

Colonial Geopolitics and Local Cultures in
the Hellenistic and Roman East
(3rd century BC – 3rd century AD)



edited by
Hadrien Bru, Adrian G. Dumitru
and Nicholas Sekunda



Colonial Geopolitics and Local Cultures in
the Hellenistic and Roman East
(3rd century BC – 3rd century AD)

Géopolitique coloniale et cultures locales
dans l’Orient hellénistique et romain
(III^e siècle av. J.-C. – III^e siècle ap. J.-C.)

edited by

Hadrien Bru, Adrian G. Dumitru
and Nicholas Sekunda



ARCHAEOPRESS PUBLISHING LTD

Summertown Pavilion

18-24 Middle Way

Summertown

Oxford OX2 7LG

www.archaeopress.com

ISBN 978-1-78969-982-1

ISBN 978-1-78969-983-8 (e-Pdf)

© Archaeopress and the individual authors 2021

Cover: Pisido-Graeco-Roman funerary stele from Tymbriada, 2nd-3rd century AD (Pisidia, Turkey)

© Ph. Hadrien Bru

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owners. This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website www.archaeopress.com

Contents

List of Figures.....	iii
List of Contributors.....	vi

Introduction	1
---------------------------	----------

Part 1 Territories and colonial settlements

Hellenistic colonization and local culture in Commagene and Northern Cyrrhestice	7
Margherita Facella	
The territory of Hierapolis in Phrygia after the Greek colonization and some remarks on Nikaia in Bithynia and Apollonia in Pisidia: the evidence from archaeological surveys and satellite remote sensing	18
Giuseppe Scardozi	
On The Treaty of Apamea. The territorial clause	35
Adrian Dumitru	
The nature of Attalid <i>katoikiai</i> (188-133 BC)	49
Nicholas Sekunda	
Les Thraces et Lyciens en Phrygie Parorée aux époques hellénistique et romaine	56
Hadrien Bru	

Part 2 Economics and imperial domination

The introduction of Hellenic cults in Seleukid Syria: colonial appropriation and transcultural exchange in the creation of an Imperial landscape	73
Rolf Strootman	
Les relations entre les Thraces et les cités grecques de la mer Noire : conflits, alliances, transferts institutionnels	92
Adrian Robu	
Late cistophoric production during the Mithridatic Wars: a comparison between the mints of Ephesus and Tralles	100
Lucia Francesca Carbone	
Regional currencies within an empire. Bronze coinages of Greece and Asia at the time of the Roman conquest: a case of partial monetary convergence	110
Gilles Bransbourg	

Part 3 Indigenous cultures and colonial contacts

Decolonizing the Indo-Greeks	126
Richard Wenghofer	

Entre perte d'autonomie, acculturation et intégration : les *incolae* de la colonie romaine de Dion.....137
Julien Demaille

Paus. X. 23. 14 on the Galatians' Passage to Asia: lost in translation148
Oleg Gabelko

**Les chrétiens d'Asie Mineure et l'évangélisation du *Barbaricum* danubien (III^e-IV^e siècles).
Des relations assez mal connues**152
Attila Jakab

Part 4 Forms of military presence

Soldiers and Hellenism: recruitment in the Hellenistic militaries160
D.J. Houle

Germanicus, Trajan, and the date of *Annals* 1-6.....167
Katherine Low

**Two military camps on the Roman *Limes*: *Dura-Europos* and *Novae* (an example of Roman Imperial
propaganda through official state religion)**174
Oleg Alexandrov

**The political propaganda of the cities of Thrace and the Asianic provinces.
Some aspects of interactions (A preliminary study)**181
Ivo Topalilov

Indices.....205
Geographical index.....205
Index of personal names.....211
Cultural, historical, geographical and political communities.....215
Deities.....217

List of Figures

Part 1

Territories and colonial settlements

Giuseppe Scardozzi: **The territory of Hierapolis in Phrygia after the Greek colonization and some remarks on Nikaia in Bithynia and Apollonia in Pisidia: the evidence from archaeological surveys and satellite remote sensing**

Figure 1. DEM of western Turkey based on data from the Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM)	19
Figure 2. DEM of the territory of Hierapolis based on data from Advanced Spaceborne Thermal Emission and Reflection Radiometer (ASTER)	20
Figure 3. A funerary tumulus of the Hellenistic age from the territory of Hierapolis	20
Figure 4. A Corona KH-4A space photograph taken in 1968.....	21
Figure 5. The northern sector of the Uzunpinar plateau in a QuickBird-2 image taken in 2007	21
Figure 6. The central part of the northern sector of the Uzunpinar plateau in a space photograph taken by satellite Hexagon KH-9 in 1980	22
Figure 7. DEM of the northern sector of the Uzunpinar plateau based on ASTER data	22
Figure 8. Land divisions of the territories of Hierapolis (A), Nikaia (B) and Apollonia (C)	23
Figure 9. The territory of Iznik-Nikaia in a space photograph taken by satellite Hexagon KH-9 in 1979	25
Figure 10. The territory of Nikaia in a DEM based on SRTM data	26
Figure 11. A detail from a space photograph taken in 1963 by satellite Corona KH-4 covering Iznik-Nikaia and the territory immediately around it	27
Figure 12. The plain of Uluborlu and the site of Apollonia in Pisidia in a space photograph taken by satellite Gambit KH-7 in 1967	28
Figure 13. A detail of a Gambit KH-7 space photograph (1967) covering the site of Apollonia-Sozopolis	29
Figure 14. A) a view of the Byzantine city walls from the west; B) a detail of the fortification and the pentagonal tower; C) the bridge of the Cirimbolu aqueduct in the deep gorge to the south of the hill.....	30
Figure 15. The territory of Apollonia in a DEM based on SRTM data	30
Figure 16. Indigenous gods of the territory of Hierapolis adopted in the Greek pantheon and assimilated to Hellenic deities	31

Hadrien Bru: **Les Thraces et Lyciens en Phrygie Parorée aux époques hellénistique et romaine**

Carte: La Phrygie Parorée et le Taurus méridional.....	59
--------------------------------------------------------	----

Part 2

Economics and imperial domination

Rolf Strootman: **The introduction of Hellenic cults in Seleukid Syria: colonial appropriation and transcultural exchange in the creation of an Imperial landscape**

Map 1. The northern Levant in early Hellenistic Times	75
Map 2. The principal Seleukid foundations in the lower Orontes region	76
Figure 1. View of the akropolis of Seleukeia in Pieria (Çevlik, near Samandağ) from the north.....	78
Figure 2. View of Mount Silpios, and the old city of Antakya, from across the Orontes River.....	79
Figure 3. Laurel leaves from the sacred grove of Daphne	81
Figure 4. Silver tetradrachm of Seleukos I from Seleukeia-on-the-Tigris, early third century BCE.....	82

Lucia Francesca Carbone: **Late cistophoric production during the Mithridatic Wars: a comparison between the mints of Ephesus and Tralles**

Figure 1. Mint ratio in 2002 hoard.....	101
Figure 2. Mint ratio in cistophoric hoards dated 100-88 BC.....	101
Figure 3. Late cistophoric production in tetradrachms obverse dies per year (2002 hoard).....	102
Figure 4. Numerical relevance of the latest issues in Ephesus and Pergamum included in 2002 hoard.....	102
Figure 5. Numerical relevance of the latest issues in Ephesus and Pergamum included in 2002 hoard.....	102
Figure 6. Chronological breakdown of the specimens included in the 2002 hoard.....	104
Figure 7 Number of tetradrachm obverse dies per year for the mints of Pergamum, Ephesus and Tralles	105
Figure 8. Number of obverse dies vs. specimens in Ephesus	106
Figure 9. Late cistophoric production in Tralles (89-77 BC).....	106
Figure 10. Late cistophoric production in Tralles (89-60s BC)	108
Table 1. Calculation of the number of cistophoric issues (128-89 BC) according to Esty 2006.....	103
Table 2. Trallian late cistophoric issues between 89 and 77 BC	107
Table 3. Late cistophoric issues between 75 and c. 60 BC excluding fractions	108

Gilles Bransbourg: **Regional currencies within an Empire. Bronze coinages of Greece and Asia at the time of the Roman conquest: a case of partial monetary convergence**

