

This pdf of your paper in *Communicating Identity* belongs to the publishers Oxbow Books and it is their copyright.

As author you are licenced to make up to 50 offprints from it, but beyond that you may not publish it on the World Wide Web until three years from publication (July 2014), unless the site is a limited access intranet (password protected). If you have queries about this please contact the editorial department at Oxbow Books (editorial@oxbowbooks.com).

An offprint from
Communicating Identity
in Italic Iron Age Communities

Edited by

Margarita Gleba and Helle W. Horsnæs

© Oxbow Book 2011

ISBN 978-1-84217-991-8

Contents

Preface	vii
Authors	ix
List of Abbreviations	xiii
Introduction: Communicating Identity in Italic Iron Age Communities – and Beyond	1
<i>Jean MacIntosh Turfa</i>	
1. Communicating Identities in Funerary Iconography: the Inscribed Stelae of Northern Italy	7
<i>Kathryn Lomas</i>	
2. The ‘Distaff Side’ of Early Iron Age Aristocratic Identity in Italy	26
<i>Margarita Gleba</i>	
3. Weaving, Gift and Wedding. A Local Identity for the Daunian Stelae	33
<i>Camilla Norman</i>	
4. Identity in the Tomb of the Diver at Poseidonia.....	50
<i>E. G. D. Robinson</i>	
5. Communicating Identity in an Italic-Greek Community: the Case of L’Amastuola (Salento)	73
<i>Jan Paul Crielaard and Gert-Jan Burgers</i>	
6. Family and Community: Self-Representation in a Lucanian Chamber Tomb	90
<i>Helena Fracchia</i>	
7. The Inscribed Caduceus from Roccagloriosa (South Italy): Image of an Emerging ‘Political’ Identity	99
<i>Maurizio Gualtieri</i>	
8. Hybridity and Hierarchy: Cultural Identity and Social Mobility in Archaic Sicily	113
<i>Gillian Shepherd</i>	
9. Wohnen in Compounds: Haus-Gesellschaften und soziale Gruppenbildung im frühen West- und Mittelsizilien (12.–6. Jh. v. Chr.)	130
<i>Erich Kistler</i>	
10. Constructing Identity in Iron Age Sicily	155
<i>Matthew Fitzjohn</i>	
11. Constructing Identities in Multicultural Milieux: The Formation of Orphism in the Black Sea Region and Southern Italy in the Late 6th and Early 5th Centuries BC	167
<i>Jane Hjarl Petersen</i>	

12. Greek or Indigenous? From Potsherd to Identity in Early Colonial Encounters	177
<i>Søren Handberg and Jan Klindberg Jacobsen</i>	
13. Coinages of Indigenous Communities in Archaic Southern Italy – The Mint as a Means of Promoting Identity?	197
<i>Helle W. Horsnæs</i>	
14. Corfinium and Rome: Changing Place in the Social War	210
<i>Elena Isayev</i>	
15. Aspects of the Emergence of Italian Identity in the Early Roman Empire	223
<i>Gary D. Farney</i>	
Plates	233

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of ancient sources

Amm. Marc.	Amianus Marcellinus
Appian <i>B Civ.</i>	Appian <i>Bella Civilia</i>
Caes. <i>B Civ.</i>	Caesar <i>Bellum Civile</i>
Caes. <i>B Gal.</i>	Caesar <i>Bellum Gallicum</i>
Cic. <i>Att.</i>	Cicero <i>Epistulae ad Atticum</i>
Cic. <i>Div.</i>	Cicero <i>De divinatione</i>
Cic. <i>Leg. agr.</i>	Cicero <i>De lege agraria</i>
Cic. <i>Nat. D.</i>	Cicero <i>De natura deorum</i>
Diod. Sic.	Diodorus Siculus
Gell.	Aulus Gellius
Hdt.	Herodotos <i>Historiae</i>
Hom. <i>Il.</i>	Homer <i>Illiad</i>
Joseph. <i>Ap.</i>	Josephus <i>Contra Apionem</i>
Livy	Livy <i>Ad Urbe Condita</i>
Plin. <i>HN</i>	Pliny (the Elder) <i>Naturalis Historia</i>
Plin. <i>Ep.</i>	Pliny (the Younger) <i>Epistulae</i>
Polyb.	Polybius
Ps. Skyl.	Pseudo-Skylax <i>Periplus</i>
SHA <i>Ael.</i>	Scriptores Historiae Augustae <i>Aelius</i>
SHA <i>Ant. Pius</i>	Scriptores Historiae Augustae <i>Antoninus Pius</i>
SHA <i>Comm.</i>	Scriptores Historiae Augustae <i>Commodus</i>
SHA <i>Hadr.</i>	Scriptores Historiae Augustae <i>Hadrian</i>
SHA <i>Marc.</i>	Scriptores Historiae Augustae <i>Marcus</i>
SHA <i>Ver.</i>	Scriptores Historiae Augustae <i>Verus</i>
Stat. <i>Silv.</i>	Statius <i>Silvae</i>
Strabo <i>Geog.</i>	Strabo <i>Geography</i>
Suet. <i>Caes.</i>	Suetonius, <i>Caesar</i>
Tac. <i>Agr.</i>	Tacitus <i>Agricola</i>
Tac. <i>Ann.</i>	Tacitus <i>Annales</i>
Val. Max.	Valerius Maximus
Ver. Fl. ap. Fest	Verrius Flaccus <i>apud Festi</i>
Verg. <i>Aen.</i>	Virgil <i>Aeneid</i>
Victor <i>Epit.</i>	Victor <i>Epitome</i>

Abbreviations of periodicals, series, books

AA	<i>Archäologischer Anzeiger</i>
ActaHyp	<i>Acta Hyperborea</i>
AION	<i>Annali dell' Instituto Orientale di Napoli, sezione Archeologia e storia Antica</i>
AIONLing	<i>Annali di Archeologia e Storia Antica</i>
AIV	<i>Archeologia in Veneto</i>
AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
AM	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung</i>
AmerAnt	<i>American Antiquity</i>
AnnPisa	<i>Annali della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa</i>
AntK	<i>Antike Kunst</i>
AR	<i>Archaeological Reports</i>
ArchCl	<i>Archaeologia Classica</i>
ArchKorrBl	<i>Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt</i>
ASAtene	<i>Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente</i>
AttiMGrecia	<i>Atti e memorie della Società Magna Grecia</i>
AttiTaranto	<i>Atti del Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia</i>
AWE	<i>Ancient West and East</i>
BABesch	<i>Bulletin Antieke Beschaving</i>
BAR	<i>British Archaeological Reports</i>
BAR-IS	<i>British Archaeological Reports, International Series</i>
BdA	<i>Bollettino d'Arte</i>
BICS	<i>Bulletin on the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London</i>
BMCR	<i>Bryn Mawr Classical Review</i>
BPI	<i>Bollettino di paleontologia italiana</i>
BSA	<i>Annual of the British School at Athens</i>
BTCGI	<i>Bibliografia topografica della colonizzazione greca in Italia e</i>

