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ABSTRACT

The Intricacies of Rome’s Subjugation and Assimilation of Etruria

A thesis presented to the Graduate Program in Ancient Greek and Roman Studies

Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Brandeis University
Waltham, Massachusetts

By Michael Lundberg

Etruscan history is scant and accounts of their own history essentially nonexistent, resulting in their origins being fiercely debated amongst scholars. Etruscologists’ primary arguments are whether Etruscan culture developed primarily in Italy or Asia Minor. Although historical accounts from Herodotus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus and archaeological evidence primarily from mitochondrial DNA studies have been used to try to establish their origins, nothing definite has been ascertained. Etruria’s fall to the Romans is one of the few definitive facts known about Etruscan history. The means by which they fell, however, are another debate amongst scholars. While the Roman conquest of Etruria is often depicted as a straightforward military annex, it was actually done by means of diplomacy, establishment of colonies, military strategy, and the thorough implementation of Roman administration. Rome was able to siege and sack the Etruscan city of Veii with minimal assistance from other Etruscan city-states, taking advantage of the ire of other Etruscan cities felt towards Veii because of Veii’s appointment of a king. Veii’s fall to Rome served as a powder keg in its domination of Italy, as the fall of a chief economic rival gave Rome considerably more room to expand its economy and military. Rome’s...
use of colonies was a large factor in facilitating its expansion, as they allowed for Rome to establish key defensive positions and enabled them to cut off their enemies both militarily and economically. Colonies like Cosa were important following Rome’s conquest of Etruria, as they allowed Rome to strengthen its influence in conquered regions and weaken the conquered cities by cutting off key economic routes (i.e. Cosa cutting off Vulci’s control of the Maremma coastline). Archaeological excavations of cities like Veii, Vulci, and Volsinii are all vital to understanding how Rome dealt with conquered Etruscan cities, with Veii showing how Rome would sometimes utterly destroy a rival city from memory and the earth, Vulci conversely how Rome would implement a city into its system thoroughly, and Volsinii a strange combination of the two. More archaeological excavations tasked with discovering the transition between Etruscan and Roman periods of occupation will need to be conducted to determine to full extent of how Rome dealt with conquered Etruscan cities.
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Introduction

Before Rome was the dominant power in Italy, Etruria (Figure 1) reigned supreme. While it was more a league of city-states than a unified state, the Etruscans were a major Mediterranean power in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.E. They began to decline in the fifth century B.C.E., which coincided with Rome’s gradual, then swift rise to power. For Rome to rise, Etruria had to fall. Once the overlords of Rome, by the third century B.C.E., all of Etruria had fallen under Roman hegemony. Rome’s subjugation of Etruria is often wrongly viewed through the lens of Rome’s later conquests, with whole regions being annexed in wars. Rome in its infancy did not have the capability to do this to Etruria, so their strategies were far more complex than mere military conquest. Another striking aspect of Etruria’s loss of independence to Rome is the lack of any evidence of a mass revolt from a proud and advanced civilization. Rome’s subjugation of Etruria was accomplished by the strategy of divide and conquer by means of diplomacy, establishment of colonies, military strategy, and the thorough implementation of Roman administration. Another aspect of Etruscans that must be understood is Etruscan identity, as it is key to seeing how it became assimilated into the Roman world. One of the best ways to understand Etruscan identity is by exploring the complex nature of Etruscan origins. This work will not attempt to provide the entire account of the Roman subjugation of Etruria, as both archaeological and historical evidence only provides a partial fragment of what occurred, but rather through these case studies show the means by which it was accomplished.
Chapter 1: The Complexity of Etruscan Origins

One of the most vital aspects of understanding Etruria’s assimilation into Rome is understanding what makes their culture unique and one of the best ways to understand their cultural identity is by understanding their origins. While modern scholars debate many aspects of the Etruscans, their origin is one of the largest points of contention: Did they develop their culture inside or outside Italy? The prevailing theory of their origin outside of Italy is that the Etruscans originated from Asia Minor. Herodotus is often seen as the primary ancient source to support this theory, writing that the Etruscans descended from the Lydians.¹ In Herodotus’ account, the origins of the Lydian colonization of Tyrrhenia (Etruria) stem from a great famine in Lydia. The famine continued for eighteen years, so the Lydian king Atys split the populace into two groups, those who would stay and those that must leave.² The king’s son Tyrrenhus led the group that left by sea and journeyed to Umbria: hereafter the Tyrrenian civilization expanded into the surrounding area.³ Herodotus states: “They sailed past the lands of many peoples until they finally reached the land of the Ombrikoi, where they halted, built cities and still dwell to this day. Moreover, they changed their name from Lydians to Tyrrenians, to commemorate the king’s son who led the expedition”.⁴

² Ibid., 1.94.
³ Ibid., 194.
⁴ Herodotus, *Histories*, 1.94.
While Herodotus typically provides several differing accounts in his *Histories*, for Etruscan origins, he neither mentions another account nor says this was the only one available to him. Immediately following 1.94, he states how he will provide multiple sources about the rise of Cyrus the Great and Persia. The next mention of the Tyrrhenians Herodotus makes is in sections 165 to 167 of Book 1 of his *Histories*, where the Phoceans fled from the Persians and settled in their previously established colony of Alalie, located on the eastern shore of Corsica. They began raiding neighboring settlements and eventually provoked the Etruscans and the Carthaginians, who sent sixty ships each to stop the Phoceans from raiding any further. The Phoceans responded with sixty ships of their own and defeated the combined Etruscan-Carthaginian forces, but took heavy losses, subsequently fleeing Corsica and settling Rhegium in south-western Italy to avoid further conflict.

What is striking about this account is that the Phoceans are yet another group of people from Asia Minor that Herodotus claims to have settled in the Italian peninsula. The proximity of Alalie to Etruscan territory in western Italy and Carthaginian territory in northern Sardinia makes it plausible that a power in Corsica came into conflict with the Etruscans and Carthaginians. Herodotus’ account confirms he was well-aware of Central Italy’s geography, as he cites the city of Caere as one of the Etruscan cities involved in the war with the Phoceans. Caere is a well-known Southern Etruscan city with its rich necropolises and tumuli clear signs of an Etruscan city. In Herodotus’ account, Caere executed their Phocian prisoners, resulting in a curse that

---

5 Herodotus, 1.95.
8 As the Etruscans are known to have occupied Eastern Corsica, a war leading to the acquisition of this territory makes sense.
9 Herodotus, 1.167.
10 Known as Cerveteri in modern Italy
paralyzed everyone in Caere. The curse was broken by making sacrifices in honor of the slain Phoceans (mandated by the Pythia).\textsuperscript{11} When modern scholars argue that the Etruscans originated from Asia Minor, Herodotus’ account is often the most cited from literary evidence and the account of the Phoceans is further evidence that the migration of peoples from Asia Minor to Italy was not an isolated incident.

While Herodotus’ account is the primary ancient source used to support the theory that the Etruscans originated from Asia Minor, Dionysius of Halicarnassus’s \textit{Roman Antiquities} is used as the strongest piece of evidence to show that their origin was Italian.\textsuperscript{12} Juxtaposed against Herodotus’ account of the Etruscans, Dionysius of Halicarnassus provides a significant amount of literary evidence to support his argument. Granted, he had access to significantly more sources since he lived over four centuries after Herodotus. He first makes reference to the commonly held belief that the Etruscans were from Asia Minor, citing Herodotus’ account as the most detailed regarding the Tyrrhenians settling in Etruria from Asia Minor, but also cites a legend that Tyrrhenia earned its namesake because Tyrrhenus, who had descended from Zeus five generations before, had conquered a large portion of Italy starting from his small colony in the Italian peninsula.\textsuperscript{13} He also cites other tales of him with a lineage tied to other mythological figures like Heracles and Telephus, with each legend having significant differences regarding the name, location, and period of the Italian colonies.

To counter these claims of Tyrrhenus founding Tyrrhenia, Dionysius of Halicarnassus uses the historical accounts of Xanthus of Lydia, who Dionysius states is: “as well acquainted

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{11} Herodotus, 1.168.
\textsuperscript{12} Dionysius of Halicarnassus, \textit{Roman Antiquities} (Translated by Ernest Cary (Harvard University Press, 1950)), 1.28.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., 1.27.
\end{flushright}
with ancient history as any man and who may be regarded as an authority second to none on the history of his own country”.\textsuperscript{14} He then argues against these claims by using Xanthus of Lydia’s statement “neither names Tyrrenhus in any part of his history as a ruler of the Lydians nor knows anything of the landing of a colony of Maeonians in Italy; nor does he make the least mention of Tyrrhena as a Lydian colony”.\textsuperscript{15} Dionysius cites Xanthus’ account that both sons of Atys remained in Asia Minor (instead of one going to Italy). The descendants of Lydus are known as the Lydians and those of the Torebus as the Torebans.\textsuperscript{16} Dionysius also tells of the account of Hellanicus of Lesbos, who affirms that the Tyrrhenians were Pelasgians who fled from the invading Greeks and settled on an island called Croton in the Ionian Gulf, then colonized the area known as Tyrrhena in Italy.\textsuperscript{17}

