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“Pliny Country” Revisited: Connectivity and Regionalism in Roman Italy

Carolynn E. Roncaglia

“Pliny Country”

Gaius Plinius Caecilius Secundus was very much a man of the empire. As an advocate at cosmopolitan Rome, a witness at Vesuvius, governor in Bithynia, a landowner in Etruria, a friend of Spanish and north African senators, Pliny had a career that demonstrated the possibilities for mobility possessed by Roman elites during the high empire. Yet, when Ronald Syme published prosopographical studies on correspondents and persons mentioned in Pliny’s letters nearly a half century ago, he found that many of the people in Pliny’s letters fell within defined networks of amicitia in a limited geographical area that Syme named “Pliny Country.”¹ Syme’s “Pliny Country”, based around Pliny’s home town of Comum near Mediolanum, included most of Lombardy and stretched to just east of Lake Garda, encompassing the Valerii at Verona but not going as far east as Aquileia and the towns at the head of the Adriatic, nor going as far west as Eporedia and Augusta Taurinorum, which controlled access to the Western Alps. Within Italy, Pliny’s region of connections was largely limited to the eastern half of the Augustan regio XI and the western part of regio X.²

Superimposed upon these regional connections were associations made in Rome, where, as Syme says, “the Plinian company . . . [acquired] recruits from schools and salons . . . from a barrister’s practice and a senator’s career. In these ways, persons from Spain and Narbonensis come in.”³ Pliny’s more illustrious amici, Suetonius and Tacitus, boasted
origins and relationships scattered across the empire, but they had in common a political connection to the city of Rome. Both regional and Roman connections in turn produced patronage obligations, adding a third set of connections to Pliny’s world. Tifernum Tiberinum, where Pliny had inherited from his family substantial landholdings from his family, adopted him as patronus, and from there Pliny built up a considerable network of Umbrian social contacts (Ep. 4.1). At Rome Pliny served as advocate for an embassy of Baeticans seeking redress against a previous—and conveniently deceased—governor; according to Pliny they had sought him out because of his previous success in the law courts of Rome (Ep. 3.4). Similarly his friend Statius Sabinus persuaded him to act as advocate for the people of Firmum Picenum (Ep. 6.18). Pliny’s most extensive patronage, however, was confined to his hometown of Comum, where he built baths and a library, set up an alimentary program for the children of the town, and provided partial funding for the hire of a new teacher.

Through the publication and survival of his letters, Pliny’s connections in Italy and the empire are exceptionally well-documented, but are they anomalous? Can other sets of regional connections be defined, and what determines their shape? How did these hypothetical regional networks—like the set of social and political bonds formed by Pliny and his correspondents—interact with other, larger networks?

Sources

Pliny’s letters stand largely alone in the high empire, but they are not the only sources that can reconstruct the personal networks created by individuals through various forms
of interaction, like marriage, business, patronage, or amicitia. This article examines one category of these sources—inscriptions on stone or bronze—that (1) provides a fairly large sample size, (2) is fairly well represented across Roman Italy, and (3) provides some evidence of the kinds of regional connections that can be seen in Pliny’s letters.

This is not to say that working with these inscriptions is unproblematic. The geographic and chronological distributions of inscriptions within Roman Italy are uneven. Inscriptions from the Principate, particularly from the second century CE, are more numerous than those from the early Republican period or from Late Antiquity.7 Similarly, some regions of Italy are epigraphically denser than others, and even within regions, epigraphic corpora tend to show an overrepresentation of freedmen, soldiers, and local elites.8 There are also regional variations in epigraphic habits—such as more frequent commemoration of women and children in the old Venetic areas around Ateste—which complicate even these general assumptions about epigraphic biases.9

Compensating for all documentary bias is beyond the scope of this project, but to allow for some standardization of bias the evidence has been limited to those inscriptions (largely funerary and honorific) that date to the period from the Late Republic through the Principate and that explicitly mention a connection to a place in Italy other than the site of the inscription, as in a dedication from Clusium, which commemorates a freedman from nearby Cortona: C(aio) Titio C(ai) l(liberto) Celeri, / domo Cortona, / VIvir(o) Aug(ustali) / liberti eius.10 Not included in the corpus are non-explicit or uncertain connections, such as those known through literary sources, proposed by prosopographical
studies, or suggested by tribal affiliations. These non-specific sources are excluded in order standardize the corpus of documentary material as much as possible and in order not favor those areas where the local prosopography has been more thoroughly or carefully studied.

