



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Settlement and Cultural Change in Central-Southern Italy (Long review of Jones 2004)

Stek, T.D.

Citation

Stek, T. D. (2006). Settlement and Cultural Change in Central-Southern Italy (Long review of Jones 2004). *Journal Of Roman Archaeology*, 19, 401-406. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/48192>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/48192>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

JOURNAL OF ROMAN ARCHAEOLOGY

VOLUME 19 2006

* *

REVIEW ARTICLES AND LONG REVIEWS,
AND BOOKS RECEIVED

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Géza Alföldy, Seminar für Alte Geschichte der Universität Heidelberg
Alan K. Bowman, Brasenose College, Oxford University
Katherine M. D. Dunbabin, Department of Classics, McMaster University
Pierre Gros, Institut universitaire de France, Université de Provence, Aix-en-Provence
John W. Hayes, Oxford
Martin Henig, Institute of Archaeology, Oxford
Eugenio La Rocca, Soprintendenza Archeologica di Roma
Carlo Pavolini, Università della Tuscia a Viterbo
D. P. S. Peacock, Department of Archaeology, University of Southampton
Jean-Pierre Sodini, U.F.R. d'histoire de l'art et archéologie, Université de Paris I
Eva Margareta Steinby, Helsinki
J. J. Wilkes, Institute of Archaeology, University of London

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

T. V. Buttrey, Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge
Amanda Claridge, Royal Holloway College, University of London
Jean-Luc Fiches, CNRS, Centre de Recherches Archéologiques Lattes
Moshe Fischer, Department of Classics, Tel-Aviv University
David L. Kennedy, University of Western Australia
John Matthews, Yale University
Richard Neudecker, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Rom
Nicholas Purcell, St. John's College, Oxford University
Isabel Roda, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
Russell T. Scott, Department of Latin, Bryn Mawr College
Cinzia Vismara, Dipartimento di Filologia e Storia, Università di Cassino
Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, British School at Rome

EDITOR

John H. Humphrey, Portsmouth, Rhode Island

ISSN 1047-7594 (for the annual journal)

Copyright © 2006 Journal of Roman Archaeology L.L.C., unless otherwise indicated

Permission to copy may be obtained only direct from JRA, by e-mail, letter, fax or phone.

The Copyright Clearance Center (USA), the Copyright Licensing Agency (UK), and other national Reproduction Rights Organizations are not permitted to authorize copying or to collect fees for doing so.

The opinions expressed in the articles and book reviews published in this journal are those of the authors and not those of the editor or the editorial committee. Reviews are solicited in good faith.

This journal is printed on acid-free paper and the signatures are sewn.

The abbreviation for this journal for purposes of citation is *JRA*.

The Journal of Roman Archaeology has a home page on the World Wide Web, at:

<http://www.JournalofRomanArch.com>

The Web site contains the full table of contents of all published issues of the journal, including a listing of all books reviewed, and full details of titles in the supplementary series (with special offers for individuals). It also contains the list of new books sent to the journal.

E-mail address: jra@JournalofRomanArch.com

Phone (USA+) 401 683 1955

Mailing address: 95 Peleg Road, Portsmouth, Rhode Island 02871, USA

Fax (USA+) 401 683 1975

Settlement and cultural change in central-southern Italy

Tesse D. Stek

HOWARD JONES (ed.), *SAMNIUM. SETTLEMENT AND CULTURAL CHANGE. THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRD E. TOGO SALMON CONFERENCE ON ROMAN STUDIES* (Archaeologia Transatlantica XXII; Center for Old World Archaeology and Art, Brown University, Providence 2004). Pp. 133, pls. 15, maps 13.

Among Italy's inland regions Samnium has long held a privileged position (especially in Anglo-Saxon research), interest being stimulated early on by Livy's vivid account of the Samnite Wars. The pioneering archaeological work by the regional *Soprintendenze* starting in the 1960s¹ did not at first permit an integrated narrative to complement the more historical approach of E. T. Salmon,² but the situation has changed in recent years with new data coming from the *Soprintendenze*'s long-term and rescue excavations, and as pre-Roman Italic archaeology has undergone a general reappraisal.

