Writing Migration¹

Laurens E. Tacoma and Elio Lo Cascio

1 The View from Monte Cassino

Somewhere towards the end of his long life Paul the Deacon (c.720/30–798/9 AD), monk, intellectual, and prolific writer, sat down in his monastery at Monte Cassino to look back on the history of his people, the Langobards. The Langobards had entered Italy in AD 568 in the midst of wars between the Byzantines and the remnants of the Ostrogothic kingdom. They had quickly established themselves as a major power, but in AD 774 they had to cede great parts of their Italian territory to the Franks and by the time Paul wrote their hold was reduced to a number of smaller kingdoms. Paul himself hailed from a Langobard aristocratic family in Friuli on the north coast of the Adriatic and was well connected both to the Langobard and the Frankish courts. In the first book of his *Historia Langobardorum* he sketched the *Werdegang* of the Langobards, which, like so many other peoples before them, originated from the north and had moved southwards to arrive after a century-long journey in Italy. Paul's narrative structure was closely modelled on that of his predecessors; his work is a classic example of an *origo gentis*.²

Paul opened his work with a remarkable generalisation:

Septemtrionalis plaga quanto magis ab aestu solis remota est et nivali frigore gelida, tanto salubrior corporibus hominum et propagandis est gentibus coaptata; sicut econtra omnis meridiana regio, quo solis est fervori vicinior, eo semper morbis habundat et educandis minus est apta mortalibus. Unde fit, ut tantae populorum multitudines arctoo sub axe oriantur, ut non inmerito universa illa regio Tanai tenus usque ad occiduum, licet et propriis loca in ea singula nuncupentur nominibus, generali tamen vocabulo Germania vocitetur; quamvis et duas ultra Rhenum provincias Romani, cum ea loca occupassent, superiorem inferioremque Germaniam dixerint.

1 Our thanks to Miriam J. Groen-Vallinga for constructive criticism, to Marilyn Hedges for correcting the English, and to Olivier Hekster for further advice.

2 For general analysis see W.A. Goffart, *The Narrators of Barbarian History (A.D. 550–800): Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede, and Paul the Deacon* (Princeton 1988).

Ab hac ergo populosa Germania saepe innumerabiles captivorum turmae abductae meridianis populis pretio distrahuntur. Multae quoque ex ea, pro eo quod tantos mortalium germinat, quantos alere vix sufficit, saepe gentes egressae sunt, quae nihilominus et partes Asiae, sed maxime sibi contiguam Europam affligerunt. Testantur hoc ubique urbes erutae per totam Illyricum Galliamque, sed maxime miserae Italiae, quae paene omnium illarum est gentium experta saevitiam.

The region of the north, in proportion as it is removed from the heat of the sun and is chilled with snow and frost, is so much more healthful to the bodies of men and fitted for the propagation of nations, just as, on the other hand, every southern region, the nearer it is to the heat of the sun, the more it abounds in diseases and is less fitted for the bringing up of the human race. From this it happens that such great multitudes of peoples spring up in the north, and that that entire region from the Tanais (Don) to the west is not improperly called by the general name of Germany, although single places in it are designated by their own names. The Romans, however, when they occupied those parts, called the two provinces beyond the Rhine, Upper and Lower Germany. From this teeming Germany, then, innumerable troops of captives are often led away and sold for gain to the people of the South. And for the reason that it brings forth so many human beings that it can scarcely nourish them, many nations have emigrated from it, nations that have indeed become the scourge of portions of Asia, but especially of the parts of Europe which lie next to it. Everywhere ruined cities throughout all Illyria and Gaul testify to this, but most of all in unhappy Italy which has felt the cruel rage of nearly all these nations.³

The passage might serve as a showcase for Paul's lively style. It also shows what types of knowledge were produced in post-classical times about what had by then become the distant past. For a man of his times, Paul was well versed in Roman history; he had previously written a *Historia Romana* in which he had reworked Eutropius' *Breviarium*.⁴ It is interesting to see how Paul thought about migration in the Roman past.

The generic, law-like statement is neither chronologically nor geographically specific. The centuries are collapsed into a single, undifferentiated

3 Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum* 1.1. Ed. MGH 1878, transl. adapted from P. Foulke (New York 1907).

4 See M. Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans? Shifting scripts of Romanness in early medieval Italy', in W. Pohl and G. Heydemann, eds., *Post-Christian Traditions: Christian and Barbarian Identities in the Early Medieval West* (Turnhout 2013), 297–364.

Roman past. Geographically, Paul's Germania is strikingly large, 'from the Don to the west', and it included Scandinavia, purportedly the homeland of the Langobards. Although Paul does refer to the creation of the Roman provinces, Germania seems at a conceptual level to remain geographically a separate sphere. Migrants are in this spatial concept externals who move into the empire.

The passage presents a mix of climatological and geographical determinism and Malthusian thought *avant la lettre*. Migration is in Paul's view caused by population pressure. Population growth is in its turn the result of climatological conditions: in what would nowadays be considered a rather paradoxical argument, the northern areas are presented as the most healthy regions because they lack sunshine. A cold climate is a healthy one, Paul holds, and this finds expression in population growth. But as the population starts to outstrip the available resources, people are forced out of the region.

Paul distinguished two basic types of migration: what we would nowadays call forced and voluntary migration. The forced migration consisted of slavery: captives were taken away and sold for money. The voluntary migration concerned groups that themselves decided to move, though their free will remained the result of a force outside their control: their territory was not capable of producing sufficient food. In both the voluntary and the forced forms of migration the movement was collective: although Paul might have been aware that mass enslavement could result in sales of individuals, he speaks of groups, not of individuals.

Underlying Paul's discussion there may have been a moral judgement about the impact of migration. Although there is a risk of overinterpretation, implicitly it seems to have had in the passage a negative connotation. Either groups were captured and sold, as passive victims, and their migration was a consequence of their enslavement. If groups decided to move of their own volition, they started to plunder and destroy cities, and migration led to devastation of the land.

The position of the passage at the very beginning of his work is in itself sufficient to demonstrate that migration and mobility were at the heart of this type of history writing.⁵ The attempt to carve out a space for the Langobards in Italy led almost inevitably to musings on migration and mobility in the past. The passage formed the narrative engine for the book; it set the Langobards almost literally in motion.

Obviously the text is primarily relevant as an analysis of the *Völkerwanderung*. But it is in that respect interesting to see how seriously the passage has been taken in the past. For F. Dahn in 1880, it formed the best example (if not

5 See Maskarinec 2013, op. cit. (n. 4) for the argument that Paul even (re)constructed Roman history in his *Historia Romana* in very similar terms.

the basis) for his structural analysis of the causes of the migrations of Late Antiquity.⁶ And indirectly one might argue that in a more general way it informed conceptualisations of Roman migration. Although there is no direct influence from Paul on later thinking about migration, his type of conceptualisation has been highly influential. In fact, many of Paul's concepts can even be found in twentieth-century discussions of Roman migration. Migration has often been conceptualised as a collective phenomenon by outsiders entering the empire in cross-border movements. It consisted mainly of two types: either captive slaves or peoples who themselves decided to move. It was seen mainly as the result of push factors, often the result of population pressure or some other external factor. It was also frequently seen as a negative force.

