

# Roman (Un)exceptionalism: Dispelling Popular Notions of Roman Belligerence

JORDAN LONG  
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

---

## *Samnium*

Within the broader context of popular notions of Roman belligerence,<sup>1</sup> the period of the Samnite Wars, c. 343-290 B.C.E., has been considered Rome's imperial point of embarkation.<sup>2</sup> Among the pervasive notions of modern scholarship concerning the Roman relationship with Samnium is the idea that the Romans sought an antagonistic and deliberate policy of conflict, calculated to eliminate the Samnites and control their territory.<sup>3</sup> This idea not only fails to acknowledge the Samnites' own warlike history, but also fails to recognize that aggression displayed by both societies was common among

---

<sup>1</sup> There are four major studies that present this aspect:

1. William V. Harris, *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome, 327-70 B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 177;
2. R. J. Rowland, "Rome's Earliest Imperialism," *Latomus* 42 (1983): 759-60;
3. K. A. Raafaub, "Born to Be Wolves? Origins of Roman Imperialism," in *Transitions to Empire: Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360-146 BC, in Honor of E. Badian*, eds. R. W. Wallace and E. M. Harris (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996), 277-78;
4. K. A. Raafaub, J. D. Richards, and L. J. Samons II, "Rome, Italy, and Appius Claudius Caecus Before the Pyrrhic Wars," in T. Hackens and R. R. Holloway, eds., *The Age of Pyrrhus*, *Archaeologia Transatlantica* 11 (Louvain-la Neuve, Belgium, and Providence, R. I.: Center for Old World Archaeology and Art, Brown University, 1992), 25-29.

Cornell uses these studies to support his thesis of exceptional Roman bellicosity, as does Gary Forsythe; see Tim Cornell, *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (C. 1000-264 BC)* (London: Routledge, 1995), 351; and Gary Forsythe, *A Critical History of Early Rome: From Prehistory to the First Punic War* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).

<sup>2</sup> Edward Togo Salmon refers to the moment that Rome accepted the Capuan *deditio* (cf. pp 21-22, below) as the "inaugural event" of Roman Imperialism; he admits that the Romans were not aware that this was the case, however. See Edward Togo Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 1.

<sup>3</sup> Cornell, *The Beginnings of Rome*, 353; Stephen Oakley, "The Roman Conquest of Italy," in John Rich and Graham Shipley, eds., *War and Society in the Roman World* (London: Routledge, 1993), 11.

ancient city-states.<sup>4</sup> The ostensibly imperial ambitions of Rome were not ambitions at all; they were simply the normal response to the martial conflict endemic in the ancient Mediterranean. Analysis of the similarities and differences between the Romans and Samnites reveals an absence of foreordained Roman superiority; in fact, the balance of power in fourth-century Italy might have been as likely to tip in favor of the Samnites. The reasons for either Samnite or Roman hostility are far more complex than expansion for expansion's sake allows.

Prior to war with Samnium in the fifth and early fourth centuries B.C.E., Rome had evolved from a loosely grouped tribal conglomerate into a city-state. Early Republican Rome boasted the rapid assimilation of Latium through a system of colonies and virgane allotments that were connected to Rome through a legally defined network of citizenship. Rome had a proclivity for capitalizing on setbacks, strategically negotiating with enemies and allies, and incorporating ethnically diverse cultures into this framework. Yet Rome was unable to enjoy the fruits of this new commonwealth for long. As Rome acquired territory to accommodate their growing infrastructure, so too did Samnium. The Samnites, having experienced their own growing influence in Italy, would vie for the same region. Not only were they rivals of Rome, but there was also the possibility that the Samnites might even subjugate the Romans. By the fourth century B.C.E. the two states were closely matched in territorial expanse and population.<sup>5</sup> Although the outcome of the Samnite Wars would be significant in the development of Rome's position in Italy,<sup>6</sup> the fate of neither Samnium nor Rome was by any means foreseeable.

---

<sup>4</sup> For a detailed analysis of the warfare characteristic of the ancient Mediterranean, see Arthur M. Eckstein, *Mediterranean Anarchy, Interstate War, and the Rise of Rome* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2009).

<sup>5</sup> Cornell, 351.

<sup>6</sup> Forsythe goes so far as to call the crucial epoch of the Samnite Wars was creating a "blue print" for future Roman endeavors. See Forsythe, 285, n. 9.

