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Abstract
The results of the archaeological exploration of the Roman vicus of Falacrinae, located in the Upper Sabina 78 miles northeast of Rome, provide excellent first-hand material for testing the concept of the “rurification” of religion. The frequentation of the area goes back at least to the late Neolithic period, but it was only in the Archaic period that a temple was built, which soon became a sort of pole of attraction for the local community. After the Roman conquest (290 BCE), an entire village gradually arose around the monument. 129 sacrificial foci, dated between the late 3rd and the second half of the 1st cent. BCE (probably linked with the festivals of the Feriae Septemtivae, Paganalia or Compitalia), and a

Resumen
Los resultados de la exploración arqueológica del vicus romano de Falacrinae, ubicado en la Alta Sabina a 78 millas al noreste de Roma, representan un excelente material de primera mano para poner a prueba el concepto de “rurificación” de la religión. La frecuentación de la zona se remonta en el tiempo al menos al Neolítico tardío, pero solo en el período Arcaico se construye un templo, que pronto se convierte en una especie de polo de atracción de la comunidad local. Después de la conquista romana (290 a.C.), un pueblo entero surgió gradualmente alrededor del monumento. 129 foci de sacrificio, fechados entre finales del s. III y la segunda mitad del s. I a.C. (probablemente vinculados a las fiestas de las Feriae Se-
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few burials (suggrundaria) of perinatal fetuses of 30/40 weeks of gestation, dated to the 2nd cent. BCE and the first half of the 1st cent. BCE, are the most intriguing traces of ritual practices that have come to light through the excavations. The analysis of these practices suggests that the local rural communities: 1) adopted styles of religious grouping that were significantly different from those taking place in urban contexts; 2) could strongly modify hierarchies of and rituals performed in the cities; 3) cannot necessarily be considered as “deviant” from the normative point of view; 4) could easily negotiate between local religious traditions and urban patterns.
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In the following article, I aim to test empirically the methodological considerations presented in the introduction to this volume. In particular, I seek to answer the following questions: Were the group-styles of religious gathering in cities different from those found in non-urban contexts? Were the hierarchies of and the rituals performed by the religious specialists in the cities the same as those in the countryside? Did being far from the cities leave more space for religious “deviance” and diversity? How did the architectural record affect these differences and how were these differences affected by it? Is there something that we may call “rurification” or “ruralization”?

In order to answer these questions, I selected the specific case-study of the vicus of Falacrinae. Why a vicus, a “village”? And why specifically Falacrinae? The excavation of vici has never exerted a significant fascination for the archaeological world. Of course, the usually extremely rudimentary nature of their structures and, therefore, their typically very poor state of preservation does not exert the same kind of seductive pull as the investigation of other (private as well as public) contexts, such as domus/villae, necropolises, sanctuaries, or administrative buildings. As for Falacrinae, despite this rural settlement’s extremely poor state of preservation, the results of the excavations attest the practices of several very peculiar (if not unique, for the time) rituals which have the potential to cast a great deal of light on the question of the “rurification” of religion. Moreover, Falacrinae is just 78 miles from Rome, which makes this case-study a perfect candidate for detecting possible interferences between the “urban centre” and the “rural periphery”, especially during the late Republican period.

1. **The Vicus of Falacrinae**

The ancient *vicus* of *Falacrinae* is known primarily as the birthplace of the emperor Vespasian (although it is more likely that he was actually born in one of the nearby *villae*) on 17th of November, 9 CE.² Thanks to the ancient itineraries, namely the *Itinerarium Antonini* and the *Tabula Peutingeriana* (Fig. 1.a), the approximate position of the *vicus* was known from at least the end of the 19th century:³ along the *Via Salaria*, on the borders of the territory of Sabina, not far from Cittareale – nowadays in the far eastern corner of Lazio – surrounded by the mountains of Umbria, Abruzzo and Marche (Fig. 1.b).⁴ Nonetheless, the precise location of the ancient village had never been identified.

This is why a note published in 2004 in the first issue of the local magazine *Falacrina* immediately attracted the attention of Filippo Coarelli. The note in question referred to the discovery (about two kilometres south of Cittareale) of an inscription written in saturnian verses and certainly belonging to a three-foot tall honorary bronze statue of a person connected with the Social War (Fig. 2.a-b).⁵ The following summer, in 2005, Coarelli organized the first of six archaeological campaigns that involved various locations of the municipality.⁶ The excavations of *Falacrinae* (directed by Coarelli together with Helen Patterson, and supervised by Valentino Gasparini and Stephen Kay respectively on behalf of the University of Perugia and the British School at Rome) led in the same year to the discovery (about 900 m from the *Via Salaria*) of the building to which the inscription must have belonged. This was a sort of tetrastyle *atrium*, supported by four 9-meter-high columns (Fig. 3.a-b), the capitals of which were undoubtedly carved by urban handcrafts, and protected
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³ See Persichetti, 1893.

⁴ De Santis, 2009b; Tripaldi, 2009a and 2009b.


