Søren Lund Sørensen

Between kingdom and *koinon*

Neapolis/Neoklaudiopolis and the Pontic cities

Alte Geschichte

Geographica Historica – 33

Franz Steiner Verlag

Søren Lund Sørensen
Between kingdom and *koinon*

GEOGRAPHICA HISTORICA

Begründet von Ernst Kirsten,

herausgegeben von Eckart Olshausen und Vera Sauer

Band 33

Søren Lund Sørensen

Between kingdom and *koinon*

Neapolis/Neoklaudiopolis and the Pontic cities

Franz Steiner Verlag

The publication of this volume was supported by the Danish Council
for Independent Research as part of the research project
'Where East meets West'.

Typesetting: Vera Sauer
Cartography: Richard Szydlak

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek:
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über
<http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Druck: Hubert & Co., Göttingen
Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, alterungsbeständigem Papier.
Printed in Germany.
ISBN 978-3-515-11312-0 (Print)
ISBN 978-3-515-11317-5 (E-Book)

Zum Geleit

Die vorliegende Studie ist ebenso wie die von Tønnes Bekker-Nielsen bzw. von Kristina Winther-Jacobsen und Lâtife Summerer herausgegebenen Bände ›Space, Place and Identity in Northern Anatolia‹ (GH 29) und ›Landscape Dynamics and Settlement Patterns in Northern Anatolia during the Roman and Byzantine Period‹ (GH 32) im Rahmen des vom Danish Council for Independent Research geförderten Forschungsprojekts *Where East meets West* entstanden.

Der erste Band dieser ›Trilogie‹ ging der Frage nach, wie nach dem Ende des Mithradatischen Reichs in Nordanatolien neue lokale Identitäten entwickelt wurden, wie aus geographischem ›space‹ mental und kulturell definierter ›place‹ wurde. Der zweite Band untersuchte die Neuorganisation dieser Territorien unter römischer Herrschaft, insbesondere die Urbanisierung. Søren Lund Sørensen beleuchtet nun die Provinzialisierung von Pontos aus doppelter Perspektive: Einerseits rückt er eine der auf Initiative des Pompeius neu gegründeten Städte, Neapolis, nachmals Neoklaudiopolis (h. Vezirköprü, Samsun İli), in das Zentrum seiner Untersuchung, andererseits nimmt er überregionale Phänomene wie Kaiserkult, Kaisereid und *koina* in den Blick.

Eckart Olshausen und Vera Sauer

Acknowledgements

This book, which is a rewritten version of my PhD thesis completed at the University of Southern Denmark (2015), owes much to the pioneers of Pontic studies: J. G. C. Anderson, the brothers Cumont, J. A. R. Munro and H. Grégoire.

I am equally indebted to Christian Marek, Timothy Mitford and Eckart Olshausen, the second generation of Pontic scholars, for valuable criticism and for giving me access to unpublished material accumulated during their intense travels in Pontos. Thanks are due to Richard Catling of the centre for the *Lexicon of Greek personal names* for placing the onomastic data on Pontos at my disposal, and I am grateful to Julie Dalaison, Daniela Dueck, Klaus Geus, Daniele Salvoldi and Marco Vitale for advice and comments on earlier drafts.

Special thanks is due to my supervisor Tønnes Bekker-Nielsen as well as the many members of the *Where East meets West* project, in particular Christian Høgel, Marit Jensen, Jesper Majbom Madsen, Vera Sauer and Kristina Winther-Jacobsen.

Finally, I express my gratitude to Eckart Olshausen and Vera Sauer for accepting my study for publication in the series *Geographica Historica*.

This book is dedicated to my father, who passed away two weeks after I started my PhD.

Contents

Introduction 11

Chapter I: The imperial oaths 19
1. The imperial oath from Neapolis 19
2. A comparison of the imperial oaths 22
3. Scholarly trends in the study of the origins and development of the imperial oath 30
4. The purpose of the preserved imperial oaths 41

Chapter II: The provincial assemblies of the Pontic areas 45
1. Marcus Antonius Rufus and the *koinon* 45
2. Enter the *koinon* 50
3. The political importance of the *koinon* 58
4. The *koinon* and *res repetundae* 62

Chapter III: The Pontic *koina* 73
1. Introduction 73
2. A war of analysts and unitarians 75
3. The impact of Deininger 78
4. Summary remarks 83
5. The Pontic *koinon* of *Pontus et Bithynia* 84
6. The Paphlagonian *koinon* 85
7. The *koinon* of *Armenia Minor* 86
8. The Pontic *koina* outside the double province *Pontus et Bithynia* 86

Chapter IV: Neoklaudiopolis – the local level 91
1. Introduction 91
2. Civic institutions 94
3. The social and private sphere 95
4. Private associations 95
5. The military sphere 96
6. The administrative sphere 96
7. The religious sphere 97
   7.1 Graeco-Roman deities 97
   7.2 Popular and elitist beliefs 98
   7.3 Oriental deities 98
   7.4 The imperial cult 98

