

# Hellenisation and Romanisation in Pontos-Bithynia: An Overview

*Christian Marek*

Ancient records on Mithridates of Pontos are not few.<sup>1</sup> However, as in the case of the Seleukids and Attalids, no biography of this important king in Asia Minor has survived from antiquity. Since the remaining evidence is hostile towards him, it is difficult to grasp his true personality. Modern accounts concentrate on the evaluation of the effect he had rather than on his achievements or merits. Mommsen wrote in the third volume of his *Römische Geschichte*: “Bedeutungsvoller noch als durch seine Individualität ward er durch den Platz, auf den die Geschichte ihn gestellt hat. Als der Vorläufer der nationalen Reaktion des Orients gegen die Okzidentalen hat er den neuen Kampf des Ostens gegen den Westen eröffnet; und das Gefühl, dass man mit seinem Tode nicht am Ende, sondern am Anfang sei, blieb den Besiegten wie den Siegern”.<sup>2</sup>

Fight of the East against the West – that sounds familiar today, as does the following, that Mithridates’ death was not an end, but a beginning. What makes Mithridates an appropriate starting point for my article on Hellenisation and Romanisation is indeed his position in the historical framework of my topic. By the end of the second and the beginning of the first centuries BC, Rome was present in Asia Minor with the establishment of three *provinciae*, Asia, Kilikia and Lykaonia. By the *synoikisms* and the settlements of the Hellenistic kings the institution of the Greek *polis* was scattered throughout most areas of these, even in the interior. The threshold between Hellenic civilisation and rural Anatolia had been gradually pushed inland by the *diadochoi* and their successors down to the Attalids and the Bithynian dynasts.<sup>3</sup> Yet the monarchies of Pontos, Kappadokia and Armenia, in spite of their Hellenised courts, Greek *philoï*, generals, officers and soldiers, in spite of the kings’ coinage and titles, *philhellen*, *philorhomaïos*, remained outside of this new region. The rulers of these kingdoms were Iranian families, and there was a strong Iranian element in the population of their realms. The Greek cities on the coast of the Black Sea, which they had conquered, were not free, and the vast interior parts lacked *poleis* and were instead dominated by fortresses, villages and farmsteads as well as extensive pastures.<sup>4</sup> Landlords and peasants lived in feudal-like relationships. Of great importance is the fact that just about the time of Mithridates’ birth the Iranian dynasties in eastern Anatolia were backed by the Arsakid Empire at its peak, a system of vassal kingdoms stretching from northwest India to Armenia.

Before Mithridates appeared, it is true that the Senate of Rome seemed unwilling to cross the threshold into the sphere of these kingdoms, as long as the balance of power was not jeopardized.<sup>5</sup> At the same time, contrary to the exaggerations of some historians, Mithridates was no Hannibal or counter-Alexander setting out to conquer Italy and the West. His motives, I suppose, are best described as a desire to resist Rome. He endeavoured to oppose a Roman Asia Minor, whose eventual establishment, however, he accelerated by his defeat. To Rome the initial blows dealt by Mithridates in reaction to her foolish gambling taught a shocking lesson that not even Greece was governable without more substantial administrative efforts in Asia, ones that went beyond the mere exploitation of the provinces and the playing off against each other of the friendly kings in this region. The work of Pompeius, in that respect, is a turning point, not just in the North. Perhaps even more than the foundation of settlements, his quite remarkable plan of subdividing the annexed kingdom entirely into city-territories gave birth to a flourishing *polis*-culture.

