



HAL
open science

Sinop in Roman times from Pontic Capital to Roman Colony

Claire Barat

► **To cite this version:**

Claire Barat. Sinop in Roman times from Pontic Capital to Roman Colony. David Braund; Angelos Chaniotis; Elias Petropoulos. The Black Sea Region in the Context of the Roman Empire. International symposium dedicated in memory of Victor I. Sarianidi (Athens 5-8 may 2016), Committee for the Pontic Studies, pp.85-93., 2022, 978-618-84868-2-9. hal-04486384

HAL Id: hal-04486384

<https://uphf.hal.science/hal-04486384v1>

Submitted on 8 Mar 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

COMMITTEE FOR PONTIC STUDIES

**THE BLACK SEA REGION
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE**



**INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM
DEDICATED IN MEMORY OF VICTOR I. SARIANIDI
(ATHENS 5-8 MAY 2016)**

ATHENS 2022

COMMITTEE FOR PONTIC STUDIES

**THE BLACK SEA REGION
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE**

**INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM
DEDICATED IN MEMORY OF VICTOR I. SARIANIDI
(ATHENS 5-8 MAY 2016)**

**EDITED BY
David Braund, Angelos Chaniotis and Elias Petropoulos**

ATHENS 2022

Εικόνα εξωφύλλου: Επεξεργασία από τον πίνακα «Σινώπη, εξωτερική άποψη του περι-
τειχίσματος της ομώνυμης ακροπόλεως» (Αύγουστος 1847), [École
Nationale des Beaux-Arts, Paris].

Εκδόθηκε από την Επιτροπή Ποντιακών Μελετών
με την ευγενική χορηγία της Εργοληπτικής Γαλανίδη Α.Ε.
στη μνήμη του Στέφανου Γαλανίδη

© Επιτροπή Ποντιακών Μελετών
Αγνώστων Μαρτύρων 73, Τ.Κ. 171 23, Νέα Σμύρνη, Αθήνα
Τηλ. 210-9325521 - Fax: 210-9354333 - e-mail: info@epm.gr
Ιστοσελίδα: www.epm.gr

ISBN: 978-618-84868-2-9

CONTENTS

Preface	5
Programme – Πρόγραμμα	9
<i>Christos Galanidis</i> Opening of the works of the symposium at the Committee for Pontic Studies	15
<i>Alexios G. C. Savvides</i> Address by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee	19
<i>David Braund, Angelos Chaniotis, Elias K. Petropoulos</i> The Pontic region and Roman Oecumene: An introduction	21
Part One: Historical Geography	
<i>Manolis Manoledakis</i> The southern Black Sea in the Roman geographic texts	33
<i>David Braund and Emzar Kakhidze</i> Reflections on the southeastern coast of the Black Sea in the Roman period	59
<i>Gela Gamkrelidze</i> In search of the city of Phasis	75
<i>Claire Barat</i> Sinop in Roman times from Pontic capital to Roman colony	85
<i>Alexander A. Maslennikov and Elias K. Petropoulos</i> Hellenic traditions in the rural area of Bosporan Kingdom in Roman times	95
Part Two: Political History	
<i>Pantelis M. Nigdelis</i> The last Sappaeian kings and cities in Roman Macedonia	107
<i>Altay Coşkun</i> The Bosporan Kings in-between the Mithradatic tradition and friendship with Rome: the usurpation of Asandros revisited	125
<i>Victor Cojocarui</i> The Bosporan Kingdom, Rome, and the Polemonids revisited	149
<i>David Braund</i> Between Crimea, Rome and Asia Minor: Dyteutus as Orestes for the princeps	159
<i>Dan Ruscu and Ligia Ruscu</i> <i>Excidium Histriae</i> once again	173
<i>Sergey Saprykin</i> The community of Pontus on the southern Black Sea coast	181

Part Three: Material Culture and Economy

<i>Eleni T. Mentesidou, Orhan Alper Şirin, Mustafa Kolağasioğlu</i>	
Roman Amisos: a study on graves and grave findings	217
<i>E. Yu. Klenina</i>	
Amphorae of the Black Sea Region as an archaeological source on trade relations in the second–third centuries AD	231
<i>Dominique Kassab Tezgör</i>	
The Roman amphorae produced in Black Sea centers and preserved in the Museums of the Black Sea coast of Turkey	257
<i>Şahin Yıldırım</i>	
The Roman trading center on the bank of Billaios River	277
<i>Andrey Bezrukov</i>	
Transit trade in the Volga and the Kama region in the late centuries BC – early centuries AD	309

Part Four: Religion

<i>Sümer Atasoy</i>	
Some considerations on the remains of a Roman temple at Tios, Southern Black Sea coast	321
<i>Alexander Minchev</i>	
The local pantheon of Odessos and its environs in the Roman period: continuity and change in the first to third centuries AD	329
<i>Bülent Öztürk</i>	
Observations on religious and cultural life in Heraclea Pontica in the Roman Imperial period	355
<i>Dimitris J. Kyrtatas</i>	
Christianising the region of Pontus	371

Part Five: Epigraphy

<i>Alexandru Avram and Mihai Ionescu</i>	
Three new inscriptions from Callatis of the Roman period	383
<i>Emyr Dakin</i>	
The honorary decree for Karzoazos, son of Attalos (<i>IOSPE I² 39</i>). A Monument for a “new man?”	395
<i>Angelos Chaniotis</i>	
Antiphon, an Olbian statesman and orator, and his values	411
<i>Christos Galanidis</i>	
End of the Symposium works	425
List of Contributors	427

PREFACE

The Committee of Pontic Studies (EPM) in 2016 –following a custom that was very common in the East for every important event– "planted a tree", the International Scientific Symposium entitled "The Black Sea Region in the context of the Roman Empire" (5-8 May 2016). With the supervision and care of three distinguished scientists, Angelos Chaniotis, Professor at the Princeton Institute for Advanced Study, David Braund, Professor at the University of Exeter and Elias Petropoulos, Professor at the Democritus University of Thrace. At the symposium were invited and participated a number of the most significant scholars-historians from Greece and abroad, engaging with the specific historical period. The symposium was dedicated to the memory of the great archaeologist Victor Sarigiannidis, honorary member of the EPM.

The presentation to the scientific community and the general public of the proceedings of the Symposium, in a carefully edited special edition of the EPM, comes to fulfill the promise given during its closing ceremony.

Thus, the first and rather unique edition is added to the world literature with reference to the historical period of Roman rule in the Black Sea. Future efforts for the same period will be deprived of the presence of Alexandru Avram, Professor of Ancient History at the University of Le Mans (France), who was a lecturer at the Symposium and passed away recently (4-8-2021).

All the presentations of the Symposium –28 in total– were written originally in English and so this edition is presented in English. However it would be beneficial to introduce a translation in Greek language, in order to facilitate the discussion in our language. Special thanks are due to Mr. Angelos Chaniotis for editing the publication. He was assisted in the editorial work (proofreading of the texts and homogenization of bibliography and notes) by his research assistants Eric Hensley (New York University), Dr. Ioannis Linardakis (University of Thessaloniki), and Dr. Matthew Peebles (Columbia University).

It is worth mentioning that this is not the first edition of E.P.M. in English, since the following have been published in the past: 1) "Black Sea" (12th Symposium on Byzantine Studies, Birmingham 1978). 2) David Bruce Kilpatrick, "Function and style in pontic dance music" (1980) and 3) Patricia Fann Bouteneff, "Exiles on Stage. The modern Pontic Theater in Greece" (2002).

The efforts of E.P.M. to cover scientifically issues regarding Pontus Era are achieved with a lot of effort, passion and concerns for the future. The future, however, can be considered secure when there are solid foundations and actions, such as this Symposium. An important driving force, moreover, for new researches is the

Preface

satisfaction that results from scientific meetings with the characteristics of the originality and the quality of the Symposium.

This edition coincides with the one hundred year anniversary (1922-2022) of the Asia Minor Catastrophe and the uprooting of Hellenism from the grounds where they lived and grew up and is another project to keep alive the memory of our ancestors, who bequeathed their history and culture, which we must promote by raising awareness of the future generations.

Christos I. Galanidis
Chairman of the Committee for Pontic Studies

ΠΡΟΛΟΓΟΣ

Η Επιτροπή Ποντιακών Μελετών (Ε.Π.Μ.) το 2016 –ακολουθώντας ένα έθιμο που επικρατούσε στην Ανατολή για κάθε σημαντικό γεγονός– "φύτεψε ένα δέντρο", το Διεθνές Επιστημονικό Συμπόσιο με τίτλο «Ο Εύξεινος Πόντος την εποχή της ρωμαϊκής κυριαρχίας» (5-8 Μαΐου 2016). Με την επιμέλεια και φροντίδα τριών διακεκριμένων επιστημόνων, του Άγγελου Χανιώτη, Καθηγητή του Ινστιτούτου Προηγμένων Σπουδών του Πρίνστον, του David Braund, Καθηγητή του Πανεπιστημίου του Έξετερ και του Ηλία Πετρόπουλου, Καθηγητή σήμερα του Δημοκρίτειου Πανεπιστημίου Θράκης, κλήθηκαν και συμμετείχαν οι σημαντικότεροι επιστήμονες–ιστορικοί με ενασχόληση τη συγκεκριμένη ιστορική περίοδο από την Ελλάδα και το εξωτερικό. Το συμπόσιο αφιερώθηκε στη μνήμη του μεγάλου αρχαιολόγου Βίκτωρα Σαρηγιαννίδη, επίτιμου μέλους της Ε.Π.Μ.

Η παρουσίαση στην επιστημονική κοινότητα και το ευρύτερο κοινό των πρακτικών του Συμποσίου, σε μια επιμελημένη ειδική έκδοση της Ε.Π.Μ., έρχεται να υλοποιήσει την υπόσχεση που δόθηκε κατά την τελετή λήξης του. Έτσι, προστίθεται στην παγκόσμια βιβλιογραφία η πρώτη και μάλλον μοναδική έκδοση με αναφορά στην ιστορική περίοδο της ρωμαϊκής κυριαρχίας στον Εύξεινο Πόντο. Μελλοντικές προσπάθειες για την ίδια περίοδο θα στερηθούν την παρουσία του Alexandru Avram, καθηγητή της Αρχαίας Ιστορίας του Πανεπιστημίου Le Mans (Γαλλία), ο οποίος ήταν εισηγητής στο Συμπόσιο και έφυγε από τη ζωή πρόσφατα (4-8-2021).

