

MIGRATION AND INTEGRATION IN THE ROMAN WORLD: A NEW APPROACH TOWARDS CULTURE AND IDENTITY¹

Ylva Klaassen

Culture, cultural identities and cultural change are widely discussed issues in many Western countries today, and have also found their way into research on the Roman world. This article proposes to let the current (public and scholarly) interest in the integration of migrants in modern-day society inspire our perspective on cultural change and identity in the Roman empire. Outlining an integration-based approach, this article suggests that we may add to our understanding of (changes in) culture and identity by according migration and integration of individual migrants an important place in our analysis, focusing on the purveyors of culture themselves, and their actual experiences, and using modern social theory to raise new questions.

Introduction

Culture, cultural identities and cultural change are ‘hot issues’ in many Western societies today, partly because of concerns about migration of people from non-Western countries, the (lack of) integration of these migrants, and their potential influence on Western society and culture. These contemporary public concerns are reflected in a growing scholarly interest, within the social sciences, in migration and its consequences, and its relation to (changes in) culture and identity (see, among many others, Alba/Nee 2003; Brettell/Hollifield 2008; Foner 2005; Gabaccia 1998; Kalter 2008; Portes/DeWind 2007). Within the field of Classics and Ancient history, cultures and their functioning have been important topics in the past two decades as well. The debate on cultural change and identities in the Roman empire – often treated under the heading of ‘Romanization’ – is and has

¹ This article is based on research carried out for my MPhil-thesis at Leiden University. I would like to thank Frits Naerebout, Olivier Hekster, Daniëlle Slootjes and the anonymous referees of *Talanta* for their comments on earlier versions of this text. I am grateful to Peter Stork, Folkert van Straten, and Casper de Jonge for their helpful suggestions on the epitaph of Xenonianus (below). A last word of thanks is due to the Royal Netherlands Institute in Rome (KNIR) for its financial support. All remaining mistakes are, of course, my own.

been a very productive one²: its participants have presented new theories, sharpened our concepts, and significantly moved forward our understanding of the processes of cultural change and identity formation. Yet not many classical scholars have explicitly linked these topics to the migration and integration of individuals.

Many scholars have argued for the need for reflection on our own practice, drawing attention to ways in which our own times bias our interpretations of the Ancient world. But contemporary concerns may also encourage a new way of looking at the past and stimulate new questions about historical processes. This article proposes to let the current (public and scholarly) interest in the integration of migrants in modern-day society inspire our perspective on cultural change and identity in the Roman world. A common ground in both strands of research is the investigation of the ways in which people adapt to changing circumstances and construct identities in new contexts. This applies just as much to migrants as to people whose own environment is changing because of immigration or conquest by a foreign power. In this article, I suggest a way in which the contemporary issues of migration and integration may raise new questions with regard to cultural change and identities in the Roman empire, and how the integration of Roman migrants may be investigated using modern social scientific theory.

It is not my intention to argue that theories about integration inspired by the situation in the Western world in the past century are directly or unproblematically applicable to Antiquity, nor that classicists should always use social scientific theory. Rather, I aim to show that the theories and insights which the social sciences have produced with regard to modern migration and integration may open our eyes to new questions and methods for the investigation of the Roman material. If one wants to use modern theories for research into the Roman world, one must obviously be careful. There are many features that distinguish modern Europe from the Roman empire. To name only some, the existence of nation-states with national languages, active governments and immigration policies, a global economy, easy communication and transportation, higher rates of literacy and broader access to education. All these factors influence decisions of migration, the possibility of maintaining contact with home, the spread of official messages; in short: the whole process of migration and integration. These difficulties are not insurmountable, however, if one handles modern theories with care and keeps a close watch on applicability.

² The last years, the focus seems to have shifted from Romanization/cultural change towards the more dynamic concept of identity (cf. Mattingly 2010b); recent publications include Mattingly 2004; Hingley 2005; Dench 2005, the issue [118(1)] of *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome – Antiquité* 2006; Roth 2007; Wallace-Hadrill 2008; Revell 2009; Whitmarsh 2010; Hales/Hodos 2010 (esp. the contributions of Hingley, Hodos and Mattingly) and Mattingly 2010a.

1. Migration and integration theory

Mobility and migration are central elements in all societies, ancient and modern (cf. Manning 2005; Moch 2003; Bade *et alii* 2007a; Horden/Purcell 2000 on the Mediterranean). The movement of people profoundly influences all aspects of daily life, be it family organisation, eating habits or economic structures. Migration played a significant role in the Roman empire as well: soldiers marched through the provinces, imperial officials and traders travelled around for matters of administration and business, slaves were transported to their new owners, and artists, doctors, teachers and philosophers moved through various cities to offer their services. Migrants were visibly present in Roman society, so even those who did not migrate were confronted with migrants in their daily lives. Yet, there have not been many studies devoted to migration in the Roman empire as a phenomenon in its own right: many publications examine migration only in the light of other themes (Moatti 2004 on the regulation of movement; Laurence 1999 on roads). Those that do deal specifically with migration and mobility usually concentrate on the (late) Republic or late Antiquity, or on particular regions (Scheidel 2004 and 2005; Erdkamp 2008; Sordi 1994 and 1995; Noy 2000; Bertinelli/Donati 2006; the papers in Olshausen/Sonnabend 2006 cover the whole of Antiquity)³. No general works on migration in the Roman empire are as yet available. Moreover, the studies on mobility and migration in the Roman world usually do not link migration to cultural change. On the other hand, studies on cultural change and identity during the Principate rarely refer to migration, except migration by colonists and veterans. As regards integration, in the context of the Roman world, this notion is commonly used with reference to the (political, economic or cultural) integration of whole regions, or specific peoples, into the empire (Ehrhardt/Günster 2002; Jehne/Pfeilschifter 2006; Roth/Keller 2007). Integration in those cases is not related to migration, but to the confrontation of peoples and areas with the spread of Roman influence⁴.

The concept of 'integration' as it is used in this article is strongly related to migration, and is defined as the process by which (groups of) migrants become part of their new society on various levels and in various spheres – and perhaps even transform this society in the process⁵. Integration is a complex, 'non-linear, long-

³ For a list of regional studies see Wierschowski 1995, 23 n. 30, Wierschowski 2001 and Kakoschke 2004. Recently, scientists have joined classicists in mapping ancient migration by way of population genetics, and skeleton and isotope analysis, producing exciting results; e.g. Leach *et alii* 2009; Vernesi *et alii* 2004; Achilli *et alii* 2007; and www.reading.ac.uk/archaeology/research/Projects/arch-Diaspora.aspx for the University of Reading project.

⁴ Some papers in Bertinelli/Donati 2005 do discuss the integration of migrants, but not systematically.

⁵ My definition of integration is largely based on Lucassen 2005. I use the term 'integration' instead of 'incorporation' because it allows for an active role of migrants in the integration process. I deliberately avoid the term 'assimilation': although it is used by some scholars in a meaning similar to 'integration', the concept has also been used to indicate a complete adaptation of migrants to the conventions of the host society, something which is not at stake here.

term, and thus intergenerational process', the outcome of which is influenced by many factors (Lucassen 2005, 19; cf. Bade *et alii* 2007b). Migrants can, to a certain extent, actively affect their integration, but the success of their efforts is very much influenced by the individual characteristics of the migrants – such as age, sex, or human capital – and by the character of the receiving society – laws, institutions, attitudes towards migrants (Lucassen/Penninx 1997, 107-111 and 173-189; cf. Alba/Nee 2003, 38-57)⁶.

Integration takes place in various spheres of life – social, political, economic, cultural – but not necessarily at the same speed or in the same form. Integration does not necessarily entail the loss of one's own cultural elements or identities or straightforward adoption of the culture and values of the host society. Continuing ties with the home society – often termed 'transnationalism' – do not necessarily conflict with integration⁷. Nor does integration result in uniformity among migrants or in the receiving society (Lucassen 2005, 18). Moreover, integration of migrants affects the host society as well as the migrants: the integration of large groups of migrants with the same background can result in cultural changes in the receiving society (Bade *et alii* 2007b, 24)⁸. The process of societal change proceeds very slowly and the lasting effects of it are often not perceived as foreign by the native population (Lucassen 2005, 19; Hoerder/Lucassen/Lucassen 2007, 49).

Following Lucassen 2005, I distinguish two kinds of integration: *structural integration* and *identificational integration*. Structural integration encompasses the functional integration of migrants in the host society, especially in the socio-economic and political spheres⁹. Successful structural integration means that migrants have access to, and make use of, the same opportunities in society as their native-born peers. Three domains of structural integration may be distinguished: the socio-economic, socio-political, and socio-cultural domains (based

⁶ In line with current terminology in sociology and anthropology, I use the terms 'sending' or 'home' society, and 'receiving' or 'host' society. This does not imply that the societies discussed actively sent out migrants – although they sometimes did, in the case of Roman administrators, *coloni*, or soldiers – but the words are used only to concur with regular usage.

⁷ On transnationalism, see Portes/Guarnizo/Landolt 1999; Levitt/Glick Schiller 2007 and Vertovec 2009. These theories on transnationalism relate to modern-day practices and will not be used in this study, due to the fundamental differences in possibilities for keeping in contact in the Roman world. However, keeping in touch with one's home community was also important in Roman times; cf. Noy 2000, 157-204 on ways in which foreigners in Rome could preserve their connections with the people and culture of their home societies.

