



INSTITUTE OF ARCHEOLOGY  
AND ART HISTORY OF ROMANIAN  
ACADEMY CLUJ-NAPOCA



UNIVERSITATEA TEHNICĂ  
DIN CLUJ-NAPOCA

JAHA  
JOURNAL OF ANCIENT HISTORY  
AND ARCHAEOLOGY

editura  
MEGA

---

# Journal of Ancient History and Archeology



Scopus<sup>®</sup>



Clarivate  
Analytics



Central and Eastern European Online Library

EBSCO

© creative  
commons

Google  
scholar

ERIH PLUS  
EUROPEAN REFERENCE INDEX FOR THE  
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

DOAJ  
DIRECTORY OF  
OPEN ACCESS  
JOURNALS

No. 11-1 / 2024

# CONTENTS

## STUDIES

### ANCIENT HISTORY

- Diego PIAY-AUGUSTO,**  
**Patricia A. ARGÜELLES-ÁLVAREZ**  
THE OWNERS OF VILLAS IN THE TERRITORY OF ROMAN  
ASTURIAS (SPAIN): ISSUES OF IDENTITY.....3
- Lucretiu MIHAILESCU-BÎRLIBA, Ana HONCU**  
THE MOBILITY OF MILITARY RECRUITS FROM RURAL MOESIA  
INFERIOR: DESTINATIONS, ROUTES, ESTIMATED DISTANCES.....9

### ARCHAEOLOGY

- Mohammad Hossein REZAEI**  
ANALYSIS OF BRONZE AND IRON AGES (YAZ CULTURE)  
SETTLEMENTS IN GOLBAHAR DISTRICT OF CHENARAN  
COUNTY: A LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY APPROACH.....19
- Selin GÜR**  
A THEORETICAL APPROACH TO LINGUISTIC POWER.....34
- DAVUT YİĞİTPAŞA, AYNUR YAĞCI**  
LIFE ACTIVITIES IN THE REGION IN THE NEOLITHIC,  
CHALCOLITHIC, AND BRONZE AGES IN THE LIGHT OF THE  
STONE TOOLS FOUND IN THE ORDU AND SINOP MUSEUM.....41
- Sergey YARYGIN, Ayşe AVLI, Sergazy SAKENOV**  
KARKARALY KORGANTAS – ANCIENT CULT OBJECT IN  
CENTRAL KAZAKHSTAN.....58
- Mohsen Heydari DASTENAEI, Ebrahim Roustaei FARSI**  
INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF THE FINDINGS FROM THE  
RESCUE EXCAVATION IN SARI GOL CRYPT AND GRAVEYARD,  
NORTH KHORASAN PROVINCE.....69
- Sorin COCIŞ, Szilamér-Péter PANCZEL, Katalin SIDÓ**  
THE TYPOLOGY AND PRODUCTION OF BROOCHES  
ON THE EASTERN LIMES OF DACIA SUPERIOR ON THE  
BRÂNCOVENEŞTI-CĂLUGĂRENI SECTOR.....80
- Marius-Mihai CIUTĂ, Florian BOIŞTEANU**  
A FUNERARY MONUMENT FROM COLONIA AURELIA  
APULENSIS, RECOVERED BY AN UNEXPECTED PATH.....101

### DIGITAL AND VIRTUAL ARCHAEOLOGY

- Jordi PÉREZ GONZÁLEZ, Oriol  
MORILLAS SAMANIEGO, Manel GARCÍA  
SÁNCHEZ, Víctor REVILLA CALVO**  
GREEK AMPHORIC EPIGRAPHY IN ROMAN OPEN DATA.....111

### NUMISMATICS

- Metodi MANOV**  
THE SILVER AND GOLD COINS OF THE ALEXANDER TYPE IN  
THE WEST PONTIC AREA IN THE 3<sup>RD</sup> CENTURY BC – “PEACE-  
MONEY”, “PROTECTION MONEY” OR SOMETHING ELSE.....118
- Cristian GĂZDAC, Marius BARBU, Andrei GONCIAR**  
COINS IN ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT (V). THE VILLA  
RUSTICA FROM RAPOLTU MARE – “LA VIE” (HUNEDOARA  
COUNTY, ROMANIA).....129
- Dmytro YANOV**  
DIGITIZATION OF ROMAN COIN FINDS FROM THE SOUTH-  
WESTERN UKRAINE: AFE-UKR DATABASE.....138

### IN MEMORIAM

- Csaba SZABÓ**  
IN MEMORIAM ROGER L. BECK (1937–2023). HIS LIFE AND  
IMPACT ON THE STUDY OF ROMAN MITHRAS.....145

### REVIEWS

- Csaba SZABÓ**  
REVIEW: ZSUZSANNA TURCSÁN-TÓTH, *ALAPVETÉS AZ  
ARTEMIS EPHESIA-SZOBROK IKONOGRÁFIAI ELEMZÉSÉHEZ  
(NOTES ON THE ICONOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF THE ARTEMIS  
EPHESIA STATUES)*, MARTIN OPITZ: BUDAPEST, 2023, P. 368.  
ISBN: 978-615-6388-07-0.....150

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14795/j.v10i4>

ISSN 2360 266x  
ISSN-L 2360 266x

Design & layout: Francisc Baja



EDITURA MEGA | [www.edituramega.ro](http://www.edituramega.ro)  
e-mail: [mega@edituramega.ro](mailto:mega@edituramega.ro)

