Roman Cities and Roman Power:
The Roman Empire and Hadrian

THE ROMAN EMPIRE was far-flung and disparate during the reign of the emperor Hadrian (A.D. 117–38). With the Mediterranean basin as its heart, it stretched north, south, and east to cover almost three thousand miles, from modern England, the Atlantic, and Germany, up the Nile, and to Syria and Armenia. Although climate, an agricultural economy, and a generalized Greco-Roman culture united most of the Mediterranean littoral, these commonalities did not extend far inland. Difficulties of land transport and communications isolated regions from one another.[1] Each of the forty-some Roman provinces of the time had its own political, ethnic, religious, and cultural histories, in which figured prominently the date and means of its falling under Roman control.[2] Possibly as many as sixty million persons inhabited the Roman empire of Hadrian's day, with only some 20 percent estimated as living above subsistence level. These fortunate few dwelled in the cities scattered along coastlines, rivers, and at land passes, probably more than two thousand in all and most dense in North Africa, Italy, and coastal Asia Minor.[3] Beyond the borders were client-king-

---

[1] C. Starr, *The Roman Empire* (New York, 1982), 3–4. Isolation was the norm even within areas now considered a unit (e.g., Patterson 1987, esp. 138, 144).

[2] The provinces were: Britannia; the two Germaniae (Inferior; Superior); the four Gallic provinces (Belgica, Lugdunensis, Aquitania, Narbonensis); the three Iberian provinces (Tarraconensis, Baetica, Lusitania); the two Mauretaniae (Tingitana, Caesariensis); Africa; Cyrenaica (including Crete); Aegyptus; Arabia; Judaea (called Syria Palaestina by the very end of Hadrian's reign); Cyprus; Syria; Cilicia; Cappadocia; Galatia; Lycia-Pamphylia; Asia; Bithynia-Pontus; Thracia; the two Moesiae (Inferior, Superior); Dacia; Macedonia; Achaea; Dalmatia; Epirus; the two Pannoniae (Inferior, Superior); Noricum; Raetia; the Alpine provinces (Cottiae, Maritimae, and by now perhaps the Alpes Atrectianae et Graiae or Poeninae); Sardinia and Corsica (perhaps separate provinces by this time); and Sicilia.

[3] Most do not distinguish chronologically their estimates of population and number of cities; e.g., G. Charles-Picard, *La Civilisation de l'Afrique romaine* (Paris, 1959), 48, posits more than 200 cities in Africa Proconsularis, with 10 in a ten-km radius of Dougga; Mackie 1983, i, "over 500" in Roman Spain, apparently including non-Roman communities; H. Nissen, *Italische Landeskunde,* Vol. II.1, *Die Städte* (Berlin, 1902), 3, ca. 500 in Roman Italy. Josephus, *BJ* 2.16.4, and Apollonius of Tyana, *Ep.* 58, specify "500 cities" for Asia, and C. Habicht, "New Evidence on the Province of Asia," *JRS* 65 (1975): 67, holds for at least 300; S. Mitchell 1993, I:243, counts 130 for Bithynia-Pontus, Paphlagonia, Galatia and Lycaonia, Phrygia, Mysia, and Lydia. Hopkins 1978, 70, estimates 900 for Africa, Iberia, and Italy, and

doms, tribes allied with Rome, and more hostile tribes and nomads. Yet only some 350 elite officials in Rome, Italy, and the provinces oversaw the imperial government, and perhaps merely 350,000 to 400,000 armed men sufficed to protect the empire from internal and external dangers.[4]

A fundamental question of the Roman empire concerns its cohesion. Rome's immense domain had been acquired, gradually but seemingly inexorably, through constant warfare during the Roman republic. The first emperor, Augustus, and his successors apparently realized that Rome could no longer sustain its sovereignty simply by continued physical violence. Instead, norms of law, religion, politics, economy, community interest, and cultural values consolidated the Roman empire, at least until the second third of the third century.[5] Compliance with these patterns was not uniform or absolute during this lengthy period of the *pax Augusta* (the Augustan peace), in which Hadrian's reign is a kind of midpoint, but armed uprisings were exceptional after a region's initial incorporation into the empire.[6] Rome never neglected its military, and the state retaliated against defiant resistance swiftly and mercilessly. The Third Jewish Revolt of A.D. 132–35, to be discussed in chapter 8, illustrated to all, including Hadrian, the devastating consequences of rejecting Roman norms and taking up arms against the state. Compliance was more practical than coercion, both for Rome and for the provinces. But compliance requires that the subordinate acknowledge, more or less willingly, the norms of the dominant power. The history of the Roman empire is marked by the interplay of persuasion and force in the relationships between Rome, on the one hand, and its cities and provinces, on the other.

The reign of Hadrian offers a particularly good opportunity to assess this interaction, particularly as it was played out at the level of Rome's cities.

---

in his *Conquerors and Slaves* (Cambridge, Eng., 1978), 68–69, estimates that 32 percent of the six million inhabitants of Italy were urban residents, ca. one million in Rome. For the relatively small population of most Roman cities (2,000–10,000), see chapter 6 of Duncan-Jones 1982. G. Sjoberg, *The Preindustrial City* (Glencoe, IL, 1960), 83, holds that in preindustrial societies about 90 percent of the total population must work on the land.

[4] Levick 1985, 1; cf. Garnsey and Saller 1987, 21–26. There may have been as few as 150 Roman elite officials, one for every 350,000–400,000 subjects (Hopkins 1980, 121). By "elite officials" I mean senatorial governors, legionary legates, equestrian procurators, and the like, but not the Roman senate in session in Rome or the more than five hundred equestrian officers serving in the provincial armies and the Roman garrison. Birley 1981, 39–43, holds for more than 400,000 men in Rome's armed forces at this time, about 100,000 more than generally assumed.

