

Chapter V EPILOGUE

'Dieselbe Wichtigkeit, die der Bau von Knochenreliquien für die Erkenntnis der Organisation untergegangener Thiergeslechter, haben Reliquien von Arbeitsmitteln für die Beurtheilung untergegangener ökonomische Gesellschaftsformationen. Nicht was gemacht wird, sondern wie, mit welche Arbeitsmitteln gemacht wird, unterscheidet die ökonomischen Epochen. Die Arbeitsmitteln sind nicht nur der Gradmesser der Entwicklung der menschlichen Arbeitskraft, sondern auch der Index der gesellschaftlichen Verhältnisse, unter denen gearbeitet wird'.

Marx 1867, 144.

The transitions in central Italy during the period 800 to 400 BC were momentous and involved all aspects of society. I have presented some of these aspects as models and processes in chapter I. The main characteristics are the advance of social stratification, the urbanisation process, the early state formation and eventually the legal definition of private family property of resources. These transformations were sustained by a growing population.¹ The archaeological evidence presented in this study, demonstrates that the organisation of production is an intrinsic feature of these changes.² The described intensification of industrial activities and the transition from household production to workshops, would not have been feasible without the associated social-economic changes such as the the stratification process and the introduction of the market mechanism. In a society undergoing significant progression in a relatively short period that basically occurred during the 8th to 6th centuries BC, one can expect to encounter various forms of increasing specialisation.³ I have, therefore, mentioned that economic centralisation initially occurs around:

- resources,
- natural harbours, *emporía*,
- sanctuaries or
- homesteads of the elite.

In my opinion these four options are represented in this study.

The settlements at Lago dell'Accesa and at Acquarossa flourished on account of their location near mineral deposits. The processing of ores and metals is shown at Lago dell'Accesa for the 6th century BC and for Acquarossa

¹ cf. Potter 1976; Enei 1993.

² By various scholars, much emphasis has been placed on transmission of technology by diffusion and the role of immigrant craftsmen in central Italy. This was not the point of departure for my study though I acknowledge that transmission of both goods and ideas assisted by freedom of trade, was essential for the development of the Etruscan and Latial culture during the early Orientalising Period. The methodology of my research, that is the analysis of primary industrial evidence, generates predominantly data on the local arrangements and less on the position of Levantines and Greeks in central Italy especially since their presence is hardly documented by inscriptions or by other data in the workshops recorded in this study. This coincides with the regulation by the indigenous communities of the internal social-economic conditions. This aspect is illustrated in this thesis because immigrant craftsmen and transmission of concepts by diffusion is not the main point but rather the internal social-economic arrangements to which immigrants and other intermediaries were submitted. Thus, I read the continuous imitation of imported pottery as a manifestation of the strength of the internal demand and market since it could accommodate the output of these workshops. Implicitly or explicitly, others prefer to record this imitation as a sign of superiority of the Greek culture. I refer to Hemelrijk for an explicit manifestation of this attitude: Hemelrijk 1984, 193. See for a reaction against such views: Morris 1994 a; Gill 1994; Arafat and Morgan 1994.

³ As mentioned in the preface and in section 1.5, agriculture remained the sound base on which the intensification of industrial activities could proceed.

from the late 8th century BC. This substantiates the hypothesis that their economic progress partially depended on accessible mineral deposits. However their development became hampered by a gradual devaluation of iron especially and by deficient social-economic dynamics.

The settlement at *Pithekoussai* exemplifies an *emporion* at a natural harbour. At this port of trade various ethnic communities lived together during the 8th and early 7th centuries BC. The settlers manufactured goods for their own consumption as well as for the Italic population on the mainland. *Pithekoussai* is a type B *emporion* which are distinguished by import trade and workshops.⁴ *Pyrgi*, *Gravisca* and *Regisvilla* are well defined Archaic *emporia* along the coast of central Italy but unfortunately workshops have not been reported from these sites.⁵ It is, however, likely that workshops existed at these gateway communities.

