for nucleated residence, extensive farming of large estates, an increase in pastoral activity, and lower population levels. In one way or another, all are linked to the direct or indirect impact of the Roman presence. To explore in further detail, however, the economic and social responses of the Achaian population to that presence, this rural picture must be expanded.

The civic landscape

One possible way to expand this discussion would be to turn to urban landscapes – the architectural and spatial design of cities. Built environments serve as a “teaching medium,” capable of clarifying individual and collective social roles and relationships; a changing society reconstructs itself through its building. Unfortunately, few cities in Greece have been dug extensively enough, or with enough attention paid to their Roman levels, to allow much analysis in this vein, though interesting work has been possible at Argos, Corinth, and, most productively, Athens. Hadrianic development of the latter city has received most attention – for example, the identification of an extensive civic complex (composed of the Roman agora, Hadrian’s Library, a basilica and possible Pantheon), aligned to relate to each other and to link the traditional center of Athens, the Classical agora, with a newly developed area to the southeast, “New Athens” and the area of the Olympieion. A comparison of the Classical agora itself in the fourth century BC with its second-century AD manifestation is striking in the amount of construction related to the imperial presence (for example, the Odeion of Agrippa and the Temple of Ares) and the resultant loss of open, “public” space (figs. 26–7). If the agora, to quote the geographer J. B. Jackson, was “a manifestation of the local social order, of the relationship between citizens and between citizens and the authority of the state . . . where the role of the individual in the community is made visible,” then, as the classical archaeologist T. Leslie Shear, Jr., remarked, these changes are “as clear a statement of the new ordering of the world as can be made through the medium of architecture.”

A different approach, however, is adopted in this chapter, one that allows a substantially wider variety of Greek cities to be considered. The civic landscape, as defined here, centers on the interaction of town and countryside: in other words, to our picture of the nature of rural activity and the social and economic implications derived from it (chapter 2), we now add the town (astu) itself. In the Classical period, the basic pattern
uniting the town and its associated hinterland was a simple one, constituting a "primate" that directly dominated smaller settlements in the landscape (i.e. in central place theory, the "administrative," or "solar," marketing model). That the altered status of Roman cities, now placed within a wider provincial framework, affected this standard Classical pattern is a possibility which this chapter explores in some detail. To do so, individual poleis will be treated as self-contained entities, and each city center considered in its regional context — that is, as the chief settlement and focus of activities within a wide and differentiated landscape. Redistribution of population and resources within the civic landscape can be read as a reflection of the network of economic and social relations that underlay the early imperial polis.

Chapter 2 discussed in detail the empirical evidence for a radical transformation of the countryside in the Early Roman period, and the various possible explanations for such a development already put forward include demographic decline and a concentration of landholding. A third factor, also already mentioned, is the seeming trend toward increasingly nucleated habitation. Nucleation is defined here as a preference for residence in larger, more populous settlements; this entails the rejection of isolated rural occupation and of Halstead's "alternative" mode of agricultural production that in part characterized Classical settlement patterns (pp. 60–1). Such a change in residential priorities will be argued here as an important force in the transformation of the Greek
landscape, and determining the motivations behind this development will serve to illustrate numerous pressures at work within the polis of the period.

The potential magnitude of such a redistribution of people across the landscape must first be weighed. Life in nucleated settlements was, after all, always the preferred choice in Classical antiquity, with the astu as the chief center of population in most poleis. The discovery of unexpectedly numerous small Classical farmsteads may have once encouraged the notion of numerous people widely scattered throughout the polis territory; but that reconstruction fails to take sufficient account of settlement trends within the polis as a whole, and the actual demographic significance of dispersed settlement has now been somewhat tempered (pp. 44–5). In one recent archaeological study, of the polis of Koressos on Keos, survey and epigraphic evidence combined to demonstrate that, even in the period of maximally dispersed settlement, only some 25 percent (at most) of the total population chose to live full-time in the chora, as opposed to the astu. Classical and Early Hellenistic evidence from the town of Hyettos, intensively studied by the Boeotia survey, likewise suggests that some 70 percent of its population lived within the urban center itself.2 So the trend to nucleation proposed for the early imperial period would thus be merely a heightening or exaggeration of a preexistent pattern, yet one that neither diminishes the significance of the development, nor rids us of the need to analyze it. The choice of where to live is a complex decision, highly sensitive to variation in social and economic circumstances at both the individual and the collective level. Reassessment of settlement priorities results from a reorganization of numerous aspects of provincial life.

