# From Kingdom to Province: Reshaping Pontos after the Fall of Mithridates VI

Jakob Munk Højte

After the final collapse of the Pontic forces and the flight of Mithridates VI in 66 BC, Pompey was faced with the problem of reorganizing the former dominion of Mithridates. This was no easy task since much of the territory, particularly the interior of Asia Minor, differed significantly in respect to its organisation and infrastructure from most of the other areas incorporated into the provincial system in the Greek East. Only along the coast could the Roman administration build on already existing polis structures. As a result, Pompey only joined a manageable portion of the western part of the Asian domains of Mithridates with Bithynia to form the new province, and the rest he parcelled out to client kings. The difficulty of this operation is attested by the fact that nearly a century and a half would pass before the remaining part of Pontos was brought under direct Roman control. Some of the cities founded by Pompey to create a continuum of urban territories later dwindled and disappeared under the rule of the local dynasts who had been installed by Caesar and Marcus Antonius, and who showed little interest in supporting an urban culture; these cities had to be refounded later.

The long and very complex historical process of transforming the territory of the Pontic Kingdom into the Roman provinces of Bithynia and Pontos, Galatia and Cappadocia in their more or less final form in the later first century AD has been treated thoroughly by Syme, Magie, Jones, Mitchell, Marek and others, and will only be dealt with in passing.<sup>1</sup>

Instead, I intend to look more closely at some of the archaeologically visible changes that occur during the Roman period on a somewhat smaller scale. First, I will undertake an examination of settlement patterns – made possible thanks to two recent survey projects – then investigate the use of eras and the reckoning of time, and finally look at what dated inscriptions can reveal about the chronology of changes in epigraphic habits and the use of personal names in northern Asia Minor, changes which may all be associated with the effects of Romanisation.

#### Settlement patterns

We know relatively little about how the Mithridatid kingdom was organized. It seems clear that apart from the coastal strip, the level of urbanisation was low in Pontos; at least there was nothing like the Greek *polis*, neither in physical appearance nor in the sense of an administrative unit. The royal residence of Amaseia may be an exception since the needs of the court would have attracted a whole range of specialised labour.<sup>2</sup> The temple states of Komana Pontike, Zela, and Ameria also supported quite large populations, but whether the temple slaves and the devotees lived around the precinct or were scattered throughout the territory remains uncertain. The account of Strabon (12.3.36-37) suggests that some form of urban structure did exist around the temples. Eupatoria, founded by Mithridates VI in Phanaroia, may have been a first attempt by the kings to encourage the formation of cities in the interior.<sup>3</sup> Symptomatically, he destroyed the city himself after it had sided with the Romans during the Third Mithridatic War.

Central to the royal control of the land was a large number of castles scattered over the whole territory.<sup>4</sup> Many of these served as treasuries of the king, but the commander ( $\phi \rho o \dot{\nu} \rho \alpha \rho \chi o \varsigma$ ) of the castle may equally well have served as governor of the surrounding district ( $\dot{\epsilon}\pi \alpha \rho \chi i \alpha$ ). This system of control has analogies throughout eastern Asia Minor, and also seems to have been exported to the northern Black Sea area after Mithridates gained control of the Bosporan Kingdom.<sup>5</sup> Pompey destroyed most of the castles, supposedly because they could become refuges for robbers and brigands, in reality probably because in the hands of disloyal local dynasts, they could be a threat to Roman control.

The administrative units in Pontos seem to have been quite small. We know from the inscriptions in the sanctuary of Zeus Stratios that the territory of Amaseia was divided into at least twelve districts, only five of which are mentioned by Strabon.<sup>6</sup> By the second century AD, when the inscriptions were erected, these districts had long ceased to have any administrative function, but their names lingered on. Almost all the districts have indigenous names ending in -nvn or -1115, probably with roots going back to the Bronze Age, and the same is true for the villages or hamlets mentioned.<sup>7</sup> On account of the inscriptions, D. French suggests that there may have been as many as 500 villages in the territory of Amaseia,<sup>8</sup> which of course brings to mind the district northwest of Amaseia called Chiliokômon, the "valley of a thousand villages". Contrary to most names of districts, this carries a Greek name, but it could of course be a Greek translation of an earlier, indigenous name. All this suggests a densely populated rural landscape in the valleys of the interior during the pre-Roman period. Supposedly it was from all these scattered villages that the inhabitants of the Roman foundations were drawn.