Chart 1. Weights of 986 <i>denarii</i> from the American Numismatic Society's collection, between 211 and 117 BC	111
Chart 2. Weights of 794 Cistophoric tetradrachms from the American Numismatic Society's collection	112
Chart 3. Weights of 313 Peloponnesian bronze coins from the American Numismatic Society, from the late 5th century BC until the reign of Antoninus Pius (AD 138-161).....	121
Chart 4. Weights of 985 Macedonian bronze coins from the American Numismatic Society, from the 5th century BC until the reign of Trajan (AD 98-117).....	121
Chart 5. Weight histogram of 723 Asia Minor bronze coins from the American Numismatic Society, 30 BC – AD 117.....	121
Chart 6. Weight histogram of 268 Asia Minor bronze coins from the American Numismatic Society, 133-30 BC	121
Chart 7. Chart 4: Weight histogram of 780 Asia Minor bronze coins from the American Numismatic Society, c. 300-133 BC.....	122
Plates 1 and 2. Greek hemiobols, silver and bronze: 1. Peloponnesus, Psophis, <i>hemiobol</i> ; 2. Peloponnesus, Messenia, Thuria, <i>hemiobol</i>	114
Plates 3, 4 and 5. Roman Republican bronze asses, decreasing weights: 3. Rome (Crescent symbol), <i>as</i> ; 4. Rome (Murena), <i>as</i> ; 5. Rome (Q. Titius), <i>as</i>	115
Plates 6, 7, 8 and 9. Sestertius, from silver to bronze: 6. Rome (T. Carisius), <i>sestertius</i> ; 7. Achaia (L. Sempronius Atratinus serving Marc Antony), <i>sestertius</i> ; 8. Asia, Pergamum? (under Augustus), <i>sestertius</i> ; 9. Rome (C. Gallius Lupercus, under Augustus), <i>sestertius</i>	118
Plates 10 and 11. Imperial as, provincial assarion (Augustus): 10. Rome (Tiberius under Augustus), <i>as</i> ; 11. Ephesus, one-unit (=assarion?)	119

**Part 3
Indigenous cultures and colonial contacts**

Richard Wenghofer: **Decolonizing the Indo-Greeks**

Plate 1. Ionic Column, Jandial Temple, Taxila	131
Plate 2. Double-Headed Eagle Stupa, Taxila.....	131
Plate 3. Bronze Karshapana of Pantaleon with bilingual Greek/Karoshthi inscription	132
Plate 4. Bronze karshapana of Agathocles with bilingual Greek/Karoshthi inscription.....	132
Plate 5. Indian standard drachm of Apollodotus I with bilingual Greek/Karoshthi legend	133
Figure 1: Map of the Indo-Greek Kingdoms	134
Plate 6. Silver Tetradrachm of Maues (c. 90-60 BC).....	134

Julien Demaille: **Entre perte d'autonomie, acculturation et intégration : les *incolae* de la colonie romaine de Dion**

Figure 1. La dédicace bilingue à <i>Anthestia Iucunda</i>	139
Figure 2. Répartition des porteurs et des non-porteurs de gentilice sur le territoire de la colonie romaine de Dion.....	142

**Part 4
Forms of military presence**

Oleg Alexandrov: **Two military camps on the Roman Limes: Dura-Europos and Novae (an example of Roman Imperial propaganda through official state religion)**

Figure 1. The eastern part of the Roman Empire in the 2nd century AD	175
Figure 2. The Roman military fortress at Dura-Europos	175
Figure 3. Military calendar <i>Feriale Duranum</i>	175
Figure 4. The Roman military fortress at Novae	177
Figure 5. The headquarters building (<i>principia</i>) at Novae.....	178
Figure 6. The headquarters building (<i>principia</i>) at Novae.....	179

List of contributors

Oleg Alexandrov, Faculty Member, University of Veliko Tarnovo (Bulgaria)

Gilles Bransbourg, Institute for the Study of the Ancient World (New York University), American Numismatic Society (USA)

Hadrien Bru, Faculty Member, Institut des Sciences et Techniques de l'Antiquité, Université de Bourgogne-Franche Comté (Besançon, France)

Lucia Carbone, American Numismatic Society (New York, USA)

Julien Demaille, Institut des Sciences et Techniques de l'Antiquité, Université de Bourgogne-Franche Comté (Besançon, France)

Adrian Dumitru, University of Bucharest/IGR (Romania)

Margherita Facella, Faculty Member, Università degli Studi di Pisa (Italy)

Oleg Gabelko, Faculty Member, Russian State University for the Humanities (Moscow, Russia)

D.J. Houle, University of Waterloo (Canada)

Attila Jakab, Faculty Member, Civitas Europica Centralis (Budapest, Hungary)

Katherine Low, Oxford University (UK)

Adrian Robu, Faculty Member, Université Paris VIII, (France)

Giuseppe Scardozzi, Istituto per i Beni Archeologici e Monumentali (CNR Lecce, Italy)

Nicholas Sekunda, Faculty Member, Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology, University of Gdańsk (Poland)

Rolf Strootman, Faculty Member, Utrecht University (Netherlands)

Ivo Topalilov, Faculty Member, Institute of Balkan Studies and Center of Thracology 'Prof. Alexander Fol' - Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (Sofia, Bulgaria)

Richard Wenghofer, Faculty Member, Nipissing University (Canada)

To the memory of
Anton Powell (1947-2020) and Alexandru Avram (1956-2021)

Introduction

The contributions published in this volume in the main constitute the proceedings of a panel entitled ‘Colonial geopolitics and local cultures in the Hellenistic and Roman East (3rd century BC – 3rd century AD)’ which was held during the *Celtic Conference in Classics 2014* (Edinburgh, Scotland, June 25-28th 2014), but the editors have taken the opportunity to also incorporate a number of papers given previously at the panel ‘Les relations entre les Balkans et l’Asie Mineure, de l’époque classique à la période byzantine (V^e s. av. J.-C. - V^e s. ap. J.-C.)’ which convened at Mamaia (Romania, September 23-27th, 2012) under the aegis of the *Symposium international Le Livre. La Roumanie. L’Europe. 5^e édition*. Due to various reasons, the final publication of both these panels has, alas, been delayed, but it is now a pleasure, at last, to produce a thematic volume incorporating all these papers. We wish to thank all the contributors for their patience, hoping that this volume will answer their expectations. The text which follows is by Hadrien Bru and is taken from the Introductory Panel of the *Celtic Conference in Classics*.

Hadrien Bru, Adrian G. Dumitru, Nicholas Sekunda



To begin, I would like to thank you sincerely for coming to be here with us in Edinburgh, in these northern territories and *eschata*, which will become central for us for a while. I am above all grateful to those who came here at their own expense, manifesting their interest in coming to this meeting despite the financial difficulties involved. Many thanks are of course due to Douglas Cairns and to Anton Powell for organizing such a huge event including no less than seventeen panels, as you know. Regrettably my former PhD advisor Maurice Sartre has not been able to attend.

The Context of this Conference

Another reason for thanking you for attending is the necessity of informing you, if you are not aware already, that you are heroes, as specialists in ancient history, a kind of person that is soon bound to disappear, because the neoconservative, liberal and authoritarian governments which we are facing, have decided to end the financial support for the Humanities and Social Sciences we used to benefit from in the past, especially in Europe. This is mostly because we do not produce any direct added value which can be measured in financial terms. Obviously the big companies or corporations are not interested in the social criticism

which arises from our studies. Consequently they deny the importance of Humanities and Cultural Studies as a whole, representing an incredible threat almost imperceptible to us, even if we have heard about certain twentieth century ‘régimes’ able to destroy the cultures. Most scholars have been surprised by this quite recent and violent attack against Humanities, which have been the basis of western culture for four hundred years, and people who thought that the University was an eternal institution are about to be highly disappointed, although we already saw clear signs of the trend fifteen years ago. I am referring to the programmatic disappearance of the University we used to know, open to the world and to universal knowledge and cultures. As concerns us, the sciences of Antiquity are of course considered useless for modern societies, and the way in which we have practiced our art since the nineteenth century has been brought into question. I fear that after a few decades, there will be very few of us left to study ancient societies officially, first because of a lack of political will, second because we need a lot of time to work on the historical or archaeological sources, and third because our studies or topics are often misunderstood and despised.

But we are still here, in the field or in the libraries, to describe, to analyse and to write on Ancient History which was the basis of what has happened up to the present day. This is all in our hands. There is no more time for division and dispersion. If we want to survive, I am convinced that we have to work together closely, historians, archaeologists, epigraphists, specialists in numismatics, linguistics, etc. We have to do this, on the one hand, because it is technically necessary, and on the other hand because we have no other choice. We have to combine our energy, our knowledge, and our technical know-how, for both scientific and personal reasons.

It is essential to find new dynamics, in the first place if we wish to carry on with Ancient studies, and second in order to publish new things together according to the highest standards. On this point, I think that we have to work with huge international publishing houses, but also with local university presses, trying to find a balance. In my opinion, we have to bear in mind that our books and articles will perhaps be discovered by potential readers much later on, maybe within one or two centuries, but at that time, I would like to think or to believe that our writings will be useful to build, or rebuild, other, better societies. That is why in my opinion we have two main missions: to write documented

synthesizes, and to propose new studies opening to future research angles for the next generations.

Right now, together with Adrian Dumitru and Nicholas Sekunda, I have chosen to question the connection between Colonial Geopolitics and Local Cultures on a quite long timespan running through the Hellenistic and Roman periods. But before we deal with the research tasks directly, a few words on language. In which language should we communicate within our field? We obviously know that this significant choice is driven by social, sociological, cultural and political issues. Should we favour English as the vehicular language, eliminating the other languages as vernacular dialects bound to disappear, 'vouées à disparaître'?