7.5 Christianity ... 99
7.6 Judaism ... 101
8. Language ... 101
8.1 Greek ... 101
8.2 Latin ... 102
8.3 Other languages ... 102
9. Onomastics ... 103
10. Citizenship – local and Roman ... 103
11. The civic era ... 105
12. Conclusion ... 106

Chapter V: The provincialisation of Pontos: Sacrilege and slaughter ... 107
1. Introduction ... 107
2. Cities, fortresses and temple states ... 108
Excursus I: Sacrilege in Judaea ... 113
3. Rebellion and reluctance – return to dynastic rule ... 117
4. Not yet fit for Roman rule – Mark Antony's reorganisation of Pontos ... 122
5. King Polemon – the making of a pious dynasty ... 125
Excursus II: The Lion of Wrath ... 126
6. Pythodoris – a wise woman and a skilled ruler ... 138
Excursus III: Eupatoria/Magnopolis ... 153
7. Polemon II and the eclipse of the Pontic kingdom ... 162
8. Pontos under Poman rule ... 164
9. Imperial rule and imperial cult in the Pontic areas ... 165
10. Pontic names ... 174
11. The imperial cult and the pressure to conform ... 177
Excursus IV: Crisis in *Galatia* ... 178

Chapter VI: Mission complete ... 183

Conclusion ... 187

Appendix: The remaining six imperial oaths ... 189

Literature ... 200
Abbreviations ... 200
Bibliography ... 200

Indices ... 215
Ancient personal names ... 215
Modern personal names ... 216
Places ... 217
Subjects ... 219
Main sources ... 221

Introduction

Sometime during the reign of the Severan emperors Ptolemaios set up an altar to Zeus Disabeites, 'who wards off evil', not far from Magnopolis in the fertile plain of Phanaroia. Ptolemaios was, however, not a native of Magnopolis. Rather, he came from Neoklaudiopolis, almost 100 km west of Magnopolis.

There was, however, nothing unusual about Ptolemaios travelling to Phanaroia. In his office as *pontarch* he travelled all the way to Neokaisareia, founded by Pompey as Diospolis, more than once a year to take part in and supervise the activities of the *koinon* of Pontos, the institution in charge of the imperial cult on the provincial level. In Neokaisareia Ptolemaios could admire the great temple for the imperial cult, and Ptolemaios had at one time been priest of the *koinon* and had undertaken the huge financial expenses expected of him when paying for the food, the hunting games and athletic contests to which participants and spectators came from afar.

Surely this had been expensive, but Ptolemaios knew that his munificence would not be forgotten by those enjoying it. Furthermore, Ptolemaios was anxious to convey an image of himself as a loyal subject of the emperor in Rome.

And after all money was not Ptolemaios' problem, for he could rely on his father Tauriskos, one of the wealthiest citizens of Neoklaudiopolis, and having held the prestigious positions of *pontarch* and priest of the imperial cult in Pontos his city would surely honour him. Obtaining honour for himself was no doubt important, but Ptolemaios knew that this would also attach additional glory to his family, a family of which several members had served as senators in Rome, the centre of the empire where the emperor, whose worship Ptolemaios administered in Neokaisareia, resided.

Ptolemaios' position among the elites of Pontos was the result of a long process begun in 63 BC, the year Cicero was consul in Rome. In this year Pompey the Great was ready to return to Rome after years of fighting in the east. Among the feats of the Roman general were the establishment of a bridgehead in the Levant, the dissolution of the once mighty Seleucid empire as well as the setting up of a new province, *Syria.* This conquest brought several very different peoples into the sphere of the Roman empire, and famous cities such as Antioch, Seleukeia and Damascus would now have to answer to a Roman governor. The territories outside the province were assigned to more or less loyal dynasts, and a confederation of at least ten cities, the Dekapolis, who owed their freedom from dynastic rule to Pompey, were assigned to the new province.

The Levant was, however, not the only area where Pompey created a province and organised its cities. Before establishing the province of *Syria* Pompey had formed an even greater province comprising large parts of the southern Black Sea littoral. In the west the double province *Pontus et Bithynia* comprised the old Bithynian kingdom that had been bequeathed to the Romans at the death of the last king. East of Bithynia lay Paphlagonia

and Pontos, areas that had been held by Mithradates VI, one of Rome's most bitter enemies. All of these territories were now united under one governor residing in the western part of the province. While Bithynia and the coastal areas comprised several city-states, of which especially Sinope had a renowned history, the interior parts of Pontos and Paphlagonia were devoid of such institutions. In these areas civic development had not progressed considerably since Achaemenid rule, and urban centres were restricted to the old royal capitals of Gangra in Paphlagonia and Amaseia in Pontos. In addition, much Pontic land had been the property of great temple states, most famously Komana Pontike, where large numbers of temple slaves farmed the land. Furthermore, up until now great fortresses scattered at strategically important sites had kept the inhabitants of both Paphlagonia and Pontos in check.