Economic centralisation around a sanctuary is so far best illustrated by the development of the settlement at *Satricum*. Workshop activities are known from about 650 BC and originally concentrated in the area around the main temple on the acropolis. Moreover, early evidence for exchange by quantification is reported at and nearby the shrine. As such the area around the sanctuary combined the functions characteristic of the later Roman *fora*.⁶ The contents of the votive deposits at sanctuaries such as St. Omobono at Rome and St. Cecilia at Anagni are related to votive deposit I at *Satricum* and thus they could represent similar conditions. Nevertheless, workshops have not been excavated around these sanctuaries at Rome and Anagni.

The last option, that is clustering of industrial activities around the homesteads of the elite, is probably exemplified by the structures at Poggio Civitate. Monumental workshop remains were excavated at this site. They record a combination of various crafts in a stoa-workshop during the second half of the 7th and early 6th centuries BC.

It is significant that none of the above mentioned sites flourished after the Archaic period. Most of them even vanished. This reflects the volatile nature of economic prosperity of centres which did not develop into urban communities and thus they illustrate a proto-urban stage with insufficient social and political centralisation. With the advance of state formation their fate became increasingly subject to the primary centres of central Italy. The development of the workshop mode of production at some of these towns such as *Populonia* and *Caere*, was examined in this study and indicates urban nucleation of local industries. These primary centres represented urban communities with a mixed, socially stratified population domineered by a political clique. The elite families at these centres became increasingly involved in internal affairs. During the Orientalising Period they had confirmed their position with prestige goods which were imported or made by the local incipient workshops. Their preoccupations became gradually redirected towards the organisation of internal conditions. The export of Etruscan commodities especially towards some regions in the western Mediterranean, is illustrated by the discovery of Etruscan transport *amphorae* and *bucchero* overseas from the 7th century BC. This reflects effective control over surplus production while the central Italian transport *amphorae* reveal some kind of administration.⁷ This scenario makes it likely that the elite of central Italy registered and directed external trade and import by the *emporia* along the coast which developed from about 600 BC. During the 6th century BC, they improved their position by increasing appropriation

⁴ The characteristics of various types of *emporia* and their development are presented in section 1.7.

⁵ At this stage I would like to recall the trade routes from central Italy towards the north which are also marked by some significant gateway communities. An early example is Frattesina in the Po plain. It is dated to the late Bronze - early Iron Age and is documented as a production centre where metals, antler, ivory, glass and probably amber was worked. It had strong Protovillanovan ties and was located along the trade route that led from Etruria to trans-Alpine and eastern Europe: Bietti Sestieri forthcoming. This route evidently revived during the second half of the 6th century BC when *emporia* such as Spina and Adria were established. Their rise is related to the increasing economic dynamics in northern Etruria: cf. Sassatelli 1990 a, 60-2; *Rasenna* 1986.

⁶ The gradual development of a shrine into a monumental *forum* with a temple and porticoes with numerous *tabernae*, is illustrated by the Spanish excavations at the sanctuary of Juno at Gabii where also some weights are recorded: Almagro-Gorbea 1982.

⁷ cf. Cristofani 1984.

of resources which lead to social tensions once economic progress could no longer be sustained in the 5th century BC.

The outline of the economic development of central Italy from about 800 to 400 BC seems mechanic but this impression fades when the general tendencies are applied to the sites examined. They all seem to represent a stage within the early state formation processes of Etruria and *Latium Vetus*. It appears that during the 7th century BC the economy came under the direction of central places of diverse character, some of which developed into towns during the following centuries.

The concept of towns is defined by many aspects but in the context of the workshop mode of production, towns are identified by the nucleation of workshops.⁸ This nucleation is a significant stage in the process of craft specialisation since it indicates that artisans became increasingly occupied with one craft. A combination of crafts as was suggested for previous centuries, becomes unlikely once nucleation of workshops is attested. Moreover, urban nucleation of pottery workshops leads to a lengthening of the production season as far as possible while the industry tends to become a full-time profession. Nucleation furthermore, creates opportunities for additional services, such as fuel and material supply. The ancient literary tradition mentions particularly that craftsmen were organised in *collegia* during the Orientalising or Archaic period.⁹ This suggests at least two principles which are not always acknowledged in the present archaeological literature:

1. the relatively independent character of workshops,
2. urban nucleation and collaboration between the various workshops.

