

The *Regiones* of Italy: between Republic and Principate¹

One of Augustus' least-known reforms has left a stronger imprint than almost any other on the ways in which classical studies on Italy are organised. This was his division of the peninsula, at an unknown date, and for reasons unspecified, into eleven regions.² These *regiones* still lead a flourishing life, having long been adopted as the organising armature for a number of *corpora*, starting with the *CIL*, and followed by the *Inscriptiones Italiae*, *Année épigraphique* and *Supplementa Italica*; *Notizie degli Scavi* and *Forma Italiae*, to name only major publications. There is an irony here: if Pliny the Elder had not decided to use the Augustan division into *regiones* as a way of organising the mass of data he had on Italy, we would not know that they existed. A smattering of later epigraphic testimony would suggest that at some point in the imperial period Italy had been subdivided into an uncertain number of regions; we might then suspect Augustus as the architect of the change; it would also be plausible, on the basis of the epigraphic evidence alone, to attribute the reform to Trajan or Hadrian.³ In any case, the Augustan *regiones* enjoy a currency in modern scholarly literature out of all proportion to the interest or utility they had for ancient writers.⁴

In 2007 I published a piece on Pliny's description of Italy in book 3 of the *Natural History*, trying to reconstruct the agendas which informed Pliny's lists of Italian communities, and to link this to Augustan, and Flavian, ideological matrices.⁵ I argued that Italy was deliberately, indeed misleadingly, presented by

¹ My profound gratitude goes to the editors for patiently waiting for this tardy contribution. It is a pleasure to acknowledge likewise the comments and suggestions made those at the Oxford conference; and to thank Lisa Bligh Nicholas Purcell and Andrew Sillett for talking through some of my ideas, and Andrew also for asking some difficult questions which I think helped me to strengthen my argument at points. The direction of which this piece has taken was the result of a gentle nudge and a quiet suggestion by Christopher Smith; as so often I realized only too late the understated sagacity behind that most restrained of prompts. I only hope that what I have written is not too many light-years away from what Christopher had in mind, but I offer it to him in any case as a very small token of recognition and appreciation for a quarter of a century's kind support and friendly encouragement. The mistakes are, of course, all my own.

² THOMSEN 1947, p. 27-29 considers the Augustan reform to be not earlier than 9 B.C., and perhaps as late as A.D. 6; ØRSTED 1988 argues for a chronological window between 10 and 8 B.C.; UDA 1990 argues for an earlier date of 20-19 B.C.; LAFFI 2007a, p. 97 is agnostic.

³ See BISPHAM 2007a, p. 64-5; add the evidence discussed at LAFFI 2007a, p. 110-12.

⁴ THOMSEN 1947, p. 17; CRAWFORD 2002, p. 1132; BISPHAM 2007a, p. 47, 64-6.

⁵ BISPHAM 2007a.

Augustus as a land full of cities and their inhabitants (*populi*) in the official documentation underlying Pliny's later lists; such a presentation supported his claims to have restored peace, prosperity and fertility through a new golden age; these claims were taken up by Pliny since they resonated with Flavian discourses about the restoration of peace and stability after civil war. The idea that demographic health was one of the things which Pliny saw in the Augustan construction of Italy, which he then attempted to emphasise as a component of Flavian ideology, I still believe to be correct. As much is strongly suggested by Pliny's closing remarks on Italy (3. 138): "this is Italy, sacred to the gods, these are its races, these the towns and the peoples; moreover this is the Italy which in the consulship of L. Aemilius Papus and C. Atilius Regulus [225 B.C.], when a Gallic emergency had been announced, alone, without any external auxiliaries, and also at that time without the Transpadani, armed 80, 000 cavalry and 700, 000 infantry".⁶ Renewed investigation of the *regiones* has, inevitably, suggested that the account I gave then previously admits of some revisions and qualifications, and that it is possible to speculate further about the *regiones* and even to scrutinise their status as an Augustan reform. There is no doubt that there was an Augustan reform, and that it presented Italy as composed of eleven regions which ostensibly owed their existence in that form to the *princeps*, and could be thought to remake Italy in his image, so to speak; this presentation was supported by a mass of 'raw data', chiefly lists of the names of all the autonomous communities in the region, real or plausible, perhaps also the distances between some of them, and perhaps intended to be read in conjunction with Agrippa's map in the *porticus Vispania*.⁷ Beyond this, however, as will I hope become clear, the utility of the term Augustan to describe the *regiones*, either in terms of the entities themselves or of the lists underpinning them, is dubious, and I have accordingly used the term 'Augustan' in much of what follows, which does not commit me to attributing what is being discussed to Augustus, but does not render him irrelevant either.⁸

⁶ On the levy of 225 see Fabius Pictor, *FRHist* 1 F21; POL., 2. 23f. The populousness of Italy as a historical given is underlined by passing references to the 360, 000 Picentes who surrendered to the Romans (3, 110, presumably in 268 B.C.) and to the three hundred Umbrian towns captured by the Etruscans (3. 113).

⁷ On Agrippa and his map see Pliny, *HN* 3. 17.

⁸ Where I use Augustan (without 'scare-quotes'), however, I refer to something which Augustus did or intended.

Pliny's decision to use the *regiones* to structure his own account of Italy is on one level unsurprising. As befitted a pioneering encyclopaedist he needed to impose some sort of order and coherence on a geographical description covering the entire empire, which entailed the listing of the names of thousands of settlements, peoples and geographical features. Where possible these needed to be broken down and organised under more localised rubrics, both for the Pliny's sanity and to allow the reader a narrative that was not completely inchoate and incomprehensible. For the rest of the empire Pliny used as his units of analysis the provinces, and within these the *conuentus* (jurisdictional districts); using these as an organising principle provided Pliny a lens with which to present the totality of the known world as subject to Roman power, and as expressing the structural truths of Roman power in its organisation. The statuses of cities (*urbes*, colonies, cities possessing the *ius Italicum*, *municipia*, 'free' cities, allied cities, *oppida*, tributary communities, *ciuitates* – there is some overlap between some of these categories) offered Pliny a further organisational strategy within the larger groupings he used. This too offered ideological purchase in describing a world of cities and peoples defined by their relationship to the power of Rome. Italy, however, represented a problem, in that it was not a province, nor was it divided into provinces or *conuentus*; furthermore, its cities were all communities of Roman citizens (with the exception of some Alpine communities attributed to Roman towns in the very north – 3. 134, 138) and almost all of a similar status, either *coloniae* or *municipia*.

The Augustan regions therefore presented a ready solution to Pliny's problem in classifying and sub-dividing his material. The *regiones* did not, however, represent an inevitable organisational strategy. Whether Pliny knew the work or not, the *Geography* of the Pontic Greek polymath Strabo, although published after the creation of the Augustan regions, makes no use of them in its account of Italy.⁹ Instead Strabo uses the Italian *ethnē*, the peninsula's historic peoples (whose identity in many places still persisted), to structure his account, even though none of them in his day had had any independent *political* identity or

⁹ Cf. FABBRICOTTI in MADDOLI 1998, p. 122. For a possible hint that Strabo was aware not only of the *regiones* but of the coastal dimensions of at least *regio* V, see PASQUINUCCI 1988, p. 57 n. 28.

agency for a century (a problem with which Strabo engages on more than one occasion).¹⁰ The *ethnē* (or the territories which they occupied) offered a subdivision of the peninsula into manageable blocks, whose relative positions and boundaries were fairly well established, and could thus be described fairly easily. They were also suited to Strabo's needs in that almost all of them had (or could be argued to have) some coastline, or at least access to the sea:¹¹ his account, here and elsewhere in the *oikoumenē*, was structured around the antinomy of a coastal *periplous* (or *paraplous*) and a description of the interior (*mesogaia*).¹² Pliny's description is laid out across the same structural diptych: descriptions of the coast, followed by lists of the inland cities, the latter signalled by "intus" (3. 48, 51, 63, 70, 72, 96, 105, 106, 111, 113, 115); "mediterranei" (3. 98, 105) or "mediterraneo" (3. 130); the exception is the eleventh *regio* (Transpadana), which is "tota in mediterraneo" (all inland, 3. 123).¹³

Pliny did not therefore *need* to use the Augustan regions as an organising principle (and indeed, in the coastal sections he used a pre-Augustan *periplous* source, onto which he grafts the *regiones* only to the extent of signalling their boundaries on the coast, mostly where they coincide with rivers). He could have done what Strabo did, and use the *ethnē* to structure his account: after all there was a tradition of describing Italy *ethnos* by *ethnos*, in an anti-clockwise direction, starting with the Ligurians in the north-west and ending with the Veneti in the north-east that went back at least as far as the *periplous* of Ps.-Skylax in the fourth century, and which had been used by Strabo (and 'Varro')¹⁴ among others. Pliny was not only well

¹⁰ One might not want to exclude *all* forms of political, or at least diplomatic, agency, however; one would like to know the date, and more details on the 'decree of Etruria' produced by Sardis in A.D. 26, recognising kinship between Etruria and Sardis, as part of an attempt to gain permission to build a temple to the imperial family and the Senate: Tac., *Ann.* 4. 55; BRIQUEL 1991, p. 105-6, for instance argues for an Augustan date.

¹¹ For problems with Strabo's treatment of the central Adriatic coast and the peoples adjacent to it, cf. FABBRICOTTI in MADDOLI 1998, p. 122.

¹² On Strabo's account of Italy see BISPHAM 2007a, p. 46-61 (and p. 50-51, 54, for Pliny's hybrid text), and now BISPHAM forthcoming a.

¹³ See THOMSEN 1947, p. 17.

¹⁴ A Varronian *periplous* (*de ora maritima*) has often been claimed as a source: Varro is mentioned at 3. 45, as authority for the distance between Italy and Africa, and at 3. 101 on the idea of bridging the Adriatic; see DETLEFSEN 1886; DETLEFSEN 1901; THOMSEN 1947, p. 46; SALLMANN 1971. I refer to the *periplous*-source (if it is a single source) as 'Varro' in what follows; it is immaterial to the argument whether Varro is actually the author in question. On Ps-Skylax see SHIPLEY 2011.

aware of this tradition, he uses it as a means of casting a summary glance over the whole peninsula at the very start of his account (3. 38):

Italia dehinc primique eius Ligures, mox Etruria, Umbria, Latium ... Volscum postea litus et Campaniae, Picentium inde ac Lucanum Bruttiumque, quo longissime in meridiem ab Alpium paene lunatis iugis in maria excurrit Italia. ab eo Graeciae ora, mox Sallentini, Paediculti, Apuli, Paeligni, Frentani, Marrucini, Vestini, Sabini, Picentes, Galli, Umbri, Tusci, Veneti, Carni, Iapudes, Histri, Liburni.

Italy starts from this point and its first people are the Ligures; soon come Etruria, Umbria, Latium ... Afterwards there is the coast of the Volsci and of Campania, then of the Picentini and of the Lucanians and the Bruttians, where Italy runs out into the sea towards the south furthest from the almost crescent-shaped chain of the Alps. From this point starts the coast of Greece; soon come the Sallentini, the Paediculti, Apulians, Paelignians, Fentani, Marrucini, Vestini, Sabini, Picentes, Gauls, Umbrians, Etruscans, Veneti, Carni, Iapudes, Histrians and Liburnians.

There are a few territorial names here, but this is Italy predominantly conceived as an aggregation of *ethnē*; it is also an account which shows its *periplous* lineage clearly, with the coasts of Italy mentioned explicitly twice; the Marsi are missing, otherwise only the Sabini can be thought of as having no coastline. Pliny could have used the *ethnē* alone as sub-units to break down and organise the mass of detail and names which would form the fabric of his account. Yet he chose not to do this when dealing with the interior: it is worth asking why. One explanation may simply be Pliny's wish to align himself with an Augustan administrative achievement (as with his emphasis on Augustus' colonies) and an ideological agenda, which also tallied with the those which were important to Vespasian. Furthermore, Augustus' *regiones* seem to have come provided with, or been easily linked to, other 'Augustan' documents which essentially contained, region by region, the information Pliny needed.¹⁵

Some preliminary observations about Pliny's description of Italy are in order before we turn to a detailed discussion.¹⁶ I mentioned above some similarities with the account of Italy in Strabo; one might

¹⁵ For the traditional view that Pliny used Augustan lists specifically written in some form or other to accompany the *discriptio* of Italy into *regions*: LAFFI 2007a, p. 98-9, with earlier bibliography.

¹⁶ I leave out of consideration Pliny's account of Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica and the other islands of the western Mediterranean: 3. 76-94.

add a concern to insert Italy into the wider geography of the known world, and within the peninsula, to record distances between various points, a practice which offered both practical utility and helped underwrite the writers' claims to authority.¹⁷ There are also some notable differences. Rivers play a much more prominent part in Pliny's account than they do in Strabo's – Pliny mentions over ninety rivers, as well as a number of lakes and marshes, and dwells for some time on two rivers, the Tiber and the Padus.¹⁸ On the other hand, whereas Strabo in some parts of his account uses Roman roads as aids to structuring his account, listing the settlements to be found along some of the major roads, Pliny in book 3 seems to have no interest in roads at all, remarkable imposition of human ingenuity on the challenges of *natura* though they were. This difference between the two is revealing about the general approach of each, and the undertaking being attempted. Pliny's description of the world is often treated as if it were a Roman geography. In some ways it is a geography of Roman power, and of its co-extension with the natural world, places and peoples; but the ways in which it is unlike a geography are more important: he says himself (3. 46) that the “neighbourhoods of the [inland] cities” (that is, their relative geographical positions) cannot be retained in his cursory discussion.¹⁹ By contrast Strabo's work is framed from the point of view of the human being engaged in an imagined, or an experiential, dynamic of travel within the *oikoumenē*, which entails the need to know relative locations of places and natural features (hence too what seems a more

¹⁷ Distances: e.g. 3. 45 (distance between African and Italian coasts); 3. 49; 3. 51; 3. 53; 3. 54; 3. 62; 3. 70; 3. 71; 3. 74; 3. 87; 3. 99, 3. 100 (also gives distance from Apulia to Apollonia on the other side of the Adriatic); 3. 101; 3. 103; 3. 110; 3. 111; 3. 115; 3. 119; 3. 126; 3. 127; 3. 129; 3. 132. Pliny (3. 16) has occasion to make a complaint which we also encounter in Strabo (6. 3. 10, 285C) about the conflicting measurements between various points given by different writers, linked in part to shifting boundaries, and which may be a trope of geographical writing.