Samnium is a rewarding area for study because its archaeology is relatively untouched and intact, and recent work is revealing the need to rethink earlier conceptions of Samnite society. The papers under review, delivered at the third conference in memory of E. T. Salmon held in 1999 at his home institution of McMaster University in Hamilton (Ontario), regrettably were not published until 2004, but nevertheless they give an impression both of progress made and of lacunae that remain in Samnite studies. Paradoxically, as H. Jones notes in the introduction (2), the "sheer volume of emerging evidence threatens to obstruct the necessary task of relating local discoveries to the broader historical framework". We may add to this the difficulties of combining different data-sets.³ The conference organizers asked both historians and archaeologists to focus on the issues of settlement and cultural change. Quite different methods and perspectives resulted. I will review each paper briefly before discussing some of the central issues and methodological challenges to emerge.

E. Dench examines the ideological contexts in which Anglo-Saxon scholars have studied Samnium. She connects the most important studies to their disciplinary and even to their political backgrounds. Because of Livy's description of the Samnite Wars and the predominantly Republican date of most Samnite archaeology, an anti-Roman image prevails (18): "British archaeology ... has found a Samnium in which what is traditionally associated with the classical plays a fairly small part. English-speaking ancient historians too have historically sought a Samnium that is in all sorts of ways anti-classical". A disciplinary divide between archaeology and ancient history did not help to correct this picture, as illustrated by the absence of points of contact between G. Barker's landscape research⁴ and more historical studies such as S. Oakley's⁵ or the relevant chapters of the *Cambridge Ancient History*. Barker's survey project has not been employed to its full potential for addressing historical questions, in part due to his deliberate concern with the *longue durée* and lack of interest in traditional historical sources. As a result of the rigidity of British academic structures, Dench is rather pessimistic for much reconciliation between the different disciplines that would be required in order to produce a fuller picture of Samnite society.

G. De Benedittis analyses the development of three settlements in the Samnite heartland, at Bovianum, the Latin colony (263 B.C.) of Aesernia (probably founded on an existing settlement), and Monte Vairano (where he directs ongoing excavations). Bovianum and Monte Vairano illustrate how different Samnite centres could

1 Especially by A. La Regina, A. Di Niro and S. Capini.

2 *Samnium and the Samnites* (Cambridge 1967).

3 An admirable effort to combine different data-sets was made by G. Tagliamonte in *I Sanniti: Caudini, Irpini, Pentri, Carricini* (Milan 1996), which serves to replace Salmon's *Samnium* by its careful integration of historical, epigraphical and new archaeological evidence.

4 G. Barker, *A Mediterranean valley: landscape archaeology and 'Annales' history in the Biferno valley* (London 1995), with review in *JRA* 10 (1997) 343.

5 S. Oakley, *The hill-forts of the Samnites* (London 1995).

evolve in the Republican period: the first could be relocated in the new Roman settlement-patterns, while the second declined in that period. At Aesernia, 4 phases are identified on the basis of different building techniques; he links (28) the construction of large terraces after the Hannibalic War to its fidelity to Rome during that war, the reconstruction of its perimeter walls in the 1st c. B.C. to the events of the Civil Wars, and the extension of its urban area to Augustus. Bovianum was a Samnite centre on a steep hill dominating the Boiano basin. Its polygonal walls are reminiscent of other Samnite *oppida*. It became a *municipium* under Caesar and subsequently a Roman colony. The heavy damage that occurred in the mid-1st c. A.D. would be explained by an earthquake in this notoriously seismic region, causing the colony to be relocated to the valley in Flavian times. At Monte Vairano, circuit-walls were built in c.300 B.C., whereas other polygonal structures and levelling of the area seems to date after 200 B.C. In the 2nd c. other buildings appear. Within a century of being built, the walls seem to have lost their defensive function since a kiln next to the Porta Vittoria deprived that gate of its practical use.⁶ De Benedittis concludes (30) that there is no direct relation between the presence of fortification walls and habitations before the Samnite Wars: often the actual settlements were located in the valleys. In most cases it was only around the time of the Samnite Wars, he says, that a part of the settlements was fortified or nearby hill-forts were constructed, and the monumental walls often lost their function when those wars ended.