These fortresses had proved an obstacle to Pompey in his conquest of Pontos, and accordingly the Roman general ordered them to be destroyed so as not to give any usurper the chance to use them. The vast amount of land belonging to the kings and the majority of the temple states was divided up between Amaseia and seven city-states, either founded by Pompey or raised to the status of a city-state. Of these only one, Pompeiopolis, lay west of the river Halys, in Paphlagonia. The remaining cities, Neapolis, Magnopolis, Megalopolis, Diospolis, Zela and Nikopolis, were all situated in interior Pontos.

For the inhabitants of these cities the first 50 years of their existence turned out to be everything but peaceful. Suddenly rumour spread that the founder of the province had died, and before anyone could think about the consequences of this event Mithradates' son Pharnakes invaded and devastated the area including several of Pompey's cities. Those in their prime of life were killed, and it was not before Caesar arrived on stage and defeated Pharnakes that order was again established. No sooner had the Mithradatic scion been ousted before Pompey's old foe lay dead and his general Mark Antony was in charge of affairs. It was necessary, so he announced, to reorganise the area, for Nikomedeia and the governor was clearly too far away. Thus, Pompeiopolis was removed from *Pontus et Bithynia* and handed over to Mark Antony's client Deiotaros, the king in Gangra. Pompeiopolis' nearest neighbouring city was Neapolis, actually not in Paphlagonia but lying east of the river Halys in Pontos. Nonetheless, Mark Antony also gave Neapolis to Deiotaros. Suddenly this city found itself forming the easternmost part of the Paphlagonian ruler's kingdom. When the inhabitants of Neapolis and its territory, which they still called by its old pre-Pompeian name Phazimonitis, ascended the road by the great Lake Stiphane they could look towards the east into the large fertile plain of Phanaroia. Here lay another Pompeian foundation, Magnopolis. This city, as well as the remaining parts of Phanaroia, belonged to a different ruler, namely king Polemon, Mark Antony's good friend, to whom the triumvir had assigned most of the Pontic part of Pompey's province. There was not much, if anything, that the inhabitants of Neapolis could do about the political partitions of the Roman general in charge of the east, but at least one could hope that the new political status might bring some peace to a landscape, which had suffered so much since the Romans first set foot in the old kingdom of the Mithradatids.

On 6 March, 3 BC Romans as well as non-Romans gathered in Gangra in Paphlagonia by an altar of Augustus and listened attentively as the sentences of a solemn oath were read aloud which they were expected to repeat immediately afterwards.

> I swear by Zeus, the Earth, the Sun, all the gods and goddesses and by Augustus himself that I will be favourable towards Caesar Augustus and his children and descendants all the time of … in word, deed and intention. I will reckon as friends those whom they might reckon as friends and regard as enemies those that they might judge to be enemies. And in defence of their interests I will spare neither body, nor soul, nor life, nor children but take any risk, whatever kind it may be, for their interests. Whatever I might perceive or hear being said, planned or done against them, I will disclose, and I will be an enemy of one who says, plans or does any of this. Those that they judge to be enemies, I will pursue them with weapons and iron at land and sea, guarding myself against them.
>
> If I should do anything against this oath or not precisely as I have sworn, I will raise for myself, my own body, soul and life, children, all of my family and my possession, destruction and utter ruin extending to all those that succeed me and all my descendants. The land and the sea shall neither receive the bodies of my children or descendants, nor shall they bear them fruit.

Until recently Gangra had been the residence of Deiotaros Philadelphos, but much had happened in the three years since the king had died. Roman officials had arrived in Gangra and informed the inhabitants that by order of Augustus Deiotaros' kingdom was now to become part of the newly established province *Galatia* to the south of Paphlagonia.

Pompeiopolis together with the other cities and larger urban centres of Paphlagonia reacted to the news of their reintegration into the Roman empire by introducing an era commencing in 6/5 BC.

On 6 March, 3 BC the inhabitants of Phazimonitis came together in Neapolis and took the same oath of loyalty to Augustus as the inhabitants of Gangra and the rest of Paphlagonia. Although situated far away from Deiotaros' capital and thereby largely left to themselves, the inhabitants of Neapolis and its territory had similarly greeted the dissolution of the Paphlagonian kingdom by inaugurating an era commencing in 6 BC. When Deiotaros passed away they somewhat sceptically awaited the next political moves of Rome, and on this day they found themselves in front of the local sanctuary of Augustus taking an oath of complete allegiance to the omnipotent ruler of Rome, the implications of which they will hardly have been aware.

The erection of an altar by the *pontarch* Ptolemaios and the taking of an oath of loyalty to the Roman emperor represent the final and initial periods covered in the present study. Much happened before, in between and later, but these two events convey the keywords of the title of this book: kingdom and *koinon.* At one end of the spectrum client kings ruled the Pompeian cities preparing them for reintegration in the Roman empire, and one of the institutions introduced by them was the imperial cult of Augustus.

At the other end the citizens of the cities ruled themselves, as it were. Naturally, a governor was present either in Ankyra or Kaisareia in *Galatia* and *Cappadocia* respectively, but his presence in Pontos as well as Paphlagonia was hardly needed, for it never occurred to the elites of the cities that there could be an alternative to Rome. Rather, these men were busy vying for influence locally, regionally and even in Rome among other things by means of the *koinon,* the provincial assembly administering the imperial cult. Participation in this organisation was restricted to the wealthiest citizens of the Pompeian cities, and the complicated networks and alliances constructed between the elites, their clients in the city as well as their patrons hindered any attempt at uniting against the dominant world order.

