

Nicholas Purcell

The Nicopolitan Synoecism and Roman Urban Policy

o quisquis volet impias
caedes et rabiem tollere civicam,
si quaeret 'pater urbium'
subscribi statuis, indomitam audeat
refrenare licentiam (Horace, *Odes* 3, 24).

Glen Bowersock has denied that there was anything Roman about the foundation of Nicopolis. Romanization, he says, was far from Augustus' mind when he decided to establish the city². Theodore Sarikakis asked the question 'Nicopolis d'Épire, était-elle une colonie romaine ou une ville grecque?' and answered firmly that it was the latter³. Augustus' plan does clearly resemble the traditional behaviour of Hellenistic kings. But in the reign of the first *princeps* we stand at the turning-point in Rome's creation of a provincial empire of some institutional homogeneity out of what had been little more than machinery for the pragmatic maintenance of Roman supremacy⁴. This particular city was the first *princeps*' first foundation. It may therefore be of some interest to explore in more detail the associations which the foundation of this city in this place at this time may have had for Augustus and his advisors. 'Romanization' is a shorthand historical concept of our own and naturally enough does not correspond to any Greek or Latin term or perception of the time. It is, indeed, city foundations much later in the series which began with Nicopolis which have done most to encourage the growth of the concept. Rather than this hindsight, we need a subtler analysis of the cross-currents between the background of Italian urban and social history and the theory and practice of the eastern Mediterranean world. Should we see the foundation of Nicopolis as a brief flirting of the last dynast of the fallen Republic with the monarchic ways of the heirs of Alexander; or as a characteristically tentative application of a complex experience in the management of the politics of settlement to the newly-won world of the nascent

1. I should like to express my gratitude to Mr. P.T. Antonopoulos and Professor E. Chrysos for the opportunity to participate in the Symposium, and to the audience on that occasion for helpful suggestions.

2. *Glen W. Bowersock*, Augustus and the Greek World, 1965, 94.

3. *T. Sarikakis*, *Balkan Studies* 11.1.1970, 91–6.

4. For some aspects of the problem and the need for great caution about hindsight see the excellent article of *A. W. Lintott*, *Greece and Rome* 28 (1981) 53–67.

provincial empire? The two viewpoints are not mutually exclusive; but the latter is much less commonly held, and so needs some exploration.

We have very little information about the first years of the new city. Apart from some evidence for the buildings of the city, above all its harbour and aqueduct, which will have an important part to play in our investigation, we have to rely on scrappy notices, principally in Strabo and Pausanias, about the formation of the city and, above all, about its synoecism⁵. These literary sources have caused much controversy about the status of the city. This has centred on the question of whether Nicopolis was a Roman *colonia* (see below, p. 18, nn. 7–8). It is unlikely that new evidence will produce a definite answer, but in its absence an examination of comparative material on Augustus' foundations may produce some illumination.

1. Nicopolis in its region

No Mediterranean city's history should be tackled in isolation. As Fernand Braudel has taught us, plain and mountains and the extended 'maritime hinterlands' of a group of islands or a string of ports must be understood together, with all their interactions, by the Mediterranean historian⁶. Nicopolis therefore, the heir of Corinthian Ambracia and the ancestor of Venetian Vonitsa, Turkish Salaora or Arta, must be studied in the context of its neighbours to north and south along the coast of Epirus, the next ports of call in both directions for coastwise voyagers. As in so many parts of the Mediterranean world we find along the west coast of the old Roman *provincia Macedonia* a neat sequence of more or less equidistant ports in intimate connection with each other but undergoing very different vicissitudes; nothing easier or more dangerous for the historian than to miss their interdependence and treat them in isolation. Putting together the representatives of each site from different epochs, we find in order from north to south Epidamnus / Dyrrachium / Durazzo (Dürres); Apollonia / Aulon / Valona; Corcyra / Buthrotum / Igoumenitsa; the Nicopolis group; Alyzia / Astacus / Oeniadae; and finally Patrae and its neighbours. There are other towns of occasional importance like Sybota or Parga or Leucas / Santa-Mavra, and there have been many local fluctuations of site. Roman Buthrotum, like Igoumenitsa on the mainland opposite Corcyra, eclipsed the island port as Igoumenitsa is doing again today. Apollonia was reduced to being a simple *scala* for Roman Byllis, and then upstaged by Byzantine Aulon a little to the south. Venetian Zante, the successor of Oeniadae, often even eclipsed Patras⁷.

5. The basic passages are Strabo 7.7.5, cf. 10.2.2; Pausanias 5.23.3; 10.38.4.

6. F. Braudel, *The Mediterranean in the Age of Philip II* (tr. S. Reynolds), 1972, ch. 2, esp. 103–110.

7. For post-classical trade in the Adriatic in general, Braudel, *cit.* (n. 6), 125–33). Naval warfare takes place in the patterns of movements established by other less aggressive maritime activities, so that it is hardly surprising

The vicissitudes of the towns of the Gulf of Arta have been still more complex. This great embayment, extended even further inland by lagoons and navigable rivers whose valleys give access to the wildest parts of continental Greece, has always been one of the centres of gravity of the communications of the area. The *scala* of Salaora on the spits of the northern shore acted as an outport for Ioannina in the time of Ali Pasha; Ambracus, in a very similar position, served as the outer harbour of Corinthian Ambracia⁸. On the south shore were Echinus, the port of Thyrraeum, and the Corinthian foundation of Anactorium, which served later as an *emporion* for Nicopolis⁹. Venetian Vonitsa between the two enjoyed similar advantages. The safe communications of the gulf, the exchange of the produce of the vast catchment-area which opened from it, and the maintenance of the teeming fisheries of its shallow waters made it an economic and social unity from a very early period. The sanctuary of Actian Apollo had served as focus for that unity before; an attempt had been made in Hellenistic times to found a major city nearby; the Augustan foundation of Nicopolis in such a region was a natural culmination of a long development¹⁰.

Although the region of the Ambraciote gulf is clearly distinct and of a particularly marked homogeneity, it formed part (in Antiquity as in the Byzantine Empire and the *Venetocratia* and its heirs) of an intimately connected series of coastal settlements. The handicap of modern national politics, in the presence of the Albanian frontier, discourages us from seeing the unity of the coast clearly, as it does in so many parts of the Mediterranean; and an interval of ten or fifteen miles between harbours is a little small for modern needs, after all. But the ancient geographers clearly recognised how integrated this series of ports was, and that will have been clearly apparent to all who used them in Antiquity. Among such visitors we may reckon the young Augustus, who spent a period of months at Apollonia up the coast from Corcyra, a city at that time described by Cicero as an 'urbs magna et

that the battle celebrated by Nicopolis should have happened in so well-connected a stretch of water (cf. *Braudel* 109). Preveza, heir of Nicopolis closest to its site, was a great depot for the Ottomans in the Turkish-Christian wars of the sixteenth century and it was in the same waters as Actium that the Turks roundly defeated Doria on September 27th 1538, establishing an Eastern supremacy which lasted until Lepanto (itself fought in equally strategic and commercially crucial waters, off Patrae and Naupactus at the mouth of the Corinthian Gulf): *Braudel* 906 with bibliography and 124 for an illuminating diagram. See also now the excellent monograph of A. *Ducellier*, *La façade maritime de l' Albanie au moyen âge: Durazzo et Valona du XIe au XVe siècle*, 1981.

8. *N.G.L. Hammond*, *Epirus*, 1967, 36–8 cf. 135; cf. *W. Leake*, *Travels in Northern Greece*, 1835, vol. I, ch. 4; vol. III, chs. 32–3; vol. IV, chs. 34–5. Cf. also Pliny, HN 4, 4 'maximeque nobilitatus Ambracius sinus'.

9. Strabo 10,2,2.

10. For Actium before Augustus Strabo 7,7, 6 'ἦγετο δὲ καὶ πρότερον τὰ Ἄκτια τῷ θεῷ στεφανίτης ἄγον, ὑπὸ τῶν περιοίκων· νυνὶ δ' ἐντιμότερον ἐποίησεν ὁ Καῖσαρ'. For the fisheries of the Ambracian gulf *Leake*, cit. (n. 8) I, 182; *Hammond*, cit. (n. 8), 137. A late antique source was not very impressed (GGM 2, 524): 'Nicopolis quae piscem multum marinum abundat ut odire speciem videntem aliquantam'. See also *E. Oberhammer*, *Akarnanien, Ambrakia, Amphilochien, Leukas im Altertum*, 1887, 239–41.

gravis'¹¹.