Dionysius of Halicarnassus then argues that the Tyrrhenians come from neither the Lydians nor the Pelasgians, as no tangible connection exists between the Tyrrhenians and these peoples.\textsuperscript{18} He affirms their most likely origin is Italian, stating: “Indeed, those probably come nearest to the truth who declare that the nation migrated from nowhere else, but was native to the country, since it is found to be a very ancient nation and to agree with no other either in its language or in its manner of living”.\textsuperscript{19} The fact that Etruscologists have found that the Etruscan language is not Indo-European helps support Dionysius’ argument that the Etruscans did not have Greek origins, but does not disprove a linguistical link between Etruscans and Anatolians. In fact, linguistical links likely exist between Etruscan, Lydian, and Louvian. According to linguist Yaroslav Gorbachov, the Etruscan word for wine, \textit{matu}, is likely a borrow word from the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14} Dionysius, 1.28.2.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 1.28.2.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 1.28.3.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Ibid., 1.28.3.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 1.20.1.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 1.30.2.
\end{itemize}
Louvian word for wine, *mattu*.20 The material culture of the Etruscans prior to the Hellenizing period is also completely unique to the Etruscans, with their burial practices, architecture, and religious practices all sharing very few similarities with any civilization in Greece or the Near East.21 Yaroslav believes this is a strong indicator the Etruscans originate from Asia Minor, but he does not provide any further specific examples of a linguistic connection that Etruscan has with Lydian and Louvian, but he affirms that Etruscans share the use of haruspicy, the practice of divination through the use of animal entrails, with these Anatolians.22

Another valuable piece of information Dionysius of Halicarnassus provides is the origin of the words used to refer to the Tyrrhenians by the Romans and Greeks. On what the Romans call the Tyrrhenians, Dionysius states “from the country they once inhabited, they call them Etruscans, and from the knowledge of the ceremonies relating to divine worship, in which they excel others, they now call them, rather inaccurately, Tusci”.23 Dionysius says that the Greeks refer to Tyrrhenians as “Θυοσκόσι”, which he affirms should not occur if their origins were actually Lydian or Greek. According to Dionysius, the name the Tyrrhenians used for themselves was the Rasenna, which is supposedly the name of one of their leaders.24 The authenticity of Rasenna cannot be verified as it is not found in any other surviving sources. Much of the information known about the names given to the Etruscans stems heavily from this discussion in Dionysius’ *Roman Antiquities*.

---

21 Dionysius of Halicarnassus., 1.30.3.
22 Simone.
23 Ibid., 1.30.3.
24 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 1.30.3.
One distinct advantage Herodotus’ account has over Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ is that he provides the exact details of where the Etruscans settled and how they came to be.25 Dionysius’ account is merely speculative, surmising that the Italians came from Italy, but provides no evidence to prove this.26 The only evidence he provides are inconsistencies in literary evidence to disprove the sea migration theories and the lack of phonetic links among the Etruscans, Greeks, and Anatolians. Dionysius claims that he will write about the history and culture of the Etruscans in another book, but it has not survived.27 If this book still exists (or ever existed at all), it would likely give Dionysius’ arguments much more substance, as it would provide information about their culture that could set it apart from others. Herodotus’ account is brief, but the tale is presented as definitive rather than his own speculation. The fact that his story is supported by his contemporaries and countless classical authors is significant, but the general lack of archaeological evidence makes Dionysius’ theory more plausible.

Another prevalent theory is that the Etruscans are related to the Raetians that migrated down from the Alps, with this suggesting the Etruscans originated from beyond the Alps, likely to the north. Compared to a migration by sea from Asia Minor, this seems more plausible, as archaeological evidence suggests that the development of the Protovillanovans came from a transalpine migration from Central Europe.28 In Book 5, Livy makes a connection between the Etruscans and Raetians, stating:

On each side of the Apennines they built twelve towns, the first twelve on the southern side towards the Lower Sea, and later the second twelve north of the range, thus possessing themselves

25 Herodotus, 1.94.
26 Ibid., 1.30.2.
27 Dionysius, 1.30.4.
all of the country beyond the Po as far as the Alps with the exception of the little corner where the
Venetians live around the shores of their gulf. The Alpine tribes have pretty certainly the same
origin, especially the Raetians, though the latter have been so barbarized by their wild
surroundings that they have retained nothing of their original character, except their speech, and
even that has become debased. 29

The most noteworthy claim Livy makes in this passage is that the Raetians and the Etruscans
share the same language family, but the Raetian language had been barbarized over time. While
inscriptions found of the Rhaetian language have been found using two variations of the Etruscan
alphabet, the differences of syncopation and vocal harmony suggest that Rhaetian and Etruscan
are not in the same language family. 30 The use of a similar alphabet, but lack of a concrete
linguistic connection, is also seen with Euboean Greek and Etruscan. An explanation for all these
borrow-words and alphabetical connections between Etruscan and Indo-European languages is
the fact that the Ancient Mediterranean was a hotbed for cultural exchange. If a culture came
across a more efficient means to accomplish something, there was a strong chance that they
would adopt it in some capacity.

For those who support the notion of the Etruscans originating from Asia Minor or outside
Italy, until recently, scant archaeological evidence existed. No signs of great disturbance from an
outside force occupying land have been found around the time period the Etruscans are said to
migrated. 31 The largest piece of archaeological evidence comes from a mitochondrial DNA study
conducted in 2007 by Alberto Piazza, Marco Pellecchia, Licia Colli, et al. shows a connection
between the cattle of Tuscany and those of the Near East. For the study, the mitochondrial DNA

29 Livy, 5.34.
31 Circa 750 B.C.E.
of eleven bovine breeds in Tuscany were sampled. Six of the breeds exhibited DNA tracing back
to the Balkans, Asia Minor, and the Middle East. Four of the breeds\textsuperscript{32} are known to have
originated in the regions of Eastern Liguria and Tuscany, both areas where the Etruscans
settled.\textsuperscript{33} For the bovine mitochondrial DNA tests conducted in Northern and Southern Italy,
almost no genetic connection was found connecting them to bovines in Asia Minor or the Middle
East. Pellechia also found a sudden burst in genetic diversity that does not match the Neolithic
colonization of Italy.\textsuperscript{34} Human mitochondrial DNA tests of Tuscan citizens were conducted as
well, with a link found between Tuscans and people of Asia Minor, albeit with far more
variance.\textsuperscript{35} With the evidence they gathered, the hypothesis Pellechia and his team reach is that
cattle and humans traveled together by sea from Asia Minor to Etruria during the Late Bronze
Age.\textsuperscript{36}

Another DNA test was published in 2013 by Silvia Ghirotto et al. that reaches a different
conclusion. Ghirotto’s team conducted a comprehensive mitochondrial DNA test of human
populations from Tuscany and Asia Minor, attempting to find a link between the two. For the
mitochondrial DNA samples in Tuscany, the DNA of bodies of thirty Etruscans and twenty-
seven Medieval bodies was compared to the DNA of three-hundred and seventy modern
Tuscans. Thirty-five bodies of ancient Anatolians and one-hundred and twenty-three modern
Anatolians were also sampled to try to find a link between the populations Etruria and Asia
Minor.\textsuperscript{37} The study found genetic links between the two populations, but the variance in the

\textsuperscript{32} Chianina, Calvana, Maremmana, and Cabannina.
\textsuperscript{33} Marco Pellechia et al., “The Mystery of Etruscan Origins: Novel Clues from Bos Taurus Mitochondrial DNA.”
\textsuperscript{34} Circa 6000 B.C.E.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 1178.
\textsuperscript{36} Marco Pellechia et al., “The Mystery of Etruscan Origins: Novel Clues from Bos Taurus Mitochondrial
DNA.” Proceedings: Biological Sciences 274, no. 1614 (2007): 1179
\textsuperscript{37} Silvia Ghirotto et al., “Origins and Evolution of the Etruscan’s mtDNA”, 1.
mitochondrial DNA suggests that a mass migration from Asia Minor likely occurred during the prehistoric period. Any development of the Etruscan culture happened far later, however, and was not an immediate consequence of a culture from outside of Italy settling the area. The study also found that Etruscan genetic continuity was only found in isolated communities like Volterra and Casentino, while urban populations in Tuscany like Florence do not show any genetic continuity through their mitochondrial DNA.\(^{38}\)

The mitochondrial DNA has reignited the fierce debate about Etruscan origins, and nationalism is one of the driving forces behind this fervor. Scholars studying the Etruscans see how advanced the Etruscans were for their time both socially and technologically, so various scholars wish to tie the Etruscans in their national ancestry if they have sufficient evidence. For Turkish scholars, the evidence from Herodotus and other ancient sources was their main source for supporting their argument that Etruscans originated from Asia Minor. With the new mitochondrial DNA evidence, their argument was buoyed. The problem with using only mitochondrial DNA is that it does not trace paternal lineage. While maternal and paternal DNA in populations are typically consistent, when a population migrates, significant discrepancies can occur. Because the Etruscans in these DNA studies are theorized as being a migrating population, it would make sense that the men would intermarry with local women, as is seen with Alexander’s generals and soldiers when they settled in former Persian territory. Another example is the legend of Aeneas where he marries the daughter of a local Latin ruler to create lasting peace between the Trojans and Latins.\(^{39}\) Because mitochondrial DNA does not reveal the

---

\(^{38}\) Ghirotto, 7.

\(^{39}\) Livy, 1.1.
direct paternal line, the exact genetic line of the Etruscans cannot be determined completely through these studies.