Examining our sources, we must ask: what are the parameters of Hellenisation and Romanisation and how can we find markers indicative of cultural change? I shall try to approach this question by analyzing a number of major issues selectively: Language, myth, cultural and political institutions and social change. Let us first, however, establish some preconditions. The Greek element was present in northern Asia Minor from the time of the first waves of Milesian, Megarian and Boiotian colonisation in the early seventh century BC.<sup>6</sup> The geography and climate of the Black Sea region which was quite different from most of the Mediterranean homelands – except around the Propontis – encumbered rather than promoted the growths of *polis*-territories. There was little or no traffic inland by roads or rivers. Amalgamation with populations in the interior seems to have taken place much later than in Aiolis, Ionia, Karia and Lykia. We know of a western population which seem to be related, on linguistic grounds, to the people of Thrace and the Lower Danube,<sup>7</sup> whereas large parts of northern middle-Anatolia were the homeland of the Paphlagonians, the southern borderland of which was occupied by Celtic tribes early in the Hellenistic period. A very interesting problem, which I cannot discuss here, is the origin of the Herodotean notion of “white Syrians”, a name applied to the population in the northern part of Kappadokia bordering on the Black Sea. The linguistic material for the whole area is confined to fragments, almost entirely personal names. The material connected to the western group is fairly abundant in inscriptions and literature, and there are also many Celtic names preserved. Strabon refers to Paphlagonian and Kappadokian names some of which are attested to epigraphically on both sides of the Black Sea.<sup>8</sup> The languages involved were apparently spoken as late as in the imperial period; for instance there is the famous anecdote from Saint Hieronymos (*PL.* 26.353) who noticed that around Ankyra the people spoke an idiom familiar to him from his time in Trier, Germany.

When we consider the spreading of Greek personal names, we can offer no sound statistics but rather trace some tendencies, in general not earlier than the Roman Imperial period. We should of course not assume that every one of these names belongs to a member of a particular ethnic group. Name fashions were certainly current at different times and in different places. But this itself is a revealing phenomenon, as the material as a whole confirms a tendency away from indigenous personal names towards Greek ones. This is particularly apparent wherever we can view a succession of generations – with exceptions to the rule, of course. For that reason this *does* tell us something about Hellenisation. I do not believe that this process concerned exclusively the urban elite. According to a well known inscription from Nikaia a couple gave three of seven sons away to foster-parents – a common social institution in northern Anatolia. The couple can hardly have belonged to the rich urban elite but the names of the four sons whom they kept with them were: *Alexandros, Chrestos, Mousikos, Gelasios*.<sup>9</sup> This is a nice example of a certain “taste” for Greek names, to which we can add instances of personal names like *Sappho* or *Socrates*.<sup>10</sup>

Complementary to the spread of Greek personal names there is evidence for the intrusion of Roman name elements. Again this goes far beyond the small groups of Roman citizens, which we find in the province from the Late Republican period on. Proportions can be studied particularly in the Severan lists of *phylarchs* from Klaudiopolis and Prusias ad Hypium, where the great majority contain Latin elements e.g. *Socratianus, Demetrianus*.<sup>11</sup> This strange pseudo-Roman nomenclature surely demonstrates an eagerness for a certain social status amongst middle-class provincials, before the *Constitutio Antoniniana* made the differentiation between Roman and non-Roman obsolete, and it can also be taken as evidence for the readiness of the inhabitants of northern Anatolia to identify with imperial Roman society.

One might consider the spread of name-fashions a rather superficial phenomenon. Perhaps even more illuminating for the progress of Hellenisation is the written language used in the area. In northern Anatolia of the Imperial period a knowledge of Greek did not remain confined to the elite in a few urban centres. The hundreds of funerary inscriptions belonging to villagers found at quite a distance from the major cities cannot have been written up as formulae pre-fabricated by a few professional stonecutters in an environment of complete illiteracy. On the gravestones Homeric verses, Greek mythology, proud references to professions and occupations, display of family relations and the narratives of individual fates and merits of the deceased demand the presence of at least some potential addressees in the vicinity who could read and understand these messages. That Greek was taught is attested by the occurrence of teachers, *philologoi, paideutai, grammatikoi*.<sup>12</sup> That there are some instances of insufficiency confirms rather than raises doubts about the dominant role of Greek, since it reveals an eagerness to make use of it even by those who were either uneducated or just not enough educated to have had full command of it.

