Christian Marek, Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia, Istanbuler Forschungen, Band 39. Ernst Wasmuth Verlag, Tübingen 1993. XVI, 259 Seiten, 56 Tafeln, 6 Beilagen.

All students of Roman Asia Minor will welcome this handsome addition to the series "Istanbuler Forschungen". Marek's study is devoted to northern Anatolia and in particular to the cities of Paphlagonia, an enormous area which has been seriously neglected by modern scholars. The work is based not only on a thorough reevaluation of the ancient sources and the modern literature, but also on eight fruitful seasons of field survey and epigraphical research, carried out in the Turkish museums of Amasra and Kastamonu and in the vast territories of four Paphlagonian cities: Amastris, Abonuteichos-Ionopolis, Pompeiopolis, and Kaisareia-Hadrianopolis.

The introduction is devoted to methodological considerations and to a survey of earlier research in the epigraphic-historical tradition to which this work belongs. Good maps are essential to this type of research and Marek remarks on the lack of any recent cartography to replace Kiepert's masterpieces produced at the end of the last century (p. 6 n. 46). But this does an injustice to J. WAGNER's masterly contribution to the Tübingen series, *Die Neuordnung des Orients von Pompeius bis Augustus* (67 v. Chr. – 14 n. Chr.). TAVO B.V.7. Wagner's representation of the political development of the region in this period agrees in almost all significant points with the conclusions of the new book. Marek himself provides one sketch map of his own showing sites and boundaries, but for detailed cartography adopts the practice used by D. H. French for his publications of Roman roads and milestones of Asia Minor, namely of printing ancient features in red onto sheets of the most recent Turkish 1:500,000 maps, which are reproduced in grey tones at 1:1,000,000 scale. The reduction renders the modern toponymy hard to read without a magnifying glass, and Marek might with profit have added more ancient place-names and features (roads, rivers, mountains, districts) to make the ancient landscape more intelligible. His "Beilagen" 5 and 6 contain precisely one ancient city each!

The main matter of the book falls into two sections of roughly equal length. Chapters 2–4 (pp. 7–62) provide a brief account of the history of northern Asia Minor before the Romans, followed by an extremely thorough and careful analysis of the foundation of the province of Pontus-Bithynia by Pompeius, the dissolution of much of the province by M. Antonius, and the gradual reimposition of direct Roman rule over the Pontic region under the Julio-Claudian emperors. The second part, chapter 5 (pp. 63–125), contains a group of case studies, which highlight aspects of the history of the four Paphlagonian cities where Marek has carried out his own field work. These include analysis of some of his most important new epigraphical discoveries. The first appendix tabulates the evidence for city eras in Paphlagonia, Pontus and Armenia Minor, which play an important part in the argument of chapters 2–4. The information here may now be supplemented by even fuller lists of the local eras in W. LESCHHORN, *Antike Ären. Zeitrechnung, Politik und Geschichte im Schwarzmeerraum und in Kleinasien nördlich des Tauros. Historia Einzelschr. 81* (1993). There follow a catalogue of the inscriptions of the four Paphlagonian cities studied in chapter 5 (290 items), with epigraphic indices, and a general index to the whole book. The book concludes with the maps and with fifty six pages of splendid photographs, which illustrate individual monuments and also, above all,

the landscapes of northern Anatolia from the gulf of Nicomedia in Bithynia to the desolate high passes of Armenia Minor between Trabzon and Erzerum. Newcomers to the region – surely most users of the book – should certainly begin with these fine illustrations. Marek is the most gifted photographer among contemporary epigraphic travellers in Turkey.