[5] Whittaker 1997, 144, points to Augustus's complete refashionings of the army and the city as the "instruments of power to realize . . . imperial ideology."

[6] S. L. Dyson, "Native Revolt Patterns in the Roman Empire," *ANRW* II.3 (1975): 138–75; Whittaker 1997, 155–56.

The ancient writers celebrate Hadrian for his liberality to cities, but as a rule they speak imprecisely. Cassius Dio, Hadrian's biographer, Pausanias, Fronto, and others give pride of place to Hadrian's building projects, in part because these were the most lasting and tangible form of imperial benefaction. They also note engineering projects such as the dredging of harbors, financial measures such as the temporary or permanent remission of taxes, and social changes such as the establishment of games in a city.[7] Inscriptions,[8] and to a lesser extent coins,[9] furnish more detail and more instances of Hadrian's interactions with cities, and supplementary information comes from documentary papyri and recondite treatises such as those of the Roman land surveyors. The available evidence shows that more than 130 cities were affected by the personal attention of Hadrian, a number that helps quantify the ancient acclaim for his civic munificence.

Despite ancient and modern agreement that Hadrian fostered cities throughout the empire to an extent rarely matched in Roman history, so far there has been no analysis of the grounds and meaning of this commonplace. Scholars have examined various facets of his civic work; for example, F. Grelle, J. Gascou, and M. Zahrnt have focused on Hadrian's changes of municipal status, and H. Jouffroy and S. Mitchell cover his public building in North Africa and Italy, and in the eastern provinces, respectively.[10] I have investigated Hadrian's activity that influenced life in the

[7] E.g., Cass. Dio 69.5.2–3: Hadrian aided allied and subject cities most munificently, and he saw more cities than any other, assisting almost all of them variously with water supply, harbors, food, public works, money and various honors; *HA, Hadr.* 19.2, 20.5: Hadrian built something and gave games in almost every city, and he donated aqueducts "without end" in his own name; *HA, Hadr.* 9.6: Hadrian went to Campania and aided all the towns there by his benefactions and distributions (*beneficia, largitiones*); Pausanias 1.5.5: Hadrian built, restored, and embellished temples, and gave gifts to both Greek and foreign (barbarian) cities; Fronto, *Princ. Hist.* 11, p. 209 VDH (see chapter 2, n. 41): one can see monuments of Hadrian's journeys in many cities in Asia and Europe; *Epit. de Caes.* 14.4–5: Hadrian restored entire cities as he journeyed with a corps of builders and artisans; *Orac. Sibyll.* 12.166–68: Hadrian gave temples everywhere. These passages reappear in my text.

[8] In Oliver, about a fourth of the ca. 160 imperial addresses to magistrates or citizens of particular cities, from the reign of Augustus to A.D. 265, originate with Hadrian during his twenty-one-year reign. This is proportionally more than for any other emperor, even accounting for the "epigraphic habit" that contributed to an overall rise of inscriptions from the late Republic to the early third century (cf. MacMullen 1982).

[9] Coins struck in Rome commemorate Hadrian generally as the "restitutor" of entire provinces and regions: e.g., Toynbee 1934, 5, and passim.

[10] For changes of civic status, see chapter 3; for Hadrian's public building, chapters 6 and 7, and Blake, Bishop, and Bishop 1973. D'Orgeval 1950, 222–30, provides lists of cities whose juridical standing, name, title, or the like Hadrian changed, but these are not accurate enough to be useful. The topic of Hadrian's civic work occurs frequently in scholarship on quite different subjects: e.g., Isaac 1992, 352–59, investigates Hadrian's "urbanization" in his discussion of imperial attention to the military, though taking a minimalist view of Hadrian's municipal activity.

capital city of Rome.[11] But no one has attempted to compile and interpret all of Hadrian's different interactions with cities throughout the Roman empire. This I now aim to do, because I see Hadrian's personal involvement in Roman cities as intrinsic to the continuance of the Roman empire itself. Even though our evidence tends to report only successful pleas, the collected data let us see that Hadrian's municipal activity was predominantly positive. His benefactions, and their fame, decidedly helped to persuade Rome's provincials to cooperate with the ruling power.

As F. Millar and others have eloquently argued, the roles played by the Roman emperor were essential to the empire. Regardless of the particular merits or faults characterizing any one occupant of the throne, the emperor was the *pater patriae* (the father of the fatherland), ultimately deemed personally responsible for the welfare of each inhabitant.[12] This "beneficial ideology," in the words of V. Nutton,[13] was demonstrated daily, in many different guises, throughout the Roman world. Coins carried the imperial image encircled by legends broadcasting the imperial virtues.[14] Statues, reliefs, and paintings of the emperor and his family embellished temples and other public buildings and spaces, as well as private houses.[15] General oaths were sworn on the ruling emperor's "genius" (procreative spirit) as well as by earlier deified emperors, and at an emperor's accession, citizens of cities swore to protect his safety forever (e.g., *ILS* 190, *OGIS* 532).[16] Public processions, sacrifices, and games involving the imperial cult periodically enlivened municipal life.[17] But these and other symbolic representations of beneficent imperial power could remain forceful only with some factual basis. Something more than symbols was required to induce, generation after generation, those swearing to uphold the Roman emperor and empire actually to contribute energy and property to this cause.

[11] Boatwright 1987.