Latin is a quite different matter. We do not know, at what level, if at all, Latin was taught in the Greek-speaking provinces. There are some well defined areas in which the use of the Latin language in public documents can be found on a more or less regular basis: the first of these is the sphere of the Roman military and the administration of the road-systems. Milestones are regularly inscribed in Latin or both Greek *and* Latin, but again there are a few examples where a milestone is inscribed in Greek only.<sup>13</sup> The very few tombstones of soldiers with Latin inscriptions do seem to indicate a small Latin speaking community, as in the case of the *miles et tubicen* in Amastris who served in a *cohors Campestris* or *Campanorum* probably stationed there.<sup>14</sup> A small number of funeral inscriptions reveal an ostentatious use of Latin in order to demonstrate proudly the status of *civis Romanus* or at least a marriage to one. Second, in the sphere of public state functions, Latin inscriptions as well as bilingual ones are to be found on monuments in honour of the Emperor or on dedications to Iuppiter Optimus Maximus. They demonstrate courtesy and loyalty towards Rome. To sum up, the Latin language, the language of the masters of the world, did not penetrate to the degree of a *lingua franca*, in either the fields of higher education and literature or those of administration and law. Pliny the Younger's activities were almost entirely concerned with matters within the institutional and legal framework of the Greek city, and he repeatedly uses Greek loanwords as technical terms to explain the issue to the emperor.

A long time after the colonisation of Propontis and the Black Sea region, a considerable expansion of the Greek cities in northern Anatolia took place in two stages. The first is described by the *synoikisms* and foundations of Lysimachos, his opponent Zipoites and his imitators, the Bithynian kings. Civic institutions were introduced in the highlands within Prusa, Prusias, Bithynion. Unlike Bithynia, however, there is no evidence in the interior of such a development under the Pontic kings, nor is there even any autonomy of the Ionian coastal towns. We have no idea of how Sinope after its annexation or Kerasous after its *synoikism* to Pharnakeia were organized.

What, for example, may have happened in Prusa, Prusias or Bithynion, is marvellously illustrated by a new document from outside Bithynia, an inscription from Phrygia Paroreios under Eumenes II. In this inscription, the king concedes to the *Toriaitai*, inhabitants of a military colony, that the Greek and non-Greeks are allowed to constitute a *polis*, organize an assembly and a council, subdivide the citizens into *phylai*, found a gymnasium and finance the oil they need for its functioning as a centre of training and education of the city's youth.<sup>15</sup>

The second stage of the expansion of city-states in northern Anatolia is marked by the *polis*-foundations of Pompeius the Great.<sup>16</sup> An act like this by a Roman general or magistrate is unprecedented and without imitation in the East, with the exception of the *synoikism* of Octavian's Nikopolis in western Greece. The Pompeian organisation of the annexed kingdom of Pontus and its

incorporation into a province embracing the greater parts of northern Anatolia differed fundamentally from the preceding institution of the province of Asia in the years 129-126 BC. The whole of the land was assigned, apart from one temple-state, to cities; in the interior of Pontos and Paphlagonia, these were all new foundations: Nikopolis, Megalopolis, Magnopolis, Zela, Diospolis, Neapolis and Pompeiopolis.

Admirable as it is, Pompeius' province of Pontos could not mean more than the establishment of a *basis* of civic institutions and urban development. There was, and there remained into the Imperial period, a threshold between the Hellenised or semi-Hellenised citizens of the *poleis* and the rural populations within their territories. This is made manifest from the outset by the distinct titles of the organisations, their presidents and priests, and those of the provincial assemblies: *Bithyniarches*, *Pontarches*, *Paphlagoniarches* on the one hand and *Helladarches*, *Hellenarches* on the other.<sup>17</sup> From their early stages on, the provincial organisations were named *to koinon ton en Beithynia Hellenon* and *to koinon ton en Ponto poleon*. Evidence of other kinds confirms the existence of this threshold which not only separated rural and urban populations but also upper and lower classes. An interesting question is whether and to what degree the rural populations were integrated into civic functions such as elections, assemblies and law courts, or whether they were just taxed and apart from that left alone as some sort of parallel-society. The exceptional evidence of the marker-stones from the sanctuary of Yassiçal in the territory of Amaseia, which was published by David French,<sup>18</sup> attests to the contrary, i.e. a well organized participation of the rural populations in at least some activities, in particular as far as cult is concerned.