Of course not, because it would be absurd to promote a sole and unique dominating language, and at the same time to study cultural diversity in Antiquity. As General Editor of the *Historical and Archaeological Atlas of Ancient Asia Minor*, I have defended the need and the right of writing history in English, but also in German, in French and in Italian. It is naturally a cultural choice. Maybe there is a connection between this choice and my present work on Hellenistic and Roman Phrygia Paroreios, where the Greek language overwhelmed the Phrygian and Pisidian languages, although it took time, as the native languages were spoken in this region since the Bronze Age.

The organizers of conference series the *Celtic Conferences in Classics* have chosen that the second conference language is French. The conferences have been organized from the beginning in the 1990s onwards, and significantly the first continental CCC was held in 2004 at Rennes 2, in France, which was my former university. It confirms the wisdom of the founders of the series, among them Anton Powell, and I thank him for that. But I do not have any illusions, because I am convinced that, for example, French, Italian, German will probably disappear as spoken languages within one or two centuries. English and Spanish will probably last a little bit more. On my side, I have chosen to give you an introduction in English, then a more personal contribution tomorrow in French. Concerning your papers, you have made your own choices.

Just a last note of clarification about our panel before we go any further. Its recent background has to be understood as the third of three meetings held over the last year. The first was a meeting devoted to 'Spaces and Territories of the Roman Eastern Colonies' held at Besançon university and organized by myself in October; an international symposium was held in November at the university of Strasbourg and organized by Cédric Brélaz on the Greek culture in the Roman Eastern Colonies, and now this panel of the CCC.

So, in order to introduce this panel, I would like to focus briefly on three connected considerations, which are Geopolitics, Acculturation and Cultural Identities.

Geopolitics

Geopolitics deals with populations living on a territory but subject to political forces or institutions, mainly States, which are often city-states, kingdoms, or empires. Therefore we have to consider the nature of the States involved in the act of colonization. Often, the local or native populations faced a royal State whose behaviour could rather be described as Imperial. Of course I am thinking primarily about Alexander the Great and the Seleucid Empire, and to a lesser extent about the Ptolemaic State. This latter state was less involved than the others in continental affairs, but we can find exceptions like Arabian Philadelphia which became Amman, the present capital of Jordan. Later on we encounter the Attalids and then the Romans. We know how the Achaemenid empire influenced Alexander and the Seleucids, them, but are we able to establish what precise influence the Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian, or Hittite empires had on Greek or Roman colonization?

This concerns considerations such as the deportation of populations, enslaved or not, upon the foundation of urban centres, and the creation of networks of roads designed for (and sometimes constructed by) armies, and later used by merchants. What was the way in which the state watched over and administrated the colonized territories? Was it by patrols, watch-towers, garrisons, strongholds and so on? We have to map the relationship between plains and mountains. I am thinking, for example, about the communications between Pamphylia and Pisidia, or elsewhere. In every case, we have to determine whether the populations were involved or not in the new ways of managing territories. Just to take a quick example, in the mountainous range of the Sultan Dağ, in Phrygia Paroreios, we know that around the third century AD an *orophylax* responsible for patrolling the heights and *eschatiai* of the Killanian plain which was obviously colonized as a Roman Imperial estate, was murdered by bandits. We learn from an inscription that this man was called Sousou, which was a typical Phrygian local name.

Another question well worth asking is what changes in the material culture can we observe, when a State is overwhelming a local population with soldiers, *katoikoi*, and civil officials or merchants? This question is common for archaeologists, who study artefacts, statues, tools, ceramics and architecture, but we need to take these aspects into account as historians, as was done, for example, in Afghanistan at Aï Khanoum by Paul Bernard because of the lack of inscriptions there. Moving forward chronologically, it is absolutely

necessary to study how the Romans were influenced by Royal Hellenistic practices in the way to colonize new territories and populations, in spite of the narrow specialities well-known among scholars.

Of course, we have to analyse systematically the precise role played by the local political, economic, social and religious élites facing the new power in the area. Was the collaboration fast? Was it long running? Where did it happen at the beginning, and where later on? Regularly we find cities or people ready to collaborate, and deep inaccessible valleys refusing to make any compromise for decades or more. In northern Pisidia, for example, people from the local city of Prostanna (close to the Eğirdir lake) deposited on the Greek island of Delos a dedication to a Roman official of the province of Asia (to the father or grandfather of Mark Antony) as early as 113 BC, but close to this city, another one called Tymbrida was reluctant to accede to Roman domination, and had a lot of troubles at the time of Mark Antony, losing three important and valuable tracts of territory to the powerful inhabitants of Apollonia in Pisidia. We are informed of this thanks to an inscription found by the American epigraphist J.R.S. Sterrett at the end of the nineteenth century.

The crucial topic in Antiquity was the ownership of agricultural land, mentioned in the inscription cited above. One of the main concerns of local geopolitics was the central question of how was the agricultural land distributed to the Greek or Roman colonists after it had been seized from the native population? Most of time the local indigenous populations were pushed out towards the *eschata*: mountains in the case of the Phrygians and Pisidians, or the steppe lands of central Phrygia where Galatian tribes were displaced, or to the Syrian *badiya* in the case of certain Iturean Arab tribes. Were there land-surveyors among the colonists? This was regularly the case from Alexander and his *bematistai* onwards down to the Roman colonists and governors with their *gramatici*. We learn this on the one hand from inscriptions, and on the other hand from the *Libri coloniarum*. In those latter technical texts, we can find advice given to the Roman colonists on how to divide up the allotments given to veterans, and also ways to fix the boundaries between a Roman colony and another city belonging to a rural local community, or to a Greek *polis* for example. For instance it could be a local river, a road, a milestone or the crest of a mountainous range. It goes without saying that the opinion of the local natives is not taken into account.

A connected theme which has to be studied is concerned with slaves, who were mainly present in order to work in the fields of the colonists. Do these slaves (and later freedmen under the Roman Empire) mainly come from elsewhere (enslaved as a result of war, trade or piracy), or were they captured in the area at the time of the

colonial conquest? In most cases onomastics can help us decide on this question.

Slavery and enslavement drive us to a wider social approach: what changes in personal status were created by the irruption of colonists onto a regional landscape? We must be aware of the geopolitical mess caused by military colonization in the form of the arrival of *katoikoi* or veterans in a specific place. What were the exact social, legal, cultural and political relationships between the natives and the newcomers? As far as the changes affecting local geopolitics are concerned, did the indigenous communities systematically become *kōmai* of the Graeco-Roman colonies or not, and when? Sometimes the rural communities of Phrygia became *poleis* or *civitates* in their own right, but this was a very late development, at the beginning of the fourth century AD under Diocletianus or Constantine, a long time after the *Constitutio Antoniniana*. The Phrygians wanted citizen status anyway, even if by that time it was politically hardly worth having, because they wished to be respected, rather than dominated and despised by the colonial cities, which was a very common thread in the Graeco-Roman and colonial mentality.

Last but not least, leaving to one side the epigraphic and literary sources, the coins struck by the Greek Hellenistic rulers and by the Roman colonies under the control of the central power, played an important role in the local economy. The eastern Roman colony of Pisidian Antioch (in fact in Phrygia Paroreios on the Pisidian border) diffused an enormous volume of bronze coins all over the region, thanks to its major hegemonic position as head of the Augustan colonial network in the southern Anatolian Taurus mountains, but also as *caput viae* of the *Via Sebaste*, the road which connected several regional colonies enabling the swift movement of Roman troops in the case of a Pisidian or Isaurian uprising. Of course the coinage of the other Hellenistic and Eastern Roman colonies has to be studied carefully for the role it played in the local economy, and also in terms of religious and political propaganda it displayed.

The contacts between native people and colonists lead logically to a phenomenon called acculturation.

Acculturation

One of the few positive points to arise as a consequence of colonization is its effect on the local culture of the area, because such cultural contacts give the birth to new cultures, or at least to new cultural features. So we could ask several questions such as:

Did the language of the colonists overwhelm the local vernacular language or not, and in what way? Did it happen quickly or slowly?

Do we find bilingual families, and was it frequently the case, or not? When? Who?

What were the mutual influences between the native and the colonial languages? We are able to deduce these from the inscriptions thanks to a careful linguistic study based on lexicology and grammar.

As concerns social structures, it might be worth evaluating the composition of the families living in the colonized area. Epitaphs can be highly useful in this field. Very often we can observe that the women use vernacular or indigenous personal names, and that they are regularly married to a Graeco-Roman colonist, as seems only logical. This is another kind of domination which completes the political submission. The names given to the children is an important consideration. The decision on whether to give them vernacular or colonial names could be linked to the social status of the mother, and so on the actual influence she had in the household.

