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INTRODUCTION

This dissertation, titled “The Local Impact of the Koinon in Roman Coastal Paphlagonia,” studies the effects that a “koinon” in the Roman period could have on its constituent communities. The introduction surveys the key concepts and approaches that inform the discussion in later chapters and examines how literary, epigraphic and numismatic sources are treated and why.

The koinon in coastal Paphlagonia is unique, given its several peculiarities of cultural and administrative geography. In the introduction, we discuss these parameters. We then take up the question of the sort of evidence we have and the approaches that this dissertation employs. We divide these discussions into three sections. The first and second concern what the spatial and organisational parameters are of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus. The third section concerns the methodological approaches in this dissertation that are formulated expressly to address the peculiar nature of sources that are available to us, and how their range is presented in the following four chapters.

FIG. 1. GENERAL OVERVIEW OF COASTAL PAPHLAGONIA
1. Coastal Paphlagonia

The area of focus in this dissertation is the land between the coast of the Black Sea and the sprawling Olgassys range, with occasional plains but mostly rugged terrain all of which is cut into sections by deep river valleys running north-south.\(^1\) This region was a problem for the Greeks in the Classical period, and also difficult to the people that inhabited it. In Xenophon’s *Anabasis* the Sinopeans recommended the ten thousand to travel by sea from Sinope to Heraclea in order to avoid both the impassable river of the Parthenios and the Paphlagonians,\(^2\) who were of different customs from the Greek colonies of Sinope and Heraclea Pontica that settled among them.\(^3\) In the Hellenistic period the Diadoch Lysimachus took control of Heraclea Pontica following the death of the tyrant Dionysius of Heraclea and took Amastris, the wife of the Heraclean tyrant and a royal member of the Achaemenids, as his wife. Amastris subsequently divorced Lysimachos and founded her namesake city through synoecism, with the center being Sesamos at the estuary of the impassable Parthenios.\(^4\) The three major cities alternated between roles as allies and subjects of the Bithynian and the Mithridatic kingdoms during the Hellenistic period,\(^5\) and were finally annexed by the Roman general Lucullus in 70 BCE.\(^6\)

\(^1\) Magie 1950, 186-188.
\(^2\) Xen. *Anab.* 5.6.9.
\(^4\) Memnon *BNJ* (434) 4.9; Burstein 1974, 81-89.
\(^5\) For synopsis on contestation of Paphlagonia by the Bithynian and the Mithridatic kings in the second to first centuries BCE, see Magie 1950, 185-212.
\(^6\) Memnon *BNJ* (434) 32-37.
Strabo informs us that when Pompey concluded the Third Mithridatic War and set about reorganising northern Anatolia he attached “a part of Pontus” to the historical kingdom of Bithynia (already a province in 74 BCE following the bequeathal of Nicomedes IV). The main parameters defining the cultural and administrative geography of “coastal Paphlagonia” come from Strabo, who distinguishes Paphlagonia ἐπὶ θαλάτη from εἰς τὴν μεσόγαιαν. The relevant passage is useful to our current discussion and is to be cited in the following.

On the east, then, the Paphlagonians are bounded by the Halys River; on the south by Phrygians and the Galatians who settled among them; on the west by the Bithynians and the Mariandyni (for the race of the Cauconians has everywhere been destroyed), and on the north by the Euxine. Now this country was divided into two parts, the interior and the part on the sea, each stretching from the Halys River to Bithynia; and Eupator not only held the coast as far as Heracleia, but also took the nearest part of the interior, certain portions of which extended across the Halys (and the boundary of the Pontic Province has been marked off by the Romans as far as this). [Trans. Jones]

Strabo defines Paphlagonia “on the sea” as the area between the Halys river and Bithynia and north of the Olgassys, with Pompeiopolis as the border region separating it from...
interior Paphlagonia. The following offers an approximate representation of coastal Paphlagonia in the Roman period.

![Map of the Double Province of Pontus-Bithynia](image)

**FIG. 2. GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE DOUBLE PROVINCE OF PONTUS-BITHYNIA**

The parameters of Bithynia and also coastal and inner Paphlagonia outlined here are based on a series of maps reproduced from Christian Marek’s reconstruction of the municipal territorium of the cities in Bithynia, Paphlagonia and Pontus in the Roman period. Marek’s method was based on topographical features along with known findsites of inscriptions that bear clear references to the belonging of a city. The resulting images are an approximation of the political definition envisioned by the Roman administrators.

---


Marek’s approximation is also based on multiple layers of literary sources. Most notable is Strabo’s description, which makes plain that much of the schematic rationale that the Roman administrators worked with was based on pre-existing conceptions of cultural geography. In particular, Strabo thought it important to point out that the “Pontic eparchia” (ἡ Ποντικὴ ἐπαρχία) was demarcated upon the territory that Mithridates actually held. The relationship of this Pontic eparchia with Bithynia is clearly defined in the letters of Pliny the Younger to Trajan. Pliny’s charge was legatus pro praetore provinciae Ponti et Bithyniae consulari potestate imperatore . . . Traiano, and the

---

specific territories that he oversaw can be identified from the letters that he dispatched to Trajan regarding Heraclea and Tium,\textsuperscript{12} as well as Amastris,\textsuperscript{13} Sinope\textsuperscript{14} and Amisos.\textsuperscript{15}

The list of cities over which Pliny held authority formed the “Pontic” section of what modern scholars have conveniently called “double province.” To understand what a double province was, one needs to consider its basic units, the \textit{eparchia}. An eparchia can be loosely translated as a province, but the essence of the word is “provincia,” which pertained to regions of responsibility that were designated to a magistrate or procurator.\textsuperscript{16}

Known procurators with cursus honorum that specified the \textit{eparchiae} under their jurisdiction offer a clear view that provinciae/eparchiae could be variously assigned in different combinations.\textsuperscript{17} There are also eparchiae that were customarily combined and assigned to one magistrate, in which case, in our modern conception, the individual eparchia under such combinations would form a “sub-provincial” unit: e.g., the eparchia of Pontus under the province of Pontus-Bithynia.

Notably, Pliny the Younger recognised Paphlagonia as a region within his jurisdiction. Pliny informed Trajan of the support that was provided to the imperial procurator Gemellinus, who was on a journey “to Paphlagonia” to obtain grain.\textsuperscript{18} Yet Paphlagonia did not seem to have been the proper term to describe the cities and peoples

\begin{footnotes}
\item[17] Vitale 2012, 21-27.
\item[18] Plin. \textit{Ep.} 10.27.
\end{footnotes}
that populated it. When Pliny spoke of Iulius Largus, who bequeathed his estate to the cities of Heraclea and Tium, he described Largus as “from Pontus,” although these cities were, in the ethnic geography that Strabo described, Paphlagonian. Here, Pliny invokes the administrative and juridical sense of “Ponticness,” just as do his reports to Trajan regarding the legal statutes that regulated the “cities of Bithynia and Pontus” and “the citizens of Pontus.” Unfortunately Pliny did not comment on what sort of geographical distinction Amisus had: as the sole city among the Pontic eparchia in the double province east of the Halys river, Amisus seems less Paphlagonian but more Pontic. This phenomenon was due to Marcus Antonius’ policy of establishing a host of client kingdoms in northern Anatolia, resulting in the sudden shrinkage of the Pontic eparchia that was attached to the province of Bithynia. By the time of the first Augustan settlement the double province of Pontus-Bithynia had become “Bithynia, with the Propontis and some parts of Pontus.” The parts so referred to are the six cities discussed earlier, namely Heraclea Pontica, Tium, Amastris, Abonuteichos, Sinope and Amisus.

Comparing the geographer’s view with that of the governor’s, we sense both the continuation of the pre-Roman legacy of coastal Paphlagonia as a spatial and ethnic

---


22 Marek 1993, 49-51.

23 Strab. 17.3.25. ἀλλ᾽ ἐν ἀρχαῖς γε διέθηκε ποιήσας υπάτες ἡπὸν δέο... δέκα δὲ στρατηγικὰς... δεκάτην δὲ Βιθυνίαν μετὰ τῆς Προποντιδὸς καὶ τοῦ Πόντου τινῶν μερῶν [but he arranged (the empire) into divisions of rule, creating on the one hand two consular positions... and on the other ten praetorian positions... and the tenth being Bithynia with the Propontis and some parts of Pontus.]
concept working along a set of Roman administrative and legal mechanisms.24 How these aspects of cultural geography relate to the koinon in coastal Paphlagonia is to be discussed in the following section.