---

# A THEORETICAL APPROACH TO LINGUISTIC POWER

**Selin GÜR**

University of Bern, Institute of  
Archaeological Sciences  
selin.guer@unibe.ch

---

DOI: 10.14795/j.v11i1.974  
ISSN 2360 – 266X  
ISSN-L 2360 – 266X

**Abstract:** In the 1st century BC, Cilicia faced a complex political landscape with the declining authority of the Seleucid Empire. The arrival of the Romans in the region led to a significant change, bringing increased political stability and the suppression of piracy. However, Cilicia's transformation into a Roman province was a gradual process, and it was characterized by significant changes, particularly in terms of language. Local languages coexisted with Greek until Greek gained prominence. Even then, local cults persisted in certain settlements. Remarkably, the Roman presence did not immediately alter the linguistic landscape, as no Latin inscriptions dating before the Sullan period have been found in Cilicia. This suggests that Greek remained the primary language in daily life during the early Roman period. Furthermore, archaeological evidence indicates that Latin was primarily used in administrative contexts, such as milestones, as Cilicia transitioned into a Roman province. This linguistic diversity provides a unique perspective on the region's cultural amalgamation. Hence, this article presents a theoretical framework for understanding the linguistic changes driven by Roman influence by shedding light on their political and social implications to assess how effectively the local population embraced these changes. Through an analysis of Latin integration in both administrative and everyday contexts, it aims to gain insight into its power.

**Keywords:** *linguistic power, linguistic transformation, language, Latin, Cilicia.*

## INTRODUCTION

Cilicia covers the south coastal region of Asia Minor and is defined by natural borders. The borders of Cilicia changed over time, and different sources have stated different opinions on this issue.<sup>1</sup> In his *Geographica*, Strabo (64 BC – AD 20) describes Cilicia as extending from Korakesion (Alanya) to the Gulf of İskenderun and bordered by the Taurus Mountains (Toros Dağları) on the north and west and the Amanus Mountains (Nur Dağları) on the east.<sup>2</sup> He then divides the region into two according to topographical characteristics.<sup>3</sup> The mountainous western part called Rough Cilicia (gr. Κιλικία Τραχεῖα (Cilicia Tracheia), lat. Cilicia Aspera) and the eastern plain part called Plain Cilicia (gr. Κιλικία Πεδιάς (Cilicia Pedias), lat. Cilicia Campestris).<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the boundary was defined by mountains, which created a physical borderline.

During the Iron Age, Cilicia's administrative structure was characterized by a decentralized network of local powers. Languages such as Phoenician,

---

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus depicted the northern border of Cilicia as Kızılırmak (Halys), and that it extended until Egypt; however, he did not give precise information about its limits. HERODOTUS I, 72; II, 34.

<sup>2</sup> STRABON XIV, 5, 2. SETON-WILLIAMS 1954, 123.

<sup>3</sup> STRABON XIV, 5, 1; KORKMAZ 2016, 147.

<sup>4</sup> STRABON XIV, 5, 1.

Aramaic, Luwian, and Assyrian were in use together with the Greek language.<sup>5</sup> Then, the vassal Kingdom of Syennesis governed Cilicia until Achaemenid Persians took control, followed by satraps until Alexander the Great's conquest. Power struggles after Alexander's death divided Cilicia between the Ptolemies and Seleucids, which was then further weakened after the Treaty of Apameia.<sup>6</sup> The Roman Province of Cilicia was then established in the first century BC to maintain peace and combat piracy along the Eastern Mediterranean coast, which had emerged due to the weakened political environment.<sup>7</sup> Along with this, Latin also came into use. This linguistic change must have significantly affected political, social, and cultural identities, too.

The use of multiple languages since the Iron Age, in this case, reflects the region's cultural diversity and intercultural interactions. The adoption of Latin as the official language during Roman rule indicates the significant role of the language as an institutional and symbolic power in governance and administration as it provides communication between organizations and societies. In this sense, this research considers language as a fundamental impact and describes its role in the political and cultural formation of the region. In addition, its role in reflecting the changing dynamics of Cilician society is also addressed.

## LANGUAGE AS SYMBOLIC POWER

Languages structure communication within both institutions and societies. They define and legitimize their practices. Institutions evolve over time, and so do languages; they adapt accordingly. Languages also affect power dynamics. Bourdieu argues that language is not only a tool for communication but that it is a symbolic power that reflects existing power structures and plays a crucial role in shaping social hierarchies.<sup>8</sup> In this situation, people who have control over language can influence discussions and establish societal norms. Often, this reinforces existing power dynamics. For instance, those who are proficient in the dominant language of a community may use it to exclude or marginalize individuals who speak other languages or dialects, thus perpetuating inequalities.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, the social dimensions of politics involve a struggle for domination between the dominant and the dominated within society, and the role of language in constructing social identities is significant as it is regarded as a form of symbolic power.<sup>10</sup>

Dispositions such as social class, religion, and education reflect similarities among people with shared backgrounds, leading to the formation of habitus, which is a subjective expression of individuality.<sup>11</sup> Habitus emerges from past experiences, current practices, and societal structures. Consequently, individuals' social actions are influenced by their habitus. Bourdieu suggests that this process results in an unconscious acceptance of cultural norms and social

distinctions, shaping one's sense of place within society.<sup>12</sup> Additionally, Bourdieu emphasizes the "linguistic habitus," which refers to the language patterns shaped by an individual's social context and experiences.<sup>13</sup> This supports the approach that individuals can adapt and change their linguistic practices over time. However, such changes are restricted by the broader social structures in which individuals are situated. So, these practices not only reflect but may also cause social inequalities.<sup>14</sup> Therefore, the linguistic habitus shapes how individuals communicate and interact within their social environments. Linguistic capital, on the other hand, refers to the accumulation of an individual's linguistic skills. Just as cultural capital influences academic success and social mobility,<sup>15</sup> linguistic capital focuses on language-related skills and their impact on an individual's position, which may impact their social and economic opportunities. As mentioned with the dominant and the dominated, the opportunities here can also predetermine their position in society.<sup>16</sup>