This coincidence should not surprise us. Though of the provinces, for the Romans of the age of Augustus, the region of Nicopolis was in no sense neutral or virgin extra-Italian territory. The coast of Epirus had become well-known in the late Republic as one of the first overseas areas in which financially successful Romans had a great interest in buying estates. These are the *Synepirotae*, the *Epirotici homines*, of Cicero's correspondence and the second book of Varro's *De Re Rustica*, men like Atticus himself, Murrius of Reate, Vaccius, Q. Lucienus or L. Cossinius¹². Ambracia (Arta), on the gulf whose mouth is at Actium, had long, like Buthrotum, been a focus for the estates of men like this, and the position of these estates on routes leading north-east to the Via Egnatia or south-east to the Gulf of Corinth was one which had many advantages. The contacts made use of by Cicero on his journeys to and from Cilicia in 51 and 50 B.C. show clearly how familiar the inhabitants of the surviving Greek cities were with passing Roman notables¹³. These areas were scarcely less accessible or more foreign to a Roman senator than the more Hellenic parts of Southern Italy.

It was not an unambiguous advantage for a provincial region to be as familiar to the aristocracy of Rome as the far-flung parts of Italy. The danger which followed such familiarity was that the region might be involved in the great schemes for the resettlement of Italians which were so active a concern of the politicians of the time. In fact few overseas districts had hitherto been considered suitable, and Rome's experiments with urban foundations beyond the Italian peninsula had been limited. The Ionian coast shared with the sites of the first overseas colonies of the late second century B.C. the advantage of a short, straightforward sea-journey to Italy and existing close contacts, fostered especially through the communities of

11. Apollonia, like Stratus and Ambracia, was slightly inland on a navigable river (the Aous), Strabo 7, 5, 8, calling it εὐνομοτάτη. It owed much of its prosperity to being at the end of one branch of the Via Egnatia. Cicero's praise: *Phil.* 11, 26. Augustus' stay from 45–4 B.C.: Nicolaus Damascenus, Aug. 16–17, Velleius 2, 59, Suetonius, Aug. 10, Appian, BC 3, 9. It is significant for Augustus' policy towards the whole area that he rewarded the Apollonians by granting them ἐλευθερία καὶ ἀτέλεια (Nicolaus 17).

12. The easy familiarity of Varro's speakers (RR 2, 1, 28: 2, 5, 1; 2, 5, 18) with herding in Epirus is the best evidence; they know estate names and herd sizes and have all the practical details at their fingertips. For Atticus' interests there Cicero, *Att.* 1, 5, 7 (*Shackleton-Bailey* 1), cf. n. 15. See also ILS 8463. Negotiatores on this coast: M. Curus of Patrae, Cicero, *Fam.* 7, 29 (*Shackleton-Bailey* 264); M. Mindius of Elis, *ibid.* 13, 26 (292) and 28 (294). Note also the settling on Cephallenia of the exiled C. Antonius, who began the process of founding a city there (Strabo 10, 2, 13).

13. On his way to Cilicia Cicero was lavishly entertained by clients of Atticus at Corcyra and Sybota (*Att.* 5, 9 = *Shackleton-Bailey* 102); and, having decided to go overland from Actium to Athens rather than risk rounding the end of Leucas, by other sympathetic connections at Thyreum (*Fam.* 16, 5, 1, *Shackleton-Bailey* 124). On the way back a year later in 50 his experiences were similar, and he thanks Atticus for hospitality at Actium Corcyrae – which might suggest that at this date Actium was in the hands of the Corcyraeans (*Att.* 7, 2 = 125 *Shackleton-Bailey*). The place name is not uncommon, but Cicero did certainly stop at the real Actium on this slow journey (*Att.* 5, 9, *Shackleton-Bailey* 102; *Fam.* 16, 6; 16, 9, *Shackleton-Bailey* 125, 127).

Italian *negotiatores*. It is not surprising that this coast was made use of quite early. Pompey's settlement of pirates at Achaean Dyme in the late 60s is the pioneer scheme¹⁴. We hear a great deal of Caesar's intended settlements at Buthrotum from the accounts in Cicero's letters of his spirited opposition to a plan which would so damage the Epirote interests of Atticus¹⁵. This opposition may have been successful; it was a later plan, the settlement of Italians displaced by the veteran colonies within Italy, which probably produced the *ἐποικιοί* mentioned at Buthrotum by Strabo¹⁶. It is significant that Epirus was thought suitable for these settlements of civilians, civilians who deserved well of the state: the same is true of the settling of the surplus population of the city of Rome overseas, most spectacularly in Caesar's foundation of the new Corinth¹⁷. The Greek world, or rather certain privileged parts of it, was seen as an extension of the natural setting for this demographic politics, and no conceptual divide separated the Italian peninsula from the areas most closely linked to it geographically. The full distinction between Italy and the provinces was slow to evolve. The Augustan foundations, especially Nicopolis, must be seen against this background.

14. Strabo 8, 7, 5, cf. 14, 3, 3; Appian, *Mith.* 96. In the second passage Strabo gives depopulation as an excuse, an official line which excused much Roman practice in Greece. The Dymaeans soon took to piracy again in the troubled times of 44, making use in their way of the opportunities offered by the maritime hinterland of their new city: Cicero, *Att.* 16, 1 (=409 *Shackleton-Bailey*), 3. Part of the reason may have been the imposition of more veterans by Caesar (*M. Grant*, *From Imperium to Auctoritas*, 1946, 264–5, who sees numismatic evidence for further deductions by Q. Hortensius and Antony), but this is not nearly as certain as implied by *F. Vittinghoff*, *Römische Kolonisation und Bürgerrechtspolitik*, 1951, 85–6, followed by *Bowersock*, *op. cit.* (n. 2), 62–3. The case rests wholly on the letters C.I.D. on the city's coinage (*Grant*, *cit.*, p. 264).

15. Cicero's first allusion to the matter is in October 46 B.C., *Att.* 12, 6a (=423 *Shackleton-Bailey*), 2; there are nineteen other references to it in the same correspondence for 44 B.C., from April to July, *Att.* 14, 15, 16 (364–408 *Shackleton-Bailey*). The most important and informative of these is Cicero's résumé of the case to L. Plancus, *Att.* 16, 16a (407a *Shackleton-Bailey*).

16. Strabo 7,7, 5, *ἐποικίους ἔχον Ῥωμαίους*. The term *ἐποικιοί* is not simply casual, and may indicate the settling of displaced Italian civilians, which is asserted of Dyrrhachium on this coast with Philippi *ἄλλα τε* by Dio (51, 4, 6) who also uses the verb *ἐποικεῖν*. The allotment of the territory of Cnossus to Capua is another example of the Greek world placed at the disposal of Italians; this grant of 36 B.C. was intended to compensate Italian interests for the deduction of veterans in Campania: Velleius 2, 81, 2; Dio 49, 14, 4–5. This event should be kept distinct from the deduction of the *colonia Iulia Nobilis Cnossus*, known from coins, (*Grant*, *op. cit.* [n. 14], 261–3), referred to also by Strabo 10, 4, 9, of the date of which we know nothing.

17. Strabo 8, 6, 23 *ἰδιὰ τὴν εὐφυῖαν ἐποικίους πέμψαντος τοῦ ἀπελευθερικοῦ γένους πλείστους*. There is no need to put Buthrotum and Dyme in this category as does *Bowersock*, *op. cit.* (n. 2), p. 67; Corinth was a very singular case, as Strabo saw, because of its *εὐφυῖα*, which Caesar hoped to enhance with an Isthmus canal (Suetonius, *JC* 4, 3). The freedmen of Rome were considered suitable for the commercial associations of the place; Dyme and Buthrotum had no such reputation, whatever their actual advantages. Caesar's dealing at Rome with men who hoped to benefit from the Buthrotum scheme, *Att.* 16, 16a (407a *Shackleton-Bailey*), 3 *mirari equidem solebam pati Caesarem convenire eos qui agrum Buthrotium concupissent* does not prove that the land was not intended for veterans, and there is no other evidence that it was not at any other Caesarian foundation in the East.