To summarise, the overlap between the cultural, administrative and organisational parameters that define what “coastal Paphlagonia” means in this dissertation, we return briefly to Strabo’s definition of “Paphlagonia on the coast.” This definition captures the territories excluding Amisus. Yet, to invoke the latent legacies of the Hellenistic cultural past embedded in the concept of Paphlagonia, and to avoid confusion by calling the area of study Pontic, we define coastal Paphlagonia as including Amisus, based on proximity and also the Roman administrative rationale that Amisus was better attached to the group of cities west of the Halys than east of it. Accordingly, coastal Paphlagonia, coastal Paphlagonian cities and the coastal Paphlagonian koinon will appear in this dissertation with such sets of parameters based on historical, cultural and administrative considerations.

2. A Coastal Paphlagonian Koinon

As we move to discuss the koinon in coastal Paphlagonia we first need briefly to define what a koinon was in the Roman period. Barbara Burrell’s definition remains strikingly accurate and useful to cite here in full.

“A koinon was an organisation of cities of similar ethnic background and interests within a region, bound together by the practice of a particular cult. Under the

24 Relevant information rehearsed in Madsen 2009, pp. 29-40.
Empire the central cult of most koina was that of a living human being, the emperor of Rome.”

The clarity of this sentence overshadows some of the more complex variations among the koinon in the eastern provinces. A glance at the proposed translations of the term “koinon” in modern scholarship reveals the potential issues of typology. The koinon has been variously translated as representative government, league, federation, commonalty, or provincial assembly. Some translations adopt the Latin term “commune” or suggest a sort of synthetic provincial entity that arose in response to Roman administrative organisations. Others invoke the historical legacy of the Hellenistic koinon or ethnos. It is also important to point out that Burrell’s emphasis on “similar ethnic background” is true in general, but there are significant questions with regard to the coastal Paphlagonian koinon, which name, “the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus,” placed no emphasis on ethnicity but rather the urban nature of its constituent communities. These factors render necessary the step of specifying how the koinon is defined in this dissertation.

In this dissertation, the working rationale privileges the synthetic sense of “commune.” The reason is that, while some koina in the eastern provinces seemed to have retained some form of ethnically orientated basis, not unlike like their counterparts

---


26 Marek 2016, 415-423, for more recent overview of koina in Anatolia.

27 Vitale 2012, 31-40. Cf. Madsen 2009, 40-45; Burrell 2004, 2-3; Deininger 1965, 156-158; Larsen 1955, 106. The key passage concerning the relationship between ethnos and koinon is in the Digest, where it is stated that “"Εθνος ἵερ<οσύνη>, οἶον Ἀσιαρχία, Βιθυνιαρχία, Καππαδοκαρχία, παρέχει ἕλειτουργησίαν ἀπὸ ἐπιτροπῶν, τοῦτ᾽ εστιν ἦς ἄν ἄρηπτος", Dig. 27.1.6.14 [the priesthood of an ethnos, such as the Asiarch, the Bithyniarch or the Cappadocarch, relieves the officeholder from the service as guardian as long as he is in office; translation mine]. Mønssen, in Mønssen & Kruger 1985, 783-784, adopts Politianus’s suggestion of ιεραρχία in order to complete the sense of the text, which is based on the Basilica, where Asiarchs are “οἱ ἱερεῖς τῶν ἐπαρχῶν.” Cf. Magie 1950, 1299.

28 See chapter 2 for discussion.
in the Classical and Hellenistic periods, there are numerous others that show synthetic qualities. These include their lack of administrative and juridical capacities, as well as their apparent focus on worship of the emperor. Yet some koina are created not according to their historical ethnicity but by provincial boundaries. Hence the Koinon of the Hellenes in Asia encompassed various ethnically distinct regions, and so too the coastal Paphlagonian koinon, called “the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus” in Trajanic period inscriptions, did not emphasise any sense of ethnic identity but rather the fact that it was a collection of cities. We note that some sense of “eparchic” collectivism seemed to have developed during the first three centuries CE that may have ethnic connotations due to the evolvement of the Roman juridical category of “Ponticus” in the lex Pompeia, a topic to be discussed in the first chapter.

Regarding what the koinon in the eastern provinces did in general, the simple answer is emperor worship, though the dynamics were far more complicated. There was a range of activities that emanate from the administration, organisation and financing of imperial cults, and when coupled with the koinon’s close relationship with the emperor, the influence or “impact” of the koinon on its constituent communities exceeded the simple adulation of the emperor's person. The complexity had not been of particular interest to ancient and modern historians alike. Tacitus’ negative view on the worship of
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the emperor as Greek adulatory was only part of the reason why scholars such as Peter Brunt viewed the importance of the koinon as mediocre at best.\textsuperscript{34} One could turn to the observations of Paul Guiraud in his systematic study (1887) that the koina in the eastern provinces (and the concilia in the west) played no apparent role during the civil wars of the Principate, and treat these “provincial” institutions as of minimal importance to understanding the course of Roman history.\textsuperscript{35} A similar assessment by Jürgen Deininger (1965) also found the official apparatus of the koinon limited,\textsuperscript{36} with little or no financial measures other than electing wealthy elites to bear the cost of its festivities and spectacles.\textsuperscript{37} Deininger did take note of the fact that imperial rescripts\textsuperscript{38} and repetundae cases from the eastern provinces\textsuperscript{39} indicate that the koina were important “interest groups” that negotiated directly with the emperors,\textsuperscript{40} but these did not fundamentally change the fact that the koinon as an institution was primarily dependent upon the charity and contributions of wealthy elites.\textsuperscript{41} As a result any positive assessment of the koinon’s capacities must begin by assessing elite participation.

Fergus Millar, in his positive review of Deininger, took note that he was so concerned with offering a balanced assessment of the koinon's actual capacities that he
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may have downplayed the koinon’s organisational significance.\textsuperscript{42} Millar’s assessment found that there were significant financial, juridical, and policy implications embedded within the contacts between emperors and the koina in the eastern provinces.\textsuperscript{43} Recent epigraphic discoveries also contributed to this new strand of scholarship. Edelmann-Singer’s works (2012; 2015) represent the most systematic and up-to-date approaches. Her primary method was to highlight the koinon’s “Finanzkraft” by inductively considering all known samples of income and expenditure of the koina in the eastern provinces, thereby demonstrating that koina not only also maintained regular staff and serviced the temples and ceremonies. The permanent maintenance of personnel, space and ritual implies a regular expenditure, but also had regular income aside from the election of the wealthy from constituent cities.\textsuperscript{44} Most specific examples are from the Lycian koinon, where we know from Strabo that cities received different numbers of votes in the koinon synedrion based on contribution, and the exact amount of contribution for at least the city of Myra (7000 denarii) is known from a recently published inscription.\textsuperscript{45} We note that this was a sum contributed in proportion to the 2 1/2 percent customs tax that Myra collected on behalf of the Lycian koinon, which in turn was given the collection of taxes as part of the reformed customs law promulgated by the imperial government.\textsuperscript{46} Edelmann-Singer further proposed a new meaning of the “interest group”
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that Deininger used to describe the koinon’s role as negotiating party with imperial administrators. She set Deininger’s sense of the “lobbying” interest group below what she considered a “network structure,” which involved both the “lobbying” aspect as well as a system of information exchange between elites that could lower transaction cost.47 The result is an entirely new “koinon” context of provincial elite interaction that even Edelmann-Singer herself has yet fully to explore due to the range of literary and epigraphic sources available.

To treat the koinon as an elite network structure further brings Deininger’s observation to the fore, that the importance of the koinon was contingent upon the elite participating in it.48 This anticipates the basic dynamic underlying the election of the leadership of koina in the Roman period, which was an important process that allowed admissible peers of the municipal elite to be designated in order to ensure that the maintenance of provincial imperial temples and sanctuaries was properly executed.49 Through this channel of election, respected families of a koinon’s constituent cities would be more likely to become High Priests of the provincial imperial cult, as their local stature and financial stability offered the most proper form of representation to negotiate with emperors and their agents on behalf of the leading members of the constituent cities of the koinon.50 As Edelmann-Singer suggested, such gathering of the most selective

47 Edelmann-Singer 2015, 258-268.
49 Edelmann-Singer 2015, 198-212.
50 There are excellent studies on Bithynia by Fernoux 2004, 349-360, and Bekker-Nielsen 2008, 82-97 on organisation and 97-117 on the political class of those on the urban and the regional levels of Bithynian politics. For Asia the literature is extensive, for synopsis see Edelmann-Singer 2015, 198-205.
group of cities amounts to an info-network that made the koinon valuable as a platform for exchanging information of opportunities and prospects that could further improve the familial or personal interests of the elites themselves.\textsuperscript{51} In turn, it is such prospect of self-aggrandisement as the key incentive (if indeed in addition to personal zeal to demonstrate patriotism as A. H. M. Jones assumed) that makes the risk of bankruptcy a rational choice. There is also additional authority that elites would covet. A koinon would also decide other local issues such as the bestowal of honors and matters concerning the festivities held in honor of the emperors and leading figures of the imperial household. Also, the koinon’s legal standing to pursue repetundae cases against governors and to petition emperors represented one of the best opportunities for elites who wished to perform extraordinary services, such as embassies to Rome and arguing before the Roman Senate.