2 Roman Reflections

Paul's passage has an intrinsic interest, but it also serves to highlight what we cannot hope to find in the Roman authors: a rigorous and comprehensive "theory of migration". Although elements like Paul's geographical determinism can easily be traced back to Roman ethnographic thinking,⁷ explicit reflections on the nature and causes of migration in the early imperial period are, with some noteworthy exceptions, virtually absent.

This virtual absence might be due in part to the conventions of the literary genre or to the type of history writing. Paul the Deacon belonged to a historiographical tradition that only rose to prominence in Late Antiquity. It is characterised by a specific perspective of its authors: they presented the history of their ethnic group to a Roman audience. It thus purported to offer an insider's perspective to an outsider's audience—no matter how blurred these categories were in reality.⁸ In earlier Roman times Flavius Josephus used a similar perspective in his works on Jewish history. But whereas Paul in the eighth century was part of a tradition that was already some centuries old, Josephus in the early Roman period was more or less alone. Moreover, although his history of the Jews is obviously closely connected to the Jewish diaspora, movement

6 F. Dahn, discussing *Die Ursachen der Völkerwanderung* in his 'Einleitung der neuen Auflage' to his revision of E. von Wietersheim, *Geschichte der Völkerwanderung* (Leipzig 1880²), esp. 12. Obviously, modern perspectives differ significantly; a good though highly polemical starting point is offered by G. Halsall, "Two worlds become one: a 'counter-intuitive' view of the Roman empire and 'Germanic' migration", *German History* 32 (2014), 512–532.

7 See P. Amory, *People and identity in Ostrogothic Italy, 489–554* (Cambridge 1997), 19–20 on geographical determinism in ancient ethnography.

8 Goffart 1988, op. cit. (n. 2), 5.

as such does not seem to be as central to Josephus' concerns as it was to the late-antique authors.

It was not that the Romans were unaware of the importance of mobility. In fact, they liked to point out that the very origins of Rome were grounded in the arrival of newcomers. One example concerns the use of the argument by the emperor Claudius in his speech about the admission of Gallic nobles in the Roman senate.⁹ Have we not always, Claudius asked the senators, from the very beginning of Roman history given foreigners access to our community? Is the strength of our community not based on the admission of outsiders? Historical precedent was used to legitimate present policies and to show that admitting newcomers to the Senate was no innovation. The argument itself certainly did not go unopposed, but it nonetheless formed a line of thinking that could be, and was taken.¹⁰

A distant echo of these ideas can be found at the end of antiquity. Aurelius Victor, after he had sketched a brief history of the Julio-Claudian and Flavian dynasties, referred in a flight of abstract historical generalisation just like Claudius to archaic times:

Hactenus Romae seu per Italiam orti imperium rexere, hinc advenae quoque; nescio an ut in Prisco Tarquinio longe meliores. Ac mihi quidem audienti multa legentique plane compertum urbem Romam externorum virtute atque insitivis artibus praecipue crevisse.

Up to this time men born at Rome or in Italy had ruled the empire, afterwards foreigners did, too; perhaps, as was the case with Tarquinius Priscus, they were far better. And to me at least, from the many things I have heard and read, it is perfectly clear that the city of Rome grew great in particular through the qualities of outsiders and imported talents.¹¹

Aurelius Victor's passage is striking for its positive tone. Urban growth and the prosperity of the empire are due to the qualities of outsiders, to the immigration of talented people. Yet its imagery is part of a two-sided coin: the contribution of outsiders was valued in moral terms. As happened often with such judgements in antiquity, these could be both positive and negative.¹²

9 CIL 13.1668 (the Lyon *tabula*) and Tac. *Ann.* 11.23–25.

10 A. Giardina, *L'Italia Romana. Storie di un'identità incompiuta* (Rome and Bari 1997), 3–17.

11 Aur. Victor, *De Caes.* 11 (transl. H.W. Bird, Liverpool Translated Texts for Historians 17, 1994).

12 D. Noy, *Foreigners at Rome. Citizens and Strangers* (London 2000), 31–36 for an overview. For the important positive evaluation of Aelius Aristides, see E. Lo Cascio, 'Roma come

The most famous of the negative appreciations is surely that of Juvenal. Many of his satires focus on outsider intrusion. In his most celebrated work, the *Third Satire*, poverty-stricken, hard-working Roman Umbricius loads all his belongings on a cart and leaves Rome in disgust, complaining that no space is left for him due to the intrusion of Greeks and Syrians.

The text has been cited very often, and its imagery is extremely forceful. In an influential article in 1916, Tenney Frank purported to test whether what Juvenal said was right, but in fact took over many of the pejorative connotations that Juvenal inserted into his verses (and added some more of his own).¹³ Other historians have been more cautious, but still considered Juvenal's statements to contain at least a kernel of truth about the resentment Romans felt about the Orontes flowing into the Tiber. However, literary studies of Juvenal have tended to complicate matters. The crucial point is that Umbricius' standing in the Satire is 'compromised in more than one way'; Umbricius is portrayed as ranting.¹⁴ Juvenal leaves the reader in the dark about what to think. At most, the satire can be understood as an exploration on what possible responses to foreign presence could be, but not necessarily as an invitation to the reader to endorse such a view.

The most profound reflections on mobility came from a different genre: that of Roman *exilium* literature. In particular two chapters in Seneca's *Ad Helviam*, a letter of condolence to his mother on his exile, are often cited.

Aspice aedum hanc frequentiam, cui uix urbis immensae tecta sufficiunt: maxima pars istius turbae patria caret. Ex municipiis et coloniis suis, ex toto denique orbe terrarum confluxerunt: alios adduxit ambitio, alios necessitas officii publici, alios inposita legatio, alios luxuria opportunum et opulentum uitii locum quaerens, alios liberalium studiorum cupiditas, alios spectacula; quosdam traxit amicitia, quosdam industria laxam ostendendae uirtuti nanta materiam; quidam uenalem formam attulerunt, quidam uenalem eloquentiam.

But look at this mass of people, for whom the number of houses of the immense City hardly suffices: the largest part of this crowd lacks a

"mercato comune del genere umano", in P. Desideri and F. Fontanella, eds., *Elio Aristide e la legittimazione greca dell'impero di Roma* (Bologna 2013) 185–201.