**Italian regional networks**

Mapping the connections shown by this corpus of inscriptions allows a partial reconstruction of interaction between residents of different *municipia*. Bononia provides a useful example. Within Italy, the town has links with Aquileia, Cremona, Mutina, Parma, Ravenna, and Rome. Among these Italian connections, two distinct patterns of interaction can be discerned.

The first pattern is largely a regional one: connections are largely limited to northeastern Italy, in particular to the Aemilia. Here Bononia’s ties, concentrated along the via Aemilia, the great trunk road running north of the Apennines, are created by local elites, particularly by those of the decurial class, by members of the sevirate, and *Augustales*. So, for example, in an epitaph at Bononia, a *vestiarius* advertises his Cremonese connections:

```
V(ivus) f(ecit) / L(ucius) Ursius / Sosander / vestiar(ius) Bonon(iensis) /
\[\]
\[\]
\[\]
\[\]
```

The connections between the local elites of Bononia and its neighbors in northeastern Italy stand in contrast to the connections between Rome and Bononia, which are largely
the result of recruitment by the Praetorian Guard and the urban cohorts in Rome. Explicit references to Bononia in Rome are almost exclusively to be found in the listed origins of praetorians and members of the urban cohorts. The relationship between Rome and Bononia appears to be reciprocal, as people from Bononia joined the guard at Rome and then returned as veterans to settle in Bononia.\textsuperscript{14} This bidirectional link between Rome and Bononia exists alongside Bononia’s regional network of connections in the Aemilia and northeastern Italy.

These two types of ties linking Bononia with other places in Italy are typical of other large, northern Italian towns such as Cremona, whose connections in Italy are similarly divided between the Po valley (Aquileia, Cremona, Bononia, Brixia, Ficulea, Lepidum Regium, Pola, Ravenna, and Verona) and Rome.\textsuperscript{15} Verona too has a similar dichotomy between the regional connections made by local elites and the military connections made by recruitment into the Praetorian Guard and urban cohorts at Rome and by subsequent veteran settlement, as at Reate and Pisaurum.\textsuperscript{16}

Aquileia at first appears to be the exception to this rule, with connections to Aquileia, Ateste, Augusta Taurinorum, Bononia, Brixia, Cremona, Emona, Faesulae, Forum Iulii, Fundi, Hasta, Intimilium, Mutina, Opitergium, Patavium, Perusia, Placentia, Pola, Rome, Sentinum, Tergeste, and Verona.\textsuperscript{17} These connections are both more wide-ranging and more numerous than other towns in northern Italy. The number of the connections can perhaps be explained by Aquileia’s large number of inscriptions and by the strength of the epigraphic habit among Aquileians.\textsuperscript{18} The range, moreover, is distorted by the
stationing of praetorians at Aquileia.\textsuperscript{19} Taking into account the unique circumstances at Aquileia, the patterns of connectivity seen at Bononia otherwise seem typical for similarly sized towns in northern Italy.\textsuperscript{20} But are these patterns found at Bononia and other Cisalpine towns representative of Italy as a whole?

In southern and central Italy, similar patterns prevail. At Capua, for example, there is again the dichotomy between Roman and regional connections created by local elites holding decurionates and sevirates in neighboring towns. The elongated shape of Capua’s regional connections differs from the more globular and/or triangular networks seen in the Po valley. Here geography, especially the divisive power of the Apennine chain, seems to be limiting Capua’s range of connectivity largely to the Tyrrhenian coast. A similar dichotomous network emerges at Beneventum, whose connections are either within a 40 km radius around the town or with Rome.\textsuperscript{21} Whereas Capua’s links were largely coastal, Beneventum’s spread out radially along the Calore river, the via Appia, and the via Traiana. On a smaller scale, the Umbrian town of Tuder has connections with nearby Tiber river towns Spoletium and Vettona as well as the expected military links with Rome.\textsuperscript{22} So the basic patterns of connectivity seen at Bononia are replicated across the Italian peninsula.