The combination of provincial representation and elite participation made the koinon an asset to Roman administrators, for politically contentious or nuanced problems in various locales required more than the authority of the imperial establishment. These occasions rarely appear in the literary and epigraphical sources, but we learn of the Roman governor of Macedonia and Achaia having instructed the Macedonian koinon to arbitrate a boundary dispute,\textsuperscript{52} while the governor of Asia ordered the Asiatic koinon to assist in his effort to promulgate a new provincial calendar.\textsuperscript{53} There is also the new inscription from Lycia that shows the High Priest of Lycia included in the Neronian
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customs tax reform to take responsibility for collection.\textsuperscript{54} These suggest that the administrative role of the koinon would depend upon the occasional delegation of power from Roman governors and emperors, though such cases were contingent upon need. Together with elite participation, these aspects of the koinon as a regional institution in the eastern provinces are important to placing the coastal Paphlagonian koinon in context, which the following chapters aim to achieve.

Several points are useful to mention here before they are explored more extensively. First of all, the name of the koinon in coastal Paphlagonia found on two inscriptions from Heraclea Pontica and Amastris respectively, discussed in chapter one, indicates that it was unlikely to be an ethnically based Koinon of the Cities in Pontus. Secondly, the spatial contours of the koinon can be generally mapped out by the findsites of other inscriptions that mentioned koinon offices such as the High Priesthood of Pontus and the Pontarchate, which included Heraclea Pontica, Amastris, Sinope and Amisus, suggesting that the koinon and the Pontic eparchia of the double province were likely coterminous.\textsuperscript{55} Thirdly, the use of the term “coastal Paphlagonia koinon” aims to separate the eparchia of Pontus from other eparchia of similar names, specifically Pontus Polemoniacus in Cappadocia and Pontus Galaticus in Galatia,\textsuperscript{56} which later formed the so-called Pontus Mediterraneus.\textsuperscript{57} Scholars posit that each of the eparchiae had a koinon of its own that was coterminous with the eparchic boundaries, though considerable debate
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continues regarding the exact number of cities that were included in each of the Pontic koina. We note, however, that there is considerable debate regarding whether a koinon would be co-terminous with the eparchia to which it belonged. Current scholarly discourse has moved towards the view that the koinon is a detached subsidiary organisation of an eparchia, and their hierarchical relationship is contingent upon the occasional delegation of Roman administrative tasks, but not without occasional pushback from scholars who saw a potentially extensive koina in the model of the Panhellenion or the Amphictyonic league that crosses several provinciae. Until definitive evidence surfaces, the conservative approach is to refrain from assuming that the Pontic eparchia and the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus were coterminous, but rather to emphasise that the evidence available to us gives a good indication that coastal Paphlagonia was a core region within the koinon.

3. Sources, Methodology and Approaches

Scholars who have studied coastal Paphlagonia in the Roman period tend not to treat it as a region of its own, but view it as an assemblage of cities within the framework of the Mithridatic kingdom that became attached to Bithynia by Pompey and defies explanation. Analysis can tilt towards the perspective of coastal Paphlagonia as the continuation of the city-state, as described by A. H. M. Jones’ chapter on Bithynia and

58 For brief synopsis, Sørensen 2016, 77-78.
60 Loriot 2006; Mitchell 2002.
Pontus. Jones treated Amastris, Sinope and Amisus as the coastal Greek cities of the Mithridatic kingdom, and separate from the towns of the kingdom’s interior, which included “Pontic Paphlagonia” and “Pontus” proper. T.R.S. Broughton’s economic survey of Asia Minor (1938) treated the cities of coastal Paphlagonia more as nodes within Pontus-Bithynia, and also hierarchically subject to Bithynia, as he was of the opinion that “it seems likely that there was only one provincial assembly, which met at Nicomedia, since the evidence for the Pontic koinon is late, and the reports of prosecutions of imperial officials name the Bithyni only.”

D. R. Wilson's unpublished dissertation (1960) marks an important model of study that combined coastal Paphlagonia's administrative and political history through his own autopsy and greater consideration of the geographical features as well as archaeological survey data collected by scholars from Turkish museums. His findings help clarify the underlying rationale (or lack thereof) behind the provincial organisations of the regions of Bithyni, Paphlagonia and Pontus. Wilson's study helped provide a more accurate contour of the territories of Heraclea, Tium, Amastris Abonuteichos, Sinope and Amisus based on findsites of inscriptions and geographical features, and advanced our understanding of the territories that were affected by successive reorganisations of provincial boundaries. He did not assign any social, economic or cultural significance to the existence of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus, nor did he attempt to associate what he called the potential rivalry between Heraclea and Amastris in their mutual claim to the status of metropolis in the
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Trajanic period with dynamics associated with the koinon. Most importantly, Wilson's analysis of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus privileged a questionable reading of a key inscription from Heraclea Pontica, resulting in the assessment that there were ten cities included in the koinon, as well as of its the territorial extent and nature.\(^{64}\) We note that this evidence from Heraclea Pontica is now lost, but Ernst Kalinka, whose autopsy on the inscription is the most recent published account, emphasised that the Greek numeral \textit{iota} representing the number ten reported in earlier editions of the stone did not exist.\(^{65}\) In other words, Wilson’s approach to coastal Paphlagonia is important due to its methodological value, but his interpretation of the relationship between coastal Paphlagonia and the koinon cannot for evidentiary reasons be accepted.

Louis Robert’s \textit{A travers L’Asie Mineure} (1980) also treated the cities in coastal Paphlagonia within a loose northern Anatolian framework, but focused more on cultural rather than administrative aspects. His discussion on how the rivers Parthenos, Mélès, Billaios, Ladon and Thermodon defined the shared experience of the Bithynian and Paphlagonian cities connected by them is an important observation, particularly in light of his attempt to draw a connection with the work of Konrad Kraft (1972), who identified shared dies between cities that happened to have shared rivers.\(^{66}\) Robert’s study is important, for it finds that there were regions or micro-regions between cities that were more interconnected due to factors such as shared geographical features and hydrology, and these factors create different layers of regionalism in parallel with the administrative
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region artificially demarcated by Roman administrators as instruments of jurisdiction, taxation and governance.

Christian Marek's study (1993) of coastal Paphlagonia can be described as a combination of the virtues of both Wilson's and Robert’s accounts, and his analysis is necessary to present here. Marek agreed in principle with Wilson that the koinon attested in Heraclea and Amastris was once a large Pontic koinon spanning several provinces on both sides of the Halys river, but this was its earlier phase immediately following the Pompeian organisation of the double province.\(^67\) Subsequent territorial arrangements in northern Anatolia had cut away much of this “Pompeian” Pontic province and koinon, and the final residue – which Marek termed the “restpontisches koinon” – was all that remained attached to the province of Bithynia in the First Augustan Settlement mentioned earlier.\(^68\) Marek further presented an important analysis of the series of scholarship traditions regarding the extent of the koinon attested in coastal Paphlagonia that remains influential today. Marek identified two camps in the scholarly tradition, the unitarian and the analytic, which are still rehearsed and debated.\(^69\)

The unitarian position is that there was a Pontic koinon created after the Pompeian organisation, which continued to exist even after the modifications of the territories of northern Anatolia set by Marcus Antonius, the First Augustan Settlement and subsequent

\(^{67}\) Marek 1993, 26-46.

