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This book presents the results of my PhD research, conducted at Cambridge University between 2004 and 2008. The analyses were performed between 2005 and 2006, and the writing was completed in 2007. Therefore, the bibliographic entries date mostly from that time. During my revision of the manuscript at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities in 2009–10, I consulted some new studies, such as the PhD dissertation of Luca Alessandri, *Il Lazio centromeridionale nell’età del Bronzo e del Ferro* (University of Groningen, 2009), and incorporated the results into my own account, although I have omitted the analyses.

Other articles or books were published during the preparation of my thesis for publication – for example, A. Ziolkowski, ‘Frontier Sanctuaries of the *ager Romanus antiquus*: Did They Exist?’ *Palamedes*, 4.1, 2009, pp. 91–130; F. Quondam, ‘Rinvenimenti di età proto-storica sulle pendici nord-orientali del Palatino, *Scienze dell’Antichità*, 17, 2011, pp. 621–41; B. Barbaro, *Insiemi, aree funerarie ed entità territoriali in Etruria meridionale nel Bronzo finale* (Florence, 2010); and P. Attema, J. Jan Burgers and P. Van Leusen, *Regional Pathways to Complexity: Settlement and Land-Use Dynamics in Early Italy from the Bronze Age to the Republican Period* (Amsterdam, 2010) – but it was not possible to integrate into the present volume the findings reported in these publications.

Finally, A. Carandini (ed.), *Atlante di Roma* (Milan, 2012), an important source on the archaeology of Rome and its territory, was released at the same time that the final version of this manuscript was submitted for publication. S. Stoddart is preparing a volume which will cover themes parallel to those addressed in this book in relation to the region north of the Tiber: *Power and Place in Etruria: The Spatial Dynamics of a Mediterranean Civilisation*, 1200–500 BC.
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