A good example of this cultural capital phenomenon can be seen in Apuleius' *Metamorphosis*.<sup>17</sup> The protagonist Lucius recounts an encounter between a gardener and a Roman legionary soldier. The gardener, unable to understand the soldier's Latin, tries to move away. However, the soldier becomes enraged and physically assaults the gardener. Later, the soldier repeats his question in Greek. There are suggestions that the soldier is not even a native Latin speaker due to grammatical errors in the text.<sup>18</sup> In all likelihood, the soldier, although he knows both languages, used Latin to the gardener, who does not speak Latin, so to probably feel more powerful in this way. This can be seen as an important example of how language is used as a symbolic power. In order to investigate the influence of language on social identity, it is not enough to examine language in a society in only one direction. It would make more sense in terms of understanding its sociocultural effects to examine the language(s) by dividing it into both the dominant (rulers) and the dominated (common people). In order to illustrate this, language usage can be categorized as follows: (1) official language, which includes inscriptions on milestones, official monuments, and formal letters used in administrative contexts; (2) everyday language, which the common people use communicating about their daily tasks and other routine activities, and (3) rhetoric language, which falls beyond the previous two categories, and encompasses intellectual, cultural, symbolic and sometimes metaphoric expressions used by mostly philosophers, authors, and poets. Each of these categories must also be examined in the temporal, political, and sociocultural sphere in which society is situated. They should be evaluated according to the ideologies of the period. In this way, it is possible to gain clearer insight into how language

<sup>5</sup> PILHOFER 2006, 54–56.

<sup>6</sup> APPIAN *syr.* XXXIX; POLYBIUS. XXI.42.

<sup>7</sup> KURT 2009.

<sup>8</sup> BOURDIEU 1992.

<sup>9</sup> BOURDIEU 1992.

<sup>10</sup> BOURDIEU 1991.

<sup>11</sup> BOURDIEU 1977.

<sup>12</sup> BOURDIEU 1986, 141.

<sup>13</sup> BOURDIEU 1991

<sup>14</sup> BOURDIEU 1991.

<sup>15</sup> Cultural capital refers to "the symbols, ideas, tastes, and preferences that can be strategically used as resources in social action." Cultural capital: Oxford Reference. <https://www.oxfordreference.com/>. Accessed 24 February 2024.

<sup>16</sup> As in Bourdieu's analysis of the school system and concept of cultural capital. See: BOURDIEU 1985.

<sup>17</sup> APULEIUS *met.* 9.39; GATZKE 2013, 1 cf. ADAMS 2003, 199.

<sup>18</sup> GATZKE 2013, 1; CALLEBAT 1978, 196.

builds a bridge between institutions and societies. It should be noted that this may or may not be intentional. How words are understood by both parties is important. Sometimes things can be misinterpreted by one side.<sup>19</sup> Therefore, these categories should not be analyzed unilaterally. They should be perceived as a two-sided communication, both in terms of what is being expressed and what is being understood.

Languages contribute to identity formation and social cohesion. Consequently, it is essential to examine examples from history where various powers, such as Cilicia, have had control. This continuous interaction, as well as the political and economic changes, has profoundly influenced linguistic, religious, and lifestyle aspects within the region. In response to evolving dynamics, inhabitants have had to adapt. Language policies, in particular, emerged as a means to contest existing power structures. To do so, it is necessary to understand where it stands in the temporal, political, and sociocultural spheres to yield more accurate results about the role of language in this region.

### FROM SELEUCID EMPIRE TO ROMAN RULE: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF CILICIA

In 323 BC, following the death of Alexander the Great, power struggles erupted among his close commanders regarding how to divide the empire.<sup>20</sup> During this time, Cilicia was situated within the area controlled by Perdiccas.<sup>21</sup> In 321 BC, Antipatros gained control due to the Triparadeisos treaty. Respectively, in 301 BC, after the battle of Ipsos, Antipatros's son Pleistarchos and, in 299 BC, Demetrios Poliorketes had control of Cilicia. In 294 BC, Seleucus I Nicator, founder of the Seleucid Empire, took over Cilicia.<sup>22</sup> Despite Seleucid dominance during the Diadochi period, Cilicia remained influenced by Ptolemaios of Egypt.<sup>23</sup> In 281 BC, Anatolia and Cilicia fell under Seleucus I's administration. Afterward, in 315 BC, Ptolemaios, King of Egypt, occupied Cilicia. The internal disturbance continued from 306 BC until 281 BC. Later on, the empire was divided between three regions: Egypt, Syria-Anatolia, and Macedonia. In 281 BC, Anatolia and Cilicia fell under Seleucus I's administration.<sup>24</sup> Rough Cilicia, on the other hand, resisted full Seleucid rule.<sup>25</sup> During the reign of Seleucus I Nicator, several Greek cities were established in Plain Cilicia, such as Aegae (Ayaş, Yumurtalık) and Alexandria (İskenderun), while some cities' names were changed; Kastabala became Hierapolis and Oeniandos became Epiphaneia.<sup>26</sup> In addition, the local gods were identified with Greek Gods. The Hittite God of Thunder, Tarhunt, was identified with Zeus, Runda identified with Hermes, and Santa with Heracles.<sup>27</sup> Freedom and autonomy

were given to Tarsus, one of the most important cities of the region, by the Seleucids in the third century BC.<sup>28</sup>

