Corinth after 44 BC: Ethnical and Cultural Changes

Marcin N. Pawlak

Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika, Toruń

Abstract: A few months before his death, Caesar decided to establish a Roman colony on the spot where Corinth, destroyed in 146 BC, used to lie. The population of Roman Corinth was ethnically and socially diverse from the very beginning. This, however, does not change the fact that the city was a Roman colony, whose official name was *Colonia Laus Iulia Corinthiensis*. With time, natural demographic processes started to take place, which on the one hand increased the original diversity, and on the other hand reinforced the strongest element of this diversity, i.e. Greekness. In this article, the author tries to answer the often-asked question about the circumstances in which Corinth – a Roman colony – started to be perceived as a hellenised city. What exactly does the "hellenisation" of Corinth mean and how does it show?

Key words: Roman Greece, Roman Corinth, "Hellenisation" of Roman Corinth.

A few months before his death, Caesar decided to establish a Roman colony on the spot where Corinth, destroyed in 146 BC, had once lain.[1] For some time, the dictator had been implementing his plan of building Roman points of support along the coast of western Greece, which was a strategically important site, ensuring control over the routes connecting Italy, Greece, Macedonia and Asia Minor. After Caesar's death, the execution of the slightly modified plan was continued by Augustus, on whose initiative the colony at Patras was founded on the Peloponnese. The Roman practice of setting up colonies had a long tradition. It has been noted that in the Romans' eyes, the colonies were a window display of the Roman way of life, a tool for spreading Latin culture, and a way to win over and integrate the local elites.[2] Colonies were also tasked with protecting the Roman order in case it was violated.[3] A specific civilisational mission ascribed to colonies by his-

---

[1] Caesar was not the first Roman statesman to become interested in Corinth and its territory, turned into *ager publicus* in 146 BC. The *lex agraria* of 111 BC indicates that a part of Corinth's territory was divided into plots with the intention to sell them: *CIL* I² 585; Romano 2003, 280; 2005, 26–27.

[2] Rizakis 2004, 72–73.

[3] Rizakis 1997: *passim*. On the moral, military, and economic reasons for establishing colonies by the Romans, see Rizakis 2004, 72–73.

torians was obvious in the underdeveloped west, whereas in the east, with its centuries-long tradition of urban life, it proved to be much more problematic.

The first colonists probably arrived in the Peloponnese shortly before Caesar's death. None of the ancient writers recorded their number. The information about 3,000 colonists which sometimes appears in the literature on the subject is a guess based on Appian's mention of exactly 3,000 colonists being sent out to the colony at Carthage, also set up on Caesar's initiative. It was therefore assumed that an identical number of colonists participated in both colonisation campaigns. Naturally, such symmetry is possible, but it must be remembered that Appian's information concerns only Carthage, and Corinth is not mentioned.[4] The majority of historians assume that the number of colonists may have varied between 1,500 and 3,000 people.[5]

Ancient writers provide quite detailed information about the social status of the colonists. Strabo, who visited Corinth in 29 BC and so could have met the first generation of colonists, wrote that the majority of them were freedmen. He also added information about the motives behind Caesar's decision. Supposedly, he decided to set up the colony in the place where the Greek city of Corinth had lain due to the excellent geographical location. The dictator was therefore taking into consideration the future economic growth of the colony. The economic growth was dependent not only on geographical location but also on enterprising and resourceful people, and freedmen were the most economically active element of Roman society.[6] Freedmen did not constitute the whole of the colony's population, as Strabo also noted. Plutarch's account tells us that the colonists also included some veterans.[7] M.H. Walbank does not rule out the possibility that Plutarch passes on the information he had about the colonists sent out to Carthage, who included mostly veterans, to the colonists sent out to Corinth.[8] It is well known, however, that Plutarch was very familiar with the elites of Corinth and kept in touch with them, so he could have easily obtained information about the first colonists and their social background. Veterans most likely participated in establishing the colony, although they were not a very numerous group.

Strabo's information about freedmen being the majority among the colonists sent out to Corinth was confirmed by the findings of a prosopographic study, conducted by A. Spawforth, on the social background of Corinth's elites in the period from the colony's foundation to Nero's times. Spawforth based his analysis on numismatic and epigraphic sources, in particular the unique collection of Corinthian coins signed by the *duoviri*, whose names were placed on the coins. The analysis covered 40 people. On the basis of onomastic terms, Spawforth concluded that the majority of the Corinthian *duoviri* [uncertain cases are not included] were people connected with the milieu of Roman *negotiatores* operating in the east (14 persons), followed by people of freedman origin (9 persons), representatives of local elites from other Peloponnesian cities (4 persons),

---

[4]   App. *Pun*. 136.

[5]   Romano 2010, 171. See Brunt 1971, 261, according to whom the colonies founded in the times of Caesar and Augustus had a population of 2,000–3,000.

[6]   Strabo 8.6.23.

[7]   Plut. *Caes*. 57.8.

[8]   Hoskins Walbank 1997, 97.

and finally veterans' family members (3 persons).[9] In reality, however, the presence of people of freedman origin among the Corinthian elite must have been larger than this list suggests. The first two groups overlapped, since people connected with the Roman *negotiatores* were mainly also freedmen, representing the interests of their patrons in the new colony. Clearly, during the early history of the colony, there were no representatives of local elites from Greek cities, who started to appear in Corinth only under Claudius (see below). Trying to reconcile Plutarch's account about the presence of veterans among the colonists with the results of his own research, Spawforth concluded that the veterans' families did not achieve a good enough economic position to ensure joining the city's absolute elite. This explanation is likely, although we must also remember the opinions of all the historians who emphasise that Corinth, unlike nearby Patras, was not a military colony.[10]

Other historians independently arrived at conclusions similar to Spawforth's with regard to the makeup of the Corinthian elite. Even before Spawforth's article was published, H.A. Stansbury pointed out the existence of two groups among the Corinthian elite, clearly discernible in the source material, namely wealthy freedmen and businessmen.[11] A. Rizakis also highlighted the presence of freedmen in Corinth, but pointed out that some of them could have arrived in the city after the colony had been officially founded. As freedmen from influential families of Roman politicians and *negotiatores*, and also Roman citizens, they could count on quicker integration, social and political promotion, and receiving plots of land, which was difficult in Greek cities and required a special decision of the local authorities.[12] B.W. Millis posed questions about the freedmen's origin, whether they were Greeks from the East, or perhaps Greeks Romanised in Italy, or Romanised Greeks who, as a result of their activity in the East, became re-Hellenised.[13] Ultimately, he concluded that the majority of the freedmen were of Greek origin, but were comfortable in both the Greek and Roman world due to their earlier experiences.

There are no obvious answers to Millis's questions. We could even be contrary and say that each of the questions also contains an answer. The first colonists included freedmen of Greek origin, which is indicated e.g. by the Greek *cognomina* of some elite members. Cn. Babbius Philinus, who generously supported the city in Augustus' times, used to be a slave lovingly called Philinus, or "Darling," before he was given freedom and Roman citizenship.[14] Freedmen such as him arrived together with the other colonists from Italy, so they knew Roman customs and norms, but at the same time their Greek origin made them susceptible to the influence of Greek culture. As the city grew, freedmen from all corners of the eastern part of the Mediterranean world started to arrive. Their knowledge of Roman culture and lifestyle may have been smaller than that of the freedmen sent from Italy. However, regardless of their familiarity with Roman culture,

---

[9] Spawforth 1996, 167–182.

[10] Recently, this issue was analysed by Millis 2010a, 20.

[11] Stansbury 1990.

[12] Rizakis 1996, 43.

[13] Millis 2010a, 22–23. G. Bowersock (1965, 67–71) already described the colonists in Corinth as the *Greek returning home*.

