

ROME THE COSMOPOLIS

EDITED BY
CATHARINE EDWARDS
AND
GREG WOOLF



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge, CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Cambridge University Press

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2003

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Adobe Garamond 11/12.5 pt *System* L^AT_EX 2_ε [TB]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 0 521 80005 6 hardback

Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	page vii
<i>List of contributors</i>	x
<i>Preface</i>	xiii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xiv
1. Cosmopolis: Rome as World City <i>Catharine Edwards and Greg Woolf</i>	I
2. The triumph of the absurd: Roman street theatre <i>Mary Beard</i>	21
3. Incorporating the alien: the art of conquest <i>Catharine Edwards</i>	44
4. Inventing Christian Rome: the role of early Christian art <i>Jas Elsner</i>	71
5. Slavery and the growth of Rome. The transformation of Italy in the second and first centuries B C E <i>Willem Jongman</i>	100
6. Rivalling Rome: Carthage <i>Richard Miles</i>	123
7. Migration and the Metropolis <i>Neville Morley</i>	147
8. Germs for Rome <i>Walter Scheidel</i>	158
9. Embracing Egypt <i>Caroline Vout</i>	177

10. The City of Letters	203
<i>Greg Woolf</i>	
<i>Bibliography</i>	222
<i>Index</i>	245

Figures

- | | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| 1 | Capitoline Venus. Courtesy of The British Museum | <i>page 56</i> |
| 2 | Statue group of suicidal Gaul and woman. Museo Nazionale Romano, Palazzo Altemps | 61 |
| 3 | Dacian from the Arch of Constantine (of the same type as those displayed in Trajan's Forum). American Academy in Rome (FU 4216) | 69 |
| 4 | Sarcophagus of Junius Bassus, marble, 359 CE. Front of the main coffin, a five-niche double-register sarcophagus, with lid fragments (a further fragment has been joined since this photograph was taken). Photo: Conway Library, Courtauld Institute of Art: A74/276 | 82 |
| 5 | Sarcophagus of Junius Bassus. Upper tier, central scene. Christ enthroned between Peter and Paul, to whom he is handing the Law, above a personification of Caelus. The columns on either side are carved with vinescrolls and vintaging erotes. Photo: Conway Library, Courtauld Institute of Art: A74/279 | 84 |
| 6 | Sarcophagus of Junius Bassus. Lower tier, central scene. Christ enters Jerusalem riding on a donkey. To the side, columns with vinescrolls and vintaging erotes; above, an eagle-headed conch in the arch. In the two spandrel scenes above the capitals to either side are the multiplication of loaves and the baptism of Christ, with all the figures represented as lambs. Photo: Conway Library, Courtauld Institute of Art: A74/285 | 85 |
| 7 | Lateran Sarcophagus 164, marble, second half of the fourth century: front. This is a five-niche single-register tree sarcophagus (with trees replacing columns and arches). From left to right: Cain and Abel offering sacrifice to God, the arrest of | |

- Peter, the *Crux Invicta* with doves between sleeping Roman soldiers (symbolizing the Resurrection), the arrest or execution of Paul, the distress of Job. Photo: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Rome, Inst. Neg. 3229 91
- 8 Unfinished sarcophagus from San Sebastiano, marble, third quarter of the fourth century: front. This is a five-niche single-register columnar sarcophagus. From left to right: the execution of Paul, the arrest or journey to execution of Peter, Christ the teacher, the arrest of Christ and the judgement of Pilate. In the spandrels putti carrying martyrs' (?) wreaths. Photo: Pontificia Commissione di Archeologia Sacra: S15 91
- 9 Lateran Sarcophagus 174, marble, third quarter of the fourth century: front. This is a seven-niche single-register columnar sarcophagus. From left to right: the sacrifice of Isaac, Peter, Paul turning to Christ in the centre, Christ enthroned over *Caelus* and between two figures (apostles? angels?), Peter receiving the Law from Christ, Christ arrested, the judgement of Pilate. Photo: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Rome, Inst. Neg. 33251 92
- 10 Lateran Sarcophagus 174: right end. As with most sarcophagi, the ends of this one are carved in shallower relief than the front. The image shows Peter's miracle of striking water from the rock and a miracle of Christ (probably the healing of the woman with the issue of blood). Photo: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Rome, Inst. Neg. 3231 93
- 11 Catacomb of Commodilla, *Cubiculum Leonis*, frescos painted in the last quarter of the fourth century. This view shows the interior of the *cubiculum* with the bust of Christ between Λ and Ω on the vault, the image of Christ carrying a book between Saints Felix and Adactus in the rear *arcosolium* and the painting of Peter striking water from the rock in the left-hand *arcosolium*. Photo: Pontificia Commissione di Archeologia Sacra: Com. C 28 94
- 12 Catacomb of Commodilla, *Cubiculum Leonis*. Detail of the right-hand *arcosolium* with the fresco of Peter (to the left) denying Christ beside a column crowned by a crowing cock,

- and Christ with a companion to the right. Photo: Pontificia Commissione di Archeologia Sacra: Com. C 11 95
- 13 Catacomb of Saints Marcellinus and Peter, room 3 'Cripta dei Santi', vault fresco painted in the late fourth century. Upper tier: Christ between Peter and Paul. Lower tier: lamb standing over the Jordan flanked by the martyrs Gorgonius, Peter, Marcellinus and Tiburtinus. Photo: Pontificia Commissione di Archeologia Sacra: Lau B 15 97
- 14 The pyramid of Gaius Cestius as it stands today. Photograph John Riddy. Courtesy Frith Street Gallery, London 178
- 15 Tomb Z with later sarcophagi in the foreground. The now faded figure of Horus is high in the centre of the back wall. Fabbrica di San Pietro in Vaticano 186
- 16 Water-colour by G. Piccini (1724) showing a section of the decoration of the 'Aula Isiaca', including the frieze of cult objects and panels of a sea monster with cupid and Paris and Helen. Now in Albertina Collection, Vienna 193
- 17 Intarsio panel showing Hylas and the nymphs with its Egyptianizing border from the 'Basilica' of Junius Bassus. Photograph Moscioni. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Rome, Inst. Neg. 54.148 197
- 18 Recut intarsio panel of consular figure in a chariot surrounded by riders from four circus factions from the 'Basilica' of Junius Bassus. Photograph Moscioni. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Rome, Inst. Neg. 54.149 198

CHAPTER I

Cosmopolis: Rome as World City

Catharine Edwards and Greg Woolf

What race is so remote, what so barbarous, Caesar, from which there is no spectator in your city?¹