There are, however, reasons for not accepting this interpretation of pre-Roman decentralisation *contra* Roman urbanisation too readily. Over the



Fig. 1. Satellite image of the Sinop Promontory.

past few years, our knowledge about settlement patterns and land-use in central northern Asia Minor has increased significantly, mainly due to two international survey projects carried out in Paphlagonia in the late 1990s. Many other, less intensive surveys have been carried out in Pontos by local archaeologists.

# The Sinop Survey

During the late 1990s, the Sinop Regional Archaeological Project intensively surveyed 350 selected tracts on the Sinop promontory and located 170 archaeological sites or *loci* (Fig. 1). The preliminary publications of the survey have demonstrated that until about the time when Sinope became the capitol of the Pontic kingdom, habitation was scarce on the Sinop promontory, and the city's primary lines of communication went via the sea.<sup>9</sup> The site density in most areas is very low in the archaic and classical periods, with a slight rise during the Hellenistic period, but the real change in the settlement pattern only occurs under the Empire. Exceptions are the smaller promontory Boz Tepe (which, due to its geographical position, had always been closely linked to the city) and the area around Armene west of Sinop, where Xenophon and the Ten Thousand made landfall on their westward journey by sea along the coast. The director of the project, Owen Doonan, concludes that in contrast to the earlier periods, "Roman settlement tended to be extensive, specialized and connected".<sup>10</sup> The change is particularly noticeable in the Demirci Valley

Jakob Munk Højte



*Fig. 2. The number and size of loci in different areas of the Sinop Promontory in the Hellenistic (top) and Roman (bottom) periods (from Doonan 2004, 156-157).* 

to the south of the city and the Karasu Valley to the north (Fig. 2), which saw the growth of an extensive olive production and the production of amphorae in the second century AD.<sup>11</sup> Smaller hamlets, probably relying heavily on marine resources, also began to dot the coastline during this period, and suburban elite settlements such as the possible villa site at Kiraztepe were established.<sup>12</sup>

### The Paphlagonia Survey

Likewise in the late 1990s, a British team carried out a somewhat more extensive survey of the towns of Hadrianopolis and Antoninopolis in the interior of Paphlagonia.<sup>13</sup> Their conclusion about the development of the settlement pattern was similar to that of the Sinop peninsula survey: "During the Roman period, settlement in southern Paphlagonia takes on new dimensions. For the first time we start to see widespread settlement across almost the entire landscape ... and the first appearance of a truly distinct hierarchy of settlement, ranging from large town to small hamlet with associated cemetery", and further: "A notable component of the Roman settlement pattern is the prevalence of small sites".<sup>14</sup> Precise dates are not given for specific sites, but coins and inscriptions of the third century AD are mentioned. In all, thirtyone *loci* occupied in the Roman period were identified. Only seven of these *loci* (23%) also contained material from the Hellenistic period. Moreover, in no instances does occupation terminate during the Hellenistic period. The complete site continuity from the Hellenistic to the Roman period indicates that in the later period, inhabitants spread over the landscape from already existing sites.

The reports from both surveys point to the peaceful situation during the Roman imperial period as the primary reason for the characteristically dispersed settlement pattern, which was not matched until modern times.

#### Other surveys

Several surveys have been carried out further eastward in Pontos by Turkish archaeologists. Projects initiated by M. and N. Öszait cover the districts of Amasya, Samsun and Ordu, and another group has been working in the areas around Tokat. In Paphlagonia, a team has been working in the area around Kasamonu.<sup>15</sup> However, none of these surveys follow as systematic an approach as that mentioned above, nor are they as intensive. In addition, most of the projects focus predominantly on periods earlier or later than the Hellenistic and Roman era. What can be glimpsed from the many preliminary reports boils down to a generally wider distribution of sites in the Roman period. The evidence will not at present support broader conclusions because of the preliminary nature of many of the publications, and because the Hellenistic period was shorter than the Roman period – which is often taken to include the Byzantine period as well – and also because in extensive surveys Roman remains may be more readily recognizable than Hellenistic ones.

The sum of available evidence creates an impression of a Roman landscape that, contrary to what might be expected, did not concentrate settlement in the urban centres that were the focus of the Roman administration, but rather distributed the population across the countryside in a variety of settlement types. This development under Roman rule is quite different from that of the province of Achaea, by far the most thoroughly investigated area, where "the Classical and early Hellenistic periods appear exceptionally active, characterized by the presence of numerous, dispersed, small sites". By comparison, with few exceptions the Roman landscape of Achaea appears "empty".<sup>16</sup> However, Achaea was probably not representative of the Empire in this respect, and developments in northern Asia Minor are parallelled elsewhere. This raises a question about the demographic potential of Pontos during the Hellenistic period. Where did Mithridates obtain soldiers for his campaigns against Rome if there were no large urban centres and little dispersed settlement?