¹⁸ Tiber: 3. 53-5; Padus: 3. 49, 117-123, cf. 3. 41, and 3. 59 (the Pontine marshes); 3.109 (central Italian hydrology); 3. 131 (famous lakes and rivers of the very north of Italy); 7. 1; and 5. 51-9 (the Nile), 5. 83-5; 6. 124-6 (the Euphrates); 6. 127-30 (the Tigris); on Pliny's interest in rivers and other water features: TOZZI 1988, p. 42-3; BEAGON 1992, p. 194-7 BEAGON 2007, p. 25-7; BISPHAM 2007, p. 41 n. 2.

¹⁹ This does not mean that there are no moments in which Pliny's work reads very much like geography: his own summary of book 3, in the preface in book 1, says that it contains “the sites, races, seas, towns, ports, mountains, rivers, distances, and peoples who either are or were” (“situs, gentes, maria, oppida, portus, montes, flumina, mensurae, populi qui sun taut fuerunt”). His notice that the Tiber (and the Anio) divide *ethnē* from each other, 3. 53-4, echoes Strabo's regular use of rivers as boundaries in the construction of relative geographical location (Pliny often notes rivers as boundaries between *regiones*); and at 3. 109 he gives names the territories adjacent to the Sabines, and their respective relative positions, as well as noting that the Apennines mark the boundaries of Sabine territory on each side. On similarities and differences, see further BISPHAM 2007a, p. 56.

through engagement with distances between various points in Strabo). Strabo's is in this sense *human* geography, Pliny books 3-6 are a gazetteer of empire, as seen from the lofty seat of the ruling power.²⁰

Their sources too, are different: Strabo combines personal experience with the works of those predecessors with an interest in geography, whether central or ancillary (Polybios, Eratosthenes, Artemidoros; the Chorographer, often assumed to be Agrippa), and from a range of historical and other sources (for Italy especially Antiochos of Syrakuse and Ephoros). Pliny, as his first book shows, consumed an enormous variety of written sources for book 3 (almost forty of them, including Augustus, Agrippa and Varro); some of these, especially Cato the Elder, are cited in the text; but the basic information on the lists of communities, in Italy and across the provinces, looks very much as if it has been collated from census returns and other official documents.²¹

In focussing on Pliny's account of Italy in book 3, we risk importing two separate distortions into the discussion. One is the assumption that all Pliny had to say about Italy is to be found in book 3. This is of course not so: Pliny himself says at 3. 2, describing the constraints under which he will attempt to describe the known world, "locorum nuda nomina et quanta dabitur breuitate ponentur" (*the bare names of places will be placed on record and with as much brevity as possible*) - points of note concerning individual peoples or places will be followed up later under particular rubrics. Nevertheless, I do not consider here other material pertaining to Italy and spread across the rest of the work, since my focus here is really on the *regiones* and on the summative picture given of Italy as a unit. Nevertheless, judgements made about the account in book 3 should be considered to be provisional, and potentially capable of nuance on the basis of what Pliny says elsewhere.

Secondly, the description of Italy is only a part of the wider project which occupies books 3-6, the description of the *orbis terrarium* (the world), and to single Italy out for special treatment risks separating

²⁰ At 3. 46 Pliny says that he is about to embark on the *ambitus*, literally "going around", of Italy, but this is more an acknowledgement of the *periplous*-basis of his account than a programmatic statement that he will produce a *uade mecum*; indeed he goes on to recuse himself from any attempt to group cities geographically (by *uicinitates*) on the grounds that it is too complicated; on this passage see further below.

²¹ THOMSEN 1947, p. 33-5, 41, 45.

that part of the text from the wider constraints and approaches which governed this whole section of the *Natural History*, and predicating of Italy ‘special characteristics’ which may in fact be found elsewhere.²² Italy, is, however, a special case, as Pliny himself admits: he anticipates that he will be attacked as not only lazy but also ungrateful if he describes ‘casually and in passing’ the *terra omnium terrarum alumna eadem et parens* (“the land which is the wet-nurse and at the same time the parent of all lands”, 3. 39). Pliny stresses that he recognises (and compare 3. 41 just below) that the Roman empire is an *Italian* achievement, making Italy, not Rome, the *patria* (fatherland) of all the *gentes* of the world. Italy offers “such great renown in all its places’ and ‘such fame attaching to individual phenomena and peoples”; the Campanian coast by itself offers in its beauty and fertility proof of the work of “rejoicing nature” (3. 40). These literary caveats then give way (3. 41) to conventional praise of Italy’s landscape, beauty, fertility and climate, to which he adds her openness to trade, “she herself keenly rushing forward into the seas”. Yet he cannot deal with Italy’s men, their talents or customs, or the races conquered by Italy’s “language and hand”; he has in the end to beg the reader’s indulgence for pressing on, as the world will not wait, and the highlights of Italy must suffice.²³ In any case, probing deeper to uncover the sorts of things that his readers might expect (the original location and historical antecedents of the peoples mentioned) is not always easy: he offers the example of the Ingauni Ligurians, where the complication seems to be that dozens of separate Roman grants of land, at least some involving resettlement of parts of this people, have obscured their original territory and history (an interesting example of possible effects of the conquest on settlement and identity).²⁴

Nevertheless, the treatment of Italy is at a greater scale than, for example, the other areas treated in book 3. Thus the Hispaniae are treated at 3. 6-30 (and again at 4. 110-20); Narbonensis at 3. 31-7;

²² BISPHAM 2007, p. 43.

²³ “tanta nobilitas omnium locorum ... tanta rerum singularum populorumque claritas” ... “qualiter Campaniae ora per se felixque illa ac beata amoenitas, ut palam sit uno in loco gaudentis opus esse naturae” (40); “commercio patens” ... “ipse auide in maria procurrens” (41); “neque ingenia ritusque ac uiros et lingua manumque superatas commemoro gentes” (42); cf. BISPHAM 2007a, p. 54.

²⁴ “nec situs originesque persequi facile est Ingaunis Liguribus – ut ceteri omittantur – agro tricies dato”.

and the Danubian provinces at 3. 139-52; Italy occupies the text from 3. 38-138, and even if we subtract the eighteen chapters on Sicily and other western Mediterranean islands, there are still just over 80 chapters dedicated to the Italian peninsula alone. The economy of the work thus gives, roughly, more than twice as much a space to Italy as to the Spanish peninsula.²⁵ Nor does Italy get treated with the disdain with which Pliny treats some areas of some provinces, where it seems that he cannot always bring himself to finish giving his own lists, owing to the frightful obscurity of whatever god-forsaken corner of the empire he is handling at that point (*e.g.* 3. 28, 139). Italy's favoured geographical location, climate, demographic health and imperial destiny all warranted a special treatment, which in turn justifies the decision here to focus on the one part of the empire which was not a province, a subject or an ally, but its centre.²⁶

Given the importance of Italy a unique frame of reference is needed, and this may be one additional reason for approaching this privileged part of the world via the special medium of the Augustan *regiones*. Pliny sets out his method in a crucial passage at 3. 46:

Nunc ambitum eius urbesque enumerabimus, qua in re praefari necessarium est auctorem nos diuum Augustum secuturos, discriptionemque ab eo factam Italiae totius in regiones XI, sed ordine eo quo litorum tractu fiet; urbium quidem uicinitates oratione utique praepropera seruari non posse, itaque interiore exin parte digestionem in litteras eiusdem nos secuturos, coloniarum mentione signata quas ille in eo prodidit numero.

I shall now specify the journey around it (*sc.* Italy), and its cities; in doing so, it is necessary to say at the outset that I shall follow *diuus* Augustus as our authority, and likewise follow the distribution made by him of the whole of Italy into eleven regions, but in that order which will come from tracing the coasts. Indeed it is impossible to retain the neighbourhoods of the cities in what is inevitably a hasty discussion; and so

²⁵ Even Greece, including Epirus, Macedonia, Thrace and the islands, with all the history and mythology attached to the area, gets only 74 chapters (4. 1-74), and all of Anatolia and adjacent islands, similarly historically rich, is covered in 72 chapters; the rest of book 4 is divided between the Black Sea (4. 75-93, with addenda at 6. 1-3, 32); northern Europe (4. 94-109); the Hispaniae (again, 4. 110-20). The remainder of the world is covered as follows: Mauretania (5. 2-21); Numidia: (5. 22); Africa proper (5. 23-30); Cyrenaica (5. 31-8); Libya (5. 39-40); islands (5. 41-2); African interior (5. 43-6); Egypt (5. 48-67); the Levant (5. 68-78); Syria (5. 79-82); Arabia (5. 86-7, 142-6, 153-62); Mesopotamia (5. 88-90, 117-41); Anatolia and islands (5. 91-151, 6. 4-14, 23-4); Caucasus (6. 15-17); Crimea and Scythia (6. 18-23, 33-40, 50--1); Armenia (6. 25-31); Persia, Media & Parthia (6. 41-5, 112-16); beyond the Caspian (6. 46-9, 52-5, 92-5); India & Taprobane (6. 56-91); Indian Ocean, Persian gulf and Red Sea (6. 96-111, 147-75); Ethiopia & Nubia (6. 178-97); islands off Africa (6. 198-205).

²⁶ BISPHAM 2007, p. 44.

thereafter, in the interior part (*sc.* of the peninsula), I shall follow the arrangement by letters made by the same (*sc.* Augustus), with special mention of the colonies which he recorded in that category.²⁷

The Regiones

Regio IX

Let us now examine the treatment of the individual regions, following the order in Pliny, paying attention to their content and internal structuring within the text. Thus we start with *Regio IX*, at 3.47-50. Pliny does not introduce the region *per se*, but rather refers back to it at the close of 3. 50, as the “ninth region in the *discriptio* of Augustus”, where he also gives the length of its coast between the rivers Var and Macra (but note that the Var is not the boundary of the ninth region, which should instead be placed at Albintimillum).²⁸ Instead Pliny starts (3. 47) with the rubric “Ligurian coast”, and then lists 3 Ligurian peoples beyond the Alps, and ten “on this side”, before adding “et quorum oppida in ora proxime dicemus” (and of whose towns on the coast I shall speak next). Then Pliny follows the coast from the river Rubata to the Macra (3. 48), which is the “boundary of Liguria” (not explicitly, note the boundary of *Regio IX*); Pliny names five rivers and two ports, as well as three *oppida*, but seems to leave the coast when he says “inland Tigulia; Segesta Tigulliorum”. Pliny then turns to inland Liguria, introducing it by way of a summary of the course of the Apennine chain (3. 49); beyond it, towards the Po, the country “shines with well-known *oppida*”: eleven communities, one a colony and one a “Forum”, are listed; this list is neither alphabetical nor constructed according to any apparent logic, spatial or other.²⁹ There is a general absence of mythical, historical or other comment on this region.

²⁷ On this passage see also LAFFI 2007b.

²⁸ THOMSEN 1947, p. 128-30.

²⁹ “ab altero eius latere ad Padum amnem Italiae ditissimum omnia nobilibus oppidis intent” (3. 49).

Regio VII

Regio VII is normally referred to in scholarship as Etruria, but what Pliny actually says is “the seventh, in which is Etruria” (3. 50), a small but significant difference. He lists some nine rivers (including the Macra, but excluding the 42 tributaries of the Tiber); there is one port, and the city of Luna is also famed for its port. All of this information comes in the coastal section, with which as usual Pliny starts (3. 50-1). Here Luna is the first *oppidum*, followed by the colony of Luca, and then ten communities for which Pliny specifies the status only for Cosa (“of the Volcientes”), which was “led out [founded] by the Roman People” (3. 51). We know, however, that a number of these communities were colonies: Luna, Pisae (Augustan, despite Pliny’s silence), Graviscae, Castrum Novum and Pyrgi.³⁰ Then we turn to the inland section, starting with five colonies, one the “colonia Falisca”,³¹ and the last three given adjectivally. He continues (3. 52) “de cetero” (as for the rest ...), listing thirty towns by naming their *populi* (Arretium is named three times, Clusium twice). Pliny offers some additional comment on the different peoples who have inhabited the region, on the foundation of Pisa; the fact that Populonia used to be the only Etruscan coastal town (3. 50); the foundation of Caere and “colonia Falisca” (3. 51); a few small details on name and location are added in the inland list (3. 52). He concludes with areas which preserve the names of vanished towns (*ager Crustuminus, Caletranus*).

Regio I

Pliny now pauses for an excursus on the Tiber, but does not tell the reader that with the Tiber we have reached the southern boundary of the seventh region. Not only have the *regiones* for the moment receded (unsurprisingly, as Pliny is here in *periplous* mode), but the *ethnē* have resurfaced as the prime unit of analysis: the Tiber separates Etruria from the Umbrians and the Sabines (3. 53) and closer to Rome divides

³⁰ See, for instance, SALMON 1969, p. 79, 105; Pisae: KEPPIE 1983, p. 173-4.