⁶ The preliminary results of the archaeological excavations at Cittareale are collected in CASCINO & GASPARINI, 2009. Yearly reports have been published in Coarelli & Patterson, 2007; Coarelli, Kay & Patterson, 2008; Coarelli, Gasparini, Kay & Patterson, 2009; Coarelli, Kay & Patterson, 2010; Coarelli, Gasparini, Kay & Patterson, 2011; Coarelli, Kay, Patterson, Scalfari & Tripaldi, 2012.
by huge limestone roof tiles. These monumental Republican structures were erected between the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 1st cent. BCE, and were probably already abandoned in the mid-1st cent. BCE. The unquestionably public nature of the building opens up at least two different scenarios: 1) that it was a sort of *atrium publicum* linked to the *vicus*, a structure destined (like the *villa publica* in Rome) to support the census and the review of the enlisted cohorts, and even to provide a seat for other administrative and/or commercial activities; 2) it was a structure built for a very specific and provisional function, that is Sertorius’ recruitment of the local population for the Social War.8

Subsequent research has shown that this public *atrium* building was not constructed within the *vicus*, but was isolated some half a Roman mile to the south-east (Fig. 4.a-b). The strategic position of the village itself is confirmed by the evidence for its very early frequentation: some arrowheads and a flint shard of *débitage* seem to attest human activity starting some time between the late Neolithic and the early Bronze Age,9 and then continuing during the 8th and 7th cent. BCE (Fig. 5.a).10 It should be noted that the area in which the village is sited is probably the most impervious in the entire region of the Upper Sabina, dominated as it is by high mountains, deep gorges, and very few flat areas. The main economic activities of the valley must have been vertical and horizontal transhumant breeding and timber production.11

The beginning of what is usually called the “Romanisation” of this area is generally held to have been concluded within a year of its definitive conquest by Manius Curius Dentatus in 290 BCE.12 The finding at *Falacrinae* of a bronze uncia dating back to 280–276 BCE, as well as a later sestante dating to 225–217 BCE, seems to confirm the early Roman occupation of the site (Fig. 5.b-c).13 The Sabines obtained the *civitas sine suffragio* and the conquered territory was distributed *viritim* to a certain number of settlers, while the *civitas optimo iure* (that is the full citizenship) was granted only a generation later, between 268 and 241 BCE.14 It is possible that, in such a “remote”
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7. Coarelli, 2008b; Gasparini, 2009d.
8. F. Coarelli (oral source).
area, villages like *Falacrinae* were structured in real *res publicae*, with some form of political and juridical institutions, as Festus himself seems to attest.\(^\text{15}\)

The excavations at *Falacrinae* identified the ruins of a number of structures (a slightly trapezoidal tripartite building) that seem to be related to a temple that monumentalized a cultic activity dating back at least to the Archaic period (first half of the 6th cent. BCE) (Fig. 6.a).\(^\text{16}\) Despite the total disappearance of the walls and even of part of the foundations, the temple seems not to have differed much from similar (better preserved) contemporary or later sanctuaries in central Italy, such as, for example, San Giovanni in Galdo and Castel di Ieri (Fig. 6.b-c).\(^\text{17}\)

The location of the temple was highly strategic (Fig. 7). The places of worship in the Upper Sabina seem to have typically been created at the crossing points of important road axes and livestock tracks. This is explained by the fundamental economic role exercised by these sanctuaries as the seats of fairs and markets during periodic religious events, and as way stations along very ancient transhumance paths.\(^\text{18}\) By consequence, for decades these sanctuaries acted as poles of attraction for the local population. This is why, starting from the second half of the 3rd cent. BCE (that is, immediately after the moment at which this area obtained the status of *civitas optimo iure*), a village arose spontaneously around the temple (Fig. 8.a-c).\(^\text{19}\) The *vicus* was called *Falacrinae*, which may have been due to the onomastic attribute of the *Divus Pater Falacer* cited by Varro.\(^\text{20}\) The actual monumentalisation of the village seems to have taken place in two distinct phases (Fig. 9.a). During the first phase, between the end of the 3rd and the beginning of the 2nd cent. BCE, the sanctuary was not defunctionalised, but a huge farm arose around it on all sides, temporarily respecting its sacred nature. Then, the process of “Romanisation” accelerated and intensified during the 2nd cent. BCE: not far from *Falacrinae*, in the mid-2nd cent. BCE, a grandiose sanctuary known as “Terme di Cutilia” (the Roman *Aqua Cutiliae*, known in antiquity


\(^{16}\) De Santis & Gasparini, 2009, pp. 47-48.

\(^{17}\) Campanelli, 2004; Zaccardi, 2007.

\(^{18}\) Camerieri, 2009.

\(^{19}\) De Santis & Gasparini, 2009, pp. 48-51.

\(^{20}\) Varro, L.L. V 84: *Sic flamen Falacer a dico patre Falacre; VII 45: Sunt in quibus flaminum cognominibus latent origines, ut in his qui sunt versibus plerique: *Volturnalem, Palatualem, Furinalem, Floralemque Falacrem et Pomonalem fecit hic idem*, quae o<b>scura sunt; eorum origo Volturnus, diva Palatua, Furrina, Flora, Falacer pater, Pomo[rum]na[m].*
for its sulphurous and mineral springs, undoubtedly with healing properties, which were frequently enjoyed by the Flavian emperors) was dedicated to the goddess Vacuna. This is among the oldest examples of the Italic terraced sanctuaries known as “santuari repubblicani del Lazio”.21

Despite this acceleration of the process of “Romanisation”, the local religious traditions and the rural sanctuaries of this area were untouched by this phenomenon. Instead, they maintained a preference for local divinities related to woods and rivers,22 such as Velinia (who takes her name from the local river Velino), the Lymphae Commotiles (i.e. the nymphs of the moving waters), Feronia and Silvanus (linked, respectively, to agriculture and woods),23 and, in particular, Vacuna (also a divinity frequently connected with waters).24 It is very significant that, despite the fact that this territory was strongly affected by the passage of the Via Salaria and important livestock tracks, the cult of the Roman Hercules (traditionally, the tutelary god of the herds and of the trade of salt) seems to have remained extremely marginal in the Upper Sabina, being attested in the sector of the Via Salaria bordered by Rieti and Ascoli only by a single bronze figurine.25 Meanwhile, during the last quarter of the 2nd cent. BCE, the vicus at Falacrinae was extended and a new (north-western) sector was added reusing previous architectural elements, including, significantly, a fragment of moulding (presumably part of the former temple’s podium).26 The sacellum was thus definitively obliterated.