Other modern scholars from outside of Italy also often find ways to discredit the notion that Etruscans originated from Italy. As one could guess, most Italian scholars are fervent in their belief that the Etruscans were purely Italian. Their differing beliefs on the origins of the Etruscans also change the very essence of who they believe the Etruscans were, with their own ideals of being and nationality becoming intrinsically tied with them. This is also why other matters regarding the Etruscans, like the conquest of Etruria, can be so polarizing, as each scholar has an idiosyncratic idea of what being Etruscan was.

Italian scholars began using the Etruscans as a source for national pride during the Italian Renaissance. Etruscan archaeological sites and material remains began to be rediscovered and the fact that Etruscans lived almost exclusively in Italy allowed Italian scholars to claim Italians as the primary descendants of this civilization. Etruscology became a popular study for Italian scholars, with its study used to promote Italian nationalism. The genesis of the “Etruscan Myth” began during the fourteenth century C.E., with Giovanni Villani’s work Nuova Cronica. In the Nuova Cronica, Villani details the history of the Etruscans from prehistory to the fall of Fiesole to the Romans in 283 B.C.E. He recounts the fall of Etruria to the Romans through the perspective of the Etruscan King Porsenna, who fought fervently against the Romans to preserve Etruscan independence, using Livy’s Ab Urbe Condita as his framework. By telling of the myth of a unified Etruria, Villani promotes a sense of regionalism that inhabitants of Tuscany can

---

draw from to unite together, despite Tuscany being split into city-states in the fourteenth century C.E.\textsuperscript{41}

Giovanni Batiista Piransei followed Villani’s example and incorporated Tuscan nationalism into the Etruscan myth even further. Piransei uses the letter that Coluccio Salutati\textsuperscript{42} addressed to the city of Perugia to promote Tuscan nationalism. In the letter Salutati compares the Florentine conflict with Milan with the Etruscan struggle for survival against the Romans. Both Villani and Piransei promote the idea of restoring the glory of the Etruscans in Tuscany.\textsuperscript{43} Piransei also believed that Roman architecture came almost exclusively from the Etruscans and that Etruscan architecture was inherently superior to other classical architecture, with other classical art like Greek art having a minimal influence on the Etruscans.\textsuperscript{44} In 1726, the Cortona Etruscan Academy was founded to promote a link between the citizens of Cortona and the Etruscans by investigating Etruscan culture and making their discoveries known to the public. As much of Italy was split into small states or under the rule of foreign powers in the eighteenth century, studying and promoting the idea of an Italian Etruscan heritage was a way for Italians to have pride in their history.

There are numerous pitfalls to using ancient people to justify current political goals. Coluccio Salutati essentially uses the “Etruscan Myth” to weaponize Tuscan nationalism. By evoking a glorious Etruscan past and portraying Tuscans (and Florentines especially) as the inheritors of their legacy, Salutati transforms the Florentine-Milanese conflict from regional strife into a morally justified conflict. Countless examples exist just from the modern era of the

\textsuperscript{41} Erik Schoonhoven, “A literary invention: the Etruscan myth in early Renaissance Florence”, 460.
\textsuperscript{42} Chancellor of Florence in the late fourteenth century
\textsuperscript{43} Schoonhoven, 460.
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., 10-11.
pitfalls of weaponizing nationalism, as countless evils have been justified by portraying “the other” as the antithesis to morality.

The debate on the provenance of the Etruscans will likely rage on as long as nationalism exists. Studying the debate of Etruscan provenance is vital to understanding how the Etruscans rose and fell and the study of Etruscology as a whole. As very little is known about the Etruscans through their own sources, one’s view of the Etruscans can change considerably depending on the lens with which one views them. By viewing the Etruscans as originating from Asia Minor or Greece, it makes them appear a brutal foreign conqueror, as the legends surrounding the foundations of Etruscan cities in Italy are violent. It also takes away from the accomplishments that the Etruscans likely made on their own, by attributing aspects of their culture, like their more open inclusion of women and technological feats, to another civilization. Viewing them as developing in a vacuum in Italy is also a questionable practice, as many cultures in the ancient Mediterranean learned and grew with help from each other.

The fierce debate between scholars on Etruscan origins shows how Etruscology itself is often divisive amongst Etruscologists. The exact manner of how the Etruscans fell is also a major point of contention. While their origins do not factor in directly into their demise, the various ways the Etruscans have been perceived contributes to the general difficulty of piecing together the exact means of their fall. By acknowledging the unique nature of Etruscan identity and the complexities of understanding it, the transition of Etruria to Roman rule no longer merely appears a minor change, but a major one to the framework of Etruscan society.
Chapter 2: Rome’s Strategies in Subduing Etruria

Rome conquered Etruria through a variety of strategies. Most of them were not through traditional military force and occupation. Rome’s conquest of the Etruscan city of Veii was one of the outliers, with the city being taken through a siege. The means by which the city fell vary depending on the primary source. Both Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus have similar accounts that diverge at the point when Veii fell and how the final war between Rome and Veii started. The two cities had a long relationship of hostilities, with Rome fighting Veii during the reign of Romulus. Although Rome had defeated Veii many times in the past, Veii always retained its independence. By 400 B.C.E., Rome’s attitude towards Veii had changed. Now, Rome viewed their conflict with Veii as a struggle from which only one of the two would emerge victorious, with Livy stating: “The coming of peace elsewhere found Rome and Veii facing each other with such mutual hatred and ferocity that none could doubt that defeat for either would mean extinction”. For the first time in its history, Rome made its army a standing one by beginning to pay their soldiers and making their troops remain at Veii in winter camps. This shift in strategy allowed them to emerge as the dominant power in Italy.

The final war between Veii and Rome starts differently in Dionysius’ account. Veii was preparing a revolt against Rome during the consulship of Marcus Genucius and Gaius Quintius.

---

45 Dionysius, 2.54.
46 Livy, 5.1.
47 Ibid., 5.1.
The senate then voted to enroll an army with both consuls in charge of the army.\textsuperscript{48} No other mention of the Veientes is made until section five of book twelve when Dionysius states: “the Tyrhennians the Fidenates, and Veientes were making war upon the Romans, and Lars Tolumnius, the king of the Tyrhennians, was doing them terrible damage”.\textsuperscript{49} Livy has a more detailed account of how the final war started, saying that the senate voted to declare war because Veii refused to give reparations to Rome and threatened that the Romans “would see that they got what Lars Tolumnius had given their predecessors”. Initial resistance from the tribunes was present because of the uncompleted war with the Volscians, but the motion eventually passed, and the siege began.\textsuperscript{50}

Where the two accounts are nearly identical is the part of the siege where an Etruscan soothsayer is said to have given a prophecy about Veii. The soothsayer said that Veii would not fall until the Alban Lake was diverted from its natural course, which would deny the Etruscans their water source. He said this to spite the Romans on the battlements on the other side of the wall, but a Roman centurion took this prophecy seriously by kidnapping the soothsayer and bringing him to the Roman camp.\textsuperscript{51} When he was eventually brought to the senate, the senators thought him a charlatan, but then messengers returned from Delphi with the same exact prophecy. The Romans then praised the soothsayer and then made tribute to the gods.\textsuperscript{52}

In Dionysius’ account, the Romans heeded this prophecy by tasking their engineers to begin to divert the flow of water.\textsuperscript{53} The Veientes then attempt to surrender the city peacefully,
but the Romans senate vote against this motion, as they wished to sack the city. One Etruscan envoy skilled in divination exclaimed to the senate:

A fine and magnanimous decree you have passed, Romans, you who lay claim to the leadership of your neighbours on the ground of valour, when you disdain to accept the submission of a city, neither small nor undistinguished, which offers to lay down its arms and surrender itself to you, but wish to destroy it root and branch, neither fearing the wrath of Heaven nor regarding the indignation of men! 3 In return for this, avenging justice shall come upon you from the gods, punishing you in like manner. For after robbing the Veientes of their country you shall ere long lose your own.54

Dionysius then says the city was soon overtaken and many Veientes were slaughtered or took their own lives.55 He does not say specifically how the city fell but is likely that the diverting of the Alban Lake forced them to surrender. This account of Veii’s fall is exclusive to Dionysius. The curse laid upon the Romans by the Etruscan messenger is likely a narrative device used by Dionysius to link the capture of Veii to the Gauls’ sack of Rome. As everything but the Capitoline Hill was taken by the Gauls soon after the fall of Veii, the messenger’s curse came to fruition. The city falling by the exact means that the prophecy foretold also creates a narrative bookend for Dionysius’ account. By telling the story of the fall of Veii through these means, Dionysius draws parallels between the fall of Veii and the epics of old. 56

Livy’s account does not draw nearly as many epic parallels as Dionysius’ regarding the fall of Veii. In Livy’s account, the siege of Veii swung in the Roman’s favor when Marcus Furius Camillus was appointed dictator. He promptly drove off Etruscan reinforcements from Falerii and Capena and then substantially increased the siege investment. A tunnel was then dug from the Roman battlements to the temple of

54 Dionysius 12.13.
55 Ibid., 12.13
56 i.e. the fall of Troy in The Iliad.
Juno in the central part of the city. While Livy does not specify how the tunnels linked to the city, if his account on how Veii fell is the correct one, it is likely that the tunnel connected to an Etruscan cistern, as a cistern’s own tunnels would provide a clear path to the city center and reduce the labor the Romans would have to do substantially. Camillus then situated troops inside the tunnel and then feigned a frontal assault while his men in the tunnels came from behind and then opened the gate of the city.