This book begins in the Colosseum – that site of so many deaths, human and animal – which is perhaps the most potent emblem of the all-encompassing, all-consuming city of Rome. Our epigraph is the opening of the third poem in Martial’s short collection *De spectaculis*, ‘On the games’, written to commemorate the Colosseum’s inauguration in the reign of the emperor Titus. The spectacles produced in the vast arena paraded the city’s mastery of the world.² Gladiators themselves were often drawn from distant parts of the empire.³ Lions and elephants from Africa, bears from Dalmatia, tigers from India were brought to Rome to meet violent deaths in the arena.⁴ However, not only were the spectacles themselves sumptuous and awesome demonstrations of the extent of Rome’s power, but, as Martial’s poem emphasizes, those who watched them could also function as symbols of the empire’s reach. Martial lists Thracians, Sarmatians (from the region of the Danube), Sygambrians (a German tribe), Arabs, Ethiopians. Marked out by their exotic clothing and hair arrangements, their incomprehensible speech, these people embodied the vastness and diversity of Roman territory, their presence in the heart of the city underlining Rome’s power to draw people to itself over distances almost unimaginable, from cultures thrillingly alien.

Other writers, too, remark on the diversity of the city’s population as one of its hallmarks – and not always in such positive terms. For some ancient writers, notoriously, the multifarious population of Rome was a threat to

¹ *quae tam seposita est, quae gens tam barbara, Caesar, | ex qua spectator non sit in urbe tua?*

² As Hopkins so vividly emphasises (1983b) ch. 1, esp. 11–12.

³ See Noy (2000) 117–18 on the origins of entertainers in Rome.

⁴ On the range of animals put on show in Rome, see e.g. Pliny, *NH* 8.64–71.

its Romanness – the perennial paradox of the imperial metropolis.⁵ Martial himself marvels at his exotic fellow spectators; as always at the games in Rome, the audience was itself an intrinsic part of the show. But we shall also be considering how these diverse spectators would themselves have responded to what was on view in the Colosseum – and in the city around it. One of the principal concerns of this book is the experiences of those millions of people who came to Rome from all over the empire, often over vast distances, to visit or to live (and all too frequently to die).⁶

There was much for them to wonder at in the metropolis of the emperors. Its enormous size was unparalleled; no human eye could comprehend it. The splendour of its buildings, constructed from gleaming marbles brought from distant lands, was incomparable. The marketplaces of the city were crammed with more transitory reminders of Rome's dominance over the world. Rome's appetite was often conceived as insatiable. The Younger Seneca's complaint that Romans scour the globe to load their tables (*Ad Helv.* 10.3) is echoed by countless other Roman writers.⁷ Those who had travelled vast distances to the city might be disconcerted to see familiar products on sale in the markets – or even familiar monuments on display. In the Campus Martius, for instance, Augustus re-erected an obelisk from Heliopolis, taken as part of the spoils of his victory at Actium, with the inscription on its base: *AEGVPTO IN POTESTATEM POPVLI ROMANI REDACTA* – 'Egypt having been brought under the dominion of the Roman people'.⁸ Everywhere in the city elements of the conquered world had been appropriated and recontextualized; the city had absorbed the world.

ROME THE COSMOPOLIS?

Rome itself is sometimes referred to in antiquity as 'cosmotrophos', 'nurturer of the world' (e.g. in *IG XIV 1108*).⁹ The term 'cosmopolis', however, derived from the Greek words for 'world' and 'city', occurs only as the title

⁵ Juvenal's third satire is perhaps the most notoriously negative characterization. On diversity see Herodian 1.12.1; still impressive in 357 CE, according to Ammianus (26.61). And, of course, even hostile accounts of the diversity of Rome's population such as Juvenal's third satire at the same time celebrate the extent of the city's power.

⁶ As Hopkins emphasizes, 'Rome was a huge death-trap' (1995/6) 60. See further Scheidel in this volume.

⁷ As Gowers comments: 'Like the spoils heaped up in a Roman triumphal procession lists of food, verbal "heaps" which challenged the reader's or listener's bodily capacity graphically reproduced the amassing of goods in Rome, whether on the tables of the rich or in the city's cookshops, where the wealth of conquered nations was translated into ingestible matter' (1993) 18–19.

⁸ See Steinby (1993–9) s.v. horologium. ⁹ Discussed by Purcell (1999) 141.

of a magistrate in a handful of Greek city-states.¹⁰ Stoic philosophers used the term ‘cosmopolites’ to refer to the position aspired to by the would-be wise man, transcending local attachments to identify with all of humanity as a ‘citizen of the world’.¹¹ Yet Romans from the time of Cicero onwards – and Greeks, too – liked to play on the idea of Rome as a city in some ways equivalent to the world; *Romanae spatium est urbis et orbis idem*, ‘The world and the city of Rome occupy the same space’, in Ovid’s words (*Fasti* 2.684). There is no part of the world which is not also Rome. To be a citizen of Rome was thus to be a citizen of the world.¹²

This is a familiar and enduring trope but one which bears closer examination, for this volume takes as its central concern the nature of the relationship between the city and the world; the terms in which that relationship was articulated are of crucial importance. What were the implications of likening Rome to the world – or the world to Rome? The Greek aristocrat Aelius Aristides’ oration *To Rome* (written in the mid second century) praises the Romans for extending the security associated with urban life throughout the empire (100). The Romans manage the world as if it were one *polis* (36).¹³ Written centuries later just after the sack of the city in 476 CE, Rutilius Namatianus’ nostalgic address to Rome (which he is leaving to return to his native Gaul), also evokes this aspect of the city/world equation:

By offering to the vanquished a share in your own justice, you have made a city out of what was once a world.¹⁴ (*De red. suo* 65–6)

Rutilius emphasizes the extension of Roman law throughout the Roman world; citizenship is the mechanism through which *urbs* and *orbis* are equated (though, since by this time Rome had long ceased to be a centre of government, the force of the term ‘city’ is to some extent metaphorical). Here, too, the emphasis is primarily on the city’s impact on the empire – not surprisingly so, perhaps, given the perspective from which these men were writing.

Other ancient discussions are more preoccupied with the manifestations of empire within and through the city itself. At least from the time of Augustus (when the fabric of the city underwent a major overhaul), Roman

¹⁰ According to Liddell, Scott and Jones.

¹¹ On Stoic cosmopolitanism, see Schofield (1991).

¹² The trope and its deployment are further explored by Nicolet (1991) 98–114; Griffin (1991); Gowers (1995); Edwards (1996) 99–100.