Rome added little. The *demoi*, the *boulai*, the *archontes* continued to function traditionally according to the Hellenic model. Pompeius introduced a *lex provinciae*, the contents of which unfortunately are lost except for a few fragments. The custom of life-long membership in city- as well as provincial councils certainly goes back to it, perhaps also the re-modelling of some magistracies according to Roman institutions. At first sight, Roman legislation may have imposed new constitutional elements not only upon the cities, but also created the *koina*, the organisation at provincial level we just mentioned, generally referred to in German as *Provinziallandtage*. There is no proof of this, however. The initiative instead seems to have come from the side of the provincials. As in Asia there seems to have existed a *koinon* in Pontos since the Republican period. The earliest evidence from Bithynia, 29 BC, as well as from Paphlagonia, 5 BC, emphasizes the provincials' eagerness to initiate a cult in honour of Augustus. About the structure, the procedure of delegating members into the assembly, eligibility etc. we know no details.

The topic of eras and calendars deserves a closer look. We can trace no remnants of pre-Hellenistic calendars from the cities on the south-coast of the Black Sea, but know of the use of Macedonian calendars in for example Amastris and Amaseia. Bithynia had a royal era which started under Zipoites

in the year 298 or 297 BC which is known from royal coins of Nikomedes II.<sup>19</sup> The cities, however, used a different era, starting from 282/81 BC, apparently referring to the downfall of Lysimachos. This era was not abolished together with the monarchy, and its dating continued to be used, stamped into coins of Nikaia, Nikomedeia, Tieion, Prusa, Bithynion, Apameia under two Roman governors ruling the province from 61-58 and 46 BC.<sup>20</sup> But in the imperial province, the Bithynian cities did not resume the use of this method nor did they count their years from any other historic event, let alone the introduction of Roman rule – quite unlike Paphlagonia and Pontos. Why? The Paphlagonian and Pontic cities both on the coast and inland considered themselves liberated by the Romans; their chosen dating methods mark a fundamental step towards autonomous *politeiai*. Exactly in this respect the Bithynian cities believed that they were different, for they, whenever they were founded, had enjoyed city-status since the establishment of the Bithynian Kingdom or even earlier. They saw as little reason to mark a change of their political status with the arrival of the Romans as did Miletos, Smyrna or Ephesos in Asia. By insisting on this difference between the city-states of the imperial provinces of Bithynia and Pontos, I must direct attention to the special cases of Herakleia and Tieion. Both towns, it is true, according to Pompeius' decision were not incorporated into the province of Bithynia but attached to the province of Pontos. Yet Herakleia and Tieion were geographically Bithynian and, what matters most, historically had not belonged to the kingdom of Mithridates. They considered themselves autonomous *poleis* long before Nikomedes IV bequeathed his kingdom to the Romans. Accordingly they did not use eras starting from the Roman conquest. For our purpose, we may conclude from the analysis of the eras, that their application in northern Anatolia reflects the cities' very strong desire to emphasize the coming into existence and duration of their political status as a free *polis*, i.e. the institutional and political aspects of their membership in the community of Hellenic culture.