While Ptolemaios maintained sporadic control over parts of Rough Cilicia, the region experienced alternating periods of control, with Ptolemaios II dominating Cilicia in 274–271 BC after the First Syrian War.<sup>29</sup> Subsequent Second and Third Syrian Wars (260–253 BC and 246–241 BC) witnessed shifting control until Antiochus III expelled Ptolemaios in 197 BC.<sup>30</sup> In 190 BC, the Battle of Magnesia took place between the Romans, led by Lucius Cornelius Scipio and their ally Eumenes II of Pergamum, and the Seleucid army commanded by Antiochus III. The Romans secured a crucial victory, resulting in the transfer of Anatolia's internal affairs from Seleucid rule to the Roman Empire.<sup>31</sup> The subsequent Treaty of Apamea (188 BC) compelled Antiochus to relinquish lands west of the Taurus Mountains,<sup>32</sup> retaining only the east of Cilicia and Syria.<sup>33</sup> Meanwhile, Plain Cilicia struggled with intricate politics. An authority gap appeared in the last period of the Seleucid Empire, which then also led to a serious pirate problem.<sup>34</sup> The Romans left the yet-unconverted eastern part of the region under local rulers.<sup>35</sup>

During the late second and early first centuries BC, Cilician pirates posed a significant threat in the eastern Mediterranean. Meanwhile, Rough Cilicia was under their control, along with local administrators, while Plain Cilicia remained under the Seleucids' rule. The Roman Senate initially tasked Marcus Antonius with addressing the piracy issue in 102 BC, but the problem persisted.<sup>36</sup> In response, Rome enacted the praetor states law (*Lex de Provinciis Praetoriis*) between 101 and 99 BC, designating pirates with their allies and friends as enemies of Rome.<sup>37</sup> In 92 BC, Cilicia became a Roman province and was assigned to Lucius Cornelius Sulla.<sup>38</sup> Meanwhile, Rome supported Mithridates VI, the King of Pontus. In 91 BC, Mithridates attacked Bithynia and Cappadocia, massacring many Romans to prevent the Roman Empire's expansion into Anatolia. This triggered the First Mithridatic War (89–85 BC), which the Romans ultimately won. Mithridates VI had to cede the territory he gained during the war to Rome, as per the verbal Treaty of Dardanus. Although Mithridates' prestige suffered, the Romans couldn't avenge the slain. Another war seemed inevitable.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>28</sup> The city maintained its prestigious status until 51/50 BC. ÜNAL/GIRGINER 2007, 224.

<sup>29</sup> Such as Kelenderis and Nagidos. SETON-WILLIAMS 1954, 171.

<sup>30</sup> Cilicia changed hands many times during the Syrian wars. YILDIRIM/TEMIZKAN 2017.

<sup>31</sup> TITUS LIVIUS XXXVII; APPIAN *syr.* XI.

<sup>32</sup> APPIAN *syr.* XXXIX; POLYBIUS XXI.42.

<sup>33</sup> ÜNAL/GIRGINER 2007, 224–225.

<sup>34</sup> For detailed information about the emergence and spread of piracy in Cilicia see: ÜNAL/GIRGINER 2007.

<sup>35</sup> Probably for easier management. KURT 2011, 430.

<sup>36</sup> TACITUS *ann.* XII, 62.

<sup>37</sup> RAUH 2003.

<sup>38</sup> However, it's essential to note that Sulla's authority extended only to the duty and jurisdiction area of the province (*provincia*). Therefore, the Province of Cilicia, must be established at the beginning of the first century BC to control the pirates of the Rough Cilicia and provide peace on the shores of the Eastern Mediterranean. KURT 2009.

<sup>39</sup> There is no evidence that Sulla carried out military or administrative activity in Cilicia; however, he had great support from the people of Cilicia during the war against Mithridates. Therefore, after the Treaty of Dardanos,

<sup>19</sup> BOURDIEU 1991, 170. For a modern approach to this issue from the point of view of linguistics see: KRAMSCH 2020.

<sup>20</sup> TEKIN 2010, 134–135.

<sup>21</sup> DIODORUS SICULUS XVIII. 3; SAYAR 1999, 125.

<sup>22</sup> SAYAR 2013, 177.

<sup>23</sup> SAYAR 2001, 279; ÜNAL/GIRGINER 2007, 221.

<sup>24</sup> SPANU 2001, 452; ÜNAL/GIRGINER 2007, 222.

<sup>25</sup> ERZEN 1943; ZOROGLU 1995; ÜNAL/GIRGINER 2007. Ptolemaios occupied coastal cities, but the inner parts of Cilicia remained elusive.

<sup>26</sup> MEYER 2001, 509

<sup>27</sup> SAYAR 1995, 42.

