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How did the Roman state affect areas under its control? This dissertation addresses that question by examining one area, northern Italy, which was administered by the state at its most and least intensive. In the Republican and Late Antique periods the state frequently and directly intervened in the area. During the Republic changing Roman conceptions of northern Italy led the state to intervene dramatically in ways that remade the physical and demographic landscape of the region, while in the late Roman period similarly changing attitudes led to reformulation of the region’s purpose and position within the empire. In contrast, the Roman state’s presence in northern Italy in the early Imperial period was minimal, and this study explores the reasons for and effects of that minimalist approach on northern Italy in the first and second centuries AD.

Explanations for this early Imperial policy towards northern Italy are to be found not just in the region’s late Republican history but also in the creation and evolution of Italian identities. Case studies of the Aemilia and the central Transpadana illustrate the intersection of these identities with state policy and ideology. These studies also examine the consequences of that intersection on everyday life in towns and in the countryside, on matters ranging from tombstones to taxes and from poetry to politics. Further case studies of Aquileia and Liguria look at how the state, even in its minimalist form, shaped the development of local economies and societies through the movement of people and goods around the empire. Together these studies examine the effects of the state on interregional networks as well as on individual communities.
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I

Cisalpine Gaul and Roman Italy

Introduction

What effects did the Roman state have on areas under its control? That is, what did the system composed of road-supervisors, emperors, financial secretaries, customs-collectors, senators, and centurions that administered by force and by law the territory of the Roman Empire actually do to that territory it administered? What impact did the Roman state have on local societies, economies, identities, and cultures? These next six chapters try to answer those questions by examining the impact of the Roman state on one area of the empire where the intensity of state intervention varied the most: northern Italy. Northern Italy was an area of the Roman Empire that saw three distinct phases of state involvement: (1) a period of frequent and invasive state intervention lasting from the beginning of the Roman conquest in the third century BC to the early Augustan era at the end of the first century BC, (2) a period during the first and second centuries AD where the state took a hands-off approach to governing the region, and (3) a period during the third, fourth, and fifth centuries that saw a return of direct, frequent, and invasive state intervention. These three phases make northern Italy particularly useful for studying the impact of the state, since they allow us to examine state involvement at both high and low levels.

For this work, however, most of the emphasis will be on the Imperial period, in which direct state involvement was rare, because while the effects of the Roman state in the early (1) and later (3) periods are often readily apparent, those in the Imperial period are more indirect and more subtle. Hence the history of northern Italy in the Imperial period has often been neglected, even though it forms a necessary point of comparison for both the Republican and Late Antique periods and even though much of the evidence from this period—the letters of the younger Pliny, the remains of Aquileia, the inscriptions of Brixia and Verona, the Veleia alimentary tablet, and the amphorae from Genua—is rich and evocative.

In addition to its unique administrative history, northern Italy also occupies a liminal zone between the Italian peninsula and the European provinces of the Roman Empire, in terms not just of physical geography but also of its history, its landscape, its relationship with the army, and its urbanization. Accordingly there are few better areas to look at the intersection between state actions, local identities, and Roman conceptions of the world than this place that was both Italian and provincial. With both this intermediate status and its history of alternating approaches to administration, northern

---

1 Here northern Italy is to be understood as roughly the four Augustan regiones VIII (modern Emilia-Romagna), IX (modern Liguria), X (comprising the Veneto, Friuli-Venezia, and Trentino-Alto Adige), and XI (Lombardy, Piedmont, and Aosta). These regions together form a unified, geographical unit dependent upon the Po river system and defined by mountainous and coastal borders.

2 On the problems of incorporating Cisalpine Gaul into narratives of integration into the Roman Empire and Italy, see Millar 1995: 211, Patterson 2006: 2, and Pallottino 1984: 3.
Italy offers an ideal laboratory in which to examine how the apparatus of the Roman state affected life in the Empire.

Cisalpine Gaul

This chapter examines the first phase of Roman northern Italy, during which the region was incorporated into the Roman Empire by a combination of arms and laws. From the beginnings of the conquest in the third century BC to the Augustan period, Roman intervention here was especially intensive, much more so than in Italy south of the Apennines, with the possible exception of Campania. The Roman conquest of the region radically reshaped its physical and demographic landscape, particularly in Liguria and the southern Po valley, where the Roman government moved entire populations, reordered land ownership, altered patterns of urbanization and reworked the routes of land and water transportation. In the Transpadana, or Italy north of the Po, Roman involvement was less invasive, but nevertheless the Roman conquest and subsequent administration dramatically reorganized local governments and settlement patterns. Even in areas like the Veneto, where the Roman government initially had little reason or incentive to involve itself in local activities, second and first century BC Roman politics dictated land divisions and redistributions. Such intervention was greater and longer lasting than it was in almost every other part of Italy south of the Apennines and in most of the provinces of the eastern Mediterranean. This meant that by the time that Augustus changed northern Italy from a province to a part of the new administrative district of Italy, the region had nearly as much in common with the western provinces as with central and southern Italy with which it was now grouped. This chapter attempts to ascertain why Roman involvement here was so strong and why it was configured in the way it was.

---


4 The conquest of the region falls roughly in five phases: (1) the defeat, conquest, and expulsion of the Senones in the southeastern Po valley in the 290s and 280s, (2) the campaigns against the two largest Celtic tribes, the Boii and Insubres, immediately before the Hannibalic war, (3) campaigns during and following that war aimed at protecting Roman colonies and punishing the Boii and Insubres for their Carthaginian alliance, (4) wars against the Istrians and Ligurians ending in the mid second century BC, and (5) Augustan campaigns against the Alpine tribes.

5 The dates and the northern, western, and eastern boundaries of the province of Cisalpine Gaul have been much disputed. Cassola 1991 and Laffi 1992 provide summaries of scholarship on the matter, from minimalist positions that the province of Cisalpine Gaul never existed to the other extreme—that the province existed in a relatively standard form from the battle of Clastidium (222 BC onwards). The difficulty in pinning down the dates and boundaries result from the lack of clear evidence before the time of Caesar, and the variations in the responsibilities of consuls and proconsuls sent northwards suggest that the provincia in the second century was a more fluid, less geographically defined construct. The very clear demarcation of the Rubicon River as the southeastern boundary of Caesar’s province indicates that by at least the mid first century BC the definition of the province had become more rigid, at least on its southern borders. The establishment of a clear boundary between Italy and Cisalpine Gaul sometime before Caesar might be attributed to the period after the Marian-Sullan civil wars, in which the presence Roman armies in central Italy was a sensitive issue. On the Rubicon as the border of Cisalpine Gaul see Plut. Caes. 32 (but cf. Plut. Caes. 60, which calls Ariminum a city of Italy), Dio 41.4, Vell. Pat. 2.49, and Lucan 5.346-7.
The pre-Roman landscape

Crucial to understanding the history of the region, and especially the actions of the Roman state, is the geography of the Po valley. Although connected to the Italian peninsula northern Italy had a distinctive landscape in which topographical features were more pronounced—it had larger lakes, a longer river, higher mountains, a bigger delta, and a broader plain than the rest of Italy. The Alps and Apennines formed the region’s natural borders, setting it off both from the central Europe and from most of the Italian peninsula; these did not however prove to be impenetrable boundaries, either to invaders or to the mineral wealth of the central Europe and Etruria. The Po valley also linked these mineral-rich territories to the Adriatic and hence to Greece and the eastern Mediterranean. At the same time the Po provided not only a large flat area of alluvial soil suited for agriculture but along with its tributaries a unified system of waterways for communication, trade, and travel. The agricultural wealth of the region in the Roman period was legendary. Polybius tells the story that in his time innkeepers in the region charged their guests per head rather than per item since food was so plentiful and cheap. The antiquarian Varro says that the Insubres, living around modern Milan, grew pigs so fat that they could barely stand, and both Polybius and Strabo say that Cisalpine pork fed all Italy. Strabo further says that Cisalpine Gaul also produced the wool that clothed most of Italy’s households, and that the viticulture there was so prosperous that Cisalpine wine casks were as big as houses. The potential agricultural and commercial wealth available in the Po valley thus made the region an attractive target for invaders and colonizers.

For a political power situated in the center of the Italian peninsula, as Rome was, Cisalpine Gaul thus provided a potentially great source of wealth but also one that by virtue of its position was extremely vulnerable. The double-edged nature of Cisalpine wealth is apparent in literary accounts. Polybius says that the Etruscans who once inhabited the Po valley were defeated and expelled by their envious Celtic neighbors to the north, who wanted the rich and beautiful plain for themselves. Later those Celts who had moved to northern Italy found themselves under attack by Alpine tribes who had

---

6 On the geography of the Po valley see Potter 1987 as well as Chilver 1941.
7 Trade contacts between central Europe to the eastern Mediterranean via northern Italy are clearly attested as early as the late bronze age and were maintained and even increased during the early iron age, as the collapse of the bronze age palatial systems removed political barriers to trading by smaller-scale, peripheral groups over longer distances, and during this later period Frattestina in particular connected the metal producing centers of central Europe with the international trade of the eastern Mediterranean (Sherratt; Citton 2003: 26-27). In the archaic period such trade continued under the direction of the Etruscans, and trade with the Aegean intensified. A resident community of Greek traders at Spina testifies to the importance of this trade route for both sides, as does the sheer volume of imported Greek pottery.
9 Polyb. 2.15.
10 Varro Rust 2.4.11, Polyb. 2.15, Strabo 5.1.12.
12 Polyb. 2.17
seen the new prosperity of these Italian Celts. Likewise one of the explanations that Livy provides for the Celtic migration into Italy is that they were enticed by reports of the fruits and wine of Italy; that Livy dismisses the story as chronologically improbable does not negate that the story had been in circulation. The story that Livy does accept, that overpopulation in Transalpine Gaul prompted their migration south across the Alps, still follows the same theme of northern Italy as source of agricultural wealth and promise. The wealth of the Po valley was thus ambiguously portrayed; it could clothe and feed the entire peninsula but could also entice hordes of invaders from across the Alps.

Also key to the Roman understanding of northern Italy were the practices of earlier peoples who had been drawn to northern Italy by the promise of that wealth, and before the Roman conquest communities of Etruscans, Celts, Ligurians, and other Italic peoples had repeatedly reworked the landscape—both actual and demographic—of the Po valley and its surrounding hills. The Etruscans were perhaps the most vigorous in changing the physical landscape, and the Po delta still shows evidence of their numerous hydraulic projects. Celtic tribes moving into the region increasingly in the fourth century brought with them a greater focus on livestock, especially in cattle, in turn altering patterns of land use. Such changes of course were brought about by the heavy

---

13 Polyb. 2.18. The terms “Celt” and “Gaul” are not, of course, without their problems (see Williams 2001a on the historical problems of the terms as well as the relationship of the terms to modern political and popular culture). In this paper the term “Celt” is used in its modern sense to describe peoples employing in the fourth, third, and second centuries a La Tène material culture that was shared by central European peoples referred to by the Greeks as Celts and by the Romans as Gauls (on the dating of the La Tène period in relation to the Halstatt, Golasecca, and Este periods in Italy see the introduction in Defente 2003, as well as the work of Gambacurta and Serafini in linking La Tène periods with finds in the Veneto. Agostinetti 2004: 129-131 provides a useful synthesis of epigraphic and literary material within the scheme of La Tène periods. It is important to note that the La Tène periods—used for most of Celtic Europe—overlap slightly with the Golasecca periods, which are used solely for the area around the lakes in northwestern Italy). In this matter the paper follows the conventions of modern scholarship on the tribes Insubres, Cenomani, Lingones, Anares, Boii, and Senones in Italy (see Agostinetti 2004 on the history of scholarship on the Italian Celts and the preference—developing largely in the 80s and 90s but owing a great deal to the works of Chevallier, Frey, and Peyre in the late 70s and 80s—for using the term Celt instead of Gaul in scholarship). To avoid confusion, the term “Gaul” is avoided except for descriptions of the regions known to the Romans as Transalpine Gaul and Cisalpine Gaul. Throughout the following chapters, the use of Gaul without modifiers indicates Transalpine Gaul, while Cisalpine Gaul is specified as Cisalpine Gaul.

14 Livy 5.33. See also Williams 2001a on the theme of envy in Roman portrayals of the Gauls.

15 Livy 5.34. Livy 21.35, where Hannibal points out to his troops the rich Po plain and easy living they will have in Italy, follows a similar theme.

16 Canal systems could provide for drainage, transportation, and flood control, the latter especially important for the Po delta, where Spina and Forcello show canalization (Sassatelli 1993, de Marinis 1991). The importance of these projects is reflected in Etruscan myths of Daedalus, where the Greek hero becomes “a carpenter (or architect) when managing waters” (Sassatelli 1993: 120; see also Braccesi 2004:357 and 1998: 119-121). For further work on Etruscan hydraulic developments in northern Italy see Peretto 1991, Uggeri 1991, De Marinis 1991, and Uggeri 1989. On the social and religious importance of hydraulic engineering for Etruscan culture, see the important article of Torelli 1991, who points to the prominence in Etruscan religious calendars of festivals tied to water, lakes, rivers, and irrigation.

17 Polybius’s description of the northern Italian Celts at 2.17, which stresses their nomadic lifestyle and reckoning of wealth in cattle and gold instead of land, certainly does not describe the full extent of Celtic agricultural practices but nevertheless indicates that these practices could be seen by Greek and Latin authors as significantly different from Roman and Etruscan farming. By the early imperial period the inhabitants of northern Italy consume more beef than their central and southern Italian counterparts. As this predilection for beef is also found in imperial era Gaul and even more so in Britain and Germany, it is
Etruscan and Celtic colonization of the valley, which naturally shifted the demographic makeup of the region. By the fifth century the Etruscans had founded settlements in most of the central and southeastern Po valley, and their economic power stretched even further, while by the beginning of the third century the Celtic Insubres, Cenomani, Boii, Senones, Lingones, and Anares controlled most of the valley except for the northeastern and northwestern corners, belonging to the Veneti and Ligurians respectively. Such rapid shifts in population were not atypical of Iron Age Italy—the Greek colonization of southern Italy in the Archaic period stands as an obvious example—but the Romans perceived them as recent.

The colonization of the Po valley by the Etruscans and then Celts was accompanied by experimentation in urban forms, another trend to be continued by the Romans. In the southeastern corner of the region the Etruscans had crossed the Apennines and established their dominance there with colonies, colonies that provided opportunities for their founders to try new orthogonal plans. The well preserved, rectangular layout of late sixth century Marzabotto shows especially well how such new civic foundations allowed their planners to implement new, theoretical designs, even at the expense of older settlements. A variation of Marzabotto’s urban form can be found at the town of Spina in the Po delta, a trading community of canals and pilings organized along a similarly orthogonal design. While earlier sixth century cities in Etruria proper, such as the settlement at Acquarossa in southern Etruria, had more open, less regular urban layouts, a new colonial foundation. Hence Etruscan experimentation in urban forms in northern Italy was closely linked to the process of colonization. Similarly Celtic tribes moving into the southern Po valley in the fourth century used it as a sort of laboratory in settlement design. Here the Boii, Senones, and Lingones adapted earlier Etruscan settlements like Marzabotto, Mantua, and Felsina—now renamed Bononia after

---

**Note:**

- Possible that the composition of diet in imperial northern Italy is a reflection of the practices of the region’s earlier Celtic inhabitants, and is not necessarily geographically determined, as the landscape of the Po valley and its surrounding hills is just as suited for sheep and pigs as it is for cattle. For the proportion of beef in the northern Italian diet in the Roman period see Potter 2004: 13-15 and King 1999.

---


21 On Spina see Harari 2000: 32-34, Berti and Guzzo 1993, Scullard 1967: 209-212. Spina’s primary importance was an emporium, and the town was a pivotal point in the Adriatic trading networks that connected Greece, the Balkans, central Europe, and Italy. On these Adriatic networks see D’Ercole 2002. On Adria, another important Etruscan emporium and river port in the Po delta, see Bonomi and Robino 2006 and De Min 1987.


the Boii—to their own uses. At Marzabotto Celtic tombs were placed in the middle of the Etruscan orthogonal plan, not just disrupting but also adapting the earlier design and the settlement itself.\textsuperscript{24} The two major Celtic tribes of Transpadane Italy, the Insubres and the Cenomani, developed important urban centers of their own at Mediolanum, Brixia, and probably Verona as well.\textsuperscript{25}

Thus by the time of the earliest Roman involvement in the region, the activities of the various Etruscan and Celtic communities had established northern Italy as a place that could be reorganized and reworked in new ways. This was a result not just of the landscape—the Po valley delta naturally encouraged the development of extensive canalization—but of the attitudes and practices of the colonists.\textsuperscript{26} The proximity of distinct cultures with their own traditions of land use, urban design, and governance created a situation that encouraged cultural borrowing, which in turn contributed to an environment that favored experimentation and change.\textsuperscript{27} The effects of this cultural confluence have already been seen in the use of new urban designs, as at Marzabotto, but can also be seen in regional epigraphic and numismatic habits from the late Bronze Age to the end of the Republican period.\textsuperscript{28} The particular physical and cultural geography of northern Italy helped produce a precedent of intensive and experimental intervention set by the region’s pre-Roman inhabitants. This certainly encouraged the continuation of such intervention in the Roman period, but the intensity of Roman involvement needs further explanation.

Other factors that inspired a more “hands-on” Roman approach. One that stands out most clearly in literary sources is a collective Roman fear of Celtic incursions from the north, a fear stemming from the sack of Rome in 390 BC by an army of Celts. Livy says that the attacking Celts were Senones from the southeastern Po valley and northern

\textsuperscript{25} Livy 5.34-35, Pliny \textit{HN} 3.124. 3.130, Williams 2001a: 204. Polybius’s description (2.34) of the Clastidium campaign against the Insubres in 222 BC strongly suggests that the towns Mediolanum, Clastidium (a city of the Anares in modern Lombardy), and Acerrae had some sort of fortifications, if not walls. Cf. Frey 1995: 520 and Frey 1984 on the general characteristics of northern Italian Celtic settlements, for which evidence is unfortunately very sparse, and on the problems associated with Celtic urbanism in general, see Woolf 1993.
\textsuperscript{26} Concerning the effect of the landscape on the habit of canalization in the Veneto, see Strabo 5.1.5, who says that the area was full of tidal lagoons, rivers, and marshes and that consequently the inhabitants had built canals and dikes just as the people of the Nile delta did.
\textsuperscript{27} This is not to say that there was no continuity. In the Adige valley, for example, there is relatively little slope erosion for the period between c. 300 BC and AD 600, which indicates a continuity of cultivation methods designed to prevent erosion (Coltorti and Dal Ri 1985).
\textsuperscript{28} At least three major epigraphic traditions existed in pre-Roman northern Italy, with Veneti and Celtic peoples using Etruscan-derived scripts from the archaic to Augustan periods; added to these are a substantial corpus of Etruscan inscriptions from the southern Po valley, as well as the influence of Greek merchants at Spina with their own diverse epigraphic traditions, the Umbrians, and the Raeti, especially the Camuni, also maintained a distinctive tradition of rock inscriptions through the medieval period (Agostinetti 2004). For the Celtic texts of Cisalpine Gaul the most comprehensive compilations are Morandi 2004 and Lejeune 1988, although Whatmough 1933 and Pisani 1964 remain useful. For Venetic texts see Benelli 2001, Prosdocimi 1988, and Whatmough 1933. For Etruscan texts in northern Italy, see the standard corpora of the \textit{CIE} and \textit{ET}. Cisalpine Celtic tribes had, since at least the fourth century, been minting silver coins in imitation of the Greek Massioliot coinage of southern Gaul (Agostinetti 2004: 109). In addition to showing the presence of an at least partially monetized economy, this coinage also reveals the cultural influence of Greek trade from western Liguria and the concurrent development of coinage in Etruria and Latium as well.
Picenum; he is uncertain whether they were accompanied by other Italian Celts.29 The memory of this event was perpetuated at Rome on the religious calendar; in the Fasti Antiates, the surviving Roman calendar from the Republican period, the two historical events commemorated are the founding of Rome on April 21st and the July 18th defeat of the Roman army at the Allia, which lead immediately to the sack.30 Similarly Rome’s territorial expansion into northern Italy, which began with the defeat of the Senones and the appropriation of their land in the mid third century BC and which continued with campaigns against the Boii and Insubres following the battle of Telemon, was associated with another traumatic experience for the Romans: Hannibal’s invasion in 218 BC.31 The Boii and Insubres, who had just recently been subdued by Rome, quickly joined Hannibal’s army, and Hannibal’s early successes at Ticinus, Trebia, and Lake Trasimene demolished Roman authority in the region.32 Hannibal’s invasion reinforced the view

31 Roman involvement in northern Italy began with the alliance of the Senones with the Samnites, Etruscans, and Umbrians in the Third Samnite War against Rome. In 295 BC this led to the battle of Sentinum (famous for the devotio of the Roman commander Decius), in which the Senones were defeated (Polyb. 2.19, Livy 10.27-29, Dio 21.6, Zonar. 8.1). War between the Romans and Senones again in 284 BC resulted in the expulsion and slaughter of many of the Senones, and the Romans occupied their territory, with the colony of Sena Gallica serving as a base (Polyb. 2.19, App. Gall 11.3). The wars against the Senones were tied with wars fought by the Sammites, Etruscans, Picentines, and Umbrians against Roman and Latin expansion in central Italy. These wars need not be tied with contemporary Celtic incursions into the Balkans and Greece in the 280s (Just. Epit. 24.4-8, Livy 38.16-7, Polyb. 4.46, Paus. 10.19), since the wars in Italy stem more from an ad-hoc system of alliances between central Italian peoples and their neighbors in southern Cisalpine Gaul; transalpine Celts are called in as mercenaries, indicating continuing ties between cisalpine and transalpine federations and also the not uncommon Mediterranean practice of hiring Celtic mercenaries (see Plut. Pyrrh. 26.6, Paus. 1.13.2, Dio 55.70.1, Xen. Hell. 7.1.20). The Boii also allied with the Etruscans—at the battle of Lake Vadimon in 282 BC and at another battle the following year—but these did not represent the start of any serious Roman attempt to move beyond the land of the Senones; only after the Telamon campaign in 225 BC did the Romans campaign against the Boii and Insubres in Cisalpine Gaul (282 and 281 BC battles: Polyb. 2.20, Livy Per. 12, Frontin. Str. 1.2). The Telamon campaign, in which the Boii and Insubres hired transalpine mercenaries for an attack on Rome, is said to have been motivated by resentment against the Roman distribution of the former land of the Senones and a conviction that the Flaminian distributions signaled that Roman wanted to expel all the Celts (Polyb. 2.22). During the campaign the Romans secured the alliance of the Cenomani and the Veneti, who were able to contribute 20,000 men to the battle at Telamon, which saw the defeat of the Boii and Insubres. Later campaigns secured the alliance of the Aanares, the defeat of the Insubres and Boii, and the placement of the Latin colonies at Cremona and Placentia (Polyb. 2.32-34, Livy Per. 20, Zonar. 8.20; cf. Livy 27.25, Livy Per. 20, Frontin. Str. 4.5.4, and Plut. Marc. 6-7, and Eutrop. 3.6.1 on the single combat between the Roman and Insubrian commanders at the battle of Clastidium in 222 BC).
32 Roman gains in the 220s were temporary and undone by the Hannibalic war, which saw attacks on the new Latin colonies and the siding of nearly all of Cisalpine Gaul with the Carthaginians against the Romans (Livy 21 passim, especially 21.25 and 21.55, Polyb. 3.40ff, Zonar. 8.24ff). The campaigns following the war, which were designed both to punish the Celts but also protect the much damaged colonies at Placentia and Cremona returned the Cenomani, who remained loyal to Roman longer than most, and the Insubres to the Roman alliance and subjugated the Boii (return of Cenomani in 197 BC: Livy 32.29-31, Zonar. 9.16; defeat and treaty with Insubres in 196 BC: Livy 33.36; surrender of Boii in 193 MC: Livy 35.40). The wars with the Ligurians were much more prolonged (see Ciampoltrini 2004a and b, Gambaro 1999, and Harris 1985: 225ff on the chronology of the campaigns), leading to Cicero’s claim that Liguria provided Roman generals with opportunities for easy triumphs (Cic. Brut. 78). On the chronology and nature of the campaigns in Cisalpine Gaul see Williams 2001b, David 1997, Harris 1989, Peyre 1979.
that the Alps—and of northern Italy in general—were a route that Rome’s enemies could take into Cisalpine Gaul and from there central Italy and Rome.\textsuperscript{33} The invasion of the Cimbri and the Teutones at the end of the second century again emphasized the vulnerability of the region, as the Cimbri made it as far south as Cisalpine Gaul where they were finally defeated by C. Marius at Vercellae in 101.\textsuperscript{34} Fear of an attack of transalpine Celts on Rome and central Italy was still great enough even in the late Republic for the charter of the Roman colony of Urso in southern Spain to withdraw local magistrates’ exemptions from military service in the case of a \textit{tumultus Gallicus} in Italy.\textsuperscript{35} The Romans’ perception of northern Italy as naturally vulnerable to invasion was thus combined with an inherited fear of the Celts reinforced by commemorations of the sack of Rome and by the invasion of Hannibal. In this way northern Italy’s perceived vulnerability was closely linked in Roman memory with danger to the empire and to the city of Rome itself.

These fears played a large part in Rome’s military decisions not just during the conquest but also in the remainder of the second and in the first centuries BC. During this period the region became significantly militarized. Not only were Roman armies frequently present for about one year in three for middle and late Republican periods but also the region was a major source of legionary and auxiliary recruitment. While in the Po valley proper the main Roman conquest was complete with the subjugation of the Boii in 191 BC, campaigns against the numerous and dispersed Ligurian tribes lasted until the mid 150s, and military actions against the Istrians and the various Alpine tribes occurred sporadically until the end of the first century BC.\textsuperscript{36} Additionally the civil wars of the first century were often fought on northern Italian soil; Mutina was besieged in 78 and

\textsuperscript{33} Movements of transalpine Celts into Italy are usually associated by Greek and Roman authors with the initiation of hostility with Rome. Hence Polyb. 2.19 has the Romans fear war with the Senones only when there are reports of movements of transalpine Celts into Italy in the lead-up to the Sentinum campaign in 295 BC (cf. Polyb. 2.21 on another influx of Transalpine Celts, which was leading to war with Rome until the new arrivals began quarreling with their Cisalpine allies). Similarly before the battle of Telamon in 225 BC the Romans send troops north only when they hear that Transalpine Celts—in this case the Gaesatae—have crossed the Alps south into Italy to aid their Insubrian and Boian neighbors (Polyb. 2.23).

\textsuperscript{34} Plut. Mar. 25. Vercellae has been traditionally identified with modern Vercelli in northwestern Cisalpine Gaul. The location of the battle, however, was disputed by Zennari (1956), who argued that a battle near Vercellae would mean that the Cimbri illogically turned sharply west after crossing the Brenner pass. Instead, according to Zennari, Vercellae may be interpreted not as a proper name but as a Celtic word referring to a mining area near a river. Mining areas exist throughout Cisalpine Gaul, and of these the most likely according to Zennari would be in the modern area of Rovigo near the Po delta. The latter would be even more threatening to the Romans, as this area was near a number of old and important colonies.

\textsuperscript{35} ILS 6087. See also the comments of Gardner 1983, Woolf 1998: 61, and Williams 2001a: 177ff on the Roman fear of a \textit{tumultus Gallicus}. The fear of a Celtic incursion in the preliminaries to the Telamon campaign was so great that a rare human sacrifice was ordered: the burial alive of a Greek man and woman and a Celtic man and woman in the Forum Boarium (Dio fr. 47). This sacrifice seems to have been reserved for rare and terrifying moments in the Republican period, as after the battle of Cannae (Oros. 4.13 and Plut. Marc. 3, who notes that in his time the Romans performed secret rites there every November in memory of the earlier victims of this practice). The attested performance of the practice was done in the face of the invasion of the Cimbri and Teutones in 113 BC, again pointing to the extreme fear that an incursion of transalpine Celts could produce in the Romans (Plut. Quaest. Rom. 83).

again in the 43 BC. The region saw action again in 71 BC, when Spartacus’s army marched through Cisalpine Gaul and defeated a 10,000 man army stationed there under the proconsul C. Cassius Longinus. These campaigns required Roman armies to march through, winter in, and collect supplies from northern Italy. Northern Italy’s inhabitants, especially in the settlements along the main trunk roads of the via Aemilia (187 BC) and the via Postumia (148 BC), became accustomed to dealing with large numbers of Roman and Italian soldiers both passing through and wintering in the region. There is also evidence for the placement of garrisons in Cisalpine Gaul, as support for campaigns in surrounding areas.

Supporting this militarization were local recruitment drives, since the populous valley could furnish many fighters; these were first auxiliaries but then, as the region was enfranchised, legionaries, so much so that by the Julio-Claudian period, roughly half of those legionaries serving in upper and lower Germany whose origins can be determined come from Cisalpine Gaul; the same proportion holds true for the Legio XI Claudia in Dalmatia and the Legio VII Claudia in Moesia. While these figures refer to the Imperial period, they nevertheless reflect a continuation of recruitment practices that in the Republican period were closely tied to the Roman military presence in the region, as well as to the use of the region as a base and launching pad for actions in Spain, Gaul, and Dalmatia. The military presence in Cisalpine Gaul was intermittent, not constant as it was to be on the Danube and Rhine limes under the Empire, but nevertheless the frequent presence of the armies distinguished the middle and late Republican periods in northern Italy from the early Imperial period that followed, while the pattern of recruitment established and encouraged by this militarization was to continue into the Imperial period.

Supplementing the placement of legions in the northern Italy and the integration of a growing portion of the population into the Roman army was the shuffling of native populations by the Roman government. When the Romans conquered the Senones, the large Celtic tribe living in northern Picenum and the southeastern tip of the Po valley, they confiscated a large portion of the Senones’ land. Part was used for the foundation of colonies at Sena Gallica and Ariminium in 284 BC and 268 BC respectively. The rest,

---

37 On Pompey’s 78 BC siege of M. Iunius Brutus, the father of the tyrannicide, see Plut. Pomp. 16 and Badian 1958: 275ff, while the for the Antony’s siege of Decimus Brutus at Mutina in 43 BC and the subsequent battle between Antony and the consuls Hirtius and Pansa see Appian BC 3.49-71, Cic. Fam. 10.30, Plut. Ant. 17, and Plut. Cic. 45. Mutina was used as a legionary base even during the Hannibalic war (Livy 21.25, where the three Roman commissioners assigned to establish Placentia flee and which becomes the base of the remaining Roman army in the region), and its use as a base in the later Republican period is logical given its central position on the via Aemilia and probable possession of walls.


39 In 178 BC Aquileia is used as a base for campaigns against the Istrians (Livy 41.5-6), and Caesar sends the fifteenth legion to Cisalpine Gaul to protect colonies there in 51 BC (Caes. BG 8.24).


41 Cf. Livy 23.14 on recruitment during the Hannibalic war Livy 41.5 records recruitment in Cisalpine Gaul in 178 BC, in the context of the Istrian wars, of auxiliaries from local settlements and of legionaries from the colonies. Sertorius raised troops there in 90 BC (Plut. Sert. 4.1), and Caesar recruited heavily in Cisalpine Gaul first for the Gallic wars and then again for the civil wars (Caes. BG 1.24, 1.54, 2.2, 5.1, 6.1; Suet. Iul. 30).

42 Sena: Livy Per. 11.7, Polyb. 2.19. Ariminium: Livy Per. 15.4-6; Vell. Pat. 1.14.7.
known by the Romans as the *ager Gallicus*, was under the instigation of the tribune Flaminius parcelled up to be distributed *viritim*. The Senones’s neighbors the Boii suffered a similar confiscation immediately after their final defeat in 191 BC, when the consul P. Scipio Nasica took half of Boian territory, presumably the more desirable half. These land confiscations expelled the Senones and Boii from much of their former territory; in the mid second century Polybius recorded that by the time he saw the Po valley the Celtic tribes had been expelled, except for a few districts at the foot of the Alps. While it is unlikely that all of the Boii and Senones left the region, Polybius’s comment does indicate that the tribes were no longer present as identifiable Celtic political entities and that much of the population had either moved or, more likely, assimilated into the emerging culture of Roman Cisalpine Gaul. Polybius’s comment also points to the Romans’ more equitable treatment of the Transpadane region, where the Celtic Insubres and Cenomani had not suffered significant land confiscations and, having concluded treaties with the Romans, continued to exist as independent tribes under Roman protection.

Why the Senones and Boii lost their land while the Insubres and Cenomani were largely left unpunished deserves explanation. The leniency displayed toward the Cenomani can be explained by their delay in leaving their alliance with Rome as well as their haste in returning to it, in one account literally stabbing their Insubrian allies in the backs in the midst of a battle. That they were one of Rome’s first allies in northern Italy also probably worked in their favor. Yet the Insubres were allowed to remain intact and independent as well, so why were the Boii punished? Certainly in literary accounts of their wars with Rome, the Boii appear in an extremely unfavorable light: they alone of the Cisalpine tribes are claimed to have turned a Roman commander’s skull into a gilt drinking vessel. Livy also claims it was the Boii who offered to guide Hannibal over the Alps, and Polybius portrays them as luring the Insubres from their alliance with Rome. And yet the evidence stacked up against the Boii seems, as does the accusation that it was the Senones who sacked Rome, to be more of post-facto justification of
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43 Polyb. 2.21, Cic. *Brut.* 57, Val. Max. 5.4.5.
44 Polyb. 2.35.
45 Polyb. 2.35. Strabo says that the Romans expelled the Boii from their land and that the Boii, having migrated to Pannonia, were annihilated in wars with the Dacians, yet Strabo may be confusing two similarly named tribes (5.1.6), as ancient authors noted the existence of both transalpine and cisalpine tribes of Boii, Senones, Cenomani, (e.g. Caes. *BG* 7.75).
46 Williams 2001b: 96-97 argues that “rather than extirpation, perhaps the willing abandonment of ethnic identities of the Boii and Senones is worth considering as an option to account for their apparent disappearance” and posits that the tribes may have either become *accolae* in colonies or reformed as the *fora* communities along the via Aemilia.
47 Cic. *Balb.* 32 indicates that at least in 56 B.C. the Romans still recognized the Insubres and Cenomani as independent tribes holding valid treaties with Rome.
48 Cf Livy 21.55, where Livy describes them as the only Celtic tribe still loyal to Rome (before the battle at the Ticinus river, where Hannibal turns the battle by turning his elephants against the Cenomani on the Roman right) and 21.25, where they aid the besieged Roman force under praetor L. Manlius sent to aid the also besieged Mutina. On the Cenomani’s return to their Roman allegiance see Livy 32.30, which also provides the sole evidence for the political structures of the Cenomani.
49 Polyb. 2.23.1-3.
50 Livy 23.24, in reference to the defeat of L. Postumius’s force in 216. On the religious significance of this incident and the relationship of the ceremony to Boian cult groves, see Agostinetti 2004: 91.
51 Livy 21.29, Polyb. 3.40.
terrestrial acquisition, since allegations of inciting the Insubres and volunteering to guide Hannibal were easy to invent and hard to prove. The intensive Roman intervention south of the Po, at least in terms of land confiscation, cannot be easily attributed to a Roman desire to punish the Senones and Boii. That the Insubres and Boii in particular received such differing treatment by the Romans, although their history of conflict with Rome was roughly equivalent, shows that the Romans had far different goals north and south of the Po and they did not conceive of the region solely as a single indivisible unit.

The Romans also transferred the peoples of the southern Po by more direct means. In 187 BC, the consul M. Aemilius Lepidus defeated the Ligurian Freniates and had them brought down from the hills and resettled in the plains.\(^{52}\) The Apuani were the most easterly dwelling of the Ligurian tribes, and in the early second century they had been threatening Bononia and Pisae with their raids.\(^{53}\) While Ligurians to the northwest along the coast were left as they were, the Romans treated the Apuani differently, and in 179 BC, during the campaigns of Q. Fulvius Flaccus in Liguria, the Romans transferred 47,000 Apuani from Liguria to Taurasia in Samnium, where the communities they founded were still to be found in the reign of Trajan.\(^{54}\) During the same campaign Flaccus had 3200 Ligurians moved down from the mountains into the plains.\(^{55}\) These transfers of population betray two distinct patterns: a Roman desire to move hill-dwelling peoples into the plains and, for the second century at least, the exercise of such intervention primarily in the Cispadan. A notable exception to the latter rule is to be found around Aquileia, where shortly before the colony’s foundation a band of transalpine Gauls had requested permission to settle near the site of the future colony. Their request was denied, and the Romans sent ambassadors across the Alps to warn other tribes not to cross the Alps.\(^{56}\) Similarly in 129 BC the consul C. Sempronius Tuditanus is recorded as bringing the Taurici and Carni, tribes living in the area where Venetia, Istria, and Raetia join, down from the mountains into the plains.\(^{57}\) Here in the area of the Venetia around Aquileia the Roman state seems to have been just as interested in controlling populations as it was in Liguria and in the Apennines. The reason for this seems to have been the vulnerability of Aquileia as an isolated and distant colony, whose inhabitants even in 171 BC were complaining to Rome about their defenseless in the face of Istrian and Illyrian attacks.\(^{58}\) Aquileia was an exposed base for campaigns eastward against the Illyrians, and in this sense existed outside the schema set up for the rest of northern Italy for the second and the early first centuries BC, where the Romans do not interfere in the populations and landholdings of the Insubres, Cenomani, and other Transpadani until the triumviral and Augustan periods. With Aquileia excepted as a
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\(^{52}\) Livy 39.2.
\(^{53}\) Livy 39.2.
\(^{54}\) Pliny NH 3.105. CIL IX 1455 (= ILS 6509); Maggiani 2004, Torelli 2004.
\(^{55}\) Livy 40.53. Gambaro 1999: 44, following the theories of Sartori 1965: 14 and Gabba 1987: 47, argues that Flaccus was operating in the territory of the Statellates, suggests that those 3,200 Ligurians moved down into the plains were Statellates.
\(^{56}\) Livy 39.54.-55. Livy’s statement that when these Celts left the area around Aquileia they left “Italia” should be understood in its later context, in which the Patavian Livy was describing an area that had already been incorporated into Italy by Augustus.
\(^{57}\) CIL V 8270 = CIL I 652a = CLE 1859 = ILS 8885 = ILLRP 335, from Aquileia (=Insc. Aq. 28).
\(^{58}\) Livy 43.1. which also says the Romans still were not able to fortify the town adequately. That same year they also requested additional colonists, and the Senate sent 1,500 households to the town (Livy 43.17).
security risk, the confinement of Roman state intervention to the Cispadana suggests that for much of the second century the Po, and not the Alps, was seen by the Romans as the region’s predominant border. 59

The movement of populations in the Cispadana also entailed the redistribution of the former inhabitants’ land. The foundations of Roman and Latin colonies in northern Italy could be quite generous in their allotments of such land. At the Latin colony of Bononia, founded over the old Boian settlement in 189 BC, the three thousand colonists each received between fifty and seventy iugera, although at the other end of the scale was the 183 BC citizen colony of Mutina, where colonists received only five iugera each. 60 Nevertheless, even at the minimum, two thousand colonists would take up a total ten thousand iugera. The foundation allotments of land from the three colonies at Parma, Mutina, and Bononia alone would amount to around 176,000 iugera, or 110,000 acres, a substantial amount of land to change hands so quickly. In addition to these initial post-conquest colonial foundations, there were other redistributions of land, made for veteran settlements, later urban foundations, or virtutim as in the ager Gallicus. The physical marks of this process are visible across northern Italy, most clearly in the rectilinear lines of centuriation, marks of land distributions organized by Roman committees set up for the purpose. 61 Nearly all of the settlements along the via Aemilia show the marks of centuriation schemes; here the intervention of the Roman government in land management was at its most invasive. 62 At least before the veteran settlements of the triumviral period, there is less evidence for the practice north of the Po, although there is a concentration of centuriation schemes around the eastern end of the via Postumia near Altinum and east of Aquileia. 63 Nevertheless nearly all of the major settlements in northern Italy—even in areas of the northwest where the landscape was less amenable to such geometric parceling—show physical evidence of land redistributions dating to the Republican period. 64 All of these schemes required central planning and demonstrate that Roman magistrates were actively involved in reordering the landscape of Cisalpine Gaul in general and of the southern Po valley in particular.

In the Po valley such agricultural realignments were also accompanied by the development of the area’s waterways. In 109 BC M. Aemilius Scaurus oversaw one particularly expansive hydraulic project, which drained the plains around the confluence of the Po and Trebia with a series of navigable canals that stretched from the Po to the south as far as Parma, a distance of about twelve miles. 65 The prevalence of place names containing fossa suggests that Scaurus’ project was not an anomaly, and indeed such

59 This is not inconsistent with Cato’s description of the Alps as the wall of Italy (Orig. 4.10), since Cato does not imply that the Alps were the boundary of Italy but rather that they defended the Italian peninsula—and Gallia Cisalpina—from central Europe. Livy 39.54, in which the Celts who had attempted to settle near Aquileia
61 For centuriation in general see Cambi and Terrenato 1994. Research on centuriation in northern Italy owes much to the mid-twentieth century work of Plinio Fraccaro, whose studies provided templates for future work on both mapping centuriated land and on determining the historical sequence of this centuriation (see Gabba 2001).
65 Strabo 5.1.11, Purcell 1990: 18.
projects are attested through to the Augustan period. As with the centuriation schemes, these hydraulic projects required some sort of official sponsorship, as the creation of long canals meant dealing with sensitive issues of land ownership and organizing a large amount of labor.

Such drainage schemes and centuriation certainly occurred south of the Apennines as well. M. Cornelius Cethegus’s draining of the Pomptine marshes near Rome in 160 BC was followed by the centuriation and distribution of that land, while the ager Campanus near Naples was reorganized for distribution in 165. Nevertheless Roman land reorganization in Republican-period Cisalpine Gaul, especially in the southern Po valley, was greater in scale and longer in duration than anywhere south of the Apennines—that hydraulic schemes were more numerous is less surprising, given the size of the Po. The centuriation in the Po valley covers a much broader area, especially along the via Aemilia. Even the original distribution of the ager Campanus involved only 1500 iugera, just 15% of the land distributed in the comparatively small citizen colony at Mutina, and while the Romans placed colonies through Italy during the middle and late Republic, the sheer extent of land divisions associated not just with colonies but also with other projects in the southern Po valley was much greater than in central and southern Italy. Out of approximately 764,900 iugera distributed in new Latin and Roman colonies founded in the first half of the second century, 559,000 were in Cisalpine Gaul, even though only 6 of the 22 new colonies were founded there. Closer comparisons can be found in the western provinces and particularly in the lower Rhône valley, which follows the Po valley in its pattern of extensive centuriation accompanied by large drainage projects. The reasons for this high distribution of land should be placed with the confiscation of land from the Boii and Senones, itself stemming from the Romans’ perceived need to secure the land between the Po and the Apennines, since that area was thought by the Romans both to be vulnerable to invasion from the north and to lie within their conception of Italy.

All of these distributions depended on the presence of towns, from which the surrounding countryside could be administered. Here again, the history of these towns’ development demonstrates the active role Roman officials played in remaking the landscape of the Cispadana so as to provide for the security of the rest of peninsula. Along the Aemilia the presence of towns like Forum Corneli, Forum Livi, and Rhegium

---

67 The difficulties engendered by similar projects can be seen in Spain in the Tabula Contrebiensis, where the Sosinestani’s right to sell land for the construction of a canal to the Salluienses is disputed by the Allavonenses, as are also the Salluienses’s right to construct a canal over land other than that which they had bought and thirdly the limits of the public and private land of the Sosinestani (Richardson 1983, Birks, Rodger, and Richardson 1984). The legal mess in which the Salluienses, Sosinestani, and Allavonenses found themselves could easily be replicated in republican period northern Italy, as the boundary dispute between the Genoese and the Viturii Langenses in 117 BC shows (CIL I² 584 = CIL V7749 = ILS 5946 = ILLRP 517). In the case of the Genoese and the Viturii Langenses it is worth noting that a commission of Roman senators was established to mediate the dispute. It is possible that land redistribution and hydraulic projects might require further management from Rome some time after their original completion. For the political implications of such a provincial dispute at Rome, see Patterson 2006: 144 and Badian 1956: 157.
68 Livy Per. 46, Cic. Leg. Agr.2.82, Gran. Lic. 9-10.
69 Gran. Lic. 9-10.
70 Numbers drawn from Polo 2006.
Lepidum, whose names honored important Roman individuals—frequently but not exclusively magistrates—who founded them suggests the extension of patronage ties into the region; that nearly all of these towns are located along the road points to its decisive influence in determining which settlements survived into the Imperial period.\(^72\) In the Transpadane towns developed differently, since Roman colonies were fewer here and there was in general greater urban continuity from the pre-Roman period, but again the trajectory of their development was heavily influenced by the actions of Roman officials.\(^73\) To facilitate the administration of the Transpadane after the region was given Latin rights by the \textit{lex Pompeia} in 89, larger towns were assigned responsibility for governing smaller communities nearby.\(^74\) This process of \textit{attributio} was important for the development of the region, for it created cities—such as Verona, Brixia, and Mediolanum—with exceptionally large administrative territories, in the process encouraging the growth of those cities at the expense of smaller settlements.\(^75\) In Liguria and the Veneto the pattern was largely the same, with Genua and Aquileia especially benefiting.\(^76\) Examined alongside the earlier movement of hill peoples into the plains and the encouragement of urban growth along the via Aemilia, \textit{attributio} contributes to a pattern of Roman administrative behavior in Cisalpine Gaul, where the Roman magistrates promoted the growth of towns as a means to govern and secure the province. Again it was security concerns—roads built for the transit of armies and wild hill peoples brought down to suitably Roman fora in the plains—that drove this process.

By the late Republic Roman magistrates, soldiers, and colonists had transformed northern Italy. Patterns of urban settlement and agriculture had changed and populations reordered, partly as a continuation of precedents established by earlier inhabitants, more effectively as a result of Roman conviction that the region was vulnerable. Guiding
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\(^72\) On these fora settlements see Laurence 1999: 32ff (also on their organization and historical development into the imperial period) and Brunt 1971: 568. On the regular spacing of these settlements along the via Aemilia, the overall sparse settlement away from the road, and the role of markets and \textit{praefetura}, see dall’Aglio 2000.

\(^73\) For an overview of Roman colonization across the Cisalpine, see Bandelli 2006.

\(^74\) Asc. Pis. 3c, Plin. \textit{HN} 3.138.

\(^75\) On the process of \textit{attributio}, by which smaller, surrounding communities were incorporated into the territory of a larger town, see Laffi 1966. The evidence for it comes mostly from the Augustan and Julio-Claudian period, but given the large territories (of Brixia in particular) in the early Imperial period, the process seems to have begun earlier. Plin. \textit{HN} 3.138 describes Alpine communities as attributed to Italian \textit{municipia} by a lex Pompeia under Augustus. The process is attested primarily in the alpine foothills, as at Tridentum in Venetia, where the Anumi, Tulliassi, and Sinduni inhabiting alpine valleys were attributed to the city by the emperor Claudius (\textit{CIL} V 5050 = \textit{ILS} 206), and at Tergeste, where the Carni and Catali were attributed to the Adriatic port (\textit{CIL} V 532 = \textit{ILS} 6680). On \textit{attributio} at Brixia see chapter four, as well as Gregori 2008. On the relationship between alpine and subalpine communities see Gabba 1975a.

\(^76\) Genua had already benefited by the actions of Spurius Lucretius in sponsoring the city’s rebuilding after the destruction caused by Mago in 205, and Roman actions afterwards were designed to protect the coast but also not to compromise Genua’s position as lead city of the coast (Livy 30.1). Colonies and settlements were founded at a reasonable distance away, the roads did not bypass the city, and \textit{attributio} worked in the city’s favor (Marrone 2004: 449; cf. the boundary dispute between the Genuates and the Langenses Viturii in 117 BC: \textit{CIL} I² 584 = \textit{ILLRP} 517). Settlement around Aquileia was controlled, perhaps as much for defensive reasons as to secure the city’s economic wellbeing (Livy 39.54). The regional dominance of both cities was nearly guaranteed by the 148 BC construction of the \textit{via Postumia}, whose termini were at Aquileia and Genua and which was, along with the \textit{via Aemilia} and the Po itself, one of the region’s three most important arteries (see also Tozzi 1999). On the development of urban forms in the Transpadane, in particular in Mediolanum, Brixia, Alba Pompeia, and Verona, see Rossignani 2006.
Roman actions in the region was a perceived distinction between northern Italy north and south of the Po. Italy south of the Po was felt to belong more fully to Roman territory; the Po thus marked the boundary of Roman Italy. This boundary was not without its complications and ambiguities, however, and the consequences of Romans using the Po as the boundary of what they imagined Italy shaped the political development of the region in the last decades of the Republic.