	<i>nelle isole tirreniche. Vols. I–XVII, 1977–2000. Pisa-Roma</i>	<i>MEFRA</i>	<i>Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École française de Rome, Antiquité</i>
<i>CAH</i>	<i>Cambridge Ancient History</i>		
<i>CAJ</i>	<i>Cambridge Archaeological Journal</i>	<i>MLQ</i>	<i>Modern Language Quarterly</i>
<i>CIE</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum</i>	<i>MonAnt</i>	<i>Monumenti Antichi</i>
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i>	<i>MRP</i>	<i>Magistrates of the Roman Republic, T. R. S. Broughton, 1951–1986, New York</i>
<i>ClAnt</i>	<i>Classical Antiquity</i>		
<i>CR</i>	<i>Classical Review</i>		
<i>CronCatania</i>	<i>Cronache di Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte</i>	<i>NEA</i>	<i>Near Eastern Archaeology</i>
		<i>NSc</i>	<i>Notizie degli scavi di antichità</i>
<i>DialArch</i>	<i>Dialoghi di Archeologia</i>	<i>OJA</i>	<i>Oxford Journal of Archaeology</i>
<i>EchCl</i>	<i>Echos du monde classique. Classical Views</i>	<i>OpRom</i>	<i>Opuscula Romana</i>
		<i>PBSR</i>	<i>Papers of the British School at Rome</i>
<i>EJA</i>	<i>European Journal of Archaeology</i>	<i>PCIA</i>	<i>Popoli e civiltà dell'Italia antica</i>
<i>HBA</i>	<i>Hamburder Beiträge zur Archäologie</i>	<i>PMLA</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Modern Language Association</i>
<i>ILLRP</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae, H. Degraasi, 1963 and 1965, Firenze</i>	<i>PP</i>	<i>La Parola del Passato</i>
		<i>PZ</i>	<i>Prähistorische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>ILS</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae, H. Dessau (ed.), 1892–1916, Berlin</i>	<i>RA</i>	<i>Revue Archéologique</i>
		<i>RendAcadNazLinc</i>	<i>Rendiconti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei</i>
<i>IstMitt</i>	<i>Istanbuler Mitteilungen</i>		
<i>JAnthArch</i>	<i>Journal of Anthropological Archaeology</i>	<i>RhM</i>	<i>Rheinisches Museum für Philologie</i>
		<i>RivFil</i>	<i>Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica</i>
<i>JdI</i>	<i>Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts</i>	<i>RN</i>	<i>Revue numismatique</i>
		<i>SA</i>	<i>Sovetskaya Archeologiya</i>
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>	<i>SEG</i>	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i>
<i>JMA</i>	<i>Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology</i>		
		<i>SicArch</i>	<i>Sicilia Archeologica</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>	<i>StAnt</i>	<i>Storia Antica</i>
<i>LIMC</i>	<i>Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae</i>	<i>StEtr</i>	<i>Studi Etruschi</i>
		<i>TAPA</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>MAAR</i>	<i>Memoires of the American Academy in Rome</i>		
		<i>TLE</i>	<i>Testimonia linguae etruscae, edited by M. Pallottino, 1968. Florence</i>
<i>MeditArch</i>	<i>Mediterranean Archaeology. Australian and New Zealand Journal for the Archaeology of the Mediterranean World</i>	<i>VDI</i>	<i>Vestník drevnej istorii</i>
		<i>WorldArch</i>	<i>World Archaeology</i>

Corfinium and Rome: Changing Place in the Social War

Elena Isayev

*The underlying theme of this paper is the relationship between attachment to place and its role in identity construction. It will reflect on how we balance the apparently coherent communities, which may be exemplified by concentrations of similarities in material culture, and those trends that reach beyond local boundaries, which are often ascribed to wider elite and commercial networks. By focusing on the situation of Italic communities and individuals in the 2nd and 1st centuries BC, especially in central Italy, it will be suggested that the link between the ruling elites and their locality may have been tenuous. The context of Aeclanum and Corfinium, two very different settlements, will be used to explore the necessarily changing meaning of 'place' and Rome itself during the time of the Social War. The idea of a 'capital city' was embraced by both the Romans and the Italian *socii* but how each envisaged its role may have differed significantly. As such, the Social War and the extension of the Roman citizenship which followed it needs to be seen in part as a negotiation of that role.*

Introduction

In the early 1st century BC, Rome's position of power was threatened by the Italian *socii* in a war which, some ancient authors argue, aimed to create a parallel state to that of Rome.¹ But what did the Italian *socii* want Rome to be? How different was the role she had to the one which they might have envisaged for her? Part of the answer may be sought in their creation of Corfinium as a *caput imperii* – a capital city – during the Social War. It is also informed by the distinct relationships which communities and individuals had with settlements on the peninsula and, perhaps more importantly, how *place* was conceptualised. According to human geographers, *place* is a cultural system. As such, we use the discourse of *place* to position ourselves and make sense of the world. The role of *place*

and its connection to a sense of identity or shared membership, such as citizenship, is not a given, but dependent on a particular socio-cultural context. It is an essential part of what Anderson (1991) described as the imagined community. What happens then when groups, each with a distinct understanding of *place*, come together? How do they negotiate a new meaning within a discourse of shared membership? In what way does the role of *place* necessarily transform in order for the emergent community to exist, and which meaning dominates? These are all questions which will be applied to the period of the Social War, a pivotal moment in the history of Italy and Rome, which was both a culmination of, and a departure from, the diverse constructed landscapes of the peninsula in the preceding centuries. Within this context I would

like to test the hypothesis that there were distinct meanings of *place* operating concurrently, that were then reconfigured and possibly moulded into a single concept in the generation that followed. Part of this moulding was carried through in the form of the *municipia* and the officially designated *origo*. The final resolution of the internal power struggles, through the extension of Roman citizenship from a single city-state to the whole peninsula, could not have occurred without a mutual agreement on how *place* was to be related to that new shared membership.

The Social War had begun in the early 1st century BC, between Rome and her supporters on the one side and the Italian allies – referred to as the *socii* – on the other. The latter were primarily from the central and south part of the peninsula. The main period of fighting took place between 91 and 87 BC but could have ended in 90 BC with the grant of Roman citizenship by the *lex Julia* to the loyal Italian communities, which primarily affected those among the Latins, Etruscans and Umbrians.² However, even within this group there were some, such as the Latin colony of Venusia and possibly the Umbrian Tuder, which were excluded presumably because of their disloyalty.³

The traditional view of the war, which has now been challenged, is that it was a revolt by the Italian *socii*, sparked by the Roman refusal to grant them citizenship. In the last decade there has been a significant shift in how this conflict has been understood, primarily as a result of moving away from a Romano-centric focus and the substantial contribution of archaeological research.⁴ In-depth studies of material remains in the Italian landscape have highlighted the wealth and growth of Italian communities in the 2nd century BC overturning Toynbee's view of an impoverished and struggling Italy in the wake of the Hannibalic War (Toynbee 1965).⁵ The creation of such monumental sites as the sanctuary of Pietrabbondante (Bispham 2007b, with bibliography), and a proliferation of settlements across the peninsula in the period, as well as inscriptions which attest to the substantial network of Italian merchants overseas,⁶ all point to communities which appear stable with a strong resource base. Without such reserves, the *socii*

would have been unable to support the necessary infrastructure and some 100 000 troops that formed a serious challenge to Roman-based hegemony in the early 1st century BC.

The Social War now tends to be viewed as an attempt by Italian communities to gain a position of power equal to, if not surpassing, that which was orchestrated by Rome. Scholarship has also moved away from seeing the two sides as coherent definable groups. The 'federation' of the *socii* was not ethnically or geographically determined. Nor was the decision to be part of the *socii* governed by the status of individual settlements in relation to Rome. The Latin colonies of Venusia and Aesernia were part of the so-called rebels, the latter under duress. At the same time, troops were being raised by Italian commanders in the heartland of the *socii*, such as Hirpinia, to fight for the Roman cause. Within such a context it is difficult to identify shared grievances or the reason behind the decision to continue fighting despite the possibility of gaining Roman citizenship in the second year of the war. Part of the challenge is to comprehend what it is that determined allegiance within such an environment, and to what extent different ideas about *place* may have effected those ties. This I would like to explore first by focusing on two known places which feature in the Social War: Aeclanum and Corfinium. The last part of the paper will consider the *origo* as a juridical meaning of *place* through which Roman citizenship was enacted.