[14] Rizakis/Zoumbaki 2001, 273–274 (COR 111).

they were all legally Roman citizens, and by virtue of their resources, contacts, and enterprise they quickly started to play a leading role in the colony. Finally, people holding Roman citizenship but not of servile origin also played a role among the first colonists, as illustrated by L. Aeficius Certus, *duovir* in 43/42 BC, or M. Insteius C.f. Tectus, *duovir* between 43/42 and 37/36, and again in 34/33 BC, a close collaborator of Mark Antony, who were both Italics.[15]

It can be assumed that the first colonists sent out to Corinth were a very diverse group, in terms of both social and ethnic background, although the Greek element was strongly represented. With time, natural demographic processes started to take place, which on the one hand increased the original diversity, and on the other reinforced the strongest element of this diversity, i.e. Greekness. As D. Engels observed, until the 19th century no city could survive without an influx of new people. The death rate in cities was higher than the birth rate, and the difference was closed by immigrants, who migrated to cities for various reasons, but usually economic.[16] The phenomenon must have occurred on a large scale in Corinth, where there were few original colonists, while the necessity e.g. to build public buildings created demand for workforce. It is likely that many poor Greeks from the Peloponnese or other regions of Greece, tempted by the promise of earning money, moved to Corinth.[17] Some of them stayed in the city permanently, but did not become Corinthian citizens, belonging to the category of *incolae*. A buoyant trade and economic centre such as Corinth could not function without such people. With time, the more enterprising and braver, as well as luckier, *incolae* could be granted Roman citizenship and become inhabitants of Corinth with full rights. Such cases were probably rare, but we should not overlook them. Some of the *Claudii* present in Corinth could have been former *incolae*, who obtained citizenship during the reign of the Julio-Claudian dynasty.[18] The Corinthian *Flavii* and *Aelii*, who owed their naturalisation to the Flavian and Antonian dynasty, could have been a similar case.[19]

The population of Roman Corinth was ethnically and socially diverse from the very beginning. However, this does not change the fact that the city was a Roman colony, whose official name was *Colonia Laus Iulia Corinthiensis*.[20] Official documents were published in Latin, official titles were Latin, and the city apparatus was a copy of the Roman one, with *duoviri* as equivalents of consuls. Members of the most important priestly colleges also had the same names as their Roman equivalents, i.e. pontiffs and augurs. Typically Roman buildings were erected in Corinth, such as a basilica and an amphitheatre.[21] This is where *munera gladiatora* and *venationes*, i.e. hunts for wild animals, were organised.[22] The official name of the colony included the word *Corinthiensis*. Its begin-

---

[15] Engels 1990, 68; Rizakis/Zoumbaki 2001, 249 (COR 10); 330–331 (COR 320).

[16] Engels 1990, 74–76. S. Alcock (1997b, 103) draws attention to the depopulation of Greece probably caused by migration to urban centres.

[17] Engels 1990, 69.

[18] Stansbury 1990, 252; Rizakis 1996, 45; 2007, 193.

[19] Rizakis/Zoumbaki 2001, 314–318 (*Flavii*), 250–252 (*Aelii*).

[20] Hoskins Walbank 1997, 95–130.

[21] The amphitheatre in Corinth was the only building of this kind on the Peloponnese: Di Napoli 2010, 258–259.

[22] The gladiator fights in Corinth were mentioned e.g. by Dion of Prusa (Dio 31.121). See also Apul. *Meth*. 10–18.

ning referred to the old name of the Greek city, but the ending, *-ensis*, indicated that the colony had new citizens, who wanted to be called the *Corinthienses*, not the *Corinthii*, which was the Latin name for the old inhabitants of Corinth.[23]

* * *

An interesting reflection on the inhabitants of Roman Corinth can be found in the work of a tireless traveller and searcher of Greek antiquities, Pausanias, who visited the city in the second half of the 2nd century. He said repeatedly that the present inhabitants of Corinth were immigrants, descendants of the colonists sent by Caesar, who had nothing in common with the old inhabitants of the Greek city. Although he called the inhabitants of Corinth "Peloponnesians," he also added that they were the newest inhabitants of the peninsula.[24]

Favorinus, who wrote earlier than Pausanias, had a somewhat different opinion on the cultural identity of the Corinthians. The rhetor and representative of the Second Sophistic was particularly revered in Corinth, whose inhabitants asked him to leave Ephesus and live among them. Although Favorinus declined, the city authorities decided to dedicate a statue to him. Soon afterwards, in unclear circumstances, Favorinus lost the favour of Emperor Hadrian and the liking of the Corinthians. During his third stay in the city, he saw that his statue had been pulled down and only an empty base was left. He then made the famous speech, *Korinthiakos*, in which he defended the destroyed statue, and indirectly himself, against the aspersions cast on him by the fickle Corinthians. In a passage from the speech, Favorinus referred to Corinth's cultural identity:

> But if someone who is not a Lucanian, but a Roman, not one of the masses but of the equestrian order, who has emulated not only the language but also the sensibility and the manner and the dress of the Greeks … in order to achieve this one thing above all else, namely both appear and to be Greek, then should this man not deserve to have a bronze statue set up by you? Yes, he even deserves one in every city – by you, on the one hand, because he, though the Roman, has been thoroughly **Hellenised, just as your very own patrimonial city has been**…, and, on the other hand, by all the Greek cities, because he pursues philosophy and has both aroused many of the Greeks to join him in the pursuit of philosophy and has caused not a few of the barbarians. Why, it seems he has been equipped by the gods for just such a purpose.[25]

Thus, Favorinus voiced the opinion that the Roman colony which Corinth had become in 44 BC became a Hellenised, Greek city after 150 years of existence. As a representative of the Second Sophistic and propagator of the Greek renaissance, Favorinus was enthusiastic and sympathetic to all manifestations of the strength of Greek culture.

Favorinus' opinion about Corinth is also substantiated by the fact that the city was admitted to the Panhellenion, i.e. an organisation gathering Greek cities. Corinth joined such old Peloponnesian cities as Argos, Epidauros, Methana, or Sparta.[26] J. Oliver concluded that Corinth's accession to the Panhellenion proved that the Roman colony was

---

[23]   Broneer 1941, 388–390; Stansbury 1990, 119. Cf. Engels 1990, 69.
[24]   Paus. 2.1.2; 5.1.2; 5.25.1. On Pausanias' attitude to Corinth and its inhabitants, see Hutton 2005, 147–149, 166–173.
[25]   Favorinus, *Korinthiakos* 25 (trans. L.M. White).
[26]   Spawforth/Walker 1985, 80.

officially declared a continuator of Greek Corinth by Emperor Hadrian.[27] This is a very bold conclusion, but that does not change the fact that Roman Corinth must have been under strong Greek influence, which ultimately led Favorinus to formulate the quoted opinion about the city being Hellenised. In this article, the author tries to answer the often-asked question about the circumstances in which Corinth – a Roman colony – started to be perceived as a Hellenised city. What exactly does the "Hellenisation" of Corinth mean, and how is it manifested?

* * *

According to Greek and Roman writers, Corinth was razed to the ground by the soldiers of Lucius Mummius in 146 BC. The complete destruction of the city walls and buildings was described e.g. by an anonymous epitomator of Livy's work, by Diodorus Siculus, by Velleius Paterculus, and by Pausanias.[28] As a matter of course, the destroyed city must also have been depopulated. This is referred to by Strabo, who stated that Corinth was deserted for a long time, and the situation changed only with the arrival of the Roman colonists in 44 BC.[29] Ancient writers put a lot of effort into convincing their readers that the old Greek city had disappeared off the face of the earth in 146 BC. To some extent, Cicero stood apart. Remembering his journey to Greece as a youth, he mentioned that in Corinth he had seen and spoken to people he called the *Corinthii*.[30] Archaeological studies conducted in recent decades have allowed us to revise many parts of the picture painted by the ancient writers. It is thought today that some buildings in this Greek city survived almost untouched and only required minor repairs.[31] This is confirmed by Pausanias, according to whom the most noteworthy curiosities of Roman Corinth were the remnants of archaic times.[32] We can suspect that the soldiers of L. Mummius, preoccupied with plundering the city, did not have enough time to completely destroy the city. The city walls and the most important public buildings were most likely razed.[33] It is also increasingly difficult to believe the image of a completely abandoned city. The presence of people in Corinth during the transition period (i.e. 146–44 BC) is confirmed by excavated amphorae from the eastern part of the Mediterranean world, but also from Italy, as well as coins and inscriptions.[34] These inhabitants, sometimes referred to as squatters, did not come to the city directly after the Roman forces had withdrawn, but only at the end of the 2nd century BC.[35] Most researchers believe that they were not descended from the former inhabitants of Corinth, although it must be said that there is no unanimity on the subject.[36] Regardless of all difficulties over interpretation, it is clear that the vision propagated by ancient writers, of a destroyed and abandoned Corinth where colonists arrived in 44 BC, was not necessarily a fact. In 146 BC, Corinth

