

## **The Romanization of the Greek elite in Achaia, Asia and Bithynia: Greek Resistance or Regional Discrepancies?<sup>1</sup>**

One of the most accepted views in the study of Romanization is the idea that the population in the provinces of the Greek mainland, on the west coast of *Asia Minor* and in the Greek colonies in Bithynia did not adopt Roman culture in any significant way.<sup>2</sup> The continued use of Greek as the governmental and epigraphic language, the supposed limited presence of Roman architecture, as well as the criticism of the Roman presence in Greek communities on the part of Greek intellectuals have been taken as firm indicators of a general anti-Roman sentiment among the Greek population. In response to this view, the present article will argue that the differences in the way the Greek and western provinces interacted with Roman culture are to be regarded as originating in regional discrepancies in urbanization and in the general stages of development rather than a symptom of Greek scepticism and a particularly strong pro-Roman sentiment in the western provinces. It is the argument in this paper that even though deeply rooted in the Greek culture, members of the local elite in the Greek Provinces were just as open to the influence of Roman culture and the Roman way of life as the local elite in the western provinces. However, the outcome of the Greek interaction with Roman culture took a different form than in the west, where it was the Romans who brought urbanization and monumental as well as epigraphic habit into the Iron Age communities in Gaul and Britannia. In Spain and Africa, where a pre-Roman urbanism under the Greek and Phoenician influence had already taken on, the urbanization continued driven by an extensive colonization and re-colonization, where new and old cities were either constructed *ex novo* or at the time of Augustus transformed towards the Roman civic structure. By this profound

---

<sup>1</sup> I will like to thank Pia Guldager-Bilde, Eckart Olshausen, Jesper Carlsen, Lise Hannestad, Vladimir Stolba, Jakob Munk Højte, George Hinge and Jane Hjarl Petersen for having read and commented on earlier drafts of this paper. I would also like to express my most sincere gratitude to Tønnes Bekker-Nielsen who at several occasions has been kind enough to discuss and read various ideas and versions. I am of course the only one responsible.

<sup>2</sup> The Roman provinces in Achaia, Asia and Bithynia will for the sake of convenience be termed the Greek provinces. In this paper, the provinces of Central Anatolia, Syria, Cyprus and Aegyptus are not included in this term. Here the governmental and epigraphic language was Greek and Greek culture, promoted by Hellenistic kings, did influence especially the upper levels of society. When these provinces are not included here it is because the present study seeks to investigate how the elite in a society deeply rooted within the classical Greek period responded to the cultural pressure from Rome.

urbanization Rome marked the western provinces in a much more materialistic and recognisable way than in the Greek provinces.

The issue of Romanization has received much scholarly attention during the last 120 years. Therefore, this article will begin by discussing some of the contributions that have had the greatest influence on today's understanding of how, why and to what extent Roman culture was integrated in the eastern and western provinces.

Theodor Mommsen was the first to discuss the adoption of Roman culture in the conquered areas. According to this German scholar, the process of cultural adoption throughout the western part of the empire was a natural result of the superior position held by Roman culture over virtually any western Iron Age civilisation. The leaders in the Iron Age communities were therefore more than happy to replace their less advanced culture with Roman civilisation, which was based on law and order. To Mommsen, the Romanization of the provinces was a conceptualised and a one-way process whereby the conquered people initiated a complete adoption of the Roman way of life; and saw Romanization as a creation of a unified way of being Roman.<sup>3</sup>

Mommsen's idea of Romanization, rooted as it was in the nationalistic and romantic movements of nineteenth-century Germany, was first challenged by Francis Haverfield, who, in his study of the Romanization of Britain, underlined the considerable cultural differences between Roman Britain and Roman Gaul. Thus, the cultural interaction between Rome and her subjects did not lead to the same result in Britain as in Gaul, Spain, Africa or the eastern provinces.<sup>4</sup> The idea of regional differences in respect to how the provinces adopted Roman culture marked the beginning of a new understanding of the cultural assimilation that took place between Rome and her subjects.<sup>5</sup> Despite their different ideas on the provincial adoption of the Roman way of life, Haverfield only departed to a degree from Mommsen's view of Romanization; like Mommsen, Haverfield saw the Roman Empire as a sort of garden based on law and order surrounded by a chaotic barbaric world. "The Roman Empire

---

<sup>3</sup> T. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, V. 5 (Berlin 1885 reprinted 1929) 1-6; 225-227.

<sup>4</sup> F. Haverfield, *The Romanization of Roman Britain* (London 1923) 12.

<sup>5</sup> The idea of the Roman Empire as a closed territory created to keep out wild tribes of barbarians has been modified by studies of the Roman *limes*. It has been proven that the *limes* were moved from time to time and that the people outside the empire crossed the *limes* into the empire to trade and for other purposes. Romanization therefore surpassed the *limes*, and different tribes took part in everyday life within the empire. See C. R. Whittaker, *Frontiers of the Roman Empire. A social and economic study*, (London 1994).

was the civilised world; the safety of Rome was the safety of all civilisations. Outside roared the wild chaos of barbarism.”<sup>6</sup>

Also Michael Rostovtzeff saw Romanization as a result of a “natural attraction of a higher form of life offered by a dominant state and nation”<sup>7</sup>, and the provincials’ adoption of Roman culture as therefore both “natural” and voluntary. According to Rostovtzeff, Romanization was for the most part an unproblematic process with a large amount of flexibility, which is clearly seen in Rome’s civilisation of the non-Hellenised areas in the east such as central Asia Minor and the Black Sea coast, which Rome tried to Hellenise in a more Greek form.<sup>8</sup>

Romanization is by Mommsen, Haverfield and Rostovtzeff, generally seen as a process of assimilation where the provincial population in the western provinces gave up central element of their own cultural pattern in order to replace them with aspect of Roman culture and thereby to present themselves as Roman. This view has been challenged by the British historian R. G. Collingwood, who, in his study of Roman Britain, questioned the idea of Romanization as a matter of assimilation and saw Romanization as a process leading to a cultural fusion or mixture between the Roman and the provincial societies.<sup>9</sup>

To see Romanization not as a process of assimilation but mere as a process of acculturation was tried by the Austrian-Hungarian M. E. Swoboda that in his article “Zur Frage der Romanisierung” argued that being Romanized not necessarily implied a knowledge of Latin.<sup>10</sup> Swoboda questions the idea of Rome’s education and civilization of the younger members of the local elite through schools in the local communities, as has been generalised from the passage in Tacitus’ *Agricola* (21). Instead, Swoboda argues that no schools appear in neither the literary nor epigraphic sources in *Pannonia Superior*; his area of study.<sup>11</sup>

Instead, Romanization is by Swoboda understood as a transformation, where Roman political structure, economy and administration together with a desire

---

<sup>6</sup> F. Haverfield, *Romanization* (as in n.4) 11.

<sup>7</sup> M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1957) 131-149; see also M. Rostovtzeff, *Rome* (Oxford 1927) 215.

<sup>8</sup> M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman World* (Oxford 1957) 1020; *Rome* (as in n.7) 215.

<sup>9</sup> R. G. Collingwood, *Roman Britain* (Oxford 1934) 91-92.

<sup>10</sup> M. E. Swoboda, “Zur Frage der Romanisierung,” in *Anzeiger Der Österreichischen Akademie Der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse* 100 (1963) 159-160.

<sup>11</sup> M. E. Swoboda, *Zur Frage* (As in n. 10) 1963, 162.

to create a civic structure within the order of *civitas romana* was adopted by the local elite in the native communities.<sup>12</sup>

An alternative view of Romanization developed as a post-war, post-colonial reaction to the idea of the provincials' "natural" adoption of the Roman culture. Romanization was instead seen as a deliberate Roman policy with the aim of leading or forcing the conquered people to take on the Roman way of life.<sup>13</sup> This view of native resistance to Rome has also found its way into the study of Roman Britain, where Romanization was seen as a surface gloss on a largely unchanged Celtic culture. According to this perspective on Romanization, the British pragmatically used Roman symbols in public while the majority of the British population remained Celtic in private.<sup>14</sup>

The different views of how Roman culture came to influence the conquered areas depend largely on the definition of Romanization. There is no generally accepted definition of the term Romanization, and therefore it is necessary to discuss the question of its potential meaning.

### **A matter of definition**

Haverfield defined Romanization as a gradual process of cultural interaction between the Roman and native cultures whereby the local population adopted Latin or Roman manners, norms, political and economical customs, and material culture, which then merged with their native culture.<sup>15</sup> According to Haverfield, Romanization is a question of behaviour. Members of the provincial population had to behave in certain, though not necessarily identical, ways to be recognised as Romans and thereby as Romanized. With Haverfield's contribution, studying patterns of behaviour within the provincial population has become the method by which cultural interaction and the adoption of Roman culture are measured, and thereby the backbone of how we understand and define Romanization today.

Romanization as a matter of behaviour is also the important criterion when W. Harris, in his study of the Romanization of central Italy, defines Romanization as "the process by which the inhabitants come to be, and to think of themselves as

---

<sup>12</sup> M. E. Swoboda, *Zur Frage* (As in n. 10) 1963, 172.

<sup>13</sup> For a pioneering study, see M. Bénabou, *La résistance africaine à la romanisation* (Paris 1976).

<sup>14</sup> J. Webster, "Creolizing the Roman Provinces," in *American Journal of Archaeology* 105 (2001) 212.

<sup>15</sup> F. Haverfield, *Romanization* (As in n.2) 22.