13 T. Frank, 'Race mixture in the Roman Empire', *American Historical Review* 21 (1916), 689–708.

14 C. Edwards, *Writing Rome. Textual Approaches to the City* (Cambridge 1996), 125–129, quote at 127.

fatherland. From their *municipia* and colonies, from the whole world they have streamed together. Some have been brought by ambition, some by the requirements of public office, some by an embassy that was imposed upon them, some by luxury, searching a convenient and rich place for their vices, some by the wish to study, some by the spectacles; others are drawn by friendship, others by zeal, finding ample opportunity to display virtue; some have brought beauty for sale, some eloquence for sale.¹⁵

A caelestibus agetum te ad humana conuerte: uidebis gentes populosque uniuersos mutasse sedem (...) Liberos coniugesque et graues senio parentes traxerunt. Alii longo errore iactati non iudicio elegerunt locum sed lassitudine proximum occupauerunt, alii armis sibi ius in aliena terra fecerunt; quasdam gentes, cum ignota peterent, mare hausit, quaedam ibi consederunt ubi illas rerum omnium inopia deposuit. Nec omnibus eadem causa relinquendi quaerendique patriam fuit: alios excidia urbium suarum hostilibus armis elapsos in aliena spoliatis suis expulerunt; alios domestica seditio summouit; alios nimia superfluentis populi frequentia ad exonerandas uires emisit; alios pestilentia aut frequentes terrarum hiatus aut aliqua intoleranda infelicitis soli uitia eiecerunt; quosdam fertilis orae et in maius laudatae fama corruptit.

Come now, turn your attention from things divine to the affairs of men; you will see that whole tribes and nations have changed their abodes. (...) Wives and children and elders burdened with age trailed along. Some have not settled upon a place from choice, but, tossed about in long wandering, from very weariness have seized upon the nearest; others have established their right in a foreign land by the sword; some tribes, seeking unknown regions, were swallowed up by the sea; some settled in the spot in which a lack of supplies had stranded them. And not all have had the same reason for leaving their country and seeking a new one. Some, having escaped the destruction of their cities by the forces of the enemy, have been thrust into strange lands when stripped of their own; some have been cast out by civil discord; some have gone forth in order to relieve the pressure from over-crowding caused by an excess of population; some have been driven out by pestilence or repeated earthquakes or

15 Sen. *Cons. ad Helv.* 6.2.

certain unbearable defects of an unproductive soil; some have been beguiled by the fame of a fertile shore that was too highly praised.¹⁶

Seneca is one of the few authors to discuss motives for migration, and for that reason alone his testimony deserves full attention. In the former passage, referring to the growth of the city of Rome that was the result of immigration, he lists a series of “pull factors” which attract individual migrants. In the latter one, he enlarges his perspective to migration of *gentes* and *populi*, and now the stress is on what we can call “push factors”. Both the former and the latter lists are certainly far from exhaustive. At the same time, it is clear that the context of the two passages is rhetorical, and that the former text presents an elite perspective. The most striking element for a modern observer is that Seneca seems to omit labour from his long list of motives. Historians of migration agree that labour is in most historical periods the major impetus for migration, and it was certainly so also in the case of individual migration to Rome. But it would be improper to expect an allusion to labour in general in a society in which there was no unitary and abstract idea of labour (and, for that matter, no word in the Latin language for it).¹⁷ Moreover, according to the elite perspective as it is expressed in a famous passage of Cicero’s *de officiis*,¹⁸ there was a clear divide between the honourable *artes* or *artificia* and the *quaestus*, which are *sordidi*; and a hint to the former could be in the allusion to the “*industria laxam ostendendae uirtuti nancta materiam*”, which induces certain people to migrate to Rome. In any case it would be methodologically unsafe to base too much on Seneca’s enlistment of migration motives alone, no matter how perceptive his comments are in other respects.¹⁹

Roman reflections are thus not absent, but the Romans hardly reflected on migration as an independent phenomenon. Their reflections concerned other issues. For all their differences, the passages just quoted might all be read as explorations of the consequences of migration for Roman identity rather than being about migration itself. Mobility appears to be taken as a given, but the authors addressed the question what it implied socially and culturally. What did being away from Rome mean? What did the influx of foreigners imply for Romanness in the heart of the city? Who was regarded as Roman? Could citizenship be expanded at will? Could one be Roman while being relegated outside Rome?

16 Sen. *Cons. ad Helv.* 7.1; 3–4 (transl. J. Henderson Loeb Classical Library 1932).

17 See now M. De Nardis, ‘Terminologia e concetto di lavoro nel mondo romano’, in A. Marcone, ed., *Storia del lavoro in Italia. I. L’età romana. Liberi, semiliberi e schiavi in una società premoderna* (Roma 2016), 79–90.

18 Cic. *De Off.* 1.42.150–151.

19 Cf. Noy 2000, op. cit. (n. 12), 85–139.

3 An Abundance of Sources

Of course, we do not have any real reason for complaint. The fact that Roman reflections on mobility are scarce does not mean that sources about mobility and migration are absent. In fact, Roman imperial history presents us with a surprising number of sources that attest to forms of mobility.

Three examples, from different periods and areas, may suffice to demonstrate their nature and the possibilities for analysis.

The first is an inscription from Ravenna on the Adriatic coast of North-East Italy. The text actually consists of two separate inscriptions written on the same slab, showing two different ways to inscribe mobility: the one implicit, the other explicit. The stone, about a metre high, contained the portrait of a woman with a text written below it. The first text, undated but stemming from the early imperial period, reads as follows:²⁰

[D(is) M(anibus)] / Herenniae / Faventine n(atione) ver(nae) / co(n)i(ugi)
vix(it) an(nos) XX / L(ucius) Pomponius / [.....] et sibi / b(ene)
m(erenti) p(osuit)

To the gods of the underworld. To Herennia Faventina, of local origin, his wife, who lived 20 years, well deserving; Lucius Pomponius [.....] has placed (this memorial), also for himself.

The text of the inscription is in itself highly conventional: a husband erected a memorial for his deceased wife. The use of the phrase *natione verna*, ‘of local origin’, is remarkable, however. It is well known that the word *verna* was normally employed to indicate locally born slaves, in contrast to imported ones. Although *verna* was predominantly used alone, *natione verna* could be used in a similar way for slaves.²¹ However, Herennia Faventina was certainly not a slave. Her free status is indicated by her *duo nomina*; it should also be noted that she was described as a *coniunx*, a term normally reserved for a spouse in a legal Roman marriage. Although rare, the combination of *natio* with *verna* for a free person is not completely unknown. In fact, there are two more instances among the inscriptions of Ravenna.²² It is probably no coincidence that both

20 *CIL* 11.61 (with p. 1227). The lacuna at the beginning in line 6 is given in the Clausss-Slaby database as three letters, but *CIL* gives 8; it contained in all likelihood a *cognomen*.

21 For a (relatively early) certain case, see *CIL* 1.2965a from Rome.

22 *CIL* 11.59: *D(is) M(anibus) / L(ucius) Fulvi(us) Sever(us) / scrib(a) III(triere) Vict(oria) / n(atione) vern(a) / vix(it) ann(os) XXXV / mil(itavit) an(nos) XVII / Volcena Severa / et C(aius) Volcena Titu(s) / h(eredes) p(onendum) c(uraverunt)*, ‘To the gods of the underworld. Lucius Fulvius Severus, clerk of the trireme Victoria, of local origin, he lived 35

belong to a military context, and the same may be surmised in the case of the text discussed here.²³ In military inscriptions, when names were written out in full, they almost invariably contained a reference to the origin of the individual. *Natione* (or a similar term like *domo*) was a standard element, followed by a region, a city or a tribe. Its formulaic use points to an expectation that soldiers originated elsewhere—as was of course the norm. The use of *natione verna* implies that a local origin was not the default option, but needed to be spelled out. In the case discussed here, this principle apparently even applied to wives. Implicitly it suggests that many people (including wives of soldiers) hailed from elsewhere.

