

Review: Michels, Christoph. *Kulturtransfer und monarchischer "Philhellenismus": Bithynien, Pontos und Kappadokien in hellenistischer Zeit. Schriften zur politischen Kommunikation Bd. 4.*

Wu, Ching-Yuan

Ph.D. student, Ancient History Graduate Group, University of Pennsylvania



Author: Christoph Michels
Kulturtransfer und monarchischer“Philhellenismus”:
Bithynien, Pontos und Kappadokien in hellenistischer
Zeit. Schriften zur politischen Kommunikation Bd. 4.
(Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008).
Pp. 439.
ISBN 9783899715361

Discussion on what Alexander’s conquest and his successors’ kingdoms meant to the ancient world has been focused on the reception and rejection of terms such as Johannes Gustav Droysen’s “Hellenismus” and concepts such as W. W. Tarn’s “Alexander the Great and the unity of mankind”. Current

back-and-forth has come to what A.B. Bosworth described as “a welcome erosion of traditional dogmas” (1980:1), moving away from a generalizing interpretation of cultural transformation and also a simplistic understanding of a top-down directive to Hellenize the barbaric. Christoph Michels’ published Ph.D. thesis is a recent addition to the revisionist project. His volume presents a comparative study of known instances of euergetism, minting, and city foundation that were pursued by three north Anatolian monarchies in the Hellenistic period. Consensus among the Greek sources is that the kings of Bithynia, Pontos, and Kappadokia were not of Greco-Macedonian origin: Bithynians were the Thyni, a Thracian tribe that spanned the Thracian and Salmydessian coasts (Strab. 12.3.3, 12.4.30; the Mithridatids were reportedly Persian nobles (Diod. 19.40.2, 20.111.4); the Ariarathids claimed Persian ancestry as well (Diod. 31.19.1). Hellenocentric sources such as Diodoros Sikulos lauded their adoption and use of Greek cultural elements as philhellene acts that seeks to civilize oriental barbarism (Diod. 31.19.8). Such self-civilizing is often referred by scholars as hellenisation, following Droysen. The volume takes a cautious approach to such assumptions through the reappraisal of epigraphy, numismatics, and literary sources.

In the introduction, M. recontextualizes the term *hellenisation* in the language of cultural anthropology, treating it analogously with *kulturtransfer* (“cultural transfer”), simplifying the term into a formula: a non-Greek culture taking spiritual and material elements of Greek culture (p. 19). M. further designates the intentional practice of *kulturtransfer* a form of cultural policy, or *hellenisierungspolitik* (Hellenizing policy) in the present study. M. emphasized that a Hellenizing policy need not be intended to “civilize” oneself or to “propagandize” oneself as Greek, but can be for pragmatic purposes. M. also addresses in the introduction the issue of hellenocentric sources and paucity of evidence regarding the research of the three kingdoms in North Anatolia. These circumstances created a veil of homogeneity in

terms of the hellenizing policies of each kingdom. M. explains how a comparative approach can bring to light the indigenous and uniqueness of each kingdom's Hellenizing policies, and come to contextualize the state of cultural transfer in North Anatolia in the Hellenistic period (p. 26-3). Earlier efforts in the study of coinage by Reinach (1888) and prosopographical studies by Olshausen (1974) have produced a variegated picture of the use of Greek elements by each of the three kingdoms. Invoking these studies, M assumes that Hellenising policies are case-specific (p. 36-38).

Three chapters that follow the introduction delineates the specifics of Hellenizing policies in each of the three kingdoms, organized respectively into acts of euergetism, minting, and city foundation. While euergetism, minting and city foundation can be useful separately as reference chapters guiding researchers to updated scholarship on epigraphy, numismatics, and occasional literary sources, they are laid out in logical progression (Kleu 2009).

In chapter 2, M. first asks the question of intent. A catalogue of Bithynian benefactions, such as statue of Nicomedes I at Olympia, Ziaëlas' recognition of *asylia* by Kos, and the dedications by Prusias II in Delos and Didyma, as well as the donation of slaves by Nicomedes III at Delphi, may suggest that Bithynian kings have designs to win prestige through philhellene benefactions, and therefore hardly an "honest" admiration of Greek culture (p. 86). Yet, M. showed that/the individual motive behind each dedication is difficult to ascertain. Continuity of this euergetistic habit across generations suggest a habit instead of individual calculation. Patterns of benefaction also creates tendencies that can be argued as types of intent. The spread of cities and sanctuaries where Bithynian kings have chosen to dedicate is striking compared to that of the Pontic kings, who have a very clear emphasis on Athens and Delos. Here, M. assumes that this disparity may be the result of the Roman domination and subsequent sabotage of monuments associated with the Mithradates (p. 121), but considering that the Pontic kingdom was considerably more Iranian/Anatolian compared to that of the Bithynian kings,

one might suspect that cultural differences was more a factor compared to vandalism. In this case, the focus of Pontic kings on Athens and Delos may have to do with economic reasons.