### Defining time - the use of calendar systems in northern Asia Minor

Space was altered as new settlement patterns changed the landscape and the administrative infrastructure was shaped along new lines when the land was parcelled out among newly created cities. Time, or rather the reckoning of time, changed as well.

Prior to the Roman conquest, the dominant system for reckoning years in northern Asia Minor was according to the Bithyno-Pontic era, counting the vears from the accession of King Zipoites of Bithynia in 297/96 BC.<sup>17</sup> The earliest evidence for its use are coins struck in 149/48 BC, the year Nikomedes II became king after the murder of his father Prusias. Earlier Bithynian coins carry no indication of date, and it is possible that the calendar was in fact invented on this occasion. In 96 BC or shortly before, Mithridates VI began to strike coins in precious metals, and with the exception of a very small number of undated coins they are from the beginning dated according to the Bithyno-Pontic era, which must have been adopted in Pontos in the early part of his reign.<sup>18</sup> His forefathers, on the other hand, had used the Seleucid era. Mithridates' motives for adopting another state's era are a mystery, as this would normally indicate a subordinate position. Furthermore, relations with Bithynia were not very amicable at the time, at best rather competitive. Only in the joint invasion of Paphlagonia in 108 BC did the two kings cooperate, and this event marks the most likely time for the changeover.<sup>19</sup>

With the Roman conquest, the Bithyno-Pontic era ceased to be used in Asia Minor, but continued to be used in the Bosporan Kingdom at least until the end of the fifth century AD. The era was certainly employed in inscriptions in the Hellenistic period, as evidenced by inscriptions from the Northern Black Sea area,<sup>20</sup> but to my knowledge no dated inscriptions have turned up in either Bithynia or Pontos, where so far it is only known from coins. It has generally been assumed that the Bithyno-Pontic era was abandoned because it was associated with kingship, but against this speaks the fact that the Seleucid era remained the predominant calendar system in the East until the Arab invasion, and continued to be used sporadically in Asia Minor well into the imperial period.<sup>21</sup> Furthermore, the Bithyno-Pontic era was not particularly associated with Pontos and Mithridates VI, the enemy of Rome, since it had only been introduced in Pontos a generation prior to his succession; and the Romans in general seemed disinterested in imposing new calendars in the conquered territories. Changing the calendar system was therefore a very conscious choice of connecting oneself to Rome, and the initiative undoubtedly came from local authorities. Had it been in the interest of the Roman administration to regulate the reckoning of time this could easily have been brought about at any time by implementing a common provincial era, a familiar phenom-



*Fig. 3. Grave stele for Iulia Galatia erected by Antiochos in the year 174 of the local era (AD 171/72), now in Amasya Museum (author's photo).* 

enon in other provinces. For the administration of the province, it could not have been practical to encounter at least six different calendar systems when travelling the relatively short distance from Herakleia to Polemonion. Many cities chose the year of the city's inclusion in the Roman province of Bithynia and Pontus as the starting point for their new era (or in Galatia in the case of the inner parts of Paphlagonia and Pontos).

For some reason, however, no one seems to have used the initial creation of the province of Bithynia and Pontus in 63 BC, nor is there any solid evidence for the often proposed Pompeian era. Instead, the Lucullan era starting in 70/69 BC was chosen in Amastris and Abonouteichos. Amisos deviates from the rest in that this city seems to have used its grant of freedom in the year 32/31 BC as the starting point.<sup>22</sup> The long use of the Seleucid and the Bithyno-Pontic calendars in Asia Minor may explain the unusual popularity of calendars with years numbered in succession as opposed to eponymous magistrates or the year of reign of the emperor.

It is one thing to calculate out the year from which a particular era was reckoned, guite another to figure out when the era was actually introduced. In a few instances the two events are definitely contemporary. In Amastris, for example, coins were struck in year one of the Lucullan era,<sup>23</sup> but often we find a considerable gap between the starting point of the era and our earliest evidence for its use. Along the coast, the gaps generally tend to be short; inland, on the other hand, it is a question of centuries rather than decades: Neapolis/Neoklaudiopolis, 115 years; Pompeiopolis, 174 years; Kaisareia/ Hadrianopolis, 170 years; Gangra/Germanikopolis, 198 years - all according to the Paphlagonian era starting 6/5 BC.<sup>24</sup> The proposition that this era was already used in the famous oath of the Paphlagonians to Augustus is false.<sup>25</sup> The number three in the text does not refer to the local era but rather to the third year of the 12th consulship of Augustus. That the two different readings in fact yield the same date, 3/2 BC, is a mere coincidence. The oath's close connection with the emperor can further be seen in the date chosen, the 6th of March, the anniversary of Augustus' elevation as *pontifex maximus*, and the use of νωνών Μαρτίων transliterated from Latin further suggests a nonnative dating system.