Further (geophysical as well as stratigraphic) surveys have tried to identify the limits of the village in this period, leading to the discovery, at a distance of several hundred meters from the central core, of vestiges of further houses, which suggests that the village may have occupied as much as eight hectares.27 While the architectural activity seems to have stopped from the mid-1st cent. BCE (in parallel with what happened at the atrium publicum of Pallottini), the population continued to attend the site as late as the beginning of the 3rd cent. CE. Apart from some very sporadic ceramic fragments from the Middle Ages, there is no material dating after ca. 200 CE.28
I will return below to what can be inferred, from a historico-religious point of view, from this general presentation of the archaeological findings at Falacrinae. First, in order to give a complete (although necessarily highly synthetic and simplified) picture of the cultic practices performed there, it will be necessary to discuss in some detail at least two specific rituals attested during the mid- and late-Republican periods.

2. The Rituals
2.1. The Foci

First of all, the excavations in the area of the vicus led to the discovery of 129 pits, dated between the late 3rd cent. BCE and the second half of the 1st cent. BCE. These pits are very heterogeneous in terms of shape, size, and content (Fig. 9.b). Some are perfectly circular or oblong, while others are square or rectangular. Some have a diameter of only twenty centimetres and a depth of even less, while others reach a length of more than two meters and a considerable depth (Fig. 10.a-b).

The finds recovered from the filling levels of the pits leave no doubt about their sacrificial function. The ancient sources call these pits foci and connect them with sacrifices performed (in honour of underground deities) “in effossa terra” or “scrobiculo facto”, that is by digging a pit into the ground. The excavation has uncovered various osteological and malacological remains that help us to understand the type of ritual activities that took place there, namely bloody sacrifices of young sheep, goats, and pigs, but also, occasionally, of cattle or even canids, dormouse, weasels, snails, or birds (including a vulture and a cock whose legs were found still in situ in a ritually broken patera) (Fig. 11.a).

Pottery was typically found alongside these remains. Some examples were miniaturized (Fig. 11.b), while others were inscribed with graffiti. Of the latter,
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29. Gasparini, 2009c.
33. Cascino & Gasparini, 2009, p. 130, cat. no. 12 (L. Ceccarelli).
some bear the left-handed Latin inscription *T(itus) Ba(*---*) and can be dated between the end of the 3rd and the beginning of the 2nd cent. BCE (Fig. 11.d), while many others show the epigraph *Q(uintus) At(*---*) of the second half of the 3rd cent. BCE (Fig. 11.e). These graffiti give us some clue about the actors responsible for these sacrifices, namely members of the *gens Barronia* (or *Bassaea, Baebia, Babbia, Babria*) and the *gens Attia* (or *Attiena, or Attilia*).66 Fragments of tiles and nails, coins, lamps, knives, arrowheads, anklebones, spindles and loom weights, styluses, armillas and fibulas, and even sharpening stones, were also included (Fig. 11.c and f-g).

By far the most peculiar finding in these sacrificial pits is represented by the presence of grey or yellowish sandstone ovoids or spheres, weighing between 0.6 and 3.7 kg, with a diameter between 9 and 18 cm. The singularity of these objects, twenty-six in total (but only ten preserved *in situ* in the pits) is increased by the fact that some of these specimens carry engraved numerals (II, IV, V, VII, and XVI), with II and V replicated on two occasions (Fig. 12.a-f). To my knowledge, there is no directly comparable evidence from other sites. It is clearly unlikely that such stones should be considered as numbered catapult projectiles (as attested in other Republican contexts, such as at Calahorra in Spain). There is no correspondence between weight and numerals, so the latter cannot be interpreted as units of measure. The sacrificial context also discourages an interpretation as funerary *signacula* that surmounted, for example, the burials of infants (in which case the numerals could be taken as recording the age in number of days). Neither does the presence of numerals fit with non-anthropomorphized representations of divine *simulacra* (such as, for example, the *lapis manalis* or *manales petrae* recorded by the literary sources). I will suggest two alternative (and more satisfactory) explanations of the presence of this material.

My first hypothesis refers these stones to some ritual practice aimed at the delimitation of spaces. These might be *termini sacrificales* hinting at the sacral division of land between the sacred enclosure of the temple and the “profane” land, or, more likely, *termini agrorum* dividing the different properties of private individuals (per-
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34. Cascino & Gasparini, 2009, pp. 133-134, cat. nos. 35-37 (L. Ceccarelli).
38. Scalfari, 2009, pp. 66-68.
42. Ibidem.
haps the *termini succubi* or *termini sub terra* attested by the *Gromatici Veteres*). But how to explain the presence of these *termini* within the *foci*? In the first book of the *Fasti*, corresponding to January 24th, Ovid confesses that he had not been able to find any information concerning the sowing festival (*Feriae Sementivae*). The author imagines that the Muse, hearing him, comes to his rescue by politely explaining that he tried in vain looking in the calendar, since this kind of holiday, although normally celebrated in the second half of January, did not have a fixed date. Rather, it was established and announced by the *pontifex maximus* on an annual basis. On that occasion,

> “[l]et the village keep festival: farmers, purify the village, / And offer the yearly cakes on the village hearths. / Propitiate Earth and Ceres, the mothers of the crops, / With their own corn, and a pregnant sow’s entrails. / Ceres and Earth fulfil a common function: / One supplies the chance to bear, the other the soil”.