2. The victory city as a type

The victory city in the classical tradition goes back to Alexander's foundation of a Nicopolis to celebrate the battle of Issus¹⁸. The more immediate precursor in the East was Pompey's Nicopolis in Armenia Minor. Dio says 'he synoecized a city in the locality in which he had won the battle, and gave it to those of his soldiers who had been wounded or who were past the age of military service. Along with them many of the local inhabitants joined in with the foundation of their own free will, and remain there still under the name Nicopolitae, enrolled as part of the province of Cappadocia'¹⁹. This city, despite its Roman veterans, was not called a *colonia*²⁰. Moreover it combined Romans and locals, and was the product of synoecism. The foundation shows clearly how these acts were not simply war memorials but were designed to alter for the better the social geography of the area where the victory had been won, partly for military purposes and partly for the glory of the conqueror. Philippi, founded by Antony to celebrate the defeat of the liberators, is another recent precedent; here the city was founded as *colonia Victrix Philippi*, but little is known of its relations with the surrounding area²¹. The other victory city whose foundation helps us understand Nicopolis in Epirus is Augustus' other and less well-known (and less successful) city of that name, Egyptian Nicopolis.

This city Augustus founded some three miles east of Alexandria and equipped with magnificent public buildings. It was 'not less than a city' in Strabo's time, but no-one records the source of the substantial population involved. Dio tells of systematic improvements in local communications²². Strabo does remark that the religious activities and precincts associated with the great amphitheatre and stadium of the new city had had a very adverse effect on the traditional cults of Alexandria, and it is not unlikely that this was intended and perhaps encouraged by some

18. For Alexander's Nicopolis see E. Honigmann, PW XVII, cols. 535–6. The city received very unusual attention from the Roman authorities, acquiring an *aqua Augusta* under Tiberius in the style of an Italian town or overseas *colonia*: CIL III 6703 = EJ² 284.

19. Dio 36, 50, 3, 'πόλιν ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ ἐν ᾧ ἐνεκικήκει συνώκησε, τοῖς τραυματίαις καὶ τοῖς ἀφηλικεστέροις τῶν στρατιωτῶν αὐτὴν δοῦς, καὶ σφισι καὶ τῶν περιχώρων ἐθελονταὶ πολλοὶ συνώκησαν, καὶ εἰσὶ καὶ νῦν Νικοπολιταὶ τε ὀνομασμένοι καὶ ἐς τὸν Καππαδοκικὸν νομὸν συντελοῦντες'. Cf. Strabo 12, 3, 28, Appian, *Mith.* 105. See now A.N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Foreign Policy in the East*, 1984, 258.

20. When the region was reincorporated in Cappadocia in A.D. 72 it was considered appropriate that Nicopolis should be its *metropolis* and headquarters of its *koinon*; by the third century it had acquired colonial status and the *ius Italicum*. But for Pliny, HN 6, 10, Nicopolis is of no remarkable status. See A.H.M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, 1971, 171 and 428.

21. Strabo 7, frag. 41 (Frag. Vat.) ἠύξήθη δὲ μετὰ τὴν περὶ Βρούτων καὶ Κάσσιον ἦταν. Grant, *op. cit.* (n. 14), 274–5. That Antony had founded a sanctuary in the new city to commemorate the victory is implied by Dio 54, 9, 6.

22. Strabo 17, 1, 10–11; Dio 51, 18, 1 (describing the dredging of silted waterways).

physical removal of religious material²³. The elaborate penteteric festival held there and called Actiaca was a major competition for at least two centuries²⁴. The prominence of such festivals and of the spectacle-architecture associated with them in the practice of loyalty religion and emperor worship throughout the empire makes Alexandrian Nicopolis a rather important case in the history of Augustus' urban policy²⁵. Religious attention to his achievements and person was a matter which he considered during his settlement of the East in the winter of 30–29 B.C., but it is not clear when the Actia of Egypt were inaugurated²⁶. At least it is certain that it was at a time when the victory city at Actium itself was in Augustus' mind.

In summary, therefore, to celebrate a victory by founding a city was a practice with a long history; it involved the dedication of trophies connected with the battle, often including part of any fortifications involved; it involved a quest for population, and so tended naturally to involve the soldiers who had participated in the battle; but it also needed to draw population from the surrounding area, and so was associated with major reorganization of a region; and this inevitably brought a complex religious dimension to the foundation, besides the aspects of gratitude to the gods who had presided over the victory and to whom the trophy was dedicated. Finally it was kingly to consider the wider implications of the new foundation, for the strategic needs of the time and the general social intercourse of the area with its neighbours. By the time of Augustus that last consideration might be to an extent economic in a general sense. It should be stressed that such cities were not distinctively Greek or alien to the Romans. Their own institution of the *colonia* resembled these in many ways, even if it was lower-key and more commonplace. Between the practice of east and west there was for much cross-fertilization.

At Nicopolis in 29 B.C. Augustus dedicated the beaks of Antony's ships to Neptune and Mars in the great monument built on the site of his encampment

23. Strabo 17, 1, 10 τὸ τε Σαράπιον καὶ ἄλλα τεμένη ἀρχαῖα ἐκλελειμμένα πως διὰ τὴν τῶν νέων κατασκευὴν τῶν ἐν Νικοπόλει· καὶ γὰρ ἀμφιθέατρον καὶ στάδιον καὶ οἱ πεντετηρικοὶ ἀγῶνες ἐκεῖ συντελοῦνται· τὰ δὲ παλαιὰ ὀλιγώρηται. This may, of course, be what the Roman public expected to hear; for Augustus' official line against Egyptian cults, Dio 53, 2, 4 (28 B.C.), 54, 6, 6 (21 B.C.).

24. L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche*, 1953, nos. 65, 67, 68; L. Robert, *Les gladiateurs dans l'orient grec*, 1940, no. 70 and discussion.

25. S.R.F. Price, *Rituals and Power*, 1984, 98, 106–7. Precedents of this kind were important for the foundation *ex novo* of festivals and shrines like that at Lugdunum in 12 B.C.

26. Dio 51, 20, 6–7: Romans in Ephesus and Nicæa are to worship 'the hero Julius' and Rome; the non-Roman population of Asia and Bithynia was permitted to found cults to him at Pergamum and Nicomedia. The schematism of his thought, Roman and non-Roman, province by province, city by city, is notable and not irrelevant to the foundation of Nicopolis. As for the date of the foundation of Egyptian Nicopolis, Dio (cit., n. 22) makes it clearly subsequent to the Epirote city. It is best to assume that Augustus was present in person at the official act of foundation, and that this followed directly on the victory of August 1st 30 B.C. The official foundation of Nicopolis will likewise have directly followed the battle of Actium, 2nd September 31 B.C., and the dedication of the great monument to Mars and Neptune in early 29 be the inauguration of the new Actia, not the establishment of the city. See further n. 27.

before Actium, and enriched the city with the other spoil²⁷. Below was the suburb of his new city, equipped with a great stadium and theatre and other shrines, the site of the new penteteric festival of Apollo²⁸. Clearly visible from the vantage-point of the monument were the two harbours which were to be so important to the success of the ensemble²⁹. The sanctuaries of the new settlement were enriched with the dedications of temples throughout the region, and the relations of the city with its neighbours were crystallised in a complex federal arrangement³⁰. The cities closest at hand also provided the city's inhabitants, to an extent against their will³¹. Were there also Roman settlers there, veterans of the battle, as the parallels of other victory cities might lead us to suppose?³² A further comparison may make the possibilities clearer.

3. The parallel of Patrae

The elaboration of the synoecism of Nicopolis was such that it inspired a poet, besides the relatively full notices in Strabo and Pausanias (see n. 30). Augustan Greece offers a similar case, in which the complexity of the new system went far beyond the collection of population which was basic to the foundation of any new city. The parallel is, moreover, explicitly pointed out by Pausanias, implicitly by Strabo. Three day's sail down the coast the Roman city of Patrae, site of a *colonia* of Augustus' veterans, was also the product of a synoecism³³. This is extremely unusual. Communities were regularly attributed to colonial settlements, and we hear of the provision of revenues for the *colonia* at Patrae in a way which is clearly quite normal: Strabo tells us that the Romans of Patrae enjoyed the revenues of the

27. The best text of the dedication of the monument is *J. M. Carter*, *ZPE* 24, 1977, 227–30. Cf. Suetonius, *Augustus* 18, 2 'ampliato vetere Apollinis templo locum castrorum quibus fuerat usus exornatum navalibus spoliis Neptuno ac Marti consecravit'. Both the ancient precinct of Apollo and the camp of Augustus may thus be located in the suburb of the new city where the new theatre and stadium housed the revived Actian games.