Livy also describes a great slaughter that occurred when the Romans assaulted the city, but also remarks that Camillus ordered any individual that was unarmed to be spared after the initial carnage. In opposition to Dionysius’ account, Livy states that citizens of Veii were completely unaware of the prophecies that foretold their doom and were completely surprised by the Roman attack from the tunnels. Livy also tells of another prophecy that foretold the doom of Veii, with a priest telling the king of Veii during a sacrifice that whoever carved up the sacrifice’s entrails would be the war’s victor. A Roman soldier in the tunnel overheard this and took the entrails to Camillus to carve up. Livy does think the tale “too much like a romantic stage-play to be taken seriously” and does not give it any historical credence.

Not only do both accounts diverge significantly regarding how the city fell, but Livy’s account of the siege of Veii is also significantly more detailed. Livy describes several stages of the siege, while Dionysius discusses only the stages of the siege following the Alban Lake prophecy. One significant detail in Livy’s account is that the
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Roman commanders decided to construct winter quarters at Veii.\textsuperscript{62} Never before had the Roman army operated year-round for a military operation. Not only did this change play a pivotal part in Rome’s victory over Veii, it also fundamentally changed how the Roman military and society worked. Livy reports the tribune of the plebs was outraged at this change, claiming that the construction of the winter quarters was “simply and solely to prevent the presence in Rome of large numbers of those active men who constitute the whole strength of the popular cause- if they are not here, then nothing will be done for you”.\textsuperscript{63} With soldiers serving year-round on campaigns, the tribune’s concerns were legitimate, as the power of Rome began moving towards the patricians rather than the precarious balance that had existed before.

The introduction of armies standing year-round throughout their campaigns also marked a dramatic shift in Roman military doctrine. Before, Rome’s campaigns had been primarily defensive in nature, with Rome defeating its enemies, then signing long peace agreements like the forty-year treaties along with demands of reparations and tributary payments. With Veii, Rome’s policies started to become much more aggressive. Because Rome could commit its forces to a siege and Veii consisted of only one city, Veii’s surrender meant a complete and utter defeat of the city-state. When Rome took and sacked the city, the fertile land around the city was distributed amongst the Romans, with the senate giving three and half acres of land from the estates in Veii to every free-born male plebeian.\textsuperscript{64} The occupation of the city itself was rather limited, as a proposed migration of Romans to Veii after Rome’s sack by the Gauls was prevented by

\textsuperscript{62} Livy 5.1.
\textsuperscript{63} Livy 5.2.
\textsuperscript{64} Livy 5.30.
Camillus. While Rome would not repeat the same level of aggressiveness that it displayed with its capture of Veii until the Samnite Wars, the fall of Veii marked the beginning of the end for Etruria, as Rome now had much more room to grow economically and physically, with a rival with such close proximity now utterly destroyed. While it outright annexation would not begin for a while, Rome began increasing its influence through the use of military colonies after the fall of Veii.

   Rome’s military colonies (Figure 2) played a vital role in its domination of the Etruscans and the rest of the Italian peninsula. Dionysius of Halicarnassus mentions Rome’s use of colonies when telling of a speech a Roman soldier made when justifying their takeover of Campania even after being granted shelter by the Campanians. In the speech, Dionysius recounts:

   Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ ἴσως μὲν καὶ κατ᾽ εὐχὴν δέξονται τὸ πραξθὲν ἀπασαν ἀξιοῦντες Ἰταλίαν ταῖς αὐτῶν ἀποικίαις κρατεῖσθαι
   
   The Romans perhaps will accept our action as truly an answer to prayer, ambitious they are to rule all Italy by their own colonies”.66

Dionysius’ choice of diction is striking in this passage, as the verb κρατεῖσθαι suggests a significant change in Roman power dynamics. κρατεῖσθαι translates into to rule or to have power over in English. By the time of the Samnite Wars, when this account takes place, Rome had been the leader amongst the Latin powers for quite some time, but did not claim to rule over them. Regarding Rome’s role amongst the Latin states using a verb

65 Livy 5.49.
66 Dionysius of Halicarnassus 15.3.
like \( \alpha \rho \chi \varepsilon \sigma \tau \omega \) would have been more typical. Although the soldiers depicted by Dionysius are depicted as wicked, greedy and power hungry\(^67\), Dionysius’ own use of \( \kappa \rho \alpha \tau \varepsilon \iota \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \) suggests a significant rise of Roman hegemony through the use of their military colonies. Another employment of diction is seen through Dionysius’ use of the traditional Greek word for colony, \( \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \omega \kappa \iota \alpha \varsigma \) to describe the Roman colonies. While indeed a word for colony, \( \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \kappa \iota \alpha \) carries a different connotation from the Latin \( \textit{coloniae} \). The former suggests a Greek civilian-led endeavor that is autonomous, while the latter is normally associated with colonies of a military-oriented purpose. Regardless of the exact reasons he employed the words, Dionysius’ choice of diction helps support the notion that Rome’s military colonies were a significant factor in gaining hegemony over Italy.

Rome’s use of military colonies is by far one of the leading causes of how Rome rose above the other Italian states and especially how they conquered and subdued Etruria. One of the leading scholars on the key role of Roman military colonization played in their domination of Italy was Edward T. Salmon, who details of how Rome’s military colonies led them to supremacy over Italy. One of Salmon’s strongest points is that “By strengthening their progress thus periodically with new \( \textit{coloniae} \), the Romans and Latini managed to liberate Latium from all control by alien Etruscii, Aequi, and Volsci: even the Celtic assault of 387 was quickly repulsed and repaired. The region became forever Latin”\(^68\). Salmon affirms that the Romans made these colonies militarily strategic by placing them in naturally defendable terrain, and still connected with other militarily-strategic points that made a military network difficult for Rome’s enemies to

\(^67\) Dionysius., 15.3.
traverse. They were often placed in the territory of defeated enemies to cut their and their allies’ settlements off from each other. While the enemy settlements themselves were often not occupied by the Romans/Latins during the early period of Roman colonization, these new defensive networks created by *coloniae* hindered any organized counterattack against Rome.

A majority of these early colonies were a mixture of citizens from Rome and other members from the Latin League, so while these colonies were key allies of Rome, most of its inhabitants were not considered Roman citizens. These early colonies were known as *Priscae Latinae Coloniae* (Table 1). They were allegedly formed beginning from the time of Romulus, but the primary record of these colonies can be traced back to the reign of Tarquinius Superbus. The *Priscae Latinae Coloniae* were in effect fully independent from Rome, but they served as valuable allies to Rome against their enemies. Fidenae was one of the first of these colonies and served as a crucial bulwark against Veii and the Faliscans.

Once Veii was dismantled by the Romans, the colonies of Sutrium and Nepi were founded as two additional bulwarks against the Etruscans around 382 B.C.E. Salmon describes them as “the keys to Etruria” and “Sutrium controlling the route to Volsinii via the forbidding Ciminiian forest and Nepet the route to Falerii and ultimately to Umbria; the Celts had shown as recently as 387 how vulnerable this region was”. After the Latin War, Nepet and Sutrium, along with Ardea, Cicerii, Norba, Setia, and Signia, were all designated as *Colonia Latina* (Table 3), maintaining a considerable degree of autonomy.
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Other Latin cities had been completely assimilated into Rome after the Romans defeated them and disbanded the Latin League, but the strategic importance of these seven colonies made them more valuable as independent entities rather than being completely dependent on Rome.71

Nepet and Sutrium were pivotal in forming a key strategic position against disaffected Etruscans in Southern Etruria, as the Roman were beginning to consolidate their hegemony over the region.72 During an attack on the two cities in 386 B.C.E., Livy describes the two cities as “velut claustra portaque Etruria”, underlying their key importance in the stemming Etruscan incursions into the heart of Latium.73 Livy makes several references to the cities being besieged during a war with the Etruscans between 389 and 386, but they were allies of Rome rather than colonies at this point in time. Because of the distance and lack of quick support from the Romans, the cities changed hands several times between the Romans and Etruscans.74 To strengthen Nepet, Livy says a board of three plebian tribunes were appointed to establish a Roman colony in the city in 383 B.C.E.75 Livy makes no mention of Sutrium here, but likely a similar board was appointed to make a colony in that city as well.

The two cities would continue to serve a critical role in the conflicts between the Romans and the Etruscans. During the Second Samnite War, Livy claims the Etruscans entered the war by laying siege to Sutrium in 311 B.C.E. A battle ensued when the Romans intercepted the Etruscans, with Livy stating that “Never in any battle would there
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have been fewer fugitives and more bloodshed, had not nightfall given its protection to those Etruscans bent on dying, so that the conquerors stopped fighting before the conquered”. 76 The siege allegedly eliminated the entire Etruscan frontline, pausing the siege. 77 Livy affirms the Etruscans renewed the siege in 310 B.C.E., with the Etruscans then being driven into the Ciminian Wood after being once again defeated by the Romans. 78

In addition to serving as vital defensive bulwarks, Sutrium and Nepet also played a key role in creating an economic strain on the Etruscans. Following the establishment of *coloniae Latinae* at Sutrium and Nepet, the archaeological record shows a decline in population density of rural settlements in Southern Etruria. A decline in agrarian production is also likely. 79 While declines in agrarian production are often heavily influenced by environmental factors, the placement of colonies like Sutrium and Nepet not only cut off Etruscan settlements from each other militarily, but also disrupted established trade routes. The seizure of land in the countryside gave Etruscan settlements less land for agrarian production as well. While economic disruption was not likely a primary motivation for the establishment of these colonies, the economic erosion of their enemies weakened them further and allowed for the additional growth of Roman hegemony.