¹³ Swain (1996) 274–84 argues that Aristides is rather lukewarm in his praise of the advantages Rome brings to provincial subjects.

¹⁴ *Dumque offers victis proprii consortia iuris, | urbem fecisti quod prius orbis erat.*

writers express concern that the city's appearance should be commensurate with its power over the world.¹⁵ The architect Vitruvius praises Augustus for the care he has taken: 'that the splendour of public buildings should bear witness to the majesty of the empire', *ut maiestas imperii publicorum aedificiorum egregias haberet auctoritates* (1 pr. 2). For the Elder Pliny writing under Vespasian (like Augustus, responsible for initiating extensive public building projects) the buildings of Rome, which he terms *miracula*, 'marvels', were another demonstration that the rest of the world was *victum*, 'outdone', of course, but also 'conquered'; *sic quoque terrarum orbem victum ostendere* (NH 36.101). And Aristides, too, in an earlier section of his oration, uses the vocabulary of wonder; the extent of the city's power initially inspires amazement:

If one looks at the whole empire and reflects how small a fraction rules the whole world, he may be amazed at the city, but when he has beheld the city herself and the boundaries of the city, he can no longer be amazed that the entire civilized world is ruled by one so great. (*To Rome* 9)

The physical fabric of the city gives plausibility – authority even – to Rome's claim to rule the world. The greatness of the city at the same time serves to render comprehensible the extent of its vast empire. And thus the huge expenditure of resources in the capital (not least on successive emperors' building projects) is justified.

Other approaches to characterizing Rome's relationship to the world deployed by Greek authors include the notion of Rome as an epitome or summary of the world. The medical writer Galen invokes it (attributing it to the sophist Polemo), in emphasizing the huge number of types of limb dislocation he has had the opportunity to see while working in the city (one consequence, then, of the varied nature of the city's population).¹⁶ Athenaeus, in the *Deipnosophists* (written in the final years of the second century CE), comments: 'it would not be far off the mark to call the city of Rome an epitome of the civilized world, for within it every city may be seen to have planted a colony' (1.20.b–c). The availability within the city of the produce of every region could be similarly interpreted. Aristides notes:

Here is brought from every land and sea all the crops of the seasons and the produce of each land, river, lake, as well as of the arts of the Greeks and barbarians, so that if someone should wish to view all these things, he must either see them by travelling over the whole world or be in this city. (*To Rome* 10)

¹⁵ According to Livy (also writing under Augustus), Rome's shabbiness in comparison with the capitals of the Greek East had been mocked in the middle and late republic (40.5.7).

¹⁶ Galen 18a.347. On this see Swain (1996) 363–5.

All the world is to be found in Rome. This point is reinforced a few paragraphs later, as Aristides comments: 'And whatever one does not see here neither did nor does exist' (13).

The slippery rhetoric of comparisons between the city and the world could lend itself to negative readings. In the course of his description of the Temple of Peace (which immediately follows his account of the triumph of Titus and Vespasian, celebrating their victory over the Jews) the Jewish writer Josephus comments that in Rome one could see the treasures of the world brought together; the convenient assembly of these spectacular objects thus saves the seeker after marvels from touring around all those different cities (*Jewish War* 7.5.7).¹⁷ But the remark (from one who had witnessed the Romans' devastating victory over his own people) is double-edged. Rome creams off the best of everything. The city draws to itself from the rest of the world the most valuable and beautiful of its possessions, as well as the most gifted of its inhabitants (including Josephus himself, of course). The city, then, could be figured as dominating the world but also as representing or summing up the world – in terms of synecdoche constituting its head (*caput mundi*), in terms of metonymy standing for its totality (every region is represented within it), in terms of epitome gathering together its most precious contents.

In this sense, at least from the perspective of those within the city, Rome had not merely taken over the world but eclipsed it completely. The city's relative indifference to its vast territories is perhaps reflected in a comment the geographer Strabo makes about Rome's architectural splendour. In his account of Rome, he praises the structures of the Campus Martius in detail, lists the monuments of the rest of the city and then concludes that, if you saw all these: 'you would easily become oblivious to everything else outside. Such is Rome' (*Geography* 5.3.8). The world as it is represented within the city displaces the actual world beyond it.

More specific evocations of the interrelationship between *urbs* and *orbis* were also to be found incorporated into Rome's built environment.¹⁸ Pompey celebrated his great victories in the east with the construction of a magnificent theatre complex in 52 BCE, in which was set up a statue of Pompey himself holding a globe, thus signifying Rome's dominance over the *orbis terrarum*. Among the honours decreed to Julius Caesar in association with his triumphs of 46 BCE was a statue set up on the Capitoline hill, of Caesar with his foot on a bronze image of the *oikoumene* – the

¹⁷ On Rome as a city of wonders, see Purcell (2000) 405–7.

¹⁸ These monuments have been suggestively discussed in Nicolet (1991).

inhabited world.¹⁹ According to the Elder Pliny, the map of the world set up by Augustus' associate Agrippa in the northern Campus Martius aimed to 'show the entire world to the city', *orbem terrarum urbi spectandum propositurus* (*NH* 3.17).²⁰ The notion of display is foregrounded here, the city itself personified as the viewer. Agrippa's map and the inscription bearing Augustus' achievements, his *Res gestae* (with its long list of territories incorporated into the empire) can thus be seen as a development of the 'cosmocratic tradition' of Rome's triumphant generals.²¹

The city's physical fabric more generally has been a particular focus of scholars' attention in recent decades. Several of the essays offered in this volume (those by Edwards, Elsner and Vout) pursue specific aspects of the impact of empire on the fabric of the city (though we do not aim to offer a comprehensive account of this vast issue). Some of the most influential recent work in this area has tended to simplify the impact of Rome's public monuments.²² A common concern of our essays is to emphasize the multi-valent and shifting significance of monuments in the city and in particular the varied perspectives of viewers. Vout, for instance, explores the potential meanings of Egyptian imagery, as it was used in a number of contexts in the city of Rome. Was the pyramid (constructed around 12 BCE) which served as the funeral monument of Gaius Cestius perceived as a gesture of sympathy with the Egyptianizing Mark Antony, Augustus' arch rival in the civil wars so recently concluded? Or perhaps as an appropriation of Egypt in homage to those undertaken by the emperor himself? Can such allusions to and explorations of the 'alien' cultures included within the empire ever have been straightforward? Vout's paper highlights the importance of examining the specific contexts in which particular cultures are evoked.