[12] Millar 1977, 363–463, with postscript of 1992 reprint (636–52). Cotton 1984, 265–66, dates to the principate of Trajan an important shift in the concept of the emperor. She holds that under Trajan the concept of the emperor as a *parens,* a parent whose indulgence could be begged for but was not automatically merited, supplanted the "image of the *princeps civilis,* the *princeps* as a fellow-citizen, a fellow-senator, an equal, a friend-*amicus.*"

[13] Nutton 1978, 209.

[14] See Wallace-Hadrill 1986 on the nature of the persuasive language of imperial coinage; cf. T. Hölscher, *Staatsdenkmal und Publicum. Vom Untergang der Republik bis zur Festigung des Kaisertums in Rome. Xenia* (Constance, 1984).

[15] For one example of the vastly varying imagery and ideology of such images, see R. R. R. Smith, "The Imperial Reliefs from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias," *JRS* 77 (1987): 88–138. Fronto remarks on the ubiquity of images of Marcus Aurelius when he was still only a "caesar" in Antoninus Pius's house (*Ad M. Caes.* 4.12 [VDH p. 67]). The passage, *HA, Marc.* 18.5–6, notes that an image of Marcus Aurelius was expected in every house that could afford it, located even with the household gods. See Hannestad 1986, 222.

[16] See also the sources collected in Levick 1985, 116–36.

[17] Fishwick 1987–92, II.1:475–590; Price 1984b, 101–32; and chapter 5 of this volume.

Positive reinforcement came through personal appearances of the emperor and, more lastingly, through manifest imperial favor.[18] At times this largesse graced an individual, as can be seen in the numerous inscriptions marking personal commendation by the emperor: for instance, M. Fabius Paulinus, honored by a dedication from his fellow townsmen in Ilerda (modern Lérida in northeast Spain), was "raised to equestrian status by Hadrian" (*CIL* II 4269). Such individualized attention was instrumental to the system of personal patronage underlying the social structure of the Roman empire.[19] It was one way Hadrian and other emperors encouraged the provincial elite to assume liturgies (public duties involving expense and usually personal service) and to contribute to their cities and Rome.[20]

Again the sources primarily document favorable attention: Hadrian is even said to have dropped earlier animosities upon assuming the throne, content simply to ignore his erstwhile enemies (*HA, Hadr.* 17.1). But we also hear, for example, that "in the case of some who clashed with him Hadrian thought it sufficient to write to their native cities the bare statement that they did not please him" (Cass. Dio 69.23.2). In a similar but more personalized instance, the sophist Favorinus gave in to Hadrian in a dispute about grammar, despite being in the right, because, as he said to friends, he was unwilling not to yield to the commander of thirty legions (*HA, Hadr.* 15.13, cf. Philostr. *VS* 489). The ostensibly nonchalant remark expresses well the tension between persuasion and force that was inherent in all exchanges with the emperor.

Rather than focusing on Hadrian's dealings with select individuals, however, I investigate benefactions affecting whole cities, for these interactions should be understood as systemic. Their existence and repetition reveal that imperial patronage was intrinsic to the endurance of the empire.[21] Although Hadrian's benefaction to a city was typically mediated or "bro-

[18] For Hadrian's trips, see Halfmann 1986; Syme 1988; T. D. Barnes, *JRA* 2 (1989): 247–61; and J.-L. Mourgues, *JRS* 80 (1990): 219–22. Aelius Aristides claims that in order to secure loyalty, the emperor has no need to tour the empire or visit individual peoples; he can simply use correspondence from Rome (*On Rome* 33). Birley 1997, 303n. 10, 357, reads Aristides' words as criticism of Hadrian, contra Oliver 1953, 919. We see below and in chapter 2 the significance of displayed imperial missives, and Swain 1996, 278, notes the importance to Aristides of "the emperor's epistolary support" in his long struggle for immunity and status.

[19] See Saller 1982; Veyne 1990; Millar 1983, esp. 77–78.

[20] The emperor's effects on the municipal elite, and the lives and ambitions of these provincial notables, have begun to be explored in fascinating detail for various cities of this era, such as Sparta (see Cartledge and Spawforth 1989), Ephesus (Rogers 1991), and Oenanda (Wörrle 1988). See also A. R. Birley, "Hadrian and Greek Senators," *ZPE* 116 (1997): 209–45.

[21] I do not, however, subscribe to the view expressed most notably by A. H. M. Jones in his numerous works on Greek cities, that cities simply served their Roman overlords. Wallace-Hadrill 1989, 4–6, remarks on the importance of assessing patronage in the ancient world as part of the "state" rather than as merely individual relationships.

kered" by a member or members of the municipal elite, as documented in various cases treated in this book, the city benefited as a whole, celebrated the benefaction as a whole, and was reaffirmed as a whole. Roman cities were much more than built-up and densely populated areas. They were always considered individual peoples, a fact reflected in their proper nomenclature as ethnic plurals rather than as place names. They combined an urban agglomeration of buildings and services, including administrative and governmental ones, with the land (*territorium* or *chora*) furnishing the basic livelihood for inhabitants of "city" and "countryside" alike.[22]

The obligations cities undertook for the Roman emperor and state were heavy ones, especially the collection of taxes and census registration. Tasks less onerous, because imposed more sporadically, included recruitment of armed men, supply of animals for transport, provision of hospitality and transportation for travelers on official business, and shelter, equipment, and supplies for journeying soldiers and the army. Such duties to the central Roman government were offset by a high degree of local autonomy. Individual cities were left to themselves, as a general rule, to oversee their own public buildings and cults, the maintenance of their water supply and baths, local law and order, and embassies to Roman officials, including the emperor.[23] They were also free to negotiate other relationships, with different cities in the area or farther afield (as we see especially in chapter 5), and with powerful individuals who were not serving officially at the time (as indicated in chapters 3 and 4). Despite isolating barriers of travel, transportation, and communications, albeit less severe during the second cen-