⁸ However, due to unbalanced power relations and the greater size of the native-born population, migrants usually affect their host societies to a lesser extent than the other way around. Evident changes are observable in, for instance, cuisine (cf. Gabaccia 1998), language or popular culture. It would be interesting to examine certain processes in the Roman empire – for instance in the widespread use of Greek in Rome, or the popularity of 'foreign' cults – in this light. On oriental cults in the Roman empire, see Alvar 2008. Generally, on foreigners in Rome: Noy 2000.

⁹ It is analogous to Lucassen/Penninx's 'social position' (1997, 102).

loosely on Lucassen/Penninx 1997; Ager/Strang 2004; Lucassen 2005; Bijl *et alii* 2008). For the Roman world, the first includes participation in the labour market, the possession of or income from immovable property, social mobility, mixed residence – in contrast to ethnic residential segregation – and the participation in associations or *collegia*. The second, socio-political sphere covers the possession of citizenship and/or suffrage, the holding of public office, euergetism (cf. Lomas/Cornell 2003, and, most recently, Zuiderhoek 2009) or financing of (building, artistic or other) projects, and the participation in networks of patronage. Lastly, the socio-cultural domain encompasses the command and usage of the new language, the participation in the religion of the host society, the expression of cultural forms of the host society¹⁰, social relationships with non-migrants, and exogamy. Depending on several factors, migrants may be more or less integrated in either sphere, but some degree of structural integration of migrants is almost inevitable, as migrants have to work in their new society to make a living, find a place to sleep, and have to be able to make themselves understandable to function in society. It is virtually impossible for a migrant to be completely unaffected by the host society after a certain period of time (Lucassen 2005, 19).

Identificational integration, on the other hand, relates to the degree to which “migrants and their offspring keep on regarding themselves as primarily different and to the extent that they are viewed as primarily different by the rest of society” (Lucassen 2005, 19; cf. Lucassen/Penninx’s 1997 ‘ethno-cultural position’ and their definition of ‘assimilation’ at 102-103). Important questions in assessing the extent of identificational integration are, for instance: “how ‘different’ or ‘not our sort of people’ are the newcomers felt to be? And vice versa, how alien do the newcomers find the host society? If the group of newcomers themselves stress their ‘otherness’, is this consciously preserved, or even cultivated? And to what extent are there tendencies in the host society which emphasize the ‘otherness’ of the newcomers, for example, by promoting nationalist sentiments?” (Lucassen/Penninx 1997, 102, with regard to the ‘ethno-cultural position’). Identificational integration is highly subjective and thus difficult to measure, especially when there is no possibility of interviewing migrants. Identificational integration often occurs *after* structural integration, and generally is a slower process: it usually takes many years – and often more than one generation – for migrants to become completely identificationally integrated, although the exact duration varies according to the situation. Research on contemporary integration reveals that many indicators of structural integration may also point towards identificational integration¹¹.

¹⁰ Including architecture, dress customs, eating habits, music, nomenclature, funerary rituals. Language and religion are such important aspects that they are treated separately.

¹¹ The use of the language of the host society, participation in the religion and the funerary practices of the host society, social relationships with non-migrants, exogamy, the reduction of the emphasis on a separate identity, the assumption of a name common in the host society (either for migrants themselves or for their children), and the reduction of discrimination or

Moreover, besides usually preceding identificational integration, structural integration (of the lack thereof) may also influence the process of identificational integration. For example, exclusion of migrants from institutions in the host society may discourage migrants to identify with their new society (Bijl *et alii* 2008, 201)¹². We may thus assume that, in general, the greater a migrant's structural integration, the more likely he or she is to identify with the new society. This does not mean that all migrants who are well integrated structurally do identify with their new society: structural integration without identificational integration is possible, when migrants work and live in their new society, but do not participate in the society's social and cultural life. Identificational integration without structural integration is a less likely combination, but it might occur when migrants are not considered 'foreign' anymore, yet do not have the possibility to change their social position. Migrants can, of course, also be integrated both structurally and identificationally. But integration is not inevitable: migrants can also miss out on the process, and become marginalized (for various combinations of structural and identificational integration see Lucassen/Penninx 1997, 102-103).

This division of structural and identificational integration – between becoming part of the new society in a more practical sense, and identifying with it – is a useful analytical distinction, not just because these forms of integration may arise from different motives, but also because they should be investigated in different ways. By differentiating these two forms, the question of how much migrants participate in the host society – something which can be more or less objectively measured – can be examined separately from the complex and contested issue of identity; although one should remember that this separation is analytical, and that the two forms are intertwined in reality¹³. Another advantage about this distinction is that it combines the societal dimension of many modern studies of inte-

negative stereotyping of migrants (based on Lucassen 2005, with some additions). Regarding foreigners in Rome, Noy (2000, 157-204) discusses several aspects of integration and identification by foreigners in Rome; he refers to the importation of foreign gods to Rome, distinct burial practices, and the use of one's native language and perhaps names as possible indicators of foreigners retaining their own (ethnic) identity. Because of the overlap of indicators for structural and identificational integration, it is sometimes hard to distinguish between the two. Language, for example, is primarily a means of communication, and in that sense belongs to the structural domain. But when migrants prefer to use the language of the host society even in the private sphere, this tends more towards an identificational issue (cf. Dench 2005, ch. 5 on the relation between language and identity). This holds true for many other socio-cultural domains as well: they partly overlap and influence each other. See Mattingly 2004; Dench 2005; Revell 2009; Hales/Hodos 2010 and Whitmarsh 2010 on various kinds of identities in the Roman world.

¹² On the other hand, structural integration supports some forms of identificational integration; Snel/Engbersen/Leerkes 2006, 287: "Empirical research shows that structural and cultural dimensions of integration are strongly related. Migrants with good social positions (high education, stable job) generally also have more informal contact with native Dutch people and more often endorse 'modern' ideas and values than other migrants".

¹³ Cf. Hingley 2010 on the use of 'Roman' elements for purposes other than 'becoming Roman'.

gration – which often pay much attention to integration in a structural sense – with the focus on identity and culture which prevails in many studies of cultural change in the Roman empire.

2. A model of integration for the Roman empire

Taking into account the limitations of the applicability of modern evidence to Antiquity, I have constructed a model based on modern social scientific theory in order to analyse the integration of migrants in the Roman empire. The proposed model consists of the list of indicators of structural and identificational integration as set forth above, plus a set of twelve factors that influence the integration of migrants¹⁴. For every factor there is a set of theories concerning the influence of that factor on the integration of the migrant, as suggested by current research. By filling in the variables and applying the accompanying modern theories one can make estimates of the forms and degrees of integration of migrants. Although many of the variables and accompanying theories are applicable to groups of migrants, the principal target here is the individual migrant¹⁵. Some factors partly overlap, and, more importantly, they are not isolated forces: they interact with each other and with the various indicators of integration, to influence the process of integration.

(1) A first factor which may influence integration is the total of structural characteristics of the place of destination which constitute the framework for integration. Structural characteristics – the society's political institutions, social relations, economic structures, the nature of the area and the population – partly determine the context of reception and thus migrants' possibilities, for instance in the field of political activity or participation in the labour market (cf. above and Morawska 2003).

(2) Another important factor is the occupation of the migrant, which influences the incentives to integrate and the necessity of contact with diverse groups of people. For instance, merchants regularly come into contact with the native population and have a clear economic interest in trying to learn the local language, whereas Roman administrators only communicate with a smaller and less diverse group of people¹⁶.

(3) Furthermore, in a world where a substantial part of the population was not free and did not possess Roman citizenship, legal status determined many aspects of

¹⁴ Inspired by Morawska 2003; Hoerder/Lucassen/Lucassen 2007, esp. 36-39 and 46-52; and Mattingly 2010a, ch. 8. The model is adapted to the Roman world: variables that are non-existent or that are not documented for this period – such as, for example, the presence of a nation-state, access to modern methods of communication, or quantitative data on education or crime – are left out.

¹⁵ Modern integration research uses census data, population registers, newspapers, personal interviews, etc. and can thus be both quantitative and qualitative. However, the restrictions on the ancient evidence preclude a full-scale quantitative analysis, and this investigation must of necessity be qualitative, and focused on individual migrants. Cf. Bijl *et alii* 2008, 201-202 on three levels of integration.

¹⁶ On the migration of merchants and craftsmen see Ruffing 2006.

life: freedom of action, legal protection, and the right to vote, hold office, participate in imperial gifts, serve in Roman legions, and conclude legal business transactions or marriages. Thus, some kinds of structural integration were unobtainable for those without freedom or, to a lesser extent, Roman citizenship. Legal status also has a bearing on identity (cf. Dench 2005, ch. 2).

(4) Linked to legal status are the social characteristics – by which I mean the gender, age, social capital and human capital – of the migrant. A migrant's gender determines social expectations and opportunities, such as employment opportunities, legal rights, access to education and social contacts, the prejudice encountered, etc. (Hagan 1998; Parrado/Flippen 2005; Curran *et al.* 2006; cf. Gardner 1986 and James/Dillon forthcoming on the position of women in the Roman world). All of these influence the possibilities for integration, often by putting women at a disadvantage. The age and life cycle of a migrant to a certain extent influences integration; for instance, younger migrants usually integrate quicker or more easily (Chiswick/Lee/Miller 2004; Trilla/Esteve/Domingo 2008; Rebhun 2008). A migrant's social and human capital are of specific importance for advancing in a society. Social capital can be defined as 'the ability of actors to secure benefits by virtue of membership in social networks or other social structures' (Portes 1998, 6). The use of these resources can bring certain advantages, such as job opportunities, housing, or better health (Völker/Pinkster/Flap 2008, 325-326), and may be acquired through participation in networks of patronage, membership of a *collegium*, political activity, or contact with friends (on associations in the ancient world see Waltzing 1895-1900; Van Nijf 1997; Verboven 2007 and 2011). Human capital refers to the migrant's "stock of knowledge, abilities and characteristics (...) that influences his or her productivity" (Bommes/Kolb 2006, 112), and comprises, for instance, education, professional qualifications, social skills, and language proficiency. More human capital generally leads to better chances in society; migrants with more human capital (e.g. in the form of literacy), or bringing a special skill to their host society – such as doctors or artists – were thus advantaged for structural integration.