Along with the *coloniae Latinae*, the Romans began implementing additional ways to establish/govern colonies. 80 When Rome began using the *municipium* (Table 2),
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civilian colonies, a considerable number of the inhabitants of these colonies were granted full Roman citizenship. These settlements possessed considerably autonomy, having their own local government, but did not lose their original Roman citizenship (if they were initially from Rome).\(^81\) This type of colony contrasts greatly with the Greek apoikia citizens where the inhabitants surrendered citizenship in their original polis. By establishing enclaves of largely autonomous Roman citizens, it allowed Rome to expand its hegemony without overtaxing the central government in Rome, which had yet to establish an effective provincial government. Salmon argues that Rome used colonies instead of outright annexation for this very reason, as the government was not organized enough to govern large areas, nor could they afford to anger their allies.\(^82\)

With the prospect of Roman citizenship and the many perks it entailed, the Roman municipium also allowed Rome to assimilate other cultures into their own. This was especially efficient in Central Italy, where it was strategically beneficial to have a large concentration of expanding Roman citizens. In the farther reaches of Italy, especially in Cisalpine Gaul, it was often a matter of fierce debate whether to grant Latin status or Roman status to the citizens., despite the manpower draw of citizen colonies making them far more effective in defending from threats.\(^83\) Even when their enemies were completely subdued, these citizen colonies allowed Rome continuous generation of more citizens loyal to the state.
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\(^81\) Salmon 49.

\(^82\) Salmon 48.

\(^83\) Ibid., 109. A Latin colony established at Aquileia in 183 did not have the strength to stop Gallic incursions, while a citizen colony would have likely been more effective due to drawing a larger number of people.
The colony established at Cosa (Figure 3 and Figure 4) was created for this very reason. Once the Romans defeated Vulci in 280 B.C.E., Cosa was established in 273 B.C.E. to cement Roman hegemony in the region. Cosa is considered the prototypical example of a Roman colony, as its design is typical for the average colony. It is a compact area of 33 and 1/8 acres of land, surrounded by a wall with square towers and three main gates. Its layout is in a rectangular centuriation grid, with a Cordo Maximus and Decumanus Maximus creating the main throughways and the other streets completing the grid. The arx is located at the center of the settlement, with the structure imperative to keeping the city organized.

Although Cosa is only about 139 kilometers from Rome, its location in the heart of Southern Etruria, close to Tarquinia and Vulci, meant Cosa was more strategically viable as a Latin colony opposed to a Roman one. The city is settled on a cliffside overlooking the Tyrhennian Sea. Because of its strategic position on the sea, these colonies were designated as *coloniae maritimae*. These colonies would ordinarily be designated Latin colonies if they were connected to Rome by a continuous block of Roman land and Latin if separated from Rome by non-Roman soil. Cosa was formed concurrently with the colony of Paestum in the south to subdue the Etruscans and Oscans and to build a defense against the growing Carthaginian threat. The exact population of Cosa is unknown, but the lack of any archaeological evidence of development extending
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beyond the original layout of the city suggests that the city never developed extensively.\textsuperscript{90} While the colony was founded in 273 B.C.E., archaeological evidence suggest that the remains of the city that have been found date to the second century B.C.E., even though they are within the original plan of the city.\textsuperscript{91} All the coinage found dates to the second century B.C.E. and after, with more than half of the coins from the Roman Republic.\textsuperscript{92} There is a significant dip in coinage until the time of Constantine, where 174 coins dating from the late fourth to the fifth century C.E. were found.\textsuperscript{93} The heavy concentration of coinage during the mid-Republican period suggests that Cosa was most valuable strategically during the mid-second century despite its foundation a century earlier being a critical time for the colony.

While Cosa’s design is exceptionally ordinary for a \textit{colonia maritima}, the lack of change from its original design helps accentuate the key features of this type of colony. With its key location in the heart of Southern Etruria, Cosa likely played a large role in subduing the Etruscan city of Vulci and the surrounding area. With Cosa’s postition on the Tyrrhenian Sea, it likely drew maritime commerce to that once went to Vulci, thus weakening it. While Vulci was a wealthy and preeminent city during the Etruscan era, it never reached the same heights during the Roman era, with its status then primarily middling.

Another colony that shows how the Romans utilized colonies to cement their hegemony in Italy was Paestum. Formed concurrently with Cosa in 273 B.C.E., Paestum

\textsuperscript{90} Dennis, 445. \\
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\textsuperscript{93} Ibid., 251.
served a similar purpose as Cosa in securing Roman control of the Tyrrhenian Sea. Paestum differed from Cosa in that it was placed in former Greek and Lucanian territory instead of Etruscan and was established inside an existing settlement instead of being a new site like Cosa. While not an Etruscan area, Paestum serves as an excellent example of how the Romans established their hegemony in already developed areas. Inscriptions from the third century B.C.E. show that the magistrates were designated as *quattuorviri*, a Roman magisterial position, and all Greek and Oscan governmental inscriptions were entirely replaced by Latin. The Greek agora of the city was also abandoned around this time and the old meeting hall (Ekklesiasterion) was destroyed, replaced with a new Roman forum (Figure 5), containing two Roman temples, a curia, baths, and a gymnasium. The presence of new Roman cults replacing/changing the old ones is apparent as well, with new figurines of mother and children suggesting a new fertility cult to Juno and votive inscriptions written in Latin rather than Oscan and Greek. The change in language of the inscriptions suggests a heavy influx of Latin colonists into Paestum, steadily outgrowing the city’s past inhabitants. Paestum serves as an example of how concerted an effort the Romans made in cementing their hegemony in newly occupied areas, replacing the past administrations with their own form of governance and making its citizens firmly Roman.

Cosa and other colonies the Romans erected played a significant role in cementing Roman hegemony. When Rome lacked the manpower and systemic
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organization to annex whole cities of their enemies, colonies provided an excellent alternative. Not only could they provide an enclave of Roman and Latin citizens allied or loyal to Rome in key areas that allowed expansion of the state, but they also provided a crucial defensive network that cut off Rome’s enemies from each other and also made it more difficult to target Rome itself. As Rome steadily grew more powerful following its recovery from the sack of Rome, these colonies provided a vital powerbase for Rome to cement its power in Italy permanently. They also ensured that enemy powers like the Etruscans could no longer readily recover from their economic losses from Rome and ensured their decline.

In addition to their colonies, other aspects of Rome’s statecraft also played a large role in subduing the Etruscans. As they consolidated their power in Italy, they were generally effective in not having all their enemies unite against them. When Veii was being besieged by the Romans, the Romans knew better than to try to take all the Etruscans on at once, allowing them to fight amongst themselves. As a consequence, only two of the twelve Etruscan states came to assist Veii, as the other states were angry with Veii for appointing a king of their own volition.\(^{98}\) When Caere was about to join the Tarquinians against the Romans, they had second thoughts. Roman diplomats were able to secure a one-hundred year truce between them and Caere, with the terms quite favorable for Caere since they had provided the Romans grain and shelter when the Romans had a massive famine in the fifth century and sheltered their citizens after

\(^{98}\) Livy, 5.5.
Rome’s sack by the Gauls. This deliberate sabotage of Etruscan unity falls firmly under Rome’s strategy of *divide et impera* (divide and conquer).

With other long peace treaties like this, Rome was cementing its hegemony over the other Italian powers. Forty-year treaties were generally an acknowledgement of their superiority, but the one-hundred-year treaties essentially cemented the other party firmly as a subordinate to Rome. When other Etruscans subsequently accepted one-hundred-year treaties, they remained firmly under the yoke of the Romans thereafter. Only the Etruscan cities that did not firmly resist the Romans would receive such friendly terms. Because these treaties were made individually, they also helped prevent the Etruscans from rising up against them in a mass revolt, as they were treated by the Roman state as separate entities.

Rome was adept at assimilating conquered peoples into their ranks through diplomacy. After Rome’s final war with Veii, Livy reports that Rome granted full citizenship to those who had deserted the cities of Veii, Capena and Falerii for Rome. They were also given a land allotment in the surrounding area as well. The offering of Roman citizenship was a benefit many enemies of Rome could not pass up when it appeared the tide of war was not in their favor, in addition to the considerable benefits of Roman citizenship. While the circumstances of the war were unique, the Romans accepted former rivals into their fold much more quickly when they did not resist Rome.
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When Caere was defeated for the final time by the Romans in 273 B.C.E., the city was soon granted citizenship *sine suffragio* by Rome. The denizens of Caere had the full rights of Roman citizenship, save for the right to vote in Rome’s elections. Caere received citizenship far earlier than other Etruscan cities because of their special relationship with Rome, with only brief periods of hostilities between the two. While the circumstances were unique, other Etruscan cities conquered by the Romans were more likely to accept Roman occupation peacefully after seeing the amenities Rome gave Caere. With time, these cities likely hoped to receive similar benefits.