Όλες οι εισηγήσεις του Συμποσίου –28 τον αριθμό– έγιναν στην αγγλική γλώσσα και έτσι η έκδοση αυτή γίνεται στα αγγλικά, αν και καλό θα ήταν να υπήρχε μετάφραση στα ελληνικά, ώστε να διευκολυνθεί η συζήτηση στη γλώσσα μας. Για την επιμέλεια της έκδοσης θερμές ευχαριστίες οφείλονται ιδιαίτερος στον κ. Άγγελο Χανιώτη. Στην επιμέλεια του τόμου τον βοήθησαν οι επιστημονικοί συνεργάτες του Eric Hensley (Πανεπιστήμιο της Νέας Υόρκης), Δρ. Ιωάννης Λιναρδάκης (Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης), και Δρ. Matthew Peebles (Πανεπιστήμιο Κολούμπια).

Αξίζει να αναφερθεί ότι δεν είναι η πρώτη έκδοση της Ε.Π.Μ. στην αγγλική γλώσσα, αφού και κατά το παρελθόν εκδόθηκαν: 1) «Black Sea» (12^ο Συμπόσιο Βυζαντινών Σπουδών, Birmingham 1978), 2) David Bruce Kilpatrick, «Function and style in pontic dance music» (1980) και 3) Patricia Fann Bouteneff, «Exiles on Stage. "The modern Pontic Theater in Greece"» (2002).

Οι προσπάθειες της Ε.Π.Μ. να καλύψει επιστημονικά ό,τι αφορά τον Πόντο επιτυγχάνονται με πολύ κόπο, μεράκι και αγωνία για τη συνέχεια. Το μέλλον, ωστόσο, μπορεί να θεωρηθεί εξασφαλισμένο, όταν υπάρχουν θεμέλια γερά και δράσεις, όπως το συγκεκριμένο Συμπόσιο. Σημαντική κινητήρια δύναμη, εξάλλου, για νέες αναζητήσεις αποτελεί η ικανοποίηση που προκύπτει από επιστημονικές συναντήσεις με τα χαρακτηριστικά της πρωτοτυπίας και της ποιότητας του Συμποσίου.

Preface

Η έκδοση αυτή συμπίπτει με τη συμπλήρωση εκατό χρόνων (1922-2022) από τη Μικρασιατική Καταστροφή και τον ξεριζωμό του ελληνισμού από τις εστίες που έζησε και μεγαλούργησε και αποτελεί ένα ακόμη έργο στη μνήμη των προγόνων μας, οι οποίοι μας κληροδότησαν την ιστορία και τον πολιτισμό τους, που οφείλουμε να προβάλλουμε ευαισθητοποιώντας και τις επερχόμενες γενιές.

Χρήστος Ι. Γαλανίδης
Πρόεδρος της Ε.Π.Μ.

OPENING OF THE WORKS OF THE SYMPOSIUM
AT THE COMMITTEE FOR PONTIC STUDIES

Distinguished guests
Dear delegates

Welcome to tonight's ceremony. Your presence honours us and at the same time constitutes a recognition of the important work the Committee for Pontic Studies has been carrying out since it was first founded in 1927 until today on the "collection, study and publication of the linguistic, folkloric and historical material of Pontus", according to article 1 of its Statute.

Today's event marks the start of the works of the International Scientific Conference on the subject "The Black Sea – Euxinus Pontus in the era of the Roman dominance", which will last three days, until Sunday the 8th of May 2016.

At this point I would like to thank all the delegates of the Symposium and especially those of you who came from the Black Sea countries, Europe and the United States and convey to you that your presence brightens our ceremony, and your presentations are anticipated with particular interest from the Greek scientific community. I wish you all a pleasant and interesting stay in our country.

This Symposium is dedicated to the memory of the great archaeologist Victor Sariyannidi, an honorary member of the Committee and dear friend of mine who passed away on December 22 2013 at the age of 84. His passing left a great void in his family, the international scientific community and the multitude of his friends.

The Board of the Committee for Pontic Studies took the initiative to organize a series of scientific symposia and workshops, because it is our belief that the time is ripe for a serious synthetic approach of the scholastic deductions from every geographical area of Euxinus Pontus. Such an overall approach will enable the clarification of many vital issues of Hellenism during its three thousand year presence in this (Black Sea) region.

And so we begin today our International Symposium devoted to the Roman dominance in Euxinus Pontus, a topic chosen due to the decisive influence this period exerted on the subsequent developments, bringing about important changes (Christianisation and change of religious beliefs, literary development, as well as artistic and technological development, consolidation of Greek traditions, changes in housing and town-planning of settlements etc.).

In this Symposium we have the pleasure and honour to host prominent scholars and academics from countries around the Euxinus area (Turkey, Georgia, Russia, Romania, Bulgaria) and beyond (Poland, England-the United Kingdom, France, Spain, Canada, U.S.A) and, of course, 6 delegates from Greece, whom we warmly thank for their participation and overall contribution to the success of the Symposium.

Similarly, I would like to extend my sincere thanks to the members of the Symposium's Scientific Committee, Aggelos Chaniotis, David Braund and Hlias

Petropoulos, not only for their personal contribution with interesting and important presentations, but primarily for the successful choice of subject and their suggestions for invited participants. I have to admit that, without their valuable input, the Committee of Pontic Studies would have been faced with a difficult and laborious task.

Lastly, I need to thank the members of the Organising Committee, Yiannis Ermopoulos, Georgia Haritidou and Dimitrios Tomboulidis who undertook and executed impeccably the organisation of this Symposium.

It is hoped that the proceedings of the Symposium, which will be published in a special volume of the Committee's journal "Archeion Pontou – Pontus Archives" will contribute towards achieving our goal, thus substantially enriching the heretofore results of scholarly research on this topic.

With these thoughts, I declare the start of the works of our Symposium, which I hope will meet all our expectations and wish you all best of success.

Christos Galanidis
Chairman of the Committee for Pontic Studies

ΕΠΙΣΗΜΗ ΕΝΑΡΞΗ ΤΩΝ ΕΡΓΑΣΙΩΝ ΤΟΥ ΣΥΜΠΟΣΙΟΥ
ΣΤΑ ΓΡΑΦΕΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΗΣ ΠΟΝΤΙΑΚΩΝ ΜΕΛΕΤΩΝ

Εκλεκτοί προσκεκλημένοι,
Αγαπητοί εισηγητές και σύνεδροι,

Σας καλωσορίζω στη σημερινή εκδήλωσή μας. Η παρουσία σας αποτελεί τιμή για μας και συγχρόνως αναγνώριση του σπουδαίου έργου που επιτέλεσε και επιτελεί η Επιτροπή Ποντιακών Μελετών από της ιδρύσεώς της το 1927 ως και σήμερα για την «περισυλλογή, μελέτη και δημοσίευση γλωσσικού, λαογραφικού και ιστορικού υλικού του Πόντου» σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 1 του ιδρυτικού Καταστατικού της.

Η αποψινή εκδήλωση σηματοδοτεί την έναρξη των εργασιών του Διεθνούς Επιστημονικού Συμποσίου μας με θέμα «Ο Εύξεινος Πόντος στην εποχή της ρωμαϊκής κυριαρχίας», που θα διαρκέσει 3 ημέρες και θα κλείσει την Κυριακή 8 Μαΐου 2016.

Το Συμπόσιο είναι αφιερωμένο στη μνήμη του μεγάλου αρχαιολόγου Βίκτωρα Σαρηγιαννίδη, επιτίμου μέλους της Ε.Π.Μ., επιστήθιου φίλου μου, που έφυγε από τη ζωή στις 22 Δεκεμβρίου 2013 σε ηλικία 84 ετών, αφήνοντας ένα μεγάλο κενό στην οικογένειά του, στη διεθνή επιστημονική κοινότητα, στη μεγάλη ελληνική ποντιακή οικογένεια και στους αμέτρητους φίλους του.

Το Δ.Σ. της Ε.Π.Μ. ανέλαβε την πρωτοβουλία να διοργανώσει σειρά επιστημονικών συμποσίων και ημερίδων, γιατί πιστεύει ότι είναι καιρός για μία σοβαρή συνθετική προσέγγιση των επιστημονικών πορισμάτων από κάθε γεωγραφική περιφέρεια του Εύξεινου Πόντου. Μια τέτοια συνολική προσέγγιση θα μπορέσει να αποσαφηνίσει πολλά και καίρια ζητήματα της ιστορικής πορείας του ελληνισμού κατά την τρισχιλιόχρονη παρουσία του στο χώρο αυτό.

Εκινάμε λοιπόν σήμερα το Διεθνές Επιστημονικό Συμπόσιο με αντικείμενο την «Ρωμαϊκή κυριαρχία στον Εύξεινο Πόντο», γιατί φρονούμε ότι η συγκεκριμένη εποχή επηρέασε καθοριστικά τις εξελίξεις, επιφέροντας σπουδαίες μεταβολές (εκχριστιανισμός και αλλαγή των θρησκευτικών δοξασιών, ανάπτυξη των γραμμάτων, των τεχνών, της τεχνολογίας, διατήρηση των ελληνικών παραδόσεων, αλλαγές στην οικιστική και την πολεοδομία κ.ά.).

Στο Συμπόσιο αυτό έχουμε τη χαρά και την τιμή να φιλοξενούμε τους πλέον έγκριτους ειδικούς επιστήμονες και ακαδημαϊκούς από τις χώρες του παραεξείνιου χώρου (Τουρκία, Γεωργία, Ρωσία, Ρουμανία, Βουλγαρία) και εκτός αυτού του χώρου (Πολωνία, Αγγλία, Γαλλία, Ισπανία, Καναδά, Η.Π.Α.) και φυσικά 6 εισηγητές από την Ελλάδα, τους οποίους ευχαριστούμε θερμά για την παρουσία τους και τη συμβολή τους στην επιτυχία αυτού του Συμποσίου.

Ομοίως ευχαριστίες θέλω να εκφράσω στα μέλη της Επιστημονικής Επιτροπής του Συμποσίου κ.κ. Άγγελο Χανιώτη, David Braund και Ηλία Πετρόπουλο, όχι μόνο για την προσωπική συμμετοχή τους με σημαντικές και ενδιαφέρουσες εισηγήσεις, αλλά κυρίως για την άκρως επιτυχή θεματολογία που επέλεξαν και

την υπόδειξη των εισηγητών, που ομολογώ ότι χωρίς τη βοήθειά τους το έργο της Ε.Π.Μ. θα ήτανε επίπονο και δυσχερές.