During this period, Lucius Licinius Murena, the governor of Asia, engaged in conflict with Mithridates, leading to the Second Mithridatic War, where Murena faced challenges against the formidable opponent. Sulla's recall of Murena and the ongoing struggles within the Seleucid Empire further complicated matters. In 83 BC, Cilicia fell into the hands of the Armenian king Tigranes. This situation persisted until the Third Mithridatic War when Mithridates VI and Tigranes were defeated by the Roman commander L. Lucinius Lucullus.<sup>40</sup> Even during these wars, pirate issues persisted. Consequently, Rome decided to establish a Roman Province in Cilicia. The exact timing of Cilicia's transformation into a Roman Province remains unclear, but the first known governor was Gn. Cornelius Dolabella served around 80/79 BC.<sup>41</sup> His arrangements in Cilicia indicate that he held the position of the province's inaugural governor.<sup>42</sup> In 90 BC, Dolabella was replaced by Servilius Vatia. Despite several achievements, the issue of piracy persisted, and as a result, Cilicia remained only partially under Roman control.<sup>43</sup> Afterward, in 74 BC, Lucius Octavianus was appointed as governor of Cilicia, but he died before he could contribute to the region. During the period from 74 to 67 BC, Lucius Lucullus held the governorship of Cilicia, simultaneously dealing with the Third Mithridatic War; however, he showed little interest in Cilicia. Following Lucullus, Quintus Marcius Rex took charge from 67 to 66 BC.<sup>44</sup> In 67 BC, piracy had reached a critical point and posed a serious threat to Rome. Therefore, they decided to take more serious action. They commissioned Pompey to punish the Cilician pirates, granting him broad powers under the "Lex Gabinia".<sup>45</sup> Pompey's mission was to put an end to piracy activities in both the western and eastern regions of the Mediterranean.<sup>46</sup> Cilicia was completely cleaned from the pirates.<sup>47</sup> In 64/63 BC, Plain Cilicia came under the administration of the Roman Empire.<sup>48</sup> Pompey's actions extended beyond eliminating pirates; he also achieved supremacy against Mithridates. Pompey abolished the Kingdom of Pontus and established the Province of Bithynia-Pontus. Additionally, he made the Kingdom of Armenia an ally of Rome. As a result, Syria and Plain Cilicia were included in the Roman territory.<sup>49</sup> Pompey also ended the Seleucid kingdom during his stay in Anatolia. Thus, finally, both Rough and Plain Cilicia were included in the Province of Cilicia.<sup>50</sup> For the first time, the Province of Cilicia encompassed the lands from which it derived its name. Its borders extended along the coasts from the Khelidonia (Kırlangıç) Cape to the Issos Bay, including the regions of Pamphylia and Isauria, both along the coasts and inland. The capital of the province was Tarsus.<sup>51</sup>

the Cilician borders expanded from the coast of Pamphylia to Phrygia and Lykaonia in the north. SYME 1979, 120.

<sup>40</sup> ÜNAL/GIRGINER 2007, 226–227.

<sup>41</sup> During his mandate, Pamphylia, Isauria, Pisidia and Lykaonia were included within the borders of Cilicia.

<sup>42</sup> MAGIE 1950.

<sup>43</sup> LEVICK 1967, 23.

<sup>44</sup> SHERWIN-WHITE 1976.

<sup>45</sup> MUTAFIAN 1988, 196; KURT 2011, 430–431.

<sup>46</sup> PLUTARCH *pomp.* 28, 3.

<sup>47</sup> KURT 2011, 430.

<sup>48</sup> ÜNAL/GIRGINER 2007, 232.

<sup>49</sup> MAGIE 1950, 357–360.

<sup>50</sup> MAGIE 1950, 360.

<sup>51</sup> KAYA 2005, 12; TOPDAL 2007, 62.

During the shift from Seleucid to Roman control in Cilicia, significant changes occurred in the region's political authority. Under the Seleucids, Greek administrative practices influenced governance. However, with Roman rule, a more centralized administrative structure emerged.<sup>52</sup> Key to this new framework was municipia, self-governing urban communities with rights akin to Roman citizens. Cities like Tarsus and Anazarbus gained municipal status, allowing them to manage local affairs and participate in provincial governance. Alongside municipia, the Romans introduced administrative offices and procedures to ensure efficient tax collection and public order maintenance. This political framework defined Cilicia's governance throughout the centuries of Roman rule.

### A THEORETICAL APPROACH TO THE LINGUISTIC IMPACT IN CILICIA

Cilicia did not become a Roman province overnight. Considering the extensive geographical reach of Roman rule, it is essential to recognize that this process developed differently for each individual province, resulting in varying experiences. The process of Cilicia becoming a Roman province was not straightforward, unlike other provinces. It involved indirect methods and encountered challenges. Although military action was employed, the transition occurred without internal turmoil, ultimately integrating Cilicia into the Roman provincial system.<sup>53</sup> Controlling the mountainous part was challenging for geographical reasons, but the geopolitical importance of the region and the strategic benefit it would bring to the empire were worth the effort.<sup>54</sup> To understand Cilicia, we must consider it to be comprised of two distinct regions, the Rough and the Plain, as urbanization varied across the entire Cilicia region due to geographical factors.<sup>55</sup> The density of settlements was not high in the inland highlands and the steep coastal areas of Rough Cilicia. These settlements lacked a specific order. Hellenistic cities already existed in the plains of the eastern region. These cities likely adopted Roman practices more rapidly due to their established nature.<sup>56</sup> However, it is essential to remember that when discussing Cilicia as a region, the specified borders serve to delineate geographical boundaries rather than cultural ones.

When discussing the Roman practices to which the people of Cilicia adapted, it is also necessary to look at the language. Starting from the time when Cilicia came under Roman rule, the majority of inscriptions dating from this period are mostly still in Greek. The earliest Latin inscription is

<sup>52</sup> The fusion of Greek administrative practices with Roman governance principles must have shaped the region's identity, too. For further discussion see: GÜR 2023.

<sup>53</sup> It is also known that the taxes collected during this period constituted an important budget for the Roman Empire.

<sup>54</sup> BORGIA 2017, 311.

<sup>55</sup> BORGIA 2017. In terms of daily life, there were notable differences between the two regions. While agriculture thrived on the fertile plains of Plain Cilicia, the Mountainous Region predominantly focused on the timber industry and animal husbandry (such as goats). In addition, olive and wine making gained importance, especially between Lamos and Kalykadnos, and fishing was also carried out in almost all cities on the coast. PILHOFER 2006, 68–69.

<sup>56</sup> BORGIA 2017, 311.

a fragment found at Mallos (Karataş) dating to the Sullan period.<sup>57</sup> The fragment, unfortunately, is too fragmented to provide a clear interpretation, and it reads as below:<sup>58</sup>

Italicei qu]ei · Mallei ·  
negotiantu]r  
..... f.Me]nemachi. n.