I could record the simultaneous existence of several workshops in one urban centre in the previous chapters for sites such as Populonia, Laurentina-Acqua Acetosa, Marzabotto and probably *Caere*. Concerning nucleation, Peacock writes that: '*co-operation rather than competition seems to be the rule and mutual aid is commonplace*'.¹⁰ This co-operation may have led during the 7th and 6th centuries BC, to a communal organisation of workshops at those centres where nucleation occurred. The association of groups of craftsmen could have been an prototype of what later became the *collegia opificia*. It is probable that nucleation and presumably collaboration existed between the various workshops in the major centres of central Italy from the 7th century BC. An illustration of this hypothesis is presented by the situation at *Caere*. At this primary Etruscan centre, several pottery workshops could be identified during in the 7th century BC such as workshops producing *bucchero*, Italo-Geometric ceramics and the *Bottega dell'Urna Calabresi* which produced large vessels like funerary urns and probably other related fabrics, for instance, painted architectural terracottas.¹¹

Two examples of nucleation were presented but both exemplify different processes. At Laurentina-Acqua Acetosa the pottery workshops were located next to each other in an industrial quarter. This type of concentration

⁸ Various characteristics of towns are described in section 1.6. The existence of industrial quarters around towns by the late 6th century BC does not merely establish that the urbanisation process had advanced significantly but also that the perceptible and intentional centralisation of industrial activities in these quarters, contributed to the early urbanisation process of central Italy.

⁹ The ancient literary texts on *collegia* refer to conditions in Rome. This indicates that nucleated workshops existed in Rome by the 6th century BC as was recorded for other sites in central Italy. Thus Vulca from Veii and other itinerant master craftsmen were requested for specific assignments and entered a town with substantial local industries: see section 2.7. The activities of these master coroplasts in central Italy mirror the itinerant masters who made the monumental bronze statues in Classical Greece: cf. Zimmer 1990.

¹⁰ Peacock 1982, 43.

¹¹ Buranelli 1985, 27. It remains at present hypothetical whether the Red Ware production at *Caere* included painted architectural terracottas as were recovered at Acquarossa. The resemblance of the painting tradition at Acquarossa and *Caere* makes it probable that building materials were decorated at *Caere* as well: Wikander, C., 1988, 131-2. Fabric descriptions of the coarse wares for large ceramic artefacts could demonstrate to what extent one workshop was involved in the production of *amphora*, *pithoi*, *pissides*, house urns, *sarcophagi* as well as architectural terracottas. The content of kiln II at *Satricum* indicates that during the late 6th century BC one workshop was involved in the production of both architectural terracottas and large vessels like storage jars and *teglie*.

probably also developed at Populonia where the metal workshops became located in an industrial quarter outside the original settlement. The evidence from Marzabotto presents another type of workshop concentration. Several metal and pottery workshops are recorded at this site but these are not nucleated in specific quarters of the town but dispersed over the whole urban area. This may be due to the existence of workshops prior to the orthogonal layout of the town. It was established that the location of various workshops survived the urban reorganisation of Marzabotto during the early 5th century BC. Thus the archaeological evidence presents two options:

1. a dispersed nature of workshops in urban centres because of previous territorial prerogatives as demonstrated by the evidence from Marzabotto and the continuity of workshop activities in the urban area of Lavinium and *Caere* and
2. a nucleation of workshops in specific urban quarters because of a functional reallocation of the urban functions. This is established by the developments at Laurentina-Acqua Acetosa and probably Populonia.