Δεν θα παραλείψω να ευχαριστήσω τα μέλη της Οργανωτικής Επιτροπής μας κ.κ. Ιωάννη Ερμόπουλο, Γεωργία Χαριτίδου και Δημήτριο Τομπουλίδη που ανέλαβαν και διεκπεραίωσαν με άψογο τρόπο την οργάνωση αυτού του Συμποσίου.

Τα πρακτικά του Συμποσίου, που θα δημοσιευθούν σε ειδικό τόμο του περιοδικού συγγράμματος της Ε.Π.Μ. «Αρχεῖον Πόντου», ελπίζουμε ότι θα συμβάλουν στην επίτευξη του στόχου, εμπλουτίζοντας σημαντικά τα όσα μέχρι σήμερα έχουν προκύψει από την επιστημονική έρευνα πάνω στο θέμα αυτό.

Με τις σκέψεις αυτές κηρύσσω την έναρξη των εργασιών του Συμποσίου μας, που ελπίζω να δικαιώσει τις προσδοκίες όλων μας και να ευχηθώ Καλή Επιτυχία!

Χρήστος Γαλανίδης
Πρόεδρος της Ε.Π.Μ.

ADDRESS BY THE VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE,
ALEXIOS G. C. SAVVIDES

Σεβασμιώτατε, Εξοχώτατε, εκλεκτοί προσκεκλημένοι μας,

Θα μου επιτρέψετε να απευθύνω τον σύντομο χαιρετισμό μου στα αγγλικά για τους διακεκριμένους επιστήμονες που μας τιμούν σήμερα με την παρουσία τους στο Συμπόσιο της Επιτροπής μας.

Your Eminence, Your Excellency, Distinguished Guests,

This is a most happy and auspicious circumstance for the Committee for Pontic Studies, for which all members of its administrative board are indeed content and proud. A Symposium on the Pontos –in fact on the Euxine littoral in general– under Roman rule has been a *desideratum* for some time now and our Committee has finally brought this academic necessity to a happy, speedy, conclusion.

Eminent scholars from several countries have gathered here in order to testify to a most interesting and important period of late Antiquity; although I myself am a medievalist and not a historian of Antiquity, it is my conviction that a sound knowledge of the Late Antique Era (also in particular relation to the Black Sea region) may enable us to have a firmer grasp of the transitional period from Late Antiquity to the early Middle Ages; let us remember at this juncture that for several scholars around the globe great portions of the aforementioned periods in fact merge into each other, if not coincide. Such is my own experience for some years now with my additional teaching duties regarding Roman History at Peloponnesos University (in the Department of History, Archaeology and Cultural Resources Management, at Kalamata).

Dear colleagues-distinguished speakers of the Symposium, we welcome you hoping to share with you your findings, corollaries and proposals in this academic event which takes place –as I am sure you know– in particularly difficult circumstances for our country.

Thank you and welcome to our Symposium,

Alexios G.C. Savvides, Professor of Medieval & Byzantine History
Dean/School of Humanities & Cultural Studies, Peloponnesos University
(Kalamata - Greece)
Vice-chairman/ Committee for Pontic Studies

The specific significance of the Black Sea region in ‘Roman times’ – that is, in the period in which Rome was the dominant power in the Mediterranean, the Pontic region, and the Near East – turns on its heterogeneity. In this closed geographical region, areas that were under direct provincial administration co-existed with autonomous cities and allied kingdoms; we find traditional Greek cities, Roman colonies, and communities of indigenous populations, including a range of pastoralist and non-urban societies. It is in this particular context that the impact of Roman rule emerges as a significant historical force, accommodating and integrating variety across time and extensive (and distinctly varied kinds of) space, including steppe, sea and the mountains of the Caucasus, Crimea and Pontic Alps.

What at first glance distinguishes the period of Roman rule from the earlier Hellenistic period is a gradual incorporation into an over-arching administration of areas that had been autonomous states or parts of (semi-) independent kingdoms. By the time of the Severan dynasty, almost all of the shores of the Black Sea were either directly or indirectly under Roman provincial administration, with the notable (and partial) exception of the Bosporan Kingdom. In the north-west Olbia and Crimean Chersonesos fell to the governor of Lower Moesia. On the south coast of the Black Sea, we have the province of Bithynia et Pontus, and Cappadocia, whose governor acquired responsibility for Colchis, famously visited by Arrian in the wake of Hadrian’s visit to Trapezous, with its supply-line south to the eastern frontier of the empire.

What we see in the Severan years around 200 AD, is only the last phase of a long process. Roman rule reached the shores of the Black Sea at different times, in different ways, and under special conditions, sometimes with military conquests, sometimes on the basis of treaties, and sometimes after the death of allied kings. For example, Bithynia came under Roman rule in 75/4 BC on the basis of King Nikomedes IV’s bequest, while Thrace became Roman provincial territory from AD 46 after the death of its king, Rhoimetalkes III. Consequently, the impact and pace of Roman involvement can be observed at different times in the various areas. For instance, around AD 100 in Crimean Chersonesos we find civic reform in the administration of justice under the apparent influence of Roman institutions,¹⁶ Bithynia and Pontus had already been under Roman rule for more than 150 years; in Bithynia and Pontus, Roman influence on law and political institutions had already been applied very directly by Pompey, and can be seen subsequently in the correspondence of Pliny, the province’s governor, with the Emperor Trajan.¹⁷ For this reason, “Roman Pontos” is an abstraction that entails many different facets, developments, and local peculiarities. In 8 AD, Ovid’s exile in Tomis seemed to the Roman poet a journey to the end of the world; half a century later, things looked very different, even if this most urban and urbane of Rome’s poets would most likely have remained unimpressed.

culture: see the papers by D. Braund, E. Dakin, and A. Chaniotis.

¹⁶ SEG LV 838. See Kantor 2012.

¹⁷ References to Pompey’s *lex provinciae* in Pliny, *Letters* 10.79, 112, and 114. See also Kantor 2020.

Let us consider some of the consequences of this gradual process. The late integration of certain areas into the Roman administration had a significant impact on their exposure to dangers and wars, on the development of urban life, on the existence or non-existence of Roman colonies, on the migration of populations from Italy and Rome, and on the degree of their integration into a homogeneous culture. For instance, in Thrace, which became part of the Roman Empire about a century after Bithynia, wars continued to present a problem until the end of the first century BC – such as the conflict with the Bastarnae in 29–28 BC, the catastrophic invasion of the Scordisci in 16 BC, and a little later the revolt led by Vologases of the Bessi from 15 to 11 BC. The fact that Olbia was left unprotected in the last years of Mithridates' reign and later by the victorious Romans, resulted in its exposure to the attack of the Getae, often linked with Burebista. According to Dio of Prusa, who claims to have visited Olbia around 100 AD, the signs of decline were very evident there, at a time when the cities of Asia Minor were experiencing a period of prosperity and general peace.

A second consequence of the gradual and uneven expansion of Rome in the Black Sea region is the presence (and absence) of Roman colonies, and with them the introduction of Roman institutions.¹⁸ The establishment of colonies was usually (but not exclusively) the result of military conquest. Pompey had already settled veterans in Nikopolis and Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia in 63 BC. A great wave of colony-foundations followed under Caesar and Augustus – that is, at a time of limited Roman presence in the west, east and north coasts of the Black Sea, where we do not find colonies of Roman citizens. Caesar turned Sinope into a Roman colony (*Colonia Iulia Felix Sinope*)¹⁹ and Augustus renamed Apamea Myrleia in Bithynia as *Colonia Iulia Concordia*. Of course, the absence of Roman colonies in some areas was counterbalanced by the presence of numerous settlements, fortresses, and stations, especially in Dacia and Lower Moesia, and also by the settlement of Roman army veterans in cities of the Balkan provinces and in Asia Minor. This migration resulted in the presence of Latin speakers. In 9 AD, Ovid, complained that there was not a single person who spoke Latin in Tomis. However we interpret him, the fact is that three generations later he would have had no difficulty in finding people with whom he could communicate in Latin, though whether he would have found enough people appreciative of his verses is another matter. From the time of Trajan onwards, the number of Latin and bilingual inscriptions increased in the areas that joined the Roman oecumene relatively late.²⁰

Despite such local peculiarities, there were important factors that contributed to the integration of the Pontic cities into the fairly homogeneous culture of the developing Roman oecumene. The most important among them is the movement of populations, and with them the movement of ideas, religious beliefs, art forms,

¹⁸ On Roman colonies in the Balkans and Asia Minor see more recently Brélaz (ed.) 2017.

¹⁹ See the paper of C. Barat in this volume.

²⁰ For Lower Moesia see Loungarova 2016.

culture, and customs. Depending on geographical and political conditions, population movements have different causes and forms.²¹ The most organized form is the presence of the Roman army in the Balkan provinces as far north as Dacia; mixed marriages (formal or not) with women from the local population contributed to the spread of the Latin language and Roman customs, which also offered the hope of success in life under Rome. Migration from Asia Minor to the Danubian provinces was also motivated by economic interests – e.g. for the exploitation of mines in Dacia, where settlers from Asia Minor also brought their local cults.²² The cult associations of ‘Asians’ (Ἀσιανοί) reveal the presence of such immigrants, who kept a form of local identity.²³

A special form of population movement is the settlement of Jews in the cities of the Black Sea. Organized synagogues are known mainly from the epigraphic sources in the kingdom of the Bosphorus, but Jewish inscriptions exist in other areas as well;²⁴ sometimes we recognize the presence of people of possible Jewish origin from their name (e.g. Σαμβατίων). In addition to organized population movements, large-scale periodic movements of professionals of all kinds – merchants, craftsmen, artists, actors, poets, gladiators, and athletes – contributed to the more cosmopolitan character of the Black Sea cities in the Imperial period.

Apart from the phenomenon of migration, which is a general phenomenon in the Roman Empire, in some areas of the Black Sea, especially on the north coast, we may have mixed marriages with non-Greek populations of the hinterland – Scythians, Sarmatians etc. – and the naturalization of members of non-Greek population, perhaps meeting problems of demographic decline and in result of long co-existence. Much depends on the evidence and interpretation of names in inscriptions there.²⁵

The participation of the inhabitants of the Pontic cities in cults in Panhellenic sanctuaries and in mystery cults is also a significant development, along with other innovations in the area of religion. We mention only two examples. The first is the presence of people from the Black Sea among the initiates in the cult of the Great Gods in Samothrace.²⁶ The inscriptions that list the mystae mention several visitors from the cities of the west and north coast. The second example is the worship of the snake god Glykon Neos Asklepios. This cult was established (rather as Lucian’s satire has it) by Alexander, the ‘false prophet’, in the Paphlagonian city of Abonou Teichos (renamed Ionopolis) around 140 AD. It soon became a magnet for worshipers who came to the sanctuary for divination, cure, and initiation into a

²¹ See e.g. the study of Cojocaru 2009, on foreigners in the cities of the west and north coasts of the Black Sea.