Compared to the rich literary history of Rome, little is known about the Samnites.<sup>7</sup> Archaeology agrees with ancient literary sources that the Samnites were originally conquerors from farther inland Europe, who finally settled in central Italy. Once there, they amalgamated with a group called the Osci,<sup>8</sup> who themselves displaced the aboriginal inhabitants of that area. There were also significant ties to Campania, which in the sixth century was a mixture of Etruscans, Greeks, and Samnites. However, by the fourth century the people who lived in the rich, fertile plains of Campania had few, if any, remaining ties to their Samnite kinsmen in the hills.<sup>9</sup>

The four main tribes of Samnium were the Pentri, the Caudini, the Hirpini, and the Carricini.<sup>10</sup> Like the Romans, Latins, and Hernici, the Samnite tribes practiced a form of effective unification. The Samnites, however, only united during times of war. Conversely, the Latin League adhered to the Cassian Treaty of 493 B.C.E. for an indefinite period of time. Unlike the Latin League of the fifth and early fourth centuries, the Samnites appointed a single general to lead the tribal coalition.<sup>11</sup> This ethnic camaraderie within the Samnite Federation is distinctive when compared to most other Mediterranean city-states,<sup>12</sup> making Samnium relatively exceptional and rather formidable.<sup>13</sup>

The standard procedure outside of Samnium was for each society to show up on the battlefield, each division with its own commander. When the Latin League went to war, for example, the respective powers would deliberate over who was to lead the campaign, which led to diluted command over the constituent parts. As the Samnite threat increased, though, the Romans responded by adopting the

---

<sup>7</sup> For a more detailed look into the history of Samnium, see Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites*, which is regarded as one of the only comprehensive sources on the origins of the ancient Samnites.

<sup>8</sup> *Ὀπικοί* is the name in Greek, and the more common *Osci* is the Latin form. The Oscan origin of the Samnites is discussed in Strabo 5.4.12.

<sup>9</sup> Emma Dench, *From Barbarians to New Men* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 136-37.

<sup>10</sup> Eckstein, 140; For Carricini, see Livy 9.31.4 and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 17.4.4, 5.1; for Caudini and Hirpini, see Livy 23.42.1.

<sup>11</sup> The Samnite League is described in greater detail as the Samnite Federation in Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites*, 80-87. The appointment of a tribal war chief appears in Livy 9.1.2, 9.3.9, 10.12.1, et al.

<sup>12</sup> Cornell, 346.

<sup>13</sup> Eckstein, 141.

Samnite practice of installing a single commander to manage the armies, doing so by appointing a *dictator*.<sup>14</sup> At the behest of Rome, the Latin League began a similar practice, and it was not uncommon for non-Romans to take the lead.<sup>15</sup> The emphasis was placed on a leader's ability to win a battle and not necessarily on mere status or wealth. Although through different means, both Samnium and Rome used systems that overcame societal divisions in a time of war. A concrete adherence to tribal unification during war allowed the Samnite tribes of the central Apennines to grow quite fearsome. The expanse of Samnite power was a result of these tribes' effective confederacy. Indeed before the rise of Rome, the sixth-century Samnites' sphere of influence ranged as far south as Tarentum.

As illustrated by the Cassian Treaty and the viridine allotments of the sixth and fifth centuries, Rome's early territorial expansion was not entirely due to war. Diplomacy and colonization held sway at times. By contrast, Samnite power spread chiefly through the agency of militarism. Among the examples of the Samnites' predisposition for warfare was the sack of Cumae in 421 B.C.E., in which they massacred the Greeks who lived there.<sup>16</sup> Wholesale slaughter of civilians was not a characteristic common to warring societies in the ancient world. Though it did happen, incidents were relatively isolated within the context of almost annual campaigning. It certainly did not occur on a scale that justifies this Samnite overreaction. Further evidence of Samnite pugnacity has been uncovered in the archaeological discovery that all graves thus far uncovered containing Samnite males have contained weapons. This universal inclusion of weapons as a grave good for males was notably not a characteristic of Roman burials.<sup>17</sup> Archaeological remains of more than eighty hilltop fortifications scattered throughout their Apennine territory, demonstrate the unremittingly militaristic history of the

---

<sup>14</sup> The Roman *dictator* was a magistrate with absolute power over the state. The term of office was six months, and was considered an extraordinary measure, usually taken to preserve the security of the state.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Festus quoting Cincius, and its analysis. See Forsythe, 188.