M. Gualtieri offers an insightful comparative approach to settlement development, exposing a Romano-centric bias in the analysis of Italic settlement.⁷ He assesses the value of new discoveries in relation to the rôle of hill-forts within the '*vicus-pagus-oppidum*' pattern of settlement. His own work with H. Fracchia at Roccagloriosa, combining excavation with regional field survey, makes this one of the best-studied hill-forts. Discussing the '*urbanizzazione in progress*' in different 'Samnite' areas (some of them more than 200 km distant from coastal Roccagloriosa), he notes that urban features seem to develop earlier on the fringes of the 'Samnite' area than in the mountain-enclosed core regions.⁸ Gualtieri concludes that Roccagloriosa reflects some basic aspects of an 'Italic' mode of settlement. He finds evidence that hill-forts assumed a centralizing rôle, not only in a demographic sense but also in the formulation of institutional and political structures. In this regard, a fragment of a bronze *lex*, thought to derive from a public building near the central gate, is relevant: it mentions magistrates, and other formulae seem reminiscent of Latin *leges*. He dates it to the first half of the 3rd c. B.C., unlike G. Tocco who gives its probable date as 130 B.C. ± 10 years.⁹ Gualtieri's early date seems partly based on the development of the site as it emerges from the archaeological record (48); thus, inferences on the level of organization in that period may become rather circular, but he presents other arguments too.¹⁰ For him, the *lex* proves the importance of this hill-fort as a civic centre, the place of both central administration and habitation. His evidence for solid houses may also argue for an "embryonic form of territorial 'city-state'" (46). But it is problematic to use this case to create more general patterns in the development of hill-forts, since similar formulaic inscriptions appear in different contexts, such as sanctuaries. Still, his is an important discussion of Italic settlement-patterns and of 'urban' developments, accompanied by a rich bibliography and two appendices, one on the fragmentary *lex*, the other on a comparison with the Iguvine tablets.

J. Patterson turns to the Roman period, questioning whether Samnium can still be considered "Samnite"¹¹ but arguing for the intrinsic interest of this area under the Romans. He concentrates on changes in the rural settlement-pattern, the history of the urban centres, and on the development of the latter in relation to élite networks and to Rome. Field surveys point to a general decline in numbers of sites from the Samnite to the Early Imperial period, and to a further decrease in the 3rd c. A.D. This is partly due to the reduction in the number of small sites (or the failure to recognise them, related to the modest dissemination of African Red Slip wares by comparison with earlier fine wares). It may also be explained by migration to larger centres such as Beneventum, Capua and Puteoli, while rural settlement may have become more nucleated around villas and

6 Cf. S. Capini, "Archeologia del territorio e insediamenti abitativi nei Pentri: alcune osservazioni," in *Studi sull'Italia dei Sanniti* (Milan 2000) 256.

7 Cf. also M. Frederiksen, "Changes in the patterns of settlement," in P. Zanker (ed.), *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien* (Göttingen 1976) 341-54; C. Letta, review of *Insedimenti fortificati in area centro-italica*, in *Athenaeum* 85 (1997) 310-13.

8 Cf. *I Sanniti* (supra n.3).

9 G. Tocco, "Frammento di legge in lingua osca su tavola bronzea," in *Studi dell'Italia dei Sanniti* (supra n.6) 224.

10 M. Gualtieri, "Una lex osca da Roccagloriosa (SA). Il contesto storico-archeologico," *Ostraka* 9 (2000) 247-53.

11 He cites Strabo's dim picture (6.1.2): 'the Samnites have utterly declined'.

vici. In the towns he points to diversity in developments, and to correlation with Roman interests: after a first wave of monumentalization in the Early Imperial period, small towns seem to become impoverished. He thinks the towns were mainly dependent on the wealth of their territory and the support of benefactors (both local and Roman élite) — relationships which would determine the later fate of the small towns. After their initial enthusiasm for building, the local élites often moved to larger cities, and the parallel enlargement of their estates compounded this trend, with the risk that wealth would flow directly to the larger cities and to Rome, not engaging the region very much. In some cases, curators or patrons might be appointed, and local *collegia* might assume civic functions in the 2nd and 3rd c., but in Samnium this development was rather modest. After a brief *floruit* in the 1st c. A.D., in the later Imperial period Patterson sees Samnium as being generally in decline, and “there was little particularly Samnite about it” (63).