While settlers in citizen colonies had always had full citizen rights, those in Latin colonies like Bononia and Aquileia were only partially enfranchised, and the clear majority of northern Italy’s population lacked any citizen rights. The civic status of immigrants to Cisalpine Gaul, especially in the southern Po, may have been a point of contention, but still there is no clear evidence that there was any serious demand in northern Italy for enfranchisement before the Social War, which started in 91 BC. Whether there was support there for that revolt against Rome, as there was in Picenum, Etruria, and Umbria, is unclear. One incident that might lead us to think so, the slaughter of the town council of Mediolanum by troops of Pompey, is ambiguous, since it is unclear whether the incident happened with Pompeius Magnus or his father Pompeius Strabo. The first century AD writer Frontinus, describes the incident in the context of military strategies for dealing with rebellious soldiers:

After the senate of Mediolanum had been murdered by the army, Cn. Pompey, so as not to arouse a mutiny, as would have been the case had he only called out the guilty, also summoned some who were innocent to come intermixed with them.

Two questions here are crucial: which Pompey is the passage referring to, and why did the soldiers kill the Milanese senators? The senate of Mediolanum might have been pushing for war with Rome, and Strabo’s purging of that body to eliminate the potential for revolt is a plausible scenario; a show trial of mutineers may have been designed to shield Strabo from blame. If there were in fact some support for war with Rome in the Transpadana, then Strabo’s subsequent granting of Latin rights to the region may have been a measure designed to appease the region and prevent serious revolt, a method similar to that used in Etruria and Umbria, which were mollified by the grant of citizen rights through the lex Iulia. If however the Pompey in question is Strabo’s son,
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77 On the origins of the Social War and the goals of the various Italian constituencies, see Brunt 1965, Gabba 1954, and Mouritsen 1998.
78 In Etruria and Umbria, there was armed revolt, and although App. BC 1.49 is ambiguous on whether the Etruscans and Umbrians were at war with Rome or just preparing for war, Livy Epit. 74 and Oros. 5.18 speak of battles with the Etruscans and Umbrians, and Flor. 2.6.5-6 also indicates war in at least southern Umbria. On Etruscan and Umbrian concerns over the agrarian laws of Drusus see App. BC 1.36, as well as Harris 1971. On the roles in the Social War of the Umbrians in particular, see Bradley 217ff. The Picentine situation is clearer, and the Picentines were the first Italians in the war to revolt, killing the proconsul Q. Servilius and other Romans at Asculum in Picenum in 91 BC (Liv. Per. 72, App. BC 1.38, Oros. 5.18, Diod. 37.12-13, Cic. Font. 41, Vell. Pat. 2.15).
79 Frontin. Str. 1.9.3: Cn. Pompeius, trucidato ab exercitu Mediolani senatu, ne tumultum moveret, si solos evocasset nocentes, mixtos eis, qui extra delictum erant, venire iussit.
80 On the lex Iulia: App. BC 1.49. On the scope of the lex Iulia and a survey of other enfranchisement measures following the Social War, as well as for recent bibliography on these enfranchisement measures, see Bispham 2007.
Pompeius Magnus, then the most plausible context is during Pompey’s campaign against Brutus at Mutina.\textsuperscript{81} It is possible that there was support at Mediolanum for Brutus, and the town’s keeping of a statue of the son of that Brutus during the Augustan period might be taken as evidence of familial connections with the town.\textsuperscript{82} The statue of Brutus at Mediolanum makes this later scenario more likely, although not decisively so, and so there is still no clear evidence of any agitation for the franchise in Cisalpine Gaul, at least none inciting revolt against the state and requiring Roman military attention.\textsuperscript{83} This lack of any clear northern Italian desire for enfranchisement makes the following events that much more surprising.

The \textit{lex Iulia} granted citizenship to all allied communities in Italy who wanted it, and it appears that such a grant—or possibly one of the slate of enfranchisement measures enacted during and immediately following the Social War—also included the inhabitants of the Cispadane region of Cisalpine Gaul.\textsuperscript{84} Under the \textit{lex Pompeia} of 89 BC the Transpadani received “Latin rights, so that they might have the same rights which other Latin communities have, that those seeking office should obtain Roman citizenship.”\textsuperscript{85} These two actions of the Roman state, the full enfranchisement of the Cispadana and the partial one of the Transpadane, reinforced the notion created during the past century of state intervention that Roman Italy ended at the Po River. The reasons for these enfranchisement measures in northern Italy are unclear, especially in light of any apparent dissatisfaction in Cisalpine Gaul over citizenship, agrarian laws, or other state matters; one possibility is the Roman desire for a uniform political treatment of what they conceived of as Italy, so as to avoid legal complications over which Italians were citizens and which were not. The enfranchisement of Cispadane Gaul and Pompey Strabo’s enfranchisement of the Transpadani might be seen as both a reward for loyalty and a bid for elite clients with voting power.\textsuperscript{86} The Transpadani, however, were not long satisfied with this arrangement and by the 60s and 50s they were demanding full Roman citizenship, probably because of a combination of factors: their elites were starting to

\textsuperscript{81} Plut. \textit{Pomp.} 16
\textsuperscript{82} Plut. \textit{Comp. Dion et Brut.} 5.2. Suet. \textit{Rhet.} 6 mentions a statue of Brutus prominently displayed in Mediolanum; this might be the same statue.
\textsuperscript{83} Brennen 2000: n. 368 places the massacre in the context of Pompey’s journey to Spain as proconsul in 77 BC; this scenario seems unlikely in that Pompey’s journey through northwestern Italy would more likely follow the coastal Ligurian road. Williams 2001a:121, supports the first scenario, suggesting that the incident “may refer to soldiers of Pompeius Strabo punishing the Milanese for supporting the Allied cause in the Social War.”
\textsuperscript{84} The extent of the \textit{lex Iulia}’s coverage in the Cispadana has been disputed, with Brunt 1971 arguing that the Cispadane Ligurians were excluded from the \textit{lex Iulia}’s coverage as “these backward hill-dwellers had no interest in political advancement,”(169-170), contra Sherwin-White 1973, arguing that Asconius implies that only the Transpadani received special treatment. Ewins 1955 proposes a piecemeal distribution of citizen rights across the Cispadana, with unenfranchised communities, like unattributed Ligurians, being unimportant and “their agitation for advancement…on a negligible scale” (78). Given the demonstrated Roman interest in associating these “hill-dwellers” with communities in the plains, a system of \textit{attributio} might be expected to provide the southern and western Ligurians with citizenship under the \textit{lex Iulia}, but it seems unlikely that, given the demands for legionary recruitment in the post-Social War period, any small Cispadane settlements would be denied in claims of possessing Roman citizenship.
\textsuperscript{85} \textit{Ius dedit Latii, ut possent habere ius quod ceterae Latinae coloniae, id est ut petendo magistratus civitatem Romanam adipsiscerentur} (Asc. Pis. 3C).
\textsuperscript{86} Pompeius Strabo’s grant of citizenship to a squadron of Spanish cavalry follows a similar logic of citizenship as a reward for service (\textit{CIL} I 709 = \textit{CIL} VI 37045 = \textit{ILS} 8888 = \textit{ILLRP} 515). Cf. Criniti 1970.
make headway into magisteries at Rome, Transpadane writers were pushing for a more expansive notion of Italian identity that encompassed both cultural and political notions and that stretched to the Alps, and ambitious politicians saw the advantage of championing the enfranchisement of such a populous and wealthy area that was now eager to penetrate the high political circles at Rome. Both Crassus and Caesar attempted unsuccessfully to grant their request during the 60s and 50s, and the latter was successful only in the context of a civil war. With the lex Roscia Caesar enfranchised the Transpadani on March 11th in 49 BC, just weeks after crossing the Rubicon, the boundary between the province of Cisalpine Gaul and Italy proper.

That political boundary ceased to exist in 42 BC, when the triumvirs, at Octavian’s insistence, incorporated Cisalpine Gaul into Italy. Although Roman commanders continued to operate in the region during the civil wars and in campaigns against Alpine tribes, northern Italy would no longer be assigned as a provincia or have a governor. Thus ended a seven-year period of administrative ambiguity for Cisalpine Gaul, well illustrated by the lex de Gallia Cisalpina, which specifies that municipal magistrates may appeal before a praetor at Rome rather than the provincial governor, and by the related fragmentum Atestinum, which prescribes adjustments for the jurisdictions of local magistrates. The triumvir’s decision was probably motivated less by a desire to

---

87 The earliest attested magistrates of Cisalpine extraction (not always certain) at Rome are: Cn. Octavius Ruso (possibly Aquileia), quaestor of Marius in 106 BC; Q. Tittius Mutto (probably Aquileia), triumvir monetalis in 90 BC; C. Publicius (possibly Verona), triumvir monetalis in 80 BC; Q. Publicius (possibly Verona), praetor in 67 BC; Tuticanus (probably Verona), father of an equestrian who was present with Caesar at Dyrrachium; C. Hostilius Saserna (possibly Verona), Caesar’s legate in Africa, 46 BC; L. Hostilius Saserna, brother of the above Caesar legate and triumvir monetalis in 48 BC; P. Hostilius Saserna (possibly Verona), brother of the above two and also Caesar legate in Africa; C. Helvius Cinna (Brixia), ill-starred tribune of the plebs in 44 BC; Sepullius Macer (probably Patavium), triumvir monetalis in 44 BC (Alföldy 1999: 261ff); C. Vibius Varus (possibly Brixia), triumvir monetalis in 41 BC; and P. Alfenus Varus (probably Cremona), legate of Augustus in 41 BC. On the intersection of Italian identity and the causa Transpadani, see chapter four.

88 Dio 37.9.3, Suet. Caes. 8. The actions of Crassus and Caesar were not isolated but rather part of a protracted political struggle after the Social War—but seeming to intensify in the 60s and 50s—over the causa Transpadani. For Roman politicians espousing the enfranchisement of the Transpadani, the rewards were a potentially great amount of electoral support; cf. Caesar’s sending of Labienus to Cisalpine Gaul to persuade the inhabitants—presumably those south of the Po or those select communities and individuals north of the river already possessing citizenship—to support his candidacy for the consulship (Caes. BG 8.52). The potential political support, combined with lingering Roman resentment towards Celts (see Tac. Ann. 11.23, where one senator claims that it is bad enough that the Insubres and Veneti have broken into the Senate), also fueled opposition to the causa Transpadani. A letter of Cicero reports rumors that Caesar was ordering the Transpadani to form citizen communities; these rumors were fueled by fears of Caesar’s growing political power (Att. 5.2.3). The consul M. Claudius Marcellus’s 51 BC beating of a magistrate of Novum Comum, which had been given a citizen colony by Caesar, was a peice of political theater directed at Caesar and the legality of his support for the Transpadani. N.b. Cic. Arr. 5.11.1, where Cicero claims that the beating was revolting since although the victim was not really a magistrate—Cicero thus doubts the legality of Caesar’s colony—he was nevertheless a Transpadanus and by implication civilized (Marcellius foede in Comensi. etsi ille magistratum non gesserat, erat tamen Transpadanus). See also Curio’s espousal of Transpadane enfranchisement (Cic. Off. 3.88). On the causa Transpadani see Mouritsen 1998: 107ff and Gruen 1974: 409ff.

89 Dio 41.36.


91 CIL I 205 (= XI 1146). For a more detailed discussion of this law and the probable slate of laws facilitating Cisalpine Gaul’s incorporation into the new administrative district of Italy see chapter two.
clean up the judicial ambiguity left by Caesar’s actions than by the more pressing problem of having a provincial governor so close to Rome, a problem vividly demonstrated not only by Caesar’s invasion but by the dispute with Decimus Brutus and the Mutina campaign.

While the administrative incorporation of Cisalpine Gaul into Italy, finalized later in Augustus’s creation of the Italian regiones, seems to have been dictated by a number of political and logistic demands—the need to remove governors from the region following an unusual period of civil wars, an inherited concern for Cisalpine Gaul in general, and possible intentions to raise the area’s stature prior or simplify its administration prior to personal campaigns in Illyria and the Alps—this political move nevertheless marked a sharp change in the administration of the region. The disappearance of provincial governors and their attendant staff meant the removal of the apparatus that had been much of the impetus for major road construction, hydraulic and agricultural projects, and urban development along the via Aemilia. Likewise the integration into Italy meant that Cisalpine Gaul was no longer a different and strange place but part of the Italian homeland, itself an idea being developed in an Augustan cultural milieu in the aftermath of the Social and civil wars.

Nevertheless the period from the Roman conquest to Augustus’s incorporation had made Cisalpine Gaul a somewhat un-Italian place. Attribution, ongoing even in the early Imperial period, was encouraging the development of cities with much larger territories than was typical in central and southern Italy, while in the Cispadane and around the Veneto the Romans had created a manmade landscape of centuriation and fossae. It was also in the Po valley that, following the pattern of the area’s pre-Roman inhabitants, the language of Roman provincial architecture and urban design was being developed. The integration of Cisalpine Gaul into Italy, then, both removed many of the institutional catalysts for the region’s Republican-period development and also attached to Italy a decidedly provincial landscape. The effects of that development will be examined in the following chapters.

---

92 For examination of the possible methodology behind the creation of the Augustan regiones see Laurence 1998: 97ff. The Augustan concern for northern Italy, not of course shown during the exigencies of the triumviral period and its attendant civil wars and land confiscations for veteran settlement, is perhaps reflected in Augustan demonstrations of respect for patrons of the region from opposing political camps. In this category fall Augustus’s exemption of Bononia from taking the oath of loyalty before the battle of Actium since the Bononians were long-standing clients of the Antonii (Suet. Aug. 17.2, cf. chapter two) and his allowing a statue of Brutus to stand in Mediolanum (Plut. Comp. Dion et Brut. 5.2). See Suet. Aug. 20 on Augustus’s use of Mediolanum and Aquileia as bases during the Alpine, Illyrian, and Norican campaigns. On Augustus and the precedent of Caesar’s treatment of Cisalpine Gaul, see Šašel Kos 2000.

93 There is little indication that Cisalpine Gaul was seen as geographically separate from peninsular Italy in the second century; Cato and Polybius both define Italy as extending to the Alps. Nevertheless, northern Italy’s status in the late republican period as a militarized provincia set it apart from central and southern Italy, as did the differing civil status of the Transpadani in the first half of the first century. The work of high profile Latin writers born in northern Italy—Livy, Vergil, and Catullus being the most conspicuous examples—certainly helped develop an image of a culturally unified Roman Italy. See also Torelli 1999: 165-183.

II

The towns of the via Aemilia:

imperial policy and administration

Introduction

Italy under the empire has multiple histories. There is first the Italy with several centuries of little political or narrative history and with only the AD 69 civil wars and the eruption of Vesuvius to break the monotony. Then there is the Italy of economic decline, with its story of evaporating Italian dominance in foreign markets and of a weakening Italian agriculture. In a similar vein there is the history of the provincialization of Italy, as the inhabitants of the region lost their political clout and rights to provincials and as emperors gradually but inexorably turned Italy into the province that it was to become in the late empire. Within these histories northern Italy—the Republican Cisalpine Gaul—occupies a problematic place. In comparison with southern and central Italy, the northern region has more narrative history, fewer signs of agricultural decline, and a number of characteristics—such as similar rates of recruitment and large city territories—that are closer to those of western provinces like Baetica than to those of peninsular Italy. Nevertheless it is because northern Italy fits poorly into standard narratives about Imperial Italy that it deserves closer examination in order to provide a better understanding both of Imperial Italy as a whole and of the geographically distinct region of the Po valley. Accordingly this chapter and the following three—in service of the larger goal of exploring the impact of the Roman state in northern Italy—examine through case studies four northern Italian regions that are each particularly suited for studying aspects of Italian history in the Imperial period. This chapter explores a set of towns located along the via Aemilia within the context of imperial policy, administration, and the supposed trend of Italy’s gradual provincialization.

Why the Aemilia? In the Republican period, the southeastern corner of the Po valley had a turbulent history; here the Roman impact on landscape and people of the Italy was at its most extensive. In 268 BC Ariminum became the first Roman colony north of the Apennines, and later in 187 BC it became the eastern terminus of the via

95 Millar 1986: 295, in an important article that has stimulated much recent work on imperial Italy, said that “Italy under the empire has no history. That is to say it has no narrative history.” For representative recent work see Giardina 1994 and 1997 (on identity and rural landscapes), Dyson 1992 (on local societies), and Patterson 2006 (on the evolution of social and economic structures in the town and countryside).

96 This vein of scholarship owes much to Rostovzeff 1926 (2nd edition 1957), followed by Potter 1987, and has been complicated in recent decades by studies showing significant regional variation in agricultural prosperity and settlement density (Patterson 2006; Curti, Dench, and Patterson 1996) and greater continuity in agricultural activity (Marzano 1997).

97 On the provincialization of Italy see Simshäuser 1980.

98 The most comprehensive work on northern Italy in the imperial period remains Chevallier 1983, but see also Chilver 1941. Patterson 2006: 2 cites northern Italy’s exceptionality as a reason for focusing on central and southern Italy.

Aemilia, the 150 mile long road that was constructed to speed Roman troops and supplies to campaigns in Liguria and that redefined and reordered the entire region, with new towns set up at places like Forum Corneli and Forum Populi, with older settlements like Mutina and Parma resettled and colonized, and with land divided to align with the new settlements and the new road.\textsuperscript{100} The intervention of the Roman state in this region—in building new canals, moving populations, or reorganizing land use—was frequent and invasive. As the most closely managed Republican-era region of Italy with the possible exception of Campania, the Aemilia serves as an ideal place to examine the nature of the more hands-off administration of the Imperial period, since the contrast in the administration of Italy between the Republican and Imperial periods is at its starkest here. So how did Rome administer this string of towns during the first and second centuries AD? Was there anything resembling a coherent administrative policy, and if so, what guided it? In short, what was the relationship between the towns along the road and the imperial government in this period?

The Republican Period

In the Aemilia of the Republican period, that relationship between subject town and central state had often been in flux. The history of Bononia (modern Bologna) is typical. First the Etruscan Felsina and then the Boian Bononia, it passed into the hands of the Romans, who expelled the Boii and appropriated their land for a Latin colony there in 189 BC.\textsuperscript{101} Under the supervision of a three man committee, 3000 new colonists settled on the site, where they cultivated a minimum of 240,000 acres.\textsuperscript{102} The town’s territory was thus reorganized, as was its government, with the creation of a colonial charter and attendant magistracies. The inhabitants of Bononia were now liable to recruitment into the Roman army, and disputes between it and other cities now fell under the jurisdiction of Roman magistrates. With full enfranchisement in 89 BC in the aftermath of the Social War, Bononia’s relationship with the state was again redefined.\textsuperscript{103} The town’s newly enfranchised inhabitants were enrolled in Roman voting tribes and recruited not into the

\textsuperscript{100} On the foundation of Ariminum: Vell. Pat. 1.14.7, Liv. Per. 15a, Plin. HN 3.105. On republican era urbanization in Aemilia see Laurence 1999: 32ff, Chevallier 1983, and Galsterer 1976. For an overview of centuriation in Aemilia, see Bonora and Giorgetti in Marini Calvani 2000, Purcell 1990 (on the ideology behind this centuriation but with attention paid to Aemilia and the Po Delta), Chevallier 1983 (on centuriation in northern Italy as a whole and by region), Chouquer 1981, and Sabatini 1978 (both on Aemilia). On the via Aemilia itself, see Livy 39.2; Quilici, Bottazzi, and Ortali in Marini Calvani 2000; Esch 1997; Chevallier 1976, as well as CIL I² 617 and 618, two republican era mile markers found near Bologna.

\textsuperscript{101} The foundation of the Latin colony is dated by both Vell. Pat. 1.15 and Livy 37.57.

\textsuperscript{102} Livy 37.57. At 50 iugera for ordinary colonists and 75 iugera for equites, a total land area of 150,000 iugera (=240,000 acres) would allow for no equites among the colonists. Conversely a maximum total of 360,000 acres would be created by a wholly equestrian body of colonists. It is likely that the actual total area was, at least initially, closer to the minimum, as even a 5% equestrian body of colonists would receive 246,000 acres. The redistribution of land around Bononia and further colonization and viritim distributions in the region had a decisive effect on land holding patterns. De Maria 1991, working from evidence gathered in surveys in the Reno river valley, argues for a sharp discontinuity in settlement patterns between the Roman and pre-Roman periods in this area, and the effects were certainly magnified nearer Bononia.

\textsuperscript{103} On issues relating to the enfranchisement of northern Italy south of the Po, see chapter 1.
auxiliaries but into the legions. Its colonial charter was now mostly obsolete, so changes had to be made to the municipal organization and laws. The incorporation of Cisalpine Gaul—for much of the late Republic assigned as a provincia to Roman magistrates and promagistrates—into Italy by Octavian in 43 BC meant that further changes to the region’s government and laws were necessary, and although the details of this legislative program cannot be reconstructed, it is clear that the slate of laws enacted in the transitional period between 49 and 43 BC touched on a wide variety of local matters, from magisterial jurisdiction and appeals to Rome to inheritance regulations and the punishment of debtors. This bundle of legislation redefined towns’ internal and external affairs. For Bononia, this meant that within a little more than fifty years, the town’s internal political structure and laws underwent an overhaul at least twice, in response to Rome’s shifting relationship with her Italian allies as a group.

The civil wars of the late Republic had a similar effect. Veterans settled by Antony at Bononia in 42 BC after Philippi required a separate charter, which Octavian replaced a decade later with one of his own, in an attempt to reduce Antony’s influence in Italy and to win over the support if not the official allegiance of a strategically placed town and its veteran settlers. By the time of the civil war between Antony and Octavian, Bononia had become integrated into larger Roman patronage networks, and the town was already a long-standing client of the Antonii; for that reason Octavian granted Bononia exemption from the loyalty oath given by other Italian towns before the final

---

104 For recent studies on municipal organization in northern Italy see Bandelli and Chiabà 2008; Marengo, Antolini, and Branchesi 2008; Gregori 2008; and Spadoni 2004.

105 The evidence for legal changes in this transitional period consists largely of two documents: the *fragmentum Atestinum* (*CIL I² 600*), a bronze tablet discovered at Ateste in 1880, and another fragmentary bronze tablet from Veleia (*CIL I² 592*). The *fragmentum Atestinum* publishes new regulations concerning the jurisdiction of local magistrates and forbids certain appeals to Rome; the text also refers to an otherwise unknown *lex Roscia*. The Veleia inscription mentions a *lex Rubria* and so is often referred to as the *lex Rubria* or the *lex Rubria de Gallia Cisalpina*, although that identification is by no means certain. The Veleia inscription lists regulations and procedures for civil cases in Cisalpine Gaul—the text does specify *Gallia cisalpeina*. The text also mentions a *praefectus Mutinensis*, which suggests that at least some towns in Cisalpine Gaul were *praefecturae*, districts administered by prefects sent by Rome. On the text, language, and legal issues of the fragmentum Atestinum see the thorough discussion of Laffi 1997. For the text of and extensive commentary on the *lex Rubria* see Bruna 1972, who also provides a summary of the long standing debates on the identifications and scope of the related laws. Cf. Frederickson 1964 on the debt legislation in the Veleia inscription. Additionally a third law, the *lex Iulia municipalis*, is mentioned in the inscription of a “IIIvir aediliciae potestate lege Iulia municipale” at Patavium (*CIL V 2864 = ILS 5406*). On this law see Bruna 1972: 305ff. Together the fragmentum Atestinum, the so-called *lex Rubria* from Veleia, and the *lex Iulia municipalis* suggest a piecemeal, relatively gradual process of bringing northern Italy, and Italian communities as a whole, into a uniform, Roman legal framework. In this respect this legislation should be seen as a continuation of the slate of enfranchisement legislation following the Social War.

106 Mommsen 1883: 172 posited that the veteran colony at Bononia mentioned by Dio 50.6.3 is post-Actian rather than post-Philippi and instead suggested that Dio had misread the evidence and had been confused by the presence of an Augustan veteran colony in a town known for its Antonian connections. Keppie 2000: 259, following the Ducati 1928 view of a post-Philippi Antonian veteran colony, points to the presence of a veteran of Antony’s Parthian wars who entertained Octavian at Bononia (Plin. *HN* 33.83). In addition to new veteran settlers Bononia seems to have received new emigrants dispossessed of their land in neighboring towns, like Mantua. For the presence of members of the Mantuan Sabatina tribe at Bononia, see Susini 1975.
confrontation with Antony. The Antonii’s patronage and Octavian’s careful cultivation of Bononia’s support demonstrate how closely the town had become connected to Roman politics, while the settlement and then reorganization of veterans at Bononia demonstrate the consequences—both on the ground and in the laws—of those political connections.

Bononia’s “contract” with the state—formulated via civic charters, inhabitants’ citizenship status, and patronage bonds—was renegotiated repeatedly through the Republican period, and the town was of course not alone in this matter. Other colonies along the via Aemilia had similar experiences. A Latin colony like Bononia, Placentia (Piacenza) went through the enfranchisement process during and after the Social War, and although Mutina (Modena) and Parma were citizen colonies, these towns nevertheless and received veteran colonies in the triumviral period. In war, the state could call upon towns for supplies: in 43 BC Decimus Brutus commandeered food, livestock, and other supplies from Mutina’s territory and brought them into the town in preparation for a siege. Likewise even smaller communities, such as the vicus of Forum Gallorum on the road between Mutina and Bononia that was the site of an important battle between Antony and the consuls Hirtius and Pansa, in addition to the peninsula-wide enfranchisement process following the Social War also had to deal with the land divisions and reorganizations of its neighbors, and during the civil wars had to provide supplies for passing armies.

By the end of the first century BC, Bononia and its neighbors along the via Aemilia had relatively new charters and also no longer answered to a provincial governor. The incorporation of Cisalpine Gaul into Italy now meant that the area was no longer a regularly assigned provincia but was instead to be governed in the same manner and by the same magistrates as the rest of Italy. This meant that disputes not handled by municipal authorities would by law be sent to the praetors in Rome. This reassignment was part of a broader change in how Aemilia, the former Cisalpine Gaul, and Italy as a whole were to be governed. From this point at the beginning of the Augustan period to the end of the second century, Italy was to be a zone of limited government, with Rome granting it continued privileges and exemptions while at the same time leaving Italian towns to govern themselves for the most part. The Aemilia was now placed within a relatively uniform administrative division, Italy, which was governed fairly conservatively, with few changes made to the division’s imperial administration over the course of two centuries. Accordingly an examination of Aemilia’s governance during the

107 Suet. Aug. 17.2. Susini 1981 stresses Suetonius’s description of Bononia’s clientage with the Antonii as antiquitus, which indicates a relationship that predated the triumviral period. This long established clientela need not be seen, according to Susini, as standing in opposition to the possibility of an Antonian veteran colony at Bononia (Dio. 50.6.3). On Antony’s occupation of Bononia during the Mutina campaign in 43 BC see Cic. Fam. 12.5.
109 App. BC 3.49.
first and second centuries AD needs to be placed within a context of imperial policy towards Italy as a whole, and so the remainder of this chapter first examines the imperial administration of Italy—with special attention paid to examples from the Aemilia—before discussing the impact of this typically Italian type of administration on towns along the via Aemilia.

**Imperial Magistrates in Italy**

During the early empire imperial magistrates allocated to northern Italy were few. Their types suggest that the two major concerns for the imperial state were maintaining the most important roads and collecting the few taxes to which Italy was liable. To maintain the major roads, such as the via Aemilia, senatorial *curatores viarum* were appointed. This position had been an important stepping stone for ambitious late Republican politicians such as Caesar and in the Imperial period continued to be an important senatorial level position at Rome.\(^2\) Throughout the Imperial period few changes were made to the office. Numbers fluctuated slightly in correspondence with the number of imperially sponsored building or restoration projects—there seems to have been a peak under Trajan—but the basic structure remained the same, and actual work on roads seems to still have been overseen by contractors, or *mancipes*.\(^3\) The responsibilities of the imperial *curatores viarum* did not extend much beyond the major roads, and in Aemilia the construction and upkeep of roads other than the Aemilia and possibly the Annia and Popilia fell to either municipal governments or local landowners.\(^4\)

Residents along the Aemilia were also liable to other taxes that fell within a defined Italian tax bracket. The Republican era *vicesima libertatis*, a five percent tax on slaves at the time of their manumission, still applied.\(^5\) To fund the compensation and settlement of veterans from the civil wars, Augustus had enacted a five percent inheritance tax—the *vicesima hereditatium*—for Roman citizens but with exemptions for beneficiaries closely related to the deceased and for poor testators.\(^6\) In addition to the

---

1\(^2\) Eck 1979: 25ff. The position in the republican period at least was seen as politically useful. Plutarch (*Caes. 5*) says that Caesar as curator of the via Appia used large sums of his own money to restore the road, while in Cic. *Att. 1.1*, one man’s previous work as a curator for the via Flaminia is seen as helping his campaign for the consulship. On the chronological distribution of the *curatores* and their political context, see Laurence 1999: 37ff.  
1\(^3\) Laurence 1999: 46ff.  
1\(^4\) *Curatores viarum* are attested for the Aemilia: L. Funisulanus Vettonianus, cos. AD 78, commemorated in Aemilia at Forum Popilii (*CIL XI 571*) and at Andaunonia in Pannonia (*CIL III 4013 = ILS 1005*); C. Iulius Cornutus Tertullus, a friend of Pliny (*Plin. Epist. 5.14*); a senator commemorated at Rome (*CIL VI 1428 = 31651*); and Ser. Calpurnius Dexter, another senator commemorated at Rome (*CIL VI 1368 = ILS 1175*). No *curatores* are attested for the two other major roads in Aemilia, the Annia and the Popilia, but as these were state-built, named roads, they would have been the responsibility of the imperial *curatores*, at least according to the definition provided by Siculus Flaccus’s *de Condicionibus Agrorum* in the early second century AD. According to Flaccus (146) public roads were built by the state, bore the names of their builders, were maintained by the *curatores* and contractors working for them, and were supplemented by taxes that could be collected from adjoining landowners.  
1\(^5\) Liv. 7.16; Eck 1979: 114-124.  
1\(^6\) Dio 55.25.6. Eck 1979: 113, 125-145.
vicesima hereditatium, Augustus instituted two sales taxes, the vicesima quinta venalium mancipiorum, a four percent tax on the sale of slaves, and the centesima rerum venalium, a one or half percent tax on auctionable goods.\textsuperscript{117} The people of Rome saw the latter as burdensome enough to ask Tiberius to remit it; Tiberius replied that its revenues were vital for the payment of the army.\textsuperscript{118} This suggests that the revenues from the tax were fairly substantial and that the tax impacted a large section of society.\textsuperscript{119} Nevertheless as an imperial benefaction Tiberius’s successor Gaius remitted the tax.\textsuperscript{120} Until the reign of Nerva, Italians were also liable for the vehiculatio, the compulsion to provide vehicles of transport for state officials; Nerva remitted the vehiculatio for Italy but not for the provinces.\textsuperscript{121} Additionally goods passing through provincial borders were subject to customs duties, the portoria.\textsuperscript{122} Italians were exempt, however, from the tributum capitis and tributum soli and were sometimes given further honorary tax exemptions by the emperors.\textsuperscript{123} The tax rate for residents along the via Aemilia and for the rest of Italy in the first century AD will have been roughly equivalent to that of the Republic era, as new taxes either allowed for substantial loopholes (the vicesima hereditatium) or were eventually remitted (centesima rerum venalium), while others were carryovers from the Republican period (vicesima libertatis).

For most of the first century, few changes are discernable in the basic structure of Italian administration Augustus set up. Those few changes that are attested—the remittances of the vehiculatio by Nerva and the centesima rerum venalium by Gaius—are in keeping with a general trend in the early empire of granting financial and honorific privileges to Italy.\textsuperscript{124} It should be remembered, too, that self-government and low taxes were explicitly tied together as Italian privileges; for example provincial cities that enjoyed the prestigious ius Italicum shared Italy’s lenient tax status and also lay outside the jurisdiction of provincial governors.\textsuperscript{125}


\textsuperscript{118} Tac. Ann. 1.78.

\textsuperscript{119} On the mechanics of the collection of taxes in Roman Italy see Corbier 1991 and Brunt 1990.

\textsuperscript{120} Suet. Cal. 16.3, Dio 59.9.6.

\textsuperscript{121} BMC Imp. 3.21 nos. 119-211 (“VEHICULATIONE ITALIAE REMISSA”)

\textsuperscript{122} The lex Caecilia of 60 BC had eliminated portoria for Italy, but Caesar had reinstituted duties on foreign goods (Dio 37.51.3, Cic. Att. 2.16.1, Suet. Iul. 43). For the portorium at Aquileia in the republican period: Cic. Font. 2; in the imperial period see AE 1934 234 and CIL V 820. Tergeste: CIL V 706 and De Laet 1949: 179-180 on CIL V 792 and ILS 1851. Pola: CIL V 8139. Tricesimum: CIL V 8180. Altimum: CIL V 2136, Glemo: CIL V 8650. Iulium Carnicum: CIL V 1864. Ploricum: AE 1923 46. For the collection of portoria in Italy see Brunt 1990 430-431 and De Laet 1949. For probable contractors associated with the collection of the portoria within northern Italy see CIL V 5090 (dedication of a freedman assigned to statio Maesins, Venetia), and CIL V 7852 (epitaph of a man assigned to statio Pedonensis, Liguria). There was also a station for collection of the portoria at Ostia: CIL XIV 4708. De Laet 1949 remains the standard work on the collection of the portoria throughout the empire; this work does not include the more recently discovered AD 62 customs dossier from Ephesus (SEG XXXIX 1189 = AE 1989: 681).

\textsuperscript{123} Augustus excused Italy from contributing crown gold for his triumphs (Res Gestae 21.3), and Hadrian cancelled debts owed to the state by the inhabitants of Rome and Italy (SHA Hadr. 7.6)

\textsuperscript{124} It is possible that the vicesima quinta venalium mancipiorum was also remitted, as it is not attested after the first century AD.

\textsuperscript{125} Ulp. D. 15.50.1.
With the second century, however, new administrative posts do appear in Italy. But do they signal a change in what had been a fairly hands-off imperial policy? Among these new magistrates were the curatores rei publicae, officials selected by the emperor to oversee a municipium’s finances or local building projects. These officials, appearing first under Nerva, are attested throughout the empire, in both Italy and the provinces, although they appear more frequently in Italy, as seen in figure 1:

![Figure 1 - imperial curatores:](image)

Attested pre-Severan curatores in Italy:
- Aecae (regio II) - 1 (CIL IX 1619 = ILS 5502)
- Aesernia (IV) - 1 (CIL IX 2860 = ILS 5178)
- Ancona (V) - 2 (CIL X 6006 = ILS 1066; CIL IX 5899 = ILS 441)
- Ariminum (VIII) - 2 (CIL VIII 7030 = ILS 1119; CIL VI 1449 = ILS 1107)
- Asculum Picenum (V) - 2 (CIL XIV 3900 = ILS 1182)
- Bovillae (I) - 2 (AE 1927: 115; CIL XIV 2409 + 2410 = ILS 6189 + 6190)
- Caere (VII) - 1 (CIL XI 3014, 4347 = ILS 5918a)
- Comum (XI) - 1 (CIL V 4368 = Inscr. It. 10-5 157 = ILS 6725)
- Faventia (VIII) - 1 (CIL VI 1450 = ILS 2935)
- Lanuvium (I) - 1 (CIL XIV 2124)
- Lavinium (I) - 1 (CIL XIV 2070 = ILS 6183)
- Mantua (I) - 1 (CIL V 5036 = ILS 5016)
- Marruvium (IV) - 1 (CIL VI 1336, 31634, 41177 = ILS 1151)
- Matilica (VI) - 1 (CIL XI 5646 = ILS 2081)
- Nola (I) - 1 (CIL VIII 7030 = ILS 1119)
- Otesia (VIII) - 1 (CIL V 5126 = ILS 2722 = AE 2004: 344)
- Puteoli (I) - 4 (CIL X 1814; AE 1920: 4; CIL X 1791; CIL II 4121 = ILS 1145)
- Saturnia (VII) - 2 (AE 1962: 153)
- Suessa Aurunca (I) - 1 (CIL X 4750)
- Tarracina (I) - 2 (CIL X 6006 = ILS 1066; CIL XIV 3900 = ILS 1182)
- Teanum Sidicinum (I) - 1 (CIL II 4114 = ILS 1140)
- Trebula Mutuesca (IV) - 1 (AE 1972: 153)
- Velitrae (I) - 1 (CIL II 4212 = ILS 1145)

Total = 31

Attested pre-Severan curatores in the provinces:
- Aquae Sextiae, Gallia Narbonensis – 1 (CIL XII 3212 + 3213)
- Avennio, Gallia Narbonensis – 1 (CIL XII 3274 + 3275 = ILS 6980)
- Cabello, Gallia Narbonensis -1 (CIL XII 3274 + 3275 = ILS 6980)
- Catina, Sicily – 1 (CIL X 7024 = AE 1960: 202)
- Ephesus, Asia – 1 (AE 1932: 50)
- Forum Iulii, Gallia Narbonensis – 1 (CIL XII 3274 + 3275 = ILS 6980)
- Narbo, Gallia Narbonensis -1 (CIL X 6006 = ILS 1066)
- Smyrna, Asia – 1 (Philost. VS 1.19)
- Syria – 1 (CIL X 6006 = ILS 1066)
- Trapezopolis, Asia - 1 (OGIS 492)

Total = 10

Typical of these curatores was Clodius Sura, a Brixian of equestrian status, who went through the posts of military tribune and, in his hometown, quaestor, pontifex, and duumvir quinquennalis. Under Trajan he was curator rei publicae at nearby Bergomum, and under Hadrian he became curatores rei publicae at Comum. His career as

---

127 CIL V 4368 (= ILS 6725).
curator was highly localized; such regionalization is typical of the office in the second century.¹²⁸ Both in Italy and in the provinces these second century curatores were generally local men, drawn from the same area in which they served as curator.¹²⁹ Not every town had them, and more specialized curatores could be assigned as well, such as the curator operum publicum and curator operis thermarum appointed by Hadrian for the southern Italian towns of Venusia and Beneventum respectively.¹³⁰ Just within regio VIII, curatores were appointed for individual towns—in the second century they are attested for Ariminum, Otesia, and Faventia—as well as for the region as a whole.¹³¹ The flexibility of the office can be seen in the career of C. Arrius Antononius, a senator who held the offices of curator Ariminiensium and curator civitatum per Aemiliam.¹³² Arrius’s appointment as curator civitatum per Aemiliam was almost certainly connected with the incursion of the Marcomanni towards the northeastern borders of Italy and Marcus Aurelius’s preparations for the defense.¹³³ The curatores seem to have been assigned on a case by case basis, with local elites granted imperial approval and recognition for local building projects or to reorder municipal finances. This gave the emperors the flexibility to deal with municipal problems and city petitions as they arose by delegating to local elites.

The appointment of the curatores, moreover, may have had as much to do with the rank and honor of individual senators—as well as the emperor’s public image in maintaining the standing of the Senate—as with more concrete problems like financial difficulties at Bergomum or the lack of a good public bathhouse at Beneventum. The Historia Augusta claims that “[Marcus Aurelius] appointed curatores to many cities, so as to extend senatorial offices.”¹³⁴ While the Historia Augusta’s attribution of motive to Marcus Aurelius is speculative, nevertheless the appointment of locally connected

¹²⁸ See also CIL V 5126 (= ILS 2722), the commemoration of a curator rei publicae Otesinorum, commemorated at Bergomum. One important exception is L. Burbuleius Optatus Ligarianus, a curator rei publicae at Tarracina, Ancona, and Narbo (CIL X 6006 = ILS 1066). Boatwright 2003: 74 has suggested that Ligarianus either was from or owned land at Minturnae, which explains his position at nearby Tarracina. All three were port cities.

¹²⁹ See also CIL V 5126 (= ILS 2722), the commemoration of a curator rei publicae Otesinorum, commemorated at Bergomum. One important exception is L. Burbuleius Optatus Ligarianus, a curator rei publicae at Tarracina, Ancona, and Narbo (CIL X 6006 = ILS 1066). Boatwright 2003: 74 has suggested that Ligarianus either was from or owned land at Minturnae, which explains his position at nearby Tarracina. All three were port cities.

¹³⁰ Beneventum: CIL IX 1419. Venusia: CIL IX 1160 = ILS 6485. C. Ennius Firmus, the curator at Beneventum, also held a number of local magistracies and can safely assumed to be a local man, while the curator at Venusia was from a neighboring town (Boatwright 2003: 73). The flexibility of the title curator can also be seen in the case where Titus’s selected by lot from among ex-consuls curatores to supervise disaster relief in Campania after Vesuvius erupted (Suet. Tit. 8.3-4).

¹³¹ Ariminum: CIL VIII 7030 = ILS 1119 (from Cirta, Numidia); Otesia: CIL V 5126 = ILS 2722 (from Bergomum); Faventia: CIL VI 1450 = ILS 2935 (Rome). Large regions and multiple cities might also be under the temporary care of a curator; under Trajan or Hadrian a P. Oppius Marcellinus was curator civitatum complurimum (CIL IX 1006 = ILS 6484).

¹³² CIL VIII 7030 = ILS 1119 (from Cirta, Numidia). See chapter 6 on the incursion of the Marcomanni into northeastern Italy.

¹³³ SHA Marc. 14.6 is vague about the defenses made by Marcus. An inscription from Thibilis in Numidia mentions a praetentura Italiae et Alpium—a garrison or frontier zone of Italy and the Alps—in the cursus of Q. Antistius Adventus. Although it is generally agreed that the praetentura was temporary and created in response to the incursion of the Marcomanni, its nature and exact dating has been disputed. See chapter 6 and Fitz 1966. Also potentially connected to these defenses is the office of legatus pro praetore Italiae Transpadanae, held in its one attested instance by L. Vitrasius Flamininus (CIL X 3870 = CIL X 4414; from Capua).

¹³⁴ SHA Marc. 11: Curatores multis civitatibus, quo latius senatorias tenderet dignitates, a senatu dedit.
curatores also suggests that the position was designed to enhance the prestige of local elites within their own regions. Within a senatorial or equestrian career that crossed the empire, the position of curator was unusual in that the location of service corresponded so closely to preexisting local connections. That curatores generally did not serve in their home communities but rather in towns close to these also suggests the position helped build or strengthen regional social bonds. Hence C. Cornelius Minicianus, the curator rei publicae of Otesia in Aemilia under Trajan or Hadrian, in addition to his service as military tribune with the legio III Augusta in Africa also served locally as a quattuorvir, flamen divi Claudii, flamen divi Traiani, and patron of Bergomum and was honored as such by the people of nearby Mediolanum. Those local offices, which exist alongside a traditionally wide-ranging—geographically speaking—equestrian career, signal regional social bonds that Minicianus certainly had. His connections in the area around Bergomum and Mediolanum encompassed Comum’s Pliny the younger as well, who wrote for him a letter of recommendation praising him as “by rank and character a credit to my region.”

To these municipally-based curatores, Hadrian added quattuor consulares, who had jurisdiction over four regions of Italy. Under Antoninus Pius these men were replaced by the iuridici, who also had jurisdiction over regions of Italy and who rendered judgment in cases brought to their attention. Their authority was somewhat fluid, and in a pinch they could be appealed to as a generic imperial magistrate and representative of the emperor. One AD 177 senatorial edict on gladiator prices says that the edict is to be enforced in the provinces by governors and in Italy by the prefect of the alimenta or, if he is unavailable, by a curator viarum, iuridicus, or prefect of the fleet. Their regional jurisdictions fluctuated over time, and so one iuridicus’s district was Etruria and Aemilia, while another was described as the iuridicus for Aemilia and Liguria, while yet another claimed jurisdiction over Aemilia, Etruria, and Tuscia. Like the curatores the iuridici

---

135 Both senators and equites are attested as curatores rei publicae. Curatores of certain senatorial rank form about sixty percent of the total curatores for Italy (Sartori 1989: 6ff).
136 CIL V 5126 = ILS 2722 = AE 2004: 344 (from Bergomum). Pliny lists Otesia among the municipia of regio VIII (HN 3.15), but its modern location is uncertain.
138 App. BC 1.38.
139 Dio 79.2; SHA Hadr. 22, Ant. Pius 2-3, Marc. 11. A similar interchangeability of imperial representatives can be found in the jurisdiction of the praetorian prefect, who seems to have had some jurisdiction in Italy outside the hundredth mile marker from Rome—within which was the urban prefect’s jurisdiction—according to an inscription from Saepinum on flock harassment (CIL IX 2438 = AE 1983: 331). Yet even within the Saepinum inscription, the praetorian prefects’ jurisdiction is vague, and the prefects are consulted only after an imperial freedman’s authority is found to be insufficient in persuading municipal decurions.
141 Aemilia and Etruria: AE 1920: 45; Aemilia and Liguria: CIL VI 332; Aemilia, Etruria, and Tuscia: CIL VIII 597. Questions of if, why, and how the jurisdictions of the iuridici changed have been vexed by the lack of evidence for their duties outside a few brief references in the Historia Augusta and in the titles preserved in inscriptions (on the relevant evidence and references for iuridici in Italy see Eck 1979: 247-66). While Corbier 1973 argued for fairly rigid and standard jurisdictions based on regions, Simhauser 1973: 240 and Eck 1979: 249ff favor more fluid, makeshift assignments, a position that seems to be supported by the fact that iuridici are attested for regions where they had already held some office or had land, which suggests that the assignments were at least sometimes custom-made for individual office holders.
acted as representatives of imperial authority and seem to have had some previous connections to the regions where they held authority. Serving as one of Hadrian’s quattuor consulares, Antoninus had, according to the Historia Augusta, “been chosen to administer the part of Italy in which he had the most properties, as Hadrian took consideration both of the convenience and honor of such a man.” Likewise C. Arrius Antoninus, the senator who served as curator both for the towns of Aemilia as a whole and Ariminum in particular, although originally from north Africa had also served as a iuridicus regionis Transpadanae. Nevertheless the post of iuridicus was not tied to the holder’s place of origin, as was generally the case with the curatores. Hence one late second century iuridicus of Aemilia and Liguria seems to have come from north Africa, were he was curator rei publicae at Cirta. The second century iuridici of Italy thus fit more easily with the typical and geographically scattershot posts of senatorial careers than with the locally tied curatores, although the emperors still seem to have made some effort to assign iuridici to places where they had connections, either through previous offices held in the area or through land-holdings.

The most conspicuous innovation of the second century was the introduction of alimentary projects in Italy. In these schemes Italian landowners borrowed from the imperial fiscus and then paid the interest on these loans to the local children on the alimentary lists. These alimenta are first attested under Nerva, and over the next century various alimentary schemes can be found in over fifty Italian municipalities. The schemes are concentrated in central and southern Italy, although it has been rightly noted that this reflects more the epigraphic density of the Italian regions than any preference of the emperors for setting up schemes south of the Apennines. That imperial—as opposed to private—alimenta are attested primarily in Italy suggests that the alimenta were yet another means of privileging the Italian peninsula over the provinces. Outside of Italy, alimentary schemes were privately run, although private programs are also attested in Italy. Pliny the Younger, for example, established one at his native Comum. Like the appointment of the curatores, the alimenta seem to have been implemented on a case by case basis, with some towns receiving imperial sponsorship and others making their own arrangements own schemes, and both the dates of their implementation and organization vary considerably.

The question remains: did these innovations mark a significant shift in the previously minimalist policy of state intervention practiced in the first century AD? To be certain, at the end of the second century AD there were more imperial magistrates assigned to regions and town in Italy than there were during the Augustan period. Were

---

142 SHA. Ant. Pius 2.11: electus est ad eam partem Italiæ regendam, in qua plurimum possidebat, ut Hadrianus viri talis et honoris consuleret et quieti
143 CIL VIII 7030 = ILS 1119
144 CIL VI 41127 = AE 1995: 231.
147 Woolf 1990a.
148 Exceptions are a scheme established by Hadrian at Antinoopolis in Egypt (SB 7602) and a proposed alimentary scheme at Athens (IG IIp 2776).
these new positions a response to a chronic under-management of Italy? There was at least one roughly contemporary suggestion that Italy needed more government. In an account of the Augustan period Cassius Dio has Maecenas advice Augustus to divide Italy into administrative districts like provinces, since Italy was so heavily populated and since it could not be governed efficiently by the magistrates at Rome. While Dio’s account describes the Augustan period and not the second century, at the beginning of the third century the historian was clearly aware of the argument that Italy had an insufficient administrative apparatus. Yet such an argument does not appear in second century explanations for the introduction of this new regimen. Rather the alimenta are made to aid Italian children, and the iuridici introduced to enhance senatorial dignity. It is possible that these official rationales cloaked more pedestrian administrative concerns, but that these developments are presented as imperial beneficence and not as attempts to fix a broken system suggests that the perception of Italy as undergoverned was not particularly prevalent, since if it had been one one would expect imperial messages at least to attempt to counteract that perception.