\(^{68}\) Marek 1993, 73-82.

reorganisations under Nero, Vespasian and Antoninus Pius.70 Marek supported the analytic camp, and in particular the key evidence – a coin issue of Geta from Neocaesarea – that was used to support the theory.71 On the reverse of this coin issue is the legend ΚΟΙΝ(ΩΝ) ΠΙΟΝ(ΤΟΥ) ΝΕΟΚΑΙ(ΣΑΡΕΙΑ) ΜΗΤΡΟ(ΠΟΛΙΣ) and the image of a seated tyche holding cornucopia, flanked by two tychai to her right, and three to her left.72 Chapot was the first to argue that the number of tychai depicted on the reverse field represented the number of members of the koinon, and the central seated figure was the metropolis Neocaesarea herself. The exact cities represented by the tychai on this coin can be debated, but as Marek and the analysts pointed out, the six figures happened to match the exact number of the province Pontus Mediterraneus that was formed either under Trajan or Hadrian, and the simplest explanation would be that the artist had in mind the six cities that coincided with both the new province and the new koinon.73

Given this reasoning, Marek was confident in reconstructing two Pontic koina: the first being the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus, including Heraclea Pontica, Tium, Amastris, Abonuteichos, Sinope and Amisus in the double province of Pontus-Bithynia, the second being the Koinon of Pontus, including Amaseia, Zela, Sebastopolis, Comana, Neocaesarea and Sebastea. Marek placed such distinction within the framework that Strabo provided in 12.3, with the reasoning that, while the Pompeian province of Pontus-Bithynia must have encompassed all of the territories under Mithridates Eupator,

70 Marek 1993, 74-75. The Unitarian position continues to be supported by various scholars, notably Loriot 2006, Dalaison 2014.
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subsequent changes under Marcus Antonius and Augustus led to a separation between the six cities of the Koinon of Pontus in Neocaesarea and the six cities in the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus, which was an administrative division. Therefore Marek called the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus the “restpontisches koinon,” because it comprised the cities that remained in the Pompeian double province of Pontus-Bithynia. 74

The influence of Marek’s study is most evident in the works of Marco Vitale (2012) and Søren Sørensen (2016). Vitale continued with the analytic hypothesis that all koina would have been coterminous with individual eparchiai, and set out to delineate and describe each of the koina in the eastern provinces. Most relevant to this dissertation is Vitale’s interpretation of the dynamics between the Bithynian and the coastal Paphlagonian koinon as hierarchic, based on the fact that no clear metropolis is attested in coastal Paphlagonian cities for much of the first to third centuries CE. 75 Since in each of the attested cases of repetundae trials the sources emphasise that it was the Bithynians who represented the province, Vitale assumed that this was indicative of the subordinate status of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon. 76 Søren Sørensen pointed out, however, that there is no clear indication that the repetundae trials were brought to the Roman Senate by the koinon and therefore, while Vitale’s hierarchic interpretation can resolve the issue of the lack of a clear metropolis for the coastal Paphlagonian koinon, this solution is built on a questionable basis. 77

74 Marek 1993, 77 fn. 534.
75 Save for brief periods in the reign of Trajan, where Heraclea Pontica and Amastris issued metropolis coins, to be discussed in chapter three.
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To conclude this brief survey of prior scholarship concerning coastal Paphlagonia and the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus, this dissertation approaches the problem of the unitarian and analytic debate by first emphasising the fact that 1) both camps agree that the Pompeian province of Pontus-Bithynia was likely influential in formulating a Pontic koinon, and 2) the main difference between the two camps is in the interpretation of the aftermath of this Pontic koinon following the various arrangements of the territories of northern Anatolia. Notably, the common premise of both camps is that a “Pompeian” Pontic koinon already existed by the mid-first century BCE. In the first chapter we examine reasons for doubting this premise. There are indications that the coastal Paphlagonian koinon did not exist until much later in the Julio-Claudian period, and Xavier Loriot argues for a Flavian or even Trajanic date.\textsuperscript{78} If the coastal Paphlagonian koinon was founded later than the Bithynian koinon, this leads to the question why the founding of a koinon that only belonged to the cities of coastal Paphlagonia was of any importance at all, and to whose advantage. It also becomes interesting to consider whether the formation process of the koinon can be traced through the assortment of literary, epigraphic, numismatic and archaeological evidence. Also, the founding of the koinon would necessarily lead to a redirection of municipal resources to the funding of koinon affairs, as well as creating or emphasising certain regionally accepted norms that eventually lead to changes in its constituent communities. These aspects are the focus of the individual chapters that are introduced in the following.

\textsuperscript{78} Loriot 2006, 528-532.
In the first chapter, we consider how the cities of coastal Paphlagonia were able to form a regionally distinct koinon despite never having done so in the Hellenistic period or earlier. We consider whether koinon formation in coastal Paphlagonia was a top-down or bottom-up process, and the first chapter addresses this problem from comparative as well as qualitative approaches. In the comparative approach we ask the same question of the formation process of the Bithynian koinon, and trace its possible origins to two factors. The first is the development of a sense of Bithynian unity in the course of events in the second triumviral period, which naturally led to the exclusion of non-Bithynian cities in coastal Paphlagonia following the Augustan mandate for the Bithynians to take charge of the worship of the imperial cult by the early Augustan period. The second factor is the development of an "eparchic" identity of Pontikos. This identity, first delineated in the Pompeian law, took root in coastal Paphlagonia and likely became exclusive to it, as the residual eparchy of Pontus remained attached to Bithynia from the Pompeian organisation to the reforms of Diocletian, but was not merged with it. The two factors -- the exclusion of coastal Paphlagonia from the Bithynian assembly, and the growing eparchic identity in coastal Paphlagonia -- were conducive to the formation of a coastal Paphlagonian assembly but were not necessarily the direct cause of formation. We propose that a statuary group near Amastris created by the perpetuus sacerdos Divi Augusti Gaius Iulius Aquila may be evidence of an imperial cult assimilated between Theos Hypsistos and Augustus that had in mind a broad audience beyond Amastris and might be the cult object of a coastal Paphlagonian assembly.
In the second chapter, we focus on two inscriptions that contain decrees issued by the coastal Paphlagonian koinon. The two inscriptions are vitally important because they contain the full name of the koinon as “the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus,” but the two inscriptions are not extensive and hence of limited informational value for the reconstruction of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon’s organisation and administration. Nevertheless, a close reading of the inscriptions still allows us to discuss two problems that the koinon ought to have been regularly concerned with, namely its ability to influence local institutions, and its concerns regarding the (s)election of koinon officials.

In the second chapter, we also train our focus on the city of Amatris, which was the findsite of the majority of inscriptions that mention officials of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon. We survey and study koinon personnel in order to situate the leadership of the koinon within the social and spatial context of the city’s territory.

In the third chapter, we examine evidence of festivities that were held by the coastal Paphlagonian koinon. A critical indicator of the vitality of koina in the Eastern provinces was how they presented agonistic competitions and gladiatorial spectacles. We are fortunate to have three inscriptions that could be plausibly associated with the koinon’s performance of festivities, though each has issues that affect their evidential value. Of note is one inscription paraphrased in the travelogue of Pascal Fourcade (1811), which may have mentioned in detail the cultic and gladiatorial activities of the koinon as well as the elites that oversaw them. However, considerable problems arise from the loss of the stone and from conflicting readings, problems which the third chapter addressed. We also seek to examine the validity of Cumont’s proposal in identifying a story of a gladiatorial
event from Lucian's Toxaris or On Friendship as a koinon event. Cumont's claim is intriguing, for if true, it would mean that Lucian’s account could provide much more substance for the coastal Paphlagonian koinon than any other epigraphic source, but this is difficult to substantiate. We approach the problem by studying two mechanisms in the story, the hiring of fighters and the paying of volunteers, to see what facts Lucian may have built upon and whether the resulting narrative is helpful to our understanding of how the coastal Paphlagonian koinon may have presented gladiatorial spectacles.

In the fourth chapter, we take on the question of the koinon's local impact from the perspective of time reckoning. The epigraphic and numismatic records show that cities in coastal Paphlagonia recorded the year with different epochs, as each epoch signified a specific historical moment that citizens considered significant. The city of Sinope, for instance, reckoned its year with the so-called colonial epoch, which began in 44 BCE when it received a Roman colony under Caesar. Surprisingly, Sinope changed its epoch in the reign of Septimius Severus and coincided with the so-called Lucullan era of Amastris, which was used in Amastris continuously from 70 BCE to at least the reign of Philip the Arab. The significance of this shift in epoch has been suggested from the municipal perspective by Wolfgang Leschhorn (1993) to have been a matter of factional strife or adherence to anti-Caesarian signals from the imperial center. In the fourth chapter, we examine the possibility that another factor attributable to Sinope's change of its epoch was related to the regionalisation process that we observed from previous discussions on the involvement of the coastal Paphlagonian elites and the various festivities of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus in the second and third chapters. The difficulty in studying
the connection between the shift of time reckoning of Sinope with regionalising forces primarily lies in the lack of sources, a recurrent theme. To address this issue, we focus on the unique body of evidence of time reckoning from Amastris, which shows considerable overlap between numismatic and epigraphic examples of using the Lucullan era.