³¹ = Cato, *FRHist* 5 F53.

the *ager Veiens* from the *ager Clustuminus*, and the *ager Fidenas* from the *agri Latinus et Vaticanus* – categorisations that ultimately map onto the divisions between Latins and others (3. 54); finally the Anio “shuts in Latium from the rear” (3. 54). When Pliny resumes the *ambitus* of Italy, the Augustan regions are no nearer the surface of the account than when we slipped silently out of the seventh *regio*. Instead he resumes (3. 56) by giving the reader the coastal extent of something called “Latium Antiquum”, which starts at the Tiber and terminates at the promontory of Circeii (he lists the different peoples who inhabit(ed) the area); inland, including the Volscians, Oscans and Ausones, it reaches the Liris river.³² This description is a useful reminder of the diversity underlying the carapace of ethnonyms: ‘Latium’ is in fact an ethnic melting pot, where peoples as diverse as Aborigines and Siculi, Arcadians and Rutuli, have mixed with Latins or otherwise left their mark on the region; Latium is also dynamic (as it was in Pliny’s own day, with Vespasian’s extension of the *ius Latii* to the Hispaniae, 3. 30): the *nomen Lati* “advanced” as far as the Liris (reminding us of the notion examined above, of Rome empire as an Italian artefact).³³

Pliny resumes his coastal survey with the colony of Ostia, then the *oppidum* of Laurentum; besides these the river Numicus and the grove of Iupiter Indigetes are mentioned, and Ardea. The status of the latter is not given, but the foundation of Ostia by Romulus (rather than the traditional Ancus Marcius) and of Ardea by Danae are also noted (3. 56). Continuing down the coast we find the normal confection of vanished cities (Aphrodisium), rivers, colonies (Antium) and places of unspecified status, before reaching Circeii, whose evolution from island to promontory is discussed with reference to Homer and Theophrastus (3. 57-8). Beyond Circeii we move to the coastal limits of Latium, or what Pliny calls “Adiectum Latium” (Added-on Latium, 3. 59). The features mentioned combine the elements by now familiar: a river, a lake and the Pontine marshes; the colony of Minturnae; *oppida* (Tarracina and Formiae, and beyond that the vanished *oppidum* of Pira and Amyclae or Amynclae, destroyed by snakes); the port of Caietia; the “place of the cave” (*locus Speluncae*, or Sperlonga); and the unclassified Sinuessa (in fact an old colony).³⁴ Again

³² “unde nomen Lati processit ad Lirim amnem” (from where the name of Latium advanced as far as the river Liris).

³³ See also BOURDIN 2012, p. 278-9.

³⁴ Sinuessa: SALMON 1969, p. 77.

several of these entries are accompanied by further information: the miraculous location of 24 cities in the Pontine marshes, or the etymological derivation of city names pointing to remote or mythical origins (Formiae, Sinuessa; compare the previous name of the Liris). As with the Volscian name for Tarracina, Pliny again shows his sensitivity to the layering of myth, history and ethnicity in Italy, at least in the *periplous* sections.

Having reached Sinuessa, we leave Latium for “fortunate Campania”, which Pliny, reprising his comment at 3. 40, singles out for the reputation of its wine especially, and its other natural products, and its (in)famous hot springs.³⁵ He also notes, once again, the succession of different peoples who occupied this happy land (3. 60). The reader might wonder where the *regiones* are at this point: we seem to be wandering through a different and older conception of Italy; but Pliny is still following the coast, and has yet to deal with the interior. The treatment of the Campanian coast contains few surprises or deviations from the broad pattern previously established: the same mix of features recur, with the same laxity about juridical status (Volturnum and Liternum are both colonies, though neither is so designated, and the former is listed as *oppidum*).³⁶ Likewise the past intrudes, whether in the form of vanished cities (of the Cimmerians, 3. 61), former names (Dichaearchia / Puteoli, 3. 61; Neapolis, 3. 62), foundation (Cumae, 3. 61; Neapolis, 3. 62) or myth (Surrentum, 3. 62).

As we turn inland the *regiones* reassert themselves: Pliny now finally reveals that we are in the first region, which began at the Tiber.³⁷ His laying out of the information (3. 63-5) is much more spare, and better structured, starting with the colonies (7 of them, all with place names), and then with lists of *oppida* (some 54 of these, of which some had been colonies (Praeneste) and some still were (Auximum, which however does not belong in this region); 47 are given by the name of the people (*e.g.* Accerrani) rather than the place.³⁸ Of these sixty-odd names it is striking that only three are supplied with even the slightest further

³⁵ Cf. BOURDIN 2012, p. 667.

³⁶ SALMON 1969, p. 97-9.

³⁷ “regio ea a Tiberi prima Italiae seruaturs ex discriptione Augusti” (this region starting at the Tiber is recognized as the first according to the distribution of Augustus).

³⁸ Auximum: SALMON 1969, p. 112-13.

comment: Capua is named from *campus* (plain), 40 miles across; Cora was founded by Dardanus (3. 63); Praeneste was once called Stephane (3. 64); in addition a number of communities are supplied with a localising or ethnic *cognomen*, to distinguish them from homonyms (such as the three Alfaterni, 3. 63). All of which, minimal as it is, pales to nothing beside the three chapters (65-7) devoted to Rome. Pliny concludes the inland description of the first region with lists of (3. 68) 20 towns “in the first *regio*” which no longer exist (not listed alphabetically); (3. 69) the thirty *populi* who used to share in the sacrifices at the Mons Albanus (listed alphabetically); and (3. 70) four cities which have died (or are dying) in Campania, on some of which Strabo is more forthcoming, with a broad dating for the capture of Apiolae (which he does not seem to realise is the Greek name for Pometia, mentioned in 3. 68, and should thus be in Latium) and an exact one for the destruction of Stabiae. It is not clear whether these three chapters depend on whatever lists accompanied the ‘Augustan’ regions, as the mention of the “first region” in 3. 68 might suggest, but the fact that one list is alphabetic, another not, and the 3. 70 introduced by “ex antiquo Latio LIII populi interiire sine uestigiis” (thus from ancient Latium 53 peoples have perished without trace) and that he then goes on “in Campana agro” (in Campanian territory), it seems on balance unlikely. Instead Pliny seems to have collected material from a number of sources.³⁹ He concludes his account of the first region by adding the *ager Picentinus*, lying between the territory of Surrentum and the Silarus river, which used to belong to the Etruscans, and contained a famous temple of Iuno; there was also Picentia, an *oppidum*.

Regio III

³⁹ The figure 53 is hard to account for, unless the figure is corrupt, or (a) name(s) are missing from Pliny’s lists: there are 50 lost cities & peoples at 3. 68-9, as well as Aphrodisium (3. 57); Amyclae and Pira (3. 59) (this is how BOURDIN 2012, p. 281 reaches 53); but there are also the city of Cimmerians (3. 61), and the 24 cities of the Pomptine plain mentioned by Licinius Mucianus (3. 59).

“a Silaro regio tertia et ager Lucanus Bruttiusque incipit” (from the Silarus the third regions begins, and the *ager Lucanus* and *Bruttius*). Thus we enter the *regio* III, but also encounter again tensions which we have already noted: this *regio* is comprised of two ethnic unities, as was *regio* I (Latium and Campania). But even this is not what Pliny says. It is true that the locution “ager Lucanus Bruttiusque” suggests that these two ethnic areas were already linked together and considered together as a unit – logic too requires this linkage, since there is no way that two separate ethnic territories can *both* start at the Silarus. Modern scholarship is uniform in calling the third region ‘Lucania et Bruttium’ or ‘Lucania et Bruttii’; but Pliny, if taken at the letter, seems to say rather that the Silarus marks the boundary of two separate entities, co-ordinated by “et”, the third region *and* the *ager-Lucanus-and-ager-Bruttius*. Thus Pliny introduces not a *regio* which is, as I said above “comprised of” these two ethnic units (or single aggregate unit), but a *regio* which is separate from, if largely co-extensive with, the *ager Lucanus Bruttiusque*, in the same way in which Pliny said that Etruria was ‘in’ *regio* VII. If so, then it should follow that Lucania et Bruttii (*uel sim.*) is not the name of the *regio*, or not necessarily the name of the *regio*, but rather of a pre-existing aggregation which, broadly speaking, provided a template for the spatial extension of that *regio*. One might go further, and suggest that we should not assume that any of Pliny’s (and thus Augustus’) *regiones* were actually called by the names which modern scholarship routinely uses. We shall return to this question below, having noted that Pliny appears to name only a single *regio* out of the total of eleven. As with Latium (3.58) and Campania (3. 60), so for this part of Italy Pliny notes the frequent succession of the different *ethne* who controlled it (3. 71), finishing with the heterodox derivation of the last people to conquer the area, the Lucanians, who are said to be “sprung from the Samnites, under their leader Lucius”.

Pliny follows the coast down to Cape Leucopetra (3. 71-4), before pausing the Italian *ambitus* to consider the islands of the western Mediterranean (3. 75-94).⁴⁰ Paestum and Velia, both *oppida*, are listed,

⁴⁰ At 3. 85 Pliny mentions some islands particularly close to Italy, including Pontiae, which had been a Latin colony (SALMON 1969, p. 59).

with their Greek names given as well (3. 71); so too Buxentum, as well as the now vanished Laus, both with their Greek past signalled (3. 72). After the River Laus (the first of five rivers noted before the cape) begins the coast of Bruttium. Blanda is called *oppidum*, as is Tempsa (with its Greek name added; Terina was a colony of Croton, and the *portus Parthenius* is said to be a Phocaeian foundation); Pliny adds the site of the vanished city of Clamptia, and the *oppidum* of Consentia ‘inland’ (3. 72). Slightly less mythical or historical information comes with the last stretch of the western Bruttian coast: the usual mix of *oppida* and communities of unspecified status and ports as far as Rhegium (and the Sila forest, 3. 74) is fleshed out only with the detail that Vibo Valentia used to be ‘Hippo’, the note that the River Crataeis was mother of the monster Scylla (3. 73), and the origins of the *cognomen* of Locri (where Pliny will resume his Italian description in 3. 95).

When Pliny does resume, there is no reminder that we are in the third Augustan region; instead he tells us that it is Magna Graecia that begins “from Locri”; he goes on to give various measurements for its extent, and notes that it was once inhabited by Ausones.⁴¹ This part of Italy has many rivers, and in general Pliny restricts himself to naming those which are navigable (3. 96) or associated with famous events or myths. Once again we have a range of different settlements in the categories (or non-categories) encountered before, current and ruined, a port and – less common – a “castrum” (camp) and an “urbs”: Scolacium, which Pliny tells us was an Athenian foundation; the only other notice at this point also belongs to the Greek past, namely Dionysius’ plan to cut a canal through what was, here, the narrowest part of Italy (3. 95).⁴² After Scolacium, until we reach Croton the account is dominated by natural features (rivers, a mountain, a promontory and islands), the only town being the *oppidum* of Petelia “inland” (3. 96). At Croton we reach an important boundary, that between what Pliny calls the first and second gulfs of Europe, divided by the Lacinian promontory (3. 97); the same section brings us to the *oppidum* of Metapontum, “by which the third region of Italy is bounded”; here are again a couple of historical notes: a mention of vanished

⁴¹ For the Ionian sea called the Ausonian, *cf.* 3. 75.

⁴² On Pliny’s use of *urbs* (mainly applied to vanished towns and to Rome) see BOURDIN 2012, p. 376, who, however, does not mention Scolacium.

Sybaris, and the former name of Heraclea (3. 97). There have been fewer than a dozen settlements named since we rounded Cape Leucopetra, outnumbered by the natural features named by Pliny; and despite the wealth of history attached to the area, Pliny general limits himself on this coast to noting Greek phases to existing Roman towns (as for the Tyrrhenian side of the Bruttian coast). The interior of the second region (3. 98), like the coast, and as with *regio* I, is subdivided into two: the inland section “of the Bruttians”, which contains only the unclassified Aprustum;⁴³ and “of the Lucanians”, for which ten *populi* are named by their ethnic, an eleventh, the Numestrani, being joined to the Volcentani. Pliny closes his account of this region with citations from Cato on the vanished Lucanian Thebae, and Theopompos on “Pandusia of the Lucani” as the place where Alexander of Epirus met his death.⁴⁴

Regio II

The second region now follows. Pliny does not name it, but says that it “embraces” the Hirpini, Calabria, Apulia and the Sallentini. He dwells briefly on Tarentum, which gives its name to the gulf which it dominates, noting it as an *oppidum* of the Spartans, to which was “associated” (*contributa*) a *maritima colonia* which “had” been settled there. He also notes that Calabria was called Messapia by the Greeks, and before that Peucetia (in each case from an indigenous leader), and that both were “in Sallentine territory” (3. 99).⁴⁵ Pliny then begins the *ambitus* of the coast of the Sallentine peninsula, but prefaces this with the heading “*oppida* inland from Tarentum”, listing only two, Uria and Sarmadium, before following the coast proper to the promontory of S. Leuca (“which they call Acra Iapygia”) – only two towns were on this coast are named, one of which had the Greek name of Callipolis, but “is now Anxa” (3. 100). Moving up the other coast, two towns, one of which, Basta, is an *oppidum*, are named before the unclassified Hydruntum, which marks the dividing point between the Ionian and Adriatic seas (3. 100). From there

⁴³ See THOMSEN 1947 p. 18 n. 4, 23, for a possible explanation for there being only one such entry.

⁴⁴ *FRHist* 5 F54.

⁴⁵ A rather heterodox ethno-history: see DE JULIIS 1988, p. 14-15.

Pliny lists seven locations, ranging from the abandoned Soletum, through the *statio* Miltiopes, which may be a port, as are Fratuertium and Brundisium, “particularly well-known for its harbour”, whose value as the start of the safest passage to Greece is noted (3. 101). Pliny is slightly more forthcoming than usual on the Poediculi, whose territory adjoins that of Brundisium: not only does he reveal an Illyrian origin, but tells us that the Poediculi had twelve *populi*, all descended from the union of nine Illyrian youths and nine Illyrian maidens – although he names only three *oppida*. Their territory possessed four rivers, including the Aufidus which flowed down from the Hirpinian mountains, and the Iapyx, named after the son of Daedalus, who also gave his name to Iapygia.⁴⁶

Next comes Apulia, which was the indigenous name for what the Greeks called Daunia (at least according to Strabo);⁴⁷ this dual perception of ethnicity, and their inter-relationship, are reflected here in Pliny’s assertion that Apulia “has the *cognomen* ‘of the Daunians’” (3. 103), Daunus being the father-in-law of the Greek hero Diomedes, a significant founding figure among Daunian polities, and indeed elsewhere along the Adriatic. Moving north from the Aufidus he lists the *oppidum* of Salapia, which is distinguished as the scene of Hannibal’s dalliance with a prostitute; and the unclassified centres of Sipuntum, and (Apulian) Uria. Then he tells us that the River Cerbalus is the “boundary of the Daunians”; beyond which lie the ports of the Gargano, and Lake Pantanus, probably one of the lagoons on its northern shore, and the river Fentor; and then the communities of Teanum Apulum, Larinum and Cliternia. In other words, the Gargano and the coast north of it as far as the Biferno river, are Apulian, but not Daunian, which would have surprised Strabo, although presumably Pliny had some authority for it (probably ‘Varro’). Finally (a point to which we shall return) he says, following his naming of the River Tifernus, “from this point is the Frentane *regio*”. Pliny then complicates his own picture by continuing: (3. 104): “so there are three races of Apuli: the Teani, named from their leader, who was of Greek stock; the Lucani, subjected by Chalcas – these places the Atinates now hold; and besides the places mentioned above ...”. This is an opaque entry on any reckoning. Unless something (*e.g.* a third *genus* of Apulians) has fallen out of the text

⁴⁶ On Cretan legendary presence in Iapygia: DE JULIIS 1988, p. 11-14.