Our knowledge of the Pompeian cities in their earliest phase is very sparse. No contemporary sources relate the foundation of these city-states or the general reorganisation of Pontos, but three hundred years later these Pompeian cities resurface fully developed and

incorporated in the Roman empire. They have all the accoutrements associated with a Greek city in the eastern part of the Roman empire, and their inhabitants carry Roman citizenship, speak Greek and are involved in the ubiquitous cult of the Roman emperor.

One cannot help but ask the question what had happened. How did these Pompeian cities develop from a previous existence as villages in a Mithradatic kingdom more Persian and Anatolian than Hellenistic to fully-fledged cities in the provinces of *Galatia* and *Cappadocia?*

In the present study I seek to answer this question. In doing so I will not focus on the war(s) fought between the Romans and Mithradates but on the period from the foundation of the cities by Pompey to the Severan emperors, when the region was subjected to fundamental changes. Rather than trying to write an annalistic history of this period from the viewpoint of Pontos, I shall try to explore the changes that took place in the former Mithradatic kingdom. One approach is to look at how indigenous and Anatolian elements were dealt with in relation to Graeco-Roman gods, eg the temple states were either reorganized or dispensed with. Another is to examine the dissemination of Greek and Roman institutions via these cities. Here the imperial cult takes precedence, for I shall argue that the imperial cult was not merely a concomitant of the provincialisation instituted by the foundation of a number of Greek cities, but rather an important factor in the success of these cities and their integration into not just the provinces but the whole empire. Obviously, the imperial cult does not just imply some form of recognition of the divinity of the emperor. It also constructs a personal relationship between the participant of the cult and the emperor in Rome. As will become clear, the subtle distinction between *divus* and *deus,* supposedly observed in Rome, does not apply to Roman Pontos. In the cities under discussion the living Augustus was simply θεός. It is, however, not my purpose to investigate whether or not the inhabitants of Roman Pontos thought that the emperor was divine. Instead, I am interested in the two institutions that facilitated provincialisation and promoted the imperial cult: client kings and the provincial assemblies known as the *koina.*

For a considerable part of their history the Pompeian foundations did not form part of the double province *Pontus et Bithynia* but were, rather, assigned to client kings. For the majority of the cities under discussion these client kings were the Polemonids, named after Polemon I. Polemon, his wife Pythodoris and their grandson Polemon II ruled most of the Pompeian foundations for almost a century (from the last quarter of the first century BC to AD 64). This period of dynastic rule proved crucial for these cities, for at the beginning of the second century AD they emerge with a fully developed civic structure as they are assigned to the provinces of *Galatia* and *Cappadocia.* Furthermore, the imperial cult appears to have been imbedded in these cities by the client kings. A good example of this is provided by the imperial oath from Neapolis, a famous document inscribed on stone and discovered more than a century ago in the modern successor to one of Pompey's cities. The takers of this oath pledge their complete loyalty to the living god Augustus, by whom they swear. Furthermore, the oath is taken at the altar of Augustus in the temple of Augustus. This fascinating document provides us with information on the civic society and the spread of the imperial cult fostered by the client kings.

The imperial oath also points forward to the reintegration of Pompey's cities into the Roman empire, when loyalty towards the emperor in Rome is no longer forced upon the inhabitants by means of oaths. Rather, as in so many other places in the Roman empire the

Pontic cities are found vying for prestigious titles within the province. Many of these are closely connected to the imperial cult, eg *neokoros,* a title given by the emperor sanctioning the construction of a temple to the emperor. Similarly, Roman citizenship was an asset much coveted by the inhabitants of Pontos. Roman citizenship meant privileges and opportunities: citizens of Pontos competed fiercely for offices in the *koinon,* the organisation responsible for the imperial cult on the provincial level, and only the most ambitious, and wealthy, could hold the offices of high priest and *pontarch,* leader of the *koinon* of Pontos. As involvement in the *koinon* was the highest level of influence and prestige obtainable for citizens in the province this had the effect of guaranteeing participation in the imperial cult, thereby promoting provincialisation and preventing any attempts at rebellion in Pontos. The imperial cult remains an obvious example of the well-known principle of *divide et impera.*

Reference is made to the oath from Neapolis throughout the study, since it is a unique document for the early history of Pompey's cities. It must be remembered that the oath from Neapolis is a very Roman document, part of a unique group of seven imperial oaths taken to three different emperors and preserved on stone. These inscriptions receive a thorough discussion in the first chapter of this study. Spanning a period of no more than forty years they were all found outside the capital. Though similar in content, their form varies much more than is often assumed. Furthermore, in the first chapter the oath from Neapolis will be introduced, translated and commented upon. A translation of the remaining six oaths is given in an appendix.