Romans.”<sup>16</sup> But defining Romanization and Roman culture according to a certain pattern of behaviour and to the individuals’ own self-recognition poses the problem of how to define Roman culture.<sup>17</sup> Although Harris’s definition seems to be straightforward, it leaves us with the questions of what it means to be Roman and consequently how we are to recognise the adoption of Roman culture. One way of defining Roman culture is the one chosen by G. Woolf, who in his study of Roman Gaul defines Roman culture as “a range of objects, beliefs and practices that were characteristic of people who considered themselves to be, and were widely acknowledged as, Roman.”<sup>18</sup> This very broad definition follows the ideas of Jonathan Hall, who, in his studies on ethnic identity in ancient Greece, holds self-identity and the individual’s ability to relate to a common myth of origin as the most essential criteria in a community’s definition of its own ethnic identity.<sup>19</sup> According to Hall, ethnic identity is not based upon objective criteria, but rather primarily upon a subjective literary invention of tradition independent of material, linguistic, and religious realities.<sup>20</sup>

The invention of tradition played a role also in Roman self-understanding, such as when the myth of Romulus and Remus and the myth of Aeneas and the fall of Troy were combined at a time when the political situation made a Trojan origin essential for the Romans in their effort to present themselves with a more respectable past and to obtain allies from cities with a Trojan descent. One example is the First Punic War in 263 BC, when the Sicilian town of Segesta became Rome’s ally.<sup>21</sup> Roman families did also attach themselves to gods or semi-gods, as in the case of Julius and Anton. But there is a difference in how Greeks and Romans related myth of origin and identity: one did not need a Trojan decent nor even a Latin to be accepted

---

<sup>16</sup> W. Harris, *Rome in Etruria and Umbria* (Oxford 1971) 147.

<sup>17</sup> Jane Webster provides an alternative to the term Romanization, arguing against Romanization as a meaningful term to describe the cultural interaction that took place between Roman and native cultures. Instead, Webster proposes the term creolization, defined as a term that has been used for a multicultural adjustment J. Webster, *Creolizing* (as in n.14) 217. Whether J. Webster’s use of the term Creolization presents a new angle is doubtful, and it should be recalled that already in 1923 F. Haverfield argued that Romanization was not uniform. See F. Haverfield, *Romanization* (As in n.3) 2.

<sup>18</sup> G. Woolf, *Becoming Roman. The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul* (Cambridge 1998) 11.

<sup>19</sup> J. Hall, *Hellenicity* (Chicago 2002) and J. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek antiquity* (Cambridge 1997) 16.

<sup>20</sup> J. Hall, *Ethnic Identity* (As in n.19) 24. See also E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger, eds., *The Invention of tradition* (Cambridge 1983), which discusses the creation and meaning of tradition within the British Empire, concluding that traditions were for the most part invented to create a link to the past, as shown by H. Trevor-Roper’s example of the traditional Highlander kilt, which was originally English 28-29.

<sup>21</sup> T. J. Cornell, *The Beginnings of Rome* (London 1995) 65.

and characterised as Roman. People in the provinces could therefore claim the same origin as Romans originated from the city of Rome.

Woolf assumes that artefacts, architecture, and material culture as such play an important role in cultural identity. According to Woolf, Romans identified with their surrounding material culture much more than the Greeks.<sup>22</sup> Special types of ceramics and other imported goods, public *thermae* facilities with hot water baths<sup>23</sup> and gladiator games, were typical examples of Romanization and contributed to creating a new cultural identity.<sup>24</sup>

When defining Romanization scholars have worked within two traditions: cultural identity has been defined either as a matter of how the individual conceived his own identity (Harris and Hall) or, alternatively, as a matter of behaviour (Woolf).

According to Woolf's definition of Roman culture and how to be Roman, it was not sufficient for a member of a conquered community to consider himself Roman; he also had to behave in a certain way to be recognised as such, unlike the population in Rome, which was Roman by origin.

The majority of scholars have defined Roman behaviour in terms of whether the concerned people had knowledge of Latin and Classic Greek literature,<sup>25</sup> wore certain cloths, furnished their homes with artefacts, acknowledged themselves as Roman, consumed certain kinds of food, and built their private houses in the Roman architectonic style.<sup>26</sup> Alternatively, it was a question of participating in the Roman form of political life as magistrates or members of the local *ordo decurionum*, by means of which members of the local elite stated their positions by financing the construction of all sorts of Roman-style buildings such as temples, baths, *basilicae*, *fora* and theatres or by sponsoring religious festivals.<sup>27</sup>

The importance of artefacts and behaviour patterns in Woolf's study of Gallic Romanization is due to the lack of literary sources available on the Gallic population's view of its own identity, whereas regarding the Greek area, Hall has a

---

<sup>22</sup> G. Woolf, "Becoming Roman, Staying Greek. Culture, identity and the civilizing process in the Roman East." in *PCPhS* 40 (1994): 130.

<sup>23</sup> Inge Nielsen, *Thermae et Balnea. The architecture and cultural history of Roman public baths.* (Aarhus 1990). 6-9.

<sup>24</sup> G. Woolf, *Staying Greek* (as in n.22) 127.

<sup>25</sup> Haverfield, *Romanization* (as in n.4) 29-32; P. A. Brunt, "The Romanization of the local ruling classes in the Roman empire" in P. A. Brunt, *Roman Imperial Themes*, (Oxford 1990) 268; G. Woolf *Becoming Roman* (As in n.18) 72-3.

<sup>26</sup> Haverfield, *Romanization* (London 1923) 44.

<sup>27</sup> M. Millett, *The Romanization of Britain* (Cambridge 1990) 80; G. Woolf, *Becoming Roman* (As in n.18) 126-7; R. MacMullen, *Romanization in the Time of Augustus* (New Haven 2000) 16-22.

larger amount of source material and therefore a better foundation for defining cultural identity based on a literary tradition.

When using the number of Latin inscriptions, Roman-style buildings, pieces of Roman art, and the amount of Roman or Italian artefacts in the provinces as criteria for measuring the degree of cultural interaction between Rome and her subjects, the unavoidable conclusion is reached that mostly members of the locale elite interacted with Romans and adopted elements of Roman culture into their everyday life and that Romanization was merely an upper-class phenomenon. To appear in public was a matter of resources. Only the rich could afford to send their sons off to schools to learn Latin and read literature, to cost inscriptions to promote themselves or their families, or to sponsor public buildings and festivals, and it therefore indicated their desire to present themselves as and be considered Roman. The average person did not have the means to sponsor or receive inscriptions or sponsor buildings or festivals, and we therefore know very little of how the major part of the provincials reacted to Roman culture. Individuals outside the elite are assumed to have been indifferent to whether a local aristocracy, Greeks, Romans or Hellenistic kings ruled them.<sup>28</sup>

Turning to studies of the Hellenistic empires in the east, one of the extreme views is that only a limited part of a native population in the colonies founded by Alexander the Great and his successors was ever in contact with Greece and Macedonia. In his study of the Seleucid Kingdom, E. J. Bickerman argues that Hellenistic culture was a ruler's culture that never interacted with society in general. According to Bickerman "Hellenization demanded no conversion or transformation, only the ability to speak the Greek language and the desire to think in it... and (therefore) did remain superficial".<sup>29</sup> The Greeks and natives only met in connection with governmental matters. Greeks did not have to learn the vernacular, and according to Bickerman most natives never learned any Greek. What Greek domination did was form a middle class of locals who had learned Greek for administrative reasons and who thereby separated themselves from the rest of the population.<sup>30</sup> Hellenism only brought about cultural change if promoted by the rulers who had liberated themselves

---

<sup>28</sup> R. MacMullen, "Notes on Romanization", in R. MacMullen, *Changes in the Roman Empire. Essays in the Ordinary* (Princeton 1990) 60-62; G. Shipley, *The Greek World after Alexander*, (London 2000), 321-2.

<sup>29</sup> E. J. Bickerman, "The Seleucids and the Achaemenids", in E. J. Bickerman, *Religions and Politics in the Hellenistic and Roman periods* (Como 1985), p. 507. On old Near Eastern languages in the local administration, see G. Shipley, *The Greek World after Alexander 323-30 B.C.* (London 2000) 295.

<sup>30</sup> E. J. Bickerman, *Seleucids* (As in n.23) 507.

from Macedonian control, but by maintaining the Greek cities and their aristocracy and administrative form, Hellenistic kings prevented their states from dissolving in the struggle for power between different empires, kings and satraps in the east.<sup>31</sup> But even though different Seleucid kings needed the Greek administration, Greek cities remained enclaves with a limited cultural influence on the surrounding native tribes.<sup>32</sup>

It is possible that the majority of the population in Asia Minor did not concern themselves with ethnic identity or whether they were ruled by a Greek, Hellenistic or Roman power. It is also likely that they generally did not try to imitate the new rulers because they were not interested in doing so, did not have the means to do so, or had no visible role model to imitate. However, it seems credible that Hellenistic culture was not confined to the Greek elite in the Greek cities. As the many private initiatives to promote Greek culture in non-Greek communities illustrates, Hellenism was not exclusively for the Greek elite but was shared by the non-Greek elite in the various Hellenistic kingdoms.<sup>33</sup> But how did the local elite in Greek provinces respond to the cultural pressure from Rome? Did the Greek or Hellenised elites interact culturally with the Romans or did they try to resist the cultural pressure from the new Mediterranean superpower?

The most obvious ways to determine how provincials in general responded to Roman culture is to study how individuals behaved in their public and private appearance and what the literary and epigraphic sources state about cultural relations. In contrast to material culture, where the availability of goods and their degree of penetration might say more about what products could be supplied rather than what was preferred, behaviour and statements about cultural affiliation are a far better indicator of how individuals and communities presented themselves and wished to be conceived by others.