<sup>16</sup> Kathryn Lomas, *Rome and the Western Greeks, 350 BC-AD 200: Conquest and Acculturation in Southern Italy* (London: Routledge, 1993), 35.

<sup>17</sup> Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites*, 62.

Samnites.<sup>18</sup> The hyperbole used by ancient annalists indicates the extent to which there was a perceived Samnite threat.<sup>19</sup>

Perhaps most noteworthy, however, is how the tribes of Samnium managed the resources available in the hills of the Apennines. For varying reasons,<sup>20</sup> the Samnites appear to have been migrating onto the plains of Campania in the fifth and fourth centuries. When resources in the central Apennines were limited, the *ver sacrum*, or sacred spring, was performed.<sup>21</sup> This ritual was a fairly common one among ancient tribes, in which the first fruits of the spring would be sacrificed. Yet for the Samnites, it was a ritual in which the men, whom the tribe could not continue to feed, were sent forth to acquire new land for farming.<sup>22</sup> These migrations occurred over the course of centuries. At first these excursions into adjacent, non-Samnite territories were relatively passive and even peaceful. Yet by 450 B.C.E. there was a distinct shift in the nature of the *ver sacrum*. Though perhaps circumstantially necessary,<sup>23</sup> it became invasive, with the Samnites displacing by force the people who dwelt on the plains of Campania. Samnite expansion into Campania also seemed likely to confront the expanding influence of the Romans. However, Rome and Samnium initially encountered one another in a different context and along a different border.

---

<sup>18</sup> Stephen Oakley, *The Hill-Forts of the Samnites*, Archaeological Monographs of the British School at Rome, no. 10 (London: British School at Rome, 1995), 1.

<sup>19</sup> Polybius's and Strabo's use of the term *Saunitis* for the Samnites has led some to believe that this word was invoking the Greek word for javelin, *σαυτιον*. While Eckstein uses this point to further his argument, Salmon decries it as a trick of "popular etymology." See Eckstein, 138, and Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites*, 28, respectively; also see Vergil, *Aeneid*, 7.729; Strabo 5.4.2; Polybius 1.6.6 (where he likens the Samnite aggression to Celtic military prowess). Even Thucydides, ca. 415 BCE, tells of aggressive Samnite expansion in central and southern Italy.

<sup>20</sup> Kathryn Lomas cites a large-scale increase in the Samnite population during this time, calling it a "demographic explosion," See Kathryn Lomas, *Roman Italy, 338 BC-AD 200: A Sourcebook* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 11-12. Dench posits that there existed a paucity of resources in the Samnites' Apennine territory; see Dench, 189.

<sup>21</sup> Though the genesis of this practice is somewhat debated, even biased sources agree that such a thing existed. Typically it is the practice of sacrificing the first fruits and animals of spring to various fertility gods. The Samnites adopted the unique practice of using humans instead of fruits and animals, and sent them forth to support themselves—in essence, as a colony—instead of sacrificing them. See Neil Faulkner, *Rome: Empire of the Eagles* (Harlow, United Kingdom: Pearson Longman, 2008), 46-47; see also Dench, 189-93.

<sup>22</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.16; Strabo 5.4.12.

<sup>23</sup> It can be presumed that, given a choice between returning to their tribe in Samnium and vying for decreasingly available land on the Campanian plain, the Samnite colonist chose the latter; see also Lomas, 33.

The first record of any diplomatic interaction between Rome and Samnium was a treaty in 354 B.C.E.<sup>24</sup> The background of the treaty is as important as the terms themselves, for the stage was being set for conflict. In the decades before the treaty, the Liris River Valley had become a shared border between the Samnite tribes and the Latin League. Leading up to the treaty, the Samnites were again making a push in Campania to their southwest, and, of greater concern to the Romans, across the Liris River, presumably for the iron deposits and fertile soil.<sup>25</sup> In the mid-fifth century B.C.E., Samnite expansion became violent and pervasive,<sup>26</sup> and Roman colonization was beginning to affect the makeup of the territory surrounding Latium. In a world with limited international mediation, it would seem likely that two expanding powers like the Romans and Samnites would eventually clash. In central Italy, as in most of the ancient Mediterranean, survival ultimately depended on the ability to either make war or successfully defend from attack.<sup>27</sup> The impending confrontation between both cultures was well within this context.