Therefore, at least until this period, Greek must still have been actively used in daily life and administration. During that period, the process of adjusting to the new language in Cilicia was not rapid. However, the fact that the Hittite names of some places were still in use indicates that they probably did not leave the Luwian language yet, either.<sup>59</sup>

In addition, Latin inscriptions in this period are seen in various uses, such as milestones, grave inscriptions, legal texts, and honoring inscriptions.<sup>60</sup> It is rather difficult to ascertain the extent to which Latin was used by the common people, since this diversity was mostly associated with official matters. Pilhofer refers to an honorary inscription that encourages doubt in this context. The inscription reads as follows<sup>61</sup>:

[C.] Erennio Maxim[o]  
veterano leg. v  
Macedonicae,  
[s]acerdoti Ca[e]  
[s]aris, civitas [Sy]  
ed[r]en[s]ium h.c.

Γ. Ἐρεννίω Μαξιμ[ω]  
ἐντείμως ἀ[πο]λε-  
λυμένω λεγι[ῶ]νος  
εἰς Μακεδονικῆς, [ἀρ]-  
χιερ[ε]ῖ Καίσαρ [ος, Συε]-  
δ[ρέων ἢ πόλις τε]μιῆς  
ἐν[εκεν]

The inscription (in both languages) translates as, “The people of Syedra erected this honorary inscription in honor of C. Herennius Maximus, a veteran of the Legio V Macedonica<sup>62</sup> and a Caesar’s priest.” As shown above, the inscription was written in both Latin and Greek. The Latin version followed the conventions of the language at that time, beginning with the names of the dedicants and mentioning the honored individual in the accusative case, as in *C. Herennius Maximus*. Here, this usage is correctly used for the direct object of a sentence, and in this case, it

indicates the receiver of an action. In contrast, the Greek version exhibited an unusual linguistic usage. As in Ἐρεννίω Μαξιμ[ω], here ω indicates the dative case. Dative case typically signifies the recipient or beneficiary of an action. However, in this context, it emphasizes that the honor is directed toward Gaius Herennius Maximus.<sup>63</sup> Pilhofer states that this must be because the inscription was first written in Latin and then translated into Greek. This could indicate that the people still did not understand or prefer Latin.<sup>64</sup> It could also be that people simply preferred imitating the Latin version, as the accusative case was frequently used in Latin inscriptions for honoring individuals. This preference may indicate a cultural influence. However, in either case, it is evident that the inscription was initially written in Latin and there was a need to translate it into Greek. In that case, this fragment provides an important example of how language affects social interactions.

Another example of language use and preference stems from religion. The gods and local deities that the people worshiped at that time are mostly known from epigraphic documents, coins, and rock reliefs.<sup>65</sup> Zeus was prominently featured in inscriptions found in West Cilicia and was associated with various nicknames, including Soter, Olympios, and Ktesios. Additionally, he was sometimes linked to specific places, such as Zeus Olbios and Zeus Korykios. Furthermore, Zeus was also referred to by grander titles like Megas, Megistos, Aneiketos Kosmios, and Keraunios, which were connected to the Luwian weather god Tarhunt. So here, the name of the Luwian god was merged with that of the Greek god. Nevertheless, one should note that there is no direct evidence for worshipping Tarhunt (*in Hittite tarḫu*). However, in regions where Zeus is mentioned alongside local gods, it’s assumed that Zeus represents Tarhunt due to Tarhunt’s association with the sky.<sup>66</sup> An example of this could be a Hittite (and probably also Luwian) myth dating to the second millennium BC in which a Storm God defeats a dragon named Illuyanka. This myth, similar to the Greek story of Zeus and Typhon, originally did not take place in Cilicia; however, later versions did after the fifth century BC.<sup>67</sup> This blending of divine identities demonstrates how various mythologies and religious practices were merged together during that time. Likewise, in places with Greek names such as Zeus Olbios, he was worshiped in Latin as Iupiter Olbios.<sup>68</sup> In addition, similar uses have been seen for Hermes, Athena, and Selene, too.<sup>69</sup>

Therefore, the coexistence of Greek and Latin indeed created a bilingual environment in Cilicia, and it is likely that other languages, such as Luwian, were still in use as well. Although Greek was in greater use, both Greek and Latin must have been associated with power and prestige, such that Latin represented Roman authority alongside the

<sup>57</sup> Lucius Cornelius Sulla served as propraetor in Anatolia in around 97/96 BC. SAYAR 2013, 78. The dates were initially proposed by Badian. BADIAN 1959. About discussions regarding Sulla’s presence in Cilicia, see: KEAVENEY, 1995. See also: PLUTARCH *sulla* 5–6.; APPIAN *mith.* II.10.; SEXTUS JULIUS FRONTINUS. *stratagems* I.18.; STRABON V. 2. 11.; APPIAN *hist.* I. 77.

<sup>58</sup> Heberdey and Wilhelm dated the inscription (No. 18) according to its letter forms. HEBERDEY/WILHELM 1896, 8.

<sup>59</sup> PILHOFER 2006, 54–56. Such as; Lamos – Lamia, Olba – Ura, Nagidos – Nahita. PILHOFER 2006, 56; HOUWINK TEN CATE 1961, 193–197.

<sup>60</sup> ECK 2000. For a detailed research see also: SEVINDIK ERTEN 2011.

<sup>61</sup> BEAN/MITFORD 1962, 192.

<sup>62</sup> A Roman legion stationed in the eastern region, particularly in Moesia. BEAN/MITFORD 1962, 192–193.