In addition, if a provincial chose to present himself as Roman either through an explicit statement or by using a Latin name, a Roman motif on gravestone reliefs or Roman architecture and ornamentation in private houses and villas, we must assume that he chose to present himself as Roman and was also seen that way by his fellow citizens. The same does not apply to artefacts: individuals might not have

---

<sup>31</sup> E. J. Bickerman, *Seleucids* (As in n.23) 507-8.

<sup>32</sup> E. J. Bickerman, *Seleucids* (As in n.23) 518.

<sup>33</sup> G. Shipley, *The Greek world* (As in n.29) 270. For a relatively more optimistic view on the cultural interaction between members of the Greek and native elite, see also S. Sherwin-White & A. Kuhrt, *From Samarkhand to Sardis; A new approach to the Seleucid Empire* (London 1993) 179.

related the use of different Roman artefacts to specific cultural relations, but rather they might have used them simply because they were available, of a higher quality, or more convenient than the products that could traditionally be obtained on the local market.<sup>34</sup>

Therefore, in this article Romanization is defined as a cultural influence from Rome on the native culture, whereby provincials responded by adopting elements of Roman public and private customs in order to present themselves, either through statements or actions, and be recognised as Roman. The provincials' attempt to be recognised as Roman forced them to imitate and behave in a certain way in order to succeed, and it is this effort that we are able to trace today.<sup>35</sup>

There are, of course, a lot of silent provincials whose cultural affiliation we cannot see today yet who felt Roman, spoke some sort of Latin, spent time in theatres of different kinds, visited public baths, participated in politics, and celebrated various Roman festivals. We therefore have to consider the examples we have while bearing in mind that among the silent there was also a group that was not Roman and therefore even more difficult to distinguish.

When discussing Romanization in the Greek and Hellenised areas it should be noted that Hellenistic culture had a considerable influence on Roman culture. In light of this cultural interaction it can be argued that Roman culture was related to Hellenistic culture to such a degree that Rome was unlikely to have culturally affected the Greek population.<sup>36</sup> Even though Greek culture influenced the monumental habit as well as art and literature in Rome, and Rome may have introduced a Greek form of Hellenism in the less Hellenised areas of the eastern provinces, Roman culture was different from the culture on the Greek mainland and the west coast of Asia Minor. Roman culture evolved under the influence of several different cultures – Latin, Etruscan and Greek – but was at the same time an individual culture, with particular religious, social and political practises and with a particular architectonic, artistic and material form of cultural expression.

---

<sup>34</sup> G. Woolf, *Staying Greek* (As in n.22.) 129-31.

<sup>35</sup> A different approach is the one chosen by MacMullen in *Romanization* (As in n.27) p. xi, namely not to define Romanization at all but only relating to the new things, issues and thought appearing in the provinces due to the coming of Rome. By not defining what we mean by Romanization, we easily come to the point, where all kind of Roman like behaviour can be seen as a matter of adaptation to the Roman way of leaving and the term thereby risks to loose its meaning.

<sup>36</sup> R. MacMullen, *Romanization*, (As in n.27) 1-4.

Therefore, when an element from the Roman form of cultural expression appears and is integrated within the local culture, especially when promoted by the local elite on the Greek mainland or in Asia Minor, it is an example of a reaction to the cultural influence from Rome and possibly an example of Romanization.

But what drove the process of cultural assimilation and Romanization forward? Why was it so attractive to adopt a Roman way of life, as indicated by the considerable effort among provincials to appear Roman.

### **Romanization and its underlying motives**

The driving force behind the cultural interaction between Rome and people in the provinces has its origin in the centre of the Roman Empire as well as the periphery. From the Roman point of view, it was essential to create and maintain good relations with the provincial aristocracy. Only by doing so could the Roman form of provincial administration succeed. As is generally agreed, the Roman Empire was largely governed through the local elite, who formed the governing class in the area prior to the Roman conquest. This arrangement allowed the Romans to keep supreme power while leaving everyday problems to a local administration and consequently to run the empire with a limited number of officials and military personal.<sup>37</sup>

Rome gave the local elite a working model that they could imitate.<sup>38</sup> If we are to believe Tacitus's account of Agricola's procedure in *Britannia* and at least consider it as not uncommon for other governors, the Roman officials assisted members of the local elite and encouraged them to build public buildings and private houses in a Roman style and to teach their sons Latin and rhetoric for the purpose of making their subjects more civilised and accustomed to peace and order (Tacitus Agricola 21).

After having conquered the province and stabilised it militarily, Rome was met with a set of obstacles such as language and cultural barriers that had to be surmounted to secure peace and stability. In contrast to later empires, the Roman government could not rely on a military solution alone to suppress the anger of the conquered people, which would be an effort far beyond the means of the Roman army.<sup>39</sup> There were several ways in which Rome could suppress resistance: by moving a people into city of Rome as Livy described happened to the Sabinians after

---

<sup>37</sup> M. Millett, *Romanization* (As in n.27.) 8.

<sup>38</sup> P. A. Brunt, *Romanization* (As in n.25.) 268.

<sup>39</sup> T. Bekker-Nielsen, "Kelternes Indtræden i Verdenshistorien. Romaniseringen af det nordvestlige Europa, 58 f.Kr.- 70 e.Kr.," in *Piranesi* (1983) 51-52.

they lost against the Romans or by taking members of the local elite as hostages, as in the case of Polybius. A different way to overtake and pacify a conquered population and encourage Romanization was by transferring Roman and Italian colonists to the area; however, as pointed out by M. Bénabou, among others, this policy could be met by resistance from the local population.<sup>40</sup>

However, the best way to promote peace and stability in the long run must have been the method described in Tacitus's *Agricola*, wherein the Britons began to imitate the Romans to a degree that made them similar regarding their norms and values. That members of the local elite eventually shared the political beliefs of the old Roman aristocracy is further illustrated by the fact that senators, magistrates and emperors of provincial origin never questioned any of the privileges obtained by Italian individuals, such as when immunity from all the heavy taxes was enjoyed in Italy until the beginning of the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD.<sup>41</sup> However it must be remembered that the provincial elite when coming to Rome was forced to obtain expensive Italian land, and in spite of its strong ties with its home country, it also had financial motives for keeping the taxation system as it was.

Rome saw one of her essential roles as civilizer of barbarians. Several commentators, especially from the imperial period, point out that the Roman people had an obligation to bring civilisation and Roman virtues such as *humanitas*, *mores* and *dignitas* to the barbaric peoples.<sup>42</sup> To Pliny the Elder and Strabo, *humanitas* meant giving up warfare against the Romans and concentrating on establishing a society founded on laws and agriculture.<sup>43</sup> It was the Romans who gave the conquered areas norms and values and thereby civilisation and the ability to reach their full potential as human beings, an idea clearly expressed by Pliny the Elder in a very important passage:

I am well aware that I may with justice be considered ungrateful and lazy if I describe in this casual and cursory manner a land which is at once the nursling and the mother of all other lands, chosen by the providence of the gods to make heaven itself more glorious, to unite scattered empires, to make manners gentle, to draw together in converse by community of language the jarring and uncouth tongues of so many nations, to give

---

<sup>40</sup> M. Bénabou, *La résistance* (As in n.13.) 30.

<sup>41</sup> P. A. Brunt, *Romanization* (As in n.25.) 274.

<sup>42</sup> Cicero, *Ad Quintum fratrem* 1.1.27-8; Virgil, *Aeneid* 6.851-3; Tacitus, *Agricola* 21. See also G. Woolf, *Becoming Roman* (As in n.18.) 54-60.

<sup>43</sup> Pliny, *NH* 3.4 and Strabo, *Geografica* 4.1.5.

mankind civilisation, and in word to become throughout the world the single fatherland of all the races.<sup>44</sup>

Nec ignoro ingrati ac segnis animi existimari posse merito si obiter atque in transcurso ad hunc modum dicatur terra omnium terrarum alumna eadem et parens, numine deum electa quae caelum ipsum clarius faceret, sparsa congregaret imperia ritusque molliret et tot populorum discordes ferasque linguas sermonis commercio contraheret ad colloquia et humanitatem homini daret, breviterque una cunctarum gentium in toto orbe patria fieret.

Pliny is not alone in this view, but draws on earlier thoughts from at least the beginning of the imperial period, when Virgil writes in his *Aeneid* that the purpose of Roman existence was to rule and impose morality on the people it conquered.<sup>45</sup> Rome's idea of *humanitas* has been seen as a way to legitimise its imperial activities and position as a civilising culture, which justified its historic role as the culture that disseminated the civilisation initiated by the Greeks.<sup>46</sup>

Whereas the Romans were concerned with peace and order in the provinces and sought to motivate especially the local leaders to integrate the Roman way of life as much as possible, people in the provinces had their own motives for interacting with Roman culture depending on their place in society.

The provincial elite in the west as well as in the east received Roman citizenship as a reward for their civil service<sup>47</sup> and obtained the juridical and economic privileges that accompanied this. Roman citizenship removed the distinction between rulers and subjects,<sup>48</sup> and the leaders of the newly conquered peoples were now members of the imperial elite and could transform former subjects into rulers. Interaction with the Romans was primarily related to power.

Romanization means adopting the rulers culture. When people in the provinces met Romans, they often met individuals in powerful positions: proconsuls or propraetors, *legati*, colonists, members of the army or members of the *familia caesaris*, which were Roman representatives with considerable influence in the local

---

<sup>44</sup> Pliny the Elder, *NH* 3.39.

<sup>45</sup> Virgil, *Aeneid* 6.851-3.

