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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

During the Iron Age, Cilicia’s administrative structure was characterized by a decentralized network of local powers. Languages such as Phoenician,
Cultural capital: Oxford

The symbols, ideas, tastes, and preferences that
in an unconscious acceptance of cultural norms and social
experiences, current practices, and societal structures.

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

LANGUAGE AS SYMBOLIC POWER

Languages structure communication within both insti-
tutions and societies. They define and legitimize their prac-
tices. Institutions evolve over time, and so do languages;
they adapt accordingly. Languages also affect power dynam-
ics. Bourdieu argues that language is not only a tool for com-
munication but that it is a symbolic power that reflects exist-
ing power structures and plays a crucial role in shaping social
hierarchies. In this situation, people who have control over
language can influence discussions and establish societal
norms. Often, this reinforces existing power dynamics. For
instance, those who are proficient in the dominant language
of a community may use it to exclude or marginalize individ-
uals who speak other languages or dialects, thus perpetu-
ating inequalities. Therefore, the social dimensions of poli-
tics involve a struggle for domination between the dominant
and the dominated within society, and the role of language
in constructing social identities is significant as it is regarded
as a form of symbolic power.

Dispositions such as social class, religion, and education
reflect similarities among people with shared backgrounds,
leading to the formation of habitus, which is a subjective
expression of individuality. Habitus emerges from past
experiences, current practices, and societal structures.
Consequently, individuals’ social actions are influenced by
their habitus. Bourdieu suggests that this process results
in an unconscious acceptance of cultural norms and social
distinctions, shaping one’s sense of place within society. Additionally, Bourdieu emphasizes the “linguistic habi-
tus,” which refers to the language patterns shaped by an
individual’s social context and experiences. This supports
the approach that individuals can adapt and change their
linguistic practices over time. However, such changes are
restricted by the broader social structures in which individu-
als are situated. So, these practices not only reflect but may
also cause social inequalities. Therefore, the linguistic habi-
tus shapes how individuals communicate and interact within
their social environments. Linguistic capital, on the other
hand, refers to the accumulation of an individual’s linguis-
tic skills. Just as cultural capital influences academic success
and social mobility, linguistic capital focuses on language-
related skills and their impact on an individual’s position,
which may impact their social and economic opportunities.
As mentioned with the dominant and the dominated, the
opportunities here can also predetermine their position in soci-
ety.

A good example of this cultural capital phenomenon can
be seen in Apuleius’ Metamorphosis. The protagonist Lucius
recounts an encounter between a gardener and a Roman
 legionary soldier. The gardener, unable to understand the
soldier’s Latin, tries to move away. However, the soldier
becomes enraged and physically assaults the gardener. Later,
the soldier repeats his question in Greek. There are sugges-
tions that the soldier is not even a native Latin speaker due
to grammatical errors in the text. In likelihood, the sol-
dier, although he knows both languages, used Latin to the
gardener, who does not speak Latin, so to probably feel more
powerful in this way. This can be seen as an important exam-
ple of how language is used as a symbolic power. In order
to investigate the influence of language on social identity, it
is not enough to examine language in a society in only one
direction. It would make more sense in terms of understand-
ing its sociocultural effects to examine the language(s) by
dividing it into both the dominant (rulers) and the domi-
nated (common people). In order to illustrate this, language
usage can be categorized as follows: (1) official language,
which includes inscriptions on milestones, official monu-
ments, and formal letters used in administrative contexts;
(2) everyday language, which the common people use com-
municating about their daily tasks and other routine activi-
ties, and (3) rhetoric language, which falls beyond the previ-
uous two categories, and encompasses intellectual, cultural,
symbolic and sometimes metaphorical expressions used by
mostly philosophers, authors, and poets. Each of these cat-
egories must also be examined in the temporal, political,
and sociocultural sphere in which society is situated. They
should be evaluated according to the ideologies of the period. In
this way, it is possible to gain clearer insight into how language
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builds a bridge between institutions and societies. It should be noted that this may or may not be intentional. How words are understood by both parties is important. Sometimes things can be misinterpreted by one side. Therefore, these categories should not be analyzed unilaterally. They should be perceived as a two-sided communication, both in terms of what is being expressed and what is being understood.