Aeclanum

The centre of Aeclanum was founded at some point in the 3rd or 2nd century BC near modern Passo di Mirabella, on a key ancient route that became the Via Appia between Beneventum and Venusia.⁷ It was situated in Hirpinia, a region of strong opposition to Rome during the War. But the populace which inhabited Aeclanum had ambivalent affiliations. We know from both the epigraphic record and ancient texts that some of the prominent members of that community were from the family of the Magii, a number of whom aided the Roman cause and benefited from it. Two Oscan inscriptions of the 2nd century BC attest to their

wealth and status. These were found just outside the site of the ancient centre, near modern Mirabella Eclano at Passo di Mirabella. One records the act of building by Gavis Magiis Flakis son of Pakis,⁸ the other is a dedication on an altar to Mefitis, by Siviiú Magiú, a female member of the *gens*.⁹ The *nomen* also appears on two post-war Latin inscriptions from Aeclanum dated to the late 1st century BC. One notes a Marcus Magius Surus, son of Minatius, as one of the *quattuorviri* responsible for rebuilding the town's fortifications, with the support of Gaius Quinctius Valgus.¹⁰ The other, an inscription from the Augustan period, records that a Marcus Magius Maximus gained the highly-sought-after position of the *praefect* of Egypt.¹¹ Of the individuals noted in the epigraphic record the one of most interest for our purposes is Minatius, the father of Marcus Magius Surus. It is highly plausible that he, or a close relation of his, was the very same Minatius Magius from Aeclanum who had a significant role in the events of the Social War. According to Velleius Paterculus, Minatius led a legion of Hirpinians he had himself recruited as part of Sulla's contingent, helping the Roman commander take Herculaneum and besiege Pompeii, as well as occupy the nearby Hirpinian town of Compsa (Velleius 2.16.1–3). But the actions of Minatius did not necessarily gain support from his fellow townsmen, nor did they prevent the Roman troops attacking his hometown. Appian's account (*B Civ.* 1.51) illustrates how Aeclanum suffered at the hands of Sulla in 89 BC, when it was besieged and its walls burnt down, as it awaited the support of Lucanian troops.

Once the war was over, the inscriptions from Aeclanum bear evidence that members of the Magii returned to the city and continued to hold high positions, despite the fact that Minatius' friend Sulla was responsible for attacking it. We may even wonder whether the fortifications that were being rebuilt several decades later by the *quattuorviri*,¹² one of whom was Minatius's son Marcus, were those destroyed in 89 BC. The short history of this episode is only one example of competing interests and divided loyalties.¹³ Similar narratives are also associated with ancient Compsa at the time of the Hannibalic War. Livy relates how members of the Mopsii *gens* received Roman protection and

safe passage out of Compsa before it was given over to the Carthaginians in 216 BC by their fellow townsmen, only for it to be taken over by Rome two years later (Livy 23.1.1–4; 24.20.5).¹⁴ A more dramatic account of a divided community is described by Livy (23.4.5–8) as he charts the struggles in Capua, which resulted in the decision to hand over the city to Hannibal, an action which was vehemently opposed by the pro-Roman Decius Magius.¹⁵ We can only speculate as to whether he was a relation of any of the later Magii from Aeclanum. It would appear that members of this prominent Italic family were not mistaken for siding with Rome, judging by the honours they were given and the high positions they achieved in the later Republican period. Or, stated in a different way – they clearly benefited from choosing to invest in the horizontal ties that formed part of an elite network, the interests of which were spearheaded by the lead figures in Rome.

From the circumstances at Aeclanum, and the actions of her leading members, it would be hard to argue that allegiance, of such elites at least, was in any way connected to a sense of ethnicity or place-based community, nor Rome as such. Rather, they relied on shared connections that transcended any sense of territoriality, or membership – such as citizenship. It is this socio-political outlook which is prevalent in the works of Cicero who, as Steel notes, operated with a concept of empire that depended not on territory but on the power wielded by individuals (Steel 2001, 3). However, to ask whether communities should be perceived as coherent wholes or as conglomerates of individuals,¹⁶ may be to set up the wrong dichotomy. It would be difficult to accommodate the scenario described above, for example, within such a categorisation, in particular in relation to the troops that Minatius raised. Where were they from? And did they have any interest or relation to Aeclanum, or any of the other sites which they helped attack under the leadership of the Aeclanite Minatius in order to help Sulla of Rome?

Alternatively, we can consider *place* as a conduit for diverse intersecting imagined communities by integrating a more fluid *relational* approach, which has been advocated by the geographer Doreen

Massey.¹⁷ It asserts that, since boundaries are socially constructed, and *place* is internally multiple, it is best to think of it as a point of meeting, the location of intersections and activity spaces, and of the interrelations of influences and movements (Massey and Jess 1995, 178–181, 193, 221, 230). But that locatedness itself is a construction and not a given. While the physical location may be shared, its meaning need not be. In applying this to ancient Italy, since the meaning of place is dependent on context and experience, we may hypothetically conceive of four basic groupings of residents with different imaginaries that intersected at Aeclanum: elites,¹⁸ soldiers,¹⁹ stay-home families, and inhabitants who were outsiders, including foreigners and slaves.²⁰ Each of these would have been differently affected by the position of Rome, the creation of Corfinium as an alternative capital, and, in the end, by the extension of Roman citizenship to the whole of Italy. With this in mind, I would now like to turn to Corfinium, a key centre, which played a very different role to that of Aeclanum in the Social War.

Corfinium

From the high level of preparedness of the allied Italians who formed the *socii* at the time of the Social War, it is clear that their organisation could not have been a spur of the moment rebellion, and also that it relied on strong links within an elite network that was centred differently to the one which operated through the Rome of Sulla's circle. Aside from their ability to quickly raise a substantial army, the *socii* also set up what may be best termed a 'capital city' at Corfinium (Sherwin-White, 1973, 137, 147; Mouritsen, 1998, 139; Keaveney 2005). The site was well placed for such a purpose: it was situated in the centre of the Apennines, at the north end of the territory where many of the *socii* were based, and within proximity to a number of key routes and monumental sanctuaries. It was a headquarters of operations as well as a symbol, embodied in the new name *Italica* (or *Italia*).²¹ According to the ancient sources, the centre became the seat of the allied council of 500 with representatives from different communities, and it also acted as a military hub for

the army led by two generals.²² While the details of the institutional structures which the centre hosted may be questionable, the numismatic evidence makes it clear that here was a sophisticated and representative organisation. Its composition and symbolism were cemented in the allied coinage, which used both Oscan and Latin script. Some of the issues had stamped on them *Italia* or its Oscan form *viteliu*. The coins also carry images of oath taking scenes with groups of two to eight figures, probably representing allied leaders (Rutter 2001; Pobjoy 2000, 200).