Another problem highlighted in this chapter is Hellenocentric source. Diodoros' described the Kappadokian king Ariarathes V has having imposed forced-hellenisation (*forcierten Hellenisierung*) upon his kingdom, as he received a Greek education and made his kingdom a place of sojourn to men of culture (Καππαδοκία τότε τοῖς πεπαιδευμένοις ἐμβιωτήριον ὑπῆρχεν, Diod. 31.19.8). M. observed that no parallel activities in other places of the Greek world shows such commitment to self-hellenization. It is likely that this derivation from the norm of Kappadokian policies of interaction with non-Iranian communities may be an intervention by a hellenocentric Diodorus, or more likely related to the turmoil in the succession caused by Orophernes Nicephoros the pretender supported by Demetrios I Soter of Syria (p.125-7). In the latter case, Orophernes' benefactions in Priene can be seen as a competitive drive for prestige and legitimacy, and Diodorus happened to have documented the response by Ariarathes V, namely a philhelle policy that is purposefully competing with Orophernes. Prestige was manifestly important to all three kingdoms, but to say that there is a uniform type of euergetism across all cases would be a vulgar generalization.

As the second chapter pointed to general tendencies and patterns of euergetism as indicative of different sorts of intent, the third chapter uses numismatic iconography to show deliberate hellenization of the subjects of each kingdom in question. Since currency bears the portrait of the ruler on the obverse and religious symbolism on the reverse, they ought to be considered as official documents and function as political and cultural-political statements that speaks of the cultural policies of kings and kingdoms (p. 151). Yet, M. questions the value of such assumptions for the purpose of measuring the degree of Hellenisation of non-Greek populations, because there are no sources that talk about the reception of these images by the

potential indigenous observer of the rural population (p. 152). As such, while one may see numismatic iconography as a form of Hellenisation and monetisation of society, M. follows Howgego (2000) and Callataÿ(2000) to argue that currency were primarily minted for spending, not propaganda; then Bresson (2005), who remarked that "Propaganda must necessarily be redefined as a by-product of minting, not its aim" (qtd. p. 155).

Having unpegged the relationship between iconography, propaganda, and audience, M. went on to demonstrate with clear photos of coins that the kings of the three kingdoms did not simply imitate Greek iconography, but rather showing a conscious reception of specific characteristics while mixing un-Greek traits. In the case of Nicomedes I, which the silver tetradrahm displays his portrait in the tradition of the diadochoi, the conscious invocation of Bendis is a clear demonstration of Thrako-Bithynian elements (p. 160; 180). The same sort of deliberate manifestation of local traits can be seen on the tetradrahm of Pharnakes I, with the non-Greek deity "Men Pharnaku" on the reverse (p. 193-4; 217). The Kappadokian coinage were first designed based on Achaemenid models, and by the time of Ariarathes IV the adoption of Seleucid designs become apparent, with the reverse showing that Athena Nikephoros Ma was frequently invoked. Apart from Athena Ma, the norm of the iconography on the reverse shows deities which Greeks would certainly recognize as Greek – Bithynian coins often show Zeus, Herakles, and Hermes; Pontic coins Athena, Zeus, Hera, Apollo. M. sees these silver tetradrahm iconography as aiming for international audience, if not the court circle, which were the direct recipients of silver tetradrahms. Such critique against the generalizing use of silver tetradrahm as measurement of the degree of hellenisation is a convincing revision. M. also noted how bronze coinage may be used. Compared to bronze denominations with Greek characteristics, which Fernoux used to argue for their value of measuring cultural change in Bithynia (2004), silver tetradrahm has little value for revealing the Hellenising process in the rural indigenous population.

However, M. pointed out that the limited number of Bithynian bronze coinage reflects our limited knowledge of the degree of monetization of rural regions. It is the case, however, that the profuse existence of Kappadokian bronze coinage with Achaemenid characteristics shows that Kappadokia was for a very long time separated from Greek audiences, international or domestic. A page illustrating the types of Median headdresses also help demonstrate how the diverse forms of regional self-representation in Kappadokia formed a mature monetary system of its own (p. 246).

After having critiqued assumptions that Hellenisation is measurable via the extent of Hellenising policies, M. moves to discuss city foundations in chapter 4. Reports of kings founding cities have often been used to argue that these kings were Hellenising their kingdoms through urbanisation. Addressing such interpretation, M. pointed out that city-foundation associated with the three kingdoms should be treated with care. One reason is the term πόλις and its cognates. For example, Pharnakes I of Pontos founded Pharnakeia through synoecism, incorporating the population of Cotyora (Strab. 12.3.17), but was Pharnakeia founded as a πόλις? Strabo described Trapezus as πόλις Ἑλληνίς, and the port Pharnakeia as ἐρυμνὸν πόλισμα, a fortified town (12.3.17). Was Pharnakes I founding a πόλις? Was this a Hellenising policy?