(5) The economic status of the migrant – in the form of existing financial capital, migrants' earnings and the possession of land or buildings – influences the kind of accommodation he can afford, the neighbourhood where he can live, and the possibility to invest in education or in one's own business.

(6) A different factor is the cultural background of the migrant: his beliefs, values, habits and traditions, cultural competence, religion, etc. This is important, as both the cultural background of the migrant and its similarity to the culture of the receiving society influence the willingness and capacity of the migrant to integrate into the new society.

(7) A migrant's motives for migration affect what a migrant expects from migration, to what extent he is focused on the home or host society, and how much he wants to invest in integration (Bijl *et alii* 2008, 205). Migrants with an economic motive are more likely to have been willing to integrate, as knowledge of local languages and customs would increase their potential of success.

(8) Moreover, the duration of the migration – both the actual length and the period as initially expected by the migrant – influences whether migrants want to and have the chance to become integrated. The situation is clearly different in the case of temporary migrants such as seasonal workers, than in the case of persons being enslaved by Rome and with the prospect of permanent relocation.

(9) Migrants' attitudes towards and expectations of (life in) the host society influence their goals and their inclination towards integration: migrants disillusioned in their goals might develop a negative attitude towards the host society.

(10) A further factor is the presence of other foreigners in the place of destination, for instance the existence of ethnic communities or foreigners' associations, as they may help migrants find their way in the new society (cf. Noy 2000, 146-152). Associations of individuals or professionals from the same place of origin – such as those attested at the Piazzale delle Corporazioni in Ostia, or the *stationes* found around the Forum Romanum – or the communal worship of local gods could have a positive impact on structural integration, but may have limited identificational integration¹⁷.

(11) Another relevant aspect is the attitude of the host society towards foreigners, as expressed in laws and policy, the degree of ethnocentrism of the population, and prejudice. These may encourage or discourage individual or collective efforts at integration, or may in- or exclude particular groups from certain benefits or opportunities. The Roman empire did not have systematic immigration policies or laws with regard to foreigners (Moatti 2006), but did at times take *ad hoc* measures against specific ethnic, religious or professional groups, which often included many foreigners (Noy 2000, 37-47; Balsdon 1979, 106-108). On the other hand, the Roman state encouraged some groups, such as doctors and teachers, to migrate to Rome (Noy 2000, 47-48). Attitudes towards foreigners as found in literature are mostly negative, but it is difficult to unravel daily practice and literary *topos*; in any case, prejudice probably varied according to the ethnic group concerned (Noy 2000, 34-36).

(12) The last factor which may influence integration is the set of ties and differences between the home and host society of the migrant. In general, the more the host society resembles the home society in all aspects, the easier it probably is for migrants to get used to it and thus to integrate. Furthermore, power relations are

¹⁷ There has been a lot of modern research on the effects of ethnic communities in the host society. Associations of migrants and an ethnic infrastructure – churches, shops etc. – have been shown to create a network which provides information and practical support, thus aiding structural integration (Zhou 2007; Hirschman 2004; Takenaka 2003). However, migrants who have limited opportunities for contact with fellow countrymen intermarry more with natives (Schroedter/Kalter 2008) and may have a higher level of proficiency in the language of the host society (Chiswick/Lee/Miller 2004). Takenaka 2003 demonstrates how ethnic communities may hinder the identificational integration of their members, even though they are very well integrated structurally. On *stationes* in Rome cf. *IGUR I, Stationes civitatum exterarum* (pp. 70-78) and Noy 2000, 160-164, discussing also their role in providing information and facilitating communication with the homeland.

of profound importance: for instance, Roman provincial governors are not likely to integrate identificationally, because they do not need to: they are in power. Provincials wanting to rise in the social hierarchy, however, need to adapt themselves to the culture of those in power. Economic ties, the regularity of contact between the societies, technological differences and differences in cultural complexity between the home and host society may be further influenced by dis- or encouraging integration.

All of the above-named factors affect migrants' integration. Some of them may be traced through the archaeological record: for instance, an inscription may provide information on the age, status, occupation, origin and background of the migrant, whilst the characteristics of the find place and the quality of such an inscription may tell us something about the new society of the migrant, and his financial position. Other factors, such as motives for migration, attitudes and prejudice, are less straightforward and more difficult to trace, and will have to be inferred from other sources (e.g. literary) or be a matter of hypothesis.

It is important to remember, furthermore, that the factors discussed should not be considered to operate separately: they also influence each other. For example, financial capital and information about schooling (in the form of social capital) may lead to an increase in language proficiency (human capital), which can lead to an increase in contacts with natives, a better job or better housing conditions, which might influence the attitude of the migrant towards the host society and his expectation of the duration of his residence there. In the same way, the indicators of integration listed above "are 'markers'; because success in these domains is an indication of positive integration outcomes, and 'means' because success in these domains is likely to assist the wider integration process" (Ager/Strang 2004, 3). In the next section, I will test this model in two case studies, after which I will evaluate both the usefulness of my model for investigating integration in the Roman empire, and the contribution that an integration-based approach can make to research on cultural change¹⁸.

3. A first case of integration: Thaim, Syrian decurion and trader in Lugdunum

The first migrant is Thaim, also known als Iulianus, son of Sa'ad, who was a native of the village of Atheila (modern 'Atil) and was decurion in nearby Septimiana Canatha (or Canotha; modern Qanawat), in the Hauran in southwestern Syria (on Canatha before the Severan period, see Gebhardt 2002, 258-265). He was working as a trader in the area of the the Roman colony of Lugdunum (Lyon). The information about his life is preserved on a marble cippus (1.17 x

¹⁸ The case studies – two individual migrants attested by inscriptions – have been chosen on the basis of their richness of information, as expressed in text length, amount of detail and variation.

0.40 m.) dating from the end of the second or beginning of the third century AD¹⁹, which was found in the foundations of a villa in Genay, a village some kilometres from Lyon. The cippus was erected by Avidius Agrippa, Thaim's brother²⁰. The two funerary inscriptions on the cippus largely recount the same story:^{21,22}

[έν]θάδε κείται Θαῖμος ὁ καὶ Ἰο[υ]/λιανὸς Σαάδου· /
 [έ]σ[θ]λός τε πέφυκε καὶ ν[ή]δυ[μ]ος / Ἀθελιηνός, /
 βουλευτῆς πολί[τ]ης τε Κανωθαί[ω]ν ἐ[π]ί // Συρίας. /
 [δ]ς πάτρην τε λειπὼν ἦκε τῷδ' ἐπὶ χώρῳ, /
 [έ]ς π[ρ]ᾶσιν ἔχων ἐνπόρ[ι]ον ἀγορασμῶν /
 [μ]εστὸν, ἐκ Ἀκου[ι]τανίης ᾧδ' ἐπὶ Λουγου/δούνοιο. //
 ὤλεσεν ἐπὶ [ξ]ενίης θανάτῳ μοῖρ[α] / κραταίη.

“Here lies Thaimos, also known as Iulianos, son of Saados: he was born a noble and delightful Athelian, and was a councillor and citizen of (the people of) Canotha in Syria. Leaving his native land, he came to this region, for his business taking with him a storehouse full of purchases, from Aquitania here to Lugdunum. Mighty fate in a foreign country destroyed him through death”.

Diis Manibus / Thaemi Iuliani Sati [fi]l(ii) Syri / de vico Athelani decurion[i] //
 S]eptimiano Canotha nego/tiatori Luguduni et prov(incia) / Aquitan{ac}ica
 Avidius / Agrippa fratri pientissi/mo ob memoriam eius // faciendum curavit et /
 sub ascia dedicavit.

“To the di manes of Thaemus Iulianus, son of Satus, a Syrian, from the village of Athila, decurion in Septimiana Canotha, trader in Lyon and in the province of Aquitania. Avidius Agrippa had this made to the memory of his most loyal brother, and dedicated it sub ascia”.

The first factor which may influence integration, according to the proposed model, is the total of structural characteristics of the place of destination: the

¹⁹ As Rougé 1976, 215 states, the *terminus post quem* is related to the defeat of Clodius Albinus in 197; the *ante quem* is 212 (the Constitutio Antoniniana), because Thaim does not seem to be a citizen.

²⁰ This raises the question to what extent the text reflects Thaim's wishes. Of course, this is impossible to know, and therefore one has to be careful in interpreting any intentions. However, it is likely that the epitaph would not run counter to Thaim's last wishes; he might even have composed parts of the Greek text. Rougé 1976 takes *frater* to mean 'brother' in the sense of 'compatriote et (...) ami', which is also possible.

²¹ *CIL* XIII 2448 = *ILS* 7529; *IG* XIV 2532 = *IGR* 25; *AE* 1975, 616. Quoted here is the *IG* version of both texts, except for the fifth and sixth line of the Greek, for which the *CIL* reading is used. On epitaphs and other funerary practices in general, see Carroll 2006; on their use for research on identity see Van Nijf 2010.

²² Translations: Ylva Klaassen.

Roman colony of Lugdunum. The capital of Gallia Lugdunensis, Lugdunum was an important city, with a flourishing trade and probably a pluriform population – indigenous Gauls, merchants and craftsmen from all parts of the empire, and perhaps Roman veterans. There were thus quite some opportunities for foreign traders (cf. Wierschowski 1995, 174).