Greek myth and genealogy have a very long tradition in Anatolia. Ilium managed to fascinate Alexander and the Romans with her claim to be the descendant of Troy. The Attalids demonstrated how a semi-barbarian dynasty successfully acquired heroic Greek ancestors and gained the reputation of saviours and protectors of the Hellenic civilisation in Asia. Throughout Asia Minor the construction of genealogies flourished exuberantly from the Hellenistic to the Imperial periods. Such a construction became almost compulsory for any autonomous community in order to be acknowledged as a full member of the Greek family.<sup>21</sup> The Archaic colonies at Propontis and along the Black Sea had no problem as regards their Greek ancestry, the question for some was simply whether Doros or Ion had founded them. Others made use of the most prominent myths of the North as a sort of naval basis for their origins, in particular the Amazons and the Argonauts. As far as Hellenic genealogy is concerned there is the remarkable exception of Pompeiopolis, a city which refrained from constructing a suspicious network of Greek kinship instead

deliberately advertising her foundation by Pompeius. On the other hand, however, it is rather surprising that this *polis* with no Hellenistic predecessor and a stock of Roman settlers possessed purely Greek institutions, besides *phylai* and a gymnasium with *epebes*.

The heroes of the mythical past in many cities are followed by heroes in science, art and literature, who contributed to their birthplaces' reputation and self-esteem even when their careers unfolded far away from these cities. A tiny little coastal town on the Black Sea shore of Paphlagonia, Kromna, dared to advertise a claim which in the eyes of reputed ancestral Hellenic *poleis* like Chios, Smyrna, Ephesos or Miletos should have sounded rather ridiculous: they claimed they were the birthplace of Homer.<sup>22</sup>

Evidence for contests organized together with the celebration of funerals or festivals in honour of the Gods goes back to the age of Homer. Whatever parallels from the ancient near-eastern cultures may be drawn, the phenomenon in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor is genuinely Greek. This institution is of considerable significance for the spread of Hellenism in general and applies in particular to the northern Anatolian provinces.<sup>23</sup> When Greek cities and confederacies followed the example of Ptolemaios Philadelphos and founded "isolympic", "isopythic" contests the growing multi-cellular festival cosmos of the Hellenistic world certainly reached out to the cities of Bithynia. Polemon II established an *agon* in honour of Claudius in Pontos. Apart from that, east of Bithynia we know until now only of contests in the Pontic and Paphlagonian provincial *koina* in Neokaisareia and Pompeiopolis. But that does not mean much. Evidence in some cases shrinks to a single coin or inscription. It must be considered generally that the nature of our main sources of information may fall short of covering the range of activities that took place in the provinces. For there are regional differences both concerning the "epigraphic habit" and periodic emissions of provincial coinage.

Fundamental for the gradual penetration of the provinces by Greek mass entertainment was mobility, the touring of many professionals and semi-professionals who carried glamour and glory to a multitude of places and events scattered over the map of the Empire. One of the powerful associations with the name Ἱερὰ περιπολιστικὴ σύνοδος – "the holy synod of the travelling competitors" is now attested, surprisingly enough, in the Roman foundation of Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia. The epigraphic record of this mobility is impressive particularly with regards to the wide distribution of epitaphs telling us the fate of athletes and artists who died abroad as well as the records of victories worldwide. Northern Anatolia is well represented.

The overall picture we get from the inscriptions suggests that short of trade and the movements of army units, the festivals were the greatest cause of long and short distance mobility. Apart from legal, social and economic consequences, here is to be found the basis of transcultural influences contributing to the genesis of, eventually, an almost universal culture of mass entertainment.<sup>24</sup>

If one wishes to add to this gladiatorial games as an element of Romanisation, one is generously awarded by our sources from northern Anatolia. They appear to have been celebrated on a regular basis on the occasion of provincial assemblies in different cities, large and small. For contemporary observers from the second century AD onwards, such activities had become a uniform, comprehensive phenomenon. Whether the fighting of gladiators, horse races or dancing and acting on the stage, boxing and catching in the arenas, they were all *spectacula* (Tertullian), and they were thought to be something thoroughly Hellenic, synonymous, for a Syriac and Christian writer like Tatianos, with Paganism. The attacks on such *spectacula* launched repeatedly by the Christian pamphletists and Church-Fathers are sharp. What the bishops feared and hated was more than the performance of adultery and salacious dances on the stage, the bloodshed in the arena, more even than the persistent reminder of the visible vitality of pagan rites and myths even within a prevailing Christian population. There was a powerful, very deeply rooted adherence, perhaps addiction, to entertainment of this kind, so that it drew away even open believers regularly from the congregations and assembled and united them instead in a different community. Jakob of Serugh in his fifth century AD homily quotes and furiously refutes the excuses which Christian adherents to these forms of entertainment put forward.<sup>25</sup>