---

[27]   Oliver 1978, 191.
[28]   *Perioch*. 52; Diod. Sic. 32. 27; Vell. Pat. 1.13.1; Paus. 7.16.7, 9. See Wiseman 1979, 491–494.
[29]   Strabo 8.6.23.
[30]   Cic., *De leg. Agr.* 2. 87; *Tusc. disp.* 3. 22. 53.
[31]   Wiseman 1979, 494–496.
[32]   Paus. 2.2.6.
[33]   This is pointed out by Gebhard/Dickie 2003, 264.
[34]   Edwards 1981, 198–199; Romano 1994, 57–104; Gebhard/Dickie 2003, 268–269.
[35]   Wiseman 1979, 494–496; Williams/Russell 1981, 27–29.
[36]   Bookidis 2005, 149–150; Millis 2010b, 244–257. Engels (1990, 70) has a different opinion.

ceased to exist as a city and was relegated to the category of a village, but it did not completely disappear off the face of the earth.

The fame of this formerly important city, like the material remnants of Greek Corinth, could have aroused the colonists' interest in the history of the place where the colony was being built. The earliest traces of this interest, which are also examples of the colonists voluntarily referencing Corinth's past, can be found on coins. In Roman Corinth, as in many other cities of the empire, the decision to mint coins lay with the local authorities, i.e. the council of decurions. The production of coins was in turn supervised by the colony's highest officials, i.e. the *duoviri*. Now and then, an issue of coins was sponsored by wealthy benefactors, who provided the precious metal and sometimes paid the workers.[37] The obverse contained references to central authorities, i.e. emperors, while the colony authorities decided what images and symbols to place on the reverse. If the issue was financed by a benefactor, he could also influence the choice of motifs. The mint in Corinth, like other local mints, did not issue coins regularly, but only when needed or e.g. to commemorate an event. That said, in the period from 44/43 BC to 68/69 coins were issued regularly and in large quantities. Usually, the names of the *duoviri* currently in office were placed on the coins (duovirat coinage). Corinth briefly lost the right to issue coins following Vespasian's decision, but regained it under Domitian. In the second period, the names of the *duoviri* disappeared from coins and it became the norm to place the ruler's image on the obverse.[38]

Coins from the first year of the colony's existence already show scenes referring to local traditions and myths from the times of Greek Corinth. Reverses of coins from 44/43 show the image of Bellerophon sitting on a flying Pegasus.[39] According to the myth, Bellerophon had to leave Corinth after he had killed Bellerus and his own brother. After many adventures, he reached the court of the king of Lycia, who demanded that he kill Chimera. In order to accomplish this task, he first needed to capture Pegasus. Bellerophon managed to do so in Corinth, where Pegasus was drinking water from the spring Peirene, and then killed Chimera. Similar figures and symbols from the local tradition regularly appeared on coins issued in Roman Corinth. They included Poseidon, Chimera, a dolphin, Pegasus, and representations of Aphrodite. As we can see, the first officials of Roman Corinth deliberately and voluntarily referred to Greek Corinth, one of the most developed cities in Hellenic times in terms of culture and economy. Their decision provokes two questions. Firstly, where did they acquire their knowledge of Greek Corinth; secondly, why did they decide to refer to the past of the place where the colony was being built?

At least a few hypothetical sources of this knowledge can be named. Apart from the material remnants of the old city (mentioned above), we should again reiterate the fact that some of the colonists were of Greek origin. It is also known that some mythical stories connected to Corinth were familiar in Italy. To illustrate, we could quote the story of Melicertes-Palaemon known to Plautus, Virgil and Ovid.[40] We could also consider the possibility that stories connected to Corinth survived in other places in Corinthia, which

---

[37] Mattingly 1962, 193–194.
[38] Amandry 1998; Hoskins Walbank 2003a, 337–349.
[39] *RPC* I 1124, 1116.
[40] Plautus, *Rubens* 160–162; Verg. *Georg.* 436–437; Ovid. *Fast.* 6.583–582; *Met.* 4.416–542.

had not been destroyed by L. Mummius' army. Finally, it is a known fact that some in-habitants of Corinth managed to escape the slaughter in 146 BC and found shelter e.g. in Athens, in Egypt and on Rhodes, where they cultivated the traditions of their home city.[41] Thus, the Roman colonists' knowledge about the history of Greek Corinth had various sources. It is very unlikely, however, that the first officials deciding to place the images of Bellerophon and Pegasus on coins had conducted antiquarian studies.[42] It is simpler to assume that a group of the first colonists were well-versed in the history of the place they were sent to by Caesar's will.

It is more difficult to answer why the colony's authorities decided to make refer-ences to local mythical motifs from the very beginning. An interest in culture could have played a role, but this is unlikely given the low social status of the colonists, especially in the very earliest period of the colony's existence. Possibly, there was a desire to dem-onstrate to the Greeks from other cities that Roman colonists were favourably disposed towards and interested in Greek history and traditions.[43]

Regardless of the motives of the Corinthian elite soon after the foundation of the col-ony, the tendency to place symbols referring to the local past on Corinthian coins contin-ued until the times of Caracalla and Geta, i.e. the last known issues from Corinth.[44] The greatest diversity of these symbols coincided with Hadrian's times. Under this emperor's rule, the most frequent motifs on Corinthian coins were scenes connected to the cult of Melicertes/Palaemon and mythical stories about Bellerophon's fight against Chimera. The next most used motifs on known coins were various representations of Poseidon and the temple or statue of Aphrodite in Acrocorinth.[45] The desire to highlight the classical background of Roman Corinth can also be seen in the case of a group of pseudo-auton-omous coins from Hadrian's times, whose reverses depict Tyche, Bellerophon, Triptol-emus on a chariot drawn by snakes, and the tomb of Lais, a famous courtesan from the 4th century BC. However, M. Hoskins Walbank warns against jumping to conclusions, stressing that even in the period of frequently referring to the Greek past, the Corinthians also took care to emphasise that they were Romans, for example placing the head of the goddess Roma on their coins. It is difficult not to agree with this historian, who stated, "The Corinthians were in the enviable position of having their cake and eating it, for they could enjoy the cultural cachet conferred by a Classical pedigree (…), and at the same time enjoy the privileges of Roman colony."[46]

The decision for the city to take over control of the famous Isthmian Games could also have been dictated by the desire to symbolically link the Roman colony with Greek Corinth. As we know, after Corinth was destroyed in 146 BC, the presidency over the games was taken over by the Sicyonians, who after a while moved them from the Isthmus

---

[41]   Millis 2010b, 244–257.

[42]   Therefore, they probably did not use various local historical accounts such as *Korinthiaka* by Eumelos of Corinth, or other such reports from the 2nd century known to Pausanias.

[43]   Stansbury 1990, 154–155. Papageorgiadou-Bani (2004, 59) points out that the message of the images placed on coins was directed at receivers in the whole empire on the one hand, and at inhabitants of a given province on the other, so the iconography must have been comprehensible for the local population.

[44]   Papageorgiadou-Bani 2004, 59–65.

[45]   Hoskins Walbank 2003a, 345–347.

