UM Libraries Depository

103324902008

THE HISTORY OF BITHYNIA

by

Letha Cornelia Reed. A.B., B.S.

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
in the
GRADUATE SCHOOL
of the
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI.

1914.

*Approved
A.T. Christhead.*

378.7M71
XR25

Table of Contents.

Chapter One-The Geography of Bithynia and the Origin
of its People.

Chapter Two-Bithynia as an Independent State.

Chapter Three-Bithynia as a Client State of Rome.

Chapter Four-Bithynia as a Roman Province.

Chapter Five-The Culture History of Bithynia.

CHAPTER I

The Geography of Bithynia and the Origin of its People.

Natural boundaries on three sides separate the Bithynians from their neighbors. On the north the Euxine, on the west the Propontis, and on the south the mountain range of Olympus confine its limits. The eastern line is not so easily determined. Herodotus believed the Sangarius river to be the boundary line since the Mariandynians are placed between the Sangarius and Heraclea.¹ Arrian described the Sangarius as flowing through the country of the Bithynians.² In that case, the dividing line between Bithynia and Paphlagonia would probably be the Billaeus, it being the nearest natural boundary to the east.³ Xenophon made Bithynian territory extend to the city of Heraclea.⁴

Bithynia was well fitted by nature to be the home of a hardy race. The greater part of the country consists of mountains covered by forests, but the valleys and districts near the coast are very fertile. The most important mountain range is the Mysian Olympus which is more than seven thousand feet above sea level. Its snow capped peaks are visible at a distance of seventy miles. East of this range is the Ala-Dagh, which extends from the Sangarius river to Paphlagonia. Both ranges help form the border of mountains which bound the great table land of Asia Minor. The country between these mountains and the coast is covered with forests and traversed with but

1. Plin. H. N. V, 3.

2. Arr. Anab. I, 29.

3. Rawlinson, Herod. I, 385, assumes that the Parthenius is meant. It is not likely that Bithynia extended that far east for we have no indication of the diminution of Bithynian power and this country was certainly not in their possession during the regal period.

4. Xen. Anab. VI, 4.

few roads even in modern times. The country which lies to the west is very broken and is also covered with forests.

Two deep inlets indent the west coast. The greatest, the Gulf of Astacus, penetrates nearly fifty miles into the interior. At the head of this Nicomedia was situated. South of this is the Gulf of Cius which is only twenty-five miles long. At its extremity and at the mouth of a valley communicating with the Ascanian lake, the city of Cius was built. On the shore of this lake lay Nicaea, surrounded by a plain, fertile but unhealthy in summer.¹

On the northern coast, Calpe afforded a good harbor in ancient times.² It was midway between Byzantium and Heraclea and was protected from storms by a long, rocky promontory which extended into the sea. There were springs of fresh water and wood of various kinds, some especially fit for ship building. The inland country had a rich, loamy soil free from stones. Barley and wheat, pulse of all sorts, millet, sesame, and figs grew there. Grapes, which produced sweet wines, were cultivated.

The principal rivers are the Sangarius, flowing through the country from north to south; the Rhyndacus which separated Bithynia from Mysia; and the Billaeus which rises in the Aladagh, fifty miles from the sea, and flows past Claudiopolis to the Euxine Sea near Teium.

The roads followed the coast line with few exceptions. A road crossed Bithynia from Nicomedia to Flavopolis there

1. Strab. XII, 4.

2. Xen. Anab. VI, 4.

separating, one branch leading to Ancyra; the other going north through Paphlagonia. It was the last of these which was so extensively used in the Mithradatic wars.¹

Many and varied are the accounts we have of the origin and distribution of the Bithynians. Herodotus combined the terms Thynian and Bithynian and called both Asiatic Thracians, but placed the Thynians on the peninsula between the Euxine and the Gulf of Izmid and the Bithynians in the interior.² While they lived on the Strymon, they had been called Strymon-eans but had been driven out, according to their own account, by the Mysians and Teucrians. Strabo believed the Bithynians to have been a body of Mysian colonists who had gradually assumed the names Thynian and Bithynian from Thracian people who came and settled among them.³ He cited Scylax of Caryanda and Dionysius as authorities for the Bithynians, saying that there still existed in their time a people in Thrace who called themselves Bithynians. Pliny quotes other authors as saying the Bithynians were descendants of the Thyni who crossed over from Europe.⁴

Appian records the beliefs that were current in his time.⁵ The Greeks, he said, believed that the Thracians who accompanied Rhesus to the Trojan war, fled to the outlet of the Euxine sea where the crossing was shortest, and lacking ships, they took possession of the country called Bebrycia. Others believed that these fugitive Thracian crossed to the Bithya river and settled

1. Ramsay, Hist. Geog. As. Min., 197.

2. Herod. VII, 75.

3. Strab. XII, 5.

4. Plin. H. N. V, 42.

5. App. Mithr. 1.

along its banks in the territory called Thracian Bithynia. Being forced by hunger to return to Bebrycia, they changed the name of their new home to Bithynia in memory of the river on whose banks they had dwelt. Or perhaps the name was gradually changed since there was little difference between Bithynia and Bebrycia.¹

Interesting, but entirely untrustworthy are the legendary accounts which are given of Bithynian origin. Some Greeks believed that their first ruler was Bithys, the son of Zeus and Thrace and that the Bebrycians and Bithynians derived their names from the illustrious parentage of their king.² In Roman imperial times, when the Mantineans were seeking a pretext for giving divine honors to Antinous, the favorite of Hadrian, they declared that he belonged by birth to the town of Bithynium beyond the river Sangarius and ^{that} the Bithynians were originally Arcadians from Mantinea.³

Herodotus is undoubtedly correct in his statement of the Thracian origin of these people. He knew them well enough to describe their armament and ^{the} dress used when they accompanied Xerxes to Greece. He is supported by Pausanias,⁴ who called Ziboetes, the King of Bithynia, a Thracian, also Arrian⁵, and Xenophon⁶ who spoke of these people as Bithynian Thracians.

1. Appianus Rhodius, in his epic poem the Argonautica, distinguished between the Bebrycians and the Bithynians. Lycus told of the conquest of the Bithynian tribes by his father and of the later coming of the arrogant Bebrycians, who seized portions of his territory. Argonaut. II, 155.

2. App. Mithr. 1.

3. Paus. VIII, 9, 7.

4. Ibid. V, 12, 5.

5. Arr. Anab. I, 29.

6. Xen. Anab. VI, 4

Present day studies also show that these invading Bithynians were of Indo-European stock, connected with the Thracians and the Phrygians and were imposed on a Mediterranean or Hittite stock who had been there from earlier times.¹

The Mariandynians seem to have separated the Bithynians from the Euxine coast in early times,² but the Bithynians rapidly gained power and extended their influence to the sea.³ The Mariandyni^{and} moved to the east and with the Paphlagonians and some tribes of the Epicteti formed the eastern ethnic boundary of the Bithynians. To the south dwelt the Mysians and the Phrygians of the Hellespont.⁴

Of the history of these people during the Lydian period, we know little. All northern Asia was overrun by the Cimmerians during the reign of Ardyas, 686-637 B.C.⁵ A later King, Alyattes, drove them from Asia. Croesus, the last Lydian King, brought the Thynian and Bithynian Thracians, together with the rest of the nations west of the Halys, under his power,⁶ but his control was only nominal. It is not likely that he ever even reached the interior for the people remained unaffected by Lydian culture. They seem to have kept themselves equally remote from Greek civilization for Xenophon found no towns or other evidences of civilization from the mouth of the Euxine sea to Heraclea.⁷

1. Olmstead, Lectures.

2. Plin. H.N. V, 43.

3. Xen. Anab. VI, 4; Strab. XII, 3.

4. Strab, XII, 314.

5. Herod. I, 14.

6. Ibid. I, 28.

7. Xen. Anab. VI, 4.

Croesus was defeated by the Persian King Cyrus and all of Asia became a dependency of Persia. Cyrus and his successor Cambyses seem to have given little attention to this part of their empire.¹ Darius in his organization of the Kingdom into twenty satrapies placed the Asiatic Thracians (Bithynians), Phrygians, Mariandynians, Paphlagonians, and the Syrians (Cappadocians) in the third satrapy and fixed their tribute at three-hundred and sixty talents.² This organization as planned by Darius was probably carried out for we know of two Persian governors of this territory, Memnon and Mentor, who ruled before the invasion of Alexander.³ The Bithynians formed a part of the army of Xerxes in his invasion of Greece and were led by Bassaces, who was the son of Artabanus and the nephew of Darius.⁴ Although these people followed Persian leaders in war, they remained unsubdued by them at home. The Persian government aimed only at holding the cities and the important lines of communication with its capital. Thus the Bithynians, living in the interior, were left free to develop in their own way and to become organized under native princes who succeeded in maintaining their independence until Roman power became supreme in the East.

1. Strabo. XII, 3 tells us that Prusa, at the base of Mount Olympus, was founded by Cyrus, but Pliny H.N. V, 43 gives this honor to Hannibal who was sheltered at the court of Prusias I. The name of the city clearly indicates that it was build during the reign of the Bithynian King.

2. Herod. III, 90.

3. Diod. XVII, 7.

4. Herod. VII, 75.

Chapter II

Bithynia as an Independent State.

The first leader of the Bithynians of whom we have definite knowledge is Deodalsus, who led his marauding bands into the territory of the Chalcedonians and Byzantines, and made it necessary for them to enroll Thracian mercenaries in their armies to repel the invaders.¹ With Deodalsus, whose accession dates between 430 and 440 B.C., we have the beginning of a dynastic line which extends to 74 B.C., the nucleus of a state whose barbaric power remained unbroken by Persia or any other eastern power. The Bithynians nominally belonged to the satrapy of Phrygia.² Although they continually harassed the Satrap, they aided him in driving out the Ten Thousand who were invading Persian territory.³ When the Greeks led by Xenophon started to forage in Bithynia, the Bithynians and the cavalry of Pharnabazus cut off five hundred of their number. Later, in the day they attacked the advance guard of the army itself but were driven off. The expedition proceeded without further attack through Bithynia to Chrysopolis.