28. Strabo 7, 7, 6 'τό τε κατασκευασθὲν τέμενος ἐν τῷ προαστείῳ τὸ μὲν εἰς τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν πεντετηρικὸν ἐν ἄλσει ἔχοντι γυμνάσιόν τε καὶ στάδιον, τὸ δ' ἐν τῷ ὑπερκειμένῳ τοῦ ἄλσεος ἱερῷ λόφῳ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος'.

29. Strabo 7, 7, 5 for the harbours of Nicopolis (cf. also n. 9); 7, 7, 6 for its prosperity 'ἡ μὲν οὖν Νικόπολις εὐανδρεῖ καὶ λαμβάνει καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπίδοσιν'.

30. Strabo 7, 7, 5 'συνώκισε τὴν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κληθεῖσαν Νικόπολιν ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τούτῳ' cf. 7, 7, 6 'αἱ δ' ἄλλαι κατοικίαι περιπόλιοι τῆς Νικοπόλεως εἰσιν'; cf. 10, 2, 2. Pausanias 5, 23, 2; 7, 18, 8–9; 10, 38, 4. *Anth. Pal.* 9, 553, see *A.S.F. Gow* and *D.L. Page*, *The Garland of Philip*, 1968, II, 421–2. For its wider role in Greece Strabo 7, 7, 6 on the games of Olympic status run by the Spartans, and Pausanias 10, 8, 3–5 on the revived Amphictyonic League.

31. Pausanias 10, 38, 4; some of the inhabitants of Aetolia fled to Amphissa rather than go to Nicopolis.

32. For Greek colonists in Hellenistic city foundations, *A.H.M. Jones*, *The Greek City*, 1940, ch. 1.

33. The basic source for the foundation of Patrae is Pausanias 7, 18; the most important discussion is that of *U. Kahrstedt*, *Historia* 1 (1950), 549–61. For full details *Ernst Meyer*, *RE* XVIII, 4, cols. 2191–2222. See also *Grant*, op. cit. (n. 14), 265; *Vittinghoff*, op. cit. (n. 14), 127–30; *A.G. Woodhead*, *Hesperia* 28 (1959), 279–82.

fishery in the lake at Calydon³⁴. But a formal synoecism of non-Romans to a Roman *colonia* is quite a different matter. We must examine the case of Patrae in more detail.

As Kahrstedt pointed out in his basic discussion of the two synoecisms, Patrae seems to have gained three different types of territory, apart from the Calydonian revenues just mentioned³⁵. The former *colonia* at Dyme, westernmost of the Achaean cities on the gulf of Corinth, was incorporated;³⁶ so were the villages along the coast from Patrae itself, and its traditional dependencies, together with the once independent town of Rhypes;³⁷ and so was all of Ozolian Locris on the north shore of the Corinthian gulf with the exception of the city of Amphissa close to Delphi³⁸. Silences about some of these arrangements in Pliny and Strabo have encouraged some scholars to postulate a gradual process of building up of the territorial strength of Patrae; others have demurred, but remained puzzled³⁹.

An answer can be provided. It rests on the fact (which has long been recognised) that the city of Patrae was a double entity institutionally⁴⁰. There were the Romans of the *colonia* and the Greeks of the synoecism. The latter were Achaeans, and their synoecism and the glorification of Patrae was seen as a refurbishment and revival of the old Achaean League, which had had a shadowy senility at Olympia for more than a century. Patrae of the Achaean League was made by Augustus a *civitas libera*⁴¹. When the Achaeans of Patrae are mentioned by our sources, it is of this organization, and not old Achaea the region or new Achaea the province, that they are thinking⁴². Recognising this makes the notices of

34. Strabo 10, 2, 21.

35. Op. cit. (n. 33), 549–54.

36. Pausanias 7, 17, 5, not alluding to the Pompeian colony, on which n. 14 above.

37. Rhypes at some stage had belonged to Aegium and Pharae, Strabo 8, 7, 5 'ἔσχον Αἰγιεῖς καὶ Φαρεῖς', cf. 8, 7, 4 'Αἴγιον καὶ Ῥύπες καὶ Πατρεῖς καὶ Φαρεῖς'. Pausanias 7, 18, 7 distinguishes it clearly from the villages of the territory of Patrae; those were incorporated, but formerly independent Rhypes Augustus razed to the ground (cf. 7, 23, 4, and Strabo 8, 7, 5 'Ῥύπες οὐκ οἰκοῦνται').

38. Pausanias 10, 38, 9 'πλὴν δὲ Ἀμφίσσης, ὑπ' Ἀχαιῶν οἱ δ' ἄλλοι Πατρεῶν ἄρχονται, βασιλέως σφίσι δόντος Αὐγούστου'.

39. Kahrstedt, op. cit. (n. 33), 551–2 takes Strabo's silence about a change in the position of Locris as authoritative, and considers Pausanias' Augustan date for the change (see n. 38), simply false. There is a period of some 16 years after the composition of this part of Strabo's geography before Augustus' death, which might be invoked to remove the problem: R. Baladié, *Le Péloponnèse de Strabon*, 1980, 11–14, cf. Bowersock, op. cit. (n. 2), 92–3 with n. 7. The solution proposed in the present discussion is somewhat more economical: cf. n. 43 and text at that point.

40. See Kahrstedt, op. cit. (n. 33), 552; and on double communities, below, n. 71.

41. Pausanias 7, 18, 7 'καὶ (Αὐγούστου) ἔδωκε μὲν ἐλευθέρους Ἀχαιῶν μόνους τοῖς Πατρεῶσιν εἶναι, ἔδωκε δὲ καὶ ἐς τὰ ἄλλα γέρα σφίσιν ὅποσα τοῖς ἀποίκους νέμειν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι νομίζουσι'. The distinction between the community thus honoured and the actual *colonia* could hardly be made more explicit. For the Achaean League, Bowersock, op. cit. (n. 2), 92–3.

42. When Pausanias (n. 41) says that the Achaeans of Patrae alone were given freedom he cannot mean that they alone of the *provincia Achaea* received the honour, because the islands of Zacynthus and Cephallenia, which

Strabo and Pausanias easier to understand. It would indeed be odd if Strabo had overlooked the attribution of the cities of Locris to the *Romans* of Patrae; such a relationship would have ended the history of those cities. But he would not have found it so worthy of mention that they were closely linked to the *Achaean*s of Patrae in the new synoecistic federal revival of the Achaean League. The language of Pausanias about the Locrians proves to be exact (cf. n. 38); he does not talk of attribution to the *colonia* but asserts simply that, as a result of a grant by Augustus, the cities are 'ruled by the Achaean of Patrae'. This formula refers to the new *civitas libera*; the subjects of that *civitas* were sharers in its freedoms, and that is why Pliny the Elder lists the Locrian cities as *immunes*⁴³. If they had been attributed to a *colonia* by his time (in the last sixteen years of Augustus' reign for example: cf. n. 39) this categorization would have been meaningless⁴⁴.

Augustus' activity bound both sides of the Corinthian gulf tightly together with a striking institutional originality, reflecting closely the social geography of the region. Local communities were given privileges which mattered, notably freedom from imperial taxation. A scattered and probably dwindling population had much to gain from being concentrated in a place whose maritime communications commended it⁴⁵, and even the arrival of the new settlers may not have been unwelcome; it was certainly welded to the revived local organizations in as painless a way as could be imagined. The replacement of an underpopulated area with a thriving city, whose textile workshops were numerous enough to cause a noticeable imbalance in the proportion of women to men, should not be seen as an accidental consequence of administrative decisions taken in the spirit of *Realpolitik*⁴⁶. Rome's rulers could understand, especially in an area to which their like had long looked for

also received confirmation of their freedom at this time, belonged to the province too (Pliny, HN 4, 52–3), along with Corcyra. We may compare his grant to Apollonia (n. 11); all these privileges may reflect a consistent attitude towards this important coast.