The question is whether the era was actually introduced at a later date or whether it appears so due to the insufficiency of our sources. It is quite possible that a city could maintain and employ a calendar system that was never revealed in any of the sources available to us, as these comprise only coins and monumental inscriptions on stone. I would suggest, however, that the introduction of eras related to the city's incorporation into the Roman empire was part of a larger package that included new settlement patterns, the introduction of local coinage, new social structures, and new means of self-expression, both individually and for communities as a whole, the latter primarily visible through what has become known as "the epigraphic habit". All these markers seem to coincide more or less chronologically – at a much later date than the creation of the province. The correlation between coinage and inscriptions is of particular interest, as these contain our most precisely datable evidence and can therefore provide a clue to the date of this transformation.

#### The epigraphic habit

The epigraphic habit, or the use of inscriptions in public and private contexts, was a fundamental feature of participation in the Graeco-Roman cultural sphere. Judged by this parameter, northern Asia Minor, apart from the coastal cities, was by no means Hellenized under the Pontic kings, as hardly any inscriptions exist from the Hellenistic period. The epigraphic habit was closely associated with the Greek language, and the use of Greek seems very restricted and a rather late phenomenon outside the old Greek colonies – with the exception of coin legends. Several literary sources remark on the linguistic talents of Mithridates VI and relate that the king spoke all the tongues and dialects of his domain: twenty languages or more.<sup>26</sup>

Since a surprisingly large proportion of inscriptions in northern Asia Minor can be dated accurately, we can determine with some degree of certainty when the epigraphic habit was introduced. Naturally, caution should be taken when drawing conclusions from epigraphic sources. The preserved epigraphic monuments are by no means an unbiased selection of what once existed. Most importantly, we essentially only possess inscriptions written on stone. In northern Asia Minor, hard limestone was in scarce supply; on the other hand, metal was abundant, and inscriptions on bronze may have been more common than we can perceive today. Painted inscriptions on wooden panels may also have existed in an area rich in wood and Sinopean red dye.<sup>27</sup> This leads to the question of survival rates. In Herakleia Pontike, for example, only about seventy or eighty inscriptions have been preserved, and the earliest may well be a base for a statue of Claudius. By this time the city had been among the major cities in the Black Sea for nearly 600 years, and no one would hesitate to place it within the Greek cultural sphere. The destruction of the city by Cotta in 70 BC, the extensive reuse of inscribed stones as building material, and the destructive forces of modern town planning are the standard explanations given for the small number of preserved inscriptions.<sup>28</sup> At the sites chosen for investigation here, however, the inscriptions do not seem to have been subject to such radical selection during the Roman period and probably represent a fairly random sample.

Decade	Number of inscriptions
AD 50-59	0
60-69	0
70-79	0
80-89	0
90-99	3
100-109	1
110-119	0
120-129	3
130-139	5
140-149	6
150-159	5
160-169	13
170-179	13
180-189	3
190-199	9
200-209	6
210-219	4
220-229	0
230-239	3
240-249	2
250-259	4
260-269	0
270-279	0
280-289	0
-	
370-379	1
Total	81

Table 1. Chronological distribution of the dated inscriptions from Amaseia (based on French1996).

#### Amaseia

By far the best sample of dated inscriptions derives from the territory of Amaseia, the former capital of the Pontic Kingdom, and was collected by David French. Although the corpus still awaits publication, the published lists of dated inscriptions provide us with an adequate impression of the material. The latest count shows 443 inscriptions: 6 Hellenistic, 350 Roman, and 87 Byzantine – figures that strongly testify to the scarcity of Hellenistic material. Among the Roman inscriptions, 278 relate to funerary monuments, and of these 84, or 30%, can be dated according to the local era.<sup>29</sup>

We have no idea as to what caused people to include or omit the year in the epitaphs of their relatives. It does not seem to be a question of chronology. A study of the limited material published with photographs or drawings in *Studia Pontica*<sup>30</sup> on the basis of letter forms suggests that there is no overall discrepancy between the chronological distribution of the dated and undated inscriptions. The monuments likewise appear to be a representative sample with regard to quality. I think that we can safely take the dated inscriptions as indicative of the whole corpus.