The policy of Deodalsus, when he rose to power, was to favor the Greeks so long as they came on friendly missions, and to protect the Greek cities already established on his borders. An instance of this friendship is ^{the} protection given to the Athenian general Lamachus when on a

1. Herod. III. 90.

2. Xen. Anab. VI. 4, 24; Hell. III. 11.

3. ~~Id.~~ Id. VI. 24.

tax collecting expedition to Heraclea.¹ His fleet had been destroyed at the mouth of the river Calix, by a sudden flood, while he was inland ravaging the country². They returned secure from attack through the country of the Bithynians to Chalcedon. Deodalsus put an end to the constant attacks his people had been making on Astacus, a Greek city on the Propontis, which had been founded in 435 B.C.³ Although admirably located, it had not risen to importance because of ever present danger from attack⁴.

Of Boteiras, the successor of Deodalsus, we know nothing beyond the fact of his being next in line of succession and that the Bithynians were still free and continuing to defy external control. This struggle against foreign domination is evident in the reign of Bas, who succeeded his father Boteiras. He defended his country from Calas, the satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia and defeated a well equipped force which was sent into Bithynia.⁵ The invasions made by the generals of Alexander the Great were repelled and the country saved from Macedonian supremacy.⁶

Ziboetes became King in 326 B.C. and fought the power of Antigonus⁷. His position was made more difficult by the Greek cities on his borders who favored his enemy. Eleven years after his accession, he came from the interior of

1. Thuc. IV, 75.

2. Just. XVI, 3.

3. Strabo. XII, 4.

4. Mem. 20.

5. Ibid. 20; Arr. Anab I, 17.

6. Diod. XVIII, 44.

7. Ibid. XIX, 60.

Bithynia and beseiged Astacus and Chalcedon. He was prevented from taking them by Polemaus, the general of Antigonus. Polemaus, however did not have strength great enough to reduce Bithynia, so he made terms with Ziboetes which seem later to have been embodied in a kind of an alliance.¹ In the partition which followed the battle of Ipsus, in 301 B.C., Bithynia was given to Lysimachus.² He tried to bring the inhabitants under subjection by sending a body of Macedonian soldiers into the country. This force was defeated and its commander killed. A second army was sent only to be routed and chased from Bithynian boundaries by the able Ziboetes. Lysimachus then resolved to conduct the war in person and led out an army which was also defeated. Whether Lysimachus decided to agree to Bithynian independence after this defeat, or was planning another attack, we do not know. But these victories led Ziboetes to assume the title of King in 297 B.C. and Bithynia was no longer merely a collection of tribes but became a state with a recognized head.

The defeat of Lysimachus did not solve the problem of maintaining the independence so recently acquired. After the death of Lysimachus the whole of Asia Minor belonged nominally to Seleucus, who had either to recognize King Ziboetes as head of the Bithynian state or make war on him as a rebellious chieftain. Seleucus probably decided on

1. Diod. XIX, 60.

2. Mem. 9, 10.

the latter course, for he made an alliance with Heraclea against the Bithynians. But we have no data relating to the invasion of a Seleucid army. When Antiochus^{the} First succeeded Seleucus, he attempted to subdue the revolting parts of his father's dominion.¹ Hermogenes of Aspendus, who was a lieutenant of Patrocles, was sent to regain the Greek cities of Bithynia and bring them under Seleucid control. Heraclea made terms with Hermogenes, thus securing herself from attack, but Ziboetes drove the invaders from his territories.

Diplomatic skill as well as military power was shown in the subsequent relations of the Bithynians with Antiochus^{the} First.² He sent an army into their territory to wipe out the defeat of Hermogenes and assert his own supremacy. This attack came at an unfavorable time for the Bithynians who were involved in quarrels as to the succession. Ziboetes had died and Nocomedes, his eldest son had succeeded him, after killing all possible heirs to the throne except his brother Ziboetes. The extreme western part of Bithynia, opposite Byzantium, called Thynia, was held by this Ziboetes. Nocomedes, realizing the danger of foreign attack while his country was in this divided state, formed an alliance with Heraclea against Antiochus. He gave the Thynian dominions which Ziboetes held to Heraclea. Ziboetes was forced to

1. Mem. 15.

2. Ibid. 16.

fight the Heracleots and Nicomedes was left free to defy Antiochus. The Northern League and Antiochus joined Nicomedes at this time.¹ The Northern League had been formed by the union of Heraclea and the cities of Tios, Cierus and Amastris. Heraclea had recently purchased Tios and Cierus and had attempted to buy Amastris. Antiochus was of little aid to his allies for he soon made peace with Antiochus and left them to carry on the war alone. They then found it necessary to call in the aid of the Galatians.² These Galatians were bands of savage fighters from the north who could be induced, through hope of booty, to fight on either side. They did not belong in Asia Minor and must not be confused with the inhabitants of the Roman province of Galatia who belong to a much later period of history, and only in part were descendants of these Gauls. Vengeance was first wreaked on Ziboetes, who was probably under Seleucid protection. The Thynian country was ravaged and its inhabitants massacred. The Galatians soon passed beyond the control of Nicomedes and remained a problem for his successors to solve.³

Bithynia was troubled by Antiochus no longer, after Nicomedes' enlistment of the Gauls. He was still considered an enemy, however, for he was not included among the guardians of the royal children. In 250 B. C., when Nicomedes

1. Memn. 17.

2. Just. XXV. 2.

3. Paus. X, 23, 14; Liv. XXXVIII, 16.

died, he left them to the protection of Antigonus, Ptolemy, and the neighboring cities of Byzantium, Heraclea and Cius.¹ Bithynia again endured a civil war. Nicomedes left his kingdom to the sons of Etazeta, his wife at the time of his death. An earlier wife, Ditizele, who was a Phrygian, had a grown son named Ziela, who had been banished. When news of his father's death reached him at the court of Armenia where he was being entertained, he secured a band of Galatians and invaded Bithynia. The claims of Etazeta and her children were upheld by those sovereigns and cities under whose protection they had been placed by the late King. They were defeated by Ziela who then secured the entire kingdoms.¹ He punished the Heracleotes for their opposition by allowing his Galatians to raid the city. Antigonus probably took the unfortunate heirs of Etazeta to Macedonia, where a son of Nicomedes named ^{Zibotes} later appears.²

Ziela seems to have been allied with the Seleucids in their struggle with the Attalids. He gave his daughter in marriage to Antiochus Hierax,³ who no doubt thought to neutralize the Hellenic support his rival Attalus was receiving by this alliance with barbarian power. Ziela planned the murder of the Gallic chieftains whom his father had invited into his

-
1. Justin mentions a Eumenes, King of Bithynia, B.C. 245 who, while Antiochus Hierax and Seleucus were weakened from war, attacked Antiochus and the Gauls. He desired to reduce Asia and gained possession of the greater part of the country, Just. XXVII, 3. He evidently has reference to Eumenes of Pergamum.
 2. He was an uncle of Prusias I. The Byzantines supported his claim to the Bithynian throne.
 3. Eus. I, 251, Bevan, House of Sel. I, 201.

Kingdom. They learned of the Kings intentions and killed him.

Prusias I, son of Zitelas, assumed royal power in 228 B.C. The Gauls already in his kingdom were a constant menace to his power but Attalus brought over a fresh supply to assist him against Achaëus.¹ These barbarians began attacking, plundering and burning the cities of the Hellespont, and met with no check until they beseiged Ilium. They were driven driven from there by the inhabitants of Alexandria Troad. They moved on to the territory of Abydos and seized Arisba, continuing their depredations until Prusias led an army against them. In the pitched battle which followed, Prusias used Gallic methods in fighting. He killed the men, women and children in camp and left their baggage to be plundered by his soldiers. This defeat turned back the wave of barbarian invasion and delivered not alone the cities of the Hellespont but the inland Kingdoms from invasion.

Prusias was now free to increase his own power and influence. There was no united Seleucid power to oppose him, since Antiochus III was fighting to hold together his ancestral domain in the East and Achaëus and Attalus were contending for the sovereignty of Asia. This last struggle pleased Prusias.² Either, if victorious, would make a powerful neighbor who would not look with favor on his self aggrandizement. Byzantium afforded an excellent opportunity for a trial test of Prusias' policy of expansion. They had been levying toll on

1. Polyb. V, 111.

2. One of Prusias' pretexts for making war on the Byzantines was that they had helped reconcile Achaëus and Attalus. Polyb. IV, 49.

all passing ships. Those commercially interested appealed to Rhodes since the Rhodians were acknowledged masters of the sea.¹ After an attempt to arrange the matter amicably with the Byzantines, the Rhodians voted for war and sent an embassy to Prusias to ask for his alliance. Prusias was glad for this opportunity to make war on Byzantium but justified himself in the undertaking by saying that the Byzantines had voted to put up statues of him and had neglected to do so; they had sent a mission to join in the Attalid celebration of the festival of Athene but had sent no one to him when he was celebrating the Soteria;² and they had gone to great trouble to end hostilities between Achaeus and Attalus and friendship between these two was detrimental to his own interests.³ Prusias arranged with the Rhodian ambassadors that they were to carry on the war by sea and he would conduct it on land.

The Byzantines were aided by Caurus, King of the Gauls in Thrace, who protected merchants sailing into the Pontus.⁴ They had been confident of securing the alliance of Achaeus, but, by a clever strategem of the Rhodians, Andromachus, the father of Achaeus, was secured from Ptolemy. The possession of this most important hostage forced Achaeus to remain neutral.⁵ Prusias began the war by his seizure of Hieron, which was favorably situated at the entrance to the channel.

1. Polyb. IV, 47.

2. Soteria was the celebration in honor of the King as Soter or Saviour.

3. Polyb. IV, 49.

4. Ibid. VIII, 24.

5. Ibid. IV, 51.

This place had been in the possession of Byzantium only a short time, having been purchased by them at a great expense.¹ Because of its location, it could be used as a vantage point against merchant sailors, fishermen, or those engaged in slave trade. Prusias next took possession of a district in Mysia which had belonged to Byzantium for many years.