H. Fracchia, starting from Roccagloriosa, discusses the drawing of comparisons between Samnite and Lucanian contexts in the 5th–3rd c. B.C., focusing on territorial developments, funerary practices, and the development of cult. In this way her paper complements Gualtieri’s on urban developments. Roccagloriosa’s development would be marked by Greek colonial influence and by the ‘fact’ that “the Lucanians are descendants of the Samnites” (70); most comparable to Roccagloriosa are the peripheral zones of Samnium — the Caudine area, Irpinia, and Frentania. But although the Lucanians are sometimes called Samnite, it is risky to use outsiders’ statements to explain ethnic sentiments, let alone behaviour. The ‘Samnitization’ of Lucania would be supported by an Oscan-Sabellian bronze statuette found near Roccagloriosa, since these statuettes would mark (70) the “Samnitic movement across Magna Graecia in the fifth and fourth century B.C.”. In any event, the 5th c. brought a significant change in settlement-patterns around the site, at which stone buildings were erected at the end of the 5th c. and which Fracchia links to similar structures in Samnium, Apulia and Messapia, interpreting them as multi-functional, for cult and habitation. On the basis of funeral evidence she discerns (72) “an emerging aristocratic element”, with a pre-eminence of banqueting pieces showing that collective feasts were central. The Italic ‘warrior ideology’ was of minor importance here. In the 4th c., a large courtyard house was built over the 5th-c. multi-functional building, with a small rectangular shrine in the corner of the courtyard. A relation between habitation and cult seems to continue, suggesting domination of the religious realm by an élite. The shrine’s location within a porticoed courtyard is reminiscent of the later ‘public’ sanctuaries in Lucania, and Fracchia suggests that the earlier domestic location provided the model for later Samnite public sanctuaries, with Roccagloriosa presenting a “transitional form”; she discerns a development from “aristocratic domestic but semi-public to actual public space” (77). But this should not be overstated, for we do not know how “public” these later sanctuaries really were. A small number of names of the same families recurs in the epigraphy, at least for the 2nd c. B.C.,¹² and it is possible that semi-public cult plus habitation centers continued alongside the emergence of ‘public’ sanctuaries. Next, Fracchia turns to the settlement pattern in the territory, which in the 4th c. B.C. saw a greater *vicus/pagus* system and, in the 3rd c., a decline in sites. She argues for seeing an ‘Italic’ organization of settlement, one that was much more planned than it appears and “centered in all ways on the eminent families or *gens* and their physical structures” (79). This is an attractive suggestion. She thinks that the construction of ‘public’ structures indicates diminishing power concentrated in the hands of the élite. Perhaps, however, that same family-based élite managed to maintain its position but in different ways. Her conclusion is that Roccagloriosa provides a valid example for Samnite developments. She stresses the need for developing an ‘Italic’ model of settlement structure, which she sees developing from huts on a hill to the construction of public and cult buildings as part of a well-planned effort, organised more around the walls and gates than around a central place.

A. McKay treats Greek and Samnite influences at Cumae. Historical evidence for that Euboean colony suggests a proper seizure on behalf of an external Samnite group (whereas at Capua supposedly an internal revolution took place), but he assumes a strong integration of Hellenic and Italic “cultures”.¹³ Confusingly, McKay applies the terms Lucanian, Samnite, Campanian, and Oscan in a rather inaccurate fashion.¹⁴ Little is known about the habitations, and the “parallels” of Larinum and Monte Vairano (90) do not add much. The Samnites found an already developed centre and they treated most structures reverently, but McKay wonders why the “Oscan-Samnite city fathers” would reconstruct and embellish the old temple of Apollo/Hera. The explanation (92), that Apollo was an antique “Samnite deity”, familiar through the Italic presence on Delos,

12 A. La Regina, “I Sanniti,” in *Italia omnium terrarum parens* (Milan 1989).

13 It is unclear why McKay rejects W. Johannowsky’s Samnite periodization of the fortifications of the acropolis, favouring (89) the statement on its existence in 505 B.C. by Dionysius who wrote five centuries later; cf. also his acceptance (94–95) of Dionysius’ description of the city at the time of Aristodemus.