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

FROM SELEUCID EMPIRE TO ROMAN RULE: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF CILICIA

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

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

During the late second and early first centuries BC, Cilician pirates posed a significant threat in the eastern Mediterranean. Meanwhile, Rough Cilicia was under their control, along with local administrators, while Plain Cilicia remained under the Seleucids’ rule. The Roman Senate initially tasked Marcus Antonius with addressing the piracy issue in 102 BC, but the problem persisted. In response, Rome enacted the praetor states law (Lex de Provinciis Praetorioris) between 101 and 99 BC, designating pirates with their allies and friends as enemies of Rome. In 92 BC, Cilicia became a Roman province and was assigned to Lucius Cornelius Sulla. Meanwhile, Rome supported Mithridates VI, the King of Pontus. In 91 BC, Mithridates attacked Bithynia and Cappadocia, massacring many Romans to prevent the Roman Empire’s expansion into Anatolia. This triggered the First Mithridatic War (89–85 BC), which the Romans ultimately won. Mithridates VI had to cede the territory he gained during the war to Rome, as per the verbal Treaty of Dardanos. Although Mithridates’ prestige suffered, the Romans couldn’t avenge the slain. Another war seemed inevitable.
During this period, Lucius Licinius Murena, the governor of Asia, engaged in conflict with Mithridates, leading to the Second Mithridatic War, where Murena faced challenges against the formidable opponent. Sulla's recall of Murena and the ongoing struggles within the Seleucid Empire further complicated matters. In 83 BC, Cilicia fell into the hands of the Armenian king Tigranes. This situation persisted until the Third Mithridatic War when Mithridates VI and Tigranes were defeated by the Roman commander L. Lucinius Lucullus. Even during these wars, pirate issues persisted. Consequently, Rome decided to establish a Roman Province in Cilicia. The exact timing of Cilicia’s transformation into a Roman Province remains unclear, but the first known governor was Gnaeus Cornelius Dolabella served around 80/79 BC. His arrangements in Cilicia indicate that he held the position of the province’s inaugural governor. In 90 BC, Dolabella was replaced by Servilius Vatia. Despite several achievements, the issue of piracy persisted, and as a result, Cilicia remained only partially under Roman control. Afterward, in 74 BC, Lucius Octavianus was appointed as governor of Cilicia, but he died before he could contribute to the region. During the period from 74 to 67 BC, Lucius Lucullus held the governorship of Cilicia, simultaneously dealing with the Third Mithridatic War; however, he showed little interest in Cilicia. Following Lucullus, Quintus Marcus Rex took charge from 67 to 66 BC. In 67 BC, piracy had reached a critical point and posed a serious threat to Rome. Therefore, they decided to take more serious action. They commissioned Pompey to punish the Cilician pirates, granting him broad powers under the “Lex Gabina.” Pompey’s mission was to put an end to piracy activities in both the western and eastern regions of the Mediterranean. Cilicia was completely cleaned from the pirates. In 64/63 BC, Plain Cilicia came under the administration of the Roman Empire. Pompey’s actions extended beyond eliminating pirates; he also achieved supremacy against Mithridates. Pompey abolished the Kingdom of Pontus and established the Province of Bithynia-Pontus. Additionally, he made the Kingdom of Armenia an ally of Rome. As a result, Syria and Plain Cilicia were included in the Roman territory. Pompey also ended the Seleucid kingdom during his stay in Anatolia. Thus, finally, both Rough and Plain Cilicia were included in the Province of Cilicia. For the first time, the Province of Cilicia encompassed the lands from which it derived its name. Its borders extended along the coasts from the Khelidonia (Kırlangıç) Cape to the Issos Bay, including the regions of Pamphylia and Isauria, both along the coasts and inland. The capital of the province was Tarsus.

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

A THEORETICAL APPROACH TO THE LINGUISTIC IMPACT IN CILICIA

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

When discussing the Roman practices to which the people of Cilicia adapted, it is also necessary to look at the language. Starting from the time when Cilicia came under Roman rule, the majority of inscriptions dating from this period are mostly still in Greek. The earliest Latin inscription is...
a fragment found at Mallos (Karataş) dating to the Sullan period.\textsuperscript{57} The fragment, unfortunately, is too fragmented to provide a clear interpretation, and it reads as below:\textsuperscript{58}

\begin{verbatim}
Italice qu(e) · Mallei · negotiantur
..... f. Me)nemachi. n.
\end{verbatim}

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

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

\begin{verbatim}
[C] Erennio Maxim[o] 
veterano leg. ν 
Macedonicae, 
[s]acerdōti Ca[e] 
[s]arīs, civitās [Sy] 
ed[ren][s]ium h.c.

Γ. Ερεννίῳ Μαξίμῳ
έντειμος ο[πολε]·
θυμόν Λησ[ίον]·
ε’ Μακεδονικής, [ἀρ]·
χιερ[ε]ί Καίσα[ρ] ο[ς, Συ]·
δρέων ή πόλις τειμῆς·
Εν[εκκ]
\end{verbatim}

The inscription (in both languages) translates as, “The people of Syedra erected this honorary inscription in honor of C. Herennius Maximus, a veteran of the Legio V Macedonica\textsuperscript{62} and a Caesar’s priest.” As shown above, the inscription was written in both Latin and Greek. The Latin version followed the conventions of the language at that time, beginning with the names of the dedicants and mentioning the honored individual in the accusative case, as in \textit{C. Herennius Maximus}. Here, this usage is correctly used for the direct object of a sentence, and in this case, it indicates the receiver of an action. In contrast, the Greek version exhibited an unusual linguistic usage. As in \textit{Ερεννίῳ Μαξίμῳ}, here \textit{ο} indicates the dative case. Dative case typically signifies the recipient or beneficiary of an action. However, in this context, it emphasizes that the honor is directed toward Gaius Herennius Maximus.\textsuperscript{63} Pilhofer states that this must be because the inscription was first written in Latin and then translated into Greek. This could indicate that the people still did not understand or prefer Latin.\textsuperscript{64} It could also be that people simply preferred imitating the Latin version, as the accusative case was frequently used in Latin inscriptions for honoring individuals. This preference may indicate a cultural influence. However, in either case, it is evident that the inscription was initially written in Latin and there was a need to translate it into Greek. In that case, this fragment provides an important example of how language affects social interactions.

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

Therefore, the coexistence of Greek and Latin indeed created a bilingual environment in Cilicia, and it is likely that other languages, such as Luwian, were still in use as well. Although Greek was in greater use, both Greek and Latin must have been associated with power and prestige, such that Latin represented Roman authority alongside the other languages, since this diversity was mostly associated with official matters.
cultural and historical dominance of Greek. However, it is likely that this authority did not force the people of Cilicia to use Latin specifically. The fact that no inscriptions were found in Latin until the Sullan period supports this idea. The use of languages not only shaped administrative norms but also demonstrated that they indeed functioned as vital impacts within societies.

CONCLUSION

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

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