The Byzantines tried to weaken Prusias' power by setting up a rival claimant to the throne. Tiboetes was an uncle of Prusias and had been living at the Macedonian court. A Byzantine embassy had been sent to conduct him from Macedonia but in the progress of the journey, Tiboetes died. They were thus deprived of the advantage which would have been gained by a dynastic struggle in Bithynia. Prusias had realized the danger in the introduction of Tiboetes and had pulled down every fort which could be of any possible use to his enemy.² Fully appreciating the advantage given him by the death of Tiboetes and the elimination of Achaëus as a Byzantine ally, Prusias renewed the war with increased ardor. He conducted the war on the Asiatic side in person and hired Thracians on the European side to prevent the Byzantines from leaving their gates.³ The Rhodian fleet prevented ships from sailing into the Pontus⁴ and Byzantium was surrounded by enemies.

1. Polyb. IV, 50.

2. Ibid. IV, 52.

3. Ibid. 51.

4. Ibid. 50.

Cavarus, a Gallic King, came to Byzantium and offered freindly intervention.¹ The treaty agreed to was simple in its regard to the Rhodians, the Byzantines were not to collect toll from any ship sailing into the Pontus. In the clause relating to the Bithynians, the promise of peace and amity forever was given. Neither was to attack the other. Prusias promised to restore to Byzantium all lands, forts, populations and prisoners without ransom; the naval and military supplies taken; the timbers, stonework and roofing belonging to fort Hieron; and to compel the Bithynians to restore any property taken by them from the farmers in the Byzantine district of Mysia. According to this treaty, Prusias gave up all he had gained during the war. It seems incredible that in the moment of victory he would have conceded so much. It is possible that he feared to go on without Rhodian aid since their withdrawal would leave him without naval support, a considerable item in a war with Byzantium. Rhodes had gained all she was fighting for and could not be expected to continue the struggle. The threat of invasion by Achaeus from so near a military base as Sardis might also have influenced him.²

Prusias found a new ally in Philip of Macedon, who, being checked in his extension of power in the West by Rome, resolved to gain eastern territory. This alliance was formed entirely for the sake of aggrandizement for Philip made

1. Poly. IV, 52.

2. Ibid. V, 77.

no attempt to justify his actions. He hoped to gain the Ptolemaic possessions in Asia, now easy prey because of the minority of Ptolemy Epiphanes.¹ Prusias coveted the Greek mercantile cities in his territory. The passage of the Macedonian army to Asia was protected by Prusias who was soon rewarded with the gift of Chalcedon. This city submitted to them without even the semblance of a fight. Prusias had long desired the Greek city of Cius which was admirably located in regard to communication with the interior of Bithynia. It is located at the mouth of the river draining the Ascanian lake, upon whose shore was located the Bithynian capital, Nicaea. Cius is to Nicaea what Joppa is to Jerusalem, a seaport. Philip took the city by storm, then razed it to the ground, and sold its inhabitants into slavery. He presented the vacant site to Prusias, who had desired the city in all its prosperity and was incensed at this needless destruction.² At the Congress at Nicaea, several years later, Philip defended himself by saying that he did not go to war with Cius but only assisted Prusias to take it.³ Myrleia, near Cius, was next destroyed and Prusias' dominions extended to the Rhyndacus.⁴ Rhodes, Byzantium, and Pergamum felt that their existence was threatened and formed an alliance against Philip and Prusias. Philip gave up his Eastern conquests and returned to Macedonia in 201 B.C. Prusias fought the Attalids while Philip conducted campaigns in Greece. In 209 B.C., there was a

1. Polyb. XV, 20.

2. Ibid.. XV, 22.

3. Ibid. XVIII, 4.

4. Ibid. XV, 23; Strabo XII, 4.

Bithynian invasion of Pergamum, serious enough to recall Attalus from the Aetolian wars.¹ Prusias was considered an ally of Philip against Rome all through the Macedonian war for he was mentioned not only in the treaty between Philip and the Epirotes in 207 B.C.² but in the treaty with Rome after the battle of Cynoscephalae as well. In this last treaty Flamininus was ordered to write to Prusias commanding him to liberate Cius.³

Antiochus III had desired the Syrian towns belonging to Egypt quite as much as had Philip.⁴ But his desire had been for all so he waited until Rome had defeated his rival. He tried to bribe Eumenes by a marriage alliance and to secure the friendship of Greek cities but the alliance of Bithynia was especially necessary to him since their territory lay on the flank of the Roman advance. He had reason to expect their aid for Prusias had been an ally of Philip in his late war against Rome and the Bithynians were hereditary enemies of the Attalids, now staunch allies of Rome.

Antiochus placed the matter before Philip as being not only a matter of defense of territory but of existence itself.⁵ He said that Rome was coming to abolish all monarchies;^{that} Philip of Macedon and Nabis had already fallen and that he (Antiochus) was the next to be attacked. When he

1. Liv. XXVIII, 7

2. Ibid. XXIX, 12.

3. Polyb. XVIII, 44; Liv. XXXIII, 30.

4. Ibid. XV, 20.

5. Liv. XXXVIII, 25; Polyb. XXI, 11.

was subdued, Prusias would come next., since Eumenes had submitted to voluntary servitude. Prusias was moved by this reasoning but saved from a Seleucid alliance by a letter received from the Scipios.¹ Scipio Africanus relieved his fears by a clever defense of Roman policy.² He pointed to instances where Rome had established Kings and showed that she had always extended their powers and increased their dominions. He spoke of their magnanimous treatment of Philip of Macedonia, of their generosity in dealing with Massanissa in Libya. Prusias was probably influenced most by a report from Caius Livius who commanded the fleet as praetor. He came to him as an ambassador direct from Rome and showed him how much better Rome's chances were of winning than those of Antiochus.

Prusias seems not to have rendered Rome much actual service in this war. However, the friendship of the Bithynians and Macedonians determined Flamininus, in 190 B.C., to take the land route in conveying his army to Asia. The battle of Magnesia placed Bithynia outside of Seleucid power forever. Asia was no longer a state, but a motley collection of Greek cities, small kingdoms, and semi-barbarous tribes which inhabited the interiors. This collection was not as yet wholly under Roman control but was fast becoming so. Bithynia's enemy, the Kingdom of Pergamum, had been greatly strengthened in the Roman settlement after the

1. Polyb. XXI. 11.

2. Liv. XXVII, 25; App. Syr. 23.

battle of Magnesia. To their territory had been added Mysia, the provinces of Phrygia on the Hellespont, Lydia, Caria, Great Phrygia and Milyas.¹

Prusias had great confidence in the military genius of Hannibal whom he had harbored since his flight from Antiochus. The Romans had demanded the surrender of Hannibal but he had eluded the vigilance of his guards and had escaped by way of Crete to Bithynia.² Prusias now resolved with Hannibal's aid, to attack Eumenes of Pergamum.² He was successful on land and sea. The Attalids sent many embassies to Rome imploring the Senate to intervene. Some of these expeditions were to inform the Senate against Philip, who, they alleged, aided Prusias against them.³ In 185 B.C., a Roman embassy, headed by Titus Quintus Flamininus, came to Prusias demanding answers to the charges made, of making war on Eumenes, who was an ally, and of harboring Hannibal, who was an enemy.⁴

Prusias was the first Bithynian King to yield obedience to a command. He made no attempt to protect Hannibal but sent a body of troops to surround his house and prevent escape.⁵ Hannibal had long understood the Romans and doubted the faith of princes and had secreted poison to be used when the time came for his surrender. He took his own life.

The last years of Prusias' life were spent in attempts

1. Liv. XXXVIII, 39; Polyb. XXI, 24, 48.

2. Just. XXXII, 4.

3. Polyb. XXXIII, 1; Liv. XXXIX, 46.

4. Liv. XXXIX, 51; Cas. Dio. I, fr. 64.

5. Liv. XXXIX, 51; Just. XXXII, 4.

to take Heraclea. In 182 B.C., Tiberius Gracchus had forced Pharnaces to restore to Prusias Tium which Eumenes had given to the Bithynian King some years before.¹ The possession of Tium and Cierus, which he now took by force of arms, enabled him to surround Heraclea. In an attack on the city, Prusias was injured by falling stone and forced to give up the siege.² He was borne in a litter back to Bithynia where he died from his injuries.

With Prusias I, the independence of Bithynia ceases. The cessation of hostilities with Pergamum and the surrender of Hannibal at Rome's demand shows Bithynia's submission to a stronger power. In the restoration of Tium to Prusias after it had been taken by Pharnaces, we see Rome's policy of protecting her client. With Prusias II, the client relationship becomes fixed.

1. Polyb. XXV, 1.

2. Mem. 27. .

CHAPTER III.

Bithynia as a Client State of Rome.

Prusias II ascended the throne of Bithynia in 180 B.C. Although not possessing education, virtue,¹ or even a pleasing personal appearance, he was gifted with superior reasoning power.² He had married the sister of Perseus of Macedonia but when the third Macedonian war began, Prusias did not allow this marriage alliance to interfere with his own safety.³ His reasons for neutrality were, that Rome could not expect him to make war against his wife's brother; and if Perseus were victorious, Macedonian favor for himself could be secured through the Bithynian queen. However, Prusias recognized his duty as a client prince of Rome to the extent of furnishing Caius Marcius five ships of war to be used against Perseus.⁴

In 171, Prusias sent an embassy to Rome to ask that peace might be made with Perseus.⁵ The ambassadors stated that Prusias had always supported Rome and would continue to do so as long as the war should last but that Perseus desired peace and had asked for Bithynian mediation at Rome. Prusias could not have given Rome the support demanded from a client prince or he would not have feared so for himself when Perseus was captured. His abject submission was shown by his shorn head and his costume, consisting of a Roman toga, Italian shoes, and a Roman hat. In this dress of a slave, who

1. Liv. Ep. 50; Polyb. XXXVII, 7.

2. Polyb. XXXVII, 7.

3. Liv. XLII, 29.

4. Ibid. XLIV, 10.

5. Ibid. 14.

had been made free by his masters will, he met the Roman Generals, explaining that he realized his position as the libertus of the Romans.¹ The generals laughed at his appearance and sent him on to Rome. His behavior at Rome was equally absurd. He entered the senate, after paying reverence to the threshold, and greeted the seated senators as his preservers.² Livy seems prone to give dignity to ceremonies that took place in the capital city and his account of the visit is much more favorable to the Bithynian King.³ Prusias and his son Nicomedes arrived at Rome accompanied by a large retinue, to pay their respects to the deities, senate, and the people of Rome. Perseus is mentioned once. Prusias congratulated the Romans on their victory over him and on the augmentation of their empire. The quaestor was delegated to conduct the Bithynian party over the city. When Prusias visited the Senate, on the third day of his sojourn at Rome, he mentioned his own deserts in the late war and asked to be allowed to sacrifice for the further success of the Roman people. He desired a renewal of the Roman and Bithynian alliance and modestly requested that any territory which had been taken from Antiochus and not granted to any other might be given to him. He then presented his son Nicomedes to the senate and waited for their answer. They granted all that he asked for except the increase in territory and promised to send a