The problem of representing empire in the city is an issue also explored in Beard's discussion of the ritual of the triumph. This spectacular procession, staged only to celebrate the greatest Roman victories, was centred on the person of the triumphant general. It regularly included campaign spoils, as well as the most distinguished of the conquered enemy and sometimes representations of battles fought or territories acquired; the triumph served

¹⁹ The significance of these statues is discussed by Nicolet (1991) 37–41.

²⁰ The symbolic significance of this has been discussed by Nicolet (1991) 98–114.

²¹ Nicolet (1991) 11.

²² Zanker (1989). For criticisms of his position see Wallace-Hadrill, 'Rome's cultural revolution', *JRS* 79 (1989) 157–64. While Zanker's more recent work (e.g. 1997) has focused more closely on the experience of the viewers of ancient monuments, he has been concerned rather with change over time, arguing that viewers were more interested in the political symbolism of images in the early principate than they were later. The differing perspectives of individual viewers as conditioned by e.g. their own place of origin are not discussed.

to put Rome's increasingly exotic conquests on display before the people of Rome. But to what extent could its meaning be controlled? The crowds in the Roman streets were to a significant degree composed of conquered people themselves, or at least their descendants. How did they respond to these spectacles? What was the relationship between the spectacle and what had happened on the empire's frontiers? Some triumphs were presented in written accounts as substitutes for rather than representations of conquest. And the triumphant general's symbolically charged yet problematic status (he was dressed in the same costume as the statue of Jupiter on the Capitol) may itself have served, as Beard emphasizes, to raise questions about the credibility of the whole show.

Prominent among the spoils paraded through the city in triumphs of the middle years of the republic were artworks, particularly statues, taken from the Greek East. Edwards' paper explores a variety of responses, Roman and Greek, to these 'foreign bodies', many of which found a permanent home in Rome's public spaces. Here they might function as symbols of Rome's conquest over the Greek world; but they could also be read as highlighting Rome's artistic inferiority or the disruptive personal ambitions of the generals who had captured them and put them on display. Commissioned statues might also play a part in representing empire within the city. Pompey's theatre complex, mentioned above, included statues personifying the territories he had conquered. But these, too (and others like them), did not function simply as reassuring indices of the empire's vast extent.

The city of imperial splendour was full of reminders of the violence of conquest. This violence might be translated into the arena, where gladiatorial fights and wild beast hunts were staged to celebrate great victories. It might be frozen in the defeated stance of a marble barbarian, displayed on a triumphal monument. It might be reconfigured in the brutality of a master beating a slave, captured, brought to Rome and sold in the aftermath of another imperial victory. The bustling metropolis may have seemed largely ordered but how confident could its inhabitants be that this violence would always be contained?

SUSTAINING COSMOPOLIS

Rome, the Cosmopolis, was made to stand against change. As the power of the Roman people grew so the roots of the City were dug deeper into antiquity, down beneath Romulean Rome and Evander's settlement, to the scene of Hercules' battle with the monster Cacus, and ultimately back to Troy. At the same time Rome's posterity was extended forwards. The monuments

created by Republican dynasts, Caesar's and Augustus' calendrical manipulations and the latter's monumentalization of the *Fasti* pointed the way to the slogan *Roma Aeterna*.²³ The City became a fixed point in the Cosmos, a cityscape layered and relayered with myth and history, a theatre of memory and at the same time a stage on which all future generations of Romans were destined to play a part... or else have their absence noted. Ammianus' Constantius II, visiting Rome for the first time in 357 in the twentieth year of his reign, is prepared for his *adventus* to play the part of an impassive and colossal statue, but he is transformed from spectacle to spectator by the sights of the City.²⁴ His inadequacy as an emperor is underlined by his ignorance of what lies at the heart of his empire, the 'glories of the eternal city'.

In reality, naturally, the Cosmopolis was not built once and for all time. The City had to be constantly rebuilt and repaired, both at the mundane and at the cosmic level. Roads needed periodic repaving, the embankments along the Tiber and the bridges that crossed it needed maintenance, the *insulae* of the city needed to be reconstructed after fire damage, flooding and the collapses caused by their often poor construction: the cost of this enterprise was phenomenal.²⁵ As Frontinus' treatise, along with a vast body of recent epigraphic and archaeological research, makes very clear, the complex water supply of the city required constant expert attention.²⁶ The monumental fabric too could not be static. If Rome was to remain central to the Cosmos, to persist as a faithful epitome of the world, it had to keep pace with the changes in that greater whole. New imperial *fora* had to be added, bigger and better amphitheatres and *basilicae*, more splendid *thermae* furnished with artworks appropriate to their theme. Earlier programmes might be slighted or plundered in the endless recalibration of *Urbs* and *Orbis*. The Arch of Constantine points us back to the early second-century monuments it reuses at the same time as it marks a new stage in the endless renegotiations of the Senate's tortuous relationship with the emperors.

Perhaps the most obvious feature of this homeostatic process is seen in the evolving sacred topography of the city.²⁷ The Flavians brought their patron

²³ Wallace-Hadrill (1987), Griffin (1991) and Hardie (1992) on the Augustan manipulation of time. Matthews (1986) on *Roma Aeterna*, and Constantius' *adventus*.

²⁴ Ammianus Marcellinus 16.10.14–15.

²⁵ DeLaine (2000) on the constant need for rebuilding and maintenance of the urban fabric.

²⁶ Bruun (1991), Dodge (2000) offer excellent accounts.

²⁷ Beard, North and Price (1998), vol. 1 maps 2–4 give a vivid impression of the ubiquity of new cults in Rome. For a succinct account of developments in the cults of the City cf. chapter 5 of the same volume.

Isis to Rome and established her in a splendid sanctuary on the Campus Martius. Successive emperors made their own marks with immense temples to their chosen divinities, Domitian to Minerva, Hadrian to Venus, Severus to Liber and Hercules, Caracalla to Sarapis, Aurelian to Sol, Constantine to Christ and so on. The cults of the Cosmopolis were notionally regulated by the Senate, although the emperors' interventions were never challenged even when, as in the case of the fourth-century Christian emperors, they were often resented.

Change was not always managed from above. The monuments of imperial Rome show shifts of religious topography that were not co-ordinated from the centre. Immigrants brought with them to Rome a bewildering variety of cults from all over the empire.²⁸ Shrines to Palmyrene and Syrian deities are prominent in Trastevere but there was little religious zoning and new cults appear all over the City. Some forty sanctuaries and monuments to Mithras are known from all parts of the City: most must be dated between the early second century and 376–7, when a Mithraeum was destroyed by a Christian urban prefect Furius Maecius Gracchus in a *cause célèbre* related gleefully by Jerome.²⁹ The destruction of shrines too was a necessary recalibration of City to Empire, the process Elsner describes in this volume as the invention of Christian Rome. Changing patterns of private cult seem generally to set the pace, until specific cults attained the prominence that led to prohibitions, expulsions or incorporation into the *sacra publica*, and sometimes all of these in turn. Cult illustrates the limits in the capacity of Senate and emperors to orchestrate the performance of Empire in the City.

