the Romans. It does not have any sort of
negative political implications in terms of tribes versus city-states, for instance; this is in
any case an overly crude way of looking at political sophistication, as set out in chapter
one.

In fact there are good reasons for thinking that there were many small Umbrian
states in alliance with Rome. The paucity of the evidence for the treaties formed during
the conquest of Italy is an adequate explanation of why we have evidence for only three
allied Umbrian states - Camerinum, Iguvium and Oriculum. We only have explicit
evidence for one federated Etruscan state - Tarquinia\textsuperscript{52} - and yet it is likely that most of
central and northern Etruria was bound to Rome by treaties. It is thus legitimate to
assume that there were many unattested treaties with the Umbrian communities that
were not colonised or absorbed into the Roman state.

With a careful examination it can be seen that Livy's narrative does not conflict
with the notion that Umbria was a region of many small separate states rather than an

\textsuperscript{49} U. Coli, 'L'organizzazione politica dell'Umbria preromana', in \textit{I problemi di storia e
archeologia dell'Umbria} 154-7.

\textsuperscript{50} The historicity of this notice is difficult to substantiate.

\textsuperscript{51} See ch. 2 section 1. There is no Umbrian \textit{nomen} cited in the Tables, as in the rest of
Umbrian epigraphy, although this is not wholly surprising for reasons discussed in ch. 2.

\textsuperscript{52} P. Romanelli in \textit{NSt} (1948) 267; M. Torelli, \textit{Elogia Tarquiniensia} (Florence, 1975) 162-3.
large politically unified (or confederated) 'tribal' group. In the defeat at Mevania in 308 the Umbrian alliance appears to have been extremely fragile, and would have broken up on the arrival of the Romans if Materina had not taken the initiative and led the others into battle. After their defeat the various Umbrian peoples surrendered individually and over a period of several days. We know that the Ocriculani at least were treated as an individual entity by the Romans at this stage. Later on no other Umbrian peoples are said to have come to the aid of the Nequinates in the lengthy siege of their stronghold, despite its strategic importance for the whole of the region. Had this happened, M. Fulvius Paetinus would surely have claimed a triumph over the Umbri as a whole rather than just the Nequinates. We can also examine the list of allies that contributed towards the expedition of Scipio to Africa in 205 BC (see above). The only individual states named by Livy are Etruscan and Sabine, but his mention of the Umbrian peoples (Umbriae populi) does not mean he equates them with the Marsi, Paeligni and Marrucini listed subsequently. On the contrary the formula used is the same as for the Etruscans, only without the detail of individual communities' contributions.

4. COLONISATION

Before the conquest was over the Romans began to settle people in Umbria. This intervention lasted for almost all the third century BC and profoundly changed the pattern of settlement in the region. It took two forms: the foundation of Latin colonies and the settling of individual farmers with Roman status on the land of existing communities. We know of three Latin colonies founded in Umbria from literary sources: Narnia, modern Narni, in 299 BC (Livy 10.10.5), Ariminum (Rimini) in 268 BC (Livy, Per. 15; Velleius Paterculus 1.14.7) and Spoletium (Spoleto), in 241 BC (Velleius 1.14.8; Livy, Per. 20). In addition, we can use archaeological and epigraphic evidence to make a strong case for regarding Interamna Nahars (Terni) as a Latin colony which must have been founded at some point between the Roman conquest and the Social War. The major settlement on this site before the Roman conquest has been documented in the previous chapter. Interamna was the starting point for routes to the Marche via the Nera valley, to the southern part of the Valle Umbra via Spoletium and to Reate and the Abruzzi region beyond. The consensus in recent scholarship has been that this centre was given Roman status after the conquest, and that much of its territory in the Conca Ternana

53 Contra Fontaine, Cités, cited above.
54 Ariminum was later in the eighth Augustan region, but in its early history seems closely associated with the Umbrians (see below).
was given to individual Roman settlers. The main reason for assuming this is the centre's Latin name, which was also given to two other towns in the late fourth and early third centuries BC, the Latin colony of Interamna Lirenas and Interamnia Praetuttiorum, probably a conciliabulum within Roman territory. Curiously the magistrates of the community after the Social War were quattuorviri, typically the chief office in new municipia that had been of allied or Latin status until the Social War. Several scholars have seen this as a magisterial form that developed from an earlier octoviral constitution, as is presumed to have occurred at Fulginiae and Plestia (both of Roman status) in this region, but this explanation seems forced.

In fact the archaeological evidence for the city recently assembled by Fontaine strongly suggests it was a Latin rather than a Roman colony, although he seems unaware of its implications. He has demonstrated that the blocks in the remains of the fortification around the site were cut to the same proportions as those in fourth century Roman ramparts such as the Servian walls at Rome and those of the colonies at Nepet and Sutrium. The size of the blocks was calibrated according to the Roman foot (confirmed by autopsy), and so the fortification probably dates from after the conquest. From an examination of the ancient position of the rivers, bridges and cemeteries around the town Fontaine has estimated that an area in the order of 35 ha was enclosed. The plan of the city walls was probably trapezoidal, and inside there are traces of an orthogonal street pattern with rectangular insulae. It is clear from this that there was a substantial Roman intervention here, amounting to the creation of an urban centre on a greater scale than the colony at neighbouring Spoletium. The most likely date would

---

55 Taylor, Voting Districts 83-85; Harris, Etruria and Umbria 153; Humbert, Municipium 225-6. For the geography of this area see map 4.
56 Varro L.L. 5.28: oppidum Interamna dictum, quod inter amnis est constitutum, the town Interamna gets its name from its position inter amnis 'between rivers'. Paulus-Festus 16L: Unde Interamnæ et Antemnæ dictæ sunt, quod inter amnes sint positæ, vel ante se habeant amnes, 'Interamna and Antemnae were so called because they were positioned between rivers, or had rivers before them'.
57 Taylor, Voting Districts 84.
58 Taylor, Voting Districts 82. For an early attestation of quattuorviri here see CIL i² 2099 in appendix 3.
59 Taylor, Voting Districts 82-3 and Humbert, Municipium 225-6, following a suggestion of Beloch, Römische Geschichte 504; he thought Interamna was originally of allied status (606). On Fulginiae and Plestia, praefecturae before the Social War, see sections 5(b) and (c), below.
60 Fontaine, Cités 122-30; he implausibly sees Interamna as a "pseudo-colony" founded by Rome but not given the normal colonial status (Latin I assume) (421).
61 Fontaine, Cités 128, deduced from excavated traces of Roman paving, the medieval street plan and the positioning of the city gates. This type of plan was typical of third century BC colonies such as Cosa, although Marzabotto shows that the Etruscans were familiar with these ideas from c. 500 BC.
62 For the sizes of these communities see below.
seem to be in the third century BC, given the archaeological parallels for the wall and the street plan, although a second century date cannot be ruled out. A colony of such a size with Roman rather than Latin status would be unprecedented in the third century: that it was Latin also seems more likely from its later quattuorviral constitution (discussed above).

There are two main objections to this theory, which to my knowledge has not been previously proposed. The most serious is that no literary or epigraphic source names Interamna Nahars as a colony, but although this is surprising in the light of the size of the installation, arguments from silence are a poor guide considering how much of Livy we are missing. It is interesting to note in this context the recent conclusion of Paci that Urbs Salvia in Picenum was another colony (probably of Roman status) that was founded before the Social War and was also not recorded in any literary source. The other objection is that Interamna was in the Clustumina tribe, which is often regarded as a 'penalty tribe' with a large concentration of Umbrian ex-allied communities who had revolted in the Social War; the arguments in favour of this are weak in my opinion.

We can only speculate on the exact date of the colonisation of Interamna. One obvious possibility is that the foundation was connected with that of Narnia in 299 BC, but Livy's account of this episode (9.10.5) offers no support for such a hypothesis. Another possible point is in 290 BC, when the neighbouring Sabines, to whom Interamna was strongly linked, were conquered.

Difficulties with flooding are attested before the conquest from the alluvial layers that were periodically laid down over the Iron Age cemeteries, and at a later date in the disputes between Interamna and Reate (for example Tacitus, Annals 1.78). This must have been a problem for the organisers of the settlement in the area. Presumably when M'. Curius Dentatus diverted some of the water in the Veline lake into the Nera in 272 BC creating the Cascate delle Marmore (Cic. Att. 4.15.5), there were already drainage

---

63 On the sources for Republican colonies, see Salmon, *Roman Colonisation* 167-8 n. 11. Note that Velleius' list (1.14.1-15.5) excludes Narnia. It is possible that references to an unspecified 'Interamna' that are assumed to be Interamna Lirenas are really to Interamna Nahars, although this seems unlikely for those in Livy.

64 G. Paci, 'Vent'anni di studi e ricerche urbisalvensi', in L. Bacchielli *et al.*, *Studi su Urbisaglia romana* (Tivoli, 1995) 99, from the magistracies - praetores, quaestors, aediles - it shared with nearby Auximum (founded in 157 BC, according to Velleius 1.15.3). Uniquely in Picenum, Urbs Salvia has quattuorviri as well, which, like those at Interamna, have also been explained as an evolution of the octovirate (see Delplace, 'La colonia augustea di Urbs Salvia', in the same volume, 28-9 for bibliography).

65 See ch. 5 section 4.

66 The 'Interamna' of Velleius 1.14.4 is presumably Interamna Suasina (also called Lirenas) in Latium, whose foundation in 312 BC was recorded by Livy 9.28.8.
schemes in the Conca Ternana to cope.\textsuperscript{67}

Despite this large scale Roman intervention there is evidence that at least part of the original Umbrian inhabitants in the area were incorporated into the colony, rather than being expelled. An interesting imperial inscription discussed in chapter 2 records the foundation of the city 704 years earlier. If this foundation date is not an Augustan fabrication it would show that even in the imperial period there was an awareness that the city pre-dated the influx of settlers in the third century BC. Such an awareness must be the result of the incorporation of the pre-existing Umbrian community into the Latin colony. We might tentatively join to this the evidence for the peak sanctuary on M. Torre Maggiore which shows signs of use from the fifth century to the late Republican period, probably by people from the Conca Ternana which it overlooked.\textsuperscript{68}

There is archaeological evidence that the other colonies in Umbria were also founded on the sites of pre-existing communities, as was common elsewhere, such as at Alba Fucens.\textsuperscript{69} At Ariminum there is specific evidence, both archaeological and literary, that the colonists were mixed with the existing population.\textsuperscript{70} Brunt assumes that this was an exception to the general rule that the locals were expelled because the population here wanted to keep out the Gauls.\textsuperscript{71} What happened to the Umbrian inhabitants at Narnia and Spoletium - whether they were incorporated, expelled or killed - is uncertain, as at most other colonial foundations. Brunt says that 'it seems hardly credible that after prolonged resistance they [the Nequinates] should have been admitted within the walls of a fortress designed to control their country or given a share in the government of the new city.'\textsuperscript{72} Yet, as Brunt concedes, the treachery that enabled the Romans to capture the town suggests the presence of a group of individuals within the community that had proven loyalty to Rome. It is at least possible that such a group was incorporated in the new colony, and in fact it would have been poor strategy for the Romans to leave those who aided them without reward, even if Roman writers preferred

\textsuperscript{67} Cf. Pliny \textit{N.H.} 18.263 on drainage ditches here, CIL i\textsuperscript{2} 2099 (appendix 3) on other drainage work; Fontaine, \textit{Cités} 27.

\textsuperscript{68} See ch. 2 section 3 (b) (iii) for the inscription and the archaeology of the pre-Roman centre.

\textsuperscript{69} The evidence for pre-Roman settlement at Nequinum is discussed in section 2 above; for Alba Fucens see J. Mertens, 'Alba Fucens', \textit{DdA} 6 (1988) 87-104.

\textsuperscript{70} Strabo 5.1.11: 'Ariminum is a settlement of the Ombri, just as Ravenna is, although each of them has received Roman colonists'; M. Zuffa, 'Abitati e sanctuari suburbani di Rimini', in \textit{La città etrusca e italica preromana} 312-13: continued use of an extra-urban sanctuary before and after colonisation; Crawford, 'Italy and Rome' 157.

\textsuperscript{71} Brunt, \textit{Manpower} 540; but was the population really Umbrian at this time, despite Strabo? The surrounding area was certainly taken over by the Gauls well before the foundation of the colony. Unfortunately the archaeological record offers us little help in this: see M. Maioli, 'Per la storia di Rimini nel V e nel IV secolo a. C.', in \textit{Analisi di Rimini antica: storia e archeologia per un museo} (Rimini, 1980) 84.

\textsuperscript{72} Brunt, \textit{Manpower} 539.
to emphasise the handing back of traitors.

Nevertheless when it comes to the mass of the population it seems more probable that the Umbrians of Spoletium were incorporated as colonists than the Nequinates. Our sources for the foundation of Spoletium are very brief, but because it occurred long after the conquest, it is unlikely that the town was besieged and sacked.\textsuperscript{73} There was Roman military activity in neighbouring Etruria in this year (241 BC), however. Falerii Veteres, modern Civita Castellana, was attacked by a Roman army and the Faliscans who survived the capture of the city moved to a new settlement on a less defensible site (Falerii Novi), five kilometres to the west.\textsuperscript{74} In addition the Via Amerina, which connected southern Umbria to Rome, was built soon after the foundation of Falerii Novi, and perhaps in connection with it, the walls of Amelia. All three actions may relate to consolidation of the route northwards from Rome with the ending of the First Punic War. The circumstances of the foundation of Spoletium thus suggest that it is more likely to have included the existing native population than Narnia. The contribution of archaeology to this question is intriguing but inconclusive. On the current state of the evidence the substantial city walls around the site are probably to be linked to the foundation of the colony; a network of drainage tunnels across the city are constructed in the same polygonal stone technique and thus are also likely to date from soon after 241 BC.\textsuperscript{75} An earlier Umbrian presence here is proven by the discovery of graves dating from the seventh century BC and perhaps later and by schematic bronze votives found on the Rocca and on the slopes of the modern (and ancient) town.\textsuperscript{76} Interestingly there is an inscription in the Umbrian language and alphabet from Spoletium;\textsuperscript{77} if this originates from the territory of the ancient town and has not been brought from elsewhere, it could be evidence for an Umbrian presence within the colony.

In general there are good arguments for believing that allies were often included in Latin colonies. Cornell points out that the 19 Latin colonies founded between 338 and 263 BC must have required the emigration of the order of 70,000 adult males and their dependants.\textsuperscript{78} This would surely have been too heavy a loss for the Roman state of 290 BC to sustain, if estimates in the region of c. 160,000 adult males in 290 BC can be

\textsuperscript{73} De Sanctis, \textit{Storia dei romani} 2 341 thought that Spoletium and Fulginiae were incorporated into the Roman state after Sentinum, but the foundation of a Latin colony (Spoletium) on the site of a pre-existing Roman community would be unprecedented.

\textsuperscript{74} Polybius 1.65.2; Livy, \textit{Per.} 20.

\textsuperscript{75} See ch. 4.

\textsuperscript{76} Colonna, \textit{Bronzi votivi} listed the votives as unclassifiable: p. 116, XI; see also L. Di Marco, \textit{Spoletium. Topografia e urbanistica} (Spoleto, 1975) 19f.; for details see ch. 2.

\textsuperscript{77} Po 11; I think Po 12 is probably Latin rather than Umbrian (see appendix 2).

\textsuperscript{78} Cornell in \textit{CAH} 7.2\textsuperscript{3} 388 and Table 9 based on A. Afzelius, \textit{Die römische Eroberung Italiens (340-264 v. Chr.)} (Aarhus, 1942); cf. Brunt, \textit{Manpower} 26-33, based on Beloch.
taken as a useful guide. Some of those colonists who emigrated from Latium might have been replaced by slaves, of whom there must have been significant numbers even in the fourth century, but this was only a substitute for the agricultural workforce, not for men to serve in the legions.

When considering the fate of the pre-existing inhabitants of a colonised site it would be dangerous to assume that there were no political divisions within Italian towns analogous to those attested at Rome in the early Republican period or in Italy during the Social War. Despite the lack of interest of Roman writers in affairs within Italian communities, we can gauge that internal tensions were widespread from incidents such as the betrayal of towns like Nequinum to the Romans, the dissensions in Arretium in 302 BC (Livy 10.3.2) and Volsinii in 264 BC (Zonaras 8.7) and the turmoil within many cities of Magna Graecia and Sicily in the Second Punic War. Hence a defeated enemy was often not simply a unified hostile body that had to be dealt with as a single entity.

There is a danger here that we accept modern preconceptions about the ethnic unity of ancient Italian peoples. We should bear in mind that movement between communities and indeed ethnic groups is well documented for the archaic period in both epigraphic and literary sources, exemplified by the immigration of many of the kings of Rome, for example Titus Tatius and Numa from Sabinum and Tarquinius Priscus from Etruria, and the 'defection' to the Volsci of the Roman Coriolanus. In many circumstances it is possible that other allegiances, such as clientship and hospitality, were more important than allegiance to a state. In Umbria the sharing of a common language was not enough to prevent inter-state rivalry, as is clear from the curses of the Tadinate name and tribe by the Iguvines in the Iguvine Tables (VIb 58). At Tuder the community seems to be linguistically mixed, with Etruscan and Gallic as well as Umbrian elements present. On the eastern frontier of Umbria the ancient settlement at Colfiorito (Roman Plestia) shows a strong Picene influence in its funerary material, uses a magistracy, the octovir, that was probably borrowed from the Sabines, and yet has also produced several Umbrian inscriptions. Such communities had heterogenous influences and were perhaps also ethnically diverse. That linguistic groups could often
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79 From Afzelius, *Die römische Eroberung Italien* 181; the census figures are much higher but probably cannot be relied on.
80 Cornell in *CAH* 7.2 334.
81 Although most of our examples come from city-states there is no theoretical reason why they could not occur in less urbanised areas as well; it may be that such divisions are more explosive within a city where the adversaries are more closely confined.
82 M. Cipollone, 'Presenze celtiche a Todi', in *Todi. Verso un museo* 50: Etruscan and a Gallic inscription have been found here.
83 *Guida Laterza* 104; Harris, *Etruria and Umbria* 153 n. 7; Po 2 (see appendix 2).
be violently divided within themselves is shown by the destruction of Greek colonies in southern Italy by their sister cities.\(^{64}\) We should not therefore assume that all the Umbrians were anti-Roman, Camerinum being an important case in point, or indeed that all the inhabitants of a particular community that opposed Rome followed their state's lead.

The foundation of Latin colonies on the sites of pre-existing communities contrasts with the only Latin colony in Etruria, Cosa, which was planted on a section of *ager publicus* confiscated from a city, Vulci, that continued to exist. The earlier Umbrian states were certainly smaller than the colonies that replaced them. Presumably all their territory and some of that of surrounding states had been confiscated. Literary sources record that colonies had either 2,500, 4,000 or 6,000 (adult male) settlers, who would bring their dependents to their new home. Based on the probable size of the ancient city's territory, Narnia would seem to be one of the smaller colonies.\(^{65}\) Spoletium must have been considerably larger as the area enclosed within its city walls is more than four times greater than that of Narnia.\(^{66}\) The third century town walls of Interamna enclosed an area of 35 ha according to Fontaine's reconstruction, substantially larger than that of Spoletium and without any uninhabitable sectors.\(^{67}\) Nevertheless, given the smaller amount of plain (the Conca Ternana) available for distribution here than at Spoletium, we should perhaps estimate the size of both at 4,000 adult males, with Narnia having 2,500.

The size of these colonies would have dwarfed all but the largest neighbouring Umbrian communities, which were small by the standards of Italian city states, and they would have effectively become the dominant centres in southern Umbria. The colonies would also be able to fulfil a very powerful military role, preventing any disturbances or revolt in central and southern Umbria. The sites of both Spoletium and Narnia facilitate defence, with the precipitous cliffs on one side of the latter making it a natural fortress. But the colonies were also in good positions to control rich agricultural plains: in Tacitus (1.79) the land of the Conca Ternana between Narnia and Interamna is described as the 'best land in Italy'.

---

\(^{64}\) Salmon, *Roman Italy* 158.

\(^{65}\) See table in Cornell, *CAH* 7.2 \(^{2}\) 405.

\(^{66}\) Spoletium: c. 30 ha, although about 1/4th of this (the Rocca) was too steep for habitation; Narnia: c. 7 ha (more hypothetical, but unlikely to have been much more due to topography) (Fontaine, *Cités* 104, 143). The territory of Spoletium contained much more agricultural plain that could be centuriated; the nearest substantial municipia in the Valle Umbra, Mevania and Fulginiae, were 24 km away (Trevi was tiny). Narnia shared its smaller plain, the Conca Ternana, with Interamna Nahars.

\(^{67}\) Fontaine, *Cités* 127.
5. THE EXTENSION OF THE ROMAN STATE IN UMBRIA

(a) Introduction

Besides the foundation of Latin colonies mentioned above, the third century also saw the absorption into the Roman state of the territories and communities of Fulginiae (Foligno) and Plestia (Colfiorito), the evidence for which is discussed below. These two communities became praefecturae in the period before the Social War. Similar status has also been claimed for Carsulae and Tadinum on the basis of duoviri (typical of centres with Roman status before the Social War) who might be the magistrates of these places in the late Republic/early Empire: the evidence is indecisive in the case of the former, but suggestive in the case of the latter.\(^\text{88}\) The absorption of Tadinum into the Roman state around the time of the Roman conquest has interesting implications, if correct: it means that the totar tarsinater (the Tadinate community in the standard interpretations of the text) referred to in the Iguvine Tables must be an autonomous entity (the Tadinates) before the conquest.\(^\text{89}\) This would thus provide further support for the argument expounded above that the Umbria conquered by the Romans was made up of many small autonomous states.

The precise date of the incorporation of all these Umbrian communities can only be guessed at. M. Humbert thinks it occurred between '299 (pacification de l'Ombrie) et 290 (conquête des Sabins limitrophes)',\(^\text{90}\) but only the Nequinates, in the southernmost tip of Umbria, were defeated in 299 BC. The aftermath of the battle of Sentinum seems a much more likely occasion to me, although it is not impossible that the incorporations happened after the defeat in 308 BC, or later than the conquest of Sabinum.\(^\text{91}\) The communities involved almost certainly received citizenship without the vote like the Sabines, being a considerable distance from Rome itself.\(^\text{92}\)

\(^{88}\) Archaeological evidence makes it likely that Carsulae was created afresh as an urban entity only at the end of the Republican period or the start of the Augustan one: see Guida Laterza 123. Several inscriptions attest quattuorviri from here. Unless the Augustan duovir iure dicundo of CIL XI 4575 is a survival of an earlier magistracy from a possible preceding Umbrian settlement at Cesi four miles away, some other explanation must be sought. A funerary cippus (CIL XI 5802) from Costacciaro, 17 km away from Tadinum (and so more probably Iguvium's territory?) records a Cn. Disinius T.f. Ciu. Ilvir. Bormann argued that none of the surrounding states had duoviri and so it must relate to Tadinum (CIL XI pp. 823 and 853). The tribe of Tadinum is not otherwise known; only Iguvium of the surrounding states was in the Clustumina recorded on the inscription, but quattuorviri seem to have been the chief magistrates here.

\(^{89}\) On totar in the Iguvine Tables see Prosdocimi, 'Il lessico istituzionale italico'.

\(^{90}\) Humbert, Municipium 222 n. 54, assuming that Interamna was also a Roman community.

\(^{91}\) Taylor, Voting Districts 87 suggests Fulginiae may have been annexed when the Via Flaminia was built.

\(^{92}\) Compare the fate of the peoples of Campania in 338 BC (Livy 8.14.10-11); see Salmon, Roman Italy 60.
Incorporation within the *ager Romanus* is usually assumed to be closely associated with viritane Roman settlement, but this is poorly attested here, as in the rest of Italy. We have some archaeological evidence that suggests an influx of settlers took place at Plestia. More problematic is the case for viritane settlement in the area around Fulginiae. Humbert takes the foundation of nearby Forum Flaminii (modern S. Giovanni Profiama), which probably occurred in 220 BC, as evidence of previous land distributions in this area to full status Roman citizens, because fora seem only to be found within enfranchised areas of the Italian peninsula. But this conclusion is far from watertight: north of the Appennines Gallic and provincial fora clearly 'arise or are established for *peregrini*, non-Romans. Our evidence about fora is subject to severe limitations and we should be cautious about accepting Humbert's use of this as an argument for viritane settlement.

In fact we might expect that many Umbrian communities, like others throughout Italy, had some of their land confiscated by Rome and made into *ager publicus*, but we know from Appian's introduction to the Civil Wars (1.7) that much of it probably remained unassigned to colonists and was leased to local cultivators. In fact Appian says that this was why the Etruscans and Umbrians opposed the bill of Drusus in 91 BC (BC 1.36).

The reasons for the incorporation of the two Umbrian centres into the Roman state appear clear. Both are in strategically important areas. Plestia was sited on an important pass to Camerinum and the Marche from central Umbria. Fulginiae was at the exit into the Valle Umbra of the Topino valley, used by the Via Flaminia from 220 BC, and of the route from the pass at Plestia. In themselves, however, the sites were not naturally defensive; this is exemplified by Plestia, where the Roman era town on the shores of the Plestine lake seems to have 'replaced' hillforts on the peaks around.

Were economic factors more important in the decision of the Romans to incorporate these communities? Humbert suggests that they were incorporated because they were adjacent to areas of viritane distributions to full Roman citizens. Although I have pointed out the problems of assuming viritane settlement from the presence of a forum, other evidence (at least for Plestia), examined below, suggests he is broadly right. Fulginiae was in some of the best agricultural land in Umbria, and it would not be surprising that the Romans picked it for viritane distribution. The basin between Interamna and Namia must have been dominated by the presence of Latin colonies.

---

94 Brunt, *Manpower* 570; see also 715.
95 Quoted and discussed in ch. 5 section 4.
96 But although the territory of Plestia was contiguous with that around Forum Flaminii, there was a substantial amount of rough, mountainous land between them.
(although the original inhabitants were probably not excluded). Similarly most of the southern half of the greatest Umbrian plain, the Valle Umbra, was either Latin or Roman. Plestia is surrounded by several upland plains (around 800 m. above sea level) and clearly has some reasonable agricultural land. But it was surely chosen for incorporation more to give the Romans control over the pass here where they could attempt to hold back enemies, for example when Centenius was sent there against Hannibal after Trasimene (Appian Hann. War 9.11). Thus different reasons are apparent for different areas of incorporation.

(b) Plestia

The evidence for Plestia (near modern Colfiorito) having Roman status before the Social War is both epigraphic and archaeological. Two inscriptions attest the presence of the octovirate, a board of eight magistrates, here at the start of the imperial period. This shows that Plestia was not constituted after the Social War with *quattuorviri* as supreme magistrates, as happened to the communities of Latin and allied status. It must therefore have been of Roman status before the Social War, probably as a *praefectura*. It only became a *municipium* with later, probably at some time in the early empire. It still remains uncertain whether the octovirate was created by the Romans or was a local magistracy from the pre-Roman period whose name was latinised. This office is also found at Sabine Amitemum, Nursia and Trebula Mutuesca, and at Praetuttian Interamnia. Its geographical distribution throughout several different peoples has led to one school of thought holding that this magistracy must have been imposed by the Romans. This argument is hardly 'incontestable' as Humbert claims as all these places are geographically linked as a block, and an Umbrian borrowing from Sabinum, like their borrowing of the quaestorship from Rome and perhaps the maronate from Etruria, is perfectly feasible. Harris has put forward another alternative, that Plestia is more likely to be Sabine
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97 CIL XI 5621: ...cliconio.serapioni.patri / armelae secundaes.c.clionio[... / t.liconio.t.f.ofr.viii.vir posvit bm]; L. Sensi, 'Gli ottoviri di Plestia', BSCF 9 (1990) 456, quoted below for the other.
99 Following H. Rudolf, *Stadt und Staat im römischen Italien* (Leipzig, 1935); for bibliography see Humbert, *Municipium* 240 n. 133.
100 Humbert, *Municipium* 240 n. 133; see P. Brunt, 'Italian aims at the time of the Social War' endnote 4 in *The Fall of the Roman Republic* (Oxford, 1988). Despite dismissing Rudolf's thesis on the wholesale Roman creation of municipal magistrates Sherwin-White, *Roman Citizenship* 66, 73 still sees the octovirate as Roman because of its supposed advantages in rural areas. This seems very weak.
than that this is an isolated Umbrian borrowing of the institution. But this is difficult to sustain: the octovirate is also used by the Praetutti at Interamnia, who must also have been influenced by the Sabines; Plestia is topographically more Umbrian than Sabine; Pliny (N.H. 3.114) numbers the Plestini amongst the peoples of Umbria; three archaic inscriptions from the sanctuary here have been taken as Umbrian (although they are very short).

Most authors writing on the octovirate assume it had a civil function as a civic magistracy. In contrast C. Letta has suggested that it was instead a priestly college on the lines of the octoviri Augustales found elsewhere. A recently published inscription from Colfiorito (in the area of ancient Plestia) apparently records an octovir who is a freedman which, if the reading is correct, would support this hypothesis, as freedmen were generally ineligible for civic magistracies. Plestia was such a minor centre, however, that in the absence of better qualified candidates, a freedman might have held office here.

The coming of the Roman period, and the bestowing of Roman status on Plestia is associated with a dramatic change in the local pattern of settlement. The human occupation of the area in the pre-Roman period was characterised by a complex system of hillforts and their corresponding cemeteries, similar to that in the Abruzzi region. The last phase of the most important cemetery, that below M. Orve, shows a decline in the quality of the grave goods from the mid fourth to third centuries BC. Burials end here after the third century BC, and generally after the fourth century in the minor cemeteries in the surrounding area. It is tempting to imagine that the disuse of these cemeteries and the fortified centres they relate to is connected with the 'foundation' of the praefectura of Plestia on the shores of the Plestine lake in the (?early) third century BC. A Republican temple and late Republican/early Imperial house belonging to the Roman settlement were excavated in the 1960s near the church of S. Maria di Pistia, which conserves the ancient name. Remains of Roman rural establishments discovered through survey and excavation indicate a smaller population living in the countryside in the Roman period, which may be the result of some of the original
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101 Harris, Etruria and Umbria 153 n. 7.
102 Po 2 (appendix 2). See also Feruglio, Antichità dall’Umbria a Budapest 85-8.
103 L. Sensi, 'Gli ottoviri di Plestia', BSCF 14 (1990) 456: ...jm.annio.t.l[... / viii.vir.ch[... this is read by Sensi as M(arco)? Annio, T(ii) l(iberto) [... / (octo)vir(o), ch[...?]. Other interpretations seem possible: son of a libertus, or some other qualification missing at the end of line 1?
104 For details see Bonomi Ponzi, 'Topographic survey'; discussed in ch. 2.
105 Brief note in Bonomi Ponzi, 'Topographic survey' 234 n. 1. This excavation has not to my knowledge been published. No Roman cemetery site is known.
inhabitants moving to Plestia.\textsuperscript{106} It is interesting to note that the farms of the Roman era seem to be 'typologically homogenous', as would be expected from viritane settlement.\textsuperscript{107} By itself the archaeological evidence cannot yet confirm whether the change in the pattern of settlement is the result of direct Roman intervention, connected with an influx of settlers, but the epigraphic evidence for Plestia's Roman status discussed above must lead us to suspect this. This sort of transition from a pre-Roman system based around mountain top hillforts to a Roman one based on an urban centre in a valley bottom or plain position is common in Samnium and the neighbouring central Appennine regions, but is unique in Umbria.\textsuperscript{108} This may be because we can only document this type of system around Colfiorito (Plestia), an undeveloped upland area, but also seems to suggest that Roman domination only had a dramatic effect on the settlement pattern in Umbria where there was a hillfort and village system, a system only found in the uplands.