⁴⁷ 5. 2. 4, 241-2C; 6. 1. 15, 265C, 6. 3. 1, 277C.

(which is very compressed in any case), Pliny names the Teani and Lucani as two Apulians, and strongly implies that the Daunians were a third, but it is not clear how this fits with his claims that the Cerbalus was the boundary of Daunia. The Teani present no problem, although one wonders how Teanum Apulum came to lay claim to the status of *metropolis* of the Apuli (which is what “Teani” seems to imply). The Lucani are puzzling: there was a Lucania Atina, but it is so far away from Daunia (on the other side of the Apennines) as to make a claim of consanguinity very puzzling. Alternatively, as I have argued elsewhere, there seem to have been more than one part of Italy where the indigenous inhabitants were called Lucani.⁴⁸ As for the Daunians, Pliny lists their inland towns as: the colonies of Luceria and Venusia, and the *oppida* of Canusium and Arpi, the latter of which has two earlier names, Argos Hippium when founded by Diomedes, and then Argyripa (3. 104).

In whatever way the crux is to be resolved here, it is important to note that for Pliny depth and complexity is not a property of the *regiones* themselves, but always of the ethnic elements which they include, or bring together, or to which they approximate. The *regiones* always resurface though: Pliny goes on to produce another of his long spare lists of the towns of the interior, beginning “for the rest inland in the second region are ...” (3. 105). Here he gives the colony of Beneventum first, “of the Hirpini”, and then a series of alphabetical lists run together. These are (i) “of the Hirpini”, Ausculani to Vescellani; (ii) Aeclani to Ulurtini; (iii) “the inland (peoples) of the Calabri”, Aegetini to Tutini; (iv) “the inland (peoples) of the Sallentini”, Aletini to Veretini. Of these, only the Cannenses merit a historical note, and there is otherwise no comment except minor geographical specification, mostly through the use of *cognomina*. List (i) is made up of mainly Hirpinate settlements, but the Caudini also feature, as does Daunian Ausculum; the communities listed here seem to be more those in the Apennines. List (ii) is dominated by settlements of Apulia, the Monti Dauni, the Murge and the *fossa Bradanica*, but also includes Hirpinate Aeclanum. Neither list has an uncomplicated ethnic composition; however these lists came about, Pliny’s attachment

⁴⁸ BISPHAM 2014, p. 234-5, although I missed this instance, if indeed it is another example of the same phenomenon.

of the first (and perhaps by implication the second) to the Hirpini is odd, whether he made it himself or took it over from a source.

In any case, for the first time we are able, unless Pliny has grossly muddled things, to see the internal architecture of an ‘Augustan’ *regio* close up. In examining regions I and III we noted that they were made up of broad ethnic groups, which Pliny handles separately despite their classification within the same region (Latium + Campania; Lucania ‘and’ Bruttium). We also saw that even these subdivisions could be subjected to a more finely grained treatment, with Pliny picking out Antiquum Latium, Adiectum Latium and Magna Graecia. These three ‘pre-existing’ entities, it should be said, are cited when Pliny is in *periplous* mode, not in discussing the interior; that is, they do not form part of the architecture of the region. Even the entities which seem to define each of these regions (Latium / Campania; Lucania / Bruttium), may not, as I have argued above, give their names to the ‘Augustan’ *regiones*, and they may not in fact, form part of their architecture either, but rather be in some sense co-extensive with them or approximations to them. With *regio* II the case is slightly different, as Pliny reveals its internal structure while describing the interior. It seems that at least this region was consciously assembled out of ethnic ‘building blocks’ (Hirpini, Apuli’?, Calabri, Sallentini), but that two of these blocks are oddly heterogeneous and do not correspond to any clear ethnic identities. Furthermore, as with every region, but observable more clearly here than elsewhere, older ethnic groups, such as the Daunii, survive within the coastal descriptions, bearing witness to complex maps of consanguineity and the changing of boundaries over time which still play a dynamic part in Pliny’s account. The meshing of the two is not always successful: thus Larinum appears twice, at 3. 103 and 105; similarly Venusia is twice listed, once in the ‘Augustan’ list of 3. 105, and once as a Daunian community of the interior at 3. 104, in a summary description which seems not to be associated with any ‘Augustan’ template.⁴⁹

Regio IV

⁴⁹ THOMSEN 1947, p. 18, 21, 86-103; BISPHAM 2007, p. 49.

The Larinates “cognomine Frentani” appear in *regio* II at 3. 105; at the Biferno river we reach the boundary of the “fourth region” (3. 106); but this is also what Pliny describes as the start of the Frentane district – or, to be precise, *regio Frentana* (3. 103, complete with the “Frentane shore”, 3. 106). Here we see directly the superimposition of one *regio* on another, smaller, earlier, and to some extent organic rather than constructed. In other words, there had been a Frentane identity, while there had never been and never was an identity which corresponded to that of *regio* IV – although, uniquely, Pliny does ascribe an attribute to this region, calling it the “region of perhaps the bravest races of Italy” (3. 106), something which of course resonates well with Augustan ideologies of ‘ancient Italic virtues’, but also looks back to a complex history of central Italian war for and against Rome. The persistence of this smaller region and the identity which it focussed is notable. The *regio Frentana* may or may not have constituted a building-block for *regio* IV in the same way in which *e.g.* the Sallentini did for *regio* II, but it was still important for Pliny two generations later, and could not be overlooked as a sub-division of his coastal *ambitus*. Indeed, it was essential to use it, as the “ora Frentanorum” was pretty much the only coast attached to the fourth region, which extended from the Tifernus to the Aternus. Pliny lists three *oppida*, and on reaching the Aternus turns inland. The first four communities must be Frentane too, as the *cognomen* “Frentani” for the Anxani shows. Thereafter we find the same sort of grouping by *ethnē* which we encountered in *regio* II, with ethnic rubrics in the genitive, followed by the *populi* belonging to each (3. 106-7). We noted that list (ii) for *regio* II was rather polyglot, and even list (i) lacked the cohesion of lists (iii) and (iv). The shorter lists for *regio* IV are much more coherent, those for the Frentani, Marrucini, Paeligni, Marsi, Aequiculani, Vestini and Samnites (that is, in essence, Pentri), which have between one and eight *populi* attached (and the colony of Bovianum Vetus).⁵⁰ The Latin colony of Alba Fucens has interestingly acquired its own ethnic, Albenses, whose city Alba is noted as being “by the Fucine lake” (3. 106). The problems come with the last ethnic rubric, that of the Sabines (3. 107): Pliny lists eleven *populi* as Sabine and two places (Forum Deci and

⁵⁰ Pliny has made a doublet out of the single community of Bovianum: see KEPPIE 1983, p. 161-3.

Forum Novum), but one may doubt whether the Fidenates, Nomentani and Tiburtes are really Sabine. Indeed, as many commentators have pointed out, the Fidenates have already been listed under *regio* I (3. 69) as among those who shared in the sacrifice at the Mons Albanus, while the Nomentani appear as a *populus* of the interior of the same region at 3. 64; the inclusion of Tibur in *regio* IV has long caused academic headaches.⁵¹ It may be that the construction of longer lists where ethnic identity was weaker, more fluid, or more polyphonous, led to those lists being less coherent and accurate than where the lists were smaller and / or where ethnic identity was stronger or more historically embedded in the perception of the outsider.

As we would expect, these lists of the interior are sparsely garnished with additional detail: the only historical detail is that given at 3. 107, when we are told of the Samnites that they were called Sabelli, and by the Greeks, Saunitae. Once he has concluded his lists, Pliny pauses to list vanished towns among the Aequicoli and “n Piceno”, and Archippe, founded by Marsyas the Lydian, now submerged in the Fucine Lake. Special mention is reserved from the Sabines, so important in Rome’s early history, and thereafter crucial to their developing identity (3. 108). Pliny dwells on possible origins of the name, rooted in Sabine religiosity (from the Greek *sebas*, piety), before noting that they dwell in the fertile hills around the lakes of Velinus, which drain into the River Nar; this leads him into a short but dense discussion of the hydrology of this part of central Italy, including the marvellous phenomena of sulphurous waters and even the floating island in the lake of Cutilia. This is said to be the “navel” (*umbilicus*) of Italy by none other than Varro, whose interest in things Sabine is a matter of record.⁵² The mention of Varro does not prove that everything here derives from his works, but it does show that Pliny here has moved away from the *regions* as template again, and is operating in a different modality. This is confirmed by an uncharacteristic piece of relative topography, probably triggered by the mention of the ‘navel’ of Italy: he lists, unusually,

⁵¹ UDA 1990; BISPHAM 2007a, p. 49; see now BOURDIN 2012, p. 134 n. 557, 143 n. 654, who sees two perspectives in contrast, the historical ‘Latin’ one and the imperial ‘administrative’ one; for this and other cases of poor ‘fit’ between ethnic boundaries and the boundaries of the *regiones* see THOMSEN 1947, p. 21-2, 25, 56-60; BISPHAM 2007a p. 49-50, 53.

⁵² Another *umbilicus Italiae* was said by “chorographi” (geographical writers) to be at the shrine of Mefitis at Valle d’Ansanto in Hirpinia (SERV., *ad VIRG., AEN.* 7. 563); see BOURDIN 2012, p. 732 n. 203; and BISPHAM forthcoming c.

the territories adjacent to the Sabines (Latium, Picenum and Umbria), as well as describing it as hemmed in by the Apennine ranges on each flank (3. 109).

Regio V

“The fifth is the region of Picenum” (3. 110), continues Pliny. This is a possible instance where we are being given the ‘official’ name of the region; on the other hand, Picenum was an obvious and pre-existing name, and Pliny goes on to speak of the region as densely populated by Picentes. After noting that the Picentes were sprung from the Sabines, and reached Picenum via a sacred spring, he proceeds to enumerate the coastal features. There are six rivers, including the Aternus and the Helvinus, which mark the northern and southern boundaries, but it then emerges that these rivers are the boundaries not of the ‘Augustan’ region, but of the *Praetuttiana regio*, and that the “regio Picentium” only begins from the Helvinus. Here then, the coastal region reveals as still operative an older and more granular series of ethnic units, one of which has, either officially or in common parlance, come to give its name to the ‘Augustan’ *regio*. Thus the picture hitherto built up by analysis of (especially) ‘Augustan’ regions II and IV is borne out further. The *Praetuttiana regio* is further split into what seem to be at least three important territories: the *ager Hadrianus* of the colony Hatria; the *ager Praetuttianus* and the *ager Palmensis*; there are other communities at Castrum Novum and Truentum (which Pliny calls the last remaining Liburnian enclave in Italy, 3. 110). The coast of the (original) *regio* of the Picentes is handled in a rather strange way, where Pliny mixes settlements actually on the coast (the *oppidum* of Cupra and the *castellum* of the Firmani with, “above it” the colony of Asculum (the best-known town of Picenum), Novana (‘inland’), then four cities “on the coast” ending with the colony of Ancona. There are few other additional notes: Numana and Ancona were founded by the Siculi, and the distance from the Gargano to M. Conero, above Ancona, is given. Then we pass to the alphabetical list of inland communities linked to the ‘Augustan’ *regio*, again given as *populi*, with no further classification offered (3. 111).

Regio VI

The sixth region comes next, lying as it does to the north of the fifth: normally called ‘Umbria’ in modern scholarship, what Pliny actually says is: “to these [?regions ?cities] is joined the sixth region which embraces Umbria and the *ager Gallicus* this side of Ariminum” – we have to admit we cannot be sure what, if anything the region was called.⁵³ Despite the (apparent) extirpation of the Senones who had lived here, Pliny can speak of the “Gallic shore” here, adding that the region has the *cognomen* of “togate Gaul”, which is a first century B.C. denomination.⁵⁴ This nod to the (transformed) Gallic past of the area seems to prompt Pliny to say more on the succession of peoples to occupy the coast: the Siculi and Liburnians originally held much of the seaboard, “especially” the territories of Palma, the Praetuttii and Hatria (see above); they were then replaced in turn by Umbrians (who, Pliny adds, are thought to be Italy’s oldest people), Etruscans and then Gauls (3. 112).

Noting that ancient Umbria had three hundred towns which were taken by the Etruscans, Pliny turns to the situation “now” on the coast (3. 113).⁵⁵ First comes the River Aesis, then Senigallia, after which is the River Metaurus, the two colonies of Fanum Fortunae and Pisaurum, and the River Pisaurum; Pliny then adds two more colonies located ‘inland’ (Hispellum and Tuder). Then he speaks “de cetero” (‘concerning the others’), with the normal ‘Augustan’ alphabetical lists (3. 113-14), giving over forty names of *populi*; other than *cognomina* the only additional information is that Narnia was once the *oppidum* called Nequinum. Pliny concludes 3. 114 by noting, as in other places, peoples and places now vanished (about a dozen,) as well as giving the very old date for America’s foundation, according to Cato (c. 1134 B.C.).⁵⁶

Regio VIII

⁵³ “iungetur his sexta regio Umbriam complexa agrumque Gallicum citra”, 3. 112.

⁵⁴ *Gallia togate*: cf. HIRTIUS, *BG* 8. 24, 3, 52. 1; VARR., fr. 320 Funaioli; CIC., *PHIL.* 8. 27; cf. MELA 2. 4. 2; DIO, 48. 12. 5; WILLIAMS 2001 p. 124-6 on this term (noting the while Hirtius uses it, Caesar avoids it); deconstructing the idea of the extirpation of the Senones (and Boii) in Pliny and other literary sources: WILLIAMS 2001 p. 210-14.

⁵⁵ BOURDIN 2012, p. 117, argues that Pliny had a restricted conception of Umbria.

⁵⁶ *FRHist* 5 F55.