Rome's evolution as Cosmopolis was never wholly planned: at times the process evidently generated considerable anxiety. Much of what passes for testimony to Rome's cosmopolitanism is in fact generated by attempts to police, limit and control the influx of people and traditions on which the physical and demographic survival of the city depended. Some Romans sought to reject the Cosmos. Umbricius' condemnation of the 'Greek City' in Juvenal's third satire is the most quoted example of this.³⁰ The satire does not attack an innovation but a perennial concern: Greek Rome was as old as all the other Romes.³¹ By presenting Rome as an alien capital, Juvenal's speaker attacks a series of fundamental culture myths that opposed the heterogeneous roots of Rome – her great families above all – to the myth of Athenian autochthony. Trojan and Arcadian refugees provide the

²⁸ Noy (2000) on immigration and its consequences.

²⁹ Epistle 107.2, with discussion in Matthews (1975) 22–3.

³⁰ Edwards (1996) ch. 5.

³¹ A theme of Cornell (1995).

chronologically earliest layer of these myths, but the theme is taken up in Romulus' establishment of the asylum, in the kidnap of Sabine women, in the Etruscan and Greek ancestry claimed by various of the older houses, a series of legends brought together by Cato in his *Origines*, by Livy in his archaeology of the Roman people and by Claudius in his speech on the admission of Gauls to a Senate in part resistant to the move. At no period in Roman history is it possible to detect a consensus about the most desirable rate at which the aliens should be admitted into the city.

Modern accounts stress migration to Rome as the main means by which it grew – perhaps doubling in size twice a century over the course of the middle and late Republic to an Augustan peak of 1 million – and then as the precondition for its survival as the greatest city of the Mediterranean world for the first three centuries C.E. The argument is familiar. Death rates exceeded birth rates so dramatically in all pre-industrial cities for which we have figures, that any ancient megalopolis must have needed constant replenishment from without.³² Recent research has further strengthened this inference. Scheidel shows in this volume how the City gathered to itself all the most noxious germs of the empire and set them loose on a population as densely packed as any, and which included many whom systematic malnutrition had rendered especially vulnerable. At a lesser scale similar processes of high mortality, and even higher immigration, must lie behind the survival of other great regional hubs, Carthage – discussed by Miles in this volume – and also Alexandria and Antioch, Pergamum, Athens and Ephesus. As Jongman shows in his chapter, the first three centuries of the empire saw large cities grow at the expense of smaller ones, and the global urban population of the empire approach an apogee in absolute terms and as a proportion of the total population. If Rome was swollen by imperialism, she was sustained at that level as the peak of a settlement hierarchy generated by empire.

Yet this demographic picture is too simple. Or rather this model illustrates the *minimum* levels of immigration needed to sustain the megalopolis. As Morley's chapter makes clear, these mass movements are in fact aggregates of many different kinds of journeys to Rome. And there were journeys away as well. Rutilius Namatianus' *envoi* and Umbricius' bitter leave-taking have already been mentioned. And others left only to return and leave again.³³ These trajectories can be imagined at different

³² A case made brilliantly for the Republic by Hopkins (1978a) chapter 1 and for the early empire in Hopkins (1995/6) 58–60. For late imperial Rome see Purcell (1999) 140–4.

³³ Parkin (1992) 5 noting the potential demographic complications introduced once movement back and forth from Rome are taken into account.

levels of society. At its summit Constantius was not the only emperor to visit the World City rarely: after the first century CE few emperors ruled mainly from Rome. Senators were required by law to spend much of their lives in the City, but in their first two or three decades after admission to the Senate many spent quite long periods in the provinces. The imperial Senate when it met lacked the current commanders of the legions, those away governing provinces and a few others deputed on special missions for the emperor as well as those over 60 (or 65) who exercised the option of not attending meetings. If part of the shared experience of senators in Rome was service abroad, past and anticipated, so senators in the provinces looked back and forward to Rome. Equally as provincials entered the Senate in greater and greater numbers they retained strong links with their ancestral homes.³⁴ Provincial wealth flowed to Rome as they purchased their houses on the Esquiline and in other fashionable areas and set up their considerable establishments. Many senators also continued to patronise their compatriots and monumentalise their home cities. On visits home they and their relatives brought experience of the capital with them. Rome thus became part of the mental furniture of the empire's elite.

The journeys of others took them back and forth between the metropole and the provinces. Equestrians are less epigraphically visible but some examples of provincial recruits to the procuratorial service are known and many served in the City for part of their careers.³⁵ Imperial patronage, and that of the senators, brought poets, teachers, orators and other performers to the City.³⁶ Other visitors included scholars, missionaries and, when the emperors were in Rome, ambassadors. One way Rome became a *Cosmopolis* was as a place much visited, a common point through which many of the empire's most prominent inhabitants passed at least once in their lifetimes, a secular Mecca and so a shared cityscape of memory and the imagination.

The transient, temporary and occasional population of the City was much more diverse than the xenophobic rant of Juvenal's third satire

³⁴ Eck (1997). On the changing character of the senatorial elite cf. Hopkins (1983b) 120–200. On the Senate itself Talbert (1984).

³⁵ Sablayrolles (1999) for a recent survey of the grandest posts in the equestrian service. At 378–9 he notes the relative slowness of the order to recruit from provincials, except to the highest levels, and Eck (1997) 76 notes how few equestrian as opposed to senatorial names appear on the lead water pipes that provided private water supplies, by imperial permission, for mansions in Rome. For Eck, the latter indicates 'the marked difference in the strength of the ties that bound the two *ordines* to Rome'. Yet even if fewer equestrians were granted the right to abstract water from the public aqueducts, it is difficult to believe that provincial recruitment of senators did not rest on the recruitment of equestrians.