1. Polyb. XXX, 19; App. Mithr. 2.

2. Ibid. XXX, 19; Cas. Dio. I, fra. 68; App. Mithr. 2.

3. Liv. XLV, 44.

commission to investigate that. Presents were given to Nicomedes, of the same value as those given to Masgaba, the son of King Masinissa, who was a client prince of Rome. Subsequent events in Prusias' dealings with the Attalids show that the Bithynian King really had some influence at Rome. It is probable that Livy's account is partly true.¹

Prusias used his privileges of clientship to the fullest extent when he returned to Bithynia. Embassies, complaining of Eumenes, followed in rapid succession. In 165 B.C., Eumenes was accused of ravaging Bithynian borders and of entering into a conspiracy with Antiochus against the Romans.² A more definite statement of Attalid aggression was made a year later by Pytho, an ambassador from Prusias.³ He declared that Eumenes had taken certain places from Prusias, that he had not evacuated Galatia or obeyed the decrees of the senate, and that he opposed everyone who tried to shape his policy according to Rome's desires. The senate carried out its policy of delay and took no definite steps in protecting Bithynia. However, fresh security for the freedom of Galatia was obtained.

Prusias used his influence against Eumenes in Asia, and persuaded the Gauls and the Pisidian Selgians to ^{send} embassies to Rome to complain of the Attalids.⁴ Eumenes sent his brothers to defend him against these accusations but did not succeed in allaying the suspicion of the senate. In 161, a delegation

1. Livy was familiar with Polybius' account but believed him prejudiced. His own account, he states, is drawn from those of other Latin writers. Eutropius, IV, 20, agrees with the Livy statement.

2. Liv. Ep. 46.

3. Polyb. XXXI, 6.

4. Ibid. 9.

of Bithynians and Gauls came to Rome on the same mission,¹ but Attalus defended the position of his brother Eumenes.

Failing to secure Roman intervention, Prusias decided to carry on the war alone. He invaded the Pergamene territory and defeated an army led by Attalus.² He next directed his forces against Nicephorum, destroying the temples and carrying off the works of art. South of Pergamum lay Elea, a coast city. Prusias' attack was not successful here, because of reinforcements which had been sent into the town by Sosander, Eumenes' foster brother. Marching east to Thyatira, he plundered the temple of Artemis in the holy village. He robbed Temnus, then destroyed it by fire.

While Prusias had been fighting battles, the Attalids had been sending embassies to Rome. Andromachus had reported Prusias' first invasion to the Senate.³ Nicomedes and the Bithynian embassy had little difficulty in convincing the Senate of the untruth of the report, so well had Prusias stirred up distrust of the Attalid power.⁴ The senate followed the usual custom in such cases and sent Apulcius and Gaius Petronius to investigate. After the defeat of Attalus, his brother Athenaeus was sent with Publius Lentulus to Rome. The senate was thoroughly alarmed by the report of Lentulus and called Athenaeus in to testify. After listening to him,

1. Ibid. XXXII, 3.

2. Polyb. XXII, 27.

3. Ibid.. XXXII, 28.

4. The senate distrusted the Attalids also because of an alliance they had formed some years before with Cappadocia and Syria. This alliance, though avowedly philo Roman, had not been regarded favorably by the Senate.

the Senate decided to send out Cento, Hortensius, and Arunculeius with orders to Prusias to cease warring against Attalus, who was their ally.¹

When the ambassadors reached Asia, they demanded that Prusias should take a cavalry support of a thousand and should go to a place on the frontier.² He would be met there by Attalus with a like number and a treaty would then be arranged. Prusias agreed to comply with these regulations and sent the ambassadors ahead. But instead of following with the required cavalry escort he led forward his entire army. Attalus fled at the sight of the Bithynian army. Prusias plundered their camp and took possession of their beasts of burden, then passed on to Nicephorum, devastating the country and burning the towns. Pergamum was the next point of attack. Attalus had fled there from the frontier so Prusias resolved to besiege the city. News of Prusias' disregard of the Senate's decree and discourtesy to the Roman ambassadors had reached Rome. The Senate was enraged and appointed ten commissioners led by Anicius, Fannius, and Quintus Fabius Maximus to put an end to the war and compel Prusias to indemnify Attalus for injuries.³ Prusias, realizing that Rome was thoroughly roused and that he could gain nothing by prolonging the war, raised the siege of Pergamum and agreed to a treaty of peace. The Roman embassy decided that he must give Attalus twenty decked ships and five hundred talents of silver.⁴

1. Polyb. XXXIII, 1; App. Mithr. 3.

2. App. Mithr. 3.

3. Polyb. XXXIII, 9.

4. App. Mithr. 3.

In 148, Prusias sent his son, Nicomedes, to Rome because he had designs on the Bithynian throne.¹ His nominal business was to secure Prusias' release from payments still due Attalus.² Nicomedes was high in favor at Rome and could obtain this release if it were possible for any one to do so. Nicomedes' death might have been planned with the idea of benefiting the younger children of Prusias, for he had married a second wife.³ But judging from our knowledge of Prusias' character, his love of power and his jealousy of Nicomedes who was loved by the Bithynians, he was evidently safeguarding his own power when he sent the young prince to Rome.

Menas, the agent of Prusias, was charged with the task of killing Nicomedes,^{or,} if he was not successful, in securing the remission of payments.⁴ When the case was argued in the senate, Andronicus, who represented Attalus, showed that the payment was less than the plunder. Menas, being attracted by Nicomedes' personality and argument, hesitated to kill him but did not dare to return to Prusias without having done so. Nicomedes sought a conference with Menas and together they formed a plot against Prusias. Andronicus, the legate of Attalus, was to assist by persuading Attalus to convey Nicomedes to Bithynia.⁵ These negotiations were carried on secretly at night, on board a ship near Bernice

1. Cas. Dio. IX, 28; Just. XXXIV, 4.

2. App. Mithr. 4.

3. Just. XXXIV, 4.

4. App. Mithr. 4; Just. XXXIV, 4.

5. Ibid. 4.

in Epirus. In the morning, Nicomedes donned the diadem and the purple of royalty and came forth.¹ Andronicus immediately saluted him as King and gave him an escort of five hundred soldiers. Menas had been accompanied from Bithynia by two thousand native soldiers. These men would be of great assistance to Nicomedes on his return so Menas, by a skillful setting forth of the facts, secured their allegiance for the young King. He pointed out to them that their safety would depend on their being able to judge which would be the stronger King. He contrasted the two Kings: Prusias was old, hated by his subjects; Nicomedes was young, loved by all Bithynians, in the favor of Rome and possibly in alliance with Attalus, since Andronicus had furnished him with a guard. His alliance with Attalus was of vast importance, since he ruled extensive territories bounding Bithynia and was an old enemy of Prusias. The wisdom of following Nicomedes was plainly seen and the troops saluted him as King of the Bithynians.²

Attalus was delighted to see the throne of his ancient enemy threatened and gladly agreed to conduct Nicomedes to Asia. On reaching Asia, he ordered Prusias to assign certain towns for his son's occupancy and territory to furnish him supplies. Prusias' reply was truly characteristic. He responded that Nicomedes would not be at a loss for territory over which to rule for he would soon be given the territory

1. App.. Mithr. 5

2. Ibid. Pr. 4.

of Attalus. He had invaded Pergamene territory once before for this purpose and would do so again.¹

Prusias then sent a report of the affair to Rome asking that Attalus and Nicomedes be brought to trial. The forces of Attalus invaded Bithynia at once. The Bithynians were soon won to the side of Nicomedes and his ally, for Prusias was both hated and feared by his subjects. Prusias hoped for help from Rome, so, taking a body guard of five hundred men loaned him by his son-in-law Diegyllis, the Thracian, he took refuge in the citadel of Nicaea, to await the return of the Roman embassy. The urban praetor at Rome was under the influence of Attalus so there was a long delay in introducing the Bithynian ambassadors to the Senate. When they finally gained an audience and stated their case, the Senate voted that the legates sent to adjust the difficulty should be chosen by the urban praetor. The embassy selected was composed of three men, Aulus Manrinus, whose head had been badly scarred from a falling tile; Marcus Licinius, who was lame from gout, and Lucius Mallerlus, who was said to be the most stupid man in Rome.² Polybius quotes Cato's comment on this embassy as follows: " Not only would Prusias perish before they got there but Nicomedes would grow old in his Kingdom. For how could a nation make haste, or, if it did, how could it accomplish anything when it had neither feet, head, nor intelligence. "³ The ambassadors on reaching

1. App. Mithr. 6.

2. Ibid. 6; Liv. Ep. 50.

3. Polyb. XXXVII, 6.

Bithynia ordered the cessation of hostilities.¹ Nicomedes and Attalus, anxious to keep the favor of Rome, agreed to it, being certain that the Bithynians would not allow Prusias to be restored to the throne.² The inhabitants of the country expressed their hatred and fear of Prusias and the legates returned to Rome without taking any definite steps toward the King's restoration. Despairing of help from Rome and deserted by his people, Prusias retired to Nicomedia, to strengthen its fortifications in order to resist attack. The inhabitants opened their gates to Nicomedes. Prusias took refuge in the temple of Zeus where he was stabbed by some emissaries of Nicomedes.³

During the first part of the reign of Nicomedes II, he gave Rome much needed assistance in her war with Aristonicus.⁴ With the death of Attalus, the royal line of Pergamum^{had} became extinct. In such a case, the last King could dispose of his Kingdom by testament so Attalus, being angry at his subjects, willed his throne to Rome. Aristonicus, the son of Eumenes II by a concubine, placed himself at the head of Thracian mercenaries and slaves whom he had set free and gained control of almost the entire Kingdom.⁵ There being few Roman troops in Asia, the burden of this war fell heavily on the client states. The first army of the allies met

1. App. Mithr. 7

2. Ibid; Polyb. XXXVII, 7.

3. Justin says that he was killed by his son Nicomedes but his account of the affair is very brief so he may mean only that he was killed by his order. Just. XXXIV, 4.