Thaim was a *negotiator*, with an ἐνπόριον ἀγορασμῶν μεστόν ἐκ Ἀκουιτανίης ὧδ' ἐπὶ Λουγουδούνοιο: a storehouse in Lugdunum, full of goods from Aquitania. He thus seems to have imported Aquitanian wares and stored them in Lugdunum, perhaps to sell them there, or to redistribute them to other areas²³. The text does not specify what kind of goods Thaim traded in, or to whom he sold them, but through his occupation as a trader, Thaim would regularly have come into contact with local inhabitants. Thus, he must to some degree have spoken the local language – either a Celtic language, or Latin – to be able to communicate with his suppliers and buyers. Both inscriptions also mention that Thaim was a *decurio* (βουλευτής) in the city of Canatha, but he probably would not have carried out any curial duties while in Gaul.

Thaim must have been freeborn, as he could not have been a decurion if he were a slave or *libertus* (Langhammer 1973, 191). Thaim was a citizen of Canatha, but not a Roman citizen, as there is no sign of the *tria nomina*: his legal status was thus that of a *peregrinus*. Working in a Roman colony, this must have caused certain disadvantages, such as limited legal protection and not being able to participate in local politics, or to conclude legal transactions or a legal marriage with Roman citizens (on Roman citizenship, see Sherwin-White 1973). However, modern research shows that lack of citizenship of migrants is a disadvantage particularly when it is accompanied by other factors, especially a low socio-economic position (Lucassen/Penninx 1997, 13). As Thaim had a relatively high economic and social status, his lack of Roman citizenship will have posed fewer problems to his integration. Furthermore, Thaim was a *decurio* in Canatha, which gave him certain (social and legal) privileges and immunities (Langhammer 1973, 219-236).

He must have had relatively much social capital²⁴. Although his membership of the Canathan upperclass might not have helped him much in Gaul, his status as a *decurio* – and thus his membership of the empire-wide upper class – might have made it easier for him to come into contact with the local elite in Lugdunum (cf. Woolf 1998 on the creation of an empire-wide elite culture, esp. 238-241). Although he does not seem to be associated with a *collegium* or other professional

²³ Cf. Rougé 1976. West 1924, 184, however, thinks that Thaim was a wholesale trader in both Lyon and Aquitania, instead of between the two places.

²⁴ A distinction can be made between bonding social capital – ties within a homogeneous social group, such as fellow countrymen – and bridging social capital – relations with people from heterogeneous groups (such as natives in the case of migrants). Whereas bonding social capital can encourage migrants' integration in the labour market, bridging social capital may lead to a decrease in discrimination; Iosifides *et alii* 2007.

association, as a trader, he had contacts with his suppliers and his customers (cf. Rougé 1976, 220). This bridging social capital may have led to a decrease in discrimination, and must have made integration easier for Thaim. His human capital was probably relatively large as well²⁵. One might expect that, as a *decurio*, he would have received a good education: he must have been literate and proficient in various languages – Greek, perhaps the indigenous Semitic language of Canatha, Latin, and some words of the local Celtic language. Thaim's human capital gave him opportunities to communicate with a variety of people and some experience in administering and organising, making it easier to set up a business in Gaul; all of these factors will have increased his socio-economic chances in general.

The fact that Thaim was a councillor means that he must have been quite well-to-do²⁶. Moreover, Thaim also possessed a storehouse. His financial status will have facilitated his migration to the other end of the empire, the setting up of his own business and his possible participation in public life in Lugdunum.

The fact that both Greek and Latin are used in the inscription is remarkable, as this may tell us more about Thaim's identifications (but cf. Kaimio 1979, 169 on inferring language use from inscriptions). Even though the Greek would not have been understandable to most of the readers of the inscription, the use of Greek is not surprising, as that would have been Thaim's native language. But what were the reasons for including a Latin epitaph as well? The clue to interpretation lies in the fact that the Latin is not a direct translation of the Greek: the content and tone of the two texts are different. The Greek text is more poetic and comprehensive, while the Latin text is factual, concise and more impersonal²⁷. This probably reflects a difference in intended audience, as well as in purpose (cf. Adams 2004, 32-36). The Latin epitaph conforms to local funerary practices: Latin was considered 'the natural language to use for epitaphs' (Noy 2000, 170 on Rome, but probably also valid for a Roman colony like Lugdunum; cf. also 174-175),

²⁵ Cf. West 1924, 183: "Unlike the wandering Jews, the Syrian traders seem to have been almost without exception men of the better class". More human capital generally leads to a better socio-economic status in the new society, and more contact with natives (Alarcón 2000, 316; Schroedter/Kalter 2008, 363; Trilla/Estève/Domingo 2008); cf. the various members of the Greek elite resident in Rome. Better educated migrants are generally more proficient in the language of the host society, which leads to better chances on integration, both in the structural and in the identificational domain, ranging from greater suitability for all kinds of jobs to increased opportunities to communicate with and befriend natives (Smits/Gündüz-Hogör 2003; Chiswick/Lee/Miller 2004; Bijl *et alii* 2008, 206).

²⁶ The minimum level of wealth required to become a *decurio* in Canatha is unknown, but may have been around the level of the equestrian census; Der Neue Pauly, *s.v.* *decurio* (C. Gizewski).

²⁷ The Greek inscription is metric, but not of very high quality (cf. Kaibel's comment in *CIL* XIII, p. 379), and seems to be trying to imitate Homeric poetry with the Ionic genitive Λουγουδούνοιο, the formula μοῖρα κραταιή and the beginning of a sentence with ὃς in verse four – although the *moira*-formula may also have become common in metric epitaphs; Robert/Robert 1976, 800.

and the *sub ascia*-dedication is a formula distinctive of Lugdunum (Audin 1979, 188-194). Thus, whereas the Greek was a logical choice, the Latin inscription may have been added to concur with local standards. However, language can also be a very important marker of identity when an individual has a choice between various languages (Adams 2004, 751-752). Thus, perhaps the use of Latin was also a way of stressing Thaim's new identity as a Latin-speaking inhabitant of a Roman colony. The Greek was probably added to evoke Thaim's cultural origins – a Hellenistic *polis* – and express a certain cultural identity, and, through the hexameters and poetic allusions, highlight his refinement²⁸. We may thus add the expression of cultural forms of the host society to the indicators of integration, but should also keep in mind the emphasis on Thaim's Greek cultural origins.

Research shows that migrants' use of names that are common in the receiving society can be taken as an indicator of identificational integration (Gerhards/Hans 2008 on migrants in Germany; cf. Adams 2004, 752-753 on the Roman world). Thaim's name is Semitic, as is that of his father (Wuthnow 1930); however, Thaim also has a second name, Iulianus (cf. Jones 1978 on another Syrian trader in Lyon with the name Julianus). The use of aliases – in the form of ὀ καὶ-names – is regularly documented in the eastern part of the Empire, and can be a practical measure, facilitating communication. On the other hand, considering the inclusion of his second name in his epitaph, together with the fact that half of his epitaph is written in Latin, Thaim may have identified to some extent with the Gallo-Roman culture of Lugdunum (on the use of names in constructing identity, see Van Nijf 2010).

In general, migrants with a cultural background similar to that of the receiving society are more likely to integrate than migrants coming from a culture which is very different from the receiving society's. This applies to the structural, but perhaps even more to the identificational sphere (Grant 2007)²⁹. There were obvious differences between Gaul and Syria, for instance in language, indigenous material culture, and religion³⁰. On the other hand, Canatha and Lugdunum also had certain things in common, due to Roman influence on administration, religion (e.g. the presence of cults for Roman gods and emperors), and architecture. However, in terms of the model, the perceived cultural distance between Canatha and Lugdunum was probably relatively large, which will have complicated integration.

²⁸ Cf. Noy 2000, 172 on Greek as a literary language. Adams 2004, 688: "The languages chosen for the epitaph advertise on the one hand his eastern origins, and on the other his acquired Latin culture".

²⁹ Research on the Netherlands shows that migrants with a cultural background similar to the Dutch – i.e. from western Europe and the U.S. – have more contact with native Dutch than migrants with more dissimilar cultural background such as Turks and Moroccans: Völker/Pinkster/Flap 2008. Migrants with a Christian background integrate faster into western European societies than do those with a Muslim or Hindu background: Lucassen 2005, 207.

³⁰ Canatha was one of the cities of the Decapolis, and had a native Semitic culture and a strong Greek influence: Sourdel 1952, 11; Butcher 2003, 113. On religious life in Lyon see Willeumier 1953, 88-97.

It does not become clear how long Thaim has been in Gaul, but in any case long enough to have established a business. The formulation ἐπὶ ξενίης seems to suggest that he had no intention to die in Gaul and that he expected to return home eventually; this might mean that he was less inclined to identify with Lugdunum's society³¹.

The attitudes of the host society – both in its official policies and in popular opinion – have a great influence on migrants' integration³². The Roman stereotype of Syrians as found in literature is quite negative: they were considered servile, degenerate, effeminate (Isaac 2004, 337-350). However, due to the spread of Syrian traders throughout the Roman empire, Thaim's high status, and the fact that there were also many other foreigners in Lyon who might not have shared Roman prejudice, Thaim might have been looked upon with more appreciation. There were no unequal power relations between the provinces of Lugdunensis and Syria: both regions were under Roman rule. The city of Lugdunum was a *colonia*, however, and therefore the part of the population with Roman citizenship was in a dominant position vis-à-vis non-citizens such as Thaim. Social mobility thus necessitated adaptation to the rules laid down by the Roman administrators and some forms of structural integration, such as proficiency in the language of the administration.