The urban nucleated workshops that could be examined, date to the late 6th and 5th centuries BC. It is, however, likely that in primary urban centres such as *Caere*, Vulci and Tarquinia, nucleation of some kind occurred prior to the late 6th century BC. Early workshops were attributed to these centres on the basis of distinctive artefacts which were mainly recovered from the necropoleis. The actual remains of the workshops are lost or still await excavation. Another gap in the archaeological record are early kilns and furnaces. For instance, the earliest examples of large rectangular kilns are dated to the 6th century BC while on account of the 7th century BC tiles from Poggio Civitate and Acquarossa, one can expect these kilns to have existed from the middle of the 7th century BC. Nevertheless, the positive archaeological evidence for urban nucleation of workshops from the late 6th century BC indicates a complex economy acquainted with market exchange. This complexity is confirmed by the early acceptance of measures.¹²

The archaeological evidence for workshops and pre-monetary exchange by quantification from the 7th century BC, is not in line with the still prevailing minimalist opinion of the economy in antiquity.¹³ The main argument for playing down the progress in economic operations was the absence of evidence from the countryside. However surveys in central Italy during the past decades demonstrate again and again that the territory around urban centres became increasingly settled from the 7th century BC onwards. The development of settlement patterns in central Italy is characterised by nucleation of settlements during the 9th and 8th centuries BC, followed by a substantial increase in population and their subsequent dispersal over the countryside.¹⁴ With advancing exploitation of the hinterland, the urban centres must have functioned as regional markets. This encouraged the development of craft specialisation. In this context it is noteworthy that the workshop remains of this period are excavated in central places and early towns. So far, neither workshop nor the nucleation of workshops is found in the countryside.¹⁵ Concentration of industrial facilities in the hinterland is probably of later date and emerges from the reallocation of workshops outside urban centres which is recorded from the 6th century BC.

¹² See chapter IV.

¹³ cf. Finley 1981. Morris writes in a review article on the Athenian economy twenty years after Finley's trend-setting *Ancient Economy*, that 'recent agricultural history perhaps points toward a level of market activity far beyond what Finley imagined': Morris 1994 b, 366.

¹⁴ The initial phases of settlement nucleation emerged in Etruria during the early Iron Age. Within each territorial unit sites were abandoned and the larger plateaux were settled by several communities. These nucleated settlements matured into the primary centres of the early Etruscan polities. Bietti Sestieri accurately pointed out that this change in settlement organisation is intentional and documents the emergence of state formation from the early Iron Age onwards. She also records that in Etruria the socio-political structure was far more complex than in other regions in Italy such as *Latium Vetus* and Campania: Bietti Sestieri forthcoming. The subsequent arrival of overseas merchants and craftsmen must be read within this context.

¹⁵ The settlement at Lago dell'Accesa cannot be classified as a rural concentration of workshops since the households were involved in various activities among which mining and processing of metal ores.

During the Archaic period, state formation evolved and the primary centres absorbed the smaller units in their territory. Several of these minor centres lost their significance or even disappeared altogether during the 6th and 5th centuries BC. These smaller units are represented in this study by the settlements at Poggio Civitate, Acquarossa, *Satricum* and Lago dell'Accesa. A reconstruction of the process of craft specialisation at these secondary sites is complicated since the number of variables increase. Several possibilities, such as part-time engagement, itinerant craftsmen or a combination of industrial activities by the same artisan, become feasible. Except possibly at Acquarossa, nucleation of workshop did not develop at these sites. For the settlement at Lago dell'Accesa, it is feasible to reconstruct a stage in the complex process of industrial intensification. At this site, mining and processing of ores were combined with subsistence activities. The limited specialisation at this settlement represents, however, another stage of specialisation in comparison with the high quality production at secondary centres such as Poggio Civitate and *Satricum*. These sites did not present any evidence for nucleation but are rather distinguished by the simultaneous existence of various crafts. The settlements at Poggio Civitate and *Satricum* present two examples where craft specialisation occurred in pottery production, metalwork and carving of materials such as bone, amber or ivory. A combination of crafts or an alliance of crafts and services is possible at these sites. For example, the close relation between potters and other craftsmen during the Orientalising Period is recorded in the similarities between on the one hand metal and ivory artefacts and on the other hand *bucchero* vessels.

