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Abstract

AN EXPLORATION OF EARLY ROMANIZATION: A COMPARATIVE AND SEMIOTIC APPROACH

by

Mikel Wein

Adviser: Professor Alexander Bauer

Romanization became a popular academic topic after its initial proposal in 1915 by Francis Haverfield. Even today, it is maintained as a popular theory to explain how Rome came to dominate everything from the Italian peninsula to Roman Britain. Traditionally, Romanization has been framed using a theoretical framework of dominance through cultural diffusion. Several authors have challenged this dynamic, but have not framed this discussion within contexts of pre-Republican Roman expansion. This paper challenges this traditional framework and suggests utilizing a comparative and semiotic approach to evaluate early Roman expansion and early Romanization. The paper also challenges the traditional definition of Romanization, suggesting that small elements of Rome, such as the method used for creating decorative architectural tiles, helped contribute to her overall regional power and identity. The methods applied are comparative, in that they strive to understand the origin of styles by comparing similar finds to one another. They are also semiotic, in that meaning is drawn from material remains based upon their symbolic meaning within the communities that interacted with them. The study compares architecture, layout, and archaeological remains, primarily from town centers or fora, between early Rome, five neighbor settlements (Crustumerium, Veii, Gabii, Praeneste, Falerii) within 50 km of the city, and five Roman colonies. Semiotic analysis of architectural terracotta from these sites provides evidence for an impact of Rome and its artisans on Latium and surrounding areas by the early 6th century in the form of modes of production, materials, and designs linked to
competition among cities via impressive, publicly located, decorated buildings. Initial influences were small, such as on figural design or mould choice, but changes accumulated over time, with some ‘spurts’ that represent the spread of advancements, in the case of moulds and clay mixtures, or political change in the region, such as the wave of colonization after the Latin War. The collective analyses suggest that the Romans were transforming sites even at a very early period through artistic advancements and trade as well as traditional conquest. Finally, this paper suggests that Rome’s early cultural development is formative to her later rise to dominance and should not be forgotten in conversations about her history.
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Introduction

Few civilizations conjure the image of power, wealth, and expansive control as well as Rome. The later political structure, architecture, art, and conflicts of the Romans are relatively well studied. Rome’s early development, however, is often interpreted through the lens of its later glory, and still needs to be addressed in its own right in order to improve our understanding of how that civilization became dominant. This paper explores Rome’s expansion from its founding, which historians put at the mid-8th century BCE (Cornell 1995, kindle 2125) through its conquest of peninsular Italy by the end of the Third Samnite war in 290 BCE (Cornell 1995, kindle 8535, 8597). Building on recent work by Fulminante, who took a ‘multi-theoretical’ approach (Fulminante 2014, 459) and found that an area with a radius of 10-15 km from Rome would have been required to sustain the population by the mid-8th century (Fulminante 2014, kindle 5484), the project focuses on material remains, especially architecture, architectural terracotta, layout, and material associated with town centers or fora, from early Rome, three closer (< 20 km) and two farther (< 50 km) neighbor settlements, and five Roman colonies (Table 1). The goal of the study is to examine evidence for early ‘Romanization.’ Romanization has been shown to involve change that ranges from minimal impact, through consolidation or renovation, to complete removal or new establishment of cities (McCall 2007, 192-194). It has been a popular concept since the late 1960’s; however, arguments for Romanization mostly have derived from studies of Imperial Rome or Roman frontier archaeology, and generally from examples of large-scale changes in social hierarchy, architecture, town layout, or government. Here, I argue that a new concept, which allows for the interpretation of small changes, is needed to evaluate early Romanization. I take a multi-theoretical approach and draw from Pierce’s theory of semiotics as adapted to archaeological study (Preucel and Bauer 2001; Preucel 2006) to
bring more modern treatments of Romanization, such as studies of identity creation, into a dialogue with a system of meaning creation, and allow for fuller interpretation of the archaeological evidence of Rome’s early period. By considering multiple lines of the archaeological remains and spread of relatively minor changes within this framework, I demonstrate that there is evidence for early Romanization that spread outward from the developing city and was manifest in changes in town layout and public architecture that reflect Roman culture, social structure, and politics. In this finding, I challenge traditional interpretations of Rome’s major expansion as a later, post Latin War (338 BCE) phenomenon and suggest that there was a calculated and varied effort from a very early period to both actively, through conquest and intimidation, and passively, through trade and cultural influences, expand the city’s regional power.

Rome sits near the center of Italy, bordering the Tyrrhenian Sea to the South West, Campania to the South East, and the Tiber River to the West. The area is often termed Latium Vetus (Old Latium) (Fig. 1), which derives from the original settlers of the area, the ‘Latini,’ and encompassed a small area bounded by the rivers Tiber and Anio on the north and west and a line running from the Astura to Palestrina on the east (Cornell 1995, kindle 9678). Alongside the Latini were numerous other tribes, including the Aequi, Marsi, Sabini, Rutuli, Hernici, Volsci, and Aurunci, as well as more dominant groups such as the Etruscans, who controlled most of the area to the north of Rome (Fig. 1). Indeed, early Rome has been characterized as a frontier settlement on the border between Latins, Sabines, and Etruscans (Cifani 2014, 23). Rome eventually came into contact with these neighbors in various ways. The Sabines are quite well known from the myth concerning theft of the Sabine women (Cornell 1995, kindle 2233). Historical sources record a strong influence of the Etruscans on Rome’s development, and recent
archaeological work (e.g., Perkins 2014; Robinson 2014) supports exchange and shared characteristics between Rome and Etruscan settlements in central Italy from the mid-7th century BCE (Perkins 2014, 64-68). Over many years, Rome eventually came to control the entire area the neighbor tribes inhabited and the region became known as Latium (*Latium Vetus* + *Latium Adiactum*). Of interest to archaeologists, the points of confrontation between Rome and its neighbors provide foci for investigating how Rome interacted with, and eventually subjugated, these peoples. At the core of the issue, and this study, is an attempt to understand if, when, and how Rome left its mark on the architecture, decoration, function, or design of its neighbor settlements in central Italy, and what impacts these confrontations had on the development of the region.

Recently, Fulminante (2014) used a multi-theoretical approach to bring together multiple types of evidence and seemingly opposite theories, including exogenous versus endogenous influences and evolutionary versus non-evolutionary theory, to examine settlement patterns and urbanization in Rome and the surrounding region from the Middle Bronze Age to the Archaic. Fulminante concludes that Rome developed a centralized power between the middle of the 8th and 7th centuries BCE, as evidenced by the wall around the Palatine Hill, communal spaces such as the Forum, aristocratic residence, and cult places in the Comitium (Fulminante 2014, kindle 5438). During the second Regal Period Rome came to look like a city, with its political and religious buildings constructed of stone and a population between 30,000 and 40,000 (Fulminante 2014, kindle 5470). This developing city certainly required resources from the surrounding territory to support its growth. Fulminante calculates, if both urban and rural populations are included in the analysis, an area with a radius of 10-15 km from Rome would have been required to sustain the population by the Early Iron Age (mid-8th century)(Fulminante
This area would have included part of the territories of Fidenae, Ficulea, and the nearest city examined here, Crustumerium (Table 1). Rome might have looked to these nearest neighbors and beyond, to those that offered strategic military or economic importance. In analyzing the environmental factors that might have influenced the pattern of settlements in Etruria and Latium, Fulminante found constant high correlation with good agricultural soils (Fulminante 2014, kindle 5507). Increasing association of sites with higher and steeper locations from the Orientalizing Age (730-580 BCE) onwards was thought to indicate intensified agricultural production, which led to occupying less accessible areas. Further, distance of settlements from rivers increased, perhaps due to the increasing importance of roads and the construction of drainage and water supply channels (Fulminante 2014, 5507). In general, the Orientalizing Age saw larger, dominant centers develop in Etruria and Latium around Rome. The Archaic and Republican periods saw the opposite trend, however, with de-urbanization of centers, such as Crustumerium, that were conquered by Rome and incorporated into her territory (Fulminante 2013, kindle 5521). Clearly, Rome influenced the development of neighbor settlements through these periods, but further analysis is needed to identify more specifically when changes occurred and how they were manifest among and within the settlements around Rome.

For the current project, neighbor sites for analysis were identified from among the various regional tribes that were contemporaneous with Rome based on textual data and archaeological survey projects. These sites encompass the majority of peoples Rome encountered at various points during its development. Sites present varying sizes, degree of development, extent of excavation, and availability of published studies. Whereas sites such as Gabii and Veii have recent excavation records (c.f. Becker et al. 2009; Mogetta and Becker 2014, Gabii), or
have been reinterpreted (Cascino et al. 2012, Veii), other sites such as Otricoli (Oriculum) have had more limited excavation and surface or geophysical surveys conducted with varying success (Hay et al. 2013). In the case of Oriculum, only two small areas were examined, and these did not provide meaningful results (Patterson et al. 2000, 399-400). As of 2013, the town itself remained relatively unknown before the early 1st century BCE (Hay et al. 2013); several other potential sites within the region also remain unstudied, emphasizing the need for further studies such as the Tiber River Valley Project, which spent several years surveying and documenting sites along the Tiber River Valley (Patterson 2004). However, excluding selected Roman colonies, five sites (Table 1) have available excavation records that document the site and material remains, and can be used to help interpret the changes that took place because of Roman interaction. The closest of these sites, Crustumerium, lies only 15 km from Rome and was inhabited from roughly 850 BCE through its decline around the beginning of the 5th century BCE (Attema et al. 2014, 192-193). Veii, which is thought to have been settled between the beginning of the Iron Age and the 7th century BCE, lies only 16 km from Rome and has been characterized as its fiercest enemy before being conquered in 396 BCE (Cascino et al. 2012, 336, 341-351). Gabii, just 18 km from Rome, appears to have emerged in the same wave of urbanization and maintained prominence until it began a slow decline during the Republican period (Becker et al. 2009, 632; Kay 2013, 286). The remaining two study sites, Praeneste and Falerii, were farther from Rome, at 36 km and 50 km, respectively. Praeneste was known for the sanctuary and oracle of Fortuna Primigenia (‘first born’), which likely was active from the 7th century BCE (Bradshaw 1920, 237; Paggi 2005, 20). Over time, Praeneste sided against and with Rome, but it eventually lost half its territory for opposing Rome in the Latin War of 340-338 BCE (Bradshaw 1920, 236). Falerii Veteres is estimated to have been settled at the end of the Bronze Age (Carlucci et
al. 2007, 43), and was a religious center until it reportedly was destroyed by the Romans in 241 BCE and the survivors were settled at the adjacent site, Falerii Novi (Zonaras, Epitome Historiarum 8:18, cited in Opitz 2009, 5). Rome reorganized or settled a number of sites after the end of the Latin War and dissolution of the Latin League in 338 BCE; these are known as the early Roman colonies. This paper focuses on five of the colonies that were investigated by Sewell (2010): Ostia, Fregellae, Alba Fucens, Paestum, and Cosa. Colonies often were created with specific goals, and each of these colonies was attractive to a growing Rome for various reason. Collectively, they and the settlements considered here have material remains that can be used to help interpret the changes that took place due to interactions with Rome.

A brief note on sources seems relevant here. Textual sources are not used to interpret the archaeological evidence, but only to inform understanding about when and how Rome may have come into contact with a site. In other words, for this study they will serve merely to help develop the timeline of the data and the general framework of the story archaeologists create from their data. The historical accounts themselves are of course wonderful but inherently problematic, and it must be remembered that they serve primarily to help envision how sites may have been shaped by contact with other peoples. Where textual sources are used, a brief exploration of the dynamics involved with the source, including potential biases and problems with drawing in-depth conclusions from the text, is provided and explored in as much as it benefits this study. This is done to help the reader better understand the available, reliable information as well as the context of the author. Where all the details available about a site come from textual sources, the site was not used in this study unless it contributes to understanding the overall dynamic of Rome from a historical perspective.
This raises the question of how to understand the meaning of the archaeological remains. Traditionally, Romanization has been framed using a theoretical framework of dominance through cultural diffusion (Millett 1992, 1). In simple terms, sites become more like Rome and the people act more like Romans because it was beneficial to their own success. Rome instituted several policies such as commercium, conubium, and ius migrandi (the right to engage in commerce and own property, marry, and hold citizenship among Latin cities) which helped nudge peoples into aligning their interests with Rome’s (Forsythe 2006, 183). However, a study of Romanization at an early period, before the establishment of these policies or the grandness of the Imperial presence in the frontiers of the empire, would appear to require a different approach. The concept of Romanization was first developed by Francis Haverfield, a British historian and archaeologist, in his 1915 (Third Edition) “The Romanization of Britain” (Haverfield 1915). In this work, Haverfield laid the building blocks of the discussion of Romanization today. He defined the concept in terms of both historical processes and material changes within the culture, essentially representing both internal and external stimuli (Haverfield 1915, 15-20). More recently, Millet discussed the development of the study of Romanization, including Haverfield’s contributions, in his work “The Romanization of Britain: An Essay in Archaeological Interpretation” (Millet 1992). He questions just how effective the study of Romanization, both as Haverfield framed it and as it evolved, has been for understanding Roman Britain (Millet 1992). In brief, Millet argued that from early on Romanization must be viewed as a “dialectical change, rather than the influence of one ‘pure’ culture upon others” (Millet 1992, 1). Romanization studies have begun to move in the direction Millet suggested, but studies of early Romanization have been harder to frame within a dialectical argument, given the nature and scarcity of the evidence (Merryweather and Prag 2002, 8-10). Although historical texts and material evidence
are available, early Roman history is muddled, even among Rome’s historians themselves, and archaeo-
logical exploration has been slow. For these reasons, more modern treatments of Romanization, such as studies of identity creation, need to be brought into dialogue with a system of meaning creation, which will allow for fuller interpretation of any conclusions drawn from the data. A “multi-theoretical” approach, which allows seemingly disparate explanations or evidence to be brought together in a dialectic synthesis (Fulminante 2014, 459) has been applied to study social complexity in northeast China from the fourth to first millennium BCE (Shelach, 1999, as cited in Fulminante 2014, kindle 1177), and may be particularly apt for studying early Romanization, which likely resulted from small, gradual, and multidirectional changes rather than catastrophic change. Further, the evidence for early Romanization comes from multiple sources, such as tombs, architectural decoration, and town layout, and each of these types of evidence is variously available. In this project, a multi-theoretical approach is used to pull the differing types of evidence and different theoretical approaches, such as endogenous (single-site) and exogenous approaches, together in investigating Rome’s interactions with its neighbors.