[46]   Hoskins Walbank 2003a, 348.

to Sicyon.[47] Traditionally, it is thought that Corinth regained presidency over the games only in 2 BC. However, this date seems inconsistent with the fact that early Corinthian coins show many symbols directly referring to the games (e.g. wreaths to decorate the victors).[48] E.R. Gebhard's research shows that the Isthmian Games returned to Corinth soon after the colony was founded in 44 BC. However, they were not organised on the Isthmus, but in Corinth itself.[49] If we accept this date, Strabo's words become clear; he noted in 29 BC: "On the Isthmus is also the temple of the Isthmian Poseidon, in the shade of a grove of pine-trees, where the Corinthians used to celebrate the Isthmian Games."[50] The renowned geographer saw an element of the new reality, in which the games were not organised on the Isthmus, but this does not mean that they were not organised at all. If the task of organising and presiding over the games was taken away from the Sicyonians and handed over to the Roman colonists as soon as the time when the colony was founded, this would be a clear statement of intent not only on the part of the colonists, but also Caesar and his entourage.[51] They probably made deliberate efforts to show that the colony would not dissociate itself from the Greek past of the place where it was founded.[52] The Isthmian Games were part of the traditional *periodos*, and the way they were administered after 44 BC remained Greek through and through. In inscriptions, the person responsible for the programme is referred to by the Greek term *agonothetes*, the judges were called the *hellanodikai*, and Greek remained the language in which lists of victors were drawn up. The decrees honouring the *agonothetai* were written in Latin, however (Greek terms were transliterated), and publically displayed in Corinth.[53] Stansbury pointed out that the games must have played an important role in the "Hellenisation" of Roman Corinth, but he also emphasised that they had strong Roman overtones: their *agonothetes* was a Roman citizen, and they were the only Panhellenic games which included a special competition dedicated to the emperor, the *Caesarea*.[54] Therefore, the games did not so much contribute to the "Hellenisation" of Roman Corinth as be important for connecting the old local traditions with the new Roman reality.[55]

As has been mentioned before, the games were initially organised in Corinth itself. The sanctuary on the Isthmus, i.e. the traditional location of the games, was largely destroyed, and the first traces of repair works date back to the middle of the 1st century AD.[56] As M. Kajava showed, the Isthmian Games (but not the *Caesarea*, which continued in Corinth) returned to the Isthmus in 43 AD with the help of Cn. Cornelius Pulcher

---

[47]   Paus. 2.2.2.

[48]   Gebhard 2005, 182–183.

[49]   Gebhard 1993, 79–82.

[50]   Strabo 8.6.22.

[51]   Stansbury (1990, 228) rightly points out that the decision to take over control of the games must have either been made in Rome or approved by Roman authorities.

[52]   Consideration of economic benefits that the games and mainly the competitors and spectators coming to see them could have brought Corinth may also have been a factor. Amandry observed a tendency to increase the number of coins in the periods when the games were held: Amandry 1998; Stansbury 1990, 231; Spawforth 1989, 197.

[53]   *Corinth* VIII, 3.149–247; Geagan 1968, 69–80; Hupfloher 2008, 159–160.

[54]   Stansbury 1990, 231–232.

[55]   Walers 2005, 407.

[56]   Gebhard/Dickie 2003, 264–265.

from Epidauros.[57] He was one of the handfuls of Peloponnesian Greeks who decided to start a career in the Roman colony. We are familiar with his activity not only in Corinth, but also in Epidauros. The information provided by inscriptions pictures him as a man attached to Greek traditions on the one hand, and manifestly devoted to Rome on the other.[58] His father, Cn. Cornelius Sodamos, son of Nicatas, was a very influential figure in Epidauros. He was twice a priest of the imperial cult, as well as an *agonothetes* of the games called *Apolloneia kai Asklapeia*, to whose programme he added competitions dedicated to the emperor. During such combined games, his four-year-old son held the function of *gymnasiarchos* and *agoranomos*.[59] In the early 40s AD, the young Cornelius Pulcher moved to Corinth, where, as a member of a wealthy family, he was granted the colony's citizenship. In Corinth, he followed the local *cursus honorum* from *aedile* to *IIvir quinquennalis*. He was twice an *agonothetes*; during his second period in office he accomplished two things, important in the context of this discussion. He was the first to organise the *Isthmia* on the Isthmus, i.e. in their traditional location, which contributed to the restoration of the original character of the Isthmian Games. He also initiated a competition dedicated to deified Iulia, which he added to the programme of the games dedicated to the emperor.[60] He was, in a nutshell, a wealthy man originally from Epidauros, who pursued a public career in Corinth. In the Roman colony, Cornelius Pulcher appeared to be an active propagator of the imperial cult, but he also reformed the Isthmian Games so that they recaptured much of their original character. Other Greeks from outside Corinth, but pursuing a career in the colony, also became *agonothetai* of the Isthmian Games; however, none of them manifested their attachment to the Greek past in quite the same way as Cn. Cornelius Pulcher. It is likely that they became *agonothetai* because it was the most prestigious function in Corinth, not because they wanted to emphasise their Greek background.[61]

***

The Isthmian Games were inextricably linked to the cult of Melicertes/Palaemon. According to the myth, Melicertes was boy who, together with his mother, Ino, drowned in the sea. The boy's body was carried by a dolphin to the Isthmus, where the ruler of Corinth, Sisyphus, organised his burial and held the first Isthmian Games.[62] After her death, Ino was transformed into the goddess Leucothea, and Melicertes became the marine deity called Palaemon, connected to Poseidon. References to this myth appeared on Corinthian coins from Tiberius' times. The sanctuary of Palaemon on the Isthmus was built around the mid-1st century AD and was subsequently reconstructed multiple times. One of the reconstructions was sponsored by a generous euergetes, Publius Priscus Iuventianus, who repaired and decorated not only Palaemon's temple, but also a number of

---

[57]   Kajava 2002, 171–176.

[58]   Rizakis/Zoumbaki 2001, 302 (COR 226); 187–188 (ARG 116).

[59]   Rizakis/Zoumbaki 2001, 186–187 (ARG 115).

[60]   *Corinth* VIII, 3.153, I subscribe to the new reading of this inscription, proposed by N. Kajava (2002, 168–178).

[61]   C. Iulius Laco: Rizakis/Zoumbaki 2001, 335–336 (COR 345); C. Iulius Spartiaticus: Rizakis/Zoumbaki 2001, 338 (COR 353); Cn. Cornelius Pulcher: Rizakis/Zoumbaki 2001, 302–305 (COR 228). See also below.

[62]   Gantz 1993, 176–180, 456, 478, 733.

other cult buildings connected to Corinth's past, e.g. the temple of Demeter and Cora.[63] The circumstances of the "revival" of the cult of Palaemon in Corinth have become the subject of an interesting discussion, which illustrates well the problems encountered when studying the pantheon of Roman Corinth. According to M. Piérart, in the case of the cult of Palaemon on the Isthmus, we are not dealing with a simple continuation of cult practices from before 146 BC. In his opinion, the colonists had brought knowledge of the cult of Portunus-Palaemon from Italy and then, many decades after the colony was established, the cult was developed and new practices were added, which gave it a Mysteries-like character. This could have been the result of the antiquarian interests of parts of Corinthian elites, posing as direct heirs of the old Greek *polis*. An argument for Piérart's theory may seemingly be provided by Pausanias, who in passing mentions an altar of Melicertes in a place called Cromyon.[64] Pausanias was mainly interested in the past, and it is possible that he considered the cult of Melicartes/Palaemon to be too recent and did not include it in his depiction of Corinth and Corinthia.[65] It is worth re-membering, however, that Pausanias' account is a specific one and should not be treated as a tourist guidebook of sorts.