The book is a work of sober and methodical scholarship, with extensive documentation. It is not possible to produce a work on this scale without a few minor slips and I noticed the following: 4–5: J. G. C. Anderson was a Scot, not an Englishman, and the two Cumonts and Grégoire were Belgian not French. D. R. Wilson's excellent Oxford thesis of 1960 was a Blitt., not a DPhil dissertation; 61: *legio XII Fulminata* transferred to Melitene in A.D. 70 not 71 (Ios. bel. Iud. 7, 1, 3 [18]); *legio XVI* [not *XIV*] *Flavia Firma* probably did not arrive in Satala until after A.D. 75 (cf. H. Halfmann, *Epigr. Anatolica* 8, 1986, 39–51); 88: the Ancyran inscriptions for C. Iulius Senecio, cited by Marek to support his belief that parts of Paphlagonia were attached to the province of Galatia in the late second and early third centuries, should be dated not to the Severan period but around A.D. 250 (cf. S. Mitchell, *Anatolia* II [1993] 158–9); 95: the inscription which Marek cites from Syrian Antioch has been published by D. Feissel, *Syria* 62, 1985, 71–103 (*SEG* XXXV [1985] 1483); 109 n. 780: read *Journal Roman Stud.* 60, 1970; 119 n. 859: of the twelve Galatian/Lycaonian communities listed by Ptol. 5, 4, 8, not only Laodicea Catacecaumene, but also Vasada (Dere Köy), Perta (Gimir) and Cinna (Karahamzılı) have been firmly localised; 133: read Antoninus Pius; 215: the epigraphic index of personal names includes the form Ἄτθις (misprinted) but the text of the inscription (Kaisareia Kat. Nr. 77) shows that this is a reference to the land of Attica; Δράκων of Kaisareia Kat. Nr. 34 and the remarkable proper name Σιμιοκηνίς (fem.) in Amastris Kat. Nr. 107 are omitted from the index; the latter should clearly be compared to Σιμιοκενίς (fem.) attested in Amastris Kat. Nr. 50, which has been indexed.

Marek has not been able to avoid the problem which bedevils all attempts to produce regional studies of the history of Asia Minor *(experto credite)*, namely that of how and where to draw the geographical boundaries. There is a substantial geographical discrepancy between the areas discussed in the two main sections of the book. The first part is concerned with the whole of northern Asia Minor, especially in the period 63 B.C. to A. D. 64. Indeed it may almost be seen as an extended historical commentary on the main source for Pontic history in this period, Strab. 12, 3, 1. The second part, on the other hand, is restricted to aspects of the history of four Paphlagonian cities. The advantage is that Marek can thus expound some fascinating and detailed historical material which has been gleaned from his own survey work and can provide an authoritative account of the Paphlagonian landscape which he knows intimately; the disadvantage is that he has relatively little to say about other, more important Pontic cities, notably Sinope and Amasia, which played critical roles in the development of the region in the late Republican and early Imperial periods.

The main conclusions of the first part are not strikingly novel. Marek's core task is to identify the eleven cities of the Pontic part of Pompeius' new province (Strab. 12, 3, 1) and thus establish its geographical extent. He argues in detail and wholly correctly against the view of K. Wellesley, *Rhein. Museum* 96, 1953, 293–318 (accepted by several recent scholars), that the province did not extend significantly east of the river Halys except in the Phazemonitis around Amisus. There is briefer but very similar argumentation in S. Mitchell, *Anatolia* I (1993) 41, but the essential points were already clearly set out by D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* II (1950), 1232–4 and indeed by R. Syme in his voluminous *Anatolica. Studies in Strabo,* 111–24, written in Istanbul during the Second World War, but only now recovered from his papers and edited for publication by A. R. Birley (1995). Marek lists the eleven cities of Pontus as follows: Amastris, Sinope, Amisos, Pompeiopolis, Neapolis, Magnopolis, Diospolis, Nikopolis, Zela, Magnopolis, and finally either Abonuteichos or Amasia. Memnon 38,9 refers to Amasia as a *polis* in 70 B.C. While this is not formal proof that Amasia had city status in 63 B. C., its claims over Abonuteichos are overwhelming. The one Hellenistic inscription from the latter (p. 155; Abonuteichos Kat. Nr. 1), dated to 137 B. C. is a resolution of a group of *phratores* in favour of a *strategos* who had previously been honoured by the *koinon* (of Pontus?). The fact that there is no mention or hint of regular *polis* institutions in this elaborate public inscription argues powerfully that the place was not a city in the second century B. C. (see Marek's own remarks on p. 82–3).