²² See the recent studies on the presence of miners from Galatia in Dacia: Mitchell 2017; Piso 2018.

²³ See e.g. *SEG* LIII 726 (Nikopolis on Istros); *IGBulg* I 23 (Dioysopolis); *IGBulg* II 480 (Montana); *IGR* I 787 (Perinthos).

²⁴ See the collection by Noy, Panayotov, and Bloedhorn 2004.

²⁵ See Heinen 2006, 65 (on Olbia) and the onomastic studies of Cojocaru 2004 and Hupe 2005. See also the paper of E. Dakin in this volume.

²⁶ See the publication of these texts by Dimitrova 2008.

mystery cult.²⁷ Textual sources and archaeological finds show the spread of Glykon's worship beyond Asia Minor to the west coast of the Black Sea.

Local and regional identities were constructed and displayed anew in this new stage of a Roman oecumene, but also in the context of long multicultural traditions, migrations, and both friendly and hostile contacts with non-Greek peoples. The civic identity and the local pride of citizens of Greek *poleis* co-existed with a sense of belonging to a broader Pontic community. Already in the early first century AD, an honorific decree of Byzantion for Orontas of Olbia provides direct evidence for such a Pontic identity, when he is characterized as "a man of principal position not only in his own fatherland but in the entire Pontic ethnós."²⁸ The specific bonds between colonies and mother-cities was another important form of identity. The author of the Chersonesian honorific decree for Thrasymedes of Herakleia (first or second century AD) compares his attitude in Chersonesos to that of a good father towards affectionate sons (οἷα πατέρων ἀγαθῶν πρὸς υἱοὺς φιλοστόργους [εἶχ]εν <ε>ῦνοϊαν).²⁹ He calls Herakleia "our mother". A similar vocabulary of affection is found in a decree of Chersonesos for Herakleia (mid-second century AD), in which the Herakleiotēs are called "most pious fathers" (εὐσεβέστατοι πατέρες).³⁰ The overlap of identities is a particularly complex phenomenon in the case of immigrants, who could develop a sense of loyalty toward two fatherlands; this idea is expressed in the epigram for Heliodoros from Amastris, who died at a young age in Pantikapaion (first century AD): "now I have two fatherlands (*patrides*); the one that earlier raised me, and the present one, in which I stay."³¹ In this new Roman universe of multicultural contacts the traditional Hellenic identity was not forgotten, but surfaced in a variety of contexts, not only as an identity that differentiated between the inhabitants of Greek cities and non-Greek peoples but also as an identity founded in education and culture. Meanwhile, of course, it remained all too easy for Greeks of the Mediterranean heartlands - and especially in the great cities which claimed the best Hellenism, most obviously Athens - to judge their Pontic cousins in more critical fashion. As the Black Sea world became more multicultural, its forms of Hellenism were easily characterized by critics as diminished, not enhanced. Perhaps the most striking indication of that kind of response from the centre to the Black Sea periphery is the remarkable fact that we know of no Greek city of the Euxine which was included in Hadrian's Panhellenion, wherein proper Hellenism was key to membership.³²

²⁷ Victor 1997; Miron 1996; Sfameni Gasparro 1996 and 1999; Chaniotis 2002.

²⁸ IOSPE I² 79. On the Pontic koinon see the paper by S. Saprykin in this volume.

²⁹ IOSPE I² 357.

³⁰ IOSPE I² 362.

³¹ CIRB 134: ἔχω δὲ πατρίδας νῦν δύο τὴν μὲν πάλαι ἐν ἣ τέθραμμαι τὴν δὲ νῦν ἐν ἣ μένω. Discussed by Dana 2013.

³² On this Black Sea absence and related cultural snobbery, see Braund 1998; 2021.

REFERENCES

- Avram, A. (2013) *Prosopographia Ponti Euxini Externa*, Leuven.
- Badoud, N. and A. Avram (2019) Bulletin archéologique – Amphores et timbres amphoriques grecs (2012-2016), *REG* 132, 129–151.
- Boțan, S.-P. and C. Chiriac (2016) State of the Art and Prospective Research Directions on Hellenistic and Roman Glass from the Pontus Euxinus, in Cojocaru and Rubel (eds.) 2016, 101–115.
- Braund, D. (1998) Greeks and Barbarians: the Black Sea Region and Hellenism under the Early Roman Empire, in S. Alcock (ed.), *The Early Roman Empire in the East*, Oxford, 121–36.
- (2018) *Greek Religion and Cults in the Black Sea Region: Goddesses in the Bosphoran Kingdom from the Archaic Period to the Byzantine Era*, Cambridge.
- Braund, D. (2021) “Colchians Did not Like to Write”: Reflections on Greek Epigraphy in the Eastern Black Sea Region and its Hinterland, in M. Manoledakis (ed.), *Peoples in the Black Sea Region from the Archaic to the Roman Period*, Oxford, 131–140.
- Braund, D., E. Hall, and Wyles (eds.) (2019) *Ancient Theatre and Performance Culture Around the Black Sea*, Cambridge.
- Brélaz, C. (ed.), *L'héritage grec des colonies romaines d'Orient: interactions culturelles dans les provinces hellénophones de l'empire romain*, Paris.
- Bresson, A., A. Ivantchik, and J.-L. Ferrary, eds. (2007) *Une koinè pontique. Cités grecques, sociétés indigènes et empires mondiaux sur le littoral nord de la mer Noire (VII^e s. a.C.-III^e s. p.C., Bordeaux.*
- Chaniotis, A. (2002) Old Wine in a New Skin: Tradition and Innovation in the Cult Foundation of Alexander of Abonouteichos, in E. Dabrowa (ed.), *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient World (Electrum, 6)*, Krakow, 67–85.
- (2017) Political Culture in the Cities of the Northern Black Sea Region in the ‘Long Hellenistic Age’. The Epigraphic Evidence, in V. Kozlovskaya (ed.), *The Northern Black Sea in Antiquity: Networks, Connectivity, and Cultural Interactions*, Cambridge, 141–166.
- Cojocaru, V. (2004) *Populația zonei nordice și nord-vestice a Pontului Euxin în secolele VI-I a. Chr. pe baza izvoarelor epigrafice*, Iași.
- (2009) “Fremde” in griechischen Städten Skythiens und Kleinskythiens auf Grundlage der epigraphischen Quellen bis zum 3. Jh. n.Chr. Forschungsstand und Perspektive, in A. Coşkun, H. Heinen, and S. Pfeiffer (eds.), *Identität und Zugehörigkeit im Osten der griechisch-römischen Welt. Aspekte ihrer Repräsentation in Städten, Provinzen und Reichen*, Frankfurt, 143–172.
- (2016a) *Instituția proxeniei în spațiul pontic / Die Proxenie im Schwarzmeerraum*, Cluj-Napoca.
- (2016b) Das Forschungsprojekt “External Relations of the Pontic Greek Cities in Hellenistic and Roman Times” (PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0054). Ergebnisse und Perspektiven, in Cojocaru and Rubel (eds.) 2016, 21–40.
- Cojocaru, V. and A. Rubel, eds. (2016) *Mobility in research on the Black Sea Region* (Proc. Intern.Symp. (July 5-10, 2015), Cluj-Napoca.
- Dana, M. (2013) Ἐχω δὲ πατρίδας δύο (CIRB 134). Relații și rețele între cetățile grecești din studi Mării Negre și vecini lor pontici, in F. Panait-Bîrzescu, I. Bîrzescu, F. Matei-Popesci, and A. Robu (eds.), *Poleis in the Black Sea Area: Inter-Pontic Relations and Local Productions*, Bucharest, 45–86.
- (2016) Les médecins dans les provinces danubiennes, *REA* 118, 99–123.

- Dimitrova, N. M. (2002) Inscriptions and Iconography in the Monuments of the Thracian Rider, *Hesperia* 71, 209–229.
- (2008) *Theoroi and Initiates in Samothrace. The Epigraphical Evidence*, Princeton.
- Ejstrud, B. (2006) Size Matters: Estimating Trade of Wine, Oil, and Fish-sauce from Amphorae in the First Century AD, in T. Bekker-Nielsen (ed.), *Ancient Fishing and Fish Processing in the Black Sea Region*, in 171–181.
- Heinen, H. (2006) *Antike am Rande der Steppe. Der nördliche Schwarzmeerraum als Forschungsaufgabe*, Mainz/Stuttgart.
- Hupe, J. (2005) Der Dedikantenkreis des Achilleus als ein Gradmesser von Akkulturationsprozessen im kaiserzeitlichen Olbia. Ein Beitrag zur olbischen Onomastik, in F. Fless and M. Treister (eds.), *Bilder und Objekte als Träger kultureller Identität und interkultureller Kommunikation im Schwarzmeergebiet. Kolloquium in Zschortau/Sachsen vom 13.2.–15.2.2003*, Rahden Westf., 43–52.
- Kantor, G. (2012) Local Courts of Chersonesus Taurica in the Roman Age, in P. Martzavou and N. Papazarkadas (eds.), *The Epigraphy of the Post-Classical City*, Oxford, 69–86.
- (2020) Navigating Roman Law and Local Privileges in Pontus-Bithynia, in B. Czajkowski and B. Eckhardt (eds.), *Law in the Roman Provinces*, Oxford, 185–209.
- Loungarova, P. (2016) Bilingual Inscriptions from the Province of Lower Moesia, in *Monuments and Texts in Antiquity and Beyond. Essays for the Centenary of Georgi Mihailov (1915-1991) (Studia Classica Serdicensia V)*, Sofia, 162–172.
- Miron, A. V. B. (1996) Alexander von Abonuteichos. Zur Geschichte des Orakels des Neos Asklepios Glykon, in W. Leschhorn, A. V. B. Miron, and A. Miron (eds.), *Hellas und der griechische Osten. Studien zur Geschichte und Numismatik der griechischen Welt. Festschrift für Peter Robert Franke zum 70. Geburtstag*, Saarbrücken, 153–188.
- Mitchell, S. (2017) Two Galatian Cults in Dacia, *Gephyra* 14, 15–21.
- Mordvintsrva, V. (2016) Barbarians of the North Pontic Region and their Contacts with Centers of Antique Civilization from the 3rd Century BCE to the Mid-3rd Century CE (According to the Research of Elite Burials), in Cojocaru and Rubel (eds.) 2016, 387–438.
- Noy, D., A. Panayotov, and H. Bloedhorn (2004) *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis. Volume I. Eastern Europe*, Tübingen.
- Piso, I. (2018) Kleinasiatische Götter und Kolonisten in Dakien, *Gephyra* 15, 37–70.
- Ruscu, L. (2013) The Relations of the Western Pontic Apoikiai with their Greek and Barbarian Neighbours in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, F. Panait-Bîrzescu, I. Bîrzescu, F. Matei-Popesci, and A. Robu (eds.), *Poleis in the Black Sea Area: Inter-Pontic Relations and Local Productions*, Bucharest, 11–44.
- (2016) Griechen, Römer und Einheimische in Poleis von Thrakien und Pontos, in Cojocaru and Rubel (eds.) 2016, 301–321.
- Sayar, M. (2016) Die Beziehungen zwischen der Bevölkerung der griechischen Poleis des Propontis-Gebietes und der westpontischen Küste von der hellenistischen Zeit bis zum Ende der römischen Kaiserzeit, in Cojocaru and Rubel (eds.) 2016, 289–300.
- Sfamini Gasparro, G. (1996) Alessandro di Abonutico, lo ‘pseudo-profeta’ ovvero come costruir-si un’identità religiosa. I. Il profeta, ‘eroe’ e ‘uomo divino’, *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni* 62, 565–590.
- (1999) Alessandro di Abonutico, lo ‘pseudo-profeta’ ovvero come costruirsi un’identità religiosa. II. L’oracolo e i misteri, in C. Bonnet and A. Motte (eds.), *Les syncrétismes religieux dans le monde méditerranéen antique. Actes du colloque international en l’honneur de Franz Cumont*, Bruxelles/Rome, 275–305.