Where, however, can we draw the line, if anywhere? What were the limits of Hellenisation as far as Greek mass entertainment is concerned? The question has not yet been answered conclusively, and opinions of modern scholars differ from each other. The problem, of course, is greatest in the provinces with a high portion of oriental populations and epichoric languages. It has been emphasized that the difference between rural and city-life has to be considered as a major barrier. Following these arguments the villagers and peasants in the rural areas of Anatolia remained almost entirely excluded, cut off by their lack of literacy, their command of the Greek language and their legal status as non-citizens.<sup>26</sup> To them should be added the Jews and Christians who refused to join in out of religious reasons. I do not believe this to be correct in my view of the evidence.

The Christian Empire of course prohibited this development but failed to abolish it all together. Particularly the stage performances outlived the *agones* and *munera* for centuries. Late Antique intellectual life in the Anatolian provinces borrowed a lot from this continuity. The travelling sophists, teachers and rhetoricians had participated in and accompanied the contests; verse, *enkomion*, and philosophical disputes undoubtedly could not have penetrated provincial life to such an extent as they did without the many festivals.

An interesting field of research, not systematically investigated so far, is the language of inscriptions – especially of Late Antiquity – as regards its metaphorical and technical usage of “*agonistica*”. Because of the high level of literary education, which seems to have been present everywhere, one ought to be able to discern to the widespread usage of such language by ordinary



men in the interior of the country, and this is indeed the case. This applies particularly to funerary inscriptions. An ordinary villager in the remote hinterland of Bithynia praised his wife, calling her Βραβεῖον ἀρετῆς – yardstick of virtue. *Brabeion* is a technical term for a crown as the prize in games.<sup>27</sup> A young woman who was killed by barbarian invaders is praised by the epigram on her tombstone in Paphlagonia. Having preferred death to being raped, she has become – in the eyes of her husband and contemporary society – an exceptional example of female virtue: she has “won the crown” – as the inscription says.<sup>28</sup>

The usage of this language by Christian writers deserves particular attention. Martyrdom itself, the *ascesis* of the holy man, the hatred of a luxurious life, as one modern scholar formulated it, is pre-eminently athletic.<sup>29</sup> The martyr of Euchaita in Pontos (near Amaseia), Theodoros the “Soldier”, is praised by a fifth century AD inscription as ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀθλητής.<sup>30</sup>

I believe that together with the political institutions of the *polis* this culture of periodic festivals celebrated in almost every city, large and small, evolved into a central activity that attracted elements from all kinds of cultural and ethnic backgrounds, both from the upper and lower classes, the rich and the poor. It contributed much to the uniformity of the Hellenic world and therefore had the strongest impact on what we may call “Hellenisation”.

Above and beyond the cultural and political framework of the *polis* the inhabitants of the northern Anatolian provinces came into touch with Roman institutions particularly through service in the military and careers which in a few instances led to the eminence of an ordinary consulate in Rome.

There were no legions in imperial Pontos-Bithynia, and Roman military units stationed there were few. Other than in border-provinces the influence of the garrisons on economic, social and cultural change cannot have been far-reaching. At the same time, epigraphic documentation attests to a considerable number of provincials from Pontos, Paphlagonia and Bithynia serving in army-units around the Roman world, with a certain concentration in garrisons on the Lower Danube.<sup>31</sup>

Careers in the imperial orders, especially the senatorial, seem to have started out in the *coloniae*. Roman colonies existed in Apameia, Herakleia Pontike and Sinope, where they were, in the beginning at least, strictly separated from the *poleis*. Apameia advertised its special relationship to Rome by the depiction of Aeneas and Anchises on her coins. Not surprisingly, the earliest senators originating from northern Anatolia, are Apameians in the Flavian and Pompeiopolitans in the Trajanic periods, only a little later the most prominent of course were Arrianos of Nikomedeia and Cassius Dio of Nikaia.<sup>32</sup> So far, there is no senator attested further to the east than Pompeiopolis or, from other coastal cities than Amastris. Since double citizenships – although restricted by the Pompeian law – flourished in the Imperial period, the provincial elite perhaps endeavoured to settle in the West, in the larger and prosperous Bithynian cities close to Propontis and the Mediterranean.