The earliest definite evidence of the use of the local era in Amaseia is provided by three coin issues during the Flavian period.<sup>31</sup> Slightly later, we find the earliest epigraphic use of the era on a sarcophagus dated to 97/98 AD, and from then on, the number of inscriptions increases until the 160s and 170s, after which a decrease sets in (Table 1). The high figures in the late 160s and 170s can possibly be interpreted as an increased mortality rate due to the Antonine Plague, followed by a reduced number of deaths and perhaps economic stagnation in the 180s AD.<sup>32</sup> The Gothic and Sassanian invasions in the 250s and 260s brought an end to the use of local calendars, or at least to our knowledge of them. It may be of significance that local coinages ceased at the same time. The very sporadic use of the Amaseian era and other eras in northern Asia Minor in the late fourth, the fifth and even sixth centuries AD reveals that the memory of the era was somehow kept alive in media not preserved for posterity or was reinvented during late antiquity.

One area where the dated inscriptions offer promising evidence concerns the changes in the use of personal names: When did people begin to use Roman names and how common do they become, how long did indigenous and Persian names persist, can we detect gender related practices etc. The list of questions raised by these changes is long, and to answer them adequately would require a very thorough study; here I will restrict myself to one aspect: the introduction of Latin names. In this respect the evidence from Amaseia is a bit disappointing because the transition from Greek and indigenous names to the mixture of Greek, Latin and mixed names that can be observed in the second and third centuries must have taken place before our record of inscriptions begins (Fig. 4). The earliest inscriptions already have a majority of Latin names. Indigenous and Persian names that were relatively common

Decade	Number of inscriptions
AD 50-59	1
60-69	1
70-79	0
80-89	1
90-99	1
100-109	2
110-119	2
120-129	1
130-139	2
140-149	2
150-159	2
160-169	1
170-179	1
180-189	2
190-199	1
200-209	4
210-219	0
220-229	0
230-239	1
240-249	0
250-259	1
260-269	0
270-279	0
280-289	0
Total	26

*Table 2. Chronological distribution of the dated inscriptions from Amastris (based on Marek 1993, 157-187).* 

at the time of Mithridates VI, judging from a study of names of officials and officers,<sup>33</sup> had largely disappeared.

### Amastris and Inner Paphlagonia

A smaller sample of twenty-six dated inscriptions from Amastris shows a somewhat different pattern (Table 2).<sup>34</sup> Here the earliest inscription dates from 50/51 AD, i.e., half a century earlier than in Amaseia. It is, however, no less



Fig. 4. Ethnic composition of the names in the dated inscriptions from Amaseia (based on French 1996).

than 121 years after the introduction of the Lucullan era; and as mentioned above, Amastris is in fact one of the few places where we have certain evidence of the use of the calendar immediately after its introduction. The end of the use of the calendar likewise coincides with the invasions in the 250s and 260s AD. Between these end points, the inscriptions are distributed more evenly than in Amaseia, with only a slight increase in the first half of the second century. The concentration of four inscriptions under Septimius Severus is probably coincidental. With regard to the ethnic character of the names, we see a clear development away from purely Greek names over time. In the three earliest inscriptions of the first century AD, all names are of Greek or Iranian inspiration. During the first half of the second century, Greek names still dominate but Latin names or Latin tria nomina with a Greek cognomen begin to appear; after the middle of the century only a single Greek name appears. In two instances, a father with a Greek name gave his children Latin names.<sup>35</sup> This could be a sign of the times or of the upward mobility of the persons that appear in the epigraphic record.

The last examples I shall present here concern the cities of Pompeiopolis, Neoklaudiopolis and Hadrianopolis in inner Paphlagonia. Apart from two inscriptions from Neoklaudiopolis from the 120s, dated inscriptions only begin in the 160s (Table 3), yet end around 260, with one late example from the 280s.<sup>36</sup> The small size of the sample and the scattered distribution does not permit a detailed statistical analysis of the development in the use of names.