Although there seems to be this significant change in the pattern of inhabitation in the Roman period, probably connected with an influx of settlers, this did not result in the expulsion of the original local population, who must have received citizenship without the vote. This seems evident from the retention of the octovirate, from the continuity of use of the sanctuary here from the fifth or fourth century to the first century BC, and from the name Plestia itself, which is extremely close to the ethnic used on fourth century inscriptions from the sanctuary here.\textsuperscript{109}

\textbf{(c) Fulginiae}

The only traces of pre-Roman settlement on this site are some sixth to fifth century tombs and some Italic bronze votives, which could indicate the presence of a sanctuary.\textsuperscript{110} The evidence for the community's Roman status after the conquest is a fragment of Cicero's pro Vareno preserved by Priscian (\textit{Gramm. Lat.} 7.14.70 = fr. 6 Puccioni): Cicero pro Vareno: 'C. Ancharius Rufus fuit e municipio Fulginate' idem in eadem: 'in praefectura Fulginate'.\textsuperscript{111} C. Letta has plausibly suggested that Cicero's references must mean that Fulginiae was a \textit{municipium} when the speech was delivered,
but at some time referred to in the recent past was a praefectura. Fulginiae was thus probably a praefectura until the Social War, after which it became a municipium. An Umbrian inscription using the Latin alphabet found in 1926 shows that this community retained the Umbrian marones after its incorporation into the Roman state. Fulginiae's magistrates also included quattuorviri at some time, which are standardly seen as a development of an older octoviral constitution. A simpler explanation would be that the community as a praefectura was governed by marones, who were replaced by quattuorviri when Fulginiae became a municipium.

(d) Promotion from citizenship without the vote to full citizenship

Humbert has argued that the elevation of Fulginiae and Plestia from citizenship without the vote to full Roman citizenship is closely related to the foundation of Forum Flaminii. This centre was presumably organised by C. Flaminius when he built the Via Flaminia, either in his censorship of 220 or in his consulship of 223 BC. Forum Flaminii was probably on the site of modern S. Giovanni Profiamma, where the route from Interamna and Spoletium met the Via Flaminia coming from Mevania. It was thus ideally placed to act as a market place, a function suggested by Festus: 'a forum is a place of business, such as Forum Flaminium, Forum Iulium, which were named after those men who saw to the establishment of these fora'. Whether this forum was formed, as Humbert thinks, for full Roman citizens who had been given land individually is discussed above.

L. R. Taylor noted that the assignation of Forum Flaminii and neighbouring Plestia to the Oufentina tribe, that had up to now been centred on Tarracina in southern Latium,

112 E. Campanile, C. Letta, Studi sulle magistrature indigene e municipali in area Italica (Pisa, 1979) 62; municipal status is confirmed by CIL XI 5218 'municipes et incolae' (Humbert, Municipium 222).

113 Ve 234 referring to the building of a fountain or cistern built by marones (appendix 2). Humbert's argument that proximity to Forum Flaminii proves viritane settlement in this area is examined in the introductory section above.

114 Quattuorviri i.d.: CIL XI 5220. See Humbert, Municipium 223, citing previous bibliography. There is no direct evidence for octoviri here.

115 Humbert's argument (223 n. 60) that this magistracy must be pre-Social War does not convince.

116 Humbert, Municipium 225-6.

117 Livy, Epitome 20 (with lacuna), Plutarch, Quaest. Rom. 66: censorship; Paulus-Festus 79L: consulship; Strabo 5.1.2: 187 BC (consulship of his son). See Harris, Etruria and Umbria 162 n. 3. Brunt, Manpower 571 points out the uncertainty in assuming who the founder of a Forum is from its name.

118 Gaggiotti, Guida Laterza 103 for S. Giovanni Profiamma. The Spoletium branch of the Via Flaminia must have been important before 241 BC when the Latin colony was founded here.

119 Festus-Paulus 74L: Forum sex modis intellegitur. Primo negotiationis locus, ut forum Flaminium, forum Iulium, ab eorum nominibus, qui ea fora constituenta curarunt ...
was not governed by any geographical logic. She therefore speculated that this was the result of Gaius Flaminius putting people who would support him into his own tribe or one which he aimed to control. Humbert has carried this train of thought further, arguing that just as Flaminius was behind the assignation of Forum Flaminii and Plestia to the Oufentina on political grounds, so his censorial colleague, L. Aemilius Papus, in response put Fulginiae into the Cornelia tribe. An alternative explanation for the tribe of Fulginiae, put forward by Taylor is that it was chosen because it was roughly aligned with the existing area of this tribe, around Momentum, from Rome, a principle followed in the creation of other new areas of existing tribes in the third century. The alignment, however, is only approximate here. Humbert's argument is neat, but, as Crawford has pointed out, the 'fragility of the construct should not be disguised'. We do not really know when the territory of Fulginiae, or indeed of Plestia, was annexed nor when they were assigned to their tribes. It is interesting to note that if the reconstruction of Taylor and Humbert is right, political expediency was clearly more important for the elevation of at least Fulginiae to full citizenship within 80 years of annexation than its adoption of Roman linguistic and institutional models: the Umbrian inscription from Fulginiae recording marones (discussed above) may well date to after the proposed 223/220 BC promotion.

6. THE TELAMON CAMPAIGN AND THE HANIBALIC WAR.

Towards the end of the third century BC we begin to get evidence for the new military obligations imposed on the Umbrians in their treaties. It is almost certainly the result of the limitations of our sources that we do not hear about the Umbrian contingents in the Roman army before this because their treaties were probably formed on the whole at the beginning of the third century, and the narrative of Livy is lost from 292 BC. Our first piece of information comes from Polybius (2.24), who in the course of a digression concerning the wars fought between Rome and the Gauls, gives the numbers of the forces called on by the Romans for the Telamon campaign in 225 BC, and breaks them
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120 Taylor, Voting Districts 91-2, 306.
121 Crawford, 'Italy and Rome' 154.
122 Ve 234; another possible Umbrian inscription from Fulginiae is Ve 235, although Harris, Etruria and Umbria 185 has questioned whether its language can be deduced (for both inscriptions see appendix 2). A senator called Q. Statilienus, attested by an inscription of c. 140 BC, could be useful in this context (T. R. Broughton, The Magistrates of the Roman Republic 2 622; Taylor, Voting Districts 256; Humbert, Municipium 225 n. 71). His tribe may be the Cornelia, in which case he might come from Fulginiae: if so this would help confirm that Fulginiae was promoted at an early date.
down into ethnic contingents. His figures are very likely to originate in Roman documentary sources, and, despite their problems, probably give us a reasonable basis for some cautious deductions.

The cavalry of the Sabines and Etruscans, who had come to the temporary assistance of Rome, were 4,000 strong, their infantry above 50,000. The Romans massed these forces and posted them on the frontier of Etruria under the command of a praetor. The Umbrians and the Sarsinates inhabiting the Appennines together amounted to about 20,000, and with these were 20,000 Veneti and Cenomani. These they stationed on the frontier of Gaul, to invade the territory of the Boii and divert them back from their expedition.

Polybius goes on to say that the Romans could call on (amongst others) 77,000 Samnites, 24,000 Marsi, Marrucini, Frentani and Vestini, and 273,000 of their own citizens. Brunt believes that in reality the 54,000 'Sabines and Etruscans' in Polybius excludes the Sabines, who would have been registered as Romans, and that the Umbrians and Sarsinates would number 2,000 more if their cavalry were included.\textsuperscript{123} He takes these figures to be comparable to those of the Samnites and Central Appennine peoples in that they are really the numbers of men available, that is those registered on the lists returned by the allies in 225 (Polybius 2.23.9), not merely those under arms, because such huge numbers of recruits do not fit with what we know of the campaign. Brunt follows Afzelius in thinking that the figure for the central Appennine peoples includes the other tribes of this area that are unmentioned - the Paeligni and possibly the Asculani - and if this is the case then the figure for these peoples is almost certainly too low: he adjusts it to 34,000 to correspond to the density of the region in the census of 1936. This remains conjecture, however, and it does not seem implausible to me that the area had a similar level of population to Umbria: these regions are equivalent in size and Umbria surely has the better land. It might seem paradoxical that mountainous Samnium was, by these figures, more than twice as densely populated than the gentler landscape of Etruria, but two factors lessen the contrast. Firstly, much of what was the most densely populated part of Etruria, the south, was incorporated into the Roman state by 225 BC. Secondly, the figure for the Samnites might include the allied states in the densely populated southern part of Oscan-speaking Campania, such as Nola.

However we adapt the figures, and I think we should be cautious in assuming that this can be done by comparison with the 1936 census, we can still retain the rough proportions given by Polybius. Samnium was surprisingly densely populated, and would

\textsuperscript{123} \textit{Manpower} 48-9.
clearly have been the largest unified entity apart from Rome in the late fourth century BC. The individual states of Umbria and the central Appennines would have been vastly smaller. In fact the Umbrian infantry was one of the smallest allied contingents recorded, on a par with the 24,000 of the Marsi, Marrucini, Frentani and Vestini on the military registers at Rome.\(^{124}\) The Umbrians as a group were thus much larger than these tribes individually, but each Umbrian state was much smaller than their central Appennine equivalents. Dividing Brunt's corrected figures for all free persons in Umbria (111,000) by our estimated maximum number of Umbrian allied states of 21, we arrive at an average for each state of around 5,300 people.\(^{125}\) Some communities will have been smaller, others, such as Camerinum, considerably larger.\(^{126}\) More importantly, we can also roughly gauge the colossal scale of Latin settlement in this region. If we accept 10,500 as a likely figure for the adult male settlers led out to Narnia, Interamna Nahars and Spoletium, we can estimate the total immigrant population at these centres at around 33,000 free persons.\(^{127}\) This represents an augmentation of the Umbrian population of c. 111,000 in 225 BC by 30% (even ignoring Roman virilans settlement). Doubtless a sizeable part of the 'new' colonial population was made up by those Umbrian inhabitants already living on the sites, at least at Spoletium; but even taking this into account, we are able to see that this represents a massive insertion of a Roman presence into the region.

Umbria was not a major setting of the Hannibalic War. The main theatre of action was the south and Campania. Umbria suffered only a short period of devastation immediately after the battle of Lake Trasimene, although this may have had a considerable impact. The centres of Umbria were probably small in size and so vulnerable to large forces such as the Carthaginians. Most of the peasants in the countryside will have been at subsistence levels, and an interruption of the harvest (being brought in at this very time) would rapidly lead to famine. Despite Hannibal's

---

\(^{124}\) It is not clear why no figure is given for Umbrian cavalry, but there are other omissions such as the Greek cities and Bruttians.

\(^{125}\) The figures for Umbria will not have included Latin colonies or Roman areas, which have their own figures. For the number of allied states see section 3.

\(^{126}\) The two cohorts from Camerinum, numbering at least 800 men, whom Marius famously enfranchised (Cicero, Pro Balbo 50) would seem to indicate that this was a centre with several times the manpower resources of our hypothetical average, and perhaps that approaching the level of a central Appennine people; it is possible, however, that these cohorts included men from some of the smaller neighbouring centres. For this suggestion and a list of other allies who contributed cohorts to the Roman army see Toynbee, Hannibal's Legacy 426 n. 5, 427.

\(^{127}\) Using the same scale as that of Brunt, Manpower 54 for his calculations from the Polybian figures, and the likely number of settlers worked out in section 4.
devastating victory at Trasimene no Umbrian or Etruscan communities came over to him, although there are signs that some preparations were made to support Hasdrubal in 207 BC.

There are two episodes after the Roman defeat at Lake Trasimene of importance to Umbria. Firstly a battle took place, almost certainly in Umbria, in which the Carthaginians defeated a force commanded by Gaius Centenius. Secondly, part of Umbria was devastated by Hannibal's army on its way to Picenum. The topography of both these events is disputed. We have four accounts of the defeat of Centenius. Polybius (3.86) says that Centenius with a force of 4,000 cavalry was sent ahead of the advance of the consul Gnaeus Servilius, stationed at Ariminum (Rimini), to join with Flaminius against Hannibal. But Hannibal defeated Flaminius and, hearing that Centenius was approaching, dispatched Maharbal who defeated Centenius' force, capturing those who were not killed. Livy (22.8.1) adds little information except that the defeat occurred in Umbria. Appian (Hann. 9.11) gives a rather confused account in which Centenius was 'sent into Umbria to the Plestine lake, to occupy the narrow valleys that provide the shortest route for Rome' where he was subsequently defeated by Hannibal. Zonaras (8.25) says that Centenius was defeated in an ambush near Spoletium, but this must have originated from the presence of Spoletium in the other versions. We would expect Centenius to have travelled down the Via Flaminia from Ariminum into the Valle Umbra, and it has been suggested that the 'Plestine lake' was a misunderstanding for the lacus Umber here. But Polybius and Livy give no topographic alternatives and so do not necessarily contradict Appian. It is certainly possible that Centenius came into Umbria via the pass at Plestia, although more likely that only part, rather than all as Appian says, of Hannibal's force defeated him.

There are several versions of which particular route Hannibal took after Lake Trasimene, the most important of which are those of Polybius and Livy:

Meanwhile Hannibal, who by this time felt completely confident of success, decided against the idea of approaching Rome for the present and began to march towards the Adriatic; there he met no opposition and proceeded to ravage the country as he went. He passed through Umbria and Picenum and reached the coast on the tenth day of his march. During his advance he amassed so much plunder that his army could neither drive it nor carry it with them, and he

---

128 De Sanctis, Storia dei Romani 3.2 124; Walbank, A Historical Commentary on Polybius 1 421.

129 The exaggerated reports of Zonaras (8.25) and Appian (Hann. 12), who claim Hannibal reached Narnia or close to Ariminum can be disregarded because these are surely too great a distance away for the time allowed.
also killed a number of the inhabitants on his route. He had given the order, which is customary when a city is taken by storm, that all adults whom his troops found there should be killed, and he had done this because of his inborn and inveterate hatred of the Romans. (Polybius 3.86)

By contrast Livy writes:

Hannibal marched straight on through Umbria as far as Spoletium. But when, after systematically ravaging the country, he attempted to storm the town, he was repulsed with heavy losses; and conjecturing from the strength of a single colony which he had unsuccessfully attacked how vast an undertaking the city of Rome would be, he turned aside into the Picentine territory ... (Livy 22.9.1-2).

The essential problem is whether Hannibal did actually attack Spoletium, or whether this was an invented Roman success. The main problem of compatibility between the Livian and Polybian accounts is held to be the ten days Polybius reports Hannibal to have taken on the way to the Adriatic.\footnote{For a list of scholars who have dealt with this problem see Harris, *Etruria and Umbria* 133 n. 6; see Walbank, *Commentary* 1 422 for the case against Livy’s account.} This is supposedly too little time for Hannibal’s forces to have diverted to Spoletium and to have unsuccessfully attacked it. But the rejection of the attack on Spoletium seems to me to be based on an excessive scepticism of Livy’s account and an over-valuation of the details given by Polybius; the two sources are not actually incompatible. To begin with it is important to note that the absence of the episode in Polybius is not really an argument against its happening: his description of the march is totally lacking in any specific geography. If we took the period of ten days in Polybius to start with the defeat of Centenius’ force, the timescale does not definitely preclude a rapid thrust towards Spoletium, even assuming that the most obvious route to Picenum via Plectia and not one further south was then followed; this is particularly plausible if a detachment was sent on from the main body of the army. But as De Sanctis points out we do not have to assume that Polybius’ ten days begins with Centenius’ defeat, even if we accept the accuracy of this time period.\footnote{De Sanctis, *Storia dei romani* 3.2 121, followed by Harris, *Etruria and Umbria* 133.} Polybius could be taken as referring to ten days from the siege of Spoletium, which Livy says is why he decided against marching on Rome.

Livy and Polybius both agree that Hannibal’s army ravaged Umbria on the way to Picenum. Harris thinks this fits with the general pattern of Hannibal’s strategy in seeking allies predominantly in the south, the Etruscans and Umbrians not being particularly promising rebel material. Even leaving aside any doubts about the evidence for Etruscan social structure (none of which applies to Umbria), which he thinks is the
cause of this,\textsuperscript{132} we can speculate that Hannibal's professedly pro-Italian tendencies will have led him to do more damage to Roman and Latin settlements in Umbria than to allied. Indeed Polybius, who will have been well aware of the distinctions between Romans and allies, seems to suggest that this was the case, citing 'hatred of the Romans' as Hannibal's motive. As he moved unopposed down the Valle Umbra, probably to Spoletium, the Roman territory around Fulginiae in particular will have been extremely exposed, probably lacking the protection of a fortified centre. If he then took the route over the pass at Plestia to Picenum, as Appian plausibly suggests, this Roman area will also have suffered. Any damage inflicted on the territory of Spoletium was not catastrophic, however, as the colony continued to fulfil its financial and manpower obligations to Rome in 209 BC, whereas Narnia, which was probably undisturbed to the south, was one of those which claimed its resources to be exhausted.

Our only specific evidence for Umbrian disaffection with Rome during the war comes from a notice of Livy (28.10.4-5) concerning the end of 207 BC. The dictator Marcus Livius, after laying down his office, was sent by the senate 'to conduct an investigation as to what communities among the Etruscans or Umbrians had discussed plans to revolt from the Romans to Hasdrubal upon his arrival, and which states had aided him with auxiliaries or supplies or any kind of assistance.' To what extent such suspicions were justified is unclear. Hasdrubal was defeated by the Romans before he was able to enter Etruria and Umbria, and none of the peoples here would have abandoned Rome without Carthaginian protection.

7. CONCLUSION

Even with an awareness of the limitations of the source material the conquest does not seem to have been the devastating takeover that the word itself might suggest. Most Umbrian communities seem to have been brought under Rome's control without the need for the Romans to besiege their fortified centres (Livy's \textit{urbes munitae}). Only Nequinum is said to have suffered this fate. The sources mention two major battles in the field: at Mevania in 308 and at Sentinum in 295. This seems to correlate with the archaeological picture of the continuity of settlement on most important sites before and after the conquest.\textsuperscript{133} Only at Colfiorito (ancient Plestia) do there seem to have been

\textsuperscript{132} The Roman military presence in the region was a significant factor in the period after Cannae. No ally, knowing the depth of Roman resources as Polybius did, would risk a break before this battle.

\textsuperscript{133} This is examined in ch. 4.
serious discontinuities in settlement, and even here they may be more the result of the Hannibalic War than of the Roman conquest.

The treaties that controlled the relations of the majority of the Umbrians with Rome were probably contracted with a large number of individual Umbrian communities. We know that Iguvium, Camerinum and almost certainly Ocricum had treaties with Rome. In addition we know that Tuder and Tadinum were probably autonomous states by the mid third century, judging by the coinage of the former and the mention of the *totar tarsinater* (Tadinate community) on the Iguvine Tables. Tuder must have had its own alliance with Rome; Tadinum seems to have been incorporated into the Roman block. The paucity of the evidence for such administrative arrangements means that, although we know of no others, there were probably many other states with analogous bonds to Rome. The total number of these small Umbrian states can only be estimated. It is likely, however, that the Umbrians were more fragmented politically than the other peoples in the Appennines to the south.

It is tempting to ascribe the ease of the Roman take-over to the political organisation prevalent in Umbria at the time. The apparent division into a mass of tiny states, who came together for collective defence but were in Livy's picture prone to disagreement, would seem to have none of the resilience attributed to the Samnites. But we may be at the mercy of ill-informed Roman sources here. The peoples of the central Appennines, the Marsi, Paeligni, Marrucini, Frentani and Vestini, also failed to resist the Romans effectively, and yet they seem to have been individually as politically unified as the Samnites. Polybius' figures (2.24) for the allied contingents to the Roman army in 225 BC show that as a whole the manpower resources of both the central Appennine peoples and the Umbrians were substantially smaller than those of the Etruscans and the Samnites; all these peoples were dwarfed by the Roman state. These figures can only, of course, be taken as rough indications for the time of the conquest: the Roman state had expanded hugely at the expense of the allies during the fourth and third centuries. Nevertheless, it seems clear that the average Umbrian state or central Appennine tribe (if this is a useful concept) would have had a much smaller population than, for instance, an Etruscan or Campanian city-state. Furthermore, the unity of the Samnites and the size of the area they controlled meant that they could draw on a far larger pool of manpower resources than all of these peoples, and this explains why they were far more effective challengers to the Romans than any other similarly organised Appennine tribe.

---

134 Cornell in CAH 7.2^3 376.
135 Given above in section 6.
It is fairly easy to highlight the strategic aims of the Romans in founding Latin colonies in Umbria. Narnia and Spoletium were both naturally defended sites that controlled the vital route through the region to the north later followed by the Via Flaminia. Interamna sat astride this route, the entry to the Valnerina leading across the Appennines and the north-south route to Reate. Similarly, viritane settlement was also clearly guided by economic principles, with portions of the region's most fertile land in the Valle Umbra confiscated and distributed. But neither type of settlement was governed by one purpose alone. Spoletium, Interamna and Narnia controlled swathes of the rich Umbrian plains as well as the routes that led into them. The influx of settlers to Plestia helped consolidate Roman control on the routes from Umbria to Picenum. It is also interesting to note that the viritane settlement in Umbria was in no sense protected by an outer barrier of Latin colonies. Viritane settlement was probably not on a huge scale, but Latin colonisation certainly was. The three huge entities of Interamna, Narnia and Spoletium must have completely overshadowed the small surrounding Umbrian centres, and provided three new poles of attraction to rival the influence exerted by the neighbouring Etruscan cities of Perugia and (until 264 BC) Volsinii.\footnote{For the size of these centres see sections 4 and 6 above.}
UMBRIA IN THE THIRD AND SECOND CENTURIES BC

1. SOURCES.

Archaeology is the only type of evidence that can give us a detailed perspective on the region's long term development. In particular it is the predominant source of information for urbanisation and for the external influences on the region. The dominance of archaeology is particularly marked for the period of Umbrian history before the Roman conquest, for which there is much less literary or epigraphic evidence. In this period we get only indirect testimony of the presence of towns, for example from the excavations of cemeteries, which seem to show a concentration of wealth and population on particular sites. For the period after the conquest there is more direct testimony of urbanism with the survival of the remains of temples and fortifications. In addition it is really only after the conquest that we can supplement archaeology with literary and epigraphic evidence, which gives us a picture of the region's political and administrative organisation.

The reliance on archaeology, especially for certain aspects and periods of this region's history, means that it must be used with considerable methodological care. The problems that arise are largely to do with the historical conclusions drawn from archaeology rather than with the interpretation of the actual results of excavation. As with all other types of source material, it is important to realise the short-comings of archaeological evidence. These are largely to do with the bias and selectiveness of the sample. The history of the region means that the conditions for the survival of archaeological material are not especially favourable. Few other regions have had as much continuity of settlement from ancient to modern times as Umbria. Not only have almost all the ancient towns been built over, with the odd exception such as Urvinum Hortense and Carsulae, but they have also been used as quarries by the medieval and early modern builders of this region. The only building structures that have survived above ground level are those which have continued to be used, such as city walls,

1 Discussed in ch. 2.
2 In some respects this is compensated by the greater likelihood that ancient material will be uncovered here because modern building work is concentrated on these sites.
temples that have been turned into churches, or monuments too big to be destroyed by quarrying, such as amphitheatres. In addition, the area had (until quite recently) been subject to less excavation than many other Italian regions. And although a notable amount of work has been done in the last fifteen years, it is still the case that the majority of finds were made in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when the methodology of excavation was much less sophisticated. Investigation has on the whole focused on cemeteries rather than city sites, where excavation is only really possible in very restricted areas, such as under redundant churches, or where building work has been undertaken.

The result is that it can be misleading to compare this region directly with others of ancient Italy without taking into account the differing history of their archaeology. For example, when we compare the rural sanctuaries of Umbria and Samnium are we really comparing two equivalent categories? The rural religious sites of Umbria are most heavily attested in the archaic period, those in Samnium in the third and second centuries BC (see below). The rural sanctuaries of Samnium are much more impressive archaeologically than those of rural Umbria, but they should really be compared instead to the sanctuaries within Umbrian settlement centres onto which the emphasis of religious life seems to have shifted between 300 and 90 BC (see below). The temples within the nucleated settlements of Umbria have been almost ignored because their remains, mostly architectural terracottas, are archaeologically almost invisible. Yet this evidence is, in my opinion, as significant as that for Samnium: all that is required is an awareness of the much better conditions for the survival of remains in rural Samnium than in urban Umbria.

In support of this we can look at the example of Narnia in southern Umbria, a Latin colony founded in 299 BC. The complete absence of evidence for this city in the Republican period illustrates the deficiencies of the archaeological record typical of many cities in this region: comparisons with other excavated Latin colony sites, such as Alba Fucens, Cosa, Fregellae or Paestum, show that the public buildings thought necessary for the political and religious life of the community, such as the comitium, curia and capitolium, were quickly erected after the foundation of the colony according to a standard model. The same process almost certainly occurred at Narnia, but without the analogous examples from elsewhere we would be totally ignorant of this.

We must treat indications in other sources of different levels of development very seriously. Important information is provided by literary and epigraphic sources on the

---

3 Malone and Stoddart, Territory, Time and State 177.

4 On the archaeological profile of Samnium see Dench, Barbarians 137.
political organisation of Umbrian communities, for which the picture conflicts to some extent with that provided by archaeology. Inscriptions with the titles of magistrates are the best source for this, supplemented by the more detailed but often obscure picture of the organisation of the citizen body as a whole provided by the Iguvine Tables. No inscription from before the Social War refers to the Umbrians as a whole, however, and for the collective organisation of this people we have to use snippets of information preserved by Livy (in the narrative of the conquest) and by antiquarian writers.\(^5\)

In summary, our methodology when dealing with this subject should be to use all the types of evidence available, and as far as possible compare their implications. Where one type of evidence is predominant, it is extremely important to be aware of its limitations, and to allow for any biases it might have. The gaps in all the types of evidence make reliance on arguments from silence dangerous: such fragmentary evidence should only be used to argue in a positive way.

2. MONUMENTAL BUILDING: THE EVIDENCE OF ARCHITECTURAL TERRACOTTAS AND TEMPLE PODIA\(^6\)

In this chapter I will examine the evidence for urbanisation in Umbria and for changes in activity at rural sanctuary sites in the pre-Social War period. The importance of urbanisation has been examined in chapter one. Although its absence should not be assumed to preclude the presence of effective organisational structures, the growth of urbanism is a positive indication that a society is becoming more complex and probably more centralised.

The evidence for building activity in Umbria before the Social War in 90 BC is almost wholly confined to city sites. Only rudimentary structures have been discovered in rural areas, mostly connected with sanctuaries.\(^7\) The first substantial buildings within lowland settlement sites were probably temples, although domestic buildings and fortification structures have also been identified. The evidence for these temples consists mainly of architectural terracottas, with a few podia. These tend to be the only parts to survive archaeologically because the superstructures of monumental buildings in central Italy before the Social War were often constructed in materials of little durability such as wood, or mud-brick, rather than stone.\(^8\) Two examples of temple podia survive

---
\(^{5}\) See ch. 3.
\(^{6}\) For references and details of the sites mentioned in this section see the table in appendix 1, and maps 1 and 4.
\(^{7}\) See section 6.
from the period before the Social War, at Collemancio di Cannara (ancient Urvinum Hortense) and at S. Maria in Canale near Todi. Although the large stone blocks that were used to build this part of the temple made for a more durable structure, they were also more suited to re-use, as happened with the moulded block found filling up a window of the Rocca at Spoleto.

Terracotta tiles and plaques were used to cover the timbers of monumental wooden buildings and protect them from the elements. Other architectural terracottas were more decorative in function, such as antefixes and pedimental statues. In Umbria, where the building to which they pertain is known, it is always a temple, for instance at Bettona (ancient Vettona) and Collemancio (Urvinum Hortense). In other regions and especially in the archaic period, however, they were also used on monumental buildings which seem not to have been purely religious in function, e.g. the 'palaces' at Murlo and Acquarossa, and the Regia at Rome. Whilst allowing for the possibility that such multi-functional buildings existed in Umbria, particularly in the seventh and sixth centuries, it is legitimate to assume that architectural terracottas from third and second century Umbria are probably evidence of large sacred buildings.

Unfortunately architectural terracottas, and thus any temples associated with them, are difficult to date, for two reasons: (i) the archaeological circumstances of their discovery, which often occurred in the nineteenth century or earlier, are usually poorly documented. (ii) the types of design on them were often repeated for long periods, preventing the establishment of a clearly defined progression of datable types. Only recently have detailed studies appeared using stylistic comparisons to date terracottas more closely. Place of manufacture is another important question that has not yet received substantial attention. Manconi has suggested that most of the surviving terracottas from Collemancio, Gubbio, Bettona, Spello, Todi and Magione (on the shores of Lake Trasimene) were produced locally rather than imported from neighbouring
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11 M. J. Strazzulla, 'Le terrecotte architettoniche: le produzioni dal IV al I sec. a.C.', Società romana e produzione schiavistica, II. Merci, mercati e scambi nel Mediterraneo (Bari, 1981) 189 claims that they are solely employed in sacred building from the fourth to second centuries BC. But note the antefix on a building at M. Vairano of c. 200-50 BC, the so-called 'casa di LN' (Dench, Barbarians 132).
12 Strazzulla, 'Terrecotte architettoniche' 187.
13 For instance Manconi, 'Terrecotte architettoniche'.
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regions, because the moulds used were extremely similar. Little more has been established to date.\textsuperscript{14}

There are other problems with using architectural terracottas as evidence of temples in this region. Some architectural terracottas, such as those from Assisi, lack any provenance and can only be assigned in general to the town in which they turn up, but the possibility that they were brought from elsewhere in a later period should be kept in mind. They could, for example, come from rural religious sites although excavated examples, such as M. Ansciano and M. Acuto, suggests that their use in rural sanctuaries was uncommon. If the real provenance was another settlement centre, my central point (that this is material evidence for the beginning of urbanisation) remains unaffected.

Later building on ancient cities in Umbria means that almost all of the attested architectural terracottas are chance survivals from the decay and subsequent destruction of the temples (or other buildings) associated with them. The remains of temples found outside medieval and modern urban areas, such as Colle di Bettona, Collemancio and S. Maria in Canale, generally have more surviving structures. Inside town centres only odd architectural terracottas or podia blocks tend to be preserved, unless a large amount of material was buried together in antiquity, as seems to have happened at Todi. The destruction of ancient buildings and the difficulty of excavation make it likely that the terracottas attested represent only a small proportion of the Republican temples that once existed in Umbria.

Despite these problems with the source material some tendencies are detectable from this small sample. Perhaps predictably building activity before the Social War seems to have been restricted to the sub-Appennine zones of Umbria, as opposed to the more mountainous areas. In the latter no traces of temples on the Etrusco-Italic model from before the Social War have been found to date.\textsuperscript{15} Furthermore, except for Jesi and Civitalba, there is no evidence from the eastern side of the Appennines, where urbanisation seems to have been largely confined to the post-Social War period. Most evidence for building activity comes from the Valle Umbra, an area dominated by Perugia at one end and Spoleto at the other. By the end of the third century there were probably monumental buildings at Arna, Assisi, Bettona, Bevagna, Collemancio and Spoleto. Gubbio and Todi, away from this valley, are also likely to have had temples before 200 BC. The most significant evidence in quantitative terms is for Bettona, Civitalba,

\textsuperscript{14} Manconi, 'Terrecotte architettoniche' 64.
\textsuperscript{15} This mountainous zone stretches to the east of the Iguvium - Spoletium axis (see map 1). The rural sanctuaries found in this (and other) areas are examined in section 6 below.
Collemancio, Spoleto and Todi. At all of these sites except Civitalba the groups of terracottas have been found by excavation. At Todi, the discoveries may relate to a refuse dump; according to Tamburini, the terracottas' quality and quantity could suggest a school of craftsmen working within the town.¹⁶ In the case of Spoleto, the finds probably come from more than one temple. There is obviously much less certainty in deducing the presence of temples from single terracotta fragments; but where there has been no excavation, very few pieces are likely to be casually found or preserved by chance.