Gebhard expressed a different opinion on the cult of Palaemon in Roman Corinth from Piérart's; according to her, the main elements of the cult of Palaemon had existed in Corinth before 146 BC and were continued by the colonists after the colony was established. By regaining control over the Isthmian Games and by reviving the cult of deities worshipped on the Isthmus, the colonists deliberately referred to one of the old-est traditions of the Greek city. However, the question arises about the manner in which the colonists had acquired their knowledge of the cult of Palaemon. Some of them may have derived their knowledge from Roman literature. The figure of Palaemon/Melicertes appears in the works of e.g. Plautus, Vergil, and Ovid.[66] Gebhard believes that the colonists could have gleaned further information from the Sicyonians, who administered the Isthmian Games from 146 to 44 BC. The memory of the cult of Palaemon may also have survived in those cities in Corinthia which, like Tenea, had not been destroyed by the Romans.[67]

Questions about continuity and change can be asked with reference to many other cults practised in Roman Corinth. It is obvious that the colonists brought with them many cults typical of Rome, such as Iuppiter Capitolinus, Iuppiter Optimus Maximus, Ianus, Saturnus, the Genius of the Colony and the Genius of Augustus.[68] Dividing the deities into Greek and Roman is risky, however, due to the progress that was made in the 1st century BC with regard to the process of identifying Greek gods with their Roman equivalents. In the case of cults such as Apollo Augustus, Neptunus Augustus or Mars

---

[63] Geagan 1989, 349–360; Rizakis/Zoumbaki 2001, 343–345 (COR 378).

[64] Paus. 2.1.3.

[65] Piérart 1998, 85–109; Lafond 2006, 290.

[66] Plautus, *Rudens* 160–162; Verg. *Georg.* 436–437; *Aen.* 5.823; Ovid. *Fast.* 6.538–552; *Met.* 4.416–542.

[67] Gebhard (2005, 165–203) summing up her analysis, concluded that: "There was thus both continuity and change in cult practice between the rites observed in Greek Corinth and in the Roman colony, but the debt to tradition seems to have been greater than previously supposed" (at p. 203); see also Wiseman (1979, 493–496) who suggests that it was the people living in Corinth before 44 BC that spread the knowledge of local cultures among the colonists.

[68] Bookidis 2005, 152–159; Hupfloher 2008, 154–155; Hoskins Walbank 2010, 362–364.

Augustus, we can never be sure whether we are dealing with a cult imported from Rome, or a Latin translation of the names of Greek gods, who became merged with Augustus.[69]

On the other hand, there is no doubt that the deities that used to be worshipped in the Greek city played an important role in the pantheon of Roman Corinth. Above all, we should name Aphrodite, Poseidon, Demeter and Cora, the cults of local heroes such as Sisyphus and Bellerophon, or the already mentioned Melicertes/Palaemon (Paus. 2.4.2; Strabo 8.6.21). Engels, who is a proponent of the theory that the colonists continued the cult practices of Greek Corinth rather than simply reviving them, pointed out several ways in which continuity was possible; e.g. he allowed the possibility that cult practices were carried on in Corinth in the transition period, something which is not documented by archaeological sources.[70] Another possibility is connected with those inhabitants of Corinth who were sold into slavery, but continued the religious traditions of their city, and subsequently their descendants settled in Corinth, bringing the traditions back. The continuity could have been a consequence of the antiquarian interests and searches of colonists themselves. It was also possible that the colonists wanted to secure the favour of Corinth's old gods of protection, especially Aphrodite and Poseidon. Engels himself concluded that the most likely possibility was the need to ensure the favour of the gods of protection and the colonists' interest in the history of the place.[71] He is probably right, although the list of factors he proposed is not exhaustive. However, before we suggest other ways, or rather reasons for the colonists worshipping local gods, it is worth noting that the factors he mentioned would play a role in the case not only of continuation, but also of revival of the old cults.

As has been mentioned above, there is much to indicate that the colonists sent to Corinth in 44 BC did not arrive at a sea of ruins. They saw many buildings in various states of repair and encountered some inhabitants. The fact that some of the old buildings, especially cult ones, survived, may have had some influence on adding the gods formerly worshipped in Corinth to the new pantheon.[72]

We do not know the technical details of the establishment of the colony in Corinth. To fill this gap in our knowledge, researchers very often refer to the *lex coloniae Genitivae* concerning the colony in Urso, Spain, established in 44 BC on Caesar's initiative. It follows from this law that decisions concerning cults practised in the colony, erecting temples, and performing public sacrifices, were made by the *duoviri* and decurions.[73] The situation was probably identical in Corinth (at least there are no reasons to think otherwise), where the first officials and members of the council also made the first decisions concerning the official pantheon. It was they who decided to place references to the local Corinthian hero Bellerophon on the reverses of coins. It was also they who decided to add Greek gods to the colony's religious calendar; archaeological findings show that it was these gods, i.e. Asclepius, Demeter and Cora, and Aphrodite, who were the earliest

---

[69] Engels 1990, 95; Hupfloher 2008, 154.
[70] Bookidis 2005, 149–150.
[71] Engels 1990, 94–95.
[72] Engels 1990, 94–95; Bookidis 2005, 151–164.
[73] *ILS* 6087; Bookidis 2005, 152; Hoskins Walbank 2010, 358.

to be worshipped.[74] Some of the sanctuaries devoted to the gods survived in good enough condition that the colonists did not necessarily have problems with their identification.[75] In the case of other cults, information could be retrieved from surviving inscriptions or oral accounts. However, it is not the sources of knowledge that are the most important, but the decision, made already at the time of the colony's establishment, to worship the gods that had formerly played such a big part in Greek Corinth. Naturally, one reason may have been and probably was the desire to ensure the protection of the old gods, but there was something else as well. By reviving the cults connected with old Corinth, the colonists wanted to show that the colony of *Laus Iulia Corinthiensis* was in no way trying to distance itself from Greek Corinth. Restoring old cult practices was a deliberate attempt to create a connection between Greek and Roman Corinth. All cities attached a great deal of significance to rites referring to the mythical past and their origins; the elites of Corinth wanted to act in the same manner, even at the price of creating the false impression that there was continuity between Greek Corinth and the Roman colony.

Decisions made at the point when the colony was established had an impact on the cultural character of the city in the future, in the sense that they set a model of behaviour and showed how the Greek past of the city could be referenced. Corinth was not lacking in wealthy people who sponsored the construction of new buildings, but also generously provided funds for the restoration or rebuilding of old Greek sanctuaries. There is a well-known example of Marcus Antonius Milesius, who, together with several others, rebuilt the temple of Asclepius and thus contributed to the revival of this god's cult.[76] References to Greekness sometimes took on a more surprising character. Greek terms transliterated into Latin appeared in Latin administrative titles. We know the term *theocolus Iovis Capitolini* from several epigraphic texts; the first example of its use is very early, and dates back to Augustus' rule.[77] The Greek term *theocolos* referred to the cult personnel at Olympia, and its addition to Roman terminology may have been dictated by snobbism and the desire to follow the Greek model. A. Hupfloher noted that all known examples of using the title *theocolus Iovis Capitolini* come from inscriptions placed on monument bases, which indicates that we are dealing with persons of high social standing.[78] Another interesting phenomenon was the divine worship of Octavia (sister of Octavian and wife of Mark Antony) in Corinth. She was never deified, but a temple was erected for her in Corinth and she was clearly included in the imperial cult. This practice can be interpreted as a local, Greek version of the imperial cult, which is explained by the role Octavia played in Roman politics. It cannot be ruled out that her cult was established in Corinth in the 30s BC by the supporters and clients of Antony. If this was the case, their act tells us much about their origin and religious customs.[79]

---

[74] Bookidis 2005, 159–160, who notes that the list of deities worshipped first should also include Zeus and Apollo. Cf. Hupfloher 2008, 153–154; Hoskins Walbank 2010, 365–368.

[75] Engels 1990, 94–95, for example the temple of Asclepius and Hygieia, or Demeter and Cora.

[76] *Corinth* VIII. 3. 311; Rizakis/Zoumbaki 2001, 263 (COR 65).

[77] *Corinth* VIII. 3. 152 (Sextus Olius Secundus – Augustus' reign), 194–196, 198.

[78] Hupfloher 2008, 156–159.

[79] Kantiréa 2007, 129–131; Hupfloher 2008, 154–155.