Interestingly enough, the slab was reused in late antiquity, probably in the late fourth or early fifth century AD. The female portrait, the letters D.M. and what was probably the *cognomen* of the previous dedicator were partly erased (possibly the latter was a name with pagan overtones like Hermes). A new text was added, for a Christian migrant hailing from Africa.²⁴

Caius Zobo/nis de lo(co) Kasen/se civis Afer qui / vixit annis quin/
quaginta vives / in pace

Gaius Zobonis, of the town Casae, African citizen, who lived fifty years.
May you live in peace

years and served 17 years. Volcena Severa and Gaius Volcena Titus, his heirs, have taken care that (this monument) was erected". *CIL* 11. 65: *D(is) M(anibus) / M(arcus) Iulius / Maximus / optio III(triere) Victo(ria) / nat(ione) verna / vixit annis / XXXXVI mil(itavit) / annis XXVI / C(aius) Aulius / Successus / heres / b(ene) m(erenti) p(onendum) c(uravit) /* [, "To the gods of the Underworld. Marcus Julius Maximus, chief aide of the trireme Victoria, of local origin, he lived 46 years, he served 26 years. Gaius Aulius Successus, his heir, has taken care that (the monument) was erected, well deserving". See also e.g. *CIL* 10.3646 for a veteran sailor at Misenum. Some discussion in C.G. Starr, *The Roman imperial navy 31 B.C.–A.D. 324* (3rd ed. Chicago 1993), 69–70, excluding slave origin in their case, and in particular idem, 'Verna', *Classical Philology* 37 (1942), 314–317, though whether as Starr seemed to think the phrase means in military contexts "born in the camp", equivalent to *ex castris*, rather than simply "from the local community" must remain open.

23 Most of the inscriptions of Ravenna of the early imperial period can be connected to the presence of the fleet. As it was common that dedicators gave much less information about themselves, the omission of a military function of Lucius Pomponius is not an obstacle, nor is the presence of a wife unusual, despite the formal prohibition for soldiers to marry.

24 *ILCV* 4451b; cf. *AE* 2008, 531.

The inscription was set up for a male immigrant from Casae in Numidia (mod. El. Madher in Algeria). Late-antique changes are visible in the Christian formula ‘may you live in peace’, and in the somewhat different formulae used to demarcate the origin of the deceased (*locus* and *civis*), while the lack of mention of a dedicator is also typically late antique. In addition the rather un-Roman name of Zobonis is remarkable.²⁵ It cannot be inferred from the text what brought Zobonis to Ravenna. The character of Ravenna changed dramatically in the early fifth century when it became an imperial residence. As Ravenna lost its homogeneously military function, it might be expected that in Late Antiquity it attracted a far more diverse crowd of immigrants than it did before.

The second example comes from the other end of the empire and consists of a small passage in the New Testament. The New Testament is, in fact, full of mobile people. This applies in particular to Acts,²⁶ but the Gospels too contain many vignettes of people who travelled, for various purposes. In the Gospel of Luke, the evangelist relates how Mary is visited by the Archangel Gabriel. Gabriel announces that she will have a son who is to be named Jesus. When Mary objects she is still a virgin, Gabriel comforts her by telling how her relative Elisabeth, who was thought to be infertile, was also with child. After the vision, Luke writes:

Ἀναστᾶσα δὲ Μαριάμ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὴν ὄρεινὴν μετὰ σπουδῆς εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον Ζαχαρίου καὶ ἡσπάσατο τὴν Ἐλισάβετ.²⁷

Then Mary got up and went with speed to the hill country, to a city in Juda, where she entered the house of Zacharia, and greeted Elisabeth.

The phrase εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα is geographically slightly enigmatic, but commentators agree that it refers to the mountainous parts of Judaea. If they are correct, the implication must be that according to the Gospel Mary travelled on her own for a journey of three to four days to visit Elisabeth.²⁸ Such details may be

-
- 25 The name does not occur elsewhere in the Clauss-Slaby database, and does not occur, for example, among the Roman *Sklavennamen* analysed by H. Solin.
 - 26 D. Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian. Writing the 'Acts of the Apostles'* (Engl. transl. K. McKinney, G.J. Laughery and R. Bauckham) (Cambridge 2002), 231–256.
 - 27 Luke 1: 39–40 (Nestle-Aland, 1991¹²).
 - 28 W. Wiefel, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament) (Berlin 1988), 54–55.

rejected as unhistorical; we have after all just previously read about a vision, and the passage is part of a larger story in which a parallel is created between John the Baptist and Jesus at several levels. However, one could equally argue that the narrative strategy was to authenticate the miraculous by using plausible social and topographical details. Apparently, in the opinion of the readership, a young woman, engaged but not yet married, could with some degree of plausibility be presented as travelling on her own for a long distance, and making her own decisions about visiting relatives. It presents a social universe in which young unmarried women had a relatively large freedom of movement.

The third example is a marriage contract preserved on papyrus. In such texts a prospective couple (or their parents or guardians) made arrangements about the mutual obligations between the spouses, with particular reference to the dowry. The contract under consideration belonged to a Greek couple from Alexandria and dates to 12/11 BC. The obligations of the husband, Dionysios, to his wife Isidora were 'that he not mistreat her or abuse her or throw her out or bring another woman into (the house)'. For the wife Isidora, the following rules applied: she 'does not sleep away or be away for a day from Dionysios' house without Dionysios' approval, or damage the home, or be with another man'.²⁹ The gendered differentiation between the obligations of husband and wife was a standard element in such marriage contracts. The husband's obligations were defined with respect to his wife; he was not to abuse her, physically or otherwise. The wife's obligations were formulated to protect the marriage and thereby her husband's reputation—there were all kinds of sexualised threats to the marriage which needed to be controlled. From a mobility perspective, the stipulation that Isidora was not to be away from the house without her husband's consent is noteworthy. It will have severely restricted her freedom of movement. Should we take it literally, or should we interpret the clause together with the other ones in a more abstract way? It suggests at the very least that the movement of this married woman was subject to her husband's control.

More examples could easily be found, including from other types of sources. Epigraphers have collected hundreds of inscriptions testifying to mobility; authors on ancient travel have brought together series of passages in which travellers appear, scholars of slavery have analysed how groups of slaves were

29 BGU 4. 1050: μή κακουχεῖν αὐτήν μήδ' ὑβρίζειν μήδ' ἐγβάλλειν μήδ' ἄλλην γυναῖκα ἐπεισάγειν and μήτε ἀπόκοιτον μήτε ἀφήμερον γείνεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς Διονυσίου οἰκίας ἂνευ τῆς Διονυσί[ου] γνώμης μηδὲ φθείρειν τὸν οἶκον μήδ' ἄλλω ἀνδρὶ συνεῖναι. Transl. J. Evans Grubbs, *Women and the Law in the Roman Empire: a Sourcebook on Marriage, Divorce and Widowhood* (London and New York 2002), 123–125.

moved throughout the empire. And besides the texts there is an enormous amount of material culture available that can be employed to analyse mobility: it varies from shipwrecks to ethnic grave goods, from amphorae that allow us to trace shifts in trade patterns to archaeological surveys attesting to increasing settlement clustering. They each offer tantalising insights.