The graph of the evidence shows a steady increase in the number of temples from the fourth to the second century BC.¹⁷ Although the numbers involved are very small, they seem to be in the sort of proportion that we might expect. This growth in building is something that, apart from a little activity in the archaic period, began in the century before the Roman conquest. The progressive increase from the fourth century onwards also shows that the building boom of the second and first century common to much of Italy had a background of gradually increasing activity in the previous centuries in this region. From the first century onwards, the evidence of architectural terracottas becomes less representative as monumental buildings began to be built totally out of stone, such as the so-called 'Temple of Minerva' in Assisi (40-20 BC).¹⁸ Architectural terracottas are still produced, however, as is clear from the restoration of the older style, predominantly wooden, temples of Collemancio and Bettona in the first century BC.

In theory, the designs of the architectural terracottas should give us some idea of the contacts between Umbrian centres and other regions before the Social War. This in turn might help us to identify some of the sources of inspiration for the building of temples in this region. As I have noted above, the architectural terracottas of Umbria have been subject to little study, except for those from Collemancio and Todi. Nevertheless the picture from these two sites correlates with that given by other elements of material culture: that is to say, the dominant influence on Umbria in the fourth century BC is Orvieto.¹⁹ In all probability, the designs of the fourth century

¹⁶ P. Tamburini, in Todi. Verso un museo 54. He also documents the substantial ceramic production here from the fourth to the third century, although the case for the terracottas is unprovable. G. Gualterio, Todi. Verso un museo, and M. Tascio, Todi. Verso un museo 19, see them as of Orvietan or Faliscan production: this would still demonstrate considerable purchasing power.
¹⁷ See figure 1 (in the pocket at the end).
¹⁸ This reflects a new Hellenised culture according to F. Coarelli, 'Assisi repubblicana: riflessioni su un caso di autoromanizzazione', Atti Accademia Properziana del Subasio 19 (1991) 21.
¹⁹ See, for example, the alphabets used for inscriptions (discussed later in section 9, and in ch. 5 section 2).
terracottas from Todi, Perugia and Arna are derived from Orvietan prototypes. In the period after the conquest we can only use the evidence of Collemancio: here Manconi has suggested that the terracottas, though locally produced, show stylistic parallels with several central and northern Etruscan sites.²⁰ This evidence has important implications for the development of communal organisation. In basic economic terms the building of temples shows the concentration of resources, almost certainly in the hands of an aristocracy. Temples in the world of Republican Italy often bore the name of one or more private benefactors, although they may have paid for it whilst holding magisterial office. The construction process requires the organisation of a labour force and the presence of specialised craftsmen, if not in the town, then in the region.²¹ It seems reasonable to argue that the emergence of organisational structures gave the aristocracy more power, and that the prestige of monumental buildings helped justify this power. However, the extent to which the aristocracy actually used the rituals associated with these temples to create an ideology and provide religious sanction for their own position is unclear, although this is often judged to be a universal feature of early states.²²

We are on more certain ground in adducing the implications of temple building for urbanisation.²³ Temples are a clear confirmation that settlement sites in Umbria are serving a new function (besides that of residence and burial); in my first chapter I suggested that the variety of functions performed by a site is a useful index of urbanism. It is also surely significant that temples were situated where the population was congregating, and not at the places of obvious natural significance (mountain tops, caves, passes) that had been designated for religious rituals in the archaic period.²⁴ The creation of temples within towns could be related to the decline in votive deposition at sanctuaries in the Umbrian countryside, although many obviously continued to be frequented.²⁵ There is a clear contrast with the third and second century situation in the

²⁰ D. Manconi, 'Terrecotte architettoniche' 64, citing Luni, Cosa, Arezzo and Sovana.
²¹ Assuming Manconi is right to stress the often local nature of terracotta production (above).
²² Skalnik, 'The early state as a process' 615: 'Mostly ideological persuasion is predominant in the legitimation of the early state. The state has to be justified to the members of both the communities and the pre-state tribal aristocracies [assuming the state to be monarchical] which have lost their independence as a result of the annexation of their groups ... At the same time also, the far-reaching penetration of ideas of the dominant religion, i.e., that of the ruling stratum, takes place.' Cf. Cherry, 'Polities and palaces' 31.
²³ Cf. Stoddart, Territory, Time and State 174; he sees the creation of a temple around 500 BC in Perugia, known from its antefixes, as a sign of the town's urbanisation, 'representing a new centralised religious authority'; Cornell, Beginnings 102 on the importance of religious buildings at Rome.
²⁴ A few settlement sites, such as Spoleto and Todi, may have had sanctuaries in the archaic period (discussed in ch. 2).
²⁵ See section 6 below.
more mountainous parts of Central Italy (such as the part of Samnium occupied by the Pentri) where religion was firmly centred around rural sanctuaries, which were increasingly given a monumental dress.

3. FORTIFICATIONS

The only other constructions attested archaeologically are fortifications. The dating of these is controversial, however, as it usually rests on the type of construction technique employed rather than on excavation, and most techniques were used for several centuries. Current opinion is that the urban fortifications of Bettona, Amelia and Otricoli predate the Roman conquest. Several cities of allied status seem to have been walled before the Social War. Pliny records that the walls of Bevagna were, like those of Arezzo, made from brick. No traces of this wall have been found, but the late Republican stone circuit that must have replaced it is still visible. The brick wall is likely to date from at least the second century BC (assuming Pliny's notice is correct).

Much of the ancient city wall of Assisi, built from the rose-coloured stone of Monte Subasio, is still extant. The most detailed study, by Fontaine, has concluded from the construction technique and the topography of the fortification that it dates from 90-50 BC. Coarelli, however, has suggested that the wall's date could be put considerably earlier on the basis of an architrave that he believes pertains to the wall. This piece of stone is of the appropriate monumental size (half an original of probably c. 3 m long) and has an Umbrian inscription on it (Po 7). The inscription's lettering and language, and its use of the Umbrian alphabet, suggest a date in the third century or the first half of the second century BC, which could determine the date of the wall. If this hypothesis is correct, it provides a significantly early date for a fortification which, at 2,500 m long, is larger than that of Augustan Spello (1,900 m long), and comparable with the size of second century BC Perugia, which had walls of 2,900 m.

Urvinum Hortense, next to modern Collemancio di Cannara, is a third Umbrian

---

\(^{26}\) See ch. 2.

\(^{27}\) N.H. 35.173: In Italia quoque latericius murus Arreti et Mevaniae est. Pliny's use of the present is curious: he could have copied this from an earlier source without any knowledge of the changed circumstances at Mevania, or it could simply be a mistake.


\(^{29}\) M. J. Strazzulla, Assisi romana (Assisi, 1985) 25 has also suggested it could pertain to a building, but it is more of the scale required for a city wall. For Po 7 see appendix 2.
centre that may have been walled before the Social War. Limited excavations in the 1930s uncovered sections of walling built with a construction technique, using squared sandstone blocks, analogous to that of a temple podium on the site. The latter probably dates from the third century BC; this could also be the date of the wall. The blocks of this podium were cut using the Roman foot as a module and the temple has a tripartite cella on the lines of Roman capitolia, but we need not assume actual Roman involvement in this fairly remote site, which is not near any important through routes. A third to second century date has also been postulated for the walls of Urbino (ancient Urvinum Mataurense), and a late second century date for the terraced fortifications of Todi, although both could be later.

Two other Umbrian sites are of relevance here, both with spectacular polygonal walling. Fontaine has attributed the walls of Spoleto and Amelia to Roman builders working after the conquest of the region. A good case can be made for Spoleto, although the question remains controversial. Fontaine's extensive investigation of the construction technique, plan and topography of the wall around the site led him to believe that the earliest phase of fortification should be associated with the Latin colony founded there in 241 BC. Unfortunately, most of his arguments are indecisive. There were probably three different phases of building, but the actual construction technique used does not by itself provide us with indications of the date. A similar type of polygonal work was used at S. Erasmo di Cesi, north of Terni, whose mountain peak position and probable religious function suggests that this was not a site built as a result of Roman intervention. On analogous lines it seems unsafe to take as exclusively Roman the overlapping wall arrangement of Via Cecili which protected an entrance by making attackers expose their shieldless right sides to the defenders. It is also used in Samnite hillforts, which were probably built during the fourth century as protection against Roman troops.

Nevertheless more compelling arguments are possible from the topography of the

---

30 G. Canelli Bizzozzero, 'La zona archeologica di Collemancio', *BSDPU* 30 (1933) 143-181; M. Matteini Chiari, *Raccolta di Cannara* 30, 64 reviews the excavation and dates the architectural terracottas found.
31 For references see ch. 5 section 5.
32 Fontaine, *Cités* 149-51 (Spoleto), 79-80 (Amelia).
33 Fontaine, *Cités* 150; there are four different techniques visible: we are concerned here with the most irregular polygonal phase; the second and third types (with more rectangular blocks) are thought to make up the base and upper parts of the same phase by Fontaine (147); the last phase, of regular rectangular blocks, is datable by epigraphic evidence to the first century BC (see ch. 5 section 5).
34 Buettner, 'L'abitato umbro di Cesi' 53-65.
35 As does Fontaine, *Cités* 150.
36 See the plans of M. Vairano and Chiauci in Coarelli, *La Regina*, *Abruzzo Molise* 277, 283.
fortification and its relation to the site as a whole. Fontaine has already pointed to the two great drains within the city built with the same construction technique as the first walling phase, and thus probably contemporary with it. More importantly, however, the building of the wall seems to be linked to a re-organisation of the community here: the fortification envelopes parts of the site that had been used previously for burials and so must represent a deliberate decision to expand the 'urban' area.\(^{37}\) The impression given by the new installation is of a concern with the whole operation of the 'urban' site rather than just its defence. Although there is a danger of making unjust assumptions here, these last considerations are strongly suggestive of the infrastructure created by Latin colonisation at sites such as Alba Fucens, where a massive polygonal circuit and sewer system were created soon after the foundation.\(^{38}\) One more difficulty in the equation is Roncalli's claim in a recent work that archaeological investigation has dated the walls, on the basis of the stratigraphy, to the second half of the fourth century BC.\(^{39}\) In the absence of further details and any publication of the results, and in the light of the other indications from the site discussed, judgment should be suspended.\(^{40}\)

The dating of the walls of Amelia is also uncertain. In chapter two it was suggested that a smaller fortification may have enclosed the upper part of the site before the Roman conquest. The main city walls around the lower part of the hill were probably built later.\(^{41}\) Fontaine suggests two likely periods in which they could have been set up: in connection with the building of the Via Amerina, which he assumes occurred in 241 BC, or in connection with the constitution of Amelia as a municipium soon after 90 BC. Both possibilities are suggested on the basis that the construction could only have been Roman inspired, if not executed. There are three objections to his arguments. Firstly, the technique of polygonal work is visible at at least one Umbrian site, S. Erasmo di Cesi (discussed above). Secondly, Amelia's status was probably allied rather than Roman before the Social War and it is unlikely that the Romans would fortify an allied community, even if it was a vital staging-post on a new road.\(^{42}\) Thirdly, Fontaine thinks that the city walls could only have been built in connection with an important historical

\(^{37}\) A point made by Roncalli, 'Gli Umbri' 405. These burials are attested down to the fourth century BC.

\(^{38}\) Mertens, 'Alba Fucens' 90-1.

\(^{39}\) 'Gli Umbri' 405: 'Le recenti indagini stratigrafiche condotte sulle mura di Spoleto ne datano alla seconda meta del IV secolo a. C. la cerchia poligonale, coerente con tracce di un assetto urbanistico che raccoglie nell’abitato spazi sottratti a precedenti necropoli.'

\(^{40}\) No firm results are reported from the recent archaeological work on the Rocca: De Angelis (ed.), Spoleto. Il collo della Rocca. Primi risultati di scavo.

\(^{41}\) See Plan 1.

\(^{42}\) Taylor, Voting Districts 85 n. 18, using the evidence of Cicero's Pro Roscio Amerino (see ch. 3 section 3).
event in Amelia's history, such as municipalisation after the Social War, and that this event is one we know about through the surviving sources; both assumptions may be wrong. Thus a substantial level of doubt remains regarding the date of both the walls at Amelia and at Spoleto.

4. OTHER TYPES OF BUILDING ACTIVITY
Apart from temples and fortifications, which provide the most important evidence for monumental construction in this period, we also have evidence of other types of building in third and second century Umbria. Two Umbrian inscriptions record building work concerned with the management of water supplies, probably springs (depending on the interpretation of the Umbrian word *bia*). The example from Foligno (Ve 234) is in a cursive rather than a monumental Latin alphabet, which makes it extremely difficult to date: the most likely period seems to be the mid third to the mid second century BC.\(^43\) The second inscription, from Fossato di Vico (Ve 233), is generally dated to the second half of the second century BC, and more specifically, by some authors, to the Gracchan era.\(^44\) One other useful inscription in this context, this time in Latin, is that recording the building of a cistern and (terracing) wall by six *marones* at Assisi.\(^45\) The dating of this inscription is also controversial; through letter forms and spelling it should perhaps be assigned to c. 110-90 BC.\(^46\) The structure of the cistern mentioned in the inscription and today preserved within the cathedral of San Rufino includes a cornice very similar to the only surviving city gate, which is probably also of a late second/early first century date.\(^47\) Remains of another edifice uncovered by building work and subsequently destroyed in the early part of this century were probably linked to the north-eastern part of these constructions. There was a large square keep and a portico with four large travertine columns, of which the mid to late second century Ionic bases survived to be recorded.\(^48\) Coarelli identifies this as a monumental entrance to what served as the *arx* of the city.

---

\(^{43}\) Text of inscriptions in appendix. Dating - Harris, *Etruria and Umbria* 185: 'soon after 150 BC, if not earlier'; F. Roncalli in *Antichità dall'Umbria a Budapest* 165: c. 250-200 BC; M. Crawford (personal comment): before 150 BC.\(^{44}\) E.g. A. Feruglio, in *Antichità dall'Umbria a Budapest* 165.\(^{45}\) CIL XI 5390: see appendix 3. The exact nature of the *fornix* and *circus* mentioned is unclear, although the inscription does not imply that the *circus* was created at the same time. Coarelli, 'Assisi repubblicana' identifies it with the level area that is now the Piazza Matteotti.\(^{46}\) Many authors have placed it after the Social War because of the use of Latin, e.g. J. Heurgon, 'L'Ombrie à l'époque des Gracques et de Sylla', in *I problemi di storia e archeologia dell'Umbria. I convegno di studi umbri*. Congress: Gubbio, 1963 (Perugia, 1964) 128, but this is not a decisive argument.\(^{47}\) Coarelli, 'Assisi repubblicana' 9-11.\(^{48}\) E. Stefani, *NSc* (1935) 19-24; Strazzulla, *Assisi romana* 26-7; Coarelli, 'Assisi repubblicana' 9-10.
We have archaeological testimony of two other building complexes in Umbrian cities before the Social War. Just to the north of Mevania, in a position that may have been inside the ancient city walls, a structure interpreted as a nymphaeum was excavated from 1980-1982 on the same site as a preceding seventh century BC building. It has been dated by the excavators to the late third to second century BC. Archaeological work in 1990-1991 in Amelia brought to light a building of unclear function with part of its structure dated roughly by the excavators to the mid to late Republican period.

Two further pieces of archaeological information deserve mention. Archaeological research has established that the huts on the site of Spello were replaced by stone walled buildings in the third century. Secondly, a large rubbish dump of material in the suburban Guastaglia area of Gubbio testifies to the active occupation of this site from the late fourth to early second century BC.

5. URBANISATION: A SUMMARY

The evidence for urbanisation in Umbria before the Social War is not particularly impressive by the standards of neighbouring Etruria. The settlement centres here were probably not cities on that scale. Nevertheless the evidence when collected shows that there are more signs of urbanisation than has been previously thought. In addition the example of Nami, where no major Republican building work survives, should remind us of the huge restrictions of the archaeological record in Umbria. Any material from the Republican period that we know about must represent a tiny fraction of what once existed. From the period between the conquest and the Social War there is evidence of public building at Bevagna and Assisi, and to a lesser extent at Fossato di Vico, Foligno, Gubbio and Spello. Fortifications were built at Bettona, Amelia, Otricoli, Bevagna, Assisi and Collemancio di Cannara before the first century BC. Now we can add to this the architectural terracottas and podia found at a wide range of sites, but largely ignored by previous writers. This evidence demonstrates that Umbrian settlement

49 Mevania 87-90.
50 D. Monacchi, 'Amelia (Terni). Parco Farrattini. Rinvenimento di strutture medio-tardorepubblicane e di edificio romano', Bollettino di Archeologia 11-12 (1991) 87-93. The absence of stratigraphy prevented accurate dating, but the first construction phase of an opera quadrata wall, a well (both built without cement) and a 'cocciopesto' (crushed pottery) pavement are likely to be pre-Social War.
51 Brief notice by D. Manconi in Antichità d'Umbria a Leningrado 153.
52 Gaggiotti et al., Guida Laterza 185. For more details see ch. 2 section 3 (b) (x).
53 As seems to be reflected by the scarcity of pre-Social War material found in the recent survey of the Gubbio basin (Territory, Time and State 144: see ch. 5 section 7).
centres were performing a range of functions (religious, political, protective) for the people living in and near them.\textsuperscript{54} Thus a basic form of urbanism is attested.

6. RURAL SANCTUARIES\textsuperscript{55}

The picture of cult sites in the countryside provides us with a contrast to the rise of sanctuaries on town sites. The use of rural sanctuaries in the archaic period and its possible significance for the communities of this region has been examined in chapter two. In this section I want to follow the changes that occur to these sanctuaries and the cult activities that took place there in the period after the Roman conquest. Perhaps the most important question to be addressed is whether the changes are a result of the new Roman presence in and control over the region, or of the development of urban temples in the last centuries of the Republic outlined above. Previous work has linked the Roman presence to a decline in the use of rural sanctuaries. M. Verzar has pointed to the 'abandonment' of sanctuaries in more Romanised areas, for example M. Subasio (Assisi) and M. San Pancrazio (near Otricoli) and to the prolonged use of those in the Appennine zone, for example Col di Mori.\textsuperscript{56} To those she classifies as 'abandoned' we might add the sanctuary of Campo la Piana near Nocera Umbra, where there is no votive material from after the second century. In the other direction, there is also evidence of prolonged frequentation into at least the first century BC, if not the imperial period, at M. Torre Maggiore (north of Terni), Grotta Bella (between Amelia and Todi), M. Ingino and M. Ansciano (behind Gubbio), M. Acuto near Umbertide, and Colfiorito.

But there are problems with this sort of approach. Firstly, it is very difficult to be certain about levels of frequentation of rural cult sites. Only a small number of them have dated building phases, and in most cases we are reliant on the quantity of votives found. We can only assume that the deposition of votives roughly reflects the level of activity, and that no votives at all mean that the site was abandoned. We can never actually rule out the possibility that activity continued on a site in a way that has left no archaeologically visible traces. Secondly, Verzar's view does not even take any account of the changing proportions of material found on these sites in different chronological

\textsuperscript{54} The early centrality of religious buildings to urbanisation is clear in many ancient cities: witness the building of the sanctuary in the Forum Boarium in the late seventh century BC, Rome's earliest known monumental building apart from the Regia.

\textsuperscript{55} For the location of the sites referred to in this section see Maps 3 and 4.

\textsuperscript{56} M. Verzar, 'La situazione in Umbria', in Società romana e produzione schiavistica I (Bari, 1981) 373.
periods. Most sanctuaries are poorly documented; we only get anything approaching a representative picture from the handful of sites which have been both recently excavated and fully reported. We can take M. Ansciano as an exemplar of these, although it should be borne in mind that the artefacts and remains found here were not elaborate by the standards of most Umbrian sanctuaries. The excavators date the most intense phase of use of the sanctuary to a period between the late sixth and third centuries BC, following the work of Colonna on the style of the votives. The material from after this period is less significant in quantity, although it shows that the site continues to be frequented, presumably still with a continuing ritual purpose. These rituals no longer focus around bronze figurines: the finds instead include Roman Republican coins and numerous fragments of Imperial cups and lamps. The pattern at M. Ansciano of a most intensive phase of usage down to the fourth/third century, followed by a reduced, but continued frequentation may be common to other less well investigated sites. In other words, the mere presence of later Republican material noted in less detailed reports may actually mask a decline in use. Most summary accounts simply fail to acknowledge this.

This pattern is paralleled in other sanctuary excavations. At Pasticcetto di Magione, the most intense phase of activity seems to have been from the fifth to the third centuries BC, judging by the typology of the bronze votive material and the architectural terracottas. The presence of some black glaze and terra sigillata pottery shows that frequentation of the site continued into the imperial period, although this was probably only on a sporadic basis. The same pattern of offering - frequent in the period before the conquest, but tailing off in the third or second century BC - has been ascribed to the sanctuary on M. Subasio near Assisi. Unfortunately only nine small bronzes from the votive deposit discovered here in 1879 have been preserved and recorded, and so we cannot be absolutely sure that significant quantities of later material were not also present, especially considering that late Republican material has been found at all the sites excavated in the last twenty years. The various statuettes, the later examples of which may not have been produced in Umbria, have been assigned by Monacchi on the grounds of style to various dates from the end of the sixth or start of the fifth century to the third or second century BC. It is tempting to connect the apparent ending of ritual activity here and the decline of that at M. Ansciano to the beginnings of evidence for

---

58 But Colonna, Bronzi votivi 24 states that most production ends in the early fourth century BC.
59 Bruschetti, in Antichità dall'Umbria a Budapest 113-23.
60 Helbig, Bull. Inst. (1880) 249-50, noting the presence of archaic bronze votives and ceramic fragments; Monacchi, 'Monte Subasio' 77-89.
temple building in the centres of Assisi and Gubbio. But without better information on M. Subasio we really need more such examples to be certain of this being a general trend.

By contrast there are other sanctuaries in Umbria where frequentation, as far as we can tell, does not show a serious decline in connection with the Roman conquest. The best known of these is in Grotta Bella, excavated from 1970 to 1974, after 'clandestine' activity had seriously damaged the stratigraphy. Of the material that remained, the largest quantity was from the pre-Roman period (304 bronze and lead votives) but a considerable amount belonged to the 300 - 90 BC period. The latter was more varied than the former, including pottery, four anatomic votive terracottas and 97 bronze coins, of which the largest number were from the second century. There is a gap in the evidence from the Social War to the first century AD, probably as a result of the site's abandonment, and thereafter only sporadic evidence for use of the site until the fourth century AD has been recovered. The results of this excavation would seem to suggest that not all rural sanctuaries went out of use in the period around the Roman conquest. Clearly the frequentation of Grotta Bella in the third and second centuries BC remained at a much higher level than that of comparable sanctuaries at M. Ansciano and Pasticcetto di Magione. The continued use of the sanctuary at Ancarano, near Norcia, in this period parallels that of Grotta Bella. This example might suggest that it was the position of such sanctuaries away from developing urban centres in wholly rural districts, although still near communications routes, that ensured their longer-term survival.

Two other sanctuaries show some evidence of continued use. A Roman statue and base and large numbers of votive bronzes turned up within or next to the enclosure of the sanctuary at Col di Mori north of Gualdo Tadino, whose form was clarified by superficial excavation in the early 1930s. The intensity of its use in the Roman period remains unclear, however, without more detailed archaeological information. In addition, Roman era material was also found in the excavation during the 1960s of the sanctuary at Colfiorito. The ancient city of Plestia grew up within a kilometre of this sanctuary, probably over the last three centuries of the Republic and with Roman rather than allied
status. The results of the excavations have only been briefly summarised, unfortunately, and we can say little more than that the sanctuary continued in use between the fifth and first centuries BC, with all the attendant problems, discussed in relation to M. Ansciano, of what this actually means.

Further evidence of the religious changes in this period come from the votive deposits themselves. There is a dramatic change from the period before the Roman conquest, when they consist almost totally of bronze figurines, to after, when coins, and fictile products like pottery usually predominate, with bronze only in much smaller quantities. The later fictile material includes some votives imitating anatomic forms. These are typical of Latium and their presence is often taken as a sign of Romanisation. Does this mean that where they occur Umbrian cult practices of the pre-conquest period had been replaced by Roman inspired forms of dedication?

The exact significance of this change in Umbria seems hard to pin down. It is not at all clear that the ending of Umbrian production of bronze figurines is connected to the Roman conquest. Such bronzes have not been excavated from stratigraphic contexts, and have to be dated on the basis of style. Colonna, in the standard work on Umbrian votive bronzes, says that their manufacture becomes sporadic after the early fourth century BC, although that of schematic figures could continue for a longer period. Other writers, such as M. Verzar, have taken the Roman conquest as the most significant break.

After the conquest terracotta votives appear in some deposits but only in small numbers. Just outside Amelia three anatomic votives and fifteen terracotta heads were found together with coins and a large number of bronze as well as some lead figurines in the 1860s. A votive deposit found in the late nineteenth century in association with a sanctuary at Campo la Piana near Nocera Umbra contained two terracotta heads as well as about 150 small bronzes. Within the same area, two votive terracottas are known to have come from Colle di Nocera to the north. Similar proportions of anatomic votives to earlier bronze material have been discovered at Grotta Bella (discussed above) and at Isola di Fano near Fossombrone on the other side of the Appennines.

---

66 This ceramic material is usually either produced in Roman (and Etruscan) areas or consists of local imitations of their forms.
67 Colonna, Bronzi votivi 24.
71 Bonomi Ponzi et al., Il territorio nocerino tra protostoria e altomedioevo 72.
72 Bull. Inst. (1875) 75-81; NSc (1899) 260-1.
In addition one other site in Umbria has to my knowledge produced terracotta votives, this being Bevagna. The civic collection of this town includes a mould for the production of terracotta feet, a terracotta head and a small terracotta altar, all of mid Republican date (third or second centuries BC). Do such small proportions of material indicate that these cults were now of a predominantly 'health-giving' character, and does this represent a radical change from their earlier nature?

There are some similarities between the votive deposits of the fifth and fourth centuries and those of the period after the Roman conquest. Firstly, Umbrian sanctuaries such as M. Subasio, Todi and Nocera Umbra continue to receive offerings of bronze figurines in the third and second centuries. These figurines are common to a large area of central Italy and were not necessarily manufactured in Umbria, unlike the archaic figurines. Secondly, representations of anatomic parts are not unknown in archaic Umbrian votive deposits, cropping up at Bettona, Arna, M. San Pancrazio and Todi, and outside Umbria at Magione di Pasticcetto and Fonte Veneziana (Arezzo). Obviously, these parallels should not be pushed too far, but we should note that the evidence of the votive material suggests a complex process of change rather than a simple replacement of an 'Italic type' of cult with a 'Roman type'.

A further element of continuity is the survival of pre-Roman cults into the Roman period, for which the evidence is mainly epigraphic. The most obvious example of this is probably the worship of Cupra. Umbrian dedicatory inscriptions have been found at Colfiorito (Po 2), dating from the fourth century and at Fossato di Vico (Ve 233), probably from the second half of the second century BC. Worship of the goddess was particularly diffused in Sabinum and Picenum, where a record of the existence of two sanctuaries to her has been preserved in the modern place names of Cupra Marittima and Cupramontana. Other pre-Roman cults certainly continued through the Roman period in Umbria, but it is often difficult securely to identify them as indigenous rather than Roman-introduced. Many so-called Italic cults, such as that of Hercules, must have come ultimately from Greece or be local deities which have been given a Hellenised character, for example, and unless (rare) pre-conquest epigraphic dedications survive, it is often unclear where the exact origin was.

Find sites noted in Monacchi, 'Monte Subasio', 87 n. 53. These may not be produced in Umbria.
Antichità dall'Umbria a Budapest 122, 126.
A. E. Feruglio in Antichità dall'Umbria a Budapest 86.
D. Monacchi, 'Un luogo di culto di Feronia a Narni', DdA 2 (1985) 93-107, suggests that the cult of Feronia was introduced to Narnia in the late fourth or early third century, but it is impossible to be precise here.
In summary, there seems to be evidence that the creation of some sanctuaries in settlement sites in the fourth and third centuries, which we know from the evidence of architectural terracottas,\(^78\) did correspond to a decline in use of some, if not most, rural sanctuaries of archaic origin. The building of temples within towns from the fourth century onwards must be a manifestation of the increasing emphasis of life in the region on nucleated centres. Archaeology has shown that cult activity at rural sanctuaries generally continues beyond the Roman conquest.\(^79\) Furthermore, we know from one of Pliny’s *Letters* (8.8) that rural sanctuaries, in this case that associated with the Lacus Clitumnus, were a part of the Umbrian landscape in the early second century AD. Nevertheless, at some (perhaps most) sites, continuity of ritual activity was probably only on a sporadic basis. This is the case with M. Ansciano and M. Subasio (although we are poorly informed on this excavation), both of which are near important centres (2 km from Gubbio and 3 km from Assisi respectively) where we have probable evidence for temple building in the fourth or third centuries BC. It thus seems likely that these new temples took over the function of the old mountain top sanctuaries.\(^80\) A few other sanctuaries in more rural surroundings far from nucleated settlements, such as Grotta Bella, continue to be frequented on a regular basis down to the Social War, but even here the archaic phase was almost certainly the period of greatest cult activity.\(^81\) After the Social War the archaeological evidence from all the excavated examples of rural sanctuaries in Umbria suggests they fell out of common use; the literary evidence of Pliny, however, shows that this was by no means the whole story.\(^82\)

7. **POLITICAL ORGANISATION**\(^83\)

We have other evidence, besides urbanisation, that the organisation of Umbrian society in this period was significantly increasing in complexity. The first category is that concerning political institutions. The source material for the magisterial structure of Umbria before the Social War is overwhelmingly epigraphic. Most of the relevant

---

\(^78\) See above.

\(^79\) See above on Grotta Bella, M. Ansciano, M. Subasio, M. Acuto, Col di Mori and so on.

\(^80\) The discovery of architectural terracottas and a votive deposit relating to a temple under Santa Maria in Camuccia at Todi, shows that the deposition of votives was a part of the rituals at both types of site (see appendix 1 for details).

\(^81\) On the assumption that the decline in the number of votives left is not wholly the result of a change in the pattern of offering.

\(^82\) See ch. 5 section 6.

\(^83\) The convention of words that are written in the Umbrian alphabet being represented in bold, and those in the Latin alphabet by italics, is followed here. For the Umbrian inscriptions cited see appendix 2, for the Latin see appendix 3.
inscriptions are in the Umbrian language, but there are a few in Latin. Nearly all are less than 20 words long, with the notable exception of the Iguvine Tables, the longest document in any Italic language besides Latin. The Tables are thought to record the ritual procedure of a priestly college within the ancient town of Gubbio, and it is often difficult to decide whether the institutions they describe are religious or civic. The other Umbrian inscriptions are mostly of a civic rather than religious character and so are less ambiguous, if brief. The uncertainty in translating Umbrian inscriptions should not be under-estimated, and the very small number of examples exacerbates the problem. A recent commentator has even claimed, for instance, that whole sections of the Iguvine Tables are verging on the incomprehensible. In addition political structure may have varied from place to place rather than being uniform across the whole region, reflecting the division of Umbria into a large number of small states.

Almost all Umbrian inscriptions date from the third or second centuries BC. The composition of the Iguvine Tables, which use both Umbrian and Latin script, probably stretches over both centuries. John Wilkins' recent attempt to down-date their inscription in bronze to the Augustan era seems wildly implausible to me, not only because the change in scripts used suggests a long period of composition, but also because these scripts are themselves 'archaic'. Moreover, the actual content of the Tables clearly includes some elements from a more ancient past. The list of the enemies of the Iguvine state who are banished from the body of citizens gathered for a lustration consists in part of other Umbrian peoples, an animosity that must pre-date the Roman organisation that resulted from the conquest. In general much of the political structure attested by Umbrian epigraphy is likely to date from before Roman influence became decisive, that is probably before the conquest, because the terminology used is not of Roman origin.