In 358 B.C.E. the Romans created yet another colony of its citizens, this one in Publilia. Though it was an assertive move, the colony might have been a defensive measure to keep the Volsci in check. This new colony was located on the Roman side of the Liris River, but was in Volscian territory. In the fifth century B.C.E., wars between the Volsci and Rome were commonplace,<sup>28</sup> threatening Roman regional stability to the extent that the Volsci even marched to the gates of Rome.<sup>29</sup> The Liris River Valley became ever more contentious, the Samnites creating a colony on the Roman side of the river in reaction to a perceived power grab by Rome over the Volsci. The Samnites infringed on Roman territory,

---

<sup>24</sup> Livy 7.19.4; Diodorus 16.45.8.

<sup>25</sup> Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites*, 189.

<sup>26</sup> Specifically, southeast to Apulia, Livy 9.13.7; southwest into Calabria; west to Capua and Cumae, Oakley, *War and Society in the Roman World*, 13; and northwest into Latium. See Eckstein, 139.

<sup>27</sup> Eckstein, ch. 3, 4, and 6.

<sup>28</sup> During the first half of the century, a campaign against the Volsci occurred almost each year. The historical notation is almost pervasive: Livy books 1-8, Strabo 5.3, Appian, *Italy*, ch.1, and Plutarch, *De Fortuna Romanorum*, to name a few. The constant threat of the Volsci is a mainstay of early Roman history.

<sup>29</sup> Livy 3.66.5; the record includes both routine defeats by the Volsci, Dionysius of Halicarnassus 8.84-6; Livy 2.58-60; and epic failures by the Romans, Livy 4.38.

but the Romans acted unexpectedly; rather than come to blows over the disputed terrain and the resources within it, Rome chose peace. The Romans approached the Samnites with a defensive treaty that indirectly addressed the controversial border along the Liris River by creating a line of demarcation between the two powers.<sup>30</sup> Although by now the Volsci were in a relative state of decline, they still threatened both Roman and Samnite interests along the Liris River. As a common enemy, the Volsci were a mechanism through which the treaty of 354 B.C.E. was achieved. Thus, when war broke out a decade later over Campania, the Liris River Valley seemed to be a settled matter, but was not.

In 343 B.C.E. Samnite expansion once again reached Campania. Not having developed a centrally governed network of citizen colonies as Rome had, the Samnites continued to use conquest in Campania in order to deal with the lack of adequate resources in the Apennines. They invaded the town of Teanum, which enlisted aid from nearby Capua.<sup>31</sup> The Capuans fought two major engagements against the Samnites,<sup>32</sup> but lost them both. Capua then sent an embassy to ask help of Rome only as a measure of last resort. The Roman Senate informed the Capuan delegation that the treaty with the Samnites was binding and Rome could not interfere.<sup>33</sup> After this initial rebuff, the Capuans offered Rome a *deditio*, or total surrender. Through *deditio*, Capua thus presented itself as property of Rome.<sup>34</sup> As such, Samnium would be declaring war on Rome if they were to attack Capua; once they had, the Romans were obligated to defend Capua.

Before forcibly protecting their new diplomatically acquired territory, though, the Romans attempted arbitration between the Samnium and Capua. The Romans sent envoys to the Samnites,

---

<sup>30</sup> Livy and Diodorus note the treaty, but do not discuss its reason, only to describe the common border. Presumably, the treaty was the result of growing tension.

<sup>31</sup> Livy 7.19.

<sup>32</sup> Eckstein, 141.

<sup>33</sup> Livy 7.31.2.

<sup>34</sup> Livy 7.31.4-5.

asking them to refrain from waging war against Campania. The Samnite confederation<sup>35</sup> reportedly responded to the Roman delegation by giving the army orders, in the presence of the Roman legates, to march to war.<sup>36</sup> The first of the Samnite wars began in this way; it was not through Roman imperialism, but as a result of Samnite antagonism as well as Campanian pleas for aid and protection .