³⁶ For Lucian's satire on this see Woolf in this volume.

pretends. Umbricius' tirade pictures the immigrants as opportunistic economic migrants, adventurers trading on their lack of moral constancy or scruple to insinuate themselves into every possible role offered by the imperial city. Some of the rhetoric is all too familiar to us today: just as today migration into ancient Rome must have been much more complex than it suggests.³⁷ Many, after all, were involuntary migrants, slaves arriving by sea from the trading markets of the east, or marched by land from Roman Europe or beyond.³⁸ A significant section of the population – numbering over 30,000 by the Severan period – were soldiers: the majority were recruited from Italy, but there was also a unit of German cavalry and there were some troops detached from provincial armies.³⁹ Many of the demands for labour in Rome's evolving ports and transport structure, and on the building sites – private and public – that dotted the City, were seasonal or casual.⁴⁰ Slave workforces are less plausible in these contexts and so we must imagine the Italian poor moving to the City when work was likely to be had, and leaving it again for their homes in the slack season.

What were the mechanisms that sustained this labour? Recent studies have concentrated on the best-attested activities, those funded by the emperors and so, indirectly, by the empire. The great dispersals of grain, followed by oil and meat, to the Roman masses are well documented.⁴¹ The greatest building projects too – aqueducts and the *thermae* they fed as well as temples, entertainment structures and palaces – were imperial, both because of their cost, and because no-one dared rival the emperors.⁴² There is no question that the emperors used wealth extracted from the provincials to maintain the City and its population – the permanent part of it, that is, as far as they could distinguish – in a privileged condition. The City was a showpiece of imperial munificence to all who passed through it.⁴³

There were other sources of wealth too. First the senatorial elite, who may have spent less on public monuments than their republican predecessors but spent more on their own houses and establishments. Generation by generation they seem to have had more to spend, as their failure to reproduce led to the concentration of fortunes into fewer and fewer families and as their numbers were swollen by new senators bringing provincial wealth

³⁷ For a suggestive modern parallel see Hopkins (1971) on Hong Kong.

³⁸ Harris (1999a) 72–3 for the continued import of slaves from outside the empire.

³⁹ Coulston (2000). ⁴⁰ Whittaker (1993).

⁴¹ Rickman (1980), Garnsey (1988), Morley (1996). Note also several of the contributions to part II of Moatti (1998).

⁴² DeLaine (1997) is a path-breaking study in costing imperial building. For the decline of senatorial building in Rome cf. Eck (1984).

⁴³ Griffin (1991).

with them. The process is difficult to trace in detail, but the Senate of the late empire collectively controlled much more land than had its first-century CE predecessors and at least some senatorial families were sustained by landholding in many different provinces. Even before then, the super-wealthy appear celebrated in Statius' *Silvae* and Gellius' anecdotes and satirized by Lucian and Galen among others. Collectively the spending power of an imperial elite resident in Rome, for at least part of their lives, represented an alternative route through which provincial production was channelled into expenditure in the capital. Rome's many visitors brought more wealth to the city. Tourists have already been mentioned. Traders also swelled the population (for at least for part of the year). Philo writes of traders from everywhere leaving Rome for their home ports at the beginning of autumn rather than over-winter in a foreign land.⁴⁴ Rome was not just a good place to sell produce but also an excellent place to buy it, as the shipping routes and harbour facilities stimulated by the needs of the capital made it the regional hub of the western Mediterranean. The wealth of senators and the centrality of Rome in the market-oriented network of exchanges that bound together the cities of the Mediterranean world, and through them their more productive hinterlands, together help explain why the City thrived in the second century even as emperors began to spend less and less of their time and money at Rome. The notion of Rome as a cultural and economic – and not just an administrative – capital is central to the notion of it as a World City.

CULTURE AND IMPERIALISM

The most powerful and glamorous of Hellenistic rulers, the Attalids of Pergamum, the Ptolemies of Egypt in particular, were famed not only for the exquisite artworks they possessed and the imposing buildings they commissioned but also for their extensive libraries, in which the greatest scholars of their day conducted their labours. Books figured among the spoils brought back to Rome by the conquering generals of the late republic, men who were coming to see themselves as the equals, indeed the superiors, of those Hellenistic kings.⁴⁵ Lucius Aemilius Paullus took nothing but books from among all the royal treasures of Macedon after his great victory of 167 BCE (Plut. *Aem.* 28.6). This was, it seems, the first Greek library to come to Rome. In 86 BCE, Sulla's trophies from conquered Athens apparently

⁴⁴ Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium* 14.

⁴⁵ On the monarchical pretensions of the generals of the late republic, see Rawson (1975).

included the remains of Aristotle's library (Strabo 13.1.54). Lucius Licinius Lucullus also appears to have acquired much of his famous collection of books in the aftermath of his great eastern victories; Plutarch comments that 'his use of them was more honourable than the way he acquired them' (Plut. *Luc.* 42).⁴⁶

The libraries acquired by the great men of the republic were, it seems, often located in their villas (where they had more leisure for scholarly pursuits – and their pretensions to Hellenistic grandeur were less conspicuous than would have been the case in the city itself).⁴⁷ That of Lucullus, for instance, was housed at Tusculum. After the civil wars between Pompey and Caesar, however, libraries came to be included among the monumental amenities of the city – as efforts were made to transform Rome into a capital worthy of an empire. Caesar himself planned a library for the city (Suet. *Jul.* 44.2). To mark his triumph over the Illyrians in 39 BCE, Asinius Pollio founded a library in his Atrium Libertatis; Pliny terms it 'the earliest public library in the world funded out of the spoils of war', *bibliotheca quae prima in orbe... ex manubiis publicata* (Pliny, *NH* 7.115) – a graphic example of the conquest of culture.⁴⁸ A few years later, Augustus set up a library in the Porticus Octaviae and another attached to the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine (each with one section for Greek works and one for Latin).⁴⁹ Later emperors followed his example, most notably Trajan, who incorporated a vast library into his Forum complex. All the learning of the civilized world was brought together in Rome.⁵⁰

Scholars, too, flocked to the city from all over the Greek world (some perhaps following their relocated libraries). Plutarch writes that for Greek scholars in Rome Lucullus' library had functioned as a home from home (*Luc.* 42). Rome offered opportunities for the learned to study – and to earn a living through teaching. In attempting to estimate the number of scholars in Tarsus, Strabo comments paradoxically, 'But it is Rome that is best able to tell us the number of learned men from this city; for it is full of Tarsians and Alexandrians' (14.5.15). Strabo himself had come to Rome from Pontus, one of many Greek intellectuals to do so in the aftermath of Actium.⁵¹ Seneca, writing in the time of Nero, lists the desire for study among the many possible motives of those who leave their native lands to

⁴⁶ On libraries in the late republic, see Marshall (1976); Rawson (1985) ch. 3; Casson (2001).

⁴⁷ As Zanker has suggested (1988) ch. 1. ⁴⁸ See also Isidore, *Orig.* 6.5.2.