The Ovidian description seems to match quite well with the archaeological evidence emerging from the excavations at the *vicus* of Falacrinae. I therefore hypothesize that, on the occasion of the annual *lustratio* of the *pagus* during the *Feriae Sementivae* (or even similar rites, such as the *Paganalia*, if they are not actually the same festival), stone *termini* were buried and specific sacrifices were performed within *foci* dedicated to Ceres and Earth (or possibly to Sabine deities such as *Feronia*).

I will now offer a second possible interpretation. As we know from, among others, Cato, Dionysius, Festus, Macrobius, Persius, and Varro, between the end of December and the beginning of January (this date was also established and announced by the *pontifex maximus* from year to year), the members of the *pagus* celebrated the *Compitalia* by sacrificing to the *Lares Compitales* through a *lustratio* performed at the *compitum* (that is, the crossroads) or in a *focus* (which it is possible to translate as the “domestic hearth”). This would explain why many of
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46. Cato, *De agric.* V 3: *Rem divinam nisi Compitalibus in compito aut in foco ne faciat; Dion. Hal., Ant. Rom. IV 14: ἣν ἐτι καὶ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἐστὶν ἄγοντες Ῥώμαιοι διετέλουν ὀλίγας ὡστερον ἡμέρας τῶν Κρονίων, σεμνῆν ἐν τοῖς πάνω καὶ πολυτέλη, Κομπιτάλαι προσαγορεύοντες αὐτὴν ἐπ’ τῶν στενωπών κομπίτων γὰρ τοὺς στενωποὺς καλοῦσι· καὶ φυλάττουσι τὸν ἀρχαῖον ἐθισμὸν ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν, διὰ τῶν
these pits at *Falacrinae* were dug either at a crossroads or inside the houses of the *vicus*. This sacrifice involved both free men and slaves, and entailed the hanging on the door of each house at night (which would justify the presence of oil lamps), as many balls (apparently made of wool) as there were slaves in the house and as many puppets (apparently made of wool or flour) as there were free men. Evidently the feast was also intended as a censorial activity of each administrative district. I wonder whether our stone spheres could not represent an alternative tool used to count the *capita*, the heads of the slaves, the number carved on each hinting at the number of the slaves belonging to each *familia*.

In either of these two cases, *Falacrinae* would represent the oldest, and probably the most significant, archaeological attestation of the *Feriae Sementivae* (or *Paganaelia*) as well as of the *Compitalia* (the latter then attested in Delos only by the third quarter of the 2nd cent. BCE).47

### 2.2. The Suggrundaria

The second example of rituals performed at *Falacrinae* is also illustrative of an intriguing (but, again, much neglected) aspect of non-urban religion: funerary practices currently linked to *Sonderbestattungen*, as they are commonly called in German, i.e. “anomalous” or “deviant” burials.

During the uncovering in 2007 of the ruins of the temple mentioned above, an Etruscan bucchero cup was brought to light. This item was discovered below the level of the original pavement of the temple, along its eastern sidewall. The cup (which can be dated to the first half of the 6th cent. BCE, possibly around 580-560 BCE) may have originally hung somewhere in the sanctuary, as is suggested by two holes not far from the rim (Fig. 13.a). At some later point, the cup was used in a secondary burial to hold the remains of a human skeleton which the anthropological examination identifies as belonging to a 38/40-week-old child (Fig. 13.b). Further analysis dates the burial to around 520 BCE (± 35 years), that is, one or, more likely, two generations after the cup was made.

Falacrinae sheds light on similar practices performed a few centuries later, during the 2nd cent. BCE and the first half of the 1st cent. BCE. Indeed, further infant burials were located (Fig. 14) along the walls of the houses built during the second phase of the vicus. The individuals were buried in simple superficial pits dug into the natural soil (Fig. 15.a-c). There depositions show no preferential orientation but are rather adapted to the directions of the walls and to the corners between them. In one case, the individual had been deposed directly within an imbrex. Some of the burials still had a flat tile covering and protecting the remains of the deceased and, possibly, marking the location of the burial. The eldest of these perinatal foetuses had an age between 38 and 40 weeks of gestation, the youngest 30 to 32. Thus, it is very likely that these babies were born dead or died immediately after birth.

This liminal condition between birth and death, combined with a misunderstanding of a passage from Cicero’s Tusculanae Disputationes, led scholars in the ’80s and ’90s to think: 1) that Romans, being used to a high mortality rate, deemed that the death of an infant was not deserving of any kind of sorrow or grief; 2) that they treated deceased children more or less as rubbish by throwing their corpses out without regard for location; and 3) that differential treatment of infants that is identi-
fiable in the archaeological record necessarily means that the babies in question were the victims of infanticide and objects of surreptitious burials.\textsuperscript{52} More recent studies have shown this position to be entirely wrong, stressing that ancient antiquarians, jurists, and physicians carefully classified the stages of infancy from being a foetus and new-born without a soul, through becoming a member of the community with a personal name, up to attaining the status of a social human being, and, ultimately, a Roman citizen. A plethora of Roman gods, listed by Varro in his\textit{Antiquitates rerum divinarum}, were deemed to be in charge of protecting each of the crucial steps of the growth of the human being from conception (Janus and Saturnus) to pregnancy (Fluvonia and Alemona), then delivery (Diespater and Lucina), and finally to life after birth (Aius, Vaticanus, Farinus).\textsuperscript{53}