With time, as the influx of Greek population to the city increased, the presence of Greek elements became more and more visible. The pantheon of Roman Corinth became increasingly varied, with eastern cults, Judaism and Christianity entering the fold.[80]

***

The influx of Greek people must also have had an impact on the language prevalent in Corinth. It is commonly known that Latin was the language in which inscriptions were written throughout the 1st and in the early 2nd century. The situation changed in the 2nd century, with Hadrian's reign being the turning point. From the period of Augustus' rule to Trajan's times we only have six Greek inscriptions, while there are more than 100 Latin ones. From Hadrian's reign onwards, the trend changed; there are 39 Greek and 17 Latin texts in the period until Gallienus' rule.[81] Therefore, we can see that Latin, which was initially dominant, gradually gave way to Greek, although it did not disappear altogether. In the 2nd and 3rd centuries, honorific inscriptions for elite members continued to be written in Latin, which emphasised the privileged position of such persons in the local community.[82] The phenomenon of Latin being replaced by Greek as the language of inscriptions was typical not just of Corinth, since it also occurred in other colonies established on Greek lands.[83] Millis posed the question whether the fact that official inscriptions were written in Latin in the 1st century AD must mean that Latin was indeed a commonly used language in Corinth. In his opinion, public Latin inscriptions from the forum or theatre do not necessarily indicate this. In a Roman colony, Latin simply must have been used in the public sphere. However, Millis emphasised that Greek graffiti or writings on pottery are more numerous than Latin ones. Writing to the Christian community in Corinth, Paul the Apostle also used Greek, since he wanted to reach the greatest number of people. According to Millis, a "significant portion of the population" used Greek as the everyday language.[84] In light of what we have already said about the colonists, their habits, and their attitude to the Greek past of the city, Millis' conclusion seems correct.

***

Finally, it is time to consider what impact on the cultural transformation of Roman Corinth could have been made by members of influential Greek families from various Peloponnesian cities, who pursued a public career in the colony. Spawforth pointed out five such persons among the Corinthian elite during the period he analysed (i.e. until the end of Nero's reign).[85] They started to appear among Corinthian officials during Claudius'

---

[80]   Hupfloher 2008: "…the Corinthian pantheon of imperial times was kind of an agglomerate containing different elements of different provenience: traditional Greek elements and newly imported elements from Rome and from the east and the south-east of the Roman Empire. The pantheon of Corinth was certainly not dominated by Roman gods." Cf. Bookidis 2005, 161; Hoskins Walbank 2010, 368–369, 371–372. Engels (1990, 102) however, saw a domination of Roman gods in Corinth.

[81]   *Corinth* VIII, 3, 18–19 (Kent); Engels 1990, 71; Dixon 2000, 338; Lafond 2006, 303.

[82]   Engels 1990, 73. The funerary dedication erected by L. Coranus Patrobius for himself and his family is dated to the early 3rd century: *Corinth* VIII, 3. 302.

[83]   Rizakis 1995, 373–391; Baldwin Bowsky 2004, 50–95 (the example of Knossos).

[84]   Millis 2010a, 23–29.

[85]   It is known, however, that P. Caninius Agrippa had been connected with Corinth (his social background is uncertain; it is only known that he was Greek (see Rizakis/Zoumbaki 2001, 279–280: COR 135)) and so

reign, over 80 years after the colony was established. This is not a long period if we remember that the process of granting Roman citizenship to influential Greeks from the Peloponnese was a slow one. Holding Roman citizenship was necessary for the colony authorities to add someone from a different city to the list of citizens (*adlectio*). At least some parts of the elites of Greek cities viewed the possibility to sit on the colony's council of decurions, holding offices, and thus participating in governing the colony, as a special privilege crowning their efforts to join the political elite of the empire.[86] Among the Greeks pursuing a career in Corinth were C. Iulius Laco and C. Iulius Spartiaticus, the son and grandson, respectively, of the famous Spartan dynast Eurycles, who had already sided with Augustus at the Battle of Actium, for which he was rewarded with Roman citizenship, among other things. The group also included Cn. Cornelius Pulcher, who came from a family that had propagated the imperial cult in Epidauros since Augustus' times.[87] Each of these three men held the financially demanding function of *agonothetes* of the Isthmian Games, as well as other offices in Corinth. Possibly, the readiness to finance the games was a good enough reason for the Corinthian authorities to accept them as citizens. The men in question treated their careers in Corinth as a way to increase the prestige of their families, previously known and influential in local Greek communities and now announcing their presence on the provincial level. It seems doubtful that these few Greeks could have had an impact on the cultural identity of the city and its inhabitants. Only Cn. Cornelius Pulcher contributed, as mentioned earlier, to restoring the original character of the Isthmian Games. His achievement was a response to the growing interest of the colony's inhabitants in the city's Greek past. We have no knowledge of any similar achievements of the other men in question. Both Spawforth and Rizakis concluded that, through their activity in Corinth, the Greeks from good families from Sparta or Epidauros contributed to facilitating the integration of the colony with its Greek surroundings.[88] However, this seems rather doubtful. C. Iulius Laco, C. Iulius Spartiaticus and others pursued a career in Corinth above all because they wanted to be Romans and act like Romans.[89] It is difficult to see how they might have facilitated the integration with the Greek surroundings or other cities on the Peloponnese and in Achaea.

A large amount of data shows that Corinth's integration with its Greek surroundings was difficult. The Greeks' dislike of the colonists of low social status is recorded in the famous epigram of Crinagoras of Mytilene, writing in Augustus' times. He did not hide his contempt for the servile origin of the new inhabitants of Corinth.[90] Even if this was only his personal opinion, it can still be assumed that there were other Greeks who thought similarly. From the point of view of the Greek inhabitants of the Peloponnese, the very fact of sending the colonists to build a new city on the ruins of the old famous

---

had Eurycles of Sparta, who built a bathhouse in Corinth, but there is no indication that he held any offices in the colony.

[86]   Raggi 2004, 55–68.

[87]   We know nothing about the origin and ancestors of C. Iulius Polyaenus of Sicyon and P. Memmius Cleandr of Delphi.

[88]   Spawforth 1996, 167; Rizakis 1996, 46.

[89]   Walters 2005, 409.

[90]   *Anth. Pal.* 9.284.

Greek centre might have caused distrust and dislike and encouraged them to keep their distance. The colonists were, after all, representatives of the new rulers of the world who had conquered the Greeks. In the turbulent period of the last decades of the Republic there were plenty of events that could only fuel the Greeks' negative feelings towards the Romans. Greece was the place where fights among the feuding Republic generals were taking place, and the warring sides did not hesitate to make use of the increasingly meagre resources of the Greek cities. The mentioned dislike may have focused on the colony's inhabitants, as they were the closest Romans. It should also be remembered that the very establishment of the colony may have been regarded by the local people as the most glaring manifestation of Roman domination.[91]

The dislike towards Corinth may have been intensified by the fact that its importance gradually increased, as it became the seat of the Roman governor. Traces of this dislike can be found as late as the second half of the 1st century. It was then that the city of Argos sought to regain the privilege that exempted it from paying for the organisation of the *venationes* in Corinth. The city had enjoyed this privilege since it bore the cost of organising the Panhellenic games called the *Nemeia*. However, it lost the privilege at some point as a result of a decision of the Roman authorities. In the letter concerning regaining the privilege, sent by Argos to the Roman governor, it was emphasised that the *venationes* were neither Greek nor ancient and that they were organised by others, i.e. the Corinthians. The authors of the letter also noted that Corinth was much wealthier than Argos.[92] The *venationes* referred to in the letter were one of the features of the celebrations connected with the imperial cult established in the Achaean *koinon* in 54 AD. The festivities took place in Corinth, which could also have been a source of frustration for the inhabitants of Argos. Previously, meetings of representatives of the cities participating in the *koinon* had been held in Argos. The letter shows that the causes of dislike towards the colony and its inhabitants may have been varied and may have existed at different times, not only at the moment of its establishment. It took time for such frictions to cease to have a negative impact on the mutual relations of the inhabitants of the colony and Greek cities.[93]

***

From a colony established by a few hundred people sent from Italy by Caesar, Corinth evolved into Greece's largest city within 150 years.[94] The increase in the population occurred as a result of migration from close and far corners of the Mediterranean world. Presumably, the majority of those who decided to settle in Corinth spoke Greek. The influx of immigrants had an impact on the ethnic identity of the city, although this does not mean that the Roman city became a Greek one. F. Millar's opinion, although formulated with regard to Greek cities in Roman times, seems to be correct; according to him, the

---

[91]   Sartre 2001, 127; Rizakis 2004, 83–85.