4. Entrop. IV, 20.

5. Just. XXXVI, 4.

with an overwhelming defeat. The Roman army sent out under the leadership of Publius Crassus Mucianus was surprised, defeated, and its commander captured.¹ Marcus Perpenna then led an army of Romans and their allies and captured Aristonicus who was taken to Rome and executed.²

Nicomedes II and Mithradates formed an alliance and invaded the Roman territory of Paphlagonia which lay between Bithynia and Pontus.³ Paphlagonia was a rich prize since it contained many Greek cities which were centers of trade and very wealthy. It was now divided between the two invading kings. The Roman senate sent ambassadors to both Kings demanding its restoration. Mithradates based his claim upon inheritance, the Kingdom having been held by his father, unquestionably belonged to him. Nicomedes admitted that he had no right to the country and promised to restore it to the legitimate sovereign. He immediately changed his son's name to Pylamenes, the royal Paphlagonian name, and assigned the kingdom to him. The ambassadors, unable to adjust the matter without military support, returned to Rome.

Cappadocia, located just south of Pontus, was in a condition favorable to the ambitious schemes of Nicomedes and Mithradates. Gordius, an assassin hired by Mithradates, killed King Ariarathes VI and put his son Ariarathes VII, who was a minor, on the throne.⁴ Nicomedes had invaded the country

1. Justin XXXVI, 4.

2. Eutrop. IV, 20; Justin says that Aristonicus died before he could be led in triumph, thus ending the rivalry between Aquilius and Perpenna.

3. Just. XXXVII, 4.

4. Just. XXXVIII, 1.

and taking advantage of Mithradates' delay in settling the succession, had married the Cappadocian queen Laodice, a sister of the Pontic King. Mithradates, then drove Nicomedes from the country and reinstated Ariarathes VII. Failing to gain influence over the young king, he had him assassinated and gave the Kingdom to his own son, a child of eight, and appointed Gordius to be his guardian. The rebellion of the Cappadocians was put down by Mithradates. Nicomedes brought forth a rival claimant to the throne whom he claimed to be the third son of Ariarathes V.¹ He tried to gain Roman sanction by sending his wife Laodice to Rome to testify that the Cappadocian prince was the son of that Ariarathes who had fallen in the war against Aristonicus when giving aid to the Romans. The senate, realizing the ambition of both Kings, took Cappadocia from Mithradates and Paphlagonia from Nicomedes, declaring both countries free, - not subject to Kings. Rome did not desire to see any of her eastern dependencies grow strong. There were no longer powerful Kingdoms who needed watching as there had been in the instance of Pergamum and Syria. Rome needed no buffer state in northern Asia Minor.

Nicomedes II, dying at this time, the Kingdom passed on to his son Nicomedes Philopator.² His claim was recognized by the Bithynians and the Roman Senate, but was disputed by his brother Socrates who was sometimes called Chrestus. Socrates was supported by Mithradates and with the aid of a

1. Just. XXXVIII, 2.

2. Ibid. XXXVIII, 3; Liv. Ep. 76.

Pontic army held the coast of Paphlagonia.¹ Nicomedes appealed in person to the Roman senate who immediately sent an embassy under Aquilius to reinstate Nicomedes.² Mithradates agreed to their terms and even put to death the pretender Socrates.³ To gain restoration to the throne, Nicomedes had to pay a large sum of money to the commissioners and had to borrow it from the Roman capitalists.⁴ Rome was not able to send an army against Mithradates, because of trouble in Italy, so she diplomatically ignored his share in the affair of Nicomedes and Ariobarzanes, though the senate knew of his responsibility in the matter. They were quite eager for his power to be weakened and hinted to Nicomedes that a move against Mithradates would not be regarded with disfavor by Rome.⁵

Nicomedes then sent vessels to close the Bosphorus against Mithradates and led an army into Pontic Paphlagonia, securing rich spoils and laying waste the region of Apast-ris. Mithradates offered no resistance since it gave him a pretext to go to war, but sent an embassy to Rome asking for either their mediation or permission to defend himself.⁶ The ambassadors of Nicomedes told the senate of Mithradates' preparation for war which was aimed as much against Rome as Bithynia.⁷ The senate's decision was truly indicative of their

1. App. Mithr. 10; Liv. Ep. 76.

2. Just. XXXVIII, 3; Liv. Ep. 74.

3. Ibid. XXXVIII, 5.

4. App. Mithr. 11.

5. Ibid; Cas. Dio. Fr. XCVII.

6. Cas. Dio. Fr. XCVII.

7. Ibid. 14.

vacillating policy in dealing with eastern questions. They ^{that} said, while they did not wish Mithradates to suffer harm at the hands of Nicomedes, they could not allow war to be made upon Nicomedes.¹ Upon receiving the report of the failure of his embassy, Mithradates sent his son Ariarathes with a large army to occupy Cappadocia. He then sent an embassy to the Roman generals stating the justice of his cause and the probability of an alliance with Egypt and Syria.² The generals, without appealing to the Senate, sent the ambassadors away and collected forces from Bithynia, Cappadocia, Paphlagonia, and Galatia. Because of the slave revolt in Italy, few Roman troops could be sent to Asia so the war was carried on mainly by the Asiatic contingents.

The Bithynian army under Nicomedes was stationed between Amastris and Sinope; the divisions under Lucius Cassius, Manius Aquillius, and Quintus Appius were in the interiors of Bithynia, Galatia, and Cappadocia.³ The fleet composed of Roman and Bithynian vessels blockaded the Bosphorous.⁴

On the Amnias, a tributary of the Halys, the Bithynians encountered the vanguard of the Pontic army, led by Neoptolemus and Archelaus.⁵ Nicomedes' forces were much more numerous since his entire army was engaged. Each side fought for possession of a small rocky hill. The Bithynians were successful until Neoptolemus drove his scythe bearing chariots against

1. Cas..Dio. Fr. XCVII.

2. App. Mithr. 16.

3. Ibid. 17.. 17.

4. Ibid. 12.

5. Ibid, 18.

their lines. This spectacle, of men cut in halves and still breathing, confused them. They were then attacked in front and rear and were forced to fight facing both ways. After the greater part of his army had been destroyed, Nicomedes fled with the remainder into Paphlagonia, leaving his camp, money chests, and prisoners to Mithradates. The Bithynian King then joined Manius.¹ Mithradates moved his army to Mount Scoreba which lies on the boundary of Bithynia and Pontus. He captured several hundred of the cavalry. After this loss, Nicomedes fled to Cassius and the Roman ambassadors. They decided to go to Lion's Head, a powerful stronghold in Phrygia, and there to recruit their army. After spending some time in drilling, they found the soldiers still inefficient so they separated, Nicomedes going to Pergamum. When news of the defeat on land reached the fleet, the vessels scattered and were soon taken by the Pontic sailors.² After Mithradates had taken Bithynia, he regulated the cities and organized his conquests in Asia Minor into satrapies.

Sulla was now given the right to conduct the war against Mithradates but was prevented from doing so by a war in Italy and lack of funds.³ Greece joined Mithradates against Rome.⁴ Flaccus was sent by Cinna to conduct the war in Asia but was displaced by Fimbria who traveled through the provinces devastating the territories of the towns that did not open their

1. App. Mithr. 19.

2. Ibid. 19.

3. Ibid. 22.

4. Ibid. 28.

gates to him.¹ Mithradates' forces in Greece were defeated, so after the battle of Orchomenus, he sued for peace. In the meantime, Sulla had taken command and marched to Asia. He offered Mithradates the same terms that had been offered Archelaus in Greece; namely, to surrender the fleet, Roman officers, prisoners of war, deserters and slaves; to restore deported people to their homes; to withdraw all garrisons and evacuate Asia, Bithynia, Paphlagonia and Cappadocia and retain only his ancestral domain and to pay two thousand talents as costs of the war.² Sulla then directed Curio to restore Nicomedes to his throne.³

Nicomedes did not live long after this restoration and dying childless, willed his Kingdom to Rome.⁴ The validity of the will has been questioned. In one of the fragments from Sallust he gives the following letter from Mithradates written to King Arsaces.⁵ "On the death of Nicomedes, they (the Romans) seized and ravaged the whole of Bithynia, though there was undoubtedly a son born of Nisa whom they had recognized as queen." Whether or not Nicomedes had a successor recognized by Rome, Sulla had evidently determined on the reduction of Bithynia. At the close of the war with Mithradates, Bithynia gained nothing although she had suffered greatly during its progress. Bithynia lost her position as a client state of Rome and from this time to the fall of the Roman Empire she was either an imperial or a senatorial province.

1. App. Mithr. 51.

2. Ibid. 55.

3. Ibid. 60.

4. Ibid. 71; Liv. Ep. 93; App. Mithr. I, 3.

5. Sall. ^{fr.} Tr. 30.

Bithynia, a Roman Province.

In the first century B.C., Rome shows a definite change of policy toward her dependencies. The client relationship had been satisfactory so long as there were monarchies in the east which were a menace to her power and Rome was desirous of having her frontiers defended without trouble or expense to the Roman state. But when Bithynia was willed to her, she must either accept the inheritance and provide for its defense or allow it to fall into the hands of Mithradates, who had not given up hope of annexing it to his dominions. He was successful in forming an alliance with Sertorius of Spain¹ and in the partition of the Roman world which followed, Bithynia fell to the share of the Pontic King. Cotta, who had been appointed governor, was altogether unwarlike and fled to Chalcedon at the first attack. Some order was brought into the Bithynian and Roman forces which were in the province by the naval prefect Nudus but he was unable to resist an attack made by Mithradates.²

Lucullus was then sent over with a legion to conduct the war.³ He first reorganized the army, then pitched his camp at Cyzicus from which base he could cut off the supplies of his enemy.⁴ Mithradates, becoming alarmed, planned to send his horses, some cattle and soldiers unfit for service to Bithynia. When they were crossing the river Rhyndacus, Lucullus attacked them and captured the horses and the baggage trains. Mithradates then fled to Nicomedia, and Aparnea and

1. Livy Ep. 93; App. Mithr. 68.

2. Ibid; App.; Mithr. 71.

3. Plut. Luc. VII; App. Mithr. 68.

4. Liv. Ep. 94, 95; App. Mithr. 72; Plut. Luc. 11.

Prusias were taken by the Roman generals Triarius and Barba.¹ Lucullus had ordered Voconius to take the fleet and prevent the King's escape.² Having lingered in Samothrace, Voconius arrived after Mithradates had left, Lucullus then marched through Bithynia and Galatia into Pontus where he beseiged Amisus. Failing to take the city, he led his forces against Mithradates at Cabira.³ The Roman cavalry was defeated but Lucullus was successful in capturing the Kings camp. He then marched to Amisus.⁴ When the walls of the city were taken, the inhabitants set fire to the city, but the flames were extinguished by the order of the Roman general and the people rendered homeless were cared for.