Were these new magistrates instead an attempt to provincialize Italy, to update its status for a world where the provinces had usurped much of its political and economic dominance? The iuridici had existed on the provincial level previously, and it is possible that their introduction into Italy, where they took on some of the legal responsibilities of their provincial counterparts, signals a significant change. Yet the overwhelming concentration of state-sponsored alimentary projects in Italy suggests that Italy continued to be an exceptional, privileged entity within the empire; indeed the sole certain provincial outlier in distribution of state alimentary schemes, Hadrian’s favored Antinoopolis in Egypt, confirms the notion that these projects were strongly linked to imperial favor. Likewise the creation of curatores seems more in line with continuing official privileges for Italy. The position of curator allowed emperors to honor Italian elites and localities; the phrase dato ab imperatore used in inscriptions underlines this connection between the appointment of curatores and imperial care and euergetism. So the imposition of municipal curatores should be seen not as an erosion but rather as a confirmation of Italy’s privileged status. More importantly, Italy’s tax burden remained roughly the same through the first two centuries AD; a few taxes dating to the Augustan period had even been removed. Should the Antonines have wished to bring Italy’s administration more into line with the provinces, a gradual attenuation of its tax

---

150 Dio 52.22.6.
151 Plin. Pan. 28 (cf. Dio 68.5.4).
152 On the legal privileges and substantial tax exemptions enjoyed by the citizens of Antinoopolis see Zahrnt 1988 and Bowman and Rathbone 1992.
153 CIL IX 1160 = ILS 6485 (Acclanum, regio II): curatori operum publieorum Venusiae dato ab divo Hadriani. CIL XII 3212 (Nemausus, Gallia Narbonensis): curat[ori] Aquensi [coloniae] dato ab Imperatore T[rajan]. CIL V 4368 = Inschr. It. 10-05: 157 = ILS 6725 (Brixia): curat[ori] rei publieae Bergom(atium) dat(o) ab Imperatore) Hadriano. AE 1969/70: 155 (Luceria, regio II): curat[ori] rei publicae dat(o) ab Imperatore). The phrase dato ab imperatore is also used of the curatores of minor roads as well: CIL IX 2655 (Aesernia, regio IV: curatori viae Cubulter(inae) dato a divo Hadri(a)no] and curatori viae Allifanae dato ab Imperatore) Anton[ino Pio]. This suggests that occasional construction or restoration work on minor roads could also be seen as a sign of imperial benefaction, as were probably the occasional appointment of curatores calendari, for whom the same phrase is used; the curator of CIL IX 1160 was also curat(ori) Kal(endari) Nolanorum dato ab Imperatore Antonino Aug(usto) Pio.
exemptions would have proved tempting. Rather, Italy was able to maintain its privileged position within the empire despite any political or economic decline relative to the provinces.

These second century changes in administration in Italy therefore do not signal a substantial change in imperial policy, which continued to emphasize traditional Italian privileges, respect for the Senate, and imperial euergetism. On the ground along the Aemilia, this stability in policy led to relative continuity in the relationship between state and citizen for most of the first and second centuries AD.

The implementation of imperial policy in Ariminum and Bononia

In the region’s largest cities, Ariminum (Rimini) and Bononia, this meant little change in the actual structures of government both over time and between towns. At both Ariminum and Bononia, municipal magistrates consisted of aediles, quaestores, decuriones, and duoviri; together these offices created a basic political homogeneity found throughout Italy that allowed and encouraged office-holding in neighboring cities by local elites. Similar municipal structures also meant that certain epigraphic abbreviations could be used and understood across the region; the use of abbreviations like L(ucus) D(atu)s D(ecreto) D(ecurionum) could become standard only through the existence of standardized municipal magistracies over a broad area and for a long period of time. This is not to say that there were no differences in municipal government;

---

154 Into the first part of this policy also fall Domitian’s abortive edict on vines (Suet. Dom. 7.2, 14.2), which privileged Italy, and Trajan’s edict that senators must have a third of their wealth invested in Italian land (Plin. Ep. 6.19). On Domitian’s edict see also Stat. Silv. 4.3.11-12, Piccoli 2004: 118-119, and Purcell 1985: 9ff, and Tchernia 1986. On the nature of imperial policy, see Burton 2002, who sees a more active, rational imperial approach to governance, and Millar 1977, for whom imperial policy is more reactive (cf. Lo Cascio 2000a).

155 On the relative size of Cisalpine cities see de Ligt 2008.

156 C. Galerius, the augur and duovir commemorated at Ariminum (tribal affiliation Aniensis), must by his tribal affiliation (Lemonia) be a citizen of Bononia; it is possible that he held his duovirate in both towns (CIL XI 413). CIL XI 6793a also records a citizen of Bononia commemorated in Ariminum. AE: 1973 237, an epitaph from Mutina, commemorates a decurio of Bononia. One vestiarus from Bononia held a sevirate at Cremona (CIL XI 6839 = AE 1896: 113). Although town charters are not preserved for either Bononia or Ariminum, it is possible that holding a magistracy in a neighboring town meant meeting residency prerequisites. The republican period charter from Tarentum specifies that potential decurions of Tarentum own a house with at least 1,500 roof tiles in the city of Tarentum or its territory (CIL P 590 = ILS 6086).

157 As this abbreviation was widespread across the western empire, it should be taken as a sign of standardization not just in Italy but across the empire. LDDD at Bononia: CIL XI 694 (dedication to Isis); CIL XI 696 = ILS 4313 (dedication to I.O.M.D., a sign of certain degree of religious standardization as well). LDDD at Ariminum: CIL XI 377 (commemoration of a iuridicus); CIL XI 378 = ILS 1381 (commemoration of a governor of Pannonia under Antoninus Pius); CIL XI 385 (commemoration of a primus pilus centurion); CIL XI 386 = ILS 6659 (commemoration of a primus pilus centurion); CIL XI 387 = ILS 6660; CIL XI 392 (commemoration of local duumvir); CIL XI 393 = ILS 2739 (commemoration); CIL XI 405 (commemoration of a woman); CIL XI 411 (commemoration of augur and duumvir); CIL XI 417 = ILS 6661 (commemoration of duumvir); CIL XI 418 (commemoration of augur and duumvir); CIL XI 420 (commemoration of sevir); CIL XI 422 (commemoration of local decurion). The discrepancy in numbers between Ariminum and Bononia probably does not reflect differing corpus sizes—for both cities the surviving number is just over 500—but rather differing compositions of inscription types, with fewer...
Ariminum, for example, was divided into seven urban *vici* with Roman topographical names, like *vicus Aventinus*, while there is no evidence for a similar division at Bononia. Nevertheless the basic and most important magistracies, as well as their correlation to the major magistracies at Rome, remained the same. In terms of imperial magistrates the cities seem to have been administered in roughly the same fashion. One *curator rei publicae* is attested for Ariminum and none for Bononia, although as noted above the same person also served as *curator* for all the towns of Aemilia. The *curatores viae Aemiliae* and their contractors would have responsibility for Bononia’s main road, while within Ariminum’s territory the *curatores viae Flaminiae* should be added as well; with both cities the empire’s major concern was the maintenance of the important trunk roads. Taxes, and the relevant tax officials, were the same for both cities.

Nor do there seem to be any major discrepancies in their treatment by the emperor. Both towns received some imperial euergetism. In AD 53 after a severe fire, a speech made on Bononia’s behalf by a young Nero netted the city a grant of ten million *sesterces*, while Ariminum benefited from road work done on the via Aemilia and the via Flaminia, which terminated at the city, by Augustus and by Gaius Caesar. Smaller benefactions were also made to Ariminum by Domitian and Marcus Aurelius. Imperial benefactions seem to have been infrequent, but had the potential, as in the case of Bononia, to be a substantial safety net; this kind of disaster relief was also given to Cremona after its sacking in AD 69 and the cities around the Bay of Naples after the eruption of Vesuvius. Thus while imperial benefactions were not frequent enough to make a substantial impact on daily life, they would be on hand in case of calamity.

---

158 The *vici* at Ariminum: *CIL* XI 377; *CIL* XI 379 = *ILS* 6664 (a *vicus Dianensis*); *CIL* XI 404 (possibly a *vicus Fortunae*); *CIL* XI 417 = *ILS* 6661 (a *vicus Velabri*); *CIL* XI 418; *CIL* XI 419 = AE 1997: 53 (a *vicus Cermali*); *CIL* XI 421 = *ILS* 6662 (a *vicus Aventini*). That two of the *vici* at Ariminum also share names with *vici* at Psidian Antioch, an Augustan colony, which suggests that the organization of Ariminum into *vici* took place during the Augustan period (Chilver 1941: 18, cf. Keppie 1983: 91 and Mansuelli 1941: 47).

159 That division into *vici* at Ariminum seems to have continued through the second century AD. Elsewhere in Italy divisions of cities into *vici* are attested at Rome (On the division by Augustus see Suet. Aug. 30 and Plin. *HN* 3.66, as well as Lott 2004. For individual *vici* see Aul. Gell. 18.4; Suet. *Aug* 57; *CIL* VI 975; *CIL* VI 9185, *CIL* VI 2225; *CIL* VI 2226). Pompeii, Ostia (*ILS* 5395), Volcei (*CIL* X 415), Spoletum (*CIL* XI 4815), Puteoli (*CIL* X 1631 = *ILS* 6322 = AE 2000: 342; *ILS* 6323 = AE 1890: 65 = AE 1977: 200), Pisaurum in Umbria (*CIL* XI 6367; *CIL* XI 6359; *CIL* XI 6362 = *ILS* 7364; *CIL* XI 6378), Fanum Fortunae (*CIL* XI 6237 = *ILS* 6653), and Castrum Novum in Erruria (*CIL* XI 3585). Divisions into *curiae* are found in Italy at Lanuvium (*CIL* XIV 2114 = *ILS* 6201; *CIL* XIV 2120 = *ILS* 6199 = AE 2005: 309; *CIL* XIV 2126 = *ILS* 6202), Tarentum (*FIRA* 1.168), and Savaria (*CIL* III 4150). Cf. Nicolet 1988.

150 *CIL* VIII 7030 = *ILS* 1119 (from Cirta, Numidia).


162 Tac. *Hist.* 3.34 records that Cremona received aid both from other Italian towns and from Vespasian, whose troops had just sacked it. See Suet. *Tit.* 8 for Titus’s aid to the Campanian cities after Vesuvius’s eruption and to Rome after a fire.
More common than these forms of disaster relief were the edicts and decrees issued by the Senate and emperor at Rome; how much would these decisions affect the local government and populace at Ariminum and Bononia? Claudius, for example, issued one edict banning anyone from traveling through the streets of Italian towns if not on foot, in a sedan, or in a litter.\textsuperscript{163} For towns like Ariminum and Bononia, both large towns with major roads running through their city centers, the potential impact of this edict if enforced would have been great. Other edicts that applied equally to Italy and the provinces had similar potential. For example, that preserved on the Tabula Siarensis, a copy of a senatorial decree granting honors to the dead Germanicus, decrees that a day of mourning be observed throughout the empire’s municipia, on which no weddings, shows, sales, or banquets were to be held.\textsuperscript{164} Together with civic and military calendars from Praeneste near Rome and Dura-Europos in Mesopotamia, the honors for Germanicus show how much local calendars reacted to honors decreed for the imperial family at Rome.\textsuperscript{165} Such honors needed to be enacted by local magistrates, and public holidays or days of mourning impacted daily life for people using the market, marrying, conducting business, or producing or enjoying entertainments; in a municipium like Bononia or Ariminum and in their territories this would mean nearly everyone. Edicts issued from Rome sometimes came with the proviso that they be inscribed and displayed in visible places in towns in both Italy and the provinces, sometimes for a specified amount of time; this meant that the forums, town gates, and other public, frequently trafficked, highly visible places of Bononia and Ariminum were filled with visual reminders of the decisions of the imperial government, even if agents of that government were few.\textsuperscript{166} In a different fashion “damnationes memoriae” also presented visual representations of the decisions of the central government; at Ariminum Domitian’s name was erased from one building inscription in a negative reminder of state power that outlasted the removal of the late emperor’s statues from the town’s public areas.\textsuperscript{167} Actions like “damnatio memoriae” were of course not specially mandated to Bononia or Ariminum but were instead meant to apply more broadly to the empire or occasionally just to Italy, but this broadly aimed legislation had the potential of affecting the otherwise under-managed Bononia and Ariminum both frequently and substantially.

In theory then, the actions of the emperor and Senate at Rome, even without a large support structure of imperial magistrates on the ground in municipalities like Bononia and Ariminum could easily and often affect local governments and citizens. Yet how could these decisions be enforced? To what extent was the potential impact of imperial legislation borne out in fact? Petitioning imperial magistrates will have been one method; it was through complaint to various imperial officials that an imperial

\textsuperscript{163} Suet. Claud. 25.3.
\textsuperscript{164} AE 1984: 508.
\textsuperscript{165} The Fasti Praenestini, dating from the Augustan period and set up by M. Verrius Flaccus bin the forum at Praeneste near Rome, (Inscr. It. 13-2: 17; Suet. Gram. 17), shows the frequency of public holidays commemorating Augustus and the deified Caesar. The feriale Duranum, a cohort’s festival calendar preserved on an early third century papyrus, also shows a high frequency of festival days dedicated to the imperial family; the calendar even proscribes specific sacrifices to be made for deified members of the imperial family (P. Dura 54).
\textsuperscript{166} Claudius’s edict on Jewish rights also came with a proviso that the edict be displayed for at least thirty days (Joseph. AJ 19.91).
\textsuperscript{167} CIL XI 368; cf. Horster 2001: 328-329.
freedman having difficulty with the magistrates of Saepinum obtained redress.168 Accused of abusing the lessees of imperial flocks, the magistrates of Saepinum were sent a strongly worded letter by the prefect in Rome, who had been petitioned by imperial freedmen; it threatened investigation and then possible punishment if the magistrates did not desist from abusing the lessees. This letter seems to have sufficed, but what if threatening letters were not enough? Prosecution initiated by private individuals might then be in order. In AD 21 Cn. Domitius Corbulo complained that the mancipes of the curatores viarum were swindling the state and that some of Italy’s roads had been so neglected that they were now impassable; during the next eighteen years Corbulo initiated prosecutions against both the curatores viarum and the mancipes.169 The potential for prosecution by local rivals may have encouraged a town’s magistrates to enforce centrally-issued regulations more rigorously. Although the small number of imperial officials effectively prevented their active prosecution of decrees and edicts, these same decrees and edicts might essentially be self-policing, and at Ariminum and Bononia local magistrates could chose not to enforce imperial edicts only at risk of prosecution by others in their communities or at Rome. It was with this prospect in mind that a magistrate at Ariminum under Claudius might be more responsive to complaints of people riding through the streets of Ariminum in wagons.

So at Ariminum and Bononia under the early and high empire we find a consistently low number of imperial magistrates, a slate of imperial edicts enforced by complaints and prosecutions initiated by private individuals, infrequent but potentially city-saving imperial benefactions, and a relative uniformity of municipal structures. Yet Ariminum and Bononia were large towns, and we might expect their experience with the state to be exceptional; an examination of smaller towns is thus in order.

Faventia and Caesena

For Faventia (Faenza) and Caesena (Cesena), two moderately sized towns on the via Aemilia about halfway between Ariminum and Bononia, the relationship between town and government in Rome was remarkably similar.170 Like their neighbors at Bononia and Ariminum, both saw the same lack of imperial oversight and administration. Caesena had a curator later in the third century, and both were presumably overseen briefly by C. Arrius Antononius, the curator civitatum per Aemiliam under Marcus Aurelius.171 At the same time Antononius was overseeing the towns along the Aemilia, the Marcomanni were approaching northeastern Italy, and both emperors were stationing themselves at Aquileia, the future emperor Pertinax was made procurator of the alimenta in the Aemilia.172 AD 168 was anomalous, and Caesena and Faventia—along with Ariminum and Bononia—were in less exciting years left with strikingly little imperial administration. The curatores minded via Aemilia, and the procurators for the handful of

168 CIL IX 2438; Corbier 1983.
169 Tac. Ann. 3.33; Dio 59.15.
171 CIL XI 556 = ILS 5687. Antononius: CIL VIII 7030 = ILS 1119
172 SHA Pert. 2.
taxes saw that their contractors brought in money from the sale of slaves and from inheritances. Both towns were also subject to the same tax rates as Bononia and Ariminum. One difference is that imperial benefactions seem to be rarer in Caesena and Faventia than their larger counterparts. Towns like Faventia, especially those which—unlike a handful of other smallish towns like Ilium—had no major claims of historical merit, were not large or important enough to attract a great imperial benefaction. Nevertheless in the case of a major disaster these towns might, like those around the Bay of Naples after Vesuvius, have received some aid. Faventia also benefited from the general upkeep done by the central government on the via Aemilia, which in the Imperial period remained the town’s main artery. Caesena, received some imperial benefaction—the restoration of one structure by Hadrian is attested—although almost certainly less than its larger neighbors. That a town like Caesena received any benefactions at all is perhaps a sign of well placed connections. The similarly sized town of Vicetia in Venetia had representatives or patrons in Rome able to oppose a local landowner’s request for a market, so it is not unreasonable to suppose the closer Caesena had similar connections at Rome. In this manner even a smaller town like Caesena might still have access to the infrequent imperial largesse bestowed on Italian towns, and in terms of their administration and overall treatment by the emperor and the imperial government, these moderately sized municipia had essentially the same relationship with the state as did Bononia and Ariminum. Here what mattered in their treatment by the state was their status as Italian towns; from this fact they received preferential treatment by the emperor, and this preferential—in comparison with provincial communities—treatment was shared fairly equally among Italian municipia.

Faventia and Caesena also demonstrate well how great an impact the state could have on the individual inhabitants of towns where its representatives were largely absent. At Caesena the tomb of one Iunia Thalilia and her husband bears a warning that anyone who should open the tomb should pay into the fiscus Caesaris 60,000 sesterces. Such warnings were typical of the ancient Mediterranean, but the stipulation that the tomb violator pay to the fiscus implies that fines could be and were collected and sent to the fiscus; if this were not the case then the threat would have been empty and Iunia Thallia would have had better luck with the usual threats of divine retribution. This would mean that anyone wishing to punish a violator of a familial burial plot would have to know whom to take their case to—a local magistrate, a patron, or any available imperial

173 AE 1991: 694 = AE 2002: 477 (building inscription). Caesena (deLigt 2008: 169) seems to have been—on the basis of similar descriptions by Strabo and roughly equal inhabited areas—about the same size as Faventia. The imperially sponsored work on the Balneum Aurelianum at Caesena dates from the reign of Aurelian in the third century (CIL XI 556 = ILS 5687)

174 Plin. Ep. 5.4, 5.13. The Vicetian representatives in Rome had hired the hapless Tuscilus Nominatus to speak on their behalf; but Nominatus did not show up in court; Vicetian connections apparently had their limits.

175 For imperial assertions of concern for Italy, see also Trajan’s arch at Beneventum and the ITALIA RESTITUTA coins of Nerva, Trajan, and Hardian (see Patterson 2003: 97-8 on the coinage in the context of the imperial relationship with Italy; on the arch at Beneventum see Kleiner 1992: 224-229). See also chapter four on imperial edicts expressing concern for Italy.

176 CIL XI 565

177 On Greek and Roman funerary imprecations, particularly on the rather threatening corpus from Asia Minor, there is a vast bibliography, for which see Chaniotis 2004 and Strubbe 1991. L. Robert’s study (SEG XXVIII 1609) from 1978 remains exceedingly useful.
magistrate all might be tried—and that person had to have either the authority or connections to a person with the authority to resolve the matter, collect the money, and have it delivered to the fiscus. The efficacy of Iunia Thallia’s funerary imprecation thus relied on a system of personal and official connections between local authorities and the fiscus at Rome. For Iunia Thallia, the authority and perceived efficacy of the state were tools that could be used to protect the burial space of her familia; in this case the relationship between state and subject was at least partially reciprocal, for while she was subject to imperial legislation like Claudius’s edict on wagons and paid inheritance taxes, she could also manipulate the local perception of the state to her own advantage.

For the young men of Faventia, the state also offered opportunities, especially in the form of the military. The army formed the main means of mobility across the empire, and veterans and soldiers from Faventia can be found buried at Viroconium in Britain, at Mogontiacum in Germany, at Carnuntum in Pannonia, at Scardona in Dalmatia, and at Rome, where they served in the prestigious and lucrative Praetorian Guard. In contrast Faventians abroad not associated with the state are rarer, even allowing for a more pronounced epigraphic habit in the army. Those Faventians not explicitly tied with the army still might have taken advantage of economic opportunities offered by military communities along the limes; this is probably the case with the fifty year old Faventian doctor commemorated in Moesia at Troesmis, a legionary base. Service in the legions under the empire was no small commitment; Titus Flaminius, the Faventian buried at Viroconium, served roughly half of his life. C. Pomponius Severus, a veteran commemorated at Faventia, had held a decurionate in Luceria in Apulia and a sevirate at Faventia. Likewise taking advantage of economic opportunities, as T. Rascanius Fortunatus the doctor at Troesmis did, also required serious life changes. Fortunatus was commemorated by two heirs, Rascania Phoebe and T. Rascanius Eutychus, a fact that suggests either that his family accompanied him to Moesia or that he started a family there. Migration in the other direction was possible too; one funerary marker at Caesena commemorates a Syrian veteran of the Ravenna fleet and his Syrian wife; the sole significant concentration of Roman troops in northern Italy, Ravenna was near enough to the southeastern Aemilia that men stationed there could and did develop connections with

179 Troesmis: CIL III 6203.
180 AE 1999: 647. The relevant portion of the inscription reads DECUR NUCERIAE APL, with Susini 1958 providing a restoration of decur(io) Nuceriae Ap(ului)ae and a suggestion that Nuceria here stands for Luceria, on the basis of the restoration of Apulae, on the attestation of another veteran of the III Macedonica and on the not uncommon substitution of Nuceria for Luceria. Todisco 1999 cites Suetonius’s reference to Vitellius’s domus at Nuceria (Suet. Vit. 2.2) and Tacitus’s citation of Vitellius’s domus at Luceria (Tac. Hist. 3.86.1); Todisco also proffers a second century curator rei publicae Nucerinorum Apulorum et Spoletinorum (AE 1952: 220). It should be added that the attribution of Pomponius Severus to the III Macedonica is probable but not certain, given the heavy damage to the top half of the stone; the V Macedonica is possible but not likely “on the grounds of space available” (Keppie 2000: 324). There is a Nuceria Camellaria in Umbria, near Perusia, and a decurionate there would be more reasonable, given the general range of inter-city office holding in imperial Italy (mostly within the same or neighboring regiones), yet this site would require another interpretation of the APL abbreviation.
local towns. Even excluding the admittedly atypical Ravenna, it is clear that the military, and the opportunities that Roman military communities provided, directly impacted the lives of those along the via Aemilia. And so for Caesenan Iunia Thallia and Faventians Pomponius Severus and Rascanius Fortunatus in particular, a state largely absent did not equate to a state without impact.

Conclusions

Roman administration of Italy under the empire was—through a combination of deprovincialization at the end of the Republic and an imperial habit of preserving and even increasing Italian privileges—a minimalist affair, at least in terms of the numbers of magistrates, the tax rate, and the overall administrative apparatus. This did not mean that local communities, such as those along the via Aemilia, were disconnected from Rome or the empire. The actions of the emperor and the Senate were made manifest in the postings of decrees and edicts, and local politics was never entirely separable from politics and lawsuits at Rome. Continued recruitment into the legions also connected inhabitants of towns to Rome and the limes. While it is true that imperial euergetism was relatively rare in Italy outside of Rome and its environs, nevertheless the central government could act as a kind of safety net, and both Bononia and Cremona were rebuilt with large amounts of imperial cash. Thus a rather minimalist tax rate and administrative apparatus neither signaled imperial neglect—on the contrary it signified respect for what were perceived to be traditional Italian privileges—not removed Italian communities from the imperial system as a whole.

That such an apparatus survived nearly two centuries is in itself remarkable and a departure from the history of Italy—especially in the Aemilia—in both the Republican and late antique periods; its survival can not have been automatic but must rather have been the result of consistent effort both by Italians concerned with preserving their status and also by emperors concerned with their reputations for upholding what were perceived to be traditional Italian privileges.

---

181 CIL XI 352. The inscription notably bears a funerary imprecation, with the stipulation that anyone disturbing the tomb pay a fine to the municipal treasury of Ravenna; this underlines the choice available to local inhabitants, with two Caesenans choosing two different means of enforcing the inviolability of their burial places. Other connections between inhabitants of Ravenna and towns along the via Aemilia can be seen at Mutina (CIL XI 863 = ILS 665 = AE 2003: 661), Faventia (CIL XI 61, a verna), Bononia (CIL XI 21, veteran of legio VII Claudia Pia Fidelis), Ferrara (ILS 9223 = AE 1898: 144), Cremona (CIL XI 347, a decurio Cremonae commemorated at Ravenna). It is important to note that Ravenna was anomalous for northern Italy, and veterans drawn through Ravenna into northern Italy are clustered around the eastern end of the Po valley.
III
Aquileia: imperial and regional networks

Introduction

For most of its Iron Age history northern Italy had been a border region, as Etruscans, Veneti, Cenomani, Boii, Insubres, Ligurians, Istrians, Greeks, Illyrians, Romans, and Picentines competed for political and economic dominance in the wealthy Po valley. The region’s inclusion within a politically unified territory under the Romans thus marks a significant departure from its early history. Yet for the remainder of the Republican period, borders continued to play an essential role in its development. The Po served as both a geographical and political one, at least until the enfranchisement of the Transpadani in 49 BC, while the province of Cisalpine Gaul was still set off from the rest of Italy, as Caesar’s crossing of the Rubicon in January of the same year illustrated so vividly. Nevertheless the deprovincialization of Cisalpine Gaul in 43 BC and the Augustan conquest of the Alps and Noricum in the Augustan period meant that northern Italy was no longer the physical border of the empire, nor was it set off from Italy. The latter half of the first century BC had redefined its place with an empire; now it was part of a new border, an internal border between a privileged Italian peninsula, as described in the previous chapter, and a ring of European provinces. What were the implications of this new arrangement? What was northern Italy’s place within it? What were its relationships to the rest of Italy, to its neighboring provinces, and to the empire at large?

To answer these questions this chapter examines the local and long-distance relationships, both social and economic, of one particular northern Italian town and its hinterland: the port city of Aquileia, the successor to pre-Roman emporia like Spina and Adria and the predecessor to Venice as the northern Adriatic’s commercial hub, the caput Adriae. The choice of Aquileia as a test case is based primarily on the wealth of information from the city. Its later history as a “failed town,” one that survived the medieval period as anything as a mere village, means that its Roman remains are better preserved than those of other large Roman towns like Mediolanum and Bononia. A long history of excavation in and around Aquileia means that its buildings, development, and material culture are also well documented. It boasts over 5,000 surviving

182 On Caesar’s crossing into Italy from Cisalpine Gaul see Plut. Caes. 32 (he states clearly that the Rubicon separated Cisalpine Gaul from the rest of Italy and although here he says that Ariminum, south of the river, was a large city in Cisalpine Gaul at Pomp. 60 he calls Ariminum a city of Italy), Dio 41.4, Vell. Pat. 2.49, and Lucan 5.346-7. Cf. Caes. BC 1.8 on Caesar’s harangue at Ariminum after the crossing of the Rubicon.
183 For Aquileia as a “failed town,” see Christie 2006: 183, who also quotes the Carolingian era poem—probably by Rufinus of Aquileia—lamenting Aquileia’s destruction, which in one verse says “You [Aquileia] are put up for sale everywhere throughout the world, / nor is there rest even for those buried in you, / soon their bodies are cast out of the tombs for the sake of their marble which is bartered” (The Destruction of Aquileia, verse 19, trans. Godman 1985). This verse highlights that although the town’s decrease in population ensured better than average survival, there was still a tremendous amount of early medieval repurposing and destruction of Roman era materials.
184 On the history of recent excavations at Aquileia see Bertacchi 2003 and Bertacchi 1994b, on earlier excavations see Calderini 1930 and Brusin 1934.
inscriptions, easily the largest single corpus from any north Italian town.\(^{185}\) It can thus stand in for other large commercial centers in northern Italy, like Mediolanum, whose Imperial period remains and inscriptions are less well preserved.\(^{186}\) In addition to its wealth of epigraphic and archaeological material, Aquileia also offers a chance to examine a town that like Genua, Albintimilium, and Tergeste was an important port at the borders of Italy.\(^{187}\) Aquileia is set apart from these other towns by its size; at its height in the Imperial period its population probably exceeded 100,000.\(^{188}\) Physically it was large as well; the space within its walls was around 40 hectares, about equal to that of Verona, itself a large city according to Strabo, and about a tenth the area enclosed by the ‘Servian’ walls at Rome.\(^{189}\) While Aquileia was, by virtue of its size and heavily commercial focus, somewhat unique in northern Italy and not wholly representative of other towns in the region, nevertheless it shares similarities with those towns mentioned above and so presents an opportunity to examine the effects of empire on this class of large commercial towns.

**Aquileia in the Republican period**

Before addressing the impact of the imperial system on Aquileia’s place in (1) its region, (2) Italy, and (3) the empire as a whole, some background of its history in the Republican and Augustan periods is necessary in order to understand the town’s later development. In its early history it was both exceptional in and typical of the region. Like other northern Italian colonies it was settled as a base for military campaigns, in this case against the Istrians.\(^{190}\) Its earlier years were plagued by problems. Before the

---

\(^{185}\) On the inscriptions of Aquileia, the standard corpus is Brusin’s *Inscriptiones Aquileiae* (=Inscr. Aq.), with Lettich 2003 providing a useful introduction to the corpus and more recent bibliography.

\(^{186}\) On Mediolanum’s imperial era trading networks, see CIL V 5911 (commemoration of a member of transalpine trade corporation who was also patron of a collegium of sailors at Comum), AE 2000: 632 (commemoration of a negotiator and vestiarus Cisalpini et Transalpini at Novaria, near Mediolanum), *CIL XIII* 2029 = *ILS* 7279 (commemoration from Lugudunum of a negotiator from a corporation of Cisalpine and Transalpine traders), *CIL XIII* 5303 = *CIL XIII* 11547 (another attestation of a corporation of Cisalpine and Transalpine traders), as well as Garnsey 1976 and Tibiletti 1967. See also Morley 1996: 181-2 on Mediolanum as one of a group of “major regional centres,” together with Patavium and Aquileia, which commanded important junctions, provided higher level marketing functions for a wide area and may have also been involved in manufacturing.” Patterson 2006: 270-1 also places Aquileia in a class with Puteoli, Mediolanum, Verona, Brixia, Patavium, Beneventum, and Capua. On the origins of Mediolanum’s trade networks and its quite different history from the Latin colony of Aquileia, see Ceresa Mori 2001 and 1992, as well as Ceresa Mori and Tizzoni 2004.


\(^{188}\) Calderini 1930: 336 surveys estimates of Aquileia’s population during the principate, which range from 100,000 to 800,000. Even the lower estimate represents a huge increase in population from the initial colonial foundation of 3,000 settlers and their families. In comparison, Delia 1988 puts the maximum population of Alexandria, the Mediterranean’s most important port city, at 500,000-600,000 during the principate, with a number near Dioecetus’s 300,000+ probably closer to reality.


\(^{190}\) Livy records the stationing of troops at Aquileia throughout the campaigns against the Istrians (41.1, 41.5-6, 41.10, 43.1), and the city probably served as a base again during the campaign of Tuditanus.
colony was even established, the Romans had to expel a group of transalpine Gauls that had settled near Aquileia’s proposed site; in addition the neighboring Istrians were trying to prevent the settlement of the colony, which even with the use of Roman military force took at least two years, with the colony finally settled in 181 BC.¹⁹¹ The Roman government provided colonists between 50 and 140 iugera each, allocations that were at the high end even for northern Italian colonies, which were as rule more generous in their distributions of land than those located south of the Apennines.¹⁹² Yet even with such incentives, Aquileia struggled to maintain its population in its first decade, and in 169 BC, worn down by constant campaigns by the Istrians, the colony received a reinforcement of 1500 more families.¹⁹³ Thus while its troubled early history and military usage by the Roman state was typical of other colonies, particularly Cremona and Placentia, the size of its land allocation and greater distance from Rome set it apart.

In the late Republic Aquileia was at the vanguard of northern Italian towns whose inhabitants were trying to integrate into high level political and social circles at Rome. Along with citizens from Cremona, Brixia, Patavium, and Verona, elites from Aquileia were among the first northern Italians to integrate into the government at Rome, and the first attested Roman magistrate from northern Italy is a Q. Titius Mutto, a Roman triumvir monetalis from Aquileia in 90 BC.¹⁹⁴ Sometime in the early or mid first century BC, Aquileia received full voting rights, probably in the slate of enfranchisement legislation following the Social War, and the town changed its chief magistrates from the duoviri, an office typically associated with colonies and communities with constitutions set up before the Social War, to quattuorviri, magistrates associated with the new, post-Social War class of enfranchised Italian municipia; the town’s new citizens were enrolled in the Velina voting tribe.¹⁹⁵ The town was thus becoming more integrated not just with

---

¹⁹¹ Livy 40.34. See also chapter one on colonial land distributions.  
¹⁹² Livy 43.1. Cremona and Placentia also had to be supplemented with addition population; the two Latin colonies after Hannibalic war had lost enough population through war and illness that both needed to be resettled, with 6000 new families divided between them (Livy 37.46-47).  
¹⁹³ Alfoldy 1999: 261, 286. See also Broughton Magistrates 206 and Crawford Coinage n. 241. A Cn. Octavius Muso, a quaestor of Marius in 106 BC, might also have an Aquileian origin. See Alfoldy 1999: 285-286 for the identification of this Muso (Sall. Iug. 104) with the Cn. Octavius listed as a member of Pompey Strabo’s consilium in the decree of CIL VI 37045 (= ILS 8888 = ILLRP 515). On the earliest magistrates from northern Italy as a whole see chapter one.  
¹⁹⁴ Aquileia is referred to as a municipium in CIL V 968, a tablet commemorating a gift made to the city by a citizen of Interamna (= ILLRP 541 = Inscr. Agq. 51). The change to municipium is also marked by the transition from colonial duoviri to municipal quattuorviri in the first century BC; the earliest attested quattuorviri are on inscriptions CIL V 966 (= Inscr. Agq. 36), CIL V 8288 (= Inscr. Agq. 37), both dated the middle of the first century by letter forms, while the last—and indeed only—mention of duoviri at Aquileia is in CIL V 971, dating to the early first century BC (= Inscr. Agq. 33). For the Velina tribe at Aquileia see Forni 1989. On the numerous problems and ambiguities associated with the development of municipia as a political category in the late Republic see Bispham 2007.
politics at Rome but also with a larger Italian world of the *municipia*. At the same time Aquileia was solidifying its position as a hub for trade in the northern Adriatic, and the town’s growing commercial importance can be seen in the mid first century BC by the placement there of *portoria* stations; these are the earliest attested for northern Italy.\(^{196}\)

Far from being the distant and beleaguered outpost that it was in the early second century, by the end of the Republic Aquileia was very much integrated into the Roman and Italian political systems, as well as Adriatic trade networks.

### The Augustan settlement

The Augustan period saw a continuation of earlier Republican practices. As Caesar’s legions had wintered at Aquileia during the Gallic wars so the town would, along with Mediolanum, serve as a base for Augustus’s Pannonian and German campaigns, and it was in this context that Herod I met Augustus at Aquileia in 12 BC.\(^{197}\) Similarly, as the town had served as a base for earlier campaigns against Adriatic pirates, Augustus also used it to support coastal security in the Adriatic and eastern Mediterranean. When he created a base for the new Adriatic fleet at Ravenna, he stationed a detachment from that fleet at Aquileia, at one point probably attached to the trireme *Corcodilus*; joining them was a small troop of praetorians.\(^{198}\)

He also created a string of colonies and *fora* around Aquileia and along the Illyrian border, including *Iulia Concordia*, *Iulia Parentium*, Pietas Iulia (Pola), *Forum Iulii*, and *Iulium Carnicum*.\(^{199}\) These settlements were useful to him in two ways: they provided opportunities for the critically important settlement of veterans and could also support campaigns in Noricum, Illyria, and in the Alps.\(^{200}\) At the same time they also constituted a major reorganization of the area, a reorganization that heavily favored Aquileia. The roads built connecting these cities all ran through Aquileia, now made the hub for land and sea transport in the region. So while veteran settlements could be highly disruptive to other Italian cities, as they were for Cremona, for Aquileia they only bolstered its position. Just as importantly, the territories of some of these newer foundations were made substantially smaller than those of Aquileia.\(^{201}\) Hence potential rivals to its regional dominance were made at the outset subordinate to the earlier colony. At the same time Augustus’s organization of Italy into *regions* put Aquileia into *regio X*, a broad administrative district that included Transpadane Italy from Brixia to Istria, the latter of which had not even been part of the province of Cisalpine Gaul but economically was closely connected to Aquileia.\(^{202}\)

---

\(^{196}\) Cic. *Font.* 2.


\(^{198}\) For the fleet detachment at Aquileia see *Inscr. Aq.* 2816 and *CIL* V 960, as well as Panciera 1977. For the praetorians at Aquileia see Keppie 2000: 115-116.

\(^{199}\) Bertacchi 2003: 16. See also Keppie 1983.

\(^{200}\) Dio 54.20 and *CIL* III 2973 (=*ILS* 899) for the campaigns of P. Silius; Suet. *Aug.* 20, 25; *Tib.* 16.

\(^{201}\) On the smaller territories of Tergeste, a rival port to Aquileia, and Emona, a rival commercial hub, see Šašel Kos 2002.

\(^{202}\) Plin. *HN* 3.46. Cf. Nicolet 1988. Plin. *HN* 3.127 says that the eastern boundary of Istria in his time was previously the boundary of Italy, while Strabo 7.5.3 says that in his time the boundaries of Italy encompassed Pola, in Istria (Šašel Kos 2000: 280-1).
Although this reorganization of the eastern Venetia closely followed the well established, Republican era precedents of building roads, establishing colonies, and using towns as bases for military operations, this was also the last burst of intensive state activity in the region for the next two centuries. The Augustan period thus set up the regional framework in which Aquileia functioned during the early and mid Imperial periods: one in which it was at the center of a reorganized network of towns and roads and in which Aquileia was linked to the support and supply of legions in Illyria, Noricum, and Pannonia.

Aquileia within regio X

Helped by the Augustan reorganization of the region, Aquileia became the town through which smaller settlements in northeastern Italy conducted their business. Aquileian merchants and businessmen dominated the commerce of Istria and the eastern Veneto, which in turn fed Aquileia’s economy. Herodian says of early third century Aquileia:

Aquileia was already a huge city, with a large permanent population. Situated on the sea and with all the provinces of Illyricum behind it, Aquileia served as a port of entry for Italy. The city thus made it possible for goods transported from the interior by land or by the rivers to be traded to the merchant mariners and also for the necessities brought by sea to the mainland, goods not produced there because of the cold climate, to be sent to the upland areas. Since the inland people farm a region that produces much wine, they export this in quantity to those who do not cultivate grapes. A huge number of people lived permanently in Aquileia, not only the native residents but also foreigners and merchants.²⁰³

Herodian’s description is from a later period, but his words are confirmed by earlier material. Wine producers in the Veneto and in Istria depended on Aquileia’s markets and merchants for the sale of their wine, not just to the large population at Aquileia but also to markets in Italy and the eastern Mediterranean.²⁰⁴ Pliny names a number of Adriatic vintages growing in popularity at the end of the first century BC, one of which, the vinum punicum, Augustus’s wife Livia cited as the reason for her longevity.²⁰⁵ When Maximius marched against the town in AD 238, his army found—and burned—vines even in the suburbs.²⁰⁶ Sheep and cattle were an important part of its economy, and the land around it was divided into demarcated grazing pastures.²⁰⁷ For wool, too, Aquileia’s vestiarii

²⁰³ Herod. 8.2.3-4.
²⁰⁴ On viticulture is northern Italy and in the Veneto see Picolli 2004.
²⁰⁵ HN 14.67.
²⁰⁶ Herodian 8.3.
²⁰⁷ Modugno 1999. Cf. CIL III 15053 (=ILS 5953a), an inscription cut into the mountains near Parentium in Istria and which allowed water access to the flocks of a neighboring city: Ex conventione finis / inter Ortoplinos et Pare/ntinos aditus ad aquam / vivam Ortoplinis passus / D latus I (By agreement (this is) the boundary between the Ortopini and the Parentinii. There is access to fresh water for the Ortoplini, access that is 500 paces in length by 1 pace in width).
depended on its hinterland to the east and south for raw supplies, and with those supplies the vestiarii were able to acquire the town’s largest burial ground as their private necropolis.208 Also represented in its cemeteries were the purpurarii (purple-dyers), fabri (artisans), linteones (linen-weavers), and negotiatores (merchants), all testifying to the size and variety of the merchant community in the town as well as to the town’s position as the center of exchange for the area’s goods.209

That commercial focus could be seen in Aquileia’s urban plan, which while typical of other colonies in northern Italy in its basic orthogonal layout, evolved to adapt to the town’s growing commerce. In the middle Republic this meant the construction of the large macellum northwest of the forum, while in the Imperial period the town constructed and, more importantly, repeatedly renovated a nearly 300m long complex of magazines to hold goods being shipped and received.210 The importance of the town’s craftsmen could be seen in the funerary monuments lining the roads to Aquileia, and the dedications made by the town’s residents showed a broad pantheon, a token of broad trading connections and the association large population of resident aliens.211 Likewise local politics reflected Aquileia’s commercial identity, and the town commemorated one of its elites for persuading the emperor to impose the same munera on resident aliens that citizens paid.212

As a commercial center, the town offered opportunities for social advancement and economic gain to inhabitants of neighboring towns. Freedmen in particular came to Aquileia, where some acted as business agents for the elite families of the region. While freedmen of the Veronese Gavii, that town’s most important family, are attested in other northern Italian towns outside Verona, most of them are attested at Aquileia.213 Freedmen and freeborn local elites from neighboring towns built social ties at Aquileia, and Aquileia’s inhabitants returned the favor. About 15% of its attested sevirs also held the sevirate in another town (Ateste, Tergeste, Concordia, are attested).214 Likewise men

---

208 Panciera 1972: 92, who also notes the dedication of a vestiarius Aquiliensis in Bogliuno in Istria (CIL V 324). See also Inscr. Aq. 678a+b, the funerary cippi of the cemetery of the vestiarii.
210 Brusin 1934; Bertacchi 2003. For the macellum see Maselli Scotti et al. 2006.
212 CIL V 875 = ILS 1374 = Inscr. Aq. 495a-b.
214 For Aquileia see CIL V 819 = Inscr. Aq. 340 (sevir at Ateste), Inscr. Aq. 289 (sevir at Concordia, from Patavium), and Inscr. Aq. 516 (sevir at Tergeste). In Brixia, where documentation on the sevirate in northern Italy is the fullest, about 7% of attested sevirs hold the sevirate in another town, while at Forum Iulii, closer to Aquileia, the proportion is 25% (on Brixia’s freedmen and the sevirate see Mollo 1997 and 2000) . In order to create a sufficiently large sample size, the category of seviri here includes those described as seviri and seviri augustales, although it should be noted that the precise distinctions of seviri, augustales, and seviri augustales remains somewhat unclear, despite extensive study (Abramenko 1993; Duthoy 1976; cf. Hope 2001: 30). On the freedmen composition of the sevirate in northern Italy see Abramenko 1993, who notes that the proportion of freedmen in the sevirate in northern Italy is much
holding the sevirate at Aquileia appear at the nearby towns of Pola, Emona and at Forum Iulii. Nor was this pattern limited to Aquileia. Concordia, to the east, has sevirs appearing at Opitergium, Altinum, Patavium, Ateste, Aquileia, and at Forum Cornelii in Aemilia. This custom of holding office in multiple towns shows that social ties extended beyond town walls, and as a whole the pattern of dual office holding suggests that the social network of Aquileia’s sevirs encompassed most of the eastern Veneto and Istria.

Aquileia’s size and population also meant that it offered services its smaller satellite communities in regio X could not. Teachers and instructors of rhetoric are well attested in Aquileia but not elsewhere elsewhere in the region. This distribution would mean that inhabitants from neighboring towns would have to go to Aquileia to be educated. For those families not able to hire their own instructor or send their older sons abroad, this might be a problem. Even fairly sizeable towns like Concordia might lack schools. In one letter the younger Pliny reports asking a young boy from Comum where he went to school; the answer is Mediolanum since there was no such school at Comum. That Pliny even felt the need to ask where the boy went to school suggests that the practice of sending children off to neighboring cities for their education was not

smaller than in southern Italy, where the proportion is around 85%. This corresponds to a greater proportion of ingeni in northern Italy’s collegia (Mollo 1996; cf. Royden on the status of the collegia’s magistrates, for which there is not much evidence from northern Italy) as well as to a smaller proportion of freedmen in funerary monuments, which in (George 2005: 58ff; cf. Mouritsen 2005 on freedmen and funerary monuments). This does not mean that distinctions and hierarchical relationships between freedmen and freeborn were not enforced—in Cisalpine funerary reliefs the hierarchical positioning of ingeni and freedmen is strict (George 2005; cf. Peterson 2006 on freedmen in Roman art in general)—but that freedmen and freeborn shared the collegia and sevirate offices more frequently in this region than in other parts of Italy suggests a distinctive regional culture, formed by its more recent enfranchisement and the subsequent greater emphasis on social mobility.

Pola: CIL V 71 (= Inscr. It. 10-1: 296); Forum Iulii: CIL V 1758, CIL V 1768 (= Sup. It. 16: 6 = AE 1998: 572). At Emona, one of the Aquileian sevirs is a T. Caesernius, from a family originating in Aquileia and spreading in the late republican period to Emona, where they are well attested in the early empire (Šašel Kos 1995).


While Aquileia’s close economic and social connections with Istria and the eastern Veneto are a natural result of the geography of the northern Adriatic, the dynamics of those relationships are dictated by contemporary political situations. Hence later in the medieval period the sees of Aquileia and Grado (Venice), associated with different political states, fought for dominance over Istria, with Aquileia at one point in AD 1285 supporting the revolt of Trieste (Roman Tergeste) and the Istrian peninsula against Venice (Nicol 1992). Regional distinctions, encouraged by the northern Adriatic’s fracturing into different political entities in the early medieval period, affected language as well: Dante Alighieri’s early fourteenth century De Vulgari Eloquentia 1.10.6 says that the Aquileians, Istrians, and Venetians all had acquired different vernaculars, although at 1.11.6 he says that the Aquileians and Istrians say “Ces fas tu?” with the same harsh tone.


An education at Aquileia might also bring with it greater prestige than education in smaller communities, both because of the town’s status as a regional hub but also because the town may have been better placed to attract well reputed teachers.


Ep. 4.13.
uncommon. Aquileia, then, with an established community of teachers, would have been able to draw citizens, at least temporarily, from other communities in the region.\textsuperscript{222}

At the same time there were limits to Aquileia’s influence in the region. While Aquileia seems to have had a greater supply of teachers, doctors in contrast are evenly dispersed throughout \textit{regio X}, with even towns like Vicetia and Altinum possessing specialized doctors like veterinarians and eye doctors, although this prevalence of physicians possibly reflects the greater importance of this profession to the region’s inhabitants.\textsuperscript{223} Aquileia’s status as regional center was also limited when it came to public entertainment venues. Its large amphitheater, which could seat 27,000-30,000 persons, was no doubt a regional attraction, as was its theater.\textsuperscript{224} At the same time, spurred on by the popularity of the games and cultures of civic benefaction and competition, Patavium, Pola, and Verona had amphitheaters that were older and larger, while theaters could be found at Acelum, Altinum, Adria, Brixia, Concordia, Opitergium, Patavium, Pola, Tergeste, Tridentum, Verona, and Vicetia—Pola even had two; Aquileia had no monopoly on the games.\textsuperscript{225} Politically, its elites were well connected at Rome, but so were elites from Patavium, Brixia, Verona, and Mediolanum. It was one of Italy’s largest and wealthiest cities, but as \textit{regio X} was in general wealthy and populous, the distinctions between Aquileia and neighbors like Concordia and Trieste were lessened.