However, our prosopographical material especially from the Paphlagonian and Pontic cities is too scarce to allow valid conclusions. Membership in the equestrian order was more widespread. The elite group was eager to claim a noble origin using formulae such as *ek synkletikon* for senatorial, *apo strateion hippikon* for equestrian, and even *ek epitropon* for procuratorian family members.<sup>33</sup> These people identified themselves with Rome. And again they perhaps did not conceive of the powerful world-empire with a perspective other than that of Aelius Aristeides in his famous speech *eis Rhomen*: a universal *polis*.

The dominance of Greek language, education, religion, and way of life was not hindered by Roman authorities in an age, when the Emperor Hadrian instituted the *panhellenion*, and the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, a Spaniard by birth, wrote down his philosophy in Greek. Hellenisation in the East enforced as well as safeguarded the unity of the Empire far more effectively than the legions, the law and the cult of the Emperors. In northern Anatolia as well as in the whole of Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine and Egypt, to be “Hellenic” in terms of literacy, language and education became a condition for access to the society of the ruling classes. Hellenisation in the Later Roman Near East did not just correspond to, but was identical with Romanisation. A beautiful glimpse of this powerful tradition is preserved in the Turkish notion of Anatolian Greeks, from the Ottoman Empire down to the *cumhuriyet*, being called *Rum*, Romans.

## Notes

- 1 Still the most comprehensive account is given by Reinach 1895. See also McGing 1986.
- 2 Mommsen 1856, 138.
- 3 Cohen 1995.
- 4 I am grateful to Brian McGing for raising the interesting point of the rock-cut inscription of Gazioura (Anderson, Cumont & Grégoire 1910, no. 278a; cf. *SEG* 13, 539, and see Robert in Firatlı 1964, 154-155; J. Robert & L. Robert *BE* 1965, 402 & 245). It has been interpreted in a way that a gymnasium *agon* may have existed in the third century BC; this would suggest a rather advanced Hellenisation very early in the interior of Pontos at least at that place. However, the epigraphic basis for such an interpretation is insufficient and the traces, as George Bean read them, suggest a different understanding as to somebody’s victory of an *agon* at Byzantion rather than somebody from Byzantion having won a victory at Gazioura.
- 5 This discussion has been reopened by Kallet-Marx 1995.
- 6 Ehrhardt 1983.
- 7 Wittke 2004.
- 8 References to literature in Marek 2003, 174, n. 1.
- 9 *SEG* 33, 1085, territory of Nikaia.
- 10 Marek 2003, 175, n. 7.
- 11 See Ameling 1985 and Marek 2002, 31-50.
- 12 Marek 2003, 176, n. 12.
- 13 Robert 1937, 295, no. 3.4.

- 14 Catalogue of Amastrian inscriptions in Marek 1993, 171, no. 52.
- 15 Jonnes & Ricl 1997, 1-29; add the essential corrections by Müller 2005, 355-357.
- 16 Marek 1993, 26-46.
- 17 Marek 1993, 78 and n. 535; Marek 2003, 66.
- 18 French 1996, 75-92.
- 19 Leschhorn 1993, 178-191.
- 20 Leschhorn 1993, 191-197.
- 21 See the literature quoted by Marek 2003, 101, n. 6.
- 22 Marek 2003, 150 and 64, Abb. 98.
- 23 Robert 1982, 229: "La diffusion de ces concours sous l'Empire marque la diffusion géographique de l'hellénisme".
- 24 For this and the following, see Marek 2003, 95-103.
- 25 Moss, 1935, 87-112.
- 26 Herz 1997, 255-256.
- 27 Robert 1982, 263-266.
- 28 Catalogue of the inscriptions of Kaisareia-Hadrianopolis in Marek 1993, no. 38.
- 29 Eisler 1961, 82-97.
- 30 Anderson, Cumont & Grégoire 1910, no. 101.
- 31 The evidence is collected in Marek 1993, 62, n. 9.
- 32 Halfmann 1979, 68-69.
- 33 Marek 1993, 175, n. 8.