Assessment of time reckoning in Amastris from the Hellenistic and the Roman periods indicates that we need to consider two distinct systems of time reckoning at work in Roman coastal Paphlagonia: that of the month and year. The reckoning of the month poses the most significant challenge, as only Amastris in the Roman period appears to have the habit of specifying the month in epigraphic context. Treating Amastris as a case study is again necessary. The reckoning of the year is different, for as noted before, it is the convergence of the Sinopean with the Amastrian reckoning of the year that lies at the heart of the problem at hand. A full survey of known methods of reckoning the year among coastal Paphlagonian cities is still essential. Individualistic time reckoning was socially significant to the everyday lives of Sinopeans and Amastrians. Even though we do not have any evidence that illuminates Sinopean reactions, the change in the reckoning of the year must have been a significant political signal that would have elicited a range of views and emotions, for it is a deviation from a local practice that dictated local behavior for more than two hundred years.
CHAPTER 1. FORMATION OF A COASTAL PAPHLAGONIAN KOINON

When Pompey created the province of Pontus-Bithynia in 64 BCE, he joined the coastal Paphlagonian cities under Mithridatic domination to the province of Bithynia created in 74 BCE. Scholars such as Christian Marek consider Pompey’s reorganisation to be the moment when the Bithynian and the coastal Paphlagonian cities formed their individual common assemblies.79 Yet, the earliest evidence for a common assembly of coastal Paphlagonian cities – an organisation called “Koinon of the Cities in Pontus” – dates from the Trajanic period.80 Similarly, the first evidence for the title “Koinon of the Hellenes in Bithynia” or “Koinon of Bithynia” dates from the reign of Domitian.81 The gap between assumed and attested dates of the common assemblies makes it necessary to review the evidence used to build this claim.

In part one, we frame the questions of whether and when a Bithynian common assembly actually existed into one question: whether we can contextualise the evidence within a formation process. We find that the Bithynian common assembly likely existed in concrete form during the second triumviral period, due to the need to negotiate with warring factions, and evolved into the Koinon of the Hellenes in Bithynia during the Augustan period. The koinon formation in Bithynia is a critical example of comparison

80 See Chapter two for discussion of the inscriptions from Amastris and Heraclea Pontica with the two titles.
81 Fernoux 2004, 350 discusses fragment from the Pergamene Asklepion, IVP III 151. In l. 3 one of the dedicants as [ . . . ] Αeschylinus, who was Bithyniarch, and lines 7-8 includes [Αὐτοκράτορ Δ]ομιτιανός | [Καῖσαρ Σεβ]. Other references concerning the Bithynian koinon could only be dated generally to the second century CE. Furthermore, earlier sources that have been considered relevant to the debate do not mention of the Bithynian koinon per se.
for its coastal Paphlagonian counterpart, since we know that the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus must also have undergone a process of koinon formation as well. We examine in part two evidence concerning the High Priests from Amastris dating from the Julio-Claudian period, and focus in particular on a prominent equestrian procurator whose infrastructural investments in Amastrian territory may have created favorable conditions for the formation of a common assembly for coastal Paphlagonian cities.

1.1 Koinon Formation in Bithynia

The beginnings of the common assembly of Bithynian cities, later known as the Bithynian koinon or the Koinon of the Hellenes in Bithynia, remain opaque due to evidentiary limitations. Scholars use Pompey’s reorganisation of the double province as the hypothetical origin for the two “eparchic” assemblies, but Fernoux’s discussion of the Bithynian evidence indicates that such hypothesis needs revision. In part one, we use Fernoux’s discussion as a paradigm for studying the origins of the coastal Paphlagonian assembly. Henri Fernoux highlighted the potential stages of the Bithynian koinon’s formation process, and argued that the Koinon of Bithynia was likely founded in 20 BCE when Augustus was in Asia to administer Bithynian and Asiatic affairs, and not dates such as 29 BCE when Octavian gave permission for the Hellenes in Bithynia and Asia to worship his person, or when Pompey founded the double province of Pontus-Bithynia
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in 64 BCE. The general thrust of his reconstructed formation process for the Bithynian koinon offers a clear perspective on how regionalism developed within the double province of Pontus-Bithynia, and hence serves as a critical comparison for approaching the early phases of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon, which is even more elusive.

1.1.1 Early Sources for a Bithynian Collective

Fernoux focused on three sources from the second half of the first century BCE to discuss the early origins of the Bithynian assembly, including 1) a series of epistles believed to have been written by Brutus, in which the tyrannicide demanded “Bithynians” contribute to his war effort; 2) a joint dedication at Rome by Bithynian cities and the coastal Paphlagonian city of Tium to a common patron of consular rank, whose identity remains unclear, as the surviving fragments only contain the cognomen Rufus and his filiation son of Lucius; and 3) passages from Dio Cassius concerning the

85 Strab. 12.3

86 Hercher 1873, 188-191 nos. 59-68; Hercher 1873, xxviii-xxx states that the reproduced text is based on Westermann’s edition of 1856, which used five codices (Palatinum 398 (A), Palatinum 356 (B), Vaticanum (C), and two Parisian editions 352 (D) and Mazarin. 611 A (E), with further additions from Monacensi 490 Laurentiano plut.XXXII 32 Marciano 521 (N) Vaticano 622 (V).

87 Hercher 1873, 177 section 1. is a letter from “King Mithridates” addressed to “cousin Mithridates” (Μιθριδάτης βασιλεύς Μιθριδάτη τῷ ἀνέψιῳ χαίρειν). The letter notes that the responses to Brutus were written by Mithridates the collator as a rhetorical exercise. ἀποφαίνοντος δὲ σοῦ δυσαποκρίτως αὐτὰς ἔχειν, ὡμήρης δὲν πείραμα ποιήσασθαι τῆς ἀντιγραφῆς καὶ πορίσασθαι λόγους, οἵους εἰκός ἦν ἔκαστον ἀποκρίνασθαι τῶν ἐπεσταλκότων. [since you apparently find this too difficult, it seemed necessary that I try to compose responses and furnish arguments so that that they responded to each of the letters (sent by Brutus) as would have been appropriate (Translation mine.)] What is implied seems to be that the letters authored by Brutus were genuine, and were considered important teaching specimens. See Smith 1936 for narrative against authenticity, and Jones 2016 for most recent argument in support of authenticity.

88 Fernoux 2004, 181-182. CIL VI 1508 = Moretti IGUR 63-65. Only a fragment with Prusias ad Mare and Apamea (parts of d, entirety of e and traces of f) was refound in 1975 in the chiesa del Camposanto Teutonico at Rome, but the drawings of Ligorio was republished by Moretti 1958 and Eck 1984.
formal permission from Augustus for Bithynian and Asian Hellenes to worship his
person.89

Fernoux’s positions on the first two sources are as follows. Fernoux takes
Deininger’s view that a koinon in the Greek East in general would have been unable to
mobilise ships, men, and funds for any war effort, due to the Roman enmity towards such
capable regional assemblies. Hence, the Brutus epistles, which mention the Bithynians,
Macedonians and Lycians as having performed capably, must have been inauthentic.90 As
for the Rufus monument, the inscriptions on the joint dedication by Bithynian cities and
Tium – a city in coastal Paphlagonia – indicate that each participating city claimed the
proconsul as their patron individually, instead of dedicating under a collective identity
such as the “Bithynians”, “a Bithynian synod”, or comparable entities. Thus, there is no
reason to infer that this monument supports the existence of “a fixed institutional
framework.” Here, we have evidence of an inter-city network that preceded the existence
of the Bithynian koinon, but this common sense of a shared historical past and
“unanimous fervor” due to the exigencies of civil war only suggests that the formation
process of the Bithynian koinon began in the form of a patronage-based interaction
between cities that was not strictly bound by ethnic belonging.91

Recently, Christopher Jones has presented a compelling case supporting the
authenticity of the Brutus epistles, making it necessary to revise Fernoux’s assessment of

89 Dio Cass. 51.20.6-7.

90 Fernoux 2004, 181, following Deininger 1966, 366, argues that the treatment of the cities of Asia
following Sulla’s victory over Mithridates in 85 BCE was to issue orders and summons based on individual
cities and not the Asiatic koinon – App. Mithr. 4.61-62, App. BC 5.1.4.