<sup>46</sup> A. Wallace-Hadrill, "Mutatio Morum: the Idea of a Cultural Revolution", in T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro, (Cambridge 1988) 8-10; G. Woolf, *Staying Greek* (As in n.22.) and G. Woolf, *Becoming Roman* (As in n.18.) 57-8. However, the idea of Rome as a nation that civilised the Iron Age community might be a view primarily held by Rome's upper class and more easily followed by historians of colonial powers in twentieth-century Europe than by the inhabitants in ancient Rome.

<sup>47</sup> A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford 1973) 337.

<sup>48</sup> P. A. Brunt, *Romanization* (As in n.25.) 273.

community. If members of the local elite wanted to keep their old position in the decentralised and locally based provincial administration, or to use the coming of a new dominant power to gain a better position in society, imitating or assimilating the Roman magistrates or other influential Romans must have been the wise thing to do. The local governing class throughout the empire imitated the Roman way of public appearance by being politically active in the Roman administration, constructing public and private houses in a Roman style, or sponsoring Roman festivals for gods or emperors, such as in 1 AD when Apollonios, son of Kertimmos from Kalindoia in Macedonia was honoured for sponsoring a statue and sacrificing an oxen to Augustus.<sup>49</sup> The contribution of the local elite to the construction of public buildings is evident in the building program in Pompeii in the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD, when members of the most influential families constructed temples that celebrated the Emperor and his family on and around the *forum*, temples that were connected both to the imperial building program in Rome and the imperial cult.<sup>50</sup>

Within the Empire we find a series of power relations between Rome and the provinces, and between different tribes and different cities in the provinces, which were often artificially divided to simplify the Roman administration. We also find power relations between members of the local elite and between the elite and the lower level of society. By imitating the Roman elite and participating in public life, the local elite was able to create a patron-client relationship with members of the Roman aristocracy and thereby improve their chances of upholding the right to govern their local societies as well as maintain their status and prestige in their home area. With good relations to the Roman officials, members of the local elite also made it possible to participate in political activities in Rome and thereby join the ultimate level of imperial society. Even though only a few members of the provincial elite ever became praetors or consuls, they still became members of an exclusive society with special rights and a sense of belonging to the imperial ruling class.

The coming of Rome did not mean that average provincials moved any closer to a place in the governing institution. Their way to Roman citizenship generally went

---

<sup>49</sup> SEG no. 35.744. See also F. Millar, "The Greek City in the Roman Period", in M. H. Hansen. *The Ancient Greek City-State* (Copenhagen 1993) 248-9. The same held true in the West, where members of the local elite took active part in honouring and celebrating Emperors; see G. Woolf (As in n.18.) 215-7. The fact that not just *Augustales* but also local aristocrats held priesthoods in the imperial cult indicates the prestige of the highest priesthoods in the cult.

<sup>50</sup> P. Zanker, *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder* (München 1987), pp. 312-19; P. Zanker, *Pompeji. Statbild und Wohngeschmack* (Mainz 1995) 86-110.

through long military service in the *auxilia*, a career choice that was a lot more common in the west than in the Greek provinces. Their motivation was social mobility, and through Roman citizenship their sons could join the Roman legions with better salaries and supplies and further possibilities for social mobility.

The urbanisation and infrastructure introduced by the Romans were an additional motivating factor among provincials of all social groups to live according to Roman fashion. Even though the Greek provinces had achieved a high level of urbanisation prior to the Roman conquest, the coming of Rome was also followed by the construction of better infrastructure here: roads, bath buildings, aqueducts, reconstructions of in particular temples and to a lesser extent amphitheatres – buildings that all had the purpose of improving everyday life in the cities.

However, it was more than just a desire for a more “civilised” life with better housing, a more pleasant town life, Latin letters, or the consumption of a certain type of food or drink that motivated the provincials to interact and adopt Roman ways of life. Romanization was an instrument in the power struggle, a way for members of the local elite, or the layer just below it, to maintain old positions in society or achieve better ones – first of all in the local hierarchy – and thereby a matter of maintaining social status or provoking social mobility.<sup>51</sup> Even though this competition for power was in many ways universal, the outcome we are able to follow today diverged significantly throughout the Empire and has had a major effect on the way we comprehend Romanization in the Greek provinces.

### **Romanization and regional discrepancies**

The reason for this difference has been offered much attention in the study of Romanization; it has been explained by the idea that Greek culture was, or was thought to be, superior to Roman culture, and therefore Greeks did not need Roman culture to reach a higher level of civilisation. According to Haverfield, the Romans did not succeed in Romanizing the Greek area because the Greeks were not attracted by Roman culture. Greeks never used Latin to any great extent, and Greek continued to be the ordinary language of government. From Haverfield’s point of view, it was far easier to Romanize what he calls “an uncivilised people” than the Greeks, who

---

<sup>51</sup> M. Millett, *Romanization* (As in n.27); G. Woolf, *Becoming Roman* (As in n.18) 238-9.

were the founding fathers of the Mediterranean culture that Rome was part of.<sup>52</sup> According to A. H. M. Jones, the Roman Emperor did nothing to Romanize the Greek provinces and saw the establishing of Roman colonies as more feasible than attempting to Romanize the Greek population.<sup>53</sup>

MacMullen considers the lack of Latin in the east, the few amphitheatres in the Greek cities, and the cultural debt of the Romans to the Greeks as evidence of the lack of Romanization: Romans were, so to speak, Greeks.<sup>54</sup> Due to the small number of Latin inscriptions, MacMullen argues that it was much more likely that Roman and Latin colonists who came to Greece were Hellenised than that Roman culture was spread to the Greek population.<sup>55</sup>

According to Woolf, the population of the Greek area remained culturally Greek. Throughout the Roman Empire there was a cultural transition towards the Roman culture from the beginning of the 1<sup>st</sup> century, but the Greeks were more selective in their adoption of cultural elements from Rome. Roman material culture did reach the Greek area, but the flexibility of Hellenism and the many ways of being Greek made such interaction unproblematic in order for the Greeks to maintain their Greek identity.<sup>56</sup>

Simon Swain accepts the possibility of an interaction between Romans and Greeks – especially on a political level – but rejects the idea of a generally pro-Roman sentiment among the Greeks.<sup>57</sup> According to Swain, the criticism of the Roman presence, raised by a number of Greek sophists and historians, is to be taken as a general attitude among the Greek elite.<sup>58</sup> Even among the worst critics of the Romans, we find positive feelings towards the Roman Empire, which Swain explains as a pragmatic attitude on the part of the author; for example, Aristide's *Sacred Tale*, which is critical of the Romans, is a more genuine expression of his position towards the Romans than his more supportive speech titled *To Rome*.<sup>59</sup>

Only in a few cases is the idea of Romanization accepted in the Greek area, such as when Fergus Millar points out that Greek cities are strongly influenced by

---

<sup>52</sup> F. Haverfield, *Romanization* (As in n.4) 12-3.

<sup>53</sup> A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, (Oxford 1937) 60-62.

<sup>54</sup> R. MacMullen, *Notes* (As in n.28) 57; R. MacMullen, *Romanization* (As in n.27) 2.

<sup>55</sup> R. MacMullen, *Romanization* (As in n.27) 4-5 and 29.

<sup>56</sup> G. Woolf, *staying Greek* (As in n.22.) 127-8.

<sup>57</sup> S. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism and Power in the Greek World, A.D. 50-250* (Oxford 1996) 412.

<sup>58</sup> S. Swain, *Hellenism* (As in n.57.) 414.

<sup>59</sup> S. Swain, *Hellenism* (As in n.57.) 416.

both Greek and Roman culture and suggests that “Greek cities” in the imperial period are more aptly described as Graeco-Roman.<sup>60</sup> Studies of Roman architecture in the east have furthermore revealed that Roman-style buildings became an integral part of the urban landscape in the eastern cities during the imperial period.<sup>61</sup>

This and other studies, such as Susan Alcock’s study of the landscapes of Roman Greece demonstrating the significant effect Rome’s influence had on the countryside and urbanization in the early imperial Achaia<sup>62</sup> raises the question whether the Greek provinces were just as influenced by the Roman presence as the rest of the Roman Empire. It is true that the development in the Greek provinces took a different course than in the west, but seen in the light of the large regional and historical differences between the western and the Greek part of the Mediterranean in almost all respects, discrepancies can only be expected.

One of the most decisive discrepancies between the Greek and western provinces is the degree of urbanisation before the Roman conquest. In the western provinces, where urbanisation was not as developed as in Italy and the east, we find extensive building activity following the Roman conquest. All sorts of Roman-style buildings were constructed throughout the western provinces paid for by the local elite, and already from the beginning of the imperial period we find a city culture, as in Italy, largely introduced in the western provinces first in Spain and Africa and later in Gaul and last in Britain.

We also see a profound interest in sponsoring Latin inscriptions, by which local communities and families celebrated, honoured, or paid their final respects to their loved ones, fellow citizens, emperors and different gods, just as in Rome and Italy. This widespread use of Latin inscriptions and especially Tacitus’s account of the eagerness to learn Latin among the sons of the local leaders in Britain have convinced us that Latin was the language used for administration and legal practise, and it leads to the conclusion that members of the western elite were generally Latin speaking.

Members of the local elite in the west did not commit themselves as eagerly to the construction of Roman-style buildings and the adoption of the Roman language and norms for the sake of the struggle for power and the attention of the Roman

---

<sup>60</sup> F. Millar, *The Greek City* (As in n.49.) 238.

<sup>61</sup> S. Macready and F. H. Thompson, *Roman Architecture in the Greek World* (London 1987).