<sup>63</sup> The name should appear as [C(aio)] Erennio Maxim[o] in Latin and Γ(αίω) Ἐρεννίω Μαξιμ[ω] in Greek.

<sup>64</sup> PILHOFER 2006, 57–58.

<sup>65</sup> For a more detailed assessment of the religions in the region during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, see; KAIZER 2008.

<sup>66</sup> ELTON 2004, 238.

<sup>67</sup> For the myth see: BECKMAN 1982. For a comparison of the myth with the Greek story of Zeus and Typhon see: ELTON 2004, 239.

<sup>68</sup> PILHOFER 2006, 76–79.

<sup>69</sup> For further information and examples see: PILHOFER 2006, 79.

cultural and historical dominance of Greek. However, it is likely that this authority did not force the people of Cilicia to use Latin specifically. The fact that no inscriptions were found in Latin until the Sullan period supports this idea. The use of languages not only shaped administrative norms but also demonstrated that they indeed functioned as vital impacts within societies.

## CONCLUSION

The linguistic dynamics in Cilicia during the Roman period undoubtedly influenced the political environment, languages impacted power structures, identity formation, and the integration of the region into the broader Roman Empire. The predominance of Greek in general use is also essential for understanding the local identity of the region. This linguistic unity is also indicative of a social identity among the population. In general, there seems to have been no compulsion in terms of language. On the contrary, Latin must have been introduced gradually. This linguistic integration likely contributed to the gradual inclusion of Cilicia into the Roman political and economic framework, as well as the spread of Roman cultural and institutional norms.

These changes must have also had negative political consequences. The use of Latin in governance, legal documents, and administrative matters must have created barriers to political participation and access to power for the non-Latin-speaking and exclusively Greek-speaking population. This linguistic division could have strengthened existing social hierarchies and disparities in political representation. Indeed, as the case of Apuleius' *Metamorphosis* shows, those who spoke Latin must have felt more powerful. These linguistic strategies also demonstrate how language is used as a symbol of power. Therefore, to understand how languages shape social identity, examining it in only one direction is insufficient. Language needs to be examined in three categories: the official language used by the dominant, the everyday language used by the dominated, and the rhetorical language that falls outside these two categories but affects both sides. These categories should be analyzed in the context of society's temporal, political, and sociocultural conditions, taking into account the ideologies of the time. This approach helps to better understand how language functions as a power link between political institutions and society.

## REFERENCES

- ADAMS 2003  
Adams, J.N., 'Romanitas' and the Latin language, *The Classical Quarterly* 53/1, 184–205.
- APPIAN  
Appian, *Roman History* (H. White, Trans.) (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1899).
- APULEIUS  
Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* (S. Gaselee, Trans.) (London: William Heinemann; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1915).
- BADIAN 1959  
Badian, E., Sulla's Cilician Command, *Athenaeum* 37, 279.
- BEAN/MITFORD 1962  
Bean, G. E./Mitford, T. B., Sites Old and New in Rough Cilicia, *Anatolian Studies* 12, 185–217.
- BECKMAN 1982  
Beckman, G., The Anatolian Myth of Illuyanka. *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 14, 11–25.
- BORGIA 2017  
Borgia, E., Cilicia and the Roman Empire: Reflections on Provincia Cilicia and its Romanisation, *Studia Europaea Gnesnensia* 16, 295–318.
- BOURDIEU 1977  
Bourdieu, P., *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- BOURDIEU 1985  
Bourdieu, P., The social space and the genesis of groups, *Social Science Information* 24/2, 195–220.
- BOURDIEU 1986  
Bourdieu, P., The Forms of Capital. In: Richardson, J. G. (ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (New York: Greenwood Press), 241–258.
- BOURDIEU 1991  
Bourdieu, P., *Language and symbolic power* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press).
- BOURDIEU 1992  
Bourdieu, P., *Culture, Status and Distinction* (London: Routledge).
- CALLEBAT 1978  
Callebat, L., La Prose des Métamorphoses: g n se et sp cificit . In: Hijmans Jr., B.L., van der Paardt, R. Th. (eds), *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass* (Groningen: Bouma), 167–187.
- DIODORUS SICULUS  
Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History*, Volume I: Books 1–2.34., Loeb Classical Library 279 (C.H. Oldfather, Trans.) (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933).
- ECK 2000  
Eck, W., Latein als Sprache politischer Kommunikation in Stadten der  stlichen Provinzen, *Chiron* 30, 641–660.
- ELTON 2004  
Elton, H., Romanization and some Cilician cults. In: de Ligt, L., Hemelrijk, E., Singor, H.W. (eds.), *Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives. Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, c. 200 BC – AD 476), Leiden, June 25–28, 2003* (Leiden: Brill), 231–241.
- ERZEN 1943  
Erzen, A., *Tarsus: Kilavuzu* (Istanbul: Maarif Matbaası).
- SEXTUS JULIUS FRONTINUS  
Frontinus, *Stratagems. Aqueducts of Rome*, Loeb Classical Library 174 (C.E. Bennett and M.B. McElwain, Trans.) (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925).
- GATZKE 2013  
Gatzke, A. F., Language and Identity in Roman Anatolia: A Study in the Use and Role of Latin in Asia Minor (Unpublished doctoral thesis, The Pennsylvania State University).
- G R 2023  
G r, S., *Change, Continuity and Identity: Cilician Houses and Households from Neo Cilician 5 until Late Cilician 4 (605 B.C. – A.D. 300)* (Istanbul: Ege Yayınları).
- HEBERDEY/WILHELM 1986  
Heberdey, R./Wilhelm, A., *Reisen in Kilikien: ausgef hrt 1891 und 1892 im Auftrage der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Classe 44* (Wien: In Commission bei C. Gerold's Sohn).
- HERODOTUS  
Herodotus, *The Histories* (A. D. Godley, Trans.) (London: William Heinemann, 1920).
- HOUWINK TEN CATE 1961  
Houwink Ten Cate, P.H.J., *The Luwian population groups of Lycia*