In the case of the burial rituals of infants, Roman sources use the terms\textit{ mors immatura, praematura, acerba}, and\textit{ cruda} to relate the unripe death to the premature ripeness of fruits and to define infants who had died\textit{ ante suum diem}.\textsuperscript{54} These sources technically describe their\textit{ funus} as\textit{ funus acerbum} or\textit{ immaturae exequiae}. According to Seneca and Servius, the burials were held at night, by the light of torches and candles.\textsuperscript{55} Of course, the dead infants could be buried in necropolises. But often they were inhumed in infrasettlement areas, in domestic contexts, in workshops or barns, under the eaves, along the walls, in niches within the walls and especially in the corners, near or under the threshold, or beneath the floors, usually in places associated with hearths/ovens and hypocausts. The younger the infants were, the closer to the interior of the house they were placed (Fig. 16.a). Generally the infant was inhumed in a shallow pit, but sometimes also in an amphora, a wooden or stone coffin, a brick box, or an item of pottery. In the majority of the mentioned cases, the burials were covered with roof tiles or eaves (\textit{tegulae} or\textit{ imbrices}). Infants were usually wrapped in a garment, laid in a flexed position, mainly on the right side and aligned north to

\textsuperscript{52} See e.g. Harris, 1982; Néraudau, 1987; Golden, 1988. \textit{Contra} King, 2000 and Moore, 2009, with further bibliography.

\textsuperscript{53} See e.g. Perfigli, 2004, pp. 21-106; Carroll, 2011, pp. 113-116.

\textsuperscript{54} See e.g. Ter Vrught-Lentz, 1960; Kazazis, 1989; Martin-Kilcher, 2000; Fernández González, 2003; Carroll, 2018, pp. 147-249; Aglietti, 2020.

\textsuperscript{55} Sen., \textit{Ep.} 122, 10: \textit{Quantulum enim a funere absunt et quidem acerbo qui ad faces et cereos vivunt?}; Servius, \textit{Ad Aen.} XI 143: \textit{magis moris Romani ut impuberis noctu efferrentur ad faces, ne funere immaturae subdolis domus funestaretur […] ali sicut Varro et Verrius Flaccus dicit: si filius familias extra urbem decessit, liberti amicique obviam procedunt et sub noctem in urbem infertur cereis facibusque praelucentibus, ad cuius exsequias nemo ragabantur.}
south, or simply adjusted to the walls’ direction or placed at their corners. The presence of grave goods in these types of burials is quite rare.56

These burials are related to the term suggrundaria, mentioned as a hapax legomenon by Fulgentius, denoting an inhumation reserved for infants who had not yet lived 40 days.57 The term literally means something “under the eaves”, referring to grunda, “eave”, as is attested in Varro and Vitruvius, for example.58 However, the meaning of the term must have conveyed a wider sense than just the disposal of the corpses inside the eaves – as it has been sometimes interpreted – or under the eaves outside the house. Rather, in a wider domestic context, the eaves of the roof metonymically represent the whole house and its surrounding neighbourhood.

Fulgentius’ suggrundaria are not exclusive to Roman culture. Infrasettlement infant graves are also testified in Turkey and along the border between Serbia and Romania as early as the Mesolithic and Neolithic epochs, in Greece during the Geometric periods, in Italy (including Rome) in the 9th-8th cent. BCE, in France, Spain and England from the Iron Age (5th cent. BCE).59 During the Roman epoch, this ritual practice spread from Central Italy (where it is testified, as it occurs at Falacrinae, in several settlements immediately after the Roman conquest) to reach non-Celtic areas of the Roman provinces (such as Southern Spain), although it does not seem to have crossed the borders of the Roman Empire. In the period following the fall of the western Roman Empire, this custom survive into the Middle Ages and is even attested in some locations, for example in the Basque Country, until the last century.60

As for the Roman suggrundaria, some scholars have gone so far as to suggest a radical change in the society of Imperial Rome which, having been deprived of its political power, took refuge in the family as a sort of compensation. On this account, the idea developed of the child as the heart of the family and a sort of bridge for meta-

56. On infant death and burial see now Carroll, 2018.
57. Fulg., Expositio sermonum antiquorum 7: [Quid sint suggrundaria]. Priori tempore suggrundaria antiqui dicebant sepulchra infantium qui necdum quadriginta diez implissent, quia nec busta dici poterant, quia ossa quae comburentur non erant, nec tanta inmanitas cadaveris quae locum tumisceret. Cremation was not used for children before their teeth came out: see Plin., N.H. VII 70-72: Hominem priusquam genito dente cremari mos gentium non est; Iuv., Sat. XV 139-140: vel terra clauditur infans et minor rogi.
58. Varro, Rust. III 3, 5: apes enim subter sugrundas ab initio villatico usae tecto; Vitr., X 15, 1: Est autem et aliud genus testudinis, quod reliqua omnia habet, quemadmodum quae supra scripta sunt, praeter capreolos, sed habet circa plateum et pinnas ex tabulis et superne subgrundas proclinatas, supraque tabulis et coriis firmiter fixis continentur.
59. An overarching study of this phenomenon still remains a desideratum. Several pre-Roman contexts are gathered and analysed in Tabolli, 2018.
physical hopes, influenced by the new philosophical currents and by the so-called “Oriental cults.” More frequently, scholars have sought to explain the phenomenon as a simple legacy of earlier local traditions, namely the funerary practices performed by the autochthonous Celtic populations. According to this common view, the persistence of local pre-Roman customs would also explain why these infant burials were usually concentrated in rural (and, thus, supposedly less Roman) settlements, and are only found very sporadically in towns.

A fair assessment of all the evidence does not support the view that those living in Roman urban centres emphasised the commemoration of children more than those resident in rural contexts, or that the upper classes cared more about their dead infants, with their preference for necropolises, than did freedmen and rural people. Secondly, and rather obviously, the urban context entailed practical obstacles for the suggrundaria: within the city, houses stood in close proximity to one another, and the upper storeys could not be used in order to bury the corpses under the floor. But, even if differences in the archaeological evidence between urban and rural excavations are taken into account, these elements cannot adequately explain the extremely rare presence of urban infant burials.