During the late Republic a multi-polar situation that developed in northern Italy with Brixia, Verona, Aquileia, Mediolanum, and Patavium acquiring large amounts of wealth, land, and political connections through a combination of \textit{attributio}, land redistribution, political climbing, and control of trade routes. This meant that Aquileia’s influence was limited to the south and west Verona and Patavium created their own spheres of economic influence and social connections to the west and south. In short, Aquileia was clearly the most important town in its region, in that it acted as the hub for regional trade and provided services that were otherwise unavailable in the area, but it was also just one of a handful of large and influential towns in northeastern Italy.

\begin{footnotesize}
\vspace{0.5cm}
\textbf{Aquileia within Italy}

Within Italy as a whole, connections with Aquileia are surprisingly scarce. Aquileian origins are rarely found in inscriptions in Italy outside of the northeastern corner. The major exception is in Rome, where along with other northern Italians they
\end{footnotesize}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item [\textsuperscript{222}]But cf. \textit{CIL} V 7047 (= \textit{CLE} 1092) for an Aquileian educated in Emona.
\item [\textsuperscript{223}]While about a third of inscriptions recording doctors come from Aquileia, their concentration in Aquileia is no doubt exaggerated by the large number of inscriptions found there. Aquileia has nearly five times the inscriptions as the next largest sources of inscriptions—Mediolanum, Brixia, and Verona—and nearly ten times that of nearby Concordia and Tergeste. Altinum: \textit{CIL} V 2183; Vicetia: \textit{CIL} V 3156.
\item [\textsuperscript{224}]On Aquileia’s amphitheater and theater see Bertacchi 1994a. Cf. Chevallier 1983: 136 on the seating of the amphitheater and \textit{CIL} V 1037 on the games.
\item [\textsuperscript{225}]Chevallier 1983: 128ff. Indeed the existence of \textit{familia gladiatoria Transpadana} (attested at Concordia and Aquileia: \textit{CIL} V 8659, \textit{Inscr. Aq.} 487), as well as the commemoration of gladiators outside their home town (like the Aquilian citizen, from Bellunum, buried at Salona in Illyricum: \textit{CIL} III 12925) suggest that the games in northern Italy drew from regional pool of trained gladiators and that the support structure of supplies and men for the games was broadly based. Animals for the games would have to be supplied from outside the region; one of Pliny’s correspondents at Verona was unable to get the African panthers he had bought for his games in time because of travel delays caused by weather (\textit{Ep.} 6.34).
\end{itemize}
dominated the rosters of the Praetorian Guard and urban cohorts. Aquileians were also active politically at Rome; the Caesernii were particularly successful there, obtaining the offices of consul suffectus, curator of Nicomedia, and proconsul of Cyprus. The appearance of elites from Aquileia in the government at Rome is no surprise given their early integration into Roman politics in the late Republican period, but it is worth noting that they preferred appointments at Rome to offices in regional centers in northern Italy, like Mediolanum, Brixia, or Patavium. Also rare are cases of dual office-holding or collegia membership in both Aquileia and in towns outside the northeast corner. One freedman’s epitaph from Placentia boasts of membership in both the Placentian and Aquileian colleges of augustales, and another man interred at Hasta in Liguria was a decurion in both Hasta and Aquileia, but these kind of political connections are remarkable primarily for their rarity. Another outlier instead confirms the pattern. An inscription from Augusta Taurinorum, in the western Transpadana near Liguria, commemorates a L. Tettienus Vitalis who was born in Aquileia, taught in Emona, and who died probably in Augusta Taurinorum. His life corroborates the ties between Aquileia and nearby Emona; why he went to school there instead of in Aquileia is unclear, although it does again highlight the limits of Aquileia’s regional dominance. Much more typical are the connections of the town of Altinum, in the Venetia, whose inhabitants are also attested at Aquileia, Mantua, Atia, Opitergium, and Vicetia. Similarly the social connections of Cremona’s local elites—all prae torians at Rome and in Latium—are with Ravenna, Regium Lepidum, Brixia, and Bononia, all within a fairly circumscribed region. Political and social connections around Aquileia and in northeastern Italy in general seem to cluster around large cities and in small portions of the regions.

---

226 Surviving rosters with Aquileians: CIL VI 2375 (= CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515 = AE 1999: 421), CIL VI 2378 (= CIL VI 32519 = CIL VI 32911), CIL VI 2379 (= CIL VI 32520 = AE 1968: 26 = AE 1999: 421), CIL VI 2380 (= CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522), CIL VI 2382 (= CIL VI 32638 = AE 1964: 120a), and possibly CIL VI 3886 (= CIL VI 32531). The epitaph of the praetorian Q. Caedius also gives an Aquileian origin (CIL VI 37214). Cf. CIL X 6229, the epitaph of a praetorian interred at Fundi in northern Campania. On other northern Italian recruits in the Praetorian Guard and urban cohorts see appendix A. Italians as a whole dominated the rosters of the praetorians and urban cohorts (on the urban cohorts see Mench 1968 and Freis 1967). On the Italy-based recruitment of the praetorians see Dio 75.2 (on Septimius Severus’s banning of the Italians from the Guard) and Tac. Ann. 4.5 (on praetorian recruitment from Latium, Etruria, and Umbria). On military recruitment in general in northern Italy, there are inscriptions documenting recruitment drives under Hadrian (CIL VIII 7036 = ILS 1068, documenting recruitment in the Transpadana) and Marcus Aurelius (CIL VI 44142 = ILS 1098, referring to an Italian levy).


228 See appendix A for comparanda from other northern Italian towns.


233 Humphries 1999: 32-36 sees the networks of dual office holding as forming “regional clusters,” formed by strong regional centers like Mediolanum as well as by entertainment centers like Verona, at which are buried gladiators from across the Po valley.
Aquileia and the Veneto were not atypical of northern Italy in this regard. Even the younger Pliny, one of the most visible and successful northern Italians in the early Imperial period, had a social circle limited to only a section of northern Italy. “Pliny country,” as Syme has noted, is quite limited geographically, mostly to the Piedmont and the central Po valley, in a ring centered around Mediolanum and ending in the east at Verona—roughly the western end of Aquileia’s influence—and in the west at Vercellae.\(^{234}\) In Pliny’s letters there is no correspondent from Aquileia, nor indeed any mention of the town, one of Italy’s largest, anywhere in his work.

In Aquileia itself these patterns of interaction with Italy and the rest of the empire are mirrored in the town’s population, as seen in figure 3.

Figure 3- Resident aliens at Aquileia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Fabius L. f.</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>Ateste (Venetia)</td>
<td>CIL V 1029 = Inscr. Aq. 1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Iunius Successus</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>Altinum (Venetia)</td>
<td>CIL V 743 = Inscr. Aq. 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Cato M. f.</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>Cremona (Venetia)</td>
<td>CIL V 8274 = Inscr. Aq. 2834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macerus L. f.</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>Bergomum (Transpadana)</td>
<td>Inscr. Aq. 2760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Decimus Aprus</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>Bononia (Aemilia)</td>
<td>Inscr. Aq. 2829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Miledius M. f.</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>Mutina (Aemilia)</td>
<td>Inscr. Aq. 2755a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Maenelius St. f.</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>Mutina (Aemilia)</td>
<td>Inscr. Aq. 2836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Manlius Valerianus</td>
<td>iudex</td>
<td>Sarsina (Aemilia)</td>
<td>CIL V 923 = Inscr. Aq. 2842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. f.</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>Perusia (Umbria)</td>
<td>Inscr. Aq. 2843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Sallustius</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>Urbino (Umbria)</td>
<td>CIL V 8283 = Inscr. Aq. 2841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Albicius C. f.</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>Album Intimilium (Liguria)</td>
<td>CIL V 886 = Inscr. Aq. 2844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Caesius P. f.</td>
<td>aedile, publicanus</td>
<td>Sora (Latium) and Rome</td>
<td>CIL V 976 = Inscr. Aq. 519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Valerius Primus</td>
<td>negotiator, margaritarius</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Inscr. Aq. 718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicius Placidus</td>
<td>negotiator</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Inscr. Aq. 148 = AE 1898: 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Eutius Sex. f.</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>Vienne (Gaul)</td>
<td>Inscr. Aq. 2744 = AE 1902: 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Secundus Genialis</td>
<td>negotiator</td>
<td>Claudia Agrippinensis (Germany)</td>
<td>CIL V 1047 = Inscr. Aq. 717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Atlilius L. I. Saturninus</td>
<td>negotiator</td>
<td>Flavia Scarbantia (Pannonia)</td>
<td>ILS 8507 = Inscr. Aq. 861 = AE 2003: 1281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Valerius L. f. Longinus</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>Savaria (Pannonia)</td>
<td>CIL V 1011 = Inscr. Aq. 2856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnopolis</td>
<td>ierogrammateus</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Inscr. Aq. 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutychas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>IG XIV 2338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restulus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Inscr. Aq. 3508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 26 epitaphs and dedications in which one of the dedicants is given an origin outside of Aquileia, half mention Italian and half provincial towns. The proportion of provincials to Italians is high, and of those Italian cities represented, not one is south of Latium. Just as striking is the heavily military composition, especially of veterans, of the non-Aquileians of Aquileia. While this may reflect the greater frequency with which Roman soldiers erected funerary monuments, it also points to the small military presence

\(^{234}\) Syme 1985: 343. See also Syme 1968.
at Aquileia as well as to the function of the Roman army as one of the main movers of people in the empire. Aquileia’s provincial connections, as seen in the above table, still however need to be explained.

**Aquileia within the empire**

To the east and north, Aquileia’s reach was less bounded than it was in Italy. Territories in Pannonia, Rhaetia, and Noricum newly brought under Roman control were not as urbanized as northern Italy, and there was less economic competition. In Noricum merchants from Aquileia traded pottery, glass, oil, and wine from northern Italy for metal wares, including gold from the mines that had been discovered near Klagenfurt in the second century BC. Norican iron was the region’s most famous product, and Aquileia’s control of the trade is illustrated in the presence at Virunum of a *conductor ferriarum Noricarum* from Aquileia. Noricum also functioned initially as a section of the amber road from the Baltic to the Mediterranean. Since the Bronze Age, amber had made its way down from the Baltic, over the Brenner and Resia passes, down the Adige and Po valleys, to the Adriatic ports, and then to markets in the eastern Mediterranean. In the Republican period Aquileia gained control of the trade within northern Italy, and from the late Republic to the second century was the land terminus of the amber road as well as the point from which finished objects entered markets in Italy and the Mediterranean.

By the reign of Tiberius Aquileians had established a trading post on the Danube at Lauriacum and, at the trading settlement of Magdelensburg in particular, were active as merchants. Their presence in these communities proved to be long-lasting. They

---

235 On the epigraphic habits of the Roman legions, see Hope 2001 and Carroll 2006. Todisco 1999: 124ff on the relationship between Aquileia’s small military detachments and veteran settlement in and around the city.

236 Strabo 4.6.12. On economic ties between Aquileia, Italy, and Noricum see Alföldy 1979. Aquileia functioned as the main hub for trade in glass products manufactured by workshops in northern Italy and even some in central Italy; from Aquileia these products were transported and sold in the eastern Alps, the Balkans, and the Danube provinces. Lazar 2006 estimates a 100% increase in regional glass production in the second half of the first century AD. With this boom, Aquileia capitalized on an multi-regional demand for specific types of glass ware, particularly bright blue glass produced at Emona, and even after more cheaply transported glasswares from the Rhine began supplanting northern Italian production, northern Italian producers and their Aquileian merchants shifted towards selling the Danube provinces higher quality glass products in order to compete with their Rhine valley rivals. See also Mandruzzato and Marcante 2005, which replaces Calvi 1968, and which notes the presence of a sizeable glass workshop at Sevegliano just north of Aquileia.

237 *CIL III* 4788. Both Horace (*Carm.* 1.16.9) and Ovid mention Norican iron (*Met.* 14.712). See also Dolenz 1998, Straube 1996, and Dušanić 1977 on the Norican mining industry in the Roman period, as well as Ørsted 2000 on state control of mining (and on the significant provincial variations of Roman mining administration).


239 Giovannini 2002: 159, Negroni Catacchio 1975. See Vianello 2005: 89-90 on the relation of the amber trade to other Late Bronze Age trade routes.


married into the local population, creating business partnerships and sometimes obtaining for their new family members citizenship bestowed *viritim*. In one case the sons of a native father and Italian mother even took on their mother’s citizenship and voting tribe, Velina, which suggests that the mother was either from Aquileia or Pola.242 These merchants stayed long enough to be buried in Noricum, and when they died they were commemorated in the funerary fashion of Aquileia. In the first century this meant elongated, rectangular funerary plaques topped with timpani; later in the second century rectangular portrait niches began to be inserted between the text and the timpanum.243 These styles became popular in Noricum and remained the basic blueprint for Norican funerary art in the Roman period, even as the province’s art evolved and in the second and third centuries adopted a few artistic elements, such as clipeus portraits, that were exceptionally rare in Aquileia.244

Likewise Aquileia and its merchants were active along the rest of the Danube frontier, in Pannonia and Moesia. Through Aquileia came imports from the Mediterranean and goods manufactured in the Veneto and Istria—such as pottery from the kilns of C. Laecanius Bassus, near Pola—and in return from Pannonia and Moesia came hides, metal goods, and slaves.245 Aquileia had so much economic pull in the Danube provinces that much of the trade from Germany to Dacia went through Aquileia, even though the town presented a far southern detour.246 In Pannonia and Moesia, as in Noricum, people claiming Aquileia as their home appear frequently as civilians; in contrast representatives from other large northern Italian towns are almost exclusively veterans and legionaries (fig. 4). The contrast at once underlines the great extent and intensity of Aquileian commerce and illustrates the different ways in which the empire guided the movement of people within its territory.247 Aquileia’s dominance of trade with the Danube provinces, to the point of excluding other northern Italian towns, in some ways continued the role played in the pre-Roman period by northern Adriatic towns like Adria and Spina.248 Northeastern Italy of course had longstanding trade links with central Europe: the trade in metals from central Europe through the Adriatic ports to the Mediterranean is well attested even in the Bronze Age.249 The amber trade, too, predated by much even the earliest Roman expansion into northern Italy. Yet Aquileia’s Imperial period position as *caput Adriae* would not have been possible without the actions of the Roman state: in the Republican and Augustan periods it had organized the roads, towns,

---

242 *CIL* III 4843 (=*ILS* 2015); see also Alföldy 1974: 76.
244 Verzár-Bass 1996 sees the confluence of northern Italian and Balkan/Macedonian artistic traditions in these later monuments.
245 Rostovtzeff 1926: 611. For the distribution of lamps see Di Filippo Balestrazzi 1996.
246 Mócsy 1974: 130.
247 At least some of this trade with the Danube provinces seems to have been in swords and other arms, made from provincial ores but manufactured at Aquileia (Buora 1996).
248 It should be noted that the economic interests of the large towns of Verona, Brixia, and Mediolanum were directed elsewhere north of the Alps. See the attestations of corporations of transalpine and cisalpine traders: *CIL* V 5911 (Comum), *AE* 2000: 632 (Novaria), *CIL* XIII 2029 = *ILS* 7279 (Lugdunum), *CIL* XIII 5303 = *CIL* XIII 11547 (Basilia in Raetia).
249 For connections between northern Italy, central Europe, and Greece in the LHIIIB-C period see Smith Vianello 2005, 1996: 26 and Taylour 1958 but note the more cautious approach of Blake 2008. For connections between Italy and Crete in the bronze age, see Hallager 1985, while Bennet 2008 provides a useful economic overview of the period.
and customs stations around Aquileia, and in the Imperial period—by its working of the mines, stationing of legions along a new border, and military control of important roads—it encouraged the town’s merchants to move into the Danube provinces.  

250 On the economies of frontier zones and their relationship to the development of legionary communities, see Cherry 2008, as well as the classic “taxes and trade” model of the limes as consumers developed Hopkins 1980 (cf. Lo Cascio 2000b and 2008 for elaboration of the model and surveys of criticism).  

251 Emona is included on this list because the town was an important part of trade routes leading to Pannonia. While the city has previously been claimed as part of Pannonia, on the basis of a boundary stone discovered in a riverbed roughly in situ between Aquileia and Emona in 1991 it seems clear that Emona and Aquileia both belong in Italy’s regio X (Šašel Kos 2002).

---

### Figure 4 - Northern Italians in inscriptions in Dalmatia, Noricum, Pannonia, Moesia, and Dacia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of origin</th>
<th>Place commemorated</th>
<th>status</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altinum</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Promona</td>
<td>legionary, praefectus castrorum</td>
<td>AE 1925: 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altinum</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Vindobona</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 2005: 1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Dacia: Alba Iulia</td>
<td>centurion</td>
<td>AE 1977: 653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Italia (X): Emona</td>
<td>sevir Aquileiae</td>
<td>CIL III 3836a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Italia (X): Emona</td>
<td>centurion</td>
<td>CIL III 3836b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Italia (X): Emona</td>
<td>centurion</td>
<td>CIL III 404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Moesia: Singidunum</td>
<td>“consistentes Aquileiae”</td>
<td>AE 1956: 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Noricum: Celeia</td>
<td>centurion</td>
<td>CIL III 5217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Noricum: Lenta (Linz)</td>
<td>conductor ferriarum Noricarum; praefectus iure dicundo</td>
<td>CIL III 4788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Praetorium</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Salonauij</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 2062 = CIL III 2069 = CIL III 8747 = CIL V 2164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>Pannonia: Bolcske</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>AE 2003: 1436+1437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurinorum</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1900: 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixia</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1982: 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixia</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>Hild 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixia</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary trumpet</td>
<td>AE 1979: 463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixia</td>
<td>Italia (X): Emona</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1958: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixia</td>
<td>Moesia: Oscus</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 12348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 15001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 15007d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 14997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6416 = CLE 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1900: 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 11229 = CLE 1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 13485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 2002: 1151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>Legion XIV Apo. 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 14358.15a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Poetovio</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 10878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Poetovio</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 10879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Dacia: Alba Iulia</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 1258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Iader</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 2915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Salona</td>
<td>eques</td>
<td>CIL III 1469.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Moesia: Tropaetum Traiani</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 14214 = ILS 910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Poetovio</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 4057 = ILS 2462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Savaria</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 4196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eporedia</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Tilurium</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 2711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The importance of military garrisons along the roads should not be underestimated, as travel was still a dangerous enterprise. Two inscriptions from Aquileia list men killed “by bandits.”\(^{252}\) One of the two, the princeps of the legio XIII Gemina and thus the second highest ranking centurion of that unit, was killed in the Julian Alps at a place evocatively called Scelerata.\(^{253}\) That the centurion Antonius

\(^{252}\) On the meanings and importance of the phrase see Shaw 1984.

\(^{253}\) *Inscr. Aq.* 2785 (cf. a similar inscription commemorating the same man in Tergeste: *ILS* 2646, which again highlights the close connections between towns in this area).
Valentinus died in what seems to have been, judging from his rank in the military, a minor military engagement says how dangerous the Julian Alps surrounding northeastern Italy were. Tellingly the other bandit causality seems to be a civilian, L. Atilius Saturninus from Flavia Scarabantia in Pannonia, a legionary base and a trading partner of Aquileia. Two possibilities exist to explain why Saturninus was commemorated in Aquileia: either he died nearby, on his way from Flavia Scarabantia, or the brother and friend commemorating him lived in the area. Either case points to the strong links between the Danube legionary towns and Aquileia as well as to the danger of the travel, even with the Roman military presence.

A similar impact had by the state can be seen in Aquileia’s relationship with Illyricum. Perhaps even more so than with the Danube provinces, northeastern Italy had a long history of strong connections with the Dalmatian coast and with the Illyrians. Commerce between the two areas continued into the Imperial period, when trade in Dalmatian metals became important; the Neronian period saw an increased exploitation of Dalmatian mines, and Dalmatian miners became so proficient that in the second century they were exported en masse to Dacia when the Romans began systematic mining there. Dalmatian copper was used by Aquileia’s numerous metal workshops; at least fourteen independent bronze workshops are attested in Aquileia, and Aquileian metalwork—in vases, fibulae, and even Medusa head appliqués—is distributed through the upper Adriatic, in Pannonia along the road to Carnuntum, and along the Rhine and Danube limes. The Dalmatian coast also exported wine and oil to Aquileia, which then traded those goods to Pannonia. Returning though Pannonia were amber pieces, which, after being worked at Aquileia, were traded as luxury items in Dalmatia. This kind of triangular trade was dependent not just on the state controlled mining complexes in Dalmatia but also on Roman military control of the Danube provinces and the main roads leading through them.

The close relationship between Aquileia and these provinces is epitomized in the history of one Aquileia’s largest merchant families, the Barbii. At Aquileia their inscriptions are concentrated in the first century AD but continue into the third. Their most conspicuous member, a Barbius Fulvius Aemilianus, obtained the praetorship and was eventually quaestor pro praetore provinciae, although what province is unknown.

254 Inscr. Aq. 861 = ILS 8507
255 On forts along the roads in Pannonia see Mócsy and Frere 1974, as well as the decree of the emperor Commodus, attested in multiple locations, that small towers be built between forts on the border (ILS 395, CIL III 10308 commemorates an stationarius in Pannonia, but cf. CIL III 8266 (= CIL III 14574), which, although fragmentary, commemorates a man killed possibly by a stationarius.
256 The Liburni and the Veneti, for example, shared similar onomastic patterns (Wilkes 1995: 71; Doria 1972: 28-32; Prosdociimi 1986; Alföldy 1966)
257 Zagegro 2006; Harl 1996, who attributes the migration of Dalmatian miners to promises of good pay, free board, and “perhaps a tacit understanding that miners could cart off unreported production” (80-81); Rostovtzeff 1926: 71.
258 Bolla 1996.
259 Strabo 5.1.8. The overlapping distributions of lamp stamps in Dalmatia, Aquileia, and Pannonia also indicates that the three areas comprised a unified commercial system (Duncan-Jones 2002: 49ff).
260 Zaccaria 1996.
261 For the prosopography of the Barbii and maps of their attestations across the empire see Šašel 1966.
262 For third century examples see Inscr. Aq. 952 and Lettich no. 452, both sarcophagi.
263 CIL V 864.
The *familia* included a large number of freedmen, and both freeborn and freedmen can be found in roughly similar distributions outside Aquileia, which suggests that the family’s commercial interests were largely unified and that it acted as a kind of commercial firm at Aquileia. At Aquileia they were members of *collegia*, veterans, and probably heavily involved in trade. In northern Italy they are attested at Altinum, Ateste, Atria, Bellunum, Concordia, Forum Iulii, Opitergium, Pola, Tergeste, Vicetia, and Ravenna, a list that corresponds almost perfectly to Aquileia’s sphere of influence in northeastern Italy. This is confirmed by the fact that westernmost examples from northern Italy are from Brixia and Cremona; there are none from Mediolanum. In central and southern Italy the family appears in Rome and Puteoli, the latter attestation is not surprising considering Aquileia’s maritime connections. In the provinces the name is most prevalent in Noricum—where it appears in various inscriptions along the route from Aquileia to Magdelensburg—but also is found with frequency in Pannonia along the Danube and in towns along the Dalmatian coast. The Barbii became a permanent presence in some provincial towns; in the Pannonian town of Savaria, along the amber road, they even rose to the decurionate. The Aquileian Barbii, their freedmen, and their descendants thus spread throughout the empire in a pattern that mimicked almost perfectly the town’s major commercial connections.

Aquileia was able to trade in these provinces because of the access the town had not only to goods from the Veneto and Istria but also to imports from the rest of the Mediterranean, which it obtained from its Adriatic port at Grado and from the river port just south of the town. Aquileia conducted trade with Cyrene, Egypt, Syria, and even with the western provinces throughout the Imperial period: pottery and glass ware from northeastern Italy appear in Carthage, Gaul, Cyrene, Syria, and Britain, while Aquileia’s specialized luxury industry in the production of amber pieces and engraved gemstones found consumers on the Black Sea, Athens, and Cyrene. Not all trade was a luxury, and Aquileia, despite its proximity to the fertile Po valley, imported some of its grain from Cyrene. The variety of these trade connections may account for the large pantheon of gods worshipped at Aquileia; we find dedications to the Bithynian Attis, Mithra, the Celtic Iunones, the local Bellenus, and Anubis Augustus, and worship of Isis.

---

264 *Inscr. Aq.* 676, the funerary monument for the *collegium sac(rum) Mart(is)*, whose members included the freedwoman Barbia Amanda and the *medicus* Aulus Barbiius Zmaragdus. *Inscr. Aq.* 96 records the third century dedication of L. Barbius Montaus, a *primus pilus* centurion.


266 Brixia: *CIL* V 4546 (=*Inscr. It.* 10-5: 345); Cremona: *CIL* V 4104.


268 Duncan-Jones 2002: 32.
at Aquileia is particularly well attested.\textsuperscript{273} The presence of the imperial fleet at Ravenna, with a detachment in the later first century at Salona on the Dalmatian coast, made commerce on the Adriatic safer and also encouraged trade to other parts of the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{274} Again, while trade connections between northeastern Italy and the southern and eastern Mediterranean had existed previously—the presence of ivory and ostrich egg pieces at Frattesina in the LHIIIC period is one of the more striking illustrations of these connections—the scope and configuration of these connections were now reactions to the structure of the Roman imperial system, and the impact of those connections was now more extensive and more lasting.\textsuperscript{275}

Conclusions

Thus Aquileia’s experience and even physical appearance in the early principate were heavily dependent on its position within its territory, which in turn depended a good deal on the actions of the Roman state. Through the Roman acquisition and militarization of Danubian provinces, a boom in state-controlled mining, and the pacification of the Adriatic, Aquileia became the hub of the trading network in south-central Europe, while through Adriatic shipping it maintained trading contacts with most of the provinces of the Roman empire, including Britain, with which pre-Roman contact had been minimal. Within northern Italy the lack of a provincial capital meant that influence was divided between a handful of regional centers, with their own spheres of influence, and within Italy the influence of the town of Rome was so great that the political and social ambitions of Aquileians were directed towards the town, to the relative exclusion of the rest of Italy. Thus even after the removal of governors and armies at the end of the Republic, the Roman state continued to have a strong impact on Aquileia’s development and on the its place within the empire; while the town was neither in the center—that was Rome—nor on the periphery, its economy, demography, and religious life were shaped by both.\textsuperscript{276}

\textsuperscript{273} Maselli Scotti 2002b, Fontana 1997, Chevallier 1990: 74-76, and Budischovsky 1976: 121. The dedication to Anubis Augustus (\textit{CIL} V 8210) is otherwise unparalleled.

\textsuperscript{274} Brizzi 1978; Panciera 1978.

\textsuperscript{275} Harding 1984: 85. LHIIIC = 12\textsuperscript{th}-11\textsuperscript{th} centuries BC. While the appearance of ostrich and ivory in northern Italy is striking, trade connections go back further to Frattestina’s middle bronze age, Terremare predecessors in the central Po valley, with the use of near Eastern weight systems and the appearance of Aegean pottery in northeastern Italian sites (on pottery see Bettelli 1997, on weights see Bietti-Sestieri 2003 and Bietti-Sestieri 1973).

\textsuperscript{276} On the problems and meanings of these terms, derived from world systems theory, see Wallerstein 2004, and for their applicability to the Roman world see Woolf 1990b. Strictly within world system theory Aquileia most fits the definition of a peri- or semi-periphery, a point of exchange between the center and the periphery, yet it is an imperfect fit, as these terms do not accurately convey the variety of peripheries in the empire, with the deployment of the army in Egypt eastern’s desert was oriented more towards the protection of stone quarries and the luxury trade from India than (cf. Maxfield 1996) differing significantly from that in Noricum and Pannonia, which although still focused on the protection of mining nevertheless had a larger and more permanent military presence because of the security threats from across the Danube. Nor is the term applicable for the late antique period, in which the imperial centers and peripheries became fairly mobile.
IV

The central Transpadana: Culture and Identity

Introduction

Mantua me genuit, Calabri rapuere, tenet nunc
Parthenope; cecini pascua rura duces. 277

Mantua bore me; the Calabrians snatched me away, and now
Naples holds me. I sang of pastures, farms, and chiefs.

-epitaph of the poet Vergil

D(is) Manibus
M(arci) Iulii
M(arci) f(ili) Sab(ata)na
Maximi
Mantua
(centurionis) leg(ionis) III
Cyr(einaeae) c(h)ort(oris)
V pr(incipis) pos(terioris)
Iulia La
is con
iugi ob
[m(erita)] p(osuit). 278

Sacred to the spirits of the underworld
For Marcus Iulius Maximus,
son of Marcus,
of the voting tribe Sabatina,
from Mantua,
a centurion of the 3rd legion Cyrenaica
5th cohort,
fourth-ranked of the six centurions of the cohort,
Iulia Lais,
his wife,
set up this monument
because of his merits.

-epitaph of a centurion at Bostra in Arabia

Of these two epitaphs, the first is certainly the most well known and is probably one of the most copied and emulated epitaphs from the Roman world, while the second is fairly typical soldier’s epitaph from the frontiers. 279 One is in verse, the other in a highly formulaic series of abbreviations. What they share, however, are declarations of identity—through claims about status, rank, and geographical origin—and in the case of origin both make the same claim: that they came from Mantua. But what were the implications of this claim? What did it mean to be from Mantua, and how did this geographical origin act as a component of identity?

In order to answer these questions this chapter examines the evolution of political and cultural identity in northern Italy during the Imperial period. Since those identities have such strong roots in the political events of the late Republican period, it will be necessary first to look at the construction of those identities in the first century BC before exploring their imperial development. Hence the chronological span of this chapter begins slightly earlier than those studies covering Aquileia, the Aemilia, and Liguria. As in those other chapters, however, the focus is again on one particular region within northern Italy, in this case the central area of the Transpadana around Lake Garda and encompassing the towns of Cremona, Brixia, Verona, Mantua, and Bedriacum. 280

277 The text and location of the epigram are recorded by Donat. Vit. Verg. 36 and Jer. Chron. 190.3.
278 CIL III 102 = AE 1898: 81.
279 On the numerous ancient literary variations of this epitaph see Pease 1940 and Frings 1998.
reasons for choosing this particular conglomeration are based both on the survival in those towns of sources relevant to the study of group identity—Catullus, Vergil, and Cinna for the late Republican period and for Imperial period the large number of surviving inscriptions from Brixia and Verona—and also the inclusion of those towns in territory occupied in the pre-Roman period by one tribe, the Cenomani. While this earlier tribal identification is not without its problems, nevertheless examining an area that has at least a partial claim to a unified identity in the pre-Roman period offers a chance to trace the transformation of the identity throughout the Roman period. Similar studies could also be done for the regions inhabited in the pre-Roman period by the Veneti, the Insubres, and the various Ligurian tribes; the large amount of surviving literary and epigraphic material for the territory of the Cenomani simply makes their territory better suited for study.

Geographical and tribal identity

The region itself is a microcosm of northern Italian geography and encompasses rich agricultural plains, part of the Po and Adige river systems, Alpine foothills, part of a major Alpine pass, and one of northern Italy’s large lakes—in this case Italy’s largest. The geography of the area favored connections over divisions, and although the rivers could flood and temporarily impede travel, they more often served as routes of transport between the lakes, the Alpine and Apennine passes, and the Po valley plain. Nor were the Alps an insurmountable barrier, and the Lake Garda area had the fortune of lying south of the easiest pass, the Brenner. The central Transpadana was thus well connected not just to the rest of the Po valley but also to Adriatic and central Europe, and that permeability of possible boundaries meant that the region’s geography did not create obvious natural borders for states.

The definition of that region were thus a political artifact, in this case of the federation of the Cenomani. Livy refers to the Cenomani as Gauls, while Polybius calls them Celts, and archaeologically they are attested in the early third century, although

281 Verona and Brixia both have around 1100 published inscriptions each, while Mantua, Bedriacum, and Cremona each have around 50. For comparison the total number of published inscriptions for Italy north of the Po is 19,000 (of which around 5,000 come from Aquileia alone). The numbers are drawn from the Clauss-Slaby epigraphic database (http://compute-in.ku-eichstatt.de:8888/pls/epigr/epigraphikkl_de). On the inscriptions of Brixia see Gregori 1999, while for Verona see Modonesi 1995.

282 For most of the Roman period the lake was rimmed with villas (cf. Roffia 2001, Roffia 1997 and de Franceschini 1998), of which the so-called Grotto di Catullo at Sirmio (de Franceschini 1998: 179ff for plans and bibliography) is the best preserved and most well known. On the lake’s religious importance note the imperial period dedications made to Lake Benacus: Sup. It. 8 (Br.): 23 and CIL V 3998 = ILS 3899. (cf. Pascal 1964 and Bersani 1999a). On the great importance of the Po and its tributaries to the region, see Calzolari 2004. The Garda and Po water systems of course were and are connected (cf. Chevallier 1983: 23ff and Uggeri 1989 on lake and river networks), and a collegium nautarum is attested at Mantua (ILS 7265), located on the Mincio river that connects Lake Garda with the Po (cf. Verg. Aen. 10.205-206, in which the river Mincius is described as the son of Benacus).

283 On the connectivity of the rivers see Humphries 1999: 26; Brunt 1973: 173ff, who cites northern Italy’s river system as its most distinctive feature.

Roman literary tradition has them migrate into Italy no later than the beginning of the fourth. Livy says that they had a capital at Brixia, and both Polybius and Livy’s narratives of their actions in the third and second centuries BC indicate joint action by a single, federated political entity rather than individual settlements. The Cenomani had allied with Rome against other Cisalpine Celts in the Telamon campaign of 225 BC, and although they eventually joined the larger Celtic uprising against Rome at the end of the second Punic War, they renewed their alliance with Rome after minimal fighting, after turning on their Insubrian allies. The Cenomani seem to have maintained their good relationship with Rome throughout the Republican period, and when in 187 BC one overzealous praetor attempted to disarm them, the Cenomani’s ambassadors got the decision reversed through appeals to the Roman Senate and one of the consuls. In the late Republic Cicero and his opponent in a lawsuit could both cite a treaty made with them, of uncertain date but probably either coinciding or just postdating their return to the Roman alliance in 198 BC; Cicero’s phrasing indicates that the treaty still existed and was at in effect, and this in turn suggests that at least nominally the Cenomani were a political body even into the 50s. From their actions it is clear that the Cenomani from at least the late third century existed as a polity, and so even in the absence of contemporary accounts coming from the Cenomani themselves a self-identification of the Cenomani with a politically-defined group identity seems certain. Similarly the

285 See Polyb. 2.23 and Livy 21.55, where Livy says that they alone of the Gauls remained loyal to Rome in the opening years of the Hannibal war. On the problems associated with the timing and nature of Celtic migrations into Italy and the extent of Celtic settlement in Cisalpine Gaul see Agostinetti 2004, Defente 2003, Williams 2001a and b, Kruta and Manfredi 1999, Frey 1995, Violanti 1993, Wernicke 1991, Grassi 1991, Bernardi 1981, Pellegrini 1981, and Peyre 1979. Much of the problem with determining the extent of the Cenomani and other Celtic peoples in northern Italy is the fragmentary nature of the material evidence for fifth and fourth centuries. The terms Celt and Gaul are not without their problems, since both terms were developed by Greeks and Romans to describe others. In this paper the term “Celt” is used to describe peoples employing in the fourth, third, and second centuries a La Tène material culture that was shared by central European peoples referred to by the Greek and Romans as Celts and Gauls. On political and historical problems associated with Celtic identity, see Williams 2001a, and on the problems associated with defining ethnic identity in general see Roymans 2004.

286 On Brixia as the capital of the Cenomani see Livy 5.35, 32.30. Livy 5.35 says that the territory of the Cenomani’s extended around the towns that the Romans of his time called Brixia and Verona. On the Cenomani in general see Bonini 1989 and Gambacurta and Serafini 2001, while on the sparse epigraphy of the region see Morandi 2004 and Tibiletti Bruno 1981. On the Cenomani around Verona see Malnati 2003b and Salzani 2003. Cf. Frey 1984 on the applicability of oppida models to Celtic settlement in northern Italy.

287 Polyb. 2.23, Livy 32.29-30 attributes the defection of the Cenomani to a generational dispute among the Cenomani, with elder council members wishing to remain with Rome and younger members successfully pushing for war against Rome. If that narrative is true and not a post-Hannibalic justification for the Cenomani’s defection, such a story again points to a unified political federation, as the decisions of the council pushed all of the Cenomani and not just a few settlements into war with Rome.


290 Contra Williams 2001a: 214-215, who suggests that the Cenomani’s conception of themselves as Gauls but also as Cenomani was a result of interaction with Romans who defined them as Gauls. This interpretation seems overly to minimize the interactions between Insubres, Boii, and Cenomani both before
existence of pairs of identically named Transalpine and Cisalpine Celtic tribes—the Cenomani, Boii, Lingones, Senones, and Insubres of Italy all had Transalpine counterparts—strongly suggests that tribal identification was already developed by the time the future Cenomani of Brixia and Verona were crossing the Alps. How long identification of the inhabitants of the region as Cenomani continued is not altogether certain. Nevertheless, the disappearance of the term after the mid first century BC in all but antiquarian accounts and the simultaneous appearance of new terminology to describe the inhabitants of the territory suggest that the mid-first century was witnessing a substantial shift in how the Cenomani were representing themselves.

Making the Transpadani

By the 50s, however, the elites of Brixia, Verona, and other settlements of the Cenomani were busy seeking integration into political society at Rome. In 89 BC the Transpadani had been given Latin rights, which gave Roman citizenship to ex-magistrates, but as a whole the Transpadani still lacked citizenship, and in the 60s and 50s they continually lobbied their political allies at Rome for the franchise. A few northern Italians were making their way into the cursus honorum at Rome, and men from the old towns of the Cenomani were becoming part of Rome’s political and cultural elite. Along with Aquileia, Verona, Brixia, and Cremona the first Cisalpine towns to produce Roman magistrates. Verona was likely the hometown of a triumvir monetalis of 80 BC and a praetor of 67, while Brixia was probably the origin of C. Helvius Cinna, tribune of...
the plebs in 43, and Cremona that of a consul *suffectus* in 39. Although it has been said of Cinna that “the most famous thing he did in life was to leave it,” he was nevertheless part of an influential circle of neoteric poets, most of whom had northern Italian origins, as well as a friend of Caesar’s and one of the first of his town’s elites to enter the political system at Rome. Cinna’s fellow poet and friend Catullus also fit into this group of upwardly mobile Transpadani; his father was a friend of Caesar, and he himself served on the propraetor Memmius’ staff in Bithynia in 57 BC.

Fortunately, Catullus’s poetry also preserves some information about elite social identity in the central Transpadana. Perhaps most striking is the impression that there were two main spheres of elite interaction: one local and one in Rome and its vicinity. Hence in one poem Catullus invites a friend from Comum to visit him in Verona, and in another he complains that because he lives mainly at Rome, he has only a few books with him in Verona. He is familiar with gossip both from Rome and from Verona, and he gives the same attention to a set of Veronese siblings as to Pompey. Likewise his villas on lake Garda and near Tivoli both merit a mention. Local affairs are put on similar standing as those at Rome, a dichotomy that fits well with Cicero’s observation that Romans had two *patriae*, one by nature and one by citizenship, as Cato had his origin at Tusculum but was also a citizen of Rome. Nevertheless Catullus does make a strong distinction between what he defines as Italian and non-Italian *patriae*. This is especially apparent in poem 39, where he writes:

> If you were a Roman or a Sabine or a Tiburtine  
> or a chubby Umbrian or a rotund Etruscan  
> or a dark and toothy Lanuvian  
> or a Transpadane—so I might not leave my own people untouched—  
> or anybody else who washes his teeth with pure water  
> still I would not wish you to go grinning all over the place,  
> for there is nothing more foolish than a foolish laugh.

---

294 Alföldy 1999: 300-314. The attribution of Cinna to Brixia is made on the basis of Gell. 19.13.5, with its reference to the *Genumana* (=Cenomani), and on the appearance of Helvii in Brixian inscriptions (Gregori 1999: 96ff). See also Andemahr 1994.

295 Courtney 2003: 212. Plut. *Brut.* 20. Of the other neoteric poets, P. Valerius Cato—whose work does not survive—was said to be from Gaul, and this most likely meant Cisalpine Gaul (Suet. *De Gramm.* 11), and M. Furius Bibaculus, whose work survives in fragments, was from Cremona (Jer. *Chron* 148 H). See also Syme 1960: 251. These poets’ connections with Caesar are not surprising; Caesar had supported the Transpadani in their pursuit of enfranchisement and was a frequent resident of Cisalpine Gaul while wintering his armies there in the 50s (Suet. *Iul.* 8, Plut. *Caes.*17.8). Nor was Caesar’s cultivation of the region’s inhabitants unique. The Antonii were long-standing patrons of Bononia (Suet. *Aug.* 17.2), and Pompey too had some patronage in the Cisalpine Gaul (Asc. 3C, Cic. *Att.* 5.11.2), although at Mediolanum this may have been extremely strained (see Front. *Str.* 1.9.3 and chapter one).

296 Catullus’ father: Suet. *Iul.* 73; Catullus in Bithynia: Catull. 10, 28, 56.

297 Catull. 35, 68.

298 Catull. 100, 113.

299 On Catullus’s family villa at Sirmio see Catull. 31, and on the relationship between the so-called Grotto di Catullo (Wiseman 1990, Boschi and Roffia 1987) and the Valerii Catulli see Wiseman 1987 and 1993. While the Valerii continued to be active in the area well into the early imperial period and while the *gens Valeria* certainly held property in and around Sirmio, there is no convincing reason to connect the imperial-era structure and property of the Grotto di Catullo with the poet Catullus. Tivoli: Catull. 44.

300 *Cic. Leg.* 5.
Now as matters stand you are a Celtiberian, and in Celtiberian territory whatever they’ve pissed they use the next morning to brush their teeth and ruddy gums.  

Here Catullus explicitly identifies himself with the *Transpadani*, whom he groups with other Italian peoples and sets in contrast to the non-Italian Celtiberians. Catullus was writing just a generation after the Social War and in the context of the *Transpadani*’s agitation for full citizenship; classifying them, even culturally, as Italians would not have been without controversy. Elsewhere Catullus ridicules Arrius, a man who speaks with a Celtiberian accent; again Catullus is grouping himself with people who speak Latin correctly—i.e. Italians. Nevertheless, as one of the *Transpadani*, Catullus’s own linguistic *urbanitas* would not be entirely secure. In his *Brutus*, composed in the decade after Catullus’s death, Cicero warns Brutus that in Cisalpine Gaul he would hear words and phrases not current in Rome; he also notes that the provincial speakers he has heard have in general lacked *urbanitas*. Therefore the linguistic snobbery Catullus directs towards Arrius is in part defensive, as well as part of a larger discussion, taking place amongst Roman, Italian, and Transpadane elites, about how the *Transpadani* fit, both culturally and politically, into Italy. In this discussion terminology mattered; when Caesar, a supporter of the *Transpadani*, refers to the province of Cisalpine Gaul in his commentaries on the Gallic Wars, he generally uses *Italia* instead of *Gallia*. Of course had the franchise; *Gallia* did not. Significantly Catullus’s only mention of Italy or Italians comes in poem 1, where he dedicates his book to the Cisalpine Cornelius Nepos, who was “the only one of the Italians” to write a history of the world in three volumes. The mention of Italians in the dedicatory poem to a book written by one of the *Transpadani*, who identifies himself as such, was politically charged and demonstrates that Italian identity was something that the *Transpadani* were trying to claim both through political and cultural means.

In the process, the *Transpadani* were also building an identity as *Transpadani*, a category that was created almost by accident by the patchwork of enfranchisement measures of the Social War. While there is no indication that they sought citizenship before, or even during, the Social War, their exclusion from the full enfranchisement given to towns in Aemilia and the rest of the Cispadana meant that their civic status

---


302 Contra Dench 2007: 340, who suggests that “Catullus is perhaps once again gently digging at a distinctive aspect of contemporary pride, pride in, precisely, being so newly and so narrowly ‘Italian’.” See also Skinner 2003.

303 Catull. 84.

304 Wray 2001: 43-44

305 Cic. *Brut.* 169-170. See also Krostenko 2001 for the construction of urbane identities through speech.

306 On the connection between the spread of citizenship and the spread of Italian self-identification see Giardina 1994.


308 * unus Italorum* (Catull. 1.5). On Cornelius Nepos’s origins, see Plin. *HN* 3.22, who says he lived along the Po River, and Auson. 471.9, who says he was from Gaul.
became a major political issue in the following decades.\footnote{309} That exclusion from full enfranchisement also meant that for the first time the *Transpadani* became a defined group, who lived in a defined geographical area and had defined legal rights. This group identity was strengthened every time their status and rights came into dispute at Rome, such as when Caesar denounced Piso, the former governor of Cisalpine Gaul, for unlawfully executing a *Transpadanus* or when C. Scribonius Curio argued that although the cause of the Transpadani was just, their enfranchisement would not be beneficial to the Republic.\footnote{310} The word *Transpadanus* comes up in the Republican period predominantly in connection to the enfranchisement question, as when Cicero comments on rumors that Caesar had ordered to *Transpadani* to elect *quattuorviri*—the traditional magistrates of *municipia*—or when before the battle of Pharsalus, Labienus, by saying to Pompey’s troops that they are about to face legions recruited from Transpadane settlers, implies that these legions were illegally recruited.\footnote{311} The classification of inhabitants of Italy north of the Po as Transpadani is then a product of the political dialogue about enfranchisement.

The idea that creation of Transpadane identity was due to the enfranchisement question finds strong confirmation in the almost total absence of any form of the word Cispadanus in surviving ancient Latin; its only attestation is in the name of a cohort in Moesia in the early third century AD.\footnote{312} In Greek it is also extremely rare; Strabo uses the term Cispadana in his description of Italy, but here the term is used solely for organizational purposes.\footnote{313} The absence of a generally recognized Cispadane group identity suggests that there was no strong motivation either for Roman politicians or the inhabitants of Aemilia and southern Liguria to create such a term; there was no political or cultural stimulus to use that particular group identity. Just as striking is the absence of the concept of the Transpadana before the Social war, when the predominating geographic label used by Greek and Latin writers is “Cisalpine Gaul.”\footnote{314} Similarly, areas within Cisalpine Gaul are identified by their predominant *ethnos*, with the *ager Gallicus* of the Senones, or the Venetia of the Veneti. Transpadane group identity was therefore a relatively new phenomenon, remarkable in that it was largely free of ethnic markers.\footnote{315}

\footnote{309} On whether the Transpadani were actively seeking enfranchisement in the 60s and 50s, or whether the impetus came from ambitious Roman politicians, see Mouritsen 1998. To this author a combination of the two seems most likely, since men like Crassus and Caesar would be unlikely to gain much politically from the *causa Transpadani* without a least some support for enfranchisement among the Transpadani (Suet. *Caes*. 8 says that the Transpadani were agitating for the franchise).

\footnote{310} Sall. *Cat*. 49.2; Cic. *Off*. 3.88.


\footnote{312} *CIL* III 14429 (=AE 1902: 0126.) In contrast there are at least 63 attestations of forms of the word *Transpadanus* in Latin literature and inscriptions.

\footnote{313} Strabo 5.4.


\footnote{315} Such group identification without a significant ethnic component is almost without parallel in Italy. Of the Augustan *regiones* of Italy, all except Aemilia (VIII) and Transpadana (XI) are based on ethnic constructions. The choice of Aemilia for the southeastern Po valley possibly reflects, in addition to the great importance of the via Aemilia for the region, the expulsion of many inhabitants during and following the Roman conquest (cf. Polyb. 2.27 and 2.35, Peyre 1979). Without the expulsion of many of the Boii and Senones, the region lost much of its pre-Roman ethnic identity, and the defining feature of the Republican-period region was the new military trunk road. On the use of ethnic markers for the other *regiones* see Laurence 1998 and Nicolet 1988, as well as Farney 2007 on aristocratic manipulation of these ethnic markers. In the rest of the empire non-ethnically based geographic identities are similarly rare.
Transpadane identity was then very much the product of the unique political circumstances following the Social War, a war which at the same time developed and enlarged the concept of Italian identity. With first the enfranchisement of the Transpadana by Caesar and then the incorporation of Cisalpine Gaul into Italy under the triumvirate, the political motivations for formulating an identity as Transpadani disappeared. The Transpadana became one of the eleven regiones of Italy in Augustus’s reorganization of the peninsula. Importantly this new Transpadana did not correspond to its Republican version: Verona, the home of the self-identifying Transpadanus Catullus, now belonged to Venetia et Histria, regio X, and not to Italia Transpadana, regio XI. That the Augustan regio did not correspond to the late Republican definition of the region highlights how the enfranchisement had stripped the term of much of its political baggage. Why the new regio was called Transpadana and not, along the lines of the other regiones something like Insubrica, Libicia, or Taurinum is difficult to determine, but in the context of the earlier causa Transpadani it is tempting to attribute the use of the name Transpadana to a desire on the part of Augustus to commemorate the success of himself and his adoptive father as patrons of the region and also on the part of the inhabitants of the region to define themselves as Italy across the Po rather than as a something Gallic. The reluctance to use a Celtic name certainly shows in the naming of regio X not with a word related to the Cenomani but as “Venetia,” a term derived from the Veneti, who were more acceptable to the Romans in that they were not Celtic, were long-standing allies of Rome, and were through their mythologized ethnogenesis claiming kinship with the Romans through common Trojan ancestors. In the early Imperial period the term Transpadana came to be used in a technical sense; the elder Pliny uses it to describe a geographic region amenable to certain crops or products—and which is set in contrast to Venetia—and by Tacitus to indicate the Augustan regio XI. That Pliny contrasts the Transpadana with Venetia suggests that this new conceptualization of the term was based on Augustus’s recent administrative division rather than on a strictly geographical definition of Transpadana as that part of Italy north of the Po; after all Venetia was north of the Po as well. The Augustan organization, a somewhat arbitrary division of the old province of Cisalpine Gaul into roughly equal quarters, also helped reorder Cisalpine Gaul’s regional identity. The Transpadani disappeared in literature, and were replaced by the conceptualization of the Transpadana primarily as a state-defined administrative and geographic unit.