[22] Reynolds 1988, 15: e.g., *Carthaginienses* rather than *Carthago* refers to the city we know of as Carthage. Note the order of elements that constitute a city for Pausanias (10.4.1): "if one can give the name of a city (*polis*) to those [the city of Panopeus, in Phocis] who possess no government offices, no gymnasium, no theatre, no market-place, no water descending to a fountain, but live in bare shelters just like mountain cabins, right on a ravine. Nevertheless, they have boundaries with their neighbours, and even send delegates to the Phocian assembly" (trans. W. H. S. Jones, *Pausanias: Description of Greece,* Loeb edition, vol. IV [London, 1965], p. 383). For the economy of Roman cities, which were not simply "consumers," see Hopkins 1978 and, e.g., J. Nollé, "Pamphylische Studien 6–10," *Chiron* 17 (1987): 254–64 (focusing on third-century Pamphylian Side and Perge). In the early third century Ulpian characterized living in a Roman city as enjoying its functions as a place of economic and judicial transactions, and its offerings of public baths, attendance at shows, and participation in religious festivals (*Dig.* 50.1.27.1). Hadrian's benefactions encompassed all these urban amenities.

[23] Garnsey and Saller 1987, 32–34; with more detail from inscriptions, Reynolds 1988, 28–39. For tax collection and census registration, Brunt 1981, 163–66; transport, S. Mitchell, "Requisitioned Transport in the Roman Empire: A New Inscription from Pisidia," *JRS* 66 (1976): 106–31; recruitment, Brunt 1974b, C. P. Jones, "The Levy at Thespiae under Marcus Aurelius," *GRBS* 12 (1971): 45–48, and B. Isaac, "Military Diplomata and Extraordinary Levies for Campaigns," in *Heer und Integrationspolitik: Die römischen Militärdiplome als historische Quelle,* ed. W. Eck and H. Wolff, Passauer historische Forschungen 2 (Cologne, 1986), 258–64.

tury of the empire than at other times in ancient history, Roman cities had intricate networks of relationships. In each case the relationship was reciprocal. But rarely, if ever, were the strengths of the involved parties equal, and constant negotiation was needed to manage these relationships advantageously for both sides.

Such negotiation was undertaken for cities by their leading citizens. In addition to making political decisions, a town's magistrates and council were responsible for the fulfillment of that town's duties: they would personally have to make good shortfalls of taxes, for example. Spotty evidence indicates that from the end of the first century A.D., some cities experienced the reluctance, or incapacity, of individuals to take on municipal posts. From this, P. Garnsey, S. Mitchell, and others have argued for a progressive and marked decline of the "urban aristocracy," holding that as early as the beginning of the second century there was a diminution of the voluntary participatory character of the Roman empire as it had evolved since Augustus took power.[24]

The necessary corollary of this averred trend would be ever greater imperial control and interference as Rome extracted from cities what it needed to provision the armies, to maintain the court, to sustain games, distributions, and construction at Rome and elsewhere, and to ensure other functions deemed essential. Drawing in part on the correspondence between Trajan and Pliny the Younger, whom Hadrian's predecessor appointed as *legatus Augusti* (delegate of the emperor) to oversee the disorderly province of Bithynia-Pontus around 111,[25] some scholars have argued that the central government began to encroach on cities' autonomy by the beginning of the second century A.D.[26] Yet the domineering and rapacious Roman governors, soldiers, and officials, so unforgettably depicted in late inscriptions, legal codes, and literature, are rhetorically exaggerated even for the third and fourth centuries, and cannot be sustained generally for the second.[27]

Although recent research has shown that in Achaea, for example, there were fewer cities in the Roman imperial period than in preceding centuries,[28] on the

[24] Garnsey 1974, 232–38; S. Mitchell 1984, 124–25 (based esp. on Dio of Prusa). Jacques 1984, ix–xvii, discusses earlier expressions of this theory. See also chapter 3, n. 43 in my volume.

[25] His exact title was *legatus Augusti pro praetore consulari potestate* (delegate of the emperor with the rank of propraetor, but with consular powers). For title and date, see lines 2 and 3 of Smallwood, #230 (= *ILS* 2927), and W. Eck, "Jahres- und Provinzialfasten der senatorischen Statthalter von 69/70 bis 138/139," *Chiron* 12 (1982): 349.

[26] See, e.g., Pliny *Ep.* 10.23–24: cities needed permission from Rome to erect new buildings; *Ep.* 10.47–48: emperors could and did override a city's right to handle its own affairs. Reynolds 1988, 41–46, discusses these and similar passages; cf. Garnsey and Saller 1987, 34–40.

[27] Jacques 1984, xii–xiv. I argue in chapter 4 that Hadrian's *curatores rei publicae* (city overseers) were usually local men, not strangers imposed on the city from outside.