Marek carefully documents the process by which Pompeius' Pontic province was deconstructed by Antonius and its constituent parts handed over to various dynasts, and then gradually taken back under direct Roman control after the creation of the province of Galatia in 25 B.C. The arguments often depend on intri-

cate combinations of evidence, and a critical observation, that the era of Sebasteia-Megalopolis began not in 2/1 B.C.–1/2 A.D., but in A.D. 64 like that of the other cities of Pontus Polemonianus, came too late to be incorporated into Marek's main text (p. 57–8; corrected on p. 259; add W. Wieser, *Schweizer. Num. Rundschau* 68, 1989, 58–61 to the bibliography here). This new dating does away with an uncomfortable anomaly in the historical development of the Pontic territories in the early empire. It also removes the need for Marek's suggestion (p. 61–2), which is unsupported by other evidence, that Tiberius added the upper Halys basin including Sebasteia and Armenia Minor, to the new province of Cappadocia in A. D. 17/18.

It seems likely that Marek's reconstruction is as close to the truth as any which the evidence now allows. Since much importance is attached to methodological rigour in the argumentation, let me suggest one correction. On p. 51 it is claimed that under Antonius the two Pompeian *politeiai* of Megalopolis and Zela "verloren ihre Existenz, und das Land fiel teils an den Priester-Dynasten Komanas, teils an einen wieder ernannten Priester-Dynasten in Zela, teils...an einen Dynasten namens Ateporix". But dynastic rulers did not necessarily abolish these cities; on the contrary they might enhance them. Pythodoris, queen of Pontus from 8/7 B. C., having taken over Cabeira, Pompeius' Diospolis, προσκατεσκέυασε καὶ Σεβαστὴν μετωνόμασε, βασιλείῳ τε πόλει χρῆται (Strab. 12, 3, 31, 557). The claim that a city territory "wurde...von keiner übergeordneten, römischen Verwaltungsgrenze durchschnitten" (p. 3) is also contradicted by one example in this region, Byzantium, a free city on the Thracian side of the Bosporus, parts of whose territory lay also in Bithynia and in Asia (L. Robert, *Hellenica* VII, 46 ff.).

The conceptual framework of the enquiry is perhaps excessively determined by Strabo's acount. Other approaches to the history of northern Asia Minor in this period are also possible. The fragments of Memnon relating to the history of Heracleia, for instance, receive only very passing attention (he is not mentioned among the principal literary sources on p. 126) and the provincial *fasti* raise a number of problems that are not addressed here. A text which invites speculation is the monumental honorific monument erected for... *L. f. Rufus procos.* by eight or more Bithynian cities in Rome in the triumviral or early Augustan period (*CIL* VI 1508 with W. Eck, *Chiron* 14, 1984, 201–17). Another is an inscription of Sinope honouring C. Marcius Censorinus, as *legatus Caesaris* (of Pontus and Bithynia?) in the time of Augustus. G. W. Bowersock, *Harvard Stud. in Class. Philol.* 68, 1964, 207–11 and R. Syme, *Anatolica*, 302–7 argue that it should be connected with the activities of Agrippa in the East, who combined with Polemo I to suppress the rebellion of Mithridates' grandson Scribonius in the Bosporan kingdom, finally ending in Sinope (inevitably the base of most Roman military operations in the Black Sea area) in 13 B. C. (Dio 54, 24, 6; Nic. Damasc., *FGHist* IIa 90 F 134).

We may also trace the growing Roman military presence in the Pontic cities, in particular Amasia, during the first and second centuries A. D., which reflected, under the changed conditions of the Roman Empire, the strategic significance of the region in the time of Pompeius. In a forthcoming study *(Festschrift Hans Lieb)* M. Speidel deduces from an inscription of Amastris (Amastris Kat. Nr. 2) that a *cohors Campana,* later to be found in Dalmatia , was stationed here in the time of Augustus. The military consequences of Rome's incorporation of Pontic territory into its provinces receive little attention from Marek. The evidence for troops in the whole region is summarised by E. Olshausen, *Epigr. Anatolica* 9, 1987, 91–3; cf. S. Mitchell, *Anatolia* I (1993), 135–6; for the Pontic fleet see D. French, *Classis Pontica. Epigr. Anatolica* 4, 1984, 53–60; M. Speidel/D. French, *Epigr. Anatolica*, 6, 1985, 97–102 on Pontic-Bithynian units operating in the Crimean Bosporus; on the Bithynian garrison see M. Speidel, *Epigr. Anatolica* 4, 1984, 151–8; 5, 1985, 89–96; 7, 1986, 35–6.