The information presented in the previous chapters indicates that the origins of the urban development and the market place in central Italy are closely related to centres of production that became established during the 7th century BC. In these centres various types of workshops emerged. One might differentiate between:

- family workshops with two to five workers. A stage that is probably represented by for example, pottery workshop C at *Satricum*;
- master workshops which employ five to ten people, mainly assistants and possibly slaves depending on the social-economic development. Such workshops will have existed at *Caere* and Marzabotto;
- nucleation of workshops could lead to a concentration of 30 to 40 people. These conditions are probably represented by the workshops at Populonia, Marzabotto and Laurentina-Acqua Acetosa during the late 6th and 5th centuries BC.¹⁶

It is not possible to make a rigid distinction between these options. For example, the late Archaic pottery workshop at *Caere* is substantial. Its layout was not completely excavated but the kiln, tanks and waterworks cover an area of about 350 square metres and this could indicate a workshop which exceeds the size of a master workshop.¹⁷ Nevertheless, large industrial complexes which may employ up to 100 workers are not recorded in central Italy during the period 800 to 400 BC. The industrial quarter at Populonia must have been extensive during the late 6th and 5th centuries BC but its features are incompletely documented (Fig. 60). Thus, the archaeological evidence indicates that the workshop mode of production developed ultimately into nucleation of workshops either as family or master-assistant units. At smaller sites, less matured arrangements emerged.

Finally, I would like to present a concluding account of the prevalent transitions in central Italy based on the available evidence. It incorporates other features than merely economic prospects and constitutes a reconstruction of events introduced as a hypothesis of long-term phenomena. It seems that each of the four centuries represents a different stage when the general disparity between Etruria and *Latium Vetus* is acknowledged.¹⁸

By 800 BC the indigenous population exploited the mineral resources for an advanced industry in copper, lead

¹⁶ Scheibler 1984.

¹⁷ It may have been a manufacture which employs more than 12 labourers: Peacock 1982.

¹⁸ cf. Bietti Sestieri 1992 b; forthcoming. See also sections 1.6 to 1.8. Some of the general economic tendencies that are presented in the epilogue were previously documented: cf. Rasenna 1986, 79-156.

and tin working possibly enhanced by local iron production. In most villages metalwork was a part-time activity by a resident smith and was probably combined with agricultural labour. Specialisation of the pottery craft is not yet discernible. There was a regional and interregional exchange network which involved limited surplus production of the resources which were owned by the community and not by individual families. Settlements nucleated and the social structure evolved from a ranked into a primeval stratified society which is exemplified by the early warrior tombs.¹⁹ The clustering of villages occasionally led to considerable concentrations of people. It is reported, for example, that the population at Veii had reached the threshold of 1,000 inhabitants by 800 BC.²⁰ According to Arnold a population of this size would lead to specialisation of the pottery craft.²¹ Increasing, though small scale, specialisation occurred which was predominantly located within hut settlements during the 8th as well as the major part of the 7th centuries BC.²² It appears that a number of industrial activities were combined on the same site. Some innovative pottery as well as metalwork technologies were introduced around 750 to 700 BC. The local application of these specialised crafts was assisted by population growth as well as by the socially generated demands of the elite who tried to assert their position by the destruction of goods in a conspicuous burial rite. Because of this competition and the size of the population it is not surprising that various of these new technologies were adopted locally since there was sufficient demand. This development was accommodated by the opening of the seaborne trade relations. Central Italy became incorporated in a network which encompassed nearly all coastal regions of the Mediterranean. The Levantine and Greek intermediaries provided new markets, favouring increased exploitation of the resources and stimulating the conditions for an Orientalising *koimè*. Especially the intensification in central Italy of metallurgical industries provided opportunities for economic growth and is illustrated in this study by the development of Acquarossa and Populonia.