The tendency among modern historians is to attribute the Samnite wars to Roman bellicosity.<sup>37</sup> In particular, they point out that the Romans recorded these events and that the Samnite perspective cannot be determined. One example is that Livy, by emphasizing the *deditio*, was trying to exonerate Rome for breaking the treaty with Samnium.<sup>38</sup> However, to simply doubt the veracity of Livy's report based on the knowledge that he had ulterior motives for writing it hardly proves that the *deditio* did not happen. Without additional evidence, it can be reasonably assumed that a *deditio* had at least taken place. There are also assertions that, in order to coax Samnium into war, Rome accepted the *deditio* with Capua.<sup>39</sup> Yet this type of voluntary submission was a frequent aspect of ancient diplomacy.<sup>40</sup> For Rome to refuse acquisition of territory and resources granted by *deditio* would be exceptional indeed, and quite unexpected of an ancient city-state. Even if the Romans were attempting to draw the Samnites into war, it would likely have been to prevent Samnium from gaining a power base immediately to the south of, and thereby surrounding, Rome.

The First Samnite War failed to achieve lasting peace, partially because the Romans remained in a defensive posture, never moving beyond Campania. The war, in fact, ended in a Samnite victory: Samnium took possession of its original target, Teanum, and the Romans acquired possession of Capua

---

<sup>35</sup> At this time, 343 B.C.E., the Samnite League comprised the Hirpini, the Caudini, the Pentri, the Caraceni, and the Frentani.

<sup>36</sup> Livy 7.31.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. n. 1, above.

<sup>38</sup> Forsythe, 287.

<sup>39</sup> Oakley, *War and Society in the Roman World*, 31, n. 2.

<sup>40</sup> Cornell, 347.



through *deditio*. In the end the treaty of 354 was renewed, with the same terms as before the First Samnite War.<sup>41</sup>

By the 330s B.C.E., the paths of Samnium and Rome once again crossed. The Samnites had dispatched a military garrison to Naples, and the Romans alleged that the Samnites were taking up piracy by controlling the port city.<sup>42</sup> The gravity of the situation is reflected in the Senate's decision to dispatch a colony to the island of Pontia, which is immediately off the coast of Naples.<sup>43</sup> Commercial and economic interests were at stake: if the Samnites were to control trade moving north along the Tyrrhenian coast at Naples, then Rome's own harbor along the Tiber could be rendered ineffective.<sup>44</sup>

This escalation was further aggravated when Rome established the colony of Fregellae in 328 B.C.E. This colony was located at a Liris River crossing that connected Samnium and Latium, but it was on the Samnites' side of the river. The Romans had clearly overstepped the territorial demarcation between the two powers, instigating another Samnite War. Although the reason for the colony has been debated, it was nevertheless provocative. Notably, Fregellae was a Latin colony, and not a military garrison;<sup>45</sup> it was perhaps a more even-handed response to the Samnite garrison in Naples, but it nevertheless had the effect of starting a war. Samnium's garrisoning activities also prompted other, smaller city-states such as Apulia to ally themselves with Rome.<sup>46</sup>

In contrast to the way the Romans waged the First Samnite War, in the Second Samnite War the Romans adopted an offensive policy characterized by military invasions of Samnium.<sup>47</sup> Until this time, the Romans had remained content to defend vassal states or their own colonies. There were occasional

---

<sup>41</sup> Livy 8.2.1.

<sup>42</sup> Livy 8.26.1.

<sup>43</sup> Livy 8.28.7.

<sup>44</sup> Eckstein, 144.

<sup>45</sup> Salmon, *Roman Colonization Under the Republic*, 56.

<sup>46</sup> Livy 9.13.6.

<sup>47</sup> Eckstein, 145.

skirmishes with allies of Samnium,<sup>48</sup> but this first major incursion into Samnite territory met with disaster. In 321 at the Caudine Forks, the Roman forces suffered a humiliating defeat and were forced to surrender. As a result, the Samnites compelled Rome to surrender Fregellae.<sup>49</sup> Rome had not only attempted to respond to Samnium, but was also soundly defeated in the process.