The sources are thus abundant, but they are also highly fragmented and individualised. This makes it difficult to generalise. For example, all three texts just quoted are relevant for female mobility, but merging them into a single coherent framework proves difficult. The fragmentation can be explained in various ways. It may suggest diversity in types of mobility, different types of sources may emphasize different types of mobility, and there may be regional, social and chronological differences at work. These explanations are not mutually exclusive. The paradox is thus that there is an abundance of sources, but that there is no obvious analytical framework immediately at hand.

4 In Search of Modern Migration Theory

If the ancient sources do not themselves provide a narrative framework, the question then is what modern theory is there to help?

There cannot be any real doubt that *The Corrupting Sea* of Horden and Purcell has performed a seminal role in providing a framework.³⁰ Any short description is incapable of doing justice to the richness of Horden and Purcell's arguments and the fullness with which they are documented. It offered a seminal contribution on how the ancient world worked, and a major conceptual apparatus to analyse it. The key concept of connectivity which they explore in their book has found wide acceptance. Connectivity is described as 'the various ways in which micro-regions cohere, both internally and also one with another'.³¹ Notwithstanding the sometimes rather circumstantial formulations, the basic tenets of their model can easily be summarized. The ecology of the Mediterranean produced micro-regions that each had slightly different characteristics. Variations in rainfall led to variations in soil, in the fertility of the land, in crops, and, as a result, in population densities and settlement patterns. Such variations almost automatically led to risk-avoiding strategies among their populations, and, important for our purposes, to forms of redistribution and exchange. In consequence, the movement of goods and people

30 P. Horden and N. Purcell, *The Corrupting Sea: a Study of Mediterranean History* (Oxford 2000).

31 Horden and Purcell 2000, op. cit. (n. 30), 123.

was a structural feature of the Mediterranean world. This was facilitated by the sea, which had the capacity to connect regions far apart from each other; the Mediterranean was thus ‘the principal agent of connectivity’.³² As was observed by a commentator, Horden and Purcell ‘insist that the essential unity of the Mediterranean is far less a reified thing than a process—the impetus to connect the disparate parts’.³³

Yet Horden and Purcell’s work is also criticised.³⁴ The authors have certainly succeeded in producing an adaptable model that helps to describe a very significant chunk of history. However, its success is arguably also its major disadvantage. Their model fits so many situations that it does not provide enough direction to serve as a guide for further analysis. Moreover, as measurability and quantification are not at the forefront of the authors’ concerns, it is difficult to prove or disprove the authors’ assertions.³⁵ Their wish to discard the traditional types of periodization has at a fundamental level—and quite paradoxical—produced a static world. And while their model does allow for the presence of institutions and politics, it does not accord a central role to it. The same applies to human agency. Their model might be helpful in analysing the Mediterranean world as a whole at a general level over a period of three millennia, but it works less well in describing the particulars of the Roman highly urbanised version of it. It is not well equipped to address the question in what ways connectivity intensified during the Roman period.

In principle, network analysis has the potential to offer a formal means for the study of Horden and Purcell’s connectivity. Although its possibilities have not been explored to the full, moving beyond the metaphoric use of network terminology has as yet proven difficult. At present, its main use seems confined to the suggestion of non-hierarchical and non-unilateral flows of goods and people.³⁶ This seems an elaboration upon the concept of connectivity rather than an analysis of it.

32 Horden and Purcell 2000, op. cit. (n. 30), 133.

33 B.D. Shaw, ‘Challenging Braudel: a new vision of the Mediterranean’, *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 14 (2001), 419–453, at 424.

34 For a recent balance sheet, see E. Lo Cascio, ‘Il Mediterraneo Romano fra connettività e frammentazione’, *Studi storici* 56 (2015), 277–285.

35 W.V. Harris, ‘The Mediterranean and ancient history’, in: idem, ed., *Rethinking the Mediterranean* (Oxford and New York 2005), 1–42.

36 Explored in the case of Greek colonization by I. Malkin, *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Oxford 2011).

Another related perspective is offered by globalization theory.³⁷ It is used in cultural theory to study increasing interconnectedness and to analyse responses to it. Much discussion has gone into the question of whether the term is applicable to the ancient world, or whether it should be reserved to describe our modern, truly global, world. However, world historians have pointed out that webs of connections occur in all periods of history. There is not an evolutionary movement towards greater connectedness, but there are certain periods and societal configurations in which such connections intensify.³⁸ Roman society certainly qualifies as such a configuration. It is interesting to study both the increase in interconnectedness, and the boundaries of the Roman web—they coincide roughly with the boundaries of empire (with important implications for mobility patterns). The cognate concept of glocalization is also useful to analyse the series of adaptive responses at local level. Both globalization and glocalization, however, betray their origins in cultural studies: they focus mainly on cultural interaction rather than on mobility itself.

In all these theories and models, mobility is accorded a central role. In that sense they are very important, as they give a sense of direction to the subject and embed it in a larger theoretical discussion. They help to explain why we should study migration and mobility. At the same time, they simply postulate high levels of mobility, which itself remains unanalysed and implicitly is also sometimes thought to need no analysis. In that sense their usefulness is more limited than it may seem at first sight.

5 Filling the Gaps

Much work has been done in recent years to fill the gaps. There are many separate studies, sections in monographs, and edited volumes devoted to the subject of mobility. For example, a monograph by David Noy can be seen as the culmination of the epigraphical tradition of the study of foreigners. It offers very useful observations, mainly based on a corpus of inscriptions of foreigners at

37 The best starting point is M. Pitts and M.J. Versluys, eds., *Globalisation and the Roman World. World History, Connectivity and Material Culture* (Cambridge 2015), explicitly discussing the relationship with connectivity. For its economic aspects, see Lo Cascio 2015 (op. cit. n. 34), 283.

38 J.R. McNeill and W.H. McNeill, *The Human Web. A Bird's Eye View of World History* (New York and London 2003) (though the parts about the Roman empire are not particularly illuminating).