Lucullus remedied the evils existing in the province so far as it lay in his power. People were so oppressed by tax farmers and usurers that they were forced to sell their children as slaves.⁵ He limited the interest to one percent per month and in cases where the interest exceeded the principal he did not allow it. The creditor could receive one fourth of the debtor's income but if any lender had added the interest to the income, it was not to be paid. The public debt had been contracted when Sulla had levied a tribute of twenty thousand talents,--about twenty-two million dollars,--from Asia. This amount had been increased to one hundred and twenty thousand talents by the collectors. These reforms made Lucullus many enemies in Rome and he was soon removed from command.⁶

1. App. Mithr. 77.

2. Plut. Luc. 13.

3. Ibid. 15; App. Mithr. 78.

4. Plut. Luc. 19; Plut

5. Ibid. 20.

6. Ibid. 20; App. Mithr. 90.

Pompey was given charge of the war against the pirates and Publius Piso the protection of the Bithynian and Thracian shores.¹ The command in Pontus and Bithynia was assigned to the consul Manius Acilius Glabrio.² In the meantime Lucullus had been conducting the war in Armenia and needed help. Glabrio refused assistance and Mithradates soon occupied his old territories and the Roman victories for the past eight years stood for nothing.³ Through the recommendation of the tribune Gaius Manilius, Glabrio was recalled and all power given to Pompey.⁴ In a single campaign, conducted in Pontus and Armenia, Pompey subdued Mithradates and brought all Asia Minor under Roman control.⁵ He followed Lucullus' policy in favoring the cities and gave back to Pontic Heraclea her harbor and territories despite the fact that she had resisted the Romans. Pontus was added to Bithynia, the entire territory divided into eleven municipalities, and the Lex Pompeia was to be used in its government.⁶

These wars were a heavy drain on the provinces of Asia. Taxes were not greater than they had been in the earlier days of the republic, but more of the wealth was taken out of the country, thus exhausting its capital. The Roman generals were not responsible for this oppression. They were in the control of the political parties in Rome who considered the provinces as estates of the Roman people.

1. Cas. Dio. XXXVI, 42; Plut. Luc. 25; Pomp. 30; App. Mithr. 91.

2. Plut. Luc. 34. He does not state here that Glabrio was appointed but his life of Pompey, 30, says that Pompey receives command of Bithynia from Glabrio.

3. Cas. Dio. XXXVI, 17.

4. Ibid. XXXVI, 42; Plut. Pomp, 30.

5. App. Bell. Civ. II, 1. -39- 6. Cas. Dio. XXXVII, 10, 12; Strab. XII, 3.

These factions did not delay in making use of the newly acquired provinces. In 64 B.C., Publius Servilius Rullus proposed a new agrarian law, the aim of which was to found colonies in Italy.¹ The money to buy the land was to be obtained from the sale of the royal hunting domains in Bithynia and other recently acquired dominions. This law failed only because the people at Rome had rather receive the grain by dole than cultivate it for themselves. When Pompey's power was divided with Caesar and Crassus, the eastern territories were given to Crassus to be held for five years.² He was immediately involved in a war with the Parthians and killed. This was fortunate for the provinces, for his policy would have been one of exploitation had he lived to carry it out. Conditions seemed favorable for Pompey's assuming supreme power. In the struggle with Caesar which followed, Bithynia, together with the other provinces of Asia Minor, sent aid to Pompey.³

Pharnaces, taking advantage of the unsettled conditions, revolted from Rome and won back his ancestral Kingdom as well as some cities of Cappadocia and Pontus which were included in the Bithynian province.⁴ Calvinus, the general of Caesar, assisted by Deiotarus of Galatia and Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia, met Pharnaces in Nicopolis and was defeated. Pharnaces captured Amisus, plundered the city, and sold the inhabitants

1. Cic. de lege agr. I, 4-11.

2. Plut. Crass. 15.

3. App. Bell. Civ. II, 71.

4. Cas. Dio. XLII, 45, 46,; App. Bell. Civ. II, 91; Suet. Caes. XXXV; Plut. Caes. I.

into slavery, then hastened into Bithynia. He was allowed little time to ravage the country, being drawn away by the revolt of Asander whom he had left as governor of the Bosphorus. Pharnaces was speedily defeated and Amisus was rewarded with freedom.¹ Caesar passed through Bithynia in his progress from Egypt to Greece, collecting great sums of money from the people.² He levied all that had been promised in advance to Pompey and asked for more.

Tillius Cimber, one of the assassins of Caesar was appointed by the senate to govern Bithynia.³ After the murder of Caesar he left Rome to take charge of his province but still remained in alliance with Brutus and Cassius. The conspirators, becoming alarmed at the change in feeling at Rome, instructed Tillius to collect money and prepare an army for their use.³ Bithynia was under the control of Brutus and Macedonia of Antony. Marcus Crispus, who succeeded Tillius Cimber as governor, sent three legions to aid Marcus who was fighting Bassus in Syria.⁴ Cassius then assumed military command of Roman forces in Asia.

When the triumvirate, composed of Octavian, Antony, and Lepidus, was formed, Apuleius, one of the refugees from the proscription which followed, took command of Bithynia for Brutus and retained possession until Antony assumed control of the east.⁵

1. Cas. Dio. XLII, 49.

This was not Caesar's first visit to Bithynia. He had been sent by Thermus, during the reign of Nicomedes, to bring a fleet. Suet. Caes. 2; Cas. Dio. XLIII. 20.

2. Plut. Bru. 19; App. Bell. Civ. III, 2, says that Caesar himself appointed Tillius but Suetonius does not mention the appointment and Plutarch attributes it to the senate.

3. App. Bell. Civ. III, 6.

4. Ibid. 77; Plut. Brut. I, 28.

5. App. Bell. Civ. IV, 46.

Tillius Cimber with a fleet and a legion of soldiers protected the armies of Cassius and Brutus at Mount Serrium.¹ The conspirators met with defeat and when the second triumvirate was formed, Bithynia fell to the share of Antony.² Apuleius surrendered the province to Antony who appointed Alienobarbus as governor.³

Bithynia was now disturbed by the presence of Sextus Pompeius, who seized Nicaea and Nicomedia and obtained large supplies of money.⁴ Antony sent Furnius and Titius with reinforcements for the Bithynians. News of this reaching Pompeius, he withdrew to the interior of Bithynia where he was later captured and put to death.⁵ While Antony was in control of Asia, the provinces received little attention for his interest was in the Egyptian court and the Parthian war. His quarrel with Rome and subsequent defeat at Actium left Octavian in control of the Roman world. The problem of controlling so vast an area presented many difficulties. Although Bithynia became a province only toward the close of the republican period, she had felt the oppression of the senate's rule. A proprætor was annually elected by this body to govern the province.⁶ All civil and military authority lay with him and very little control was exercised over his actions by the senate. They gave him instructions when he started out; required him to publish an edict; to keep up a regular correspondence with them; and to

1. App. Bell. Civ. 102.

2. Liv. Ep. 125.

3. App. Bell. Civ. IV, 46; V, 63.

4. Ibid. V. 138.

5. Liv. Ep. 131.

6. Arnold, Provincial Administration, p. 50.

render accounts on his return. Money for his troops; a triumph when he conducted a war successfully; consent for making requisitions for money and ships and sanction for all his arrangements, was bestowed by the Roman Senate. The governor, supported by a body of troops, levied and remitted taxes in his province, saw to the transmission of the amount to Rome, and kept rigid control of his province. His assistant in the department of finance was the quaestor who kept the accounts, attended to the military levy and equipment of troops, and, in the absence of the governor, assumed his duties.¹ Administration of justice was given more attention during the early empire and the praetor was added to the governor's staff. Each province was divided for judicial purposes into districts called conventus and the praetor assisted by his assessors, who were Romans settled in the provinces, tried minor cases. Free and allied towns were outside the praetors jurisdiction and important civil and criminal cases were tried by the governor. These decisions were final except where Roman citizens were concerned. They could appeal their cases to Rome.

A number of minor officials accompanied the governor. A legate, usually suggested by the governor, was appointed by the senate. A number of comites, appointed by the governor was taken, nominally, to learn the business of administration. They were usually Romans of birth who either had property in the provinces which required their attention or had hopes of enriching themselves. When Memmius was governor of Bithynia,

1. Arnold. *Provin. Ad.* 65.

Catullus went with him in this position.¹ Three prefects whose duties were judicial and military in character, were in every province.

The position of the provincials was not an enviable one. Only Roman citizens had redress from the oppression of officials. Some protection was secured through the client and patron relationship. A few had powerful patrons at Rome who would use their influence in securing favors there.² The negotiatores, often agents of Roman senators,³ oppressed the people. Tax gatherers, who had great influence in Rome, collected a tithe of all produce, and troops were quartered on them unless they bribed the governor to take them elsewhere. Food and entertainment for the governor and for senators on excursions must be provided, requisitions of wild beasts for shows at Rome furnished, and money given as a voluntary contribution toward the expense of the aediles at Rome.

Julius Caesar was the first to really realize the importance of the provinces. After Pompey's defeat, he remitted one-third of the taxes of Asia.⁴ He abolished tithes, made improvements in survey, and contemplated extending the franchise. He did not rule long enough to make his changes felt but Augustus carried out his plans. Regularity and method was introduced into provincial administration by having surveys made and a census taken and the greatest care was taken to secure

1. Catul. IX. 9, 13.

2. Arnold, Provin. p.70.

3. Nicaea owed eight million sesterces to a ward of Cicero's, Cic. ad Fam. XIII, 61.

4. Plut. Caes. 48.

accuracy.¹ District officers made out the census lists, local magistrates revised them, They passed them on to the provincial censor who forwarded a copy to the emperor and kept one in the archives of the capital.² Augustus, assisted by a minister whose title was magister a censibus, received petitions concerning tribute.