This paper also draws on semiotics, the study of how meaning is made through symbols, to interpret the changes that might appear in locations after Roman contact. Peircian semiotics derives from Charles Sanders Peirce (1839-1914), the founder of the philosophy of pragmatism. The focus of Pierce’s semiotic work was to understand the world around him through an interpretation of signs. Indeed, “Peirce conceived of semiotics as an irreducible form of life, encompassing humans and nature, and indeed all that exists in the universe” (Preucel 2006, Kindle location 689). This view also allowed for a logical analysis of those signs. Peirce’s theory of semiotics has been adapted to archaeological study, most noticeably by Robert Preucel (Preucel and Bauer 2001; Preucel 2006), in an effort to interpret artifacts that can pose problems
for traditional interpretative techniques. Preucel and Bauer (2001, 93) argue that Peircian
semiotics offers a common language for understanding and communicating across contrasting
interpretive approaches. In addition, “it allows important distinctions to be made between signs
that mean something to the analyst (such as a sequence of pottery styles to represent a historical
process - a symbolic argument), signs that mean something unique to a past actor (such as a
particular pottery design used to represent a social affiliation - a dicent indexical sinsign), and
signs that mean something that is widely shared within a past community of actors (such as a
particular pottery design used to refer a specific ideology - a rhematic indexical sinsign)”
(Preucel 2006, Kindle locations 3312-3315). Preucel maintains that archaeological interpretation
of material culture should be augmented by a focus on materiality, or “how people use objects to
mediate their social existence” (Preucel 2006, Kindle location 3291). In contrast to Saussure’s
dyadic model of Signifier and Signified, approaches developed from Pierce’s model of
understanding include the Sign, Object, and Interpretant (Preucel and Bauer 2001, 90). A Sign,
or artefact in archaeology, can include Iconic meanings, which are based upon formal
resemblances; Indexical meanings, which reference other concepts indirectly, and Symbolic
meanings, in which the sign represents others of its type. Preucel and Bauer (2001, 91) use an
axe found in a burial to demonstrate these meanings. The axe-Sign can be recognized as an axe
due to its formal resemblances to other axes used in a particular culture (as an Icon); its
spatiotemporal context can provide understanding of other objects in the burial (as an Index); and
it might represent power in the culture (as a Symbol). From these multiple meanings, the
archaeologist-interpreter can make inferences about how the axe was created and experienced
within the social order of the past culture (Preucel and Bauer 2001, 92). Recently, Coben used
the concept of Peircean replicas as icons, or sinsigns, to analyze historical and archaeological
evidence, including spatial design and city planning, and demonstrate replication of an idealized capital city of Cuzco (the *legisign*) across the Inka empire (Coben 2006, 223-236). For example, Coben identified Incallajta as another Cuzco based on a number of features (signs), including the approach by a major road and increasingly restricted access to the site core; a large double plaza, with one plaza higher than the other and a stone/platform complex in the higher plaza; and a zigzag structure to the north of the site atop a hill (Coben 2003, cited in Coben 2006, 236). These different features all draw their inspiration, and often their form, from an original *legisign*, in this case, Cuzco. Furthermore, many of these elements were important to religious rites and local power structures, indicating they likely also served as symbols. As in this example, consideration of how signs were created, interpreted, and possibly replicated by the people using them makes semiotics an informative approach for answering questions posed here about the early rise of Roman identity and manipulation of material (e.g., terracotta) technology, designs, and motifs. In other words, Roman-manufactured materials and constructs, such as town layouts, must inherently contain, consciously or not, a subtle aspect of Roman culture, and by tracking even small changes it becomes possible to track larger, inter-site dynamics and development of Roman identity. The following section provides background information and an historical context for understanding early Rome and the surrounding region.

**Development of Early Rome and the Region**

*Early Rome* - Although this project is not specifically related to Rome itself, a general understanding of the early development of city, and more specifically the Velabrum, or general area of the Roman Forum, Forum Boarium, and Cloaca Maxima, can help contextualize Rome’s interactions with its neighbors. Rome grew from a “frontier settlement” (Cifani 2014, 23)
between the 8th and 4th centuries BCE. The first evidence of public works, a fortified wall at the north slope of the Palatine, is seen in the second half of 8th century (Cifani 2014, 16). The Forum area was filled between 650 and 625 BCE, dividing the city into three distinct areas that subsequently had different trajectories: religious structures on the tops of the hills, governmental functions in the Forum below, and industry further down along the Tiber River (Hopkins 2014, p. 32). Building on earlier excavations, primarily by Gjerstad (1967), Ammerman (1990) used core samples taken along a transect through the Velabrum to trace the filling of the Forum area to a steady project of community trash disposal in an effort to raise the ground layer to create workable land. The first buildings were erected around the edges of the Forum after the area was paved with gravel: the Comitium, Curia, and, across the plain, the Regia (Hopkins 2014, 42-43; Fig. 2). Remains of alters and sacrifices throughout the Regia suggest it was a religious building by at least the mid-6th century BCE (Hopkins 2014, 43). The 6th century was marked by new urban transformation in Rome (Cifani 2014, 18-21). City walls were renewed or enlarged to enclose all the seven hills and water management infrastructure grew through expansive drainage, underground conduits, and water reservoirs (Cifani 2014, 19-20). The first monumental temples were constructed, including the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus (509 BCE), which Cifani (2014, 20) describes as “without parallel in Etruria and Latium.” It had a strong Ionic influence, was built on a square stone podium, and had a tripartite cella (inner chamber) with the central part dedicated to Jupiter and the others to Juno and Minerva (Cifani 2014, 20-21). Cifani (2014, p. 21) suggests the aim might have been to emphasize links between Rome’s sovereign and the gods, and to promote the city as the premier religious center of the region.

Rome’s influence over neighbor communities increased over the 6th century through military action or diplomatic agreements; Rome was transforming into a regional power (Cifani
As evidence of this transformation and a “Rome-centric” role in building programs, numerous temples built in neighboring cities between 530 and 510 have the same roofs and carry the same images, suggesting they were commissioned by a central organization that likely was within Rome (Lulof 2014, 123). Within the city, archaeological evidence, including widespread use of squared block and clay tiles, indicates standardized building activities and suggests that power was concentrated in single public commissions, with a hierarchical society of specialized workers and craftsmen by the second half of the 6th century (Cifani 2014, 23-24). Rome renovated the buildings of the Forum at the turn of the century as it shifted to the Republic (Hopkins 2014, 44-46): three ritual chambers were added to the Regia, and a new stone pavement supported a wooden colonnade on two sides; rectilinear rooms were added to the Atrium Vestae around an open space and sacred hearth, and a platform around a sunken well was inserted into the sacred area; and a stepped platform was added to the Comitium. New buildings included a key political meeting place, a temple to Castor and Pollux, beside the Regia and Atrium Vestae. At 27.5 m wide and 37-40 m long, it was among the largest temples in central Italy; its roof had some of the earliest full-image antefixes along sides (Hopkins 2014, 44-46). By the mid-5th century, Rome was a city filled with international architecture and sculpture (Hopkins 2014, 52). The Roman Forum continued to be developed; by the 3rd century BCE, it had tabernae (small shops) along three sides, along with the major monuments (Sewell 2010, 148).

Prior to filling, the Forum area likely was marshland that flooded at intervals (Ammerman 1990, 636; Hopkins 2014, 30). Raising the area thus was expedient for overcoming inhospitable environmental conditions that restricted expansion of the growing city from the hills into the valley (Hopkins 2014, 30). Nevertheless, the project remains an early, documented
example of Roman public-works construction that might have been directed by some authority. This, combined with the subsequent development of the Forum and surrounding areas (as discussed above), raises the possibility that the project was part of a larger city plan and was intended to express certain cultural beliefs. In other words, it may be possible to explore questions about early Roman cultural identity within the material remains of the Forum. Further, as Rome grew, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that the investment of distinctly Roman material culture within forum areas, both within the city and in conquered settlements, would increase. Sewell (2010, 11-17) examines town centers of Roman colonies and annexed neighboring settlements in the late 4th and 3rd centuries, and comments that archaeological data from forum areas are key to understanding Etruscan and Roman urbanism. This project examines the available evidence from town centers of the selected sites for markers of early expansion of Roman culture.

Etruria and Latium - A brief discussion of settlement dynamics in Etruria and Latium can help contextualize comparisons between Rome and its neighbor cities. Between 900 and 600 BCE, a rapidly expanding population led to increasing social stratification and urbanization throughout central Italy as scattered rural settlements gave way to proto-urban centers and then to nucleated urban areas (Nijboer 2004, 137; Perkins 2014, 64-68). Economic centralization initially occurred around resources such as minerals, natural harbors, sanctuaries, and homesteads of elites (Nijboer 2004, 137). Centers of urban production became established during the 7th century with emergence and nucleation of various types of workshops (Nijboer 2004, 143-144). By the mid-7th century, documented Etruscan cities such as Veii had developed in South Etruria. There is evidence of Greek influence among these settlements, and they share characteristics such as size, defenses, sanctuaries, and monuments, both among themselves and
with Rome (Perkins 2014, 64-68). Indeed, Rome should not be considered “an enigma,” as settlements throughout central Italy were connected and likely changing in similar ways (Robinson 2014, 10). By the beginning of the 6th century, centers were developing into city-states that had defined territories and trade, stone dwellings, public architecture such as temples, and infrastructure that included paved streets, drainage channels, and cisterns (Cifani 2014, 17; Perkins 2014, 76). A change in funerary practices to graves devoid of objects suggests that wealth may have been transferred to fund public projects (Cifani 2014, 17). Perkins (2014) compares the layout of settlements in Etruria in the first millennium BCE. Centers such as Pogio del Castello and di Macchiabuia had orthogonal buildings and evidence of domestic activity in an enclosed hilltop settlement from 675 through 475 BCE. The first planned settlements are seen ca. 600 (for example, at Piazza d’Armi, Veii), and gridded streets, suggestive of Greek influence, are seen in centers such as Fonteblanda and Gonfienti from the early 6th century. Following the demise of the Latin League, which had formed in opposition to Etruscan Rome at the end of the 6th century, the second half of the 4th century BCE was a period of dynamic settlement by Etruscan cities (Sewel 2010, 17). Small fortified centers were established, often in locations with defensive advantage to counter Roman expansion (Sewel 2010, 17). Many of these had orthogonal street grids (Sewel 2010, 17).

Etruria certainly influenced the development of early Rome. The Etruscan cities, in particular, were unified, headed by kings, and controlled most of the area north of Rome. Also, it is widely acknowledged that the Etruscan Kings of Rome (616-510 BCE) directly influenced the city’s development, and backlash for their rule contributed to formation of the Latin League and rise of the Roman Republic. With Etruria’s close proximity, control of regional resources, and developing urban centers, it is not surprising that Rome would have tried to create a distinct
impression of its own upon the Etruscan culture. Of particular interest to the present discussion are sites involved in the Etruscan league, a loose economic and religious confederation that formed around 600 BCE and continued for the next 200 years. Of the cities thought to be part of this confederation, Veii and Faleri Veteres/Novi (a Faliscan settlement) have been studied sufficiently to offer a body of evidence for comparative study; that is, for objects which are distinct or tied to Rome to be sufficiently available in the remains.

The Sabines were also Rome’s neighbors (Fig. 1). Their origins were debated even in ancient times, though it seems most likely that they were an indigenous people (Dionysius, I.14; Fulminate 2014, kindle 1348). A Roman myth, recorded by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, describes the Sabines dividing into two sects, with one sect moving into the area near Rome, and eventually being Latinized, while the other remained in the Apennine Mountains. One basis for this myth is periodic forced migration from the mountains to the more fertile valley to alleviate overcrowding (Cornell 1995, kindle 7334; Fulminante 2014, kindle 1256). Although Rome would come into confrontation with the Sabines who remained in the mountains during the assimilation of that territory, of more immediate concern for this project is the second set of Sabines who moved into the area just northeast of Rome. This group became assimilated into Rome very early as seen by remaining facets of their culture, including cults to Sabine gods such as Sancus and Quirinus and associated early sites such as the Quirinale and Quirinal hill (Cornell 1995, kindle 2191; Forsythe 2006, 85). This early merge with Rome means that much of the Sabine’s land became homogenized quickly and sites are less informative for the current project. However, integration of Sabine culture is part of the formation of Rome’s identity, or what is meant by ‘Romanization.’ In other words, the early integration of the Sabine people contributed to a distinct style of building and art that became identified as Roman. The Samnites, who were
made up of the Caracini, Caudini, Hirpini, and Pentri, also are believed to be of Sabine origin; they shared a language and art style (Cornell 1995, kindle 7334). The Samnites held considerable power and were a formidable foe until Rome defeated them for a third time (the Third Samnite War) in 290 BCE. Like Rome, Samnium was a melting pot of other cultural influences, including the Greeks and Etruscans; this mixture of cultures creates difficulty in identifying the influences of Samnite culture on Rome, or vice-versa. The present project, however, is primarily concerned with differences between Sabine and Samnite sites as they might have affected how Rome interacted with, and transformed, these neighbors.

Many other peoples, including Enotrians, Equians, Ligurians, Lucanians, Messapians, Picenians, Opicians, Umbrians, and Volscians, inhabited areas of the Italian peninsula during the period of Rome’s development and outward expansion (Forsythe 2006, 188). Much of what is known about many of these groups and their cultures comes from Roman historians, who mostly were unconcerned with peoples they saw as unimportant. As most of these sites have not been investigated extensively by archaeologists, they are not included in the present analysis. This project also does not directly consider the Greeks, who inhabited southern Italy and undoubtedly had a large impact on Roman culture early on, especially in terms of artistic styles. However, Greek settlements were not close to Rome. Further, Roman conquest of Greek territories occurred near the end of the time period considered here, which would not allow discussion of change over time. This is not to dismiss the importance of Romanization through trade, just that it would be difficult to analyze within the boundaries of the present study, especially in the Greek cities of Southern Italy.
Analyzing early Romanization in Latium and Beyond

This section considers Rome’s interactions with the focal settlements (Table 1). Building on Fulminante’s (2014) spatial analysis of settlement patterns in Rome and the surrounding region, it begins with the three nearest (< 20 km) neighbors, Crustumerium, Veii, and Gabii, and extends to the farther (up to 50 km) neighbors, Praeneste and Falerii, and five Latin colonies. The focus is a comparison of material remains between the chosen sites and developing Rome. Specific artifacts considered vary with availability and cultural importance, although emphasis is on architecture, layout, and material associated with town centers or fora. For example, to investigate interactions between Rome and Veii, where public works focused on temple construction and decorative techniques, a small, Archaic period temple on the Piazza d’Armi is compared with a contemporaneous Roman construction, the Regia. The goal is to identify similarities and differences between the two, here especially in architecture and the amount and type of decorations, which could reveal the origins of styles and materials, and elucidate cultural interactions between the cities. When considered in the context of distance from Rome, comparative analyses of material remains from the focal cities provide additional insights into development patterns and the spread of early Roman culture in the region.