[92]   Spawforth 1994, 211–232.

[93]   It is probably no coincidence that we know so little about these relations on the micro scale, i.e. on the level of normal families. One of the exceptions is a woman named Salvia from Thessaly, who married a wealthy Corinthian and went to live in her husband's home town (Rizakis/Zoumbaki 2001, 378–379: COR 545).

[94]   Aristeides put forward such an opinion in the second half of the 2nd century.

cities remained under a strong influence of both Greek and Roman culture. Therefore, it is preferable to call them Greek-Roman cities rather than Greek cities.[95] Similarly, the Roman colony of Corinth remained under the influence of Greek culture. It is awkward, however, to talk about "Hellenisation" of Roman Corinth. The term "Hellenisation," similarly to "Romanisation," is used more and more cautiously by historians. Both these terms imply a one-sided process of absorbing Greek culture by the Romans (Hellenisation) or Roman culture by the Greeks (Romanisation). In fact, contacts between the two communities resulted in starting a dialogue in which both sides were active participants.[96]

The cultural identity of a city is decided by its inhabitants. As has been shown above, very early on, practically at the moment of the colony's establishment, the first colonists started to deliberately use various elements connecting it to the Greek *polis* destroyed in 146 BC. The reasons for this may have been varied, ranging from personal preferences, fascinations, or the wish to add prestige, to posing as heirs of the inhabitants of the old city. Let us remember that a considerable part of the elite of Roman Corinth were freedmen, with the desire to emulate their superiors, characteristic of this group.[97] In Corinth, thanks to Caesar, freedmen were granted the right to perform public functions (the privilege was later rescinded by Augustus), which satisfied their political ambitions. In order to increase their cultural prestige, they started to refer to the Greek history of the place where they happened to live.

The example came from the Roman authorities, and from Caesar to be specific. Cassius Dion noted that the dictator, establishing the colonies in Corinth and Carthage, wanted to restore the memory of the old inhabitants of these cities.[98] The first few decisions made by the colonists suggest that they had clear directions how to act, but also extensive authority (taking over the games). It is likely that Caesar's objective to create a city in which cultures could intermingle coincided with the objectives and ambitions of the colonists. In 16/15 BC, Augustus established another Roman colony, at Patras. The colony was built as a result of a procedure which slightly resembled synoecism. The new political structure was assigned the inhabitants of not only the territories closest to Patras, but also lands on the northern coast of the Gulf of Corinth. Augustus also ordered for the most important cult statues from Calydon (Artemis Laphria and Dionysus Calydonios) to be moved to Patras and placed in new temples.[99] In this way, he reorganised Patras' pantheon, founding it on old traditions. The cult of Artemis Laphria was quickly connected with the cult of the emperor, but this is beside the point.[100] What is crucial is that the reference to local traditions occurred on the initiative of the authorities, i.e. Augustus, who followed in Caesar's footsteps when it came to his policy on establishing colonies.

---

[95]   Millar 1993, 232–260.

[96]   Woolf 1994: 116–143; 1998, 22; Alcock 1997b, 109; Walters 2005, 397–417; Madsen 2006, 87–113 (the Greeks' attitude towards the Romans).

[97]   On the attitude of Roman freedmen, see Veyne 1990, 3–43.

[98]   Cass. Dio 43.50.4–5.

[99]   Paus. 7.18.8–9.

[100]   A. Rizakis (1996, 282–283; 2010, 129–154) analysing the cults and, mainly, the architectural development of the city, concluded that Patras was neither Greek nor Roman, but a typical Greek-Roman city. M. Kantiréa (2007, 98–101) analyses the case of Artemis Laphria in the context of the religious policy of Augustus, who sought to revive old cults not just in Rome, but also in the provinces.

Roman Corinth showed interest in its Greek predecessor from the very beginning of its existence. This followed both from Caesar's intentions and from the attitude and ambitions of the colonists themselves. With time, Greek elements in the Roman colony became more numerous and more visible. However, the inhabitants did not manage to convince everybody that they were heirs of the Greek inhabitants of the city. Pausanias, as a lover of Greek antiquities, was particularly sceptical; he was not fooled, and emphasised several times that in his time Corinth had not been inhabited by any of its old citizens.

Finally, one more thing must not be forgotten. Corinth was an important trade centre, visited by legions of merchants, sailors, games participants and spectators. It was these people that made it a buoyant and ethnically diverse city. Multi-ethnicity leads to cultural diversity, so caution should be called for whenever we try to classify Corinth using the terms "Roman" or "Greek."

Bibliography

Alcock, S.E. (1997a): Greece: A Landscape of Resistance?, in: Mattingly 1997: 103–115.

Alcock, S.E. (ed.) (1997b): *The Early Roman Empire in the East*, Oxford.

Amandry, M. (1998): Le monnayage des duovirs corinthiens (*BCH* Suppl. 15), Athènes.

Baldwin Bowsky, M.W. (2004): Of Two Tongues: Acculturation of Roman Knossos, in: Salmeri/Raggi/Baroni 2004: 50–95.

Bookidis, N. (2005): Religion in Corinth: 146 B.C.E. to 100 C.E., in: Schowalter/Friesen 2005: 141–164.

Bowersock, G.W. (1965): *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford.

Broneer, O. (1941): Colonia Laus Iulia Corinthiensis, *Hesperia* 10: 388–390.

Bruneau, Ph. (1971): Lampes corinthiennes, *BCH* 95: 437–501.

Brunt, P.A. (1971): *Italian Manpower*, Oxford.

Di Napoli, V. (2010): Entertainment Building of the Roman Peloponnese: Theatres, *Odea*, and Amphiteatres and Their Topographical Distribution, in: Rizakis/Lepenioti 2010: 253–266.

Dixon, D. (2000): A New Latin and Greek Inscription from Corinth, *Hesperia* 69: 335–342.

Edwards, Ch.M. (1981): Corinth 1980: Molded Relief of Bowls, *Hesperia* 50: 189–210.

Engels, D. (1990): *Roman Corinth*: *An Alternative Model for the Classical City*, Chicago, Il.

Gantz, T. (1993): *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*, vols. 1–2, Baltimore–London.

Geagan, D.J. (1968): Notes on the Agonistic Festivals of Roman Corinth, *GRBS* 9: 69–80.

Geagan, D.J. (1989): The Isthmian Dossier of P. Priscus Juventianus, *Hesperia* 53: 349–360.

Gebhard, E.R. (1993): The Isthmian Games and the Sanctuary of Poseidon in the Early Empire, in: T.E. Gregory (ed.), *The Corinthia in the Roman Period. Including the Papers Given at a Symposium Held at The Ohio State University on 7–9 March, 1991* (*JRA Suppl*. 8), Portsmouth, Rhode Island: 78–82.

Gebhard, E.R. (2005): Rites for Melikertes-Palaimon in the Early Roman Corinthia, in: Schowalter/Friesen 2005: 165–203.

Gebhard, E.R., Dickie, M.W. (2003): The view from the Isthmus, ca. 200 to 44 B.C, in: Ch.K. Williams II, N. Bookidis (eds.), *Corinth the Centenary 1896–1996*, Athens: 261–278.

Hansen, F. (ed.) (1993): *The Ancient Greek City-State*, Copenhagen.

Hoskins Walbank, M.E. (1997): The Foundation and Planning of Early Roman Corinth, *JRA* 10: 95–130.

Hoskins Walbank, M.E. (2002): What's in a Name? Corinth under the Flavians, *ZPE* 139: 251–264.

Hoskins Walbank, M.E. (2003a): Aspects of Corinthian Coinage in the Late 1st and Early 2nd Centuries A.C., in: Williams/Bookidis 2003: 337–349.

Hoskins Walbank, M.E. (2003b): Unquiet Graves: Burial Practices of the Roman Corinthians, in: Schowalter/Friesen 2005: 249–280.