The answer is, I suspect, much simpler and implicit in the legal conditions of the Roman rural landscape, organised as it was into vici, villae, and pagi. The vicus is, according to the definition of Isidore of Seville, a settlement sine muris or sine munitione murorum – that is, without walls – and so ritually and juridically not defined as distinct from the surrounding territory (the ager). It is the ritual foundation through the sulcus primigenius that makes sanctae the walls and divides the city of the living people (the oppidum) from the city of the dead. Without it (as in the case of vici and villae), any law interdicting burials inside the walls loses its function: there are just no walls to define the application of such a law. So, the burial of infants inside
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a *vicus* or a *villa* is not “anomalous” because it does not in fact represent a deviation from the norm at all. The Roman family – trying to grant their infants the full value of individuals that had been them denied to them in life by putting them at the heart of their living place – found in the Latin juridical system a gap which, outside Rome (the *Urbs*) and other walled cities (the *oppida*), simply did not interdict the inhumation of perinatals within *vici* and *villae*.

This helps to answer a further question: Why is this phenomenon testified more in certain areas and much less in others? Its pattern of distribution is appreciably patchy, with strong concentrations (for example, in *Samnium*, *Cisalpina* and Switzerland, Eastern Spain, and Southern England) and evident gaps (in Etruria, Southern Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, and Western Spain) (Fig. 16.b). Briefly, the phenomenon seems to be found in areas in which the military occupation was followed by a phase of civilian re-organisation that tried to fill the gap left by the departure of the troops. As brilliantly shown by Luigi Capogrossi Colognesi and Michel Tarpin, this gap was filled precisely with the administrative system of *vici* and *pagi*.66 The *vici* (rural villages) and the *pagi* (rural districts) were created, starting from the 3rd cent. BCE, in order to formalise the possession of the land in a less traumatic way for the local populations than the colonial model and to integrate the individuals into the Roman cultural and administrative system. This system is not testified everywhere, but only where marginal communities of “uncompleted” citizens (with a still strong native cultural background) were organised in fractions of territory with a geographical and social coherence.

### 3. CONCLUSIONS

We can now connect the archaeological evidence discussed above to its wider historico-religious context. Despite the poor condition of the remains, the results of the stratigraphic excavations of a portion of a *vicus* at *Falacrinae* can help to clarify the methodological questions set out in the introduction to this volume.

First, it was asked whether the styles of religious grouping in cities were different from those found in non-urban contexts. The answer is undoubtedly yes, they were. Despite being only 78 miles distant from Rome, the case study of *Falacrinae* clearly shows that
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“[t]he peculiar environmental conditions of life (let’s call it, in Paul Lichterman’s words, the ‘scenes’) strongly influence the ‘binds’ of the local religious groups (that is the cultural ‘map’ of reference points – other groups, individuals, social categories – in relation to which the group draws its boundaries’), their ‘bonds’ (that is the ‘set of assumptions about how the actors are obligated to each other in the setting’) and their ‘speech norms’ (that is the set of ‘assumptions about what kinds of communication are appropriate in the setting’).” 67

The Upper Sabina was a world mostly occupied by a population whose activities consisted primarily of the production of food and other resources necessary for subsistence, and was thus deeply conditioned by local changes in climate. The rhythm of the seasonal cycles strongly influenced the activities of the residents of such areas and, consequently, framed the main occasions of grouping and their related rituals. This is the case for the annual lustratio of the pagus performed during the Feriae Sementivae or Compitalia. In turn, these celebrations implied very specific paraphernalia. This can be seen in, for example, the numbered capita included in the sacrificial material of the foci (pits dug into the soil in order to communicate with the gods of the earth and the underworld, themselves considered to be responsible for the production of food). Concerns related to meteorological conditions played a crucial role and implied some degree of prediction, for example in attempts to adjust the agricultural calendar by using the available public parapegmata, or mitigating social harm and economic risk by means of what is currently called “magic” (namely the consultation of seers, itinerant diviners and specialists of astro-meteorology who could decipher the vagaries of the climate). This is why, in the De re rustica, Columella recommends to the owners of the rural estates that the villicus “shall offer no sacrifice except by direction of the master; Soothsayers and witches, two sets of people who incite ignorant minds through false superstition, to spending and then to shameful practices, he must not admit to the place.” 68 These kinds of warnings must have been common in Roman agricultural texts and indicate that the villici were particularly inclined to use these kinds of magical resources. While Egon Marótí associated these commentaries with the worry and instability that the “Eastern cults” inspired in the Roman elite, Antón Alvar Nuño has more recently shown that these strategies were just part of

the available set of religious resources and were deemed by the local communities as particularly effective group-styles.69

The second (and related) question was whether the hierarchies of and the rituals performed by the religious specialists in the cities were the same as in the countryside. As we can already infer from the first question, the answer is no, they were not. Moreover, in the context of a common rural villa (like the many that populated the territory of Falacrinae, one of which must have belonged to the family of Vespasian),70 the absenteeism of the landowners (who spent a good part of the year with their urban familia, in particular during the late Republican period) could change the relationship between the religious rites and the various members of the rural familia. As explained by Cato, in the absence of the landowner, the villicus (a freedman or even a slave) could replace the dominus, who delegated to him his sacrificial techniques and related knowledge, something that was in principle forbidden in an urban context and which temporarily undermined local social hierarchies and ritual praxis.71

Thirdly, it was asked whether being far from the cities left more space for religious “deviance” and diversity? As far as diversity is concerned, the question remains open. Indeed, as I learn from Rüpke and Urciuoli, a city is a place that engenders diversity as well.72 As for deviance, the answer is probably negative if we consider deviance a violation of certain fixed norms or interdictions. The overturning of the hierarchy of ritual actors engaged in the sacrificial rituals of the villa was simply the result of a temporary mandate by which the dominus delegated his power to the villicus. This is not deviance, and neither are the ritual specificities linked to the peculiarities of the local rural space, such as the mentioned absence of the walls that ritually and juridically marked out the inhabited space from the ager, thus dividing the city of the living people (the oppidum) from the city of the dead (the necropolis). If my hypothesis is correct, this was precisely the feature which, during the civilian reorganisation of the vicus of Falacrinae that took place in the mid-2nd cent. BCE, made possible the inhumation of perinatalis in infrasettlements places (the sugrundaria). By consequence, these should not be considered “anomalous burials”.