The political hierarchy of the Umbrians seems to have been fairly basic. The interpretation that best fits the exiguous evidence is that the supreme magistrate was the uhtur; he may have held office with a colleague. This interpretation derives from the appearance of this office as a dating formula on the Iguvine Tables (Va 2, 15) and on an inscription from Assisi (Ve 236 in the appendix two). On this latter example, ohretie

---

84 Wilkins in Territory, Time and State 152-172, claiming, for example, that 'Tables II, III and IV are obscure' (171).
85 Wilkins in Territory, Time and State 171-2, suggests that the variety of scripts were the result of copying originals from differing time periods, but providing no parallels for this: archaising inscriptions tend to mimic word forms but not older scripts.
86 Ib 16-18, V1b 53-55, cited below.
87 The exceptions to this are examined below.
('uhtur-ship') precedes maronatei ('maronate', see below) and this probably reflects the order of seniority. The office of uhtur had until recently been widely assumed to be an internal office of the Atiedian Brotherhood, appointed by its members. But a funerary epitaph from Bevagna published in 1970 (Po 3) has uhtur mentioned after the dead man's name in the style of a magistracy, suggesting that this is a civic office. Although the word uhtur is similar to the Latin 'auctor', it is more likely to be an Umbrian word than a loan from Latin. This is because its difference in form and its appearance in the Iguvine Tables would require its borrowing at an implausibly early date centuries before the composition of the Tables, to enable its transformation into the form we know from the late third/early second century.

Another civic office, whose holders are called marones, is mentioned on three Umbrian inscriptions and two Latin ones from this region. Although this magistracy is also used as a dating formula (Ve 236), it is probably junior to the uhtur. The word itself may be Etruscan, and occurs on Etruscan inscriptions from the fourth century BC, well before it is attested in Umbria. It is also an auxiliary magistracy in Etruria, and its probable borrowing from here supports the interpretation that it has a correspondingly lesser status in Umbria. The Latin quaestorship also seems to have been borrowed, perhaps individually, by some Umbrian communities. Significantly, it has different functions at different places, probably being a priestly official at Gubbio (Iguvine Tables Va 23), and a magistracy related to the corn supply at Bevagna (Po 4). Thus the head of Umbrian communities, the uhtur, seems to have been gradually supplemented with institutions borrowed from elsewhere, which were presumably needed as the job of governing these communities became more complex.

We can gain some further information on communal organisation, at least within the town of Gubbio, from the text of the Iguvine Tables. A particularly useful section in this regard is VIb 53-4, usually interpreted as the banishment of enemies in connection with a lustration.

eso. eturstahmu. pisest. toto/. tarsinater. trifor. tarsinater. tuscer naharcer. iabuscer. nomner. eetu. ehesu. poplu.

Thus shall he [the adfertor] pronounce banishment: 'Whoever is of the Tadinate people, of the Tadinate tribe, of the Tuscan, the Narcan, the Iapudic name, let

89 Campanile and Letta, *Studi sulle magistrature indigene e municipali in area Italica* 50.
90 Poutney, *Bronze Tables* 23.
93 The ethnic implications of this part of the Tables are discussed in ch. 2 section 1.
him go out from this people.' (trans. Poulney, Bronze Tables).

The *nomen* was the largest ethnic group mentioned, such as the 'Tuscan' (that is Etruscan) name, which is analogous to the Latin name. Presumably an Umbrian *nomen* existed, though it is not mentioned in any Umbrian epigraphy. This was subdivided into various states (*totar* in the nominative and genitive singular) e.g. the Iguvine *totar* or the Tadinate *totar* (the latter being another Umbrian community, at Tadinum to the east). The other 'technical' term used in this passage, *trifo*, appears equivalent to the *totar* from the formula *totar tarsinater trifo tarsinater*. This expression is also attested independently by Livy (31.2.6; 33.37.1), who refers to a Roman army marching into northern Italy via a part of Umbria called the *tribus Sapinia*. This seems to imply that *trifo* means the community in the territorial sense as opposed to *totar*, the community in the political sense.

Thus there was a fairly sophisticated technical vocabulary relating to communal organisation, for which most of the terms may be of Osco-Umbrian origin and not simply borrowed from Rome. To these can also be added words *furo* (forum) and *kumne*, (comitium) which are public spaces within the town or, in the later case, an assembly. Finally, further organisational divisions are necessitated by the lustration of the Iguvine people, in which those present are required to organise themselves into various ranks, perhaps relating to priestly or military status. The overall picture is one of a society that clearly has defined groups and designated representatives with authority over the community. These are at least some of the organisational requirements that we used in chapter one to define the state; this image of Iguvium does not in my opinion conflict with the archaeological evidence for the centre.

8. WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

The political development of Umbria in the period before the Social War is further

---

94 There is a fifth century South Picene text on a bronze bracelet including the phrase *ombrifen acren posticnam*, thought by La Regina ('Entità etniche 132-3) to mean 'in Umbrian territory'; this text is discussed more fully in ch. 2 section 1.
95 *... C. Ampium, praefectum socium, hac tumultuaria manu per Umbriam, qua tribum Sapinia vocant, agrum Boiorum invadere iussit.* '[The consul Publius Aelius] ordered Gaius Ampius, the commander of the allied forces, to take this improvised force and with it to invade the territory of the Boi, marching by way of Umbria, through the district known as the *tribus Sapinia*.'
96 Poulney, Bronze Tables 274.
97 See Ernout, Dialecte Ombrien and Poulney, Bronze Tables under the entry for each word.
98 Ernout, Dialecte Ombrien 86, 81-2 sees the first as a Latin loan, the second as Osco-Umbrian in origin. Poulney, Bronze Tables (index) is more ambivalent about the former.
99 Contrast Territory, Time and State 177.
attested by the standardisation of some weights and measures. The creation of such fixed points is clear evidence of the increasing centralisation of political authority. Firstly, the Umbrians shared with the Oscans a standard square unit of land.\textsuperscript{100} Frontinus (30L=13Th) and Hyginus (122L=85Th) from the corpus of Agrimensores record that they used the word \textit{vorsus} for a measured area of land within four boundaries. This was 100 by 100 feet, as opposed to the Roman unit of 120 by 120 feet. Secondly, according to John Lydus (\textit{de mens.} 2.2), who probably derives his information from an antiquarian of the first century BC, perhaps C. Fonteius Capito, pontifex from 44 BC, the Umbrians had their own way of measuring a day, from noon to noon.\textsuperscript{101}

Thirdly, at least some of the Umbrians had their own weight standard. This can be deduced from coins issued by Gubbio which have marks denoting how many twelfths of the pound they represent. This duodecimal division of the weight standard is shared with Roman practice, but a non-Roman point of reference was used. Gubbio shared its standard pound of around 200 g with various Etruscan centres.\textsuperscript{102} The most likely issue date for these is the First Punic War, assuming that they derive from the Roman issues of cast bronze coinage of the early third century.\textsuperscript{103} In the same period, Todi issued cast and struck bronze coinage on this weight standard, but then went on later during the Second Punic War to produce another series with a weight standard of around 250 g, which was probably based on a Roman precedent, as well as using the duodecimal system of denomination.\textsuperscript{104} Both communities used their individual names in the legends: \textit{tutere} is the Umbrian name of Tuder, modern Todi, and \textit{ikuvini} or \textit{ikuvins} that of Iguvium, modern Gubbio.\textsuperscript{105} The issue of coinage with an individual legend shows that a central authority existed with the power to represent the community. The ethnics specific to each centre are also evidence of the division of Umbria amongst small centres with administrative autonomy, something that emerges from the formation of treaties.\textsuperscript{106} We can contrast this with coinage from more unified areas, such as that of the Vestini, given the mark \textit{ves} of the whole Vestinian \textit{nomen} (people) rather than that

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{100} M. H. Crawford, \textit{Coinage and Money under the Roman Republic} (London, 1985) 14.
\item \textsuperscript{101} S. Weinstock, 'C. Fonteius Capito and the \textit{Libri Tagetici}', \textit{PBSR} 18 (1950) 44-9.
\item \textsuperscript{102} Crawford, \textit{Coinage and Money} 46, 16 citing Chiusi and Chianciano; \textit{Antichità dall'Umbria a Budapest} 141.
\item \textsuperscript{103} Crawford, \textit{Coinage and Money} 43.
\item \textsuperscript{104} Crawford, \textit{Coinage and Money} 43, 46, 48; Tascio, \textit{Todi. Verso un museo} 20; R. Thomsen, \textit{Early Roman Coinage} (Copenhagen, 1957-61) 1 p. 192, 2 p. 63-5. This issue included coins on a reduced weight standard following similar Roman emissions.
\item \textsuperscript{105} Tutere looks like the name of the town, and Ikuvini/Ikuvins that of the people, but neither exact form occurs elsewhere in Umbrian epigraphy. See appendix 2 for Ernout's suggestion as to their cases.
\item \textsuperscript{106} See ch. 3 section 3.
\end{itemize}
of an individual centre within the nomen, as seems to be the case in Umbria.

We thus have some evidence that there was a unified 'Umbrian weight standard', borrowed from Etruria, which was used at least at Todi and Gubbio. Other elements of Umbrian culture, however, such as alphabets and the modules used in construction work show various centres creating or borrowing such standards independently.\textsuperscript{107}

9. EPIGRAPHY AND LITERACY\textsuperscript{108}

Literacy is another important index of organisational complexity. Although the precise relationship is disputed, it is clear on a basic level that the spread of literacy facilitated the growth of state centralisation.\textsuperscript{109} This is because literacy enabled the keeping of records, the development of bureaucracy and the creation of religious and legal codes, calendars and such-like. The available evidence for writing in Umbria before the Social War consists mostly of epigraphy. The corpus of Umbrian inscriptions is small, numbering only 24 probable examples. This evidence gives us the impression of a fairly small scale use of writing. The earliest surviving inscriptions probably date from the fifth or early fourth century BC, which is several centuries later than those in the more urbanised regions of Etruria and Latium. Most of the early Umbrian inscriptions were used for ritual purposes, recording either gifts to a deity or, in the case of the Iguvine Tables, ceremonial procedures. Whether this material supports a picture of restricted literacy in the early period, confined on the whole to a ritual context, seems difficult to say.\textsuperscript{110} A strikingly large number of early Umbrian inscriptions are on bronze; either this material was thought appropriate for the type of dedication common in the period before 150 BC, or stone only began to be used when Roman influence became stronger.

The majority of Umbrian inscriptions date from after 150 BC. Most commemorate buildings or monuments and there are a few boundary markers. The use of epigraphy in a funerary or domestic setting might be taken to indicate a more everyday use of writing, but only two texts relate to these contexts. This scarcity has been taken as further indication of the specialised nature of writing in Umbria.\textsuperscript{111} The impression is

\textsuperscript{107} See below.
\textsuperscript{108} All known inscriptions in the Umbrian language are tabulated in appendix 2.
\textsuperscript{109} Cornell, Beginnings 104, following J. Goody (ed.), Literacy in Traditional Societies (Cambridge, 1968) 27-68.
\textsuperscript{110} As proposed by Wilkins in Territory, Time and State 163-5. S. Stoddart, J. Whitley, 'The social context of literacy in Archaic Greece and Etruria', Antiquity 62 (1988) 771 draw attention to the concentration of inscriptions in Gubbio, Assisi, Todi and Foligno 'reflecting [in their opinion] the centralisation of power in these centres'.
\textsuperscript{111} Roncalli in Antichità dall'Umbria a Budapest 161.
reinforced by the variation in the alphabets used for these inscriptions (all derived from Etruria), before the Latin alphabet became the norm in the late second century BC.\textsuperscript{112} The Volsinian alphabet is used in the fourth century at Plestia and Todi, whereas the Perusine alphabet is used in the third and second century at Gubbio for the Iguvine Tables and at Assisi and Bevagna. This variation probably reflects the waning of Volsinian influence over Umbria after 300 BC and the rise of Perugia in the third century.\textsuperscript{113}

This is the picture we get from the surviving evidence, but how accurate is it? We should be aware of several important factors affecting the evidence. Firstly, the sample available for us to use is of course only a minuscule proportion of the inscriptions that once existed. The maximum survival rate of inscriptions from North Africa, where the conditions have been much more favourable, has been estimated by R. Duncan-Jones to be about 5\%.\textsuperscript{114} In Umbria the figure is likely to be much worse: most of the ancient cities have been built over and their stone reused, and in addition there has been only a small amount of excavation. Secondly, it should not be assumed that the habit of inscribing stone necessarily reflects the amount of writing on other, less durable, materials. Evidence from archaic Etruria suggests that this is likely to be a secondary development that followed writing on wooden tablets.\textsuperscript{115} Epigraphy may in itself be a habit that results from the influence of other regions. The change from the comparative absence of inscribed stone before 150 BC to the high proportion of it after this date could, for example, be the result of increasing Roman influence. The smaller numbers of earlier bronze inscriptions could be partly due to the value and reusability of the material. There are also problems with attaching too much significance to the absence of funerary inscriptions prior to the Social War, which might be explained by custom rather than by any social restrictions on the spread of literacy.

Odd pieces of evidence from a variety of sources suggest that the epigraphic evidence for Umbria may not give a wholly accurate picture of literacy in the region. We know that one of the earliest figures in Latin literature, the playwright Plautus, came from

\textsuperscript{112} Compare the variety of construction modules used in Umbria, such as the Attic foot at Otricoli in the fifth or fourth century (ch. 2 section 3 (b) (i)) and the Roman foot at Urvinum Hortense (section 3 above).

\textsuperscript{113} Volsinii (Orvieto) was destroyed by the Romans in 264 BC and the population moved to a new site at modern Bolsena. But note that G. Rocca, \textit{Iscrizioni umbre minori} (Florence, 1996) 12 detects a 'coscienza unitaria' in the use of the original Umbrian 'q' symbol (conventionally transcribed by \textit{f}).

\textsuperscript{114} R. Duncan-Jones, \textit{The Economy of the Roman Empire}\textsuperscript{2} (Cambridge, 1982) 361.

Sarsina in northern Umbria. Although little is known of his life, it seems quite likely that he would have been literate when he moved to Rome, perhaps at an early age. Secondly, the sheer scale of the Iguvine Tables, over 4000 words long, is significant, even if they appear isolated by an accident of survival. Thirdly, the use of eponymous dating in inscriptions at Asisium (Ve 236) and Iguvium (Iguvine Tables lb 45, Ila 44, Va 2, 15) implies that lists of magisterial names were kept in a permanent, that is, written, form. Lastly it is interesting to note that Umbria has had the second highest density of Latin epigraphic finds of the eleven Augustan regions of Italy, surpassed only by Latium and Campania. This of course does not provide direct evidence for the earlier period, but it would be surprising if this later prominence owed nothing to the preceding period.

10. CONCLUSION

The evidence suggests that in the third and second centuries (and probably already by the time of the conquest), Umbria outside the areas of Latin and Roman settlement was divided up into a number of small independent communities. Each had its own central authority with several magistracies; these representatives of the community probably oversaw the formation of treaties with Rome in the aftermath of the conquest and, in subsequent years, the levying of the troop contingents specified by such agreements. At Gubbio and Todi, the magistrates organised the production of coinage. The evidence of the Iguvine Tables suggests that the citizen bodies of these communities were both divided into smaller units and related to several types of larger groupings, such as the nomen and totar. This political and social organisation was probably formed in the main before the conquest: few of the relevant technical terms used to describe its component parts and the official standards designated for weights and measures are of Roman origin. The creation of a physical dimension to these communities begins only on a small scale before the conquest. In the third and second centuries, however, we begin to get evidence of urbanisation, albeit on a small scale, with the creation of fortifications and sacred buildings.

117 Measured as inscriptions in CIL per 1000 km² by Harris, Ancient Literacy 266.
118 See ch. 1 section 5, ch. 3 section 3.
1. INTRODUCTION: THE CONCEPT OF ROMANISATION

The change in the sense of identity of allied Italians in the period between the Roman conquest and the death of Augustus (AD 14) is an extremely important factor in the history of Italy and Rome in this period. In the conventional picture, they moved from considering themselves simply in terms of their ethnic grouping to thinking of themselves as being Roman as well as Umbrian, Marsic or whatever. It is widely accepted that this process of identification with Rome began soon after the Roman conquest, and by the late 90s BC had encouraged the Italians to want Roman citizenship so much that they were prepared to go to war to obtain it. This process is conventionally characterised as a process of 'Romanisation', and is usually mapped by both the changing political demands of the allies and through shifts in their culture and language.

The concept of Romanisation is not without its problems, however, both theoretical and practical. In using the term it is important not to be overly Romano-centric. This influence is not the sole one on Umbrian culture at this time; we can also see clear signs of Etruscan contacts, for example in the borrowing of alphabets, and both Etruria and Rome acted as conduits for Greek goods and ideas to this region. Culture is not something that can be defined in simple terms, and the myriad of sources often result in new forms, even if they are in part amalgams of features from outside. This is well documented for the effect of Roman domination on the provinces, where there is often a strong contrast between Roman and local cultures. In Italy, where Roman and non-Roman ethnic groups lived in close proximity for hundreds of years before the conquest of Italy, the distinction between Roman and non-Roman cultures is much less sharp, if apparent at all. By the time of the conquest of Italy, Roman culture is itself a complex amalgam of elements, many of which are taken from Greece or the rest of Italy.

---

1 F. Coarelli, 'La romanización de Umbria', in J. Blázquez, J. Alvar (eds.), La Romanización en Occidente 57-68 came to my notice too late to be taken into account in this thesis.
2 A full expression of this new dual identity in the mid first century BC can be found in Cicero, De Legibus 2.2.5.
3 See for instance Brunt, 'Italian Aims'.
4 Lomas, 'Urban elites' 107.
Given this complexity we should not expect to be able to attribute every major change within a region of Italy, in this case Umbria, to the influence of Rome. Internal developments may play a more important role, particularly in the years soon after the conquest, when the Roman presence is still being established. Long-term processes such as urbanisation may begin before the conquest, as I have argued in the previous chapter, and carry on despite it. Mapping the effect of the Roman presence on this is extremely difficult, although it is a reasonable assumption that it played a part in the later second century.  

Besides the problems involved in looking at cultural change, there is a perhaps more fundamental problem of how this is related to changes in identity (and thus in ethnicity). This is a area in relation to Umbria because the strength of 'Umbrian' identity is very unclear in the pre-conquest period. There are only a few fragments of positive evidence in favour of such an identity, mostly from Greek writers looking at the Umbrians from an 'outside' perspective. Evidence from within the Umbrian ethnic group provides no help regarding the extent to which this putative identity existed in any meaningful way for the Umbrians themselves. Local particularism was certainly strong. Given this background it is not at all evident that this local identity 'declined' in the Roman period as identification with Rome became more important. Much of the evidence for the identity of the Umbrians as a group comes from after the conquest. Polybius (2.24) shows us that the allied Umbrian communities fought as a group within the Roman army in the late third century BC (though it is interesting to note that the Sarsinates are mentioned separately). This by itself must have had an important solidifying effect on the ethnic group. In the period of the Social War the (allied) Umbrians again seem to act in concert (although the generic references of our sources may mask divisions) something which geographical and military necessity (as well as their experience in the Roman army) will have encouraged. Defined in territorial terms under Augustus as the sixth regio, the Umbrians were regarded by scholars in his time as 'an exceedingly great and ancient people'. As a late example we can draw on the Hispellum Rescript which mentions the celebration of a festival for the whole of Umbria, although how old it was is unclear. Thus alongside a growing identification with Rome, the concept of an Umbrian ethnic group seems to remain solid in the Roman era, and perhaps even more so.

---

5 This will become easier as the archaeological remains (foundations of buildings, architectural terracottas, etc.) are subjected to more precise study, such as that undertaken for the remains at Urvinum Hortense (Collemancio di Cannara) (Matteini Chiari, Raccolta di Cannara).  
6 This question is more generally examined in ch. 2 section 1.  
8 See ch. 3 section 3.
obtains a sharper definition than it had before. A further complication is that 'Umbrian' material culture is never a particularly distinct phenomenon, especially after the Roman conquest. Production in this region of, for instance, pottery, was heavily dependent on outside inspiration. We can cite the Popilius cups made at Mevania and Ocriculum by Latin speakers (and thus perhaps immigrants) in the second century, and the funerary urns and stelai produced at centres around the Valle Umbra in the first century BC, and almost wholly reliant on forms from Etruscan and Roman repertoires. For the period with which we are dealing, from c. 300 BC to AD 14, language is perhaps the only area where we can clearly map the influence of Rome on Umbria. It is thus a crucial index, but it is not at all straightforward to determine how this relates to identity.

2. THE INFLUENCES ON UMBRIA IN THE THIRD AND SECOND CENTURIES BC

Before the Roman conquest the dominant influence on Umbria was undoubtedly Etruscan. Etruscan bronze and ceramic products dominated the Umbrian markets in high quality 'prestige' goods, such as the Mars of Todi. The only artistically significant area of Umbrian production was the mass of small bronze votives dedicated in the region's sanctuaries, but even these drew inspiration from earlier Etruscan models. The Etruscan alphabets of Orvieto and Perusia were used for the earliest inscriptions in Umbria. The Etruscan cities must also have been mediators for imports from the Greek world such as the strigils found in fourth century Umbrian tombs or the Attic foot used for the fortifications at Ocriculum. By 350 BC, however, there are signs that the predominant position of Etruria was beginning to wane, and Roman power was starting to have an impact on the material culture of the region. L. Bonomi Ponzi notes that the spread in Umbria of Faliscan painted ceramics and Faliscan and Roman black slip pottery from the mid fourth century comes at the expense of the dominant position Volsinii had previously enjoyed over this market. The vast majority of our evidence for Roman influence on Umbrian culture, whether language, institutions or the type of pottery

---

9 The Umbrians are presented in Dionysius and Pliny as having occupied vast tracts of Italy in their mythical past, which was gradually whittled down to their historical seat (see ch. 2 section 1).
11 Torelli, 'Romanizzazione' 82; Fontaine, Cités 65 (assuming his identification is correct).
12 Faliscan and Roman material from this era includes the 'Full Sakkos group', the 'Phantom group' and pocola: see Bonomi Ponzi in Antichità dall'Umbria a Budapest 44.
used, comes from after the Roman conquest. Admittedly it is not always easy to be certain about when such a feature or idea passed from Roman to Umbrian, but where we are able to put an approximate date on things, for example with many inscriptions, it is mostly in the third, second and first centuries.\textsuperscript{13}

This is clearly the result of the hugely intensified contacts between Rome and Umbria during and after the conquest of the region from c. 310 to 266 BC. The third century BC probably saw the insertion of around 40,000 settlers in Umbria, which would have increased the population by about 35%, if Polybius' figures for the numbers of soldiers the Umbrians could contribute to the Telamon campaign in 225 BC are trustworthy.\textsuperscript{14} These settlers had Roman or Latin status and their language and culture would reflect this. A massive physical infrastructure will have been created for them: land taken from Umbrian communities would probably have been centuriated to create regular individual plots, work which would involve the construction of roads and drainage ditches; Umbrian communities that became colonies were re-organised around a grid plan of streets, and at Spoletium, Narnia and Interamna were given huge city-walls. By the end of the third century most of the recently settled dominions in Umbria were linked to the capital by the Via Flaminia, built in 220 BC. In the south, Ameria was the terminus for the Via Amerina linking it to Falerni Novi and Rome, which was perhaps set up around 240 BC.\textsuperscript{15} These major arteries must have carried high volumes of short and long distance traffic, with a profound effect on this region.

In the second century BC the intervention of the Roman authorities in all areas of Italy gradually increased, whatever their status, and was one of the main grievances of the Italian allies from the Gracchan period onwards. There are several signs of this occurring in Umbria, the most prominent being the noting by the Senate of prodigies that had occurred and required expiation. The earliest one recorded by Livy that concerns Umbria is in 214 BC, when atonement was made for a range of prodigies, including the changing of a woman into a man at Spoletium (24.10.10). Milk reputedly flowed in the Nar, and deformed children were born at Ariminum in 194 BC (Livy 34.45.6-8), and in 186 BC (Livy 39.22.5), 'it was reported from Umbria that a hermaphrodite about twelve years old had been discovered. In their fear and awe of this portent they ordered the

\textsuperscript{13} The quaestor in the Iguvine Tables must date before the earliest written parts (of the late third or early second century), and could derive from Roman contact before the conquest of the region.

\textsuperscript{14} Calculated on the assumption that there were 2,000 adult male virilane settlers (although this is only a guess), as well as 10,500 adult male Latin settlers (for which see ch. 3 section 6). This works out at 12,500 immigrant settlers, compared with the 35,200 adult males of allied Umbria (Brunt's corrected figure from Polybius' of 20,000).

\textsuperscript{15} Harris, \textit{Etruria and Umbria} 168.
prodigy to be removed from Roman soil (Romano agro) and killed as soon as possible.’

Our only indication that portents from allied communities were starting to be noticed at Rome is much later, with the sighting of imaginary armies clashing in the sky above Ameria and Tuder seen before Marius’ victory over the Teutones (Plutarch, Marius 17; Pliny, N.H. 2.148). The widening of the sources of omens of possible relevance to Rome is clearly of importance for the self-perception of the Roman authorities: non-Roman territory seems to be becoming part of the Senate’s domain in religious terms, and is certainly being thought of as less alien to Rome.

We should also draw attention to an episode on the last surviving pages of Livy, where in 167 BC the people of Spoletium refused to take custody of the Illyrian king Gentius and his family, whose detention there had been ordered by the Senate; the king was subsequently transferred to Gubbio.16 The passage suggests that Latin colonies like Spoletium had a duty to receive prisoners, and that this was also a duty that allied cities could undertake if necessary.17

It is difficult to detect the extent to which the attempt of the Gracchi to recover and make use of occupied Roman ager publicus had an effect on Umbria in the late second century. A renewal of a Gracchan cippus is known from the region, from Monte Giove just outside Fano on the Adriatic coast, but whether this marked the assignment of land by the triumvirs or just a judgement on a question of ownership is unclear.18 Nevertheless, the name of Forum Sempronii, 20 km away on the Via Flaminia, strongly suggests that this was an area of Gracchan settlement. In general there must have been ager publicus in Umbria that had not been settled by Roman or Latin colonists and was occupied by people of allied status - this much seems clear from Umbrian opposition to Drusus’ colonisation law in 91 BC (Appian, B.C. 1.36).19 Heurgon has plausibly attributed two Umbrian cippi from Asisium (Ve 236 and 237) to a desire on the part of this community to define their borders in this period, when there was a threat of Roman intervention.20 Yet the amount of unassigned ager publicus is likely to have been considerably less here than in the south, where there were probably substantial punitive confiscations after the Hannibalic War. A large proportion of the land confiscated from Umbrian communities during the conquest must have been used for the substantial

---

16 Livy 45.43.9-10; the reference to Iguvium depends on a (sensible) emendation.
17 This passage of Livy does not really offer any evidence for inferring that Iguvium took the family voluntarily, and by so doing wanted to curry favour with the Romans, contra Malone, Stoddart, Territory, Time and State 178.
18 CIL I² 719=ILLRP 474, dating from the 80s or 70s BC.
19 Discussed in section 4 below.
20 L’Ombrie’ 125-31.
colonial distributions of the third century.

While official intervention in the second century is a manifestation of the Umbrian drift into the Roman orbit, service in the Roman army was one of the great motors of change within allied areas, affecting all orders of society. The requirement of all allied states to raise troop contingents for the army, a type of 'tribute' to Rome that ensured this levying happened in most years of the third and second century, meant that these communities had to have effective self-government. Although it might seem surprising considering the relative ease of the Roman takeover in the late fourth and early third centuries, there is substantial evidence for Umbrians serving in the Roman army, and Gabba characterises Umbria and Picenum as sources of professional soldiers, with 'a local tradition of true mercenary service'. In fact, the same could be said of some of the central Appennine peoples, such as the Marsi, who were later famous for their martial prowess but put up little resistance to Rome. The evidence begins with Polybius' quantification of the forces the Romans raised against the Gauls in 225 BC (2.24), amongst which he records that 'the Umbrians and Sarsinates, hill-tribes of the Appennine mountains, raised a force of some 20,000 ...'. This shows that the Umbrians and other allies of the Romans fought as 'national' units, an organisation that was probably substantially based on pre-conquest arrangements. In the fifty years from the start of the Hannibalic War, when we have Livy's narrative, there are several references to individual Umbrians serving in the Roman army, mostly from Latin areas. Spoletium continued to support Rome with its manpower in 209 BC (Livy 27.10) while Narnia refused. Umbrian communities contributed troops to Scipio's African expedition in 205 BC, including a cohort of 600 from Camerinum, in contrast to the cities of Etruria, who seem just to have offered materials and cash (Livy 28.45). With the dearth of historical

---

21 For the implications of this for the political organisation of allies, see ch. 1 section 5.
22 Gabba, Republican Rome 185 n. 50: although talking about the first century BC, the evidence cited below suggests that this was also true of the earlier period.
23 These figures are discussed in ch. 3 section 6.
24 Livy 27.50 on Narnian knights from the battle of the Metaurus (despite Narnia's earlier refusal of aid to Rome); Livy 28.24-9: an ill-fated army mutiny in Spain (206 BC) against Scipio, led by two soldiers of the ranks, C. Albius of Cales and C. Atrius of Umbria; Livy 43.18.19: C. Carvilius Spoletinus on Roman service in Greece. For what it is worth, Silius Italicus, Pun. 8.446-460, says that soldiers from Ameria, Arna, Camerinum, Mevania, Hispellum, Narnia, Iguvium, Sarsina, Tuder and Fulginiae served in the Hannibalic War, specifically mentioning a Mevanas Varenus at 4.544 (note that Cicero defended a Varenus from Fulginiae).
25 This might reflect a greater servile population in Etruria and consequently less free peasantry for the army. The low population density in this region calculated by Brunt from Polybius' figures for the Telamon campaign have been taken to offer extra support for this hypothesis (Brunt, Manpower 55; Dench, Barbarians 143). But caution is necessary: the Umbrians, Lucanians and Apulians also have low figures in Brunt's estimation; similar proportions were produced by the 1936 census.
material after 167 BC we have no more evidence until the late second century, when Marius is known to have enfranchised several cohorts from Camerinum, and two individual ex-soldiers from Umbria, the Spoletine T. Matrinius and the Iguvine M. Annius Appius. The tradition of Umbrian service in the Roman army continued in the first century BC, and even in the imperial period Tacitus (Ann. 4.5.5) could remark in the context of AD 23 that the Praetorian Guard was 'mostly recruited in Etruria, or Umbria, or the old territory of Latins and in the early Roman colonies'.

We should in theory be able to supplement this picture with numismatic evidence. Coinage was probably produced largely to pay soldiers in the Roman army in the Republican period. The discovery of hoards of coins is likely to reflect levels of army service in different parts of Italy, as soldiers were paid in coin and also stood a good chance of not returning to collect their buried treasure. Several features of the pattern of coin hoards are notable between 300 and 90 BC. Firstly, there is only one known hoard of Roman coins in Umbria from the first half of the third century BC, from La Bruna near Spoletium. By contrast in Samnium, Lucania, the territory of the Frentani and of the Marsi, Roman coinage is found in considerable quantities from the Pyrrhic War onwards. This coinage was probably used by allied communities in these areas to pay their contingents to the Roman army. The absence of such material in Umbria could have several explanations. Firstly, the Umbrians may not have been so involved in the Pyrrhic and First Punic Wars, fought in the south of Italy and Sicily, just as the central and southern Italians seem not to have played much of a role in the Telamon campaign. Secondly, the northern areas of peninsula Italy such as Umbria were less exposed to contact with the monetised Greek world and so were probably less familiar with the advantages and practical use of coinage. Thirdly, quite a few northern communities produced their own coinage in the third century BC (such as Iguvium and Tuder in Umbria), and so would have had less need of Roman coins to pay their troops. There are a reasonable number of coin hoards from Umbria from the period between the
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27 Note also the considerable recruiting here in the 60s and 40s BC: Cic., Murena 42; Cic., Att. 8.12B. 2; Caes., B.C. 1.13-5; cf. ILS 2231 of a C. Edusius from Mevania who joined up and was resettled at Tuder.
28 This also contained three types of currency bars, and probably dates to the Pyrrhic War, i.e. before the foundation of the Latin colony in 241 BC (Crawford, Roman Republican Coin Hoards no. 16; RRC 41; Coinage and Money 4).
29 Crawford, Coinage and Money 36.
30 Judging by Polybius 2.24, where he gives the numbers of the Umbrians, Etruscans, Sabines, Veneti and Cenomani in the field, together with those who could be called up from the Samnites, Latins etc.
beginning of the Second Punic War and the Social War. Crawford lists four between 146 and 91 BC, from Mevania in the west and three communities on the Adriatic side, Iesi (ancient Aesis), Montecarotto near Iesi and Fossombrone (Forum Sempronii), to which can be added one at Ameria dating to an earlier period (from the Hannibalic War or just before) and another from Mevania deposited after 100 BC (although it might date from the Social War). The overall impression is that the number of coin hoards, if they reflect the level of army service within a region, roughly correlates with the picture of the literary sources of substantial Umbrian involvement in the Roman military from the late third century.