Moving north again we come to the eighth region, which Pliny does not name, but which modern scholars call Aemilia. Unusually, he gives all of its limits: Ariminum, the Po and the Apennines, as well as the Adriatic coast, which he now proceeds to follow. Eight rivers ending with the Bedese dominate the account of the coast, during which Pliny records the colony of Ariminum, the former limit of Italy at the Rubicon, Ravenna (a Sabine *oppidum*) and Butrium, which is said to be ‘Umbrian’. There come the “colonies inland” (five of them – but other evidence for Brixellum as a colony remains slender);⁵⁷ and then the *oppida* of Caesena and Claterna (3. 115); six communities given the title Forum follow, and then ten *populi* (from Caesena to the Urbanates forming another alphabetical list), including the “saltusque Galliani qui cognominantur Aquinates” (the woodlands of Gallius, surnamed Aquinates). The only inland community to receive a note is Bononia, with its Etruscan past as Felsina (3. 115). The survey concludes with a notice about the vanished Boii and Senones, drawn from Cato (3. 115-16).⁵⁸ Having reached at the Po one of the boundaries of the eighth *regio*, Pliny now digresses for several chapters on its course, its names, the myths attached to it, its volume and floods, and its tributaries, its erosive properties, and its mouths with the various attempts at canalization there (3. 117-23, mentioning in passing the Etruscan town of Atria, which “gave its name” to the Adriatic and was well-known for its port, the Greek foundation of Spina, a couple of other ports, and Industria beside the Po (with its Ligurian name also given).

Regio XI

“The eleventh region is called Transpadana from the river, and is entirely inland”: this seems to be the only case where Pliny unequivocally names a region; but even this might just as well be a colloquial name, given the pre-existing name Transpadani for the inhabitants of the region.⁵⁹ What is certain is that the *regio* had

⁵⁷ KEPPIE 1983, p. 189f.

⁵⁸ *FRHist* 5 F56.

⁵⁹ “Transpadana appellatur ab eo regio undecima, tota in mediterraneo”, 3. 123. On the term Transpadani: WILLIAMS 2001, p. 119-27, 214-18.

no coast, and this meant that Pliny was bereft of any *periplous* template for describing it (it seems that Cato, invoked (and challenged) in 3. 124-5, takes the place of ‘Varro’ as a guiding authority). Nor did he use an alphabetical list; the rationale for the list of the communities given seems instead to be broadly a west-to-east progression, starting with Forum Vibi and Segusio, and finishing with Comum and Bergomum. He begins with two *oppida* (Forum Vibi and Segusio), then we have the colonies of Augusta Taurinorum and Augusta Praetoria and the *oppidum* of Eporedia (each of these last three carries either a topographical or a historical note, or both, 3. 123). Pliny continues with the unclassified settlements of Vercellae and Novaria. The ethnic origins of the founders of both of these places are given, leading Pliny to disagree with Cato on the origins of the latter: it is not a Ligurian foundation, but Ticinum was; Laus Pompeia and Mediolanum were founded by the Boii and Insubres respectively. He does not dispute (or affirm) Cato’s claim that Comum (Pliny’s own town), Bergomum and Forum Licini, as well as some surrounding peoples, were descended from the race of the Orumbivii (and whence they hailed, Cato did not know). As we would by now expect, Pliny wraps up his description of the *regio* with a quick overview of the vanished cities and peoples (3. 124-5, drawing on Cato and Cornelius Nepos).⁶⁰ One is left with a strong impression of the settlement pattern of this region as being as much an artefact of Ligurian, Gallic and other indigenous settlement as it was of Roman colonization, if not more so.⁶¹ The other striking Roman absence is that of an alphabetical ‘Augustan’ list, a striking difference from Pliny’s mode of operation thus far except in *regio* IX. Did Pliny simply depart from the normal template by choice, trusting himself to be able to handle his native region adequately from his existing knowledge? Or was his source material qualitatively different? We shall return to this question below.

Regio X

⁶⁰ *FRHist* 5 F57; 45 F10.

⁶¹ Cf BOURDIN 2012, p. 81, 88-97, 762.

“The tenth region of Italy follows”, lying on the Adriatic; “of which (are) Venetia, fluvius Silis ... oppidum Altinum”. Venetia is often given as the name of the Augustan *regio*, but if the text is sound, it is rather one of a series of constituent parts of the region. We start with the river Silis, followed by the *oppidum* of Altinum; between this and the colony of Aquileia there are eight rivers, two ports and the colony of Concordia; there are no additional notes (3. 126). “This”, he continues “is the regio of the Carni, and joined to it is that of the Iapudes”.⁶² “This” must be the area of Aquileia, and in naming the regions of the Carni and Iapudes, we see Pliny using again the older ethnically-determined *regiones* which we have previously encountered lower down the Adriatic coast. He continues from the River Timavus, via the *castellum* of Pucinum, famed for its wine, the colony of Tergeste. Six miles beyond Tergeste is the River Formio, 189 miles from Ravenna, which was the “old limit of the enlarged Italy, but now is the frontier of Histria” (3. 127).⁶³ There follows a scholarly digression, arguing with Nepos and others, about the origin of the name Histria, which Pliny blames on reconstructions of the voyage of the Argo in this part of the world (3. 127-8). He then discusses Istria’s dimensions and shape, citing, unusually, an inscription, the late second century B.C. text put up by Sempronius Tuditanus on his statue.⁶⁴ Then we get a short list of settlements: “the *oppida* of Histria inhabited by Roman citizens” are Aegida and Parentium, then the colony of Pola, once founded by Colchians and now called *Pietas Iulia*. Soon after this we come to the *oppidum* of Nesactium, “and the current limit of Italy, the River Arsia” (3. 129, *cf.* 3. 132). Pliny’s awareness that this area is now part of Italy has not prevented him from grafting what is surely a list which originally applied to the province of Dalmatia onto his Italian account: *oppida ciuium Romanorum* is a category which makes no sense in Italy, where the citizenship is universal, but belongs properly in a provincial context (*e.g.* 3. 18,

⁶² “Carnorum haec regio, iunctaque Iapudum”, 3. 127.

⁶³ THOMSEN 1947, p. 27, following MOMMSEN (*CIL* 5, p. 1) in placing the establishment of this boundary in 42 B.C., when the province of Gallia Cisalpina became part of Italy (for which see CHILVER 1941, p. 9-15). An interesting discussion of the historical and ideological implications of discussions of the north-eastern frontiers of Italy as seen in the *Aeneid*, linked to the wider question of the viability of a politics of Italian unity in the Augustan period in CHILLET 2017 (I owe this reference to Nicholas Purcell).

⁶⁴ *Cf.* *ILLRP* 334-5.

noting the thirteen *oppida ciuium Romanorum* of the Hispaniae); a similar conclusion can be drawn from the fact that Nesactium is also found at 3. 140, in Pliny's account of Dalmatia.

The description of the interior of the region has a slightly more familiar look (3. 130): three colonies, of which Brixia is said to be in the “ager of the Cenomani”, and Ateste in that “of the Veneti” (again older ethnic-territorial units peep through the ‘Augustan’ frame). Then come six *oppida*, half-heartedly put into alphabetical order, and given as toponyms not ethnonyms, ending with Mantua, the last trace of the Etruscans north of the Po.⁶⁵ After a parenthesis citing Cato on the origins of the Veneti and Cenomani,⁶⁶ we get another set of lists: three ‘Raetic’ *oppida*, two which are called “of the Raeti and Euganei”, listed as *populi* but without any alphabetical order; and then a group of eleven peoples of whom Pliny says “it would not be relevant not to speak too carefully”.⁶⁷ These do come in alphabetical order; the Asseriates, the Varvari and possible the Alutrenses, reappear at 3. 139 in the Dalmatian section.⁶⁸ Again we conclude the *regio* with vanished or destroyed settlements; and a mention of the famous lakes and rivers (3. 131). Pliny wraps up the description of Italy with a survey of the Alps (3. 132-8), giving the distance from the Var to the Arsia along the arc of the southern foothills as 745 miles. The Alpine peoples and their origins are discussed, with the help of Cato, including the Euhanean *gentes* “of the Latin right”, and others, “attributed” to the jurisdiction of *municipia* (the first time this term appears in Pliny's Italian account); he does not even list the “states ... attributed to *municipia* by the *lex Pompeia*” (presumably that of Pompeius Strabo of 89 B.C.).⁶⁹

“This is Italy, sacred to the gods, these are its races, these its towns and peoples”, he proclaims (3. 138), unsurpassed in the wealth of its demographic resource, fertility or natural resources; in a typical note, however, reflecting perhaps his persistent anxiety about the ways in which the exploitation of nature can

⁶⁵ THOMSEN 1947, p. 25.

⁶⁶ *FRHist* 5 F58.

⁶⁷ “quos scrupulosius dicere non attineat”.

⁶⁸ THOMSEN 1947, p. 26-31 for a fuller discussion of the lists for this part of the region.

⁶⁹ *FRHist* 5 F59; *lex Pompeia*: BISPHAM 2007b, p. 173-5.

lead to luxury, he adds that that “this (*sc.* mining) is forbidden by an old decree of the Senate, who ordered that Italy should be spared”.⁷⁰

Pliny's Italy

What then, can we say about the *regiones*, after this thorough re-reading of Pliny. The first point is one often made in the past, and repeated at the start of this paper. The account is a hybrid of two different conspectus: (i) the ‘Varronian’ coastal *ambitus*, and (ii) the account of the interior. The first is a synopsis with a sense of dynamism and direction, a simple geography of coasting in one direction; it comes with a certain degree of notation: some important distances, some myths (3. 60, 62, 73 *etc*), foundation stories (3. 50, 51, 56 *etc*), ethnic origins or previous names (3. 59, 3. 60, 71 *etc*), historical incidents (*e.g.* 3. 103), or instances of geographical change (*e.g.* 3. 57), with all due consideration to Pliny’s stated need to keep moving. The *periplous* section is interested in water-courses or bodies of water, but also has room for other notes, from local products of the land to unexpected *mirabilia* (*e.g.* 3. 60, 127). It is impossible to say how much of this annotation comes from ‘Varro’. Some does (3. 45, 101), but not all: for instance the citation of Mucianus at 3. 59 is post-Varronian, as is 3. 119, on Claudius’ triumphal voyage at one of the mouths of the Po. It seems unnecessarily sceptical to deny Pliny almost all authorial input here, and make him simply a scissors and paste compiler (and even this requires some agency in terms of what to select, and what to leave out).⁷¹ The second overview is the much sparser gazetteer of the interior, lists, mainly of *populi* (ethnonyms), whereas the coastal towns are often given place names (toponyms).⁷² Many more individual

⁷⁰ “sed interdictum id uetere consulto patrum Italiae parci iubentium”.

⁷¹ Pliny’s role as author (as opposed to collage-maker) in the whole work was severely minimized by DETLEFSEN 1901; on Licinius Mucianus see ASH 2007.

⁷² THOMSEN 1947, p. 22.

entities are named here, but the degree of annotation is much less, and mainly limited to foundation, earlier phases of occupation by different groups, or previous names, or one or two historical events.⁷³

These two juxtaposed narratives and their different characteristics have long been noted.⁷⁴ Woven into and between them are some very brief comments to introduce the individual *regio* or parts thereof, often on the succession of peoples to occupy it (3. 50, *regio* VII; 3. 56, *regio* I; 3. 60, *regio* I; 3. 71, *regio* III; 3. 95, *regio* III; 3. 99, *regio* II; 3. 102, 103, 104, *regio* II; 3. 106, *regio* IV; 3. 110, *regio* V; 3. 112, 113, *regio* VI). All the accounts of *regiones* except for IX (Liguria), are also concluded with a summary of vanished or destroyed cities or peoples, often culled from Cato's *Origines*.⁷⁵ Pliny's contribution too is the recurrent interest in rivers, lakes and marshes, and the occasional *mirabilia*, such as 3. 109, about Sabine wonders, in part at least from Varro. Thus we are left with an impression not just of a populous, fertile, privileged and even wondrous part of the world, which has understandably come to dominate the rest, but with a sense of historical depth, of the complexity and dynamism of Italy which has developed (and literally expanded from river-frontier to frontier) into the centre of the Roman empire, a multi-layered history of which the current (Roman) phase represents the culmination.⁷⁶ In some senses the past remains present, whether in the constant reminders of what towns were once called, of their origins, and how they changed hands, or in the way in which the Roman shaping of the Transpadana is eclipsed by the emphasis on indigenous origins, or in the continuing, structural, role of the Italian *ethnē*, which give substance and life to the arid catalogues of the *regiones*, literally populating them.

Deconstructing the 'Augustan' Lists

⁷³ BISPHAM 2007a, p. 54-5, *cf.* 60, gave an insufficiently nuanced account of the level of annotation across the Italian section as a whole; if my comments hold for the 'inland' sections they seriously underestimate the more significant level of detail provided in the *periplous* section, and indeed for *regio* X.

⁷⁴ THOMSEN 1947, p. 22-3; *cf.* BISPHAM 2007, p. 46-7.

⁷⁵ BISPHAM 2007a, p. 55.

⁷⁶ On similar concepts embedded in parts of Strabo's account, see BISPHAM forthcoming.

The *regiones* remain puzzling. Are they more than flags of convenience, the dead tissue of Augustan paperwork which can only be re-animated by the inclusion of ethnic life-blood, which gives them a past and a population? An important, if unintentional, step in cracking the organic veneer of the Augustan regions, and exposing the tension between the *regions* and the ethnic regions was taken by Thomsen. He never doubted that the *regiones* were Augustan, but argued on the basis of instances of poor fit between regional boundaries and ethnic boundaries that the alphabetical lists in Pliny were unrelated to the introduction of the *regiones*, but instead represent earlier lists of the settlements of individual peoples belonging to each *ethnos*, which Pliny started to combine into unified lists, an exercise which for some reason he then gave up. Thomsen thought that the alphabetical lists were Augustan, perhaps based on census data, and designed for (or to update) the unfinished work on Agrippa's map and *Commentarii*; Pliny would then have made a rushed and not wholly successful attempt to shoe-horn these lists into the Augustan *regiones*.⁷⁷

Like many scholars, I accepted in my previous discussion that the *regiones* had official Augustan names; but I now wonder whether this is the case.⁷⁸ Indeed, if they had names, why did they need numbers; and given that they had numbers, why did they need names? Avoidance of confusion seems unlikely as the available names were by and large already well established. Not naming the regions might in itself be revealing; as also would be a situation in which *un-named* regions, designated only by number, acquired names in the popular imagination and everyday use.⁷⁹ Names and numbers can of course go together, but given that the regions clearly had official numbers (proven by Pliny's heterodox ordering of them for his *ambitus*), but seems to name only one (Transpadana), without it being at all clear that this is an official

⁷⁷ THOMSEN 1947, p. 18-41, (following the lead of Klotz at the start of the 20th century); cf. KEPPIE 1983, p. 5.