this unique literary source.\textsuperscript{92} If the Brutus epistles were authentic, as Jones argued, then Deininger’s claim that a koinon in the Greek East had no capacity to mobilise resources would be wrong. The Bithynians would have played a significant part in supplying the Caesarians\textsuperscript{93} and tyrannicides\textsuperscript{94} with fleets in 43 to 42 BCE. The exigencies of the civil war probably created strenuous conditions that may have been conducive to the formulation of a cooperative framework. The “Bithynians” were therefore coherent enough to negotiate with, support and deter warring factions as one entity, but not necessarily operating as a permanent organisation with a fixed constitution. Fernoux’s position on the Rufus monument remains valid in this regard, for there is clearly no reference to a common Bithynian institution in the surviving inscriptions, and the inclusion of Tium further undermines the claim that this monument is a product of a pre-koinon organisation. There is the possibility that the Rufus monument was a joint dedication by the cities of the entire double province. Yet, without a complete list of all participating dedicants, one can only assume that the predominant representation of

\textsuperscript{92} Jones 2016, 196-202, found no glaring chronological contradictions, and the “very gruffness, amounting almost to brutality, that emerges from certain of the Greek letters” in the corpus fits Brutus’ personality as described by Cicero. Also Torraca 1959, 59ff. Deininger 1966, 358. Rühl 1915, 315-325.

\textsuperscript{93} Jones 2016, 214 no. 11 (61) Βροῦτος Βιθυνοῖς. Αὐλὰν ἐμὸν φίλον ἑπέμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς κατασκευάσοντά μοι ναὸς στρογγύλας πεντήκοντα καὶ μακρὰς διακοσίας, τοσαῦτας δὲ καὶ Δολοβέλλα πυθάνομαι ὑμᾶς παρασχῆθαι. ὡς γὰρ ποιήσετε ναὸς καὶ ἔρτας εἰς τὰ ἀνθρώπου πλοῖα, ἄρα ἂν πρὸς ἑμὲ ἀνακομισθῇ, παρασχόντες τῷ Ακύλα καὶ σιτηρέσιον τούτων τεσσάρων, τῶν γὰρ εἰς τὴν ναυπηγίαν δεόντων ἱδῖνων καὶ τῆς τούτων παρακομιδῆς ἐπὶ θάλασσαν καὶ τεχνιτῶν ἐν εἰοί ὧδε σώζετε, ἡμᾶς δὲ Δολοβέλλα ἐλλιπόντες. [Brutus to the Bithynians. I have sent my friend Aquila to equip fifty cargo-ships for me and two hundred worships, since I hear that you provided the same number to Dolabella. You will do as you ought, therefore, in providing Aquila with the sailors and rowers for these ships until they are delivered to me, and four months’ wages for the crews. As for the timber needed for constructing the ships, its conveyance to the sea, and the workmen, I am sure that you will not be at all negligent, not having failed Dolabella either. (Trans. Jones)]

\textsuperscript{94} This prior collection that Smith referred to is reported by Gaius Cassius Parmensis to Cicero in 43 BCE, the context being that there was danger for a fleet that Cimber levied “last year” (sc. 44 BCE) to join Dolabella’s fleet. Cic. ad Fam. 12.13
Bithynian cities makes the Rufus monument a product of cities within the same province, exhibiting their collaborative potential in honoring their common governor, which was customary in the late Republican period.95

In short, the sources that Fernoux selected to negate the existence of the Bithynian koinon in the second triumviral period are in fact helpful in establishing the early existence of a Bithynian framework of cooperation. This “cooperative” likely lacked a clearly formulated constitution, but it had the power to mobilise resources within its sphere of influence and negotiate with warring factions on behalf of participating cities. In the next section, we take a closer look at the Octavianic Mandate of 29 BCE that directed the provinces of Bithynia and Asia to worship Roma, Caesar and Octavian himself. Fernoux is likely right that the Octavianic Mandate was not the formal creation of the common Bithynian assembly, since the mandate permitted Bithynians to worship Octavian, but did not stipulate how the Bithynians would proceed. The next section focuses on two questions: who received the Octavianic Mandate, and whether the mandate covered the coastal Paphlagonian cities.

1.1.2 The Octavianic Mandate

According to Dio Cassius, it was in 29 BCE that Octavian set the precedent of permitting “Hellenic peregrines in Bithynia and Asia” to worship his person, a practice

---

that was not only continued under other emperors, but expanded to include all nations
that were subject to the Romans.96

Καὶσαρ δὲ ἐν τούτῳ τὰ τῇ ἄλλα ἐχρηµατίζε, καὶ τεµένη τῇ τῇ Ῥώµη καὶ τῷ πατρὶ τῷ
Καίσαρι, ἦρασ αὐτὸν Ἰουλίων ὀνοµάσας, ἐν τῇ Ἐφέσῳ καὶ ἐν Νικαιᾷ γενέσθαι ἔφηκεν: αὐταὶ γὰρ τότε αἱ πόλεις ἐν τῇ Ἁσίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Βιθυνίᾳ προετετίµηστο, καὶ τούτων μὲν τοῖς Ῥωµαιίοις τοῖς παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς ἐποικοῦσι τιµὰν προσέταξε: τοῖς δὲ δὴ ἐν τῇ Ἁσίᾳ Ἐλληνάς σφας ἐπικαλέσας, ἑαυτῷ τινα, τοῖς μὲν Ασιανοῖς ἐν Πέργαµῳ τοῖς δὲ Βιθυνοῖς ἐν Νικαιᾷ τεµενίσαι ἐπέτρεψε, καὶ τοῦτ᾽ ἐκεῖθεν ἄρξάµενον καὶ ἐπ᾽ ἄλλων αὐτοκρατόρων ὧν µόνον ἐν τοῖς Ἐλληνικοῖς ἐθνεῖσιν. ἄλλα καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις ὑπὸ τῶν Ῥωµαιίων ἀκούει, ἐγένετο.

Caesar, meanwhile, besides attending to the general business, gave permission for
the dedication of sacred precincts in Ephesus and in Nicaea to Roma and to Caesar
his father, whom he named the hero Iulius. These cities had at that time attained
chief place in Asia and in Bithynia respectively. He ordered the Romans dwelling in
these cities to pay honor to these two divinities; but he permitted the aliens, whom
he styled Hellenes, to consecrate precincts to himself, the Asiatics to have theirs in
Pergamon, the Bithynians in Nicomedia. This practice, beginning under him, has
been continued under other emperors, not only in the case of the Hellenic nations
but also in that of all the others, in so far as they are subject to the Romans.

According to Deininger, Octavian’s mandate for peregrines to worship his person ought
to be understood as the first time that a provincial imperial cult was transferred to an
existing common assembly.97 Yet, as Fernoux pointed out, the Bithynian cities could now
worship Octavian, but how they went about this practice remains undefined in this
passage. Fernoux argues that the Octavianic mandate of 29 BCE formalised the Bithynian
framework, which led to the creation of the Bithynian koinon in a separate Augustan
initiative in 20 BCE. Here we take up a separate issue, namely who had the right to
worship Octavian under the mandate of 29 BCE?

---

96 Dio Cass. 51.20.6-7. The archaeological evidence of imperial cult for Augustus in Italy have led to
continued debate regarding Dio Cass. 51.20.8. Gradel 2002, 73-85 in particular provides a convincing
explanation that Dio Cassius’ passage was targeting a provincial audience regarding emperor worship in the
eastern provinces, and hence has little to do with worship in Italy. Cf. Madsen 2016, 23.

97 Deininger 1965, 21.
Dio Cassius made it clear that Octavian designated the peregrines of Bithynia and Asia as Hellenes, and it is the Hellenes who were allowed to worship him. Since Bithynia was part of the double province that also included coastal Paphlagonia, would the Octavianic mandate include coastal Paphlagonians as well? Epigraphic evidence suggests that it did not. The Bithynian koinon attested in the imperial period had its full title “the Koinon of the Hellenes in Bithynia,”98 and the same can be found with the Asiatic koinon, which was styled “the Koinon of the Hellenes in Asia.”99 Both koina placed emphasis on Hellenic identity. By contrast, the full title of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon was “the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus,”100 which placed emphasis on its urbanity. The contrast is clear but puzzling, for it indicates that Octavian managed to carve a distinct divide between Bithynia and coastal Paphlagonia, with the Bithynians receiving the identity of Hellenes, while coastal Paphlagonians were excluded from this identity.