Concluding, Thaim's structural integration seems to be quite high: he probably had a reasonable command of Latin; he participated in the Gallic labour market and owned immovable property; he probably had contacts among non-Syrians, such as his suppliers and customers; his social and human capital increased his business opportunities and thus his social mobility; as a Canathan *decurio*, it might have been easier to come into contact with the local upper classes in Lugdunum; and the thriving trade in Lugdunum would have created opportunities for migrants, and perhaps easier acceptance by the host society. His identificational integration is more difficult to estimate, but his very probable command of Latin, his social relations with non-Syrians, the use of Latin in his epitaph, and the assumption of the name Iulianus may point to a moderate identificational integration.

4. A second migrant: Xenonianus Aquila, Bithynian stone-merchant in Rome

The second migrant is known to us through a funerary inscription on a marble plate of a little less than one by two and a half metres. The plate, which was found

³¹ Many studies show that the level of integration often increases with the duration of stay, specifically in the case of language proficiency, likelihood of employment, and marriages to natives: Chiswick/Lee/Miller 2004; Rebhun 2008; Trilla/Estevé/Domingo 2008. Furthermore, the longer the expectation of the stay in the new society, the more reasons and opportunities migrants have to integrate: Dustman 1999; Chiswick/Lee/Miller 2004.

³² Migrants facing discrimination can have more problems integrating structurally – for example because they are denied jobs, housing or health care, and have difficulty becoming friends with natives – and tend to identify less with their host society; Grant 2007; Itzigsohn/Giorguli-Saucedo 2005; Bijl *et alii* 2008.

under the floor of the church of S. Saba on the Aventine, may be dated to the end of the second or beginning of the third century AD³³. The epitaph commemorates Marcus Aurelius Xenonianus Aquila, a λιθενπόρος (a stone-merchant, probably a marble dealer) from Bithynia, who owned a *statio* (office or shop) in the *horrea Petroniana*. The inscription quotes an imagined passer-by's question, and Xenonianus' response³⁴:

θαῦμα μέγιστον ὄρῳ· τίς ὁ ξένος / ἐνθάδε τοῦτο ἀνέθηκεν; / Μ(άρκος)
 Αὐ(ρήλιος) Ξεωνιανὸς Ἀκύλας Βειθυνὸς γενεῆ, / στατίωνα ἴσχων ἐν ὀρίοις
 Πετρωνιανοῖς / πρῶτος, λιθενπόρων ἄριστος, ζήσας // εὐχρώμωσ, ἔθηκα τὴν
 πύαλον.

*"I see a very great marvel: who is the foreigner who set up that (thing) there? I, Marcus Aurelius Xenonianus Aquila, Bithynian by birth, the first to have a statio in the horrea Petroniana, the best of the stone-merchants, having lived safe and sound, put up this sarcophagus"*³⁵.

Xenonianus seems to have chosen the sarcophagus and composed the text while still alive, considering the use of the first person (ἔθηκα). The inscription mentions a sarcophagus (πύαλον), which is now lost.

Rome was the city of the emperor and the senate, and as such marble was in great demand, for state-sponsored building projects and privately commissioned objects such as marble funerary monuments (cf. Maischberger 1997 on marble in Rome). The Emporium district, the commercial port district of Rome, housed wharves, docks and warehouses, and formed an excellent location to set up a business. In short, Rome was the perfect place for someone from Asia Minor wanting to engage in the marble trade.

³³ As Xenonianus was probably granted citizenship under Marcus Aurelius, Commodus (Loane 1944, 19 n. 60) or Caracalla, considering his name. Mercati 1924-1925, 196 dates it no later than the second century on the basis of the letter forms.

³⁴ *IGUR* II 413; *SEG* IV 106. The plate may have been broken off at the bottom; hence, the inscription may have been longer originally, perhaps indicating for whom the sarcophagus was set up, or praising its beauty: Mercati 1924-1925, 191.

³⁵ Translation: Ylva Klaassen. The interpretation of the last lines of the inscription is somewhat confusing, especially with regard to the linking of words. The most plausible reading would be, in my opinion: στατίωνα ἴσχων ἐν ὀρίοις Πετρωνιανοῖς πρῶτος + λιθενπόρων ἄριστος + ζήσας εὐχρώμωσ + ἔθηκα τὴν πύαλον, meaning that Xenonianus was the first (in general, or in his family, or of the Bithynians) to have an office in the *horrea Petroniana*, that he was the best of the stone-merchants, that he lived safe and sound, and that he put up the sarcophagus. The passage στατίωνα ἴσχων ἐν ὀρίοις Πετρωνιανοῖς is very interesting: Xenonianus uses the Latin words *statio* and *horrea Petroniana*, but in the Greek alphabet and inflected according to Greek grammar. The terms *statio* and *horreum* were probably widely used also by Greek-speaking persons in Rome, perhaps because these terms did not have a Greek equivalent with the same connotations as the Latin terms; cf. Adams 2004, 26.

Xenonianus probably imported Bithynian marble to Rome for the Roman state; he must have been an independent dealer, storing and perhaps selling the state-owned marble in the *horrea Petroniana*, which were imperial warehouses, probably in the Emporium district (Rickman 1971, 174-176; Loane 1944, 19 n. 60).³⁶ As such, he came in contact with a varied group of people – shippers, carriers, other marble dealers and Roman officials – and had an economic interest in integrating.

Marcus Aurelius Xenonianus Aquila was a Roman citizen, as evidenced by his name. He was probably a freeborn Bithynian who was granted citizenship; or else an imperial freedman³⁷. Xenonianus thus possessed all – or at least most, if he were a freedman – of the rights of a Roman citizen, and thus would have met (almost) no impediments to integration in the legal sphere (on the status of freedmen, see Duff 1928, 50-71; Treggiari 1969, 37-86).

Xenonianus' social capital must have been average or above: he had dealings with various people in the *horrea*, including probably some Roman officials managing the *horrea*³⁸. His social capital thus provided him with the resources to maintain and perhaps expand his business. If he was an imperial *libertus*, or if he was awarded citizenship on a personal basis, he may have even received some imperial support. His human capital may be considered average or somewhat above that. Apart from his native Greek, Xenonianus must have spoken some Latin to be able to establish a business in Rome. That he was literate is suggested by the epitaph, which he probably composed himself, including even some metrical elements. He also held professional skills, as the owner of a marble shop, and was thus well equipped for structural integration in Rome.

Xenonianus must have made a decent living, as he owned a shop in the *horrea Petroniana* and could set up a sarcophagus described as a *θαῦμα μέγιστον*. His economic status made it easier for him to set up a business and to attain structural integration in other domains, such as good housing or social mobility.

As argued previously, the choice of a particular language can express a certain identity, and the fact that the epitaph is not in the language of the host society, but

³⁶ He may also have dealt in sarcophagi, catering to the Roman popularity of marble sarcophagi from the early second century AD onwards; Noy 2000, 114.

³⁷ He could have been granted citizenship on his manumission, by consequence of the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, by imperial grant, or he could have inherited citizenship by birth. The last option is not likely, given the absence of the usual filiation. He could be an imperial freedman (as suggests Rickman 1971, 174 and Loane 1944, 19 n. 60), as imperial slaves and freedmen are frequently attested as contractors and administrators of marble quarries: Der Neue Pauly, *s.v.* marmor (R.M. Schneider); on freedmen involved in trade, see Duff 1928, 105-117 and Treggiari 1969, 95-106. However, one would expect the inclusion of the formula 'Aug. lib.' or something like it in the text.

³⁸ The inscription does not mention membership of a *collegium*, but he may have belonged to a professional association of marble dealers. Waltzing 1895-1900 (vol. 4, p. 29, no. 78) mentions an association of *marmorarii* in his list of known associations, but this seems to refer primarily to marble workers, not dealers.

in Xenonianus' native Greek, may indicate that there was at least an element of his Greek identity that he wanted to stress, even after death³⁹. Interesting is also the use of the uncommon term πύαλος for sarcophagus, which seems to be distinctively Bithynian (J. Kubińska in *IGUR* II.1, p. 84). Xenonianus' name is an interesting mixture of a Greek root ξενο- with the Latin ending '-ianus'⁴⁰; the cognomen Aquila is often attested in *Bithynia et Pontus* (Marek 2003, 118). Xenonianus thus had a Latin name, but with a reference to his Hellenistic cultural origins.

Xenonianus came from somewhere in Bithynia in Asia Minor; unfortunately, he does not specify the region or town. The cultural distance between home and host society in this case seems to have been much smaller than for Thaim. Greek culture was omnipresent in Rome at this time, and the Bithynian cities along the Black Sea shores had their roots in the Hellenistic period or had been under Greek-Hellenistic influence for many centuries, were highly developed, and produced leading intellectuals and scientists (Marek 2003, 66-67; 149-159). Furthermore, they were familiar with Latin and elements of Roman culture (Marek 2003, 179). Despite cultural differences between Rome and Bithynia, Xenonianus will have felt relatively familiar, which would have made integration easier.

The motives for Xenonianus' migration are not given. He may have come to Rome to set up his business, or may have been enslaved in Bithynia and transported to Rome. But, whatever the original reasons for coming to Rome, as a dealer he now had a clear economic interest in being able to communicate with his suppliers and clients, to maintain contacts with others and to understand the functioning of society. He would thus be inclined to attain a certain degree of structural integration⁴¹.