In the nearly three decades that followed, the Romans were able to bounce back. This recovery was due to their ability to reorganize and respond quickly and effectively. Also as a result of the defeat, the Romans discovered the importance of the Samnites' smaller and more mobile infantry tactics. This experience led Rome to develop the manipular legion. It is at this time that the aforementioned office of *dictator* became crucial. Having all the resources of Rome at its disposal, the office of *dictator* was used effectively in times of severe distress. The census also played a critical role by making sure that the maximum number of eligible recruits was available and by maximizing tax revenues. Thus, only the needs of the military action were addressed, with little distraction and optimal resourcing. The marshalling of resources, the adoption of Samnium's superior military tactics, and a mobilization of the entire society toward this end all led to a triumphant invasion of western Samnium in 305 B.C.E.,<sup>50</sup> decisively ending the Second Samnite War.

The Third Samnite War, which was fought from 298-290 B.C.E., was characterized by the same cross-border operations as the Second Samnite War. Once the war broke out, both the Romans and the Samnites were responsible for various invasions. Samnite aggression culminated in alliances with the Gauls and Etruscans to effect a massive invasion down the Tiber River Valley.<sup>51</sup> The Romans, working with Campania and the Latins, responded proportionally. Once again, there is some debate on the

---

<sup>48</sup> One example is in 326 B.C.E., when the Romans fought with the Vestini, a Samnite ally; see Livy 8.25.4.

<sup>49</sup> Livy 9.4.4.

<sup>50</sup> Eckstein, 145.

<sup>51</sup> Cornell, 361.

genesis of aggression: was it Roman, or was it Samnite?<sup>52</sup> This question fails to adequately capture the context: in tribal Italy, war was endemic. It truly was a world in which only the strong would survive. With either society poised to control Italy north of the Aufidus River, and given that cultural assimilation was too often the result of defeat in the ancient Mediterranean, survival was at stake for both Samnium and Rome.

The Romans did not win the Samnite Wars because they were inherently more bellicose and warlike; it was that Rome was better able to adapt, exercised a more effective political structure, and demonstrated an aptitude for revising their tactics in the face of adversity. None of these advantages is to say that Rome's motives were by any measure altruistic, nor that Samnium is culturally or even militarily inferior to Rome; it would be another two centuries before the last Samnite tribes were brought fully under Roman control. It does, however, illustrate that Rome was unexceptional in its level of belligerence. However, it was also better able to contend with Samnium by less martial means. Through treaties, compromises, and capitalizing on losses, the Romans adopted and maintained very successful policies. Rome adjusted as the situation required, paving the way to peninsular hegemony.

---

<sup>52</sup> For the pro-Roman view, see Eckstein; for the view that Rome was a sole antagonist, see Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites*.

## Bibliography

- Cornell, Tim. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome From the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (C. 1000-264 BC)*. Routledge History of the Ancient World. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Dench, Emma. *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples of the Central Apennines*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Eckstein, Arthur M. *Mediterranean Anarchy, Interstate War, and the Rise of Rome*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.
- Forsythe, Gary. *A Critical History of Early Rome: From Prehistory to the First Punic War*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Harris, William V. *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome, 327-70 B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- Lomas, Kathryn. *Rome and the Western Greeks, 350 BC-AD 200: Conquest and Acculturation in Southern Italy*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- . *Roman Italy, 338 BC-AD 200: A Sourcebook*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- Oakley, Stewart Philip. *The Hill-Forts of the Samnites*. Archaeological Monographs of the British School at Rome, no. 10. London: British School at Rome, 1995.
- Raaflaub, K. A. "Born to Be Wolves? Origins of Roman Imperialism." In *Transitions to Empire: Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360-146 BC, in Honor of E. Badian*. Edited by R. W. Wallace and E. M. Harris. Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996, 273-314.
- Raaflaub, K. A., J. D. Richards, and L. J. Samons II, "Rome, Italy, and Appius Claudius Caecus Before the Pyrrhic Wars," in T. Hackens and R. R. Holloway, eds., *The Age of Pyrrhus*, *Archaeologia Transatlantica* 11 (Louvain-la Neuve, Belgium, and Providence, R. I.: Center for Old World Archaeology and Art, Brown University, 16-50.
- Rich, John, and Graham Shipley. *War and Society in the Roman World*. Leicester-Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society, vol. 5. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Rowland, R. J. "Rome's Earliest Imperialism." *Latomus* 42 (1983): 749-62.
- Salmon, Edward Togo. *Samnium and the Samnites*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- . *Roman Colonization Under the Republic*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1969.