Rome.³⁹ Walter Scheidel offered in two articles a quantitative model for migration in the late Republic, arguing that in that period state-organized mobility (i.e. colonization) was the dominant mode of migration.⁴⁰ Paul Erdkamp has put the importance of seasonal labour migration from the countryside to the city high on the agenda.⁴¹ Saskia Hin in the context of her study of the demography of the Late Republic has emphasized the fluidity in movements between settlements—much mobility, she argues, was of a transient character.⁴² Claire Holleran has studied the openness of the labour market, arguing against easy absorption of migrants.⁴³ Elio Lo Cascio, in his critical re-evaluation of the demography of Roman Italy and the population size of Rome, has addressed the problems of applying urban graveyard theory.⁴⁴

Something of the emerging direction of the discussion might be traced on the basis of several edited volumes that have appeared on the subject of migration and mobility. Whereas earlier volumes contain fewer studies that concern the subject proper than one would expect on the basis of the title, a number have since appeared that address migration and mobility directly.⁴⁵

39 Noy 2000, op. cit. (n. 12).

40 W. Scheidel, 'Human mobility in Roman Italy I. the free population', *Journal of Roman Studies* 104 (2004), 1–26 and 'II: the slave population', *Journal of Roman Studies* 95 (2005), 64–79.

41 P. Erdkamp, 'Mobility and migration in Italy in the second century B.C.': in L. de Ligt and S. Northwood, eds., *People, Land, and Politics: Demographic Developments and the Transformation of Roman Italy 300 B.C.–A.D. 14* (Leiden 2008), 417–450, with a follow-up in 'Seasonal labour and rural-urban mobility in Roman Italy', in L. de Ligt and L.E. Tacoma, eds., *Migration and Mobility in the Early Roman Empire* (Leiden 2016), 33–49.

42 S. Hin, *The Demography of Roman Italy. Population Dynamics in an Ancient Conquest Society, 201 BCE–14 CE* (Cambridge 2013).

43 C. Holleran, 'Migration and the urban economy of Rome', in C. Holleran and A. Pudsey, eds., *Demography and the Graeco-Roman World* (Cambridge 2011), 155–180.

44 Inter alia in E. Lo Cascio, 'La popolazione', in E. Lo Cascio, ed., *Roma imperiale: una metropoli antica* (Rome 2000) 17–69.

45 It is impossible to do justice to the proliferation of studies. Other volumes include M. Sordi, ed., *Emigrazione e immigrazione nel mondo antico* (Milan 1994); M. Sordi, ed., *Coercizione e mobilità umana nel mondo antico* (Milan 1995); F. Marco Simon, F. Pina Polo and J. Remesal Rodríguez, eds., *Vivir en tierra extraña. Emigración e integración cultural en el mundo antiguo* (Barcelona 2004); M.G. Angeli Bertinelli and A. Donati, eds., *Il cittadino, lo straniero, il barbaro, fra integrazione ed emarginazione nell'antichità* (Atti del I incontro internazionale di Storia Antica, Genova 2003) (Rome 2005); M.G.A. Bertinelli and A. Donati, eds., *Le vie della storia. Migrazioni di popoli, viaggi di individui, circolazione di idee nel Mediterraneo antico* (Atti del II incontro internazionale di Storia Antica, Genova 2004) (Rome 2006); E. Olshausen and H. Sonnabend, eds., *Troianer sind wir gewesen*.

An important volume is *Roman diasporas* published in 2010, produced by a number of scholars involved in isotopic research.⁴⁶ One significant element of the volume is that it attempts to offer an integrated approach of various types of sources, textual and material. It combines analysis of epigraphy with that of isotopic evidence from skeletons and grave goods. As the title suggests, the concept of diaspora plays an important role in the volume. Migrants are primarily regarded as individuals who bridge the gap between homeland and new country. Given its focus on concepts of diaspora, the contributors not only aim to establish patterns of migration and mobility, but also analyse the way migrants articulated their ethnic identity.

An impressive series of studies has been produced as part of a large research project by Claudia Moatti called 'La mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée de l'Antiquité à l'époque moderne'.⁴⁷ The studies share two major characteristics. Firstly, they offer a new institutional approach to the legal evidence, which is read as giving insight into questions of how migration and mobility were conceptualised, how migrants were categorized, and how migration generated documentation that was used to identify them. Secondly, the project engages explicitly in comparative history. The comparative method is important to show how in different pre-modern societies similar issues occurred, but could be solved along different lines. The importance of comparative research is in itself well accepted among ancient historians, but it is not often practised. It brings nuance to an otherwise undifferentiated past of pre-modern migration.

Another recent collection of articles is contained in a volume edited by Luuk de Ligt and Laurens E. Tacoma.⁴⁸ It finds its origin in a research project about the relation between urbanisation, labour and migration in the

Migrationen in der antiken Welt. Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur Historischen Geographie des Altertums, 8 2002 (Stuttgart 2006); E. Olshausen and V. Sauer, eds, *Mobilität in den Kulturen der antiken Mittelmeerwelt. Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur Historischen Geographie des Altertums* 11, 2011. *Geographica Historica* 31 (Stuttgart 2014).

46 H. Eckardt, ed., *Roman Diasporas. Archaeological Approaches to Mobility and Diversity in the Roman Empire*. *Journal of Roman Archaeology Suppl.* 78, (Portsmouth 2010).

47 C. Moatti, ed., *La mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée de l'antiquité à l'époque moderne: procédures de contrôle et documents d'identification* (Rome 2004); C. Moatti and W. Kaiser, eds., *Gens de passage en Méditerranée de l'Antiquité à l'époque moderne: procédures de contrôle et d'identification* (Paris 2007); C. Moatti, W. Kaiser et Chr. Pébarthe, eds., *Le monde de l'itinérance en Méditerranée, de l'Antiquité à l'époque moderne. Procédures de contrôle et d'identification* (Bordeaux 2009).

48 L. de Ligt and L.E. Tacoma, eds., *Migration and Mobility in the Early Roman Empire* (Leiden 2016).

Principate. As its publication in a series on global migration history testifies, it aims to bring Roman migration history to the attention of migration historians of other periods. This is also visible in its focus on socio-economic and demographic aspects of migration; issues of acculturation and integration are (deliberately) left aside. In many papers labour migration is discussed, and urban graveyard theory plays a large role, though it is treated with varying degrees of acceptance. Underlying the volume is the argument that the distinction between forced, state-organized and voluntary migration is important for analytical purposes, but that the three forms merit being studied together, as they impinged on each other.

One at present still unpublished project also deserves a mention. A new volume edited by Andrea Zerbini and Justin Yoo will provide a diachronic overview of migration and mobility in the Near East.⁴⁹ One of the aims is to redress the balance in geographical coverage: studies of the western Latin part of the empire tend to dominate the discussion. The coverage of a more restricted region over a much longer timeframe creates the possibility to evaluate changes over time with more precision. The volume also aims to integrate the archaeological material into the discussion, while in addition the spatiality of migration is emphasized: mapping mobility is one of its major concerns.

The differences between these approaches indicate that there is as yet no proper framework for writing Roman migration. Even the question if such a framework is needed is debated, though this brief overview has hopefully made clear how much progress can be made on that front. Perhaps, even, in time the differences between the volumes will seem negligible, and there is indeed some overlap between the volumes, if only because some authors have contributed to more than one book. The overlap is, in fact, productive. The way forward seems to lie in smaller-scale studies, in studying more limited problems, in using more specific types of sources, in analysing more restricted areas, but not doing this in isolation. The more such studies, the better.