The events dated to the 7th century BC were essential in many aspects because various concepts were introduced which matured during the following centuries. The developments show that the economic progress was immense and this would have eased the tensions between the various social strata that were emerging. The economic growth could meet the increasing though different material needs of a considerable group of people. This progress is exemplified by the expanding exploitation of the countryside (Fig. 2) as well as by the transformation that occurred at Acquarossa where huts were replaced by houses during the second half of the 7th and early 6th centuries BC. The dimensions of these houses varied though their average size of about 60 square metres indicates that the majority of the households could participate in the increased prosperity. Also at other sites in Etruria, houses with stone foundations and tiled roofs were erected during the second half of the 7th century BC and somewhat later in *Latium Vetus*. The manufacture of the ceramic building materials required for construction works, influenced the development of the pottery craft significantly because it supported a continuation of the indigenous *impasto* tradition. The replacement of huts by houses coincides with an acceleration of the local industrial production by the middle of the 7th century BC which is recorded at various centres discussed in this thesis. The expanding output of the early workshops was supported by the continuing process of social stratification and population growth. An assessment of the social position of craftsmen has to be integrated in this framework of social dynamics in which private possession of land and resources became gradually defined in line with advancing state formation. During this stage reciprocity and tribute seem to have remained essential. The continuing patron-client relations in central Italy must have preserved a mechanism based on tribute and redistribution. Nevertheless, I could substantiate the introduction and partial adoption of the principles of market exchange around 650 to 600 BC. Exchange through the market mechanism is a significant step in the abstraction of social labour since it brings together craftsmen, traders

¹⁹ cf. Bietti Sestieri 1992 a, 875-7; De Santis 1995. See also: Angle and Gianni 1985.

²⁰ Berardinetti Insam 1990, 22-4; Bartoloni *et alii* 1994.

²¹ Arnold 1989, 156-7.

²² At Marzabotto this stage is documented for the 6th century BC.

and consumers irrespective of their social position unlike reciprocal and redistribution exchange mechanisms. This step is characterised by the determination of exchange value through quantification.²³ It was established that quantification by employing measures, was occasionally adopted for certain transactions. This means a more complex economy than previously anticipated. Some of the early measures published in this study, are based on systems which derived from the Near East which implies Levantine mediation and the importance of overseas imports and freedom of trade. This evidence supports the idea that the influence from the Levant on events in central Italy was profound during the early Orientalising Period as it was for Greece.²⁴ The association of weights and measures with the early workshops at *Pithekoussai*, Poggio Civitate and *Satricum* suggests that craftsmen were directly involved in the transmission of metrological units. They were instrumental for the dispersion of the concept of quantitative description. This indicates that craftsmen were probably free intermediaries since they played an active role in the spread of cognitive information. However they had to function within the prevailing social context and were, therefore, subject to an emerging establishment that dominated the internal social-economic conditions while being simultaneously open-minded in cultural affairs. This establishment gradually redirected their preoccupations because they became involved in the distributions of commodities on a grander, more institutionalised level.²⁵ For example, overseas export of Etruscan commodities was at its height from the late 7th to the middle of the 6th centuries BC. This can be ascertained from the distribution of the *bucchero* pottery, transport *amphorae* and copper alloy artefacts (Fig. 7). The concern of the elite with the administration of surplus production signals that external trade was supervised before 600 BC when export of these goods was at its peak. *Emporia* were established in central Italy and some sanctuaries functioned partly as meeting points between the different economic zones because asylum could be granted. It appears that freedom of trade turned into regulated exchange in the decades around 600 BC. This could actually reflect a strategy because seaborne trade may have become a threat once the scale of it crossed a certain threshold. The strategy involved sumptuary laws for *Latium Vetus* and the legal confinement of the *emporia* to some neutral location along the coast for Etruria. In *Latium Vetus*, the Levantine and Greek imports were curtailed in line with restrictions of the conspicuous funerary practice while in Etruria this period reflects the marked development of entrepôts like *Pyrgi*, *Gravisca* and *Regisvilla* which became the highly ritualised, gateway communities for long-distance trade of the Etruscan early states of *Caere*, *Tarquini*a and *Vulci*. This view on restricted access is substantiated by the evident separation of exchange mechanisms since Greek coins were accepted during the 5th century BC at *emporia* but not distributed internally. At these gateway communities Greek coins became what they effectively represented, that is bullion. This must have been a deliberate policy in order to protect the internal social-economic conditions. Nonetheless, the strength of the economy in central Italy is characterised by the increasing development of the regional exchange systems. These were essential for the economy during the late 7th and 6th centuries BC. Long-distance trade involving luxuries which was typical for the late 8th and early 7th centuries BC was superseded during the Orientalising Period by local production of luxury items. In time, the output of the workshops is distinguished by increasing standardisation. Workshop production gradually altered from the manufacture of luxury items into the production of standard commodities during the second half of the 7th and 6th centuries BC. The devaluation of products is recorded in the case of iron objects and *bucchero* pottery but also affected other types of artefacts. This decrease in value continued during the following century and probably influenced workshop organisation and working conditions. For example, the existence of nucleated workshops in central Italy demonstrates that productivity and output had increased which must have affected the value of the products made in these workshops. The emergence of an evaluation system by quantification assisted the assessment of this devaluation process.