The regional and cross-regional links created by local elites and recruited praetorians respectively were of course not the only forms of connectivity within Roman Italy but they nevertheless do suggest a uniformity to the patterns by which people in Roman Italy interacted with other communities.\textsuperscript{23} In general, communication and social connections
were limited to small regions, the shapes of which were strongly influenced by both the physical geography and the paths of major Roman roads, as can be seen in Beneventum’s regional network and with the shape of networks in the Aemilia.

The general shape and scale of these networks, moreover, lend further credence to the idea of a coherent “Pliny Country”. Returning to Mediolanum, the large city near Pliny’s Comum, it is clear that Mediolanum’s range of connections corresponds roughly to the area of modern Lombardy, expanding into eastern Veneto and into northern Liguria. Mediolanum’s network of connectivity neither corresponds to modern regions nor to the Augustan regio XI. It is, as at Capua, limited by geography, with Mediolanum’s connections stretching east down the Po river system but not across the Apennines into coastal Liguria or into northern Etruria. The geographical limitations of Mediolanum’s connections are again not atypical, as we see in comparison with four other towns from other areas of the Po valley—Augusta Bagiennorum, Brixia, Patavium, and Ariminium. At Augusta Bagiennorum and Ariminium especially these geographical limitations are apparent—the connections of Augusta Bagiennorum cluster around the Tanarus river valley, and Ariminum clings as much to the Po delta as to the Apennines.

While Mediolanum’s network does not match ancient or modern administrative regions, it does, however, correspond almost exactly to the Transpadane network sketched by Pliny’s letters. Using Mediolanum’s fuller epigraphic corpus to stand in for nearby Comum, it does seem that Syme’s “Pliny Country” corresponds quite closely to the network of local elites in the same area. Thus Pliny’s regional connections are not
anomalous, and here there is a pleasing overlap between the literary and epigraphic record.

Superimposed on these regional networks of local elites are those links created by military recruitment—particularly into the urban cohorts and Praetorian Guard—and veteran settlement. Within Italy, these links connect towns across the peninsula with Rome. The strength of this second form of network becomes more apparent when the range of data used for looking at regional networks in Italy is expanded to include inscriptions not only in Italy but throughout the empire that explicitly note a connection with an Italian town.

**Connections between Italy and the empire**

By expanding the data in this manner for the small Etrurian town of Faesulae, for example, a small diaspora appears: legionaries and praetorians who claim an origin in Faesulae are found in Rome, Aquileia, Formiae, Mogontiacum in Germany, and at Carnuntum in Pannonia. All of the people commemorated outside of Faesulae who mention an origin in Faesulae also claim current or former membership in the legions, the Praetorian Guard, or the urban cohorts. A major force pulling inhabitants of Faesulae away from home and beyond the borders of Italy seems to have been military recruitment.

In this matter Faesulae was not exceptional; towns throughout Italy show similar patterns, with a majority of connections outside of Italy being the results of military recruitment.
and resettlement. The same effect of recruitment on an Italian diaspora can be seen with attestations of people across the empire who claim an origin in Mediolanum. Outside of Mediolanum’s regional network in the Transpadane, it is almost always a direct military connection that accounts for the movement of Milanese throughout the empire, hence the concentration of Milanese at military sites such as Mogontiacum, Carnuntum, and Poetovio.  