Onomastics plays a central role in this study, because the choice of which personal names to give the children is a central cultural feature. Some personal names continue to be used over centuries and even millennia. They can be the only trace left by a local language centuries after its disappearance. To give a few quick examples, names like Ouanaxos survived until the third or fourth centuries AD in Asia Minor although their origin dates back to *wanax*, a word meaning king, found on Linear B tablets dating back to the second millennium BC. In Romania, we are still able to find thousands of Hadriani and above all thousands of Traiani, commemorating the conqueror of the Ancient Dacia. But onomastic studies are not so simple. Although a Jewish presence is detectable in the Graeco-Roman cultural milieu since the times of Alexander, most Jews took Greek names, so that we are not able to distinguish them in the inscriptions of Syrian or Pisidian Antioch. In this case onomastics inform us about the degree of Hellenization.

The place and the role of the slaves among the colonial milieu give us clues as to the sociological situation, and this study allows a completion of the regional description including more traditionally an approach of the colonial and indigenous élites whose attitudes are responsible for a cultural fusion or not. Whatever the cultural blend resulting from colonization, we are more or less completely reliant on epigraphic documents to give us any clue of the cultural identity being expressed.

Cultural identities

The arrival of colonists naturally creates deep changes in the local culture, and then in the representations that social and political groups create about themselves. These representations must be analysed because they

can teach us a lot about how the communities regarded themselves.

What is the language of expression of the colonized communities?

What are the naming practices, native or colonial, adopted visible in the inscriptions?

Which cultural identities did they claim?

In Phrygia Paroreios and Northern Pisidia, we can find native communities called Tymandeis or Pliennoi (Phrygians) on the territory of Apollonia, and one called Moulasseis probably on the territory of Tymbria, but the colonists of Pisidian Apollonia and of Neapolis of Phrygia in the Killanian Plain, around the Beyşehir lake called themselves 'Lycian and Thracian colonists' on their civic coins and official inscriptions alike during the Roman imperial era, in Greek, but using the Roman word *kolōn/kolonōn*, and not *katoikoi*, although their presence in the area dates back to the 160s BC. In fact they were settled by one of the Attalid kings after the treaty of Apameia, precisely Eumenes II, in order to defend the inner part of Phrygia Paroreios, and its wealthy agricultural plains against the Galatians. Because they were later jealous of the reputation of the powerful Roman colonists settled by Augustus in Pisidian Antioch, they adopted the Roman word *kolōn* between the end of the first century and the third century AD.

This peculiar period between the first and the third centuries AD witnessed an explosion of the cultural identities claimed by the communities of the Eastern Roman Empire in response to the cultural and political homogenization in progress over the *longue durée*. What were the reactions of the local communities when faced with the challenge posed by the dominant Graeco-Roman social strata? Generally we observe a complete assimilation, but sometimes there was cultural resistance, or a mixed situation.

When there was a common assimilation, we can trace it in onomastics, religious cult, dress and social habits. Here the study of funerary monuments can teach us a lot, because these documents reflect everyday social conformity. During the second and third centuries AD, we are for the most part unable to distinguish between natives and others any more, except when we find typical indigenous names in the inscriptions.

But we can find strong cultural resistance too. In this case, the subjugated populations expressed themselves through their native language and cults. In Phrygia Paroreios, the local Phrygian people accessed their written language again, and they continued to speak Phrygian at least until the sixth century AD. More incredibly the Pisidians, who were a Luwian speaking

INTRODUCTION

people, whose language dated back at least to the Bronze Age, recovered their written language just before the disappearance of their own culture.

The local native cults changed their form over time. The famous Phrygian cult of Kybele was influenced by Ionian mystic practices during Roman times, because a lot of the immigrant colonists during the Hellenistic period came from Ionia. That is the reason why we find a cult of *Gē Kataphugē*, symbolizing the call of an underground shelter, in Northern Pisidia. I will show you tomorrow the importance of traditional clothing practices on unpublished Phrygian and Pisidian funerary monuments: dress being, of course, sociologically another refuge for cultural identity, in the case in question connecting Phrygian and Pisidian shepherds.

The last case in point is the mixed acculturation that we can meet in the so-called Indo-Greek kingdoms, showing a cultural fusion, or sometimes only a colonial culture with a local veneer. If the colonial presence was not reinforced by a stable State, and several waves of colonists, as was the case in Syrian Antioch or elsewhere, we can observe a fading of the colonial cultural elements, because the local culture remained strong, admitting few traces of the colonizing culture.

With these few words I have tried to mention few possible trails to follow, in order to take our discussion further. Anyway I wish you an excellent conference, thank you again for coming.

Hadrien Bru, Edinburgh, June 26th, 2014.

Part 1

Territories and colonial settlements

Hellenistic colonization and local culture in Commagene and Northern Cyrrhестice*

Margherita Facella**

When dealing with a complex phenomenon such as the Hellenistic colonization of the Near East, and in particular marginal areas like Commagene and Cyrrhестice, it is inevitable to begin with a methodological preamble, or better, with an acknowledgment of awareness. Answering questions raised by modern scholars on this subject would require a volume of data which we do not have at our disposal. This is obviously a recurring and widespread problem for the ancient historian,¹ but it becomes quite serious for areas which are hardly touched by Greek and Roman literary sources and which the archaeological research has only partially investigated.

Before their inclusion within the Roman sphere of power, Commagene and Cyrrhестice, along with many other regions of the ancient Near East, were outside the field of view and interest of Greek and Latin authors. No mention of a conquest of Commagene by the Macedonians can be found in the extant literary sources and the few passing mentions of its absorption into the Seleucid empire² tell us nothing on the phase of conquest and settlement. Equally silent are the sources on the Graeco-Macedonian occupation of Cyrrhестice, the region with which Commagene bordered on the south. Cyrrhus, the city that gave name to the entire region, is not mentioned in Appian's list of the foundations by Seleucus Nikator (App. Syr. 57); it appears in our texts only in the first century AD, much later than the ethnic or the region's name.³ The most tangible traces of a Graeco-Macedonian colonization, preserved by the literary tradition, are the ancient toponyms of these regions,

an important, even if sometimes troublesome, body of evidence for us.

A glance at the toponymy

If we turn to the list of Commagenian cities recorded by Ptolemy (5,14.8 ed. Müller), the following are mentioned: Arake, Antioch on the Taurus, Singa, Germanicia, Katamana, Doliche, Deba, Chaonia; on the banks of the Euphrates: Cholmadara and Samosata. For Cyrrhестice he lists nineteen cities (Ptol. 5,14.10): Ariseria, Rhegia, Ruba, Herakleia, Niara, Hierapolis, Kyrrhos, Beroia, Batnai, Paphara; on the banks of the Euphrates Urima, Arulis, Zeugma, Europos, Kaikilia, Bethammaria, Gerrous, chronologically inconsistent, sources,⁴ hence the confusion that he sometimes makes in the geographical and political division of the regions. Zeugma, for example, is listed in Cyrrhестice, but not Chaonia and Deba, which were south of Zeugma.

The first point to underline, and which has often attracted the attention of modern historians,⁵ is the high occurrence of toponyms drawn from Macedonia, Thessaly and Epirus: Doliche takes its name from the homonymous Thessalian city, Chaonia was a region of Epirus; Cyrrhus, Beroia and Europos derive their names from Macedonian cities. More complex is the question of Gerrhe (Ptol. 5.15.14), between Europos and Nikephorion. Karl Müller (*Claudii Ptolemaei Geographia*, Paris 1901: 971) suggested identifying Gerrhe of Ptolemy with Serrhe of the *Tabula Peutingeriana* (Seg. XI.2), while Victor Tcherikover (*Hellenistischen Städtegründungen*,

* I am profoundly grateful to Zsolt Simon for his help with Luwian toponyms and to Alessandro Orenco for answering all my questions on Armenian linguistics. My gratitude also extends to Michael Blömer and Antonino Facella, who have read this work and provided comments on methodological issues approached here.

** Faculty Member, Università degli Studi di Pisa (Italy).

¹ On the paucity of documentary evidence on Hellenistic Syria, cf. F. Millar, *The Problem of Hellenistic Syria*, in A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White, *Hellenism in the East. The interaction of Greek and non-Greek civilizations from Syria to Central Asia after Alexander* (London 1987): 110-33; M. Sartre, *Communautés villageoises et structures sociales d'après l'épigraphie de la Syrie du Sud*, in A. Calbi, A. Donati and G. Poma (eds) *L'epigrafia del villaggio* (Faenza 1993): 117-35.

² Above all Memnon (*FGrHist* 434, F 1 [18.5]), who calls Antiochus III 'king of Syria, Commagene and Giudea' or Diodorus (31.19a).

³ Cf. E. Honigsmann, *Kyrrhos*, *RE* 12.1 (1924), col. 199; E. Frézouls, *Cyrrhus et la Cyrrhestique jusqu'à la fin du Haut-Empire*, *ANRW* II.8 : 178-82.