[28] Alcock 1993.

whole their leading citizens apparently evinced little or no reluctance to assume municipal responsibilities through most of the second century. In the second-century empire some famous men, such as Favorinus, Aelius Aristides, and Dio of Prusa, squirmed to get out of their public service[29]—who among us pays our taxes gladly?—but through that century enough others were honored to serve their cities that Rome and its provinces continued to flourish. Despite both the positivistic nature of most extant evidence and the painful awareness of Rome's abusive potential that Favorinus and some others express,[30] indications of functionally negative relations between Rome and the provincial cities begin to accumulate only toward the end of the second century.[31]

Indeed, R. Duncan-Jones has recently used building inscriptions to argue that the reigns of Hadrian and his successor, Antoninus Pius, generally witnessed a surge of construction in cities of the Roman empire.[32] He attributes this rise to the effects of Hadrian's policies, which demonstrate "concern for the fiscal and economic well-being of the empire, as well as exceptional involvement by the emperor in local affairs."[33] Noting some of Hadrian's activity I discuss in chapters 5 and 6, Duncan-Jones highlights Hadrian's general remission of unpaid taxes, worth 900 million sesterces, early in his reign.[34] Not only was this the largest tax remission up to

[29] See esp. Millar 1983 for an illuminating collection of petitions for immunities.

[30] For example, Plutarch counsels a young man entering local politics to remember always "the boots of the Roman governor poised above his head" (*Mor.* 813). See also Apul. *Met.* 4.9, Aristides *Or.* 50; cf. P. Desideri, "La vita politica cittadina nell'Impero: Lettura dei *praecepta gerendae rei publicae* e dell'*an seni res publica gerenda sit,*" *Athenaeum* 64 (1986): 371–81; F. Millar, "The World of the Golden Ass," *JRS* 71 (1981): 63–75; more generally, Swain 1996.

[31] See chapter 3, n. 43. Reynolds 1988, 51, holds for the vitality of Roman cities to at least A.D. 200. Duncan-Jones 1990, 159–73, esp. 170, argues that "the lack of direct indications of strain in the municipal system" in first-century legal rulings, inscriptions, and papyri should not be overemphasized, since these sources have much greater frequency and detail beginning in the second century. Polemo, for example, was not at all reluctant to take on "the expensive honors that came with his social position" (Gleason 1995, 23–24).

[32] Although he examines only Syria, Italy, Spain, Lepcis, Sabratha, and Thugga (Duncan-Jones 1990, 59–67). Working from the figures of Jouffroy (1986) for Africa, F. Jacques, "L'Urbanisme en Italie et en Afrique romaines," *JRA* 2 (1989): 242–44, sees a steady rise of public building after Trajan, with its apogee from A.D. 160 to 218.

[33] Duncan-Jones 1990, 66. Yet nothing points to a conscious policy on Hadrian's part materially to improve whole cities or provinces. Pausanias's remark that the Megarians were so cursed for an ancient misdeed that they were the only Greeks not even Hadrian could make more prosperous (1.36.3; Loeb translation) suggests to me the casual nature of the emperor's benevolence. See also Halfmann 1986, 191, and Alcock 1993, 160.

[34] Duncan-Jones 1990, 66–67: the rulings affecting money-changing at Pergamum, sale of olive oil in Athens, and land drainage at Coronea. He also mentions the *lex Hadriana de ruderibus agris,* which encouraged cultivation of unused or virgin land and the growing of vines and olives (*FIRA* 1.102, *AE* 1958, 9), Hadrian's reduction of the payment demanded from mine operators starting new concessions in government-owned mines (Smallwood, #439), and Hadrian's building, visits, and holding of local magistracies.

Hadrian's time, but the general amnesty was to last for fifteen years (*ILS* 309 = *CIL* VI 967, cf. Cass. Dio 69.8.1[2] and 71.32.2, and *BMC, Emp.* III, p. 417, #1207).[35] Local spending apparently rose as a result of actual money freed up and a concomitant change in economic outlook.[36] The increased expenditure on buildings by individuals and by towns (collectively) marks both the general prosperity of the era and its emphasis on urban amenities.

How much of these phenomena can we attribute to Hadrian himself and how much to larger political and social tendencies, such as competition between families, individuals, and even cities?[37] Hadrian was famous for his complex and self-contradictory personality (e.g., *HA, Hadr.* 14.11, *Epit. de Caes.* 14.6). His biography and Cassius Dio, the two most substantial literary sources, stress his competitiveness, his restlessness, and his brilliance (*HA, Hadr.* 20.7, 23.1; Cass. Dio 69.3.2–3). He had wide interests and insatiable curiosity (Tert. *Apol.* 5.7; *HA, Hadr.* 14.8–10, 15.10–16.11; Cass. Dio 69.3.1, 69.5.1, 69.11.3). Unpleasant when coupled with his pedantic insistence on being the only one hailed as correct (as when he had to best Favorinus, other sophists, or the scholars of Alexandria's Museum),[38] such intellectual qualities impelled him to climb Syrian Mt. Casius to see the sun rise, to travel up the Nile, and to devour local lore while traveling outside Italy for more than half of his twenty-one-year reign (*HA, Hadr.* 14.3, 17.8; Cass. Dio 69.9.1–2). Hadrian was indulgent with friends and acquaintances and met new people easily, although his intense competitiveness made him solitary (*HA, Hadr.* 15.1–2, 22.4; Cass. Dio 69.5.1–2, 69.6.2–3, 69.7.1–4, 69.17.3–18.1). Letters and speeches remaining from Hadrian's prolific output (see chapter 2) substantiate the literary sources' depiction of a man doggedly thorough in law and governance, meticulous in detail and thought, sensitive to difference, and as attuned to the common man as to the upper classes (*HA, Hadr.* 17.5–7, 21.1–3, 22.1; Cass Dio 69.6.2–3, 69.16.3).