⁴⁹ Suet. *Aug.* 29.3; Plut. *Marc.* 30.6; Dio 49.43.8.

⁵⁰ Though emperors might choose to exclude some volumes from their libraries. Some of Ovid's works were, it seems, banned from the libraries of Augustus (Ovid, *Tristia* 3.1.59–72).

⁵¹ Bowersock (1965) 123–8.

come to the city (*Ad Helv.* 6.2–3).⁵² The medical writer Galen, originally from Pergamon, was one of many scholars drawn to Rome in the second century C.E. Morley's piece, later in this volume, emphasizes the continuing attraction of Rome for scholars from all over the empire.

Rome gathered to itself the world's greatest books and greatest scholars. Already in the second century B.C.E. the ever-expanding Roman empire was spawning books which themselves sought to comprehend the world; Polybius' *Histories*, written in Rome, adapted Greek historiographical traditions to give an account of the history of the entire inhabited world, which focused on the rise of Rome as a world-power.⁵³ A few decades later, Posidonius' highly influential history (which survives only in fragments) also focused on the Roman empire, recording the habits and customs of many peoples within it (fr. 15). Ancient readers perceived his account as consistent with a Stoic view of the cosmos. Thus the Roman empire, embracing as it did all the peoples of the world, could perhaps be seen as reflecting the unified, living universe.⁵⁴ Strabo's *Geography*, written in the time of Augustus (when, as we have seen, a variety of strategies were being deployed to represent the world in and for the city), also gives an account of the Roman world, an account profoundly informed by earlier Greek literary models, from Homer on. Indeed, it has been suggested that the Roman world could not be conceptualized and depicted except through recourse to Greek historiographical and geographical traditions.⁵⁵

Rome, then, took possession of Greek literary culture, which, in some contexts, became a medium, if a somewhat slippery one, for the expression of Roman power. But Greek culture – *paideia* – had notoriously taken possession of Rome. By the late republic, familiarity with the great works of Greek literature was, it seems, a requirement for Romans with aspirations to refinement; to be educated meant reading Homer and Plato. For some, at least, knowing Greek was part of what it was to be Roman.⁵⁶ At the same time, the rapidly developing Latin literary tradition was itself self-consciously modelled on and informed by Greek literature.⁵⁷ Roman culture bore striking traces of the conquered.

⁵² As the Greek world became more prosperous from the mid first century C.E. Greek scholars became less dependent on the opportunities in Rome and intellectual life in the Greek east focused rather on Athens, as Swain emphasises (1996) 3. Rome nevertheless remained a major draw.

⁵³ Henderson (2001a). ⁵⁴ Clarke (1999) 188–9.

⁵⁵ Clarke (1999) 334. Numerous later Roman works can also be seen as attempts to comprehend the world, most particularly the Elder Pliny's *Naturalis historia*.

⁵⁶ See Wallace-Hadrill (1998). ⁵⁷ For a suggestive discussion of this see Hinds (1998), esp. ch. 3.

To a significant degree generated and informed by imperial expansion in the East, Latin literature had a crucial part to play in the continuing development of empire in the West in particular. Latin literary culture quickly became an index of Roman identity.⁵⁸ And it was to remain so for centuries. Ausonius' *Ordo nobilium urbium* written in the late fourth century CE parades the author's participation in the world of literature which marked him out as a true Roman (as Miles emphasizes later in this volume). Ausonius' birth in Bordeaux was no more a disqualification for this than had been Cicero's in Arpinum.⁵⁹ The responses of provincial elites to their own localities were filtered through a central Roman perspective. Miles writes of the elite of Roman Carthage approaching their own city's past through reading Virgil. Similarly, Woolf, in his discussion of Rome as cultural capital, explores the Spanish-born Martial's use of Latin literary tradition to denigrate the primitive level of culture in his native Bilbilis.

Ausonius' poem also celebrates, if defensively, the continuing pre-eminence of the city of Rome over all other cities. It was perhaps precisely provincial writers such as Ausonius who had the most intense cultural investment in Rome. Miles explores a number of texts of the third and fourth centuries CE which highlight the uniqueness of Rome in comparison with other cities of the empire, albeit for rather different reasons. SHA and Herodian's accounts of the revolt of the Gordians in the third century CE illustrate a wider discourse of power which sought to explain and justify the position of Rome as head of the empire – a project which continued even when (as Woolf emphasizes) the empire was actually governed from wherever the emperor (or emperors) happened to be.

Also focusing on perceptions of Rome from the provinces, Woolf's essay is principally concerned to analyse the image of Rome as 'the city of letters' – a city filled with elite *littérateurs* perpetually engaged in reading, writing and discussing literary texts to the exclusion of more mundane activities. This implausible world, he suggests, was very much a literary creation. And while this version of Rome may be seen as initially the product of struggles for distinction within the central Roman elite, it was an image of 'Rome' which must have dominated the perceptions of the increasing numbers in the provinces whose own Romanness was primarily generated through their relative competence in reading Latin texts. Indeed, as Woolf suggests, the link between literary texts and Roman identity was almost certainly stronger outside the capital than within it. Literary achievement became an

⁵⁸ See Woolf (1998) 72–5, 126.

⁵⁹ As Miles emphasizes, below, the final lines of *Ordo nobilium urbium* echo Cicero's articulation in *De leg.* 2.5 of the idea that every Roman has two *patriae*.

avenue through which some provincials at least could stake their claim to full participation in Roman identity. Yet for most, he argues, even – indeed especially – for those who had acquired a modest degree of familiarity with Virgil and Cicero, the allusive complexity of literary Latin was such that a little learning only made them more aware of their own ignorance.

The notion of Rome as cultural capital may be traced in some Greek literature of the principate, too. Rome's centrality is also celebrated in Athenaeus' compendious *Deipnosophistae*. Athenaeus, Egyptian-born, lived in Rome in the late second and early third centuries CE. Writing in Greek, he adapts a symposiastic setting of the kind sometimes used in Plato's dialogues but with an eclectic mix of subject matter which perhaps has more in common with the Roman genre of satire.⁶⁰ The *Deipnosophistae* is set in the home of a Roman man of letters, Larensis, who has had a distinguished career, culminating in a period as procurator of Moesia. The table-talk of the participants in the *Deipnosophistae* ranges over the Roman empire, east and west, as well as parading an erudite familiarity with all the central texts of Latin and Greek literature. At one point, the host Larensis asks his guests if they know what a *tetrax* is (9.398e–399a). After much discussion, an actual *tetrax* – a bird, as it turns out – is carried in in a cage; it has been brought all the way from its native habitat in Moesia, the province where Larensis himself was stationed. Larensis impresses his guests with his knowledge of birdlife, gleaned through both observation and reading the proper authorities (above all, of course, Aristotle). This is also an opportunity to offer further evidence of his refined table; the *tetrax* is taken away, to return later, cooked, as a part of the feast.⁶¹ The refined and sophisticated elite of the Roman empire demonstrate their power, classifying, appraising and ultimately consuming the products of the world.