Laws against extortion became more severe. The Lex Servilia rewarded the accuser who could secure a conviction, with the Roman franchise. The requisition any governor could make on a province was limited by the Lex Julia and the Lex Acilia provided for the trial of officials after their term of office had expired. With Augustus, the governorship was determined by lot.³

Bithynia was a senatorial province but received a visit from Augustus in 21B.C. The proconsular imperium gave him the right to interfere in any province so he instituted reforms which seemed to him to be desirable.

He made presents of money to some, -while in some instances he collected money in excess of the tribute. The people of Cyzicus were reduced to slavery because during an uprising they had put some Romans to death.⁴

The governors during the period of the early empire were under close surveillance. Granius Marcellus, a Bithynian governor under Tiberius, was accused of treason by his quaestor

1. Mon. Ancy. 15.

2. Arnold, Provin. p. 104.

3. Suet. Aug. 47.

4. Cas. Dio. LIV. 7.

Caepio Crispinus.¹ Marcellus had made disrespectful remarks about the emperor and had placed his own statue above that of the Caesars. Tiberius was very indignant and declared that he would vote open^{ly} on oath. Gneius Piso, in rebuke, inquired in what order he would vote. The emperor saw the justice of it, acquitted the accused, and referred the cases of extortion to a special commission..

During the reign of Claudius, Cadius Rufus was prosecuted by the Bithynians and condemned for extortion.² Junius Cilo was later accused, while Claudius was holding court, of taking bribes.³ The emperor, hearing the outcry of the Bithynians, asked Nareissus what they were saying. He replied that they were expressing their gratitude to Junius. Claudius then extended his term for two years.

Tarquitius Priscus was convicted during Nero's reign.⁴ This decision pleased the senators greatly for they remembered that he had impeached Statilius, his own proconsul. Julius Bassus had been recalled from banishment by Nerva and made governor of Bithynia.⁵ He was accused of taking bribes but secured Pliny as counsel. Pliny admitted that his client, in an unguarded moment and in perfect innocence, had received presents from provincials as tokens of friendship for he had previously served as quaestor in that same province. Since this receiving gifts was unlawful, Pliny had great difficulty

1. Tac. Ann. I. 74.

2. Ibid. XII, 22.

3. Cas. DioI LXI, 33.

4. Tac. Ann. XIV. 46.

5. Plin. Ep. IV. 9.

in securing an acquittal for his client.

Not long after this, the Bithynians impeached Varenus who had been their counsel in the Bassus case.¹ They asked that a commission be appointed to investigate their charges, Varenus' desire to bring witnesses from the province was vigorously opposed by his accusers. A lively debate followed at the conclusion of which both requests were granted;

Trajan, having exchanged Pamphylia for Bithynia, sent Pliny to investigate the condition of the province and correct abuses that he found existing. Prusa was first visited. Here he found that private individuals were holding sums of public money on some pretext or other and that many items paid from the public funds were far from being legitimate.² In Nicomedia, more than five million sesterces had been spent on two aqueducts which were left in an unfinished state and were therefore useless.³ The theater at Nicaea, costing ten million sesterces, was ruined by the sinking of part of the building.⁴ Byzantium was found to be very extravagant in her expenditures. Twelve thousand sesterces, amounting to six hundred dollars, were paid annually to the delegate who went to pay his respects to the emperor.⁵ The official who carried the homage of the city to the governor of Moesia received three thousand sesterces as traveling expenses. The senate of Amisus

1. Plin. Ep. V. 20.

2. Ibid. X, 18.

3. Ibid. 29.

4. Ibid. 41.

5. Ibid. 45.

had allowed Julius Piso to take forty thousand denarii, about ten thousand dollars, from the public funds.¹

Pliny corrected these evils and soon had the finances of his province in such a condition that the investment of the revenue became a problem. Few opportunities for buying land arose and it was difficult to find persons who wanted to borrow from the state at twelve percent per month. Pliny contemplated lowering the rate of interest and dividing the amounts to be loaned among the decurions, who were members of the provincial senate, requiring them to furnish good security for it.² Trajan advised that the interest rate be fixed according to the number of those likely to borrow but not to force a loan on any one.

Much interest was taken in improving city conditions. An adequate water supply was provided for Sinope,³ ^{the} sewerage system in Amastris improved,⁴ and baths built for Prusa.⁵ Care was taken to prevent factions from growing up which would be hostile to the emperor. A fire brigade was refused the people of Nicomedia because Trajan feared the organization might be used for seditious purposes.⁶ No diminution in the imperial fund nor any levy of new imposts was permitted, even for public improvements.⁷

The Lex Pompeia was usually followed in city governments but edicts issued by succeeding emperors had confused the

-
1. Plin. Ep. 112.
 2. Ibid. 56.
 3. Ibid. 92.
 4. Ibid. 100.
 5. Ibid. 25.
 6. Ibid. 36.
 7. Ibid. 25.

government of some cities according to the provisions of the Lex Pompeia, ~~ex~~magistrates could set in the senate but all who had seats in the senate must be at least thirty years old. Augustus issued a decree allowing any one more than twenty two the privilege of holding office.¹ Conflicts arose in regard to this provision also in regard to the admission of citizens of another city into the senate. This had been done in several instances but the censor had no right to expel them.²

Pliny eliminated any customs that savoured of bribery,³ punished the men who because of lax administration had remained in the province though sentenced to banishment.⁴

Bithynia was well governed under the Emperor Hadrian who was vitally interested in the welfare of the provinces. No soldiers were needed to preserve peace or to repel invasions.⁵ Severus, who proved to be an able administrator, was appointed governor by the emperor and so well did he manage both public and private affairs that the Bithynians desired always to remember him. Hadrian named a city which he built in Egypt in honor of his favorite, Antinous, who was from Bithynium.⁶

Saoterus of Nicomedia was a trusted friend of Commodus and possessed sufficient influence to obtain from the Senate the right to hold a series of games and built a temple to Commodus in Nicomedia.⁷

1. Plin. Ep. 81.

2. Ibid. 116.

3. Ibid. 118.

4. Ibid. 58.

5. Das. Dio. **LXIX**, 14.

6. Ibid. 11.

7. Ibid. **LXXIII**, 12.

Bithynia was involved in war from the time of Commodus on to the downfall of the empire. Aemilianus was killed while fighting with some of the generals of Severus near Cyzicus¹ and many battles were fought between the narrows of Nicaea and Cius. While conducting a war against the Parthians and Armenians in 214, Antoninus was in winter quarters in Nicomedia.²

Some attempt must have been made to preserve organized government in the province during the troublesome times of the later empire. Pollio was appointed governor of Germany, by Avitus, the false Antoninus in 218 because he had been able to reduce Bithynia to subjection.³ A year later, Macrinus sent out Castinus, an able military commander. The disturbance in the province was partly due to the presence of Celtic soldiers who had been quartered in Bithynia.⁴

With Dio Cassius, a Bithynian, though he wrote from the Roman point of view, Bithynian history ceases so far as records are concerned. We know, from later developments, that this country, having passed through the stages of independence, Roman clientage and provincialism, became a part of the Byzantine Empire.

1. Cas. Dio. LXXV, 6.

2. Ibid. LXXVII, 18, 19;

3. Ibid. LXXX, 3.

4. Ibid. LXXX, 4.

Chapter V.

The Culture History of Bithynia.

Bithynia at different stages of her history came in contact successively with Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman culture. The Bithynians, when they first come to our knowledge, are savages, unfriendly to the civilized Greeks,¹ and fighting every civilized power with whom they come in contact. Little civilization is shown in their dress. Their bodies were clothed with tunics and multi-colored cloaks; their heads covered with the skins of foxes, while on their feet they wore buskins made from the skin of fawns.² Their implements of warfare consisting of javelins, light shields and short dirks, were equally crude and primitive. The Persian supremacy had little effect on the people of inland Bithynia for the conquerors were concerned chiefly with the cities and main highways. The native population was still considered barbarian a century after Herodotus wrote.³ However, bases of Persian influence existed, the most noted being the capital city, Dascylium on the Propontis.⁴ Pharnabazus had his palace here, also his elaborately planned hunting grounds, and a Persian garrison which formed the nucleus of his military support. There was probably little feeling of unity between the Persian soldiers and the inhabitants of the city for the garrison, without any pretense of defense, evacuated at the approach of Alexander's general Parmenia.⁵

1. Xen. Anab. VI, 4.

2. Herod. VII, 75.

3. Ephor. XIV, 967. Quoted Rawlison, Herod I, 386.

4. Xen. Hell. IV, 15.

5. Arr. Anab. I, 17.

Bithynia did not form a part of the actual conquests of Alexander, but, having been nominally a part of the Persian empire, it came under the control of his successors. The coast cities were Greek in culture but not as yet a part of Bithynia. However, those who lived near the cities were often on friendly terms with the inhabitants, and must have been affected by the superior culture. When Chalcedon was attacked by the Athenians, the residents of the city deposited all their exposed property with the Bithynians who lived near them.¹ Although Bithynia possessed no Alexandria's built by the great Conqueror and received no Macedonian garrison, she had these Persian centers of influence and Greek cities, to serve as foundations from which Hellenistic culture was finally to be disseminated.

During the period of attempted Macedonian control only one city was built. Antigonos built Antigonea on the site of the ancient Ancore at the eastern end of Lake Ascania.² This city was renamed Nicaea by Lysimachus. Ziboetes, the first native prince who was strong enough to assume and maintain royal power, seems to have felt Greek influence for he gave his eldest son the Greek name of Nicomedes.³ With the rule of Nicomedes, Hellenistic culture becomes more apparent. He realized the importance of cities and formed an alliance with

1. Xen. Hell. I. 13.

2. Head, Hist. Num. p. 443.

3. Smith, Dict. Geog. p. 404. makes the statement that this indicates a marriage alliance with the Greeks. Since this fact is the only datum he has for such an inference, he assumes too much

Heraclea, Tios, and Cierus.¹ Nicomedia, which became the chief residence of the Kings of Bithynia, was founded by him² and a magnificent palace erected there.³ He was the first Bithynian King to issue a royal coinage, showing the figures of Bithynia and Nike as types.