⁴ Cf. in general A. Stückelberger, *Zu den Quellen der Geographie*, in A. Stückelberger and F. Mittenhuber, *Klaudios Ptolemaios. Handbuch der Geographie*, Ergänzungsband (Basel 2009): 122-133 and specifically for Syria E. Honigsmann 'Syria', *RE* 4 A2, coll. 1636-45.

⁵ The bibliography is very extensive. Above all see A.H.M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (Oxford 2nd edn 1971): 242-6; V. Tcherikover, *Die hellenistischen Städtegründungen von Alexander dem Grossen bis auf die Römerzeit*, *Philologus Suppl.* Bd. XIX.1 (Leipzig 1927): 54-8; E. Frézouls, *La toponymie de l'Orient syrien et l'apport des éléments macédoniens*, in *La toponymie antique. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg 12-14 juin 1975* (Leiden 1977): 219-48; P. Briant, *Colonisation hellénistique et populations indigènes I: la phase d'installation*, *Klio* 60 (1978): 57-92; F. Millar, *Hellenistic Syria*: 114-6; J.D. Grainger, *The Cities of Seleucid Syria* (Oxford 1990): 39-46; A. Bousdroukis, *Les noms des colonies séleucides au Proche-Orient*, in *La Syrie Hellénistique, Topoi Suppl.* 4 (2003): 9-24; M. Sartre, *D'Alexandre à Zénobie. Histoire du Levant antique, IV^e siècle av. J.-C. - III^e siècle ap. J.-C.* (Paris 2001): 111-120; G.M. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, the Red Sea Basin, and North Africa* (Los Angeles/London 2006), especially 28-30.

55) believed that Gerrhe, Serrhe and Perrhe (Hierokles 713.6) were different names for the same place and that they all derived from the Macedonian Serrhai (so already K. Regling, *Zur historischen Geographie des mesopotamischen Parallelogramms*, *Klio* 1, 1901: 473, note 3). It is quite likely that Serrhe took its name from the town in Macedonia, but the rest of Tcherikover's conclusions, as Cohen has remarked (*Hellenistic Settlements*, 196), is a long speculative chain. In particular the identification of Serrhe and Perrhe is, in my opinion, hardly convincing, since both cities are recorded in the same segment and section of the *Tabula Peutingeriana* (Seg. XI.2: Perrhe in the route from Samosata to Komana, Serrhe between Caeciliana and Eragiza). Tcherikover and Cohen do not mention the occurrence of the two toponyms in the *Tabula*, which I consider relevant. It is certainly worth mentioning that in the edition of the *Geography* by Alfred Stückelberger und Gerd Graßhoff (*Klaudios Ptolemaios. Handbuch der Geographie*, 2. Teil, Basel 2006, 566-7), Γέρρη of the codices is corrected into Σέρρη, following Müller's suggestion, and the last one is not identified with Pirun (modern name of Perrhe), but with Qalaat es-Sandaliya.⁶ The name of Perrhe evokes the region of Perrhebia in Thessaly, where Doliche was also located, but we have no evidence to date of a Thessalian or Macedonian place called Perrhe.

To the Cyrrestic toponyms of Macedonian origin we can add Gindarus (Tell Gindaris), which took its name from Genderos/Genderra in Macedonia. Ptolemy (5.14.11) places the city in Seleukis, but for Strabo (16.2,8) Gindarus belonged to Cyrrestice. In his important survey of ancient Syria toponymy Edmond Frézouls recorded twelve cities in northern Syria (between the middle Euphrates and the middle Orontes), which derived their name from a Macedonian place (Frézouls 1977: 219-48). His list does not include Gindarus since the first real evidence that there was a settlement called Gindarus in Macedonia arrived only in 1971. A marble stele with a poorly preserved inscription of 54 lines was found at Aravissos, between Edessa and Pella (Vavritsas 1977: 7-11). In the text, which seems to concern road repairs and other maintenance works for the agora, the toponyms *Genderos* and *Genderra* occur. The block was reused to inscribe four dedications, one of which was to Athena Kyrrhestis, who Strabo says had a temple in Syria (Strabo 16, 2,8); on the left of this text *Genderrios* (in the genitive) has been interpreted as referring to an inhabitant of that place.⁷

⁶ Following Müller (*loc. cit.*) and Chapot 1907: 281-2; Dussaud (1927: 451) identified Serre with Qara-Menbidj 'ou une ruine voisine'. As for Perrhe, the city has been sometimes identified with the city *Persa*, mentioned by Stephanus of Byzantium (s.v.): see, for example, Sturm 1937: cols. 909-910.

⁷ See Vavritsas, ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΗ, p. 10 and SEG 27 [1977]: 258. For L. Robert *Genderrios* is instead a patronymic (*Bull. Ép.* 91 [1978]: 288); cf. also Papazoglu 1988: 154. On the possible localization of Gindarus at Mandalon, see Hatzopoulos 1996: 112 (but cf. Chrysostomou 1990: 209, 222).

For Frézouls the geographic distribution of these Macedonian toponyms is not casual: 'Mais le groupement peut difficilement, en Syrie du Nord en tout cas, être aléatoire; il a dû résulter d'une politique concertée, où le choix des noms n'était pas laissé au hasard, mais exprimait la finalité militaire de l'ensemble.' (Frézouls 1977: 246).

The intention was to protect northern Syria by building two defensive lines, one along the Orontes and the other around the Euphrates; those responsible for this strategic system were the Seleucids, above all Seleucus Nikator. As we will see, new archaeological evidence seems to confirm the reconstruction of Frézouls and the importance of the strategic factor in the foundation of these settlements.

The choice of a Greek or Macedonian name for a settlement seems to imply the presence of a group of European colonists from the homonymous city, or at least from that region, but rarely do ancient literary sources offer a confirmation of this assumption. The foundation of Larissa in Syria, which Diodorus (33.4a) explicitly attributes to a group of Thessalian settlers, is an exception and caution is necessary.

Even more problematic is making deductions on cities of Commagene and Cyrrestice with a dynastic name of Hellenistic origin. In the absence of archaeological data, which can cast light on the birth of a settlement, it is problematic to determine whether its dynastic name indicates a foundation *ex novo* or more simply a re-foundation. The renaming of a pre-existing settlement was a very widespread phenomenon in the Hellenistic period (Billows 2003: 198) and many reasons could lie behind it: a constitutional or administrative change (for example, the grant of autonomy to a town) or more simply the recognition by a ruler of the importance of an urban centre above others. Jones' criterium to distinguish a new foundation from a re-foundation is to look at the evolution of its name over the centuries and to ascertain if the Greek name was retained or dropped in favour of a 'native' name (Jones 1971: 243-5). The continuity in the use of a Greek toponym (for example Nicopolis, whose Greek name survived for long time and was called Niboli until the end of the nineteenth century) indicates for Jones a new foundation. There is no need to stress the weakness of such a criterium.

If we now focus on Commagene, we can observe that here at least two cities bore dynastic names of Greek origin: two Antiochs are attested, one near the Taurus (Ptolemy 5.14.8) and the other near the Euphrates (Plin. *Nat. hist.* 5.86).⁸ The location of these cities is unknown; their name tell us only that they were foundations (or

⁸ The existence of Antioch on the Euphrates is attested also by coins (Butcher 2004: 466).

re-foundations) by a king called Antiochus, but whether he was a member of the Seleucid or Commagenian house (which also had a few kings of this name) cannot be determined. A Seleucid foundation was certainly the case for the important city of Zeugma, at the boundary between Commagene and Cyrrhestice. Zeugma was an alternative, more widespread, name to indicate the towns of Seleucia and/or Apameia, on opposite banks of the Euphrates (sources Kennedy (ed.) 1998: 139-162). The two settlements, which celebrated with their name the founder of the Seleucid dynasty and his Bactrian wife, controlled one of the most important crossing points of the river (Comfort, Abadie-Reynal and Ergeç 2000: 99-126).

In Commagene, however, we find also dynastic toponyms dating back to the Hellenistic period, which do not derive from a Greek personal name. These placenames reflect other ethnic components of the region and deserve to be examined for a better understanding of the cultural background of the region. Samosata, the capital of the kingdom, owed its name to the ruler Samos, about whom we know nothing.⁹ Now, names such as Artaxata or Arsamosata have been explained by Joseph Marqwart as the Greek adaptation of an ancient Armenian compound (personal name + *shat*).¹⁰ Since *šat* means something like 'joy, happiness', Artaxata would mean 'joy of Artaxias' and Arsamosata 'joy of Arsames'. Similarly, the name of Samosata could be explained as 'joy of Samos'.