An intriguing aspect of early market exchange in central Italy remains the customary setting where transactions

²³ Hart 1982. See section 1.7.

²⁴ cf. Strøm 1984, 1992; Botto 1990; Buchner 1982; Burkert 1992; van Loon 1974; Niemeyer 1990, 1993 and Rathje 1984, 1990.

²⁵ cf. Cristofani 1984.

could take place. It is evident that some of the Archaic sanctuaries were associated with markets. The *emporia* along the coast of Etruria functioned as markets for seaborne trade and have been described as highly ritualised.²⁶ Nevertheless the early markets for internal exchange in the primary centres at Etruria are yet to be defined. Some of the sanctuaries in *Latium Vetus* acted partially as the customary place for early market transactions.²⁷ The main sanctuary at *Satricum* is a clear example. Besides a wealth of depositions, early measures are documented in the oldest votive deposit from which I conclude that the religious authorities actually sanctioned early market exchange by quantification.²⁸ Other sanctuaries in *Latium Vetus* which are related to the main shrine at *Satricum* are those at St. Omobone in Rome and at St. Cecilia in Anagni. These have been termed 'emporic sanctuaries' but I consider this term not appropriate because *emporia* are characterised by seaborne trade and a location along the coast.²⁹ In my opinion these sanctuaries regulated internal exchange of imported goods from diverse provenance rather than overseas trade. I, therefore, suggest to reconstruct these and similar sanctuaries as incipient *fora* because the locations combine religious, public and market functions like the more monumental *fora* of later periods. This view is supported by the nature of the depositions at *Satricum*. Overseas imports were even during the period that freedom of trade can be reconstructed, in the minority when compared with the other artefacts in the votive deposits but gradually disappeared during the 7th century BC. This reflects a transition from international contacts to interregional-regional exchange activities and as such is in line with the increasing regulation of seaborne trade in the decades around 600 BC, mentioned above. Similar transitions can be observed at other sanctuaries in *Latium Vetus* because overseas imports became rare in this region during the 6th century BC. Another aspect is the gradual architectural development of the incipient *fora*. The monumental features of later *fora* are temples, shops and porticoed squares as recorded, for example, at Gabii.³⁰ An early manifestation of this architectural concept is, in my opinion, temple B at *Pyrgi* around 500 BC where the 'building of the twenty rooms' against the south boundary wall of the sanctuary, may have been associated with exchange activities in a ritualised setting.³¹ An example of an intermediate stage towards a classic *forum* may be the last reconstruction of the temple area at *Satricum* around 500 BC when *stoai* were erected which replaced the courtyard houses.³² Apart from market exchange at sanctuaries, transactions by quantification took place during the 6th and 5th centuries BC at workshops as recorded from the evidence at Marzabotto.³³

The 6th century BC is characterised by increased productivity which was sustained by a growing demand and

²⁶ Arafat and Morgan 1994, 113.