When the centre of Corfinium was overrun by the Roman side, first Bovianum (Appian *Bel. Civ.* 1.51.224), and then the Latin colony of Aesernia, which the *socii* had starved into submission, was made the capital in its place (Diod. Sic. 37.2.9). The symbol which was embodied or housed in Corfinium at the start of the war, whether it was unity, autonomy, power or resistance, was clearly moveable. But what was Corfinium itself and what was its role as a *place* for the *socii*? It is probable that it was in part chosen as the centre for its physical location; strategically positioned at the intersection of routes joining key settlements, especially the Latin colonies of Aesernia and Beneventum and also in proximity to Rome (Nagle 1973, 373; Pobjoy 2000, 191). In its role as a patron or the seat of the organisms necessary to run the campaign and the federation, if that is what it was, it may be comparable to London, as a capital global-city, or to New York in housing the UN headquarters. The placedness of both London and New York, their size, infrastructure and their positions as centres of connectivity, determined by their history, make them ideal choices for acting as the axes of power, and representatives of a state, federation, or league.²³ Corfinium too was just such a centre of connectivity, a position which it continued to have long after the Social War. A generation later the fortified town was once again used as the base of operations during the Civil War in 49 BC, providing a key focus for narratives of resistance to Caesar's forces in Italy.²⁵

Authors writing at the end of the Republic and in the early Imperial period about the events of the Social War use a variety of terms to describe the new role which the *socii* had given to Corfinium. Velleius

Paterculus (2.16.4) writes that they chose the city as *caput imperii sui* – head of their dominion/empire – and named it *Italica*.²⁵ The phrase *caput imperii* is not used in reference to any other site in Velleius' extant work. The Greek author Diodorus Siculus (37.2.4, 7, 9) calls Corfinium by a term familiar in Greek narratives – κοινὴ πόλις – the head city-state. Strabo (5.4.2) uses similar Greek terminology but also expresses her role through association, by stating that Corfinium, the metropolis of the Paeligni, was to be a city common to all Italians in place of Rome.²⁶ None of these terms or phrases are necessarily what the Italians would have used themselves in reference to the centre at the time, but rather the most appropriate ones available to each author within his individual context to describe what today we might call a 'capital city'. Of the above definitions, Strabo's comment indicating that Corfinium held a position to counterbalance that of Rome provides the most insight into her role. But how comparable was the position of Rome to that of Corfinium?

As far as we know, in Italy prior to the Social War, there were powerful groups that were not necessarily constituted around any individual settlements. Some of these inhabited a variety of sites both large and small throughout the central and southern Apennines, an area that incorporated a number of regions including those which ancient authors refer to as Samnium²⁷ and Lucania.²⁸ In these regions, large sanctuaries may have played a role similar to that of *fora* in cities, which served as socio-political hubs for a number of communities (Isayev 2007, 137).²⁹ It is otherwise difficult to identify any single site which would have had a position similar to that of Corfinium in the 1st century BC. The creation of this capital must be seen as a departure from any Italian tradition in the area and a break with what had gone before. It did not follow the long established model of the centres in Italy that may be termed *poleis*, such as for example Capua, Caere, or Taranto, among many others, that wielded power as coherent units with a defined membership, and gathered empires around them through influence and alliances. It is also tempting to include Rome in this category, and the term *polis* is often used in reference to the city in ancient narratives. However,

as Ando points out, it is debateable whether Rome was a *polis* by the end of the Republic (Ando 1999). Once Roman citizenship extended to communities and individuals beyond it, the extent to which the city itself continued to be the basic unit of political life, and the natural object of patriotic sentiment for the members carrying her name is questionable.³⁰

What we can say without a doubt is that Corfinium was clearly not such a *polis*; the reasons and process by which it became a power base in the Social War were differently constituted to either Rome, or to any of the model *poleis* from the Greek world. The *socii* did not collapse on its takeover, even if it can be argued that they were greatly weakened by that point in the war.³¹ Nevertheless, the power was not rooted there, but placed there by choice and possibly only temporarily. Their interests could have been represented by Rome but they chose an alternative capital. The cause and the alliance preceded the location where it was lodged, rather than naturally emanating from it. Should Rome have been overrun can we assume that the situation would have been different? The meaning of the *place* of Corfinium to the Italian *socii* was not the same as the meaning of Rome either to the Romans or her allies. The relationship between the *place* and the community was differently constructed, and implies a particular kind of hierarchy and allegiance, which Corfinium did not have, nor was intended to have.³² It may be that the Italian grievances, which led to the Social War, can in part be understood in light of this distinction. None of this is to negate that Corfinium would have acted as the intersection of diverse imagined communities, incorporating the same basic groupings that were suggested for Aeclanum. But unlike this smaller Hirpinian centre, there would have been a further wider imagined community for which Corfinium became a conduit, which was embodied in its new symbolic name *Italica*.³³

If we return to the underlying question of this paper: What did the Italian *socii* want Rome to be? Could it be that what they desired was not so much a parallel state, as implied in Appian's narrative (App. *B Civ.* 1.34.152), but for Rome to be a Corfinium. One way to conceive of this would be to hypothesise about how the *socii* in

Aeclanum would have related to ‘their’ capital. We would not expect that Corfinium’s status required any of the *socii* to have direct allegiance to it, or to the community which considered the settlement of Corfinium its home, and we may wonder to what extent it would have been consulted. But if Rome was to follow such a paradigm, it would mean her giving up that privileged (and contradictory) part of the status that allowed her to operate as if she was a *polis*, despite her citizen community extending well beyond the city boundaries (Mouritsen 1998, 95–99).³⁴ However, we would not expect that in the last century of the Republic Rome could have allowed herself to be regarded wholly as a representative or seat of shared power, rather than having power that could be, and clearly was, exerted on her own behalf rather than for the common interest. By ‘common’ I mean not simply acting in the interest of the community of Roman-based citizens but also in the interest of those elites from other backgrounds and holding other memberships, for whom Rome was already operating as a global city, forming part of their imagined community. At the end of the Social War, the acceptance of Roman citizenship by the *socii* did not turn Rome into a Corfinium; still, there had to have been an agreement about a shared understanding of membership and its connection to *place*, and in particular to Rome. The city had to secede some of its power and be more of a capital – *caput* – than a *polis*, which it achieved in part through the system of the *municipia*. As Bispham notes in his milestone work on municipalisation, the shift allowed Rome to be perceived as a political centre rather than as a *hegemon* (Bispham 2007a, 437).

Negotiating citizenship

The grant of Roman citizenship incorporated all Italians south of the Po, including those who aided the Roman generals, such as Minatius Magius,³⁵ and others who fought against them. Hence, on some level, the negotiation would have had to be about the distribution of power rather than the complete loss of that power on the side of the *socii*.³⁶ Otherwise the Italian communities would not have been in a position to complain about the tribes to

which they were assigned soon after they became Roman citizens,³⁷ nor would we expect to find the descendants of ‘rebel’ leaders in the Roman senate (Wiseman 1971). It is true that, in the decades immediately following the Social War, the majority of the Italians who did enter the Roman senate were not from the heartlands of the *socii*. It is not until Caesar abolished Sulla’s restrictions on the sons of the proscribed in 49 BC that we begin to see individuals from those areas become senators in Rome (Wiseman 1971, 8, 24). At a certain level the Italian ‘rebels’ were treated no differently than other Roman citizens who had ended up on the wrong side of Sulla and were barred from participating in Roman governance. It may also be possible, as Wiseman points out, that they would not have wanted the Roman senatorial status (Wiseman 1971, 24).³⁸ Had Marius survived, and dominated Roman politics, no doubt there would have been more Marsic names, such as Poppaedius Silo (Brunt 1965, 96; Wiseman 1971, 253, no. 339; Mouritsen 2006, 32), on the senatorial lists earlier on. Hence, it was not enemies of Rome who were punished but rather the *inimici* of Sulla and his network during their position of power in Rome.