- Slawisch, A. (2016) Reading the Image? Ambiguities in the Interpretation of Banquet Scenes on Grave Stelae from Roman Thrace, 591–625.
- Victor, U. (1997) *Lukian von Samosata - Alexander oder der Lügenprophet: Eingeleitet, herausgegeben, übersetzt und erklärt*, Leiden.

SINOP IN ROMAN TIMES
FROM PONTIC CAPITAL TO ROMAN COLONY

INTRODUCTION

We may start with some brief context. Sinope (a Milesian colony founded in the middle of the 7th century BC in the middle of the southern Black Sea coast) was an independent city during the entire 3rd century BC, thanks to its geographical position in northern Anatolia, away from the struggles of the Successors, and thanks to its alliance with the most powerful city of the Hellenistic period, namely Rhodes.¹ We can see the support of this ally in 220 BC, when Mithridates II of Pontos tried to seize Sinope,² after taking Amastris in 279 BC³ and Amisos before 255 BC.⁴ Upon Sinope's call for help, the Rhodians appointed a three-man commission, and gave it 140,000 drachmai to supply all that Sinope needed for its defence, including artillery and skilled operators. This Rhodian technical help is still visible in the western fortification of the city, constructed for the use of catapults. Mithridates II could not overcome Sinope in 220, but his grandson - Pharnakes I - managed to do so in 183;⁵ the protests of its Rhodian allies in Rome could not change the situation.⁶ Sinope was taken into the Pontic kingdom, which thereby established a huge territory along the Black Sea coast (650 km if we include Sinope's colonies at Kotyora and Kerasous). Between the conquest of Sinope in 183 and the murder of Mithridates V by courtiers around 120,⁷ Sinope replaced Amaseia as the capital of the Pontic kingdom,⁸ with the Hellenization of the Pontic kingdom.⁹ Sinope was the birthplace of Mithridates VI Eupator around 132. According to Strabo,¹⁰ that is why the king honoured the city and made it his capital.

The Mithridatic Wars began in 89, but Sinope was far from the battlefield. It was threatened by the Roman army after the Peace of Dardanos in 85,¹¹ which ended the First Mithridatic War. For L. Licinius Murena, governor of the Roman province of Asia, soon violated the peace and attacked the Pontic Kingdom in 83. After wintering

¹ Barat 2012b, 217–238.

² Polyb. 4.56; Fernoux 2004, 115–177.

³ Meyer 1879, 43; Sartre 1995, 38; Sartre 2003, 71.

⁴ Sartre 2003, 71.

⁵ Strabo 12.3.11.

⁶ Livy 60.2.6; Polyb. 23.92.

⁷ Strabo 10.4.10; Just., *Epit.* 37.1.6; Reinach 1890, 47: the author speaks of a “seraglio tragedy”.

⁸ Reinach 1890, 42: transfer under the reign of Mithridates IV; Rostovtsef 1951, 218 and McGing 1986, 39, n. 127: transfer under Pharnakes I.

⁹ McGing 1986, 39.

¹⁰ Strabo 12.3.11.

¹¹ App., *Mithr.* 58; Plut., *Sulla* 22.9–10; 24; Plut., *Luc.* 4.1; Liebmann-Frankfort 1969, 182–185; Will 1979, II, 484f.; Callataj 1997, 324; Sartre 2003, 228.

in Cappadocia, Murena started a new campaign.¹² His general staff had advised him to capture Sinope as a prelude to the conquest of the other Pontic cities.¹³ So Murena crossed the Halys River and plundered 400 villages before retreating into Phrygia and Galatia,¹⁴ but Mithridates was far-sighted and had left a strong garrison to defend Sinope.¹⁵ The Third Mithridatic War began when Mithridates attacked Bithynia in 73.¹⁶ L. Licinius Lucullus took command against Mithridates. During the winter of 72–71, he besieged Amisos,¹⁷ and then attacked Mithridates in Kabeira on the Lykos.¹⁸ After wintering in the province of Asia, Lucullus came back at the beginning of 70, and attacked Sinope.

Such is the background of this paper, whose purpose is to consider Sinope under three generals of the Late Roman Republic - Lucullus, Pompey and Caesar. First, I will examine the conquest of the city by Lucullus in 70. Second, the situation of Sinope under Pompey, in the new Roman province of *Bithynia et Pontus*. Third, Caesar's establishment of a Roman colony in Sinope, *Colonia Iulia Felix Sinope*.

SINOPE AND LUCULLUS: VIOLENCE AND BENEVOLENCE

In the Third Mithridatic War, Sinope was besieged by the Roman general Lucullus.¹⁹ We have four different accounts of this siege,²⁰ by Memnon, Strabo, Plutarch, and Appian. The four narratives give a quite full account of the siege, with details on the civil and military commanders. We hear also of a dream (in Plutarch and Appian), in which Autolykos –founding hero of Sinope – appeared to Lucullus, as well as details about Lucullus' attitude to Sinope after the siege.

As to command, the sources provide divergent versions. Memnon says that Mithridates gave the responsibility of Sinope to Leonippos²¹ and Kleocharēs,²² who had the same rank as Seleukos - general (*strategos*) of the king. For Strabo, Bakchides was tyrant and commander of the garrison in Sinope (*phourachos*). According to Plutarch, Cilicians held Sinope in the name of Mithridates.²³ Strabo²⁴ refers to the cruelty of Bakchides to the Sinopeans; the people could not defend their dignity

¹² McGing 1986, 134.

¹³ Memnon, *FgrH* 434 F26.3; App., *Mithr.* 65; Ballesteros Pastor 1996, 194, n. 14, wonders nevertheless if it was during this campaign or the following one that the Romans had the conquest of Sinope as their objective.

¹⁴ App., *Mithr.* 65.

¹⁵ Memnon, *FgrH* 434 F26.3; Reinach 1890, 303.

¹⁶ App., *Mithr.* 70; Sid. Apoll., *Carm.* 22.158–168.

¹⁷ App., *Mithr.* 78; Callataÿ 1997, 353.

¹⁸ App., *Mithr.* 78–79; Plut., *Luc.* 15–17.

¹⁹ Reinach 1890, 348–356; Will 1982, 492–494; McGing 1986, 132–167; Sartre 1995, 128–133; Ballesteros Pastor 1996, 233–245; Callataÿ 1997, 341–388; Sartre 2003, 230–232.

²⁰ Memn., *FgrH* 434 F37; Strabo 12.3.11; Plut., *Luc.* 23.1–6; App., *Mithr.* 83.

²¹ Olshausen 1974, 167 considers Leonippos as a representative of the Greek element in Sinope.

²² Known as a eunuch: Memnon, *FgrH* 434 F37.

²³ Cilician pirates were allies of Mithridates in his war against Rome.

²⁴ Strabo 12.3.11.

against a Greek governor imposed by their king, nor negotiate surrender to the Romans. Plutarch reports that, after having killed a great number of Sinopeans, the Cilicians set fire to Sinope and escaped. The force of Cilicians in Sinope must have been significant, since according to Plutarch, when Lucullus entered the city, he put to death 8,000 Cilicians who were still there. Appian mentions a naval battle, and that the people of Sinope set fire to the heaviest ships, and fled in the lightest ones. However, Memnon's account is the most detailed. He says that Leonippos intended to betray Mithridates, and sent envoys to Lucullus. Kleochares and Seleucos called an assembly, and accused Leonippos. As Leonippos was supported by the people of the city, he was murdered by Kleochares' supporters, who established a tyranny. In a naval battle Kleochares and Seleukos defeated the Roman admiral Censorinus, who was on his way back from the Bosphorus with grain for the Roman army. Exalted by this success, Kleochares' supporters murdered many of their opponents. Conflict ensued between Kleochares and Seleukos. For Kleochares wanted to continue resistance to the siege, but Seleukos wished to surrender the city to the Romans in exchange for substantial rewards. Each of them secretly sent their possessions to Machares, son of Mithridates. As Lucullus laid siege to Sinope, he received offers of friendship and alliance from Machares. Lucullus accepted these, provided that Machares would stop supplying Sinope. Machares did so. Kleochares' supporters put their goods aboard ships, and allowed the city to be ransacked as they fled eastwards. Seeing the flames, Lucullus ordered an assault, using ladders to scale the walls.