### Bibliography

- Ameling, W. 1985. *Die Inschriften von Prusias ad Hypium* (IGSK, 27). Bonn.
- Anderson, J.G.C., F. Cumont & H. Grégoire 1910. *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines du Pont et de l'Arménie* (Studia Pontica, 3). Bruxelles.
- Cohen, G.M. 1995. *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*. Berkeley.
- Ehrhardt, N. 1983. *Milet und seine Kolonien. Vergleichende Untersuchungen der kultischen und politischen Einrichtungen*. Frankfurt am Main-Bern-New York.
- Eisler, C. 1961. The athlete of virtue. The iconography of ascetism, in: M. Meiss (ed.), *Essays in Honor of Erwin Panowsky*. New York, 82-97.
- Firatlı, N. 1964. *Les stèles funéraires de Byzance gréco-romaine*. Paris.
- French, D.H. 1996. Amasian notes 5. The temenos of Zeus Stratiotes at Yassiçal, *EpigrAnat* 27, 75-92.
- Halfmann, H. 1979. *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jh. n. Chr.* Göttingen.
- Herz, P. 1997. Herrscherverehrung und lokale Festkultur im Osten des römischen Reiches, in: H.v. Cancik & J. Rüpke (eds.), *Römische Reichsreligion und Provinzialreligion*. Tübingen, 239-264.
- Jonnes, L. & M. Ricl 1997. A new royal inscription from Phrygia Paroreios: Eumenes II grants Tyriaion the status of a polis, *EpigrAnat* 29, 1-29.
- Kallet-Marx, R.M. 1995. *Hegemony to Empire. The Development of the Roman Imperium in the East from 148 to 62 B.C.* Berkeley.

- Leschhorn, W. 1993. *Antike Ären. Zeitrechnung, Politik und Geschichte im Schwarzmeerraum und in Kleinasien nördlich des Tauros*. Stuttgart.
- Marek, C. 1993. *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord Galatia*. Tübingen.
- Marek, C. 2002. Die Phylen von Klaudiupolis, die Geschichte der Stadt und die Topographie Ostbithyniens, *MusHelv* 59, 31-50.
- Marek, C. 2003. *Pontus et Bithynia. Die römischen Provinzen im Norden Kleinasiens*. Mainz.
- McGing, B.C. 1986. *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator, King of Pontus*. Leiden.
- Mommsen, Th. 1856. *Römische Geschichte* III. Leipzig.
- Moss, C. 1935. Jacob of Serugh's homilies on the spectacles of the theatre, *Le Muséon* 48, 87-112.
- Müller, H. 2005. Hemiolios. Eumenes II., Toriaion und die Finanzorganisation des Alexanderreiches, *Chiron* 35, 355-384.
- Reinach, Th. 1895. *Mithridates Eupator, König von Pontos, mit Berichtigungen und Nachträgen des Verfassers ins Deutsche übertragen von A. Goetz*. Leipzig.
- Robert, L. 1937. *Études anatoliennes. Recherches sur les inscriptions grecques de l'Asie Mineure*. Paris.
- Robert, L. 1982. Une vision de Perpétue martyre à Carthage en 203, *CRAI* 1982, 228-276.
- Wittke, A-M. 2004. *Mušker und Phryger: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Anatoliens vom 12. bis zum 7. Jh. v. Chr.* (Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients B. 99). Wiesbaden.