<sup>62</sup> Susan Alcock, *Graecia Capta*. The landscape of Roman Greece (Cambridge 1993).

provincial leadership alone. With the Romans followed an unprecedented civic life, where hot baths, indoor heating, running water, paved streets, elegant stone or marble temples, and different sorts of entertainment in theatres became a reality over time. By imitating the Roman way of life, the local elites were able to take their communities to a new stage of development (not to be mistaken for a higher stage of civilisation) and benefit from a more pleasant everyday life and, more importantly, the gratitude of their fellow citizens for having founded a better civic life.

The reason why Roman culture became as advanced as it did in the western provinces can be explained by the obvious advantages of the new civic development mentioned above. Romans brought economic prosperity<sup>63</sup> and political and military stability to many of the provinces, where the end of internal and external wars, *pax romana*, and the increased trade between the new provinces and the rest of the empire marked the beginning of a long and prosperous period that benefited most parts of the western Empire. The Romans held the key to both political and economical advancement, and the political relations and social mobility that were at stake should not be underestimated. The provincials' degree of success was presumably related to the number of contacts they had to influential Romans and establishes a kind of a patron client relationship (*amicitia*). One of the reasons why provincials wanted to present themselves as Romans by adopting clothes, language, norms, fashion, and architectonic preferences was their desire to impress the Romans and create even better relations with the important men. As pointed out by Macmullen, people adopt others' practices if they generally admire them, not if they hold them in contempt.<sup>64</sup>

An admiration of the Romans is quite understandable if we take Rome's higher stage of development, efficiency in warfare, superior technology, and economic superiority into consideration. It seems reasonable that local leaders were impressed and wanted to imitate the Romans and become part of the new world of power. Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery and favours are the master's gift, as is rightly stated by MacMullen.<sup>65</sup> To adopt the Romans' dress code, language, names, values and norms could only have been a natural step if the provincials were able to relate to their conquerors, and this connection may very well have been the key to obtaining Roman citizenship and being included among the imperial ruling elite.

---

<sup>63</sup> R. MacMullen, *Notes* (As in n.28) 59.

<sup>64</sup> R. MacMullen, *Notes* (As in n.28) 63.

<sup>65</sup> R. MacMullen, *Notes* (As in n.28) 65.

Because of the very limited degree of urbanisation prior to the Roman conquest and the large Roman contribution to the western provinces, Romanization in the west took a form that is easily recognisable today. The cultural interaction between Rome and her western provinces might therefore seem as a clear sign of the western provincials' eager adoption of Roman culture and of voluntary Romanization.

Compared to the west, in the Greek provinces the coming of Rome and the cultural interaction between Rome and the local population assumed a different form that is more difficult for us to recognise in the source material. In the eastern provinces urbanisation was already a reality and had been for centuries before the Roman conquest of the Greek mainland and Asia Minor, and the high degree of development in the Greek cities had a great impact on the ways in which Roman architecture eventually influenced the Greek cities. A high level of urbanisation is likely to have delayed the Greek population's interaction with the Romans and their culture.

Roman-style buildings were not erected as systematic in the Greek cities as in the west. Roman rule in the Greek provinces were based on the existing Greek urbanity. Several of the buildings in the western provinces were erected for political and administrative purposes or to serve as temples, marketplaces, and buildings for public entertainment and services. Such buildings were, to a large extent, already part for the urban structure in the Greek world, and continued to be erected, renovated and used well into the imperial period.<sup>66</sup>

Compared to building programmes in the western provinces Roman-style buildings seem to have been less numerous in the Greek cities, but to consider this a sign of Greek resistance to Roman culture is an exaggeration. As is shown in studies of the architectonic development of different areas in Italy, few constructions of public buildings are not necessarily the result of an economic crisis or a decline in the generosity on part of members of the local elite. Instead a decrease in building activity can be considered to reflect the lack of public space to build on, an already existence

---

<sup>66</sup> H. A. Thompson, "The impact of Roman Architects and Architecture on Athens 170-B.C. –A.D. 170", in S. Macready and F. H. Thompson, *Roman Architecture in the Greek world* (London 1987). 1-18.

of public buildings, and a need to restore old buildings rather than to construct new ones, or changes in the local elite's acts of euergetism.<sup>67</sup>

The lack of space and the need to renovate rather than construct new public buildings seems to be one reason why Roman buildings or Roman architectonic style were slower to become part of the architectonic appearance of the Greek cities. But even though Roman architecture was less significant in the eastern provinces, it did find its way into the Greek cities in imperial times. In Asia Minor, bath buildings constructed in ways similar to Italian baths are not a rare phenomenon. From the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD smaller Roman baths were quite common in all major cities in the southwestern part of Asia Minor.<sup>68</sup> Amphitheatres in Roman colonies and regular theatres constructed in the imperial period, with raised stages and sometimes modified in a way that made gladiator games possible, also seem to have been in accordance with Roman trends.<sup>69</sup> As illustrated by S. Price were the construction of several temples primarily for the imperial cult often inspired by temples on the imperial *fora* in Rome with a construction of high podiums and frontal axis.<sup>70</sup>

This mixture of Roman and Hellenistic styles is well illustrated in the construction of temples – for example, temples for emperors that were done in a Hellenistic style and temples mainly inspired by temples in Rome. The temple of Augustus and Roma in Ankara from c. 25 BC and several of the temples for and by Hadrian in Asia Minor and on the Greek mainland were done in a Hellenistic style, while the temples for Domitian and the Oriental god Serapis in Ephesus were built in a style clearly recognisable as Roman. In the Augustan colony of Pisidian Antioch is a temple of Augustus that clearly resembles the *Mars Ultor* temple in Rome.<sup>71</sup> The same holds true for bath buildings, where the hot *laconicum* is generally left out of the

---

<sup>67</sup> J. Patterson, “The *collegia* and the transformation of the towns of Italy in the second century AD”, p. 238; and P. Zanker, “Veränderungen im öffentlichen Raum der italischen Städte der Kaiserzeit,” 165-70, both in *L'Italie d' Auguste à Dioclétien* (Rome 1994).

<sup>68</sup> A. Farrington, “Imperial Bath Buildings in South-West Asia Minor”, in S. Macready and F. H. Thompson, *Roman Architecture in the Greek world* (London 1987) 50-9.

<sup>69</sup> W. L. MacDonald, *The Architecture of the Roman Empire II* (New Haven 1986) 110-142.

<sup>70</sup> S. R. F. Price, *Rituals And Power. The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge 1984).

<sup>71</sup> M. Lyttelton, “The Design and Planning of Temples and Sanctuaries in Asia Minor in the Roman Imperial Period”, in S. Macready and F. H. Thompson, *Roman Architecture in the Greek world* (London 1987) 38-49. There are many other examples of temples erected both in accordance with Hellenistic or Roman fashion, but because we are only aware of a limited number of the temples that once existed, the quantitative approach is likely to be misleading. Instead, it is necessary to view the material with a more qualitative approach and discuss the significance of the single examples.

baths in Asia Minor, indicating that the bathing culture in Asia Minor was different, resembling the Hellenistic rather than the Roman tradition.<sup>72</sup>

Why either Hellenistic or Roman style were being preferred or mixed is an interesting question because it shows that the architectonic tradition of the Hellenistic period was very strong throughout imperial times; but it also shows that Roman architecture managed to become an integral part of the architectonic appearance of the Greek cities. That Rome and the Emperor were confident about the Roman cultural presence in the east is indicated by the Hadrianic building programme. Hadrian's predominant use of a Hellenistic style in his building programme in the eastern provinces indicates that the implementation of Roman-style buildings was no longer necessary to remind the Greeks that they were part of the Roman Empire.<sup>73</sup> Instead, in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century it was possible for Hadrian to present himself as man of classicistic values: he was Roman but a Roman rooted in Greek culture. Being at the same time a Roman and a Hellenist he might have been more accepted as emperor by the local elite of the Greek provinces than were other emperors.

Scholars have regarded the fact that Greek remained the natural language of government and public documents (e.g., inscriptions) as a sign of Greek resistance not just to Latin and Roman culture, but also to the Roman presence in general.<sup>74</sup> However, this is probably too broad a conclusion. It is well known that language formed an important part of Greek identity, and they used the ability to speak native Greek as a way to distinguish themselves from non-Greeks. In his study of Greek identity, J. Hall proves that an ability to speak decent Greek was in itself insufficient to be accepted as Greek. However, native Greeks used language to determine whether someone was a kinsmen or just someone who had learned Greek.<sup>75</sup>

The Roman elite favoured the Greeks, who in their view had given civilisation to the world. Cicero and later Pliny the Younger clearly express this, stressing that Greeks provided Rome with *humanitas* and *leges* and therefore deserve to be treated

---

<sup>72</sup> A. Farrington, *Bath* (As in n.62) 55. Inge Nielsen, *Thermae* (As in n.23) 116.

<sup>73</sup> S. Schorndorfer, *Öffentliche Bauten hadrianischer Zeit in Kleinasien* (Münster 1997) 33-44. For a thorough study of Hadrian's public buildings in Asia Minor.

<sup>74</sup> F. Haverfield, *Romanization* (As in n.4) 13; P. A. Brunt, *romanization* (As in n.25) 269; G. Woolf, *Staying Greek* (As in n.22.) 129; R. MacMullen, *Romanization* (As in n.27) 5.