These accounts of the siege of Sinope suggest that the population was more persecuted by Mithridates' officers than by the Romans.²⁵ That is of course a Roman perspective. In fact, the Roman capture of Sinope was particularly violent. According to Plutarch, 8,000 Cilicians were slaughtered by Lucullus, while Appian says that the city was ravaged. According to Memnon, Lucullus slaughtered many. While Strabo says that Lucullus spared the public monuments, we may infer that private property was plundered by his troops. Strabo also says that Lucullus brought to Rome Billaros' globe and Autolykos' statue, sculpted by Sthenis. The literary sources constantly try to nuance Lucullus' behaviour. Memnon sees an act of pity in Lucullus' ending of the slaughter, while Strabo writes that Lucullus did not destroy the monuments of Sinope, although his victory had permitted as much. Plutarch explains that he returned the possessions of the people of Sinope, and became the protector of the city. And according to Appian, Lucullus repopulated the city, giving it freedom. In these accounts, we are shown Lucullus' benevolent attitude, less violent than might have been expected. His attitude is traced to a dream-miracle that greatly affected him.

This miracle entailed the statue of Autolykos, a companion of Jason, or of Heracles against the Amazons,²⁶ and the key founding hero of Sinope, where he had an oracular sanctuary.²⁷ According to Strabo, Lucullus seized the statue. According to Appian

²⁵ Barat 2009, 215.

²⁶ App., *Mith.* 83; Plut., *Luc.* 23.5.

²⁷ Strabo 12.3.11.

and Plutarch, Lucullus saw it in a dream, though no dream is mentioned by Memnon and Strabo. According to Appian, Lucullus believed that Autolykos called him in the night, and appeared to him. Next day, when a statue was brought to him, Lucullus recognized what he had seen. Appian links this dream and the fact that Lucullus immediately freed Sinope and repopulated the city. Plutarch provides more detail, while attributing the benevolent behaviour of Lucullus to his piety. The appearance of an enemy's divinity to a general has its parallels in antiquity: notably, Herakles is said to have appeared to Alexander during the siege of Tyre in 322.²⁸ However, all this served propagandistic purposes with regard to Sinope: the conquest of the city was presented as liberation of the Greeks, as an approving Autolykos changed sides.²⁹ Moreover, the miracle justified the especially good treatment of Sinope, which mitigated the preceding Roman violence, while the violence of the Mithridatic regime was thrown into high relief.

SINOPE AND POMPEY: NORMALISATION OF STATUS
IN THE ROMAN PROVINCE OF *BITHYNIA ET PONTUS*

Lucullus did not finish the war against Mithridates, because the Lex Manilia³⁰ of 66 BC gave this mission to Pompey the Great. In the summer of 66, Pompey was the master of the kingdom of Pontus, and Mithridates was escaping, not to his son-in-law, King Tigranes of Armenia, who denied him asylum, but to Colchis.³¹ Mithridates did not return to the southern coast of the Black Sea, but committed suicide in Crimea in the spring of 63 BC.³² In the summer of 63, after campaigns³³ in Armenia,³⁴ elsewhere in the Caucasus,³⁵ and Syria,³⁶ Pompey was in Judaea.³⁷ He was preparing to march against Petra,³⁸ when he learned the news of Mithridates' suicide. The Roman army rejoiced, and offered sacrifices.³⁹ Pompey had to return quickly to Asia Minor. According to the sources, it was in Amisos⁴⁰ or Sinope⁴¹ that Pompey received the corpse of Mithridates, sent to him from Crimea with an embassy from his son, Pharnakes. I have argued in

²⁸ Plut., *Alex.* 24.5.

²⁹ Barat 2009, 215f.

³⁰ Cic., *De imp. Cn. Pomp.* 31–35, 44; Plut., *Pomp.* 24–30; App., *Mithr.* 90–97; Cass. Dio 36.42–43; 45–49; Livy, *Per.* 99; Vell. Pat. 2.31–32; Flor. 1.41; Callataÿ 1997, 375f.

³¹ App., *Mithr.* 97–101; Cass. Dio 36.47–49; Callataÿ 1997, 376.

³² Plut., *Pomp.* 41.7; App., *Mithr.* 108–112; Cass. Dio 37.12–14; Livy, *Per.* 102; Vell. Pat. 2.40.1; Flor. 1.40.25–26; Eutr. 6.12.3; Oros. 6.5.4–6; Reinach 1890, 409f.

³³ Callataÿ 1997, 378–386.

³⁴ Plut., *Pomp.* 33; App., *Mithr.* 106; Cass. Dio 36.51–53; Vell. Pat. 2.37.

³⁵ Plut., *Pomp.* 34–35; App., *Mithr.* 103; Cass. Dio 36.54; 37.1–5; Eutr. 6.14.1.

³⁶ Plut., *Pomp.* 38–41; App., *Mithr.* 107; App., *Syr.* 49, 70; Cass. Dio 37.6.5; Vell. Pat. 2.37.5; Just., *Epit.* 40.2.5; Eutr. 6.14.2.

³⁷ Magie 1950, 363.

³⁸ Plut., *Pomp.* 41; App., *Mithr.* 106; Cass. Dio 37.15–16.

³⁹ Plut., *Pomp.* 42; App., *Mithr.* 113; Reinach 1890, 411.

⁴⁰ Plut., *Pomp.* 42.

⁴¹ App., *Mithr.* 113.

another context⁴² that the tomb of Mithridates was in Sinope and not with his forebears in Amaseia. I located it high in Sinope, on the hill of Boztepe. Thereafter, Pompey reorganised Anatolia, creating new Roman provinces, notably the double province of *Bithynia et Pontus*. Earlier, at Amisos in the winter of 65/64,⁴³ Pompey had already started to organise the future provinces, and to give gifts and rewards to princes, chiefs, and others who had helped him. His acts in the winter of 63/62 only completed the process of provincialization.

According to Strabo, the territory of the double province was divided into 11 districts (*politeiai*).⁴⁴ Not all scholars agree on the list of these 11 *politeiai*,⁴⁵ but all agree that Sinope was at the centre of one of them. Let us consider the status of Sinope in this new provincial organisation. Since its conquest by Lucullus,⁴⁶ Sinope had had the status of a free city, a *polis eleuthera*, like Amisos.⁴⁷ This status permitted exemption from taxes,⁴⁸ because in theory the city did not belong to the province⁴⁹ - a valuable privilege for its inhabitants. Did Pompey recognize this status? He is known to have cancelled decisions of Lucullus.⁵⁰ Possibly he did, for Amisos retained its liberty under Antony,⁵¹ and Sinope had been granted freedom after the epiphany of Autolykos. It is perhaps unlikely that Pompey went against such a prodigy. In this way, Sinope entered the *clientela* of Pompey,⁵² like all the province of Bithynia-Pontus. However, after his return to Rome Pompey had limited contact with the cities of the region, while we remain unclear about the administrative status of Sinope. It was after the death of Pompey that events brought Caesar to the area.

SINOPE UNDER THE DOMINATION OF CESAR:
THE DEDUCTION OF THE SANCTION COLONY

When Caesar was in Egypt, in the spring of 47 BC, he received an urgent communication from the proconsul of Asia, Cn. Domitius Calvinus, who had been left in charge of all the Roman provinces east of the Aegean Sea. For Pharnakes, the son of Mithridates Eupator, who had betrayed his father and was confined by Pompey in the Crimea, had taken advantage of the conflict between Caesar and Pompey,⁵³ and had just invaded the northern part of Asia Minor, in order to re-

⁴² Barat 2012a.

⁴³ Plut., *Pomp.* 38; Reinach 1890, 400; Ballesteros Pastor 1996, 282–286.

⁴⁴ Strabo 12.3.1; App. *Mithr.* 117; cf. Fletcher 1939, 21–23; Jones 1971, 159; Mitchell 1993, 32, uses Strabo's remarks concerning the territories of Magnopolis, Megalopolis, Zela and Neapolis.

⁴⁵ Magie 1950, 370 and 1232, n. 35; Sartre 2003, 239; Marek 1993, 39; Mitchell 1993, 31f.

⁴⁶ Bernhardt 1971, 134–143.

⁴⁷ Plin., *Ep.* 10.92 (Amisos); App., *Mith.* 83 (Sinope).

⁴⁸ Jones 1939, 115–117; Bernhardt 1980, 190–207.

⁴⁹ Marek 1993, 44.

⁵⁰ Plut., *Pomp.* 46.6; Plut., *Luc.* 36.4.

⁵¹ Strabo 12.3.14.

⁵² Sartre 2001, 111–152.

⁵³ Cass. Dio 42.9.2.

establish the kingdom of his father.⁵⁴ Calvinus was defeated by Pharnakes in the autumn of 48, at the battle of Nikopolis.⁵⁵ The region was open to the brutality of Pharnakes.⁵⁶ It was in this context that Pharnakes took Sinope,⁵⁷ and attempted to take Amisos.⁵⁸ We have no information about his treatment of Sinope which was the former capital and best harbour of the southern Black Sea. It was a strategic point that could be used as a naval base for the re-conquest of the whole southern coast.

When Caesar learned of these developments, he left Egypt and Cleopatra, and arrived in northern Asia Minor. There he defeated Pharnakes at Zela in 47 BC.⁵⁹ Here he said his famous words, *veni, vidi, vici* ('I came, I saw, I conquered'), indicating the rapidity of the victory.⁶⁰ Later, in Nikaia, he made new arrangement for the administration of the province of Pontus-Bithynia.⁶¹ Pontus was re-conquered by Calvinus or by M. Coelius Vinicianus⁶² and Pharnakes fled to Sinope with 1,000 cavalry. There, he was besieged by Calvinus, for Caesar had no time to pursue him. Pharnakes capitulated in front of two Roman legions,⁶³ and was allowed to return across the sea to the Crimea.⁶⁴ En route to Rome, Caesar changed the status of some of the cities of the Black Sea. The province of Pontus-Bithynia was reinforced by colonists⁶⁵ in Sinope, Herakleia Pontike, and Amisos.⁶⁶ There were also other Caesarian colonies in Asia Minor: Apamea-Myrlea and the twin colonies of Lampsakos and Parion.⁶⁷

Sinope received a colony of Roman citizens⁶⁸ in 45 BC.⁶⁹ The title of the city and the date of the deduction can be inferred from coins and inscriptions.⁷⁰ While forms vary

⁵⁴ Magie 1950, 407; McGing 1986, 166; Will 1982, 531; David 2000, 230; Sartre 2003, 233.