Exceptions are the Alpes Cottiae, which draw their name from an Augustan-era dynast Cottius and his family (Plin. HN 3.136-8, Dio 60.24.4, Suet. Nero 18, AE 1899: 209b, and AE 1904: 173); the Alpes Maritimae, clearly named after the geographical features; the Alpes Poeninae or Alpes Graiae, which Livy says were named after a local deity (21.38); the short-lived province of Mesopotamia; and Africa proconsularis, used in place of any references to Carthaginian rule. The lack of ethnic markers to describe the western Alps can perhaps be attributed to general Roman inattention to these areas and their inhabitants. In contrast the Norici and Raeti are commemorated in named provinces whose importance to the Danube and Rhine limes meant that they were less of an afterthought (cf. Pauli 1984).

316 Most famous is the Patavian Livy’s opening of his history of Rome with a story of the Trojan Antenor and the origins of the Veneti (1.1); see also Malnati 2003a.

317 Plin. HN 3.123, 130, 138; 10.77; 16.66; 17.49, 201; 18.66, 127, 182, 205; 19.16; 37.44. Tacitus at Hist. 2.32 lists important Transpadane cities at Mediolanum, Novaria, Eporedia, and Vercellae, all of which fall within regio XI.
Italian Identity under the Empire

Yet as Transpadane identity lost its political importance, at the same time Italian identity came to be seen as a privileged commodity. In one letter Pliny says:

He [Tacitus] was describing how at the last races he sat next to a Roman knight who engaged him in conversation on several learned subjects and then asked if he came from Italy or the provinces. “You know me,” said Tacitus, “from your reading.” At which the man said, “Then are you Tacitus or Pliny?” I can’t tell you how delighted I am to have our names assigned to literature as if they belonged there and not to individuals, and to learn that we are both known by our writing to people who would otherwise not have heard of us (Ep. 9.23).

The first question the knight asks is whether he is from Italy or the provinces, a rather striking conceptual division of the empire. Tacitus, it should be noted, dodged the question and steered the conversation to his literary, rather than regional, identity.\(^\text{318}\) It is also worth noting that in the question Italian comes before provincial, a hierarchy reflected in epigraphic and bureaucratic formulae, as in the Res Gestae of Augustus—in which when Italy and the provinces are mentioned together Italy always comes first—and in an honorific inscription set up to a Roman procurator by the Roman citizens living in Raetia—both from Italy and the provinces.\(^\text{319}\) This formulaic grouping of Italy and the other provinces, with Italy given precedence, again suggests that Italy retained a conceptual superiority over the provinces, in addition to the more tangible benefits—such as substantial tax exemption and alimentary schemes—that emperors could bestow. The granting of the ius Italicum, by which a city’s territory was treated as Italian land and therefore exempt from the tributum soli and tributum capitis, to favored provincial cities and colonies would also have highlighted how Italian status was set above the provincial.\(^\text{320}\) Through repeated actions of the emperor the hierarchy of the Italian over the provincial was reinforced even in the provinces through both official language and the granting of privileges explicitly associated with Italian status.\(^\text{321}\)

Italy’s privileged status might have encouraged Italians in the provinces to advertise their origins. One late second or early third century altar from Vindolanda in Britain reads:

To Jupiter the Best and Greatest
and to the other immortals
and to the genius of the commander’s tent
Quintus Petronius Urbicus, the son of Quintus
prefect of the fourth Gallic cohort…
From Brixia in Italy

\(^{\text{318}}\) Farney 2007: 233ff.
\(^{\text{321}}\) See, for example, Nero’s speech upon accession (Tac. Ann. 13.4).
carried out his vow on behalf of himself and his family.\textsuperscript{322}

Here the dedicant identifies himself with three larger groups apart from his immediate family: his military unit, his hometown, and Italy. Likewise the dedicant in a slightly later inscription from Lepcis Magna identifies himself as being \textit{Mediolanensis ex Italia}.\textsuperscript{323} This kind of self-identification by region was exceptional; far more typical was identification by town alone, which in itself suggests that municipal origin was considered more important than the regional and that the town’s name implied the region.\textsuperscript{324} Of those very few inscriptions that do specify an origin in Italy for the commemorated, most also list towns in northern Italy, although this may simply reflect the fact that the inscriptions are also mostly military and that the legions recruited disproportionately from northern Italy (see figure 2). Nevertheless it is still worth exploring why even these very few dedicators chose to add \textit{ex Italia}.

Figure 2 - Inscriptions listing region of origin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin (\textit{regio}, if in Italy)</th>
<th>Site and Province of Inscription</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Taurinorum, Italy (XI)</td>
<td>Bolcske, Pannonia</td>
<td>\textit{AE} 2003: 1436, 1437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixia, Italy (XII)</td>
<td>Vindolanda, Britain</td>
<td>\textit{RIB} 1686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum, Italy (XI)</td>
<td>Lepcis Magna, Tripolitana</td>
<td>\textit{AE} 1953: 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigullis, Liguria, Italy (IX)</td>
<td>Sala, Mauretania Tingetana</td>
<td>\textit{AE} 1992: 1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liguria, Italy (IX)</td>
<td>Ephesus, Asia</td>
<td>\textit{CIL} III 7135-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forentia, Italy (VII)</td>
<td>Taurumum, Pannonia</td>
<td>\textit{AE} 1964: 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priverno, Italy (I)</td>
<td>Amorium, Asia</td>
<td>\textit{CIL} III 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy, town unspecified</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>\textit{CIL} VI 1636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy, town unspecified</td>
<td>Kotaien, Phrygia</td>
<td>\textit{CIG} 3823 = \textit{IGR} 4.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arles, Gallia Narbonensis</td>
<td>Bolcske, Pannonia</td>
<td>\textit{AE} 2003: 1426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispania</td>
<td>Tyana, Cappadocia</td>
<td>\textit{AE} 1991: 1555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldae, Mauretania Stitifensis</td>
<td>Alana, Britannia</td>
<td>\textit{RIB} 812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufibus, Africa</td>
<td>Bolcske, Pannonia</td>
<td>\textit{AE} 2003: 1432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalenis, Africa</td>
<td>Stockstadt, Germania Superior</td>
<td>\textit{CIL} XIII 11783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Fanum Martis, Lugudunensis</td>
<td>\textit{CIL} XIII 1347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philoppopolis, Thrace</td>
<td>Lugdunum, Lugudunensis</td>
<td>\textit{CIL} XIII 01856 = \textit{CLE} 841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britannia</td>
<td>Bostra, Arabia</td>
<td>\textit{IGLS} 13.1: 9188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Their actions may reflect lingering uncertainty about the Italianess of the former Gallia Cisalpina. As the legal and political status of the region was no longer in any serious dispute, that uncertainty must have stemmed from other sources. For Petronius Urbicus, the Brixian prefect of an auxiliary cohort at Vindolanda, advertising Italian identity was not just a claim to be from a low tax zone; his dedication’s main audience, the military community around Vindolanda, would probably not care. That community, however, did care about Petronius Urbicus’s social status. The correspondence of Flavius Cerialis, who like Urbicus was the prefect of a cohort at Vindolanda, demonstrates how important and delicate the social connections of elite army officers could be. Cerialis’s correspondence from Vindolanda includes a letter of recommendation, an appeal for

\textsuperscript{322} \textit{I(ovi) O(optimo) M(aximo | ceterisque | diis immort(ali)bus | et Gen(io) praetor(i) | Q(uintus) Petronius Q(uinti) f(ilius) Fab(ia tribu) Urbicus | praefectus coh(ortis) III | Gallorum | ……… | ex Italia | domo Brixia | votum solvit | pro se | ac suis (RIB 1686). Birley dates the stone to the Antonine or Severan period.}

\textsuperscript{323} \textit{AE} 1953: 188.

\textsuperscript{324} The listing of voting tribe enrollment also reinforces both citizen status and town of origin.
patronage, and a New Year’s greeting, and his correspondents are local and military elites: decurions, centurions and equestrian officers. Cerialis’s wife, Sulpicia Lepidina, also participated in the social life of the fort and communicated with the wives of other officers, one of whom sent her an invitation to a birthday party. It was through these social connections that promotions or favors might be obtained. In one letter a woman named Valetta asks Cerialis for a favor through his wife Sulpicia, and in another a man named Genialis begs Cerialis not to release a man whom Genialis had earlier mistreated and from whom he now fears reprisals. In this manner Cerialis’s social connections and status determined how able he was to secure favors for others and for himself. Urbicus, in the same position as Cerialis, would have a practical incentive to advertise his Italianess, especially to centurions, officers, and other military elites who were not Italian and accordingly might be impressed by another officer’s origin in an Italy that was repeatedly and explicitly raised above the provinces by the emperor. For Urbicus and other northern Italians, promoting their Italian origins was a means to impress upon their neighbors, like the Raetian centurion who also set up a dedication at Vindolanda, that they belonged to a privileged group while their non-Italian neighbors did not.

Northern Italians like Urbicus had greater incentive to distinguish themselves as Italians than did, say, Umbrians or Calabrians, whose identity as Italians was less in question and who as the Imperial period progressed were recruited less frequently into the army and thus formed a much smaller part of the audience for Urbicus’s dedication than did northern Italians and provincials. Urbicus’s dedication, a sizeable and expensive piece of stone, was a way of promoting an imperially-elevated identity in a military community that recruited from across multiple regions. Self-promotion by association with Italy was also implicit in other inscriptions of northern Italians abroad, and a couple who made a dedication at Singidunum in Moesia went out of their way to specify that they were “living at Aquileia” in an attempt to provide a link with Italy, even if they could not persuasively claim an origin there.

At Urbicus’s home in Brixia, there was certainly less need to prove Italian legal status. Rather, inhabitants at Brixia and other towns in northern Italy attempted to mark themselves as more Italian than other Italians. Yet here this was not an attempt, as it was in the provinces, to claim a privileged status within the empire but rather to claim a particular cultural identity, as a more authentic and morally pure Italy. A set of perceived old Italian virtues might be seen to be preserved in Italian municipia when they had been long lost at Rome. Hence Tacitus describes the Julio-Claudian period as one of extravagance and luxury that came to an end when Vespasian came to power:

At the same time new men from the towns and colonies and even from the

---

325 Tab. Vindol. II.250 (letter of recommendation), 225 (appeal for patronage), 261 (New Year’s greeting). On Cerialis’s correspondents, see Tab. Vindol. II.263 and 284 (Vitalis and Verus, both decurions), 243-254 and 259-261 (various equestrian officers), and 255 and 258 (centurions).
326 Tab. Vindol. II.291.
327 Tab. Vindol. II. 256 and 257.
328 RIB 1684. Bispham 2007: 202 interprets Urbicus’s inscription as a means of using his citizenship—advertised through his tribal affiliation—“to stress his superiority over the others at Vindolanda.” Possession of citizenship was just one of the qualities Urbicus was stressing in his dedication.
329 Forni 1953.
provinces progressively entered the Senate and brought with them their native frugality. Although most came to moneyed maturity through hard work or good fortune, they nevertheless maintained their earlier mentality. But the most conspicuous model of these mores was Vespasian, who himself had an old-fashioned way of living.\(^{331}\)

Here Tacitus links both the Italians and provincials to a native frugality and old-fashioned way of living, and Tacitus’s contemporary and correspondent Pliny goes one step further, ascribing these virtues particularly to Transpadane towns.\(^{332}\) At length he praises the Patavian Thrasea Paetus and his family as *exempla virtutum* and also commends one woman by saying that she was a model of stern self-discipline (*severitas*) even to the Patavians.\(^{333}\) Pliny sets out these old Italian virtues clearly in another letter where, playing matchmaker, he praises a young man by saying that “his homeland is Brixia, from our Italy (*ex illa nostra Italia*), which still preserves and protects much of the old-fashioned modesty, frugality, and even rusticity.”\(^{334}\) These qualities, *verecondia*, *frugalitas*, and *rusticitas antiqua*, formed a set of ideals that defined Italianess in a way that could be used to counterbalance notions that these Italian *municipia* were peripheral or boorish.

Why would the northern Italian wish to express their Italian identity in such a fashion? In part this ideology reflected a century of imperial messages expressing Italianess in these terms. Augustus had used the image of the virtuous and uncorrupted Italian in his speeches and in the imagery he cultivated around himself.\(^{335}\) Under the principate this imagery suited not just Augustus, whose political rivals criticized his municipal Italian origin, but also the many local Italian elites he brought into government. Some of Claudius’s legislation too shows a concern for Italy: one of his edicts forbade anyone from passing through the towns of Italy unless by foot or in a chair or litter (presumably to avoid noise), while another prohibited the destruction of buildings in Italy unless they were to be immediately replaced.\(^{336}\) These were designed to maintain the physical and auditory character of Italian—and not the provincial—towns and, as the latter edict says, to safeguard the future of all of Italy (*totius Italiae aeternitas*).\(^{337}\)

---

\(^{331}\) Tac. Ann. 3.55. *simul novi homines e municipiis et coloniis atque etiam provinciis in senatum crebro adsumpti domesticam parsimoniam intulerunt, et quamquam fortuna vel industria plerique pecuniosam ad senectam pervenirent, mansit tamen prior animus.* \footnote{On Tacitus’s self presentation see Sailor 2008.}

\(^{332}\) Ep. 1.14.6 (on Serrana Procula, from Patavium). Pliny has of course more pressing reasons for praising Paetus than his *Patavinitas*. Paetus represented Stoic virtues more broadly (on the portrayal of Paetus’s death as admirable and altruistic—and an echo of the practice of *devotio*—see Sailor 2008: 14ff). Nevertheless Pliny’s praise of Paetus fits into his broader depiction of northern Italy as inherently virtuous.\(^{333}\) *Ep. 1.14.4. Patria est ei Brixia, ex illa nostra Italia quae multum adhuc verecundiae frugalitatis, atque etiam rusticiatis antiquae, retinet ac servat.*


\(^{335}\) Suet. Claud. 25.2 (on passage through Italian towns). *CIL X 1401 = ILS 6043* (the *SC Hosidianum*, AD 45).

\(^{336}\) *CIL X 1401 = ILS 6043.* Patterson 2003: 97 suggests that the prohibition of wagons and carts through Italian towns may have been symbolic as well, since it might “stop people riding through Italian towns as though they were conquered or provincial centres.”
Trajan’s edict that candidates for office at Rome hold at least one third of their land in Italy seems to have been designed for similar effect, as do imperially instigated alimentary schemes. 338 Even if actual imperial intervention in Italy was minor during the first and second centuries, nevertheless emperors continued to stress through speeches and edicts their concern for its future. This emphasis was not consistent from reign to reign, and certain emperors like Claudius made it a theme of their reign while others like Nero emphasized concern for other parts of the empire. 339 Nevertheless concern for Italy, which occupied a place between concern for the populus Romanus and for the empire as a whole, was one of a menu of important imperial virtues emperors could and repeatedly did advertise in the first and second centuries AD. 340

This stress was particularly pronounced in Vespasian’s reign, as he had not only to repair the damage done to his reputation by a civil war conducted on Italian soil but also had to counteract being from “an unknown family without any ancestral family portraits.” 341 At the same time he was criticized for his rustic pronunciation and, quite tellingly, stories were circulated that his paternal grandfather was a contractor for day laborers and came from the regio Transpadana. 342 So while the ideology of Italian simplicity and morality had been closely linked with the imperial house, it was still possible to be seen as too rustic or even quasi-Italian, as the attribution of Vespasian’s grandfather to the Transpadana seems to indicate. Northern Italy thus was acting in a cultural world where a morally defined Italian identity was seen as valuable but also where northern Italians’ status as Italians was still a matter of question, even as late as the Flavian period. 343 This place in cultural limbo provoked northern Italians to associate themselves rather aggressively with the cultural Italian identity built up both by imperial propaganda and by other Italian elites, a trend which again illustrates the transitional nature of northern Italy as not quite provincial and not quite Italian. 344

Urban competition, the emperor, and identity

This configuration of group identity, in which a regional identity was the byproduct of a struggle to achieve a larger peninsular one, mirrors the Republican period, when the Transpadane identity was created and strengthened by a larger discussion over how Roman and Italian identity were defined. The crucial difference between the Republican and Imperial period in this matter is the influence of the emperor in defining Italian identity, both through action, as in the legislation designed to protect or to spread

339 On the notion of imperial policy in general see Millar 1977, and on imperial policy towards Italy in particular see Patterson 2003.
340 On the articulation and presentation of imperial virtues see Noreña 2009 and Ando 2000. For a contrary view see Lendon 2006, and for Italian municipal comparanda see Forbis 1996.
341 Suet. Vesp. 1.
343 Suétónius Paullinus’s speech at Tac. Hist. 2.32 also suggests that Italy beyond the Po might be viewed as separate from Italy, as he says that although the enemy has control of Italy beyond the Po, his army still has the resources of Italy and Rome at their command and the Po river as their front.
344 See chapter one.
Italian privileges, and through the language of documents and speeches.\footnote{On the imperial transition to a system relying largely on the transfer of documents, see Ando 2000, Haensch 1992, Demougin 1994, and Nicolet 1988.}\footnote{Even burial plots in Brixia could be huge; one measured 200 by 160 feet (\textit{CIL} V 4787 = \textit{Inscr. It.} 10-5: 809 = \textit{ILS} 8355. On the process of \textit{attributio}, by which surrounding territory and communities were incorporated into the political body of a larger urban center, see Laffi 1966. The process is attested in northern Italy’s alpine foothills, as at Tergeste, where the Carni and Catali were attributed (\textit{CIL} V 532 = \textit{ILS} 6680); Tridentum, where the Anauini, Tulliassi, and Sinduni inhabiting alpine valleys were attributed to the city and had their Roman citizenship confirmed by the emperor Claudius (\textit{CIL} V 5050 = \textit{ILS} 206); and most probably Brixia as well (\textit{CIL} V 4313 = \textit{ILS} 266 = \textit{Inscr. It.} 10-5: 90, a dedication by the Benacenses and \textit{Tramplini} at Brixia). The \textit{Benacenses}, the inhabitants of the west shore of Lake Garda (where their other dedications—\textit{CIL} V 4867, \textit{CIL} V 4868, \textit{CIL} V 4869—are located), are not recorded as having their own \textit{municipium} or local magistrates, and they are almost certainly the responsibility of the magistrates at Brixia. On the \textit{attributio} of communities to Brixia see Todisco 1999: 146 and Laffi 1966: 53-54. The Camunni to the north of Brixia appear to have a separate municipal government, although there are still very strong connections between the two communities. On the relationship of Brixia and the Camunni see Gregori 2008, as well as \textit{CIL} V 4964, \textit{CIL} V 4957 = \textit{ILS} 6713, \textit{CIL} V 7817 (the \textit{Tropaeum Augusti} at La Turbie), and \textit{CIL} XI 42 from Ravenna (where the commemorated is described as belonging to the “\textit{natio} Camunn(us)”). Plin. \textit{HN} 3.138 describes Alpine communities conquered by Augustus as attributed to \textit{municipia} by a lex Pompeia.}\footnote{Tac. \textit{Hist.} 1.66 (Vienne), 2.21 (Placentia). On town rivalries in general in the Roman empire see Anti-Nucerian graffiti at Pompeii: \textit{CIL} IV 1293, 1329, Smallwood 48.} The Imperial period also broadened the field in which these games of identity were being played out, as service in the army brought people from towns like Verona and Brixia to provincial borders for long periods of time, long enough to set up dedications and even tombstones. The Imperial period both centralized and broadened the ways in which Italian identity was defined; the emperor became by far the most important person in promoting forms of Italian identity, while those forms were used and manipulated all along the provincial borders.

The existence of the emperor was also changing how people in the central Transpadana identified themselves as \textit{municipes}. Association with him became a way for people and entire towns to attempt to elevate their status. For northern Italian towns in particular, association with imperial prestige was a way to regain status lost by the leveling that had occurred at the end of the Republic. At the beginning of the empire, while the Transpadana had acquired Roman citizenship and been incorporated into a privileged Italian heartland, its towns now had little to distinguish themselves from regional rivals. Brixia, for example, had gone from being the capital of the Cenomani to being one Italian \textit{municipium} among many. While \textit{attributio} would ensure that the town would be populous and wealthy—indeed it had the largest \textit{territorium} of all Italian towns—nevertheless some greater distinction was desirable.\footnote{347 Tac. \textit{Hist.} 1.66 (Vienne), 2.21 (Placentia). On town rivalries in general in the Roman empire see Anti-Nucerian graffiti at Pompeii: \textit{CIL} IV 1293, 1329, Smallwood 48.}

Competition between towns could be fierce, and during civil war long-standing rivalries might erupt into violence, as it did at Vienne and Lyons in Gaul during the civil war of AD 69; during that same year Placentia blamed the burning of their great amphitheater on the jealousy of their neighbors.\footnote{347 Tac. \textit{Hist.} 1.66 (Vienne), 2.21 (Placentia). On town rivalries in general in the Roman empire see Anti-Nucerian graffiti at Pompeii: \textit{CIL} IV 1293, 1329, Smallwood 48.} The rivalry between towns around the bay of Naples produced scurrilous graffiti in some cases, street violence in others.\footnote{348 Anti-Nucerian graffiti at Pompeii: \textit{CIL} IV 1293, 1329, Smallwood 48.} These town rivalries could exist alongside strong social bonds, and anti-Nucerian graffiti at Pompeii exist alongside advertisements for gladiatorial fights and elections at Nuceria;
the two towns were part of the same circle of regional markets. Citizens from rival towns who traded insults in the theater were nevertheless sharing the same social space, and towns that erected honorific statues to each other might later in petitions to the emperor complain of each other’s insults. Even Brixia and Verona, which shared elite families and long-standing social and cultural bonds, also shared a competitive drive, even if it did not, as it did at Pompeii and Lyons, erupt in violence. It was in that spirit that one *quattuorvir* from Verona set up a monument at Brixia, for while the spot for the monument was decreed by the Brixian decurions, the *cursus honorum* on the inscription reads: IIIIVir(o) Veron(ae) q(uaestori) Veron(ae) et Brix(iae).

Even Brixia, Verona comes first. In contrast Brixians holding office in Verona and Brixia all list Brixia before Verona. Such epigraphic games are not as clearly antagonistic as the rumors surrounding the burning of Placentia’s amphitheater or the graffiti around the bay of Naples, but they do point to an ongoing concern with municipal rank. Imperial recognition would be one clear, external means of obtaining that rank, especially in a region without a provincial capital.

One way of securing that recognition was to acquire colonial status. Both Brixia and Verona became honorary *coloniae*, Brixia at least by the reign of Tiberius, Verona probably under Augustus and certainly by the early third century. The inhabitants of Verona thought its colonial status important enough to advertise on its most elaborate and important city gate, where the first words of the main inscription were “*colonia Augusta Verona*.” Here Verona’s civic identity was defined by this imperially bestowed status as a colony. In the absence of direct imperial benefactions, which were very rare in first and second century Italy, status as an imperial *colonia* was one means of advertising imperial favor, which was the most prestigious external confirmation of a town’s worth. For those towns like Bedriacum that were not large enough to attract imperial attention, lesser elite patrons would have to do, and a fragmentary tablet commemorating

---


350 Lendon 1997: 76. See also the celebration of the *concordia* between Concordia and Aquileia (*AE* 2001: 1007a).

351 *CIL* V 4443. This *IIIvir* belongs to the Poblilia tribe and is therefore Veronese.


353 For Brixia the evidence is a Tiberian period building inscription that refers to the town as a *colonia* (*CIL* V 4307 = *Inscr. It.* 10-5: 85 = *ILS* 114). Other inscriptions refer to Brixia as a *colonia augusta*: *Inscr. It.* 10-5: 817 (= *AE* 2001: 1067); *Inscr. It.* 10-5: 83. *CIL* V 4466 (=*Inscr. It.* 10-5: 255) from Brescia is the epitaph to a decurion of a *colonia*, which is almost certainly Brixia. Tacitus refers to Verona as a *colonia* (*Hist.* 3.8), and the third century inscription on the Porta Borsari in Verona names the town as a *Colonia Augusta Verona nova Gallieniana* (*CIL* V 3329 = *ILS* 544). The date at which Verona received the title of *colonia* is thus more problematic, especially with Catull. 17, which addresses the town “O Colonia.” On the date of Verona’s acquisition of the title see Sartori 1964 and Sartori 1960, who sees two phases of the colony, one in which the town received the honorary title of *colonia* sometime between the Augustan age and the AD 69 civil wars, and another in which it received a newer title from Gallienus as he was rebuilding its walls two centuries later. On the title and Catullus 17 see Cenerini 1989.

354 *CIL* V 3329 = *ILS* 544.


356 See chapter 2.
an unnamed patron of Bedriacum indicates that the competition for elite if not quite imperial patronage was still waged in smaller communities.\textsuperscript{357}

The ongoing competition between towns extended to their physical appearance. Embellishments such as amphitheaters and city gates added to a town’s prestige and were so much a source of pride that they became, like a large modern city’s skyline, part of the town’s identity; in Verona the theater was built with hill-side porticoes that gave spectators a panoramic view of the walled town.\textsuperscript{358} This competitive embellishment was not new, and in northern Italy this fad for urban public works dates back to at least the first century BC.\textsuperscript{359} What was new was the tendency towards associating these structures with an imperial name.\textsuperscript{360} The entablature of the AD 73 capitolium at Brixia presented a rare opportunity to publicize imperial benefaction, and Vespasian’s prominent title and name suited not only the emperor but also the town as a whole, which could point now to imperial favor.\textsuperscript{361} Likewise, statues of the imperial family set up in municipal fora, such as the Claudian family group set up in Verona, established a visual connection between the heart of a town and the imperial family, even when actual connections were few.\textsuperscript{362} These processes were of course not peculiar to Verona or northern Italy during the empire, and the setting up of imperial statues in fora and agoras across the empire was standard practice.\textsuperscript{363} Nevertheless these processes do show how standardization in urban identity—wherein towns competed to outdo each other in ways that were relatively uniform across the empire—existed alongside attempts at regional differentiation, such as the Patavian emphasis on severitas.

Within a town, competition for social prestige might be just as fierce as it was between towns. Unlike provincial cities, Italian towns could not claim to represent an entire region in the imperial cult and so could not win much prestige as a center of it.\textsuperscript{364} Yet for individuals within towns, service in the cult, whether in a municipal priesthood or in the sevirate, was a means of obtaining prestige.\textsuperscript{365} At Verona, a flamen of Rome and

\textsuperscript{357} Sartori in Pitcher 1996: 125-127. Bedriacum seems to have benefited, however, from its nearness to Cremona and that city’s concentration of well-connected elites. On Bedriacum as a subsidiary settlement of Cremona see Arslan 1996.

\textsuperscript{358} Zanker 1990: 329. Veronese elites who had contributed to the cost of the theater’s renovation had their names inscribed on the portico columns, which would associate these elites not just with the theater but also with the general appearance of the town (CIL V 3441). On the arena and theater in Verona see Tosi 1994, For a survey of structures across northern Italy see Chevallier 1983; for Brixia see Frova 1994 and Mirabella Roberti 1964.

\textsuperscript{359} Chevallier 1983.

\textsuperscript{360} On the relationship between the emperor and civic competition as expressed through monumental building, see Thomas 2007, who rightly stresses the role of the emperor and the Senate as the source of validation in competition for provincial preeminence.

\textsuperscript{361} The capitolium of Brixia has been the subject of excellent recent studies, collected in Rossi 2002.

\textsuperscript{362} Alföldy 1984. For their inscriptions see AE 1992, 00739a-c.

\textsuperscript{363} On the placement and proliferation of imperial statue bases see Hojte 2005 and Alföldy 1984, and on the impact of the Augustan period on that proliferation see Alföldy 1991. Perhaps just as important as visual reminders of the imperial position are the mile markers placed along important roads (Those from around Brixia, Mantua, Cremona, Verona, and Bedriacum are included in Basso 1986).

\textsuperscript{364} Gradel 2002: See also the reply of Fishwick 2005, 3.3: 211.

\textsuperscript{365} The exact distinctions between the seviri, Augustales, and seviri Augustales have been much contested, and it is not certain whether the difference is one of terminology or whether the titles describe different offices. Seviri were an older, six-man municipal organization that did not necessarily have religious obligations. The Augustales seem certainly to have been involved in the imperial cult, and it is possible
Augustus is described on an honorific base solely by his name, tribe, and his position as flamen; in this base his service as priest for the imperial cult has become a major part of his public identity. Augustales nearly always list that office first in their dedications and epitaphs, and the office was a primary way in which elites solidified their social connections with other cities. Hence a L. Cornelius Prosodicus was sevir Augustalis at both Brixia and Verona. Status as an Augustalis was often immediately followed by the name of the town where that office was held, which strengthened the association between citizen, town, and the imperial cult. The Augustales were an important part of the town, and the patron of Caere in southern Etruria sanctioned the construction of a new meeting place for the town’s Augustales in order to increase the dignitas municipii. The Augustales, then, increased their own status and through their actions that of their towns as well, even if not to the degree possible in the provinces. That a higher proportion of Augustales were ingeni, or freeborn citizens, in northern Italy as compared to peninsular Italy suggests that the same uncertainty about status that prompted northern Italians to emphasize their Italian legal status abroad and to advertise an idealized Italian morality also pushed the freeborn inhabitants of Verona, Brixia, and other northern Italian towns to join organizations that south of the Apennines might be considered too closely associated with freedmen.

Yet while emperors, living or dead, lent additional prestige to towns and their citizens, in nearly all of these cases the emperor and his administration extended little or no actual effort. Instead, individuals or towns took action on the local level and the emperor’s influence was largely indirect, as in Vespasian’s cultivation of an image of Italian municipal virtues. Yet that influence would have been unmistakable to anyone visiting Brixia, Verona, or even Bedriacum. The emperor’s family was visibly present in the statuary of a forum, while imperial names occurred on milestones leading to the town, as well as on the main gates of the town. Even the town’s inhabitants defined themselves in relation to the emperor, through an elite cursus honorum listing imperial service or association with the imperial cult.

that the seviri Augustales may either have been both seviri and Augustales or an indication that in these locations the Augustales were organized in the model of these older seviri. In northern Italy at least, the seviri and Augustales do not seem to be separate offices. Chronological and regional variation is probably to be expected. At Ostia, the Augustales had their own ordo (ILS 6141, 6164). Abramenko 1993 has seen a chronological development, with seviri occurring more frequently in the first century AD and gradually been superseded in terminology by the Augustales. The Augustales are traditionally seen as a position for freedmen, and the primary literary source is the depiction of Trimalchio in Petronius’s Satyricon. Nevertheless in northern Italy a large proportion, perhaps a third, was freeborn. On the insignia and iconography of the seviri and Augustales see Schäfer 1989, and for the Augustales and seviri in general see Fishwick 1987 and Duthoy 1976.

Abramenko 1993, Gregori 1990: 156ff and Mollo 1997 on the proportion of freeborn seviri in Brixia. For Verona and Brixia see Breuer 1996: 64ff. George 2005: 65, sees this discrepancy as “a peculiar feature of urban northern Italy” and the result of a population of a newly enfranchised classes that “shared the marginalization of successful freedmen.” On the tension between elites and elite freedmen in commemoration and office-holding, see Mouritsen 1997 and 2005.
Conclusions

Even the larger group identities of the inhabitants of the central Transpadana were directly related to political developments at Rome, first with the creation of the Transpadani in the aftermath of the Social War and then with the enthusiastic adoption of Italian identity by the Transpadani. The privileged status of Italy within the empire—and the attendant anxiety northern Italians had about their own possession of that status—depended on the continued benefits and preference given to Italy by the state.

Northern Italy’s intermediate place between Italy and the provinces—reinforced by similarities to surrounding provinces in landscape, language, religion, and customs—thus combined with the region’s official place within Italy and the Roman state to create new regional identities. The central Transpadana no longer had any exclusive collective identity in the Imperial period, even though the areas were very much part of the same social sphere, had similar histories, and were closely linked economically. While at the time of the Hannibalic war the inhabitants identified themselves as Cenomani, in the Imperial period they had become Italian; yet the way in which they defined themselves as Italian was not an organic process of cultural assimilation by Italy but rather a the result of aggressive appropriation and redefinition by these former Cenomani of what Italian identity meant. Consequently, when the two epitaphs quoted at the beginning of this chapter cite Mantua as the commemorated’s place of origin, they also convey not just a biographical fact but also claims about political privilege and cultural identity that were in turn shaped by the actions of the Roman state.
V

Liguria:
How Pollentian sheep got their colors
and how Pertinax became emperor

Introduction

The past two chapters have examined the impact of the Roman imperial system on Aquileia’s regional and supra-regional relationships and on conceptualizations of group identity in the central Transpadana. At Aquileia, these relationships manifested themselves in the diffusion of Aquileian people, objects, and practices to places in the empire where the Roman state had strong interests. In the central Transpadana, local elites, no longer identifying themselves as Cenomani, positioned themselves as Transpadani and as Italians and worked to define what those terms meant culturally and politically. At the same time, Aquileia, Verona, and Brixia were large, wealthy, and populous towns. Brixia’s territory was the largest in Italy, while Aquileia was at its height one of the most populous cities in the empire. What would the impact of the Roman imperial system be on the smaller towns of northern Italy? On the impact on the countryside? How did the state affect the regional relationships and group identities of such small communities?

This chapter seeks to answer these questions by examining the communities of Liguria from the end of Augustus’s Alpine campaigns to the end of the second century AD, a period that saw only limited state intervention in Liguria as well as for the rest of northern Italy. While in the Republican period, the Roman state in Liguria had moved populations around, built roads, and redistributed land, after Augustus in almost never intervened directly. During the triumviral and Augustan periods, there were campaigns against the Alpine tribes in three phases: in 34 BC against the Salassi, in 25 BC again against the Salassi, and in 17-14 BC against forty five tribes, whose defeat is commemorated on the monument known as Tropaeum Alpium. Although the primary phases of Roman campaigning in the Alps ended with Augustus, parts of the western Alps remained independent, ruled by the tellingly named M. Iulius Cottius, son of the Caesarian-era king Donnus, and his son also named M. Iulius Cottius until the death of

---

369 Population transfers by the Roman state in Liguria are recorded for 187 BC, when M. Aemilius Lepidus moved the Ligurian Freniates down from the hills to the Po plain (Livy 39.2); early in 179 BC, when 40,000 Apuani men and their families were moved to Samnium (Plin. *HN* 3.105, Livy 40.38); later that same year when Q. Fulvius Flaccus moved some unspecified Ligurians down from the mountains into the plains (Livy 40.53); and in 172 BC, when Statellati and other Ligurians unjustly sold in slavery by the consul M. Popilius had their freedom restored and were given land north of the Po (Livy 42.8-22). In 173 BC the Senate decided that land taken during the recent wars with the Ligurians and Gauls was to be distributed *ad viri tim*, with Roman citizens receiving ten iuga and Latin allies three (Livy 42.4); land was also taken away to found the colony of Luna in 177 BC (Livy 41.13).

370 34 BC campaign: Dio 49.34, 49.38; App. *Il. 17*. 25 BC campaign: Dio 53.25. 17-14 BC campagns: Dio 54.20-23; Vall. Pat. 2.95; Suet. *Aug*. 21 and *Tib*. 7; and Liv. *Per*. 138. The inscription of the Tropaenum Alpium is preserved partly on the physical monument (see *CIL* V 7817) and whole in Pliny *HN* 3.136-138. Cf. the Cottius inscription on the Susa arch (*CIL* V 7231 = *ILS* 94), which describes Cottius as *praefectus ceivitatum* [sic].
the latter in AD 63, at which point the kingdom was annexed by Nero. Thus Roman involvement in the Alpine regions to the west of Liguria was limited largely to the campaigns of the early Augustan period and the reorganization of the area under Nero, and this spate of state activity was the last significant period of direct involvement by the Roman government and army until the third century. Tiberius’s reaction to civic unrest at Pollentia was an exception, as was the sacking of Albintimilium during the AD 69 civil wars. The people of Pollentia had been holding the body of a centurion hostage in the marketplace until his heirs would agree to put on a free gladiatorial show. In response Tiberius sent one cohort from Rome and one from the Cottian Alps to Pollentia, where the soldiers were under orders to enter the town by opposite gates, sound their horns, display their weapons, and imprison most of the inhabitants and the decurions (“partem maiorem plebei ac decurionum in perpetua”). Whether the punishment meted out to the Pollentians was life imprisonment or slavery is uncertain; perpetua vincula as a penalty were generally reserved for slaves, but Pollentia may have been a special case, as Tiberius’s disproportionate use of force may indicate. What effect this imprisonment or enslavement had on the town of Pollentia is unclear. There is no evidence of disruption there, and the town’s economy shows strength throughout the Imperial period. The sacking of Albintimilium by Otho’s troops in the civil wars of AD 69 was accompanied by atrocities against the population by soldiers angered by unexpected local resistance, but like Pollentia the town shows little sign of disruption. Neither event was on par with the Republican upheavals, when entire populations were moved off their lands. First and second century Liguria at first glance seems to have been a remarkably uneventful place, and this contrast between a tumultuous Republican history and a more sedate Imperial one is typical of northern Italy. While Liguria’s history of interaction with the state is characteristic of continental Italy, the region did not contain any towns as big or as important as Mediolanum, Aquileia, Bononia, Verona, or Brixia.

372 On the incorporation of the Alps and the Cottian dynasty see Walser 1994 and Pauli 1984, as well as the relevant prosopography on the Cottians and Alpine elites in Schäfer 2000. The archaeological context of the Roman annexation is provided by Christie 1991. King Donnus’s road building projects are noted by Amm. Marc. 15.10.
373 The sole source on this incident at Pollentia is Suet. Tib. 37.3. On the sacking of Albintimilium see Tac. Hist. 2.13.
374 Suet. Tib. 37.3. See Millar 1984, quoting regulations—Dig. 48.19.35, CJ 9.47.6—forbidding the keeping of free persons in perpetua vincula.
375 Tac. Hist. 2.13 records atrocities at Agr. 7 Tacitus records the murder of Agricola’s mother, killed on her estate near the town. On Albintimilium’s urban history and urban continuity see Durante and De Apollonia 1988.
376 Of the 15 “very important” Cisalpine towns listed by De Ligt 2008—who ranks towns by their size in hectares, with “very important” towns those over 40 hectares and “important” towns those with town areas between 20 and 40 hectares—only one, Hasta, lies within regio IX, although Augusta Taurinorum lies right on the border with Liguria. While the area of Hasta was large, its epigraphic output (<100 published inscriptions) is more comparable to that of smaller towns like Mantua in Venetia or Fidentia in Aemilia than to those of other “very important” towns like Ariminum (>500), Verona (>1100), Aquileia (>5000), or Mediolanum (>900). Of important towns Liguria is much more represented with 10 out of 31 Cisalpine towns. This implies a less pronounced hierarchy of towns, with 10 of Liguria’s 18 municipia falling within the same 20 to 40 hectare range. The epigraphic output of the towns is in keeping with these less pronounced distinctions between municipia, with the most productive town, Dertona, with a corpus of...
Accordingly Liguria provides a useful test case to examine the impact of the Imperial era Roman state on northern Italy away from these larger regional centers, whose influence and wealth of evidence dominates discussion of their regions, while still examining an area whose history and administration are not atypical of the larger region. Towards this purpose this chapter looks at the impact of the state first on the definition of Liguria, then on the movement of goods, and then finally on the movement of people.

The geographical and historical setting

It is important to remember that Imperial Liguria was not the same as its Republican era counterpart. Imperial Liguria was the Augustan regio IX, possessing defined geographical limits and encompassing the hilly coast of northwestern Italy. In the Republican period, by “Liguria” the Romans meant any lands inhabited by the peoples the Romans called the Ligures—a much broader and more nebulous definition.\(^{377}\) Polybius, in the context of a treaty between the Macedonian king Philip and Carthaginian general Hannibal lists Liguria as separate from Italy and Gaul, although the boundaries of Liguria are unclear. Both Cato and Diodorus define Liguria largely as an ethnic construction, as the land of the Ligurians, who in Cato’s version are illiterate, meretricious, and untrustworthy. In Diodorus’s description the Ligurians are marked by slender and wiry frames—which he contrasts with the larger frames of the Celts—extremely tough living, and an adventurous if primitive approach to sailing, which is implicitly contrasted with the Etruscans in their following ethnography.\(^{378}\) Diodorus’s conception of Liguria is defined more by these generalized ethnic attributes than by geographical considerations. In the Republican era territories inhabited by the people the Romans called the Ligurians stretched westward to the territories of Massilia and Olbia in southern France and in Italy southeast to the territory of the Apuani south of the Macra River.\(^{379}\) At the same time who the Romans considered a Ligurian and who fell into around 270 inscriptions and the Forum Iulii Iriensium at the bottom of the scale with 12. Bekker-Nielsen 1989 ranks Liguria’s urban density (with average intercity distance of 26 km in the first century AD) between Etruria (20.6km) and Lucania and Bruttium (35); in comparison the distance is Latium and Campania, the most densely urbanized areas, is 11km while in Aquitania the average distance is 90.4km. This makes Liguria’s towns more compactly placed than Transpadana (35.6) and Venetia (35.7) but less than the Aemilia (17.3). So while Liguria’s towns were relatively compactly placed for northern Italy—but not for central Italy—these towns also had smaller territories and were roughly within the same range of population and urban areas.

\(^{377}\) Polyb. 7.9.6-7. In the second book of his Origines, Cato talks about Liguria and the Ligurians, whom he described as illiterate liars (Serv. Aen. 11.715 = Peter 31 = Chassignet 2.1; 32 Serv. Aen. XI 700 = Peter 32 = Chassignet 2.2; cf. Dubuisson 1990 on Cato’s portrayal of the Ligurians as meretricious and untrustworthy). In none of the surviving fragments of the Origines is there any mention of Liguria as a separate geographical entity, although one quoted fragment refers to a Gallia, so it is possible that Liguria was also discussed as a geographical concept (Peter 34 = Chassignet 2.4). Diodorus’ ethnography on the Ligurians describes their land as stony, wooded, wretched, and uncultivated but does not provide boundaries or any geographical markers (Diod. Sic. 5.39).

\(^{378}\) Cf. Diod. Sic. 5.28 on the tall and muscular Celts. Vergil’s Georgics also refers to hard-living Ligurians (2.138-9), and Verg. Aen. 11.699-720 showcases Ligurian trickery.

\(^{379}\) The Salluvii—or Salyes—are reported ravaging territory near Massilia (Livy Per. 60.2 and Obseq. 30). Just to their east were the Oxybii (Polyb. 33.7-10). See Strabo 4.1.9 on the Ligurian tribes living to the east of Massilia and to the west of the Varus river (near modern Nice).
neighboring categories was not always clear, since Ligurian ethnic identity was complicated by adoption of typically Celtic practices and material culture.\textsuperscript{380} In this context of confused ethnic categories the same author might call the Saluvii both Celtic and Ligurian, or, to hedge his bets, Celtoligurian.\textsuperscript{381} Movements of Ligurian peoples also meant that the conceptual boundaries of “Liguria” were fluid. In the 170s BC the Romans moved many of the Ligurian Apuani to Samnium and distributed their territory both \textit{viritim} to Roman and Italian settlers and also to the new colonists at Luna, and in doing so the Romans essentially confined northern Italy’s Ligurian tribes to the area northwest of the Macra.\textsuperscript{382} The Roman use of Macra as a boundary is not surprising given Roman tendencies to use rivers as borders.\textsuperscript{383} In this context Augustus was behaving in a traditional manner when, while defining the \textit{regiones} of Italy, he set the boundaries of Liguria to be coterminous with those of Italy, its western border now at the Varus River in the Maritime Alps, its southern border at the Macra River, and its northern border at the Po.\textsuperscript{384} Yet while the division of the Augustan \textit{regio} by rivers was traditional the demarcation of the new \textit{regio} nevertheless signalled a break with previous conceptions of Liguria, in that it set clear, purely geographical boundaries for the area.\textsuperscript{385} It excluded settlements formerly considered part of Liguria in that they were located in areas inhabited by Ligurians: thus Luna became part of Etruria, \textit{regio} VII, while Veleia went to \textit{regio} VIII, Aemilia.\textsuperscript{386} At the same time Industria and Vardacate, in the southern Piedmont, were made part of this new Augustan Liguria, but Novaria, which according to Cato had been a settlement of the Ligurians was included in \textit{regio} XI, Italia.

\textsuperscript{380} On the Ligurians and their adoption of Celtic goods and practices, see Malnati 2004; on Greek and Roman descriptions of the Ligurians see Gaggero 2004, Williams 2001a: 79-81, and Dubuisson 1990.

\textsuperscript{381} Livy \textit{Per.} 60.2. says that in 125 BC “Marcus Fulvius Flaccus, sent to aid Massilia against the Gallic Saluvii, who lived near the borders of Massilia, was the first to subdue Ligurians living beyond the Alps” (M. Fulvius Flaccus primus transalpinos Liguras domuit bello, missus in auxilium Massiliensium adversus Salluvios Gallos, qui fines Massiliensium populabantur). Liguria’s somewhat nebulous boundaries in the Republican period are certainly to blame for some of the difficulty in reconstructing their place in the enfranchisement measures following the Social war.


\textsuperscript{383} See chapter one on conceptions of Cispadane vs. Transpadane Italy (defined by the Po) and Italy vs. Cisalpine Gaul (defined by the Rubicon).

\textsuperscript{384} Plin. \textit{HN} 3.48 lists the Macra River, emptying into the Mediterranean near Luna, as the southern boundary of Liguria, and at \textit{HN} 3.49 Pliny describes the Ligurian coast as that between the Macra and Varus rivers. The northern border of Liguria seems, judging from Pliny’s description of \textit{regio} XI (\textit{NH} 3.123), to have been the Po river. On the topography and borders of imperial Liguria see Mennella and Zanda 2004 and the still fundamental study of Lamboglia 1939. See also Pavin 1992: 25-27 on problems with determining the northwestern borders of the \textit{regio}. On the use of ethnic markers for the Augustan \textit{regiones} except for Transpadana and Aemilia, see Laurence 1998 and Nicolet 1988. On reasons for the exceptionality of Transpadana and Aemilia in this regard, see chapter four.

\textsuperscript{385} The boundaries of individual communities, as opposed to the region as a whole, were better defined, primarily through disputes with neighboring communities, as in \textit{CIL} P 584 (\textit{=ILLRP} 517), the inscribed outcome of the 117 BC arbitration of a land dispute between Genua and the Viturii Langenses. The inscription also notes that the border was to be physically marked, presumably with \textit{cippi}.

Transpadana. This new conceptualization of Liguria as a definite geographical entity not bound exclusively by ethnic makeup did not immediately replace the older one—Strabo still refers to Ligurians living in territory in Gaul abutting Italy—but would eventually, and by the later first and second centuries AD the geographic definition clearly predominates.

Tacitus’s use of the term seems to coincide better with the conception of Liguria as a definite geographical entity, and he describes an exemplary inhabitant of Albitimilium as a \textit{femina Ligus}, a Ligurian woman and calls Albitimilium part of Liguria. More importantly \textit{Hist.} 2.14, where Tacitus mentions a cohort stationed in Gallia Narbonensis but filled with Ligurian and Pannonian recruits. Similarly in the Imperial period there are the the epitaph of a \textit{stationarius} and praetorian \textit{domo Liguriae} and the commemoration at Sala in Mauretania of a man \textit{ex Liguria}; and Liguria is used to describe administrative districts assigned to the late second century \textit{iuridici}. The change from one definition to another underlines the impact of what was ostensibly an administrative reform by the Roman state on group identity as well as the importance of the the incorporation of Cisalpine Gaul into northern Italy.