The fourth question was how the architectural record affected and was affected by these differences. It is clear that density (and thus the change of the concept of proximity and neighbourhood) influenced (on a qualitative as well as a quantitative
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71. Cato, Agr. 83, 1: Eam rem diuinam vel servus vel liber licebit faciat.
level) the media employed to diversify religious offers, memorialise them, stress group-styles, and consequently modify social and power relationships. It is not surprising that sanctuaries, which also played a role as the seats of fairs and markets, were built as way stations along very ancient transhumance paths. It is notable that, despite the fundamental persistence of local religious traditions in such impenetrable areas as the Upper Sabina, the impact of the process of “Romanisation” is quite plain. This is true not only from an administrative and ritual point of view (see, for example, the census performed by means of the lustratio pagi), but also from an architectural perspective. At Falacrinae, a cultic activity already started in the Archaic period was initially monumentalised by the building of a temple which became the centre for the meetings of the local community and which was later (once the civitas optimo iure had been obtained) defunctionalized by a vicus that arose spontaneously around it. A century later, a monumental atrium publicum was built by urban handcrafts, likely for urban needs, and respecting urban architectural models. These models are represented on an even more monumental scale by the construction of the terraced sanctuary of Vacuna at Aquae Cutiliae in the mid-2nd cent. BCE. Evidently, monumentality was not a prerogative of residents of cities, and local entrepreneurs could be just as ready to mobilize conspicuous sums of money, invest them in religious communication in rural settlements, and negotiate between urban models and local variables.

So, is there something that we may call “rurification” or “ruralization”? This article has been an exercise in deconstruction: deconstruction of the idea of religion as mechanically reproducing urban rituals and religious hierarchies in rural contexts, and, at the same time, deconstruction of the idea of the rural world as a space of cultural and religious resilience against a very Romanised urbanity. Of course, I do not suggest that the countryside was just a sort of bucolic, pastoral oasis that was never touched by what was happening within the urban centres and on their outskirts. I simply suggest that, as lived spaces, the rural areas represented an arena for highly situational processes of negotiation between, on the one hand, Roman administrative patterns (for example, the so-called “pagus-vicus system”), related social configurations (for example, the villa-system based on the figures of a dominus and a vilicus) and spaces (like the atrium or the Republican terraced sanctuaries), and, on the other hand, processes of social conformance to the very characteristics of a specific local rural environment, of adaptation to its peculiar habitus and religious customs (involving gods whose “competences” directly mirrored a geophysical environment made of mountains, rivers and woods). The concept of “rurification” aims to express precisely this last multifarious phenomenon of the engagement of religious actors with the specific social and spatial conditions of rural life. If this phenomenon
is mostly invisible, for example from the perspective of the study of the epigraphic record, the archaeological evidence allows us to grasp some of the peculiarities of this religious “rusticity”.