- and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic period. *Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui* 10 (Leiden: Brill).
- KAIZER 2008  
Kaizer, T. (ed.), *The Variety of Local Religious Life in the Near East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Leiden: Brill).
- KAYA 2005  
Kaya, M. A., Anadolu'da Roma Eyaletleri: Sınırlar ve Roma Yönetimi, A. Ü. Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi 24/38, 11–13.
- KEAVENEY 1995  
Keaveney, A., Sulla's Cilician Command: The Evidence of Apollinaris Sidonius, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 44/1, 29–36.
- KRAMSCH 2020  
Kramsch, C., *Language as symbolic power* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- KORKMAZ 2016  
Korkmaz, Z., Cilician Iron Age settlements, *ANODOS Studies of the Ancient World* 12, 147–163.
- KURT 2009.  
Kurt, M., Roma Cumhuriyeti Yönetiminde Kilikya Bölgesi Ve Yerel Güçler, *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 11/1, 115–139.
- KURT 2011  
Kurt, M., Ovalık Kilikya'da MÖ I Yüzyıl Roma Yönetim Olgusu ve Tarkondimotos Krallığı, *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 31, 429–446.
- LEVICK 1967  
Levick, B., *Roman colonies in southern Asia Minor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- TITUS LIVIUS  
Livy, *Ab urbe condita* (W. Weissenborn, Trans.) (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1873).
- MAGIE 1950  
Magie, D., *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of Third Century after Christ I–II* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- MEYER 2001  
Meyer, M., Cilicia as Part of the Seleucid Empire: The Beginning of Municipal Coinage. In: Jean, É., Dinçol, A.M., Durugönül, S. (eds.), *La Cilicie: Espaces et pouvoirs locaux (2e millénaire av. J.-C.–4e siècle ap. J.-C.)*. Actes de la table ronde internationale d'Istanbul, 2–5 novembre 1999, *Varia Anatolica* 13 (Istanbul: Institut français d'études anatoliennes-Georges Dumézil), 505–518.
- MUTAFIAN 1988  
Mutafian, C., *La Cilicie au carrefour des empires* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- PILHOFER 2006  
Pillhofer, S., *Romanisierung in Kilikien. Das Zeugnis der Inschriften* (München: Herbert Urtz Verlag).
- PLUTARCH  
Plutarch, *Plutarch's Lives* (B. Perrin, Trans.) (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. London: William Heinemann, 1916).
- POLYBIUS  
Polybius, *Histories* (B. C. McGing, Trans.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
- RAUH 2003  
Rauh, N. K., *Merchants, Sailors, and Pirates in the Roman World*. (Stroud: Tempus).
- SAYAR 1995  
Sayar, M.H., Kilikya'da Epigrafi ve Tarihi Coğrafya Araştırmaları 1993, *Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı* 12, 39–60.
- SAYAR 1999  
Sayar, M.H., Kilikien und die Seleukiden. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Kilikiens unter des Seleukidenherrschaft anhand einer neu entdeckten Festung und einer neugefundenen Inschrift, *Asia Minor Studien* 34, 125–136.
- SAYAR 2001  
Sayar, M.H., Kilikya'da Epigrafi ve Tarihi Coğrafya Araştırmaları 1999, *Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı* 18/1, 275–288.
- SAYAR 2013  
Sayar, M.H., Historical geography, ancient cities and harbours in Cilicia Tracheia and in Cilicia Pedias. *Collection de l'Institut des Sciences et Techniques de l'Antiquité* 1277/1, 175–181.
- SETON-WILLIAMS 1954  
Seton-Williams, M.V., Cilician Survey, *Anatolian Studies* 4, 121–174.
- SEVINDIK ERTEN 2011  
Sevindik Erten, D., Kilikia Bölgesi'ndeki Latince ve Latince-Hellence Yazıtlar. (MA Thesis, İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).
- SHERWIN-WHITE 1976  
Sherwin-White, A. N., Rome, Pamphylia and Cilicia, 133–70 BC, *The Journal of Roman Studies* 66, 1–14.
- SPANU 2001  
Spanu, M., Teatri ed edifici da spettacolo in Cilicia, *Publications de l'Institut Français d'Études Anatoliennes* 13/1, 445–477.
- STRABON  
Strabon, *The Geography* (H. C. Hamilton and W. Falconer, Trans.) (London: George Bell and Sons, 1903).
- SYME 1979  
Syme, R., *Roman Papers I–II* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- TACITUS  
Tacitus, *Annals* (R. Mellor, Trans.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- TEKİN 2010  
Tekin, O., *Eski Yunan ve Roma Tarihine Giriş* (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları).
- TOPDAL 2007  
Topdal, E., Kilikia Eyaleti: Kentler ve Roma Yönetimi. (MA Thesis, İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).
- ÜNAL/GIRGINER 2007  
Ünal, A./Girginer, K.S., *Kilikya-Çukurova: İlk Çağlardan Osmanlılar Dönemi'ne Kadar Kilikya'da, Tarihi Coğrafya, Tarih ve Arkeoloji* (İstanbul: Homer Kitabevi).
- YILDIRIM/TEMİZKAN 2017  
Yıldırım, N./Temizkan, M., Seleukoslar Döneminde Yaşanan Suriye Savaşları Üzerine Bir İnceleme, *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 14/39, 117–131.
- ZOROĞLU 1995  
Zoroğlu, L., *A guide to Tarsus* (Ankara: Dönmez Offset).