Commagene was part of the Achaemenid empire and was probably included in the satrapy of Armenia (Weiskopf 1993: 54-57). In 401 Armenia was ruled by the satrap Orontes, mentioned by Xenophon (*Anab.* 2, 4.8; 3, 4.13; 3, 5.17; 4, 3.4), Plutarch (*Artax.* 27.7) and various other sources (Facella 2006: 95-135). Orontes appears among the ancestors of Antiochus I of Commagene in his well-known 'tomb-sanctuary' on Nemrud Dağı (Dörner and Young 1996: 261, 293-294). Here the king dedicated to his paternal and maternal ancestors two rows of stelai, bearing on the front a relief and on the back the name and patronymic of the honoured person. Despite that only a few of the stelai have survived, we can be sure that at the beginning of the maternal gallery was Alexander the Great, followed by the Seleucids (Dörner and Young 1996: 322-326), while the paternal gallery started with the Great King Darius and continued with the Achaemenids. The joining link between Antiochus and the Achaemenids was Orontes (*Aroandes* in Nemrud inscriptions), son-in-law of Artaxerxes II.

⁹ Samosata is mentioned for the first time by Strabo 14, 2.29. Since in this passage Strabo explicitly states that his information is drawn from Eratosthenes, who wrote around 245 BC, the foundation of Samosata cannot be ascribed to Samos, grandfather of Antiochus and king of Commagene around 130 BC, but must be traced back to a homonymous predecessor (so Honigmann 1924: coll. 982-983; cf. Facella 2006: 169-174).

¹⁰ Cf. Markwart 1905: 93 (Artaxata); Markwart 1966: 285 (Arsamosata).

For centuries descendants of Orontes (or alleged ones) ruled Armenia and the regions connected to this satrapy, as Sophene and Commagene.¹¹ The presence of Armenian toponyms in Commagene would therefore be fully understandable. The research of Rüdiger Schmitt (1986: 445-459) shows, however, that we can be more precise. The ancient Armenian *-šat* (present also in the toponym Eruandašat) derives from Old Pers. *šiyāta-*, Middle Persian and Parthian *šād* 'happy, joyful'.¹² 'In the case of place names in *-apat*, *-kert*, and *-šat*' – writes Schmitt – 'we have to do with settlements founded by the persons mentioned, mainly kings, so that the use of an Ir. rather than an Arm. name need cause no surprise' (Schmitt 1986: 458). The toponyms in *-šat* are considered by Schmitt genuine Iranian compounds.¹³ From Xenophon we know that the father of Orontes, Artasyra, was from Bactria, hence there are no doubts that the Orontids, as their name suggest, had Iranian stem. An Iranian name is also that of Arsames (Old Pers. *Aršāma-*¹⁴), founder of Arsamosata in Sophene and of two cities called Arsameia in Commagene, respectively on the river Nymphaios and on the Euphrates (sources in Facella 2006: 174-179). I do not exclude that also the name Samos might be an Iranian one (Av. *sāma-* = 'black', MP personal name *Sām*¹⁵).

The placenames so far analysed are the product of two of the main ethnic components of Hellenistic Commagene: the Iranian group and the Graeco-Macedonian group. In the well-known *hieros nomos* of Nemrud Dağı, Antiochus defines the Persians and the Greeks 'the two very fortunate roots' of his ancestry (OGIS 383, ll. 30-31). This Graeco-Persian duality is even more explicit when looking at the statue of the gods *sunthronoi* of Antiochus and at their composite names recorded in the inscriptions. Zeus Oromasdes, Artagnes-Herakles-Ares, Apollo-Mithra-Helios-Hermes are the result of an artificial attempt to combine two different cultural and religious traditions. Through this studied syncretism Antiochus, *apogonos* of the Persian and Macedonian dynasties, wanted to display his legitimacy to rule and at the same time to ensure the support of all of his subjects, the Persian (or Persianized) and the Greek

¹¹ See, in particular, Hewsen 1984: 347-66. References to members of this influential dynasty can be found not only in classical sources, but also in Armenian sources, for example in Moses of Chorene and Agathangelos (Toumanoff 1959: 1-36). The ancient city of Eruandašat, situated at the juncture of the Akhurean and Araxes rivers, preserves in its name the memory of one of these sovereigns.

¹² So, already, Hübschmann 1904: 406, s.v. **Aršāmašāt* ('Der Name war persisch = phl. **Aršāmašāt* und bedeutete "Aršāms-Freude") and 408, s.v. *Artašāt* ('Der Name ist zusammengesetzt aus der Pehleviform des Namens arm. *Artašēs*, gr. Artaxias + phl. *šāt* und bedeutet "Freude des Artaxias").

¹³ The influence of Iranian on Armenian toponymy is quite remarkable: see, in particular, Leroy 1961: 517-521.

¹⁴ Justi 1895: 29, s.v. See Schmitt 2011: 95, no. 52, and Tavernier 2007: 13, § 1.2.3 (with previous bibliography). Cf. also Zadok 2009: 86, no. 45a.

¹⁵ Cf. Mayrhofer 1977-1979: 74-5, no. 280; Gignoux 1986: no. 823; Tavernier 2007: 563-564.

(or Hellenized) ones (Jacobs 2000: 45). But the ethnic and cultural profile of Hellenistic Commagene must have been richer than the two-faced one described by Antiochus. As a matter of fact, Persians and Greeks constituted a social elite which was the fruit of a political conquest of the country; they imposed themselves on a local population the culture of whom is hard for us to reconstruct. Again, a few toponyms bear traces of the many-faceted cultural background on which Iranians and Greeks settled.

Toponyms and ethnic substrata

Commagene of Graeco-Roman times derives its name from Kummuh, the Neo-Hittite state centered in the area of the modern province of Adiyaman and with its capital (also called Kummuh) probably located at Samosata (Hawkins 2000: 330). Heirs of the collapsed Hittite empire, the so-called New-Hittite kingdoms, perpetuated and diffused some of the Hittite traditions, among which was the use of Hieroglyphic Luwian. The name Kummuh recalls that of Kumaḫa, the city of the cuneiform Hittite texts which lay further to the north-east than Kummuh and is usually identified with modern Kemah, between Iliç and Erzincan (Del Monte and Tischler 1978: 220-221).

The survival of a Hittite toponym is a remarkable phenomenon for Michael Astour (1977: 117-141), who has laid stress on the quick disappearance of Hittite place-names after the fall of the Neo-Hittite states and on the exception that Commagene embodies. Actually a Hittite identification has been suggested for Cholmadara, which, as we have seen, appears in Ptolemy's list of Commagenian cities and in the *Tabula Peutingeriana* (XI.3) as Charmodara, not far from Samosata. Eduard Sachau (1897: 47) tentatively suggested that the Cholmadara of classical sources might correspond to the Hittite Kulmadara recorded in the Annals of Tiglath-Pileser III. This identification – accepted for example by M. Streck (1903: col. 296) – was based on a few fragmentary texts which have been reanalysed by Hayim Tadmor (1994: 4; summ. 5 col. ii 11),¹⁶ whose new restorations place Kulmadara in the kingdom of Pat(t)in, the Assyrian Unqi, which occupied the Amuq plain, hence much more southern than the supposed location of classic Cholmadara/Charmodara. A location of Charmodara at modern Tille, on the west bank of the Euphrates (province of Adiyaman) has been proposed by David French (1983: 71-101) and more recently by Stuart Blaylock (2009: 35-37). Laying stress on the fragmentary nature of the Neo-Assyrian texts where Kulmadara is recorded, Blaylock notes that the city appears next to Urrus in one of the inscriptions (Kalḫu list of cities: Tadmor and Yamada 2011: no. 43

col. ii 10). Urrus has been identified with the late Bronze Age Uršu, located in the territory of Kizzuwatna, which at the time probably included the area later occupied by Kummuh.¹⁷ Hence the two conclusions of Blaylock: 'the names listed could cover more than just the area we now understand as Unqi' and 'the second fragmentary text could be taken to support the location of Kulmadara on the Euphrates in Kummuh' (Blaylock, *Tille*, 37).

Whatever the case, we cannot exclude, without further investigation, that the Commagenian toponym Cholmadara has a Luwian origin. Zsolt Simon points out to me that the ending *-ara* could be a reflex of the widespread Luwian suffix *-alla/i-* (pronounced with flap r) and that *Kalma-* is known as a constituting element in Hittite toponyms (cf. *Kalma-zita-* and *Kalmija* in Del Monte and Tischler 1978: s.vv.).¹⁸ A Hittite derivation might also be detected in the place-names *Katamana* (*Katta-* means 'lower, below' and is used in Hittite or Neo-Hittite toponyms, for example *Kataonia* or *Katpatuka*) and *Deba* (cf. *Tapa*, *Tipuwa*, in Del Monte and Tischler 1978: s.vv.). There are phonetic differences and suffixes which need to be explained, but a Hittite or Neo-Hittite etymology is quite likely for Simon.