This obviously has various implications, particularly for cultural change. Polybius shows that allied contingents fought in regional units in the late third century BC, yet Latin must have been the mode of communication between the commanders of these units, the Romans and other allied brigades. During the second century BC the allied and Roman sections became more integrated in structure and this can only have increased the army's efficacy as a mechanism for Latinisation. The effect of this must have been most pronounced on the Umbrian elite, the people who are responsible for the public inscriptions examined below and who commanded (and organised the pay of) the allied contingents to the army.

Another, rather more exceptional, manifestation of the Romanisation of an individual is provided by the figure of Plautus, who moved to Rome in the third century from allied Sarsina in the far north of the Umbrian Appennines, and despite presumably being a native Umbrian speaker, made his name at Rome adapting Greek plays into Latin. We know that a few Umbrians had gained Roman citizenship in the late second century BC through the patronage of Marius. The recipients were not likely to be numerous, however, and this should be seen as an attempt by the great general to recognise and reward the performance of individual allies in battle, not as part of a

---


32 Note the contrast with the picture of Etruria in the fifty years before the Social War put forward by M. H. Crawford, 'Army and coinage in the late Republic', in *La Romanisation du Samnium* 135-7, based on the distribution of coin hoards (although of course I think allied Umbria should not be included in this picture).

33 Brunt, 'Italian aims' 114.

34 Gabba, *Republican Rome* 187 n. 61.

35 Festus 274L; note Festus 411L recording Plautus' use of an Umbrian word. The poet Accius came from a Roman colony (Pisaurum) and was probably of Latin speaking origin.

36 See n. 29 above. Note also that the (senatorial) moneyer of 86 BC, Gargonius, discussed in section 8 below, must have been enfranchised before the Social War; he is only possibly of Umbrian origin.
systematic Roman response to Romanisation. It was only in the mid-first century BC that the adoption of Roman customs by the Umbrian elite was rewarded with access to the senatorial order at Rome. Fulginiae may have provided a senator in the 140s, but he was probably an isolated case.  

3. THE SPREAD OF LATIN

The clearest manifestation of the increasing Roman influence on Umbrian culture between the Roman conquest and the Social War is the spread of the Latin alphabet and language. The evidence for this process is, as always, almost wholly epigraphic. It is only by a careful examination of surviving inscriptions that we can form some impression of how quickly and why this happened. Caution is needed, of course, when drawing conclusions about everyday speech and writing by using this type of evidence. In the previous chapter I questioned the extent to which epigraphy is representative of literacy in Umbria. Here we need note that the language used in an inscription may be different from that employed in speech. Many inscriptions were on public display and so presented a deliberately cultivated image. An Umbrian speaker with little Latin might commission an inscription in Latin because it was more prestigious. Conversely, Umbrian might be employed in an inscription after it had ceased to be a commonly spoken language when tradition was important, which might happen in a dedicatory formula to a deity, for instance, or a funerary epitaph.

When we attempt to detail the shift to Latin we need to be as precise as possible about the context in which the language was used. There was large-scale immigration from Roman and Latin districts into Umbria in the third century BC, and in areas where this took place the use of Latin would be unexceptional. Latin inscriptions in areas where there is no evidence of colonisation are obviously more important in this respect, because the person setting up the inscription is much less likely to have been of Latin or Roman origin. We can only be certain that a community was of allied rather than Latin or Roman status before the Social War in a few cases: Tuder, Iguvium, Camerinum, and with less certainty, Oriculum and Ameria. Other communities are generally presumed to have been allied rather than Roman if their magistrates after the
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37 Broughton, *MRR* 2 622: Q. Statilienus (see ch. 3 section 5 (c)).
38 All the Umbrian inscriptions referred to in this section are collected, discussed and dated in appendix 2, all those Latin in appendix 3.
39 Likely rather than certainly because there was considerable Roman and Latin migration into allied areas.
40 See ch. 3 section 3.
Social War were *quattuorviri*.\(^{41}\)

Republican inscriptions from areas of Roman and Latin settlement are, as would be expected, almost totally in Latin. Those from before the Social War probably include an inscription on the lip of a *dolium* and an altar recording the work of *aediles* from Narnia,\(^{42}\) two *cippi* protecting a sacred grove and an inscription mentioning a *praetor* from Spoletium,\(^{43}\) thirteen *cippi* with dedications to various deities from a wood near Pisauro,\(^{44}\) a Latin name on a *dolium* from Interamna Nahars,\(^{45}\) and a duoviral inscription and numerous *pocoia* from Ariminum.\(^{46}\) Not all epigraphy from Roman and Latin areas fits this picture, however. We should note the Umbrian inscription (Ve 234) recording the work of two *marones* from Fulginiae written in a cursive Latin script.\(^{47}\) Its date is extremely difficult to estimate, but the use of the Latin alphabet and the forms of the letters suggest it is not outside c. 250 to c. 150 BC. This shows that Fulginiae retained its Umbrian magistracy (and presumably most of its population) despite becoming a *praefectura* within the Roman state, probably in the third century BC, and perhaps receiving Roman settlers.\(^{48}\) In fact I think we should envisage much of the indigenous population in areas made Latin and Roman as remaining within the territory of their old centres and adopting a new status (remembering that this was not necessarily any better than allied status in the third century).\(^{49}\) These local populations were nevertheless more likely to adopt elements of Roman culture than those which remained under the jurisdiction of allied authorities.\(^{50}\)

Outside Roman and Latin areas, the Latin alphabet was probably adopted before

\(^{41}\) This is only a general indication, however, as they also turn up in some centres that were Roman before 91 BC, such as Fulginiae.  
\(^{42}\) CIL I\(^2\) 427, 2097.  
\(^{43}\) CIL I\(^2\) 366 and 2872, 3376.  
\(^{44}\) CIL I\(^2\) 368-81.  
\(^{45}\) CIL I\(^2\) 428.  
\(^{46}\) CIL I\(^2\) 2129a; A. Franchi De Bellis, 'Il latino nell'ager Gallicus: i pocoia riminesi' in E. Campanile (ed.), *Caratteri e diffusione del latino in età arcaica* (Pisa, 1993) 35-63. S. M. Marengo, 'Documentazione epigrafica' no. 2 records a graffito that she takes to be pre-Social War; her assumption that the settlement at Civitalba, where it was found, was not inhabited after c. 90 BC (117) seems questionable, given our extremely limited knowledge of the site (M. Landolfi, 'Il frontone e il fregio di Civitalba', in *Problemi Archeologici dell'area esino-sentinata*. Congress: Arcevia, 1990 = Le Marche. Archeologia Storia Territorio 3 (1990) 9-13 gives a useful up-to-date summary). The abbreviation 'AuI-' is, however, odd and appears early in the judgement of M. H. Crawford. Further problems: the status of Civitalba (ancient Sentinum?) is unknown, although the architectural finds which probably celebrate the battle of Sentinum suggest a Roman setting; the inscription is so short it is difficult to assert what language it is in.  
\(^{47}\) Ve 235 (probably c. 150-100 BC) may also be Umbrian, although its brevity makes it disputable what language is being used.  
\(^{48}\) For details see ch. 3.  
\(^{49}\) An Umbrian inscription at Spoletium (Po 11) may date to before the colonisation: see ch. 3 section 4.  
\(^{50}\) Hence the early use of the Latin alphabet in Ve 234.
the language itself. The oldest examples are an inscription recording the construction of a cistern under two marones from Helvillum (Fossato di Vico) (Ve 233) and a set of tiles sealing grave niches, with a record of the occupants, from Tuder (Ve 232). Both are still in the Umbrian language. Ve 233 is generally assigned to the second half of the second century, and the Tuder tiles are presumably of the same period. Helvillum was probably under the jurisdiction of Tadinum in the Republican period, which may have been a Roman centre with immigrant settlers. Tuder, by contrast, was certainly allied in the second century BC. There are four grave tiles in the group, each with the name of a different member of the family. The oldest tile records the father's name in Umbrian script, the later three the names of his daughter, her husband and their son in Latin script. Whereas the father used the Umbrian naming formula (la. ma. tvplei, i.e. La(rs) Dupleius son of Ma(rcus)), two generations later the son used the Latin formula with the patronymic coming after the gentile name (ca puplece ma fel, i.e. C. Publicius son of Ma(rcus)). Moreover, fel is probably taken from the Latin filius. The other source which allows us to follow the change in alphabets at an allied community are the Iguvine Tables from Iguvium. The chronology of these still remains imprecise as the various attempts to fix it through any other means than lettering are unpersuasive. Devoto dated the Tables in Umbrian script to c. 200-120 BC and those using Latin to c. 150-70 BC. The most recent study by Prosdocimi arrives at essentially the same conclusions, although favouring a later rather than earlier date for the Umbrian Tables within Devoto's limits, and putting the Latin Tables at the late second to early first century. Thus the Tables provide no further information to what we already know: the Latin script began to be employed in epigraphy from the middle of the second century. In any case Iguvium had by this time borrowed the quaestorship from Rome, as this appears in the
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51 E.g. by Vetter, Handbuch 167. The letter forms seem slightly older than those of the Iguvine Tables in Latin script; oseto (Ve 233) is a later form than opset (Ve 234: c. 250-150 BC) according to Vetter. Cisterno in this inscription looks like a Latin loan (Ernout, Dialecte 81).
52 For the argument, dependent on the assignation of an inscription mentioning a duovir to here, see ch. 3 section 5 (a).
53 Sisenna 4.119 records the enfranchisement of unspecified Tudertes around 90 BC.
54 Compare Ner. Babrius Titi filius, one of six marones on an Umbrian inscription at Asisium (CIL I 2112), who is presumably the same person as ner. t. babr (Ve 236), now a more senior uhtur, in an Umbrian inscription of perhaps 20 years later, this time with his patronymic before his gentile name in traditional Umbrian fashion.
56 Cicero, Pro Balbo 46 and 47 shows that Iguvium was of allied status before the Social War.
57 Devoto, Tavole di Gubbio 4-5; he thought the latest had to be after the devaluation of 89 BC, but Harris, Etruria and Umbria 185-6 refutes this, and doubts any are from after the Social War.
58 Prosdocimi, Tavole Iguvine 1 155-7.
Tables in the Umbrian alphabet.\textsuperscript{59}

On the whole it seems that the Umbrian script derived from Etruscan was dropped before the Social War in favour of the Latin alphabet, which had been first used in allied areas soon after 150. Besides those inscriptions cited above we can also point to Ve 236 and 237 from Asisium and Po 9 of unknown provenance, as well as those in the Latin language discussed below. It remains striking, however, that the Umbrian alphabet seems to have been used at Mevania on both civic and funerary inscriptions until at least the late second century (Po 3, 4 and 5), despite its position on the Via Flaminia.

The relatively small number of inscriptions using the Umbrian alphabet that survive to our day (around 14 in total), although probably only a minuscule proportion of those originally set up, are not on a large enough scale to suggest that there was a strong tradition capable of supporting a large number of stone-cutters. It would appear uncertain whether the initiative to start using Latin letters came from the stone-cutters (who might also undertake work for Latin speakers) or those commissioning the inscriptions, but I suggest that the change will have been a fairly uncomplicated process, given that writing will not have played a central role in most people's lives. In fact epigraphy itself within Umbria seems to have been heavily reliant on the customs of first Etruria and then Rome, and the change from an Etruscan-derived alphabet to a Latin one directly and fairly quickly reflects the shift in the Umbrian orbit and the shallowness of the native tradition.\textsuperscript{60}

With the conquest of Italy Latin becomes the most important language within the peninsula, as it was the only one that could be understood everywhere, and was the language of those with the greatest power and influence. The change in language from native Umbrian to Latin is likely to have been a long term process with many individuals using two languages at the transitional point; in addition we should not assume that language had the same determining force for identity as it does in the modern world. Nevertheless the process of change will have been promoted by those for whom it could be a useful tool of advancement.

The Latin language is used in inscriptions from a considerable number of allied

\textsuperscript{59} Ib 45, Il 44, Va 23.

\textsuperscript{60} Dependency on Etruscan: Roncalli in \textit{Antichità dall' Umbria a Budapest} 161. The mention of magistracies common to many later Umbrian inscriptions may itself be a sign of Latin influence (see ch. 4 section 9).
Umbrian communities before the Social War. The earliest occurrences outside Latin and Roman areas may date from around the middle of the second century to the west of the Appennine watershed, and perhaps earlier to the east. The earliest in the west may be a dedication from Ameria; the archaic dative love would, if complete, suggest a date of the mid second century, if not earlier. The formula optumo maxsumo is itself borrowed from Rome. The status of this community is not altogether certain. As the terminus of a Roman road, theVia Amerina, perhaps constructed around 240 BC, we might expect it to be Roman. Evidence from Cicero's Pro Roscio, however, implies that it is allied just before the Social War. The only other known pre-Social War inscription from this centre is in Umbrian and of difficult interpretation (Ve 229, perhaps late fourth to early third century), but also seems to refer to a dedication to Jupiter. The early Latin inscription thus appears to be a dedication to an established (indigenous?) deity, given a Latin epithet. Early Roman influence would be unsurprising at an Umbrian centre just 70 km from Rome, and linked directly to the city by a road.

The other early Latin inscription that must have been commissioned by someone of Umbrian rather than immigrant Latin/Roman origins is CIL I 2873, a bilingual with a man's name in Umbrian and Latin punched into a bronze strainer now in the Louvre. Its exact provenance is unknown, but the genitive ' -ier ending suggests it comes from Umbria; its date is probably of the second century BC. By the end of the second century we have the first example of the use of Latin in a civic context. The construction of a cistern, a wall and an arched structure (fornix) by six marones is recorded in a Latin inscription from Asisium, probably dating to c. 110-90 BC. Curiously, Umbrian was still used for a border cippus that was almost certainly set up later. As some of the personnel mentioned overlap in the two inscriptions, the
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61 The best study is still that of Harris, Etruria and Umbria 184-7, although he did not have the benefit of CIL I 2873, a bilingual with a man's name in Umbrian and Latin punched into a bronze strainer now in the Louvre. Its exact provenance is unknown, but the genitive ' -ier ending suggests it comes from Umbria; its date is probably of the second century BC. By the end of the second century we have the first example of the use of Latin in a civic context. The construction of a cistern, a wall and an arched structure (fornix) by six marones is recorded in a Latin inscription from Asisium, probably dating to c. 110-90 BC. Curiously, Umbrian was still used for a border cippus that was almost certainly set up later. As some of the personnel mentioned overlap in the two inscriptions, the
rationale behind the use of particular languages in this period must lie in their content and context, since it is unlikely that it was simply left to the stone-cutter’s preference. The Latin example, which is still in situ in the terracing wall it refers to, is a monumental building inscription set up in a prominent place in the city centre. The Umbrian cippus records the purchase and delimitation of land with religious sanction and, if its provenance (Ospedalicchio near Bastia) is where it was originally placed, it was on the boundary of Asisium’s territory with Perugia. Thus for building work in a civic context Latin was thought appropriate, whilst Umbrian was (?)required for a monument with more religious overtones, a slightly more conservative context as Coarelli notes. The decision to employ Latin in a public inscription of this sort before the Social War, like the request of Cumae in 180 BC to use Latin for official purposes (Livy 40.42.13), seems to be symbolic of the new affiliations that the Umbrian elite wanted to establish at this time. Just how successful the Mimisius family, two of whose members head the building inscription (and so were perhaps the marones who initiated the work), were in this can be judged by the career of Post. Mimisius C. f. Sardus who gained senatorial status under Augustus, and who was probably a descendent of the first of the six marones.

The only other reasonably certain Latin inscriptions from allied areas dating before the Social War come from Mevania and Tuder. Mevania is on the Via Flaminia and so might be expected to adopt Latin at an early date, and indeed an Etruscan style funerary urn (CIL I\(^2\) 2110=XI 5107) and the so-called Popilius cups, produced at Mevania and (probably later) at Oriculum, both have Latin inscriptions that are likely to predate the Social War. Roman influence was also manifested institutionally: the quaestorship was borrowed by this community (Po 4), for a magistracy responsible for the distribution of spelt, cvestur farariur in the plural, on the lines of the Roman quaestores frumentarii. Nevertheless, our meagre epigraphic sample does not suggest that Latin had replaced
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68 Coarelli, 'Assisi repubblicana' 14. The Umbrian inscription was also probably on the border with Etruscan Perugia, and this might also have affected the language chosen.
69 Cumae was a praefectura of Roman status, by contrast with allied Asisium.
70 Gaggiotti, Sensi, 'Acesa al senato' 262: probably too late to be his grandson despite Wiseman’s note (New Men no. 255).
71 Morel, 'Céramiques' 486-8: some are likely to be pre-150 BC (cf. Verzár, 'Zeugnisse' 121). The Popilius potters are immigrants, according to Torelli, 'Romanizzazione' 82. The funerary epitaph has the spelling 'Laaro' and is on an urn assigned by Feruglio to a Perugine workshop, clearly distinct from the mass of locally produced urns (Mevania 59).
72 This contrasts with the quaestors at Iguvium, who performed a different function: the institution was clearly borrowed individually by these communities rather than by the Umbrians as a whole. Curiously, the maronate 'survived' long enough after the Social War at Mevania to be inscribed on an epitaph of Augustan date from Montefalco (S. Nessi, G. Giacomelli, in SE 33 (1965) 553=Mevania 2.121).
Umbrian at Mevania before the Social War, even if there were immigrant Latin speakers within the community (recorded on the Popilius cups). The Umbrian language and alphabet is used in a funerary context in the second century BC (Po 3 and 5) and on the sundial with the cvestur farariur of the end of the second century/start of the first (Po 4), which may have had a civic setting. At Tuder a rather exceptional epitaph, dating from c. 150-100 is written bilingually in Latin and Gallic. The names of two brothers are mentioned, both of Gallic origin, a surprising find in central Italy in the century after Telamon. The inscription offers no clues as to whether the brothers were itinerant or settled in Tuder. This is rather ambiguous evidence for the spread of Latin in Umbria, but is a clear attestation of the movement of people from their places of origin in the second century, something which lay at the root of this process. Of the rest of the epigraphy from pre-Social War Tuder, there is only one inscription probably of the same era, again from a funerary context: the Umbrian grave tiles using Umbrian and Latin alphabets (Ve 232) discussed above.

To the east of the Appennine watershed, recent work by Silvia Marengo has drawn attention to several apparently early Latin inscriptions. These include two funerary cippi from Attiggio and Rocchetta di Tufico near Fabriano, dated by Marengo to the late second or early first century BC and to the 'età della acculturazione romana del territorio' respectively. In addition there are two graffiti on black slip pottery from S. Lorenzo al Fiastra (near Camerino) and Civitalba near Sassoferrato, the first of which may, if complete, be an archaic nominative form ending in '-o'. A pre-Social War date for the Civitalba graffito is more questionable. Although these four examples are of a personal rather than civic nature and thus do not tell us about the official adoption of Latin by city authorities, they present a striking group given the lack of Umbrian inscriptions from this area. This prominent Roman influence must be a result of the position of these centres, almost surrounded by Roman territory, with the Roman settlement in the Ager Gallicus and Picenum to the east, Sabinum to the south and the Roman centres of Plestia, Fulginiae and (?)Tadinum to the west.

Probably as a result of the collections of material available to him, Harris tends
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73 U. Ciotti in Mevania 84.
74 We should note in this context the Gallic appearance of the name on the Mars dedicated here in the late fifth to early fourth century BC (Ve 230).
75 Marengo, 'Documentazione epigrafica'.
76 See appendix 3 for details.
77 See n. 46 above.
to overstate the case for the progress of linguistic Romanisation before the Social War. He underestimates the number of Umbrian inscriptions to be around ten, but since then many more have been collected and published: 25 possible examples are noted in appendix two. This gives us a very different perspective on the balance within certain towns, such as Mevania, which we now know was still using Umbrian in the late second century. Furthermore, Harris probably dates too many Latin inscriptions to before the Social War: a collection of possible early Latin inscriptions are given in appendix three. In my rough assessment, the balance of Umbrian to Latin inscriptions before the Social War is now in favour of Umbrian rather than Latin (and almost half of the Latin examples come from colonies).

In essence the changes within allied communities are less far-reaching than have been portrayed. The Latin alphabet seems to have become predominant in the second century BC, although we have evidence that some communities, for example Mevania, continued to use the Umbrian script in the second half of the second century BC. The Latin language is beginning to be used on official inscriptions in Umbria west of the Appennines in the late second century, for example at Asisium, but even here Umbrian is still used in some contexts, and we have only Umbrian inscriptions from other towns, e.g. Iguvium and Mevania. Only in the southern part of allied Umbria, on the Adriatic side of the Appennines, can we say that Latin is predominant in our evidence; our evidence here, however, is even sketchier than in the west.

The epigraphic evidence alone does not show that the spread of Latin to allied areas in the second century corresponded to a decline in the Umbrian language. In fact the greatest number of Umbrian inscriptions surviving are from this period, including the Iguvine Tables. Epigraphy itself was surely not an indigenous creation serving an essential local purpose, but something stimulated by outside influence, probably from Etruria and Rome. In particular the huge growth in the numbers of inscriptions set up in the hundred years after the Social War is a clear sign of the growing influence of Rome. It would be reasonable to assume, though, that the second century BC was probably a period of dual language use, manifested in the bronze strainer in the Louvre and the funerary epitaph in Gallic and Latin from Tuder; self-advertisement and records in both Umbrian and Latin were becoming more numerous but were still on a small scale. It was only with the Social War and subsequent political change in the status of Umbria.
Latins and allies that Umbrian ceased to be used in epigraphy. In fact, Umbrian seems to have been dropped as a language of epigraphy immediately with municipalisation, which hints strongly at the fragility and undeveloped nature of the tradition. At Mevania, for instance, the custom of using urns for the dead begins with a few examples in the second century, two with Umbrian epitaphs and perhaps one using Latin, and then mushrooms in the first century BC. None of the numerous post-Social War examples use the Umbrian naming formula or alphabet, all are Latin.79

4. PARTICIPATION IN THE SOCIAL WAR

On the very poor available evidence, Umbrian communities seem to have played only a small role in the Social War, despite the propensity of their citizens to serve in the Roman army. In the build up to the war, Appian (1.36) says that they and the Etruscans opposed the agrarian law of Drusus in 91 BC because they shared the fears of the 'Italians' (τοῖς Ἰταλιῶταῖς),80 namely that

'the Roman public domain (which was still undivided and which they were cultivating, some by force and others clandestinely) would at once be taken away from them, and that in many cases they might even be disturbed in their private holdings'.

Called to the city by the consuls (with whom they may have had links of clientela) in order to oppose Drusus, they may have had a hand in his death. It was some time after the actual outbreak of the revolt in 91 BC that the Umbrians and Etruscans were being incited to join the allied side, probably in late 90. According to Appian (1.49), the Senate was forced by threat of encirclement to concede citizenship (by the Lex Julia) to those Italians who had been faithful to the alliance, an offer which was enthusiastically taken up by the Etruscans and presumably (because he does not mention them again, perhaps through brevity) the Umbrians. Some Umbrians and Etruscans clearly had raised arms against Rome by this time: the Epitome of Livy (74) records that the legate A. Plotius defeated the (or some) Umbrians and the praetor L. Porcius Cato the (or some) Etruscans. In fact even Appian's treatment of both Etruscans and Umbrians as unified groups is likely to mask differences in opinion and actions in this period. Presumably those Umbrians who had already gained Roman citizenship before the war will have tried to restrain the unfranchised members of their communities. The strength of any putative

79 66 examples (47 with inscriptions) are catalogued in Mevania 60-81.
80 Appian presumably means the rest of the Italians here (see Harris, Etruria and Umbria 212 n. 2 and Brunt, 'Italian aims' who draws attention to Appian's limitations).
anti-war force is unclear though: the franchise was not in my opinion distributed to a
large number of individuals in allied communities.

We get some clues as to which allied communities in Umbria might have been
involved from Florus and two fragments of Sisenna. The list of cities and areas
destroyed by 'fire and sword' given by Florus, which includes Ocrriculum in southern
Umbria, is doubted unnecessarily by Harris.® 1 he admits that conflict elsewhere in Florus'
list is corroborated by other sources, and at Ocrriculum this notice is surely to be linked
to the movement of the town down from the defensive hill position to a site by the
Tiber.® 2 Two other Umbrian centres, Iguvium and Tuder, are mentioned in fragments of
Sisenna's fourth book of his history in the context of an account of the war, as well as
the Etruscan city of Perusia. But without the immediate setting for these mentions it is
difficult to draw firm conclusions. The two fragments mentioning Iguvium may imply it
was the site of a Roman victory;® 3 that concerning Tuder, usually taken to mean that the
whole community was enfranchised (?due to a Roman magistrate), may in fact only refer
to some Tudertines, given citizenship on the battlefield or in similar circumstances.® 4
Making any further deductions about other possible rebels on the basis of hypothesised
'punishment' tribes, into which they may have been put, seems too problematic to be of
use.® 5

---

® 1 At least that is how I read Etruria and Umbria 216. Florus' list is accepted by Brunt,
Manpower 285.
® 2 The earliest major monument of the lower site is the so-called 'grande sostruzione' of the
mid first century BC (Guida Laterza 24-S).
® 3 Sisenna fr. 94 Peter: Sisenna historiographus libro IIII: Itaque postero die legatos Iguuium
redeuntis apiscitur ('And so on the next day he comes across the ambassadors returning to
Iguvium'); fr. 95 P: Sisenna historiarum libro IIII: Tum postquam apud Iguuiuos ac Perusinos eius
facti mentionem proiecit... ('Then after he had made mention of that deed among the people of
Iguvium and Perusia ...').
® 4 Sisenna 4 fr. 119: tamen Tudertibus senati consulto et populi iusso dat civitatem. Brunt,
'Italian aims' 109 accepts Harris' suggestion (Etruria and Umbria 230) that this could be a special
law for enfranchising ex-rebels, or those whose communities were divided in supporting
insurrection.
® 5 The argument that the Social War rebels were put together into tribes that were
disadvantageously large was first advanced by K. J. Beloch, Der italische Bund unter Roms
Hegemonie (Leipzig, 1880) 38-43; for criticism see T. Mommsen in Hermes 22 (1887) 101-6,
Taylor, Voting Districts 112-3. Harris, Etruria and Umbria 238-40 accepts that the Clustumina
tribe was a possible repository of Umbrian rebels, yet he admits that the presence of Interamna
Nahars and Tadinum in this tribe, communities of probably Latin and Roman status respectively
before the Social War and so unlikely rebel material, poses problems. Furthermore, in my opinion
the municipium at Carsulae, for which the archaeological evidence does not go back before the
late first century BC (Guida Laterza 123), was probably only created (and assigned to a tribe) in
the mid first century BC - why then put it in a 'punishment' tribe? Surely the domination of this
tribe by Umbrian communities (Harris 241), who could cooperate in their own interests, was in
some ways advantageous to them. Lastly, Ocrriculum, the best candidate for rebel status in our
source material (assuming it was destroyed by the Romans), is not in this tribe but in the
Arnensis. At the very least I would suggest that other principles were at work here, which
We are left with the job of explaining why the Umbrians were less seriously involved in the Social War than the Picentes and the peoples of the central Appennines such as the Samnites and Marsi. Several explanations can be rejected. Despite the close association of the Umbrians with the Etruscans in the sources for this period, I think there is no justification for extending to Umbria the profoundly hierarchical social divisions claimed for Etruria, which have been used to suggest that the Etruscans opposed the citizenship bill of Drusus. Appian in any case refutes this argument (1.36), clearly stating that the fears of the Etruscans and Umbrians were stimulated by Drusus' colonial schemes. In addition the rapidity with which the Etruscans and, I have assumed, the Umbrians accepted citizenship in late 90 BC shows how this was, as Appian says, 'the one thing they all desired most' (1.49). Moreover, I do not think it sustainable that the Umbrians were slow to join the rebels because they lacked the military experience or resources.

The close links between the actions of the Etruscans and the Umbrians are extremely interesting, reminding us of the close alliances they forged in resisting the Roman conquest, for example at Sentinum. Such links are natural given the long border joining the two regions, which were by the time of the Social War isolated from the rest of allied central Italy by the swath of Roman territory running across the peninsula from Rome to the ager Gallicus. Crossing this territory was difficult and dangerous for the enemies of Rome, as the failed attempt of insurgents from the Adriatic coast in early 89 BC shows. The allied communities of Etruria and Umbria thus had to act in concert, if at all; the Umbrian nobles will thus have been dependent on their Etruscan equivalents to join the rebellion, who may have had their own reasons for holding back (such as the lack of manpower suggested by Crawford). Umbria was, as Harris notes, dominated by Roman and Latin settlement, particularly in its southern half, as well as being separated from the main rebel areas; yet this was also the case for allied Picenum, where the revolt started. Picenum was, however, much less accessible from Rome than southern

---

86 E.g. by Gabba, *Republican Rome* 73-4; *ANRW* 1 788-9; *CAH* 9 112-13. Cf. Pallottino, *Earliest Italy* 154. Heurgon, 'L'Ombrie' 124-5 suggests that the interior parts of Etruria and the areas of Umbria near the Tiber had a similar pattern of small land-holding (in contrast to littoral Etruria), but does not assume that the social structures of the two were the same.

87 Quite which law of his 'they cried down publicly' is not clear; the chronology of Appian's account is flawed at this point, and I do not intend to add to the debate on this subject.

88 Gabba (CAH 9 113 n. 42) is forced to suppose that at this point Appian is only referring to the lower classes of Umbria and Etruria, a clear sign of the difficulty of his theory.

89 As proposed by Crawford about the Etruscans ('Army and coinage' 135-7). Note the evidence for Umbrian service in the Roman army (section 2, above).

90 Harris, *Etruria and Umbria* 229.
Umbria. These are the special circumstances that must have governed the behaviour of the Umbrians in the war.\textsuperscript{91}

5. MUNICIPALISATION

The Social War and enfranchisement of the Umbrian allies had momentous consequences for the region. Besides the obvious changes in political status and organisation, the first century BC also saw social and economic upheavals and cultural changes in Umbria on an unprecedented scale.