³⁹ On (elite) Greek (cultural) identity under the empire, see Swain 1996; Goldhill 2001; Borg 2004; Konstan/Said 2006. One might argue that Greek language and culture were already so widespread in Rome that an epitaph in Greek would not count as a sign of non-integration. However, although Greek 'was familiar as a spoken language in Rome at least by the time of Plautus' (Noy 2000, 171), the language was mostly associated with high culture (philosophy, literature) and with low status (ex-slaves and immigrants); Kaimio 1979, 172; Noy 2000, 172. For individuals belonging to the 'middle classes' at Rome, like Xenonianus, it is likely that the use of Greek was primarily connected to their geographical origin, and not to an attempt to highlight their cultural refinement; cf. the observation in Noy (2000, 173) that most Bithynian foreigners' epitaphs in Rome are in Greek.

⁴⁰ By the time of Severus, in some Bithynian cities Roman(-sounding) names had become popular among the upper classes, also for individuals without Roman citizenship: Marek 2003, 144. Frequently, these took the form of Greek names with a Latin suffix as *-ianus*. It is impossible to tell whether Xenonianus made up this new cognomen when he was granted citizenship, or whether this was his original name, or if his original name already contained the root ξενο- and he merely Latinised it after becoming a Roman citizen; in any case, the Latin form of the name is notable. On the use of Greek personal names see Matthews/Hornblower 2000.

⁴¹ In general, persons migrating for career motives are more inclined to be proficient in the language of the new society, probably because they are favourably self-selected or because they have an economic interest in being able to communicate with natives: Chiswick/Lee/Miller 2004. This economic interest for integration would possibly also be valid

Xenonianus' expectations for the future or his opinions on Rome are not recorded in the inscription. He does, however, call himself a ξένοϛ in his epitaph. This might suggest that he did not fully identify with Rome and still considered himself a foreigner, it may reflect the exotic appearance of the sarcophagus, or it might just be word-play with the name of Xenonianus (Mercati 1924-25, 193). There were many other foreigners in Rome and several other inscriptions by Bithynians have been found in Rome. Noy even argues that “[m]ost known immigrants connected directly or indirectly with the marble trade come from Asia Minor, particularly from Bithynia”. (Noy 2000, 114; cf. also *idem*, 229 and Ruffing 2006, 144-147). It may be possible that Bithynians dominated certain sectors of the marble trade and thus occupied an ethnic niche⁴². If they did, and if they formed some kind of community – perhaps even had their own *statio* – they will probably have helped each other in finding business opportunities and storage spaces (structural integration), but this might have hindered identificational integration in Rome.

Of Roman attitudes towards Bithynians in particular not much is known, whereas Roman views on Greeks and Greek culture is so large and well-known a topic that it is impossible to give a fair account of the discussion here⁴³. However, one can wonder to what degree the popular stereotype of the degenerate *Graeculus* would have affected someone like Xenonianus: as much of the marble coming to Rome was imported from the Greek east, it was probably considered logical that many persons involved in the marble trade were natives of those regions. Therefore, and taking into account also the presence of many other foreigners in Rome, Xenonianus' integration may not have been hindered by discrimination. Bithynia had been under Roman rule for more than two centuries when Xenonianus came to Rome: the power relations between the two regions were clear. However, Xenonianus would have been less disadvantaged by this fact, as he was a Roman citizen and was thus on an equal footing with many other inhabitants of Rome. The trade in Proconnesian marble between Bithynia and Rome formed a strong economic tie between the two regions (cf. Noy 2000, 229), which facilitated employment and business opportunities for Xenonianus, and will have familiarised the inhabitants of Rome with Bithynian people and goods.

Concluding, Xenonianus was quite well integrated structurally: he was a marble trader with professional skills and his own office (the *statio*), who had contacts with suppliers and clients, was literate, and possessed Roman citizenship and as

in relation to establishing contacts with natives, and certainly in the case of labour market participation. Cf. also Bijl *et alii* 2008, 205.

⁴² Ethnic niching occurs when particular ethnic groups dominate certain sectors of the economy: Zhou 2007. Cf. Bommers/Kolb 2006, 116-117.

⁴³ See the publications listed in Isaac 2004, 381 n.1. On Hellenic culture and Hellenisation see Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 14-28. Romans did not always distinguish between Greek-speaking inhabitants of Greece proper, Asia Minor and other areas in the Greek-speaking east; Isaac 2004, 317-319.

such occupied a privileged legal position with regard to non-citizen immigrants. If he came from one of the Bithynian cities, Xenonianus would have found many familiar cultural elements in Rome, which made it easier to adapt to the new society. Here too, identificational integration is harder to measure or estimate. Xenonianus had a Latin(ised) name and Roman citizenship, and the limited cultural distance between the Bithynian cities and the hellenised culture in Rome would increase chances on identification. On the other hand, he composed his epitaph in Greek and probably had a lot of contact with other marble dealers from the same region, which may have made Xenonianus less inclined to identify with Rome.

5. A new approach?

The examination of these two cases suggests that approaching the integration of migrants with the proposed model is rewarding. Using a broad set of indicators, variables, and theories it is possible to extract a large amount of information from the sources – information which might not have come up otherwise – and to provide better insights into the integration and experiences of migrants. It raises new questions with regard to the familiar material, by approaching it from a different angle, and can thus stimulate a new outlook on the integration of migrants. Inevitably, the model does have some drawbacks; for instance, it is not always easy to tell whether an individual that is attested intended to migrate permanently, or had planned to return home but died before getting the chance. Also, we usually only have evidence for one generation of migrants while migration scholars agree on complete integration being an intergenerational process. While this may limit the scope of observations that can be made with respect to the individual migrant, taking account of the specific context and its conventions and limitations can partially solve these problems.

More important than the suitability of this model to investigate individual migrants' integration, however, is the contribution that an integration-based approach such as this one can make to our understanding of processes of cultural change and identity construction in the Roman empire. Firstly, it draws attention to the significant role of mobility and migration in processes of cultural change. As culture contact in the Roman world did not proceed through modern mass media, but usually through direct contact between exponents of different cultures, mobility and migration are a key component in understanding culture contact and any of its consequences – such as changes in culture and identities. The impact of migration, moreover, extends beyond the experiences of the migrants themselves: people who did not migrate were regularly confronted with migrants and different cultures as well.

Secondly, this model concentrates on the practical level and on the purveyors of culture themselves, also at the levels below the elite. To fully understand the dynamics of cultural change and identity construction, one has to pay attention to the base: the human actors themselves. By using general theories to 'zoom in' on individuals, it becomes possible to look at the actual workings and consequences

of culture contact and integration. Moreover, a less biased and more comparative attitude towards the motives and consequences of these processes can be taken by employing a framework with a varied set of factors and indicators. Using a framework like 'Romanization' etymologically implies an outcome of the process that is more 'Roman' than before, and necessitates a distinction between 'Romans' and 'non-Romans'. When constructing a model with a particular set of variables which can be filled in for any situation, results may be compared to each other, and a less 'Roman-centred' view may be taken on cultural change.

Finally, this article has proposed a method to gain more insight into processes in the Roman world by using concepts and theories conceived by modern sociological and anthropological research. Social scientists can dispose of a large body of much more direct (empirical) evidence, which means that their results can be more comprehensive and more detailed. Although their findings can never be directly applied to Antiquity, they can certainly inspire new insights about the past and illuminate processes in the ancient world, both by providing guidelines and questions for research, and by enabling comparisons across time and place. For instance, Donna Gabaccia analyses the processes by which ethnic identities were expressed in eating habits in the United States of the last centuries, how these habits were influenced by the influx of migrants and came to acquire different meanings in other settings, sometimes to become completely disconnected from their original ethnic backgrounds (Gabaccia 1998). These processes might encourage a new outlook on processes of change in culture or identities in the Roman world. Another example of modern theory that may be interesting in this respect is the 'new assimilation theory', proposed by Richard Alba and Victor Nee in their *Remaking the American Mainstream* (2003). Alba and Nee define 'assimilation' as 'the decline of an ethnic distinction and its corollary cultural and social differences' (Alba/Nee 2003, 11). As immigrants strive to advance in their new society, the ethnic boundaries between them and the mainstream⁴⁴ change or ultimately disappear: "[i]ndividuals' ethnic origins become less and less relevant in relation to the members of another ethnic group ... and individuals on both sides of the boundary see themselves more and more as alike, assuming they are similar in terms of some other critical factors such as social class; in other words, they mutually perceive themselves with less and less frequency in terms of ethnic categories and increasingly only under specific circumstances". (Alba/Nee 2003, 11). Ethnic differences between groups and individuals continue to exist, but ethnicity as the primary criterion of distinction is replaced by other criteria such as class. Furthermore, while immigrants assimilate into the mainstream, they also change it in the process. To what extent can we discern similar processes in the Roman world, for instance in Roman Gaul? In his *Becoming Roman* (1998),

⁴⁴ The mainstream is the part of society "within which ethnic and racial origins have at most minor impacts on life chances or opportunities" and which includes the society's ethnic majority; Alba/Nee 2003, 12 and n. 31.

Greg Woolf seems to describe a similar development. During the first period after the conquest of Gaul – the ‘formative period’ of Gallo-Roman culture – the main differences were between ‘Romans’ and ‘non-Romans’, in a political or ethnic sense. As Gaul became integrated into the Roman empire, and Gauls acquired cultural competence in Roman culture, the importance of ‘Roman’ as a political or ethnic marker diminished and “the styles and goods that had once symbolized Roman and not Gaulish, civilized and not barbarian came to mean rich not poor, and educated not boorish” (Woolf 1998, 240). The label ‘Roman’ thus came to indicate social status and eminence⁴⁵, and social class and ‘civilization’ became the primary means of distinction and of in- or exclusion. These processes seem to contain some comparable elements, and perhaps looking at the Roman situation with Alba & Nee’s perspective may provide us with some new ideas.