Rome’s Closest Neighbors

Crustumerium – Of the five neighbor settlements considered here, Crustumerium lies closest to Rome: only 15 km NNE on the Marcigliana Vecchia hill near the Tiber Valley (Fig. 3). The site was well situated; it was connected to the Via Salaria, which encouraged trade, and was fairly defensible, as it was surrounded by steep cliffs except on one side where there was a moat (Attema et al. 2014, 175). Crustumerium was abandoned sometime during the Republic...
period. The site was lost until the 1970’s, and thus remained free from destruction through modern urbanization. The first inhabitation of Crustumerium is estimated to have been around 850 BCE based upon scattered pottery dated to Latial phase II B/III A, or roughly 850-780 BCE (Attema et al. 2014, 192). Further evidence for inhabitation comes from ceramics, charcoal fragments, and burnt grain associated with an Early Iron Age building that was uncovered during rescue archaeology and likely was used for food storage (Attema et al. 2014, 188). Evidence for early inhabitation is scarce, though, until major urbanization began in the 7th century BCE.

Materials, including five kinds of locally-quarried tuff and cappellacci (weathered bedrock) associated with a road trench, ceramics and bronze metal works uncovered in ‘Orientalized’ tombs, and defensive structures of tufa blocks indicate infrastructure was present in Crustumerium in 650 BCE (Attema et al. 2014, 185). Architectural terracotta evidence also indicates there was a unique, roofed, and decorated building within the urban area, but excavation to characterize this building is not yet complete (Attema et al. 2014, 192). Information for later periods comes mostly from geomagnetic surveys; thus, as of now, it is not possible to understand the later urban space or how Crustumerium evolved over time.

A significant necropolis, commonly referred to as Monte de Bufalo cemetery, has yielded information on 7th century burial practices at Crustumerium. Two of the tombs that have been examined are described by Nijboer et al. (2008). Tomb 223 was a fossa (trench) inhumation of a woman, approximately 45 to 50 years of age, in a wooden coffin that likely was made of a hollowed-out tree trunk. The fossa was roughly 1 m deep, was oriented SSE-NNW, and contained a loculus (niche) 20 cm higher than the floor. Grave goods included bronze fibulae (brooches); impasto cups and bowls for eating and drinking during banquet rituals; and a highly decorated tazza con ansa bifora (cup with two-opening handle) that is not functional for drinking
and thought to be specific for female tombs at Crustumerium (Nijboer et al. 2008, 1). The use of a wooden coffin, likely made from a hollowed-out tree trunk, is similar to contemporary fossa graves in the sepulcretum at Rome (see discussion in Gabii section). It is possible their use arose from similar societal practices, but this cannot be known with certainty. A second fossa tomb, number 232, had a head loculus, was at most 35 cm deep, and contained the remains of a woman 40-50 years old (Nijboer 2008, 3). Materials recovered from the tomb include ceramic shards, mostly of drinking cups and a small white-on-red holmos (rounded bodied vase), bronze fibulae, a belt of bronze clasps, ivory fibula-bows inlaid with amber, and a copper-based headdress with intricate metal designs (Nijboer et al. 2008, 4). Nijboer and Attema (2010, 30) note that white-on-red ceramics are uncommon in Latium Vetus, with only two plates reported from Rome, but are more common in other regions around Crustumerium. They suggest local production was related to earlier styles produced in Sabina Tiberina (Nijboer and Attema 2010, 30). The headdress, which possibly was connected to a veil, is a unique find. Similar headdresses on statues on the Portonaccio temple (Veii) and of Vestals (Imperial Rome) are thought to reflect an ancient style and suggest the women buried at Crustumerium were matronae, or mistresses of main households (Nijboer and Attema 2010, 33-34). Overall, the remains in these tombs suggest that 7th century Crustumerium was a thriving city, with local production that borrowed from neighbor styles, but was not influenced heavily by nearby Rome.

Compared to other sites, Crustumerium has a large number of 6th century chamber tombs, which differ among themselves in architecture and other features (Nijboer and Attema 2010; Rajala et al. 2013). Grave goods associated with these tombs include Etrusco-Corinthian ceramics, coarse ware olla, and a pyxis (cylindrical lidded box), aryballos (globular narrow-necked flask), and alabastra (small vessel for oil) (Nijboer and Attema 2010, 25). Collectively,
however, the chamber tombs did not contain the number and diversity of grave goods as the *fossa* tombs of the 7th century; for example, only two of six excavated tombs contained pottery vessels (Rajala et al. 2013, 61). The tombs did show continuation of supine burial and the use of shrouds and coffins (Rajala et al. 2013, 72-75). The 6th century change to few funerary depositions, which is also seen at Veii and throughout Latium (Cascino et al. 2012, 349), may reflect regional shifts in religious practices or social change (Rajala et al. 2013, 75-79). Rajala et al. (2013) suggest the diversity of chamber tombs at Crustumerium might reflect a new social milieu of extended families and relative wealth of families. The use of roof tiles to cover the chamber *loculi* suggests some wealth and disposable income (Rajala et al. 2013, 74-75). Nijboer and Attema (2010, 35) propose that the large number of 6th century chamber tombs supports the idea that cultural characteristics at Crustumerium at this time were shared with nearby Sabine, Etruscan, and Faliscan-Capenate regions.

Archaeological remains at Crustumerium die off sharply around the beginning of the 5th century, suggesting the textual sources are correct that Rome usurped the area and the city declined (Attema et al. 2014, 193). Livy reports that the Crustumini were present at the 8th century festival of Neptune Equester, at which the Sabine women were stolen (Livy 1.9-11, 2.19; tr: Spillan 1871). This ‘rape of the Sabine women’ started a period of hostilities between the two cities. Rome eventually captured Crustumerium around 500 BCE, and Livy reports that many of the Crustumini then migrated to Rome (Livy 1.9-11, 2.19; tr: Spillan 1871; Attema et al. 2014, 193). Although the archaeological evidence to date supports this historical account, it seems premature to draw definitive conclusions about interactions between Rome and Crustumerium in the 5th century. There is no evidence, as of yet, for hostile actions between the cities. Although Crustumerium was within easy travel distance to Rome, lending support to the idea of
resettlement there, it was as close or closer to other cities, such as Veii and Fidenae, and the archaeological evidence suggests more cultural links with these neighbors than with Rome. If Livy is correct, the Romans did not seek to colonize or transform Crustumerium, or their efforts there failed. Crustumerium then, may represent a different or early strategy of Roman domination, but this is mere speculation pending further archaeological investigation.

Veii – Rome’s next closest neighbor, Veii, is situated on a broad, defendable plateau in the Tiber River valley, about 16 km north of Rome and 25 km from the sea (Fig. 3). Compared to nearby centers Caere and Tarquinia (Fig. 3, Caere was next to Cerveteri), Veii was relatively far from the sea, but it was larger (185 ha) and on more productive soils (Cascino et al. 2012, 333). From the end of 10th century BCE, Veii was a hub of commercial traffic and culture for a large territory; it functioned as a link between South Etruria and Latium centers in the Tiber valley (Cascino et al. 2012, 339; Ward-Perkins 1961, 20). Cascino et al. (2012, 336) suggest that Iron Age (1020-725 BCE) Veii was “not much different from that imagined for the Palatine hill of early Rome,” with pathways linking scattered huts and interspersed animal enclosures, open spaces for agriculture and pasture, and patches of woodland. Smith (2012, 1) describes Veii as “more like Rome than like other Etruscan centers.” Given the proximity to Rome, it is not surprising that Veii is known from Archaic and Classical historical sources as Rome’s fiercest enemy before it was conquered under Camillus in 396 BCE (Cascino et al. 2012, 336). After its defeat, Veii’s territory was redistributed to Roman citizens and it largely disappeared from history until Augustus created a municipium there (Smith 2012, 4).

Archaeologists have divided Veii into regions, from the Piazza d’Armi in the southeast to the North-West gate (Fig. 4). Cascino et al. (2012, 341-351) reviewed the archaeological
evidence from the site: They suggest that Veii was settled between the beginning of the Iron Age and the 7th century BCE, with areas along roads occupied first and flat areas within the road network filled in later. Excavations in areas of the North-West gate, Macchiagrande (area of the Republican forum), Comuntià, and Piazza d’Armi have revealed an urban area with oval huts flanked by rectangular timber structures, often with tufa block foundations and mud-brick walls, in the first half of the 7th century. At Piazza d’Armi, there is evidence of urban organization from the second half of the 7th century in the form of a regular grid layout, with a main road and side streets at right angles. At the beginning of the 6th century, Veii was part of a wide trading network; a decrease in elaborate tomb architecture and luxuriant grave-goods supports the idea that resources were shifted to monumentalizing cult sites. Archeological evidence supports adoption of a regular urban plan throughout the settlement area, with gridded streets, public buildings, and monumental cult areas. Stone buildings of tufa blocks begin to appear. For example, excavations near the North-West gate have uncovered a stone building, dating to the middle of the 6th century, which replaced an earlier timber structure. At Macchiagrande, several rectangular houses of tufa blocks were uncovered along the road leading to the center of the plateau; further, a group of 6th century block houses with one or more rooms were found in the Republican forum area. With the exception of the sanctuary of Portonaccio (discussed below), sacred sites were situated in prominent positions at the center of the plateau or near city gates.

Cemeteries show the population growth and changing social structure of Veii. Over the 7th century BCE, there was a change from simple earth graves with loculi to chamber tombs (Cascino et al. 2012, 343). In the second half of the century, aristocratic elites began to display their status with tumulus (mounded) tombs (Cascino et al. 2012, 343). Italo-geometric and advanced impasto ceramics have been associated with these tomb areas (Ward-Perkins 1961,
Toward the end of the century, coinciding with an increase in monumental building, chamber tombs and *tumuli* decreased and there was an increase in more modest *fossa* tombs (Cascino et al. 2012, 343). From this point through the fifth century grave goods became rather impoverished, and were limited to personal objects and coarse impasto ceramics (Cascino et al. 2012, 353). Interestingly, there was a large-scale return to cremation burials in Veii beginning in the first part of the 6th century. Cremation remains generally were placed in niches within large, deep pits or in individual round shafts (Cascino et al. 2012, 354). In this return to cremation, funerary practices at Veii are more like those of Rome and other Latin settlements in the Tiber Valley than they are like other Etruscan cities (Cascino et al. 2012, 353).

In contrast to Rome, where public work focused on development of the Forum, Veii focused on temples and sanctuaries (Smith 2012, 5-7). The first cult activities appear to be open-air sites, which later were replaced by religious buildings of tufa blocks (Cascino et al. 2012, 341). Excavations carried out between 1913 and 1916 revealed a temple and, nearby, a statue of Apollo (Lake 1935, 101). Known as the Portonaccio temple, it sat outside the city (Cascino et al. 2012, 341) and is one of only two substantial public buildings that have been found (the other being the small Archaic temple on the Piazza d’Armi discussed below) (Ward-Perkins 1961, 27). There is evidence of activity on the site from the 7th century BCE on, with an altar to Minerva constructed later (Cascino et al. 2012, 341). A *sacellum* (small shrine) was built in the sanctuary in the middle of the 6th century, and an *oikos*, which had terracotta revetments, was built farther west (Cascino et al. 2012, 351). Identified statues from the crest of the roof (*acroteria*) include the “Apollo of Veii” (Fig. 5), which has been depicted in a hypothetical grouping alongside Hermes, a female often interpreted as Leto carrying Apollo, and Herakles, who is capturing a stag (Fig. 6) (Winter 2005, 248; Cascino et al. 2012, 352). The Apollo and Herakles are
contemporary with, and similar to, terracotta roofs with decoration characterized by human figures, volutes, and sphinxes in relief, known as Rome-Veii-Velletri and Rome-Caprifico types (Fig. 7). Winter (2005, 247-249) identifies this decoration as part of a change in temple architecture inspired by the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus in Rome. The Veii roof likely was produced between 530 and 520 BCE by the same workshop commissioned by Tarquinius Superbus for the *acroterion* of the *quadriga* (chariot of the gods) for the Roman temple between 530 and 520 BCE (Winter 2005, 249). The *antefixes* (vertical end-blocks) of these decorative systems had female heads between lion-head spouts, and reliefs depicting departing warriors in semi-divine processions with female charioteers, armed horsemen, and chariot races. The Rome-Veii-Velletri system also had reliefs with scenes of seated gods and banquets. Revetment reliefs from this roof system have been found in at least 16 sites, and 10 locations within Rome itself; among the sites considered here, these reliefs have been found at Veii, Gabii, and, questionably, Crustumerium (Lulof 2014, 114, 123).

The small Archaic temple found in conjunction with a cistern on the Piazza d’Armi provides another example of a 6th century temple at Veii. This temple was constructed around 570 BCE out of tufa blocks, terracotta, and wood, and was roughly 15.35 x 8.7 meters. It preserves as a simple rectangular structure, probably with a central wooden support column, and it may have had one or two doors (Ward-Perkins 1961, 28). The building was connected directly to a spring, had a cistern, and was enclosed by a *temenos* (piece of land) that may have been a sacred grove (Cascino et al. 2012, 351). Several decorative elements from this structure have been recovered, including parts of revetment reliefs and an *antefix* (Figs. 8, 9). The revetment reliefs depict military processions with warriors in chariots with shields and horses (Fig. 8, 9a,b), and a procession of felines (Fig. 9d). The feline scene is similar to the decorative system of the
third-phase building on the site of the Regia in Rome (Fig. 9c), but is slightly later (Winter 2010, 48). The antefix (Fig. 8) depicts a female head and was constructed of terracotta (Winter 2010, 47). Winter (2010, 48) concludes that the architectural terracottas from the Piazza d’Armi temple “show cognizance of Greek armor and military equipment.” This temple can be compared to Rome’s Regia in its well-preserved third phase, which dates to roughly 570 BCE and was situated in the forum (Downey 1995, 1-2). Much like the temple at Veii, the Regia is difficult to reconstruct, but architectural materials recovered by Brown (1935) allow for some insight into the building’s construction and decoration. The building reconstructs as three rooms - two rectangular and one trapezoidal - located along the western side of a large trapezoidal courtyard, though the exact dimensions cannot be known as the building was renovated several times (Brown 1935, 67-68). There is a hearth in the southernmost of the three rooms and it is known that the small middle room, which had four doors, was used as a vestibule to allow access to a shrine to Mars, the god of war. This shrine contained the shields (ancilia) and the spear of Mars, which generals rattled before setting off to war (Forsythe 2006, 88). Processional friezes from the building depict felines with birds and Minotaurs (Figs. 9c, 10); as noted above, similarities with revetments from the Piazza d’Armi temple from Veii suggest that they may have been created by similar workshops.