In addition to the oath the *koinon* plays an equally large role in the present study. The *koinon* is, however, a much-debated institution, and agreement has not been reached on the number of *koina* in the Pontic areas or on the exact role played by them across the empire. The lengthy second chapter is therefore devoted to the scholarship on the *koinon,* its constitution and history, with special regard to Pontos.

The investigations into the nature of the imperial oaths and the *koinon* take up the first three chapters of this study. The last three chapters deal with one particular city, Neapolis, which was later renamed Neoklaudiopolis, and attempt to insert it into the context of Pontos between Pompey and the Severan emperors. In addition, the above-mentioned changes in the cultic and cultural landscape are investigated with particular emphasis on the role played by the Polemonids. Finally, the imperial oath of Neapolis and the *koinon* are adressed once more and discussed in the context of the provincialisation of Pontos and the spread of the imperial cult.

As will become clear Pontos does not play as large a role in literary sources as other areas, and inscriptions are less numerous here than in most other parts of Asia Minor. To remedy this situation a number of analogies from other provinces or geographical areas (Galatia, Judaea) are provided whenever these seem warranted and valid.

In general sources are commented upon, as they appear throughout the study, and as knowledge of most of these is taken for granted a few words should suffice here.[1]

[1] All translations are my own. Abbreviations of authors, journals etc follow the *OCD* and *L'Année philologique.* Additions or exceptions to these are found in the section on abbreviations and bibliography.

The historian Strabon (64 BC – ca AD 24) takes precedence among the literary sources.[2] Not only was Strabon a native of Pontos, he was also a contemporary of many of the events under discussion in the present study. Originally from Amaseia, Strabon had seen most of Pontos and parts of Kappadokia before he left his native country for Rome. Whilst the historical work of Strabon has been lost save more than a dozen fragments, his geography has come down to us almost complete. This work is not merely a list of toponyms. Rather, Strabon adds historical and political information on many of the sites he discusses, and book twelve on Pontos is clearly based on autopsy. Although most of the information found in Strabon's twelfth book cannot be corroborated by other sources, it is curious how tacit the Pontic historian is when it comes to the reign of particularly Mithradates VI. The cruelty of the king plays a large role in other Roman historians but is never referred to by Strabon.[3] According to the Pontic historian, excesses were, it seems, committed mainly by the Romans. This view of Mithradates is surely related to Strabon's own background: Stemming from a family that had enjoyed great influence at the court, his recent ancestors had favoured and supported the Romans, seemingly to no avail, and this element of bitterness and disappointment plays into Strabon's narrative in book twelve.

Later Greek and Roman historians who were, unlike Strabon, not familiar with Pontos must fill the gaps left open by the Pontic historian. The Alexandrian historian Appian (ca AD 95–160) is helpful for the Roman war against Mithradates, a war that led to the conquest of Pontos. Appian's book on the Mithradatic war is not particularly useful for our purpose, since the account breaks off after the defeat of Mithradates at the hands of Pompey. Additional information on the following period can, however, be gathered from Appian's account of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey.

Exceptionally, the pseudo-Caesarian *Bellum Alexandrinum* contains a description of Caesar's famous victory over Pharnakes at the battle of Zela in 47 BC, and the same events are referred to in the biographies of Plutarch (ca AD 46–120) and in the history of Dion Cassius.

Dion Cassius (ca AD 135–229) wrote an annalistic account of the Romans from the foundation of Rome up till his own time. Dion, originally from Nikaia, had personal knowledge of at least *Bithynia,* the province to which Pontos was attached, and from book 37 onwards Dion describes the annexation of this area and its inclusion in the Roman realm. With a background as consul and governor Dion was well informed about provincial matters, but he wrote more than two hundred years after the inclusion of the territories in question. As a historian Dion is only interested in Pontos as far as it concerns his general historical narrative, and this is also the case with many of the other authors that provide occasional historical information on Pontos, eg Josephus (AD 37 – ca 100), Suetonius (ca AD 69 – ca 122) and Tacitus (AD 56 – ca 117).

Reference should also be made to Pliny the Younger (AD 61–113) who served as governor of the double province *Pontus et Bithynia* under Trajan. Among the ten books comprising his letters, the last of these contains Pliny's correspondence with the Roman emperor. Book ten of Pliny's letters are an invaluable source for *Pontus et Bithynia,* but sadly Pliny focuses almost exclusively on the Bithynian part of the double province.

[2] On Strabon cf Dueck 2000.
[3] Eg App. *Mithr.* 97; Cass. Dio 37.12.1.

Furthermore, the areas particularly under discussion here did not form part of *Pontus et Bithynia* in Pliny's time.

The regrettable lack of literary references to this area is, however, compensated for by the large number of inscriptions that start to appear from the end of the first century AD. The advent of an epigraphic culture is related to the rest of Asia Minor, but for our area it coincides with the termination of client rule and the reintegration of these former kingdoms into the Roman empire. For Pontos the inscriptions fall into two groups: the majority of the inscriptions preserved are epitaphs. Although often brief, epitaphs are valuable for onomastic and prosopographic purposes. Furthermore, the epitaphs often use local civic eras, a phenomenon unique to northern Anatolia. The other group of inscriptions are honorific, honouring wealthy citizens or, more rarely, emperors for benefactions done to a particular city. This group of inscriptions is particularly useful for mapping webs of power and influence in the area in question. Additionally, dedications to deities are found recorded on stone. These allow us a glimpse into the religious beliefs of the inhabitants of Pontos.