14 E.g., “Samnite” (91) refers to *Campanis*.

does not convince. Locally and temporally differing meanings could be attached to both cult place and deity, independent from general 'Samnite' conceptions of Apollo, if such existed at all. The Cumaeans Samnites would have dealt with their complex cultural situation by "redefining themselves through appropriation and through the use of models from the Hellenised *koine*, but they also contributed their ideological 'language' to the overall *koine*" (100). But how did these processes actually take place at Cumae? As the majority of the cultural inferences are substantiated by evidence from sites other than Cumae itself, McKay's conclusion lacks foundation. Hopefully, the ongoing excavations by the Italian universities and the Centre Jean Bérard will provide more data to approach these questions.

G. Tagliamonte examines the equestrian ideology and related Dioskouroi worship in Samnite sanctuaries, seeing these (105) as "privileged observatories for understanding the transformations of the ideological forms of self-assertion and self-representation" by the élites. Imagery of horsemen became important in sanctuaries especially from the 4th c. B.C. on, exemplified by statues of horses and horsemen. Samnite élites probably looked to Campania where the *equites campani* played an important rôle. Funerary evidence for an equestrian ideology (tomb paintings, bronze objects), mostly from the second half of the 4th c., is backed by manifestations of the Dioskouroi cult, which is attested by a silver plaque showing the Dioskouroi of the 4th-3rd c. from the sanctuary of Campochiaro. An inscription dedicated to the twins on a late 2nd-c. altar from Colle Vernone fascinates because of the form *pukele* — Oscan for 'son'. Because in Latin a direct translation of Dios-kouroi is lacking, this Oscan conception of the god's name (translated directly from the Greek) may point to direct contact with the Greek world and to a conceptualisation of the cult and theonym independent from Roman influence. Contact between Tarentines and Samnites is historically documented, and this may be a relevant factor. Tagliamonte's thoughtful analysis opens up the tantalising question of the existence of a Samnite cavalry in the 4th and 3rd c. B.C. (mention of which is made in the historical sources).

T. Cornell rethinks the Samnite Wars: the chronology has been questioned before,¹⁵ but Cornell challenges their general character, asking whether the military actions that are reported deserve the name "Samnite Wars". The usual subdivision into 3 or 4 Samnite Wars is a modern invention, dating back to Niebuhr's *Römische Geschichte* (1833): ancient authors refer to one "Great Samnite War" from 343 to 290 B.C. Cornell thinks (124) that both the ancient and modern conceptualizations are "in danger of investing the events with a coherence and meaning they did not really possess". Rejecting a coherent imperialist strategy on the Roman side, he concludes that "the Samnite Wars" consisted rather in that "the Romans were fighting a series of discrete and haphazard annual campaigns" (125). In accounts of those wars, Samnites are depicted as a uniform, coherent group, although it is clear that different groups in central-southern Italy are often meant. He dismisses also the idea of a "United States of Samnium" (128), implying that "the Samnites" could never have aimed at supremacy in Italy during their fights against Rome. In an appendix, Cornell proposes to identify the "Opikoi" who are mentioned in a letter traditionally attributed to Plato (*Ep.* 8.353e) with Romans, instead of with other Italic peoples, which implies that the letter was not written by Plato and must date to around the time of the First Punic War.

In sum, stimulating overviews and revisions of traditional trends in modern research are presented, as are many promising points of departure for further research. As is often the case with conference proceedings, the interaction between the papers sometimes lags behind, and a concluding paper to outline general trends and points of friction would have been welcome. One main point of criticism regards the book's production: spelling mistakes, omissions, and printer's errors are numerous, as are double footnotes, inconsistencies in bibliographical abbreviations, and so forth. Further, the lack of illustrations in the papers by De Benedittis and McKay hampers their comprehensibility.

General considerations

The attempt to delineate an independent model of an 'Italic' mode of settlement, as proposed by Gualtieri and Fracchia, explicitly adopting a comparative approach (50 n.108), is of interest. From this kind of an autonomous 'Italic' basic principle that encapsulates locally variable situations, processes such as 'Oscanization', 'Samnitization', and 'Romanization' could then be studied and integrated.¹⁶ Regional historical, economical, and cultural differen-

15 Especially M. Sordi, *Roma e i Sanniti nel IV secolo a.C.* (Rocca San Casciano 1969).

16 Cf. E. Curti, E. Dench and J. Patterson, "The archaeology of central and southern Roman Italy: recent trends and approaches," *JRS* 86 (1996) 170-89.