The favourable geographic position of the region later named Commagene, at the crossroad of important trade routes, has always made it particularly subjectable to various cultural influences. Probably as early as the mid third millennium BC the area had been penetrated by groups of Hurrians, which settled Upper Mesopotamia and North Syria and were later unified and politically controlled by the kings of Mitanni (Salvini 2000: 25-67). Some Commagenian toponyms bear trace of this Hurrian presence: according to Astour (*Continuité et changement*, 130) the name of Ardoula, a village near Doliche mentioned in the tetrarchic inscription *IGLS I 59*, is an adaptation of Ardušša, a city mentioned in the so-called Išmeriga treaty (*CTH 133*).¹⁹ Similarly Tarsa of the *Tabula Peutingeriana* (Seg. XI.2; Tharse in *It. Ant.* 186.5), called formerly Turuş and now Kuyulu, has been identified by Astour (*loc. cit.*) with the Hurrian Terušša.²⁰ Commagene and northern Cyrrhестice appear quite conservative in this linguistic attitude of preserving

¹⁷ Cf. Smith 1956: 35-43, 42. The identification of Urrus and Uršu, suggested by J. Lewy (1952: 290) is rejected by Bagg (1978: s.v. Urrus). On the geographic position of Uršu, most frequently placed by modern scholars in Commagene or Cyrrhестice, see Del Monte and Tischler 1978: s.v. Waršuwa (with previous bibliography).

¹⁸ The major problem is represented by the segment *-da-* which requires an explanation (Z. Simon, pers. comm.).

¹⁹ On *IGLS I 59*, cf. lately Bru 2011: 23. For the treaty between Arnuwanda and the men of Išmeriga cf. Kempinski and Kořak 1970: 191-217; Weeks 2004: 65 n. 51.

²⁰ For Terušša in Commagene, see Goetze 1953: 70. In the above-mentioned list of cities from Kalḫu a city called Tiris[...] is recorded (see Tadmor and Yamada 2011: no. 43. col. ii, 14). The new restoration of Tadmor places Tiris[...] in the land of Unqi, so that it is difficult to equate it with the classical Tarsa/Tharse near the Euphrates. But see above Blaylock's observations on Kulmadara and the other cities mentioned in this text.

¹⁶ And now Tadmor and Yamada 2011: nos. 14. 4; 26.3 (Kalḫu Annals); 43 col. ii 11 (Kalḫu list of cities). Cf. also Bagg 1978: 142 s.v. Kulmadara and 267, s.v. Unqi (with previous bibliography).

toponyms, if we consider that already around 1350 Hurrian states of Northern Syria were conquered by the Hittite Suppiluliuma I and Mitanni was soon annexed by the Assyrians (see Novák 2013: 345-356).²¹

However, the most significant ethnic input during the Iron Age in our regions was the settlement of Aramean tribes (Sader 2014: 20-21). Besides the Neo-Hittite kingdoms, several Aramean states emerged, but the distinction between Neo-Hittite and Aramean states cannot always be so sharp, because of the relationships between these kingdoms and the dynastic overthrows experience by some of these lands. A number of Neo-Hittite states were ruled for a certain period by kings of Aramean names (for example Masuwari/Til Barsip) or vice-versa, kings with Anatolian names ruled states where the use of Aramaic language is attested (for example Sam'al, where a good number of inscriptions in a local archaic dialect of Aramaic have been found). For this reason some scholars prefer to use the term 'Syro-hittite' states, which more precisely reflects 'the blending of Hittite and Aramean elements' (Bryce 2012: 80). The impact of the Aramean settlement in northern and southern Syria was certainly strong, not only from a political and economic point of view, but also from a cultural one (cf. Sader 2014). Already in 1922, Enno Littmann (1922: 164) drew attention to the presence of Aramean toponyms in north Syria. In Commagene an Aramean derivation is possible for the name of the modern Maraş. In the Annals of Sargon II *Marqas* (also written *Marḥas*) is mentioned as the capital of the state Gurgum (sources in Bagg 1978: s.v. Marqasa). After the annexation, the capital gave name to the entire Assyrian province, as in the case of Kummuh; Gurgum and Maraş should be therefore considered as synonyms (Hawkins 1987-1990: 352-353). In the imperial period the city was renamed Γερμανίκεια, but the new name was later dropped in favour of the Aramaic one.²²

Neo-Hittite and Aramean cultures were certainly influential in Commagene and northern Cyrrhestic, so it is puzzling for us to find no epigraphic traces of these ethnic groups during the Hellenistic period. This

²¹ The persistence of Hurrian toponyms and personal names in the area of southern Commagene and north Cyrrhestic (cf. the name of Ini-Teshup of Carchemish) supports the theory which wants to localise the place of origin of the Hurrians in the area stretching from east of the Tigris (north of Diyala) to the slopes of the Taurus (near Maraş): so Kuhrt 1995: 288.

²² Astour (1977: 131) was quite cautious on the name of Maraş, observing that it did not need to be necessarily Aramean (but he did not suggest any precise etymology). Actually we should not take for granted that a Semitic toponym, attested already in the Iron Age, is automatically of Aramean provenience, since an Amorite group was present in the region already in the third millennium. Most recently J. David Schloen and Amir Fink, members of the American team working at Zincirli (2009: 9-10), have rejected the widespread view which traces the foundation of the kingdom of Sam'al back to a certain Gabbar, leader of an Aramean group which was established there, suggesting instead that this Gabbar was 'a local resident of Amorite heritage who threw off the Luwian yoke and restored his Semitic-speaking compatriots to a position of power'.

absence is understandable for Luwian: by the end of the eighth century Aramaic was actually the dominant language of most of the Neo-Hittite states (Bryce, *World of the Neo-Hittite Kingdoms*, 60-1); less so for Aramaic, which for a few centuries disappears from our written documentation, not re-emerging before the first century AD, in its eastern version that is Syriac. Interestingly the earliest dated Syriac inscription known to us comes from modern Birecik, near Zeugma (cf. H.J.W. Drijvers and J.F. Healey, *The Old Syriac Inscriptions of Edessa & Osroene. Texts, Translations & Commentary*, Leiden 1999, 140-4, no. As55 [D1]). For the earlier period epigraphic evidence on the use of Aramaic in these regions is confined to the legend of a few coins from Hierapolis-Bambyke.²³ More generally, we can say that during the Hellenistic period contemporary written evidence for a non-Greek culture is very scarce in our areas, not to say absent. Because of this lack, it is arduous to define the 'local culture' of Commagene and Cyrrhestic and consequently to answer questions such as the response of the local population to the Greek colonization or the interactions between Greek settlers and indigenous people. Only through more intense and systematic archaeological investigations can we hope to cast light on the various aspects of the Graeco-Macedonian conquest in these areas.

The contribution of archaeology in recent years

Archaeological research has massively improved our knowledge of Commagene and Cyrrhestic in the Hellenistic period. However, only a small part of these regions has been systematically surveyed or carefully excavated to date.²⁴ As far as Commagene is concerned, the excavations conducted in the last century have focussed on sites linked to the dynasty which ruled the country in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, as well as on sites which were threatened by the inundation caused by the construction of various dams.²⁵ None of the investigated sites, however, were settled by Graeco-Macedonian colonists, the only exception being Zeugma, which for most of its history belonged to Cyrrhestic, but was annexed to the Commagenian kingdom for a certain time (Cic. *Ad Quint. fr.* 2,10; Strabo 16.2.3; App. *Mith.* 114).²⁶ However, at Zeugma

²³ Ronzevalle 1940: 3-82; Seyrig 1971: 11-21; Millar 1987: 125-126; Mildenberg 1999: 277-284.

²⁴ These brief notes do not claim to cover systematically all northern Syrian sites which have produced new archaeological evidence from the Macedonian colonization, but only to draw attention on some results which appear to me particularly significant for their historical implications. As the title of this contribution states, my overview is restricted to the zone between Commagene and Cyrrhestic and leaves aside the area between Chalcidice and southern Cyrrhestic, noticeably Doura Europos, which would require a more extensive and complex analysis (on Doura Europos, see the overview of Leriche 2003: 171-191 and Yon 2003: 193-210).

²⁵ For an overview, see Wagner 2012.

²⁶ See above. For the inclusion of Zeugma in the Commagenian kingdom cf. also the reliefs published by Wagner (1976: 117-123) and the inscriptions published by Crowther and Facella (2003: 41-80);

the Hellenistic phase of the settlement is hard to grasp. In the area excavated by the French-Turkish team under the direction of Catherine Abadie-Reynal, the most ancient levels of the city (end of the third/first half of the second century) have only been identified in *chantier* 5; levels from the second half of the second century though survive in a few *chantiers* (5, 6, and 9).²⁷ Similarly, no sealed deposit from early Hellenistic Zeugma was found during the Packard Humanities Institute (PHI) rescue excavations; the earliest datable ceramic material from closed deposits dates back to the third quarter of the second century BC, while earlier finds appear to be residual.²⁸ The narrow area which has been excavated, the colluvium and the destruction caused by the foundation of Roman houses are all factors which must be taken into consideration to explain the lack of early Hellenistic evidence,²⁹ as William Aylward notes. Nonetheless the editor of the PHI volumes invites a reversal of the current view which sees the predominance of Zeugma over Apamea at the time of the foundation (so for example Grainger, *Cities*, 51), while laying particular stress on the limited importance of Zeugma during the whole Hellenistic period: 'No surprise' – states Aylward – 'that the excavations produced little information about the earliest years of the city after its foundation by Seleucus I Nicator. The archaeological evidence from Zeugma supports suspicions raised by Jones about the lasting value of Seleucid colonization of Syria' (Aylward, *loc. cit.*).