43. Amphissa (cf. n. 38) is described as *immunis* (Pliny, HN 4, 8) alongside this notice about the Ozolian Locrians (4, 7); but it is noticeable that he makes the clear distinction between the two communities which this view of Augustus' activity would lead us to expect. The solution proposed here explains why Naupactus, Oeantheia and Chalaeon retain signs of life after Augustus: Kahrstedt, *op. cit.* (n. 33), 552–3.

44. Dyme, as a Roman *colonia* (n. 14) was probably attributed to the *colonia* of Patrae, since Pausanias records (7, 17, 5 'Αὐγούστος δὲ ὕστερον καὶ προσένειμεν αὐτὴν Πατρεῦσιν') its annexation to Patrae. Pliny (HN 4, 13) records it separately as a *colonia*: was his source, presumably Agrippa, composed before the annexation, which could well have been in 16–14 B.C. (n. 50)?

45. For the desolation of Patrae and its region after 146 B.C., Polybius 38, 16; for its remarkable growth in population with the Roman colony, Strabo 8, 7, 5 'διαφερόντως εὐανδρεῖ νῦν'. Cf. *Baladié*, *op. cit.* (n. 39), 325. The harbour was moderate in Strabo's time (*loc. cit.*) but greatly improved by that of Pausanias (for the argument *Baladié* *cit.*, 239), who considers the coastwise trade to have been a likely motive for Augustus' choice, 7, 18, 7, 'ἢ τοῦ παράπλου νομίζων κείσθαι καλῶς'.

46. Pausanias 7, 21, 7 'αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες εἰσιν ἐν ταῖς Πάτραις ἀριθμὸν μὲν καὶ ἐς δις τῶν ἀνδρῶν· Ἀφροδίτης δέ, εἶπερ ἄλλαις γυναίξει, μέτεστι καὶ ταύταις. βίος δὲ αὐτῶν ταῖς πολλαῖς ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τῆς βύσσου...'

financial reward, the advantages brought by a large and active population in a productive place with dense maritime contacts: this we should accept without fearing that we are misrepresenting them as Hanseatic merchant-princes⁴⁷.

This settlement was also remarkable for the learned evocation of the past which made its new institutions so distinctive. Rome's foreign relations were usually conducted with a very strong sense of history, the record of favours and betrayals. Whatever the actual history of Rome's relations with the Achaeans had been, in this case the *colonia* took as part of its title the name Aroe, by which an Ionian predecessor of Patrae was said to have been known⁴⁸. The new Achaean community was enriched with cult objects and rites connected with its constituent cities⁴⁹. This careful elevation of the new foundation to the status of a great metropolis will have helped overcome the negative connotations of the settlement of veterans, which might otherwise have been seen as a punishment for the Achaeans and an insult to the resident Italians (cf. n. 60). The date of the various stages of the creation of Patrae is still uncertain, but the process was certainly complete by 14 B.C.⁵⁰. For the purposes of comparison with Nicopolis the chronology is not essential.

There are clearly many striking resemblances between the two cities. In the

47. *Bowersock* (op. cit. [n. 2], 92–5) gives an account of Patrae in which Augustus' motives are overtly economic, down to the textile industry and the harbour. He goes further than I would away from the minimalist view of *M.I. Finley*, *The ancient Economy*², 1985 that 'satisfaction of material wants' (160) or 'favouring individuals materially' (165) was all that Roman emperors did in the economic sphere; but I do think that Roman decision-makers operated within a conception of general economic well-being which they were often concerned to foster, and that the Ionian coast of Greece in the early principate is an instance of this. Moreover, whether or not Augustus' intentions were more than vaguely beneficent in the case of Patrae, the passage of Pausanias quoted (n. 46) comes near to answering David Hume's request for 'a passage in any ancient author where the growth of a city is ascribed to the establishment of a manufacture': *Finley*, cit., p. 24.

48. Pausanias 7, 18, 2–3; the explanation was given him by the Ἰπατρῶν οἱ τὰ ἀρχαῖότατα μνημονεύοντες'. The point seems to be to distinguish the colony mythologically from its Achaean bedfellow.

49. Thus the cult-image of Artemis Laphria came from Calydon, Pausanias 7, 18, 8–9. Most of the furnishings of the Aetolian temples went to Nicopolis (below, n. 53).

50. Strabo 8, 7, 5 claims that Augustus settled a large part of his army at Patrae after Actium, and his statement is accepted by *L. Keppie*, *Colonization and Veteran Settlement in Italy*, 1983, 80; *J. M. Roddaz*, *Marcus Agrippa*, 1984, 431–3. But the title *Aroe Augusta* and the notice in Eusebius of the foundation of the colony in the period of settlement 16–14 B.C. seem to suggest an alternative, and have been taken as authoritative by *Grant*, op. cit. (n. 14), 265 *Vittinghoff*, op. cit. (n. 14), 127. It may be best to believe both notices (as *Roddaz*, cit.; *R. Frei-Stolba*, *Talanta* 10–11, 1978–9, 44 f.; *Keppie*, cit., 17). A new inscription may help. The new *colonia* celebrated its connection with Athens (for its Ionian antecedents, n. 28 above) with a public dedication in Greek and Latin in the Athenian agora, COLONIA PATRENSIS CIVITATI ATHENIENSIVM (*Woodhead*, art. cit. [n. 33] with *Hesperia* 29 (1960), 83 – *SEG* 18, 1962, 64). The letter-forms favour as early a date in the Augustan period as possible and the words *Augusta Aroe* are missing. Could these be an addition of the 16–14 B.C. period? *Woodhead* remarks that perhaps the titles never entered general parlance, admitting however that they occur on coinage. This is not general parlance but an official dedication, and I find it inconceivable that *Augusta* would have been casually omitted, whatever we may feel about *Aroe*. The inscription is evidence for a stage in the *colonia*'s history when it was neither *Augusta* nor probably *Aroe*, and therefore certainly gives proof of its existence before 16–14. The stages of its evolution escape us in detail.

first place the synoecism of each took place in a primarily maritime hinterland, a chain of harbours linked by important communication routes and in close contact with the newly developed harbour facilities of the metropolis. Inland communities were not enrolled in the new city; instead the cities of the Ambracian gulf, Ambracia, Argos, Echinus the port of Thyrraeum, significantly standing for its less maritime metropolis, Anactorium, which Strabo specifically refers to as an *emporion* for Nicopolis⁵¹, and then the ports of the coast southwards, Palaerus, Leucas, Alyzia, Oeniadae and the river-port of the Achelous, Stratus⁵². These cities passed on their cults and observances to the new Nicopolis, which acted also as a federal centre, heir this time to the Acarnanian and Aetolian Leagues, as well as having a privileged place on the new Amphictyonic Council⁵³. The status of the new city was marked by its being made a *civitas libera et immunis*⁵⁴. Just as Patrae played a great part in the delineation of the new province of Achaëa, so did Nicopolis in the creation of Macedonia; the two spheres of influence which we have described actually abut, and the boundary between them is the boundary between Macedonia and Achaëa⁵⁵.

4. The Italian antecedents

Italy too was part of the Hellenistic world. The processes of urbanization had been going on there too. Moreover, the part played by governmental decision in the

51. Strabo 10, 2, 2.

52. The synoecism comprised, as we saw (section 1), mainly the maritime region of Nicopolis; it was also conceived of as embracing Acarnania, and the new city was centre of a revived Acarnanian League (Pausanias 7, 18, 8–9 in general; the cities of Stratus, Oeniadae, Palaerus, Alyzia, Leucas, Argos and Anactorium, Strabo 10, 2, 2; the cities of Leucas, Argos, Anactorium and Thyrraeum, *Anth. Pal.* 9, 553). North of the gulf it took in Ambracia (Strabo and *Anth. Pal.*, *citt.*), but it is not clear whether or not it also embraced Cassope and the other states of Thesprotia (Ambracia and Anactorium are named together, Pausanias, 5, 23, 2). Pausanias alone records the inclusion of Aetolia in this synoecism (7, 18, 8–9; 10, 38, 4), but with some circumstantial detail. The only community in Aetolia named is however Calydon, and we know (n. 34) that the colony of Patrae was another beneficiary of its suppression. See in general Kahrstedt, *op. cit.* (n. 33). It is important to remember that synoecism did not mean the complete disappearance of the member states: Strabo's account of the cities above shows that they survived, reduced and subordinate. Pausanias' reports of wholesale dereliction represent the end result, but not that which was envisaged from the start.