Alongside these horizontal ties, the enfranchisement of the Italian populace meant that a new framework for the official relationship between membership and *place* needed to be created which superseded any previously existing models. It was provided implicitly by the laws through which Roman citizenship was granted, in particular the *lex Julia* in 90 BC, the *lex Plautia Papiria* in 89 BC and the senatorial decrees in the years which immediately followed.³⁹ For the first time across Italy, all communities and individuals had a single shared understanding of how each related to, and was defined by a specific *place*, which was necessary to enact one’s citizenship and served to delimit the citizen body through the census. Any previous fluidity was from then on bound to points in the landscape, in the form of Rome and the *municipia*.⁴⁰ Growing ties to specific settlements, or at least an interest in making the association visible, may be in part seen through the increasing practice of recording acts of patronage on inscriptions.⁴¹ These served not only to advertise an individual’s position

of wealth and status but also to make a permanent link with the settlement. As Woolf argues, the setting up of such public inscriptions was a way to fix and assert a place within history, society and the cosmos (Woolf 1996). These monuments did not simply preserve memory but they publicised it, perhaps as an attempt to respond with a false claim of permanency, to what may have been a time of anxiety about social dislocation (Woolf 1996, esp. 29–31, 39).

At Aeclanum, late Republican inscriptions from the settlement provide testimony to the funding of public works by Marcus Magius Surus and other new local patrons such as the Sullan supporter Gaius Quinctius Valgus.⁴² Valgus' generosity did not just stem from a sense of belonging or attachment to Aeclanum itself, patronage could be spread across a number of locations. We know that he was also a patron of nearby Frigento,⁴³ and his wealth, which allowed him to possess substantial territory in Hirpinia was, according to Cicero, the result of others' loss in the proscriptions (Cic. *De leg. agr.* 3.2.8). Bispham suggests that such a phenomenon as Valgus' multi-town magistracy and extra-local importance may reveal some of the ways that public cooperation and interaction between cities and elites, prior to enfranchisement, may have become institutionalised within the process of the *municipium* after the Social War (Bispham 2007a, 434).

The increasing trend of recording euergetism, already evidenced throughout Italy in the 2nd century BC and rapidly gaining momentum at the time of Augustus, has been charted by a substantial number of epigraphic studies.⁴⁴ These highlight the growing interest in asserting one's position as patron to a specific place or in recording a duty done as part of an official magisterial role. What needs further investigation is the way in which there appears to be a shift in the balance of such practices between settlements and the large rural sanctuaries of the south and central Apennines in the 2nd and 1st centuries BC. The prominent cult site at Rossano di Vaglio in Lucania, for example, boasts a substantial number of inscriptions particularly from the late 3rd century and throughout the 2nd century BC, at a time when very few are known

from any of the surrounding settlements (Lejeune 1990; Isayev 2007, 224; Crawford forthcoming). By the 1st century BC the situation seems to be reversed, as there is an increasing number of public inscriptions from surrounding sites, with only few from the sanctuary dated to the last period of its existence into the 1st century AD.⁴⁵ Similar shifts in the nature of the dedicatory practices at other major cult sites would allow for further insight into the changing relationship between these alternative centres of interaction, and the growing prominence of the settlement in taking on the roles previously assigned to the sanctuary.

Mobility and the *origo* in Roman citizenship

How an individual related to multiple places and the changing roles each had in defining one's identity is foregrounded in Cicero's writings, especially the *de Legibus* and *de Officiis*, where there is an urge to articulate the relationship between *place*, citizenship and belonging. That relationship is not self-evident or a given, as has been argued above, although within certain systems it is expected, as in the territorially conceived model of the bordered nation-state. The perspective of the sedentary norm that such a model promotes is in opposition to the highly mobile environment within which it is situated, and which it strives to control. A similar paradox is also prevalent in the ancient context where levels of mobility were high even by comparison with today's standards. It is particularly noticeable in the juridical context, which will be the focus of this final section, that tries to reconcile two contrasting positions: one which assumes physical stability over generations and the other which accepts, and tries to accommodate, an environment characterised by numerous people who are constantly on the move.

The kind of population movements to which I am referring are not only the mass migrations, or substantial single event phenomena, such as colonisation and dislocation of whole communities,⁴⁶ but rather the ongoing hum of mobility that is the background into which these other more distinct episodes fit. Demographic calculations, while

often disagreeing on the exact numbers and the best methods for attaining them, nevertheless give a sense of the high levels of mobility that could be reached in the ancient world. Scheidel's recent studies, even if the exact figures remain controversial, vividly illuminate the extent of the movement (Scheidel 2004; 2005; 2006). He estimates that some 2 million adults relocated in the last 2 centuries BC, and that 2–4 million slaves were imported into Italy during the same period. If we include internal or centripetal migration that would add another million.⁴⁷ All this in the context of what he suggests would have been a total free population of Italy in the range of 3–4 million in this period. Scheidel also estimates that, during the Augustan period, for which we have more precise data, some 40% of male Romans over 45 would have been born in a different location from their current place of residence (Scheidel 2004, 13–20; 2006, 223–224). Such figures bring into question the tenacity of the links between *place* and belonging, and highlight the fluidity of community membership which can easily accommodate, and perhaps is dependent on, non-territorial horizontal networks, especially among the elite.

Necessarily, therefore, fluidity needs to be incorporated into the definition of *place*. In relation to identity *place* becomes a pause, or what Massey and Jess call an “envelope of space-time” (Massey and Jess 1995, 221, 230–231). In the context of ancient Italy, its essence may be recognised in the concept of the *origo* – or hereditary origin, which became an essential, if sometimes artificial, conduit through which citizenship was articulated after the Social War. Every Roman citizen had to have an official *origo* for the purposes of the state census and voting, as Rome moved from a position of a city-state to the head of a non-territorially bound state by the 1st century BC. The vital mechanism in this process was the *municipium* which, as Bispham outlines, was revolutionary at its inception, in that it allowed simultaneously valid dual citizenship and divorced citizenship from origin (Bispham 2007a, 12, 48). With this change came a fundamental shift in the meaning and relevance of origin, and a dissociating of the Roman *populus* from their locality which, in turn,

allowed the creation of a shared homeland based on a legal fiction that transcended geographic and perceived ethnic boundaries (Thomas 1996; Ando 1999, 8). Individuals were incorporated into the Roman citizenship through an official attachment to specific place, later known as the *origo*, which determined not only that individual's membership and voting tribe, but also that of his descendants (Thomas 1996, 187, 190).

Consequently, we may assume that, following the extension of citizenship to the whole of Italy after the Social War, Minatius Magius' *origo* would have been the *municipium* of Aeclanum, which was inscribed in the Cornelia tribe (Taylor 1960, 92, 111, 310). For those who received Roman citizenship and had multiple residences, one would have had to be identified as the *origo*, through which citizenship was enacted. The *lex Plautia Papiria* of 89 BC, which was brought in following the initial grant of Roman citizenship by the *lex Julia* in 90 BC, may have been created in part to fill the gaps in those cases where an individual's domicile and *origo* did not overlap.⁴⁸ This implies that the *origo* could be distinct from birthplace and also from domicile, of which there may have been several. Embedded in the juridical texts is an anticipation of mobility both over generations and within a lifetime. As Thomas observed, since the *origo* did not necessarily have to be the individual's or his ancestors' place of birth or residence it created a juridically constructed yet fictional territoriality (Thomas 1996, 160). The legal definition of *origo* was a pause, which combined place and time and with it the contradiction of deep rootedness coupled with ongoing movement.