The epigraphic material has the advantage of taking us back to the period under study without a complicated line of transmission compared to our literary sources. Unfortunately, the inscriptions rarely comment on historical events, and the majority can at their best only corroborate what is already known.

The Pontic areas studied here have preserved almost no freestanding archaeological remains, and only a small number of cities have been excavated. What have, however, been preserved are coins. Almost all of the cities studied here struck coins whose reverses supply us with information on religious and civic life, the city's nomenclature and the prestigious titles that some of these were in possession of. Similar to the inscriptions many of the coins attest to the use of civic eras.

Finally, a note on terminology: throughout this book I try to distinguish between geographical and Roman administrative areas. For this reason *Galatia* refers to the Roman province while Galatia is the landscape known by this name, a landscape that only comprised the northern part of the province *Galatia*. Similarly, Pontos is the geographical area east of the river Halys, while *Pontus et Bithynia* designates the huge province comprising Bithynia, Paphlagonia and, for most of the period studied here, the coastal cities of Pontos.[4]

[4] On the geography of Pontos cf Biller 1987; Marek 2003: 8–11; Olshausen 2014. The above distinction is, unfortunately, not always present in the sources. Eg Strabon uses the Greek word πόντος when referring to the Black Sea, the landscape Pontos as well as the double province *Pontus et Bithynia*. Occasionally, Strabon does use the noun ἐπαρχία (eg 12.3.1; 12.3.6; 12.3.9).

Chapter I

The imperial oaths

1. The imperial oath from Neapolis

During his short visit to Vezirköprü (Neapolis/Neoklaudiopolis) in northern Turkey Franz Cumont (1868–1947) came upon a stele containing an imperial oath taken by the inhabitants of Neapolis almost nineteen hundred years prior to the arrival of the Belgian historian. The importance of the document was not lost to Cumont who attributed the discovery to Tyche 'qui est la déesse protectrice des épigraphistes'.[1]

Soon, the oath as well as Cumont's edition entered most of the standard corpora.[2] A new edition was prepared in 2013 by the present author.[3] This edition is printed below and forms the basis for the translation and subsequent discussion of the oath.

Ἀπὸ αὐτοκράτορος Καίσ[αρος]
θεοῦ υἱοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ὑπατεύ[σαντος τὸ]
δωδέκατον ἔτους τρίτου, π[ροτέραι]
νωνῶν Μαρτίων ἐν Γάνγροις ἐν [.]λ[––– ὅρ-]
κος ὁ τελεσθ[εὶς] ὑπὸ τῶ[ν] κατοικ[ούντων Πα-]
φλαγονία[ν καὶ τῶν πραγ]ματευομ[ένων πα-]
ρ' αὐτοῖς Ῥ[ωμαίων].
Ὀμνύω{ι} Δία Γῆν Ἥλιον θεοὺς πάντα[ς καὶ πά-]
σας καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Σεβασ[τ]ὸν εὐνοή[σειν Καί-]
σαρι Σεβαστῶι καὶ τοῖς τ[έκ]νοις ἐγγό[νοις τε]
αὐτοῦ πάντα τὸν τοῦ [–––] χρόνον κ[αὶ λό-]
γωι [κ]αὶ ἔργωι καὶ γνώμη[ι, φί]λους ἡγού[μενος]
οὓς ἂν ἐκεῖνοι ἡγῶνται ἐκχθρούς τε νο[μίζων]
οὓς ἂν αὐτοὶ κρίνωσιν· ὑπέρ τε τῶν το[ύτοις]
διαφερόντων μήτε σώματος φείσεσ[θαι μή-]
τε ψυχῆς μήτε βίου μήτε τέκνων, ἀλ[λὰ παν-]
τὶ τρόπωι ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐκείνοις ἀνηκόν[των]
πάντα κίνδυνον ὑπομενεῖν· ὅ τί τε ἄ[ν αἴσ-]
θωμαι ἢ ἀκούσω ὑπεναντίον τούτ[οις λε-]
γόμενον ἢ βουλευόμενον ἢ πρασσό[μενον],
τοῦτο ἐγμηνύσειν τε καὶ ἐχθρὸν ἔσ[εσθαι τῶι]
λέγοντι ἢ βουλευομένωι ἢ πράσσο[ντι τού-]
των· οὕς τε ἂν ἐκχθροὺς αὐτοὶ κρίν[ωσιν, τού-]
τους κατὰ γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν ὅπλο[ις τε]

[1] Cumont 1901: 26. For the events concerning the discovery of the oath, cf Sørensen 2015b.
[2] *Editio princeps* in Cumont 1900; 1901a. *SP III* 66 = *OGIS* 532 = *IGR* 3.137 = *ILS* 8781 = *EJ* 145, no. 315.
[3] Sørensen 2015a.