With regard to the peregrine Bithynians as Hellenes, Dio Cassius was relaying a tradition that stands at odds with writers of the first century CE. According to Strabo, the ethnic geography remained variegated in the early principate, with Bithynians, the

---

98 IK Prusias ad Hypium no. 10 ll. 8-14: ἀρξαντα τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἐν Βειθυνίᾳ | Ἑλλήνων . . . Δ. | Αὐρήλιον Διογενιανὸν | Καλικλέα κτλ.; IK Prusias ad Hypium 51 ll. 8-14: [ἀρξαντα τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν] | [ἐν Βειθυνίᾳ Ἑλλήνων] . . . | Τίμηρο [v] | [Κλαυδίου Τερετίλλα] | Σάνκτου κτλ.; IK Prusias ad Hypium ll. 17-22: ἀρξαντα τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἐν Βειθυνίᾳ | Ἑλλήνων . . . | Μ. Αὐρήλιον Φιλιππιανὸν [v] | Ιάσόνα κτλ.


100 Kalinka 1933 no. 21 ll. 1-2 Τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἐν Πόλει | τοῦ κοινοῦ τετείμησεν κτλ. Kalinka 1933 no. 67 ll. 2-3 ὁ βουλητής καὶ ὁ δῆμος καὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ | τῶν ἐπὶ Πόλεως ἐπετιμήσαν κτλ. For a discussion on the significance of the Doric and Ionic/koine dialect, see chapter 2, 89-91.
Myriandyni and the Paphlagonians each inhabiting a different stretch of the double province. In the juridical tradition, there is the *lex Bithynorum*, a law mentioned in the Institutes of Gaius, and the *lex Pompeia*, which specifically applied to Bithynians and Pontians alike, which further indicate that the Bithynian ethnicity had an enduring place in Roman jurisprudence. The two traditions further point to the Octavianic mandate as extraordinary, for it assigned the Bithynians an Hellenic identity shared by the peregrines in Asia, leading to potential complications such as the applicability of the Bithynian criteria in matters of law, as well as creating a separate ethnic distinction for the Bithynians, as if Hellenic identity were a superior status among peregrines in the double province of Pontus-Bithynia.

Some scholars attempt to downplay the emphasis of Hellenic identity designated by Octavian, arguing that the semantics of terms such as *Graeci* and *Hellenes* in the Augustan period were moving away from an ethnic category and becoming “little more than synonyms for *peregrini*, free members of non-Roman communities in the provinces.” That is to say, while the inhabitants in Bithynia have no obvious claim to Hellenic identity like their Asiatic counterparts, Octavian’s designation of Bithynians as Greeks would have been less remarkable, because Hellenic identity was no longer a mark

---

101 Strab. 12.3.2.


103 Dio Cass. 37.20.2-3 points out that Pompey *tة τε πλέιο ἔθνη τῶν ἐν τῇ Ασίᾳ τῇ ἡπείρῳ τότε αὐτοῖς ἁπτόμενον νόμοις τε ἰδίοις καὶ πολιτείαις κατεστήσατο καὶ διεκόσμησεν, ὥστε καὶ δεῦρο αὐτοὺς τοῖς ἕκαστον νομισματίσι χρῆσθαι.* [had establish and organised most of the nations in the continent of Asia then belonging to them with their own laws and constitutions, so that even to this day they use the laws that he laid down. (Trans. Cary)]

104 Spawforth 2012, 11-12. Ferrary 2001, 31-33 thinks that this line of interpretation is akin to the dilution of the notion of Hellenic identity that develops into the question of what is true Greekness, and the need to distinguish what was Greek proper.
of distinction to Roman authorities. Along such lines we could even maintain that the coastal Paphlagonians were not excluded from being Hellene, only that Dio Cassius did not mention them, or that the coastal Paphlagonians were indeed included under the term “Bithynians,” which would be even more striking.

Some scholars also have attempted to downplay the weight of the Dio Cassius passage itself in order to resolve the conflict. Soren Sørensen argued that the Hellenic identity mattered much more to Dio Cassius, who included Bithynians in the tradition of the Octavianic mandate in order to “retain an image of the cities of Asia and his home country Bithynia as decidedly Greek.”105 The upbringing of Dio Cassius certainly makes a zealous representation of the Hellenic culture flourishing in Nicaea possible,106 and there is every reason to point to the late dates of the epigraphic attestations to the Koinon of the Hellenes in Bithynia and argue that Dio Cassius was manipulating tradition based on the Bithynians’ aroused sense of Hellenic belonging during the Second Sophistic.107 Even accepting all of these, the contrast between the Bithynian emphasis on Hellenic identity and the coastal Paphlagonian emphasis on urbanity remains strikingly distinct.

In other words, the Octavianic mandate was a differentiating marker that separated Bithynian and coastal Paphlagonian senses of identity and status, ultimately creating two parallel experiences of regionalism within the double province. In the next

---

105 Sørensen 2016, 90.
107 Sørensen 2016, 81-82, 85-86 for full list of datable inscriptions containing the title Koinon of the Hellenes in Bithynia.
section, we proceed to discuss the Augustan initiative proposed by Fernoux, which was the final step in koinon formation.

1.1.3 The Augustan Initiative

Fernoux proposed that the Octavianic mandate of 29 BCE was the penultimate step towards the establishment of the Bithynian koinon, and it was the Augustan initiative of 20 BCE, described in a separate passage by Dio Cassius, that was the actual beginning of the Koinon of the Hellenes in Bithynia. Fernoux points out that 1) the Bithynian letters and the Rufus monument all suggest that a Bithynian koinon did not officially exist before 31 BCE, and 2) the establishment of the imperial cult need not have taken place along with the founding of a koinon. In short, he argues that the Dio Cassius passage referring to events in 29 BCE cannot be the definitive terminus post quem for the existence of the Koinon of the Hellenes in Bithynia. The apparent hurdle to Fernoux’s interpretation is that the Dio Cassius passage concerning 20 BCE makes no specific mention that Augustus encouraged regional collaboration.

ο δὲ οὖν Αὔγουστος τὸ τῇ Ἑλληνικὸν διήγαγε καὶ ἐς Σάµον ἔπλευσεν, ἐνταῦθα τε ἐξείμασε, καὶ ἐς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῷ ἦρι ἐν ὧν Μάρκος τε Ἀπουλέιος καὶ Πούπλιος Σίλιος ὑπάτευσαν κομισθεὶς πάντα τὰ τῇ ἐκεί καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ Βιθυνίᾳ διέταξεν, οὐχ ὅτι τοῦ δῆμου καὶ ταῦτα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ τὰ πρότερα ἐδόκει εἶναι ἐν ὁλιγωρίᾳ αὐτὰ ποιησάμενος, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάνω πάντων σφῶν ὡς καὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπιστασίας· τά τε γὰρ ἀλλα ἀσαπερ καὶ προσήκον ἐν ἐπηνώρθωσε, καὶ χρήσατα τοῖς μὲν ἐπέδωκε τοῖς δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ τὸν φόρον ἐνσενεγκείν προσέταξε. τοὺς τῇ Κυζικηνοῦς, ὅτι κτείναν, ἐδοὐλώσατο καὶ τοῦτο καὶ τοὺς Τυρίους τοὺς τῇ Σιδωνίους διὰ τὰς στάσεις ἐποίησεν, ἐν τῇ Συρίᾳ γενόμενος.

110 Dio Cass. 54.7.4-5.
Then, Augustus sorted out Hellenic affairs and sailed to Samos, where he subsequently wintered. In the Spring, during the consulsips of Marcus Apuleius and Publius Silius, he journeyed to Asia, and set all matters in order there, and all matters in Bithynia; he did not consider treating these provinces in contempt, on account of the fact that these ethne previously mentioned belonged to the people, but rather he cared for them all, as if they were his own. For these and other reasons, he made revision to what he deemed fit; he also donated money to some, and made arrangements for others to contribute above their quota of tribute. The Kyzikians, who flogged to death certain Romans during civic unrest, he enslaved, and so too the Tyrians and the Sidonians when he was in Syria. (Trans. Cary)

The passage informs us that Augustus “set all matters in order there, and all matters in Bithynia,” and that he “cared for them all, as if they were his own.” With regard to details, we learn that Augustus “made revision to what he deemed fit,” “donated money to some,” and increased “the quota of tribute” of others. More drastic measures including the enslavement of the Cyzicians, Tyrians and Sidonians for flogging Romans to death. In other words, the specifics in the passage have no bearing on the organisation of the imperial cult or common assemblies.