Those allied communities of Umbria that had not rebelled were given citizenship by the Lex Julia at the end of 90 BC. Those that had taken up arms were probably enfranchised soon afterwards, if not at the same time.\textsuperscript{92} Once their political status had changed it became necessary for the constitutions of Umbrian cities to be reorganised along Roman lines as befitting municipia within the Roman state, rather than nominally independent entities. Where we have evidence for this process of municipalisation it seems to have occurred rapidly after enfranchisement.\textsuperscript{93} The old magistrates of the Umbrian towns, probably a pair of uhtur(s) and a pair of marones, sometimes supplemented by 'quaestors', were replaced with four quattuorviri. We have to presume that the rest of the governmental apparatus, such as local councils and assemblies of the people, for which the evidence is rather shadowy, were also adapted or replaced by the standardised decurionate whose membership required a property qualification on the lines of the Senate at Rome.\textsuperscript{94}

This process of political transformation was closely associated in Umbria, as in other areas of peninsula Italy, with urban construction projects on an unprecedented scale. The list of works given by Gabba in his well-known article on urbanisation from the Social War to the battle of Actium (31 BC) can be considerably expanded for Umbria.\textsuperscript{95} Few parts of Umbria remained untouched by this phase of building, even if already urbanised.\textsuperscript{96} I am aware of the following published evidence for this period:\textsuperscript{97}

\footnotesize{91 We can also note that archaeology and literary sources suggest that a considerable number of Umbrian towns were not walled at this time, e.g. Iguvium and Fulginiae.}

\footnotesize{92 Velleius 2.16.4: 'the strength of the Romans was restored by receiving into citizenship those who had not taken up arms or had laid them down in good time (deposerant maturius)'.}

\footnotesize{93 Coarelli, 'Assisi repubblicana' 12.}

\footnotesize{94 For the pre-Social War organisation see ch. 4 section 7. Decurionate: Cic., Pro Roscio 9.25, numerous inscriptions.}

\footnotesize{95 E. Gabba, 'Urbanizzazione e rinnovamenti urbanistici nell'ltalia centro-meridionale nel I c. a.C.', SCO 21 (1972) 73-112.}

\footnotesize{96 Contra Gabba, 'Urbanizzazione' 94.}
Ameria: city walls
Asisium: urban complex with the so-called 'Temple of Minerva', a 'tetrastylum' and a paved public space
Carsulae: portico under the twin temples next to the forum
Hispellum: extra-urban theatre and sanctuary complex with terracing and a monumental fountain
Iguvium: theatre (perhaps with associated structures), public baths, domestic housing
Mevania: city walls (newly built or completely renovated)
Mevaniola: theatre and public baths
Oriculum: new urban site created with buildings such as the 'grande sostruzioni'
Sarsina: city walls and regular city plan with drainage system
Sentinum: city walls

This generally does not include isolated surviving architectural terracottas dated to the second to first century BC, which are collected in appendix 1. It should be noted that the Adriatic part of Umbria is more poorly documented, and so is probably under-represented. Like Gabba's list this does not include building work definitely associated with colonisation: I deal with this in section 8 below. '?' denotes uncertainty about the exact date.

The walls could be of the municipalisation period or earlier according to Fontaine, Cités 79-80.

90-50 BC according to Fontaine, Cités 334, with an earlier date more likely; but see ch. 4 section 3.

This complex was built on terracing that probably predates the Social War; for the precise sequence of construction phases between the Social War and the triumviral period see Strazzulla, 'Problemi urbanistici' and Coarelli, 'Assisi repubblicana' 16-21.

Guida Laterza 178-84; Malone, Stoddart, Territory 180-1: mid first century BC. A huge dump of ceramic material (mostly fourth to late second century BC) was probably re-deposited (and mixed together in the process) in its present position next to S. Biagio when the Roman city was (?)laid out just to the north (see ch. 2 section 3 b x).

Earlier city walls may have been built out of brick (see ch. 4 section 3). The remains of the fortification visible today (reused in the medieval era) consists of a cement core faced with small blocks of local sandstone; it is dated by Fontaine, Cités 238 to the first century BC, after municipalisation (cf. Bonomi Ponzi in Mevania 87).

Bermond Montanari, in NSc suppl. (1965) 98: 70-50 BC.

Guida Laterza 25: perhaps of the mid first century BC.

CIL i² 2124=ILLRP 660 (70-50 BC) records the walls (assuming the restoration [murum] longum p(edes) (miiie) is correct) built by an architectus; ILLRP 661 refers to a gate and towers which are presumably associated with the walls. See Gabba, 'Urbanizzazione' 92-3 with previous bibliography.

Of probable pre-41 date - when the city was besieged (mentioned by Appian, B.C. 5.116). Gabba ('Urbanizzazione' 100) assumes the regular urban plan is also from the early first century, but the Augustan era is as least as likely; the archaeological evidence provides no further precision (Guida Laterza 217-19).
Spoletium: restoration of city walls, houses, theatre, bridge over the Tessino river, building dedicated to Hercules, paving of the decumanus\(^{109}\)

Suasa: \(?\)house\(^{110}\)

Tuder: \(?\)terracing/city walls, with associated cistern and drainage tunnels\(^{111}\)

Urvinum Mataurense: theatre, monumental cistern, thermal complex, domestic housing\(^{112}\)

Urvinum Hortense: restoration of a third century temple\(^{113}\)

Vettona: temple\(^{114}\)

There are various reasons for the mass of activity in this period. Some centres were damaged or completely destroyed in the Social War or in one of the two civil wars that were fought on Umbrian soil: the old site of Ocriculum, for example, was probably sacked in the Social War and the community moved to a different site (which was more convenient for the Tiber trade). A similar origin may be behind the creation of an urban centre at Carsulae, where first traces of building date to the late Republican period.\(^{115}\) The upheavals of this period and the massive dangers that the cities of the region suddenly had to face must have impressed the need for city walls on those towns lacking them: we can be fairly sure that the circuits at Mevania and Sarsina date to soon after the Social War. Yet practicality was not the only driving force for walls, which were often linked to large scale replanning of the urban area, as at Sarsina. Civic pride and the necessity to meet Roman expectations of what features a proper city should possess also played an important role, as Gabba has stressed.\(^{116}\) These types of sophisticated

\(^{109}\) Walls: CIL XI 4809; bridge: ILLRP 670; building dedicated to Hercules: ILLRP 155a, depending on the restoration \(\text{[aed}(em)\) (cf. Vine, Studies 151); paving: ILLRP 155; houses, theatre (Guida Laterza 112-3).

\(^{110}\) This dates to the second half of the first century; the rest of the urban centre may also relate to this period, when the centre became a \textit{municipium} (S. De Maria, 'Suasa: un municipio dell'\textit{aeger gallicus} alla luce delle ricerche e degli scavi recenti', \textit{Le Marche} (1991) 15-52).

\(^{111}\) Fontaine (\textit{Cités} 200) dates all the walls to the municipalisation period. Tascio (\textit{Todi} 104) thinks the site was restructured in late second century with new terracing, urban spaces and route organisation; there seems little to choose between their arguments. For Augustan building here see section 8 below.

\(^{112}\) M. Luni, 'Urvinum Mataurense (Urbino) e approvvigionamento idrico', in \textit{Monumenti e culture nell'appennino in età romana} 33-64 dates these monuments only imprecisely as Republican, but are likely to date from the first century BC because of their form and the construction techniques used. He thinks the city walls are of the third or second century.

\(^{113}\) See appendix 1.

\(^{114}\) Excavated in the late 19th century, but only the architectural terracottas remain (see appendix 1).

\(^{115}\) The earlier centre of the community is clearly marked by archaic graves and massive polygonal walling at Cesi and Sant'Erasmo di Cesi, above the modern town. Continuity of population in this area could be read into the frequention of the sanctuary at M. Torre Maggiore, at which archaic (c. fifth century) Umbrian votives have been found, and which was clearly monumentalised in the late Republic (see section 6).

\(^{116}\) Gabba, 'Urbanizzazione' 108.
and ambitious building programmes often had roots in the second century BC, and work in the period after the Social War might see the culmination of a long-term plan. This was almost certainly the case at Asisium, where the spaces created by urban terraces built in the second century were topped by the 'Temple of Minerva' and various other associated structures and paved squares in the first century BC.

The result of this activity was the monumentalisation of Umbrian settlement centres according to the well established Graeco-Roman principles of urbanism, with its public spaces and buildings, city walls and terracing of the landscape. The models used for this architecture were most commonly of Greek derivation, such as at Asisium for the 'Temple of Minerva' (with its Attic column bases and Hellenistic terraced setting), although some temples continued to be constructed with the traditional Italic architectural terracottas. These new Greek influences must, as Coarelli points out, have been mediated through Rome.

6. RURAL SANCTUARIES

The changes associated with the Social War also affected the countryside. Archaeological remains of votives at all of the published rural sanctuaries decline to virtually nothing in this period, even at sites that saw a high level of deposition in the third and second centuries, such as Grotta Bella between Ameria and Tuder. The few sanctuaries that seem to have bucked this trend have different types of evidence to attest their continuing use - this could indicate that the deposition of votives is not giving us a very representative view. At M. Torre Maggiore, north of Interamna, recent archaeological work has uncovered a monumental complex with at least two phases of building activity, the later of which probably dates to the first century BC. Unfortunately this impressive sanctuary is the only site from which we have substantial evidence of construction: our knowledge of other Umbrian sanctuaries is particularly deficient in this respect, although it would probably be fair to say that many had no associated structures. The second site whose continuity of use beyond the Social War seems clear is the Lacus Clitumnus, which is described by Pliny (Letters 8.8) in the early second century AD as a flourishing cult place 'of great antiquity'. No other comparable literary description of a sanctuary survives from this region. If we are to assume, though,

117 As at Vettona and in the restoration work at Urvinum Hortense.
118 Coarelli, 'Assisi repubblicana' 22.
119 For references see ch. 2 section 3 (b) (iii). Ceramic material of imperial date is visible on the surface (autopsy).
120 Crawford in CAH 10^2 427 thinks the survival of this cult place stems from its attribution to Hispellum by Augustus.
that the dearth of votive evidence in rural sanctuaries after the Social War reflects a decline in their frequentation, how are we to account for this? I have argued in the previous chapter that temples built within settlement centres are in some way taking over the function of certain rural sanctuaries already in the third and second centuries. The apparent ending of the deposition of votives with the Social War could thus be seen as a culmination of this process. At other sanctuaries, though, the relatively high level of votive deposition in the third and second centuries, as we see at Grotta Bella, suggests that the Social War marks a drastic transformation. Recent writers on the subject have attributed the decline in the use of rural sanctuaries after the Social War to the increased importance of cities as centres of life after municipalisation, and to the changes in the social make-up of the countryside. This latter is a process that we can particularly document in southern Umbria.

7. RURAL SETTLEMENT

The first century was marked by innovations in the type of rural settlement. Considerable numbers of villas presumably run at least partly with slave labour can be traced archaeologically from this period. They were mainly concentrated around the southern cities of Narnia, Terni, Ameria and Tuder, although featuring in smaller numbers elsewhere too. The proximity of southern Umbria to Rome, and the links provided by the Via Flaminia and the Tiber, must have played a crucial part in their distribution. They were generally medium or small rather than large scale establishments; the smaller sites were commoner in more mountainous zones, the larger in better connected areas. From pottery and coinage finds they seem to have flourished only in the first century BC and the early imperial period; many began to be abandoned in the second century AD, particularly those of greater size.

It is interesting that there is a lack of archaeologically visible evidence dating

---

121 Monacchi, 'Grotta Bella' 91.
122 E.g. Crawford in CAH 10^2 427. Monacchi, 'Grotta Bella', over-stresses the similarities with the 'area sabellica' in my opinion.
123 These are documented in a volume put together by the Soprintendenza archeologica per l'Umbria, entitled Ville e insediamenti rustici di età romana in Umbria (Perugia, 1983) - used throughout this section. See also Manconi et al., 'La situazione in Umbria' 377-83.
124 Note Pliny's late first/early second century AD villa in the high Tiber valley near Tifernum Tiberinum (Letters 4.1 etc.).
125 This is true of both places where the 'Popilius' cups were produced at Mevania and Oriculum; Cic., Pro Roscio 7.20 stresses this factor in describing the 'excellence' of the elder Roscius' estates, 'for he left thirteen farms, nearly all next to the Tiber'.
126 Malone, Stoddart, Territory, Time and State 191 note that there is likely to be a bias towards larger sites.
back to the second century BC, when the spread of such establishments at the expense of small farmers is considered to be a partial cause of the agrarian conflicts that erupted with the Gracchi. Military colonisation has been suggested as the reason for the spread of the larger farms in the first century BC, but given the lack of known veteran colonies around the densely occupied basin between Terni and Narni, an area where these 'villas' flourished, economic factors would seem more important. The archaeological picture of the size of these centres correlates with the information in literary sources of Umbrian aristocrats having large land holdings made up of many scattered estates rather than a few really large latifundia. The best documented case is that of Sextius Roscius, whom Cicero defended against a charge of parricide in 80 BC: he stood to inherit his father's estates worth (Cicero claims) six million sesterces, and consisting of thirteen separate farms.

The only area of Umbria that has been subjected to a systematic survey, the Gubbio basin, has provided some interesting results in this context. The survey found a reasonable number of Roman sites in the valley bottom, all dating to the period from the mid first century BC to the end of the first century AD. The sites, as would be expected for a zone within the Appennines, were predominantly of a small size, with only 6% of sites defined as 'large farms/villas'. Nevertheless, the excavation of one of the smaller farms (below the villa category) revealed a considerable use of imported material and some scattered coins.

Unfortunately the almost total absence of dateable ceramic material found in the survey from after the first century AD (probably because Iguvium was isolated from imports) make any comparisons with the later period impossible. The absence of Republican pottery, particularly black slip, from the rural survey is more surprising as considerable quantities of it have been found in a ceramic dump in the vicinity of the

---

127 Put forward in Ville e insediamenti rustici 273 ff.; the authors claim that there is evidence in the Liber Coloniarum of virtane distributions in the territory of Narnia, Interamna Nahars and Ameria, but this is a very unreliable source (Keppie, Colonisation 8-12; Harris, Etruria and Umbria 311-13).

128 Cic., Pro Roscio 7.20. Two senatorial estates are known in Umbria, one at Ocriculum belonging to T. Annius Milo (Cic., Mil. 64), and the possessions of Crassus at Tuder, which he had sacked in 83-2 (Plut., Crass. 6.5), but we have no idea of their size. Roscius' farms must have been worth c. 450,000 sesterces on average - likely to be substantial villas even allowing for Ciceronian exaggeration. We can compare the neighbouring Umbrian estate Pliny (Letters 3.19) was considering buying for three million sesterces (knocked down from five): a sign of the larger size (assuming the value is comparable with Roscius') and progressive agglomeration of estates in his period? Roscius was the first man in his neighbourhood (vicinitas) according to Cicero (6.16), but not the region as Dyson says (Community and Society 68).

129 Malone, Stoddart, Territory, Time and State.

130 See map at 190 in Territory, Time and State.

131 Territory, Time and State 191.
Roman town. The excavators have taken this as a sign that there was a large immigration of new settlers, perhaps through an unrecorded colonisation scheme, in the last century BC. Other explanations could be advanced. It is possible that pottery imports in the third and second century did not circulate outside an elite based in the town centre: Attic pottery was very much a symbol of prestige, for instance. Rural sites may have been constructed on a modest scale with materials prone to degradation, such as wood and unfired bricks. Indeed the whole population may alternatively have been centred on Iguvium in the period before the Roman conquest, and perhaps even down to the late Republic, before conditions became settled enough to live in isolated rural farmsteads. In addition, the difficulties of the survey conditions on the lower slopes of the north-eastern side of the Gubbio valley may have prevented the discovery of much rural settlement close to the city site, where we would expect to find the larger Roman villas as well as the earliest rural settlement.

One further puzzle is that the complete absence of third and second century evidence from the Gubbio survey does not correlate with the conclusions drawn about vegetation by the excavators from a sedimental sequence. This suggested that there was a continuous progression in the extension of agriculture in the valley in the Iron Age and Roman period, rather than a sudden explosion of activity in the Roman period. The most judicious interpretation of the results would seem to be that there is a greater visibility of sites from c. 50 BC to c. AD 100, due to the use of imported pottery and stone construction in rural sites, and perhaps the expansion of rural settlement in this era into a wider area of the basin. Both these phenomena are surely explicable by an upsurge in the economy of the area (rather than a massive colonial influx), with even mountainous Iguvium becoming part of long distance trade movements.

---

132 Guida Laterza 185; Braconi, Manconi, 'Gubbio: nuovi scavi' 81. Curiously ignored in Territory, Time and State.

133 191, 197. A record of veteran colonisation could reasonably be expected to show up in the town's epigraphy: Tuder and Hispellum were both given the honorific title *colonia Iulia* for instance.

134 Hypothesised by Manconi et al., 'La situazione in Umbria' 376 dealing with the same problem concerning the sudden appearance of rural villas in the first century BC throughout Umbria, and the almost total absence of evidence before.

135 I suspect this would have only been the case if the population was relatively small; dense patterns of rural settlement in the mid Republican period have been found by survey in other areas of Italy such as Samnium (Lloyd, 'Farming the highlands') and Etruria (Barker, Rasmussen, 'Tuscania').

136 Territory, Time and State 189: the northern side of the valley had suffered from 'heavy colluviation and alluviation'.

137 Territory, Time and State 43: the Iron Age was a period of 'a sophisticated cereal agriculture which in turn implies substantial clearance most probably of the footslopes of the limestone escarpments', followed by further clearance in the Roman period.
As the evidence stands we lack a clear idea of what these new rural establishments produced, although the great wealth of individuals like Roscius suggests that cash crops were involved, probably at least in part the olives for oil and grapes for wine recommended by agricultural writers like Columella. In imperial times large quantities of bricks were produced in southern Umbria and the territory of Mevania, many of which, identified by their stamps, have been found at Rome.138 These were probably produced in the kilns of large suburban villas using the rich deposits of clay found in the vicinity of Ameria and Mevania.139 Nevertheless, we lack the evidence to trace the beginning of this type of 'industrial' production back to the late Republican period.

Away from this new developments in the fertile lowlands, much of Umbria must have remained covered by forest and pasture, both of course precious resources, which, if carefully managed, could yield significant resources. Cicero (De Div. 1.94) attributes the expertise of the Umbrians in augury from the flight of birds, like that of the Arabians, Phrygians, and Cilicians, to their 'being chiefly engaged in the rearing of cattle, and so they are constantly wandering over the plains and mountains in winter and summer'. Movement of animals through transhumance must have been common in the region, using superb summer pastures such as the Piano Grande near Nursia and Monte Subasio above Asisium.140 Farm labourers also moved for seasonal work, as we know from a rumour reported by Suetonius (Vespasian 1.4) that the emperor's great-grandfather had organised Umbrian workers employed in the summer around Reate.

8. LOCAL ELITES FROM THE SOCIAL WAR TO THE DEATH OF AUGUSTUS

It is clear from Cicero's Pro Roscio that some of the local elites in Umbria had, by the time of the Social War, accumulated enough wealth in the form of landed estates to qualify for admission to the Senate at Rome.141 This avenue of advancement now at least in theory became open to ambitious and rich Umbrians. Their spending on civic

---

138 Strabo 5.3.7 notes the building materials (specifically timber and the products of mines here) brought down to Rome by the Nar and Teneas rivers running through Umbria to the Tiber. 139 Manconi et al., 'La situazione in Umbria' 379, although many of the kilns excavated on rural villa sites, such as that at Penna in Teverina (probably in the territory of Ameria), can only have catered for internal needs. 140 Varro, Res Rusticae 2.9.6; Pliny, N.H. 11.241; Manconi et al., 'La situazione in Umbria' 372. 141 Assuming the figure is not hugely inflated. Several Umbrian equestrians are known from the period of activity of Cicero: he defended a Varenus of Fulginiae and his clients C. Cornelius and Cluentius Habitus were prosecuted by two men from Spoletium and Pisaurum (Wiseman, New Men 36). Nicolet, Orde Équestre 2 lists two other possible equestrians from before the war (from Urvinum Mataurense and Spoletium again) and five from after (Urvinum Mataurense, Spoletium, Interamna Nahars, Ameria and Narnia).
infrastructure and buildings in their home towns, now Roman *municipia*, was one of the most important ways in which they could draw attention to themselves. Money was also put into agriculture, producing the rash of villas discussed above, orientated around the farming of cash crops that could be sold at markets, particularly those in Rome. During this century the increasing wealth of the local Umbrian elites enabled them to compete successfully for entry to the senatorial order at Rome with other Italians and those of the old Roman aristocracy who had survived the turmoil of the times. During the reign of Augustus four men from the 'remote' *municipium* of Iguvium had probably amassed the resources and contacts necessary to become Roman senators. In the late first century AD there was an emperor, Nerva, whose family had Umbrian origins.

We know of one possible senator from Roman Umbria before the Social War, from Fulginiae. The first after the war may be a Gargonius who was a moneyer in Rome in 86 BC, but his name and origin are subject to some doubt. If correct he may also be from Fulginiae, a striking record for a centre that was only a *praefectura* until the Social War. The rest of the 28 possible Umbrian senators before AD 14 make the grade from the late 50s BC onwards: this rapid opening up of the senatorial order in this period must be the result of the high rate of attrition of the old Roman aristocracy from the beginning of Caesar's dictatorship in the ensuing civil wars and proscriptions. The Romanisation of the Umbrian elite is probably less of a factor in the Caesarian and triumviral periods as almost all the senators with 'known' origins come from the old Latin and Roman colonies of Spoletium, Narnia and Pisaurum. The one exception is a senator from Mevania; Wiseman points out that this is also on the Via Flaminia: accessibility to Rome played an important stimulatory role.

---

142 Wiseman, *New Men* nos. 331-3, 502. Compare the characterisation of the economy of Iguvium as lacking in access to communications and markets by Manconi and Whitehead in *Territory, Time and State* 203, who question its ability to produce wealth (186). They assert that Iguvium did not produce a 'major senatorial family' (198), yet three of its likely senators seem to have come from a single family, the *Pomponii*.

143 Vespasian's mother's family was from Vespasianae six miles from Nursia towards Spoletium and thus probably still in Sabinum rather than Umbria (Suetonius, *Vespasian* 1.3).

144 See ch. 3 section 5 (c).

145 Wiseman, *New Men* no. 193; Crawford, *RRC* no. 350A.

146 Wiseman, *New Men* nos. 96, 124-6, 188, 216. Note also the *quaestor* (and thus senator) A. Pompeius A.f. (*ILLRP* 384), active either in the Sullan period (Degrassi in *ILLRP* p. 212) or the second half of the first century BC (Gaggiotti, Senesi, 'Acesa al senato' 260). Whether he is from Interamna Nahars, which as patron he 'extricated from the greatest dangers' (*ex summis pereiculeis expeditum*) is doubted by Wiseman (*New Men* 45) but not Gaggiotti and Senisi ('Acesa al senato' 260), who note links with between this family and the Arruntii (certainly of Interamna).

147 Wiseman, *New Men* no. 357 and p. 29. Note also that Augustus' right hand man, M. Vipsanius Agrippa (no. 497), a senator from 43 BC, could be of the Sergia tribe and therefore originate from either Asisium or the Marsic region; Q. Fiscilius, a *praetor* in 28 BC and so surely a senator before Actium, could be from Urvinum Hortense (Gaggiotti, Senisi, 'Acesa al senato'
It is only with Augustus that significant numbers of members of the local elites of municipia allied before the war reached the senate; men are known to have come from Mevania, Asisium and Iguvium, and possibly from Sentinum and Suasa on the Adriatic side of the Appennines.\textsuperscript{148} This development, overseen by an emperor who had stressed the unity of Italy in his propaganda, must surely testify to the rapidity of the adoption of Roman ways by the upper class in Umbria after the Social War.\textsuperscript{149} As has been discussed above, Umbrian is completely dropped as an epigraphic language after the Social War. Funerary culture is less clear cut in its message, but recent studies have shown that the distinctive local Umbrian production of stelai and urns in the first century BC was heavily reliant on late Etruscan forms from Perugia and on Roman funerary art.\textsuperscript{150} The rapid adoption of elements of Roman culture must be why Umbria provides the largest number of senators of all the old allied regions of Italy in this period, although one of the smallest in terms of area.\textsuperscript{151} It is further confirmation of the wealth of this area, evident from the record of building work.

This wealth was amassed despite the fighting and confiscations that occurred in Umbria in the Sullan and triumviral periods. The newly enfranchised Umbrian elite seems to have immediately been sucked into the political conflicts at Rome. The lieutenants of Sulla, Crassus and Pompey fought hard campaigns in Umbria on both sides of the Appennines: in 82 BC Sena Gallica was sacked by Pompey and Tuder by Crassus, who enhanced his reputation for greed by appropriating much of the spoils.\textsuperscript{152} They then combined to defeat the Marian Carrinas near Spoletium, and laid siege to the city when he retreated there. Carrinas escaped under cover of darkness;\textsuperscript{153} Spoletium is unlikely to have been treated leniently. Other confiscations occurred at Tuder and Ameria, where Chrysogonus profited at Roscius' expense.\textsuperscript{154} Umbria was also grievously affected by the Perusine War, when armies again clashed in the Valle Umbra and the

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{260; Sensi in \textit{Raccoltà di Cannara} no. 58.}
\footnote{Wiseman, \textit{New Men} nos. 357, 255, 403-4, 497, 331-3, 502, 512, 88: all after Actium.
Gaggiotti, Sensi, 'Acesa al senato' 269 also identify an additional L. Pomponius at Iguvium. The exact origins of many other Umbrian senators who are probably or possibly from old allied towns remains unknown.
\footnote{149} On Augustus' promotion of men from the Italian municipal elites see Syme, \textit{Roman Revolution} 358-63; Salmon, \textit{Roman Italy} 143-8.
\footnote{151} For the figures see Wiseman, \textit{New Men} 189.
\footnote{Appian, \textit{B.C.} 1.88; Plut., \textit{Crassus} 6.
\footnote{Appian, \textit{B.C.} 1.90.
\footnote{Florus 2.9.27, 'Interamnium' (-eum or -ium in all manuscripts) is more likely Interamnia Praetuttiorum than Interamna Nahars (Harris, \textit{Etruria and Umbria} 265), though this was probably a more 'splendid municipium'.

173}
elite of the great Etruscan city, and perhaps the urban centre itself, were wiped out.\(^{155}\) Sentinum was also besieged and as a result probably later rebuilt with a grid pattern plan.

Veteran colonisation also took place in the triumviral period at Hispellum, Pisaurum and Tuder, and in the reign of Augustus at Fanum Fortunae.\(^{156}\) At all three centres the installation of the colony was accompanied by monumental construction projects. Hispellum was endowed with a substantial set of walls with huge gateways.\(^{157}\) Outside the town the remains of a terraced sanctuary linked to a theatre probably date from the same period. At Tuder the walls and urban spaces of the town were renovated, terraces around the lower part of the town were built, and city gates, public buildings, great substructure known as the ‘nicchioni’ and the theatre were created.\(^{158}\) The ‘nicchioni’ in particular show the way Greek ideas had thoroughly penetrated Roman architecture at this time: it consists of a wall about 11 m high and 40 m long inset with four colossal niches, whose most obvious parallels in Italy are the supporting terraces of the Hellenistically inspired sanctuaries of Jupiter Anxur at Terracina and of Hercules at Tibur. New city walls and a monumental gate were also built at Fanum in AD 9-10, again financed by Augustus, and Vitruvius records the basilica he built here.\(^{159}\) Land distributions for the soldiers required confiscations of territory from neighbouring municipia. It is interesting to note that some of the recipients had origins from other towns in the region.\(^{160}\) Propertius was a victim at Asisium, although Gabba argues that this will not have pushed such medium-scale landowners into destitution as they were likely to have holdings in various locations.\(^{161}\) He holds that the Umbrian elite remained generally stable and even flourished in the early empire. Indeed a Propertius Celer, perhaps both a member of the poet’s family and a descendent of the uhtur Vois. Ner. Propartie on an Umbrian border cippus of the (?)first decade of the century, reached the Senate under Augustus.\(^{162}\)


\(^{156}\) Keppie, *Colonisation*: Tuder in 36 BC or after Actium (176); Hispellum in 41 BC (179); Pisaurum in 41 BC (185); no specific evidence for Fanum Fortunae (184-5).

\(^{157}\) Augustus may have provided the initiative for these works: CIL XI 5266, Keppie, *Colonisation* 177. Using architectural parallels and an examination of the construction technique, Fontaine dates the Porta Consolare to c. 40-35 BC (*Cités* 255) and the other gates and full wall circuit to 30-20 BC (259), perhaps in connection with the restoration of the Via Flaminia in 27 BC.

\(^{158}\) Tascio, *Todi. Verso un museo* 105.

\(^{159}\) Vitruvius, *De Arch.* 5.1.6 (he also mentions other public buildings); Keppie, *Colonisation* 116.

\(^{160}\) Note the Edusius from Mevania at Tuder mentioned in section 2 above, and the unknown Tudertine who settled at Fanum (Keppie, *Colonisation* 176, 185).


\(^{162}\) Wiseman no. 344. Umbrian inscription: Ve 236 (appendix 2).
UMBRIA IN ITALY: SOME COMPARISONS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this last, concluding chapter is to summarise the position reached on a range of important issues in the history of Umbria in the first millennium BC and, where it is instructive, to compare this picture with the evidence for Picenum. Although of course different in many ways, the pattern of settlement in Picenum does show some important similarities with that in Umbria. In both regions there is archaeological evidence for increasing numbers of settlements, in the form of cemeteries, from the start of the Iron Age, and by the era of Augustus both had similarly dense patterns of small urban centres. Moscatelli notes 36 colonies and municipia in Picenum in the Roman period; there may be as many as 42 in Umbria in the early imperial epoch. Yet, within this chronological arc, certain interesting differences illuminate the importance of the political, economic and social changes brought about by the Roman conquest.

2. THE PATTERN OF SETTLEMENT

The evidence of archaeology in Umbria shows in general the presence of settlement on many of the sites of the later municipia from before the Roman conquest. New excavations are continually adding to this evidence and any conclusions must thus be provisional, but I will attempt to summarise the conclusions that can be drawn from the material currently at our disposal. We have evidence from a number of sites (including Interamna, Spoletium and Iguvium) for settlement in the Final Bronze Age (c. 1000-900 BC). Perhaps the most interesting picture comes from the recent excavations at Iguvium (Gubbio), which have shown that the occupation of the city site around 950 BC corresponded to the abandonment of the previously inhabited hillforts on the mountains.

---

1 'Picenum' is defined here as the area of fifth Augustan region. My discussion of Picenum is in no way an attempt at a summary of its history; rather it is used only when an illuminating parallel with Umbria can be established.

2 Moscatelli, 'Problema dell'urbanizzazione' 195; Umbria: those listed in CIL (including the centres of the ager Gallicus).
above. This movement of the population down from mountain top sites was presumably at least in part the result of a need to be closer to the better - and different - agricultural possibilities available in the plain. The new site was much less effective in defensive terms, and seems to indicate that (agricultural?) economic priorities were now more important to the inhabitants of the area. As the evidence stands, Iguvium is the only site where settlement in a mountain slope or valley bottom position, common to almost all the later towns, can be linked to the disuse of local hillforts, but it would seem unsafe to assume that the hillfort systems elsewhere in lowland Umbria were commonly used into the Iron Age.

Nevertheless, it is clear from the situation of Colfiorito (ancient Plestia) that a simple equation should not be made between developed future city sites and undeveloped hillfort-village settlement patterns. The settlement system around this plateau became relatively complex between the sixth and fourth centuries BC, with a clear division between central and peripheral sites; the controlling function of these sites allowed the aristocrats who dominated this society to accumulate and use in a funerary context levels of wealth similar to that of their counterparts in the richer lowland centres. In addition, it is not clear from the evidence that the move down from mountain to lowland sites involved a greater concentration of the population, as the Bronze Age hillfort settlements at M. Ansciano and M. Ingino above Iguvium are clearly sizeable communities. Thus it is probably wrong to place too much significance on the mere appearance of cemeteries on the sites of the later lowland cities.

As the Iron Age (c. 900-300) progresses, we gain interesting insights into both upland and lowland communities from their cemeteries. Although we know little about the spatial organisation of tombs (the significance of which has been demonstrated at other Italian sites such as Osteria dell'Osa), and cannot really gauge the size of the groups using them, the cemeteries do provide evidence for the progressive differentiation of society. Tombs in the seventh century at Colfiorito contain modest quantities of (on the whole) locally produced impasto and buccheroid pottery and metal objects. From the end of the seventh century onwards there is a pronounced upsurge in imported material within the graves here and at Tuder (Todi) and the upland centres of Colfiorito and Monteleone di Spoleto; extremely rich tombs have been discovered at these sites, with characteristically aristocratic accoutrements (such as symposion equipment, and Greek vases), and some contained chariots. The type of tomb full of large quantities of this kind of prestige material seems to peak in the sixth century at Monteleone di Spoleto (although there are only a few graves of this date), the sixth and fifth centuries at Colfiorito and the sixth to mid-fifth century at Tuder. A chariot burial and some fragments
of Etruscan and Greek imported pottery from Iguvium, and chamber tombs with imported pottery and bronze items at Ameria, may be indicative of a similar social development at these centres, although probably not on such a scale; the much poorer archaeological picture for these two places prevents more detailed conclusions. This phenomenon is clearly linked to the changes of the so-called 'Orientalising' period, well known in Etruria, Latium and Campania from around the mid-eighth century BC, and in the Padane and Adriatic regions from the start of the seventh century. These changes were the result of contacts with the eastern Mediterranean through Greek traders - inevitably the impact of these developments on the central and southern part of Umbria, not in contact with the coast, lagged behind other, better connected, regions, through which the new influences were mediated. It is also true that the Umbrian material is generally both less spectacular and found in smaller quantities than in Picenum, Etruria and Latium, which again must be a reflection of its peripheral position.