Within Liguria’s smaller and more strictly defined Imperial incarnation, the region’s eighteen \textit{municipia} were mostly located along with the coast or southern bank of the Po and its tributary the Tanarus. Along the coast were, from west to east, the
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387 But note the dispute between Pliny the Elder and Cato on the origins of the town (Plin. \textit{HN} 3.134 = Cato \textit{Orig.} Peter 40), with Cato attributing Novaria to the Ligurians and Pliny to the Celtic Vertamacori.

388 Strabo 4.1.9. N.b. the definition of the region in Late Antiquity is different, thanks to the Diocletianic reorganization of Italy at the end of the third century AD; cf. Claudian’s AD 404 \textit{Panegyric on the sixth consulship of Honorius}, where the Ticinus, formerly in \textit{regio} XI, is listed among the rivers of Venetia and Liguria (28).


390 Tac. \textit{Agr.} 7.


ports of Albintimilium, Albingaunum, Vada Sabatia, and Genua. Linking the coast across the coastal mountains to the interior were the via Iulia Augusta and the via Postumia, the latter leading east to Placentia and then Aquileia. Both roads connected at Dertona, a Republican period colony and one of the Liguria’s largest and most important settlements. Dertona was also connected by the Scrivia to the Tanarus and Po rivers, along which were located the towns of Forum Iulii Iriensium, Forum Fulvii-Valentia, Hasta, Alba Pompeia, Augusta Bagiennorum, Vardacate, and Industria.

The rivers and the roads following them connected these towns in the interior to the two major passes going west over the Alps at Segusio (the Col de Montgenèvre) and at Augusta Praetoria (the Great St. Bernard Pass). To the west was one of the newest provinces, the Alpes Maritimae, organized by Augustus after his campaigns against the Alpine tribes, and one of the oldest, Gallia Narbonensis. The Narbonese coast was accessible by sea from the Ligurian ports and by the coastal road running through those ports. To the south, connected through Genua by the via Aurelia and the sea were the Etrurian coast, Latium, and Rome. The Po and its tributaries connected the interior of Liguria to the rest of the Po valley, as did the via Aemilia and via Postumia, joining at Placentia, the hub of the road network in northwestern Italy. Although the Ligurian interior was naturally part of the Po valley and its system of rivers while the coast—separated by the Apennines and Maritime Alps—belonged to the Mediterranean, roads over the coastal hills connected these otherwise separate watersheds. The two major towns of Genua and Dertona, for example, were about 60 km away by a relatively easy road. This combination of roads, rivers, and coastline connected Liguria to its neighbors and to much larger economic networks. The inhabitants thus had a certain amount of choice regarding whom they traded with and where they traveled. Natural boundaries such as the Alps and Apennines were a hindrance but not an insurmountable one, and the high coast of transport by land was somewhat negated by access to the ports and to a large river system that was navigable even as far west as Augusta Taurinorum.

**Wool for oil**

That connectivity also meant that the towns in the region were able to react to larger, empire-wide commercial patterns. At Genua, this meant a greater volume of trade with first Baetica and then Africa, as under the empire commercial oil production in the latter began to compete seriously with that along the Guadalquivir in Baetica and as exports from both found their way to markets across the empire. About 14% of the
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393 On the problems of Dertona’s dating see Gabba 1984c and Zanda 2004.

394 On the topology of Liguria, see the still standard Lamboglia 1939. For an overview of the Ligurian landscape in the context of human manipulation of that landscape through the Iron Age, see Maggi 2004.

395 The arbitration recorded in CIL I² 584 (=ILLRP 517) names the via Postumia as a boundary.


total amphorae from first century BC Genua are Baetican and nearly none are African; by the third century AD, African amphorae account for 87% of total amphorae and Baetica represents about 9%. Inland at Alba Pompeia, a greater proportion of amphorae came from Aemilia, Istria, and the Aegean, a sign that transport by the Tanarus and Po was easier and more profitable than that over land. At the same time, amphorae from Baetica and Terraconensis make up about 16% of the total from the first and second centuries; these probably came through Vada-Sabatia or Genua. So while Alba Pompeia was more naturally connected to a commercial system of the Po’s waterways, there was both enough demand in the town for goods from Baetica and Terraconensis and sufficient access to those goods. Connection to several long-distance trade systems gave the people at Alba Pompeia a choice of kinds of olive oil, while the apparent demand for specific varieties of olive oil suggests that at least some of the population was aware of the differences between them. Pliny the Elder, ranking the olive oil varieties that were held to be the best, says that after the oil from Venafrum (in Campania), Baetican and Istrian oils were in equal competition for second place.

That competition had a number of prerequisites besides basic access to these long-distance trading systems. The first was the development of oleoculture industries in Baetica and Istria, which in turn depended on a large-scale demand for oil at Rome and in the legionary camps. The consumption of large amounts of oil by the legions and the huge urban area at Rome encouraged the increased production in Baetica in the Augustan period, while Istrian olive oil found a ready market in the legionary camps along the Danube border. Secure transportation routes were also necessary for such long-

exports, especially vis à vis the exports of other areas, comes from the amphora dump at Monte Testaccio, for which the evidence primarily postdates the mid second century (On Monte Testaccio see Blázquez 1992 as well as Peña 2007 on the technical details of the deposits at Monte Testaccio), but this is supplemented by an increase and growth in villa sites along the Guadalquivir (see also Domergue 1998 for a corresponding growth in mining).

Milanese 1993: 361ff. The data are drawn from the site of S. Silvestro, around the walls of the pre-Roman oppidum. For an introduction to Alba Pompeia and its territory, see Bersani 1999b. Bruno 1997. The urban excavations at Alba where these amphorae were recovered cover a smaller chronological span—the Augustan age to the early third century—than those excavations around S. Silvestro in Genua. On trade between Genua and the western Po Valley, Humphries 2000 disagrees with Garney 1976’s contention that trade between Genua and the Po Valley was an ordinary occurrence, saying that Strabo’s description of Genua as the emporion of Liguria (Strabo 5.1.3) does not necessarily indicate trade between regio IX’s coastal and inland towns, as Strabo’s conception of Liguria does not conform to the boundaries of regio IX (Humphries 1999: 23 n. 3). While it is clear that Strabo’s conception of Liguria was not coextensive with regio IX (note Strabo 4.1.9 cited above on Ligurians living in Gallia Narbonensis. Humphries point to Strabo 5.1.11 and 5.2.1, in which Strabo describes inland towns not in his discussion of Liguria but in that of the Po Valley), Strabo also emphasizes the role of the roads in connecting inland towns like Dertona to Genua (Strabo 5.1.11), and the roads must have played a role in the transport of Spanish goods overland, especially since a 60km distance by good road between Dertona and Genua was certainly not prohibitively expensive for transport.

Alcock 1993: 220ff aptly notes the variety of provincial responses to the supply demands of the legions and of Rome.

The role of the state in the transfer of Baetican oil—and olive oil in general—to Rome and the legions is a source of some dispute, especially over whether the oil was supplied by a free market and then purchased at the legionary bases or at Rome, was provided by civilian merchants but controlled to some degree by the
distance trade. In the pre-Roman period the Ligurians were notorious pirates, and the dangers associated with passing along their coast certainly did not encourage trade. Campaigns against the pirates in the late Republic, combined with the establishment of permanent fleets at Ravenna and Misenum, made the transfer of cargo by sea safer. So by the Imperial period, relatively secure—occasional banditry and storms remained an issue—routes by sea and land enabled merchants to send large quantities of olive oil from Baetica to Genua and then over the Apennines to Alba Pompeia or from the Istri an peninsula to Aquileia and then up the Po to Alba Pompeia. The choice of oil that the people of Alba Pompeia bought at their weekly markets or in the shops was thus fundamentally determined by larger, empire-wide forces.

The choice of goods available in Alba Pompeia was also relevant to the economic life of the countryside. Moderately sized municipia, had smaller, rural communities and villas that were dependent on them; at Alba Pompeia these communities included small rural settlements—consisting of a few buildings, some farmland, and a small necropolis—vineyard complexes, farmsteads, villas, and the extraurban settlements clustered around the town itself. A system of local and regional roads connected these communities to the town and to other nearby urban centers: Vada Sabatia, Albingaunum, Augusta Bagiennorum, and Pollentia. A town’s market would serve this larger community, which relied on it not just for goods but also for religious and social events, since at particular times in the year these markets were accompanied by parades and religious celebrations. A town’s market was important enough that rival markets on villas and large estates would not be easily tolerated, and in Venetia the Vicetians fought...
one senator’s proposal to hold a market on his estate. In both a sign of respect for the
magistrates and an acknowledgement that new markets might seriously threaten existing
ones, the emperor Claudius even asked the consuls’ permission to hold markets on his
estates. Markets in other towns, however, were another matter, and towns might
stagger their market days so that sellers and buyers could attend multiple markets.
This suggests that one town’s market could serve a broad community not coterminous
with the town’s borders. Olive oil sold at the market in Alba Pompeia was thus available
not just to the residents of the urban center but also to the territory’s smaller communities
and to neighboring towns and their territories.

For the inhabitants of the tiny rural settlements in Alba Pompeia’s territory,
whether their olive oil came from Baetica or from Istria might be of little significance
beyond matters of price or perceived quality. But what the people in Liguria’s
countryside produced and sold was vital to their livelihood was very much influenced by
the same sort of empire-wide trade patterns that connected Istria and Baetica to Liguria.

For example, the people in the countryside of Pollentia, the municipium just 11km
to southwest of Alba Pompeia, produced wool for export. Even than was the case with
olive oil, the reputation of a town or area’s wool was important to the viability of an
export industry. For elites in Rome and across the empire, wearing textiles of specific
colors and specific qualities was part of the process of maintaining and claiming a
specific status. The early Imperial period saw an explosion of new textiles and hues
for clothing. Apulian wool had a very good reputation and was exported across the
empire and sold for high prices because of it. In an attempt to capitalize on the fame of
cloaks from northern Gaul, textile producers in Asia Minor began making their own
knock-offs of Gaul’s celebrated Nervian cloaks. Colors were important. The whitest
wool took dye the best, while reds, grays, and blacks were valued for their particular
hues, and producers went to great lengths to make those colors. Columella’s uncle
crossbred Spanish and Mauretanian sheep and then the hybrid offspring of those sheep
with highly valued, imported Apulian sheep to produce a strain of sheep whose wool
combined Apulian fineness with the exotic colors of the Spanish-Mauretanian hybrids.
The origin and colors of wool helped determine wool prices; in Diocletian’s edict on
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408 Plin. Epist. 5.4. See CIL VIII 11,451 + 23,346 for a more successful petition to hold a market on a
private estate.
410 CIL IV 5380 (schedule of market days in Pompeii and neighboring towns). On the role of staggered
market days in central Italy and Campania, see Morley 1996: 166ff.
411 By the first century AD olive oil and oleoculture were already established parts of Ligurian economies,
and there was, in addition to these imports, some domestic production (see Gervasini 2004 on oleoculture
at a villa at Varignano Vecchio near La Spezia). The volume of imports, however, suggests a larger
increase in the use of oil and possibly some change in social habits (cf. Woolf 1989: 169ff on the
relationship between changes in consumption patterns and larger cultural changes in terms of
“Romanization.”).
412 On distances between Alba Pompeia and neighbors see Felippi 1997: 41.
413 Horden and Purcell 200: 352-359.
415 On Apulian wool: Mart. Ep. 14.155; Pliny HN 8.190-193; Columella Rust. 7.2-4. A hooded cloak from
Canusium in Apulia is valued at 4,000 denarii in the Edict on Prices (BE 9.4). Cf. Ermatinger 1996 on
Diocletian’s on the historical context of the edict.
417 Columella Rust. 7.4-5.
prices, the maximum price for dark wool from Mutina is set at 200 *denarii* a pound while Mutinan wool with a golden sheen could sell for 100 *denarii* more, and wool from Altinum was worth twice that from Asturia.\(^{418}\) The early fourth century edict of Diocletian is of course much later than the first century AD material on the Ligurian wool industry Columella, Martial, and Pliny the Elder provided, and a constant market in wool prices and industries is unlikely given the vicissitudes of other, better attested industries.\(^{419}\) Nevertheless while prices and tastes may have changed, throughout the Roman period the importance of a reputation in the wool trade was constant. Patavium, for example, was noted for its triple weaved cloths, so thick that Martial joked that you needed a saw to cut through them.\(^{420}\) Towns in the Po valley, especially Altinum and Parma, were famous for their white wool, and producers at Pollentia in Liguria went one step further and produced wools in whites, grays, and blacks.\(^{421}\) These Pollentians thus took advantage of the already good reputation of the Po valley’s wools and differentiated themselves from those other towns by producing a variety of colors. Obtaining the right colors and qualities of wool took time, money, and knowledge. A producer had to know where to get particular breeds of sheep and have the wherewithal to do so, and if a type of wool was to secure a good reputation, both color and quality had to be maintained in crossbred flocks over successive generations. Uniformity also needed to be kept up in the cleaning, spinning, and weaving of that wool, a uniformity that points to workshop rather than domestic production.\(^{422}\) So in order to maintain these standards of production fullers, combers, spinners, and weavers would have to be located nearby, and at least in the larger towns in the Po valley these professions had their own *collegia*.\(^{423}\) A good deal of infrastructure was thus required for the kind of textile specialization found at Pollentia. That these Pollentians went to such lengths to produce this wool cloth shows that they were aware of the reputation of their textiles in the empire and of the connection of that reputation to the value of their wares and to their own livelihood.

Pollentia’s specialization in woolen textiles was made possible by the landscape of the Timavus river valley, which lent itself to pastoralism.\(^{424}\) At the same time, Pollentia’s export-focused textile industry needed suitable and lucrative markets. The city of Rome, which had grown to tremendous size in the late Republic, was reasonably close and could be reached relatively easily by water or road; the city was almost

\(^{418}\) For a survey of wool prices in the edict see Reynolds 1981.

\(^{419}\) Italian agriculture as a whole went through a number of imperial changes, most notably a decline in the number of villa sites, that while not necessarily evidence of overall decline does suggest a combination of changing attitudes towards villa agriculture and new economic patterns. Cf Marzano 2007 and Patterson 2006.


\(^{421}\) Pliny *HN* 8.73; Mart. *Ep.* 14.155, 157; Columella *Rust.* 7.2-4; Strabo 5.1.12.

\(^{422}\) On evidence for workshop production vs. domestic production see Moeller 1976: 5-6.

\(^{423}\) At Brixia (CIL V 4501 = *Inscr. It.* 10-5: 294) and Regium Lepidum (AE 1946: 210) were associations of *lanarii pectinarii* (wool-combers). At Brixellum (CIL XI 1031), Regium Lepidum (AE 1946: 210), and Brixia (*Inscr. It.* 10-5: 875) were *lanarii carminatores* (wool-carders). To Brixia should be added Verona, which Mart. *Ep.* 14.152 says produced blankets, if Martial’s “terra Catulli” is rightly interpreted at denoting Verona and its hinterland.

\(^{424}\) A large, irregularly shaped territory that extended up the Varatia and abutted the territory of Augusta Taurinorum, whose wealthy senatorial families developed ties with Pollentia (Mennella-Bernardini 2002: 145), meant that Pollentia’s administrative borders took maximum advantage of that landscape.
certainly one of the Pollentian wool industry’s main consumers. Strabo indicates that Ligurian wools were well established commodities in Rome and Italy; he says that most of Italian households were clothed by Ligurian coarse wools.\footnote{Strabo 5.1.12.} Export outside of Italy almost certain; the Palmyrene customs tariff of AD 137 has a clause on Italian wool, and the appearance of Mutinan and Altinan wool on the edict on prices strongly suggests trade of these wools across the empire.\footnote{CIS II.3 3913.} Whether the Rhine and Danube frontiers were important markets for Pollentian wool is unclear, although woolen fragments from Mons Claudianus in Egypt suggest that long-distance transport of woolen goods was not uncommon.\footnote{While most of the fabric at the quarry settlement at Mons Claudianus seem to be produced in the nearby Nile Valley, surviving woolen fragments of the Odry and Virring types, mainly found in modern Denmark and in northeastern Germany in areas outside of Roman control, are also attested along the English-Scottish border and along the Danube frontier. The presence of this Danish/German wool in Egypt probably stems from the site’s military context, and the wool clothing there suggests either the transfer of soldiers who owned it or the transfer of military supplies (Bender Jørgensen 1991 and 2000; cf. Bender Jørgensen and Manning 2001). The implications of this for Liguria and Pollentia’s industry in particular are that if these Ligurian producers supplied, either directly or indirectly, the Roman legions, for which unfortunately there is no clear evidence, then the Roman state via the military was directly involved in dispersing Ligurian goods around the empire.} High quality wool of particular colors would not lend itself to supplies for the Roman army, although the civilian settlements that accompanied the army would have been a much more welcoming market, accessible through Aquileia’s merchants and trade connections along the Danube. The incentives for the development of the highly specialized Pollentian wool industry—and the concurrent development of textile production and trade—were as much cultural and historical as geographic. Large markets and a large elite class who claimed rank similarly through clothes—worn by their slaves as well as themselves—were necessary preconditions, as was the typically Imperial habit of “brand-naming” textiles by town of origin.\footnote{See Mart. Ep. 14.157 on the appropriateness of Pollentian textiles for a particular rank of slaves. On the “brand-naming” of textiles see Horden and Purcell 2000: 354ff.} As with the trade in olive oil, the security provided by the Roman state made long-distance trade in textiles feasible. The development of the wool industry at Pollentia, moreover, was not in response to the demands of the state. Liguria did not have to pay taxes in kind, and as taxes paid in coin were very minor, flock-owners did not need to increase their wool production to pay taxes. State involvement was instead indirect, in the maintenance of trade route security, suppression of banditry, the formation of large markets along the limes and in Rome, and the creation of a large and culturally unified elite, who emulated the clothing of the emperor and his household. At Pollentia, these larger issues almost dictated the town’s economy and its identity.

Far from being isolated Ligurian towns, Alba Pompeia and Pollentia show that even moderately sized towns in a relatively ignored corner of Imperial Italy were nevertheless part of a larger, state-influenced economic system, which in turn affected what olive oil rural inhabitants used in their homes, what kind of animals they bred, and what kind of workshops could be found in town. These larger, empire-wide trends did affect daily life in Liguria, not just in the urban centers but in the countryside as well.
State recruitment of soldiers and elites

Also affecting the countryside were the twin processes of recruitment into the legions and into the equestrian service. As for the legions, Liguria was, along with the rest of northern Italy, still a favored recruiting ground for the army in the early Imperial period. Ligurians served as soldiers at Rome and along the Rhine and Danube borders. Small towns and large furnished soldiers; one man from the small municipium of Vardacate served in the Praetorian Guard at Rome, while soldiers and veterans from the large colony at Dertona could be found in Germany, Pannonia, Moesia, Dalmatia, and in Rome. The army was almost certainly the largest mover of people in northern Italy, and it redistributed its Ligurian recruits along the limes. Many died there, and some, like a veteran from Dertona at Poetovio, settled there. Recruits could expect years of service—one veteran of the IX Gemina commemorated at Brixia served 32 years—along the provincial limes, during which time they were transferred from their local communities in Liguria into army society in the camps and military communities along the Rhine and Danube. Military society, however, was not completely separate from Ligurian society. In their new units Ligurians served alongside men from their own communities and from neighboring towns. In the legio XIV Gemina, when it was stationed at Mogontiacum (modern Mainz), were men from a broad swath of Liguria and northern Italy: Aquae Statiellae, Hasta, Pollentia, Augusta Taurinorum, Mediolanum, Vercellae, Eporedia, Verona, Brixia, Cremona, Patavium, and Ateste; if the inscriptions set up by the unit are even partially representative of the unit’s composition, it recruited nearly two thirds of its men from northern Italy, in particular from Liguria and Transpadane Italy. The remaining men appear to be mostly from southern Gaul; men from Tolosa (Toulouse) and Vienna (Vienne) are attested. Sometimes relatives served together, as is commemorated in one epitaph from the same legion at Mogontiacum reads:

Cn(aeus) Musius, son of Titus, belonging to the voting tribe Galeria, from Veleia, 32 years old, having served 15 years, an eagle-bearer of the legio XIII Gemina. His brother M(arcus) Musius, (centurion) set (this monument) up.

\[\text{\footnotesize \cite{429} Vardacate: \textit{CIL} XIV 223 (Ostia). On Vardacate see Mennella and Zanda 1996. Dertona: \textit{AE} 1995: 1168 (Mogontiacum), \textit{CIL} XIII 6960 (Mogontiacum), \textit{CIL} XIII 5206 (Vindonissa), \textit{CIL} III 4057 (Poetovio), \textit{CIL} III 14214 (Tropaeum Traiani), \textit{CIL} XIII 14698.1 (Salona), \textit{CIL} XIII 2915 (Iader), \textit{CIL} VI 2466 (Rome), \textit{CIL} VI 2970 (Rome), \textit{CIL} VI 2377 (Rome), \textit{CIL} VI 2379 (Rome), \textit{CIL} VI 2466 (Rome), \textit{CIL} VI 1636 (Rome). \textit{CIL} III 4057.} \]

\[\text{\footnotesize \cite{430} \textit{Inscr. It.} 10-5: 171.} \]

\[\text{\footnotesize \cite{431} \textit{CIL} XIII 6900 (Augusta Taurinorum), \textit{CIL} XIII 6890 (Hasta), \textit{CIL} XIII 6902 (Aquae Statiellae), \textit{CIL} XIII 6903 (Aquae Statiellae), \textit{CIL} XIII 6889 (Vercellae), \textit{CIL} XIII 6886 (Cremona), \textit{CIL} XIII 6898 (Pollentia), \textit{CIL} XIII 6910 (Verona), \textit{CIL} XIII 6905 (Verona), \textit{CIL} XIII 6907 (Brixia), \textit{CSIR} 2.5 55 (Mediolanum), \textit{CIL} XIII 7255 (Mutina), \textit{CSIR} 2.5 131 (Patavium), and \textit{AE} 1940: 113 (Ateste).} \]

\[\text{\footnotesize \cite{432} \textit{CIL} XIII 6909 (Vienna), \textit{CIL} XIII 6094 (Tolosa).} \]

\[\text{\footnotesize \cite{433} Cn(aeus) Musius T(iti) f(ilius) | Gal(eria) Veleias an(norum) | XXXII stip(endiorum) XV | aquilif(er) leg(ionis) XIII Gem(inae) | M(arcus) Musius (centurio) frater posuit.} \]
Also in the army at Mogontiacum were at least three men from the gens at Aquae Stiatiellae, two of whom were brothers.\textsuperscript{435} At Mogontiacum we see a military society that was a condensation of local societies in northern Italy, with men from neighboring towns and even the same families serving in units that were representative not of the Roman empire as a whole but of a particular section of it. This meant that men served together with men who spoke similar dialects, had eaten similar diets (before enlistment), and who often shared familial ties.\textsuperscript{436} At the same time their comrades often lived outside the natural social spheres of a town. Men from Aquae Stiatiellae, a small spa town above Genua, served alongside men from Ateste; in northern Italy these towns did not have particularly strong social or economic connections, but in Germany the Roman army created such connections, in the process making an artificially enlarged northern Italian society along the Rhine. That the merchants who frequented these military communities were often Aquileian—in addition to the Aquileians serving in the legions—only adds to this hybrid version of northern Italy created by the Roman army.

Those Ligurians soldiers that survived to retirement often returned to their hometowns, as the seven attested veterans at Hasta in the Tanarus valley did.\textsuperscript{437} One of these, a certain Pullaenus, returned after having served as \textit{primus pilus} centurion, with its attendant salary of 60,000 sesterces.\textsuperscript{438} His service in the army had elevated him to a higher social rank and economic status; in this case social mobility accompanied geographic mobility. At Aquileia, two former centurions, L. Arrius Macer and T. Cassius Firmus, reached the positions of \textit{decurio} and \textit{quattuorvir} respectively.\textsuperscript{439} Some of the veterans of the \textit{XIV Gemina} at Mogontiacum who returned home also appear to have obtained new wealth and status. One such veteran at Mediolanum was wealthy enough to buy a large burial area, while another at Placentia became \textit{duovir}.\textsuperscript{440} Veterans who survived their service and returned home generally found themselves in a higher social position than when they left and joined the ranks of local elites. This social mobility in turn might trigger other effects; new elites with money to buy land might supplant or buy out other elites, and the families of these new elites, even if they themselves had not served in the army, would benefit from their relative’s new wealth, particularly since the early Imperial army tended to recruit from those lower down on the economic ladder.\textsuperscript{441} These veterans also returned home shaped by the unique military culture of the legions, which further complicated their integration into their former society.\textsuperscript{442} The effects of army recruitment on local society in Liguria thus continued even after individual terms of service were over.

\textsuperscript{435} \textit{CIL} XIII 6902 and 6903.

\textsuperscript{436} On the peculiarities of Latin in northern Italy see Adams 2008 \textit{passim}.


\textsuperscript{438} \textit{AE} 1985: 412; Alföldy 1984: 124.


\textsuperscript{440} \textit{CIL} V 5825 (Mediolanum) and \textit{CIL} XI 1221 (Placentia). A veteran of an unspecified legion at Forum Ubii Caburrum in Liguria had a similarly large burial plot (\textit{CIL} V 7341).

\textsuperscript{441} Tac. \textit{Ann.} 4.4.2. On Roman recruitment in the imperial period, see Alston 1995, Brunt 1990: 188ff, MacMullen 1984a, Mann 1983, Forni 1953, as well as Chilver 1941 on recruitment in northern Italy.

\textsuperscript{442} See MacMullen 1984a on the Roman legion as an entity that formed close group bonds among its members but also isolated them from other societies, as well as Lendon 1997: 244-264 on legionary society.
These effects lessened with time, however, as northern Italy declined as a source of recruitment after the first century, and by the second century both northern Italy and southern Gaul contributed fewer and fewer recruits, as the Rhine and Danube legions recruited from more of the northern provinces. In the second century base of the legio II Adiutrix Pia Fidelis at Aquincum, only eleven percent of soldiers commemorated come from Italy.\textsuperscript{443} The strange hybrid version of northern Italy present at Mogontiacum did not long outlast the first century AD, after which local and familial ties were subordinated to ties created almost exclusively by the army, as men from a wider selection of provinces and with fewer pre-enlistment connections made up the majority of the legions; those Ligurians recruited into the legions in the second century entered a fundamentally different army. Second century veterans, influenced by a military society where local ties were fewer, were as likely to join veteran communities near the limes as to return to their hometowns.\textsuperscript{444} The strongest impact of military recruitment on Ligurian society was also limited mostly to the first century AD, after which enlistment from Liguria, as well as veteran settlement there, diminished.\textsuperscript{445} One crucial exception was among the urban cohorts and praetorians at Rome, which continued to draw the majority of their recruits from central and northern Italy, largely since those positions were seen as special privilege for Italians; in this regard the hybrid version of northern Italy seen in first century AD Germany found a mirror in the emperor’s bodyguards at Rome.\textsuperscript{446} Here again Liguria was strongly connected to the larger patterns of the Roman state.

On a smaller scale—but no less important—that recruitment into the army was the absorption of local elites into administrative posts and into equestrian and senatorial careers.\textsuperscript{447} Liguria was not a major source of equites or senators, a result probably attributable to its smaller population and towns. No Ligurian town could match the senatorial output of Brixia or Verona, or Patavium in terms of equites.\textsuperscript{448} The highest number of attested Ligurian senators came from Pollentia, an indication possibly of the town’s woolen wealth, while in comparison at the port of Vada Sabatia only one senator is attested.\textsuperscript{449} Like men recruited into the legions, the state removed these elites from their local societies and transferred them to administrative posts across the empire. One man from Albintimilium after serving as an officer with at least four separate military units along the limes then oversaw the census in Bithynia and Pontus, served as epistrategos in Pelusium and in the Thebaid in Egypt, and finally acted as procurator of

\textsuperscript{443} Carroll 2006: 216.
\textsuperscript{444} Mann 1982.
\textsuperscript{445} See Forni 1953 and Le Bohec 2000 on changes in Roman recruiting grounds.
\textsuperscript{446} On the presence of Italians in the urban cohorts see Freis 1967 and Mench 1968, who both put estimates at the percentage of Italians in the urban cohorts between 85-90%; on Italians as praetorians see Tac. Ann. 4.5 (claiming that the guard recruited mostly from Etruria, Umbria, and Latium) and esp. Passerini 1979: 173. The composition of the praetorians did not change radically until the reign of Septimius Severus, who sacked Italian praetorians—in revenge for Pertinax’s murder—and opened up the praetorians to non-traditional sources of recruitment, an act that Dio complained turned Italy’s youth from useful work to banditry and gladiatorial combat. (Dio 75.2).
\textsuperscript{447} On the impact of elite recruitment on local land-holding patterns and town society, see Patterson 2006, Andemahr 1994, and Dyson 1992.
\textsuperscript{448} Strabo 5.1.7 says that in AD 14 census Patavium claimed 500 equites.
\textsuperscript{449} Alfoldy 1999 lists fourteen possible candidates for Pollentia, six for Alba Pompeia, and four each for Albinaeunnum, Hasta, and Libarna. In comparison, Alfoldy can cite forty-two for Verona and forty for Brixia. The name of the senator at Vada Sabatia is not preserved (CIL V 7775).
the province of Judaea. By the end of their career the most successful of these formerly local elites would have been stationed in a variety of posts with the legions or in administrative centers across the empire and would have advanced to positions as provincial governors and to senatorial rank. That kind of status brought them into proximity with the emperor, which in turn increased their social standing and made them useful patrons. Pliny’s correspondence with Trajan shows how this imperial service could put one of Comum’s local elites into a position to ask for and receive favors from the emperor. This kind of geographic and social mobility made this small number of elites disproportionately influential; in this sense men who entered the imperial service were like those successful veterans who returned home with a centurion’s retirement bonus.

An extreme but very important example of this class is the emperor P. Helvius Pertinax, the first emperor born in northern Italy. Dio, a contemporary, says that while the Alba Pompeian Pertinax was not from a well-born family he nevertheless had through a combination of education and connections obtained a series of posts in the imperial service. By the time he was made emperor, a position he held for less than three months in AD 193, Pertinax had commanded a cavalry squadron, become prefect of a cohort in Syria, supervised the finances of Dacia, commanded the German fleet, overseen the distribution of the alimenta along the via Aemilia, and served as governor of Dacia, both Moesias, Syria, and Britain. He had also, after a brief stint as a schoolteacher, unsuccessfully applied to be a centurion via his father’s patron Lollianus Avitus; that he applied for the position at all indicates the potential for social mobility that the post offered. Luckily for Pertinax he had more a useful patron in Ti. Claudius Pompeianus, who was able to get him started in an equestrian career. An example of the social and geographic mobility made possible by the Roman imperial system in much the same way that provincials-turned-emperors Trajan and Septimius Severus were, Pertinax’s career in the imperial service took him to the empire’s borders and eventually—albeit very briefly—to the top of the Roman political hierarchy, and as Trajan and Septimius Severus’s families derived much of their wealth from state-encouraged oleoculture, so Pertinax’s family made its wealth in cloth, whose importance to Liguria and similar reliance on the state has been outlined above. As Pertinax’s family money and

---

451 In Ep. 10.106 Pliny successfully forwards an auxiliary cavalry commander’s petition to have citizenship conferred on his daughter, and in 10.10 he obtains Alexandrian citizenship for his doctor Arpocras.
452 Note that Pertinax’s successor, Didius Julianus, was either from Mediolanum or was from a Milanese family and had a senatorial career that parallels that of Pertinax’s (both supervised alimenta in Italy). Aur. Vict. Caes. 19 lists his place of origin as Mediolanum, while SHA Did. Iul. 1 says that his mother was from an African family while his paternal grandfather was Milanese. The tomb of Julianus’s great grandfather, in which Julianus was buried by his wife and daughter, was outside of Rome on the via Labicana (SHA Did. Iul. 8.10).
453 Dio 74.3.1-2.
454 SHA Pert. 1-2. See Donati 2002 and Alföldy 1999 for the chronology of Pertinax’s career and the relevant ancient sources.
455 SHA Pert. 1.4.
456 Dio 73.3.1. SHA Pert. 1.6.
457 For an overview of Trajan’s pre-imperial career see Bennett 1997, and on Septimius Severus, his African supporters, and the importance of his pre-imperial career, see Birley 1971. In both cases the
consequent connections derived from a regional industry supported by the demands of the army, Rome, and an empire-wide elite culture, so too was the future emperor’s career largely the product of a system of imperial administration, both military and civil, that drew local elites into a empire-wide network of posts, concentrated along the borders and still largely controlled by an imperial bureaucracy at Rome and around the emperor.

While economic and institutional connections brought Liguria into this larger imperial system, there were nevertheless limits to the region’s connectivity. For example, the micro-regional social spheres seen at Aquileia and in the northeastern Po valley appear in Liguria, as well. Hence at Dertona—one of the largest towns—citizens had social connections at Libarna, Albintimilium, Genua, Forum Iulii Iriensium, Mediolanum, Vercellae, and Ticinum. One senator commemorated at Augusta Taurinorum had held offices and honors in Alba Pompeia, Augusta Bagiennorum, Genua, Aquae Statiellae, and probably Forum Iulii Iriensium as well. Administrative borders made little difference, and the inclusion of Vercellae, Ticinum, and Augusta Taurinorum in the social circuits above again points to the arbitrary nature of the Augustan regiones. Land holding by local elites followed a similar pattern, and the future emperor Pertinax, from Alba Pompeia, had estates at Vada Sabatia as well at his hometown. Likewise Agricola’s mother had estates both at Forum Iulii (modern Fréjus) near the Italian border and in Liguria at Albintimilium, where she was killed in AD 69 during the civil war. At the same time social connections with the central and western Po valley are difficult to find, which suggests that there were limits to cross-regional connections in northern Italy, even as the state created long-distance connections through trade and the recruitment of soldiers and elites.

Conclusions

The Roman imperial system—that system of soldiers, magistrates, state-run economic enterprises, navies, and emperors that directed trade routes and physically moved people from farms and cloth-shops to posts in Germany and Bithynia—influenced day to day life in Liguria. Even though in the Imperial period the Roman state was no longer moving entire tribes to Samnium or redistributing land to large groups of Latin settlers and even though magistrates on the ground in Liguria were few and far between, the Roman state nevertheless helped define Liguria’s connections both within regio IX and with the rest of the empire. Indirectly it influenced what imported goods the people

family’s wealth was most likely based on the oil industry—although the Septimii seem to have had interests in Italian land-holding and trans-Saharan trade as well.

458 An sevir Augustalis at Libarna and Dertona is commemorated at Ticinum (CIL V 6425), while a veteran from Dertona is commemorated at Albintimilium (AE 1984: 412). Commemorated at Dertona is a flamen who also held the positions of flamen, duovir, and pontifex at Genua as well as a quattuorvir and praefectus fabrum at Vercellae (CIL V 7373 = AE 2004: 344). For Dertonan connections with Mediolanum, Vercellae, and Forum Iulii Iriensium see CIL V 5830, CIL V 7373, and CIL V 7375 respectively. One exception to this social sphere is the Dertonan found at Venusia in regio II, where he has been enrolled in another tribe (Supp. It. 20.222 = AE 1993: 531).

459 CIL V 7153.


461 Tac. Agr. 7.1. Tacitus’s inclusion of an exemplum of an unnamed brave Ligurian woman at Hist. 2.13, told in the context of the sack of Albintimilium might be motivated by this family connection.
in the Ligurian countryside consumed and how they defined their towns’ economic identities, while by recruiting soldiers and co-opting elites into imperial service the state changed societal dynamics in Liguria and along the limes. There were important limits: the influence of military recruitment declined as the Imperial period wore on, and as fewer Ligurians reached senatorial and equestrian status, their influence and patronage did not equal that of the large towns of the Transpadana and Venetia. Nevertheless even in a largely rural territory made up of small towns the state continued to influence daily life even when its physical manifestations were largely absent.
Ticinum: the Late Antique State

Introduction

The effects on northern Italy of both the frequent, intensive interference of the Roman state in the republican period and its more minimalist approach in the early imperial period have been examined in previous chapters; I now turn to northern Italy in the third through seventh centuries, which saw the return of heavy state involvement. During this period the towns and countryside of northern Italy saw more officials, soldiers, and taxes as the bureaucracy of the Late Roman state grew to meet new challenges and as the privileged distinctions between Italians and provincials were erased in the third century. This period also saw a series of foreign invasions, the growth of Christianity, and the final decline of Roman imperial power in Italy in the fifth century. In the post-Roman period the region was first absorbed into the Gothic kingdom of Italy at the end of the fifth century AD, then in the middle of the sixth into a reinvigorated Eastern Roman/Byzantine empire, and later in the sixth by the Lombards, who maintained control of the region for nearly two centuries, until the expansion of the Carolingian Franks into Italy at the end of the eighth. The time period and the region thus offer a tantalizing opportunity to examine the effects of both the late Roman government at its greatest expanse and the transition from that government to those of the politically fragmented, post-Roman Italy, in other words the impact of the late Roman state and its lingering effects of that state impact on the post-Roman and early medieval world. This chapter examines those effects on one particular town, Ticinum, the modern Pavia, in order to see how these larger changes affected daily life in what had been in the Imperial period a fairly typical mid-sized Roman municipium.

Why Ticinum? Ticinum was one of a number of towns—including Mediolanum, Ravenna, Aquileia, Concordia, Verona, Cremona, Bononia, and Pollentia—used by the

---

462 The period between the end of the third century and the Islamic conquests of the seventh has since the start of the twentieth century and increasingly since the 1970s been classed by scholars as Late Antiquity or the Late Antique period, although the chronological boundaries vary by author. For an introduction to the history, problems, chronology, and sources of the period see Mitchell 2007, Cameron 1993, Moorhead 1991, and Jones 1964, as well as the seminal works of Brown 1971 and Marrou 1949 (first edition 1938).

463 The transition of the town’s name from Ticinum, as the town appears in Roman period literary and epigraphic sources, to the modern Pavia, from the medieval Papia, has been the source of debate (the name Papia is first clearly attested for Ticinum in the seventh century). Celtic, Ligurian, Roman, and Byzantine origins for the name Papia have been suggested. For a summary of theories and scholarship see Gabba 2000, who proposes that the name derived from an informal name of the city during the Roman period as urbs Papia or simply Papia, itself derived from the name of a Papius presumably involved with the organization of the city following its enfranchisement in 49 BC. Gabba builds upon the thesis of Gorra 1904, who also subscribes to the theory of a Roman origin and suggests that the city derived its later name from properties or a villa owned by a member of the Papius gens. A later origin is suggested by Gabotto 1911, who proposes that the city took its name from the term papišav, a technical Byzantine term for guard of the palace, and the location of Theodoric’s palace in the city. The voting tribe of the town in the imperial period was Papiria (cf CIL V 6411, 6419, 6427, 6431 among others), as it was at Bellunum (Belluno) as well. In modern scholarship the town is generally referred to as Ticinum in treatments of the late republican and early and high imperial periods but as Pavia in discussions of late antiquity and especially the post-Roman period. To avoid confusion this chapter uses Ticinum throughout.
Roman state as bases of imperial power in the late Roman period. Although treatment of individual towns varied considerably, these towns in general were fortified, used as military bases, stationed with garrisons, stocked with imperial arms factories, staffed with magistrates and officials, and used as bases for the imperial court. The intensive state intervention of the late Roman period was directed primarily at this group of towns, which formed the basis of a militarized, closely administered network in northern Italy that supported the army and the imperial court. In an examination of the impact of this new influx of administration into the region, these towns present the most useful case studies. Ticinum in particular can stand in for many of these other towns, since it was, at points during its later Roman history, the site of a mint, garrisons, and also an arms factory. Like Verona and Bononia, its appearances in surviving literary sources are infrequent and brief, and evidence for late Roman Ticinum is not as complete as that for Aquileia and especially Mediolanum, with its early churches and the voluminous writing of its bishop Ambrose. Nevertheless Ticinum’s good fortune in surviving the Gothic wars intact and in being chosen as an Ostrogothic and then Lombard base means that its post-Roman history is better preserved than that of most other towns in this class, which allows us to trace the effects of the Roman state even after it ceased to exist in Italy and thus examine the durability of these late Roman changes. Ticinum’s proximity to the relatively well-documented Mediolanum, moreover, makes it possible to examine the relationship between neighboring towns and to see how the state shaped the interactions between larger and smaller towns. Ticinum’s transformation from *municipium* first to a subsidiary military and administrative base in the late third, fourth, and early fifth centuries, then to secondary regal capital under the Ostrogoths in the fifth and early sixth centuries, and finally to primary Lombard capital in the sixth and seventh centuries showcases the ways in which the late antique state created new regional hierarchies and redefined the purpose of the town. By focusing on Ticinum, we can see the impact of the establishment of new imperial seats at the end of the third century on neighboring towns as well as the effect of new Roman defensive zones, created not just in northern Italy but also in Gaul, the Balkans, and Syria; Ticinum can thus stand for a number of towns drafted by the Roman empire into support of a new military and administrative system. This chapter first asks why this new, northern Italian defensive zone was created, then looks at its effects, and finally examines its legacy in the post-Roman period.

As noted above, early Imperial Ticinum was a moderately sized town in the western Po valley. Its walled area under the empire was about half that of Mediolanum, the large town and former Insubrian capital 35km to the north, and nearly the same as those of Alba Pompeia and Placentia; this places it roughly in the upper middle tier of northern Italian towns in terms of size. Located on the Ticino River near its confluence with the Po, Ticinum controlled river access from the Po into the Ticino valley and Lake Maggiore, and the town was also connected by major roads to Placentia, Mediolanum, Augusta Taurinorum, and Vercellae—and through Vercellae to Eporedia, the Aosta valley, and the western Alps. Its economy depended on those connections, which tied it into larger northern Italian and transalpine trade networks, and the importance of the river network in particular to the town’s livelihood is reflected in Ticinum’s

---

464 For an introduction to Ticinum see Gabba 1984a.
The town’s social sphere seems to have had roughly the same radius as those of similarly sized north Italian towns, with local elites—including freedmen—holding office, receiving honors, and integrating into the social networks of nearby towns. Hence one man at Augusta Taurinorum also held office at Ticinum while one elite Ticinensis can be found commemorated in Verona, where he set up a large funerary plot for himself and his wife. Some of the town’s elites also held office at Rome and in imperial posts throughout the empire, and the legions and Praetorian Guard, which both recruited at Ticinum, similarly dispersed Ticinenses throughout the empire particularly to Rome and the Rhine and Danube borders. Ticinum was thus a fairly typical town for northern Italy, connected by trade and by state bureaucracy to other points in the empire.

Crisis, reaction, and the return of the Roman state

Ticinum’s connections were maintained by an extended period of internal peace in the empire, which in first and second century northern Italy was broken only for brief periods: in AD 69 in the civil wars accompanying the collapse of the Julio-Claudian dynasty and in AD 170 with the invasion of the Marcomanni, a German tribe living along the upper Danube. For all their immediate damage, the civil wars of AD 69 were

---

466 Sup. It. 9: 24. Although this inscription belongs to a late second or third century sarcophagus, collegia nautarum are attested throughout northern Italy in the early and high empire, and there is no reason to assume that Ticinum’s collegium postdated these others significantly. Collegia nautarum are attested at Brixia (Inscr. It. 10-5: 1070; CIL V 4990 = Inscr. It. 10-5: 1065), Comum (CIL V 5295), Mediolanum (CIL V 5911 = ILS 7527; AE 1932: 73), Mantua (ILS 7265), Atria (CIL V 2315), and Arilica on Lake Garda (CIL V 4016 = ILS 8373; CIL V 4017 = ILS 8372). Venetia and Transpadana—there are no attestations from Liguria or Aemilia—account for about a third of all attestations of collegia nautarum throughout the empire. On Ticinum’s economic connections see also Tibiletti 1964. On Ticinum’s epigraphic output see Boffo and Ambaglio 1992 and Majocchi 1897, and of course CIL V (Mommsen ed.).

467 Augusta Taurinorum: CIL V 6991 (=ILS 6751). Verona: CIL V 3469; the commemorator, L. Sollius Secundio, had the monument constructed while he was still alive, so the identification of himself as Ticinensis is self-made. Sup. It. 9: 19 (Ticinum) shows dual office holding at Novaria and Ticinum. Another Ticinensis can be found holding the position of sevir augustalis at Dertona and Libarna in Liguria (CIL V 6425)

468 On senators and equites from Ticinum see Alföldy 1999: 323-325. Ticinenses in the Praetorian Guard and urban cohorts: CIL VI 33038; CIL VI 2924; CIL VI 32520; CIL VI 221 = ILS 2160; AE 1984: 104; and AE 1984: 29. Legionaries and veterans from Ticinum are attested at Iader in Dalmatia (CIL III 2913), Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium (CIL XIII 8287) and Bonna (CIL XIII 8058) in Germany, at Carnuntum (CIL III 11209; AE 1973: 423) and Ebersdorf (CIL III 459) in Pannonia, and at Velitrae in Latium (CIL X 6578)

469 On the Marcomanni in general see Pitts 1989 and Mócsy and Frere 1974. Most of their pre-second century AD history is recorded by Tacitus: Ann. 2.44-46 and 62-63, Hist. 1.2, as well as Germ. 42; cf. Dio 67.6-7, Strabo 7.1.3, Vell. Pat. 2.108, Arr. Anab. 1.3.1 and Stat. Silv. 3.3.168-170. Pitts 1989 suggests that the two Suebian kings recorded as fighting with the Flavian army at Cremona in AD 69 were possibly Marcomanni, as Greek and Latin writers frequently confused the names of German tribes.

470 Northern Italy was the primary battleground in AD 69, with two decisive battles fought on the road between Cremona and Bedriacum, the first fought in March between Otho and Vitellius’s subordinates Caecina and Valents (Tac. Hist. 2.23-45) and the second in October between the Vitellians and Vespasian’s subordinate Antonius (Tac. Hist. 3.15-33). The main victim of the war was Cremona, which was thoroughly sacked by Flavian troops after the second battle of Cremona (Tac. Hist. 3.32-34), although Placentia too lost its amphitheater to fire during a siege by Caecina (Tac. Hist. 2.21), and atrocities were
brief and followed by sustained recovery efforts. Likewise the incursion of the Marcomanni into northeastern Italy, while resulting in the sack of Opitergium, the siege of Aquileia, and the creation of a temporary *praetentura Italiae et Alpium* nevertheless was also of limited consequence for northern Italy as a whole. The civil war between Maximinus and the Senate in AD 238 also seems to have been only temporarily disruptive, since Maximinus was assassinated by his men outside Aquileia before the siege was completed. Whether the civil war between Philip the Arab and Decius that culminated in a battle outside Verona in AD 249 was substantially destructive is difficult to say, given the brevity of literary material about the war, and it is possible that the battle did not take place at Verona at all but in Macedonia.

The war between Philip and Decius, however, was followed by a period of sustained violence and upheaval, lasting from the 250s through the 260s, that saw

committed in western Liguria, particularly at Albintimilium, by Othonian troops in preparation for the Vitellian invasion (Tac. *Hist.* 2.12-13 and Tac. *Agr.* 7, which counts Tacitus’s mother-in-law among the victims around Albintimilium). Also lost were many north Italians in the legions; certainly a portion of the dead after the second battle of Cremona had family members who were close enough to fetch their bodies and provide them with burial (Tac. *Hist.* 2.45).

Most immediate was an unwillingness on the part of Italian buyers to purchase slaves from Cremona; later a proclamation by Vespasian’s subordinate Antonius forbid the keeping of any captives from Cremona. Funds for rebuilding the town’s buildings came as benefactions from other Italian towns (Tac. *Hist.* 2.34), generosity possibly spurred by the presence, during the siege, of Italians from other towns, who had come to the town for an annual fair (Tac. *Hist.* 2.30).