⁷⁸ BISPHAM 2007, p. 47-9.

⁷⁹ So already THOMSEN 1947, p. 40; cf. LETTA 2007, p. 100-1. A partial parallel for the adoption of a nickname instead of an official designation, the former supplanting the latter and becoming official, might be the case of the Bakerloo Line on the London Underground: the line's proper name was the Baker Street and Waterloo Railway, but the nickname 'Bakerloo' was coined in the *Evening News* within months of the line's opening in 1906, and adopted not long thereafter by the operator itself (to the disgust of some commentators, who felt a lack of 'dignity' in the sanction given to a 'gutter' name: BOWNES, GREEN & MULLINS 2012, p. 93).

name, I am tempted to think that Augustus' *regiones* numbered I-XI, but that the names were popular ones, either pre-existing or given subsequent to the Augustan reform.

Pliny's partial use of the *regiones* is also odd: why not use them from start to finish, for coast and inland? It seems unthinkable that the Augustan *regiones* did not cover the coast as well as the inland areas. And why not follow them in number-order, from I to XI? Probably because the *periplous* model was already so well-developed, in multiple versions, offering a wide choice of annotation, and so culturally embedded in descriptions of Italy, that it was impossible to avoid: Pliny was culturally imprisoned in the 'coast-then-inland' mode of geographical description. This is not particularly shocking; what is surprising is that Pliny then made life difficult for himself by using a *pre-Augustan periplous*, but instead of using (directly or indirectly) a pre-Augustan description of the interior to match, he (or a source) stripped out the coastal cities from the 'Augustan' lists, leaving only the inland alphabetical lists.⁸⁰

Perhaps there was no need for such 'stripping out'; the Augustan lists may already have been disaggregated to some degree. For a start it is possible that they gave a privileged position to Augustus' colonies, which perhaps headed the lists for each region. This topic cannot be explored in any detail here, but Pliny's lists of Augustan colonies is not unproblematic and should neither be taken at face value nor discarded.⁸¹ Yet if we can imagine that the Augustan lists could be articulated in this way, why not extend the concept a little further, and imagine that they could have been internally disaggregated to produce

⁸⁰ Such stripping out (if this was what happened – which was the assumption of DETLEFSEN 1901, p. 12; cf. THOMSEN 1947, p. 22-3; BISPHAM 2007, p. 50-1 assumed) was pretty thorough but not perfect: see at 3. 51 and 3. 64, where Fregenae appears twice, once as a place on the coast, and as a *populus* in the inland section (THOMSEN 1947, p. 24; BISPHAM 2007, p. 47 n. 31) – unless this is a different Fregenae, as its placement in Latium might suggest.

⁸¹ On the colonies: THOMSEN 1947, p. 41-5; KEPPIE 1983, p. 4-8 (balanced assessment); for Augustus' interest in 'his' colonial foundations: SUET., *Aug.* 46, with NICOLET 1991b, p. 200-2; LAFFI 2007a p. 87-90. In *regio* VII (see above), Pliny does not mention Pisae as an Augustan colony, though it was; and the case for accepting Pliny's claim that 'colonia Falisca' was an Augustan colony, if he meant by this Falerii Novi, is unsupported, not to say highly problematic (see KEPPIE 1983, p. 170-2). In *regio* I the question of whether Nola had an Augustan colonial phase remains open, if still possible: KEPPIE 1983, p. 152; certain or possible Augustan colonies at Minturnae, Puteoli, Cumae and Nuceria are not signaled as such by Pliny, belonging in the coastal section (KEPPIE 1983, p. 141-3, 147-52). If there was a *separate* entry for, or document containing, Augustan colonies, it is hard to see why Pliny omitted Pisae (unless the Augustan colony list itself was split between coast and inland colonies), and hard to see why some entries are in the form of toponyms, and others of ethnonyms; also, why are some of the lists alphabetical and some not? One is reminded of Barbara Levick's famous caution *à propos* of juridical status: "can Pliny be trusted?" (LEVICK 1967, p. 37 n. 6).

separate lists of coastal and inland *populi*? This would have made Pliny's job much easier – or the job of his source, if Pliny used an intermediate redaction of the lists. Overall this seems a more appealing possibility: if Pliny were deleting coastal settlements from a single list which listed *populi* alphabetically regardless of location, we should expect more doublets and errors than we have. This last point raises the (again unanswerable) question of whether Pliny was looking at a document on papyrus, either an Augustan list, or a redaction made between the Augustan and Flavian eras; or rather copying from a monumental text and / or image. The latter may seem like an attractive prospect, whether in the Porticus of Agrippa, or accompanying a painted Augustan map of Italy, as I have tentatively suggested elsewhere.⁸² And yet such a map would have to have the lists written round the edge, and would be very difficult to use, let alone copy (although monumentality is not often primarily about ease of use!).⁸³ Use of a papyrus copy seems more likely.

Whose regiones?

One characteristic of the *regiones* which we have noted is the repeated underlying presence of ethnic units which broadly make up and define the extent of the *regiones* (ironically the limits for *regiones* which we have, with exception of VIII, are all rivers where they debouch into the sea, and are thus tied into the *periplous* account).⁸⁴ Nicolet had already argued almost thirty years ago for the existence of regional groupings of communities with an ethnic basis, but also reflecting geographical proximity, which on his view (re)emerged spontaneously after the Social War, and existed, in an ideological and affective sense, as active bearers of identity, but not in any institutional or legal sense, down to the end of the Republic. On these informal groupings with their deep history Augustus would have built his *regiones*. Complementing

⁸² BISPHAM 2007, p. 67.

⁸³ In the back of THOMSEN 1947 is a fold-out map of roughly A3 size. The differential level of attestation of communities across the *regiones* is striking, with *regions* I, V and VI significantly more densely 'populated' than the others. This is interesting in itself, and deserves further consideration, but it also shows how a map with the names written on it would be at best off-putting and at worst unusable, at least for 'populous' areas.

⁸⁴ THOMSEN 1947, p. 21; on the importance of the *ethne*, see POLVERINI 1998.

Nicolet's idea of survival, I introduced the possibility that some of the *regiones* formed part of a discourse of nostalgia for Italian origins, of revival in the service of a new 'national' Italian mythology.⁸⁵ While I still think that this is one of the strands of discourse in which the *regiones* are enmeshed, I also now consider that more weight should be given to Nicolet's arguments. The analysis of the Augustan *regiones* given above shows, in my view, not that they are identical with pre-existing ethnic regions (sometimes themselves called *regiones*), but that they are, rather, broadly co-extensive with them, administrative skins draped over the ethnic regions (or over aggregations of ethnic regions).⁸⁶ It is telling that we can do more, even from Pliny's text, to ascertain the boundaries of the *ethnic* groupings than we can for the Augustan region. Thus we know that the Tiber divides various ethnic groups (or territories associated with specific ethnic groups or sub-groups, 3. 50). We also know the boundaries between Lucanians and Bruttians (3. 72), between Brundisine territory and that of the Poediculi (3. 102), between Daunians and Apulians (3. 103), between Apulia and the *regio Frentana* (3. 103), the boundaries of Sabinum (3. 109), and the boundaries between the *regio Praetuttiana* and the Picentine 'region' (3. 110). Admittedly most, but not all, of these come from the *periplous* sections, but it remains true that the ethnic groupings are more substantial, more corporeal, than the 'Augustan' *regiones*. The inland boundaries of the latter can only be identified (as scholars have attempted to trace them)⁸⁷ by plotting the locations of identifiable towns on a map and drawing lines between the regions on that basis, using natural features like rivers where appropriate – but since Pliny's internal lists are mainly alphabetical series and not locational clusters, they cannot be used for this purpose without substantial subsidiary information, as he notes himself (3. 46). Thus, while the ethnic units can be envisaged, and were meant to be seen, as coherent bounded entities (as they are in Strabo, for example), the Augustan regions were not meant to be visualised in any precise geographical sense, but rather to serve as loose spatial envelopes for filing administrative data. This brings us back to the old question: what data? To this question we shall return.

⁸⁵ NICOLET 1991a; *cf.* BISPHAM 2007, p. 47-8, 50-1, 53, 63.

⁸⁶ *Cf.* BISPHAM 2007, p. 63-4.

⁸⁷ For example, THOMSEN 1947, p. 55-144.

Let us for now return to the persistence of the ethnically-based groupings or (pre-Augustan) regions. Can we push Nicolet's ideas a little further, and make these pre-Augustan units any more than ideological vectors, bearers of local or regional identity which still mattered? Since many of these ethnic regional units are precisely those which, as *ethnē* or *populi*, are described as rebelling in the Social War, it is unlikely that the Romans would encourage the persistence of, for example, Picentes or Lucani, in an institutional form with the capacity for action. On the other hand, as I have noted elsewhere, the Romans were, until the victory of Sulla, hardly in a position to discourage the persistence of local or regional groupings at a political or even an institutional level. Until the battle of the Colline Gate the Samnites and Lucanians were both Roman citizens and in a state of what amounted to unilaterally declared independence; Sulla himself made peace the preceding winter with a number of *Italici populi*, in what Livy calls a *foedus* or treaty.⁸⁸ After the victory of Sulla there was probably a campaign of repression against the Samnites, but not all the ethnic groupings could be wiped off the map, and in some parts of Italy, where nucleated multi-functional urban settlement was weakest, and dispersed settlement of different type prevalent, these groupings may, of necessity, have continued to play a some sort of formal, institutional, political role, with two sets of identities (and two languages) being operated simultaneously. An interesting discovery from Sicily seems to bear this messy situation out, attesting as it does to a group calling itself *Frentrani ceiues*.⁸⁹ So, while municipalization, and the adoption of Roman law and custom, and of the Latin language, slowly bedded down in a complex series of dialogues with individual centres (and their own laws, cults and practices), there was a role, especially in some parts of Italy, for regional groups, ethnic or sub-ethnic, to ensure stability and continuity in disturbed times.

⁸⁸ BISPHAM forthcoming a; forthcoming b. *Foedus*: *LIV Per.* 86. I hope to return elsewhere to what Sulla did to the Samnites.

⁸⁹ It is a recently published inscription from Lilybaeum, recording the building of a shrine to Hercules Nouritanus by C. Fannius Min. f. and “ceiuesq(ue) Frentran[ei q]uei in Sicilia colunt” (the Frentrane citizens who farm in Sicily), probably from the eighties or seventies B.C.: AMPOLO 2016. Assuming this date is right and that Frentrani = Frentani, the inscription seems to indicate the co-existence and equivalence of two identities, Roman and Frentrane. I owe this reference to Jonathan Prag and Nicholas Purcell. The survival of the pseudo-ethnic *Italiceis*, and its to self-identify by Italians down to at least the fifties B.C. is part of a similar phenomenon: see BISPHAM 2016, p. 13.

One such area, about which we know very little, is the levy. With the enfranchisement of the allies during and after the Social War the system of allied contributions under the *formula togatorum* will have come to an end. What happened in the ‘transition period’ between their military existence as *socii* with obligations and the institution of a levy based on their inclusion in the thirty-one rural tribes as full citizens (and perhaps registration in the Roman census) is obscure. Yet the Romans had to find some sort of system for conducting the levy with the new citizens added to the recruitment pool, and one that was more efficient and structurally robust than what Cinna had done in 87, which was to go round individual towns appealing for money and men.

One possibility is that the Romans used the eight new tribes which were created for the new citizens after the Social War (VELL. PAT., 2. 20. 2). Of these all we know is that they voted last, and that this (literally) second-class citizenship rankled with the new citizens.⁹⁰ The levy of the old citizens was conducted by tribes, and so it made sense to do the same for the new citizens as well.⁹¹ It does not much matter whether the tribes were intended as permanent or temporary institutions (with the old citizens happy for ‘temporary’ to mean ‘a long time’): the tribes could be used for voting and for the levy, until such time, if ever, as a better solution were implemented. Even once the new citizens were registered in the thirty-one rural tribes, and a significant number in the census, the eight-tribe system might have continued to play a part in the levy, as we shall see.

At this point, however, attention should be drawn to a significant contribution by Michael Crawford, who a some years ago now drew some striking conclusions from an unpublished manuscript in the Bodleian Library in Oxford containing a partial list of the thirty-five tribes, and an unpretentious group of inscribed *tesserae* in the British Museum and in Paris.⁹² Crawford started from Lily Ross Taylor’s

⁹⁰ BISPHAM 2007b, p. 175-90.

⁹¹ POL., 6. 19-20 (with WALBANK 1957, p. 699, noting also that recruitment could happen locally too, on which see also BRUNT 1987, p. 37, 408, 625-34; BRUNT 1988, p. 277-8); LIV., 29. 37. 8-10 (the *recensio equitum*, 204 B.C.); NICOLET, 1976, p. 133-40.