In short, by according migration and integration an important place in our analysis, by focusing on the purveyors of culture themselves and their actual experiences, and by using modern social scientific theory to study the Roman world, the integration-based approach presented in this article can add to our understanding of (changes in) culture and identity. Migration and integration were fundamental aspects of ancient life: they deserve a central place in our interpretations of the Roman empire.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achilli, A. *et alii* 2007: Mitochondrial DNA variation of modern Tuscans supports the Near Eastern origin of Etruscans, *The American journal of human genetics* 80(4), 759-768.
- Adams, J.N. 2003: Romanitas and the Latin language, *Classical Quarterly* 53(1), 184–205.
- Adams, J.N. 2004: *Bilingualism and the Latin language*, Cambridge.
- AE: Cagnat, R. *et alii* (eds.), 1889→: *l'Année épigraphique: revue des publications épigraphiques relatives à l'antiquité romaine*, Paris.
- Ager, A./A. Strang 2004: *Indicators of integration: final report*, London (available at <http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/dpr28.pdf>).
- Alarcón, R. 2000: Skilled immigrants and cerebreros: foreign-born engineers and scientists in the high-technology industry of Silicon Valley, in: Foner, N./R.G. Rumbaut/S.J. Gold (eds.), 2000: *Immigration research for a new century. Multidisciplinary perspectives*, New York, 301-321.
- Alba, R./V. Nee 2003: *Remaking the American mainstream: assimilation and contemporary immigration*, Cambridge, MA.
- Alvar, J. 2008: *Romanising Oriental Gods. Myth, salvation and ethics in the cults of Cybele, Isis and Mithras*, Leiden/Boston.
- Audin, A. 1979: *Lyon: miroir de Rome*, Paris.
- Ausbüttel, F. 1982: *Untersuchungen zu den Vereinen im Westen des römischen Reiches*, Kallmünz.

⁴⁵ Woolf 1998, 240: “Those Roman aristocrats who had taken on themselves the burden of regulating civilization had defined Roman culture in such a way that it might function as a marker of status, not of political or ethnic identity”.

- Bade, K.J./P.C. Emmer/L. Lucassen/J. Oltmer 2007a: *Enzyklopädie Migration in Europa: vom 17. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart*, Paderborn/München.
- Bade, K.J./P.C. Emmer/L. Lucassen/J. Oltmer 2007b: Die Enzyklopädie: Idee – Konzept – Realisierung, in: Bade *et alii* 2007a, 19-27.
- Balsdon, J.P.V.D. 1979: *Romans and aliens*, London.
- Bertinelli, M.G.A./A. Donati (eds.) 2005: *Il cittadino, lo straniero, il barbaro, fra integrazione ed emarginazione nell'antichità*, *Atti del I Incontro Internazionale di Storia Antica (Genova 22-24 maggio 2003)*, Rome.
- Bertinelli, M.G.A./A. Donati 2006: *Le vie della storia. Migrazioni di popoli, viaggi di individui, circolazione di idee nel Mediterraneo antico*, Rome.
- Bommes, M./H. Kolb 2006: Migrants' work, entrepreneurship and economic integration, in: Penninx, R./M. Berger/K. Kraal (eds.), 2006: *The dynamics of international migration and settlement in Europe: a state of the art*, Amsterdam, 99-132.
- Borg, B.E. (ed.) 2004: *Paideia: the world of the Second Sophistic*, Berlin.
- Brettell, C.B./J.F. Hollifield (eds.), 2008 (second edition): *Migration theory. Talking across disciplines*, London/New York.
- Butcher, K. 2003: *Roman Syria and the Near East*, London.
- Bijl, R.V./A. Zorlu/R.P.W. Jennissen/P. Simon 2008: The integration of migrants in the Netherlands monitored over time: trend and cohort analyses, in: Bonifazi, C./M. Okólski/J. Schoorl/P. Simon (eds.), *International migration in Europe: new trends and new methods of analysis*, Amsterdam, 199-223.
- Carroll, M. 2006: *Spirits of the dead. Roman funerary commemoration in western Europe*, Oxford.
- Chiswick, B.F./Y.L. Lee/P.W. Miller 2004: Immigrants' language skills: the Australian experience in a longitudinal survey, *The international migration review* 38(2), 611-654.
- CIL= (various editors), 1862→: *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin.
- Curran, S.R./S. Schafer/K.M. Donato/F. Garip 2006: Mapping gender and migration in sociological scholarship: is it segregation or integration?, *The international migration review* 40(1), 199-223.
- Dench, E. 2005: *Romulus' Asylum. Roman identities from the age of Alexander to the age of Hadrian*, Oxford.
- Duff, A.M. 1928: *Freedmen in the early Roman empire*, Oxford.
- Dustmann, C. 1999: Temporary migration, human capital, and language fluency of migrants, *Scandinavian journal of economics* 101(2), 297-314.
- Erhardt, N./L.M. Günster (eds.) 2002: *Widerstand-Anpassung-Integration: die griechische Staatenwelt und Rom, Festschrift für Jürgen Deininger zum 65. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart.
- Erdkamp, P. 2008: Mobility and migration in Italy in the second century BC, in: Ligt, L. de/S.J. Northwood (eds.), *People, land and politics. Demographic developments and the transformation of Roman Italy 300 BC-AD 14*, Leiden/Boston, 417-449.
- Foner, N. 2005: *In a new land: a comparative view of immigration*, New York.
- Gabaccia, D.R. 1998: *We are what we eat: ethnic food and the making of Americans*, Cambridge, MA.
- Gardner, J.F. 1986: *Women in Roman law and society*, London.
- Garnsey, P. 1970: *Social status and legal privilege in the Roman empire*, Oxford.
- Gebhardt, A. 2002: *Imperiale Politik und provinzielle Entwicklung. Untersuchungen zum Verhältnis von Kaiser, Heer und Städten im Syrien der vorseverischen Zeit* (Klio Beiheft, 4), Berlin.
- Gerhards, J./S. Hans 2008: Akkulturation und die Vergabe von Vornamen. Welche Name wählen Migranten für ihre Kinder und warum?, in: Kalter 2008, 465-487.
- Goldhill, S. 2001: *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural identity, the Second Sophistic and the development of empire*, Cambridge.
- Grant, P.R. 2007: Sustaining a strong cultural and national identity: the acculturation of immigrants and second-generation Canadians of Asian and African descent, *Journal of international migration and integration* 8(1), 89-116.

- Hagan, J. M. 1998: Social networks, gender, and immigrant incorporation: resources and constraints, *American sociological review* 63(1), 55-67.
- Hales, S./T. Hodos 2010: *Material culture and social identities in the ancient world*, Cambridge.
- Hingley, R. 2005: *Globalizing Roman culture. Unity, diversity and empire*, London/New York.
- Hingley, R. 2010: Cultural diversity and unity: empire and Rome, in: Hales/Hodos 2010, 54-75.
- Hirschman, C. 2004: The role of religion in the origins and adaptation of immigrant groups in the United States, *The international migration review* 38 (3), 1206-1233.
- Hoerder, D./J.M.W.G. Lucassen/L.A.C.J. Lucassen 2007: Terminologien und Konzepte in der Migrationsforschung, in: Bade/Emmer/Lucassen/Oltmer 2007a, 28-53.
- Horden, P./N. Purcell 2000: *The corrupting sea. A study of Mediterranean history*, Oxford.
- IG: (various editors) 1895→: *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Berlin.
- IGR: Cagnat, R./J. Toutain/G. Lafaye/V. Henry (eds.), 1906-1927: *Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes*, 3 vols., Paris.
- IGUR: Moretti, L. (ed.) 1968-1990: *Inscriptiones graecae urbis Romae*, 4 vols., Rome.
- ILS: Dessau, H. (ed.), 1892-1916: *Inscriptiones latinae selectae*, 3 vols., Berlin.
- Iosifides, T./M. Lavrentiadou/E. Petracou/A. Kontis 2007: Forms of social capital and the incorporation of Albanian immigrants in Greece, *Journal of ethnic and migration studies* 32(8), 1343-1361.
- Isaac, B. 2004: *The invention of racism in classical antiquity*, Princeton, NJ.
- Itzigsohn, J./S. Giorguli-Saucedo 2005: Incorporation, transnationalism, and gender: immigrant incorporation and transnational participation as gendered processes, *The international migration review* 39(4), 895-920.
- James, S.L./S. Dillon (eds.) forthcoming: *A companion to women in the ancient world* (Blackwell companions to the ancient world).
- Jehne, M./R. Pfeilschifter (eds.) 2006: *Herrschaft ohne Integration?: Rom und Italien in republikanischer Zeit*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Jones, C.P. 1978: A Syrian in Lyon, *The American Journal of Philology* 99(3), 336-353.
- Kaimio, J. 1979: *The Romans and the Greek language*, Helsinki.
- Kakoschke, A. 2004: 'Germanen' in der Fremde: eine Untersuchung zur Mobilität aus den römischen Provinzen Germania Inferior und Germania Superior anhand der Inschriften des 1. bis 3. Jahrhunderts n. Chr., Mönchsee.
- Kalter, F. (ed.), 2008: *Migration und Integration*, Wiesbaden.
- Konstan, D./S. Said (eds.), 2006: *Greeks on Greekness: viewing the Greek past under the Roman empire*, Cambridge.
- Langhammer, W. 1973: *Die rechtliche und soziale Stellung der Magistratus municipales und der Decuriones in der Übergangsphase der Städte von sich selbstverwaltenden Gemeinden zu Vollzugsorganen des spätantiken Zwangsstaates (2.-4. Jahrhundert der römischen Kaiserzeit)*, Wiesbaden.
- Laurence, R. 1999: *The roads of Roman Italy. Mobility and cultural change*, London.
- Leach, S.M. Lewis/C. Chenery/G. Müldner/H. Eckhardt 2009: Migration and diversity in Roman Britain: a multidisciplinary approach to the identification of immigrants in Roman York, England, *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 140(3), 546-561.
- Levitt, P./N. Glick Schiller 2007: Conceptualizing simultaneity. A transnational social field perspective of society, in: Portes/DeWind 2007, 179-218.
- Loane, H.J. 1944: Vespasian's spice market and tribute in kind, *Classical Philology* 39(1), 10-21.
- Lomas, K./T. Cornell (eds.), 2003: *Bread and Circuses. Euergetism and municipal patronage in Roman Italy*, London.
- Lucassen, L.A.C.J. 2005: *The immigrant threat: the integration of old and new migrants in western Europe since 1850*, Urbana.
- Lucassen, J.M.W.G./R. Penninx 1997: *Newcomers: immigrants and their descendants in the*