The social implications of these developments are made more fragile by the relative rarity of poorer graves, but the importance of the type of items (such as chariots) in the value systems of aristocrats in the archaic Mediterranean makes it highly probable that the graves are those of an elite, differentiated by their wealth from the rest of society. We can probably assume that this reflects a change from the previous (more equitable) social order, although it is always difficult to discount wholly the influence of funerary custom on the archaeological record. The importance of the emergence of an aristocratic class in society for the development of political organisation is controversial, although the link between the two processes is often close. The significance of this for the economy of the region is easier to delimit. The concentration of resources in the hands of a few individuals probably means that there is a greater surplus being produced by the society through increased trade and perhaps also through agriculture. The former is documented by the items on which the aristocrats spent their wealth, brought along long-distance trade routes that reached into or passed through Umbria. Such trade routes seem to have brought the greatest amount of traffic through the territory of Umbrian centres that were between other important nodes of production and consumption, such as Tuder (on the route along the Tiber valley from Volsinii and southern Etruria to Perusia), or Colfiorito (controlling the route between central Picenum...
and the Tyrrenian side of the Appennines). That the aristocracies in these places were able to appropriate much of the newly available wealth suggests that they had developed a greater ability to order and control other members of their communities, although the exact way in which this was done is unknown.

The deposition of votives at cult sites, scattered across Umbria and into neighbouring regions, which begins to occur on a large scale in the late sixth century, marks an important new trend in the disposal of wealth. Presumably this is mainly aristocratic wealth, given the value of the bronze out of which most votives were fashioned, although their numbers suggest other sectors of the society were also involved. The position of the sanctuaries themselves in the landscape, most commonly on mountain peaks, has frequently been taken as a sign of a dispersed hillfort and village system of settlement; in chapter two I have argued against such a simple equation, identifying a variety of possible relationships that these sanctuaries could have with settlements, which the examples of Etruria and Latium show would not preclude the presence of substantial urban centres. It is only in the Appennine areas of Umbria, such as the Colfiorito plateau, that we have evidence for the contemporaneous use of rural sanctuaries and a hillfort-village settlement pattern.

The rarity of investment in monumental construction at cult sites, and the sheer number of sites, might suggest that activity at these sanctuaries was largely a localised phenomenon. Even so, the participation of a particular community in this activity could help give the group definition. We can think here of (what is interpreted as) the definition of the citizen body in the rituals recorded (much later) on the Iguvine Tables, and the deliberate exclusion of outsiders.\(^6\) In addition, the use of wealth to purchase votives for display at sanctuaries (for which they were specially designed) would seem to mark a concern of the elite with their own image in the community.\(^7\) The classical bronze statue known as the Mars of Todi was left at a (hypothesised) sanctuary at Montesanto just outside Tuder in the late fifth century: even if the aim was still personal glorification (as with the accumulation of prestige items that were subsequently deposited as grave goods), it now benefitted places used by the community as a whole.\(^8\) Spending money on monumental buildings, especially those such as temples whose use was in some senses 'communal', seems a natural evolution of this activity. Although small-scale isolated instances of this are known in the seventh/sixth century, the main trend seems

\(^6\) VIb 52-60 (see the commentary in Poulton, Bronze Tables).
\(^7\) A concern that does not seem so evident from the deposition of prestige items in burials.
\(^8\) It is notable that the aristocrats who deposited decorated Greek vases, large quantities of impasto pottery and even chariots in their tombs thought that only small locally produced statuettes were on the whole appropriate for sanctuaries.
to start in the fourth century BC, when temples are built at Tuder, Arna, Mevania and perhaps Iguvium. This trend gradually increases in the subsequent centuries and can tentatively be linked to the decline in deposition at rural sanctuaries (examined below).

The distribution of evidence for monumental building and for the fortifications that also appear around some settlements in the fifth to fourth centuries BC is suggestive of the strong influence on these trends of the urbanised Etruscan and Faliscan regions. The earliest walled sites are at Ocricum, Ameria and Vettona: Etruscan and (for Ocricum) Faliscan links are apparent in the funerary material found at these sites.9 The erection of monumental buildings at Tuder, Arna and perhaps Iguvium in the fourth century clearly relates to the earlier creation of such structures at nearby Falerii, Volsinii and Perusia, and in fact the style of the architectural terracottas from Tuder and Arna can be directly linked to these centres. Another fourth century building, probably a temple, was set up at Mevania, which was slightly further from Etruria, although only 25 km down the Valle Umbra from Perusia. The contrast with the lack of material from centres on the Adriatic side of the Appennines during this period could be explained on this model by their distance from other urbanised regions; but with the level of archaeological investigation here probably lower than in western Umbria, we should be cautious in arguing from silence.

On the whole it seems difficult to link the phases of the usage of cemeteries to the changes in society we have hypothesised from the evidence of rural sanctuaries and monumental buildings. This is largely because at most cemeteries we have a very imperfect knowledge of the chronological variation in funerary practice. At the best attested examples of Tuder and Colfiorito, however, two different patterns are evident in their later phases. Burials at the former site increase in number in the second half of the fifth century and provide the greatest amount of material in the fourth and early third centuries BC, although none show a deposition of prestige goods on the scale of that in the earlier tombs. Torelli’s suggestion that this is a sign of new aristocratic priorities - sanctuary dedications and the creation of monumental buildings rather than the placing of prestige objects in graves - probably has some truth in it, even if the deposition of votives in Umbrian sanctuaries seems to start somewhat earlier than the change in funerary evidence, in the early fifth century.10 The particular brilliance of Tuder in this period cannot be dissociated from that of Perusia, to which it was so closely linked by

---

9 The fortification of the sites on the western side of Umbria could also mean that there was a greater danger of being raided here.

10 Torelli in Todi. Verso un museo 54ff. actually argues that there is a 'new aristocratic class', although we need only really see a change in their funerary habits.
the Tiber valley.

As the evidence stands, we cannot document similar social and economic changes in the other lowland Umbrian communities. This is partly the result of the lower intensity of investigation elsewhere, but also probably because Tuder was very wealthy by the standards of the region. For the upland areas the quality of the evidence from the excavations at Colfiorito allows us to infer that there was a different pattern. In contrast to Tuder, the main cemetery at Colfiorito sees a decline in the quantity and quality of grave goods from the mid-fourth century BC. The evidence at the smaller cemeteries associated with hillforts in the surrounding area ends in the fourth century, and at the central cemetery below M. Orve in the late third century. If the decline in funerary evidence here reflects that of the system as a whole, it could be linked to a decrease in traffic using this trans-Appennine route; certainly, the contemporary funerary evidence from Picene cemeteries also seems to reflect a decline in trade with the West. It may also be important that the Plestine area was probably a praefectura without its own juridical autonomy from the time of the Roman conquest to the Social War, but the funerary material starts to decline before the conquest.\footnote{Its earliest magistrates may have been octoviri, on which see below.}

3. ETHNICITY

The evidence for ethnic identity is tantalising in that it only provides us with possibilities, rather than firm conclusions. The most striking problem is the outward incompatibility of our two major sources of information. Greek authors in the fifth and fourth centuries treat the Umbrians as a single ethnic group, if occupying a rather imprecise area of northern and central Italy. The earliest epigraphic evidence from within the region in the fourth and third century BC offers no confirmation of this larger identity, with stress instead being placed on what are probably local divisions of the Umbrians as a whole. It was argued in chapter one that this apparent contrast is probably best explained by the different nature of the two types of evidence. Greek authors were initially unconcerned with differentiating between the numerous local groups within the Umbria, if indeed they were aware of them; the record becomes more detailed in the first half of the fourth century, probably reflecting Umbrian contacts with Greek merchants along the Adriatic coast and in the eastern Po valley, but these links may have declined soon afterwards with the Gallic movement into these areas.\footnote{The epigraphic attestation of the 'Umbrian' ethnic in a south Picene inscription from the Abruzzo remains enigmatic.} References to smaller ethnic
divisions (Plestinus, Nucerinus and those on the coinage of Tuder and Iguvium), show the importance of local identities. For the period of the Roman conquest, the Livian narrative has both the Umbrians acting in concert and a selection of local names, such as the Nequinum which became Narnia after its colonisation; there seems to be some difference here with the Picenes, whose individual centres are never mentioned (on which see below).

Caution has been strongly advocated when trying to use this evidence to map the formation of these ethnic groups: the effects of the different types of evidence dominate our picture. Even attaching significance to the use of these ethnics is problematic, as their appearance may be largely conditioned by the availability of a medium for expression, whether Greek writers from the fifth century, or Umbrian epigraphy from the fourth. Nevertheless it is striking that the sudden visibility of ethnics amongst this people corresponds to the significant developments in communal activity outlined above. The use of sanctuaries throughout the region (at least for depositing votives) begins in the fifth century: ways in which this religious activity might encourage group identity, on a local or regional scale, have been suggested above. The production of small, mostly simple votives, and their deposition in huge numbers in sanctuaries is also the first archaeological phenomenon that distinguishes the culture of this region as a whole from others, although it was a phenomenon with imprecise edges. In the fourth century, the erection of monumental buildings, probably with a religious function, in settlement sites and the building of fortifications around some of these places (both trends that are likely to stem from contact with the urbanised Etrusco-Faliscan region), provides further evidence for cooperation within communities. This could well be a field for future research: though it is tempting to link the expression of ethnic identity, manifested especially in the fourth century, with the political and economic development of Umbrian communities, this idea remains speculative at the moment.

4. POLITICAL ORGANISATION

There is no contemporary evidence to document the political and institutional dimension to the changes whose social and economic consequences can be seen in the cemeteries and settlements of pre-conquest Umbria. For this we must wait until the second century BC. It is evident, however, that already by the early third century a

---

13 The Fasti Triumphales record the ethnic of the inhabitants, the Nequinates.
14 There is no obvious case in which expressing the ethnic provides the raison d’être for an inscription, which would allow us to attribute the inscription to this (new) motive.
certain level of political organisation had developed. This can be surmised at least for Iguvium and Tuder from the coinage issued by their central authorities during the First Punic War, which was given the ethnic of the community as a guarantee of its validity.\(^{15}\) This coinage was probably not produced to facilitate exchange and commerce, but to provide a medium in which the wealth of the state (a word that seems justified here) could be stored, collected, or, as is probably most important in the Umbrian case, paid out to troops serving in their contingents in the Roman army. The various series of these coins were based on weight standards that must have been fixed by the authority that oversaw their production. Both Iguvium and Tuder used a standard borrowed from Etruria of around 200 g; the latter also used a Roman standard during the Second Punic War, a sign of growing Roman influence. Other standards for time and space were probably also of early origin, although quite how they were decided upon is unknown.

In addition, the individual autonomy of Camerinum, Iguvium, and perhaps also Ocriculum, Ameria, and Tuder, is presupposed by the bilateral treaties they signed with Rome. The terms of these treaties must have required each Umbrian community to assess the number of troops they were able to contribute to the Roman army, and to levy the forces required by the Romans. All those centres that were not colonised or incorporated into the Roman state were probably given treaties with Rome during or soon after the Roman conquest of the region, which seems to have ended in 266 BC. Although we lack the necessary information, the treaties known with Camerinum and Iguvium make it highly likely that other Umbrian communities also had individual treaties. These treaties were presumably contracted with the representatives of Umbrian communities, who we know in the second century included two uhtur and two marones, and, at least at Iguvium and Mevania, quaestors. The quaestorship was presumably borrowed from Rome after the conquest, although this must have happened by the late third or early second century for it to be included in the Iguvine Tables.\(^{16}\) In the light of this, the borrowing of the maronate from Etruria rather than a Roman magistracy surely took place at an earlier period: it is unlikely to post-date the conquest by much, and could well be a fourth century development.\(^{17}\)

\(^{15}\) The lead coinage that could pertain to Ameria (see ch. 2, section 3 (b) (ii)), if not a modern forgery, is unlikely to have been an official issue: lead was not durable enough for regular use as coinage (although a votive function is possible).

\(^{16}\) To be connected with the Roman influence brought by the Via Flaminia in 223/0 BC, both here and at Mevania?

\(^{17}\) The maro is first attested at Volsinii: the diffusion of Volsinian bronzes in fourth century Umbrian tombs and the use of an alphabet derived from this city at Tuder and Colfiorito (Plestia) shows the strength of Umbrian links with this centre in the century before the conquest. The octovirate at Plestia may be a Latinised local magistracy borrowed before the Roman conquest from Sabinum.
the Umbrian *uhtur*, the supreme magistrate in the second century BC (and an office which does not seem to have been borrowed from neighbouring areas), is probably even earlier. Besides this evidence for the central authorities of individual Umbrian communities, we can also point to the technical terms for divisions of the state and the apparently larger category of the *nomen* in the Iguvine Tables; most are likely to be Osco-Umbrian terms, not borrowed from Rome, and so probably pre-date the Roman domination brought by the conquest.

The contrast with the level of evidence in Picenum may help to put the Umbrian picture into perspective. Unlike Umbria, in Picenum there is an important body of epigraphy from before the Roman conquest, in what seem to be at least two different languages, conventionally called North Picene and South Picene (as well as various other names). In general, these texts are too obscure to give us much information on the societies that produced them. We can, however, identify at least one technical term on the South Picene examples of the fifth century from Penna Sant'Andrea: *tuta*, combined with what seems to be an ethnic to give *safinas tūtas*. We can compare this with the Iguvine *tota*, the *tota iioveina*, and other uses of a related term in Oscan texts. No other institutional term is recognised with any certainty in the pre-Roman corpus, although the term *pūpūnum* has been seen as the ethnic designation of another more northerly group.

Compared to the Umbrians, the impression given by the later literary accounts of the Roman conquest of Picenum is of a less differentiated ethnic group. In 299 BC Rome made a treaty with the Picene people (*cum Picenti populo*: Livy 10.10.12), apparently in contrast to the treaties with individual Umbrian centres. No other mention is made in the literary evidence for the conquest of any individual centres in the region. The Picentes are said to have warned Rome of a coming Samnite offensive in 298 BC (Livy 10. 11.8); in 268 BC P. Sempronius and A. Claudius celebrated a triumph over them (*de Peicentibus*); soon after this defeat, according to the *Epitome* of book 15 of Livy, the Picentes were granted peace; the deportation of a small part of this people to the area south of Salernum recorded by Strabo (5.4.13) probably dates to the same

---

18 E.g. the *tuta Marouca* of Ve 218. On these see La Regina, 'Entità etniche' 130.
19 This occurs on four inscriptions from sites between Macerata and Teramo (S. Omero, Castignano, Mogliano and Loro Piceno); see La Regina, 'Entità etniche' 130.
20 It is tempting to compare this with the contrast between the citing of a (?)widespread ethnic designation, *pūpūnum*, (in the La Regina interpretation) on the region's epigraphy, and only that of divisions of a putative Umbrian ethnic group - Iguvium, Tuder etc. - on Umbrian inscriptions; but this evidence dates from different eras.
What is difficult to know is whether this apparent contrast with Umbria is the result of genuine institutional differences. Graeco-Roman writers are notoriously disinterested in the internal organisation of Italian peoples, and were certainly capable of misunderstanding the ethnic identity of other groups in the peninsula. In addition, the crucial period in the conquest of Picenum seems to have been the early 260s, a period for which we lack the narrative of Livy. Nevertheless, two instances remain striking in this respect: the formation of the 299 BC treaty recorded in Livy, and the triumph in the *Fasti Triumphales Capitolini*. In both, the Picentes are treated as a whole, while in comparable examples from Umbria it is individual communities, rather than the whole ethnic group, which are involved.

When the evidence of epigraphy again becomes available for Picenum, from the third century BC and now in Latin, there are only minor detectable traces of the pre-Roman institutional structure. The octovirate, attested at Interamnia Praetuttiorum and Truentum, as well as at Plestia in Umbria, is usually seen as a non-Roman magistracy which was given its Latin title when a community was incorporated into the Roman state (always before the Social War). A few other possible elements of earlier administrative structures have been identified by Humbert surviving into the municipal epoch at a *vicus* level. Other parts of the indigenous organisation may have survived into the Roman epoch, but have remained undetectable after being Latinised. Although it is dangerous to argue from silence, there does seem to be a genuine contrast with Umbria once more: although the highest level of local administrative structures were not retained in areas subject to Latin colonisation, such as at Firmum, Hadria, and perhaps Urbs Salvia, they often remained when an area was incorporated into the Roman state. The third or second century *marones* at Fulginiae seem to be an example of this. The absence of any magistrates of a civic character in the Roman areas of Picenum therefore has some significance for the political organisation of the area in the pre-conquest period.

---

21 Only the territory of Asculum remained with allied status in Picenum after the Roman viri tane settlement in the region; this treaty must have had the same implications for organisational structures as those in Umbria.
22 There is much confusion among late Republican and imperial writers over the ethnic groups that occupied Apulia before the Roman conquest, for instance.
23 E.g. the individual treaties of Camerinum and Iguvium, and the triumph celebrated in 299 BC over the Nequinates (for details, see ch. 3).
25 Three *magistri* of a *vicus* are found in the territory of Interamnia Praetuttiorum (ILLRP 152) and in that of Hadria, a Latin colony, there is an attestation of *treviri*, again of a *vicus* (CIL IX 5048). See also the discussion of *pagi* and *vici* in Picenum below.
26 Sherwin-White, *Citizenship* 66.
27 The magistrates of *pagi* or *vici*, at least in the Roman period, did not have judicial powers.
One final comparison with the evidence for political organisation in Umbria can be made, using coinage. In Picenum, coinage was only produced (in the third century) by centres with allied status, such as Ancona and perhaps Asculum, or those with Latin status, such as Hadria and Firmum. Hadria and (if the attribution is correct) Asculum, like Ariminum to the north and the Vestini to the south, used a weight standard of 350-400 g and a decimal system of division. This standard seems to be specific to the Adriatic coast, and must stem from a non-Roman source; that it was used by some Latin colonies, but not Firmum, which used a Roman standard, suggests strong links between the colonists and the indigenous population, who at least at Ariminum seem to have been mixed within the city. The absence of coinage from a large proportion of Picene territory reflects its absorption into the Roman state and the dissolution of its autonomy. The political status of the Roman areas, as we shall see, also had an impact on the pattern of settlement in Picenum, which can be traced through archaeological evidence.

5. THE THIRD TO FIRST CENTURIES BC

In the post conquest period the divergence between Umbria and Picenum can be documented in a different way to the approach adopted for the pre-conquest period: we have much better sources for the political organisation of the area, both in terms of the overriding structure imposed by the Romans, and in terms of local administrative arrangements. The archaeological record, however, in some respects becomes poorer. In both the areas under review the evidence of cemeteries in the third and second century is far more fragmentary than in the Iron Age, and it does not seem possible to draw conclusions about the social structure of the groups using them.

Increasingly, the most interesting archaeological data comes from settlement sites. This brings serious methodological problems: the continuity of settlement on most of the major sites in Umbria has led to the widespread destruction and reuse of ancient material, and also makes modern archaeological investigation difficult. In the light of this problem, the survival of even single architectural terracottas dating to this period is significant. These terracottas were used to cover the upper structures of monumental

---

28 Crawford, Coinage and Money 9, 43-4.
29 See ch. 3.
30 Evidence (as yet largely unpublished) from the large cemetery at Hispellum, which was used throughout the last few centuries of the Republic, should provide crucial data for this period in the future.
31 Although the potential for 'rescue' excavation exploration during rebuilding work is being exploited more and more here.
buildings throughout central Italy from the seventh century to the first century BC and beyond. Although examples from other regions show that during the last three centuries of the first millennium such terracottas could be used on a variety of different types of building, I have argued that the evidence of Urvinum Hortense and Vettona suggests that most probably related to temples. If this argument is correct, we can use this evidence to point to a steadily increasing amount of building on lowland settlement sites from the fourth to the first centuries BC, building that probably had a religious function for the whole community.

Archaeological information from the countryside in this region shows that in some cases the deposition of votives on rural sanctuary sites comes to an end as the ‘urban’ evidence increases. This seems to be particularly the case with those sanctuary sites close to settlement centres where there is evidence of monumental building, such as Colle S. Rufino near Asisium, and M. Ansciano near Iguvium. At sanctuaries deeper in the countryside, such as Grotta Bella, between Tuder and Ameria, deposition continues in the third and second centuries. If the pattern of deposition reflects the pattern of frequentation of a site (not by any means a forgone conclusion), we could postulate a shift in the focus of religious activity away from some rural sanctuaries and towards nearby settlement sites. In general, it is difficult to link the remnants of activity at the two different types of site, but we are lucky to have one site, under the church of S. Maria in Camuccia at Tuder, where ceramic votive material and fourth to third century architectural terracottas were found together. This material would seem to relate to a temple with an associated votive deposit. We therefore have some justification for linking the activity at the two types of site, and putting forward the hypothesis that the monumentalisation (and creation?) of cult places in settlements, visible from their building remains, began to provide new arenas for religious activity, which was previously centred on rural sites.

This explanation seems to fit the complexity of the evidential pattern better than the attribution of a 'decline' in rural sites to 'Romanisation', so common in recent literature. It is true that the deposition of the locally produced votive figurines of the archaic era ends by the time of the conquest, perhaps in the early fourth century, and

32 If the other terracottas primarily related to private dwellings, this would only invalidate my conclusions about the communal organisation demonstrated by the creation of these buildings, not my basic hypothesis that the terracottas provide evidence for urbanisation.

33 There are some traces of votive deposition at settlement sites from the fifth century BC at Fulginiae, Tuder, Spoletium and Ameria.

34 Cf. the single third to second century bronze votive of a crowned offerant found inside a cella of the temple at Urvinum Hortense. See appendix 1.
that instead in the third and second century the material used is typically made up of Roman coins, black slip pottery, and terracotta models of, for example, heads and anatomic parts. Such material is certainly evidence of the importation and local production of items well known from the material culture of Latium, but ironically the greatest evidence of the deposition of this material comes from sanctuaries in the countryside such as Grotta Bella rather than in towns.

The pattern of religious activity in all its archaeologically visible forms in Umbria during the third and second centuries BC shows an interesting contrast with the situation in other central Italian regions such as Samnium, and perhaps also Picenum (although the picture is less clear here). In these last two regions, many 'rural' sanctuaries, such as Pietrabbondante, Vastogirardi and Schiavi d'Abruzzo, are given a monumental dress in the third and second centuries. A similar wealth of building activity is evident in second century sanctuary sites in Picenum such as Colle San Giorgio and Monte Rinaldo. Although it should probably not be assumed that these sanctuaries were wholly isolated from all settlement, or that Samnite settlements lacked religious buildings, there does seem to have been a general separation between the great rural sanctuaries and the settlements that became municipia after the Social War. The contrast with Umbria is clear: here a considerable number of sanctuaries in towns, and some just outside (as at Villa Fidelia near Hispellum), seem to have been monumentalised in the third and second centuries, but virtually none in the countryside. Nevertheless the Umbrian picture is not a black and white one: two rural sites, at the Lacus Clitumnus, and on the peak of M. Torre Maggiore, seem to have been well frequented in the first centuries BC and AD; their continuing use may be due to the establishment of close links with local municipia, certainly Hispellum for the Lacus Clitumnus and perhaps Carsulae or Interamna Nahars for M. Torre Maggiore.

The building activity documented through the survival of architectural terracottas spans both allied and Latin areas of lowland Umbria before the Social War. There seem to be two main areas where such building activity is lacking:

35 Black slip pottery imitating established forms was produced at a number of different Umbrian centres; a mould for terracotta votives has been found at Mevania.
36 See Morel, 'Le sanctuaire de Vastogirardi (Molise) et les influences hellénistiques en Italie centrale', in Hellenismus in Mittelitalien 261-2 on possible traces of settlement around the temple at Vastogirardi; cf. La Regina, 223, 247 in the same volume on a 'sacello' at Aufidena and the post Social War use of Pietrabbondante; Dench, Barbarians 136-40 on the functions performed by the major sanctuaries.
37 L. Mercando, 'L'ellenismo nel Piceno', in Hellenismus in Mittelitalien 171-2; G. Iaculli, Il tempio italico di Colle S. Giorgio (Castiglione Messer Raimondo) (Castiglione Messer Raimondo, 1993).
38 Pliny, Letters 8.8 records the attribution of the Fonti del Clitunno to Hispellum by Augustus.
i) in allied communities in the Appennine zone and the upland area of it on the Adriatic side, such as Camerinum, Urvinum Mataurense, Sarsina and a host of other centres;\textsuperscript{39} ii) the areas of Umbria which were incorporated into the Roman state and where there was virilite settlement of individual Roman families, specifically Fulginiae, Forum Flaminii, Plestia, Tadinum, Forum Sempronii and the ager Gallicus.

Some explanation for this may come from an examination of the situation in this period in Picenum. In Picenum, despite the wealth of its cemeteries in the pre-conquest period, there seems to be a greater separation between the settlement of the pre-Roman period and that after the conquest than is evident in Umbria. Many of the great Picene cemeteries lie on sites that did not develop into cities in the Roman period, such as Belmonte Piceno, Novilara, Campovalano, or Pitino di San Severino.\textsuperscript{40} Both the Gallic infiltration of the region and the impact of the Roman conquest with its associated settlement schemes could have played a part in this discontinuity, but the evidence of the cemeteries makes it difficult to say more with any certainty. Perhaps more importantly only certain zones of Picenum provide evidence for urbanisation in the third and second centuries BC. These include the colonies of Hadria, Firmum and Auximum, created as new urban centres through Roman initiative. The two other centres that show signs of monumental building are Ancona and Asculum, both allied communities which were essentially allowed to govern themselves.\textsuperscript{41} The political organisation of both is also evident from their coinage.\textsuperscript{42} The administration of the remainder of the territory was largely reliant on pagi and vici surviving from the period before the conquest, mention of which is prominent in the Latin epigraphy of the third and second century.\textsuperscript{43} Justice was dispensed through a system of praefecturae, the seat of Roman praefecti, the conventional arrangement for territories in which there had been Roman virilite settlement.\textsuperscript{44} Urbanisation here was largely an Augustan phenomenon.\textsuperscript{45} These two features of Roman Picenum may be linked: the lack of major administrative centres

\textsuperscript{39} The temple at Civitalba is a notable exception to this, but seems a special case in that it was probably built at Roman initiative.

\textsuperscript{40} In other places there is evidence of Picene habitation on the site of later Roman settlements, such as at Ancona (although this is colonised by Sicilians), Cupra Marittima, Sicina, Sena Gallica, Pisaurum, and Auximum (Moscateili, 'Municipi romani' 51).

\textsuperscript{41} Funerary evidence for Ancona: Mercando, 'L'ellenismo nel Piceno', in \textit{Hellenismus in Mittelitalien} 161-70; Hellenistic type sanctuary at Asculum: \textit{Guida Laterza} 290.

\textsuperscript{42} Although Asculum's is of uncertain attribution.

\textsuperscript{43} See the magistri from the territory of Hadria (ILLRP 305) and at Cingulum in the third or early second century (CIL IX 5679; Paci, 'Per la storia di Cingoli', \textit{Studi Maceratesi} (1983) 75-110); see also those cited above in section 4.

\textsuperscript{44} There had been successive waves of colonisation from the period of the conquest to the era of the Gracchi.

\textsuperscript{45} Delplace, \textit{Romanisation} 32.
meant that the elite did not focus their building patronage on these places as they would in allied areas; instead, patronage was directed towards rural sanctuaries such as Monte Rinaldo. The proliferation of small settlements, many with the status of praefecturae, meant that after the Social War few were immediately elevated to the rank of municipia. Caesar (B.C. 1.1.15) mentions the large number of praefecturae still here in his time, and records how Cingulum was constituted and given the appropriate civic infrastructure befitting its new status by Labienus (1.15.2). Cingulum is probably emblematic of other small centres in this region, where this process created a similarly dense pattern of municipia to that seen in Augustan Umbria, but through a much more rapid and 'artificial' transformation.

In the fifth chapter the extent to which the concept of 'Romanisation' can be used to explain the changes occurring in Umbria in the third and second centuries was explored, and some of the problems with this concept were pointed out. For me its historical usefulness as a term has much to do with the idea that it represents, and in some cases is a manifestation of, a change in identity and ways of thinking. Models explaining allied participation in the Social War have relied heavily on this reading of the concept. The area of language seems to provide the best evidence for the change in Umbria, although we are only really able follow the language of epigraphy rather than of everyday life. The evidence, in particular that from Asisium, suggests that an element of genuine choice was involved: magistrates here used both Umbrian and Latin before (and also perhaps just after) the Social War. The overlap of the magisterial personnel on an Umbrian border cippus and a Latin building inscription shows that the choice of language to use was a response to the context in which the epigraphs were set up rather than being simply governed by the language of the commissioners. The growing use of Latin in certain contexts within allied Umbria does not, however, correspond to any visible 'decline' in Umbrian epigraphy until the Social War. But very little Umbrian epigraphy has been found from after the Social War: its rapid falling out of favour at least as an epigraphic language strongly suggests that this was only a poorly established tradition in the earlier period.

---

46 For this model in Samnium see J. Patterson, 'Settlement, city and elite in Samnium and Lycia', in City and Country 151. The link between administrative status and urbanisation in Picenum has been suggested by Gabba, 'Urbanizzazione' 101-2 and in Hellenismus in Mittelitalien I 175.