ces remain paramount, however, and interpretations must in first instance depend on the actual local data; the question remains whether, in this case, the W Lucanian centre of Roccagloriosa may be used to complement our knowledge of Samnium proper. Settlement developments in Lucania and Samnium differ in substantial ways, including the chronological. The well-documented site of Roccagloriosa risks overshadowing other less-investigated sites in inland Samnium, thereby dominating the interpretation of the latter. For other Samnite settlements we should perhaps adopt the admirable methodology applied at Roccagloriosa rather than the actual model of settlement organization developed there. The contextualization of different data-sets is crucial. This applies to the rôle of hill-forts within their direct environment (Gualtieri), and also to the rôle of sanctuaries¹⁷ and necropoleis in their spatial and functional relationships to other elements in the landscape. More integration of survey and excavation data is required, as are more efforts to deploy large-scale surveys such as G. Barker's to produce historical analyses. More research on *vicus*-type settlements is essential, both through fieldwork and by studying their rôle in settlement systems.¹⁸

As regards cultural change (e.g., the 'Oscanization' and 'Samnitization' of S Italy or the 'Romanization' of Samnium itself), problems arise in trying to detect these processes in material culture.¹⁹ The possibility of delineating "a line of Italic penetration" or of detecting "the arrival of the Oscan population" (Fracchia, 70) on the basis of selected items of material culture (statuettes, 'Samnite' bronze belts, pottery) is questionable.²⁰ The 'Samnitization' of Campania, for instance, seems largely to be the result of internal developments wherein autochthonous people seized dominion.²¹ On the other hand, if we dismiss migration theories, there is the risk of 'throwing the baby away with the bathwater',²² for in some cases there is evidence for actual migration.²³ The spread of material culture may, however, be related to phenomena other than large-scale migration, such as trade, exchange, and the presence of Italic mercenaries in the south.²⁴ Along the same lines, it is not possible to conceptualise the introduction of new ceramic classes or architecture during the Roman period directly as 'Roman' features.

More importantly, the character and very existence of a Samnite identity or unity is debatable. There is a growing discrepancy between those studies that seek roots for defined ethnic identities from as early as the 6th c. B.C.²⁵ and others that emphasise the relative unimportance of these Italic identities until precisely the time of the Roman conquest.²⁶ Historical and historiographical research proves fruitful here: deconstruction of ancient and modern frameworks opens up new possibilities,²⁷ as Cornell's remarks on the character of the Samnite

17 Cf., for Abruzzo, C. Letta, "I santuari rurali nell'Italia centro-appenninica. Valori religiosi e funzione aggregativa," *MÉFRA* 104 (1992) 109-24; for Lucania, E. Greco, "Santuari indigeni e formazione del territorio in Lucania," in S. Verger (ed.), *Rites et espaces en pays celte et méditerranéen* (Paris 2000) 223-29; Tagliamonte in this collection; T. Stek and J. Pelgrom with M. Rocca, "Samnite sanctuaries surveyed. Preliminary report of the Sacred Landscape Project 2004," *BABesch* 80 (2005) 65-71.

18 Apart from I. Rainini's excellent publication, *Capracotta. L'abitato sannitico di Fonte del Romito* (Rome 1996), relatively little is known about *vici*, although several recent excavations await publication; cf. the remarks in Capini 2000 (*supra* n.6).

19 Cf. P. Freeman, "'Romanisation' and Roman material culture," *JRA* 6 (1993) 438-45.

20 Cf. S. Jones, *The archaeology of ethnicity* (London 1997); J. Hall, *Hellenicity* (Chicago 2002).

21 Cf. L. Cerchai, *I Campani* (Milan 1995) with earlier bibliography.

22 D. Anthony, "Migration in archeology: the baby and the bathwater," *American Anthropologist* 92.4 (1990) 895-914.

23 Cf., e.g., A. Bottini, "Uno straniero e la sua sepoltura. La tomba 505 di Lavello," *DialArch* 3 (1985) 59-68, for a 'Samnite' grave in Lavello.