<sup>75</sup> *Cicero, De Republica* 1.58. Cicero compares the Greek definition of identity as dependent on language (*lingua*) to the Roman definition, which according to the writer is dependent on customs (*mores*).

with respect.<sup>76</sup> In fact, Rome gave the Greek provinces special treatment from the beginning. Under the reign of Augustus Roman authorities set up public inscriptions in both Latin and Greek. One prominent example of this bilingual practice is the Augustan *res gestae* that in the east were erected in both in a Greek and Latin editions. In Ankara on the temple for *Roma et Augustus*, the Monumentum *Ancyranum*, the inscription were erected in a Greek and a Latin edition and in *Apollonia* central Anatolien Greek copy of the same inscription has been found.<sup>77</sup> In Ankara, the Greek edition was placed on the sidewall while the Latin edition was placed next to the entrance of the temple. Rome also chose to put bilingual inscriptions on milestones, as demonstrated by a series of milestones that various emperors had erected with both Latin and Greek inscriptions along the roads in for instance Asia Minor<sup>78</sup> and Cyprus.<sup>79</sup>

Official Roman bilingual inscriptions or inscriptions in a provincial language are known only from the Greek provinces and were most likely attempts to grant the Greeks special rights. The bilingual inscriptions had two purposes: the Greek inscription informed the Greek population about donations, edicts and so on, and the Latin inscription emphasized to the Greeks that they were under Roman rule, the latter generally being placed first or above the Greek translation.<sup>80</sup> Through her inscription policy in the east, Rome made it natural and acceptable for the provincials to maintain Greek as the language spoken in governmental matters and therefore also on any other occasion. That Latin never replaced Greek is therefore very much due to Rome's own policy and further strengthens the theory that Latin was primarily learned for reasons of communication.

In contrast to the provincials in the west, it was therefore not necessary for the Greeks to use Latin to communicate with the Romans. Members of the Roman elite were generally bilingual in Latin and Greek, which made it unproblematic for the Roman elite to accept assignments in the Greek provinces. Furthermore, many of the servants in the imperial administration were slaves with a Greek origin who could of

---

<sup>76</sup> Cicero, *Ad Quintum fratrem*; and Pliny the Younger, *Epistles* 8.24. See also G. Woolf, *Staying Greek* (As in n.22) 118-121.

<sup>77</sup> P. A. Brunt & J. M. Moore, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (Oxford 1967) 1-2.

<sup>78</sup> For examples see D. H. French, "The Roman Road-system of Asia Minor", in *ANRW* II, 7.2., 1980:714-727.

<sup>79</sup> Tønnes Bekker-Nielsen, *The Roads of Ancient Cyprus*, in press. 158-208.

<sup>80</sup> For Cyprus see Tønnes Bekker-Nielsen, (As in n.79) Appendix p.175, p. 176, p. 198, p. 202; for Asia Minor see D. H. French, *The Roman Road-system* (As in n.78) 714-721.

course communicate with the population in the east without difficulty.<sup>81</sup> The reason why the provincials in the west learned Latin so eagerly cannot be because the Romans forced them to, for if Roman politics<sup>82</sup> in the provinces included a language policy forcing Latin on the provincial population, it would also have been widespread in the east as well.

What urged the provincials in the west to learn Latin was their need to communicate with the Roman magistrates and officials, for only by communicating with them did provincials have a chance of being accepted into the new world with its advantages and benefits. The Greek elite, however, did not need to learn Latin as long as they limited their career to the Greek provinces or other Greek city-states. But if the Greek elite aimed towards a career in Rome, Latin was an indispensable requirement, as is illustrated by the example of an envoy, a Roman citizen of Greek origin, who lost his citizenship because he addressed the Senate in Greek.<sup>83</sup> MacMullen considers the examples of Greeks who failed to meet the Latin requirement a sign of the Greeks' general resistance to Latin.<sup>84</sup> But it is dubious whether the few examples of Greeks with inadequate Latin skills are representative of the Greeks in general. Claudius's reaction to the envoy must have been based on a general expectation of better knowledge of Latin among the citizens. The Senate frequently received delegations that spoke no Latin, so it must have been the fact that it was a citizen who was unable to communicate in Latin that frustrated Claudius.

The fact that most Greeks did not learn Latin indicates that Greeks were not interested in adopting Latin and possibly also somewhat less interested than the western provincials in imitating the Romans. But again the discrepancies between the eastern and the western provinces are to be found in the history of urbanisation and in the different stages of development in the east and the west. Greek was respected as a more intellectual language than Latin and surly more respected than the languages spoken in the western provinces; it was widespread and had a profound literary tradition. The Roman aristocracy studied Greek to attain what they saw as a higher cultural level. In speculating about why Greeks did not adopt Latin, we need to ask what motives Greeks could have had to learn the language since the Romans with

---

<sup>81</sup> P. A. Brunt, *Italian Manpower* (Oxford 1971), p. 207; R. MacMullen, *Romanization* (As in n.27) 5.

<sup>82</sup> For a discussion of the point of view that Rome did not have a policy of Romanization, see F. Haverfield, *Romanization* (As in n.4) 14. P. A. Brunt, *Romanization* (As in n.25) 268; R. MacMullen, *Notes* (As in n.28) 57.

<sup>83</sup> Suet. *Claud.* 16.2.

<sup>84</sup> R. MacMullen, *Romanization* (As in n.27) 13.

whom they had contact strongly admired and generally spoke Greek and we will have to disregard the modern link between nation and a language.

### **The Romanization of the Greeks**

As discussed above, the best way to promote one's social mobility and keep one's already obtained power was by interacting with the Romans and their culture and living in accordance with Roman norms and values. Romanization in the in Achaia, Asia and Bithynia may therefore be considered as a Roman superstructure on Greek culture rather than a process of cultural replacement whereby the Roman way of life supplanted that of the Greeks from before the Roman conquest.

When establishing the degree of cultural interaction between the Greeks and the Romans it has been common to focus on how the Greeks behaved differently rather than on what they actually did to assimilate with the Romans. One way to demonstrate that one was Roman was by taking a Latin name in its standard form with a *praenomen*, a *nomen* and a *cognomen*; the *cognomen*, often of Greek origin, appeared increasingly in the public records throughout the imperial period.<sup>85</sup> Like MacMullen, one can choose to see the use of Latin names as an upper-class phenomenon without any importance in Romanization.<sup>86</sup> But if we turn to the literary sources we find an increasing concern among Greek philosophers and moralists writing in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries AD over the widespread use of Latin names in Greek communities. One example is Philostratus, who heavily criticises those who used Roman names although they are not Roman of origin, calling this practise unworthy.<sup>87</sup> By using a Roman name a man clearly indicated that he wanted to present himself as Roman and he must also have been regarded as such by others. The same can be said of gravestones and sarcophagi depicting the deceased and possibly family members as Romans, a phenomenon that became still more common in the imperial period.<sup>88</sup> Gravestones give a good idea of how individuals saw themselves

---

<sup>85</sup> H. Halfmann, "Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr" (Göttingen 1979); F. Quass, "Zur politischen Tätigkeit der municipalen Aristokratie des griechischen Ostens in der Kaiserzeit", *Historia* 31 (1982): 198; R. MacMullen, *Romanization* (As in n.21.) 6; F. Millar, *The Greek City* (As in n.42) 249.

<sup>86</sup> R. MacMullen, *Notes* (As in n.22) 60; R MacMullen, *Romanization* (As in n.21) 6.

<sup>87</sup> Philostratus, *Apollonius EP* 72. See also S. Goldhill, "Setting an agenda: Everything is Greece to the wise," in S. Goldhill, *Being Greek under Rome* (Cambridge 2001) 6.

<sup>88</sup> N. Firatli, *Les Stèles Funéraires de Byzance Gréco-Romaine* (Paris 1964).

and, just as importantly, how they wished to be seen by their community. If a man chose to present himself as Roman with Roman clothes and a Roman hairstyle, we must expect that others were able to make the same connection; the man was dead and no longer needed to flatter the Romans. It is true that there was often a family left behind that in many cases was responsible for setting up the stone and could have had the motive of establishing good relations with Rome by presenting their family member as Roman.

However, it is reasonable to ask whether the Roman governor or others with an influence on the election of local magistrates placed any emphasis on whether the candidates' ancestors presented themselves as Romans; their interest were the living. Gravestones served to point out social standing and mobility, and someone choosing to present himself on a horse or in a toga firmly indicates that the deceased belonged to the equestrian order or the city *ordo*. Gravestones were a media that reminded the present and the future of what the deceased had achieved in his lifetime and of his place in the social hierarchy of the community. That kind of reputation was far more important than ever-changing local politics. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the way in which the deceased appears on a gravestone reflects how he identified himself rather than what seemed to be the trend at that particular point in time.

Turning to how the Greeks participated in the Roman administration of their local communities, the picture is not very different from what we see in the west. It is not surprising to find Greeks with Roman names appearing as magistrates in a Roman colony. One example of magistrates with a Greek origin comes from the Roman colony of Cremna, where a Rutilianus Longillianus Callippus served as a *duovir* in the late imperial period.<sup>89</sup> It is difficult to tell whether this man's family originated from Italy and he took a Greek *cognomen* to appear Greek or he was of Greek origin and took a Latin name to appear Roman. What we can tell, however, is that Roman names became more and more common as time went on. In Athens, after a slow start,<sup>90</sup> we find magistrates, priests and *stratego*i with strong relations to the Romans appearing with Greek names such as one Antipatros, son of Antipatros of Phlya and a hoplite *strategos* under Augustus; and Pammenes, son of Zenon of Marathon, who was a

---

<sup>89</sup> SEG. 37.1176. See also F. Millar, *The Greek City* (As in n.42.) 239.

<sup>90</sup> C. Habicht, "Roman Citizens in Athens (228-31 B.C.)", in C. Hoff and I. Rotroff, *The Romanization of Athens* (Oxford 1997) 5.