THE EVIDENCE FOR NUCLEATION

Increased levels of nucleated residence, in villages or other larger rural settlements, have already been argued on the basis of the survey data for later Hellenistic and Early Roman Greece (pp. 62–3, 72). That communal residence was preferred is suggested by the fact that such larger communities survived instead of (or at the expense of) small farmsteads at this time. It is more difficult, however, to amass hard data about behavior in the towns themselves. The literary sources, urban-biased as they are, actually offer little help in judging the demographic ratio between town and country. Urban excavations begin, and usually end, with the public center of the community and rarely reach the city limits, making it impossible to measure overall changes in settlement size. Measuring urban populations through other standard archaeological indices (e.g. theater sizes, wall perimeters, water supplies) is a dubious exercise even in the best of circumstances, and particularly where period-by-period comparison is involved. A more reliable means of noting variations in site size on a diachronic basis is, however, offered by urban or “large site” survey, a technique only recently adopted in Greece. In such investigations, the tactics of archaeological survey are applied to the entire human landscape – that is to say, to its urban, as well as to its rural, components. Artifact density distributions resulting from fieldwork of this kind can provide a vivid sequence of images of the rise, florescence and decline of an urban center, while at the same time permitting the city to be related directly to its rural hinterland. Urban survey, of course, can serve only as a rough demographic indicator: change in site size need not correlate directly with change in urban population levels, and the absolute number of people within a given area can vary through time depending on a wide range of cultural factors. Nevertheless, as a crude guide to city size and civic “health,” urban survey is fast becoming recognized as indispensable, especially for assessing trends in settlement nucleation and dispersion.

Because this kind of survey is relatively new to Greece, only a handful of results are so far available for use here. In Boeotia, the large kome of Askra, and the polis centers of Haliartos, Hyettos and Thespiai have been intensively surveyed by the Boeotia survey. Haliartos was sacked by the Romans in the Third Macedonian War and its territory given to the Athenians; the survey evidence confirms the city’s destruction and subsequent prolonged abandonment. The site identified as Askra, the home of the poet Hesiod, declined in size in Hellenistic times, and evidently disappeared completely in the Early Roman period, seemingly in confirmation of the testimony of Pausanias: “Of Askra in my day nothing memorable was left except one tower” (9.29.2). Hyettos, too, markedly contracts in size during later Hellenistic and Roman times, although a vigorous life is said to continue within the urban nucleus. Most interesting of all is the large city of Thespiai, over 100 hectares in extent in its Classical manifestation: there too a Late Hellenistic and Early Roman contraction in site size (to very approximately 72 hectares by the Early Roman period) has been observed (figs. 28–6). Considering also the overall decline in rural site numbers for the Boeotian landscape as a whole and, more tenuously, the sorry reports of Polybius, Strabo and Pausanias, it seems an inescapable conclusion that the region at large experienced a serious demographic collapse.3 From the Boeotian perspective then, the explanation of settlement nucleation is more than a little far-fetched.

That this trajectory was not universal, however, is demonstrated by
established relationships of authority and, above all, to weaken any pretense of independence. Most drastically, as in the Augustan-period synoecisms in northwest Achaia, removal of cult objects represented the deliberate symbolic destruction of a community. It is surely significant that most episodes of cult displacement occurred early in the history of the province, for the most part during the Civil Wars and the first century of Roman rule, and the subsequent waning of such behavior can be attributed only in part to factors such as increasing philhellenism or the development in Rome of a "more refined world of collecting and connoisseurship." Presumably, as resistance was either quelled or became a more remote possibility, the need (as well as easy opportunities) for such actions passed.