- Netherlands 1550-1995*, Amsterdam (translation M. Wintle). Original publication in Dutch: see *idem* 1999.
- Lucassen, J.M.W.G./R. Penninx 1999: *Nieuwkomers, nakomelingen, Nederlanders. Immigranten in Nederland 1550-1963*, Amsterdam.
- Maischberger, M. 1997: *Marmor in Rom: Anlieferung, Lager- und Werkplätze in der Kaiserzeit*, Wiesbaden.
- Manning, P. 2005: *Migration in world history*, New York/London.
- Marek, C. 2003: *Pontus et Bithynia*, Mainz am Rhein.
- Matthews, E./S. Hornblower (eds.) 2000: *Greek personal names: their value as evidence*, Oxford.
- Mattingly, D.J. 2004: Being Roman: expressing identity in a provincial setting, *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 17, 5-25.
- Mattingly, D.J. 2010a: *Imperialism, Power, and Identity: Experiencing the Roman Empire*, Princeton, NJ.
- Mattingly, D.J. 2010b: Cultural crossovers: global and local identities in the classical world, in: Hales/Hodos 2010, 283-295.
- Mercati, S.G. 1924-25: Epigraphica: epigrafe greca trovata a San Saba sull'Aventino, *Rendiconti: atti della pontificia accademia romana di archeologia* 3, 191-196.
- Moatti, C. (ed.) 2004: *La mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée. Procédures de contrôle et documents d'identification*, Rome.
- Moatti, C. 2006: Translation, migration, and communication in the Roman empire: three aspects of movement in history, *Classical Antiquity* 25(1), 109-140.
- Moch, L.P. 2003 (second edition): *Moving Europeans: migration in Western Europe since 1650*, Bloomington, IN.
- Moors, S.M. 1992: *De Decapolis: steden en dorpen in de Romeinse provincies Syria en Arabia*, 's-Gravenhage.
- Morawska, E. 2003: Immigrant transnationalism and assimilation: a variety of combinations and the analytic strategy it suggests, in: C. Joppke/E. Morawska (eds.), 2003: *Toward assimilation and citizenship: immigrants in liberal national states*, Houndmills, 133-176.
- Neue Pauly, Der* (various authors) 1996-2003: *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, 16 vols., Stuttgart.
- Noy, D. 2000: *Foreigners at Rome. Citizens and strangers*, London.
- Nijf, O.M. van 1997: *The civic world of professional associations in the Roman East*, Amsterdam.
- Nijf, O. M. van 2010: Being Termessian: local knowledge and identity politics in a Pisidian city, in: Whitmarsh 2010, 1163-188
- Olshausen, E./H. Sonnabend (eds.), 2006: "Troianer sind wir gewesen" – Migrationen in der antiken Welt, *Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur Historischen Geographie des Altertums* 8, 2002, Stuttgart.
- Parrado, E.A./C. Flippen 2005: Migration and gender among Mexican women, *American sociological review* 70(4), 606-632.
- Portes, A. 1998: Social capital: its origins and applications in modern sociology, *Annual review of sociology* 24, 1-14.
- Portes, A./J. DeWind (eds.) 2007: *Rethinking migration. New theoretical and empirical perspectives*, New York.
- Portes, A./L.E. Guarnizo/P. Landolt 1999: The study of transnationalism: pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field, *Ethnic and racial studies* 22(2), 217-237.
- Rebhun, U. 2008: A double disadvantage? Immigration, gender, and employment status in Israel, *European journal of population* 24(1), 87-113.
- Revell, L. 2009, *Roman imperialism and local identities*, Cambridge/New York.
- Rickman, G. 1971: *Roman granaries and store buildings*, Cambridge.
- Robert, J./L. Robert 1976: Bulletin epigraphique, *Revue des études grecques* 89: 415-595.

- Roth, R. 2007: Introduction: Roman culture between homogeneity and integration, in: Roth/Keller 2007, 7-10.
- Roth, R./J. Keller (eds.) 2007: *Roman by integration: dimensions of group identity in material culture and text*, Portsmouth, RI
- Rougé, J. 1976: Lyon et l'Aquitaine. À propos de CIL XIII 2448, Thaim, fils de Saat, *Actes du 96e Congrès national des Sociétés Savantes, Toulouse 1971*, Paris: 211-221.
- Ruffing, K. 2006: Die Regionale Mobilität von Händlern und Handwerkern nach den griechischen Inschriften, in: Olshausen/Sonnabend 2006, 133-149.
- Scheidel, W. 2004: Human mobility in Roman Italy I. The free population, *The Journal of Roman Studies* 104, 1-26.
- Scheidel, W. 2005: Human mobility in Roman Italy II. The slave population, *The Journal of Roman Studies* 94, 64-79.
- Schroedter, J.H./F. Kalter 2008: Binationale Ehen in Deutschland. Trends und Mechanismen der sozialen Assimilation, in: Kalter 2008, 351-379.
- SEG: (various editors) (eds.) 1923→: *Supplementum epigraphicum graecum*, Leiden/Amsterdam.
- Sherwin-White, A.N. 1973 (second edition): *The Roman Citizenship*, Oxford.
- Smits, J./A. Gündüz-Hogör 2003: Linguistic capital: language as a socio-economic resource among Kurdish and Arabic women in Turkey, *Ethnic and racial studies* 26(5), 829-853.
- Snel, E./G. Engbersen/A. Leerkes 2006: Transnational involvement and social integration, *Global networks* 6, 285-308.
- Sordi, M. (ed.) 1994: *Emigrazione e immigrazione nel mondo antico*, Milan.
- Sordi, M. (ed.) 1995: *Coercizione e mobilità umana nel mondo antico*, Milan.
- Sourdel, D. 1952: *Les cultes du Hauran à l'époque romaine*, Paris.
- Swain, S. 1996: *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50-250*, Oxford.
- Takenaka, A. 2003: The mechanisms of ethnic retention: later-generation Japanese immigrants in Lima, Peru, *Journal of ethnic and migration studies* 29(3), 467-483.
- Treggiari, S. 1969: *Roman freedmen during the late Republic*, Oxford.
- Trilla, C.C./A. Esteve/A. Domingo 2008: Marriage patterns of the foreign-born population in a new country of immigration: the case of Spain, *The international migration review* 42(4), 877-902.
- Verboven, K. 2007: The associative order. Status and ethos among Roman businessmen in late Republic and early Empire, *Athenaeum* 95, 861-893.
- Verboven, K. 2011: Resident aliens and translocal merchant *collegia* in the Roman empire, in: Hekster, O./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, 335-348.
- Vernesi, C. et alii 2004: The Etruscans: a population-genetic study, *The American journal of human genetics* 74(4), 694-704.
- Vertovec, S. 2009: *Transnationalism*, London.
- Völker, B./F. Pinkster/H. Flap 2008: Inequality in social capital between migrants and natives in the Netherlands, in: Kalter 2008, 325-350.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 2008: *Rome's cultural revolution*, Cambridge.
- Waltzing, J.-P. 1895-1900: *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains: depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident*, Brussels/Louvain.
- West, L.C. 1924: Commercial Syria under the Roman empire, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 55, 159-189.
- Whitmarsh, T. (ed.), 2010: *Local knowledge and microidentities in the imperial Greek world*, Cambridge.
- Wierschowski, L. 1995: *Die regionale Mobilität in Gallien nach den Inschriften des 1. bis 3. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.: quantitative Studien zur Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der westlichen Provinzen des Römischen Reiches*, Stuttgart.

- Wierschowski, L. 2001: *Fremde in Gallien, "Gallier" in der Fremde: die epigraphisch bezeugte Mobilität in, von und nach Gallien vom 1. bis 3. Jh. n. Chr. (Texte, Übersetzungen, Kommentare)*, Stuttgart.
- Wolf, G.D. 1998: *Becoming Roman: the origins of provincial civilization in Gaul*, Cambridge/New York.
- Wuilleumier, P. 1953: *Lyon, métropole des Gaules*, Paris.
- Wuthnow, H. 1930: *Die semitischen Menschnamen in griechischen Inschriften und Papyri des vorderen Orients*, Leipzig.
- Zhou, M. 2007: Revisiting ethnic entrepreneurship. Convergencies, controversies, and conceptual advancements, in: Portes/DeWind 2007, 219-253.
- Zuiderhoek, A. 2009: *The politics of munificence in the Roman empire. Citizens, elites and benefactors in Asia Minor*, Cambridge.

Ylva Klaassen
Department of Ancient History
Radboud University Nijmegen
PO Box 91103
NL-6500 HD Nijmegen
The Netherlands
y.klaassen@let.ru.nl