On the destruction of Opitergium and siege of Aquileia see Lucian *Alex.* 48 and Amm. *Marc.* 29.6, as well as Fitz 1966. Lucian seems to have exaggerated the damage to Opitergium (mod. Ozerzo), and the town continued to function—and indeed attracted and survived further sackings by Visigoths and Huns in the fifth century (Stella Busana 1994: 28). The evidence for the *praetentura Italiae et Alpium* is the *cursus honorum* preserved in a honorific inscription of Q. Antisti Adventus Postumius Aquilinus at Thibilis in Numidia (*ILS* 8977); it seems to have been one of the unspecified measures Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus took for the defense of Italy and Illyricum (*SHA Marc.* 14), and there is no evidence that it outlasted the wars with the Marcomanni. This is not to suggest that the invasion was not psychologically traumatic, particularly since invasions of Italy by foreign troops had not been seen since the end of the second century BC; cf. Zaccaria 2002 on the use at this time of apotropaic religious iconography particularly tied with foreign invasions. It should also be noted that the date of this invasion has been disputed, with AD 167 and 170 most often cited, although other dates have been proffered (cf. Fitz 1966, in favor of AD 169). The reasons cited for the 167 campaign are the presence of the *praetentura* in 168 or 169 (according to its place in Aquilinus’s *cursus*), which would prevent an invasion; the discussion of *tantsus timor* at Rome in 167 or 168 (*SHA Marc.* 12), suggesting that the larger invasion occurred at that time; and the absence of any mention of Marcus Aurelius being at the *limes* during the larger invasion, as he would have probably been in 170. For 170 the most commonly cited reasons are the mentions only of Marcus and not of Lucius Verus—who died in 169—during the campaign and Lucian’s story of the charlatan Alexander advising Marcus to throw two lions into the Danube to stop the invasion—the lions quickly swam to the other side and were clubbed by the Marcomanni—which suggests a later date following Roman campaigns on the Danube. For a summary of arguments in favor of 167 see Kerr 2006, while for 170 see Sheidel 1990 and Birley 1966. On the basis of the references to Marcus but not Lucius in reference to the campaign as well as the lack of later mentions of the *praetentura*—suggesting that it was either out of service by the time of the larger invasion or proven ineffective by that invasion and then discontinued—this author prefers the 170 date.

On Maximinus at Aquileia: Herodian 7-8 and *SHA Max.* 21-22.

repeated invasions of northern Italy. In AD 254 the Marcomanni again invaded Italy and came as far south as Ravenna, and just a few years later, in 258 and 259, the Alemanni invaded Italy and this time reached as far south as Rome, where they were turned back by a makeshift army assembled by the Senate, and on their way back they were defeated outside Mediolanum by the junior emperor Gallienus. That the Senate had to supplement the Praetorian Guard with emergency conscripts from the city demonstrates how unprepared the city—and Italy—were for a foreign invasion. Previous incursions into Italy, as shocking as they were, had only gone as far south as Aquileia and Ravenna. The novelty of this situation and the consequent Roman lack of preparation were demonstrated again later that same year when the Juthungi, exploiting the confusion caused by the Alemanni and by imperial preoccupations in Syria, invaded and plundered Italy; only on their way back through Raetia in April of 260 were they defeated. More tellingly, the Roman force that defeated the Juthungi near Augsburg was composed not just of soldiers from Raetia and Germany but also of conscripted local militia. The Juthungi seem to have been in Italy for some time as well, since by the time they reached Augsburg they are described as having taken several thousand Italian captives. A brief respite for northern Italy following the victory at Augsburg was interrupted by civil war in AD 268, when Aureolus, the commander of the cavalry at Mediolanum, revolted and was besieged for months by Gallienus. In the winter of 270/1 the Alemanni and Juthungi were again moving through northern Italy, where they captured Placentia and defeated the emperor Aurelian’s army in an ambush near the city. Aurelian turned back the Alemanni in a battle near Fanum Fortunae (Fano) on the Metaurus; he then destroyed much of the retreating army in a second battle near Ticinum. By the time of this decisive victory, northern Italy had experienced nearly two decades of wars and invasions, the effects of which were no doubt exacerbated by an epidemic, the Plague of Cyprian, which spread throughout the empire between AD 251 and at least 270, when it claimed the emperor Claudius II Gothicus as a victim.

The chronology of this period of the third century is not altogether certain, owing to the relative paucity and unreliability of the sources. The major literary sources are Aurelius Victor’s *De Caesaribus*, published around AD 361; the world history of the twelfth century Byzantine chronicler Zonaras; the first book of the history of Zosimus, written at the end of the fifth and beginning of the sixth century; the unfortunately unreliable lives of Gallienus, Claudius II Gothicus, and Aurelian in the *Historia Augusta*; Eutropius’s abridged Roman history, written in the second half of the fourth century, and Jordanes’ sixth century *Getica*. In addition to the confused chronology of the period there is also an ongoing debate as to the severity of this period sometimes termed the “third century crisis.” On this debate see Witschel 2004; Watson 2004; Hekster, de Kleijn, and Slootjes (eds.) 2007, particularly the essay of Liebeschuetz.


The defeat and invasion of the Juthungi are recorded on a votive inscription found in 1992 at Augsburg and originally set up by M. Simplicinius Genialis, the general who defeated them (*AE* 1993: 1231). *AE* 1993: 1231, ln. 10.

The defeat and invasion of the Juthungi near Augsburg was composition not just of soldiers from Raetia and Germany but also of conscripted local militia. The Juthungi seem to have been in Italy for some time as well, since by the time they reached Augsburg they are described as having taken several thousand Italian captives. A brief respite for northern Italy following the victory at Augsburg was interrupted by civil war in AD 268, when Aureolus, the commander of the cavalry at Mediolanum, revolted and was besieged for months by Gallienus. In the winter of 270/1 the Alemanni and Juthungi were again moving through northern Italy, where they captured Placentia and defeated the emperor Aurelian’s army in an ambush near the city. Aurelian turned back the Alemanni in a battle near Fanum Fortunae (Fano) on the Metaurus; he then destroyed much of the retreating army in a second battle near Ticinum. By the time of this decisive victory, northern Italy had experienced nearly two decades of wars and invasions, the effects of which were no doubt exacerbated by an epidemic, the Plague of Cyprian, which spread throughout the empire between AD 251 and at least 270, when it claimed the emperor Claudius II Gothicus as a victim.

The chronology of this period of the third century is not altogether certain, owing to the relative paucity and unreliability of the sources. The major literary sources are Aurelius Victor’s *De Caesaribus*, published around AD 361; the world history of the twelfth century Byzantine chronicler Zonaras; the first book of the history of Zosimus, written at the end of the fifth and beginning of the sixth century; the unfortunately unreliable lives of Gallienus, Claudius II Gothicus, and Aurelian in the *Historia Augusta*; Eutropius’s abridged Roman history, written in the second half of the fourth century, and Jordanes’ sixth century *Getica*. In addition to the confused chronology of the period there is also an ongoing debate as to the severity of this period sometimes termed the “third century crisis.” On this debate see Witschel 2004; Watson 2004; Hekster, de Kleijn, and Slootjes (eds.) 2007, particularly the essay of Liebeschuetz.


The defeat and invasion of the Juthungi are recorded on a votive inscription found in 1992 at Augsburg and originally set up by M. Simplicinius Genialis, the general who defeated them (*AE* 1993: 1231). *AE* 1993: 1231, ln. 10.

475 The chronology of this period of the third century is not altogether certain, owning to the relative paucity and unreliability of the sources. The major literary sources are Aurelius Victor’s *De Caesaribus*, published around AD 361; the world history of the twelfth century Byzantine chronicler Zonaras; the first book of the history of Zosimus, written at the end of the fifth and beginning of the sixth century; the unfortunately unreliable lives of Gallienus, Claudius II Gothicus, and Aurelian in the *Historia Augusta*; Eutropius’s abridged Roman history, written in the second half of the fourth century, and Jordanes’ sixth century *Getica*. In addition to the confused chronology of the period there is also an ongoing debate as to the severity of this period sometimes termed the “third century crisis.” On this debate see Witschel 2004; Watson 2004; Hekster, de Kleijn, and Slootjes (eds.) 2007, particularly the essay of Liebeschuetz.


476 The defeat and invasion of the Juthungi are recorded on a votive inscription found in 1992 at Augsburg and originally set up by M. Simplicinius Genialis, the general who defeated them (*AE* 1993: 1231). *AE* 1993: 1231, ln. 10.

477 The defeat and invasion of the Juthungi near Augsburg was composition not just of soldiers from Raetia and Germany but also of conscripted local militia. The Juthungi seem to have been in Italy for some time as well, since by the time they reached Augsburg they are described as having taken several thousand Italian captives. A brief respite for northern Italy following the victory at Augsburg was interrupted by civil war in AD 268, when Aureolus, the commander of the cavalry at Mediolanum, revolted and was besieged for months by Gallienus. In the winter of 270/1 the Alemanni and Juthungi were again moving through northern Italy, where they captured Placentia and defeated the emperor Aurelian’s army in an ambush near the city. Aurelian turned back the Alemanni in a battle near Fanum Fortunae (Fano) on the Metaurus; he then destroyed much of the retreating army in a second battle near Ticinum. By the time of this decisive victory, northern Italy had experienced nearly two decades of wars and invasions, the effects of which were no doubt exacerbated by an epidemic, the Plague of Cyprian, which spread throughout the empire between AD 251 and at least 270, when it claimed the emperor Claudius II Gothicus as a victim.

478 AE 1993: 1231, ln. 10.

479 AE 1993: 1231, ln. 11.


These repeated and serious threats to the security of Rome and the Italian peninsula impelled the Roman state to act. With the Danube limes proved porous and Italy vulnerable, the emperors Gallienus, Claudius, and Aurelian established a more flexible and responsive system of defense in northern Italy. In AD 268 we hear of a large, mobile cavalry force stationed at Mediolanum to guard against attacks from the breakaway Gallic empire, and according to Aurelius Victor Claudius II Gothicus was promoted to emperor that same year while he was in command of a garrison at Ticinum, whose presence in the city was probably related to the siege of Aureolus at Mediolanum, although when it was placed there and how long it stayed are unclear.483 The placement of mobile military forces in northern Italy together with the creation of a frontline in Italy itself created a need for a support structure for these troops. To ensure quicker and easier payment of them Gallienus had earlier established a mint at Mediolanum in AD 259.484 To protect important individual cities, emperors ordered the construction of new defensive walls, such as those at Rome and Verona.485 These measures, all undertaken in the 250s, 260s, and early 270s to counteract immediate security threats, represent the most dramatic change in state policy towards the region since the deprovincialization of the triumviral period.486 While many of the individual changes were temporary—the cavalry force at Mediolanum does not seem to have been stationed there under Diocletian, and the mint there was transferred—nevertheless armed units remained in the region, the minting of coins there continued, and for the next two centuries the transformation of towns into more defensive forms continued.487

---

484 Throughout the provinces in the late 250s and 260s other mints—such as those at Colonia Agrippina, Siscia, and Smyrna—were established close to combat zones (de Bois 1976: 93). For the establishment of these mints in relation to imperial economy policy and reforms of the coinage, see Watson 2004, Crawford 1975, and Lafaurie 1975, as well as Hendy 2008 on Diocletian’s monetary reforms and more current bibliography.
485 Verona, begun under Gallienus: CIL V 3329 (= ILS 544), the building inscription on the Porta Borsari. After the construction of these walls extramural buildings in Verona were abandoned (Cavalieri-Manasse and Bruno 2003: 51). Rome, begun under Aurelian: SHA Aurel. 21 and 39, Aur. Vict. Caes. 35.7, Oros. 7.23, Eutrop. 9.15. Hudson 1993 has argued that a possible third or forth century extension of Ticinum’s wall belongs to the same phase of construction as the Augustan circuit wall, which suggests that the extent of Ticinum’s walls was not substantially altered in this period. Cf. Hudson 1984 and Tozzi 1984b on earlier chronologies of the town’s architectural development.
486 One possibly change in state policy was the Constitutio Antoniniana, a proclamation by the emperor Caracalla in AD 212 that, with some limitations, gave Roman citizenship to the free inhabitants of the Roman empire, thus eroding some of the distinctions between the largely enfranchised Italy and the partially enfranchised provinces. Dio 78.9 attributes the enfranchisement to Caracalla’s desire to collect more taxes from many new, now-citizens. It is important to note, however, that Italy still retained its tax exemptions, which largely seem to have been left in place until the reforms of Diocletian at the end of the third century (see Corbier 2005). On the Constitutio Antoniniana see Dio 78.9 and P. Giss. 40, as well as the monograph of Sasse 1958. On northern Italy’s transition from the province of Cisalpine Gaul to Italy under the triumvirate see App. BC 5.3 and Dio 48.12.5
At the end of the third century, Diocletian's reforms solidified these earlier changes. The provinces were reorganized into dioceses and subdivided; Italy itself was divided in AD 297-8 further into Italia annonaria—consisting of the old Augustan regions of Picenum, Aemilia, Liguria, Venetia, Istria, and Transpadana plus the Cottian Alps and Raetia—and Italia suburbicaria, which comprised Etruria, Umbria, Campania, Apulia, Calabria, Lucania, Bruttium, Sicily, Corsica, and Sardinia. This new reorganization paid little attention to earlier distinctions between a privileged Italy and subordinate provinces; instead Sicily, Corsica, and Sardinia were grouped with southern and central Italy while northern Italy was tied with Raetia and the Cottian Alps. In a further departure from the state’s previous, more hands-off policy towards Italy, correctores were assigned to administer these dioceses. Italia annonaria, as its names suggests, was mobilized for the supply of the army, and towards this purpose the diocese was subjected to direct taxation; for northern Italy this marked an end to nearly three hundred years of relative tax exemption. These changes—the reinstatement of taxation on par with the rest of the empire, the return of imperial governors, and the diminution of Italian privileges that had been maintained since the Augustan period—can be attributed at least partly to security concerns and the support of the army. Hence northern Italy, which was nearer the borders and had to support armies and garrisons, was taxed, while southern Italy seems largely to have retained its exemptions. The distinction between Italian and provincial, already blurred in the early third century by the Constitutio Antoniniana, had been blurred even further in the mid third century by the retreat of the frontlines of the empire into northern Italy, and so the agglomeration of the Alpine provinces and northern Italy into one diocese does not so much represent an ideological attack on Italy’s privileges as it reflects the fact that northern Italy and Raetia were part of the same limes.

Diocletian’s reorganization of northern Italy into a defensive province in support of the army, a transformation that was largely in keeping with the actions of his predecessors in the mid third century, was sustained by his successors. Large groups of foreign auxiliaries were resettled in Italy, a practice that recalls the veteran settlements of the late Republic. In AD 334 the emperor Constantine settled 300,000 Sarmatians in the Balkans and Italy, and prefects were assigned to monitor them. Similarly in the 370s, defeated Goths and Taifali were settled along the via Aemilia at Mutina, Parma, and Reggio Aemilia, where they were given unoccupied land to work. These settled barbarian auxiliaries were administered by prefects, and the Notitita Dignitatum, an early

489 On Diocletian’s reforms in Italy, see Jones 1964: 45ff, Giardina 1993 and 1997, as well as Rebecchi 1993. The main evidence for Diocletian’s provincial reorganization is the Laterculus Veronensis, a list of provinces of uncertain date but probably just slightly postdating Diocletian’s abdication (for an introduction to which see Keyes 1916 and Barnes 1982).
492 Exc. Val. 6.
493 Amm. Marc. 31.9.
A fifth century document describing the organization of the empire, lists these prefects in Italy:

- Praefectus Sarmatarum gentilium Apulia et Calabriae.
- Praefectus Sarmatarum gentilium Brutios et Lucaniam.
- Praefectus Sarmatarum gentilium, Foro Fuluiensi [Liguria].
- Praefectus Sarmatarum gentilium, Opittergii [Venetia].
- Praefectus Sarmatarum gentilium, Patauio [Aemilia].
- Praefectus Sarmatarum gentilium, ..... [Transpadana].
- Praefectus Sarmatarum gentilium, Cremonae [Venetia].
- Praefectus Sarmatarum gentilium, Taurinis [Transpadana].
- Praefectus Sarmatarum gentilium, Aquis siue Tertona [Liguria].
- Praefectus Sarmatarum gentilium, Novariae [Transpadana].
- Praefectus Sarmatarum gentilium, Vercellis [Transpadana].
- Praefectus Sarmatarum gentilium, Regionis Samnitis.
- Praefectus Sarmatarum gentilium, Bononiae in Aemilia.
- Praefectus Sarmatarum gentilium, Quadratis et Eporizio [Transpadana].
- Praefectus Sarmatarum gentilium, (in Liguria) Pollentia.

These prefects—and therefore their Sarmatians as well—are overwhelmingly concentrated in northern Italy. There are three prefects who share between them nearly all of southern Italy, while all the other prefects in Italy are assigned to individual northern towns. The choice of towns is also telling. They are not imperial seats like Mediolanum and Aquileia but rather secondary centers, such as Vercelliae and Novaria for Mediolanum and Opitergium for Aquileia. This suggests that different towns had different functions in this new military and administrative network in northern Italy.

Likewise the imperial treasuries in Italy, which were essentially the financial support of the armies, were concentrated in the north; their placement was tied closely to the placement of earlier mints. The Notitia Dignitatum lists:

---

495 Not. Dign. Occ. 42. The Notitia Dignitatum is not without its problems, most to do with dating and thoroughness (as contradictory points in the document indicate that it cannot be descriptive of any particular moment in the late fourth and early fifth centuries, and it seems that the list is an amalgamation of material from a broader span of time). On the Notitia Dignitatum see Kulikowski 2000, Mann 1991, Clemente 1968, and the introduction to Goodburn and Bartholomew 1976. Kulikowski in particular takes a pessimistic view of the Notitia’s usefulness, saying “Herein lies the great problem with using the western Notitia as a source for the history of the west in the fourth and fifth centuries. The issue goes beyond questions of practicality or ideology, back to the textual history of our extant document, whatever its purpose. If it is useable only where it can be dated, and if it can be dated only in those precise cases where external evidence duplicates the information it provides, then it is not in fact useable” (376). For the purposes of this chapter issues of dating are less crucial, as when the treasuries, arms factories, and Sarmatian prefectures were established is less of an issue than that they were established at all. The fact of their establishment, combined with their distribution and irrespective of their exact dating, suggests a systematic transformation of northern Italy into an area of differentiated towns supporting the operations of the Roman army and administration during the late Roman period.

496 The presence of these barbarian settlements is also attested by surviving place names (Christie 2006: 309), which Paul the Deacon (HL 2.26) attributes to men brought in by the Lombard king Alboin in the sixth century.

Per Italiam:
Praepositus thesaurorum Aquileiensium, Venetiae.
Praepositus thesaurorum Mediolanensium, Liguriae.
Praepositus thesaurorum urbis Romae.
Praepositus thesaurorum Augustae Vindelicensis. 498

The most southerly treasury here is Rome, while Augusta Vindelicorum (mod. Augsburg) is in the former province of Raetia. That the treasures are all located in important capitals or regional hubs again suggests a differentiation in town functions; and it seems clear from the Notitia Dignitatum that while auxiliaries and treasures were part of the same military structure, the treasures were not kept in the same towns around which these auxiliaries were settled.

Along with the settlement of barbarian auxiliaries and the establishment of the financial support structure for the armies, the location of arms factories also points to a late third and fourth century reorientation of the region towards supporting the legions. The Notitia Dignitatum indicates that imperial factories made arrows at Concordia, shields at Verona and Cremona, body armor at Mantua, swords at Luca, and, most importantly for this study, bows at Ticinum. 499 That these six factories are all located in northern towns along major roads again suggests that their purpose was to provide speedy and regular supply of arms to the army, and the distinction between different types of armor again points to the creation of a network of towns in northern Italy, each with different purposes but all working towards the support of the larger military and administrative apparatus. 500 Like the treasuries and settlements of foreign auxiliaries, these factories were part of a larger, empire-wide system. In Illyricum there were

500 On the imperial fabricae see James 1988 and Jones 1964. The details of their organization and the mechanisms by which arms were supplied to the armies are not altogether clear, although later fourth century imperial edicts point to imperial oversight of arms quality as well as efforts to retain skilled workers (see below). See Christie 2006: 308ff on the conjunction of arms factories, barbarian settlement, road maintenance, the annona, and the billeting of troops. Although the evidence from the Notitia Dignitatum belongs to the early fifth century; there is scattered evidence of arms workshops earlier. In the mid third century CIL XIII 6763 = ILS 1188, a dedication to Iuppiter Optimus Maximus from Mogontiacum (Mainz), mentions arms making in Mediolanum, and CIL V 1883 = ILS 1939 from second century Concordia mentions a decuria armamentaria, or group of arms manufacturers (cf. MacMullen 1960). Both Mediolanum and Concordia were in areas that supplied the high imperial limes, and the appearance of arms workshops here is not surprising (on Concordia’s history of arms manufacture see Lettich 1982). The difference from the later period, at least on the basis of our limited evidence, seems to be the number of fabricae and their degree of specialization, as well as the greater role played by the state, which conducted quality control and oversaw production. The degree of specialization and the fairly even dispersal throughout the frontier regions, as well as their rather sudden appearance in the Notitia Dignitatum, suggests that the state was responsible for their original establishment or, through government contracts, at least their prosperity. Ward-Perkins 2005: 103 aptly notes the implications of their quantity, specialization, and dispersal: “The sheer number of these fabricae is impressive; but considerable administrative coordination must also have been required to collect, transport, and distribute their finished products. Somehow an archer facing the barbarians across the Rhine had to be united with his bow from Pavia and his arrows from Concordia, as well as his socks from Milan or Aquileia.” On the accompanying establishment of imperial weaving workshops, see Wild 1976.
imperial factories for shields, saddle-cloths, and arms at Sirmium, for shields at Carnuntum, Lauriacum, and Aquincum, and for arms at Salona.\footnote{Not. Dign. Occ. 6.} Similarly on the eastern frontiers the imperial arms factory at Irenopolis in Cilicia specialized in spears, and that at Damascus in shields and arms, while Edessa made shields and assorted military equipment.\footnote{Not. Dign. Or. 11.} Northern Italy was in this regard like other border regions of the empire, and the specialized arms factories reflect, if not an official policy, then at least a tendency on the part of Roman emperors and officials towards deepening the extent of the \textit{limes} and making large defensive zones behind the frontlines.

The military difficulties of the 250s, 260s, and 270s proved that emperors needed to be both more mobile and closer to the \textit{limes}. Those needs lay behind the creation of the Tetrarchy, in which four emperors could better respond to military threats, and to the concurrent establishment of multiple imperial seats, which did not replace Rome but supplemented it, providing places where the emperor and his \textit{comitatus} could still be close to the \textit{limes}, places that could also support the court. Beginning with Maximian at the end of the third century, Mediolanum—along with Sirmium, Antiochia, and Colonia Augusta Treverorum in the provinces—a frequent imperial seat.\footnote{On Ticinum as subordinate to Mediolanum’s regional hub see Clemente 1984: 262.} Mediolanum’s selection was only part of the broader reorientation of northern Italy towards military security we have been surveying, and while it effectively became the regional center, it is important to note that it was only part of a complicated regional network, with the emperor and court at Mediolanum supported by garrisons, arms factories, mints, and storehouses throughout towns along the Po valley’s roads.\footnote{On Ticinum as subordinate to Mediolanum’s regional hub see Clemente 1984: 262.}

\section*{Implications for Ticinum}

At Ticinum in particular, the period of foreign invasions and strong government reactions to them had a pronounced impact. A prime example is Aurelian’s transfer of Mediolanum’s minting operation to Ticinum in AD 274.\footnote{As with the establishment of a mint at Milan in AD 259, which was part of a broader policy change of putting more mints closer to the armies, the transfer to Ticinum was one of several changes Aurelian made to imperial minting operations: he added new mints and reorganized existing operations, and transferred the mints at Colonia Agrippina and Colonia Augusta Treverorum to Lugdunum. These changes were accompanied by a revamping of the monetary system (Crawford 1984: 251; Watson 2004: 130ff.; Harl 1996: 146).} With the new mint, which became Aurelian’s main producer of bronze coinage, Ticinum assumed a new regional prominence, particularly since it replaced Mediolanum as Italy’s primary mint (before Mediolanum, it had been Rome).\footnote{Aurelian had temporarily closed the mint at Rome in AD 271 following a violent urban revolt there that prominently featured mint workers displeased at imperial attempts to reform the mint and cut down on corruption; the revolt was suppressed only with difficulty and in a pitched battle on the Caelian hill near the mint (Zos. 1.49, Eutrop. 9.14, Epit. 35.4, SHA Aurel. 38.2-4, and Aur. Vict. Caes. 35.6, who says that the emperors could lend is demonstrated by}
the late fourth century *Ordo Urbium Nobilium*, in which the poet Ausonius places the imperial mint alongside traditionally prestigious urban forms—baths, temples, and walls.\(^{507}\) While the emperors establishing these late antique mints had largely practical considerations in mind, nevertheless Ausonius’s encomium of Mediolanum interprets the mint as an element of civic pride. Likewise a late fifth century AD encomium of Narbo in Gaul lists mints along with the forum, theater, baths, temples, walls, gates, and bridge as the praiseworthy attributes of that city.\(^{508}\) Ticinum’s claim to fame as Italy’s major mint was not left uncontested, and in AD 294 the tetrarchs opened a mint at Aquileia.\(^{509}\) Both mints were closed in the 320s as Constantine reorganized the imperial mints, Aquileia’s in 324 and Ticinum’s at the end of 326.\(^{510}\) Although Ticinum’s mint was not long in service—its phase of high production lasted only from Aurelian’s monetary reforms in AD 274 to Diocletian’s reforms in AD 285—nevertheless it helped to raise the town’s status.\(^{511}\)

While the transfer of the mint to Ticinum gave the town prestige and a claim of superiority over neighboring towns, for a feature that unlike more standard urban structures like theaters and temples was unique in the region, the day to day operations of the mint would have brought immediate changes to the town’s economy and society. The mint’s large output required much metal, especially copper for the large productions of billon currency. This meant the establishment of supply lines leading from provincial mining centers. As the mint produced gold and silver coinage as well, small detachments of soldiers would probably have been sent to Ticinum for security purposes.\(^{512}\) Skilled workers needed to be brought in to make the coins at Ticinum’s mint; these included *argentarii*, *signatores*, *sculptores*, *malleatores*, *suppostores*, and *conductores*.\(^{513}\) Supervising them were *procuratores* and *officinatores* of the individual *officinæ* or divisions.\(^{514}\) Each of these officials required further support staff, and a second century AD inscription from Rome lists nine slaves assisting the *officinatores* of the mint.\(^{515}\) The

---

\(^{507}\) Ausonius, *Ordo Urbium Nobilium* 7 (Mediolanum).

\(^{508}\) Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 20.41.

\(^{509}\) On the mint at Aquileia see Carson, Hill, and Kent 1972 and Ulrich-Bansa 1935. See also *RIC* VI p. 299.

\(^{510}\) On Constantine’s monetary policy and the reorganization of the mints, see Barnes 1982 and *RIC* VII, as well as Hendy 2008 for general context on late Roman monetary reforms and the transfer of mints around the empire.

\(^{511}\) Crawford 1984: 252.

\(^{512}\) P. *Gen.Lat.* 1, a list of legionary duties dating from late first century AD Egypt, records a legionary being sent out for duty at the mint (the specific assignment is dated to the first year of Domitian’s reign). Likewise a cohort at Lugdunum in the first century was probably connected with guarding the imperial mint there (Tac. *Ann.* 3.41). It is reasonable to assume that these late third century mints, in more unsettled times, had larger groups of soldiers assigned to them. On the production of gold and silver coinage at Ticinum see *RIC* V-VII, Chiaravalle 1987, Crawford 1984, and Cremaschi 1961.

\(^{513}\) See *RIC* VI p. 105ff on early fourth century mint organization. On job titles in the mint at Rome see *CIL* VI 42, 43, 44, 239, 741 (115 AD); *CIL* VI 1145 (Constantinian). The job titles themselves are not conclusively linked with specific standing within the minting organization; cf. Silver 2009 on the ambiguity of Roman job titles in general.

\(^{514}\) Chiaravalle 1987: 6-7. The *officinæ* at Ticinum are marked as P, Q, S, and T on the mint marks, in addition to the T indicating Ticinum.

\(^{515}\) *CIL* VI 43 = *ILS* 1643.
mint also required the supervision of quite high ranking imperial officials like C. Valerius Sabinus, Aurelian’s rationalis, commemorated by Ticinum’s decurions. The operations at Ticinum, and likely at Mediolanum before it, were probably closely supervised by Sabinus and his subordinates because of concerns produced by the revolt of the mint workers at Rome in AD 271, which had proved so disastrous and in which the mint workers had been suspected of rampant embezzlement. The opening of an imperial mint at Ticinum thus meant a substantial infusion of personnel—and the money they brought with them—into the town.

The mint also connected Ticinum more closely with other points of the empire with similar imperial interests. The opening of new mints, closing of others, and frequent reorganization of minting operations in the late third and early fourth century meant that specialized personnel were transferred among mints, and Ticinum seems to have received mint workers from Arles, Treviri, and possibly Lugdunum and Londinium as well. Similarly after the mint at Ticinum was closed in AD 326, the workers seem to have been transferred to the new mint at Constantinopolis. In this manner the Roman state transferred mint workers, much as it did men employed by the legions and the state bureaucracy, between places where the state was heavily involved; this process connected otherwise unrelated towns such as Londinium, Ticinum, and Constantinopolis. The closing of the mint at Ticinum and the opening of one at Aquileia meant that, if the mint brought about the changes I have suggested, many of them would have been temporary, but the effects of the mint on Ticinum were paralleled in the consequences of the other changes brought about there as the state created a new support zone in northern Italy for the army and the imperial administration.

Its bow-factory, for example, affected the community’s economy and society. Although the only certain evidence for the factory is the one line from the Notitia Dignitatum Occidentalis quoted above, and while it is uncertain when or how long it was in operation, nevertheless even a relatively short period of operation must have had a great impact on the town’s daily life. This fabrica at Ticinum worked in concert with other arms factories in the region to supply the army. As with the mint, specialized workers needed to be brought in to make the bows, procurement of raw materials organized, and a transportation system arranged to deliver the product to the armies: in effect, this meant creating an entirely new industry and integrating it with existing, related industries, all of which were overseen by imperial officials. This new industry would be visible even on the streets in Ticinum, as specialized arms makers, according to an AD 398 edict, were to be branded on their arms in the same way that military recruits were. The presence of these workers in the town had the potential to change the

---

518 RIC VII p.358-9. Although there is no direct literary evidence for the transfer of mint workers to and from Ticinum, the similarity of coin types between mints that were closing and mints that were seeing a surge in production suggests that transfer of specialized workers to meet the demands of increased production.
519 Crawford 1984: 252. See also Bruun 1962.
520 The procurement of raw materials, as it presented opportunities for embezzlement, was regulated by the government (Cod. Theod. 10.22.2), as was the output of fabricae (cf. Cod. Theod. 10.22.1).
521 Cod. Theod. 10.22.7.
town’s social dynamics. Workers at similar fabricae at Caesarea and Hadrianopolis were leading elements in late fourth century riots in those towns, and even earlier in the AD 270s the revolt of the mint workers at Rome had shown the danger large groups of imperial workers could pose to urban peace.\footnote{Cf. Jones 1964: 836 on the presence between workshop workers and urban riots. Christie 2006 gives the range of scholarly estimates of the workforce of individual fabricae as between 200 and 500. A passage of Ammianus (31.6.2) describes the crowd of people (multitudo) employed by the fabrica at Adrianople as being large (ampla).} Besides this potential for municipal violence, the presence of the guild of armorers in the town also presented economic opportunities for Ticinum’s inhabitants, who, provided that they could prove that they were not of the decurial class and had no outstanding municipal debts, could join the guild of armorers, and tattoo aside, receive imperial pay and board courtesy of the state annona.\footnote{Cod. Theod. 10.22.6.} The decree recognizes the temptation that the fabricae posed as a financial escape for a municipal class of decurions burdened by compulsory public benefactions and service. While the empire wanted to keep local decurions from fleeing their financial obligations, armorers too, once trained, needed to be retained, and once in the imperial service neither armorers nor their children could change professions; anyone who took armorers or their children as farm overseers or tenants, for example, lost part of his land to the imperial Fiscus.\footnote{Cod. Theod. 10.22.4, 10.22.6.} The presence of this closely-regulated imperial enterprise thus offered opportunities for the financially desperate but at the same time kept in something akin to imperial serfdom those who took them. The factory in Ticinum created jobs that were stable but whose terms were nonnegotiable, an infusion of imperial and military officials, and also a large, hereditary, and potentially disruptive class of bowmakers.

Since Ticinum was part of a regionally-based supply network for the court and army, the town must also have seen goods from other state fabricae passing through on the roads connecting other towns with the army or the court at Mediolanum. For example the state wool factories, the gynaecaea, produced clothing both for the court and for the armies, and so were part of the same support system in northern Italy comprising mints, arms workshops, garrisons, administrative centers, and auxiliary settlements.\footnote{On the function and organization of the late imperial gynaecaea see Wild 1976. Complementing the woolen factories were the linyvia—state fabricae for the production of linen cloth, of which there are only two attested, one at Vienna in Gaul and the other in Italy at Ravenna—and bafii, imperial dyeing workshops, of which one of the nine attested is in Italy, at Cissa in Istria (Not. Dign. Occ. 11). The status of the workers in the gynaecaea was not particularly high, and an edict of AD 336 orders a son of Constantine’s rival Licinius, once he has been apprehended, to be bound in chains and sent to serve in the woolen workshop in Carthage (Cod. Theod. 4.6.1).} In northern Italy there were two procuratores gynaeciorum, one for Mediolanum and Liguria and the other for Aquileia and Venetia.\footnote{Not. Dign. Occ. 11.} Liguria, in particular the Tanarus river valley connecting to the Po about twenty miles west of Ticinum, had since at least the early Empire been an important producer of woolen cloth, and most probably continued to do so in the fourth century.\footnote{On wool production in the Tanarus valley see Mart. Ep. 14. 157 (on Pollentian wool), Strabo 5.1.12 (wool production in Liguria in general), Columella Rust. 7.2 (on Pollentian dark wool), and Pliny HN 8.73 (again on Pollentian dark wool). Supplementing the sheep rearing were wool carding and combing at Brixia (CIL V 4501 = Inscr. It. 10-5: 294) and Brixellum (CIL XI 1031; Inscr. It. 10-5: 875). Continued production is likely based on parallels with other wool producing towns in northern Italy, as Altinum and Altinum and
clothing traveling from the Tanarus in Liguria to the court at Mediolanum and gynaeceae throughout the region.

The transport of woolen goods through the city will not have been as disruptive as the passage of the imperial comitatus. Ticinum’s proximity to the imperial seat at Mediolanum and position on the road system meant that the emperor’s retinue often passed through the town. For example in AD 355 Constantius II was on the road between Ticinum and Laumellum—at a point that Ammianus says is marked by two columns—when he heard about the loss of Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium to besieging Germans, while a senatorial embassy including the orator Symmachus stopped in Ticinum on its way to Mediolanum in February of 402. Soldiers and officials attached to the comitatus and on official business had the right to quarter in homes, with a host of restrictions; across the empire these restrictions included bans on quartering in synagogues or anywhere in Africa and prohibitions on quartering officials making demands for oil and wood. Again this practice of quartering had a visual impact—if only temporarily—on the town, as the names of those quartered in a house were written on its doorposts. After AD 400, at least, the homes of armorers were exempt from compulsory quartering, except when the emperor and his comitatus were in town. Thus even Ticinum’s bowmakers had to quarter passing imperial retinues. In civil war, such as that between Constantine and Maxentius in northern Italy in AD 312, such prohibitions may not have been enforced, especially in towns such as Augusta Taurinorum and Verona that chose the losing side. There is also the possibility that Ticinum, being close as it was to Mediolanum, will have had to house members of the imperial family or court who were out of favor, as nearby Comum did when the future emperor Julian was kept under guard there for several months in AD 354-5.

Parma, both famous for their white wool under the early empire (Mart. Ep. 14.155), both have prices for wool listed in Diocletian’s Edict on Prices. Amm. Marc. 15.15.18. Symmachus Ep. 7.13. See also Gillett 2003. Cod. Theod. 7.8.1-16. For recent bibliography on late antique quartering in Italy see Christie 2006: 308ff. Cod. Theod. 7.8.4. Cod. Theod. 7.8.8. Ticinum was a stopping point for emperors even in the early imperial period. Augustus met Drusus’ funeral cortège there in 9 BC (Tac. Ann. 1.32, Val. Max. 5.5.3), and Vitellius dined there in AD 69, when a riot broke out between his legionaries and auxiliaries (Tac. Hist. 2.68). The war between Maxentius and Constantine should be seen in the context of the power struggles and civil wars that followed the retirements of Diocletian and Maximian in AD 305 and the death of the successor Augustus Constantius early in AD 306. These wars made their way to northern Italy in 306, when the Augustus Severus moved south from his seat at Mediolanum to suppress Maxentius’ revolt at Rome; Severus’ army deserted him, and he fled north to Ravenna, where he surrendered early in 307 (Euseb. Vit. Const. 27.3, Zos. 2.10, Laactant. De mort. pers. 26-27). More serious for northern Italy was the war between Maxentius and Constantine, when Constantine crossed the Cottain Alps to march against Maxentius, then in control of Rome and most of Italy. Constantine’s army first took Segusio and then was received by Augusta Taurinorum, Mediolanum, and Brixia. After a closely fought but successful siege of a Maxentian army in Verona (depicted prominently on the Arch of Constantine at Rome), Constantine accepted the surrenders of Aquileia, Mutina, and Ravenna before moving on to Rome and the battle of the Milvian Bridge (Pan. Lat. 9.5-11, Zos. 2.15, Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 9.9.3, Euseb. Vit. Const. 37.2, Aur. Vict. Caes. 40.16, Eutrop. 10.4). Each of the two wars lasted less than a year, and during that between Maxentius and Constantine there was fighting in the region only in the spring and summer of AD 312.

Amm. Marc. 15.2.7, Julian. Ep. ad. Ath. 272-274.
Julian’s house arrest at Comum also highlights another effect of the new imperial zone in northern Italy: a shift in landholding patterns. The emperor's presence attracted a large group of elites, and elite culture required suitably picturesque country estates. Around Mediolanum this created a land grab, and in the later third century the city’s bishop Ambrose complained in a sermon about the buying up of smaller farms by larger landowners. This land grab was probably not evenly distributed around Mediolanum, and there is little indication that foggy Ticinum was seen as the most desirable setting for elite villas, at least not in the fourth century. At that time there was a minor boom in villa construction around Lake Como, and Julian’s house arrest in Comum suggests that he was kept at one of these villas. So while Ticinum itself may have not experienced substantial villa construction, towns like Comum that were within its social orbit did, and so the influx of elites into Mediolanum should also have extended into the countryside and into select towns. At the same time the Roman government ensured that productive agriculture was kept up so that the soldiers, officials, and bowmakers could be fed, and the importation of barbarians to farm the land not only provided a ready-made militia but also made previously unfarmed land productive again. Prefects of Sarmatian settlements are attested near Ticinum at Novaria and Vercellae, and thus it is likely that some barbarian soldiers were settled either near or within Ticinum’s territory. Combined with a boom market for elite villas around imperial centers like Mediolanum and Aquileia, the importation of thousands of new farmers into the region’s abandoned fields revived local economies in certain areas and at Aquileia, for example, halted a decline in the number of rural sites. Here again this change was a result of direct state intervention.

At the same time, proximity to the imperial court offered opportunities for advancement. As had been the case with the mint, those connected with the court, proximity to the imperial court offered opportunities for advancement. As had been the case with the mint, those connected with the court,

---

536 In the early empire Plin. Ep. 9.7 compares his lakeside villas favorably to those at Baiae, so lakeside villas could be seen to be as desirable as valuable maritime properties. On the continuity of elite villa culture in the late Roman and post-Roman periods as well as an increasing preference of elites for villas in place of cities for conducting business (exemplified by more specialized reception rooms in late Roman villas) see Sfameni 2004.
537 Cassiodorus attests to the continuation of lakeside villas in the Ostrogothic period (Var. 9.14). Christie 2006: 419, discussing evidence for villa distribution, suggests that “a senator with landholdings across Italy might invest far more in a villa near Lake Como than in estate building in Calabria, since the former was more likely to be used for visits if the owner was resident in Milan.”
538 The Italian lakes on which these villas were set were also fortified and provided with watchtowers, and on Lake Como at least there was a small fleet (Christie 2006: 339; Not. Dign. Occ. 42, Paul HL 3.31).
539 There is no indication that these new landowners were given land at the expense of others, and the fairly even distribution of praefecti Sarmartarum across the Po valley and a general trend towards settlement in smaller towns suggest that the government made efforts to settle these families on unclaimed or unworked land rather than displace already working farms.
540 Magrini 1997. The stabilization in the number of rural sites in the fourth century seems to point to greater emphasis on supplying food for the region rather than on the long distance trade of the early imperial period. Mancassola and Saggioro 2001 find a similar stability in rural areas around Lake Garda, with villa levels recovering from the second century AD bust of the Italian agricultural boom of the late republican and early empire. It should be noted that the fifth century saw more decline and trauma at rural sites and also at urban private residences (cf. Baldini Lippolis 2003, who notes the exception of Ravenna, where the imperial capital was located, and Ciurletti 2003, on Tridentum but with discussion of changes in northern Italian private architecture and building quality as a whole; for Italian rural agriculture as a whole in late antiquity see Lewitt 2004).
military, and bureaucracy were shuffled between other places where the state had a strong interest. One inscription at Ticinum, probably dating to the fourth century, is an epitaph commemorating a Valeria Vincentia, twenty-seven years old and for ten years, two months, and twenty-five days the wife of a Fabius Maianus, who brought her body back from Treviri for burial at her family home in Ticinum.\(^{541}\) That she and her husband were in Treviri at all suggests that they were connected, either directly or indirectly, with the imperial bureaucracy or court. In a similar manner the orator Symmachus spent some of his early life around Colonia Augusta Treverorum, while he later resided in Rome and made trips to Mediolanum, and late Roman elites in general found themselves drawn to these centers of imperial power.\(^{542}\) Although at Ticinum Valeria Vincentia is an isolated example of this type of connectivity between imperial centers, even this isolated example would have been unlikely in an earlier imperial context.\(^{543}\)

Even after late AD 402, when the imperial seat was transferred from Mediolanum to Ravenna, through the first part of the fifth century Ticinum continued to be a part of this militarized, heavily state-influenced order, although towards the middle of the century that order was breaking down in the face of declining Roman political control in Italy and the west.\(^{544}\) Indeed the primary reason for the transfer, the vulnerability of Mediolanum in the face of the Alaric’s invasion of Italy in AD 401 and 402, reinforced the need for the militarization of northern Italy.\(^{545}\) Further illustrating the need to shore up the region were the invasion of Visigoths under Radagaisus in AD 405/6, during which the invaders were allowed to roam freely throughout northern Italy while the *magister militum* Stilicho gathered sufficient forces, and Alaric’s sacking of Rome in AD 410.\(^{546}\) It is in fact in the context of increased military threats in Germany and Gaul that in AD 408 Stilicho assembled the army of Italy at Ticinum in preparation for action in Gaul against the usurper Constantine III at Arles.\(^{547}\) Accompanying that army were officials and support staff, who needed to be quartered, and supplying the armies were the arms factories of the Po valley, including the bow works at Ticinum. Also in attendance

---

541 Sup. It. 9: 51 (Ticinum). On the dating of the inscription and the relevance of court connections see Clemente 1984: 261 and Gabba and Tibiletti 1960. Judging by the name Valeria, which becomes very common after Diocletian, and the letter forms, the inscription could be as late as the mid fifth century, but is probably not earlier than the very end of the third.


543 The lack of further examples, especially in contrast with the examples noted above of early imperial Ticineses attested along the limes, is perhaps to be attributed to the growing paucity of Ticinese inscriptions after the high empire. On the overall decline of inscriptions following the second century AD see MacMullen 1982, as well as Meyer 1990 on potential causes of said decline.

544 On increased militarization at Ticinum after Honorius’s transfer of the capital to Ravenna see Clemente 1984: 262. On the movement of the court to Ravenna see Cod. Theod. 7.13.15.

545 The Visigoths under Alaric had invaded Italy in AD 402, when they lay siege to Mediolanum; battles later that year at Pollentia and Verona were narrow Roman victories, but the war made it clear that Mediolanum was not sufficiently secure. The victories at Pollentia at Verona, while placing a large number of Visigothic captives, including Alaric’s wife and children, in Roman custody, nevertheless seem to have left Alaric’s army at a formidable strength. On Alaric’s first invasion of Italy see [more]

546 The invasion of 405/6: Zos. 5.26-7. Stilicho caught up with Radagaisus when the latter was besieging Ravenna. There the Romans under Stilicho defeated the Gothic army, but Radagaisus escaped, only to be captured later near Ticinum. The sacking of Rome: Zos. 5.36-6.13, Jer. Ep. 127.12, Oros. 7.39-41. On the distinction between Radagaisus and Alaric’s armies see Heather 1999.

547 The primary account of the army at Ticinum and the subsequent coup against Stilicho and his allies there is that of Zos. 5.30-34, but see also Oros. 7.38.
there were the western emperor Honorius and many high ranking officials of his court. This moment right before the mutiny of the army at Ticinum underlines how much the crises and reactions of later third and fourth centuries had transformed the town’s purpose and identity, from the municipium that was for Augustus another transit point among many in northern Italy to the quasi-military base where nearly all the components of the late antique state combined in one place. An army mutiny followed Honorius’s arrival at Ticinum, in which Stilicho’s supporters and other high ranking officials accompanying Honorius were killed; Stilicho at the time was at Ticinum’s equivalent in Aemilia, Bononia. The mutiny shows how disastrous that particular combination could be with the catalyst of political intrigue, and Zosimus depicts the emperor wandering in a panic through the streets of Ticinum without his imperial regalia.

The staging of the army there in AD 408—it had also been there in 405—demonstrates why the town continued to be an important part of the state’s support structure even after the western court moved to Ravenna; the town’s location on the Ticinum and on the roads leading across the western Alps made it an ideal location in which to prepare military operations in Gaul while still being relatively well connected to the capital at Ravenna, and the existing infrastructure in Ticinum and in rest of the Po valley facilitated supply of that army. In the early fifth century that infrastructure was strengthened with the fortification near Ticinum of the mansio at Lomello, which protected Ticinum’s rural population and controlled access to the town. Unfortunately the importance Ticinum acquired in the later third, fourth, and fifth centuries, made possible by the larger military situation, also made it vulnerable, and when Attila invaded in AD 452 he sacked Ticinum along with the region’s two most important towns, Mediolanum and Aquileia, the latter of which was so depopulated by the calamity that Pope Leo was asked to inveigh on the matter of Aquileian women whose husbands had been taken into captivity by the Huns and had returned to find that their wives remarried. Ticinum was captured again in AD 476 in the war between Orestes and Odoacer that saw the deposition of the last western Roman emperor Romulus Augustulus.

Church and state in Ticinum

---

548 Zos. 5.31. Among those officials killed were the praetorian prefects of Gaul and Italy and the magister officiorum.
549 Zos. 5.26, 45.
550 Brogiolo and Gelichi 1996. On Lomello’s relationship to Ticinum see Boffo and Ambaglio 1992: 225-6, who cite Pliny the Elder’s (HN 19.1-9) reference to the production of linen in the area between Launellum / Lomello and Ticinum. This linen industry, if still surviving, would also have been important enough for the state to protect.
551 Jord. Get. 42; Leo Epist. 159. Physical signs of destruction stemming from the Huns’ sack of Aquileia are few, although the event does seem to have inaugurated a period of the decline, particularly in the northern areas of the city (Verzar-Basss 2003). Aquileia’s bishop had, presumably with other inhabitants, escaped the Huns by fleeing to Grado, a defensible island whose position in this period rose as those of inland towns fell (Calderini 1930: 87; Zovatto 1971). Jordanes is an ambiguous as the extent of damage at Ticinum.
552 Ennodius, Vita Epiphanii 96-97.
The state apparatus that connected Valeria Vincentia, Colonia Augusta Treverorum, and Ticinum as well as army, emperor, and officials was not the only major development in the region during the empire’s last two centuries. The place of the church in this reorganized area has yet to be examined; this question is important, as the rise of the church in northern Italy coincides with the development of this militarized and bureaucratized zone. There is little secure evidence for northern Italian churches from the third century, but by the 370s bishops are attested at Aquileia, Ariminium, Bononia, Brescia, Claterna, Comum, Dertona, Mediolanum, Mutina, Parma, Patavium, Placentia, Ravenna, Ticinum, Tridentum, and Vercellae—in short, in nearly all of northern Italy’s important towns. These bishops—as well as the deacons, presbyters, monks, and other churchmen under them—constituted a new organized authority in the region, one that paralleled that already established by the state, as the place of Ticinum’s church in this new religious order illustrates. Here Ticinum’s proximity to Mediolanum again proves useful, since Mediolanum is fairly well documented through the letters and speeches of Ambrose and hence allows a glimpse at the relationship between the sees of two nearby towns.