The ideology of the Roman empire held that good emperors manifest magnanimity by public building in Rome, Italy, and the provinces, and no Roman emperor was oblivious of the importance of cities for the empire (cf. Dio Chrys. *Or.* 47.13). Moreover, each new emperor had to outdo his

[35] Duncan-Jones 1990, 66, where he also notes Hadrian's drastic reduction of taxes on crown land in Egypt and his postponement of money taxes near the end of his reign (Smallwood, ##460, 462), and his ruling that tax-farmers should not be forced to renew contracts against their will (*Dig.* 49.14.6, cf. Cass. Dio 69.16.2).

[36] Both the cited inscription, from 118, and the pertinent passage of the biography (*HA, Hadr.* 7.6) note increased "security" as an effect of the remission.

[37] Duncan-Jones 1990, 59–60, 170–71, cautiously addresses this key question, citing these three factors. I discuss competition between cities in the conclusion to chapter 5.

[38] *HA, Hadr.* 14.8–9, 15.10–13, 16.1–11, 20.2; Cass. Dio 69.3.1–4, 69.3.6; Syme 1965, 243–49, and n. 48 below.

predecessors in some way.[39] Although the pattern was thus set for Hadrian's benefactions with cities, he seems to have gone further than required. Hadrian's immediate predecessor, Trajan, had contributed lavishly to building in Rome and more modestly to public works elsewhere. In both spheres Hadrian surpassed him in quantity, and the predominantly religious, rather than utilitarian, aspect of Hadrian's imperial work further contrasted with Trajan's.[40] Antoninus Pius's building activity consisted largely of roadwork, some restoration, and completion of works begun or promised by Hadrian (for example, the aqueduct at Athens, discussed in chapter 7):[41] in sum, much less than what is recorded for Hadrian and evincing much less initiative and imagination.

Indeed, no Roman emperor devoted as much personal attention to cities throughout the empire as did Hadrian, except perhaps Augustus himself.[42] Yet the situations in which these two emperors undertook their activity differed greatly. Augustus had to restore urban structures and encourage order after cataclysmic warfare in extensive areas, including Italy and much of the Greek East.[43] Elsewhere, as in North Africa, Spain, and parts of Gaul, he had to establish civic organs with which Rome could cooperate.[44] In contrast, Hadrian came to the throne of an empire already urbanized, many of whose cities now possessed more or less uniform administrations. Thanks to better communications made possible by the *pax Augusta* (the imperial peace), the empire of Hadrian's day was relatively familiar with the mores, laws, language, and material culture of Rome itself. Hadrian's avoidance of war and his decisive withdrawal from the untenable borders established by Trajan allowed him to direct Rome's resources toward munificence.[45] The evidence for Hadrian's personality, as biased as some of it may be, indicates that the number and variety of Hadrian's benefactions were due to Hadrian himself, their geographical spread was intentional, and their nuances were deliberate.

[39] See Millar 1977, 420–34, and Kloft 1970; for the concept of surpassing one's predecessors, e.g., J. Elsner, "Constructing Decadence: The Representation of Nero as Imperial Builder," in *Reflections of Nero: Culture, History, and Representation,* ed. J. Elsner and J. Masters (Chapel Hill, NC, 1994), 112–27.

[40] E.g., Garzetti 1974, 329–39, noting especially Trajan's attention to roads and harbors; J. Bennett, *Trajan, Optimus Princeps* (Bloomington, IN, 1997), 138–60. Syme 1965, 244, points to Hadrian's particular sensitivity to his contrast to Trajan.

[41] Garzetti 1974, 451–53.

[42] S. Mitchell 1987, 333–36, discusses the history and significance of a ruler's public or sacred buildings for the benefit of his community, beginning in the Hellenistic period and citing the main literary references for Roman emperors.

[43] Keppie 1983, 114–22; cf. E. Gabba, "Urbanizzazione e rinnovamenti urbanistici nell'Italia centro-meridionale del I sec. a.C.," *StudClassOr* 21 (1972): 73–112; F. C. Bourne, *The Public Works of the Julio-Claudians and Flavians* (Princeton, NJ, 1946), 16–20.

[44] Gros and Torelli 1992, 237–42.

[45] See, e.g., *HA, Hadr.* 5.1–2, Cass. Dio 69.5; Garzetti 1974, 381–82.

As we see throughout this book, the actual interaction between Hadrian and many cities was associated with a renewal, preservation, or promotion of the unique history of that place. Again, it cannot be determined conclusively how much of this effect was due to Hadrian and how much to larger trends. Hadrian was famed for almost perversely archaistic predilections (e.g., *HA, Hadr.* 16.5–6; see chapter 6 on tombs). Yet many cities at this same time were also fascinated with their most remote past, displaying their heroic founders and venerable traditions in sculpture and architecture throughout the Greek East.[46] The privileging of the past, evinced by Hadrian and by cities from the end of the first through the second centuries A.D., is also conspicuous in the contemporaneous literary and cultural movement known as the Second Sophistic.[47] Many of the most famous exponents of the Second Sophistic, such as Favorinus, Polemo of Smyrna, Aelius Aristides, and Herodes Atticus, are connected with Hadrian in some way, and appear in my text. But we cannot attribute solely or even chiefly to Hadrian the cultural influence they and other such stars exerted. Indeed, given the rocky relations that Cassius Dio and others depict between emperor and sophists, we might expect the reverse.[48]