53. *Bowersock*, *op. cit.* (n. 2), 91–5, is excellent on federal revivals; see also *J.H. Oliver*, *The Civic Tradition and Roman Athens*, 1983, 100 on the Amphictyonic League and Nicopolis' membership, attributing the federal plans to the initiative of the Greeks themselves: cf. Pausanias 10, 8, 4.

54. Pliny, HN 4, 5, 'civitas libera Nicopolitana'; cf. n. 68. For free cities in general *A.N. Sherwin-White*, *The Roman Citizenship*², 1973, ch. VII: *E.W. Henze*, *De civitatibus liberis*, 1892.

55. *Kahrstedt*, *op. cit.* (n. 33), 560–1 dates the final settlement of the frontier on the Achelous to the reign of Nero, partly because he considers the Augustan settlement to have given Patrae very little to the east of that river, and would like to date the gains of Patrae in both Locris and Aetolia to a later reorganization. As we have seen (above, n. 52), the nature of the involvement of Nicopolis with Aetolia is not clear; but there is no need to make the connection of Locris with the Achaeans of Patrae post-Augustan.

process had gradually evolved in a way not unlike that which existed further east. As far as can be seen the basic settlement pattern of most parts of Italy, as of much of the Mediterranean world, had been one of very numerous nucleated settlements which can best be described as villages. Some of these came to acquire city-state institutions and self-awareness; some grew greatly in size, wealth and monumentality (the two forms of change were not always closely linked). Gradually the degree of differentiation between settlements became more marked, and the hierarchy of status came to have more levels. Eventually Italy could properly be summed up as a land of cities, the sum of its constituent urban members. The imitation of the Greek city, either in south Italy or further east, either for political purposes or through the experience of wealthy *negotiatores* had played an important part in the development; the regular and consistent practice of Rome in establishing Latin and Roman *coloniae* was another potent ingredient. Indeed, the evolution of Roman urban policy, the growing experience which the rulers of Rome acquired in controlling the urbanization of their territories, can only properly be understood against the wider background. That the terminology and the legal framework of the process are distinctively Roman should not lead us to consider the phenomenon in cultural isolation⁵⁶.

The founding of new settlements by the Romans was, like the city foundations of the Hellenic world, basically synoecistic. There might be a core of Romans, the *coloni*, in the urban nucleus, but the founding of the city always involved the complete reorganization of the whole territory and the existing population. So the planned lowland town was seen as the replacement for the fortified strongholds on the heights, and a strategic purpose was fulfilled⁵⁷. But populations might be moved on a much less local scale; already by the end of the third century B.C. the Romans were prepared to redistribute large groups of their subjects over distances of hundreds of miles⁵⁸. The network of urban nuclei and

56. A good general account of the urban history of Italy is still needed. For the villages, *M.W. Frederiksen*, *Campania*, 1984, ch 2; *id.*, *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien*, ed. *P. Zanker*, 1976, 341 f. For the beginnings of urbanization *R. Drews*, *AJAH* 6 (1981), 133–65. For the fourth century, when the Romans adopted the practice of large-scale establishment of settlements, and the changes in non-Roman Italy *P.G. Guzzo*, *Sts. Maetzke*, 1984, 309 f. *N. Purcell* in *CAH VI* (forthcoming). On the Roman citizen and Latin colonies from the late fourth century, see the brief account of *E.T. Salmon*, *The Making of Roman Italy*, 1982, 63–6. For the great developments of the second century, in which the eastern connections of the Italian *negotiatores* are so important, *Hellenismus*, *cit.*, *passim*, esp. *E. Gabba* (315–26) and *H. Galsterer* (327–40). These articles take the story on into the late Republic too: see n. 59. *M.H. Crawford*, *JRS* 71 (1981) 153–60 discusses material usefully.

57. For the incorporation of non-Romans in Latin colonies, *Salmon*, *op. cit.* (n. 56), 65; in citizen colonies, 64. Cf. *Crawford*, *op. cit.* (n. 56), 157: the *coloniae* were open to *socii*, cf. *ibid.* 159 for replacement of a village settlement – pattern with scattered refuges by larger nucleated centres.

58. For the displacement of Campanians planned after the Second Punic War, *Frederiksen*, *Campania*, *cit.* (n. 56), chs. 11–12; for the displacement to Fregellae of Samnites and Paeligni, *Livy* 39, 3, 4; 41, 8, 6 f.; for the wholesale resettlement of Ligurians in 181 B.C. *Plin.* *HN* 3, 105; *Iuvv* 40, 38, cf. 40, 41 (40,000 free Ligurians with

territories was a way of enforcing complete control over tracts of the landscape; the roads which marked the huge areas of centuriated plain or rolling countryside and which penetrated the less tractable regions to join city with city were an integral part of the change. In the end the Roman elaboration of the basic synoecistic city-foundation of Hellenistic type became a justly famous repertoire of forms of control of institutions and populations, and, as imposed on the far-flung provinces of the empire in the first century A.D. and later, one of the most conspicuous and distinctive consequences of Roman imperialism. But the basic patterns were evolved in the course of Rome's conquest of Italy, and the cordon of roads with settlements at strategic junctions by which Pisidia or Thrace was tamed in the early principate, or the process by which hill-forts in Noricum, Central Gaul or Britain were replaced by cities at important road-junctions in the plain beneath, are the descendants of expedients used in Etruria, Campania or Lucania two to three hundred years before.

The first century B.C. had seen some remarkable new developments in the urban history of Italy. The first came about as the result of the extension of the Roman citizenship to all Italians as the result of the Social War. The needs of the census and the levy impelled the unbureaucratically-minded Romans to promote at least to some extent the institutional uniformity of the communities of Italy. This 'municipalization' can be dimly traced in the epigraphy, but is still far from being properly understood⁵⁹. A new urgency was imported by the problems, urgent from the sixties onwards, of settling discharged soldiers on a scale which had not been needed previously. Sulla had already in the eighties discovered the strategic advantages of settling troops in areas which might need a firm garrison in an emergency or which had deserved the inconvenience caused by the settlement by their earlier disloyalty or opposition. Through the fragments of municipal legislation surviving from the time on bronze tablets or obliquely referred to in the literary texts we can begin to see how Italian city-life was rapidly becoming more homogeneous under these pressures⁶⁰.

But it was after the Augustan peace that the least ambiguous steps were taken to complete the process. The status of the many remaining villages, the *pagi* and *vici* of the mountainous parts of the peninsula, was reorganized and the powers

families and 7,000 later). The precedent, and one of the clearest examples, was the refounding of Volsinii and Falerii in the third century; strategic centres were forcibly abandoned and replaced by reduced and not easily defended new foundations; Salmon, *op. cit.* (n. 56), 172–4.

59. Gabba and Galsterer, *citt.* (n. 56); Salmon, *op. cit.* (n. 56), 177–81.

60. The basic account of these *coloniae* is Keppie, *op. cit.* (n. 50). Salmon *op. cit.* (56) 'in the first century the title *colonia* was tantamount to a badge of shame, proclaiming that a community had been humiliated and penalized ... it needed the authority and crafty propaganda of the emperor Augustus to enhance the image of the *colonia*'. For the municipal homogeneity, *ibid.* 134–9.

of their humble officers made regular⁶¹. Wherever possible one of a group of these settlements was promoted and given the physical and institutional apparel of city status. So the village of the Lauretes in the woods near Ostia became a formal community as the *vicus Augustanorum Laurentium*; old Veii was refounded as the *municipium Augustum Veiens*; a village at the temple and fairground of the goddess Feronia in the Capenate territory became a *colonia*, Lucus Feroniae, as the result of a settlement of discharged veterans⁶². These examples could easily be multiplied many times; all over Italy, in a complex variety of ways, the homogeneity of town life was being promoted. To back it all up, Augustus made the revolutionarily schematic decision to divide Italy into eleven *regiones*, thus giving the peninsula a conceptual unity which went hand in hand with its new uniformity of organization⁶³. And the whole was further assisted by the copious but repeated gifts with which he, his family and their imitators equipped the cities – baths, aqueducts, public buildings and so on. The new munificence of which the Italian cities were the principal beneficiaries was not, for all that, aimed at a Roman inner circle within the empire. Its scale was kingly and its intention was at least in part to display monarchic magnanimity and power. Changing the dispositions of nature in building harbours and aqueducts, artificial coastlines and rivers, was the most impressive product of this rhetoric of majesty, and the rulers of the early principate made no distinction of principle about where their greatness should be made manifest. But the resulting monuments helped make homogeneous the Italian and alien cities of the Empire⁶⁴.