Hoskins Walbank, M.E. (2010): The Cults of Roman Corinth: Public Rituals and Personal Belief, in: Rizakis/Lepenioti 2010: 357–374.

Hupfloher, A. (2008): A Small Copy of Rome? Religious Organization in Roman Corinth, in: Rizakis/Camia 2008: 151–160.

Hutton, W. (2005): *Describing Greece. Landscape and Literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias*, Cambridge.

Kajava, M. (2002): When did the Isthmian Games Return to the Isthmus? (Rereading "Corinth" 8.3.153), *CP* 97: 168–178.

Kantiréa, M. (2007): *Les Dieux et les Dieux Auguste. Le culte imperial en Greèce sous les Julio-claudiens et les Flaviens. Etudes épigraphiques et archéologiques*, Athenes.

Lafond, Y. (2006): *La mémoire des cités dans le Péloponnèse d'époque romaine (IIe siècle avant J.-C. – IIIe siècle après J.-C.*), Rennes.

Madsen, J.M. (2006): The Romanization of the Greek elite in Achaia, Asia and Bithynia: Greek Resistance or Regional Discrepancies?, *Orbis Terrarum* 8: 87–113.

Mattingly, D.J. (ed.) (1997): *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism. Power, discourse, and discrepant experience in the Roman Empire*, (*JRA Suppl.* 23), Portsmouth, Rhode Island.

Mattingly, H. (1962): *Roman Coins from the Earliest Times to the Fall of the Western Empire*, London.

Mattusch, C.C. (2003): Corinthian Bronze. Famous, but Elusive, in: Williams/Bookidis 2003: 219–232.

Millar, F. (1993): The Greek City in Roman Period, in: Hansen 1993: 232–260.

Millis, B.W. (2010a): The Social and Ethnic Origins of the Colonists in Early Roman Corinth, in: S.J. Friesen, D.N. Schowalter, J.C. Walters (eds.), *Corinth in Context. Comparative Studies on Religion and Society*, Leiden–Boston: 13–35.

Millis, B.W. (2010b): Corinthians in Exile 146–44 BC, in: R.W.V. Catling, F. Marchand with the assistance of M. Sasanow (eds.), *Onomatologos. Studies in Greek Personal Names presented to Elaine Matthews*, Exeter: 244–257.

Morris, I. (1992): *Death-Ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge.

Oliver, J.H. (1978): Panachaens and Panhellenes, *Hepseria* 47: 185–191.

Papageorgiadou-Bani, H. (2004): *The Numismatic Iconography of the Roman Colonies in Greece. Local Spirit and the Expression of Imperial Policy*, Athens.

Piérart, M. (1998): Panthéon et hellénisation dans la colonie romaine de Corinth: la "rédecouverte" du culte de Palaimon à l'Isthm, *Kernos* 11: 85–109.

Raggi, A. (2004): Cittadinanza colonaria e cittadinanza romana, in: Salmeri/Raggi/Baroni 2004: 55–68.

Rizakis, A.D. (1995): «Paysage linguistique» : Le grec face au latin. Le paysage linguistique dans la peninsule balkanique sous l'Empire, in: H. Solin, O. Salomies, U.-M. Liertz (eds.), *Acta colloqui epigraphici latini, Helsinki 3–6 sept. 1991*, Helsinki: 373–391.

Rizakis, A.D. (1996): Les colonies romaines des côtes occidentales grecques. Population et territoire, *DHA* 22: 255–324.

Rizakis, A.D. (1997): Roman Colonies in the Province of Achaia: Territories, Land and Population, in: Alcock 1997: 15–36.

Rizakis, A.D. (2004): La littérature gromatique et la colonisation romaine en Orient, in: Salmeri/Raggi/Baroni 2004: 69–94.

Rizakis, A. (2007): *Les Ti. Claudii* et la promotion des élites péloponnésiennes, in: Perrin Y. (ed.), *Neronia VII. Rome, l'Italie et la Grèce. Hellénisme et philhellénisme au premier siècle après J.-C. Actes du VIIe Colloque International de la SIEN*, Bruxelles: 183–195.

Rizakis, A.D. (2010): *Colonia Augusta Achaïca Patrensis*. Réaménagements urbains, constructions édilitaire et la nouvelle identité patréenne, in: Rizakis/Lepenioti 2010: 129–154.

Rizakis, A.D., Camia, F. (eds.) (2008): *Pathways to Power. Civic Elites in the Eastern Part of the Roman Empire. Proceedings of the International Workshop held at Athens Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 19 Dicembre 2005*, Atene.

Rizakis, A.D., Lepenioti, Cl.E. (eds.) (2010): *Roman Peloponnese III. Society, Economy and Culture under the Roman Empire: Continuity and Innovation*, Athens.

Rizakis, A.D., Zoumbaki, S. (2001): *Roman Peloponnese I. Roman Personal Names in Their Social Context (Achaia, Arcadia, Argolis, Corinthia and Eleia)*, Athens.

Romano, I.B. (1994): A Hellenistic Deposit from Corinth: Evidence for Interim Period Activity (146–44 B.C.), *Hesperia* 63: 57–104.

Romano, D.G. (2003): City Planning, Centuriation, and Land Division in Roman Corinth: *Colonia Laus Iulia Corinthiensis* & *Colonia Iulia Flavia Augusta Corinthiensis*, in: Williams/Bookidis 2003: 279–301.

Romano, D.G. (2005): Urban and Rural Planning in Roman Corinth, in: Schowalter/Friesen 2005: 25–59.

Romano, D.G. (2010): Romanization of the Corinthia: Urban and Rural Developments, in: Rizakis/Lepenioti 2010: 155–172.

Salmeri, G., Raggi, A., Baroni, A. (eds.) (2004): *Colonie romane nel mondo greco*, Roma.

Sartre, M. (2001): Les colonies romaines dans le monde grec, *Electrum* 5: 111–152.

Schowalter, D.N., Friesen, S.J. (eds.) (2005): *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth. Interdisciplinary Approaches*, Harvard.

Spawforth, A.J.S., Walker, S. (1985): The World of Panhellenion I: Athens and Eleusis, *JRS* 75: 78–104.

Spawforth, A.J.S. (1989): Agonistic Festivals in Roman Greece, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 36: 193–197.

Spawforth, A.J.S. (1994): Corinth, Argos, and the Imperial Cult: Pseudo-Julian, *Letteres* 198 Bidez, *Hesperia* 63: 211–232.

Spawforth, A.J.S. (1996): Roman Corinth: The Formation of a Colonial Elite, in: A.D. Rizakis (ed.), *Roman Onomastic in the Greek East: Social and Political Aspects. Proceedings of the Inernational Colloquium on Roman Onomastics, Athens, 7–9 September 1993*, Athens: 167–182.

Stansbury, H.A. (1990): *Corinthian Honor, Corinthian Conflict: A Social History of Early Roman Corinth and Its Pauline Community*, University of California, Irvine.

Thomas, C.M. (2005): Placing the Dead: Funerary Practice and Social Stratification in the Early Roman Period at Corinth and Ephesos, in: Schowalter/Friesen 2005: 281–304.

Veyne, P. (1990): *La società romana*, Bari.

Walters, J.C. (2005): Civic Identity in Roman Corinth and Its Impact on Early Christians, in: Schowalter/Friesen 2005: 397–417.

Williams, C.K. II, Bookidis, N. (eds.) (2003): *Corinth the Centenary 1896–1996*, Athens.

Williams, C.K. II, Russell, P. (1981): Corinth: Excavations of 1980, *Hesperia* 50: 1–44.

Wiseman, J. (1979): Corinth and Rome I: 228 B.C. – A.D. 267, *ANRW* II 7.1: 438–548.

Woolf, G. (1994): Becoming Roman, Staying Greek: Cultural Identity and the Civilizing Process in the Roman East, *PCPhS* 40: 116–143.

Woolf, G. (1998): *Becoming Roman. The Origins of the Provincial Civilization in Gaul*, Cambridge.