As seen in this chapter, Roman political and military strategy allowed them to consolidate their hold on the Etruscans and the rest of Italy. Rome’s total destruction and annexation of Veii was far less common than their usual statecraft, but showed they would not allow such a prominent rival to exist. Their use of colonies was one of their most successful means of consolidating power in Italy, with the colonies of Nepet and Sutrium forming a defensive bastion in Southern Etruria that cut off Rome’s enemies from each other. Along with Cosa, these colonies imposed a significant economic strain on the Etruscans that can be seen in the decline in agricultural production in Southern Etruria. Rome’s statecraft was also vital to subduing the Etruscans, as they were often able to divide and convert their enemies with significantly less bloodshed compared to pure military force. In the following chapter, the effects of Roman strategy on the Etruscan cities they subdued will be explored in detail.
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Chapter 3: Rome’s Assimilation of Etruria

Another example of how the Romans cemented their hegemony over the Etruscans is the way they dealt with the Etruscan cities they conquered. Three cities that demonstrate a diversity with how the Romans differed in their treatment of conquered Etruscan cities are Vulci, Veii, and Volsinii, all rivals to Rome during their peak. Archaeological evidence suggests Vulci was treated relatively well by the Romans and was thoroughly integrated into Roman society. Volsinii was razed by the Romans in 264 B.C.E. after a revolt, but its citizens were relocated to a new area to settle. Veii conversely was thoroughly sacked by Rome and Roman citizens were forbidden from settling there after it was taken. The sack of Rome by the Gauls made Camillus especially fearful of Roman citizens settling there. 102

A great part of Camillus’ fear stemmed from the fact that Veii was such a great city during its prime. In his description of the city following its capture, Dionysius of Halicarnassus states: “Veii was in no respect inferior to Rome as a place in which to live, possessing much fertile land…and an atmosphere most pure and conductive to human beings…and its supplies of water were neither scanty nor brought in from outside…and were abundant and most excellent for drinking”. 103 Veii was also an extremely wealthy city as well, as it had gained a considerable amount of wealth from being the preeminent center of trade in Southern Etruria. Livy confirms

102 Livy, 5.51.
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the sheer amount of splendor Veii had by affirming that Camillus knew Veii contained more plunder than all his other campaigns combined.  

A city with such power and wealth would remain a threat to the city of Rome no matter how many times they were subdued, so the Romans essentially eradicated all presence of the Veientes. The city was essentially stripped bare, with Livy reporting that all property of value was taken and all free-born residents of the city were sold into slavery. Inscriptions found in Veii show the city would eventually be reoccupied up to the fourth century, but the city held little significance, being only around a third of the size of the original city. The Romans would repeat this type of sacking on even greater scale with Carthage, with its sack so severe the city would never pose a threat to Rome again.

The ruins of Veii today are barely visible, with little of city remaining. George Dennis in the mid nineteenth century observed that with each successive time he visited the city, fewer ruins of the city were visible. Dennis attributes this diminishment to the “pilferings of the peasantry”. According to Propertius, the city was falling to ruin even during the reign of Augustus. Propertius writes:

Et Veii veteres, et vos tum regna fuistis;
Et vestro posita est aurea sella foro;
Nunc intra muros pastoris buccina lenti
Cantat, et in vestis ossibus arva metunt.  

Veii, though hadst a royal crown of old,
And in thy forum stood a throne of gold!
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Thy walls now echo but the shepherd’s horn,
And o’er thine ashes waves the summer corn.\(^{109}\)

Propertius’ passage confirms the city of Veii was not a significant city during the Roman Empire, but it does not confirm Livy’s notion that the city was ripped apart, root from stem. While the city was falling apart during the reign of Augustus, an inscription found at Mola di Monte Gelato confirms it was still a governed municipality. The inscription describes four freedmen, with the most noteworthy being a C. Valerius Faustus, described as a *mercator bovarius* (cattle merchant).\(^{110}\) Faustus was also a member of imperial cult, designated as *Magistri Augustales*, with this particular title being replaced by *Servi Augustales* and *Augustales* around 14 C.E., suggesting that this inscription is from the late Augustan period.\(^{111}\) The presence of Faustus in Veii with an important position in the imperial cult at least suggests Veii was at least a functioning city and not an abandoned ruin as Propertius suggests. Archaeological evidence does suggest the city was abandoned in the early imperial period, but likely after the reign of Augustus.

The next factor to consider regarding Veii is how the Romans reduced the economic role of the city drastically under their governance. During the Etruscan period, Veii had an elaborate road network that made it a vital commercial center in Southern Etruria. Their innovation of roading cutting, with the roads being cut down to the valley floor through the volcanic stone. This allowed the city to create a large trade network and likely led to the significant Orientalizing influence found in the city.\(^{112}\) During the Roman period of Veii, the inverse of this was true: the
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main Roman trunk roads completely bypassed Veii. As a consequence, very little of Veii is known of during its Roman period as it played essentially no commercial role in Central Italy. After the city likely fell into ruin following Augustus’ reign, it remained abandoned until the late third century to fourth century C.E., with an inscription dedicated to Constantius I the only concrete evidence of settlement from this time period.

The reduction of Veii from a major city in Central Italy during the Etruscan period to a small municipality during Roman occupation seems purposeful. Obviously mass looting and enslavement of every free-born citizen would cripple any settlement, but the Romans seem to go out of their way to make sure that Veii will never be of any significance ever again. Following the sack of Rome by the Gauls, it makes sense that Camillus warned against abandoning the city for Veii, as not only would Rome be depleted of its citizens, but in a way, they would be taking the identity of the vanquished Veientes. Rome was not permanently occupying enemy settlements at this time as they were still essentially a city-state, even though they were already the primary power in Italy. Because Veii was an eternal enemy of Rome, Rome likely felt the need to destroy the very idea of Veii. Selling all of its citizens into slavery and scattering them throughout the Mediterranean eliminated any chance of retribution from the citizens themselves, but the reputation of the city as an economic power that matched and perhaps even exceeded Rome was something the Romans had to eliminate. Although the area’s fields and resources were fully utilized by the Romans, the city itself could never be allowed to rival Rome again, even with her own citizens in charge. Thus, Roman trade networks bypassed the city and many of the technological innovations made by Veii in the city-state’s infrastructure were ignored.
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As seen with Etruscan cities like Vulci (Figure 6), cities that did not pose such a commercial threat to Rome were integrated much more thoroughly into Roman society. One correlation that helps support this notion is the density of red-slip pottery found in a city, which helps indicate a large population of Roman elite in the city. The more red-slip pottery found, the greater the likelihood the city was a major Roman municipality.\textsuperscript{115} In the case of Veii, very little red-slip pottery has been found, further evidence it became a minor municipality during Roman occupation. Vulci conversely has a significant density of red-slip pottery. The presence of extensive Roman infrastructure in the city also confirms it was a thriving municipality. During the Etruscan period, it was one of the Twelve Cities, the twelve most prominent cities in the Etruscan League.\textsuperscript{116}

Vulci does not have the same storied history with Rome as Veii, with the only surviving record of conflict between the two found in the \textit{Fasti Consulares} in Rome.\textsuperscript{117} The \textit{Fasti Consulares} are official records describing the events that occurred during a consular year. In the year 473 (280 B.C.E.) the \textit{Fasti Consulares} report that both Vulci and Volsinii fell to the Romans:

\begin{verbatim}
........NCANIVS.TI.F.TI.N.COS.AN.CDLXXIII.
........VLSINIENSIBVS.ET.VVLCIENTIB.K.FEB.
\end{verbatim}

280 B.C.E. is a significant date in Etruscan history, as it is often considered the year most of the remaining Etruscan cities remaining after the Second Samnite War fell under Roman hegemony. The fact that Vulci is listed concurrently with Volsinii in the \textit{Fasti Consulares} suggests that
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Vulci was one of the preeminent powers in Etruria during this period, as Volsinii was one of the most powerful Etruscan cities up until it fell to Rome.\textsuperscript{118} Volsinii was also the location where members of the Etruscan League would meet to elect the High King. Vulci likely took its place as one of the Twelve Cities after Veii, Falerii, and other Etruscan cities in Southern Etruria fell to the Romans.\textsuperscript{119}

Although Vulci put up a concerted effort against the Romans, the city appears to have thrived during the Roman period. Pliny the Elder makes a brief mention of the city in Book 3 of \textit{The Natural History}, writing of Cosa and its relation to Vulci and of the citizens of Vulci, stating: “Cosa of the Volcientes, founded by the Roman people…the Voleentini, surnamed Etrusci”.\textsuperscript{120} Vulci appears not to have been an exceptionally large city, but likely held considerable wealth. Its remaining infrastructure helps reveal this wealth (Figure 7). Most of the ruins standing from the city date from the Roman and Medieval period, with very little remaining from the Etruscan period.\textsuperscript{121} The city had extensive walls during the Roman period, with five gates surrounding about two square miles of urban area. Remains of the Etruscan walls can be seen with the parts of the walls containing \textit{tufa} blocks, stone blocks made of a very malleable stone local to the region.\textsuperscript{122} The other major Etruscan remnant still standing is a temple across the \textit{decumanus maximus} from the Roman Forum. The temple is thought to originate around sixth to fifth century B.C.E., with the temple likely being dedicated to Mars.\textsuperscript{123} Its layout is typical of
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\textsuperscript{123} The following descriptions of Vulci and the archaeological excavation come from my own personal experience of the site, instruction and personal conversations with Dr. Maurizio Forte, Elisa Biancifiori, and other project archaeologists at Vulci Archaeological Park.
an Etruscan temple, made of colonnade on four sides, but there are clear signs of renovation from
the Roman period that replaced its wooden supports with stone.