⁵⁵ *B.Alex.* 39–40; *Livy, Per.* 112; *Suet., Iul.* 36; *Plut., Caes.* 50.1; *App., B. Civ.* 2.91; *App., Mithr.* 120; *Cass. Dio* 42.46.

⁵⁶ *B.Alex.* 41; Magie 1950, 409.

⁵⁷ *App. Mithr.* 120.

⁵⁸ *Strabo* 12.3.14; *App., B. Civ.* 2.91; *App., Mithr.* 120; *Cass. Dio* 42.46.3.

⁵⁹ *Livy, Per.* 113; *Cass. Dio* 42.47; *App., B. Civ.* 2.91; *App., Mithr.* 120; *Suet., Iul.* 35.2; *Plut., Vit. Caes.* 50.2; *Flor.* 2.13.63; *Oros.* 6.16.3; *Eutr.* 6.22.3.

⁶⁰ *B.Alex.* 72–75.

⁶¹ *B.Alex.* 78; *Cass. Dio* 42.49.1; Magie 1950, 1266f., nn. 29–30.

⁶² *B.Alex.* 77.

⁶³ The Thirty-sixth Legion and the Pontic Legion.

⁶⁴ *App. Mithr.* 120; *Cass. Dio* 47.5; *Bell. Alex.* 77: Calvinus is not mentioned; it is Coelius Vinicianus who was left in Pontus with two legions after the victory of Caesar.

⁶⁵ Mitchell 1993, 36f.; Sartre 2001, 112–119.

⁶⁶ Colonial assignation without colonial foundation according to Mitchell 1993, 36f., and n. 118; Barat 2014, 109.

⁶⁷ Sartre 2003, 241.

⁶⁸ *Plin., HN* 6.6; *Plin., Ep.* 10.91; *Ulp., Dig.* 50.15.1.10.

⁶⁹ First coins with the city era from the time of Antony, *Recueil I-1*, 197 no. 75 (Antony); 198 nos. 81–90 (Augustus); 199 no. 92f. (Caligula), nos. 94f. (Claudius), no. 96 (Nero); 200 no. 97, 99–100 (Nero), nos. 101f. (Vespasian), no. 103 (Domitian); 201 no. 104 (Nerva), nos. 105–107 (Trajan); 108–110 (Hadrian); 202 no. 111 (Hadrian), nos. 112–113 (Antoninus Pius), nos. 114–117 (Marcus Aurelius); 203 nos. 118–121 (Marcus Aurelius).

⁷⁰ Leschorn 1993, 150–162; *Recueil I-1*, 197 no. 75 (Antony); 198 nos. 81–90 (Augustus); 199 nos. 92f. (Caligula), nos. 94f. (Claudius); 199 no. 96 (Nero); 200 nos. 97, 99f. (Nero), nos. 101f. (Vespasian), no. 103 (Domitian); 201

in detail, the following appear more frequently: *C I F* (*Colonia Iulia Felix*), from the time of Cesar to Antoninus Pius,⁷¹ *C I F S* (*Colonia Iulia Felix Sinope*), from Augustus to Gallienus,⁷² and finally, *C R I F S* (*Colonia Romana Iulia Felix Sinope*), from Maximinus on.⁷³ The same variants can be seen in epigraphic documents.⁷⁴ The settlement of a Roman colony had the objective of sanctioning a city⁷⁵ and of watching it, because its loyalty was not sure. It was also a way to settle veterans or proletarians. This new status can hardly be seen as a privilege, as Magie seems to suggest.⁷⁶

Strabo mentions the colony at Sinope in his day. It had part of the city and the civic territory. His account shows that the urban centre and the *chôra* were shared between the previous inhabitants of Sinope and the colonists.⁷⁷ S. Mitchell considers that a double community may have coexisted in Sinope at the moment of the Caesarian foundation, which amalgamated into a single community around the beginning of the Principate.⁷⁸ However, M. Sartre has shown that no archaeological, epigraphic, and numismatic sources all suggest that a *polis* of Sinope persisted, separate from the Roman colony.⁷⁹ It seems that the inhabitants of Sinope were deprived of their land, public and private, under Caesar's imposition, whether or not it might have been cheaply bought back, or was permanently confiscated. The pre-existing inhabitants had suffered derivation. The creation of such a colony was symbolically represented on colonial coins with oxen and colonists ploughing the land.⁸⁰ *Agrimensores* (surveyors) and augurs certainly contributed to the delimitation of the territory, but we have no cadastral plan of the Roman period. Sinope also received the *ius Italicum*,⁸¹ with its privileges.⁸² A coin, issued under Domitian in 92/93 represents the satyr Marsyas raising his right arm and holding on his shoulder a wine-skin. This coin reproduces in provincial style a Republican model, issued in the name of L. Marcus Censorinus and referring to a statue of the forum in Rome, possibly erected by his ancestor Caius Marcus Rutilus Censorinus in 294 BC. This statue was a symbol of

no. 104 (Nerva), nos. 105–107 (Trajan), nos. 108–110 (Hadrian); 202 no. 111 (Hadrian), no. 112f. (Antoninus Pius), nos. 114–117 (Marcus Aurelius); 203 nos. 118–121 (Marcus Aurelius).

⁷¹ *Recueil I-1*, 196 no. 74; 198 nos. 82–85, 87–90; 199 no. 91, 93–95; 200 nos. 97–99, 101–103; 201 nos. 104, 106, 108; 202 nos. 111f.; *SNG von Aulock* 1–3, nos. 232–234, 236.

⁷² *Recueil I-1*, 198 no. 81; 201 no. 109f.; 202 no. 113.

⁷³ *Recueil I-1*, 207 no. 150, 153; 208 nos. 155–158, 160f.; 209 nos. 162, 163, 165; 210 no. 170.

⁷⁴ *I, Sinope* 87, 89 (suggestion of a restoration), 91, 121, 269.

⁷⁵ Sartre 2001, 121; *contra* Magie 1950, 414; Barat 2017, 202–215.

⁷⁶ Sartre 2001, 121; *contra* Magie 1950, 414.

⁷⁷ As in Macedonia; see Edson 1975, 97–102.

⁷⁸ Mitchell 1979, 416f., and n. 53.

⁷⁹ Sartre 2001, 131.

⁸⁰ *Recueil I-1*, 196 no. 74 (Julius Caesar and plough); 199 no. 93 (Caligula), no. 94 (Claudius); 200 no. 98 (Nero), no. 103 (Domitian and ploughing oxen).

⁸¹ Ulp., *Dig.* 50.15.1.10.

⁸² Veyne 1961.

freedom. We may observe that this iconography can be found in the coinage of cities benefiting from the *ius Italicum*.

The Roman colonists who arrived in Sinope at the foundation of the colony may have included poor Italians, who perhaps had lost property in the civil war, as well as veterans of the Caesarian armies, and Italians who were still in the province of Bithynia-Pontus. That might explain why we find in Sinope members of the *Veturii* family, known in Bithynia at the end of the first century BC and in the beginning of the first century AD through an inscription from Prusa ad Olympum,⁸³ where this *gens* of Italian notables, enriched by trade, had an estate:⁸⁴ Veturia Alexandra and her husband Veturius Callineicos⁸⁵ and T. Veturius Campester.⁸⁶ It may be, therefore, that descendants of Italian *negotiators* in Anatolia were brought within the colony at Sinope. Whatever the details, the broad history of Sinope shows change and perhaps decline in status over the centuries down to Caesar, but the city would prosper, even so, under the *pax Romana*.

REFERENCES

- Ballesteros Pastor, L. (1996) *Mitrídates Eupátor, rey del Ponto*, Granada.
- Barat, C. (2009) Miracles et apparitions: les statues voyageuses de Sinope et leur signification politique, in G. Hoffmann and A. Gailliot (eds.), *Rituels et transgressions de l'Antiquité à nos jours*, Amiens, 211–222.
- (2012a) Représentations de la dynastie du Pont: images et discours, in E. Santinelli-Foltz and C.-G. Schwentzel (eds.), *La puissance royale. Image et pouvoir de l'Antiquité au Moyen Âge*, Rennes, 45–61.
- (2012b), Relations et solidarités entre les cités grecques de la côte sud de la mer Noire (VII^e–III^e s. av. J.-C.), in L. Martinez-Sève (ed.), *Les diasporas grecques du VIII^e à la fin du III^e s. av. J.-C.*, *Pallas*, 89, 217–244.
- (2014) Conquête et destin d'une cité grecque dans l'Empire romain: Sinope (70 av. J.-C.–73 apr. J.-C.), in N. Mathieu (ed.), *Le monde romain de 70 av. J.-C. à 73 apr. J.-C. Voir, dire, lire l'empire*, Rennes, 87–129.
- (2017) La *Colonia Iulia Felix Sinope*: d'une ironie tragique à une réalité, in C. Brélaz (ed.), *L'héritage grec des colonies romaines d'Orient. Interactions culturelles des provinces hellénophones de l'empire romain*, Paris, 201–228.
- Bernhardt, R. (1971) *Imperium und Eleutheria. Die römische Politik gegenüber den freien Städten des griechischen Ostens*, Hamburg.
- (1980) Die Immunitas der Freistädte, *Historia*, 29, 190–207.
- Callatäy, F. de (1997) *L'histoire des guerres mithridatiques vue par les monnaies*, Louvain-la-Neuve.
- David J.-M. (2000) *La république romaine*, Paris.
- Edson, C. (1975) Double Communities in Roman Macedonia, in *Essays in memory of Basil Laourdas*, Thessaloniki, 97–102.

⁸³ I.Prusa 170.

⁸⁴ Fernoux 2004, 159, 161.

⁸⁵ I.Sinope 156.

⁸⁶ I.Sinope 102.