The style and decoration of the Regia probably are akin to elite Roman houses of the period; this is supported by the presence of a hearth, which was an important feature in early Latin religious practices and home life (Cornell 1995, kindle 5806). This focus on home life and the religious practices associated with it do not appear strongly at Veii, where the Archaic temple was more influenced by Greek styles, as suggested by the decoration and nearby cistern and grove. The subtle architectural differences between these two structures seem to stem primarily
from the degree of Greek and Villanovan influence on decoration. Perhaps more importantly, these buildings, which were constructed during the reign of Rome’s second Etruscan king Servius Tullius, may represent an ornamentation style that was both carried forward in time, from Villanovan to the Archaic, and carried across cultures from Greek to Etruscan and Roman in the early 6th century. Rome-Vei-Velletri roof decorations provide evidence for the advancement of Roman influence on artistic styles and depiction types during the late 6th century, and specifically during the reign of the last Etruscan king, Tarquinius Superbus (534-510 BCE), albeit through an indirect means. Through commission, Rome exerted authority over the production, and potentially the distribution, of decoration that covered temples at Rome and Veii, its close neighbor in the Tiber Valley. The idea that the commission was by a central organization further suggests centralized, and perhaps planned, development of Rome’s own artistic style through assimilation. Clearly, this style incorporated Etruscan as well as Greek elements from Veii, but did not directly copy these elements, especially the Greek styles, which tended to avoid decorative terracotta tiles. Further, this assimilation occurred a century before Veii was taken by the Romans. The question becomes whether the incorporated Veii elements remain part of the Roman artistic style into the Republic and when, or if, a uniquely Roman style appears in Veii decorative motifs. In other words, can a direct influence of Roman artistic style on Veii be identified in addition to a shared style; an indirect, economic influence through commission; and possible ‘return’ of shared decorative elements from Rome to Veii?

Winter et al. (2009) analyzed core samples from clay beds in Rome and surrounding sites, including Veii and Velletri (Fig. 1), to determine if types and decorations indicated shared technology and approaches (Winter et al. 2009, 7). The analyses revealed three main clay fabrics: A, B, and C. Fabric A, from the Velabrum clay beds in Rome, was used from the second
half of the 7th century BCE through 430 BCE for undecorated tiles and primarily on domestic structures. Fabric B, possibly a mixture of clays from beds north and south of Rome, was used for decorated roofs of civic and public buildings in Rome from 590-580 and 540/530-450 BCE and, in different mixtures, for decorated roofs in Veii, Velletri and elsewhere after 580 BCE. The authors conclude that Fabric B represented a technological advance over Fabric A in that its inclusions and calcareous fine clay allowed for more complex decoration and detail (Winter et al. 2009, 19-22). A formula for the mixture may have first been used at Rome around 590-580 BCE, along with techniques for moulded architectural terracottas. Appearance of Fabric B with different inclusions on roofs at Veii in 580 BCE suggests the workshop may have moved from Rome to Veii in that year; it subsequently might have moved back in 530 BCE, when Fabric B tiles again appear in Rome; between these times, the only decorative tile from this period is of Fabric C, which likely was imported. Similarities in the morphology of a revetment plaque of Fabric type B1, dated to around 580 BCE and recovered from Veii, with 590 BCE plaques from Rome suggest that techniques for production traveled along with the formula for mixing clays. Despite this technological sharing, figures depicted on the Veii plaque are unique to Veii, indicating the injection of local themes into the work (Winter et al. 2009, 20). Later plaques, representing processions of felines, are remarkably similar to those produced earlier at Rome however, suggesting that decorative strategies were integrated quickly (Fig. 9 c,d, 10) (Winter et al. 2009, 20). Overall, workshops at Rome and Veii appear to have actively shared ideas, technologies, and moulds (Winter et al. 2009, 21). Roofs of the Veii-Velletri-Rome style, made from the same moulds, were produced in both cities, with Veii roofs made locally and those at Velletri and Caprifico made by the workshop at Rome. Thus, technology and styles that began at Rome quickly were spread to nearby settlements. This point is important for understanding
Romanization and will be returned to in the section below on semiotics of terracotta. In addition, Rome appears to have become dominant in production of these terracotta materials after 520 BCE, as Fabric B tiles are mostly limited to Rome between 520 and 100 BCE.

Veii was taken by Rome in 396 BCE. The archaeological evidence suggests that following its conquest and redistribution of its territory to Roman citizens, life did not return to Veii until sometime between the second half and end of the 4th century (di Giuseppe 2012, 359). There is no evidence, however, that the city was destroyed; rather, existing, Archaic structures were leveled in order to build structures of the Republican period (references in Cascino et al. 2012, 356). A Roman municipium grew in the central area of the plateau in the Augustan period (di Giuseppe 2012, 360). Cult sites and artisan workshops continued to be situated along roads, near town gates, and on the highest points, often overlying Etruscan cult sites, but these now had a Roman identity, which possibly was associated with healing (di Giuseppe 2012, 360, 365).

Ward-Perkins (1961) sites the Republican forum at the junction of the two main roads that cross Veii (Fig. 11, 12). As discussed above, this area was occupied by block-built houses with one or more rooms in the 6th century BCE (Cascino et al. 2012, 351). Di Guiseppe (2012, 359-366) reviewed archaeological evidence from Veii in the Republican period, and noted that Romans transformed the area. One of two concentrations of pottery fragments from the earliest Roman phase was situated on either side of the crossing point of the roads. Approaching the forum area, terracotta votives representing male and female heads were found (2-E499, 3-E538, 4-E540, 5-E539; Fig. 13), along with wasters and spacers indicative of production for a healing cult. Other finds along the road include a male head [Fig. 13, 1-E934] and a likely fragment of a panneggio (drapery) of a statue [Fig. 13, 17-E935]. Other remains from the period indicate the Romans continued use of Etruscan cult areas and kept Etruscan religious traditions alive, including the
view of gates as points where purification rituals took place. For example, an inscription on a small jug of levigated (purified clay) pottery documents that a 5th century Etruscan cult outside of the Formello Gate was transformed into the Roman Ceres. On the hill of Communita, excavations by Lanciani in 1889 revealed a large Etruscan platform and, downhill, 2000 votives datable to no earlier than the 3rd century BCE, which suggest the building preserved a cult function until the end of the 3rd century.

Veii provides an example of how Romans changed a conquered city. In their classic way, Romans installed a system that promoted Rome but did not violate existing religious and political functions. The maintenance of the cult spaces and functions at Veii is strong evidence for this. However, it cannot be ignored that Rome heavily transformed the space. Leveling Archaic structures, repositioning political life to a more central area, and most importantly, development of “Roman identity” in votives and statuary (di Giuseppe 2012, 360) all provide evidence for this transformation. It is perhaps reasonable to conclude that, in the case of Veii, early Romanization was accomplished by reorganization of the location of political life rather than on the political system itself; this is demonstrated by the transformation of a forum area with continuation of Etruscan religious traditions. The development of a forum entrance and space decorated with figural votive objects and buildings, and redirection of public interest towards the forum represents a basic change in the daily life of the people of Veii towards interests more akin to Roman public interests. Such redirection to align with Rome’s interests could have allowed Rome to maintain control over their newly acquired area without violating the religious rites of the people. Perhaps then at Veii, Rome began experimenting with the development of systems of control that would evolve into more direct methods during later periods of the Republic and, of course, the Empire.
Gabii – The third of Rome’s closest neighbors considered here, Gabii is roughly 18 km east of Rome (Fig. 3); it sits on a narrow ledge between two ancient volcanic crater lakes: Lacus Gabina, later known as Lago di Castiglione, and Pantano Borghese. Gabii appears to have emerged a wave of urbanization that led to the development or enhancement of many sites in the area, including Rome. The first evidence for Gabii appears around 900 BCE; nucleation and centralization are thought to have been complete by about 800 BCE (Becker et al. 2009, 630; Kay 2013, 286). Early Gabii likely was similar to concurrent Rome, though it seems to have urbanized faster; evidence for this comes mostly from antiquarian sources which characterize Gabii as the “locus of culture par excellence” (Becker et al. 2009, 630). Indeed, it is at Gabii that Romulus and Remus were thought to have been educated in writing and weaponry (Kay 2013, 286). Archaeological work at Gabii (Fig. 14) has revealed a locally-produced bowl made in the style of a Greek dinos (mixing bowl), datable to the late 7th century and with a Latin inscription (Becker et al. 2009, 630). This vessel is evidence of an early Greek influence, which likely was a source for early and quick advancements at Gabii. According to Livy, Sextus Tarquinius, son of the third Etruscan king of Rome Targuinius Superbus, betrayed Gabii and captured the city for his father at the end of the 6th century (Becker et al. 2009, 630). This led to the foedus Gabinum (Gabii treaty), which reflects the relatively equal status of both settlements and influence of each upon the other. The Romans’ use of augury was definitely influenced by practices at Gabii, both through the mythic figure of Romulus, and through political action like the foedus Gabinum, which may have led to special augury status being conferred upon the Ager Gabinum (Becker et al. 2009, 631). The importance of Gabii began to diminish in the wake of the blooming urbanization and expansion of Rome. During the 4th century, Gabii began to fall under Roman influence, which started a slow decline of the city. Gabii was an ally of Rome against Praeneste.
in 382 BCE, but was ransacked by Hannibal in 211 BCE (Becker et al. 2009, 632; Kay 2013, 286).

Original exploration of Gabii, conducted by Gavin Hamilton in the 1790’s, revealed what likely was an Imperial forum (Becker et al. 2009, 633; Mogetta and Becker 2014, 186). Surveys in the 1970’s identified a large urban center that was heavily populated during the Archaic and into the Middle Republican period (Becker et al, 633). Since 2007, the Gabii Project has been investigating a sizable area of the site (Fig. 14). Conducted as part of their survey, magnetometry revealed evidence of town planning, in the form of a main urban road and associated perpendicular roads that create an urban grid dating to as early as the 8th century (Becker et al 2009, 636; Mogetta 2014, 149). The main road follows the contour of the volcanic crater, while the perpendicular roads along the crater slope delimit elongated city blocks that face the main road on their short side (Mogetta 2014, 149; Mogetta and Becker 2014, 118). This grid layout suggests town planning at Gabii occurred even earlier than that at Veii.

Excavation at Gabii has revealed an elite complex from the Archaic period (Mogetta and Becker 2014, 177). This complex, which dates to the 6th century BCE, comprises two rooms of tufa blocks: Room 1, which measures 5x6 m; and Room 2, which measures 6x8 m, has a circular pit interpreted as a fireplace, and reconstructed north and west walls (Mogetta and Becker 2014, 177). These rooms indicate wealth and regularized architecture at Gabii from at least the 6th century. Further, construction fill indicates the presence of underlying structures that date to the late 7th or early 6th century (Mogetta and Becker 2014, 176). At the end of the 6th century this area of Gabii was abandoned and reorganized as a burial area, likely under the direction of a central authority (Mogetta and Becker 2014, 178). Gabii in general was reorganized in the 5th century: a new land division utilized a recurring module to define city blocks (Mogetta and
Becker 2014, 178). In addition, roads were cut into the bedrock to decrease the slope. As they became rutted over the next two or more centuries, the road surfaces were raised with layers of packed gravel and clay (Mogetta and Becker 2014, 179). In other words, a centralized authority and organized development structure emerged at Gabii during the late 6th to 5th centuries. This parallels developments in Rome, which saw new urban transformation in the 6th century (Cifani 2014, 18-21), and was transforming into the Republic and expanding its regional influence during the 5th century.

Two sanctuaries have been investigated at Gabii. One of these, attributed to Juno Gabina, dates to around 150 BCE, which is later than the time period considered in this paper. The second, known as the Santuario Orientale (Fig. 15), dates originally to the 7th century BCE (Becker et al. 2009, 633). Although outside the city walls and thus not part of the urban center, this sanctuary can be examined in terms of its similarities and differences to early cult practices at Veii. The temple was along the road leading toward the Tibur River and was associated with a mineral spring (Gabrielli 2003, 251). It was a rectangular building made of stone and wood, and was roughly 12 x 8 m, though the exact size is unclear (Fig. 15). Inside the temple, votive remains have been recovered from a small shelf. The spring associated with the building sat beyond a small boundary wall to the west. This feature is similar to the spring and cistern associated with the small Archaic temple on the Piazza d’Armi at Veii, and suggests the Santuario Orientale was associated with health-giving waters. Interestingly though, materials recovered from the temple, votives in the shape of sitting couples or babies, suggest that the temple may have been associated with childbearing and motherhood (Gabrielli 2003, 251). Whichever explanation is correct, early cult action at Gabii, like that at Veii, appears to have revolved around peaceful pursuits and the votives recovered may have served as stand-ins for the
people who left them in hopes of healing or good luck. One difference between the two sites is the absence of terracotta tiles at Gabii. Decorative tiles certainly were being used on public buildings in the region (Winter 2009); their absence at the Santuario Orientale could reflect a difference in preferences, the building’s location outside the city walls, or lesser emphasis on temples and sanctuaries at Gabii.

In 2009, the Gabii team uncovered two Archaic period graves within excavated area of the urban center (Fig. 14, see numbers 1, 2). The two fossa (trench) tombs, designated Tomb 10 (late 8th – early 7th century) and Tomb 11 (mid-7th – early 6th century), were located in an area of the city that magnetometry revealed would be densely populated by at least the 6th century BCE (Becker and Nowlin 2011, 28, 31). Tomb 10 is oriented north-to-south, was cut into the tuff bedrock, and measures approximately 1.05 meters long by 0.26 meters deep with sharply angled sides and an accompanying grave assemblage (Becker and Nowlin 2011, 31). The skeletal remains within the grave indicate it belonged to a child, roughly 1.5 to 2 years of age. The plentiful grave goods included ten high-end impasto vessels and eight pieces of bronze jewelry; the vessels were near the feet and the jewelry were associated with the upper body (Becker and Nowlin 2011, 31; Mogetta and Becker 2014, 176). All the ceramic vessels had burnished surfaces with the exception of a skyphos (two-handled, deep-bowled drinking vessel) with painted geometric designs (Becker and Nowlin 2011, 31). Tomb 11, which included a rock cut loculus along the eastern side of the tomb, measured 1.05 meters long by 0.25 meters deep (Becker and Nowlin 2011, 31). Although damaged, probably by an animal, the mostly intact grave assemblage consisted of seven ceramic vessels and a bead; these were placed around the deceased or in the loculus. In addition to two impasto vessels similar to those at Tomb 10, two
Etrusco-Corinthian vessels were present (Becker and Nowlin 2011, 32; Mogetta and Becker 2014, 176).