6 The Studies in This Volume

The present volume is created in this vein. *The impact of mobility and migration in the Roman Empire* is the outcome of a conference of the Impact of Empire network. It should be placed in the context of its previous conferences, which concerned frontiers (Impact 9), integration (Impact 10), and external relations

49 A. Zerbini and J. Yoo, eds., *Migration, Diaspora and Identity in the Near East from Antiquity to the Middle Ages* (forthcoming).

(Impact 11).⁵⁰ Some papers have a clear regional focus, others are empire wide. Although a significant amount of late-antique evidence was also discussed at the conference, most of the papers published here focus on the first two centuries AD, though occasionally later evidence is used as well. The papers show a variety of strategies to deal with the sources, and a variety of methods are employed.

In 'Moving peoples in the early Roman Empire', Greg Woolf applies a world-historical approach. His paper forms part of a wider project to delineate the properties of ancient mobility.⁵¹ Roman historians are used to think in terms of empire building through conquest and the acquisition of territory. However, the formation of early states can also be represented as a history of enclosure. States were initially tiny, and growth meant enclosure and moving people around at will. Taking this into account, it is a noticeable feature that the Roman emperors did *not* shift populations throughout their empire. Woolf shows how remarkable this is even in the Mediterranean and Near-Eastern contexts that we normally study. Omissions are, of course, always hard to explain, and Woolf adduces a number of possible factors that might be taken into account. Woolf's paper shows how the limitations of the sources can be circumvented. No matter how diligently we may read our sources, the absence of imperial intervention only becomes apparent through comparison with other states.

That peoples were nevertheless deported through other means becomes abundantly clear in another contribution. In 'Invasions, deportations and repopulation: mobility and migration in Thrace, Moesia inferior, and Dacia in the third quarter of the third century AD' Lukas de Blois discusses how invasions of the lower Danube region caused havoc. His research is part of his wider interest in the crisis of the third century. Invading Goths, Heruli, and others led to destruction and depopulation. In structural analyses of migration, war-induced mobility is all too easily forgotten, but certainly in the third century it was a major force. De Blois' paper shows in addition how important

-
- 50 O. Hekster and T. Kaizer, eds., *Frontiers in the Roman World*. Proceedings of the ninth workshop of the international network impact of empire (Durham, 16–19 April 2009) (Leiden 2011). G. de Kleijn and S. Benoist, eds., *Integration in Rome and in the Roman World*. Proceedings of the tenth workshop of the international network impact of empire (Lille, June 23–25, 2011) (Leiden 2014). M. Peachin and D. Slootjes (eds.), *Rome and the Worlds beyond its Frontiers*. Proceedings of the Eleventh Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (New York, June 13–16, 2013) (Leiden forthcoming).
- 51 See G. Woolf, 'Female mobility in the Roman west', in E. Hemelrijk and G. Woolf, eds., *Women and the Roman City in the Latin West* (Leiden and Boston 2013) 351–368 and 'Movers and stayers', in L. de Ligt and L.E. Tacoma, eds., *Migration and Mobility in the Early Roman Empire* (Leiden 2016) 438–461.

the emergence of new source material can be (in this case the publication of a number of new fragments of Dexippus' *Scythica*) since the evaluation of the impact of the invasions hinges on a precise historical reconstruction of the events.

That crises had consequences not only for the civilian population is shown by Tony Birley. As he explains, given the fixity of the legions at the periphery in the early Principate, when crises occurred men or units had to be transferred. Such transfers could on occasion take an empire-wide character. Two cases of cross-empire movement of high officials are meticulously reconstructed in his paper, mainly on the basis of the epigraphic record. Birley shows not only how high-ranking officers could be moved from one end of the empire to the other in specific circumstances, but also how in their wake some lesser men could be transferred as well. His paper highlights how careful epigraphical and prosopographical reconstruction can illuminate broader patterns of movement.

A complement to the war-time mobility of military personnel is presented in the paper by Peter Herz. In 'Die Mobilität römischer Soldaten in Friedenszeiten' Herz discusses the rather broad range of activities that soldiers engaged in when they were not fighting. As Herz remarks, apart from its obvious functions in war, the army also represented in peace time a large labour force that could be employed by the state. In the absence of a strict demarcation between civilian and military spheres, Roman emperors took a pragmatic attitude towards this potential labour force and employed soldiers when and where they saw fit. Herz provides an empire-wide survey on the basis of inscriptions and papyri, and uses the individual bits of information to create a typology of various types of peace-time mobility. The accumulated evidence suggests that the army in peace time was astonishingly mobile.

Amidst everything that is known about the *ordo senatorius* it is remarkable that senatorial mobility has not received the attention it deserves. Werner Eck's '*Ordo senatorius* und Mobilität: Auswirkungen und Konsequenzen im *Imperium Romanum*' makes up for the deficit. Eck not only traces the movement of senators and their families, but also emphasizes its effects on society. His analysis revolves around a number of elements: the well-known changes in the composition of the senate, the requirement that senators had to be physically present in Rome, the laws stipulating that a significant amount of their property had to be located in Italy, the fact that many magistracies entailed stays outside Rome and that their tenure also implied a significant amount of mobility. The sources, mainly but not solely epigraphical, are used to create a balance sheet. Not all of the consequences were positive, Eck emphasizes: for senatorial families, movement to Rome implied loss of influence in the day-to-day politics of the local community they originated from, whereas for the

local communities the senatorial transfer of wealth to the centre could be a significant drain. Eck emphasizes that newly established aristocratic households in Rome served in their turn as magnets for local communities seeking patronage. Migration fostered further mobility.

The latter element forms a connection to the paper by Elena Torregaray Pagola, whose study 'Diplomatic mobility and persuasion between Rome and the West (I–II AD)' starts from the dual observations that diplomatic efforts in the imperial period were mainly internal rather than by outsiders, and that there was a difference in the frequency with which they occurred between the western and eastern parts of the empire. Torregaray Pagola shows how *legationes* served to reiterate loyalty, fidelity and adhesion to the princeps. In many cases the embassies had no immediate concrete purpose, but served to establish direct ties with the centre that could be capitalized on at a later stage. In an important aside, she emphasizes that the nature of our documentation is such that it only focuses on the successes. Failed *legationes* are a rarity in our sources; at the same time, the immense stream of *legationes* coming from all over the empire must have meant that obtaining access to the emperor or the court cannot have been easy and in itself must already have counted as a success.

What is recorded and what is not is also central to the paper by Laurens Tacoma, which is written as a methodological pendant to his monograph *Moving Romans*.⁵² In 'Bones, stones, and Monica. Isola Sacra revisited', he juxtaposes three source types: isotopes, inscriptions, and the migration narrative of Augustine's *Confessiones*. Each source holds great potential for the study of migration, but the problem is that each tells a rather different story. Isotopes suggest a very significant presence of migrants at Ostia/Portus, epitaphs give precise information about their whereabouts but are few in number, whereas the *Confessiones* suggest how small families may have moved in patterns of step-wise mobility. His paper is presented as a warning against integrating the sources too hastily into a single migration narrative, and also as a warning against over-reliance on epigraphical evidence alone.