24 G. Tagliamonte, *I figli di Marte. Mobilità, mercenari e mercenariato italici in Magna Grecia e Sicilia* (Rome 1994).

25 E.g., A. Faustoferri, "Prima dei Sanniti. Le necropoli dell'Abruzzo meridionale," *MÉFRA* 115 (2003) 85-107.

26 For Umbria, G. Bradley, *Ancient Umbria* (Oxford 2000).

27 Cf. G. Bradley, "The Romanisation of Italy in the 2nd c. B.C.," *JRA* 15 (2002) 401-6.

Wars exemplify. Dench highlights the differences between Anglo-Saxon and continental European approaches, especially in the realm of cultural change. Whereas the Samnite-Roman opposition has dominated Anglo-Saxon research, Italian, French and German scholars have emphasised the spread of cultural influences, especially Hellenization.²⁸ Romanization is seen as a destructive force, marginalising Samnite economy; De Benedittis, for example, interprets the decline of Monte Vairano in this way. In recent British scholarship other conceptions of Romanization put the 'motor' at a local level: 'self-Romanization' or 'emulation'.²⁹ Indeed, Patterson proposes a very direct emulation-model: the construction of amphitheatres would directly mimic the Colosseum, *macella* mimic Nero's Macellum Magnum, baths mimic the *thermae* of Nero, Titus and Trajan. One can agree with Dench that the concept of 'self-Romanization'³⁰ may sometimes be too optimistic — and much criticism has already been aired concerning the postulated dominant rôle of élites, the lack of diversity in response, and the rôle of material culture. British studies have focused mainly on the Roman provinces but in Italian studies too we find this conception of Romanization for central-southern Italy; the notion of 'autoromanizzazione' has been adopted from the early 1980s on, and comparable concepts appeared earlier.³¹ Recently, H. Mouritsen³² has demonstrated the teleological reasoning present in traditional accounts on the unification of Italy: Italic peoples would have assimilated themselves culturally and politically to Rome, with the inevitable conclusion of being ruled by Rome. Consequently, the beginning of the (self-)Romanization of Italy was set as early as the 3rd c. B.C. Ideas on the cultural and political developments in the Republican period depend greatly on conceptions of Roman imperialism. Cornell, for example, endorses W. V. Harris' characterization of Roman Republican imperialism: not the result of a coherent strategy, but rather the outcome of internal power struggles at Rome, which leads him to see Roman aggression as haphazard and *ad hoc*, not a planned series of Samnite wars.

These 'deconstructions' have important implications too for the impact, character, and periodization of Romanization in Italy.³³ A re-appraisal is needed of the 'Romanization' of Italy that does not privilege élite culture, economic changes and *munificentia* over social processes in other aspects of society. It does not help that most studies seem to focus either on the Italic, Samnite aspects of culture, seeing the Roman conquest as the endpoint of their cultural distinctiveness, or on the Roman period, with little attention paid to the processes (not necessarily straightforward and progressive ones) that took place in the interim. A paper on cultural change that deals more explicitly with this 'transitional' period would have enriched the volume. In such a paper, the partial contemporaneity of 'Samnite' and 'Roman', and its significance, could have been a point of departure. In this regard, it would be interesting to allow for broad comparisons for the later periods too, as Fracchia does for Roccagloriosa and early Rome. One becomes increasingly aware of the intrinsic 'interwovenness' of the ancient inhabitants of Italy, Romans included.

T.D.Stek@uva.nl

Department of Mediterranean Archaeology, University of Amsterdam

28 E.g., Zanker (supra n.7); *La Romanisation du Samnium aux II^e et I^{er} siècles av. J.-C.* (Naples 1991).

29 Cf. Freeman (supra n.19) and D. Mattingly, "Vulgar and weak 'Romanization', or time for a paradigm shift?," *JRA* 15 (2002) 536–40.

30 The (Anglo-Saxon) classic is M. Millett, *The Romanization of Britain* (Cambridge 1990); cf. supra n.19.

31 Cf., e.g., M. Torelli, *Tota Italia. Essays in the cultural formation of Roman Italy* (Oxford 1999); F. Coarelli and A. La Regina, *Abruzzo, Molise* (Rome 1984); A. Pontrandolfo Greco, *I Lucani* (Milano 1982). Cf. Mouritsen (infra n.32).

32 H. Mouritsen, *Italian unification: a study in ancient and modern historiography* (London 1998), with review by Bradley (supra n.27).

33 Bradley, *ibid.*