Child burials such as those at Gabii have been found at Rome and across Latium. At Rome, both Boni and Gjerstad investigated burials in the Roman Forum, particularly in the area that has come to be known as the *sepulcretum* (Gjerstad 1956; Holloway 1996, kindle 865). This area contained both *pozzo* (pit) graves of cremation remains and *fossa* inhumations (Holloway 1996, kindle 898). As pit graves were a tradition of Proto-Villanovan societies, it is thought they were older than the *fossa* graves (Holloway 1994, kindle location 915); however, all the tombs antedated the filling of the Forum in the mid-7th century, and thus are later than at least tomb 10 at Gabii. Nevertheless, comparing the child burials may reveal the extent to which Roman burial practices of the time were influenced by, or differed from, neighboring Gabii. As described by Gjerstad (1956, 117-119) tomb D is a rectangular *fossa*, 1.22-1.25 m long by 0.7-0.75 m wide by 1.45 m deep. This burial contained a coffin made from a hollowed oak trunk, but no bones were present and the corpse of a small child was represented only by five *fibulae*. Pottery in the tomb included a *skyphos*, two jars, and an *amphora*. The grave also had grains of wheat. Tomb G also had a hollowed-out oak trunk coffin, which contained small child. Pottery included two jars, two bowls, three cups, and an *amphora* which appears to be an imported mid-7th century Proto-Corinthian vessel (Holloway 1996, kindle 914). Food included emmer wheat, horsebeans, barley, and spelt. These tombs show clear differences in burial practices between Rome and Gabii. Beyond the use of wood coffins, Romans included food, which, along with hut urns used in cremation burials, represents their emphasis on the home. Including a house symbolizes the comforts of home for the dead, and the gift of food provides sustenance. In general, then, burial practices, and perhaps religious practices more widely, appear more culture-specific than
architecture or city plans among the cities discussed thus far. That is, Rome does not appear to have adopted the burial practices of Gabii.

Following the *foedus Gabinum* at the end of the 6th century, Gabii reorganized during the 5th century (Mogetta and Becker 2014, 178-181). Some areas of the settlement were reorganized from habitation to burial sites and there was a contraction of the spread of pottery fragments that may correlate with a shift towards a more concentrated population within the urban center. This could indicate an increased need for security, shrinking population, or greater importance of the urban center and perhaps increased urban life. The city, however, grew consistently less important during the Republican period as Rome gained more influence (Becker et al. 2009, 632; Kay 2013, 286). Later, during the Imperial period, Gabii would benefit from Hadrian’s investment in local Latin towns, but for the most part, Gabii’s loss of prominence was permanent until after the fall of the Roman Empire in the west. Gabii thus represents an example of a site that has strong Greek influences in terms of its material remains, but its construction is largely in keeping with early Latin and Villanovan styles. Roman presence at Gabii appears largely absent, at least from the material recovered so far, but evidence for Gabii’s influence on Rome is evident in its reputation as a cultural center and the *foedus Gabinum*. Although it is likely that Rome had strong impacts on construction and material remains at Gabii during the Republican period, the evidence simply has not been recovered yet and discussion of early ‘Romanization’ must await further archaeological work at the site.

*Rome’s Interactions with its Nearest Neighbors* - Crustumerium, Veii, and Gabii all lay within 20 kilometers of Rome and, as calculated by Fulminante, parts of Crustumerium were in the hinterland of Rome by the 7th century (Fulminante 2014, kindle 5484). Collectively, these
three nearest neighbors suggest Romanization, or at least conquest, spread outward from Rome and, in keeping with the pattern noted by Fulminante, spread first to the sites on fertile soil. Both Crustumerium and Veii lay above rich, river valley soils, which would have increased their value to Rome as farmland. There is, however, little evidence of direct, all-encompassing Roman cultural transformation before conquest; rather, these settlements arose before Rome and developed before or alongside it. Veii was a hub of culture and commerce from the end of 10th century on. It is often characterized as Rome’s greatest rival; indeed, historians record sporadic wars between the two cities beginning in the time of Romulus (Cornell 1995, kindle 1562). By the first half of the 7th century Veii had an urban area with rectangular buildings with tufa block foundations, and there was a regular grid layout in one part of the area (Piazza d’Armi) by the second half of that century. Crustumerium was founded about a century before Rome, in 850 BCE; however, major urbanization began concurrently with Rome or somewhat later in the 7th century, as evinced by ceramics and bronze metal works, defensive structure of locally-quarried tufa blocks, and terracotta evidence of a unique, roofed, decorated building. Gabii emerged about the same time as Crustumerium, in 900 BCE, but was nucleated early, by about 800 BCE, and there is evidence of an urban grid that possibly dates back to the 8th century. Gabii had a heavily populated urban center through the Archaic and was a cultural center through the end of the 6th century. These nearest neighbors developed along with Rome, each along its own pathway.

Rome’s closest neighbors, however, did not develop in isolation. There is evidence of regional trends, cultural blending, and small changes that presage Rome’s growing influence. Tombs from the 7th century indicate burial practices at Crustumerium were similar to those at Rome in the use of coffins, but grave goods, especially white-on-red pottery reflective of earlier
styles of Sabina Tiberina, suggest local production that borrowed from neighbor styles and was not heavily influenced by Rome. As at other sites in Etruria and Latium, 6th century tombs at Crustumerium are impoverished, suggesting there, as elsewhere in the region, resources were diverted to community projects and monumental building. Veii also saw a decrease in elaborate tomb architecture and luxuriant grave goods in the 6th century. This was accompanied by adoption of a regular urban plan, with gridded streets and public buildings constructed of stone throughout the settlement area. As discussed more fully below (see Semiotics section), similarities in terracotta roof decoration between 6th century temples at Veii and Rome, including the third Regia in the Roman Forum, have been attributed to production in an Etruscan workshop on commission to Rome and may represent an ornamentation style that was both carried forward in time from the Villanovan to the Archaic and carried across cultures from Greek to Etruscan and Roman. Although this journey indicates influence of Greek and Etruscan architectural decoration styles on Rome, rather than vice-versa, Rome had an indirect economic, and perhaps stylistic, influence through commission, technology (clay fabric), and shared production, on a style that ultimately came to be associated with Rome. Other evidence for shared culture between Veii and Rome comes from Veii’s return to cremation burials in the early 6th century, as this trend is also seen in Rome. Recent archaeological work at Gabii also indicates shared styles and cultural blending, in the form of an exurban 7th century sanctuary that is similar to an Archaic sanctuary at Veii and possibly was associated with health or child-bearing. Collectively, the archaeological remains indicate mixing of styles among these neighbors as they developed concurrently with Rome.

All three settlements considered here eventually came under Rome’s influence, but the timing and process of Romanization differed among them. According to historical sources,
Crustumerium began hostilities with Rome following abduction of the Sabine women and was captured by Rome ca. 500 BCE; an increasing lack of archaeological remains at the beginning of the 5th century supports depopulation of the city. Livy reports that many of the Crustumini migrated to Rome (Livy 1.9-11, 2.19; tr: Spillan 1871), but there is no direct verifying evidence. There is, however, evidence of Crustumerium’s ties to the Sabines, who were among the first people of Rome. Romanization of Crustumerium, then, might be said to have been accomplished through conquest and absorption. Although the city was abandoned in this process, Crustumerium’s culture, especially its Sabine heritage, which had been part of Rome from the beginning, was not lost; rather, it became an integral part of Roman identity. Veii was conquered by Rome during the early Republic in 396 BCE. After its conquest, Veii’s territory was redistributed to Roman citizens and much like Crustumerium, it disappeared. Life began to return to Veii, however, toward the end of the 4th century and an Augustan era Roman municipium grew in the central part of the site; Archaic structures were leveled to build Republican structures and Etruscan cult sites were transformed to a Roman identity, usually associated with healing. Like Crustumerium, then, Veii was Romanized through conquest, but this occurred more than a century later and was followed by rebuilding with a Roman plan that preserved Etruscan cult traditions. Gabii was captured by guile for Rome at the end of the 6th century. During the 5th century the city reorganized, with new roads and city blocks. However, as Rome expanded during the century, Gabii diminished; a decreased spread of pottery fragments suggests a more concentrated population within the urban center. The city grew consistently less important during the Republican period, and was sacked by Hannibal in 211 BCE. Unfortunately, archaeological work began only recently at Gabii, and a full understanding of the city and the process of Romanization is not yet possible. Based on the evidence to date, Gabii is
an example of Romanization through slow attrition, with eventual loss of the city to Hannibal.

Overall, through the 5th and early 4th centuries Rome expanded to engulf her nearest neighbors; their cultures were absorbed or changed, to a greater or lesser degree, into Roman.

Rome’s Farther Neighbors

_Praeneste_ – The nearest of Rome’s father neighbors considered here, Praeneste was located within Latium on the site of modern Palestrina, just ESE of Veii and 36 km SE of Rome (Fig. 3). It was in a naturally defensible spot in the Sabine Hills on the slope of Monte Ginestro in the Apennine mountains near the entrance to the Hernican valley (Magoffin 1908, 5-6; Bradshaw 1920, 235). Praeneste was at a commanding point for travel north up the valley of Liris or south to the Algidus pass, to use ancient geographical orientation (Magoffin 1908, 5-6; Bradshaw 1920, 236). It is likely that the first occupation of the site was on the later acropolis, although this is speculative (Magoffin 1908, 18; Bradshaw 1920, 235). A large fortification wall around the lower slope of the mountain, probably constructed in the 4th century BCE, connected up to the acropolis, which suggests that it was a prominent area (Magoffin 1908, 19; Paggi 2005, 23). Like Falerii Veteres (discussed below), Praeneste was a prominent sanctuary site. The sanctuary and oracle of Fortuna Primigenia or ‘first born’ was here and likely was active as early as the 7th century BCE (Bradshaw 1920, 237; Paggi 2005, 20). The oracle prophesized through ‘lots,’ or strips of oak wood with letters inscribed upon them; these were drawn at random by young boy from a box made of olive wood (Bradshaw 1920, 237; Brendel 1960, 45-46). The oracle was so regarded that a Roman Consul wished to consult it during the First Punic War in the mid-3rd century BCE (Bradshaw 1920, 237). Praeneste was a member of the Latin League until 499 BCE, when it left the League and signed a treaty with Rome (Magoffin 1908, 59-60).
Early evidence for elite life in Praeneste comes from the famous Barbarini tomb, so named because it was found on the property of the Barbarini princes, and the contemporary Bernardini tomb (Hopkins 1960, 369; Paggi, 2005, 4). Materials from the 7th century, including terracotta wares, a silver and gilded bowl with serpent heads, a cauldron with griffons attached, and even an ivory hand, show that the elite were wealthy enough to import gold, silver, ivory, and bronze from within Italy and overseas, including Egypt, Cyprus, and Phoenicia (Hopkins 1960, 369; Hill 1977, 1; Paggi 2005, 24). Further, much like other peoples throughout Latium, the Praeneste elite displayed their status through grave goods (Hill 1977, 1). By the 5th century, local workshops were producing decorated mirrors and toilet boxes made of wood and bronze, which would develop into engraved, cylindrical bronze containers known as cistas (Hill 1977, Paggi 2005, 1). By the 4th century BCE the remains of these are plentiful and accompanied by a die-off of imported goods, which suggests a transition to local production (Paggi 2005, 25). Although this transition might have occurred by necessity, due to expense or access to imports, a more persuasive reason might be a preference for local goods because of style or affordability. Locally produced goods can be, and indeed were, injected with local themes and myths (Paggi 2005), and generally were easier to acquire. Whatever the reason, at this time in Praeneste there is a break with the former tradition of burying the dead with impressive imported goods; burials began using ‘Orientalized’ locally-produced goods.

In 499 BCE, Praeneste left the Latin league and became allied with Rome (Bradshaw 1920, 236). This alliance, however, did not prevent Praeneste from opposing Rome’s rise to power and siding against Rome in the Latin War of 340-338 BCE (Bradshaw 1920, 236). Praeneste lost half of its territory for its dissension, but was not directly absorbed into Rome and remained an allied territory that would continue to distinguish itself for Rome throughout the
period covered by this paper. As discussed above, Praeneste was a strong city with abundant locally-produced goods in the 4th century. Yet, perhaps due to its friendship with Rome, or in preparation for its dissension during the Latin War, Praeneste fortified its defenses by building walls (Paggi 2005, 23). Magoffin (1908) describes the walls of Praeneste. They were quite long, roughly 4.8 km, and constructed of locally-sourced polygonal blocks of limestone. They were built in differing styles and with varying degrees of precision, suggesting either they were not built by a single team of builders or were built at different times. Regardless, the walls certainly added to the already naturally fortified city.

Rome’s early influence at Praeneste, if any, is not well understood due to the relative scarcity of remains between the 7th and 4th centuries and a tendency of early research to focus on the 2nd century sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia. However, Maddalena Paggi’s dissertation, *Four Praenestine Cistas and the Society and Workshops of Praeneste*, demonstrated how Etruscan and Greek themes were modified by local traditions, and thus provides insight into how Roman themes might have been received at Praeneste (Paggi 2005). Paggi focused on four *cistas* which she argues were produced in the same workshop and were “among the most representative of Hellenized taste” (Paggi 2005, 2). She found that Greek myths were represented differently at Praeneste, such as by different central figures, and that unconnected myths often were mashed together to produce a scene not found in Greece (Paggi 2005, 65-66). This is illustrated by remains that show two myths: the battle of the griffins and the “Arimasps” and the sacrifice of the Trojan prisoners. Several forms of the Trojan prisoner myth were demonstrated on *cistas* from Praeneste, and the griffins and Arimasps myth appeared on a bronze medallion and terracotta fragments (Paggi 2005, 65, 68). Many features of the Praeneste remains, including a bare-chested Arimasp, do not appear on the Greek mainland. Paggi suggests these differences
could be attributed to a different concept of the “Heroic,” which likely came from Etruscan art and represented a need of the elites of Praeneste to have a different concept of heroes against evil within their decoration (Paggi 2005, 72). The Trojan prisoner scene in particular was popular throughout Italy, and it is likely that an original few archetypes were spread by traders and travelers to many sites, where they differentiated over time. Distinct, empirical differences such as a bare-chested Arimasp provide a quantifiable shift at Praeneste, although similarities with Falerii Veteres suggest development at the regional level as well. Paggi concludes that elite style at Praeneste drew from Etruscan and Greek art, and that a former (misguided) “attempt to place the art of Praeneste within the Roman cultural sphere was caused by a desire to see Rome as a cultural center in this early period” (Paggi 2005, 118). Certainly, the location of Praeneste at a crossroads and the popularity of the Fortuna Primigenia oracle demonstrate the potential for widespread cultural exchange, while Praenestes’s wealth and switched allegiance suggest the city was pulling away from Rome in the 4th century BCE. However, by that time, Rome was beginning to subjugate many of her neighbors. Also, it should be noted that while viewing Rome as a cultural leader could be a flawed hypothesis, to disregard the political, and cultural, influence of Rome by the 4th century BCE seems equally untenable. Indeed, earlier, 6th century architectural friezes from Praeneste and Rome share a similar processional motif (Fig. 16).