This process, systematic though elements of it were, was after all spread over decades from the time of Caesar to that of Nero. It was hardly the putting into effect of some immensely detailed blueprint. Nor would we have expected it to be: the Romans did not work like that. But there was a singularity of underlying thought behind the process, a new and relatively doctrinaire conception of what Italy was to be like; and it is that makes it of such high importance to compare what was happening in Italy with what was going on elsewhere.

It is to be expected that at least some reflection of the attitudes behind these changes can be found in the literature of the time. In Livy we find some interest in

61. *Frederiksen*, *Hellenismus*, cit. (n. 56).

62. *Vicus Augustanorum Laurentium*: *G. Simonazzi Maserich*, *Mon. Ant.* 1, 5, 1973. *Veii*, *J.B. Ward-Perkins*, *PBSR* 29 (1961), 57–60. *Lucus Feroniae*: *Strabo* 5, 2, 9; *Keppie*, op. cit. (n. 50), 168–9. This combination of a settlement of veterans with a flourishing religious centre whose fair attracted visitors from all over the region is particularly interesting. On *pagi* and sanctuaries, *Frederiksen*, *Hellenismus*, cit. (n. 56), 353–4.

63. For the *regiones* *R. Thomsen*, *The Italic Regions*, 1947; *Salmon*, op. cit. (n. 56), ch. 7 for Augustus' Italian policy, and 153 on the *regiones*.

64. A single account of the benefactions of Augustus and his family to the cities is still wanting. For the great harbour-works of Campania, built in the context of the war against Sextus Pompey shortly before Actium, and their audience, *N. Purcell*, in *Frederiksen*, *Campania*, cit. (n. 56), ch. 14.

the Athenian deme-system, expressed in very Augustan institutional terms, which is a valuable indication that the Romans were inclined to use their own institutional concepts when dealing with the world outside the Italian peninsula⁶⁵. But it is in Dionysius of Halicarnassus that we find some of the most instructive information; he is keen to digress substantially on the subject of towns, villages and their mutual relations⁶⁶. This is, it is true, in the context of the mythical beginnings of Roman history – but he is at pains to compare how the tales which explained later practice had actually evolved. It is of the greatest interest to find a Greek in the intellectual circles of the Augustan household interesting himself in this type of material; and in Strabo's similar tastes (and very good quality up-to-date information) we find further confirmation⁶⁷. The Greek connection of these ideas may point in either or both of two important ways. In the first place it may help us not to be surprised at finding the extension of the institutional preoccupations of Augustus beyond the confines of Italy, especially to the East. In the second it awakens us to the possibility that the ideas, the systematic thought, behind the administrative changes carried out by Augustus, not just in this field but in others, may owe something to the Hellenic tradition. The case of Nicopolis illuminates several different aspects of this cross-fertilization, and it is time we returned to a more detailed consideration of it in the light of this section. It is evidence not just of how much of the Italian experience there was in what Augustus did in the provinces but also of how highly Augustus prized the Greek tradition in his attitude to city foundations everywhere.

Augustus founded Nicopolis by means of a treaty. The *foedus aequum* he made with the new population gave them the status of a *civitas libera*⁶⁸. The use of such treaties was one of the institutional bonds which kept the empire together, and the first emperors used the diplomatic repertoire of treaty-making to good effect in shaping relations between Rome and the provinces. This practice was consciously

65. Livy 31, 26, 9; 30, 5–6, with *Frederiksen*, *Hellenismus*, cit. (n. 56), 346.

66. Dionysius 4, 15 f.

67. In Strabo's description of Italy we find no attempt to conceal the lack of cities and prosperity in certain places, and he records areas where villages rather than cities exist at 5, 1, 6; 5, 1, 11; 5, 2, 1; 5, 4, 2; 6, 1, 2. The survival of urban institutions at obliterated Fregellae (5, 3, 10) and the effect of the dioecism of the Picentes (5, 4, 13) interests him, and he provides us with a good contemporary term for the reorganization of settlement in an area: the settlements on the via Flaminia have grown in population because of the road, 'μᾶλλον ἢ διὰ πολιτικὸν σύστημα' (5, 2, 10). He is moreover quite aware of the economic ingredient in the success of Italy; among its advantages is that 'τὸ ἀλίμενον κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον καὶ τὸ τοὺς ὄντας λιμένας μεγάλους εἶναι καὶ θαυμαστούς... τὴν τῶν ἐμποριῶν ἀφθονίαν συνεργόν' (6, 4, 1). Cf. n. 47.

68. Servius, in *Aen.* 3, 'is [Augustus] enim cum in Epiro Nicopolim conderet cavit in foedere civitatis ipsius ut cognati observarentur a Romanis' (this is not quite 'un *foedus* selon lequel les Nicopolitains étaient considérés comme parents des Romains', *Sarikakis*, op. cit. [n. 3], 95). Cf. Pliny, HN 4, 5 *civitas libera Nicopolitana*. A nice glimpse of the way in which the people of the city were accustomed to celebrate their special position forms an example in Epictetus 4, 1, 14 'οὕτως καὶ Νικοπολίται ἐπιβοᾶν εἰώθασι «νῆ τὴν Καίσαρος τύχην, ἐλευθεροῖ ἔσμεν»'.

felt to be a part of the immemorial tradition that had operated from the regal origins of Rome to bind her to her friends and neighbours. The federal ideal had a history which started with Servius Tullius, and under Augustus and Claudius found new applications both within Italy (we might think of the revival of the Etruscan League, or the federal rituals of the Latin League at Lavinium and the Alban Mount) and in the provinces (conspicuously with the federal sanctuary of Lugdunum and the imperial cult at Tarraco)⁶⁹. Nicopolis too was not to be an isolated, single, self-sufficient πόλις; it was a foundation which was conceived in a complicated and widely ramified context. That context was unmistakably Roman and imperial. First, as the centre of the vast synoecism, it occupied a vital place within the *provincia Macedonia*; second, as centre of the revived Acarnanian League of Actium it had federal ties which bound to it the whole of that important coastline. Third, as headquarters of the great Actian games, it was one of the series of focal points for the celebration of the new imperial order, the progression from one to another of which, by the performers who competed from all over the east, did much to articulate the presence of the ruling power. The sequence of Actiads became a dating system of some importance to the politics of the east⁷⁰. In such things as giving the presidency of the games to the Spartans more opportunities of subtle distinguishing of status were available⁷¹. Fourth, Nicopolis took its place as a great centre of communications. When the Mytileneans wished in the twenties or teens B.C. to publish copies of their decrees setting up their own penteteric festival they specified a long list of such high-ranking centres; Pergamum, Actium, Brundisium, Tarraco, Massalia and Syrian Antioch are the names preserved⁷². These cities became capitals, foci of euergetic attention for all over the east; hence the benefactions (besides those to Athens, Sparta and so on) of Herod of Judaea, who provided most of the Nicopolitans' public buildings⁷³. Fifth, as chief member of the revived Amphictyonic League Nicopolis came to occupy the position within the network of leagues which comprised the Augustan empire which cities like Tarraco and Lugdunum held in the west; she was a sacred city, Holy Nicopolis as the coin

69. For the revival of the Alban rites by Claudius, *N. Purcell*, *PBSR* 51 (1983) 165–6; Claudius and Laurentum/Lavinium, *ILS* 5004; cf. *C. Saulnier*, *Latomus* 43, (1984), 517–33. For Etruria *B. Liou*, *Prætores Etruriae XV Populorum*, 1969; *M. Torelli*, *Elogia Tarquiniensia*, 1975, 185–97. For the federal principle extended to the western provinces, *J.A. O. Larsen*, *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History*, 1955, 138; *J. Deininger*, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit*, 1965: for Tarraco, *D. Fishwick*, *Madrider Mitteilungen* 23, 1982, 222–23; for Lugdunum, *id.*, *JRS* 62 (1972) 46–52.