But here we are decidedly turning to the wrong set of questions; more important, and more appreciable in the data I have assembled, is the tenor of the past that Hadrian's municipal benefactions evoked. This "past" was inseparable from Hadrian and contemporary Roman might. S. Walker and A. J. Spawforth have brilliantly demonstrated, for instance, how closely tied to Hadrian himself was the Panhellenion, his re-creation of Athens's pre-eminence in the Greek world.[49] In Athens and many other cities, Hadrian's appreciation of local history and his interest in the recondite may have helped define the form his imperial largesse took as the restoration of a monument, the support of a festival, or something else that recalled the city's past. Regardless of its configuration, by his benefaction Hadrian effectively appropiated that past into the ongoing history of the Roman empire.[50]

My evidence for this process allows us to assess in a more nuanced way the topic of Romanization. The term *Romanization* traditionally has been used to describe assimilation by provincials, especially provincial elites, of Roman culture in all its variety, from materials and art forms to personal

[46] See Curty 1995, 254–63, and Scheer 1993 on legendary founders; and, for an example of this trend's architectural and sculptural expression, M. T. Boatwright, "The City Gate of Plancia Magna in Perge," in *Roman Art in Context: An Anthology,* ed. E. D'Ambra (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1993), 189–207.

[47] E.g., Anderson 1993, Andrei 1984, and earlier fundamental works, such as Bowersock 1969, and Bowie 1982.

[48] See Bowersock 1969, 50–53; Gleason 1995, 146–47.

[49] Spawforth and Walker 1985 and 1986. I discuss the Panhellenion in chapter 7.

[50] Cf. M. Bloch, "The Past and the Present in the Present," *Man* 12 (1977): 278–92, and A. Appadurai, "The Past as a Scarce Resource," *Man* 16 (1981): 201–19.

nomenclature and Roman law. Recent work has emphasized, however, that acculturation during the Empire was not simply a transferral of Roman culture to the "uncultured" non-Romans the empire encompassed. Rather, the interaction of Romans and provincials provided a stimulus for continual modification of dominant and subordinate cultures alike.[51] This give-and-take is manifested most clearly in Rome's interactions with the provinces in which Greek was the primary language, many of which were around the Aegean Sea, and long before Hadrian's era Rome's elite and not-so-elite had embraced Greek learning and cultural achievements.[52] Hadrian himself was derided as a "Graeculus," a little Greekling (*HA, Hadr.* 1.5, *Epit. de Caes.* 14.2), because of his deep and abiding interest in Greek literature, history, and learning. But in the Latin West as well as the Greek East Hadrian's work manifested his attentiveness to cities' particular traditions, as when he assumed a city's highest magistracy in absentia, or restored or completed temples begun long before the Romans' arrival.

Through his constant municipal activity, and particularly through his boons affecting religion, Hadrian ensured that the beneficent image of the Roman emperor was inextricably woven into the patterns of daily life in cities of the Roman world. Valorization of urban life and acknowledgment of the emperor's supremacy are the most universal markers of what it meant to be Roman during the Empire, not temples to Jupiter Optimus Maximus, amphitheaters, the use of Latin, or even the diffusion of Roman citizenship.[53] Just as important as reinforcing a basis for cohesion of the immense Roman world, however, Hadrian's benefactions encouraged civic munificence, including the assumption of obligatory civic duties (now often termed liturgies), on the part of the municipal elites. His travels, ceaseless correspondence, and reception of embassies, often even his largesse itself, were mediated by cities' grandees, whose social and political standing was concomitantly advanced by their association with the emperor.

Hadrian's general laws affecting cities seem to have promoted civic pride. He introduced a *senatus consultum* that confirmed legacies could be left to any city in the empire (Ulp. *Reg.* 24.28).[54] He prohibited demolition of houses for the purpose of transferring their materials to another city (*HA,*

---

[51] See, e.g., the review article by Freeman 1993; Millett 1990; and Mattingly 1997. I avoid the older "Romanization" model, which has often been used, for example, in interpretations of Hadrian's changes of city status (see the end of chapter 3).

[52] See, e.g., Wallace-Hadrill 1988.

[53] Cf. Sherwin-White's discussion of "status Romanus" in the third and fourth centuries (1973, 451–60). As is clear in my discussion of city statuses in chapter 3, I feel less strongly than he about the importance of Roman citizenship in the second century.

[54] Johnston 1985: this followed a constitution of Nerva. The *SC Apronianum*, allowing cities throughout the empire to sue for *fideicommissa hereditatis* (*Dig.* 36.1.27), may date to Hadrian's reign (Talbert 1984, 446, #95).

Hadr. 18.2), evincing general concern for the physical appearance of cities.[55] He issued an edict (*CodJ* 10.40.7), according to which local citizenship was created by *origo* (normally descent from a male citizen of a town, e.g., *CodJ* 10.39.3), manumission by a citizen of the town, adlection, or adoption; status of *incolae* arose from the establishment of *domicilium* (place of residence) in a city (cf. Ulp. 1.2 ad ed., *Dig.* 50.1.1pr.).[56] Hadrian thus reaffirmed individuals' legal ties to towns, as he did when promoting a man to citizenship in a second town (chapter 4). Hadrian also gave legal privileges to decurions, which served to reward these town councillors for their service (*Dig.* 48.19.15).[57] Although he cannot be proved responsible for distinguishing Latin rights into "greater" and "lesser" Latin rights (*Latium maius* and *Latium minus,* with "greater Latin rights" awarding Roman citizenship to town decurions as well as magistrates),[58] his laws concerning legacies to cities and decurions' privileges may have boosted local benefactions by members of municipal elites.[59] The laws simultaneously increased the prestige of those who undertook municipal service and made it easier to benefit one's town materially. They facilitated the nexus of public service and public acclaim (often called "euergetism") that was characteristic of the Roman empire and essential to the health of cities and empire alike.[60]

Much more frequent and impressive than Hadrian's laws affecting all cities, however, were his direct interactions with individual cities outside of Rome: during Hadrian's twenty-one-year reign more than 130 cities received, in all, more than 210 marks of his favor. This book is the examination of those imperial interactions, divided according to general topics. As I show in chapter 2, the presentation of my evidence and methods, my ap-

[55] This notice fits with other laws against demolishing buildings, such as the *SC Acilianum* of 122 (*Dig.* 30.1.41, 43; cf. *Dig.* 18.1.52). See Lewis 1989; Boatwright 1987, 23–24; Murga 1976. Hadrian reveals similar aesthetic concerns in Coronea and other cities discussed below.