_Falerii Veteres/Falerii Novi_ - Falerii Veteres was located roughly 50 km N of Rome in the Faliscan region at the site of modern Civita Castellana (Fig. 3). Although they were allied with the Etruscan league, Strabo (Geography, Book V, Chapter 1; Hamilton and Falconer 1903) asserted that the Falisci spoke their own language and were distinct from the Etruscans; this distinction is quite possible based upon inscriptions found at Faliscan sites, which have Latin
origin (Bakkum 2008; De Lucia Brolli and Tabolli 2013, 259). Falerii Veteres was first studied by Dennis in 1848, with later work by the South Etruria Survey (Frederiksen and Ward-Perkins 1957) and, most recently, the Roman Towns Project (Carlucci et al. 2007). The town is often cited as an example of unique pre-Roman urbanism; unlike more nucleated settlements, it sprawled over 13-15 ha of plateaus and ravines (Carlucci et al. 2007, 43; Opitz 2009). The dissected topography certainly influenced settlement patterns. The earliest remains come from the Vignale plateau (Fig. 17) and are datable to the end of the Bronze Age based upon ceramic evidence (Carlucci et al. 2007, 43). From the Iron Age through its destruction by Rome in 241 BCE, Falerii Veteres was a religious center, as evidenced by an Archaic sanctuary complex on the Vignale plateau ‘acropolis.’ Based on a dedication scratched on the foot of an Attic kylix, the sanctuary was attributed to Apollo by the 5th century BCE; two cisterns remain visible (Moretti et al. 1998, 63; Carlucci et al. 2007, 44). Other sanctuaries, including the Temple of Sassi Caduti and the Temple of Juno Curitis, lay in the valley floor along a path from Vignale down steep terraced slopes, through the valley, to the urban settlement on the site of modern Civita Castellana (Opitz 2009, 24). The road system also served to display the religious function of the site; whenever someone approached the Vignale plateau, their first images were of the sanctuary (Opitz 2009, 22).

Late 19th century excavation by R. Mengarelli and A. Pasqui of the two cisterns associated with the Vignale sanctuary complex yielded a number of terracottas (Fig. 18), which have been interpreted by Carlucci (Carlucci et al. 2007, 92-97). A group of these terracottas includes roof statues in the shape of a female and griffins, relief fragments of a winged horse and of Hercules and a centaur, and antefixes in the form of a silen and the head of a Maenad and Silenus (Fig. 18); this group appears to be locally-made and a later (5th century) modification of
The human and animal figures have parallels in Portonaccio at Veii (see also Veii section, above). Terracottas belonging to a partial restoration of the temple, including antefixes in the form of a Maenad and Silenus and a haloed female head, also derived from a later Veianian style used at Portonaccio. A third group, however, consisting only of moulds for antefixes representing Juno Sospita and a mask of Silenus, is related to a Roman style of the early 5th century. Surviving material from the early 4th century, including a bust of Juno, small head of Mercury with a rimmed cap, antefixes with Maenad and Silenus heads, and a group of horses and knights, indicate that a mature Faliscan school had developed and that the sanctuary likely was reorganized at this time.

Development of an identifiable Faliscan style can also be traced in pottery remains. Falerii Veteres became a regional political and economic center in the 6th and 5th century; an influx of high-quality red-figure and black-figure Attic pottery became the basis for local products (De Lucia Brolli and Tabolli 2013, 264). An increase in the number of chamber tombs and loculi for burials suggests a growing population during this time. At the beginning of the 4th century, following the increased growth and wealth of the city, large-scale restructuring led to reconstruction of the temples on the Vignale plateau and in the valley bottom and settlement area (Carlucci et al. 2007, 94; Obitz 2009, 24; De Lucia Brolli and Tabolli 2013, 265). The remains from these temples, which are in the Faliscan style, show Greek and Etruscan influences, and indicate these cults were active to the second century BCE (Carlucci et al. 2007, 94). For example, an Apollo from the Temple of Lo Scasato (Fig. 19), which dates approximately to the late 4th century BCE, reflect continuing local modification of earlier styles. The torso and head of the Apollo stand 56 cm, or approximately ¾ life size (Taylor and Bradshaw 1916, 7; Moretti et al. 1998, 55). The statue reveals “…both the influence of late classical Greek sculpture and the
eclecticism of local elaboration” (Moretti et al. 1998, 55). It shows influences of Greek sculptors Scopas, Praxiteles, and Lysippos, sculptor to Alexander the Great; and indeed, Apollo’s head and hair are similar to the style of the latter’s statues (Taylor and Bradshaw 1916, 8; Moretti et al. 1998, 55). The piece demonstrates how Falerii artisans continued to incorporate Greek themes while developing their own styles and incorporating local materials and techniques. However, there is no evidence of Roman influence at Falerii Veteres, beyond the terracottas discussed above, through the time of the city’s destruction in 241 BCE.

Zonaras, a 12th century CE historian, reported that Rome destroyed Falerii Veteres and resettled the survivors at a new site, Falerii Novi, in 241 BCE following a revolt (Zonaras, Epitome Historiarum 8:18, cited in Opitz 2009, 5). This relocation is supported archaeologically by new buildings associated with the *Via Amerina*, which is thought to have been constructed the same year (Keay et al. 2000, 2; McCall 2007, 3). The consequences of the relocation for Falerii Veteres are not completely understood; although activity declined on the site, the temples remained standing and the site was a cult center during the Roman period (McCall 2007, 179; Opitz 2009, 25). Although Falerii Novi was founded a half century later than the focal time of this paper, it is worth brief consideration here as it represents a nearly complete replacement of a neighbor town by the Romans and is often cited as an example of a Roman Republican settlement. Excavation has been limited at the site and modern work is focused on survey, including surface collection, geophysical, topographic survey, and Lidar survey, to elucidate the urban and extramural layout and landscape (Keay et al. 2000; McCall 2007; Opitz 2009; Hay et al. 2010). The town was situated on a slight east-west ridge, with the *Via Amerina* crossing north to south. Although historically described as less defensible than Falerii Veteres, walls around the urban area suggest a fortified city. Surveys have revealed gates, a forum, a bath complex, and
temples within the city. Similar to Roman colonies (e.g., Cosa), Falerii Novi was laid out in a grid of intersecting primary streets that passed through four primary gates and a network of less regular streets that led to secondary gates (McCall 2007, 38). The forum was centrally located and McCall (2007, 216) speculates that it would have had buildings and features needed for an administrative center, but there is no evidence for these as yet. Based on its layout, then, Falerii Novi was, indeed, a Roman town. However, it also had temples and retained ties with Faliscan cults. Opitz (2009, 16-17) describes remote Lidar (Light Detection and Ranging) evidence for a ritual processional route from Falerii Novi to temples at Falerii Veteres. This seeming incongruity between the account of total conquest, with a defeated city founded on a Roman plan, and continuation of local religious practices has been interpreted by McCall (2007, 215) as cooperation between Rome and local elites to establish a new administrative center with easy access to a road after a social uprising. Under this interpretation, Falerii Novi, provides an example of the diversity of how Romanization was achieved; political and administrative change, archaeologically manifest in the new town plan, was brought about through cooperation, while local religious traditions continued on.

Rome’s Interactions with its Farther Neighbors - There is little evidence of early (pre-Republican) Roman influence on the farther cities considered here; rather, each was a prospering settlement with local production that primarily reflected Etruscan and Greek styles through the late Republic. An abundance of gold, silver, ivory, and bronze items in 7th century tombs suggests the Praeneste elite imported a variety of luxury goods and displayed their status through grave goods. By the 4th century, local workshops were producing cistas, which showed heavy Greek and Etruscan influences. Falerii Veteres was a religious center from the Iron Age through
its destruction by Rome in 241 BCE. Fifth and 4th century remains from temples and graves show a wealthy city, with local production of pottery and terracotta in a recognizable Faliscan style that shows strong Etruscan and Greek influences, although one group of moulds for antefixes representing Juno Sospita and a mask of Silenus is related to a Roman style of the early 5th century. Rome, however, was certainly aware of these neighbors early on. Praeneste’s sanctuary and oracle of Fortuna Primigenia drew visitors from Rome and elsewhere beginning as early as the 7th century, and its location at a commanding point for travel north up the valley of Liris or south to the Algidus pass would have made Praeneste strategically attractive to the growing city. The sanctuaries at Falerii Veteres and its location along a trade route likely also made it a known and attractive site.

Although both these farther neighbors eventually came under Roman influence, their interactions with Rome differed. Praeneste formed an alliance with Rome at the beginning of the 5th century, but opposed Rome’s rise to power and sided against it in the Latin War of 340-338 BCE. Although Praeneste lost half of its territory for its disloyalty, it was not directly absorbed into Rome and remained an allied territory through the first century BCE when its people were offered Roman citizenship. History records that Falerii Veteres was destroyed by Rome and the layout of Flaerii Novi suggests it was a Roman town, but new evidence of a processional route from the new center to temples at Falerii Veteres has led to speculation that it was established through cooperation between Rome and local elites to establish a new administrative center with easy access to a road. Falerii Novi, then, possibly provides an example of Romanization through political and administrative change, but not the destruction of social identity, a strategy potentially similar to actions taken at Veii though more nuanced since it involved local cooperation. Taken together, and considering the new interpretation of events at Falerii, these
farther settlements outside Rome’s immediate influence are examples of later, Republic-era Romanization that possibly was accomplished through cooperative transformation or adoption of Roman identity. In this they resemble the nearer settlements examined here. Further, of all the settlements considered, only Falerii Novi and RepublicanVeii had a (Republican era) town-center or forum, and neither of these has been well-described or is in the time period considered here. The Roman colonies, which are discussed below, provide the most investigated evidence of Roman influence on fora.

The Roman Colonies

After the end of the Latin War and dissolution of the Latin League in 338 BCE, Rome offered citizenship to the inhabitants of cities involved in the revolt. Some of these cities became *civitas sine suffragio*, citizens without voting rights, while others went on to become self-governing *municipia*. These were the early Roman colonies. They supplied Rome with troops, helped ease the pressure of a growing population in Rome, defended Rome’s growing territory, and helped enhance and control trade (Sewell 2010, 10). Rome reorganized these sites, although they might appear to share few similarities at first glance as changes were overlaid onto existing, older styles that had developed from Greek, Etruscan, and other regional influences (Sewell 2010, 13). Sewell (2010) investigated Roman and foreign influences on development of colonies, particularly their fora. This paper focuses on five of the colonies considered by Sewell: Ostia, Fregellae, Alba Fucens, Paestum, and Cosa. Each of these sites was attractive to Rome for various reasons and were often established with specific goals. Fregellae, which was founded in 328 BCE, lay on a fertile plateau 100 km SE of Rome in a site that was close to the junction of the Liri and Sacco rivers and which controlled the Apennine river valleys to the east and the
Monti Lepini to the west; its founding in this site has been suggested to have been a cause of the Second Samnite War in 326 BCE (Crawford and Keppie 1984, 21). Cosa, founded 273 BCE, lay 137 km N of Rome, on the Tuscan coast in fertile land on the hill of Ansedonia; it had been the site of the Etruscan fort of Cusi, which was built to guard the coast (Cosa 1949, 146). Alba Fucens, founded 303 BCE, lay 105 km NE of Rome at the foot of Monte Velino; this site allowed the Roman armies to be a wedge between Samnium and Etruria to prevent their forming a coalition (de Visscher 1959, 123). Paestum, founded 273 BCE, lay around 300 km S of Rome in the fertile coastal plain of the Sele River; it was found on the site of an older coastal Greek colony, which later was occupied by Lucanians who likely did not reorganize the city (Curtii et al., 1996, 173, 183). Finally, Ostia, founded between 396 and 267 BCE as a military fortress known as the Castrum, lay 30 km SW of Rome on the Tyrrhenian Sea at the mouth of the Tiber; it was created for sea defense and access to coastal salt pans (Ostia Antica 2015, 2.2). Rome transformed these sites in individual or broad ways.

The Greeks were crucial to understanding how Roman colonies were shaped both before and by the Romans. By the 4th century BCE, Greek influences can be seen in street organization and town planning (see also Veii, Gabii), the positions of town centers, placement of gates, and the pattern of street widths (Sewell 2010, 47). However, as important as these styles are to understanding how Roman colonies sites came to be shaped, more important to this discussion are examples where Romans instituted their own traditions. For instance, like Archaic period Latin and Greek towns, Alba Fucens and Cosa lay on elevated sites, but instead of facing south like most Greek colonies, they were on the north side of hills (Sewell 2010, 57). In addition, their fora were placed at high points within the town, unlike the agoras of Greek hilltop sites, which typically were in low sites to aid with water supply (Sewell 2010, 57). Fregellae was built
on relatively level ground, but its forum was at a relatively high location on a ridge running through the town (Sewell 2010, 57). Architecturally, with the exception of the Comitium, very few Roman political buildings bear any resemblance to Greek political architecture; thus, the architecture in Roman town centers was quite different from that Greek town centers. In comparing the fora of four colonies to the Greek agora and Roman forum, Sewell noted that none of the 4th and 3rd century colonies had *stoa* (covered walkways), which dominated 4th century Greek agoras (Sewell 2010, 67). Archaeological work at four colonies (Fragellae, Cosa, Paestum, and Alba Fucens) has revealed that each had a circular, stepped Comitium, similar to Greek circular assembly areas dating back to the 7th century in Magna Graecia and Sicily and to the (possibly Greek-inspired) 3rd century Comitium in the Roman Forum (Sewell 2010 37-45). A rectangular Curia was attached to the Comitium at Fragellae (Sewell 2010, 41). Much like the Roman Forum, the fora of three of these four colonies had *tabernae* (Sewell 2010, 59). In addition, all four had at least two rows of stone-lined pits; such pits also are seen in the Roman Forum, but their function is not known (Sewell 2010, 69-71). Overall, the town centers of the Roman colonies appear to have been reorganized to adopt the layout and political functions of the Roman Forum, but they are not identical copies. Further, the architecture at all the sites is influenced by other cultures, especially Greek.