On the other hand Marek makes handsome amends by publishing with detailed commentary a new inscription from the territory of Hadrianopolis, which gives in verse the life history of a farmer, recruited into an auxiliary unit under Trajan, who returned to the land after retirement (p. 100–116). It deserves to be adopted as an exemplary document in source collections on the Roman army. Marek infers that the soldier Priscus had performed heroic deeds on the battlefield in the emperor's presence from the verses which describe how he had accomplished contests *(athla)* equal to those of Achilles and Hector, and that Trajan, amazed at his prowess and qualities, himself rewarded him, as victor of these contests, with a high post. But Marek rightly concedes that the vocabulary of the poem is as readily applicable to a quasi-sporting competition as to a battlefield. Since there is no specific information in the epigram about the enemy against whom Priscus carried out his exploits, it may be that Priscus had won his spurs in a military tournament staged before the emperor (as suggested to Marek by Speidel *op. cit.* 107 n. 76). One may not only compare the Batavian who

won Hadrian's admiration by swimming the Danube in full armour (*ILS* 2558 with Dio 69, 9) but also the career of the Moorish general Lusius Quietus, a member of a Moorish cavalry unit, noted for outstanding horsemanship, who attracted Trajan's attention by his great deeds (Dio 68, 32, 4; cf. R. W. Davies, *Service in the Roman Army* [1989] 71–90).

Marek has paid less attention to the evidence of the Bithynian areas adjoining Paphlagonia to the west than he has to Pontus. The creation in 6/5 B.C. of the community called the *Kaisareis Proseilemmenitai* (whose name is convincingly elucidated by analogy with the western practice of *attributio;* see further K. Strobel in: E. Schwertheim (ed.), *Forschungen in Galatien. Asia Minor Stud.* 1 [1994] 59–60) is part of a pattern suggested by two other neighbouring Augustan foundations: Juliopolis (located correctly by D. H. French at Eskişehir on the Aladağ Çay despite Marek's note p. 58 n. 407), and the city of the Agrippenses, probably located at Creteia (later Flaviopolis), from which we now have an inscribed decree, published by R. Merkelbach, *Epigr. Anatolica* 3, 1984, 137–40. The recent discovery by Th. Corsten of the site of the western Bithynian city of Caisareia Germanice near Yaylacık Köy also allows more to be said about developments in this area (*Epigr. Anatolica* 15, 1990, 19–48; mentioned but not discussed by Marek, p. 59 n. 408). In the table on p. 60 its foundation is tentatively assigned to 16–12 B. C., but on p. 58 n. 408 a date late in Augustus' principate is suggested, since the city is not mentioned by Strabo. R. Syme, *Anatolica* 356–67 may now be cited to demonstrate the precariousness of such arguments from Strabo' silence. We cannot rule out a thorough early Imperial reorganisation of provincial territory in Bithynia, subsequent to the foundation of cities in north Galatia between 25 and 20 B.C. (W. Leschhorn, *Chiron* 22, 1992, 315–36), perhaps initiated by Agrippa.