The phenomenon of displaced cult can thus be identified as an externally motivated act, designed to disrupt or override local symbolic systems in the interests of the new political order. Two sides exist, of course, to the story of these transfers. For every town that lost out another systems in the interests of the new political order. Two sides exist, of course, to the story of these transfers. For every town that lost out another

The sacred landscape

In any religious study of a Roman province, the institution and reception of the imperial cult must bulk especially large, although here only the spatial dimension of this enormous subject can beconsidered. The most basic question to ask is where temples, images or altars of the imperial cult were established. From the perspective of Achaia as a whole, all the province's larger cities hosted the cult: Athens, Corinth, Nikopolis, Patrai, Argos and Sparta, for example, accumulated many shrines and monuments to the emperor. A far wider distribution across the provincial landscape is also demonstrated, however, by the cult's additional appearance in small and relatively undistinguished centers, such as is shown in the distribution of altars dedicated to Augustus in the province (fig. 60). Some more subtle variants have been suggested within this overall pattern; for example, in Arcadian cities dedications by and large seem directed to those emperors who had themselves visited Greece in person. Free cities, too, have been suspected to rely especially heavily upon this channel to maintain their privileged position. On the whole, however, given the obvious advantages to be gained from attracting imperial attention and favor, the cult's presence in small as well as large Achaian cities is hardly unexpected. As for the topographic placement of cult within these individual civic units, a strong preference for the most prominent and public of locations springs out as one immediately compelling pattern. Examples, both from Pausanias and from the results of archaeological investigation, are plentiful; only clear and representative cases will be cited here, beginning with the major centers. In Athens, both the agora and the acropolis became scenes for the imperial cult, as well as the gigantic Olympieion of Hadrian to the southeast; this latter, though officially dedicated to Zeus, was as much a precinct sacred to the emperor, and each Greek city was said to have set up his image in the temenos, resulting in a veritable forest of at least 136 Hadrians (fig. 61). On the acropolis, a small Ionic monopteros to Roma and Augustus, modeled closely in points of detail upon the nearby fifth-century bc Erechtheion, probably stood before the east end of the Parthenon (fig. 62). A massive bronze inscription on the
Parthenon's eastern façade is a prominently placed summary of an honorific decree to the emperor Nero; at the end of the second century AD, the cult and temple of Athena Polias was assimilated to Julia Domna. As for the second center of civic life in ancient Athens, manifestations of the imperial cult in the agora will be discussed in some detail below (pp. 195–6), and here it is simply worth noting that of the fifteen public Athenian altars to Augustus, all but one were found in or near this area. The new Roman agora, begun by Julius Caesar and finished under Augustus, has also been proposed as the site of a Kaisareion. For comparison, Pausanias says of Sparta: “On the market place are temples; there is one of Caesar, the first Roman to covet monarchy . . . and also one to his son Augustus, who put the empire on a firmer footing and became a more famous and a more powerful man than his father. His name ‘Augustus’ means in Greek ‘Sebastos’” (Pausanias 3.11.4). The Spartan potentate, Eurycles, set up naoi to Caesar and Augustus in the agora of both Gytheion and Messene.

This concentration upon the most public and accessible zones of the city is visible in other centers as well. The Sebasteion in Messene, dating to the Augustan period, lies at the head of a monumental staircase set within a large precinct of Asklepios; this precinct probably bordered on the Messenian agora (fig. 63). In Boeotian Orchomenos lay the Treasury of Minyas, a Mycenaean tholos tomb reused in the Hellenistic period as a heroon. Excavation revealed a large statue base inside the tomb monument, with a partial inscription attesting to the presence of the imperial cult – a particularly unusual setting for it, one might think, until it is remembered that the Treasury was still visible and prominent in Roman times, indeed being considered by Pausanias “a wonder second to none either in Greece itself or elsewhere” (9.38.2; fig. 64). Apart from sanctuaries proper, other public centers could be involved in the performance of rituals connected with the cult, as for example at Gytheion, where sacrifices were enacted within the theater as part of the worship of emperors. Processions throughout a city could also form one aspect of an imperial festival; at Gytheion again, ceremonial movement symbolically linked together various key religious and political centers of the city (sanctuaries, the agora, the theater).