Of the five focal colonies considered here, Ostia is unique: it was created for sea defense and access to coastal salt pans; maintained over many years of use; and established relatively early, possibly around 350 BCE. It was situated on the Tyrrhenian Sea, about 200 m from the mouth of the Tiber and 30 km SW of Rome (Fig. 3). According to legend, Ancus Marcius, the fourth king of Rome (642-617 BCE), founded Ostia to replace Ficana, which had been conquered and destroyed, but no archaeological evidence predates the 4th century BCE (Ashby
1912, 153; Ostia Antica 2015, 2.1). The earliest settlement in the archaeological record, arguably constructed between 396 and 267 BCE, was a rectangular military fortress known as the Castrum (Ostia Antica 2015, 2.2). It was protected by a wall of large tufa blocks, some of which remained around the forum that was built later on the area (Ostia Antica 2015, 2.2). Like other Latin and Etruscan cities, Ostia was laid out in a grid pattern, with two main roads and four gates in roughly cardinal directions, although comparatively small streets suggest a small population or constraints of the coastal topography (Sewell 2010, 16; Ostia Antica 2015, 2.2). In the 2nd century BCE Ostia gradually changed from a fort into a sea-trade town, and by the early Imperial period it was a self-governing city. The original 4th century settlement was incorporated into the growing town’s forum, and Ostia continued to develop as a Roman city through the second half of the 2nd century AD.

In addition to town layout and forum architecture, individual choices, such as house design and location, may help define Romanization due to their importance to how Romans displayed status and connected themselves with the political sphere. Sewell argues that atrium style houses built at the colonies retained themes of earlier (Etruscan) versions, such as Archaic-style roofs, but also incorporated Roman adaptations of Greek *prostas* (vestibules) (Sewell 2010, 131). Roman variations of *prostas* can be found at Fregellae, Ostia, and Cosa (Sewell 2010, 133). With its flexibility to be both simple housing and a jumping-off point for more complex plans, the atrium style house within colonies can be seen as a means of social differentiation by elites; in fact, over time it became a standard for wealthy Italian elites (Sewell, 134). In addition, placement of the house, specifically proximity to the forum, could reflect social status. Forum construction at Fregellae, Paestum, Alba Fucens, and Cosa suggests that, as in the Roman Forum, some consideration was made for elite housing around the space, with the most important
plots nearest the forum (Sewell, 137-145). This arrangement was not a part of Greek settlements; although it might have been Etruscan, it is likely that the Romans either created or at least codified this design. Thus, ‘Romanization’ in the colonies incorporated status display. Further, as discussed below, Roman identity was expressed through citizenship, and the local elites who occupied atrium houses and gained citizenship reinforced the Roman presence in the colonies.

The colonies examined here clearly show ‘Romanization’ through changes in house design and arrangement, public architecture, and town layout, especially associated with the forum, that reflect Roman culture, social structure, and politics. In particular, by focusing housing, social standing, and business on the forum, the political center of the city, Rome transformed life in the colonies toward Roman concepts. By this point, the concept of what it was to be Roman was being defined, in part, by citizenship and its associated rights and responsibilities. By making the focus of towns the political sphere, and juxtaposing social status (through housing) and commerce (through tabernae), Rome conditioned the non-Roman inhabitants to think of citizenship as necessary to fully invest themselves into life at the site. In some ways, Rome created a system for expanding her control by injecting a population of Romans into distant sites. Even areas that were not integrated, or did not receive grants of rights, saw the effects of Rome’s growing strength through the colonies. Thus, whether founded through contract or conquest and for defense or trade, the colonies were instrumental in Romanizing Italy after the end of the Latin War.

The Material Semiotics of Early Romanization

Collectively, the evidence from the cities examined here indicates Romanization spread outward from Rome, perhaps first driven by the need to support a rapidly growing population
and later by targeting strategic trade or military locations. The process of Romanization, whether accomplished through conquest, cooperation, or attrition, brought changes ranging from gradual and small through rapid and total. At one end of the spectrum, Praeneste lost half its territory, but remained allied with Rome and its people eventually were offered Roman citizenship. At the other end of the spectrum, Falerii Novi and Roman colonies were established with a new Roman city plan. It is important to note, however, that Roman culture and institutions were not completely foreign to its neighbors; rather, Rome’s political, social, and cultural identity developed within a regional context, and was an amalgamation of the many cultures of its neighbors and rivals.

The following discussion draws on semiotics to examine the development of Roman culture and identity in the region as expressed in the architectural terracotta remains. As noted by Preucel (2006, kindle location 3291), semiotics allows archaeological interpretation of material culture to have a focus on *materiality*, or how people interacted with, and invested cultural meaning in, objects. In other words, materials made or influenced by Romans contain aspects of their culture, and semiotics can be used to interpret even small changes and track larger, inter-site dynamics and development of Roman identity. Coben (2006) demonstrated the usefulness of semiotics for interpreting material remains and identifying replicas of the Inka capital Cuzco and its culture across the Inka Empire. In the present study, the focus is on architectural terracotta, as it generally is available, documented, and studied, and can vary among sites even within a small area. Further, most of the works considered here date between the 6th and 4th centuries BCE, when settlements began to build monumental sanctuaries (see Veii discussion, above). Although decorations for these structures were informed by Greek models developed over the previous century, themes often were modified to reflect the building’s
purpose and local culture. For example, Apollo and Herakles are well represented in Italian architecture decoration, but in forms that incorporate local themes, either specific to individual sites or shared among sites within the region (e.g. Fig. 6). Another example, from Rome, is the ‘wounded warrior’ (Fig. 20); this work reflects Greek influence as well as Roman adaptations. The piece itself likely dates to no later than the late 6th century BCE although it sits on a base that is not the original and likely was added later (Van Buren 1914, 187). The chest plate is nearly identical to a 6th century Greek counterpart (Van Buren 1914, 187). The painted decoration covering the body, however, is more in keeping with early Roman styles; the use of red clay with a cream slip and red and black trimming is reminiscent of impasto works of the area. It is possible this piece was influenced by Greeks who had migrated to the area, but were constrained to materials which were readily available in the area. The work thus nicely represents the melting pot effect seen in decorative art from this period, as well as the potential for terracotta to reveal cultural influences. However, some caveats for the present analysis should be noted. Some of the terracotta remains analyzed here are whole, but others are fragments and only partially restored. Another pressing issue centers on documentation; the materials were recovered at various times, some as early as 1912. Further, this study relies on pictures, which can lack sufficient detail. Despite these caveats, several interpretable terracottas have been found.

To illustrate the use of semiotics in interpreting the terracotta remains, consider the clay mixture Fabric B, discussed above, which was used to create an improved and distinctive revetment style; it likely was developed at Rome and then was adopted, and adapted, elsewhere in the surrounding region. Fabric B is iconic of a particular local mixture of clay for creating decorative building tiles; it indexes both the original mixture and previous clays, such as Fabric
A, from which inspiration may have been drawn; and it symbolizes superior material for architectural terracotta of civic and public buildings. From these meanings we can build inferences about how different cultures interacted with Fabric B, such as its use in constructing other signs (e.g., revetment friezes). For instance, we might infer that Rome had a strong influence on the creation of the medium from which decorative terracotta was produced. Rome also controlled how Fabric B first was used to create architectural terracotta for decorated roofs. Evidence for this comes from moulds and motifs used in the early terracotta of decorated roofs, such as the procession of felines on revetment plaques from the Piazza d’Armi that are similar to, but later than, those on the third Regia (see discussion in the Veii section); they also are iconic of the type associated with Rome, although likely modified from earlier Greek and Etruscan themes.

Before continuing with these inferences, it is important to understand a few assumptions being made in this interpretation, as well as the connection between choice of clay material and Roman cultural expression, or identity, in the terracotta created from that clay. It is assumed that artisans would have been able to detect differences and choose more advanced options among clays and construction techniques, as competition through technical advancement was important to the workshops of the time. However, it seems a stretch to move from this assumption to recognizing the clay and created terracotta objects as distinctly Roman or as signifying emergence of Roman identity. Bauer (2008, 2013) utilized Piercean semiotic concepts of ‘interpretant’ and ‘habit,’ or repeated meaning conveyed by a sign, to examine the technology of pottery construction alongside stylistic choices and understand interactions among groups in the Bronze Age Black Sea (Bauer 2008, 89; 2013, 23-24). In this analysis, replication of signs within a dynamic trading community can mediate new social relations and the rise of new culture, or
‘Black Sea identity’ (Bauer 2008, 90; 2013, 19). Thus, trade takes on new meaning, acting as a way for separate cultures to influence one another in multiple ways, and creating a “community of those moving among the regions and groups,” sharing elements of their home on an individual level (Bauer 2008, 91). More specifically, Bauer identifies six types of pottery that share a similar clay structure and concludes that “similarities in the pottery assemblages appearing at this time reflect, on a literal level, a shared manufacturing tradition, and may signify…a shared community identity” (Bauer 2008, 99). Although Bauer’s conclusions do not reflect Rome during the period of the present study, a semiotic interpretation of exchange and technical advancements allows for a more dynamic understanding of how everyone, not just artisans and those commissioning the pieces, understood terracotta decorations. It suggests that some, if not all, people would have understood the specific elements that went into creating the decorations through interactions with individuals from where the techniques for creating the terracotta were first applied; these “intangible” aspects of trade are entailed when groups communicate with one another (Bauer 2008, 90). Further, as “technology is closely related to the social identities of communities, since it contains features identifiable with specific social groups” (Bauer 2008, 92), it does not seem inconceivable for locations to have been openly, and actively, proud of their advancements and even to have displayed them for visitors to see and understand. This is itself, after all, an expression of identity and power.

Architectural friezes from roofs provide material for the present analysis of interactions among cultures during the 6th century in the region around Rome. As discussed in the Veii section above, distinctive Rome-Veii-Villetri and Rome-Caprifico styles of late 6th century revetment friezes have been found in at least 16 sites, and 10 locations within Rome itself (Lulof 2014, 114-119, 123; Winter 2009). Among the sites considered here, these friezes have been
found at Veii, Gabii, and, questionably, Crustumerium (Lulof 2014, 114). They depict a consistent motif of warriors in procession, armed horsemen, and racing chariots with female charioteers (Figs. 7, 8). Winter (2005, 247-249) identifies this decoration as part of a change in temple architecture inspired by the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus in Rome; that is, the individual friezes are *iconic signs* of a Rome-inspired *legisign*. The style of friezes from the small Archaic temple on the Piazza d’Armi at Veii also is shared with Rome. The reliefs depict a procession of felines (Fig. 9d) that is similar to the decorative system of the third-phase building on the site of the Regia in Rome (Fig. 9c), but is slightly later (Winter 2010, 48). Winter (2010, 48) notes that the style of this processional frieze also shows awareness of Greek military equipment and clothing. A different motif is seen in 6th century processional friezes from Praeneste and Rome (Fig. 16). The Praeneste frieze includes a helmeted man with a curled trumpet or staff, a chariot drawn by a pair of winged horses, a warrior with a crested helmet, a chariot drawn by horses without wings and driven by a man, and a dog (van Buren 1914, 66-69). The chariots, which have a low parapet and wheels with spokes, show Greek influence (van Buren 1914, 66). The frieze from Rome (Fig. 16, bottom) depicts a similar chariot driven by a pair of horses with curled wings. Such friezes also have been found at Velletri (van Buren 1914, 66-69), which is about 40 km from Rome. The elements are not identical among these friezes as they are among the Veii-Velletri-Rome revetments, suggesting they were produced by different workshops. Overall, the friezes indicate shared styles with local modifications; that is, as described by Coben (2006, kindle location 3408), they are *iconic signs*, or instantiations of more widespread *legisigns*, and their habitual interpretation within the trading community can reveal cultural influences in the region around early Rome.
From the collective frieze remains and clay analyses we might infer that workshops at Rome were actively distributing their ideas and wares to other cities beginning in the early 6th century. However, clay mixtures and frieze motifs created at other sites still retained much of their local identity, and we might also infer that neighboring settlements which came into early contact with Rome, such as Veii, Falerii Veteres, and Praeneste, do not display a complete remission of local themes post Roman interaction. In addition, the methods in which these themes were displayed, as pediment figures, acroteria, antefixes, and friezes of decorated buildings, are shared among sites and reflect Etruscan and Greek influences. They are iconic of the earlier styles and likely contain symbolic meaning in the form of reference to the lasting power and history of these peoples. This is not to say, though, that preferences for Roman motifs, and Roman regional influence, did not grow over the century. Decoration styles of the third Regia (ca. 570 BCE) are seen in a later frieze from Praeneste. As noted by Winter (2005, 247-249) creation of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus in Rome inspired a change in temple architecture at the end of the 6th century that may symbolize the increasing dominance of the area by Rome, although Lulof (2012, 123) proposes that the archaeological evidence is not sufficient to determine if Rome was the originator or dominant in the movement. It might be possible to conclude that architectural terracotta and temple decoration in the region surrounding Rome was transformed by the late 6th century from Etruscan and Greek styles to being symbolic of Roman decorative choices, but it seems a stretch to term this Romanization due to the interconnectedness of trade and intermixing of cultures in the region at the time.

Construction of more elaborately decorated monumental temples continued through the 5th and 4th centuries, and Rome’s growing influence in the region may be symbolized by architectural terracotta during the developing Republic, although Lulof (2014, 123) cautions that
similar styles could have arisen independently in multiple locations. Larger *acroteria*, revetment plaques with floral rather than figural decoration, and large *antefixes* that featured dancing satyrs and maenads as well as mythological figures were produced (Lulof 2012, 3; 2014, 123). Fifth century satyrs from Rome and Falerii Veteres (Fig. 21) are iconic of these. The wavy beard, moustache, curled hair, and diadem of ivy leaves of a late 6th century BCE Satyr *antefix* from the Esquiline Hill in Rome are quite detailed (Fig. 21A). This satyr was constructed from dull red clay, covered with a cream slip, and like the ‘Wounded Warrior’ discussed above, painted with white, red, and black. A later satyr from Rome, which possibly dates to the end of the 5th century BCE, also supports a wreath of ivy, and has an even more ornate beard and color scheme of red and brown (Fig. 21B). In keeping with the idea of local variation, a 5th century satyr from Falerii is similar to those from Rome in structure of the eyes, nose, mustache, and beard, but differs in having a wreath of six, five-petalled, rosettes and ears that wrap around the lowest rosette.