Decade	Number of inscriptions
AD 50-59	0
60-69	0
70-79	0
80-89	0
90-99	0
100-109	0
110-119	0
120-129	2
130-139	0
140-149	0
150-159	0
160-169	4
170-179	2
180-189	1
190-199	6
200-209	1
210-219	3
220-229	1
230-239	2
240-249	3
250-259	4
260-269	2
270-279	0
280-289	1
Total	32

*Table 3. Chronological distribution of the inscriptions from inner Paphlagonia: Neoklaudiopolis, Hadrianopolis, Pompeiopolis, and Germanikopolis (based on Leschhorn 1993, 481-484).* 

Suffice to say that at least some non-Greek, non-Latin names still occur among the inscriptions.

Keeping in mind the danger of overinterpretation, I think that the three examples given here can be taken as evidence of how the custom of erecting inscribed monuments (particularly of a funerary nature) to commemorate oneself and one's family spread among a wider section of the population. It began on the coast in the first century AD and then slowly penetrated the hinterland before the mid-second century. In most cities it coincides with the introduction of local coinage, the more common use of Latin names, the construction of public buildings, and probably other, less clearly dated phenomena such as changed land-use and settlement patterns. It is difficult to say whether these changes were perceived as Romanisation by the local population, but they were certainly a product of the favourable conditions offered by the *Pax Romana*.

## Notes

- 1 Magie 1950; Jones 1971; Marek 1993; Mitchell 1993; Syme 1995.
- 2 Strabon 12.3.39.
- 3 Syme 1995, 115.
- 4 Mitchell 1993, 84. Olshausen & Biller 1984 (map) for location.
- 5 Saprykin & Maslennikov 1996, 1-14.
- 6 French 1996b, 78.
- 7 Dalaison 2002, 261-276.
- 8 French 1996, 82. Appian (*Mithr*. 65) furthermore relates that Murena captured 400 villages belonging to Mithridates.
- 9 Doonan 2004.
- 10 Doonan 2004, 47.
- 11 Doonan 2004, 103; 111-112.
- 12 Doonan 2004, 47.
- 13 Matthews, Pollard & Ramage 1998.
- 14 Matthews, Pollard & Ramage 1998, 203.
- 15 Özdogan, Marro & Tibet 1999; Özsait 2002; 2003; Özsait & Özsait 2002; Dönmez 1999 to mention a few. In her new book on the Pontic kingdom, Erciyas (2006, 53-62) offers a summary of all the surveys conducted in Pontos.
- 16 Alcock 1993, 48.
- 17 For the beginning of the era, see Perl 1968, 299-330.
- 18 Callataÿ 1997, 8-9 & 33-36.
- 19 Leschhorn 1993, 83-86. McGing 1986, 66. Justinus 37.4.3.
- 20 An inscription from Phanagoreia dated to the year 210 (88/87 BC) published by Vinogradov & Wörrle (1992, 159-170), and another newly found inscription from Olbia dated to the year 220 (78/77 BC) published by Krapivina & Diatroptov 2005, 167-180.
- 21 Leschhorn 1993, 418.
- 22 Leschhorn 1993, 106-115.
- 23 Waddington, Reinach & Babelon 1925, 176, no. 19.
- 24 For the earliest occurrence of the era in the different cities, see Leschhorn 1993, 481-484.
- 25 Anderson, Cumont & Grégoire 1910, no. 66.
- 26 Pliny (*NH* 7.24; 25.3) reports that it was a well-known fact that Mithridates spoke twenty-two languages and never required the service of an interpreter. Gellius (17.17) offers the figure of twenty-five, and Aurelius Victor (*De vir illustr.* 76.1) claims that he spoke fifty languages.
- 27 For inscriptions on wood in the Roman period, see Eck 1998, 203-217.
- 28 IK 47, p. 1-2.
- 29 French 1996, 86-87.
- 30 Anderson, Cumont & Grégoire 1910, 109-187.

- 31 Burnett, Amandry & Carradice 1999, 236-238. The legend on a Julio-Claudian coin formerly read as E[TOYΣ] MA (year 41) turns out to read EΠI BAΣIΛA. Basila served as legate of Galatia sometime during the first decades of the first century AD.
- 32 For more examples of the impact of the Antonine Plague, see Duncan-Jones 1992, 108-136.
- 33 Olshausen 1974, 153-170.
- 34 Marek 1993, 157-187.
- 35 Marek 1993, 170, no. 48; 184, no. 104.
- 36 See Marek 1993, 135-155; 187-210, for the inscriptions from Pompeiopolis and Hadrianopolis. See Anderson, Cumont & Grégoire 1910, 46-108, for the inscriptions from Neoklaudiopolis. In Hadrianopolis, two statue bases for Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, respectively, testify to the fact that inscriptions were erected before the practice of dating the inscriptions was introduced in epitaphs.