The first two sections of the fifth chapter, concerned with the internal development of Paphlagonia, contain more analysis of provincial arrangements. There is a useful detailed discussion of the problems connected with the various *koina* of Pontus, including the illuminating proposal that the communities belonging to these *koina* coincided with the territorial extent of Roman *provinciae* or *eparchiai*. Thus in northern Asia Minor there were *koina* of Bithynia, Paphlagonia, Pontus Galaticus, Pontus Polemonianus, and Armenia Minor. In eastern Anatolia the *eparchiai* are not to be understood as the entire sphere of command of a provincial governor (that is provinces as defined by modern scholarship) but as regions, usually including several city territories, within those provinces. Marek's arguments clearly show that my proposal in *Anatolia* I (1993) 91–2 to identify these *eparchiai* with pre-Roman *hyparchiai* is wrong. The original use of this terminology was clearly not initiated in or restricted to the Pontus. It occurs in the *Lex de provinciis praetoriis* of 100 B.C. (text and bibliography now in W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Knidos* I [1992] [IK 41] no. 31: Knidos col. III 25 *(eparcheia Lykaonia)* and col. IV 11–12 *[Chersonesos* and *Kainike]*) and *eparchiai* were recognised divisions of late republican and early imperial Asia (see T. Drew Bear/C. Naour, *ANRW* II 18, 3 [1990] 1974–7). Some light is thrown on their relevance to provincial organisation by Cicero's *Pro Flacco*, 32. Cicero defends Flaccus, propraetor of Asia in 61 B.C., against the charge that he had practised illegal extortion on the pretext that the money was needed to pay for a fleet, as follows: *Dimidium eius quo Pompeius erat usus imperavit; num potuit parcius? Discripsit autem pecuniam ad Pompei rationem, quae fuit accommodata L. Sullae discriptioni. Qui cum omnis Asiae civitates pro portione in provincias discripsisset, illam rationem in imperando sumptu et Pompeius et Flaccus secutus est.* Editors have tended to follow Lambinus emendation to *Qui cum in omnis Asiae civitates pro portione pecuniam discripsisset,* but there is no warrant for this violent alteration and the *provinciae* of the original are clearly to be understood as *eparchiai* in the sense identified and expounded by Marek. They were not a novelty devised for the organisation of Pompeian or Julio-Claudian Pontus, but were integral to the structure of the province of Asia both at the time of Sulla's reorganisation of 85 B.C. and earlier.

Marek has confined his enquiries to a relatively narrow period, not extending beyond A. D. 200, and has posed questions with a clearly delimited historical focus: "Mein Vorhaben beschränkt sich auf Elemente einer historischen Landeskunde: darauf, den Prozeß der politischen Ordnung des Raumes und sein chronologisches Gerüst zu untersuchen sowie Aspekte der sozialen, kulturellen und wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung aufzuhellen, die von diesem Prozeß bedingt sind" (p. 1). He has, however, also collected a mass of evidence, old and new, which will be integral to any future study of north-central Anatolia.

A new Glycon sculpture from the Museum at Amasra (Taf. 29,4) is an addition to the dossier on the much discussed cult at Abonuteichos. Marek summarises recent work on Lucian's Alexander (p. 83–4; overlooking R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* [1985] 241–50). He has morover, definitively dated the inscription

from Amastris which mentions the *legatus Augusti pro pr.* L. Lollianus Avitus, to A. D. 159 (p. 82–8, confirmed in *Epigr. Anatolica* 23, 1994, 83–6). This not only shows that Pontus and Bithynia became an Imperial province under Antoninus Pius, but also fixes the historical moment at which Lucian escaped from the murderous clutches of Glycon's prophet Alexander and was restrained from bringing a charge against him by the same Avitus.

The many new inscriptions should also attract detailed examination. S. Durugönül, *Epigr. Anatolica* 21, 1993, 61–69, has set the ball rolling with a fascinating commentary on the grave stele chosen by Marek as his cover illustration (Pompeiopolis Kat. Nr. 51), which depicts a naked couple identified as brother and sister, and can be interpreted as evidence for brother-sister marriage in Paphlagonia in the 3rd century A. D. As ever local cults and onomastic evidence, for which the inscriptions contain much new evidence, provide the obvious starting points for a reappraisal of Paphlagonian regional culture. Marek's own contributions, based on a unique knowledge of the terrain, will be most eagerly awaited. Beyond that there is a larger project demanding attention, a study of the resources and cultures of the regions north and south of the Black Sea which formed the power base of Rome's most resilient and effective challenger in the first century B. C., Mithridates VI. The Pontic lands, in the most vibrant and best documented period of their history, still await their historian.

Swansea Stephen Mitchell