[56] Cf. Millar 1983, 80; cf. Nörr 1965.

[57] *Divus Hadrianus eos, qui in numero decurionum essent, capite punire prohibuit . . . verum poena legis Corneliae puniendos mandatis plenissime cautum est* (the deified Hadrian prohibited capital punishment of those who were decurions . . . but it was amply warned through mandates that they should be punished by the liabilities of the Lex Cornelia [by being deported]). See Garnsey 1970, 153–62.

[58] Cf. *CIL* VIII 14763 = *ILS* 6781; Gai. *Inst.* 1.96. *Latium minus* refers to the situation in which only magistrates receive Roman citizenship. Sherwin-White 1973, 255–56, 262–63, 414, and chapter 3, nn. 7 and 46 in this text. For the uncertain date and attribution of *Latium maius* and *minus:* Zahrnt 1989b, 179–80; Galsterer 1988a, 86; Langhammer 1973, 19–20.

[59] Johnston 1985, 110–12.

[60] The phenomenon is explored in depth in Veyne's masterful *Le Pain et le cirque* (see Veyne 1990), and by Gauthier 1985 (though for the Hellenistic period). I return to it in the following chapters.

proach has been largely determined by my sources. Romans celebrated Hadrian's municipal benefactions, whatever their guise, with the same words: *beneficium, indulgentia, euergesia,* and the like. Such undifferentiated terminology has persuaded me to examine comprehensively Hadrian's activities with cities outside Rome, rather than to concentrate exclusively on building donations or some other particular type of benefaction.

Chapter 3 addresses one of the most frequent forms of Hadrian's personal dealings with cities, at least in the Latin West: his changes of civic status. In my investigation I discuss the functions and political life of cities in Italy and the provinces during the empire, the roles of the municipal elite, and the interactions of cities and the central power in Rome. The chapter thus delineates, albeit along broad lines, life in cities throughout Hadrian's empire. In chapter 4 I discuss other local administrative and economic changes Hadrian brought about in various cities by, for example, holding a local magistracy in absentia, appointing a *curator aedium sacrarum* (supervisor of sacred buildings) or a *curator rei publicae* (supervisor of a city) to oversee a town's sacred buildings or finances, redistributing land, or adding to citizen lists or town councils. Chapter 5 complements chapter 4 by presenting the evidence for Hadrian's alterations of a city's status vis-à-vis its surrounding region or Rome itself. The material includes Hadrian's modifications of a city's territory, his determination of a city's taxes, revenues, or grain supplies, his promotion or ratification of festivals in a city, and his grants of various civic titles not marking a change of city status.

In chapter 6 I turn to Hadrian's construction or reconstruction of buildings and his engineering projects in various cities. Since my research points to almost one hundred Hadrianic structures in all, in this chapter I discuss only outstanding examples of the various types of construction he supported. In chapter 7 I examine three cities as case studies: Athens, Smyrna, and Italica. These are chosen for the wealth and detail of the data attesting the buildings and other benefactions they received from Hadrian, and their discussion allows me to address issues of planning, material, and technique. In chapter 8 I treat Antinoopolis, Colonia Aelia Capitolina, and other cities Hadrian created completely or largely *ex novo*. These provide the best opportunity to evaluate questions of urbanization and Romanization. The concluding chapter, chapter 9, brings together the rich evidence for Hadrian's personal interactions with cities throughout the empire, discussing the material chronologically and geographically, and emphasizing its significance for the Roman empire.

The title of my book reflects my ultimate aim, to illuminate the Roman empire of Hadrian's day rather than to focus on Hadrian himself. Hadrian provides the prism for my endeavor, thanks to the frequency, variety, and geographical spread of his municipal activity. His prominence in both title

and book, moreover, indicates the difficulty of establishing the relative weights to assign to structure and agency in historical inquiries. Although Rome's structural realities were already in place—its ideology, mentalités, economy, geography, and the like—Hadrian maximized their potential. The evidence I have collected and assessed compels me to believe that Hadrian had a profound effect on the Roman empire, and particularly on its achievements of the second century: consensus, general internal peace, and expansion of urban amenities. Even if these benefited at most 20 percent of the population under Rome's sway, the proportion is greater than in any other preindustrial society. Those benefiting from Rome had a chance at values generally esteemed today: freedom within the law; access to culture; voluntary participation in social and religious ritual; a sense of one's place in society and history; the feeling that one's voice and actions matter and help determine one's fate. I know well that Rome's accomplishments were gained at a heavy price: Hadrian's war against the Jews abhorrently exemplifies Rome's ruthless suppression of nonconformists, and every city bolstered by his attention deprived others of revenues. Nevertheless, in the second century A.D. the benefits of Rome's rule seem to me to have outweighed the disadvantages. Hadrian's attention to the cities of the empire significantly influenced this generally positive effect, and the wealth of evidence amply repays close inquiry.