Unfortunately, the Roman Forum of Vulci remains in the hands of private landowners, so
the forum remains unexcavated. Excavations at the forum would likely reveal a considerable
amount about the municipal status of Roman Vulci. Fortunately, land surveys and drone
mapping has revealed that the Roman Forum was extensive, proving itself a considerable
administrative center. The largest piece of evidence showcasing Vulci’s wealth during the
Roman period is a large villa known as the *Domus Cryptoporticus* (Figure 8). It was built between
the second to first century B.C.E., with the high density of coins found during this period a key
indication of the era’s prosperity. The surface portion of the villa is standard for a wealthy
Roman villa, with the typical storefronts, reception, living and dining areas, and a bathhouse.
The villa receives its namesake from the extensive tunnels underneath the villa, likely a storage
area for goods like wine. A villa of this size in Vulci suggest that the city was a major economic
center in the region.

While the temple showcases Etruscan occupation of the city and the *Domus
Cryptoporticus* shows wealth during the Roman Period, Duke University’s excavation site (Figure
9) between the two structures shows the crucial period of Vulci’s integration into Roman
hegemony. Co-directed by Maurizio Forte and Elisa Biancifiori, the excavation’s focus is
discerning the transition between the Etruscan and Roman periods of Vulci. The site is 30x10
square meters and consists of an array of fill and cut layers. As a result of this mix of periods in
the fill layers, Etruscan and Roman artifacts were found together during excavation. For
example, Italian red-slip and Etruscan black glazed pottery were often found in the same context, even though their age gap was over three-hundred years.\textsuperscript{124}

The most significant aspect of this transitional period relates to the drainage systems found at the site. Lying underneath a travertine floor in the center of site is an Etruscan cistern. The primary tunnel descending into the cistern measures about ten meters long and a meter and half wide. The excavation of the cistern began during the 2018 season, but the bottom was not reached until the 2019 season headed by speleologists from A.S.S.O. Excavations of the cistern began in early June and concluded the week of June 21\textsuperscript{st}. Around seven meters was excavated by the team downwards and about three meters excavated from the tunnels, diverting from the main chamber, that lies around eight meters down.\textsuperscript{125} The excavation of the cistern found an array of artifacts from both the Roman and Etruscan period mixed together. The fill consisted primarily of pottery sherds, lamp fragments, and coins; large chunks of iron slag were also found.

The mix and density of artifacts found in the Etruscan cistern found likely confirms that the cistern was backfilled at some point during the Roman period. Any reason for why the cistern is pure conjecture at this phase of the investigation, but there are several theories that can be provided. One is that, once the Roman took over the city, they wanted to erase any obvious former Etruscan presence in the city. This theory is extreme, but the addition of Cosa in 272 B.C.E. is an obvious sign that Rome wished to maximize Roman presence in the region. The fact that Vulci does not appear as a major rival to Rome as Veii also indicates they likely would not resort to such wanton destruction of Etruscan infrastructure. A more likely alternative is that
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during the Roman period of the city, the cistern gradually fell into disrepair and eventually was backfilled to minimize risk.

Another significant find that was found during the 2019 excavation season was a partial model of a city, likely Vulci. The model was originally found in fragments, but most of the model was able to be reassembled. It is a terracotta figure and resembles the Etruscan temple found in Vulci. It is almost an exact match of another model of an Etruscan temple found in Vulci, housed in the Villa Guilia (Figure 10), but the newly discovered model lacks a model set of other buildings. While the models do not appear to be exact copies of buildings in Vulci by any means, they provide valuable insight on how the Etruscans depicted their own structures.

While almost no historical knowledge is preserved regarding Vulci and its relationship to Rome before and during Roman occupation, the archaeological evidence shows how life continued for the people of Vulci. As opposed to Etruscan cities like Veii and Volsinii, the heavy presence of Roman infrastructure in this city makes it apparent Rome made a concerted effort to make the city thrive. Vulci did not hold nearly the same importance as the aforementioned cities, as Vulci was not a bitter rival to Rome like Veii, nor the symbolic capital of Etruria like Volsinii. The existence of the city did not serve as a symbol for fellow Etruscans to rally behind, so it was integrated into Rome’s hegemony relatively organically. There are considerable gaps in historical and archaeological information concerning Vulci’s integration into the Roman Republic, but the mix of archaeological contexts at Vulci at least show there was integration rather than separate municipalities established near the former site, like Veii.

While Vulci and Veii show Roman agency in mitigating Etruscan resistance, very little is known of the agency of Etruscan citizens in dealing with Roman occupation. The only documented organized resistance is Volsinii’s revolt against Rome in 264 B.C.E. Cassius Dio
writes of this revolt, affirming that Volsinii was a powerful foe of Rome, but slipped into debauchery and slothfulness once they came under Roman rule. The masters kept giving their slaves more power and autonomy until the slaves seized the city themselves. When the senators of Volsinii secretly deliberated on whether to enlist Rome’s help, they were put to death by the slave leadership. Quintus Fabius was then sent to deal with them and Dio states:

> He routed those who came to meet him, destroyed many in their flight, shut up the remainder within the wall, and made an assault upon the city. In that action he was wounded and killed, whereupon the enemy gained confidence and made a sortie. Upon being again defeated, they retired and underwent a siege; and when they were reduced to famine, they surrendered. The consul scourged to death the men who had seized upon the honours of the ruling class, and he razed the city to the ground; the native-born citizens, however, and any servants who had been loyal to their masters were settled by him on another site.

Rather than depicted as any resistance to Roman occupation, Dio attributes the revolt to moral decay. The most contemporary surviving source, Valerius Maximus, also writes of the moral decline of Volsinii, reporting that the height of the decadence was when the slaves passed a law that made it legal for slaves to rape their masters’ wives and no virgin woman could marry a free-born man until she had sex with one of them.

> The fact that all the sources attribute this revolt to debauchery makes the accuracy of these reports dubious at best. Whenever a Roman author reports a revolt, they often portray the revolt as the result of moral decay or as an incursion led by a band of brigands. The revolt was likely more organized and included a large amount of the general population of Volsinii, as Rome razing an entire city to the ground because of a slave uprising seems arbitrary and excessive. Whatever the true nature of the revolt was, it likely served as a deterrent for other
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Etruscan cities to revolt against Rome. Seeing the city where the Etruscan High King was elected razed to the ground must have been a significant ideological blow to Etruscans still wishing to cast off Roman rule.

Analyzing the archaeological record of Volsinii to determine the means and impact of Roman occupation is difficult, as the site of the original Volsinii is still disputed among scholars. The prevailing theory now is that the original city was located at Orvieto and the city where the Volsinians were said to have been relocated by the Romans is thought to be located at Bolsena, 21 km away. While archaeological evidence does not show widespread destruction in Orvieto around 264 B.C.E., there is a halt in development around this time and a low concentration of Latin inscriptions in Orvieto compared to Bolsena, with only one of thirty-one inscriptions related to religion in Volsinii found in Orvieto. Conversely, the Roman forum found at the site in Bolsena dates to the third century B.C.E., placing its construction around the same time as the destruction of Old Volsinii. Archaeological evidence at Orvieto also shows the city prospered during the Archaic and Classical periods, making it highly likely that the city is the location of Old Volsinii.

Apart from evidence from inscriptions and construction around the same period, the transition from Old Volsinii to New Volsinii can be seen through evidence in New Volsinii of the continuation of religious cults from Old Volsinii. The Etruscan goddess Nortia is reported by Tertullian to have been worshipped during the Imperial Era. Nortia was considered one of the
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chief patron deities of Volsinii, so the religious cult likely continued through inhabitants that were relocated from Old Volsinii to New Volsinii. Several inscriptions found in New Volsinii show that Nortia retained her Etruscan name, with one reading “[t]empl[um] deae N[orti]ae”. Livy’s report of nails being driven into the temple of Nortia in the same manner as the temple of Minerva in Rome suggests the former was assimilated into the latter. While there are clear archaeological signs of the resettlement of Old Volsinii in the Late Republican Period, the continuation of key religious cults in New Volsinii strongly suggests the bulk of Old Volsinii’s surviving population migrated to New Volsinii and the resettlement was likely a new municipium established by the Romans.

By the time Hannibal invaded in 218 B.C.E., Etruscans had been under Roman rule long enough and had seen what happened to those who resisted not to raise up arms against Rome. Etruscans likely had significant qualms with Hannibal frequently moving his troops through Etruria, as Polybius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus both report that Etruria was vital staging ground for Hannibal as he was moving his forces down to Southern Italy. Hannibal’s army probably ran out of their own supplies long before they finished crossing the Alps and exploited the countryside of Etruria for food and equipment. The presence of Roman troops in the area likely deterred Etruscans from revolting as well.