In the aftermath of the Social War, the official role which a concept such as the *origo* afforded a physical *place* in determining one's identity, would have presented a new framework of allegiance and belonging. As well, while it may be argued that administratively it became a necessity for conducting the census in order to identify the *cives* or *populus Romanus*, it also counteracted the reality of the highly mobile society which it encompassed. In this early period, it is unlikely that the old meanings of *place* were supplanted. Rather, the process added a new layer that was

shared by all, and that also included Rome. The role, which this city now had, was not the same as was held by Corfinium during the Social War, but it did gain some of the elements of a capital, in that it now became the chosen representative of the universal membership, the *universae civitatis*. The acknowledgement of this position may be in part seen by the number of Italians who eventually ended up in the Roman senate; from then on, the elite networks would have intersected there. Other places such as the *municipia*, first in Italy and then the empire, were connected to it in a way that created a unit that, although it had territorial spread, was not a territorial state. Sites which would have previously served as alternative *fora*, such as the so-called federal sanctuaries, would have had to abandon the socio-political aspect of their role. This may explain why such major sanctuaries, as for example at Rossano di Vaglio in Lucania, no longer functioned after the 1st century AD (Isayev 2007, 132–139, 224). Their role as cult centres may have been secondary and not enough of a reason to continue their upkeep, or perhaps the main cult activities were now hosted by the main settlements.⁴⁹ The clusters of networks that previously filtered through a number of different types of centres, including sanctuaries among them, were now re-oriented to intersect in Rome.

The changing nature of *place* in the period which followed the Social War exemplifies the way in which the concept is relational and its meaning a process of negotiation, especially in its link to membership and belonging. The development of the concept of the *origo* in juridical terms was a paradox, which gave the illusion of a sedentary condition while at the same time embodying and anticipating continuous movement. This abstract approach to the physicality of place sat alongside the very concrete boundaries created by the Augustan regime, which delineated the regions of Italy.⁵⁰ At the same time there was encouragement for the propagation of local place-based cultural traditions, which by the time of the principate would have been no more than nostalgia⁵¹ and (re)invented relics. Farney's study of moneyers' choice of coin imagery reflects a similar trend of an increasing association of symbols of myths with places, and his analysis of

ethnic *cognomina* further indicates how Augustan senators were keen to advertise their Italian origin roots, as long as they were of the right kind (Farney 2007: coins 49–53; cognomina 215–227; and in this volume). But this is not a reflection of any reversion to a pre-Social war identity; as Bradley observes, ironically the prominence of such names in our historical sources is a sign of the success of these small-town notables in leaving their own origins behind (Bradley 2007, 316). It is as if there was a desire to give more value through emotional and mythical attachment to the local in the context of what today may be defined as a period of intense time-space compression, or, to use that loaded term, globalisation. What needs to be investigated further is why this particular construct of *place* would have been more beneficial in the context of empire. Why is it not enough to simply maintain places, such as *municipia*, as administrative tools, and to what extent is there a need, on some level, to have a sense of belonging attached to them?

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Margarita Gleba and Helle Horsnæs for inviting me to the conference in Copenhagen, and for the generous funds provided by the Knud Højgaard's Fond as well as the Exeter Migrations Network. The lively discussions with the other participants at the workshop as well as with my colleagues Mark Goodwin and Altay Çoskun have been tremendously helpful in thinking about approaches to this period of history.

Notes

1. App., *B Civ.* 1.34.152. For overviews of the debate about Italians seeking equality and liberty see Gabba 1994; Mouritsen 1998, 9–11; Pobjoy 2000, 189.
2. These are the main groupings, although there is some debate as to who precisely was given citizenship at this time: Pobjoy 2000, 195; Thomas 1996, 104–107; Bispham 2007a, 162–172.
3. Taylor 1960, 107, 112; Harris 1971, 236–240; Bradley 2000, 120, note 59; Bispham 2007a, 184–186; Çoskun forthcoming.
4. In particular: Mouritsen 1998; Pobjoy 2000; Jehne and Pfeilschifter 2006; Bispham 2007a and 2007b.

5. Gabba 1994, 106–108, gives an overview of increasing wealth and investment among Italians.
6. Wilson 1966; Sherwin-White 1973, 134, 142; Patterson 2006a, 35; Bispham 2007b, 208.
7. This was the later 2nd century AD *Colonia Aelia Augusta Aeclanum*: *CIL* IX 1111, *cf.* 99; Colucci Pescatori 1975, 37, n. 107; Colucci Pescatori 1991, 98–99; Pescatori Colucci 1996, 232–240.
8. The inscription in Oscan is: *g(a)v(is). magiis. p(a)k(e)is. flakis. famatted*: Gavis Magiis Flakis son of Pakis, ordered (this to be done).
9. *ST* Hi4. The inscription in Oscan is: [-?-] *siviiu. magiu. [-?-] mefit(e)[-?-]*.
10. *ILLRP* 2.523 = *ILS* 5318, *CIL* I(2) 1722: *C.Quinctius C.f. Valg(us), patron(us) munic(ipii), / M.Magi(us) Min(ati) f. Surus A.Patlacius Q.f. / IIIvir(i) d(e) s(enatus) s(ententia) portas turreis moiros / turreisque aequas qum moiro / faciundum coiraverunt*: For discussion and text see Bispham 2007a, 270–1; 476, Q12.
11. *ILS* 1335 = *CIL* IX 1125.
12. *ILLRP* 2.523 = *ILS* 5318, *CIL* I(2) 1722.
13. For divisions in Italian communities: Giardina 1997, 104 n. 209.
14. For discussion of the site and earlier bibliography, see Isayev forthcoming.
15. Livy 23.7–10, with discussion in Sumner 1970, 257–258.
16. Mouritsen 2006, 34–35; Bispham 2007a, 431–432. For an overview of Italian elite relations with Rome, Patterson 2006b.
17. Massey and Jess 1995, 54 (especially in reference to boundaries, 68); Massey 2004, 6.
Amin 2004, 34, recasts cities and regions as spatial formations of continuously changing composition, character and reach. Hence, they come with no automatic promise of territorial or systemic integrity.
18. Galsterer 2006, argues for the increasingly close connections between the elites in Italy, which encouraged the process of integration after the Social War. Alternative views are presented in Jehne and Pfeilschifter 2006. Incentives for keeping elites within their communities may be part of the reason that magistrates of Latin colonies were given citizenship soon after 125 BC; Gabba 1994, 105.
19. A number of studies have examined the extent to which the army may have promoted the integration of Italians and the spread of Roman culture: Jehne and Pfeilschifter 2006, with up to date bibliography.
20. These last two groups, perhaps the most difficult to find in our sources, appear in terms of numbers and calculations for demographic studies, and in particular in Rosenstein 2004 and Scheidel 2004; 2005.
21. The term *Italia* we know from the coin evidence, while the sources suggest that the new name given to Corfinium itself was *Italica*: Strabo 5.4.2; Velleius 2.16. See Pobjoy 2000, for the meaning of *Italia*.
22. The key source for the organisation at Corfinium is Diodorus Siculus (37.1–2); the reliability of the text and its use of the Roman institutional model is discussed by Mouritsen 1998, 139–140; Pobjoy 2000.
23. Massey 2004 and Amin 2004 discuss the idea of ‘Global Hubs’.
24. *Caes. B Civ.* 1.15–23; *App. B Civ.* 2.38; *Cic. Att.* viii. 3, 5, ix. 7; *Suet. Caesar* 34.
25. ... *Caput imperii sui Corfinium legerant atque appellarant Italicam...*
26. ... Κορφίνιον, τὴν τῶν Περίγνων μητρόπολιν, κοινὴν ἅπασι τοῖς Ἰταλιώταις ἀποδείξαντες πόλιν ἀντὶ τῆς Πρώμης, ὀρητήριον τοῦ πολέμου, μετονομασθεῖσαν Ἰταλικήν...
27. Bispham 2007a, 38; 2007b with earlier bibliography for Samnium.
28. Isayev 2007 with earlier bibliography for Lucania.
29. Importance of sanctuaries as administrative units along with the structure of the *vicus* and *pagus*: Bispham 2007a, 81; Buonocore 2002, 30–44.
30. Thomas 1996; Ando 1999, 8; Bispham 2007a, 37 considers the appropriateness of Hellenistic models for the changing role of Rome in the Republican period.
31. Pobjoy 2000, 201, prefers to see its collapse as signifying also that of the *socii*.
32. How the concept of *Italia* was connected to this is a different issue, and beyond the scope of this paper. See discussion in Pobjoy 2000; Bispham 2007a, chapters 1 and 3; Torelli 1999.
33. For discussion of the name see note 21 above.
34. Bispham 2007a, 37, considers how Rome maintained the fiction of the polis-style institutions and that effective participation in politics was denied by its persistence.
35. Wiseman 1971, 24, on citizenship given to individuals, whatever the status of their *patria*, in relation to Rome.
36. Bispham’s intricate analysis of the stages of