Athenaeus has recently been invoked to paint a seductive picture of Rome as a city of culture around the turn of the second and third centuries. Among his refined interlocutors there is little sign of friction between Greek and Roman. Larensis makes all his guests feel at home in Rome (1.3c). The Roman empire, on this view, ethnically diverse even – or especially – at its heart, may be seen as held together by culture.⁶² But whose culture is this? Larensis, we might pause to remember, does not invite just anyone to dinner. Perhaps we need to keep our distance a little more from the attractions of Larensis' table, to resist what is part of the continuing lure of

⁶⁰ On the relationship of satire to Roman imperialism, see Gowers (1993) 124–6.

⁶¹ This incident is suggestively discussed by Braund (2000). ⁶² Purcell (1994) at 443.

Graeco-Roman culture, that insidious feeling that you only need to read the books to belong – even if, as Woolf emphasizes, such feelings are rarely uncomplicated by doubts about one's own competence as a reader.

COSMOPOLIS – SO WHAT?

As Keith Hopkins' students we learned early the importance of being able to justify our labours and always to have ready an answer, ideally both elegant and plausible, to the implied question *So what?* It is appropriate, then, to end this introduction by asking: What gains are to be had in looking at Rome as a *Cosmopolis*? Do the chapters that follow simply explore and document a trope, a commonplace metaphor of the kind that we might expect to have existed in any world empire? Is *Cosmopolis* merely a conveniently inclusive rubric under which to assemble chapters and authors that in fact testify to the breadth and diversity of Keith's interests and influence?

Cosmopolis is indeed an inclusive rubric, and some such inclusive rubric was indeed a necessity to draw together even an unrepresentative sample of Keith's students.⁶³ It would be disingenuous to deny this. Yet it is perhaps not by chance that in different ways we have all picked up from Keith Hopkins an inclination to look at the bigger pictures, at issues cast on an imperial – if not always cosmic – scale. We make no apologies for this. For us too the *Cosmopolis* of Rome has been a convenient microcosm of empire, a good stage on which to deploy arguments about imperial culture and religion, about the economics and epidemics of the Roman world, about the visual and textual fabric of imperial Roman life (and much else).

And yet there are other justifications for focusing attention on the *Cosmopolitanism* of Rome. Other imperial capitals have resembled Rome, but not all have become epitomes of empire. Many early empires made the body of the emperor, and the rituals that surrounded it, the point at which the cosmos was collapsed into the contingent.⁶⁴ Elements of this strategy are evident in the Roman case too. An early component of Roman court rituals that might take place anywhere would be the receptions given to the ambassadors wherever they managed to track emperors down in their travels around the empire: the account of Wei-liao is justly famous.⁶⁵ An

⁶³ An appropriate point to register how many more would have liked to contribute to this volume had other commitments allowed. The risk of omitting names makes us reluctant to list any.

⁶⁴ No book in honour of Keith would be complete without a reference to China. Here it is Yates (2001).

⁶⁵ Conveniently reproduced in Hopkins (1978b), 181–2. On the principal function of footnotes see Hopkins (1990), 624.

important theme of many of the chapters that follow is the transformation of the Cosmopolis as emperors first appeared on the scene, and then gradually disappeared from it. Constantius' *adventus* has already been discussed. Rituals like this and *osculatio*, combined with a court staffed with eunuchs and bureaucrats, were used by the emperors to gradually convert the image of their power from that of the *civilis princeps*, a first citizen-cum-senior senator, a *privatus* with extraordinary personal rights and privileges, to that of a full-blown itinerant monarchy. Always gods in some parts of the empire, and always able to absent themselves from the capital if they wished, from the mid-second century on it was residence in Rome, rather than absence from it, that became an option. *Senatus consulta* were eclipsed by *edicta*, embassies rarely approached the City, senators ceased to hold the chief military commands or to govern provinces . . . and yet Rome survived, indeed flourished. How? Several chapters try to answer that question. Here we limit ourselves to pointing to the vast investment of symbolic capital in the City from the middle republic on. Edwards and Vout show the way the alien was appropriated and incorporated into the fabric of the City, until it became a permanent mnemonic of empire. Beard offers the spectacle of ritual performances that drew the urban plebs into a pageant of empire. Jongman, Morley and Scheidel explore some of the unintended consequences of empire and how they too contributed to fixing Rome at the centre. Elsner and Woolf focus on the work done by interested groups to refurbish Cosmopolis, to suit *urbs* to *orbis* in times of change. Late antique Rome was no mere relic or fossil of an earlier imperialism. Rome remained the Cosmopolis because the power invested in it was still of use, because its claims to epitomise the empire were still worth defending to groups with the power to do so. Another way of envisaging this is to say that Rome the City was so deeply inscribed in the master texts of empire that it could never safely be erased. New Rome on the Hellespont indicates the power of empires, but the survival of Old Rome on the Tiber shows the limits of that power.⁶⁶

Finally, Rome is our Cosmopolis too. Latinists and Roman historians as well as classical archaeologists of every kind have, from Winckelmann on, passed back and forth through the Eternal City on trajectories that mirror those of ancient senators and sophists. Back in our libraries and lecture halls we summon up images of the *fora* and other monuments just as Cicero did in Cilicia or Ausonius in Bordeaux. This is not (just) a matter of romance. For classical archaeologists the monuments of Rome have proved

⁶⁶ Harris (1999c) collects a rich variety of papers that illustrate this theme.

the essential reference collection in relation to which all imperial art and architecture is to be assessed. Long study visits to the foreign schools and academies play formative roles in the training and subsequent ‘networking’ of classicists from all those countries where the study of ancient Rome is now strong. The long succession of patrons that have ruled from and endowed Rome makes its museums and libraries unavoidable (not that many in the profession make much effort to avoid them). And even for the most literary of scholars the City is so central in Latin literature that it must be imagined if it is not visited and remembered. This is not to say that Romanists must study the City of Rome above all else: indeed several chapters here emphasize the difficulty of understanding the City without the Empire. Rather, we argue, the creation of Rome as Cosmopolis has bound empire and city together into an indissoluble complex. It is that nexus that these chapters set out to explore.