70. Thus, for example, the great expansion of Herod's territory in the late 20s B.C. is described by Josephus (*AJ* 16, 5, 3 – 147) ἄς 'after the first Actiad'.

71. Strabo 7, 7, 6 'τὴν δ' ἐπιμέλειαν ἔχουσιν αὐτοῦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι'.

72. *IGRR* IV, 39a (= *OGIS* 436).

73. Josephus, *AJ* 16, 5, 3 – 147; *BJ* 1, 2, 11.

legends say, her cults proclaiming her for Macedonia what Patrae was for Achaëa⁷⁴. Sixth, she took her place among the free allies of Rome, a noble series of those who had deserved well of the *fides* of the Roman People; her inhabitants used to chant 'by the Fortune of our Emperor, we are free!'; she was the *civitas libera Nicopolitana*⁷⁵. Seventh, as this section has hoped to show, Nicopolis was a city in the new tradition of city-founding that created centres of regular type where there had been none before, a tradition which had been developing above all in Italy. These cities were intimately tied to Rome and regarded, whether in Italy or elsewhere, as parts of a single set. This process was bringing to an end the ill repute which was associated with Roman *coloniae*. Patrae was a striking example of the new style. The position of Nicopolis would also suit such a double community excellently, and I believe Pliny's detailed description of the city as 'colonia Augusti Actium cum templo Apollinis nobili ac civitate libera Nicopolitana'⁷⁶. But as a city whose territory was centuriated, which received great benefactions such as aqueduct and harbours, Nicopolis belonged in the series of cities which received favour on the Italian scale and in the Italian style, whether or not it also had veterans.

5. Conclusions

The long involvement of the Ionian coast with Roman colonial schemes, the precedent of Pompey's Nicopolis, the closeness of the parallel with Patrae, and the Italian background all make it seem quite natural that Augustus should have settled veterans at Nicopolis of Epirus. Both the Elder Pliny and Tacitus call Nicopolis a *colonia*; the peninsula was centuriated and the city equipped with imperial benefactions like an Italian *colonia*; the names of its inhabitants include elements which would tally well with a deduction of Augustan veterans. So why has the *colonia* not been more widely accepted? Because the principle of a double community was much less well understood than it is now. Not only has the complex status of Patrae itself not been clearly perceived before, but the idea that the two communities did not need to have physically separate shapes has only been clear since the Augustan cities in Pisidia and Cappadocia have received proper study⁷⁷.

74. On the Amphictyony, Pausanias 10, 8, 4, cf. n. 53; for the coinage of Nicopolis *M. Καραμεισίνη – Οικονομίδου*, 'Αρχ. Έφ. (1967), 91–114. Nicopolis of Macedonia, Titus 3, 12; compare the presence there of Epictetus (n. 82).

75. Cf. above, n. 68.

76. The idea of a totality of Roman cities scattered through the *imperium* and linked to the centre through the regular coming and going of ambassadors and other representatives emerges clearly from the new *Tabula Siarensis*; *J.C. Gonzalez*, ZPE 55 (1984), 55 f., frag. II, col. b, 23–7. For Pliny's description cf. n. 54.

77. The ascription to towns whose status remained unchanged of veterans was first examined by *T.R.S. Broughton*, TAPA (1935) 18 f.; for the lively debate on the subject and the best recent discussion, with particular reference to central Anatolia, *Ś. Mitchell*, Historia 28 (1979), 409 f. The term 'double community' should be

There too double communities had long escaped notice because of the absence of strong positive evidence. It should now not be hard to accept the double nature of Augustus' victory city⁷⁸.

This small shred of fact is not of great significance in itself. But it is of much greater importance to have attempted to ask why Augustus undertook the founding of cities as he did. The establishment and maintenance of cities and their institutions was one of the most characteristic hallmarks of the Roman Empire: the choices and associations involved in the early days of the principate are therefore of particular interest. I hope to have explored some of those in this discussion; two may perhaps be outlined again by way of conclusion.

The first is the economic flavour of the planning behind the establishment of these cities. Pausanias considered that the maritime communications of Patrae were a likely reason for the expansion of the city there⁷⁹, and the harbours and maritime connections of Nicopolis are emphasized by the ancient sources, Strabo in particular remarking on the continual growth in prosperity of the new city⁸⁰. The founders of these communities were personally familiar with the complex social relations of the numerous Roman businessmen in this area, which, as we saw, was one which had long been particularly important in the entrepreneurial world of the late Republic. That had been because of the natural advantages of its nodal position on Mediterranean shipping lanes, which has made it an area of economic importance at many other periods. Of those shipping lanes, the ones which would be used to bring Egyptian corn to Rome will have been of special concern to the first *princeps*; interest in the harbours which, like those of the Ionian coast, were linked to that trade, can be clearly attested in the early principate⁸¹. The connection of Actia Nicopolis with Egypt was one which was hardly obscure. These contexts are the ones in which we may say that city foundations in the early principate could be carried out for economic motives. In so saying we are not predicating any great

understood in a very wide sense; there was a great range of possibilities for the relative status of former inhabitants and veterans, and the institutional form of the community of veterans at Nicopolis will probably never be exactly known. For some of the variants found in Italy, *Keppie*, op. cit. (n. 50), 102–4.

78. For the argument see *Kahrstedt*, op. cit. (n. 33) with full bibliography. There are two inscriptions which could refer to the institutions of the *colonia*, ILS 2080 and IG IX² 92, if the possibility of its existence is accepted. The principal counter-arguments (see *Sarikakis*, op. cit. [n. 3], passim) are that there is no *site* for the *colonia* and that Nicopolitan epigraphy has no trace of veterans. But a double community of the sort which we are postulating does not have two physical entities; and in fact the nomenclature of Nicopolitans presented by *T. Sarikakis*, 'Αρχ. Έφ. (1970) 67–85, presents a quite high proportion of possible names of veteran descent (e.g. his nos. 8–9, 21, 22, 23, 29–30, 37, 68–9, 71, 90, 121, 136, 150).

79. Pausanias 7, 18, 7 'ἡ τοῦ παράπλου νομιζῶν κείσθαι καλῶς'. Coastwise trade, *not* the journey to Italy, must be what is intended here; contrast *Baladié*, cit. (n. 45).

80. Strabo 7, 7, 6 'ἡ μὲν οὖν Νικόπολις εὐανδρεῖ καὶ λαμβάνει καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπίδοσιν, χῶράν τε ἔχουσα πολλήν καὶ τὸν ἐκ τῶν λαφύρων κόσμον'.

81. For the corn trade of Preveza in the early modern and late mediaeval periods, Braudel, op. cit. (n. 6), 583.

economic sophistication of Augustus and his advisors, let alone moving towards a mercantilist model for Roman imperialism. But it is crucial to observe that there was another type of consideration present in Roman decision-making apart from the military and political. Too aggressive a minimalism about the ancient economy will result in an oversimplification of the choices made by the Roman élite. Some basic economic thought was possible, and did influence executive action by rulers (cf. nn. 47 and 67 above).

The second important conclusion concerns the evolution of the identity of Roman imperialism and the ever-changing relation between Roman practice and Hellenic precedent; we must see the early Roman empire as a time of constantly shifting self-definition and self-awareness on the part of Greeks and Romans, and avoid too dualistic an analysis which categorizes activities, ideas, innovations, decisions as either Greek or Roman. To ask 'was Nicopolis a Greek city or a Roman *colonia*?' is to misunderstand the most important characteristic of the age, the fusion and mutual influence which blended the Italian experience of Rome with the traditions of the Hellenistic kingdoms to produce the *koine* of the second century after Christ. It is entirely appropriate that it should provide a home for so formative a figure in that development as 'that halting slave, who in Nicopolis / Taught Arrian, when Vespasian's brutal son / Clear'd Rome of what most shamed him'⁸².

82. For Nicopolis, Epictetus 1, 19, 28; 25, 18; 2, 6, 20; 21, 14; 3, 22, 52; 4, 1, 14. Cf. *Matthew Arnold*, *To a friend*, 1849, 6–8.