καὶ σιδήρωι διώξειν καὶ ἀμυνεῖσθ[αι].
Ἐὰν δέ τι ὑπεναντί̣ον τού̲τωι τ[ῶι ὅρκωι]
ποήσω ἢ μὴ στοιχούντως καθὼ̣[ς ὤμο-]
σα, ἐπαρῶμαι αὐτός τε κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ καὶ σ̲[ώμα-]
τος τοῦ ἐμα<υ>τοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς καὶ βίου κα[ὶ τέ-]
κνων καὶ παντὸς τοῦ ἐμαυτοῦ γέν[ους]
καὶ συνφέροντος ἐξώλειαν καὶ πα̲ν̲[ώλει-]
αν μέχρι πάσης διαδοχῆς τῆς ἐ[μῆς καὶ]
τῶν ἐξ ἐμοῦ πάντων, καὶ μήτε σ[ώματα τὰ]
τῶν ἐμῶν ἢ ἐξ ἐ̲μοῦ μήτε γῆ μ̲[ήτε θάλασ-]
σα δέξαιτο μηδὲ καρποὺς ἐνέγ[κοι αὐτοῖς].
Κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ὤμοσαν καὶ οἱ ἐν [τῆι χώραι]
πάντες ἐν τοῖ̣ς κ̲ατὰ τὰ CΥΙ [––– Σε-]
βαστήοις παρὰ τοῖς βωμοῖ̣[ς τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ].
Ὁμοίως τε Φαζιμωνεῖται οἱ̣ [τὴν καὶ Νεάπο-]
λιν λεγομένην κατοικοῦντ[ες ὤμοσαν σύμ-]
παντες ἐν Σεβαστήωι παρὰ τῶ̣[ι βωμῶι τοῦ]
Σ̲εβαστοῦ.

When the emperor Caesar Augustus, son of the god [Julius Caesar] had been consul for the twelfth time, in the third year, 6 March, in Gangra in …, the oath was taken by those who dwell in Paphlagonia and by the Romans who pursue their business among them.

'I swear by Zeus, the Earth, the Sun, all the gods and goddesses and by Augustus himself that I will be favourable towards Caesar Augustus and his children and descendants all the time of … in word, deed and intention. I will reckon as friends those whom they might reckon as friends and regard as enemies those that they might judge to be enemies. And in defence of their interests I will spare neither body, nor soul, nor life, nor children but take any risk, whatever kind it may be, for their interests. Whatever I might perceive or hear being said, planned or done against them, I will disclose, and I will be an enemy of one who says, plans or does any of this. Those that they judge to be enemies, I will pursue them with weapons and iron at land and sea, guarding myself against them.

If I should do anything against this oath or not precisely as I have sworn, I will raise for myself, my own body, soul and life, children, all of my family and my possession, destruction and utter ruin extending to all those that succeed me and all my descendants. The land and the sea shall neither receive the bodies of my children or descendants, nor shall they bear them fruit.'

All those living in the countryside swore according to the same terms at the altars of Augustus in the sanctuaries of Augustus that are in the …

Likewise did the Phazimonitai, who dwell in what is also called Neapolis, all swear in the sanctuary of Augustus at the altar of Augustus.

Notes

The text is dated 6 March (the day before the Nones of March), 3 BC. The twelfth consulship of Augustus commenced in 5 and the thirteenth in 2 BC. Counting three years from Augustus' twelfth consulship leaves us with the year 3 BC. Whether the dating to the third year concerns Augustus' consulship or the civic era of the areas mentioned in local documents makes no difference. The eras of the Paphlagonian cities as well as Neapolis started in 6/5, and the third year ends up being 3 BC.[4]

[4] Marek 1993: 129–34.

The stone is badly damaged on the right side and has a diagonal rupture in the upper part. This has made room for several restorations by Cumont. After its discovery the stone was transported to the museum in Istanbul where it is kept in the archives. Since its discovery the stone has suffered additional damage, but the inscription remains legible. The re-examination of the stone in 2013 proved that the base of the stone is smooth, for which reason it can be concluded that the inscription ended with line 42.

In line 4 the restorations proposed by Cumont, Hausoullier, Dittenberger and Grégoire (ἐν [κ]ά[στροις] / ἐν πανηγύρει / ἐν τἀγορᾶι / ἐν Καισαρήωι) have to be rejected.[5] The remains of the letter thought to have been an *alpha* has been shown to be a *lambda*. Recently, Christian Marek has suggested that the second-last word of line 4 designates the place where the oath was taken. Accordingly, Marek proposes restoring the word as ἐν[γ]λ[υφθεὶς] and translates: 'Oath inscribed in Gangra that was sworn by the population of Paphlagonia'.[6] Marek's restoration is a most welcome addition to a much-discussed lacuna, and in my opinion it is only the stylistically inelegant accumulation of passive participles (ἐν[γ]λ[υφθεὶς] ὅρκος ὁ τελεσθείς) that speaks against this proposal.