*strategos* and priest of goddess Roma and Augustus Caesar.<sup>91</sup> Later on, under the Julian-Claudian emperors, Athenian citizens began to appear with Roman names – for instance, Ti. Claudius Novius, son of Philinos of Oion, who was a *strategoi* twice in 41 and 42 AD, and Ti. Claudius Balbillus, who was a *strategoi* several times under Claudius and Nero, and also a certain C. Julius Spartiatikos, a *strategoi* from 53 to 59 AD.<sup>92</sup> Greek *strategos* in Athens kept their Greek names until the reign of Claudius, when some of them adopted Latin names, including their cognomen. Nothing indicates that they were somehow forced to do so under Claudius, at which point there were also *strategos* who chose to keep their Greek names unchanged, such as Diokles, son of Themistokles of Hagnous, who was a *strategoi* at least twice from 35 to 44 AD. This indicates that at least the top level of Athenian society voluntarily chose to identify itself more closely with the Romans during the early imperial period.

Concerning the construction of Roman-style buildings, members of the Greek elite were engaged in the construction of different kinds of Roman buildings. From Pliny's journey to Bithynia, we hear about several constructions of Roman buildings initiated by the city *ordo* in different cities, such as bath buildings,<sup>93</sup> and an aqueduct in Nicomedia and Sinope.<sup>94</sup> Roman architectural style did also mark the Greek countryside. As shown by S. Alcock, a new type of land estate evolved on the Greek mainland already in the early Imperial period, it was much larger than the traditional Greek land estate and several of the larger sites can by their architectural appearance be identified as villas. In the same style as we see in Italy and the western provinces and as discussed above, temples in honour of the imperial cult inspired by Roman temples in Italy became more and more common in Asia Minor and also on the Greek mainland.<sup>95</sup>

Members of the Greek elite also frequently dedicated statues to emperors<sup>96</sup> – for example, Dionysodoros, son of Sophokles, erected a statue in Athens in honour of Claudius; and Dio of Prusa, whose speeches are often read as anti-Roman

---

<sup>91</sup> D. J. Geagan, *The Athenian Elite: "Romanization, Resistance, and the exercise of power"*, in C. Hoff and I. Rotroff, *The Romanization of Athens* (Oxford 1997) 23.

<sup>92</sup> D. J. Geagan, *The Athenian Elite* (As in n.84) 25.

<sup>93</sup> Pliny *EP*. For Prusa see 10. 23 and 10.70.1; For Claudiopolis see 10.39.5.

<sup>94</sup> Pliny *EP*. For Senope see 10.90; for Nicomedias see 10.37, 10.38.

<sup>95</sup> S. R. Price, *Rituals and Power* (Cambridge 1984) 249-274; M. Lyttelton, *Design* (As in n.71.) 38-39.

<sup>96</sup> Even though the practice of private dedication were less frequent in the eastern provinces. Jakob M. Højte, *The Roman Imperial Statue Bases part II*, Ph.D. dissertation University of Aarhus 2001. 203-204.

statements,<sup>97</sup> erected an image of Trajan in his *porticus* at Prusa.<sup>98</sup> Dio claimed that he had a particularly close relationship with Trajan, which may be the motive behind the dedication. On the other hand, erecting a statue in honour of the emperor indicates a positive gesture towards the imperial house. Dio's dedication to Trajan is an action that was most likely interpreted, by Romans as well as by the citizens of Prusa, as his acceptance of the Roman emperor and his presence in Bithynia, a reaction Dio must have expected.

Members of the local elite could also demonstrate their pro-Roman political beliefs by using the local cities and their political and religious institutions to present themselves as being in accordance with Roman hegemony or as faithful Roman citizens living by the norms and values appreciated by Rome. In addition they could employ Roman iconography on their coins. The cities on the Greek mainland and in Asia Minor held the right to mint their local coins and decide on their motif. Despite this independence, the Greek cities, and thereby the local elite, often chose to strike a Roman related motif on the other side of the coins.<sup>99</sup> From the beginning of the imperial period motifs of different emperors, depictions of the temples in honour of the imperial cult, or Latin catchwords such as *fortuna*, *iustitia*, *libertas*, *pietas* and *pax* become increasingly more common on Asian coins.<sup>100</sup> By choosing an iconography that celebrated or honoured the Roman members of the local city elite they not only showed their acceptance of the Roman presence, they also made it clear that their cities and thus they themselves were part of the Roman Empire.

It can be argued that the Greek attempt to honour and celebrate the Roman emperor to obtain the best opportunities possible for themselves and their cities was a normal practice already under the Hellenistic kings.<sup>101</sup> On the other hand, it must be remembered that Greeks never obtained Persian names, nor did Greek cities seem to have had a tradition of striking coins celebrating the Hellenistic kings and their relations to kingdoms as they did towards the Romans. Instead it were the Hellenistic kings and their non Greek followers that wished to appear Greek.

---

<sup>97</sup> S. Swain, *Hellenism* (As in n.57.) 191.

<sup>98</sup> Pliny, *EP.* 10. 81.7.

<sup>99</sup> For a catalogue see P. R. Franke, *Kleinasien zur Römerzeit. Griechisches Leben im Spiegel der Münzen* (München 1968) 76. One side of the coin was reserved for a portrait of an imperial family member; for the other side the cities were free to choose a motif of their own and to strike coins with their city founder, related gods, heroes or monuments of special importance.

<sup>100</sup> P. R. Franke, *Kleinasien* (As in n. 99.) 10.

<sup>101</sup> R. MacMullen, *Romanization* (As in n.27) 6.

What was important to members of the Greek elite was the possibility of becoming part of the ruling elite and thereby gaining political influence. To become part of the imperial elite and obtain the important personal privileges was essential and provided the best possible conditions for their personal status and that of their cities of origin. The examples given here suggest that members of the Greek elite behaved in much the same way that members of the western provinces did when interacting with the Romans. In fact, if we take the high stage of development in the east into consideration and accept that it may have had a profound influence on the need for and interest in especially Roman architecture, we do not see a stronger reaction against the Romans and elements of their culture in the Greek provinces than we do in the west. However, scholars have argued that the Greeks took part in Roman politics, used Roman names, and erected Roman-inspired buildings, and dedicated temples and statues to the emperor primarily for pragmatic reasons.<sup>102</sup> For example, based on the so-called Second Sophistic, which is regarded as highly representative of the Greek elite,<sup>103</sup> Swain argues that Greek intellectuals generally opposed the Romans and their culture. He considers the fact that Greek writers made a large number of positive statements about the Romans and especially their administrative skills as primarily a matter of private agendas or flattery and not as an indication of their “real” attitude towards the Roman presence.<sup>104</sup>

It is rather uncertain whether the Sophists present the common opinion among the Greek elite. Swain’s argument that the writers somehow must have been in harmony with their audience does not take into consideration that disagreement with the majority is an integral part of being critic of the present social order.<sup>105</sup> Instead, the contributions of sophistic writers can be seen as a reaction to an increasing Greek assimilation with Roman culture. Philostratus’s statement that it is shameful to have a man’s name but not his looks<sup>106</sup> is a reaction to the use of Roman names among Greeks, which became more and more widespread all over the Greek provinces; it also constitutes criticism of the Roman tradition behind adoption. Dio of Prusa, too,

---

<sup>102</sup> S. Swain, *Hellenism* (As in n.57.) 418.

<sup>103</sup> S. Swain, *Hellenism* (As in n.57.) 241.

<sup>104</sup> S. Swain, *Hellenism* (As in n.57.). On Dio of Prusa see p. 208; on Aristides see p. 283; on Lucian see p. 314, and on Cassius Dio see p. 401.

<sup>105</sup> One ancient example of this is the debate in the agricultural manuals by Varro and Columella arguing against extensively cultivated land, absent landlords and the import of food to Italy. This was an attack on the Roman land-owning elite, which presumably did not share their view; see Varro *RR* II. Praef. 3; Collumella *RR* 1, pp. 13-15.

<sup>106</sup> Philostratus, Appolonius *EP* 72.

criticises the Greek elite for interacting with the Romans and competing for the right to use the Roman title of *Metropolis* - mother city- for their cities, and condemns the local elite for accepting the least important things.<sup>107</sup> In *Political Advice*, Plutarch argues that Greeks should not participate in Roman politics and religion as magistrates and priests because it is both expensive and not a matter of freedom (824c).

The Sophists criticise the Romans but their criticism is actually directed towards other Greeks for interacting with the conquerors and adopting the Roman way of life. However, not all Greek intellectuals who were considered part of the Second Sophistic were heavy critics of the Roman presence in the Greek area. In his speech *To Rome*, Aristides recognises that Rome brought peace to the east (69) and stresses that Rome established an empire where the conquered peoples obtained something as unusual as citizenship and the same legal rights as their conquerors (93).

Studies of the Second Sophistic have generally treated these writers as a single group with common cultural beliefs and attitudes towards Rome, without taking into consideration that the authors lived in very different parts of the eastern empire and had diverse audiences and relations with the Romans. One of the most significant differences that influenced the writers is the contrast between the economic stages of development in Asia Minor and the Greek mainland, experienced by Plutarch and Dio of Prusa in the 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> century and by Aristides and Cassius Dio after the time of Hadrian. From the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan we get the impression that many of the cities in Bithynia suffered from economic difficulties at the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, when Pliny reports that several public buildings were falling apart or unable to meet their needs.