To address this problem, M. proposes that city foundations should be examined by the degree which it affected its immediate region, before they become tools to measure hellenisation. In the case of Zipoition, Ariaramneia and Ariaratheia, there is no indication that establishments such as founder cults were present, in order to provide a platform for rulers to communicate with these “cities”. Pharnakeia would be an instance which the Pontic kings were concerned with how to make claims of authority and legitimization. In this regard, while reports by Greek authors such as Strabo show that Bithynian, Pontic, and Kappadokian kings were keen to “found” cities as if mimicking Greco-Macedonian precedents, these foundations were more

related to demonstrating royal attributes through the nominal act of naming rural settlements as dynastic name-bearing, but not the actual enforcement of change in their way of life (p. 340-341). There are, however, actual city foundations, particularly Tyana under Ariarathes, where there were intentional introductions of gymnasium, festivals (Dionysian Techniten) and the adoption of the Greek language. The point M. wishes to emphasize is again the plurality of hellenising policies and hellenising acts that serve different purposes.

In the concluding chapter, M. again invoked the language of cultural anthropology through a short discussion of cultural policy and instrumentalization of culture. He argues that one should separate the notion of cultural policy in the modern world from that of the ancient world. Cultural policy in antiquity, as he defines it based on earlier findings, does not mean an active promotion and dissemination of culture, but rather refers to the instrumentalization of culture, namely the patronage of art, religion and literature, as well as a range of royal representations aimed at establishing legitimacy in the domestic as well as international domains (p. 346). The equation of what appears to be Greek with Greekness is simplistic and misleading. In this sense, the utility of speaking cultural anthropology is limited. In a counterexample, Michels discusses a second century BCE funerary inscription (= IK 29.98) from rural Tarseia in Bithynia (p. 347-8). The stele has inscribed the names of the family members that appear to be apparently Thracian, but the funerary epigram was an imitation of Homeric Greek. The apparent Hellenisation of these Thracian elites show a clear disjunct if one chooses to interpret urban as Greek and rural as non-Greek, or to say that Thracian names indicate non-Greekness. In closing, Michels emphasized that possible interpretations of archaeological, epigraphical and numismatic materials should take into account of plurality and variability of the process of Hellenisation, and that there is no intentional policy in the

three kingdoms to Hellenize their domain. Somewhat surprisingly, the term *kulturtransfer* is not referred to outside of the introductory chapter.

If instrumentalisation of culture is the heart of M's thesis, *kulturtransfer* seems too heuristic a term for this volume. The guiding concept could use some more discussion at the end to return to M.'s research design and methodology. This comparative study seems to have room for further reconfiguration of the notion of Hellenisation other than stressing the plurality of avenues of approach and interpretation. Perhaps an opportunity missed.

This volume is a welcome addition to the scholarly corpus on Hellenistic kingdoms such as H. Fernoux's *Notables et élites des cités de Bithynie aux époques hellénistique et romaine* (2004), J. G. Manning's *The Last Pharaohs: Egypt under the Ptolemies, 305-30 BC* (2010), but also comparative approaches to studying the process of cultural change, for example the Christian Mileta Christian Mileta, *Der König und sein Land: Untersuchungen zur Herrschaft der hellenistischen Monarchen über das königliche Gebiet Kleinasiens und seine Bevölkerung* (2009). Michels' comparative approach is backed by impressive scholarship (1798 footnotes, updated bibliography across various languages) and careful documentation of primary sources (p. 351-58). Each chapter is introduced and concluded meticulously. Photos and illustrations are clear, mostly black/white or gray scale for numismatic presentations and inscriptions.

Bibliography

- Bosworth, A.B. "Alexander and the Iranians." *JHS* 100 (1980) 1-21.
- Bresson, A. "Coinage and Money Supply in the Hellenistic Age. *Making, Moving and Managing.*" *The New World of Ancient Economies, 323-31 BC*. Eds. Archibald et al. Oxford, 2005, pp. 44-72.
- De Callatay F. "Guerres et monnayages à l'époque hellénistique, Essai de mise en perspective suivi d'une annexe sur le monnayage de Mithradate VI Eupator." *Économies antiques. La guerre dans les économies antiques, Entretiens d'archéologie et d'histoire*. Eds. J. Andreau et al. Saint-Bertrand-de Comminges, 2000, pp. 337-364.
- Fernoux, H.-L. *Notables et élites des cités de Bithynie aux époques hellénistique et romaine (IIIe siècle av. J.-C. – IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)*. Lyon, 2004.