In line 37 another lacuna has invited several restorations. Cumont suggested τὰ συνέδρια, ie the assemblies in which the oath would have been taken. Initially, Cumont only read CYI,[7] but the drawing accompanying Cumont's edition reads CYΓ.[8] Theodore Reinach already conjectured this Γ to be a Π and suggested τὰς ὑ[παρχίας.[9] A *hyparchy* is an administrative subdivision employed among others by the Seleucids in the Hellenistic period.[10] Reinach's suggestion was accepted by Cumont, but the passages advanced from Strabon concerning Pontos and Paphlagonia are inconclusive. The passages in question do not seem to read ὑπαρχία, but rather ἐπαρχία.[11] *Eparchy,* and not *hyparchy,* was the technical term used by the Romans to designate both a province and an administrative area below the level of province.[12] Marek has proposed an innovative restoration of lines 36–38 and reads: κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ὤμοσαν καὶ οἱ ἐγ [ταῖς πόλεσι] πάντες ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὰ σύγ[γραφα Σε]βαστήοις παρὰ τοῖς βωμοῖ[ς τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ] ('According to the same terms all those in the cities swore the oath at the altars of Augustus in the *Sebasteia* as specified in the written agreements.').[13] The well-known urban character of the imperial cult prompts Marek to discard the reading οἱ ἐγ [τῆι χώραι], since it would have been unlikely that altars and sanctuaries of Augustus were available in the countryside. Although the text of the oath may imply that the oath was taken by those living in the countryside, it does, however, nowhere designate where this oath was administered. As in line 4 Marek's restoration of line 37 (ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὰ σύγ[γραφα Σε]βαστήοις) is ingenious. Κατὰ τὰ αὐτά (line 36) and ὁμοίως (line 39) do, however, imply that the contents of the oath were the

5 Sørensen 2015a: 18.
6 Marek 2015: 309–10.
7 Cumont 1900: 690.
8 Vitale 2012a: 208.
9 In a letter dated 2 February, 1901 from Theodore Reinach to Franz Cumont. The letter has the catalogue number 2539 and is kept in the Cumont archives at the Belgian Academy in Rome.
10 Bikerman 1938: 198: 'Nous trouvons des "hyparchies" en Perse et en Troade, des "chiliarchies" en Lydie, et des "toparchies" en Syrie, qui gardaient en Palestine l'appellation ptolémaique de νομοί'.
11 *SP III* p. 85. Strab. 12.3.37; 12.3.39.
12 Vitale 2012a: 208–9.
13 Marek 2015: 310.

same in Gangra as in Neapolis and among those living in the countryside. This necessitates a counterpart to τὰ σύγ[γραφα in the preamble in Gangra, but none is found. Marek's restoration of lines 36–37 will not stand up to closer scrutiny. The matter cannot be solved, since the stone in its present condition reads only CYI.

2. A comparison of the imperial oaths

When attempting to grasp the importance of the oath from Neapolis it is necessary first to compare it with the other imperial oaths in terms of content, history, genre and purpose.[14]

The seven unique oaths offer us an invaluable insight into one of the ways in which the early emperors obtained obedience and loyalty for themselves, for there can be no doubt that these seven texts preserve oaths that were taken to demonstrate loyalty towards the emperor and his successors. Though the texts span four decades and distant provinces they have several elements in common. A graphic comparison will be helpful.

Oaths/elements sworn	Conobaria	Neapolis	Samos	Palaipaphos	Assos	Aritium	Sestinum
swearing by the gods and the emperor		×		×	×	×	
promise of loyalty (εὐνοήσειν, etc)		×	×	×	×		
extension of the oath to the family of the emperor	×	×	×	×	×		×
same friends and allies	×	×		×	×	×	
to pursue at sea and at land	×	×	×	×		×	×
wage devastating war	×					×	×
curse for perjury		×			×	×	
benefits in store for swearing truly					×		

Table 1. A comparison of the elements included in the seven oaths.

Table 1 illustrates the large number of thematic parallels between the various oaths and proves the contents of the oaths to be very similar. What table 1 fails to convey is how close these parallels are in the Latin and Greek wordings respectively. The similarity of wording should become obvious below.

The element of swearing by the gods is present in all the Greek oaths except the text from Samos and in two of the Latin oaths. An invocation of the gods will most likely have been present in the oath from Samos, but the fragmentary state of the inscription makes it impossible to conclude this with any certainty. In the oath from Neapolis the invocation is rendered by ὀμνύω Δία Γῆν Ἥλιον θεοὺς πάντα[ς καὶ πά]σας καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Σεβασ[τ]όν; in Palaipaphos the invocation is much longer: [νὴ τ]ὴν ἡμετέραν Ἀκραίαν Ἀφροδίτην κα[ὶ] τὴ[ν ἡμ]ετέραν Κόρην καὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον Ὑλάτη[ν Ἀπόλλ]ω καὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον Κε[ρ]υνήτην Ἀπόλλω καὶ τοὺς ἡμετέρους σωτῆρας Διοσκούρους καὶ τὴν κοινὴν τῆς νήσου Βουλαίαν

[14] Cf the appendix for translations of the six additional imperial oaths.