²⁷ I would like to stress here that most sanctuaries did not develop into incipient *fora*. Many religious deposits in *Latium Vetus* are confined assemblages of specific materials and do not display characteristics of the sanctuaries associated with early markets. These are distinguished by deposits with mixed materials, a relatively high incidence of imported goods and metals. For example, votive deposits of miniature vessels as found at Campo Verde or Lavinium, signify ritual acts and have little in common with some of the depositions that occurred at the sanctuaries where early market exchange was concentrated: cf. Kleibrink forthcoming; Guaitoli 1990, 184; Fenelli 1984, 331. Bartoloni wrote in this respect a commendable study of the early votive deposits at Rome from which one can abstract that the nature and meaning of these deposits is miscellaneous: Bartoloni 1989-1990.

²⁸ Waarsenburg is preparing at the moment a catalogue of the offerings from votive deposit I: Waarsenburg forthcoming.

²⁹ I refer to Bartoloni, Coarelli and Gatti for the notion of *emporic* sanctuaries: Bartoloni 1989-1990; Coarelli 1988; Gatti 1994-1995. I give a description of *emporia* in section 1.7.

³⁰ Almagro-Gorbea 1982.

³¹ Serra Ridgway mentions other interpretations of the building such as cubicles for sacred prostitution, shelter for pilgrims or a series of ritual dining rooms: Serra Ridgway 1990, 522.

³² Maaskant-Kleibrink 1992, 139-44.

³³ See section 4.5.

the urbanisation process. The industrial installations were enlarged which is reflected by the dimensions of the workshops and their nucleation. Apart from the evolution of master-assistant workshops, the household remained the primary economic unit since the production facilities for the workshops were mainly located within or near individual houses. The construction of various industrial quarters in the region signal urban planning and the vigorous growth in regional markets. However during the second half of the 6th century BC, export overseas decreases and marks a levelling off in the economic growth because external expansion became more arduous. Internal conflicts and the more important role of conquests indicate the progress of state formation but also a preoccupation with domestic conditions. This is exemplified by the fading or disappearance of some of the sites presented in this study, such as Poggio Civitate, Acquarossa, Laurentina-Acqua Acetosa, *Satricum* and the settlement at Lago dell'Accesa. During the second half of the 6th and 5th centuries BC, their fate became steadily subject to the political power of the primary centres. Especially the fading of Laurentina-Acqua Acetosa is noteworthy since it has been related to the upsurge of Rome.³⁴ Its decline substantiates the vigorous growth of Rome because the excavations by Bedini revealed a settlement with distinct urban features such as the nucleation of workshops. Around 500-450 BC Rome must have held a comparable position in *Latium Vetus* as some of the most potent primary centres in Etruria.

The 5th century BC is characterised by a consolidation of previous conditions though appropriation of resources by individual families resulted in increasing social tensions between the various strata once these could no longer be pacified by substantial economic growth. During the previous centuries demand had favoured production and *vice versa* which sustained increasing social-economic complexity. Whenever this mechanism falters it will cause severe friction between the different social units. Economic dynamics shifted to the northern regions of Etruria. In southern Etruria, the economic level of the previous century was maintained though reallocation of resources continued with increasing social inequality. It appears that in Etruria, the primary urban centres with their respective hinterlands became virtually self sufficient, early states during the 5th century BC since the political elite was primarily interested in domestic affairs. Imports became unusual and market conditions remained limited. Workshops were probably directly involved in the exchange of their commodities. Rome as a polity, increased its territory and became dominant in *Latium Vetus* and eventually in the entire region of central Italy.

³⁴ Bedini 1981, 257. See also section 2.6.3. Another Latin site that declined during this period is Ficana: Pavolini 1981. I refer to Cornell and Bouma for comments on the general shift in *Latium Vetus* towards warfare and political instability from the late 6th century BC: Cornell 1995, 293-309; Bouma 1996, 192-5.