One might object that *Falacrinae* is an *extreme* example, a particularly *anomalous* case. I would counter that examples are always extreme. Certainly, other rural settlements of the ancient Western Mediterranean might present entirely different patterns and features, but this variety is implicit in the conception of rural settlements as “lived spaces”. This conception subsumes, as I have tried to show, a strong component of regional (or, better, local) diversity that we should seek to emphasise by means of the interdisciplinary analysis of a combination of literary sources, archaeological evidence, numismatics, epigraphy, archaeozoology, archaeobotany, and many other disciplines.
Fig. 1: a) The Tabula Peutingeriana placing the vicus of Falacrinae 77 miles from Rome (graphic elaboration by WM Design – Gualtiero Palmia); b) The “Valle Falacrina” and its Velino river as seen from the north: lower left, the modern municipality of Cittareale (Rieti, Lazio); at its feet, the localities of Vezzano, where the ruins of the vicus have been identified, and Pallottini, place of discovery of the “Cittareale Stone” and of the “Atrium publicum”; at the very bottom of the valley, crossing the plain to the east and facing the Abruzzi Apennines, the modern via Salaria (photo by V. Gasparini).
Fig. 2: a) The “Cittareale Stone”, 14.3 x 12.5 x 13.3 cm, post 88 BCE, Civic Museum of Cittareale; b) The hypothetical reconstruction of the text of the “Cittareale Stone” by F. Coarelli (photo by F. Coarelli; graphic elaboration by WM Design – Gualtiero Palmia).
Fig. 3: a) Plan of the “Atrium publicum” and its campus, placed between the vicus and the ancient via Salaria (locality Pallottini); b) reconstruction of one of the Corinthian columns holding the compluvium (graphic elaboration by WM Design – Gualtiero Palmia).
Fig. 4: The “Atrium publicum” and its campus. Hypothetical reconstruction as seen from a) south-east and b) west (graphic elaboration by WM Design – Gualtiero Palmia. After Cascino & Gasparini, 2009, pl. IX).
Fig. 5: a) Bronze navicella-type fibula, 6 x 2.7 x 3.5 cm, end of the 8th – beginning of the 7th cent. BCE, Civic Museum of Cittareale, inv. no. FLC-V 06 790 (photo by Ars Labor. After Cascino & Gasparini, 2009, p. 132, cat. no. 26); b) Bronze uncia, 28.64 g., Ø max. 27.94 mm, 280-276 BCE, Civic Museum of Cittareale, inv. no. FLC-V 06 834 (photo by S. Ranucci. After Cascino & Gasparini, 2009, p. 135, cat. no. 52); c) Bronze sestante, 46.95 g., Ø max. 34.75 mm, 225-217 BCE, Civic Museum of Cittareale, inv. no. FLC-V 06 797 (photo by S. Ranucci. After Cascino & Gasparini, 2009, p. 135, cat. no. 53).
Fig. 6: a) Plan of the archaic temple of *Falacrinae*, first half of the 6th cent. BCE (graphic elaboration by V. Gasparini. After Cascino & Gasparini, 2009, p. 48, fig. 2); b) Plan of the temple at S. Giovanni in Galdo, Colle Rimontato, late 4th – early 3rd cent. BCE (adapted by Stek, 2009, p. 42, fig. 3.2 after Zaccardi, 2007, p. 63, pl. 1); c) Plan of the temple at Castel di Ieri, end of the 2nd cent. BCE (adapted by Stek, 2009, p. 130, fig. 7.2 after Campanelli, 2004, p. 18, pl. 7).
Fig. 7: *Calles, viae, centurial limites* and excavated areas in the territory of *Falacrinae* (graphic elaboration by P. Camerieri. After Cascino & Gasparini, 2009, pl. V).
Fig. 8: The excavated area of the *vicus* (campaigns 2006-2008): a) Photomosaic (graphic elaboration by V. Gasparini. After Cascino & Gasparini, 2009, pl. VII); b) Drawing of the plan (graphic elaboration by V. Gasparini); c) Reconstruction of the plan (graphic elaboration by WM Design – Gualtiero Palmia).
Fig. 9: a) Plan of the three phases of the vicus: in red the archaic temple (first half of the 6th cent. BCE), in light brown the earliest domus (end of the 3rd – beginning of the 2nd cent. BCE), in dark brown the further extension of the village (last quarter of the 2nd cent. BCE) (graphic elaboration by WM Design – Gualtiero Palmia); b) Plan of the foci of the vicus (graphic elaboration by V. Gasparini. After Cascino & Gasparini, 2009, p. 59, fig. 5).
Fig. 10: a) The concentration of foci in the western area of the vicus as seen from the north-east, with (lower left) focus no. 20 (photo by V. Gasparini. After Cascino & Gasparini, 2009, p. 59, fig. 6); b) The carbonized bottom of focus no. 20 as seen from the north-east (photo by V. Gasparini).
Fig. 11: a) Black-glazed cup with the sacrificial remains of a cock, h. 5.6 cm, Ø max. 12.5 cm, ca. 250 BCE, Civic Museum of Cittareale, inv. no. FLC-V 07 1848-1849; b) Black-glazed miniature olpe, h. 4 cm, Ø max. 3.5 cm, 3rd-2nd cent. BCE, Civic Museum of Cittareale, inv. no. FLC-V 08 2843; c) Phoenician-Punic blue glass-paste eye-bead pendant, h. 0.9 cm, Ø max. 1.3 cm, 4th-2nd cent. BCE, Civic Museum of Cittareale, inv. no. FLC-V 08 2619; d) Inscribed black-glazed cup, h. 5.2 cm, Ø max. 13.2 cm, end of the 3rd-2nd cent. BCE, Civic Museum of Cittareale, inv. no. FLC-V 08 2629; e) Inscribed fragment of black-glazed cup, Ø max. 15 cm, ca. 250-200 BCE, Civic Museum of Cittareale, inv. no. FLC-V 08 3140; f) Bone stylus, l. 8.2 cm, Ø max. 0.8 cm, 2nd-1st cent. BCE, Civic Museum of Cittareale, inv. no. FLC-V 08 618; g) Clay lamp, 9 x 5.8 cm, 150-50 BCE, Civic Museum of Cittareale, inv. no. FLC-V 07 1304 (photos by V. Gasparini. After Cascino & Gasparini, 2009, pp. 130-134, cat. nos. 12-13, 16, 19, 23, 35 and 40).
Fig. 12: Sandstone spheroids inscribed with numbers: a) II; b) IV; c-d) V; e) VII; f) XVI (photos by V. Gasparini. After Cascino & Gasparini, 2009, pp. 134-135, cat. nos. 45, 47-51).
Fig. 13: a) Etruscan bucchero chalice, h. 9 cm, Ø max. 13 cm, *ca.* 590-570 BCE, Civic Museum of Cittareale, inv. no. FLC-V 07 1407; b) The bucchero chalice as originally used as secondary deposition for the bones of a perinatal (photos by Ars Labor and Ll. Alapont Martin. After Cascino & Gasparini, 2009, p. 130, cat. nos. 10-11).
Fig. 14: Location of the suggrundaria in the western area of the vicus (graphic elaboration by WM Design – Gualtiero Palmia, adapted by V. Gasparini).
Fig. 15: The perinatal deposition no. 2, end of the 2nd cent. BCE – first half of the 1st cent. BCE (photos and drawing by Ll. Alapont Martin, adapted by V. Gasparini. After Cascino & Gasparini, 2009, p. 56, fig. 2).
Fig. 16: a) Reconstruction of the practice of *suggrundaria* (after Gusi i Jener, Muriel & Olaria Puyoles, 2008, p. 371, fig. 5); b) Provisional map of distribution of the *suggrundaria* attested in the Roman West (graphic elaboration by V. Gasparini & E. Groff).
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