Under Hadrian the situation seems to have improved. According to Cassius Dio, a certain Severus was sent to Bithynia as governor and improved both the public and private affairs of the province.<sup>108</sup> The effect of Hadrian's activities in the east seems to have been profound.<sup>109</sup> Aristides, who writes shortly after Hadrian's death, relates that the Greek cities experienced a period of prosperity, with the construction of many beautiful monuments (*To Rome* 93-97). Under and after the reign of Hadrian,

---

<sup>107</sup> Dio of Prusa *or.* xxxviii. 37-8.

<sup>108</sup> Cassius Dio 69.13.4.

<sup>109</sup> Cassius Dio 69.10-11; HA *Hadri.*19.2. See also M. T. Boatwright, *Hadrian and the cities of the Roman Empire* (Princeton 2000).

Greeks begin to appear more regularly in the *fasti consulares*.<sup>110</sup> Greek consuls indicate that the Greek elite not only had become more integrated in the Roman Empire, but also had obtained the financial means to obtain a political career at Rome.<sup>111</sup>

Aristides and Cassius Dio, both senator, consul and proconsul, who knew the more prosperous east, were also more positive towards the Roman dominance than Dio of Prusa who, like Plutarch, lived in a less prosperous age and had several problems with the Romans: his exile, the investigation of his accounts by Pliny, and his unsuccessful attempt to obtain liberty for Prusa. Cassius Dio's criticism is not directed against the Romans; Dio is a critic of the incapable emperor, whom he holds up against a partly constructed picture of Augustus, who constituted Dio's own ideal emperor.<sup>112</sup>

The Sophists did not form a unified movement in any obvious way but were very diverse in their agendas and topics, as were Latin authors like Sallust and Velleius Paterculus or Livy and Tacitus. Even though they all criticise Rome, her emperors, her governors, or Greeks who imitated the Romans, they should not be regarded as a unified group because they did not describe the same society; they wrote within different genres such as philosophy, history, moralities, and biography, and had a variety of styles and audiences.

### **Citizenship and identity in the Greek provinces**

The last aspect this article shall treat is the relation between the legal rights of Roman citizens and cultural identity. From the *fasti consulares*, the epigraphic material and prosopographic studies, it is clear that more and more Greeks obtained Roman citizenship during the imperial period; whether or not they considered themselves Romans has been questioned by several scholars.<sup>113</sup> Much attention has been given to the fact that Roman citizens of Greek origin normally did not identify themselves as Romans, but as Greeks. None of the Greek intellectuals writing in the imperial period seem to identify themselves as Roman. Not even Cassius Dio, who had a splendid

---

<sup>110</sup> W. Liebenam, *Fasti Consulares Imperii* (Bonn 1909).

<sup>111</sup> F. K. Yegül, "Memory, Metaphor and meaning in the cities of Asia Minor," in *Romanization of the city. Creation, Transformations, and failures*, ed. E. Fentress (Portsmouth 2000).

<sup>112</sup> J. W. Rich, *Cassius Dio. The Augustian Settlement* (Warminster 1990) 14-15.

<sup>113</sup> G. Woolf, *Staying Greek* (As in n.22.) 166-43; S. Swain, *Hellenism* (As in n.57.) 412; R. MacMullen, *Romanization* (As in n.27.) 5.

political carrier in Rome, says that he is Roman; instead he claims his fatherland to be Nicaea (75.15.3; 80.5.2.). It is true that Cassius Dio was inspired by Thucydides' way of writing history, especially in his role of the observer, but, as pointed out by J. W. Rich, Cassius Dio's debt to Thucydides is not stylistic.<sup>114</sup> Dio's style is annalistic and more indebted to the historic tradition of the Romans and writers like Livy and Tacitus.<sup>115</sup>

According to Swain, it is as an example of Greek identity when the Romans are mentioned in the third person or when a Greek describes his country of origin as his fatherland.<sup>116</sup> Yet while it is true that when a Greek describes his place of birth as his fatherland it tells us that he felt he was Greek, what else should we expect? Cassius Dio did not have to state the fact that he was a Roman citizen; it is obvious when he uses the first person plural in mentioning senators<sup>117</sup> and from the fact that both he and his father held offices as the consul- and proconsul. Regarding Roman citizenship as a legal status that substituted whatever civic status a person had beforehand is problematic. In Italy, it was common for the Italian people with Roman citizenship to see themselves as having two nationalities. Cicero, for example, describes himself and everyone who lived in cities around the empire as men with two nationalities.

“Surely I think that he (Cato) and all natives of Italian towns have two fatherlands, one by nature and the other by citizenship.”

“Ego mehercule et illi et omnibus municipibus duas esse censeo patrias, unam naturae, alteram civitatis.”<sup>118</sup>

And that Cicero still thinks much of Arpinum is evident from the following statement.

“Thus I shall never deny that my (fatherland) is here, though my other fatherland is greater and includes this one within it.”

---

<sup>114</sup> J. W. Rich, *Augustian Settlement* (As in n.112.)11.

<sup>115</sup> J. W. Rich, *Augustian Settlement* (As in n.112.) 5.

<sup>116</sup> S. Swain, *Hellenism* (As in n.57.) 247 and 245.

<sup>117</sup> J. W. Rich, *Augustian Settlement*, (As in n.112.) 2.

<sup>118</sup> Cicero, *Leg.* II. 2. 5.

Itaque ego hanc meam esse patriam prorsus numquam negabo, dum illa sit maior, haec in ea contineatur ...habet civitates set unam illas civitatem putat.<sup>119</sup>

Cicero was not alone in his view; Pliny the Younger, for one, often mentions that he was from Como. But what seems to be more interesting in our discussion is that Aristides also thought of himself as a man with two nationalities.

“You have caused the word Roman to be the label, not of membership in a city, but of some common nationality.”

“  
\_\_\_\_\_ π \_\_\_\_\_ π \_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_»<sup>120</sup>  
\_\_\_\_\_.

We should not expect Roman citizens with an origin outside of Rome to describe themselves as Romans. Cicero’s discussion in *De Legibus* shows that identity was related to people’s regional origin. Being a Roman citizen did not involve sharing a common origin, obtained by birth or adoption. Roman citizenship was rather a matter of belonging to a union. Aristides emphasizes in *To Rome* that peace and stability, equal rights, prosperous development in the cities, local influence, and the protection of an army were some of the benefits of the Roman Empire.

While it is true that Plutarch and Dio of Prusa might not have felt any association with the union formed by the Roman Empire, Arrian, one of the first-known Greek senator,<sup>121</sup> Lucian and certainly Cassius Dio, who all held offices in Rome were, apart from the censorship, integrated, also financially, in the administration of the Empire. Also the Greeks with Latin names and/or gravestones with Roman motifs presented themselves as Romans, and one must assume that they considered themselves to be part of the Roman community. The same holds true for those who did not have a Roman name but were nevertheless integrated in the Roman administration; they, too, participated in maintaining the empire.

Another matter is the stability that followed the Roman domination. According to many Greek writers, the Romans brought peace and stability to the

---

<sup>119</sup> Cicero, *Leg.* II. 2. 5.

<sup>120</sup> Aristides, *To Rome* 63.

<sup>121</sup> See also A. R. Birley, Hadrian and the Greek senators in *ZPE* V 116 1997, 226.

Greek provinces and a net of communication that improved trade relations.<sup>122</sup> Even though Greek cities had achieved a high level of urbanisation, the construction of aqueducts, baths, theatres, and other public buildings improved the overall urban picture in many Greek cities, something that all levels of society benefited from.

## **Conclusion**

Cultural influences from Rome affected cultural life in the Greek provinces. Even though the process of cultural assimilation between Greek and Roman culture developed more slowly compared to the western empire, Roman-style buildings were erected and became integrated in the urban landscape in most cities in the Greek provinces. Members of the Greek elite adopted the Roman name tradition (*tria nomina*), which clearly stated their relation to the ruling power of Rome. The local elite also showed their pro-Roman attitude by taking a leading role in the imperial cult and in the Roman administration on a local level as well as in Rome, where the number of Greek senators and magistrates increased especially during the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD.

Greek intellectuals criticised the Roman presence on the Greek mainland and in Asia Minor, but whether this reaction was widespread is dubious. Critics of society have always disagreed with the majority, and criticism of Greeks taking Roman names and administrative or religious posts in the Roman administration and imperial cult indicates that the local elite in the Greek provinces was culturally involved with the Romans and participated in their administration, just as the local elite did in the western provinces.

Romanization primarily has to do with power and social mobility, and the same driving force seems to be behind cultural interaction in both the east and the west. It is incontrovertible that Greeks never adopted Latin and that Roman architecture never became as widespread in the eastern part of the empire as it did in the west. However, the continuous use of Greek as the language of government and the relatively slow adoption of Roman architecture does not reflect resistance to Rome or Roman culture. Instead, when examining the Romanization of the Greek provinces it is necessary to take into consideration that the Greek provinces already had a

---

<sup>122</sup> Aristides, *To Rome* 69, 97 and 102.

celebrated literary tradition, a high level of urbanization, and were at a higher stage of development compared to the west. There is therefore nothing unnatural about the fact that the parts of Roman culture connected to urban space were slower to appear in the Greek provinces than in areas with no or a limited urban structure. In the imperial period the erection of public buildings were often done in an architectural style with clear resemblances to the architecture in Rome, Italy and the western provinces.

The differences in how Roman culture influenced the eastern and western provinces are therefore not a matter of strong Greek resistance and a blind western obligingness to Rome and Roman culture, but a matter of regional differences and, accordingly, of the way Roman culture appears in the sources traditionally used to determine the degree of Romanization in the Greek provinces.

Jesper Majbom Madsen  
The Danish National Research Foundation's  
Centre for Black Sea Studies  
University of Aarhus