47 See for instance Brunt, 'Italian Aims'.

189
6. CONCLUSION

At the end of this work we can come back to the apparent separation described in the first chapter between the archaeological and literary/epigraphic evidence for Umbria. In some senses a strong contrast remains between the two pictures: the recent archaeological work in the region has not turned up any substantial new indications of large urban settlements before the Roman conquest, or even of cemeteries with the richness of material visible in neighbouring Etruria and Picenum. The meagre amount of evidence from before the Social War found in the survey of the Gubbio valley has not conflicted with a negative picture of the small Umbrian centres. Nevertheless our examination of the literary, epigraphic and numismatic sources for Umbria has shown that a significant number of the small settlements documented by archaeology were politically organised communities at least by the time of the conquest, and that the few pieces of this puzzle we are lucky enough to have are likely to be representative of much of the rest. In fact the archaeological evidence, although suggestive of a less sophisticated economy than in neighbouring areas, does show an increase in social complexity from the seventh century, at first through cemeteries, and then through urbanisation and the use of sanctuaries, that correlates with the picture from other sources. One of the most interesting facets of the comparison of these sources is the conclusion that urbanisation is in this region probably a secondary phenomenon in regard to the formation of states. This picture, which is supported by comparative work both in Italy, for example on Samnium, and outside, is probably more visible here than in other regions of Italy already fully urbanised by the Roman conquest, because state formation was still very much an ongoing process when the region came into collision with the Roman state. As a consequence of this collision Umbria entered the historical record in a significant way.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX ONE: ARCHITECTURAL TERRACOTTAS AND TEMPLE PODIA IN THE SIXTH AUGUSTAN REGION (UMBRIA) IN THE FIRST MILLENNIUM BC

(The sites are arranged in chronological order. It should be noted that although I have tried to be systematic and complete in compiling this list, the inadequacy of the publication in many cases prevents absolute precision.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE (including circumstances of discovery when known)</th>
<th>NATURE OF EVIDENCE AND DATE OF DISCOVERY (if excavated)</th>
<th>DATE BC (always on stylistic grounds) AND REFERENCE</th>
<th>COMMENTS (e.g. origin of objects, parallels etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bevagna (site 1): about 100 m north of the medieval centre, excavated site</td>
<td>fragmentary antefix and modest building remains (early 1980s)</td>
<td>VII c. Mevania cat. no. 1.43²</td>
<td>Impasto sima very similar to examples from Poggio Civitate (Siena). Parco Silvestri plaque has similarities to many examples from central Tyrrhenian Italy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevagna (site 2): Probable temple of rectangular plan discovered in Parco Silvestri outside Porta Foligno (no longer visible but plan in communal archive); terracottas excavated recently in this area. Two fragments of architectural terracottas in Museo Civico of Bevagna of which exact provenance unknown.</td>
<td>building foundations (1884); 'several' fragments of architectural terracottas (early 1990s) including a revetment plaque of hard reddish clay with traces of polychrome. Two museum terracottas including fragment of architectonic plaque of soft yellowish clay</td>
<td>IV c. (plaque) Mevania cat. no. 2.378</td>
<td>Later terracottas must relate to a different site or a restoration of the Parco Silvestri temple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II c. Mevania cat. no. 2.51, other noted p. 134 but unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otricoli (site 1)</td>
<td>revetment plaque</td>
<td>early VI c.</td>
<td>G. Dareggi, <em>MEFRA</em> (1978) 627-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from Cisterna farm along road to Tiber (1 km. outside the centre), probably a casual find.</td>
<td>II - I c.</td>
<td>U. Ciotti in R. Abbondanza (ed.) <em>Umbria</em> (Milano, 1970) fig. 111; Strazzulla in <em>Società romana</em> 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fragment of architectural terracotta in full relief, perhaps from a pediment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very similar but not identical (i.e. different mould) to examples from Veil, Rome and Vignanello (near Civita Castellana). Likely to pertain to a different site from VI c. terracotta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubbio: Guastuglia district (around Roman theatre)</td>
<td>antefix</td>
<td>IV - III c.</td>
<td>Unpublished, see Strazzulla in <em>Società romana</em> 196 (information from Soprintendenza)<em>3</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todi (site 1): architectural terracotta dump(?) found in narrow trench dug near Porta Catena (probably just outside s-e corner of ancient city); other architectural terracottas found together with votive ceramic material under S. Maria in Camuccia church (probably southern edge of ancient town); proximity and some similarities between two deposits suggest from same original site. Todi (site 2?): material found in a tract of the ancient wall between Via San Lorenzo and Piazza Montarone (northern end of ancient city).</td>
<td>c. 160 fragments of architectural terracottas including antefixes, cornice, tiles, painted eaves-tiles and figures in relief (1925) revetment plaques (1960s) at least 12 travertine column drums (80 cm in diameter), terracotta dump</td>
<td>second half IV c. Andrèn, Terracottas 318-19; Todi. Verso un museo 125, 138 IV - III c. Fabbricotti, Ritrovamenti archeologici. II - I c.? (own estimate) Becatti, Tuder Carsulae 14-15; Guida Laterza 59; Tascio, Todi 31-4 nos. 5-7; Fontaine, Cités 212-3.</td>
<td>Perhaps of local production (a mould also found) with Faliscan influence. Fabbricotti hypothesises presence of temple on site of S. Maria from votive material. Drums dated to III c. in Guida Laterza 59, but this section was probably rebuilt in late imperial times (Tascio, Fontaine) and also contains several Latin inscriptions (CIL XI 4668a-e).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perugia (site 1)</td>
<td>plaques, antefixes, fragments of full relief sculpture; plaques, antefixes, fragments of column revetment</td>
<td>IV - III c. SE (1966) 303; Strazzulla in Società romana 196. II - I c. Strazzulla in Società romana 203</td>
<td>(included for comparative purposes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perugia (site 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoleto (1)</td>
<td>(re-)discovered on the Rocca in 1980s by excavation in 19th c. layers, and probably result of discovery and disposal of material at this time, referred to by Sordini, <em>NSc</em> (1898) 6-9; block found placed in window of Rocca.</td>
<td>III-IV c.</td>
<td><em>NSc</em> (1898) 6-9; <em>Guida Laterza</em> 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoleto (2)</td>
<td>excavated from earth against city wall in via Cecili</td>
<td>III c.</td>
<td><em>NSc</em> (1903) 196; <em>Guida Laterza</em> 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bettona:</td>
<td>temple excavated in 19th c. near Colle di Bettona below the hilltown; exact site uncertain (<em>Guida Laterza</em> 81). No surviving traces. All fictile material now in communal collection.</td>
<td>III-IV c.</td>
<td><em>NSc</em> (1884) 143-5; <em>Andrén</em> 265-6; <em>Strazzulla in Società romana</em> 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fragmentary fictile material including antefixes, head and scrolls sculpture 'presumably from a figurative capital' (<em>Guida Laterza</em> 97), tile fragments, fragmentary pedimental statuettes</td>
<td>I c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. 200 fragments of architectural terracottas including revetment plaques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collemancio di Cannara: antefixes excavated next to temple and also elsewhere on site; some now in Municipio di Cannara.</td>
<td>podium built from large squared arenaria blocks with 3 cella plan; 34 architectural terracottas (1932 and 1938) including plaques, cornices, antefixes and a piece of high relief sculpture</td>
<td>2 from second half III c., most late III - II c. Strazzulla in <em>Società romana</em> 203; Manconi, <em>BSCF</em> (1985) 356; Matteini Chiari, <em>Raccolta di Cannara</em> 64ff²; Campana plaques</td>
<td>All material made using moulds; stylistically very close to Gubbio, Bettona, Spello, Todi, Magione (mould sometimes equivalent). A III-II c. bronze votive (crowned offerant) was found inside a cella of the temple. Campana plaques not certainly from temple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Maria in Canale, between Todi and Amelia: temple podium and walls built into an ex-monastery, now a farm.</td>
<td>temple podium in polygonal masonry with three cellae</td>
<td>III - II c. (my own estimate: its construction is very similar to second phase of the colonial walls of Spoleto); Ciotti, <em>Arch. Class.</em> (1991) with no attempt to date</td>
<td>According to Ciotti this is the probable provenance of an Umbrian inscription (Ve 229).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Artifacts Found</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civitalba, near Sentinum</td>
<td>All terracottas found casually; most important discoveries in late 19th c., continuing to 1975.</td>
<td>Fragments of pedimental sculpture in almost full relief showing a mythological theme, part of a frieze with high relief figures representing the sack of a temple by Gauls, plaques and antefixes (1896-1975)</td>
<td>Early II c. E. Brizio, <em>NSc</em> (1897) 283-304; <em>I Galli e Italia</em> exhibition catalogue (Roma, 1978) 196f.; Landolfi, 'Frontone e fregio' 9-13° Site of a settlement that might be identified with the Republican Sentinum sacked in 41 BC and rebuilt 6 km to south-west. No traces of temple yet found; of small dimensions in most reconstructions. Commonly thought related to Roman programme to celebrate victories at Sentinum, Telamon and Arezzo. Clear stylistic influence of Hellenistic monuments of Asia Minor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisi, S. Maria degli Angeli</td>
<td>Plaques, antefixes</td>
<td>II-I c. BDSPU (1933) 127; Strazzulla in <em>Società romana</em> 203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foligno: Cancelli district</td>
<td>Antefix with female head</td>
<td>II-I c. Unpublished, see Strazzulla in <em>Società romana</em> 203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iesi</td>
<td>Architectural terracottas, including fragments of full relief sculpture, plaques, antefixes</td>
<td>II-I c. Unpublished, see Strazzulla in <em>Società romana</em> 203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spello:</td>
<td>extra-mural sanctuary 1 km north-west at villa Costanzi/Fidelia. architectural terracottas including fragment in full relief, plaques, moulds for antefixes with 'potnia thèron'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II - I c. Unpublished, see Strazzulla in Società romana 203; Manconi, BSCF (1985) 356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theatre-temple complex had several levels on terraces built out of cement and small blocks of local limestone (like city wall).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevi:</td>
<td>architectural terracottas II - I c. Unpublished, see Manconi BSCF (1985) 356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terni:</td>
<td>dug up with reused frieze in city centre in late 19th c. antefix? Date unclear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lanzì, NSc (1901) 176: terracotta fragment thought to be an antefix because of the fracture of a 'convex projection' on the posterior part.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Those architectural terracottas or temple podia dated with certainty to the fourth to second centuries BC are marked on map 4.

APPENDIX TWO: UMBRIAN INSCRIPTIONS

The convention has been adopted of representing the Umbrian alphabet in bold type and the Latin alphabet in italics, with the Latin translation given where possible below. For abbreviations used see end.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>REFERENCE (see end)</th>
<th>ALPHA-BET (with derivation where known)</th>
<th>DATE BC (based on letter forms except where noted)</th>
<th>TEXT (taken from first reference unless stated otherwise)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gubbio: found near the Roman theatre in 1444 according to an annotation of a 17th c. manuscript.</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>Ve 239 (the Iguvine Tables).</td>
<td>U (similar to Cortona and Perugia) L</td>
<td>late III - mid II c. late II - early I c. (Devoto 5)</td>
<td>see Poulney, Bronze Tables; G. Devoto, Le Tavole di Gubbio; A. Prosdocimi, 'L'umbro', in Populi e civiltà VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bronze plate inscribed on both sides; both ends lost</td>
<td>Ve 229; Morandi, <em>SE</em> (1974) 358-61; Morandi, <em>Epigrafia Italica</em> no. 21 (photo).</td>
<td>U (Volusian similar to Ve 230)</td>
<td>late IV-early III c. (Morandi 359)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The alphabet of this inscription uses q for d, as in Ve 230, but unlike the Iguvine Tables where q represents ř. The actual meaning is very uncertain, although Morandi and others see the first line of each side as corresponding to 'lovi donum dederunt/dedit', taking duvi(e) to be related to Oscan 'Diûvei' and Old Latin 'Diovi'. Prosdocimi (SE (1974) 360 n. * expresses caution. For Morandi this is a dedication performed by a family group called the 'Hortensii'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todi:</td>
<td>statue found in 1835 buried in a travertine-lined 'grave' on Monte Santo, 500 m outside Todi.</td>
<td>Ve 230; Roncalli, 'Il &quot;Marte&quot; di Todi', <em>Atti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia</em>, II.2; <em>Antichità dall’Umbria in Vaticano</em> 64.</td>
<td>U Volusian</td>
<td>late V c.-early IV c. (Roncalli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bronze statue (Mars of Todi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ahaltruttitis dunum dedit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visces Amerinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todi:</td>
<td>from Peschiera cemetery.</td>
<td>Ve 231; F. Roncalli, 'Gli Umbri' 309.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>III c. (Roncalli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>painted bowl: perhaps a potter's mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>visce amerens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Inscriptio/Translation</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Todi</td>
<td>now in Pesaro museum.</td>
<td>Ve 232.</td>
<td>a U, b-d L</td>
<td>c. 150-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on tiles serving as grave inscriptions, sealing grave niches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. la ma tvplei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. ma puplece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. ca puple-/ce ma fel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. tupleia pu-/piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossato di Vico</td>
<td>found at Aja della Croce in 1868.</td>
<td>Ve 233; Co 354; Antichità dall'Umbria a Budapest 6.4 (photo).</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>c. 150-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bronze fixed onto a large piece of a terracotta rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cubar. matrer. bio. eso / osto. cistern. n. CLV / su. maronato III / u. 1. uarie. t. c. fu lonie Bonae Matris fontana haec. Facta cisterna n(ummis) CLVIII sub maronatu V(ibi) Varii L(uci f.), T(ti) Fullonii G(ai f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foligno</td>
<td>found at S. Pietro di Flamignano.</td>
<td>Ve 234; Antichità dall'Umbria a Budapest 6.3 (photo).</td>
<td>L (cursive script)</td>
<td>c. 250-150 (cursive script makes dating very difficult)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stone, broken on right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bia : opset / marone / t.foltonio / se.ptnio Fontanam fecerunt marone(s) T. Foltonius, Se(uxtus?) P(e)tr(o)nius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foligno</td>
<td>block of limestone</td>
<td>Ve 235; Co 354 bis.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>c. 150-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supunne / sacr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harris, <em>Etruria and Umbria</em> 185 n. 1 thinks the language is uncertain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisi: Ospedalicchio Bastia.</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>Ve 236; CIL XI 5389.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>c. 100-80</td>
<td>Ager emptus et terminatus oht(retie)* C(ai) Vestini V(.filii), Ner(. ) Babril T(iti filii), in maronatu Vois( .) Propartii Ner( .filii), T(iti) Voisi V( .filii). Sacro sto. * probably meaning 'in the uhtur-ship of'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisi: Museo Civico.</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>Ve 237; CIL XI 5431a.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Toce / stahu publice sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todi and Gubbio</td>
<td>bronze coins</td>
<td>Ve 238; Crawford, <em>Coinage and Money</em> 43, 46, 48.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>mostly c. 275-250, with some issues of Todi from 218-202 (Crawford).</td>
<td>a) tutere with variants tuter, tut, tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) ikuvins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffolo (5 km east of Cupramontana), now lost.</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>Ve 240; Radke, RE suppl. IX coll. 1751-2; Colonna, <em>Bronzi votivi</em> n. 13; Marinetti, <em>Iscrizioni sudpicene</em> 257.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>caiapiazvariens / iuvezalsecure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>statuette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gaius (?) Paetus Varienus lovi - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Colonna's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marinetti notes that the alphabet is not South Picene, and is similar to that of the Iguvine Tables; the language may be Umbrian. Vetter thought that the alphabet was derived directly from Etruria (and not via Umbria), although he thought it similar to the Umbrian alphabet; he thought the language Umbrian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Bertona'</td>
<td>group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Publication(s)</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Bologna     | found under a Bolognese house in 1881.                                   | NSc (1885) 214; Peyre, REL (1972) 6-8; Prosdocimi, SE (1976) 267 (photo).        | c. 350-280 | reh: nuvkri:
|             |                                                                        |                                                                                 |            | Re( ) Nuceri(nus) |
| Pleastia    | from excavation of sanctuary in the early 1960s; now in Perugia.        | Po 2; Antichità dall'Umbria a Budapest 2.24-26.                                | IV c.      | a) cupras matres pletinas sacr[u....
|             |                                                                        |                                                                                 |            | b) [cupr]as matres p[letinas....
|             |                                                                        |                                                                                 |            | c) cup[ras....
|             |                                                                        |                                                                                 |            | Cuprae Matris Pletinae sacr[....
|             |                                                                        |                                                                                 |            | cf. the dedication to Cupra in Ve 233 |
| Bevagna     | now in civic collection, Gubbio.                                        | Po 3; Mev 2.120 and 2.52 (photo).                                              | U          | pe.pe.ufeñer.uhtur
|             |                                                                        |                                                                                 |            | Pe( ) Pe( ) f. Aufidius uhtur |
|             |                                                                        |                                                                                 |            | Same gentile as Po 4. |
| Bevagna     | dug up by ploughing in 1969.                                            | Po 4; Mev 2.119 (photos).                                                      | U          | M[ ]p. nurtins. ia. t. ufeñie[r]
|             |                                                                        |                                                                                 |            | cvestur. fararur |
|             |                                                                        |                                                                                 |            | [ ] P(ubli?) (filius) Nortinus, la(ntus) T(iti) (filius) Aufidius quaestores farari |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bevagna:</td>
<td>found together with another at the Fabbrica district, now in S. Silvestro.</td>
<td>sandstone urn cover 0.45 m long</td>
<td>U (Perusine)</td>
<td>II c.</td>
<td>via. kaltini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vi( ). Caltini(us)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisi:</td>
<td>found in 1938 between S. Vitale and (ex) S. Lorenzo, with other moulded blocks, at around 3m depth, now in garden of ex-Berkeley villa.</td>
<td>stone architrave, 1.5 x 0.66 x 0.63m; broken</td>
<td>U (Perusine)</td>
<td>mid III c. - mid II c.</td>
<td>estac vera pape[...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mestiça vipes e[...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Istam portam Papi[...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>magistratu(?) Vibi E[...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spello:</td>
<td>embedded in entrance gate of Palazzo Preziosi.</td>
<td>local rose limestone</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>Damaged with at least 2 letters missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>probably Umbrian, mistakenly attributed to Hungary; now in Louvre.</td>
<td>bronze strainer</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>II c.</td>
<td>a) Numesier. Varea. Polenia*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Nomesi. Varia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* or Folonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Numesier in a) is an Umbrian genitive ending according to Lejeune. b) is in Latin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoleto</td>
<td>Fragment of a small travertine column, height: 0.43 m, diam.: 0.20 m</td>
<td>Po 11;</td>
<td>'Dubious' according to Poccetti because only known from a manuscript source, but shows Umbrian alphabetic features.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todi</td>
<td>Bronze votive statuette of a warrior of Colonna's Todi group</td>
<td>Colonna,</td>
<td>The first four letters are difficult to discern, the last three difficult to interpret. Colonna notes that the inscription could, like other examples, have been faked. 'Tuttere' is extremely close (perhaps suspiciously so) to the 'Tutere' of the coin legends of Tuder (Ve 238).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Città di Castello</td>
<td>Bronze currency bar with bull in relief</td>
<td>Rix, SE</td>
<td>'Sestines' must relate to Sestinum, c. 30 km to north. Coleman gives 'of the forge at Sestinum' (in Crawford).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Spello: from tomb 10 of the Portonaccio cemetery just to the south of the town centre. | on a bronze flask (fiaschetta) perhaps of Chiusan origin | Antichità dall'Umbria a Leningrado no. 2.102. | U | tomb dated to late III c./early II c. | num. tu
  The t is similar to that of on the Mars of Todi (Ve 230). Manconi in *Antichità dall'Umbria* gives vi(is) mun(isis) (but does not read it retrograde despite seeing it as Umbrian), and says the inscription is in the genitive and denotes ownership. |
Marinetti notes that the alphabet is not south picene and may be Umbrian; similarly the linguistic attribution is uncertain, 'con propensione per l'umbro'. Cianfarani notes that the letters are increasingly crowded towards the right, suggesting that it was written left to right (unlike the Umbrian alphabet). He gives issoiorvpidvrons. The actual reading, let alone the language, seems very unclear: there are only a few similarities with the Umbrian alphabet in my opinion. |

I regard Po 6 and 12 as too problematic to be worth listing. Po 10 is surely Latin rather than Umbrian, despite Pocetti's identification of Umbrian alphabetic features (using, I assume, the drawing in *NSc* (1900) 131): it reads left to right, unlike the Umbrian alphabet, and (decisively) was seen by Bormann in 1907 (CIL XI 7890), who read Ma[t]rini [P]riscion[is].

Abbreviations used:
Umbrian
U
Latin
L
Ve
P. Pocetti, *Nuovi documenti italici a complemento del Manuale di E. Vetter* (Pisa, 1979)
Po
R. S. Conway, *The Italic Dialects* 1(Cambridge, 1897)
Co
Mev
V. Pisani, *Le lingue dell'Italia antica oltre il latino* (Turin, 1953)
Pisani

207
1. This does not include Etruscan inscriptions found in Umbria, such as those from Bettona (TLE 692a and b). G. Rocca, *Iscrizioni umbre minori* (Florence, 1996) appeared too late to be taken fully into account in this thesis: it contains photos of most of the inscriptions listed here.

2. The use of d is not consistent between here and Po 3 and 4 because Vetter transcribes the symbol 'q' as d, and Poccetti as ū.
APPENDIX THREE: LATIN INSCRIPTIONS CERTAINLY OR PROBABLY BEFORE THE SOCIAL WAR.

Key:
** marks probable pre-Social War date in my opinion.
I² and XI refer to volumes of CIL.
Harris = W. V. Harris, *Rome in Etruria and Umbria* (Oxford, 1971)

Ameria

**I² 2101=XI 4348=ILLRP 183: now lost. Probably not much later than 150 according to Harris 186. The reading followed here is the more archaic 'maxsumo' of CIL XI rather than the 'maxumo' of I²; the archaic dative 'love', if not love[i], would suggest an early date. *love* and *lovei* occur in one of the Spoletine cippi (I² 366). There may be a degree of conservatism in a borrowed religious formula.

*love* / Optumo / Maxsumo / T. Pettius. T. f. T. n. / d(onom) d(edit) l(ubens) m(erito)

Ariminum


I² 2129a=XI 400=ILLRP 545

Duoviri are the colony's magistrates before they were replaced by quattuorviri after the Social War according to Degrassi in ILLRP, but note that the earliest magistrates here were probably consuls (see I² 40=XIV 4269=ILLRP 77 from Nemi).

C. Obulcius C.f./M. Octavius M.[f.]/duovir(i)/ hoc opus fac(iundum)/ quraverunt

I² 2129b=XI 401: same legend as above, now ruined.

Asisium

**I² 2112=XI 5390=ILLRP 550: large characters engraved onto a wall above a cistern now built into San Rufino. The letters B P and R have early forms, whereas C and S suggest a later date. 'Coiravere' is also usually early, though it survives Sulla. Six marones (three pairs?) are more likely to date before the constitution of the municipium; Ner. Babrius T. f. is maro here and more senior uttur in Ve 236 (c. 100-80 BC), which is therefore presumably later. Dated by Coarelli ('Assisi repubblicana' 11-13) to 'some decades' before 100, and not after the Social War, on the basis of onomastics, lettering and the presence of six marones. A slightly later dating is advanced here on the basis of the more classical C and S forms. Overall date of c. 110-90 BC.

Post. Mimesius C(ai) f(ilius) T(itus) Mimesius Sert. f(ilius), Ner. Capida C(ai) f(ilius) Ruf. / Ner. Babrius T(tit) f(ilius), C(aius) Capidas T(tit) f(ilius) C(ai) n(epos), V. Voisienus T(tit) f(ilius) marones / murum ab fornice ad circum et fornicem cisternamq(ue) d(e) s(enatus) s(ententia) faciundum coiravere.

CIL I² 2118=XI 5457: funerary stele decorated with 2 dolphins, typical of the first century BC. Pre-Social War according to Harris 187 n. 1, because of spelling of 'coiugi carisumae', although 'the inscription has an illiterate appearance, and may be later'. In the second line, the A is written without a bar; a cursive form of e is used in lines 1, 2 and 5.

audiae/ hygiae/ Q. T. P. Pos./ coiugi/ carisumae/ et nomadi soro(ri)
**Attidium**

**I** 2121 = XI 5681: inscription on a cylindrical funerary *cippus*. Marengo, *Documentazione* no. 1 dates it to the late II/early I c. BC because of the lack of tribe and the letter forms.

*P. Calventius L. f.*

**Camerinum**

**Marengo, Documentazione** no. 3: a graffito on a fragment of black slip pottery found in 1933 in a burial at S. Lorenzo al Fiume di Fiastra. Now lost. The nominative ending in *-o*, if complete, suggests an early date: possible analogies noted by Marengo date to the third or early second century, e.g. I2 382 (Cupra Montana) and 383 (Firmum).

*T. Petilio(s)*

**Hispellum**

I2 2116 = XI 5338: funerary *cippus* decorated with a rose. Dated to before the Social War by Harris 187 n. 1 because of the spelling of 'obeit'.

*R]vf Serveiv/m/ S. Sex. f. Provin(cialis?)/ obeit

I2 2117 = XI 5359 = ILLRP 215: funerary *cippus* with a rounded top, now lost. Again dated to before the Social War by Harris 187 n. 1 because of the spelling, but this is again indecisive here.

*deum maanium*

I2 3386 = XI 5358: Bormann in CIL XI says that it seems to be 'aetatis antiquae', but 'quoius' is used well after the Social War, e.g. in Tabula Heracleensis.

...[quoius. desiderio ... /... luget consu[

**Interamna Nahars**

XI 4208: from Colle d'Oro near Terni train station and next to the modern Via Flaminia. Bormann notes the 'litterae vetustae' shaped to receive bronze. Dated to the second century by Verzar, *Guida Laterza* 299, who takes it to refer to work on the Via Flaminia, but unlikely to be before the I c. BC according to Crawford.

... [.]. maxumus/ [viam sternejndam/ [curavit]

**I** 428 = XI 6691: Latin name on a dolium. From before the Social War according to Harris. On the basis of comparisons could be from 130s to 70s. M and A in ligature.

*Q. Maelii*

I2 2099 = ILLRP 615 = XI 4221 and 4222: Salmon, *Roman Italy* 137 thinks that this shows that the town had instituted a quattuorviral constitution before Sulla returned from the east in 83 BC.

[-] Valer[ius - , - - ]ius Sex. f. IIIvir(i)/[facus, aq[ae ductum?] fac(iendum) coer(averunt)

**Mevania**

**I** 2110 = XI 5107 = *Mevania* 2.55 (photo): a travertine urn cover with reclining deceased, probably produced in Perugia. The spelling of 'C. Laaro' suggests a pre-Social War date according to Harris 186; elements of the lettering are early (particularly the C and R).

*C(arius). Laaro. V. f(ilius). T(iti). n(epos)*
Mevania (and Ocriculum)

**i² 418-38; ILLRP 1222-7: black slip cups mostly found in Etruria. Marked with various names including 'Popilius', from which they are named. Dated by Morel, 'Céramiques' 486-8 to II and I c., with some before 150 BC.

e.g. ILLRP 1224=XI 6704.3 C. Popili(us) Mevania

ILLRP 1225=XI 6704.4: a) Ocricio C. Popili(us) b) C. Popili(us) Ocriclo

Narnia

**i² 427: on lip of dolium, using cursive E. Early nominative form.

Cn. Iunio(s) C. l. Poblieios

**i² 2097=XI 4125=ILLRP 628: on a travertine altar from S. Pellegrino. Aediles were the magistrates of the colony before the Social War according to Degrassi in CIL i² fasc. 4.


Pisaurum

**i² 368-381=ILLRP 13-26: found in a wood near Pesaro in 1781. Archaic cippi with dedications to deities. Lettering and spelling suggest III or early II c. BC; dated to just after 184 foundation of colony by Wachter, Altlateinische Inschrifter A32-7.

e.g. CIL i² 375=ILLRP 21: Cesula / Atiiia / donu(m) / da(t) Diane

CIL i² 377=ILLRP 22: Feronia / Sta(tios) Tetio(s) / dde

Sentinum

**Marengo, Documentazione no. 2=L. Brecciaroli Taborelli, Sentinum. La città, il museo (Ancona, 1978) 41-2: a graffito on a black slip pot of the II-I c. BC. Found at Civitalba, now in Sentinum museum. The odd abbreviation would suggest an early date in the opinion of Crawford.

Aul(us) Ma[---].

Spoletium

**i² 366=XI 4766=ILLRP 505: the 'Lex Sacra' found in the wall of S. Quirico, near Montefalco, in the 1870's. Vine, Studies 289 dates this inscription to c. 185-150 BC on paleographic grounds. CIL i² 2872 is a duplicate with only small differences.

Side A


Side B


**i² 429: a mark on a 'vas cretaceum' of dark colour (CIL i²). The P is very open.


**i² 3376=XI 4822=ILLRP 669: Republican lettering according to Degrassi. The 'pr(aetor)' was probably the pre-Social War magistrate of the Latin colony.

---

Tuder

**Tuder** 2103=ILRP 687: a funerary epitaph in Gallic and Latin repeated on two sides of the stone. A north Etruscan alphabet (of Lugano) was used for the Gallic text. Buranelli in *Antichità dall'Umbria in Vaticano* no. 3.4 dates it to the second half of the II c. BC (De Simone in *Galli e Italia* no. 607).

Side A:

[Atg(nati)] / [Druti - - -] um / [C]ois Drutif(ilius) / [f]rater eius / minimus locav[...]/[sta] tuitque /
[At]eknati Trutikni / [kar]niitu lokan Ko / [isi]s / [Tr]utiknos

Side B:

[Atg(natei)] / [Drutei f(ili)] - - - / [Co]is Druteif(ilius) frater / eius / minimus locav- / it et
statuit / Ateknati Trut- / ikni karntiu / artuas Kois T- / rutiknos /

Tuficum

Marengo, *Documentazione* no. 4: a limestone funerary cippus. Dated to the 'età della acculturazione romana del territorio', based on the unfamiliarity with epigraphy shown by the poor quality technique (a dubious basis), the archaic appearance of the letters (certainly true of the A), and the lack of a cognomen (also unreliable). (See also Susini, *Epigrafica* 41 (1979) 151-3 with photo, *AEp* (1982) 257.)

*T. Statarius.*

Urvinum Hortense

I^2^ 3379: Spelling gives little indication, but dated to mid I c. BC by Sensi, *Raccolta di Cannara* 85. Aedileship and praetorship may be the highest offices before the creation of a quattuorviral constitution here according to Sensi.

*T. Veriasius. T. f. Sert(oris) n. aid(ilis) praetor - - ?*

IX 5183: Latin inscription of slave. Dated to end II c. by Sensi, *Raccolta di Cannara* no. 45, but with little justification; poor quality of engraving makes chronological precision difficult.

*Priamus Mar(ci)/ serv(us) magiste[r]/ navium*

Unknown

**Tuder** 2873=ILRP 1206=Po 9: bilingual Umbrian and Latin names on a bronze strainer. II c. BC according to Harris 186. The provenance is probably Umbria, despite its attribution to Hungary; now in the Louvre.

a) *Numesier. Varea. Polenia*  

b) *Nomesi. Varia*

* or *Folonia*  

'Numesier' in a) is an Umbrian genitive ending according to Lejeune *REL* (1952) 98, b) is in Latin.
**APPENDIX FOUR: FIRMLY ATTESTED TREATIES FORMED BY ROME DURING THE CONQUEST OF ITALY 338-264 BC**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE WITH WHOM TREATY FORMED</th>
<th>DATE TREATY FORMED (BC)</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gauls</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>Polybius 2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis (equal)</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>Livy 8.26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucani and Apuli (<em>societas</em>)</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>Livy 8.27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apulian Teates</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>Livy 9.20.7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camerenum (equal)*</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Livy 9.36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthage</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>Livy 9.43.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samnites</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>Livy 9.45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsi, Paeligni, Marrucini ?and Frentani (text emended)</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>Livy 9.45.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestini</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Livy 10.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsi (renewal)</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Livy 10.3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picentes</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Livy 10.10.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucani</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Livy 10.11.11-12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iguvium*</td>
<td>?295 - 266</td>
<td>Cic., <em>pro Balbo</em> 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samnites (renewal)</td>
<td>?290</td>
<td>Livy, <em>Epitome</em> 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boii</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>Polybius 2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclea (equal)</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Cic., <em>Arch. 6</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthage</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Livy, <em>Epitome</em> 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarquini</td>
<td>?</td>
<td><em>NSc</em> (1948) 267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* marks those in Umbria
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assisi (one or more sites):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>immured in piazza S. Rufino and via Dono Doni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found between S. Vitale and (ex) S. Lorenzo, at around 3m depth, now in garden of ex-Berkeley villa near Rocca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact provenance unknown, but now in private collection with other local material. Excavated in via Arco dei Priori.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 terracotta antefixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pieces of local travertine and limestone architrave (with inscription Po 7) and cornices with mouldings and dentils, probably pertaining to city gate or building (1938); head from a pediment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piece of limestone with high relief architectonic decoration (1979-81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV - III c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III - II c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Guida Laterza</em> 165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Exact provenance unknown, but now in head from a pediment II c. private collection with other local material. see Strazzulla above. Fill thought to come from area of the 'temple of Minerva' up the slope. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antefixes follow Orvietan and Perugian models. Style of head is similar to Volterrani production.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

194 continued
Figure 1. Graph of the surviving evidence for temples built in the first millennium BC in regio VI (Umbria). The evidence is collected in appendix one. The totals for each century are calculated by assigning evidence dated to two centuries, i.e. second to first century, to the later century. Minimum and maximum possible figures are marked for the third to first centuries. For the graph, Collemancio is assumed to be third century; the 'Hellenistic' remains from Spoleto are taken as second century. Real or assumed restorations are excluded, as are Perugia (outside the region), the second Todi site and Terni (both of uncertain identification).
PLAN 1: Amelia

A  First, earliest phase of polygonal walling
B  Later phase of polygonal walling
C  Restoration of B

Source: P. Fontaine, Cités et Enceintes de L'Ombrie Antique (Brussels-Rome, 1990)
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