Review: Michels, Christoph. *Kulturtransfer und monarchischer "Philhellenismus": Bithynien, Pontos und Kappadokien in hellenistischer Zeit. Schriften zur politischen Kommunikation Bd. 4.*

Howgego, C. *Geld in der antiken Welt. Was Münzen über Geschichte verraten, aus d. Engl. von J. u. M. Nollé.* 2000.

Kleu, M. Review of: Christoph Michels, *Kulturtransfer und monarchischer "Philhellenismus": Bithynien, Pontos und Kappadokien in hellenistischer Zeit.* *BMCR* (2009) no. 4.
<http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2009/2009-09-04.html>. accessed 24.05.2014.

Olshausen, E. *Prosopographie der hellenistischen Königsgesanden. Teil I: Von Triparadeisos bis Pydna. Studia Hellenistica 19.* Lovanii, 1974.

Reinach, T. *Trois royaumes de l'Asie Mineur. Cappadoce, Bithynie, Pont.* Paris, 1888.

中文提要

克里斯脫夫·密赫爾(Christoph Michels)《文化轉移與君王的希臘瘋：希臘化時期的比提尼亞、旁圖、加帕多西亞》是德國萬登出版社(Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht)政治傳播學系列的第四冊。此書作者以文化人類學下的文化轉移概念出發，研究希臘化時期三個小亞細亞地區的非希臘裔王朝統治各自領地的手段。多年來，學界檢討卓業森(Johann Gustav Droysen)所提出的「希臘化」概念，多發現馬其頓君王不只是於領地內眾建希臘城市，而是多有接納所轄領地之內地方統治文化與生活方式的現象，以致於小亞細亞、列凡特、美索不達米亞、埃及等地，文化種類繁雜。延續如此研究潮流，此書作者以三個非希臘裔的小亞細亞王國作為研究對象，針對三國的碑刻、錢幣、眾建城市等往往被認為是代表「希臘化」或「希臘文化政策」的表徵，研究非希臘裔君王與希臘文化之間的關係。以方法論，此書以文化人類學理論為基礎，檢視卓氏「希臘化」定義之下的「希臘瘋」君主以及「希臘化」定義下的「文化政策」兩個面相。非希臘裔君主究竟是不是扮演「推動希臘文化者」這個角色？這些君主究竟有無所謂的「文化政策」？研究發現，三國雖鑄錢幣，且錢幣文字與圖示在設計上雖與希臘錢幣雷同（如正面有君王人頭像、背面有神祇圖示、並使用希臘文標註君王或國度名稱等等），但是神祇模樣與種類呈現在地化的特徵，並不能說是以希臘人為目標群而設計的。城市亦然：雖然有作家如有三國非希臘裔君王眾建城市、並如

馬其頓諸王將城市以自己或皇室成員命名的記載，但究竟三國建的是生產或防禦型的鎮，還是如希臘地區一般有體育場、劇院等公共設施的城市，就難以考證。考古資料顯示，希臘化時期在此三國領地之內的希臘城市似乎多原本就是希臘殖民地，隨後被各王國或征服、或威嚇，而收入勢力範圍之內。由希臘化時期三國諸王建起的希臘型城市少之又少，其餘多是以生產或是管理方便而擴大範圍的城鎮。各君王的目的似是要建立統治體系，而不是要希臘化。之所以會有非希臘裔國王建城以將其領土希臘化的誤解，多與古希臘作家的偏見有關。此書作者所提的核心例子就是西西里的狄奧多羅(Diod. Sic. 31.19.8)敘述加帕多西亞君王阿立阿拉提五世(Ariarathes V)的希臘瘋(Philhellenismus)。狄奧多羅記載，阿立阿拉提五世母親是希臘人，早年受希臘教育，在王位競爭中勝出後，在加帕多西亞內推行希臘制度，終於成為有文化水準的人都能暢遊的國度。然而，此書作者強調，除了加帕多西亞並沒有明顯的希臘化特徵之外，沒有任何跡象顯示阿立阿拉提五世有如其他非希臘裔君王一樣，在希臘半島與愛琴海諸島上大肆捐獻雕像建築，以宣傳自己的希臘性。狄奧多羅應是以希臘本位思想渲染了阿立阿拉提五世的若干舉措，而這些舉措（如領雅典城公民資格、由波斯式錢幣改為鑄希臘式幣、大興土木在提亞那(Tyana)建希臘式公共建築等），或與王位競爭時依靠馬其頓與希臘勢力較有關係。作者結論以為，三國君主是有文化政策，但所謂文化政策的意義與今日不同。三國文化政策並不是主動地推行和散佈希臘文化，而是將文化當成統治者自我表述的工具，以穩定國內外局勢。建立權力與正當性才是三國文化政策的目的。若有其他效果，也不是主要的目的。