Significant unrest emerged in Etruria around 208 B.C.E., when Livy reports the pro-praetor Gaius Calpurnius reported that a revolt was unfolding in Etruria, with Arretium the

---

132 Calapà, 43.  
133 Calapà, 43.  
134 Livy, 7.3.7.  
135 Calapa, 41.  
center of the revolt. Calpurnius was then instructed by the Roman Senate to occupy Arretium and take hostage the children of the city’s senators. While some senators were able to escape, 120 children were transferred to Rome as hostages. This measure appears to have pacified Arretium, as no other mention of the city is made by Livy until the account of the major Etruscan cities pledging supplies to Scipio in 205 B.C.E., with Arretium’s contribution being 3,000 shields and helmets, 50,000 pikes, and 120,000 measures of wheat.

The fifty-six-year gap between any recorded revolt is significant. Periods of unrest in Etruria between these time periods probably existed, but no record remains, with the loss of Books eleven to twenty of Livy a major gap in knowing the political climate of Etruria during this time period. Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ *Roman Antiquities* are also fragmentary during this period. Rome’s integration policies as seen with Vulci and the fear of reprisal it instilled with the destruction of Volsinii probably dampening unrest in Etruria by a significant margin, but undoubtedly there was still resistance to Roman rule. The placement of colonies between these conquered settlements also likely helped prevent the mass organization of the Etruscans against the Romans. The fact that Rome was able to conquer the Etruscan cities individually contributed to the prevention of mass revolt. By separating their enemy both physically and diplomatically, the Romans used the autonomy of each Etruscan city against them. Their lack of unity proved their downfall. The lack of mass revolt was no coincidence, skilled Roman statesmanship pacified Etruria.
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Conclusions

Rome’s subjugation of Etruria was far from a straightforward conquest. It was an adept weaving of military strategy and political acumen. Rome’s history with Veii shows that Veii’s close proximity to Rome was a massive inhibitor to Rome’s growth. Once Veii was defeated by Rome in 386 B.C.E., Rome soon became much more aggressive in their foreign policy, as they now had the economic means to begin expansion. Before they had the political and economic base to begin annexing their defeated foes, Rome dealt with its defeated enemies diplomatically while concurrently creating colonies to act as a military deterrent, especially in the case of Nepet and Satrium. While Roman/Latin colonies had the effect of separating their enemies from each other, the division they created between enemy settlements also cut off trade networks, weakening the economies of these settlements considerably, as seen with Cosa cutting off Vulci from Mediterranean trade. Trade was what made the Etruscans such a powerful force in Italy to begin with; by denying them economic superiority, Rome hastened the decline of Etruscan power. In its infancy, Rome did not have the manpower, political system, or the economic base to annex their enemies. Through their proficient use of divide and conquer with the Etruscans, they were able to erode the base of their largest rival in Italy and integrate them into the Roman state once they were completely defeated.

While the archaeological record does not provide a clear picture of how the Romans subjugated the Etruscans, it does show partially how the Romans integrated
conquered Etruscan cities into their domain. As the Romans had differing strategies in subjugating each Etruscan city-state, they integrated the cities through different means as well. In the case of Veii, the scant archaeological record supports the notion the city was abandoned following its final defeat by the Romans in 396 B.C.E. Because of the city’s proximity to Rome making it a rival for local resources, in addition to its considerable wealth, the Romans felt they had to prevent the city from ever being a threat to Rome again. While Roman settlements were added to the area, they never came close to the splendor of the original city. Rome’s defeat of Veii was a watershed moment that marked the beginning of the end for the rest of Etruria, as the city that was limiting their economic expansion was no more.

Vulci’s integration into Roman hegemony was considerably more complex than how Veii was dealt with. While Vulci was weakened by the creation of Cosa, archaeological evidence shows the Romans made a significant effort in developing the city, with the Roman Forum and the Domus Cryptoporticus signs of Roman economic development in the city. The mixture of Etruscan and Roman artifacts in the Duke Excavation site at Vulci strongly suggests Roman renovations of former Etruscan areas. The backfill of the cistern found in Vulci possibly shows that the Romans were willing to destroy useful infrastructure of their subjugated foes in order to solidify their new regime. The destruction/abandonment of Paestum’s old Greek/Lucan city center to create a new Roman forum also supports this notion.

Volsinii’s integration into the Roman fold manages to be even more complicated than Veii and Vulci. The historical accounts of the city being destroyed in 264 B.C.E. are supported by the lack of development in the city center until the Late Republic. As
opposed to Veii, the bulk of the surviving population of Volsinii appears to have migrated to New Volsinii, located on Lake Bolsena twenty-one kilometers away. Inscriptions in New Volsinii of the Temple of Nortia confirm the continuation of prevalent religious cults stemming from Old Volsinii. While the citizens of Volsinii were allowed by the Romans to remain together, the movement to New Volsinii and the construction of a Roman Forum around the time Old Volsinii’s abandonment suggests their resettlement had to be on the Romans’ terms.

While these case studies can partially reveal the nature of Roman subjugation and integration of Etruria, the whole story remains unclear. One of the largest missing pieces is the complete lack of a surviving chronicle of Etruscan history. Not only is there a complete lack of historical sources from the Etruscans, but the full accounts of Etruscan affairs from Roman authors like Claudius and Dionysius do not survive either. Livy and Dionysius’ accounts of Roman history become fragmentary in the early third century B.C.E., the period when most of Etruria fell under Roman occupation.

Archaeological evidence remains scant as well. Because of the time elapsed and the general difficulty of ancient military archaeology, finding archaeological evidence to show military conflict between the Romans and Etruscans is next to impossible. If signs of conflict between the two powers could be found, it could help date when each city Etruscan city fell to the Romans. Even so, this evidence would remain inconclusive and circumstantial. The larger problem is the general lack of archaeological excavations of transitional Etruscan sites. Duke University’s excavation of Vulci is one of the few excavations focusing on the interlayering of Etruscan and Roman occupation of an originally Etruscan city; most explore before or after. Vulci Archaeological Park may
soon extend archaeological permits on a wider scale, so the influx of additional
excavations may reveal a considerable amount about Vulci’s transition to a Roman city. If permission is given by private landowners to excavate the supposed site of the Roman forum, it may serve as the greatest supporting evidence of how Rome implemented their administration in Vulci. While the historical accounts of the Etruscans will likely be lost forever, additional archaeological excavations will make the study of the Roman subjugation and integration of Etruria a captivating field. While today the whole story remains woefully incomplete, the historical and archaeological evidence presented serve as the building blocks to understand this critical period of Roman and Etruscan history further.
Table 1: Priscae Latinae Coloniae: List originally from M.K. Termeer’s “Early colonies in Latium (ca 534-338 BC) A reconsideration of current images and the archaeological evidence”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colony</th>
<th>Foundation Date B.C.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signia</td>
<td>Tarquinius Superbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circeii</td>
<td>Tarquinius Superbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora</td>
<td>Tarquinius Superbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pometia</td>
<td>Tarquinius Superbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidenae</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signia</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velitae</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitellia</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circeii</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satricum</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setia</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutrium</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepet</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: List of Roman Colonies (municipium) established following the Latin War to 245 B.C.E.: List originally from Kathryn Lomas’ The Rise of Rome: From the Iron Age to the Punic Wars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Colony</th>
<th>Region/Territory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Antium</td>
<td>Volsci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Tarracina</td>
<td>Volsci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Privernnum</td>
<td>Latium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Minturnae</td>
<td>Aurunci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Sinuessa</td>
<td>Aurunci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290-286</td>
<td>Castrum Novum</td>
<td>Picenium or Etruria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Sena Gallica</td>
<td>Umbria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Aesis</td>
<td>Umbria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Alsium</td>
<td>Etruria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Fregenae</td>
<td>Etruria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 3: List of Latin Colonies Following the Latin War**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Colony</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Settlers (adult males)</th>
<th>Territory (km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Cales</td>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>Fregellae</td>
<td>Latium</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Luceria</td>
<td>Apulia</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Saticula</td>
<td>Samnium</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>SuessaAurunca</td>
<td>Latium</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Pontiae islands</td>
<td>Latium</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Interamna Lirenas</td>
<td>Latium</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Sora</td>
<td>Latium</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Alba Fucens</td>
<td>Central Apennines</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Narnia</td>
<td>Umbria</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Carseoli</td>
<td>Central Apennines</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Venusia</td>
<td>Apulia</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Hadia</td>
<td>Central Apennines</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Paestum</td>
<td>Lucania</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Cosa</td>
<td>Etruria</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Arimium</td>
<td>Umbria</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Beneventum</td>
<td>Samnium</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Firmum</td>
<td>Picenum</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Aesernia</td>
<td>Samnium</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Map of Etruria
Figure 2: Map of Roman and Latin Colonies in Italy

Roman territory about 500 B.C.
Additions to the Roman territory by 246 B.C.
Limit of the Roman territory about 235 B.C.
Roman territory and Latin colonies about 100 B.C.
Latin colonies about 100 B.C.
Roman allies about 100 B.C.

Roman roads

The figures indicate the dates B.C. of the founding of colonies. See also p. 2627 and 3635.
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Figure 3: Plan of Cosa
Figure 4: Cosa’s Relative Location to Vulci
Figure 5: Map of Paestum’s Forum and Abandoned Agora

Figure 6: Map of Vulci
Figure 7: Drone photo of Area Surrounding Duke Excavation

Figure 8: Domus Cryptoporticus
Figure 9: Duke Excavation Site, Cistern in the Top Center of Unit
Figure 10: Identical Model in Museo Villa Guilia to Model Found at Vulci (top)
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