- enfranchisement investigates the balance between the offer of citizenship as a measure to prevent disaffection and, alternatively, as a favour given to the defeated. He also demonstrates that the Italians were in a position to negotiate for different terms throughout the war, even if they did not necessarily get what they wanted. Their success was in part dependent on the particular communities that were being addressed, and the position of their leaders in relation to the politicians in Rome; Bispham 2007a, chapter 4, esp. 162–199.
37. Most of the complaints were about the creation of new tribes, a decision which was soon reversed and all the Italians were enrolled in the already existing 31 rural tribes. There is another debate as to whether some of the Italian communities would have been enrolled in the more favourable tribes (for example, Aeclanum was assigned to the Cornelia tribe), and the extent to which those decisions would have depended on personal connections of the elite (*e.g.* Minatius Magius in the case of Aeclanum); Taylor 1960, chapter 8, esp. 102–103, 111–112; Bispham 2007a, 178–179, 189–199. Sherwin-White (1973, 156) notes that, in regard to the distribution of the new citizens among the voting tribes, the deals completed by radical leaders do not seem malicious or partisan.
 38. Bispham 2007a, 430, also points out that for some Etruscan aristocrats, such as for example Caecina and Maecenas, who had a prestigious heritage, the entry to the Roman senate would have been a step down.
 39. For a recent overview and discussion of the variety of laws that granted Roman citizenship, see Bispham 2007a, chapter 4.
 40. Bispham 2007a, chapter 4, suggests that provisions for the *municipia* framework and distribution of the citizen body into tribes was probably the result of senatorial decrees which followed the *lex Julia*.
 41. *Municipia* were now the primary areas for elite display and included competition between communities; Bispham 2007a, 430.
 42. *ILS* 5318 (*CIL* I (2). 1722, *ILLRP* 2.523), for full text see note 10 above.
 43. *ILLRP* 2598: *C. Quinctius C. f. Valgus / L. Sepunius L. f. quinq(ue)n(nales) / murum, portas, forum, porticus, curia(m) cisterna(m) / de d(ecurionum) s(ententia) facie(ndum) curar(unt) eid(??emque) prob(arunt)*.
 44. Recently there have been a number of important studies, particularly by Cébeillac-Gervasoni, on euergetism and also on the epigraphic habit; those with relevance for an Italian overview: Cébeillac-Gervasoni 1996; 1998; AA.VV. 1983; Cooley 2000.
 45. I am grateful to Michael Crawford for sharing these ideas with me in discussion. According to the currently available evidence, it appears that, in the 2nd century BC, during a period of restructuring, there may have been a shift in the nature of dedications within the sanctuary at Rossano di Vaglio. The earlier private inscriptions seem to have been removed and reused within the rebuilt sections, while a new wave of magisterial dedicatory texts took priority of place within the cult site.
 46. Polo 2006, provides a summary and catalogue of these movements in republican Italy.
 47. In terms of private migration, although Scheidel feels that it did not occur on a massive scale, he admits that centripetal migration, or internal relocation to centres, is more difficult to measure, and suggests that some one million adult males would have transferred to cities; Scheidel 2004, 14–20.
 48. Sherwin-White 1973, 151–153; Thomas 1996, 106–107. For an overview of the law; Bispham 2007a, 172.
 49. In reference to the cult of Mefitis at Rossano di Vaglio in Lucania, Lejeune 1990, 39 suggests that it was moved to the nearby colony of Potentia in the early Imperial period.
 50. Augustan regions with earlier bibliography; Laffi 2007.
 51. Bradley 2007, esp. 310–317, considers the proliferation of antiquarian research in ancient Rome at this time, and the encouragement, as well as revival of ancient rites and rituals. Bispham 2007a, 39, 443–446 and Dench 2005, 365, note local particularism in the Augustan period.

Bibliography

- AA. VV. 1983. *Les bourgeoisies municipales italiennes aux II et I siècles av. J.C. Centre Jean-Bérard, Institut français de Naples, 7–10 décembre 1981*. Paris.
- Aitken, S. and Valentine, G. (eds) 2006. *Approaches to Human Geography*. London.
- Allen, J. 2004. The Whereabouts of Power: Politics, Government and Space. *Geografiska Annaler*, Series B: Human Geography, 86B.1, 19–32.
- Amin, A. 2004. Regions Unbound: Towards a New Politics of Place. *Geografiska Annaler*, Series B: Human Geography, 86.1, 33–44.

- Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London.
- Ando, C. 1999. Was Rome a polis. *ClAnt* 18:1, 5–34.
- Bispham, E. 2007a. *From Asculum to Actium: the municipalization of Italy from the Social War to Augustus*. Oxford/New York.
- Bispham, E. 2007b. The Samnites. In G. Bradley, E. Isayev and C. Riva (eds), *Ancient Italy, Regions Without Boundaries*, 179–223. Exeter.
- Bradley, G. 2000. *Ancient Umbria: state, culture, and identity in central Italy from the Iron Age to the Augustan era*. Oxford.
- Bradley, G. 2007. Romanization: The end of the peoples of Italy? In G. Bradley, E. Isayev and C. Riva (eds), *Ancient Italy, Regions Without Boundaries*, 295–322. Exeter.
- Bradley, G., Isayev, E. and Riva, C. (eds) 2007. *Ancient Italy, Regions Without Boundaries*. Exeter.
- Brunt, P. A. 1965. Italian aims at the time of the Social War. *JRS* 55, 90–109.
- Buonocore, M. 2002. *L’Abruzzo e il Molise in età romana tra storia ed epigrafia*. L’Aquila.
- Cébeillac-Gervasoni, M. (ed.) 1996. *Les élites municipales de l’Italie péninsulaire des Gracques à Néron : actes de la table ronde de Clermont-Ferrand (28–30 novembre 1991)*. Rome.
- Cébeillac Gervasoni, M. 1998. *Les magistrats des cités italiennes de la seconde guerre punique à Auguste : le Latium et la Campanie*. Paris.
- Chanotis, A. 2004. Mobility of persons during the Hellenistic wars. State control and personal relations. In C. Moatti (ed.), *La Mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée de l’antiquité à l’époque moderne*, 481–500. Rome.
- Colucci Pescatori, G. 1975. *Il Museo Irpino*. Cava dei Tirreni.
- Colucci Pescatori, G. 1991. Evidenze archeologiche in Irpinia. In M. D’Auria (ed.), *La Romanisation du Samnium aux IIe et Ier siècles av. J.C. (Actes du colloque: Naples, Centre Jean Bérard, 4–5 Novembre 1988)*, 85–122. Naples.
- Colucci Pescatori, G. 2000. *Municipium, aliunde, ignotum*: Frigento in età romana. In *Studi sull’Italia dei Sanniti*, 47–55. Milan/Rome.
- Cooley, A. E. (ed.) 2000. *The epigraphic landscape of Roman Italy*. London.
- Çoskun, A. forthcoming. ‘Civitas Romana’ and inclusion of strangers in the Roman Republic the case of the Social War’.
- Crawford, M. H. forthcoming. *Imagines Italicae*. London.
- Dench, E. 2005. *Romulus’ Asylum. Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*. Oxford.
- Dyck, A. R. 1996. *A Commentary on Cicero, De Officiis*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Farney, G. D. 2007. *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome*. Cambridge.
- Gabba, E. 1994. Rome and Italy: the Social War. In *CAH* Vol. 9, 2nd ed., 104–28. Cambridge.
- Galsterer, H. 2006. Rom und Italien vom Bundesgenossenkrieg bis zu Augustus. In M. Jehne and R. Pfeilschifter (eds), *Herrschaft ohne Integration? Rom und Italien in Republikanischer Zeit*, 293–308. Frankfurt.
- Giardina, A. 1997. L’identità incompiuta dell’Italia romana. In A. Giardina (ed.), *L’Italia romana. Storie de un’identità incompiuta*, 3–116. Bari.
- Harris, W. V. 1971. *Rome in Etruria and Umbria*. Oxford.
- Isayev, E. 2007. *Inside Ancient Lucania. Dialogues in History and Archaeology*. London.
- Isayev, E. forthcoming. Italian perspectives from Hirpinia in the period of Gracchan land reforms and the Social War. In K. Lomas and E. Herring (eds), *JRA Suppl.*
- Jehne, M. and Pfeilschifter, R. (eds) 2006. *Herrschaft ohne Integration? Rom und Italien in Republikanischer Zeit*. Frankfurt.
- Keaveney, A. 2005. *Rome and the Unification of Italy*. 2nd edition. Exeter.
- Kelly, G. P. 2006. *A History of Exile in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge.
- Laffi, U. 2007. L’organizzazione dell’Italia sotto Augusto e la creazione delle *regiones*. In U. Laffi (ed.), *Colonie e municipi nello stato romano*, 81–117. Rome.
- Lejeune, M. 1990. *Méfitis d’après les dédicaces lucaniennes de Rossano di Vaglio*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
- Massey, D. 2004. Geographies of Responsibility. *Geografiska Annaler*, Series B: Human Geography, 86.1, 5–18.
- Massey, D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouacouci, A., Pellegrino, A. and Taylor, E. J. 1993. Theories of international migration: a review and appraisal. *Population & Development Review* 19:3, 431–66.
- Massey, D. and Jess, P. (eds) 1995. *A Place in the World? Places, Cultures and Globalization*. Oxford.
- Moatti, C. 2004. *La Mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée de l’antiquité à l’époque moderne*. Rome.
- Mouritsen, H. 1998. *Italian Unification*. London.
- Mouritsen, H. 2006. Insight and historiography: writing the history of pre-Roman Italy. In M. Jehne and R. Pfeilschifter (eds), *Herrschaft ohne Integration? Rom und Italien in republikanischer Zeit*, 23–37. Frankfurt.

- Nagle, D. B. 1973. An Allied View of the Social War. *AJA* 77:4, 367–378.
- Nicolet, C. 1988. *L'Inventaire du Monde. Géographie et politique aux origines de l'Empire romain*. Fayard. *Space, geography, and politics in the early Roman Empire* (eng. trans. H. Leclerc 1991). Ann Arbor.
- Patterson, J. R. 2006a. *Landscapes and Cities. Rural Settlement and Civic Transformation in Early Imperial Italy*. Oxford.
- Patterson, J. R. 2006b. The relationship of the Italian ruling classes with Rome: friendship, family relations and their consequences. In M. Jehne and R. Pfeilschifter (eds), *Herrschaft ohne Integration? Rom und Italien in Republikanischer Zeit*, 139–153. Frankfurt.
- Pescatori Colucci, G. 1996. Aeclanum romana: storia di una città. In G. Pescatori Colucci (ed.), *Storia illustrata di Avellino e dell'Irpinia. L'Irpinia antica*, 225–240. Avellino.
- Pobjoy, M. 2000. The first *Italia*. In E. Herring and K. Lomas (eds), *The Emergence of State Identities in Italy*, 187–211. London.
- Polo, F. P. 2006. Deportation, Kolonisation, Migration: Bevölkerungsverschiebungen im republikanischen Italien und Formen der Identitätsbildung'. In M. Jehne and R. Pfeilschifter (eds), *Herrschaft ohne Integration? Rom und Italien in Republikanischer Zeit*, 171–206. Frankfurt.
- Rosenstein, N. S. 2004. *Rome at war: farms, families, and death in the Middle Republic*. Chapel Hill/London.
- Rutter, N. K. 2001. *Historia Numorum*. London.
- Salmon, E. T. 1958. Notes on the Social War. *TAPA* 89, 159–184.
- Schaub, J.-F. 2004. Une historiographie expérimentale. In C. Moatti (ed.), *La Mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée de l'antiquité à l'époque moderne*, 305–312. Rome.
- Scheidel, W. 2004. Human mobility in Roman Italy. I: The free population. *JRS* 94, 1–26.
- Scheidel, W. 2005. Human mobility in Roman Italy. II: The slave population. *JRS* 95, 64–79.
- Scheidel, W. 2006. The demography of Roman state formation in Italy. In M. Jehne and R. Pfeilschifter (eds), *Herrschaft ohne Integration? Rom und Italien in Republikanischer Zeit*, 207–226. Frankfurt.
- Sherwin-White, A. N. 1973. *The Roman Citizenship*, 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Smith, C. J. 2006. *The Roman Clan: The Gens from Ancient Ideology to Modern Anthropology*. Cambridge.
- Steel, C. E. W. 2001. *Cicero, Rhetoric, and Empire*. Oxford.
- Sumner, G. V. 1970. The truth about Velleius Paterculus: Prolegomena. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 74, 257–297.
- Taylor, L. R. 1960. *The voting districts of the Roman Republic*. Rome.
- Thomas, Y. 1996. 'Origine' et 'commune patrie'. *Étude de droit public romain (89av. J.-C.–212 ap. J.-C.)*. Rome.
- Torelli, M. 1999. *Tota Italia: essays in the cultural formation of Roman Italy*. Oxford.
- Toynbee, A. J. 1965. *Hannibal's legacy: the Hannibalic War's effects on Roman life*. London/New York.
- Walbank, F. W. 1972. Nationality as a Factor in Roman History. *HSCP* 76, 145–168.
- Welch, K. and Hillard, T. W. (eds) 2005. *Roman Crossings. Theory and Practice in the Roman Republic*. Swansea.
- Wilson, A. J. N. 1966. *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome*. Manchester.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1971. *New Men in the Roman Senate 139 B.C.–A.D. 14*. Oxford.
- Woolf, G. 1996. Monumental writing and the expansion of Roman society in the early empire. *JRS* 86, 22–39.