Prusias I. protected the Greek cities of the Hellespont from the barbarous Gauls and formed an alliance with Philip V of Macedonia in order to gain control of the Greek Cities in his territory. When Cius and Myrleia came into his possession, in the ensuing war, he rebuilt them from ruins, changing the name of Cius to Prusias and Myrleia to Apameia in honor of his wife.⁴ He kept the festival of Soteria⁵ which, though of Greek origin and formerly celebrated in honor of Zeus, Soter, had been transferred to Asia and the name Soter affixed to the Hellenistic King, Antiochus the First, who desired to convey the idea that he was a god on earth. Prusias also followed the lead of other Hellenistic rulers in sending a liberal donation to Rhodes when wrecked by an earthquake.⁶ His coins are of silver and bronze and show the diademed head of a King. The reverse side displayed Zeus, resting on a sceptre and holding a wreath.⁷ During his reign the Greek cities belonging geographically to Bithynia, were brought under his dominion.

In these Greek cities, which became a part of the Bithynian Kingdom, the normal Greek life existed with its banquets, phil-

1. Mem. 17.

2. Strab. IV, 2.

3. Steph. Byz. I, 19. Quoted Hermes XXXI, 125.

4. Strab. IV, 3.

5. Polyb. IV. 47.

6. Ibid. V. 90.

7. Head, Hist. Num. 444.

osophers, and devotees of the worship of Apollo and Asclepius.¹ But not always was the Greek cult preserved in its purity. A slab of marble found recently at Cyzicus shows figures of an archaic type that represent Hermes and Andeiris.² The worship of Andeiris was prevalent in Andeireme, a small town in the Troad. Evidently the local cult had found votaries in the city of Cyzicus and had combined with the Greek worship. Of the religion of the Bithynians who lived in the interior, we know nothing further than that their principal deity was called Papas.³

These Greek cities had felt the influence of Hellenistic culture for the coins of Calchedon were tetradrachms of the Lysimachian type,⁴ and the head of Greek gods were displayed on the coins of Apameia and Prusias.⁵ With the accession of Prusias II, who was without philosophy or education, progress seems to have been retarded. In his expeditions against Pergamum, he ruthlessly destroyed shrines and holy places and waged war on both gods and men. But he was not consistent in this barbarous policy for he sacrificed to the Pergamene gods and carried back to Bithynia a statue of Asclepius, said to have been an admirably executed work of Phyromachus.⁶ Roman

1. Athen. Mitt. VII. 251.

2. Jour. Hell. Stud. ^{XXII 1902} A comparison has been made with an inscribed relief of the bust of Cybele, now in the Louvre (C.I. G. IV, 6836) with the idea that both had been copied from a common original, but the Hermes and Andeiris relief is the more carefully executed and is in all probability the earlier work.

Attis

3. Arr. fr. 30. The name was sometimes given to this god, but it is of Phrygian origin.

4. Head, Hist. Num.

5. Ibid. 437.

6. Poly. XXXII 27.

influence was apparent in his coins which show a winged diadem with an eagle on the reverse side. Nicomedes II wore the trappings of an Oriental monarch but dated his coins according to the Pontic era which commenced in 297 B.C.¹ The wars, which attended and followed his accession, left little opportunity for cultural development.

With the peace which came with the establishment of the Roman empire, Bithynia, which had now become a province, resumed her normal life. The cities were still the cultural centers and their organization was little changed but the local governments gradually assumed the Roman form and were carried on by the senates and magistrates. The censor determined the membership of the ruling body according to the Lex Pompeia or the edicts of the Emperors. Cities were improved by the building of baths, sewers and aqueducts. Free oil was distributed, amphitheatres built for the amusement of the people, and temples erected for the worship of their gods. Games in honor of the Emperor were celebrated, athletic contests held, and the gladiatorial combat was an ordinary form of amusement.

Native servitude had been a part of the economic system of Bithynia since her first contact with Rome. Nicomedes had replied to Marius, when asked for a levy of troops, that one half of the adult males of his country had been kidnapped and were now working as slaves on Roman plantations.² In the carved stones of the Roman period, found in Bithynia, the figure of a

1. Head, Hist. Num. 445.

2. Diod. fr. XXXVI, 3.

slave in the background is often seen.¹ During the lax administration before Pliny's governorship, slaves had risen above their station, some were in the army, others drawing an annual salary as public slaves for guarding prisons.² Pliny reduced these to their legal status. Roman imperial worship was installed in Bithynia by Augustus who granted permission to Nicaea that certain precincts be dedicated to Rome and to Caesar, his father, who should be called the Julian hero.³ He ordered all Romans who dwelt near Nicaea to pay honor to these two divinities. The foreigners, under the name of Hellenes, he allowed to establish a precinct to himself at Nicomedia. This custom was followed by succeeding emperors. The greatest care was exercised to prevent the formation of societies, religious or otherwise,⁴ that might be against the emperor. Formation of fire brigades and the meeting of the early Christians were forbidden for this reason. Not until the time of Hadrian was Bithynia allowed to have a common a common religious festival. A marvelous temple of polished stone with threads of gold inserted, was erected at Cyzicus in honor of Hadrian.⁵ It was destroyed by an earthquake during the reign of Antonines.⁶ The Nicomedians, through the influence of Saoterus, favorite of Commodus, obtained from the senate the right of holding a series of games and of building a temple in the emperor's honor.⁷

-
1. J.H.S. XXIII, p.84.
 2. Plin. ep. X.21,31,32.
 3. Cass. Dio. LI 20.
 4. Plin. ep. X.35, 98.
 5. Plin. H. N. XXXVI 22.
 6. Cass. Dio. LXX, fr. Xiph.
 7. Ibid. LXXIII 12.

Organizations, at first political in character, of towns in a province to make known their desires to be governor, gradually assumed a religious significance.¹ When these diets met there was usually a celebration of festivals and games which came to be associated with the provincial worship of the emperor. The conduct of these fell to the president of the diet, the Bithyniarch, who had to bear the greater part of the costs of the celebration. Some of the expense was covered by voluntary gifts and endowments or was apportioned among the several towns. Great pomp and splendor attended the Bithyniarch, who was clothed in purple and on his entry into a town, was preceded by a procession of boys swinging vessels of incense. The chief priest supervised the practice of the cultus in his district. Arrian, the historian, was a priest in Nicomedia from A.D. 150, to the time of his death.²

Bithynian culture reached its climax during the imperial age. Some of the best authors of this period were born and educated in Bithynia. Memnon wrote a history of Heraclea dealing with the rule of its tyrants.³ Our knowledge of his work comes from Photius who had read only from the ninth to the sixteenth book. This period here treated of begins with the rule of the tyrant Clearchus, who was the disciple of Plato and Isocrates, and concludes with the death of Brithagoras, who was sent by the Heracleans as an ambassador to Julius Caesar after his assumption of supreme power. It is impos-

1. Mommsen, Prov. I, 374.

2. Phot. 73.

3. Mem., F.H. G. III. 525.

sible to fix the date of this writing since we do not know how far down the work was carried. Photius mentions books which come after the sixteenth, and conveys the idea that Memnon¹ possessed a clear, simple style and that his words were well chosen.

Dion Cassius, the eminent Roman historian, was born at Nicaea^{and}, received his training in the rhetorical schools of the time. He went to Rome at the time of Commodus' accession and was raised to the rank of a Roman senator.¹ His time was devoted to pleading in the courts of justice and collecting material for a history of Commodus. Being successful in his first literary effort and receiving the approbation of the Emperor, he was led to write a history of Rome from the earliest time. Ten years were spent in collecting material and making the preparatory studies and twelve more in composing it. This work, consisting of eighty books, embraces the history from the legendary landing of Aeneas in Italy to A.D. 229, the year in which Dion left Italy for Nicaea. His work is valuable for the history of the later republic and the empire. The prominent position he held in Rome and his friendship and travels with the emperors, lend actuality to his work. He tells us, in one of his fragments, that he is not merely a compiler of facts but weighed his authorities and exercised judgement in selection of materials.

A book on dreams and prodigies, one of the reign of the Emperor Trajan, a life of Arrian, the Getica, and a work on

1. Cass. Dio, Intro. (Cary, trans.)

Persia, are attributed to him by Suidas.

The biographer of Alexander, Arrian, was a Bithynian born in Nicomedia,¹ In early life he was interested in philosophy, being a friend and pupil of Epictetus. He attended the philosophical lectures, familiar conversations, and abstract of the practical philosophy, and the life of his master.²

He enjoyed the friendship of the Emperor Hadrian, who personally bestowed on him the purple ribbon denoting Roman citizenship. The latter part of Arrian's life was spent in historical writing. His account of the Asiatic expedition is complete, with the exception of a part of the twelfth chapter of the last book. His skill as an historical critic is shown in his Anabasis which is based on works of the contemporaries of Alexander, to whom he had access but who are lost to us. His work on India, drawn from accounts of Megasthenes and Eratosthenes, contains an excellent description of the interior. His miscellaneous works include, a treatise on the Chase, the description of a voyage taken around the coasts of the Euxine Sea, a work on Tactics, the lives of Dion, Timoleon, Tulliborus, and histories of Alexander's successors, of the Parthians, the Bithynians, and the Alani.

Noted philosophers of Bithynia were Dio of Prusa, Xenocrates of Chalcedon, and Dionysius of Heraclea.³ Bithynian scientific learning is represented by the achievements of Hipparchus and Theodosius who were great mathematicians and Asclepiades the physician of Prusa.

1. Strab. XII, 4.

2. Arrian Anab., Intro., Chonook Ed.

3. Strab. XII, 4.

If the true test of a culture lies in the men of learning that it produces, Bithynia, though not so fast in development as the other states of a Hellenistic pattern, attained a standard equal to any and deserves a position among them. Hellenism, though working outward from but few centers and encountering the native of Thracian stock who was not quick to grasp ideas, wrought changes which were no less permanent and far reaching in effect.

378.7M71
XR25

OCT 2 1964
UNIV OF MO

D

This thesis is never to leave this room.
Neither is it to be checked out overnight.