In his study of the imperial cult in Asia Minor, Price observed a very similar distributional pattern. It is also worth noting that related
monuments, such as triumphal arches, tend also to be in central and prominent locations. Probably the best-known Achaian example is the Arch of Hadrian in Athens. The usual assumption that this arch stood as a boundary marker between an “Old City” (of Theseus) and a “New City” (of Hadrian) has recently been challenged by the suggestion that Hadrian is celebrated here as a founder (ktistes), replacing Theseus and renewing the city of Athens as a whole; in this reading, the arch serves more as a propylon to the Olympieion temenos, bestriding a road leading back toward the acropolis and agora (fig. 65). Whatever the truth, the arch clearly held a definitive place in Attic civic topography. Another major triumphal monument is the victory trophy raised by Augustus after Actium. Rather than being in “downtown” Nikopolis, the monument sat upon a hill on the city’s outskirts (figs. 66–7).

Here “under the open sky” on a wide terrace supported by a Roman rostra [sic] of grandiose proportions was a portico which focused the visitor’s attention on two
images. The first was near at hand: the simple consecrated place where Octavian's tent had stood. The second was in the distance, where one could see on the horizon the site of the glorious Battle of Actium; and in the middle ground hummed the living city which celebrated the great victory.  

Even if not in the city center, the monument's link to the urban foundation is eminently clear.  

The cult of Antinoos, the favorite of the emperor Hadrian, also deserves mention in this context. His cult proved rather popular in Greece (fig. 68), with (according to Pausanias) worship offered especially in Mantinea.  

Antinoos too was deified by [the Mantineians]; his temple is the newest in Mantinea... He has won worship in Mantinea for the following reason. Antinoos was by birth from Bithynium beyond the river Sangarius, and the Bithynians are by descent Arcadians of Mantinea. For this reason the Emperor established his worship in Mantinea also; mystic rites are celebrated in his honor each year, and games every four years. (Pausanias 8.9.7-8)
the imperial cult in fine fifth-century BC: architecture is evident and understandable, but it must also be stressed that the imperial presence aimed to control the civic space.

Annexing monuments

Reuse of monuments, as demonstrated by the itinerant temples, is actually part of a broader phenomenon and there exist other cases where structures or monuments were taken over and redirected to the glory of Rome. Different manifestations of such reuse can be identified. Commemorative markers, for example, were sometimes redeployed. Aemilius Paullus, after Pydna

gave his army a chance to rest, while he himself went about to see Greece, occupying himself in ways alike honorable and human . . . At Delphi, he saw a tall square pillar composed of white marble stones, on which a golden statue of Perseus was intended to stand, and gave orders that his own statue should be set there, for it was meet that the conquered should make room for their conquerors. (Plutarch, Aemilius Paullus 28)

Such commemoration won him, of course, a second symbolic victory over Perseus and an important memorial at a panhellenic sanctuary (fig. 74).

Another “second-hand” monument stood just outside the Propylaia on the Athenian acropolis. Originally an Attalid dedication, it was in turn made over to Antony and Cleopatra (as the New Dionysos and Isis), and then, fittingly enough, to their nemesis Agrippa, probably at the time of the dedication of his Odeion (fig. 75). Under the empire, a quadriga in the Athenian agora, probably dedicated originally to Attalos II in thanks for the eponymous stoa before which it stood, is known to have been rededicated to Tiberius, probably in the early years of his reign. Other forms of such ritual reuse include the annexation of pre-existing shrines to the imperial cult, in which the emperor either completely took over or “shared” the temple with the older gods. We have just seen examples of such processes at work in the Athenian agora, and other cases are numerous—from the Metroon at Olympia, to “an ancient sanctuary” in Megara where “in our day likenesses stand . . . of Roman emperors, and a bronze image there of Artemis named Savior” (Pausanias 1.40.2). The addition of Hadrian to the line of Eponymous Heroes in the Athenian agora can be regarded as simply another aspect of this same type of activity.26