Female heads representing maenads from the 4th century also illustrate local adaptations (Fig. 22). Although pieces of the *antefixes* are missing and some details are hard to discern from photographs, heads from Rome (A), Veii (B), Praeneste (C), and Falerii (E) appear to have similar scalloped ‘bangs,’ hair with curved ends, and stylized ears with disc-earrings (hair and ears missing from the Rome piece). However, to the extent that it can be determined, the surrounding headdresses appear to differ among the pieces from Veii (A), Praeneste (D), and Falerii (E). Further, a second example from Falerii (F) has wavy hair pulled back under a veil and less prominent ears.

The patterns of local interpretations, and indeed the amount of terracotta from a site, can be analyzed in the context of interactions among the settlements over the 5th and 4th centuries. As discussed in the site comparisons section above, Crustumerium was captured by Rome ca.
500 BCE and a lack of archaeological remains, including terracotta, in the 5th century might be attributed to depopulation and loss of that culture. Terracottas from Falerii symbolize the continuation of Veii as a cultural rival to Rome, but also suggest spread of Roman identity. As interpreted by Carlucci et al. (2007, 92-97), terracotta from cisterns associated with the Vignale sanctuary complex at Falerii were made locally and a 5th century modification of styles from Veii. A Maenad and Silenus (Fig. 18) appear derived from a later style used at Portonaccio. However, like the satyrs discussed above, a group of moulds for antefixes representing Juno Sospita and a mask of Silenus from the Falerii cisterns reflect styles of 5th century Rome. By the 5th century, Praeneste was known for locally made bronze and wood cistas, which reflect Etruscan styles and locally interpretations of Greek themes. Despite its wealth and strong production, at the beginning of the century (499 BCE), Praeneste left the Latin League and became allied with Rome. This decision, however, may have been due less to the rise of Roman material culture than to its growing military and political power; by the beginning of the 4th century (396 BCE), Rome had captured Veii, and by the later part of that century had built Republican structures on the site. At the end of the 4th century, a change in temple decoration, with pedimental groups set against a closed background, appeared first at Rome (Lulof 2012, 3), and certainly symbolized the city’s growing power. Destruction of Etruscan cities and establishment of Roman colonies, including a production center for roofs at Cosa in 273 BCE, led to the spread of Etrusco-Italic type temples through northern and central Italy. These temples, with their decorative architectural terracotta, are clearly iconic of Roman types and symbolize Rome’s now dominance in the region, to the extent that Lulof (2012, 3) described them as “instruments of Roman propaganda.” From this we can conclude that Romanization was
symbolized in part by the spread of a type of temple and decorative terracotta, and was in full force in 3rd century Republican Rome.

**Conclusions – Early Romanization**

In a 1996 discussion of the state of archaeological and historical exploration of Rome, Curti et al. made a simple, yet meaningful, statement: “The challenge to the scholar working on [Roman Italy] is to take due account of the specific local situations within the area of study, while at the same time not losing sight of the broader historical frameworks into which the detailed analysis must be set” (Curti et al. 1996, 172). With this in mind, this paper has attempted to discuss concepts associated with Romanization in a location-specific, yet broadly interpreted manner. Although terming the early expansion of Rome “Romanization” as defined by traditional broad-scale approaches would certainly seem a stretch, one goal of this project was to determine if there are in fact clear examples of change associated with, and likely caused by, Rome at this period. Further, at what point do these trends indicate or become equivalent to “Romanization?” An approach that takes into account even minute changes, and can track these changes within a relatively short comparative window, can give the archaeologist hints to answer to these questions. Under a Piercian semiotic approach adapted for archaeology (e.g., Preucel and Bauer 2001) and used here, the degree of change does not hamper or limit interpretation and the required detail and information needed to track changes across time and space is equally unfettered. This is not to say, however, that this approach becomes a free-for-all of conflicting and corresponding data, as having limited data can even enhance interpretation by narrowing the scope of the information recovered so that it might be assimilated more easily into the larger narrative. In other words, a shift from discussing “Romanization” in terms of the broad picture of
cultural change that dominated scholarship for years to include a focus on local specifics as explored through a semiotic approach seems to simultaneously increase the number of examples of “Romanization” and help define the amount, or perhaps level, of effect.

In terms of specifics, this project can conclude that there is fairly strong evidence for an impact of Rome and its artisans on Latium and surrounding areas by the early 6th century in the form of modes of production, materials, and designs. Furthermore, it seems certain that, much like in Archaic Greece and later in Imperial Rome, some of this impact was linked directly to competition among cities via impressive, publicly located buildings, and equally impressive decorations for those buildings. At Rome as elsewhere, the buildings and decorations are associated with local myths, traditions, and cultural practices. Thus, it might be inferred that building designs and decorations were chosen specifically to represent these beliefs with the purpose of linking both the building to the space in which it was built and the builder or culture to the myth, gods, or traditions. In other words, building and their decorations were chosen to invest distinct elements of a site, the location, the people who resided there, and local traditions into a space through a physical, material manifestation of beliefs. It follows then, that variations in these representations are representative of both place and time, i.e., a location and period. From this we might conclude that Rome began to influence its neighbors via decorative advancements. Over time, surrounding cities developed styles similar to Rome’s, either through intentional or unintentional means, though there is evidence for intentional transmission in the form of shared moulds and clay mixtures. It is important to remember, however, that many decorative choices also were emulations or local adaptations of older Latin, Etruscan, and Greek styles, which created a melting-pot effect over the region. Therefore, while it can be claimed that Rome certainly influenced elements of decorative concepts through the period considered here
(290 BCE), initial impacts were small, such as on figural design or mould choice, and changes accumulated over time, although with some ‘spurts’ that represent the spread of advancements, in the case of moulds and clay mixtures, or political change in the region, such as the end of the Latin War, which initiated a wave of colonization.

Collectively, the site comparisons and terracotta evidence suggest that Rome’s influence in the region grew outward from the city, first to nearby sites that could help support a rapidly growing population and then to farther strategic trade or military locations, and from initial small changes that were incorporated into neighboring settlements to varying degrees, perhaps due to differing types and levels of contact with Rome. Although the evidence is open to a multitude of interpretations, this model supports the generally acknowledged tendency of the Romans, at least early on, to refrain from violating the cultural and religious traditions of their neighbors. For example, by creating a ‘desirable’ clay mixture and mould that included historical styles of the Etruscans and Greeks but was locally accessible, the Romans instituted a small, but important, change in decorative choices. Key elements of this decoration, including mixture recipes, moulds, and techniques, could be shared and exchanged among cities without heavy repercussions to the local artisans or requiring that a particular artisan be in control of construction. Furthermore, over time, the decoration style increasingly became imbedded and infused with traditional and local styles, such that the decorative style of public, urban buildings became a melting-pot of various cultural styles. This process, however, could be considered a form of “Romanization,” as competition among cities in technological and stylistic advances drove decorative spurts that appeared during this period in both Greece and Italy. Consequently, an effect that Rome initiated in the creation of public building decoration transformed an important element of public life into a more Roman concept of public life. Further, this small
initial change, although modified locally, snowballed over time, especially as Rome began to
gain territory through conquest and colonization, until decorated temples came to symbolize
Rome’s political as well as artistic dominance in the region.

As a final thought, it is important to remember that ‘Rome,’ as used here, is a theoretical
construct or abstraction of the artists, political figures, merchants, and builders who interacted to
create works, as well as the modern interpreters of the material remains of these works. As Curti
et al. (1996, 182) put it, “…one is not referring to actual cultural entities,” merely the modern
perception of the sum total of a very complex system. This project has hoped to connect specific
aspects of life at Rome, such as the creation and use of decorative terracotta, to that construct of
‘Rome’ and ‘Romanization,’ with the goal of making a piece of these constructs somewhat less
abstract. This is not to deny, however, that discussions of ‘Rome’ and ‘Romanization’ are also
necessary, both to ease discussion of these concepts and allow for broader interpretation. In this
regard, theoretical frameworks, such as the semiotic and multi-theoretical approaches used here,
which are grounded and derive meaning from the material remains, and rely upon an
interpretation of that meaning with active agency of the culture who created the works, help
avoid reducing discussion of more general constructs to abstractions. As Curti et al. (1996, 183)
put it, “In recent years some of the most suggestive discussions have taken place in relation to
the study of iconography: with regard to Archaic Italy, there have, for example, been some
excellent studies of Etruscan use and appropriation of myth, while emphasis on the making of
myth and the formation of ideology as an interactive process rather than as a one-sided product
of Archaic Greek ethnocentrism has potentially dramatic consequences for the way in which the
history of early Rome may be perceived.” Nearly twenty years later, discussion of
‘Romanization’ still needs to move towards this interactive process of meaning creation instead
of stagnating at the level of cultural interaction. Although this might require a change from the readiness to view Rome through the lens of the later Imperial state, it does not necessitate ending the discussion of Rome and its people through the early Republic. This paper suggests that by considering multiple lines of evidence and the spread of small changes, discussion of Rome can remain relevant without negating the importance of the cultural development of an important city at an early point in her history.
Table 1. List of settlements examined in this research, including their approximate distance and direction from Rome and dominant ethnic group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Distance from Rome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crustumerium</td>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td>15 km NNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veii</td>
<td>Etruscan</td>
<td>16 km NNW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabii</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>18 km E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praeneste</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>36 km ESE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falerii</td>
<td>Faliscan</td>
<td>50 km N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonies</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>varied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Map of Latium, showing cities of the Latin League and Rome’s neighboring peoples (by M. C. Ahenobarbus; http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Ligue-latine-carte.png).
Figure 2. Roman Forum after reclamation (from Hopkins 2014, Fig. 7, 43).
Figure 3. Location of Veii, Rome, and other main Etruscan, Faliscan, and Roman centers, as studied by the Tiber Valley Project (from Smith 2012, Fig. 1.1, 2).
Figure 4. Archaeological areas within Veii (from Witcher and Craven 2012, Fig. 2.1, 11).
Figure 5. “Apollo of Veii” acroterion from Portonaccio Temple, housed in Villa Giulia National Museum. Image from SCALA, Florence/ART RESOURCE, N.Y.
Figure 6. Hypothetical reconstruction of *acroteria* grouping from the Portonaccio temple at Veii. From left to right are Hermes, Herakles, Apollo, and Leto (from Winter 2005, Fig. 3, 248).
Fig. 1. Reconstruction of the Rome–Veii–Velletri roof and some of its elements (after Winter 2009, Roof 5-7, 321).

Figure 7. Reconstruction of the Rome-Vei-Velletri roof as illustrated by Winter (2009) (from Lulof 2014, Fig. 1, 115).
Figure 8. Reconstruction drawing of the roof of the Archaic temple, Piazza d’Armi, Veii (from Winter 2010, Fig. 1).
Figure 9. Reconstruction drawings of revetment plaques from Rome and Veii. A: Veii, Piazza d’Armi, 580 BCE; B: Veii, Piazza d’Armi, 580-575 BCE; C: Rome: Rome, 590-580 (Regia, Castor and Pollux); D: Veii: Piazza d’Armi, 580-575 BCE. (From Winter et al. 2009, Figs. 3, 5, 6, 7)
Figure 10. Reconstruction drawings of roof decoration of the third-phase Regia in Rome. A: central view (from Winter 2006, Fig. 2b). B: frieze with felines and minotaur (from Winter et al. 2009, Fig. 4).
Figure 11. The central settlement area of Roman Veii, from Ward-Perkins (1961, Fig. 18, 65), showing the Forum area at the junction of the major roads.
Figure 12. Map showing location of the Republican Forum at Veii (Bousquet et al. 2012, Fig. 5.99, 311).
Figure 13. Roman terracotta finds at Veii (from Bousquet et al. 2012, Fig. 5.98, 308)
Figure 14. Map of Gabii’s archaeological areas, showing 1) the Gabii Project excavation; 2) the Area Urbana; 3) the Forum area described by G. Hamilton; and 4) the Temple of Juno (from Mogetta and Becker 2014, Fig. 2, 173).
Figure 15. Santuario Orientale (from Mancini and Pilo 2007, Fig. 2, 88).
Figure 16. Sixth century BCE architectural terracotta friezes. Top: Praeneste (Image from SCALA, Florence/ART RESOURCE, N.Y.; see also van Buren 1921, Plate 31, Fig. 1); Bottom: Rome (“Covering slab with procession of carriages,” area of the Temple of Jupiter Capitoline, Musei Capitolini, inv. AntCom15800; see also van Buren 1821, Plate 31, Fig. 3).
Figure 14. The locations of necropolises and settlement areas at Falerii Veteres. (After Millett, 2007: fig. 2.)

Figure 17. Map of Falerii Veteres (from Opitz 2009, Fig. 14, 21).
Figure 18. Terracottas from the Sanctuary of Apollo at Vignale housed in the Villa Giulia Museum (from Moretti et al. 1998, 6-62). A-D date to the beginning of the 5th century BCE, E-F to the beginning of the 4th century BCE, and G to the first half of the 4th century BCE. A: acroterial female figure; B: griffin acroterion; C: antefix with dancing Maenad and Silen in the round; D: Silen-head antefix with crown of rosettes; E: head of small pedimental figure of Mercury with winged helmet; F: Silen-head antefix; G: head of veiled Maenad.
Figure 19. Statue of Apollo, central figure in a pedimental grouping, Temple at Lo Scasato, Falerii. Image from SCALA, Florence / ART RESOURCE, N.Y.
Figure 20. Remains of a ‘wounded warrior’ decorated torso. The torso is 37 cm tall, mounted on a base which is not the original pairing, and constructed of red clay with cream colored slip. The armor resembles that from 6th century BCE Greece; it is decorated with stars and has an ornate chest wound from which the piece draws its name (from van Buren 1914, Fig. 25, 186).
Figure 21. Satyr antefixes. A: Esquiline Hill, Rome, 6th century or beginning of 5th century BCE (van Buren 1914, plate 32, No. 2, 182); B: Via dei Serpenti, Rome, end of the 5th century BCE (van Buren 1914, plate 33, No. 1, 190); C: Falerii Veteres, 5th century (van Buren 1921, Plate 4, Fig. 1).
Figure 22. Maenad and female 4th century BCE antefixes (A-E from van Buren 1921). A: Rome (Plate 10, Fig. 2); B: Veii (Plate 12, Fig. 1); C: Praeneste (Plate 11, Fig. 2); D: Praeneste (Plate 8, Fig. 2); E: Falerii (Plate 12, Fig. 2); F: Falerii (Moretti et al. 1998, Fig. 78, 62).
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