⁹² CRAWFORD 2002. The *tesserae* are oblong flat slips of bone or ivory, with one end marked off by an incised line, and then terminating in a sub-circular finial, pierced by a central hole; letters are inscribed on one side, and numbers on the other.

observation that in the late Republic the thirty-five tribes were listed in a fixed official order, and although the rationale behind this order was not obvious, there was some reason to think that a broadly anti-clockwise numeration had been followed.⁹³ Bringing to bear the new evidence, Crawford was able to make some corrections to Taylor's order for the rural tribes, and to confirm other parts of it, and above all to make a good case that the order of the tribes was tied to the succession of Roman roads, following an anti-clockwise direction starting with the Via Ostiensis. He suggests that the order of the tribes was conceived in or after 241 B.C., and quite possibly in the context of the Gallic *tumultus* of 225, to allow the most efficient despatch of messengers (or recruiting officers), with the numbers of recruits required that year, into the tribal districts where the recruitment normally happened, at least after the Hannibalic War. Mobilization would thus happen as quickly as possible, and contingents could be moved along the main roads to Rome, or elsewhere, as required. He ends with the brief but acute suggestion that the 'Augustan' *regiones* I-VII were in fact *late Republican* recruitment districts, created after the Social War, and tied to the road network; for Crawford, Augustus simply added *regiones* VIII-XI. This is an important insight, and must be broadly correct; but I think that the hypothesis can be fleshed out, and tweaked in some important respects.⁹⁴

Firstly, I want to return to the eight tribes created after the Social War, and to suggest there is a link between these and the *regiones*. *Prima facie* that sounds absurd; after all there were eleven regions and only eight new tribes. But, as the preceding analysis has made clear, the three northern *regiones* are somewhat anomalous in comparison with the other eight; the description of their interior is not organised in the same way as it is in the southern eight regions; indeed it is not really organised in any perceptible way, other than in the broad west-to-east orientation of *regio* XI.⁹⁵ It would have been perfectly possible for Augustus to have had an alphabetical list of the interior of (or all of) each region made up – it was hardly the most challenging task he faced during his reign. Why do the three northern *regiones* deviate from the

⁹³ TAYLOR 1960, esp. p. 69-78.

⁹⁴ CRAWFORD 2002, p. 1133 cites BRUNT 1988, p. 276-7 in support of the areas of recruitment for the republican armies as being "exactement" the seven 'Augustan' *regiones* of peninsular Italy, but what Brunt said there does not support this claim.

⁹⁵ BISPHAM 2007a, p. 46 n. 27.

pattern which holds for listing the interior in the other *regiones* (much less attention to alphabetical lists, marked preference for place names over local ethnonyms)? One reason might be that the outcome aimed at in *regiones* I-VIII, whatever that was, required alphabetisation of the lists, and the use of *populi* not places, whereas the outcome required in *regiones* IX-XI could be achieved without that. Yet it is hard to see what such a differential in outcomes could actually be, and why this differential would exist within the unified system of the *regiones*. A more likely outcome, which does not require us to prejudge the issue of that the *regiones* were actually for, indeed a rather straightforward explanation is that the two sets of lists differ because they belong to two different moments in time. Now, *regiones* I-VII lay south of the Arno – Rubicon line, they been part of Italy since before the Social War, since the rise of *terra Italia* indeed (in the mid-third century, as I have argued elsewhere).⁹⁶ *Regio* VIII lay outside; but as Ursula Ewins long ago argued, although Cispadane Gaul (which is more or less equivalent to what we think of as Aemilia) was probably not enfranchised during the Social War, the Latin colonies of Cisalpina must have been enfranchised by either the *lex Iulia* or the *lex Pompeia*, and their new citizen inhabitants will have added their numbers to the thousands of *assidui* settled in the centuriated land alongside the Via Aemilia over the course of the second century. So while *regio* VIII lay outside Italy, it contained a significant, and after 90/89 even larger (with the enfranchisement of Ariminum, Bononia, Placentia and Cremona), pool of potential conscripts, who needed to be brought within the evolving recruitment mechanisms which grew up after the Social War.⁹⁷ In any case, whether we include *regio* VIII or, with Crawford, exclude it, the Social War provides the *terminus post quem* for the creation of a new system for grouping and listing communities for the purposes of the levy: the *regiones*. In my view there is no grave objection to including *regio* VIII (which would also be the tribe for the former Latin colonies of Cisalpina) in the new arrangements, and the eight tribes recorded by Velleius can thus easily be *regiones* I-VIII, aimed at aiding the mobilisation of new citizens as well as restricting their votes.

⁹⁶ BISPHAM 2007b, p. 53-73.

⁹⁷ EWINS 1955, esp. p. 76-9.

The geographical extent of these eight tribes would have had to cover a considerable area, corralling large numbers of new citizens into monolithic blocks, covering both areas where there were large swathes of contiguous ex-allied territory, and, closer to Rome, areas where there had since the fourth and third centuries been an intricate patchwork of Roman and non-Roman communities. If we imagine something like what I have claimed the Augustan regions were, administrative ‘skins’ draped over existing structures, something similar may have happened now after the Social War: mobilization districts could have been created as ‘skins’ laid over existing regional, ethnic or geographical areas, already fairly clearly defined, and which had, in some cases at least, provided the units of organisation and recruitment for the rebel armies of the Social War. Within each of these districts new citizen communities would be organised to supply a given number of soldiers; old citizen communities would continue to comply with the *dilectus* as before. If we imagine that these mobilization districts were not only identical with the geographical extension of the new tribes (which would also, in some cases, have contained enclaves of old citizens in the thirty-one rural tribes), but also that these eight districts more or less corresponded with the first eight ‘Augustan’ regions, we may note one striking fact. Through each of the regions runs at least one major road, which traverses the region in question and finishes directly (or indirectly) in Rome.⁹⁸ Thus *regio* I is crossed by the the Via Latina and the Via Appia, the latter extending across *regio* II to Brundisium (probably by the end of the second century B.C.); *regio* III is served by the Via Annia (see *ILLRP* 454), which runs from Rhegium to Capua, there joining the Appia; *regio* IV is served by the Via Valeria running across to Alba Fucens and thence to the Adriatic, as well as the Via Salaria as far as Reate; *regio* V is traversed fully by the Salaria; *regio* VI by the Flaminia; *regio* VII by the Aurelia along the coast, and the Cassia and Clodia inland; and *regio* VIII by the Aemilia.⁹⁹ The utility of these roads in allowing messengers and recruiting officers to move in a quick and targeted way straight into the recruiting areas, as well as then moving the

⁹⁸ The link between *regiones* and roads was noted by LAURENCE 1999, p. 172-5, who, however, drew different conclusions from those reached here.

⁹⁹ The order of the numbering of the regions may be explained as follows: *regiones* I and II owe their priority to the centrality of the Appia (cf. CRAWFORD 2002, p. 1133); thereafter the regions (like the tribes in the analysis of CRAWFORD 2002) follow an anti-clockwise direction from III to VII; VIII would (on my view) conclude the series in that it lay outside the boundaries of Italy.

troops raised, is obvious. There was clearly a close connection between ethnic regions, major road, and efficient mobilization of the allies.

What happened after the Social War may well have been simply another step in the formalisation of a much older *praxis* surrounding the mobilization of the allies. Pliny, as we have seen, concludes his description of Italy at 3. 138 by recalling the huge volume of manpower mobilised (or listed as capable of being mobilised) in 225 when Italy faced a major Gallic invasion (without the Transpandani, he adds). The details of the levy are given by Polybios (2. 24), who describes the allies mobilizing (or being able to mobilize, or some combination of the two) according to large ethnic blocs, for each of which he gives the total of foot and horse. The totals do not concern us here, but the ethnic blocks are interesting when compared to the *regiones*. Table 1 sets out the information given by Polybios.¹⁰⁰ There are some close matches with the *regiones* we are considering: the Iapygian entry looks to be largely co-extensive with our *regio* II, and Umbria with *regio* VI; the Veneti and Cenomani recall the later *regio* X; and the Lucanians our *regio* III, more so if, as some scholars have argued, the Bruttian levy is subsumed within the Lucanian total. Other Polybian groups show that the idea of combining smaller *ethnē* into larger regional entities, as with the Marsi, Marrucini, Frentani and Vestini, who were all to be associated again in *regio* IV, was not original to the ‘Augustan’ *regiones*. Even bigger units could be combined, as in the lumping together of ‘Romans’ (whatever that means) and Campanians, which prefigures to some degree *regio* I, Latium and Campania (where a number of the communities which Polybios lumps together under Romans would be counted in the Plinian lists as part of Latium; as for Polybios’ group ‘Latium’, it possibly refers to the *nomen Latinum*, those who had Latin citizenship as a legal rather than an ethnic status). In any event, what Polybios records here, even though it is a response to an emergency, shows that the Romans could for the purposes of the levy divide Italy up into ethnically-based regions, whether they contained a single *ethnos* or grouped together two or more. As such his account provides a conceptual precedent for precisely the kind of organization which I am arguing that my post-Social War *regiones* represent.

¹⁰⁰ BRUNT 1987, p. 44-60.

Table 1 *Levy of 225 broken down by ethnos*

Ethnos	Soldiers	Region
Etruscans & Sabines	54,000	VII IV
Umbrians & Sarsinates	20,000	VI
Samnites	77,000	IV II
Iapygians	66,000	II
Lucanians	33,000	III
Marsi, Marrucini, Frentani, Vestini	24,000	IV
Romans & Campani	273,000	I

Veneti & Cenomani	20, 000	X
Latins	80, 000	I?

At some point after the suppression of the province of Gallia Cisalpina and its incorporation in Italy, three further *regiones* were then added to the original eight. The towns for these two were catalogued, but in a manner which did not match the earlier criteria followed in compiling the lists for the first eight regions. This, the addition of three extra *regiones* to the post-Social War eight, was, I would argue the Augustan reform. If so, it would follow that not only the first eight regions, but also their associated lists of communities, were pre-Augustan. The different nature of the lists for *regions* IX, X and XI could be explained in a number of ways. The lists could be Augustan, but their heterogeneity with respect to each other makes that perhaps less likely. Rather they look as if they have grown up organically over time. It may be that they represent in fact lists of communities drawn up for various purposes, and perhaps in a piecemeal way, over the course of the late Republic. Obvious ‘triggers’ for the collection of such data, which may be related to ongoing claims about the status and obligations of specific communities, which may have stretched the ‘data collection’ out over time and made the resulting information less organic, would be the implementation of the *lex Pompeia* in 89, or the implementation of the *formula prouvinciae* when the province of Gallia Cisalpina was created, in the 80s, if not precisely in 89;¹⁰¹ successive governors of Cisalpina may have made various adjustments or additions to the data available to them; and Caesar’s enfranchisement of Cisalpina in 49 presumably generated more lists of entitled communities; in the end the whole bundle of lists would have been available to Augustus.

An obvious objection to this whole reconstruction is that the eight new tribes were much resented, and that the new citizens were re-distributed through the thirty-one rural tribes in (probably) 86 B.C., a *fait*

¹⁰¹ LAFFI 1992.

accomplis accepted by Sulla.¹⁰² The eight tribes then should have been abolished, and both the unsatisfactory arrangements about voting and the levy based on them should have been consigned to history. Yet we know so little about how the levy was conducted after the Social War, and how the old and new citizens were integrated into it, that it is hard to be dogmatic. Indeed the eight new tribes, abolished as political units, may well have had a continued role to play in the levy. The pre-Social War geographical disposition of the thirty-one rural tribes may originally have been made to facilitate the levy, with the official order of the tribes, as Crawford argues, arranged to radiate out from Rome along the roads in an anti-clockwise direction. But the rural tribes were now deployed up and down the peninsula in such a way that it was no longer possible to retain the same quasi-linear alignment that had previously allowed decentralised conscription to take place quickly and efficiently in the tribal areas, and if necessary to funnel conscripts into Rome, or elsewhere along the road network.¹⁰³ In that situation, the eight new tribes, although politically abortive, would have served just as well to organize and facilitate the levy of *all* citizens living within their boundaries, as they had to organize the levy among the *noui ciues* alone. This seems to be confirmed by Crawford's interpretation of the bone slips, according to which the tribes and the *regiones* are part of an interlinked structure.¹⁰⁴

If I am right then, the overall picture would evolve as follows. In 225, if not before, the Romans were capable of mobilising their allies, when needed, via big ethnic blocks, either composed of single *ethnē* or of a number of *ethnē* bundled together. This may not have happened often, but equally we do not know that 225 was the only time it happened, and Polybios seems to find the scale of the recruitment remarkable, but not the method. Indeed, we know that there were alphabetical lists of Roman colonies, divided between the Tyrrhenian and the Adriatic ('upper' and 'lower') seas, already by the Hannibalic War; similar lists may

¹⁰² See BISPHAM forthcoming b.

¹⁰³ CRAWFORD 2002, p. 1131.

¹⁰⁴ Note also Hadrianic and later inscriptions mentioning a *delictus* conducted *per* particular *regiones*: *CIL* 8. 7036; 10.3856; 6.3836; BISPHAM 2007a, p. 65, and on post-Augustan developments, THOMSEN 1947, p. 147-95.

have survived for the *socii nauales*.¹⁰⁵ After the Social War the eight new tribes established for the new citizens, politically destructive thought they were, offered a structural solution to the problem of new-citizen recruitment, creating large geographical catchments within which conscripts could be collected and enlisted efficiently and quickly, also avoiding the need for dangerous localised appeals by ambitious commanders. Thus the Romans created, probably formalising previous practice and using in large part existing ethnic entities, eight *regiones*, which they probably numbered I-VIII (to avoid the resurrection of rebel identities so soon after the Social War).¹⁰⁶ When these new tribes were abolished (or became dead letters) with the redistribution of the new citizens among the thirty-one rural tribes, the geographical areas they covered could still be used for the levy, to gather up, enlist and deploy, conscripts; indeed they were on my reading more important in this role given the geographical fragmentation of the rural tribes after the Cinnan period, and the consequent difficulty in using the thirty-one tribes as the basis for recruitment as had happened before the Social War. It is at this point, perhaps in the seventies B.C., perhaps a little later, that alphabetical lists of all the *populi* in each region, old and new citizen, would have been drawn up, a replacement for the *formula togatorum*.¹⁰⁷ I explored the possibility (above) that there were originally two lists of communities, the inland and the coastal – such a division could make sense if the lists were compiled at a time of the pirate incursions on the Italian coasts, which the seventies was. It may have seemed to make more sense to articulate the manpower resource in a way that allowed some of it to be deployed if necessary for coastal defence (which is not to claim that this actually happened, but that the possibility could have been central to organising the lists; these coastal lists in Pliny's account would then have been substituted by him, for the reasons given above, by the 'Varronian' *periplous*). Be that as it may, it is to this period, to the late Republic, that the inland lists found in Pliny belong. That is to say that they are not, as often assumed, by

¹⁰⁵ Liv., 27. 38. 1-2 (207 B.C.); BISPHAM 2000, p. 165-6; BISPHAM 2007a, p. 52-3.