The exceptions are at Narbo in southern Gaul, where the occupation of the commemorated in the relevant inscription is not clear, and at Leptis Magna, where a marble base in the theater commemorates a particularly successful Severan-era pantomime:

\[
\begin{align*}
M(\text{arco}) & \text{ Septimio Aurelio Agrippae} \\
M(\text{arci}) & \text{ Aureli Antonini Pii Felicis Aug(usti) lib(erto)} \\
\text{pantomimo temporis sui primo,} \\
\text{Romae adventus productorum} \\
\text{condiscipulo ad Italiae spectacula} \\
\text{a domino nostro Aug(usti) provecto,} \\
\text{decurionalibus ornamentis Verona} \\
\text{et Vicetia ornato, Mediolano in=} \\
\text{ter iuvenes recepto, in Africa} \\
\text{Lepci Mag(ina) a domino nostro Aug(usti)} \\
\text{ordinato. P(ublius) Albucius Apollonius}
\end{align*}
\]
Mediolanensis ex Italia amico rari
exempli permissu splendidissimi ordinis posuit.

“To Marcus Septimius Aurelius Agrippa, freedman of Marcus Aurelius
Antoninus Pius Felix Augustus, leading pantomime of his time, fellow-
pupil of the young men at Rome, brought to Italian performances by our
lord Augustus, decorated with decurial honors at Verona and Vicetia,
admitted into the iuvenes at Mediolanum, appointed to the town council in
Africa at Leptis Magna by our lord Augustus. Publius Albucius
Apollonius, Milanese from Italy, to a friend of uncommon specimen, set
this up by the permission of the most splendid town council.” 29

Agrippa’s career, as far as the honorific monument from Leptis records it, encompasses
three distinct areas: Rome, Leptis Magna, and a region in northern Italy including
Verona, Vicetia, and Mediolanum. Agrippa’s place of origin is uncertain, but given that
he was brought ad Italie spectacula, a provincial origin, albeit not necessarily North
African, is likely. Once in Italy, Agrippa seems to have made connections at Rome,
Vicetia, Verona, and Mediolanum. Given his position as imperial freedman, his education
at Rome is not surprising. Agrippa’s connections with Vicetia, Verona, and Mediolanum
are perhaps less expected, but given the nature of Italian regional networks as outlined
above, once Agrippa made a patron or connection from one town—most probably the
Milanese Apollonius—connections with other towns in Mediolanum’s network might
easily follow.\textsuperscript{30} Agrippa’s career appears thus to have been shaped not only by imperial patronage but also by local regional networks in Italy.

Hence even outliers in the empire tend to confirm the two basic patterns of connectivity seen in Italian inscriptions, namely (1) that the regional networks are created mainly by local elites and (2) that larger networks are created by the Roman state through recruitment—mostly military but also administrative and, in the case of Agrippa, theatrical—and link local networks with Rome and the \textit{limes}.

\textbf{Conclusions}

These two basic patterns are not dissimilar to Pliny’s own connections, with a web of regional associations in central northern Italy overlapping with those made at Rome or through state service. “Pliny country”, for Pliny, was more than a web of friends and acquaintances. Throughout his letters, Pliny shows flashes of a sense of belonging to the regions that his network encompasses. He describes Cornelius Minicianus, from Bergomum just to the east of Comum, as \textit{“ornamentum regionis meae”} (Pliny, \textit{Ep.} 7.22.2). In another letter he describes a man from Brixia as \textit{ex illa nostra Italia} and then proceeds to list values (\textit{verecundia, frugalitas, rusticitas antiqua}) for which that part of Italy is known (\textit{Ep.} 1.14.4-7). So, Pliny understood himself to be from a particular region of Italy, a region that was constructed partly geographically, by the practical limits imposed by mountains and by the connections provided by rivers, and partly culturally,
by means of the values of old fashioned frugality and simplicity that Pliny attributes to the region.

That region was also a network of *municipia*, the basic building blocks of a *regio*, and indeed Pliny ascribed the people in his works to *municipia* first and only secondarily to *regiones* (as in *Ep.* 1.14). “Pliny country” was a regional network, but it was one conceptually constructed out of *municipia* and one that replicates the regional networks illustrated by local *vestiarii*, *duoviri*, and *seviri* claiming ties and offices in other *municipia*. Cortonese freedmen C. Titius Celer and Agrippa the pantomime may have had little else in common with Pliny, but the ways in which all three interacted with the rest of Italy and the empire fit into patterns replicated on a grand scale.
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