- Fernoux, H.-L. (2004) Les cités s'entraident dans la guerre: historique, cadres institutionnels et modalités pratiques des conventions d'assistance dans l'Asie Mineure hellénistique, in J.-C. Couvenhes and H.-L. Fernoux (eds.), *Les cités grecques et la guerre en Asie Mineure à l'époque hellénistique*, Tours, 115–177.
- Fletcher, W.G. (1939) The Pontic Cities of Pompey the Great, *TAPhA*, 70, 17–29.
- Jones, A.H.M. (1939) *Civitates liberae et immunes* in the East, in W.M. Calder and J. Keil(eds.), *Anatolian Studies Presented to William Hepburn Buckler*, Manchester, 103–117.
- (1971) *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford.
- Leschorn, W. (1993) *Antike Ären. Zeitrechnung. Politik und Geschichte im Schwarzmeerraum und in Kleinasien nördlich des Taurus*, Stuttgart.
- Liebmann-Frankfort, T. (1969) *La frontière orientale dans la politique extérieure de la République romaine depuis le traité d'Apamée jusqu'à la fin des conquêtes asiatiques de Pompée (189/8–63)*, Brussels.
- Magie, D. (1950) *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, Princeton.
- Marek, C. (1993) *Städt, Ära un Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia*, Tübingen.
- McGing, B.C. (1986) *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator, King of Pontus*, Leiden.
- Meyer, E. (1879) *Geschichte des Koenigreichs Pontos*, Leipzig.
- Mitchell, S. (1979) Iconium and Ninica – Two Double Communities in Roman Asia Minor, *Historia*, 28, 409–438.
- (1993) *Anatolia. Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor. Volume I: The Celts in Anatolia and the Impact of Roman Rule*, Oxford.
- Olshausen, E. (1974) Zum Hellenisierungsprozess am pontischen Könishof, *Anc.Soc.* 5, 153–170.
- Reinach, T. (1890) *Mithridate Eupator, roi de Pont*, Paris.
- Rostovtzeff, M. (1851) Pontus and its Neighbours: the First Mithridatic War, *CAH*, 9, Cambridge, 211–260.
- Sartre, M. (1995) *L'Asie Mineure et l'Anatolie d'Alexandre à Dioclétien IV^e siècle av. J.-C. / III^e siècle ap. J.-C.*, Paris.
- (2001) Les colonies romaines dans le monde grec. Essai de synthèse, *Electrum*, 5, 111–152.
- (2003) *L'Anatolie hellénistique de l'Égée au Caucase*, Paris.
- (2004) Les colonies dans le monde grec: du corps étranger à l'assimilation, in G. Salmeri, A. Raggi, and A. Baroni (eds.), *Coloniae romane nel mondo greco*, Roma, 309–319.
- Veyne, P. (1961) Le Marsyas colonial et l'indépendance des cités, *Revue philologique*, 35, 87–98.
- Will, E. (1979–1982) *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique 323–30 av. J.-C.*, Nancy.

END OF THE SYMPOSIUM WORKS

Dear friends,

Our three-day journey between the past and the present has come to its end. A past that is manifested by the numerous monuments, which, in ruins most of them, are scattered throughout the Euxinus region and which you so brilliantly documented in your presentations, monuments, which were created in a period when Hellenism constituted a dominant and decisive element among the people of this region; and the present, which is represented by us here in Greece, descendants of the people of that region and all the other peoples which, under different state entities, live in the Black Sea countries. All of us now have a duty to protect and bring to light these monuments because they are part of the world's cultural heritage and belong to all humanity, irrespective of who manages and maintains them today.

The Committee of Pontic Studies always has and is still moving along the direction of fulfilling this duty and today, with the end of the works of this Scientific Symposium, we feel the need to warmly thank you for your presence here and congratulate you for your excellent collaboration and your high standard presentations. We would also like to inform you that the proceedings of the Symposium have been recorded and filmed on DVD and that your presentations will be published in a special volume of our Committee's journal "Archeion Pontou – Pontus Archives" both of which will be sent to you by post.

Closing, alongside our respect and appreciation for your work and contribution in this field, please accept some mementos. An album for the 550 years from the fall of Trabzon (1461-2011) which was published by the Committee for Pontic Studies and is accompanied by a DVD presenting the founding history, the publishing work and the Museum of the Committee. A folder with engravings, maps and coins of Pontus in English and Greek. A gold-plated medal with the one-headed eagle, emblem of the Committee, on one side and on the other side a personalized dedication "with compliments" for your participation in the Symposium. Finally, I want to leave you with the wish to return safely to your countries and the saying in the pontic dialect «Υίαν κι Ευλο(γ)ίαν», να είμαστε ούλ καλά και να ευρούμεσ σ' άλλον μίαν.

Health and Blessings.

May we all be well and meet again.

Christos Galanidis
Chairman of the Committee for Pontic Studies

ΛΗΞΗ ΤΩΝ ΕΡΓΑΣΙΩΝ ΤΟΥ ΣΥΜΠΟΣΙΟΥ

Αγαπητοί φίλοι,

Το τριήμερο οδοιπορικό ανάμεσα στο χθες και το σήμερα έφθασε στο τέλος του. Ένα χθες που το μαρτυρούν τα άπειρα μνημεία, που, ερείπια τα πιο πολλά, ευρίσκονται διασκορπισμένα σ' όλες τις περιοχές του Εύξεινου Πόντου και τα οποία τα παρουσιάσατε τεκμηριωμένα κατά έξοχο τρόπο στις εισηγήσεις σας, μνημεία που φτιάχτηκαν σε μία περίοδο που ο Ελληνισμός αποτελούσε κυρίαρχο και καθοριστικό στοιχείο ανάμεσα στους κατοίκους αυτής της περιοχής, και το σήμερα που το αποτελούμε εμείς εδώ στην Ελλάδα, απόγονοι των κατοίκων αυτής της περιοχής, και όλοι οι λαοί που, κάτω από διαφορετικές κρατικές οντότητες κατοικούν στις χώρες του Εύξεινου Πόντου. Όλοι εμείς λοιπόν σήμερα, έχουμε χρέος να προστατεύσουμε και να αναδείξουμε αυτά τα μνημεία γιατί αποτελούν μνημεία παγκόσμιου πολιτισμού που ανήκουν σ' ολόκληρη την ανθρωπότητα, ανεξάρτητα ποιός τα διαχειρίζεται σήμερα.

Στην κατεύθυνση αυτού του χρέους κινήθηκε και κινείται η Επιτροπή Ποντιακών Μελετών και σήμερα, με τη λήξη των εργασιών αυτού του Επιστημονικού Συμποσίου, αισθάνεται την ανάγκη να σας ευχαριστήσει θερμά για την εδώ παρουσία σας, να σας συγχαρεί για την άψογη συνεργασία σας και για τις υψηλού επιπέδου εισηγήσεις σας, και να σας ενημερώσει ότι οι εργασίες του Συμποσίου μας που έχουν ηχογραφηθεί και βιντεοσκοπηθεί, θα γίνουν DVD, όπως επίσης οι εισηγήσεις σας θα εκδοθούν σε ειδικό τόμο του περιοδικού συγγράματός μας «Αρχαίον Πόντου» και θα σας αποσταλούν ταχυδρομικά.

Κλείνοντας, μαζί με τη μεγάλη εκτίμηση για το έργο και την προσφορά σας, δεχθείτε παρακαλώ κάποια αναμνηστικά δώρα. Το Λεύκωμα για τα 550 χρόνια (1461-2011) από την πτώση της Τραπεζούντας που εκδόθηκε από την Ε.Π.Μ. και συνοδεύεται από DVD για το ιστορικό ίδρυσης, το εκδοτικό έργο και το Μουσείο της Ε.Π.Μ. Μία έκδοση με γκραβούρες, χάρτες και νομίσματα του Πόντου στα ελληνικά και αγγλικά. Το επίχρυσο ανάγλυφο μετάλλιο με το μονοκέφαλο αετό, έμβλημα της Ε.Π.Μ., από τη μία όψη και από την άλλη όψη ονομαστική αφιέρωση στον καθένα «Τιμής Ένεκεν» για τη συμμετοχή σας στο Συμπόσιό μας, με την ευχή να επιστρέψετε καλά στον τόπο καταγωγής σας, και το λόγο στην ποντιακή διάλεκτο «Υίαν κι Ευλο(γ)ίαν», να είμαστε ούλ' καλά και να ευρίουμες σ' άλλον μίαν.

Υγεία και Ευλογία, να είμαστε όλοι καλά και να ξαναβρεθούμε.

Χρήστος Γαλανίδης
Πρόεδρος της Επιτροπής Ποντιακών Μελετών

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

† **Alexandru, Avram**

Professor of Ancient History, University of Le Mans, France

Atasoy, Sümer

Emeritus Professor of Classical Archaeology, Karabük University, Turkey

Barat, Claire

Maître de conférences en histoire ancienne et archéologie classique, Université de Valenciennes et du Hainaut-Cambrésis, France

Bezrukov, Andrey

Assistant Professor of Ancient History, Nosov Magnitogorsk State University, Russian Federation

Braund, David

Emeritus Professor of Ancient History, University of Exeter, UK

Chaniotis, Angelos

Professor at the Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton, USA

Cojocaru, Victor

PhD in Archaeology, Senior researcher at the Institute of Archaeology of the Romanian Academy, Iasi Branch, Romania

Coşkun, Altay

Professor of Ancient History, Waterloo University, Canada

Dakin, Emyr

Instructor in Classics, College of New Jersey, USA

Gamkrelidze, Gela

Chief Researcher at the Centre of Archaeology of the Georgian National Museum, Tbilisi, Georgia

Ionescu, Mihai

Researcher, Callatis Archaeological Museum, Mangalia, Romania

Kakhidze, Emzar

Associate Professor of Classical Archaeology, Batumi State University, Georgia

Klenina, E. Yu.

Head of research department, the State Museum-Preserve "Tauric Chersonese", Russian Federation

Kolağasioğlu, Mustafa
Amisos Museum, Turkey

Kyrtatas, Dimitris J.
Professor of Ancient History, University of Thessaly, Greece

Manoledakis, Manolis
Associate Professor of Classical Archaeology, International Hellenic University, Greece

Maslennikov, Alexander A.
Professor of Classical Archaeology, Institute of Archaeology, Moscow, Russian Federation

Mentesidou, Eleni T.
PhD candidate at Democritus University of Thrace, Greece

Minchev, Alexander
Dr. of Archaeology, Archaeological Museum of Varna, Bulgaria

Nigdelis, Pantelis M.
Professor of Ancient History, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Öztürk, Bülent
Assistant Professor of Ancient History, Sakarya University, Turkey

Petropoulos, Elias K.
Professor of Ancient History, Democritus University of Thrace, Greece

Ruscu, Dan
University of Babeş-Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Ruscu, Ligia
University of Babeş-Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Saprykin, Sergey
Professor of Ancient History, Moscow State University M.V. Lomonosov, Russian Federation

Şirin, Orhan Alper
Samsun Museum, Turkey

Tezgör, Dominique Kassab
Professor of Classical Archaeology, Bilkent University of Ankara, Turkey

Yıldırım, Şahin
Assistant Professor of Classical Archaeology, Karabük University, Turkey