The careful evaluation of the whole archaeological documentation by Abadie-Reynal reveals that the picture of Hellenistic Zeugma drawn by Aylward is too restricted, and that a development of the urban complex took place between the second half of the second century and the first century (Abadie-Reynal 2015: 824). Distinctions are therefore necessary when describing a period covering three centuries. It is manifest, however, how little information we have on the early phase of the settlement:

'Il semble certain que les niveaux du début de l'époque hellénistique sont très rares à Séleucie: ils doivent donc être d'étendue limitée et se concentrer probablement autour du point de passage de l'Euphrate et d'un lieu défensif haut, dominant ce franchissement. Cela dit, à l'heure actuelle nous ne disposons d'aucun niveau archéologique cohérent

qui vienne appuyer cette hypothèse.' (Abadie-Reynal 2015: 825).

A different picture emerges of Apamea on the opposite bank of the Euphrates. The surveys of Guillermo Algaze and the archaeological works by the team of Catherine Abadie Reynal have revealed a system of city walls over a length of 2,200 m, built of polygonal masonry and reinforced by 27 towers.³⁰ The wall circuit surrounds a c. 40 ha settlement with a Hippodamian plan, reconstructed also with the help of geophysical techniques.³¹ The city had the primary function of controlling and protecting the river crossing, but already by the end of the second century had started to lose its importance, becoming in the Roman period a suburb of the flourishing Zeugma: this is clearly hinted at not only by literary and epigraphic sources, but also by the dearth of Roman archaeological material recorded by the excavators – 'Tout d'abord, en ce qui concerne Apamée, la fin du II^e s. ou le tout début du I^{er} s. av. J.-C. correspond à l'époque où la ville aurait été abandonnée'.³²

Unfortunately brief time for archaeological investigations and the complete loss of Apamea under water prevents us from answering more specific questions about the impact of the Graeco-Macedonian colonization on this area; maybe more can be said when the pottery from the excavation at Apamea will be published. Zeugma, on the other hand, has not been very generous with information concerning the early years of the settlement. We have therefore to wait until further fieldwork in the region provides us with new documentation. The recently started project of the Forschungsstelle Asia Minor (University of Münster) focussing on the excavations of Keber Tepe, the hill where the ancient Doliche lay, is therefore welcome.³³

A new foundation by Graeco-Macedonian colonists was most likely Gindarus. The excavations conducted by the University of Konstanz and the Museum of Damascus at Tell Ġindaris (1993-2001) have revealed a settlement hiatus between the early Iron Age and the early Hellenistic age, when archaeological evidence attests the presence of a Greek group (Kramer 2004, 263-5). Finds from the early Hellenistic period (end of the fourth-beginning of the third century) are not as numerous as those of the late Hellenistic period, but they are sufficient to prove a Seleucid foundation of a town smaller than cities like Cyrrhus and Beroia, but larger than the neighbouring villages. Unfortunately part of the site is still awaiting investigation, for example

Ergeç and Yon 2012: 155-6, no. 3. On the annexation of Zeugma to the province of Syria, see Butcher 2009: 81-3.

²⁷ Cf. the numerous preliminary reports, regularly published in *Anatolia Antiqua* since 1996. Five monographic works have appeared to date, three of them in the series *Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée-Jean Pouilloux*.

²⁸ Cf. the overview in Aylward 2013, vol. I: 1-54, in particular p. 9.

²⁹ This lack concerns also the numismatic material published by Frascione (2013); and by Butcher (2013, vol. III: 1-92). Cf. the overview Butcher 2015: 860.

³⁰ See, above all, Algaze 1989: 241-281; Algaze, Breuninger, Lightfoot and Rosenberg 1991: 175-240; Algaze, Breuninger and Knudstad 1994: 1-96.

³¹ Abadie-Reynal and Gaborit 2003: 149-69.

³² Cf. C. Abadie-Reynal 2003: 371, with previous bibliography.

³³ Cf. <http://www.doliche.de/doliche/stadtgrabung/>

the western area, where the core of the Hellenistic settlement might have lay (Kramer 2004: 266, n. 23). On the basis of the examined material, Norbert Kramer comes to the conclusion that most of Gindarus' settlers were Greek or Macedonian, possibly soldiers;³⁴ a likely eventuality is that over time an indigenous component joined the original nucleus of the population, yet this is impossible to determine from the extant archaeological evidence. Influence of local traditions could not be detected on the material culture of the site, so that 'in jedem Fall macht Gindaros ab frühester hellenistischer Zeit den Eindruck einer griechischen Siedlung und behält diesen auch bis zu seinem Ende in byzantinischer Zeit bei' (Kramer 2004: 266, n. 23).

On a first glance, the scenario emerging from Gindarus seems to confirm the idea of Pierre Briant that in the initial phase the Greeks formed separate enclaves in the colonized area and were spatially and socially divided by the existing population (Briant 1982, to which I refer for sources and previous bibliography). The absorption of indigenous people in the civic community and their involvement in the political rule appears to Briant very restricted, not only at the beginning (as one logically expects), but also at a later stage:

'Les documents actuellement disponibles ne permettent pas de considérer que les villes hellénistiques d'Orient sont passées progressivement (et encore moins rapidement) sous la domination d'une couche sociale ethniquement mixte [...]. Cette constatation n'implique pas – évidemment – que les 'élites indigènes' ont été complètement laissées à l'écart de l'exercice du pouvoir: mais, la documentation actuellement disponible laisse supposer qu'elle ont tout au plus tenu un rôle d'appoint.'³⁵

To conclude for the absence of a 'nouvelle classe dominante mixte et intégrée' actually means to strongly limit the degree of social and cultural fusion between Greek colonists and local population of the 'Macédoine syrienne'. A less radical view is expressed by Briant in a later and more general article on the Hellenistic colonization in the Near East (1998: 309-333): new epigraphic and archaeological material reveals that the interaction between Greeks and non-Greeks in Asia Minor and the Near East was much more complex than previously thought, so that the study of this topic undergoes a constant transformation. In a useful overview of Hellenistic colonization in Syria, Maurice Sartre comes to the well-grounded conclusion

that if at the beginning an integration of the indigenous population is very unlikely, over the time 'la situation évolua et l'on vit de nombreux indigènes participer à la vie civique au fur et à mesure de leur hellénisation' (Sartre 2001: 143).

As is implicit, the relationship between colonists and local people could not be unidirectional and beside 'hellenisation' of the indigenous population, one expects that, with time, a certain absorption of local culture by the Graeco-Macedonian group occurs. But is it necessary to wait for the Roman period to see expressions of the mixed culture which developed in Commagene and Cyrrhestice, as well as in most of Syria, or do signs of it already surface in a later stage of the Hellenistic period? In search of hints which are potentially relevant in answering this question, we briefly turn back to the preliminary results from the excavations at Apamea on the Euphrates and to the archaeological finds from Gindarus; finally we will direct our attention to the new data from another crucial site, Jebel Khalid.

The excavations of Apamea on the Euphrates have significantly improved our understanding of the urban plan and land division of Hellenistic foundations (Leriche and Gaborit 2003: 374-391). The abandonment of the site, at latest towards the end of the first century B.C., allows us to look at a 'fossilised' situation, undisturbed by later structural transformations (Leriche and Gaborit 2003: 381) or cultural evolutions. Yet, the published material does not offer any evidence in the direction of our enquiry.

Slightly different is the situation at Tell Ğindaris. Kramer (2004: 355) lays stress on the totally Greek character of the finds of the early Hellenistic period, but a careful reading of his historical synthesis shows how hard and uncertain is the distinction between Greek and local ceramic production when it comes to coarse ware, i.e. where one usually expects to find an indigenous influence. The lack of reference works on this ceramic class of Hellenistic Syria, as well as the interruption in settlement continuity in the late Iron Age, made it hard for Kramer to draw secure conclusions: native models may have inspired the 'drip-painted' pottery, and possibly the use of mud bricks for construction can also be explained as an adoption of local traditions, but it is all very elusive (Kramer 2004: 265-267). At this point one wonders whether the absence of an indigenous influence on the material culture is actually real or is a product of our inability to spot it.

The most encouraging and stimulating results come from the excavations at Jebel Khalid, a Hellenistic settlement for which the ancient name is not yet known and which lies on a limestone plateau above the west bank of the Euphrates. Here, at the border between

³⁴ Kramer 2004: 268-270. Kramer is not aware of the inscription from Aravissos, published by Vavritsas in 1977, which speaks for the existence of a Macedonian settlement called Gindarus (see above). This epigraphic evidence overthrows his considerations on the non-Greek name of the city, while reinforces his hypothesis of a Macedonian nucleus of settlers.

³⁵ Briant 1982: 97-98.