¹⁰⁶ If I am right then the 'Augustan' lists will go back, for the new citizens, to the Social War, and analysis of how communities were assigned to regions may tell us something important about the politics of enfranchisement. Thus Aeclanum, which had rebelled but also seen a legion of loyalist paramilitaries enrolled, was separated off from the rest of the Hirpini within *regio* II; more interestingly, the Samnites were split off from the Lucanians, and were themselves divided between *regions* I (see THOMSEN 1947, p. 63-4, 67, 71-4) II and IV. They would then seem to have been intentionally broken up, perhaps a sign of mistrust.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. a similar evolution sketched out in BISPHAM 2007a, p. 53.

me previously, as much as almost all other writers, Augustan lists. Augustus' contribution was to add three new *regiones*, which he numbered IX, X and XI – I would argue that like their republican cousins, they had no names.

Conclusions

In 2007 I wrote that “it is as clear as day that Pliny has one or more Augustan documents available to him ... for his description of Italy”.¹⁰⁸ I wish I could say it was a foggy day when I wrote this, but if memory serves it was a fine day in early summer. Like the vast majority of commentators, on that clear Oxford afternoon I took at face value Pliny's reference to Augustan documentation (whether a single list, or separate sources, *i.e.* (i) a map showing the *regiones* (ii) an alphabetical list of the *populi* of the interior and (iii) a list of Augustan colonies). Yet what has emerged from this re-analysis is that the Augustan reform seems to be a late tweak to, and extension, of a system of organisation which was inherited from the last decades of the Republic (and that system in turn seems to have antecedents of sorts reaching back to the third century). To be sure, what Pliny had at his disposal probably trumpeted this as a major Augustan re-imagining (or revival, preservation, restoration) of Italy, something which could sit happily beside the Virgilian evocations of Italy's past in the last six books of the *Aeneid* or Iulius Hyginus, *de urbibus Italicis*.¹⁰⁹ After all, Augustus made much of, and extravagantly monumentalised, what was a tiny, if important, tweak to Caesar's reform of the calendar, on the monumentalisation of which Pliny himself is a source of evidence.¹¹⁰ So we can forgive Pliny for treating the *regiones*, in his hasty dash through the known world, as a straightforwardly Augustan confection, and creating the impression that Augustus kneaded and shaped the dough of Italy in his own image. Augustus, on my interpretation, added three new *regiones*, and there may well have been some optimistic redaction of the existing republican lists to pad

¹⁰⁸ BISPHAM 2007a, p. 50.

¹⁰⁹ See *FRHist* vol. I, 479-80.

¹¹⁰ *HN* 36. 72-3; HESLIN 2007.

them out a bit and produce an impression of a yet more populous Italy. Overall, however, the picture of a comprehensive Augustan reboot of the peninsula needs to be abandoned in favour of something more like window-dressing, at least in practical or organizational terms; no doubt Augustus did not fail to exploit the new 'edition' of the *regiones* as a means to tie Italy as an entity more closely to his own person.¹¹¹ If we have reduced Augustus', we have gained potentially important insights into how Italy was imagined and organised in the immediate aftermath of, and in the fifty years after, the Social War. In 2007 I drew attention to a section of Strabo's account of inland Etruria (smaller settlements near the Via Cassia) which seemed to be based on a *Latin* alphabetical list, in contrast to his usual practice; I offered an argument, which I think still holds good, for thinking this small list reflects the situation in the late Republic, rather than the Augustan principate.¹¹² Thus this is not one of the Plinian lists; rather a place can be found for it in the context of the later Republican lists of communities which I have been trying to reconstruct, and which I hypothesised in my previous discussion as emerging after, and indeed conditioned, by the Social War. Such regional, ethnically-influenced, groupings do not then emerge spontaneously in the interstices of Roman power, as Nicolet argued, or as straight forward survivals of post Social War entities, but, at least in part, *through* discourses of Roman power, which articulate and define them.¹¹³

If I am right we have recovered a lost element of Rome's administrative and ideological control over Italy, as well as some missing steps in the story of the integration of new and old citizens. Equally striking is the vitality of the *ethnē*, expressed as large-scale ethnicities like Lucanian, smaller-scale groupings like the *regio Frentana* or *Praetuttiana*, or subdivisions like Latium Antiquum or Adiectum. These exist both as part of a bundle of historical trajectories, but also as part of a way of seeing Italy as it

¹¹¹ Symbolic role: NICOLET 1991b, p. 171-8. The dominant role given to Augustus in BISPHAM 2007, p. 61-3 holds true inasmuch as Augustus promoted the idea of an Italy of towns and demographically healthy *populi* through official lists (like those used by Pliny) and other means, and in so doing provided a template for the Flavian revival; beyond this the claim no longer has traction.

¹¹² STR., 5. 2. 9, 226C; BISPHAM 2007a, p. 51-2 (comparing 5. 2. 7, 254C, Sardinia); BISPHAM, forthcoming a.

¹¹³ Cf. BISPHAM 2007a, p. 52-3, 64.

is, not just as it was.¹¹⁴ Pliny, before he ever mentions the *regiones*, opens his account of Italy with the *ethnē* (3. 38), and concludes with them. They preceded the *regiones*, made them possible, and long outlived them. For once, the Republic defeated Augustus.

Bibliography

AMPOLO (C.) – <<Il culto di Ercole a Lilibeo: un nuovo document dei rapporti tra genti e culture diverse nella Sicilia occidentale>>, in: *Mare Internum. Archeologia e culture del Mediterraneo*. 8, 2016, p. 21-37.

BEAGON (M.) – *Roman Nature. The Thought of Pliny the Elder*, Oxford, 1992.

BEAGON (M.) – <<Situating Nature’s Wonders in Pliny’s *Natural History*>>, in: E. H. BISPHAM, G. D.

ROWE, E. MATTHEWS (ed.) – *Vita Vigilia Est. Essays in Honour of Barbara Levick. BICS Supplement 100*, London, 2007, p. 19-40.

BISPHAM (E. H.) – <<Mimic? A Case Study in Early Roman Colonization>>, in: E. HERRING, K. LOMAS, (ed.) – *The Emergence of State Identities in Italy in the First Millennium B.C.*. *Accordia Specialist Studies on Italy 8*, London, 2000, p. 156-86.

BISPHAM (E. H.) – <<Pliny the Elder’s Italy>>, in: E. H. BISPHAM, G. D. ROWE, E. MATTHEWS (ed.) – *Vita Vigilia Est. Essays in Honour of Barbara Levick. BICS Supplement 100*, London, 2007, p. 41-67 = 2007a

BISPHAM (E. H.) – *From Asculum to Actium. The Municipalization of Italy from the Social War to Augustus*, Oxford, 2007 = 2007b.

BISPHAM (E. H.) – <<The Lucanians: Historical Perspective>>, in: M. ABERSON, M.C. BIELLA, M. DI

¹¹⁴ On the survival in the late Republic and into the empire of self-conscious ethnic groupings with agency and their own agendas, interacting with wider political and military concerns, see BROADHEAD (this volume); and BRADLEY 2007.

- FAZIO, M. WULLSCHLEGER (ed.) – *Entre Archéologie et histoire: dialogues sur divers peuples de l'Italie préromaine*. EGeA 2, Geneva, 2014, p. 311-330
- BISPHAM (E. H.) – <<Una, nessuna or centomila romanizzazioni?>> in: M. ABERSON, M.C. BIELLA, M. DI FAZIO, P. SANCHÉZ, M. WULLSCHLEGER (ed.) – *L'Italia centrale e la creazione di una koine culturale? I percorsi della 'romanizzazione'*. EGeA 3, Geneva, 2016, p. 5-14.
- BISPHAM (E. H.) – << Boundaries in Strabo's Italy: Space, Time and Difference>> forthcoming = forthcoming a
- BISPHAM (E.H.) – <<Sulla and the *populi Italici* >> in: G. ZECCHINI, M.T. SCHETTINO, *L'età di Silla / The Age of Sulla*. Monografie del Centro Ricerche di Documentazione sull'Anichità Classica 46, Rome, forthcoming = forthcoming c
- BISPHAM (E. H.) – <<The Cults of Mefitis>> in D. MIANO, E.H. BISPHAM (ed.) – *The Italic Gods*, forthcoming = forthcoming c
- BOURDIN (S.) – *Les Peuples de l'Italie préromaine. Identités, territoires et relations inter-ethniques en Italie centrale et septentrionale (VIII^e – I^{er} s. av. J.-C.)*. BEFAR 350, Rome, 2012.
- BOWNES (S.), GREEN (O.), MULLINS (S.) – *Underground. How the Tube Shaped London*, London, 2012.
- BRADLEY (G. J.) – <<Romanization. The End of the Peoples of Italy?>> in: G. J. BRADLEY, E. ISAYEV, C. RIVA (ed.), *Ancient Italy. Regions Without Boundaries*, Exeter, 2007, p. 295-322.
- BRIQUEL (D.) – *L'origine lydienne des Étrusques: histoire de la doctrine dans l'antiquité*. CEFR 139, Rome, 1991.
- BRUNT (P. A.) – *Italian Manpower. 225 B.C. – A.D. 14*, revised edn, Oxford, 1987.
- BRUNT (P. A.) – << The Army and the Land in the Roman Revolution>> in: P.A. BRUNT, *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*, Oxford, 1988, p. 240-280.
- CHILLET (C.) – <<L'Italie augustéenne au regard de l'Italie virgilienne: ethnographie, poésie et principat>>, in: *MEFRA*, 129, 1, 2017, p. 33-42.

- CHILVER (G.E.F.) – *Cisalpine Gaul. Social and Economic History from 49 B.C. to the Death of Trajan*, Oxford, 1941.
- CRAWFORD (M.H.) – <<Tribus, tessères et regions>>, in: *CRAI*, 146, 2002, p. 1125-36.
- DE JULIIS (E.) – *Gli Iapigi. Storia e civiltà della Puglia preromana*. *Archeologia* 8, Milan, 1988s.
- DETLEFSEN (D.) – <<Vermutungen über Varros Schrift de ora maritima>>, in *Hermes* 20, 1886, p. 240-65.
- DETLEFSEN (D.) – <<Die Beschreibung Italiens in der Naturalis Historia des Plinius und ihre Quellen>>, in: W. SIEGLIN (ed.), *Quellen und Forschungen zur alten Geschichte und Geographie I*, Leipzig, 1901, p. 1-61.
- EWINS (U.) – <<The Enfranchisement of Cisalpine Gaul>> in: *PBSR* 26, 1955, 73-98
- HESLIN (P.) – <<Augustus, Domitian and the so-called Horologium Augusti>> in: *JRS* 97, 2007, 1-20.
- KEPPIE (L.) – *Colonisation and Veteran Settlement in Italy, 47 – 14 B.C.*, London, 1983.
- LAFFI (U.) – <<La provincia della Gallia Cisalpina>> in: *Athenaeum*, 80, 1992, p. 5-23.
- LAFFI (U.) – <<L'organizzazione dell'Italia sotto Augusto e la creazione delle *Regiones*>> in: U. LAFFI – *Colonie e municipi nello stato romano*. Storia e Letteratura. Raccolta di Studi e Testi 239, Rome, 2007, p. 81-117 = 2007a.
- LAFFI (U.) – <<Nota sull'testo di Plin., *N.H.*, III, 46: L'uso del titolo *colonia* nella descrizione pliniana delle città dell'Italia>> in: U. LAFFI – *Colonie e municipi nello stato romano*. Storia e Letteratura. Raccolta di Studi e Testi 239, Rome, 2007, p. 119-25 = 2007b.
- LEVICK (B.M.) – *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, Oxford, 1967.
- LAURENCE (R.) – *The Roads of Roman Italy. Mobility and Cultural Change*, London, 1999.
- MADDOLI (G.) (ed.) – *Strabone el'Italia*. Università degli Studi di Perugia, Pubblicazioni degli Istituti di Storia Antica e di Filologia Classica della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Perugia, 1988.
- NICOLET (CL.) – *Le métier de citoyen dans la Rome républicaine*², Paris, 1976.
- NICOLET (CL.) – <<L'origines des 'regiones Italiae' augustéennes>> in: *CGG* 2, 1991, p. 82-95

- NICOLET (CL.) – *Space, Geography and Politics in the Early Roman Empire*, Ann Arbor, 1991.
- ØRSTED (P.) – <<Regiones Italiae.’ Ehreninschriften und Imperialpolitik>> in: *Studies in Ancient History and Numismatics, Presented to R. Thomsen*, Aarhus, 1988, 124-38.
- PASQUINUCCI (M.) – << Strabone e l’Italia centrale >>, in: G. MADDOLI (ed.). – *Strabone e l’Italia*. Università degli Studi di Perugia, Pubblicazioni degli Istituti di Storia Antica e di Filologia Classica della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Perugia, 1988, p. 45-59
- POLVERINI (L.) – << Le regioni nell’Italia romana>> in: *Geographia Antiqua*, 7, 1998, 23-34
- SALLMANN (K.G.) – *Die Geographie des Alteren Pinius in ihrem Verhältnis zu Varro*, Berlin and New York, 1971.
- SALMON (E.T.) – *Roman Colonization under the Republic*, London, 1969.
- SHIPLEY (G. J.) – *Pseudo-Skylax’s Periplus. The Circumnavigation of the Inhabited World. Text, Translation and Commentary*, Exeter, 2011.
- TAYLOR (L.R.) – *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic. The Thirty-Five Urban and rural Tribes*, Rome, 1960.
- THOMSEN (R.) – *The Italic Regions from Augustus to the Lombard Invasion*. Classica et Mediaevalia, Dissertationes IV, Copenhagen, 1947.
- TOZZI (P.) – <<L’Italia settentrionale di Strabone>> in: MADDOLI (G.) (ed.) – *Strabone el’Italia*. Università degli Studi di Perugia, Pubblicazioni degli Istituti di Storia Antica e di Filologia Classica della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Perugia, 1988, p. 25-43.
- UDA (A.) – <<La <<sabinité de Tibur dans l’Italie des épîtres. Vision poétique et réalités régionales>> in: *MEFRA* 102, 1, 1990, 303-55.
- WALBANK (F.W.) – *A Historical Commentary on Polybius I, Commentary on Books I-VI*, revised edn, Oxford, 1970.
- WILLIAMS (J.H.C.) – *Beyond the Rubicon. Romans and Gauls in Republican Italy*, Oxford, 2001.