In 'Between mobility and connectivity in the ancient Mediterranean: coast-skirting travellers in the southern Levant', Gill Gambash explores the limitations of Horden and Purcell's concept of connectivity. Connectivity is not the same as actual human mobility, Gambash argues, and if Horden and Purcell's *cabotage* was as important for trade in the Mediterranean as they say, this must have important implications for passenger transport as well. Gambash's reading of the literary sources and the archaeological evidence from shipwrecks

52 L.E. Tacoma, *Moving Romans. Migration to Rome in the Principate* (Oxford 2016).

leads to a nuanced account of the possibilities and obstacles: most travel will have consisted of broken journeys, in small ships. Yet shipping routes were also remarkably resilient, in the Southern Levant continuing well into the early Islamic period.

Shipwrecks—imagined or real—also play a large role in the study by Margherita Carucci. It is well known that migration and mobility are gendered: male and female patterns of mobility, and the roles that are ascribed to them, may differ significantly. In ‘The dangers of female mobility in Roman imperial times’, Carucci explores the tension between two strong ideological concepts. On the one hand there was a rigid division of gender roles in which the female role was firmly positioned within the household, while on the other hand *concordia* between wife and husband structured their marriages. When husbands moved out of the house to serve as magistrates or generals, a conflict arose between the two concepts. It found its most literal expression in the concrete question of whether wives should follow their husbands abroad. On the basis of a large number of passages from Latin literature, Carucci shows how the tension was explored in literature, while at the same time pointing out that the female perspective is almost entirely lacking in such writings.

Starting from the famous papyrus in which the emperor expelled the Egyptians from Alexandria, Elena Koestner explores the concept of ethnic colonies. In ‘The *linouphoi* of P. Giss. 40 ii revisited: applying the sociological concept of ethnic colonies to Alexandria’s linen-weavers’, she argues that the Egyptians who migrated to Alexandria from the *chora* as labourers can be regarded as an ethnic community. This community functioned as a gateway for migrants into Alexandrian society, yet at the same time because of its visibility it could also be easily targeted in times of crisis, with the result that all Egyptians were expelled from the city.

‘*Coloni et incolae*, vingt ans après. Mobilité et identité sociales et juridiques dans le monde romain occidental’ by Stéphane Benoist starts from the observation that the perspective in the study of mobility has changed in response to modern concerns. Where 25 years ago the aim was to define imperialism and empire, nowadays modern refugee streams, problems of integration, and their consequences for societal cohesion are at the forefront of the concerns. Benoist focuses on those documents that provide information about terminology and the legal status of outsiders in the Roman host societies, mainly epigraphical ones. They show that Roman categorisations were far from stable; the meaning of *incolae* and *coloni* shifted over time. This dynamism forms a good starting point for the study of heterogeneity and integration.

Some of Benoist’s themes are picked up in the survey by Claudia Moatti. As stated above, her paper forms part of a much wider research project that is based on two principles: comparative research and the integration of law and

politics. Taking migration as a social process, she discusses how foreigners were categorized and at what level migration was subject to control. Moatti moves away from the notion that state intervention was limited but rather focuses on its role in channelling migration. She shows how the rich tapestry of legal evidence can not only be employed to determine formal state policy, but also or even primarily gives insight into general attitudes and mental categories.

7 Creating Empire

Although a new framework is still in the making, it is clear how far we are removed from Paul the Deacon's eighth-century perspective on Roman migration. The causation of migration is nowadays usually perceived quite differently from that proposed by Paul. We are wary of determinism, and perceive migration easier in pull terms than push terms (or try to avoid such terminology altogether). We tend to regard migration and mobility primarily as individual movement rather than that of collectives. We also try to avoid value judgements, and do not automatically see migration as a negative force.

We are inclined to think in multiple types of mobility rather than two types of migration. Various types of mobility are discussed in the papers. Collective deportations are discussed by de Blois and by Woolf, diplomatic mobility by Torregaray, and senatorial mobility by Eck. Cross-empire mobility of *virī militares* is addressed by Birley, peace-time military mobility by Herz. Marital mobility (of women accompanying their husbands) is covered by Carucci and Tacoma. Trade underlies much of the discussion of Gambash; temporary labour mobility is discussed by Koestner. A significant part of the mobility spectrum is covered, of varying duration and varying degrees of permanency.

These types of mobility impinged on each other. So, as Eck points out, senatorial mobility consisted of two separate movements: first the permanent migration of prospective senators to Rome, then their subsequent movement away from Rome as administrators for shorter stints. That Roman mobility patterns were extremely complex and interconnected might seem all too obvious, but its diversity is certainly a fundamental trait to keep in mind. For the modern period, a recent encyclopaedia lists over 200 forms of migration,⁵³ and it would be surprising indeed if in the Roman period migration were monolithic.

Obviously, people, goods and ideas spread, though not always simultaneously. It also seems likely that in the Roman period its scale was much larger than in previous and later periods. There cannot be any real doubt that the shift

53 K.J. Bade, P.C. Emmer, L. Lucassen, and J. Oltmer, eds., *Enzyklopädie Migration in Europa. Vom 17. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart* (München 2007).

in geographical horizons also entailed a shift in mental ones. One may with justification emphasize that women were socially caged,⁵⁴ but the sources also suggest that even their geographical horizons widened in the Roman period.

Such behaviour had economic consequences. These consequences are in the case of senatorial mobility explicitly addressed by Werner Eck: the concentration of wealth in Italy and the corresponding depletion of local funds. Elena Torregaray Pagola mentions the costs of the *legationes*, and of course some *legationes* were used to bring local economic problems to the attention of the emperor. The type of rural-urban labour migration discussed by Koestner from the Egyptian chora to Alexandria will have generated streams of wealth from the centre to the periphery.

As the diaspora theory discussed by Moatti suggests, migrants acted as intermediaries between sending and receiving communities.⁵⁵ Some did so in a literal sense. The case of the ambassadors is telling; apart from concrete benefits, they participated in a form of social ritual that tied communities to the centre. If we assume that many migrants remained in close contact with their home communities, such cultural brokerage became all the more important in creating a sense of coherence.

In that sense people created the Roman empire with their feet. Yet what did this empire look like? Migration streams are often conceptualised as a network. By moving around, people created a web of relationships. Obviously the density of the network intensified under Roman rule, and this was without doubt a very important development. Nevertheless, it remains remarkable that on the one hand people could travel freely from one end of the empire to the other, but, as Birley's paper shows, even within the army the attested cases remain exceptional. Rome's centrality in the migration network was undoubted, but for the rest there were regional patterns of zoning. Following Gambash' analysis of broken voyages, perhaps should we speak of a fractured connectivity in the Roman world?

Leiden-Rome, June 2016

54 Woolf 2013, op. cit. (n. 51).

55 T.T. Terpstra, *Trading Communities in the Roman World: a Micro-economic and Institutional Perspective* (Leiden 2013).