The elevation of Mediolanum as imperial seat brought prestige to its religious leaders, and the bishops Auxentius and Ambrose used their position in that town to influence church affairs in other towns in the region. For Ticinum, again proximity to power both provided opportunities and heightened hierarchies that placed Mediolanum over Ticinum. An illustration can be found in the later third century in an unnamed bishop of Ticinum, who found himself entrusted with a sum of cash by a local widow. When the widow went into debt, her creditor appealed to the magister officiorum, who then ordered the bishop to surrender the money. The bishop in turn appealed to Ambrose, the influential and vociferous bishop of Mediolanum, and after conclave with Ambrose physically barred the men sent by the magister officiorum from retrieving the money from its hiding place. Worth noting in this story is that both parties, in the church and imperial bureaucracies, appealed to their superiors—the magister officiorum to the emperor and the bishop at Ticinum to the more powerful bishop at Mediolanum. In the case of the former, the hierarchical relationship is clearly acknowledged by laws

---

553 See Humphries 1999: 45ff and Wataghin 2000 on evidence for the earliest churches in northern Italy. For Ticinum most of the evidence is literary, from lists of attendees at church conclaves, the life of Epiphanius of Pavia, and the writings of Ambrose. Unfortunately one large granite sarcophagus from Ticinum which claims to be that of Surus ep(is)c (opus) is of highly questionable authenticity (Boffo and Amboglio: 305, no. 77). Surus/Surus was later celebrated as the first bishop of Pavia and as patron of the city, but his cult was not prominent until at least the tenth century (Thaker and Sharpe 2002: 22-23). The circumstances surrounding the sarcophagus’s finding are suspicious, as are the chronology of the development of Surus’s saint cult and the extremely crude lettering, the latter of which suggests a later attempt to produce a suitably primitive looking inscription for an early Christian saint. Iuventius, active in the 370s and 380s, is the first securely attested bishop at Ticinum. On the Christianization of the region and the religious conversion of the inhabitants, see Lizzi 2001 and 1990; for the larger imperial context of conversion see MacMullen 1984b and on the speed and patterns of conversion see Bagnall 1987.

554 See Lizzi-Testa 1989 on ecclesiastical hierarchies in the region in general.

555 Humphries 1999: 148 explains the early dominance of Mediolanum’s see, even before Ambrose, by suggesting that “the bishop of Milan, living in a city regularly occupied by the court, proved to be a useful intermediary between the emperor and other ecclesiastics, thus giving him a certain prestige outside the city.” For an introduction to Ambrose see Liebeschuetz 2004, Ramsey 1997, Williams 1995, and McLynn 1994.

556 Ambrose De Off. 2.150-151.
defining orders of precedence but with the bishops the relationship is very much modeled
on the perceived authority of their sees, itself derived from connections to imperial
power. In that light, it is not surprising that Mediolanum’s main episcopal rival during
this period was Aquileia, another imperial seat.557

The hierarchical relationship between the Mediolanum and Ticinum’s churches is
again demonstrated by Ambrose’s ordination of bishops of other towns, including a
bishop of Ticinum in AD 397 and Gaudentius of Brixia, the latter of whom tellingly
brought back to his church saints’ relics from Mediolanum.558 Likewise in Ticinum the
two early basilicas of Saints Garvaius and Protasius and of Nazarius and Celsus are
dedicated to Milanese martyrs.559 That Ambrose found the relics of the first two martyrs
in AD 386, in the midst of the bishop’s quarrel with the emperor Valentinian over the
latter’s profession of Arianism emphasizes the political nature of Ticinum’s choice of
new saints.560 Relics of these saints given to Ticinum’s churches were undoubtedly the
personal gifts of Ambrose, and by accepting the relics the church authorities at Ticinum
were showing loyalty to him at a time when he was involved in a very public dispute with
the emperor and his family. As in the episode of the Pavian widow, Ticinum found itself
between competing authorities, but again it is important to note the subsidiary role the
town played.561 As for the remains of the saints Nazarius and Celsus, found by Ambrose
in Mediolanum in AD 395 around the time of the death of Theodosius, their exhumation
provided a chance for the bishop to demonstrate his authority at a time when his
influence with the new emperor and court was in doubt.562 For Ticinum, the acceptance
of these latter two saints’ relics illustrates the town’s position within a regional religious
hierarchy with the imperial center Mediolanum at the top.

Within Ticinum itself the church was slow to develop. While Ticinum remained
in the fourth and early fifth centuries a subsidiary imperial base, its church and bishops
defered frequently to Rome and Mediolanum and supported those cities’ bishops in a
series of synods in the last quarter of the fourth century.563 By the end of the fourth
century it had only two churches, both extramural, and the first seems to have been
modeled on the church of S. Nazaro at Mediolanum, which suggests that not just the
relics but also the buildings that housed them were derived from Mediolanum, which in
turn derived much of its authority from its connection with imperial power, even if that
connection was not always harmonious.564 Only after the imperial court moved to
Ravenna and Roman imperial authority in Italy began to weaken did Ticinum’s church

558 See Ramsey 1997: 39-40 on Ambrose’s ordinations. Gaudentius describes the relics as dust mixed with
blood (Tractatus 17.12).
560 Paulinus Vita Ambrosii 14, 29, 32-33. On the Arian controversy and the dispute between Ambrose and
561 During the Arian controversy with Valentinian Ambrose made at least one attempt to flee to Ticinum
(McLynn 1994: 46), suggesting that he thought he had reliable supporters in the town.
562 The chronology of Theodosius’ death and the exhumation of saints Nazarius and Celsus is difficult to
determine. Paulinus Vita Ambrosii 32 says that the exhumation was done quo in tempore of Theodosius’s
death. Ambrose’s miraculous discovery of two saints, Vitalis and Agricola, at Bononia two years earlier
suggests that the ceremonies surrounding the finding of saints’ relics were useful in spreading regional
influence.
564 Bullough 1966: 90.
gain significant regional authority and prominence in the town, and in the last quarter of the fifth century, after the fall of the western empire, the town’s bishop Epiphanius took a leading role in embassies to Gothic kings at Toulouse (Euric) and Ravenna (Theodoric) and served as an intermediary between the emperor Julius Nepos and a council of Ligurian elites.\footnote{On the chronology of these events in the \textit{Vita Epiphanii} see Gillett 2003: 284ff.} This represented a departure from the practices of his late fourth and early fifth century predecessors who are mostly attested at Italian synods.\footnote{See Humphreys 1999 on synod attendance and attestations of Ticinese and other northern Italian bishops.} Even at this point the influence of Mediolanum, still by far the larger town, remained strong. The \textit{Vita} of the bishop Epiphanius claims that the people of Mediolanum were jealous that Ticinum had so pious and virtuous a bishop as he.\footnote{Ennodius \textit{Vita Epiphanii} 41-2.} This little taunt directed only at Mediolanum suggests that, even in the Ostrogothic period over a century after Mediolanum had ceased to be the imperial seat, the people of Ticinum still felt the need to assert their status against their neighbors at Mediolanum.

The correspondence between the relationship of Ticinum and Mediolanum’s churches and the position of the two cities in northern Italy’s larger administrative network was not unusual. The actions of the state within northern Italy were closely connected to those of the church. One late fourth century instance of violence in another part of northern Italy illustrates these connections. In AD 397 north of Tridentum in the Val di Non, where the withdrawal of the Raetian \textit{limes} had turned the area into a vulnerable border and where the local church was attempting to suppress pagan practices that in the church’s view might bring about divine wrath, pagans angry at the church’s efforts to prohibit Christian converts from attending a pagan purification ceremony lynched three Christian priests.\footnote{For a detailed discussion of this incident, and for the connection between imperial efforts to defend the area (cf. Lizzi 1990) and intensified church efforts to clamp down on what they saw as dangerous practices, see Salzman 2006 and Wataghin 2000. \textit{Cf.} Grégoire 1997.} Here the stress put on the Roman state to defend this area translated to stress for both the area’s pagan and Christians. After the incident Virgilius the bishop of Tridentum sent letters describing the lynching first to the bishop of Mediolanum, Simplicianus, and then to John Chrystostom the bishop of Constantinopolis, and here the sending of letters—these letters were accompanied by the ashes of the new Val di Non martyrs—first to Mediolanum and then to the capital of the eastern empire at Constantinopolis shows the importance of those two sees in the church hierarchy and the correlation between that religious hierarchy and the secular one.\footnote{Virgilius \textit{Epistolae Duae} PL 13: 549-558. See also Sotinel 2004.} After news of the incident in the Val di Non was taken to Mediolanum, it traveled throughout northern Italy, probably on similar communication networks, and in AD 401/2 and 405 the bishops of Brixia and Augusta Taurinorum described the incident in their sermons.\footnote{Salzman 2006. Gaudentius of Brescia \textit{Tr.} 17 (= \textit{PL} 20 964a and \textit{CSEL} 68, 144). Maximus of Turin \textit{Serm.} 105-8 (= \textit{PL} 57).} In this framework, in which the political and religious standing of towns mirrored each other, the position of Ticinum’s church with regards to Mediolanum is not therefore atypical of northern Italy or the empire as a whole.
Ticinum in the post-Roman world

Ticinum’s place within these hierarchies, both secular and religious, changed remarkably slowly. The fifth century saw the disintegration of the Roman empire in the west and the establishment of Gothic kingdoms under first Odoacer and then Theodoric. The latter’s treatment of northern Italy is instructive. The new leader of Ostrogothic Italy put on games, restored old buildings, and built new structures in Rome, Ravenna, Verona, and Ticinum, all of which were important centers associated with late Roman imperial power; Theodoric was, at least in terms of his euergetism, portraying himself in the mold of late Roman emperor and reaffirming the status of older imperial centers. At Ticinum Theodoric built a palace, and here the Ostrogoths also had work done on the amphitheater, walls, baths, granaries and drains. At Ticinum in particular, Theodoric confirmed older Roman priorities and hierarchies, as when at his urging Epiphanius, bishop of Ticinum, convinced local elites in depressed local communities to move to Ticinum, and when the bishop of Mediolanum was made responsible for overseeing the sale of grain from Ticinum’s state granary; Epiphanius also negotiated Theodoric’s AD 489 entry into the city and thus spared the city violence. In the first case the city is exalted over the ruined countryside; in the other Mediolanum is made the administrator of Ticinum. The town also continued to serve its military purpose, and the bishop Ennodius’s panegyric of the first decade of the sixth century records large numbers of troops quartered in the town, so many that large houses had to be divided into smaller huts. The town’s military function is clear in a letter Cassiodorus, Theodoric’s magister officiorum, wrote to its comites, defensores, and curiales, communicating the king’s order to provision a delegation of Herulians who were on their way to Ravenna, “so that they might see the difference between Italy and their famished homeland.” Cassiodorus makes further reference to a garrison at Ticinum, and the imprisonment and

571 On Ostrogothic Italy, see Amory 2003, Moorhead 1992, and Wickam 1981.
572 Anon. Val. 60-71. Theodoric also repaired an aqueduct at Parma (Cassiod. Var. 7.29 and 7.30). Cassiod. Var. 2.37 also records Theodoric’s euergetism at Spoletium, where the inhabitants were supplied with free baths. On Theodoric see especially the essays in Teodorico il Grande 1993, and on Theodoric’s building projects see Johnson 1988 and La Rocca in Teodorico il Grande.
573 Ward-Perkins 1984; Bullough 1966. Cf. Majocchi 2008. For work on the amphitheater see CIL V 6418 (=ILS 829). This work was accompanied by church building, and this period sees the first intramural churches at Ticinum; previously churches were constructed outside the city walls around cemeteries (Christie 2006: 107). Useful comparanda for urban change in Ostrogothic northern Italy are supplied by the well-studied Brixia (see Brogiolo 2006), Verona (see Verona 1982; cf. CIL V 3329 on Ostrogothic alterations of Verona’s walls and the Versus de Verona, collected in Godman 1985), and Ravenna (see Brown 1998 and 1993 on everyday life in Ostrogothic Ravenna, as well as Cassiod. Var. 1.6 on Theodoric’s requisition of mosaicists from Rome for work in Ravenna).
574 Ennodius Vita Epiphanii 120-1, Cassiod. Var. 10.27. This is the first reference to a state granary in Ticinum. The same letter also mentions state granaries at Dertona in Liguria and at Tarvisium and Tridentum in Venetia.
575 Ennodius. Panegyricus Theodorico. The town was later used as a gathering point for troops in AD 532, during the Gothic wars, when the Ostrogothic king Teias assembled his army at Ticinum in preparation for battle against the Byzantines (Procop. Goth. 8.33-5). Around a thousand survivors of these battles later retreated to Ticinum (Procop. Goth. 35.37). On the history of Ostrogothic Ticinum see Cracco-Ruggini 1984.
576 Cassiod. Var. 4.45. Bullough 1966: 92 describes this “combination of old and new forms of city government and military authority” as “characteristic of late Imperial and Ostrogothic Italy.”
execution of his predecessor Boethius at Ticinum also suggests that the town continued to serve as a secondary administrative center.\textsuperscript{577} Needing to establish legitimacy, Ostrogothic rulers leaned towards continuity, and emulated earlier Roman practices in their treatment of Italian towns and urban culture. For Ticinum this meant that the town remained an important base for the army and the administration.

It was only with the Gothic wars, which saw a particularly destructive sack of Mediolanum and which Ticinum survived relatively well, and with the Lombard invasion of Italy, which saw the new invaders make Ticinum their capital, that the town’s position in the region changed significantly. During the AD 539 sack of Mediolanum by a combined force of Goths, Franks, and Burgundians, the city’s male population was massacred and its women and children sold off to the Burgundians; Procopius claims that over 300,000 Milanese were killed.\textsuperscript{578} While Procopius’s tally is probably exaggerated, even at a tenth the total the sack would have been a demographic disaster for the town. Consequently Ticinum was now the preeminent fortified settlement in the region; moreover the town was able to maintain many of the amenities built by the Romans and Ostrogoths, including its extensive drainage system.\textsuperscript{579} Nor was Mediolanum’s fate atypical; the Byzanto-Gothic wars were disastrous for Italy and probably exacerbated the effects of the Justinianic plague, which struck Italy in AD 541-2. Procopius records the story of the Ostrogothic king Theodahad, who in order to predict how the war with the Byzantines would go took the advice of a Jewish astrologer and shut up three groups of ten pigs in three huts for days without food, labelling one group "Byzantines," another "Ostrogoths," and the third "Italians;" most of the Byzantine pigs survived, all but two of the Gothic pigs died, and of the Italian pigs half died and the surviving half shed their bristles.\textsuperscript{580} For Procopius the fate of the “Italian” pigs stood for the devastating impact of the extended wars of reconquest on Italy. Many smaller communities such as Aquae Statiellae and Segusio shrank

\textsuperscript{577} Cassiod. \textit{Var.} 10.28, which also mentions a garrison at Placentia and describes the king Theodahad’s households at Rome and Ravenna, very much suggesting a continuation of the hierarchies present at the beginning of the fifth century, with Ticinum and Placentia as supporting centers and Rome and Ravenna as the major capitals. Boethius’s imprisonment in the town also recalls Julian’s house arrest at Comum in the fourth century.

\textsuperscript{578} Procop. \textit{Goth.} 2.21.39. Procopius at \textit{Goth.} 2.5.38 ranks Mediolanum as the second most populous city in Italy, after Rome. The campaign of Belisarius against the Goths from 535-540 saw early Byzantine successes in Sicily and at Ariminium and Mediolanum but Ticinum (2.12) escaped capture when the town’s garrison managed to shut the city gates against the Byzantines.

\textsuperscript{579} Tomaselli 1976 describes the organization and construction of these drains, which were built of two-level (at least on the main lines), brick vaulted channels, which carried water from the river Ticino. Ward-Perkins 1984: 134 cites the drains’ descriptions in the tenth century by Liutprand of Cremona, a native of Pavia, who describes the drains on one unusual occasion as blocked with human remains and on another as flowing with molten gold (Liutprand, \textit{Antapodasis} 1.35, 3.3).

\textsuperscript{580} Procop. \textit{Goth.} 9.3-6.
considerably in the sixth century while even larger fortified towns like Verona show widespread abandonment of buildings; others like Beneventum had their walls removed after sieges.\footnote{Aquae Statiellae and Segusio: Mercando 2003. Verona: Cavalieri Manasse and Bruno 2003. Beneventum (Procop. Goth. 6.1). Pesarum and Fanum had their walls razed to half size (Procop. Goth. 7.11, 7.25). Marcellinus. Auct. 2.106 also says that the Goths destroyed the walls of Mediolanum. See Gonella 2008 on the contemporaneous cessation of ceramic importation in certain central and northern Italian communities. The question of continuity in urban and rural settlement in post-Roman Italy has been of particular interest in the last thirty years; for a summary of the debate see Ward-Perkins 1997 and for the ideological implications of the transition to early medieval settlement patterns, see Brogiolo 1999. On the decreasing important of the \textit{vici} in northern Italy see Sena Chiesa 2003 .} As in the earlier wars of the late third century and even earlier in the Alemannic incursion during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, plague accompanied warfare and came in waves in the early 540s (the Justinianic Plague), the 570s, the 580s, and again at the beginning of the seventh century.\footnote{Christie 2006: 500-4 on the sixth century plagues in Italy. On the effects of the Antonine plague in the second century see Bruun 2007, Greenberg 2003, Bruun 2003, Bagnall 2002, and Bagnall 2001.} Along with this potent combination of war and plague the eighth century Lombard historian Paul the Deacon records serious flooding along the Po and its tributaries as well as famine throughout Italy.\footnote{HL 2.24 (floods), 2.26 (famine). See Brogiolo 1999 for an analysis of destruction and disruption caused by the war and on the continued lack of secure evidence on damage caused by the floods mentioned by Paul the Deacon.} Ticinum’s survival and ability to maintain its drains was unusual, other towns were more unfortunate. As one of the last Gothic strongholds, Ticinum avoided being sacked, and that it survived while other towns declined meant that by default it became regional base.\footnote{Ticinum became the base of Gothic operations in Italy after the retaking of Ravenna and Mediolanum; the Gothic regal court and treasury were kept there (Procop. Goth. 2.20, 4.33-34, where Procopius attributes the situation of the treasury there to the town’s strong defences), and Gothic kings Ildibad and Totila / Baduila were invested at the city in the 540s (Bullough 1966). The town was not captured by the Byzantines during the initial successes of Belisarius but served as a base for a Gothic resurgence under Totila, and after the disastrous battles of Taginae, in which Totila was killed, and Mons Lactarius in 553 in which the last Gothic resistance was defeated, was allowed to return with other surviving Gothic outposts peacefully back as imperial subjects. Procopius also mentions Ticinum’s role as Gothic capital and base also at Goth. 3.1 and 3.4.} Without the earlier late Roman investment in the town’s infrastructure, however, the town would not have been considered as a base.

When the Lombards under Alboin invaded Italy in AD 568, Ticinum was a valuable prize, and they spent three years besieging it. Writing in the eighth century, Paul the Deacon records:

The city of Ticinum, after withstanding the siege for three years and a few months, surrendered itself to Alboin and to the besieging Lombards. When Alboin entered it from the eastern side of the city through the gate of St. John, his horse fell in the middle of the gate, and, although goaded by spurs and whacked with spears from either side, was not able to be brought to its feet. Then one of the Lombards said to the king: "Remember my lord king, what vow you have made. Break such a harsh a vow and you will enter the city, for the people in this city are truly Christian." Alboin had vowed that he would put all the people to the sword because they had been unwilling to surrender. He broke this vow
and promised clemency to the people, and then his horse immediately rose, and he entered the city, and he did not inflict harm on anyone but kept his promise. Then all the people, thronging around Alboin in the palace that king Theoderic had built, after so many troubles began to feel relieved, trusting in hope for the future.  

The Lombards subsequently made Ticinum one of their bases and regal seats—along with Verona, a reduced Mediolanum, and Monza, a previously insignificant village just ten miles outside Mediolanum—and in the early seventh century made it their main capital, where they built churches and monasteries, enlarged the palace complex, and stocked their court with scholars like Paul the Deacon; in doing so the Lombard kings set the town up as a rival to Ravenna and Constantinopolis, as the Carolingians were later to do at Aachen.  

The effects of regal benefaction at Lombard Ticinum were similar to those at imperial Mediolanum and Ravenna, namely urban renewal, a boom in public building projects, and a new influx of elites. There were important differences, too. Ticinum’s incorporation into the Lombard kingdom severed it from Byzantine possessions in Liguria, which were becoming more heavily defended on the landward side and more focused towards maritime life.  

Being the capital of a politically fragmented Italy meant that Ticinum’s orbit was much smaller than those of earlier capitals Mediolanum, Ravenna, and Rome.  

Nevertheless Ticinum’s selection and the consequent patronage of the Lombard court meant that the town thrived during the seventh and eighth centuries, and that selection was based largely on the infrastructure established there by the Romans and Ostrogoths, whose use of the town respectively as

585 HL 2.27: At vero Ticinensis civitas post tres annos et aliquot menses obsidionem perferens, tandem se Alboin et Langobardis obsidentibus tradidit. In quam cum Alboin per portam quae dicitur Sancti Iohannis ab orientali urbis parte introiret, equus eius in portae medio concidens, quamvis calcaribus stimulatus, quamvis hinc inde hastarum verberibus caesus, non poterat elevari. Tunc unus ex eisdem Langobardis taliter regem adlocutus est dicens: “Memento, domine rex, quale votum vovisti. Frange tam durum votum, et ingrediemur urbem. Vere etenim christianus est populus in hac civitate.” Si quidem Alboin voverat quod universum populum, quia se tradere noluisse, gladio extingueret. Qui postquam tale votum disrupiens civibus indulgentiam promisit, mox eius eiusque consurgens, ipse civitatem ingressus, nulli laesionem inferens, in sua promissione permansit. Tunc ad eum omnis populus in palatum, quod quondam rex Theudericus construxerat, concurrens, post tantas miserias animum de spe iam fidus coepit [ad] futura relevare. There are several possibilities for interpreting this passage: first that the incident was genuine and that the Lombard decision to spare the city was based on a similar interpretation of an omen, second that the incident was real but staged and the reasons behind Alboin’s were more practical in that the city and its inhabitants were more useful to the Lombards intact, and third that the incident was fabricated after the fact, as an explanation of the city’s survival of the siege.

586 On Lombard Ticinum see Brogiolo 2000 and Bullough 1966. Majocchi 2008: 17-38 traces Ticinum’s rivalry with Mediolanum over the status of Lombard capital. Rothari, reigning from 636-652, seems to have been the first Lombard ruler to make Ticinum his primary residence and place of burial. On continuity between Roman and Lombard Italy see Marazzi 1998, Christie 1998, and Everett 2003 (on literacy). On Lombard urbanization and settlement models see Brogiolo 2000a and 2000b.

587 See Zanini 1998 on Byzantine Liguria.

588 Additionally there was a substantial cultural difference in the interests of the Lombard state and laws. Lombard laws punishing officials who fail to investigate or fail to find witches and sorcerers (Leges Langobardorum Liutprand 85.II), mandating death for slaves caught branding trees (Rothair c. 238), and fining men who send their pigs into another man’s defended forest (Liutprand 151.VIII) show just some of the cultural difference between Roman and Lombard legal codes.
imperial base and subsidiary capital also lent the town and its Lombard heirs a useful legitimacy.  

Conclusions - Ticinum and the Roman state

Ticinum’s transformation from typical municipium to regal capital in the approximately four hundred year period from the Marcomannic invasions of the second century to the Lombard invasions of the sixth was guided by the actions of first the Roman state and then its Ostrogothic successors, who followed late Roman precedents. The Roman state, shaken by an extended and psychologically shocking period of wars and invasions in the 250s-270s, gradually converted northern Italy into a combination of limes and capital, where the emperor, his court, the army, arms factories, wool mills, and mints were present; this represented a degree of state interference exceeding anything the region had seen since the middle republic. The effects were seen even in everyday life, with new, state-run industries in the factories and mills and with increased connections to other centers of state interests. While many of the effects of the state in the early imperial period had been indirect, the connection between many larger state actions and local life in the late antique period was more direct and would have been much clearer to the inhabitants of Ticinum and similar towns in northern Italy—like Verona, Cremona, Aquileia, or Concordia—and around the empire where state interference was prominent. The catalyst of that change, from largely indirect state impact to a more direct one was the extended military threat to Rome and to an Italy that had for the last two centuries been set up as a privileged heartland. This is the same kind of military threat that had incited the Romans to intervene so drastically in the region in the republican period, and so the history of northern Italy under Roman control provides a suitable symmetry, with intensive state intervention providing both the beginning and end of Roman rule.

---

589 See Balzaretti 1996 on the economy of Ticinum and the Po valley during its Lombard and Carolingian floruit.
Conclusions

In the mid third century BC, Roman armies entered the Po valley and over the next century returned again and again until all of northern Italy fell under their control. By the time the exarchate of Ravenna fell in the mid eighth century AD, the region had been under some form of Roman rule for nearly a millennium, during which it had been transformed several times over. The northern Italy that the Ostrogoths, Lombards, and Carolingians inherited in the early medieval period was the product of not just its peculiar geography but also centuries of direct and indirect reactions to the Roman state.

During the Roman Republic, population transfers, road building, colonization, port construction, canalization, and land distribution had transformed the natural, urban, and demographic landscapes of the region. The perceived vulnerability of the area motivated these actions, while the conception of Italy as ending at the Po limited their impact in the Transpadana. Late Republican politics extended that border to the Alps and incorporated Cisalpine Gaul into a newly reorganized Italy. At the same time those politics expanded notions of Italian identity, as debates over the extent of the Roman franchise created a new group identity, that of the Transpadani, which replaced the older tribal identities of the Insubres, Cenomani, and Veneti. The Transpadani defined themselves in both cultural and political terms, with the cultural argument of themselves as Italian in manners and speech supporting the political argument of themselves as Italian in their right to the franchise. When the Transpadani gained that franchise, the label lost its usefulness and was replaced by an evolving identification as Italians.

As the Republic turned into the Principate, that changing Italian identity was reflected in state policy and ideology. Conceptions of Italian identity that had origins in the citizenship struggles of the late Republic found new vigor in the early Empire, when competition from provincials endangered the Italians’ newly won status. Yet Italians maintained their privileged status within the empire, which was marked by a conceptual dichotomy between Italy and the provinces, a division found throughout the literature and edicts of the Principate. Emperors like Augustus, Vespasian, and Nerva whose reigns needed legitimization pursued it partially through expressions of concern for Italy. These emperors created and increased privileges for Italy: tax exemptions, self-government, honors, alimentary schemes, and special magistracies. Thus Italian identity became closely connected with its status within the empire and with the rights and privileges it enjoyed because of that status. Northern Italians, whose recently acquired Italian identity was still questionable, represented themselves as more fundamentally Italian in terms of values and character. At home and abroad they advertised this particularly defined Italianness as a means of compensating for their later arrival into this privileged Italy.

One of Italy’s privileges, a reliance on self-government, meant that few imperial officials were present in northern Italy. The small number of taxes also meant less administration for the region. At the same time, political concerns about the proximity of late Republican armies to Rome led to the removal of most of the Roman military from northern Italy at the beginning of the Principate, with only a small naval presence at Ravenna. Accordingly for the first two centuries AD the state was relatively uninvolved in the region.
The state was, however, heavily involved elsewhere. Along the Danube and Rhine *limes* the state created a system of forts and quarries, manned by soldiers, overseen by officials, and linked to other regions by guarded roads and patrolled seas. At Rome the urban cohorts and Praetorian Guard protected the emperor, his court, and the city. To feed both the army and the city, the state encouraged the development of industries in parts of Spain and Africa. These actions created a system where the state was more active in some areas than in others, and this in turn created greater economic prospects in those state-intensive zones.

The economic opportunities offered by these zones dispersed northern Italians through the empire in particular patterns. Merchants from Aquileia exploited those opportunities and created trading networks throughout the Danube provinces and Dalmatia. Towns and roads set up by the Romans in the Danube provinces encouraged trade along certain routes, and even the old trade in amber took a new road. Accompanying these merchants were cults, customs, and artistic forms, and in this manner the diffusion of Aquileian practices also meant the diffusion of Aquileian practices.

These state-intensive zones required not just supplies but people, and the army and the bureaucracy both recruited from northern Italy. Through the recruitment of elites into the imperial government and soldiers into the military, the state became the primary mover of people through the empire, again not randomly but in dispersal patterns that coincided with areas of state involvement. Northern Italian soldiers were recruited to serve along the Rhine and Danube, where their high proportions within units created hybrid versions of northern Italy. Here along the empire’s borders, soldiers from the region’s towns served alongside each other within a distinctive military culture. When they returned home, they brought back with them new wealth and status. In this fashion these soldiers were following the same economic opportunities that the merchants did. A similar process happened at Rome with the Praetorian Guard and urban cohorts, which both recruited heavily in northern Italy.

Opportunities for advancement also enticed local elites, who served in official positions throughout the empire. Like recruited soldiers these men entered a culturally unified society. Within this elite society, competition for status depended on certain material trappings, and such competition spurred the development of specialized export industries. For example towns in Liguria and the Aemilia crossbread sheep to obtain specific varieties of wool, each suitable to a different segment of the elite household. An interconnected empire encouraged the branding of these export goods, and, as along the Danube, state patrol of the seas and roads stimulated growth. An intersection of this economic development and the state’s elite recruitment can be found in the career of Pertinax, the first emperor born in northern Italy. This Alba Pompeian owed his family wealth to the Ligurian wool industry and his rise in status to the imperial service.

Pertinax’s time as emperor was short, and so too was northern Italy’s period of minimal direct state intervention. In Late Antiquity in response to repeated security threats, the state transformed the region into a militarized, more heavily administered zone that supported a newly introduced imperial court. For this purpose it set up mints, garrisons, arms-factories, palaces, and granaries. These changes affected northern Italy directly, and the state began to use different towns for different purposes. Towns also became more defensively oriented, with greater emphasis on fortification and supply. The reforms of Diocletian reorganized the empire and split Italy in two. The northern
half, which had already seen some erosion of its status with the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, was taxed more heavily. The return of greater administration and taxation brought an end to the relatively hands-off approach taken by the early Imperial government.

Yet the preceding argument has shown that such minimalist government was not synonymous with the cessation of state influence. Two interwoven threads of change can be discerned within Imperial northern Italy: an ideological construction of the region as part of privileged, exceptional Italy (chapters two and four) and the movement of goods and people through the empire in response to the demands of the army, the government, and Rome (chapters three and five). Both threads show that the Roman state continued to influence areas under its control even when the state itself was relatively absent.
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### Appendix A

**Northern Italians in provincial and Italian inscriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of origin:</th>
<th>Also attested at:</th>
<th>status:</th>
<th>Reference:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alba Pompeia</td>
<td>Italia (IX): Aquae Statillae</td>
<td>senator, patron of Aquae Statillae</td>
<td>CIL V 7153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba Pompeia</td>
<td>Italia (IX): Augusta Bagiennorum</td>
<td>senator, patron of Augusta Bagiennorum</td>
<td>CIL V 7153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba Pompeia</td>
<td>Italia (IX): Augusta Bagiennorum</td>
<td><em>augustalis</em> at Augusta Bagiennorum</td>
<td>CIL V 7604 = ILS 6749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba Pompeia</td>
<td>Italia (XI): Augusta Taurinorum</td>
<td>senator</td>
<td>CIL V 7153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba Pompeia</td>
<td>Italia (IX): Genua</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL V 7153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba Pompeia</td>
<td>Italia (IX): Pollentia</td>
<td><em>augustalis</em> at Pollentia</td>
<td>CIL VII 7604 = ILS 6749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba Pompeia</td>
<td>Numidia: Lambaesis</td>
<td><em>legatus Augusti pro praetore</em></td>
<td>CIL VIII 2533 = CIL VIII 18043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba Pompeia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2649 = ILS 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albingaunum</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albingaunum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albingaunum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altinum</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Promona</td>
<td><em>legionary, praefectus castrorum</em></td>
<td>AE 1925: 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altinum</td>
<td>Galatia: Amasea</td>
<td><em>decurio alae</em></td>
<td>CIL III 13635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altinum</td>
<td>Italy (X): Aquileia</td>
<td></td>
<td>AE 1956: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altinum</td>
<td>Italy (X): Aquileia</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL VII 745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altinum</td>
<td>Italy (X): Atria</td>
<td>curato rei publicae at Atria</td>
<td>AE 1956: 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altinum</td>
<td>Italy (X): Mantua</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL V 4063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altinum</td>
<td>Italy (X): Opitergium</td>
<td>curato rei publicae at Opitergium</td>
<td>AE 1956: 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altinum</td>
<td>Italy (X): Vicetia</td>
<td>curato rei publicae at Vicetia</td>
<td>AE 1956: 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altinum</td>
<td>Pannonia: Vindobona</td>
<td><em>legionary</em></td>
<td>AE 2005: 1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altinum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2384 = CIL VI 3884 = CIL VI 32526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altinum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 25678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Dacia: Alba Iulia</td>
<td>centurion</td>
<td>AE 1977: 653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Italy (X): Emona</td>
<td>sevir Aquileiae</td>
<td>AE 1998: 548 + AE 1936: 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Italy (X): Emona</td>
<td>sevir Aquileiae</td>
<td>CIL III 3836a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Italy (X): Emona</td>
<td>sevir Aquileiae</td>
<td>CIL III 3836b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Italy (X): Emona</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL III 404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Italy (X): Emona</td>
<td>educated at Emona</td>
<td>CIL V 7047 = CLE 1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Italy (X): Augusta Taurinorum</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL V 7047 = CLE 1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Moesia: Singidunum</td>
<td><em>&quot;consistentes Aquileiae&quot;</em></td>
<td>AE 1956: 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Noricum: Caelia</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL III 5217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Noricum: Lentia (Linz)</td>
<td></td>
<td>AE 1999: 1214a (=AE 1955: 101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Noricum: Virunum</td>
<td><em>conductor ferriarum Noricarum; praefectus iure dicundo</em></td>
<td>CIL III 4788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Noricum: Virunum</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL III 4869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>centurion</td>
<td>CIL III 14358;15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL III 10300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Pannonia: Dunafoldvar</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL III 4351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Pannonia: Poetovio</td>
<td></td>
<td>ILJug 2.1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Pannonia: Sirmiun</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL III 10232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2378 = CIL VI 32519 = CIL VI 32911 = ILS 2102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>CIL References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2380 = CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ateste</td>
<td>Italia (VIII): Ariminium</td>
<td>sailor with Ravenna fleet</td>
<td>CIL XI 373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ateste</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ateste</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atria</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 7010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atria</td>
<td>Italia (I): Nola</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CLE 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Bagiennorum</td>
<td>Italia (IX): Pollentia</td>
<td>servir augustalis at Pollentia</td>
<td>CIL V 7670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Bagiennorum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2378 = CIL VI 32519 = CIL VI 32911 = ILS 2102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Praetoria</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Salona</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 2062 = CIL III 2069 = CIL III 8747 = CIL V 2164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Praetoria</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Praetoria</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Taurinorum</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Taurinorum</td>
<td>Italia (I): Praeneste</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL XIV 2951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Taurinorum</td>
<td>Italia (IX): Caramagnia Ligure (near Albingaunum)</td>
<td>flaminica perpetua</td>
<td>CIL V 7629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Taurinorum</td>
<td>Italia (XI): Eporedia</td>
<td>servir at Eporedia</td>
<td>CIL V 7033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Taurinorum</td>
<td>Italia (XI): Eporedia</td>
<td>decurion at Eporedia and Augusta Taurinorum</td>
<td>CIL V 6955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Taurinorum</td>
<td>Italia (XI): Eporedia</td>
<td>held office, unspecified, at Eporedia</td>
<td>CIL V 7016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Taurinorum</td>
<td>Pannonia: Bolcske</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>AE 2003: 1436+1437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Taurinorum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Taurinorum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2421 = ILS 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Taurinorum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononia</td>
<td>Italia (X): Cremona</td>
<td>vestiarius, servir at Cremona</td>
<td>CIL XI 6839 = ILS 6668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononia</td>
<td>Italia (VIII): Ravenna</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL XI 6734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononia</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1900: 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2378 = CIL VI 32519 = CIL VI 32911 = ILS 2102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2384 = CIL VI 3884 = CIL VI 32526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bononia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixellum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2380 = CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixellum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixellum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixellum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixellum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixia</td>
<td>Bithynia and Pontus: Nicomedia</td>
<td>decurion at Nicomedia</td>
<td>CIL V 4485 = ILS 6716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixia</td>
<td>Italia (X): Cremona</td>
<td>awarded decurial honors at</td>
<td>CIL V 4392 = ILS 5631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Italia (X): Emona</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1958: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Italia (X): Tridentum</td>
<td>sevir Augustalis at Tridentum</td>
<td>CIL V 4439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Italia (X): Verona</td>
<td>decurion at Verona</td>
<td>CIL V 4485 = ILS 6716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Italia (X): Verona</td>
<td>awarded decurial honors at Verona</td>
<td>CIL V 4392 = ILS 5631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Italia (X): Verona</td>
<td>sevir Augustalis at Verona</td>
<td>CIL V 4416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Verona</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL V 4418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Moesia: Euscus</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 12348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1982: 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legioary</td>
<td>Hild 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legioary trumpet</td>
<td>AE 1979: 463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2378 = CIL VI 32519 = CIL VI 32911 = ILS 2102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2380 = CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Brixia Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2380 = CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Caesena Verona</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Claterna Verona</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 15001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 15007d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1900: 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 14997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6416 = CLE 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 7232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 11864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 5216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Hispania citerior: Zamora Verona</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL II 2631 = ILS 2256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Italia (I): Antemnae</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>AE 1978: 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Italia (I): Ficulena</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL XIV 4007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Italia (VIII): Ravenna</td>
<td>decurion at Cremona</td>
<td>CIL XI 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Italia (VIII): Regium Lepidum</td>
<td>augustalis at Cremona</td>
<td>AE 1985: 408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Italia (X): Aquileia</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL V 8274 = ILS 2069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Italia (X): Briixa</td>
<td>sevir at Cremona</td>
<td>CIL V 4399 = ILS 6702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1900: 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 11229 = CLE 1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 13485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 2002: 1151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>LegioXIVAp. 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 14358.15a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Poetovio</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 10878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Poetovio</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 10879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2378 = CIL VI 32519 = CIL VI 32911 = ILS 2102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2378 = CIL VI 32519 = CIL VI 32911 = ILS 2102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2380 = CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2380 = CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>AE 1997: 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 3641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 37217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 37229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Dacia: Alba Iulia</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL III 1258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Iader</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 2915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Salona</td>
<td>eques</td>
<td>CIL III 14698,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1995: 1168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Germania: Vindonissa</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 5206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Italia (IX): Genua</td>
<td>flamen, pontifex, and decurio</td>
<td>CIL VII 7373 = AE 2004: 344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Italia (XI): Mediolanum</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL VII 5830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Italia (II): Venusia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. It. 20: 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Italia (XI): Vercellae</td>
<td>flamen at Vercellae</td>
<td>CIL V 07373 = AE 2004: 344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Italia (X): Verona</td>
<td>gladiator</td>
<td>CIL VII 3468 = ILS 5122 = EAOR 2: 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Moesia: Tropaeum Traiani</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 14214 = ILS 910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Poetovio</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 4057 = ILS 2462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>AE 1983: 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 221 = ILS 2160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL VI 1636 = ILS 1361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2377 = CIL VI 32518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emona</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6708 = ILS 2294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emona</td>
<td>Germania: Noviomagus Batavorum</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL XIII 8735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emona</td>
<td>Hispania citerior: Tarraco</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL II 6087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emona</td>
<td>Italia (I): Praeneste</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL XIV 2952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Savaria</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL III 4196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emona</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL VI 34408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eporedia</td>
<td>Britannia: Glevum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 2005: 897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eporedia</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Tilurium</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 2711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eporedia</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eporedia</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 11854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eporedia</td>
<td>Italia (VII): Falerii</td>
<td>legionary – evocatus</td>
<td>CIL XI 3110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eporedia</td>
<td>Macedonia: Philippi</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1968: 466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eporedia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faventia</td>
<td>Britannia: Viroconium</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faventia</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Scadona</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 2817 = ILS 2467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faventia</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faventia</td>
<td>Moesia: Troesmis</td>
<td>medicus</td>
<td>CIL III 6203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faventia</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 11214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faventia</td>
<td>Italia (X): Tergeste</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL XVI 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faventia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>AE 1966: 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faventia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>AE 1916: 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum Cornelii</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Tilurium</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 14931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum Cornelii</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2378 = CIL VI 32519 = CIL VI 32911 = ILS 2102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum Livii</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genua</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasta</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industria</td>
<td>Pannonia: Poetovio</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 10877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulia Concordia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulium Carnicium</td>
<td>Noricum: Voitsberg (near Graz)</td>
<td>decurion</td>
<td>CIL III 11739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laus Pompeia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2380 = CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libarna</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantua</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2378 = CIL VI 32519 = CIL VI 32911 = ILS 2102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantua</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantua</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantua</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantua</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantua</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Africa Proconsularis: Carthago</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VIII 1025 = CIL VIII 2467 = CIL VIII 12467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Gallia Narbonensis: Narbo</td>
<td></td>
<td>AE 1940: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Germania: Bonna</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 8071 = ILS 2279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Germania: Bonna</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 8079 = ILS 2275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Italia (VIII): Parma</td>
<td>curator rei publicae at Parma</td>
<td>CIL XI 1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Italia (VIII): Placentia</td>
<td>duovir iure dicundo at</td>
<td>CIL XI 1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Italia (VIII): Placentia</td>
<td>duovir iure dicundo at Placentia</td>
<td>CIL V 5847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Italia (VIII): Travi</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XI 1294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Italia (VIII): Travi</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XI 1296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Pannonia: Andautonia</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>ILJug 2:1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1934: 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Pannonia: Poetovio</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 4061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Pannonia: Savaria</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>AE 1972: 414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Pannonia: Savaria</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>LegioXIVAp. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32519 = CIL VI 32911 = ILS 2102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutina</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2378 = CIL VI 32519 = CIL VI 32911 = ILS 2102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutina</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2378 = CIL VI 32519 = CIL VI 32911 = ILS 2102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutina</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutina</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2384 = CIL VI 32526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutina</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutina</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2380 = CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutina</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2380 = CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutina</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2380 = CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutina</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2380 = CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novaria</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optergium</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2380 = CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Britannia: Lavatrae</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>RIB 733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1979: 446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>ILJug 2: 840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1910: 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII: 11863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Italia (X): Aquileia</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL V 905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Italia (IX): Augusta</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL V 7719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Pannonia: Aquincum</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>AE 1965: 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Pannonia: Poetovio</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>AE 1920: 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2378 = CIL VI 32519 = CIL VI 32911 = ILS 2102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2384 = CIL VI 3884 = CIL VI 32526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2384 = CIL VI 3884 = CIL VI 32526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patavium</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 11220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patavium</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 11259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patavium</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>LegioXIVAp. 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Reference Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patavium</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2384 = CIL VI 3884 = CIL VI 32526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patavium</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patavium</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 14997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Salona</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 8763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Germania: Aquae</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 11717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Germania: Aque Mattiacorum</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL XIII 7575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1979: 435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 4502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>AE 2002: 1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2384 = CIL VI 3884 = CIL VI 32526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pola</td>
<td>Tergeste</td>
<td>sevir augustalis at Tergeste</td>
<td>CIL V 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollentia</td>
<td>Britannia: Viroconium</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>RIB 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollentia</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1903: 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollentia</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollentia</td>
<td>Germania: Novaeesium</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 8554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollentia</td>
<td>Germania: Tenedo</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 5240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollentia</td>
<td>Italia (I): Salernum</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL X 533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollentia</td>
<td>Italia (I): Thermae Himeraeae</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL X 7:7366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollentia</td>
<td>Numidia: Lambaesis</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL VIII 3007 = CIL VIII 18323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollentia</td>
<td>Pontus and Bithynia: Comana</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1990: 896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollentia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollentia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>medicus</td>
<td>CIL VI 1958 = ILS 7793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollentia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollentia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>AE 1984: 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2378 = CIL VI 32519 = CIL VI 32911 = ILS 2102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2384 = CIL VI 3884 = CIL VI 32526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2384 = CIL VI 3884 = CIL VI 32526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2384 = CIL VI 3884 = CIL VI 32526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2384 = CIL VI 3884 = CIL VI 32526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2375 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhegium Lepidi</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhegium Lepidi</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarvisium</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2380 = CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarvisium</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2380 = CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tergeste</td>
<td>Africa proconsularis: Thabraca</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL VIII 17334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tergeste</td>
<td>Italia (X): Forum Iulii</td>
<td>sevir</td>
<td>CIL VII 1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tergeste</td>
<td>Italia (X): Parentium</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>Inscr. It. 10-2: 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tergeste</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1978: 627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tergeste</td>
<td>Pannonia: Siscia</td>
<td></td>
<td>AE 1935: 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tergeste</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tergeste</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>AE 1976: 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tergeste</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2380 = CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tergeste</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tergeste</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Iader</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 2913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Germania: Bonna</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL XIII 8058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Italia (IX): Dertona</td>
<td>sevir augustalis at Dertona</td>
<td>CIL V 6425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Italia (IX): Libarna</td>
<td>sevir augustalis at Libarna</td>
<td>CIL V 6425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Italia (I): Velitrae</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Moesia: Novae</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL III 757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1973: 423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 4593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2321 = ILS 2160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tridentum</td>
<td>Raetia: Boidurum</td>
<td>negotiator, vinarius</td>
<td>AE 1984: 707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tridentum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tridentum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tridentum</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 2404 = CIL VI 32515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veleia</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary, aquilifer</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veleia</td>
<td>Germania: Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensis</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL XIII 8286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veleia</td>
<td>Italia (VIII) Placentia</td>
<td>Ilvir at Placentia</td>
<td>CIL XI 1192 = ILS 6674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vercellae</td>
<td>Pannonia: Aquincum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 3567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vercellae</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2378 = CIL VI 32519 = CIL VI 32911 = ILS 2102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vercellae</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vercellae</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vercellae</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2379 = CIL VI 32520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vercellae</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL VI 2382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vercellae</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2384 = CIL VI 3884 = CIL VI 32526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vercellae</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>praetorian / urban cohort</td>
<td>CIL VI 2380 = CIL VI 2381 = CIL VI 32522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Bigeste</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1979: 444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 15005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>ILSq. 2: 839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 9939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Burnum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 2834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Iader</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL III 2937 = CIL III 9988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Salona</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Salona</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 2041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Dalmatia: Tilurium</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL III 13976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Germania: Aquae Granni</td>
<td>legionary, primus pilus</td>
<td>AE 1968: 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Germania: Ascibergium</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL XIII 8590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 8634a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Germania: Mogontiacum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Germania: Noviomagus Batavorum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 8741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Germania: Vindonissa</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL XIII 5211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Italia (I): Albanum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL VI 5393 = CIL XIV 2281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Italia (I): Aquinum</td>
<td>patron of the colony</td>
<td>CIL X 5393 = ILS 6286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Italia (IV): Reate</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL IX 4685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Italia (VI): Pisaurum</td>
<td>praetorian</td>
<td>CIL XI 6348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Italia (VII): Persia</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XI 2060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Italia (X): Aquileia</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>CIL V 911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Italia (X): Brixia</td>
<td>quaestor at Brixia</td>
<td>CIL V 4443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Macedonia: Dium</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>ILGR 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Moesia: Scupi</td>
<td>decurion, quaestor, Ilvir</td>
<td>AE 1984: 747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Noricum: Celeia</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>CIL III 5220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Aquincum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1990: 813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>AE 1929: 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>AE 1938: 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicetia</td>
<td>Britannia: Viroconium</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td>RIB 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicetia</td>
<td>Italia (I): Ostia</td>
<td>Illvir at Vicetia</td>
<td>CIL XIV 4673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicetia</td>
<td>Italia (X): Patavium</td>
<td>priest of Isis</td>
<td>CIL V 2806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicetia</td>
<td>Italia (I): Rufnae</td>
<td>decurion at Vicetia</td>
<td>CIL X 4832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicetia</td>
<td>Italy (X): Verona</td>
<td>curator Vicentinorum</td>
<td>CIL V 3401 = ILS 6696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicetia</td>
<td>Moesia: Scupi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicetia</td>
<td>Moesia: Scupi</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1984: 762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicetia</td>
<td>Pannonia: Aquincum</td>
<td>legionary, custos armorum</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> III 3549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicetia</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1973: 424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicetia</td>
<td>Pannonia: Carnuntum</td>
<td>legionary</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1907: 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicetia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Veteran, urban cohort</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 2000: 242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>