On the other hand, we know that Pliny cites the portion of the Lex Pompeia addressing the Bithynians as having excluded anyone under thirty years of age from taking up a magistracy or becoming a member of the municipal senate, but including anyone who had served as magistrate; he further informed Trajan that Augustus had issued an edict permitting persons of the age 22 or above to hold lesser magistracies.111 Fernoux proposed that Augustus’ emendation of the lex Pompeia mentioned by Pliny may be associated with the Dio Cassius passage of the events in 20 BCE.112 In this light,


Fernoux does have good grounds to posit that Augustus issued further orders and opinions regarding the formation of a koinon with a representative assembly to oversee the systematic worship of his person at the provincial level that was permitted in 29 BCE, and hence the date 20 BCE ought to be that of the foundation of the Bithynian koinon.

We note another possible occasion that Fernoux did not consider, namely the Augustan settlement of 27 BCE that formally defined the double province of Pontus-Bithynia as a praetorial province held by the Roman Senate. According to Strabo, this Augustan settlement gave a precise definition of the double province as a praetorian appointment with a jurisdiction encompassing Bithynia, the Propontis, and certain parts of Pontus.\(^{113}\)

Strabo only gives the contours of the settlement, and the territories of the double province could have been further defined, but this lack of precise detail does not affect the general thrust of Fernoux’s argument. We can expect that the refined definition of the double province, including the internal administrative framework of Bithynia, would have been set in order by 20 BCE. It is also possible that a basic framework of the imperial cult was also established in “certain parts of Pontus,” a point to be further discussed in the second part of this chapter.

---

\(^{113}\) Strab. 17.25. δίχα διείλε πάσαν τὴν χώραν καὶ τὴν μὲν ἀπέδειξεν ἑαυτῷ, τὴν δὲ τῷ δήμῳ. [Ge divided the whole of his empire into two parts, and assigned one portion to himself and the other to the Roman people] . . . καὶ εἰς μὲν τὰς Καίσαρος ἡγεμόνας καὶ διοικητὰς Καίσαρ πέμπει, διαιρῶν ἄλλοτε ἄλλως τὰς χώρας καὶ πρὸς τοὺς καιροὺς πολιτευόμενος, εἰς δὲ τὰς δημοσίας ὁ δήμος στρατηγοὺς ἢ ὑπάτους, καὶ αὔται τὰς μερισμοὺς ἀξοναί διαφόρους, ἐπειδὰν κελεύῃ τὸ συμφέρον. [. . . to the provinces of Caesar, Caesar sends legati and procuratores, dividing countries in different ways at different times and administering them as the occasion requires, whereas to the provinces of the people, the people send praetors or proconsuls, and these provinces also are brought under different divisions whenever expediency requires.] . . . ἀλλ᾽ ἐν ἀρχαῖς γε δείθηκε ποιήσας ὑπατικὰς μὲν δὺο . . . δέκα δὲ στρατηγικὰς . . . δεκάτην δὲ Βιθυνίαν μετὰ τῆς Προποντίδος καὶ τοῦ Πόντου τινὸς μερῶν. [Caesar organised the provinces of the people by creating, first, two consular provinces . . . and secondly, ten praetorial provinces . . . and Bithynia along with the Propontis and certain parts of the Pontus. Trans. Jones]
In sum, Fernoux’s argument is useful in the sense that it distinguishes evidence of different dates in accordance with stages of a prolonged formation process. Fernoux is right to point out that the koinon of the imperial period required the prior existence of the imperial cult. For the imperial cult to be assigned to a functional group of cities, Augustus would have looked to a group of cities that had a functional framework of cooperation. Bithynian cities had the advantage of being part of the former Bithynian kingdom and a common sense of belonging. In this sense, one can agree to a point that a Bithynian group existed during the late Republican period, but how much of this can be attributed to Pompey would be disputed – we find that the exigency of civil wars and patronage were the more apparent factors, instead of top-down organisation. In light of our survey of evidence, Marek’s recurring thesis that “the earliest commonalties, those of Asia and Pontus et Bithynia, go back to the time of the republic,” and “a new Bithynian koinon appeared in the early Augustan period,” would unlikely be valid: the Bithynian koinon in the strict sense was first founded in the early Augustan period, and the process of koinon foundation in Bithynia was likely separate from developments in coastal Paphlagonia.

We now turn to the second part of our discussion on the implications Fernoux’s study, namely regarding the formation process of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon. Cities of coastal Paphlagonia are not featured in the Brutus epistles nor the Octavianic mandate as preserved by Dio Cassius, but at least Tium participated in the dedication of the Rufus monument. It seems that, during the early stages of the formation process of the Bithynian koinon, specifically before the Augustan period, coastal Paphlagonian cities could participate in affairs that were dominated by Bithynian interest groups due to
common patronage and benefaction. Under this dynamic, preexisting cooperation between Bithynian and coastal Paphlagonian cities did not conflict with the preferences of ethnic belonging that individual cities chose to adopt.

Yet, the Octavianic mandate may have generated a strong sense of exclusivity among Bithynian cities, to the effect that coastal Paphlagonian cities retreated altogether from participating in Bithynian affairs. Assumedly, the retreat of Tium and potentially five other coastal Paphlagonian cities from the periphery of the Bithynian experience of regionalism during the Augustan period would have led to the awareness of a new regional framework. In the next section we examine the Pontic identity in the juridical tradition as a kernel of such a new regional framework.

1.1.4 From the Bithynian to the Pontian Perspective

In this section we shift focus from our discussion of the formation process of the Bithynian koinon to a new examination the formation process of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon. This discussion is immediately hampered by the absence of evidence. Some scholars privilege this absence. Xavier Loriot, for instance, argued that the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus was actually founded much later than the Bithynian Koinon, because there is no indication that it existed earlier.\(^\text{114}\) He associates the foundation of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon with the “Western Pontic Koinon” in the lower Danube, which was

\(^{114}\) Loriot 2006, 530-531.
perhaps founded during the wave of re-organisations of the Balkan and the Danubian provinces in the Trajanic period following the annexation of Dacia.\textsuperscript{115}

Loriot’s point on the dearth of pre-Trajanic evidence is indeed critical for any assessment on the issue, but so are other indications that Pompey’s organisation gave rise to a new sort of social identity in coastal Paphlagonia that was legally instead of ethnically defined. An excerpt of the jurist Celsus’s opinion in the \textit{Digest} is of particular interest: “Pontians, by a beneficium of Pompeius Magnus, can regard anyone who is born from a Pontic mother as being Pontic.”\textsuperscript{116} Marshall thinks that this clause must have been concerned with the conditions of “local” citizenship, because a child born of a Roman father and Pontic mother would have been a peregrine, unless the Pontic mother held \textit{conubium}.\textsuperscript{117} As to what exactly a Pontic citizenship means, Marshall did not elaborate.

Some scholars, such as Stephen Mitchell, have taken the Celsus clause as an indication of a synthetic identity created by Roman administrators to define a broad ethnic territory, and the Koinon of Pontus was a regional assembly that was based upon it.\textsuperscript{118} Mitchell notes in particular the absence of any sense of Pontic ethnicity during the Mithridatic period, as the Mithridatid dynasts never claimed such geographic designation.

\textsuperscript{115} Nawotka 1993, 348-350.

\textsuperscript{116} Dig. 50.1.1.2: “Celsus etiam refert Ponticis ex beneficio Pompeii Magni competere, ut qui Pontica matre natus esset, Ponticus esset. [Celsus also reports that the people of Pontus, by a grant of Pompeius Magnus, can regard anyone who is born from a mother from Pontus as being from Pontus” (Trans. Watson)]. We note that the italicised translation reads Ponticus as related to location, which can be interpreted as eparchic, though one would notice the ethnic connotation as well.

\textsuperscript{117} Marshall 1968, 107-108. The point is that a child would have attained Pontic identity through both the paternal and the maternal lineage. Vitale 2012, 187. Plin. \textit{Ep}. 10.112.1: Lex Pompeia, domine, qua Bithyni et Pontici utuntur, eos, qui in bulen a censoribus leguntur, dare pecuniam non iubet. [Sir: the code of law drawn up by Pompey, to which Bithynians and Pontics are subject, does not require those elected to the local senate by the censors to pay a fee.]

\textsuperscript{118} Mitchell 2002, 51-56.
or ethnicity – they identified themselves with Persian and Macedonian more than an independent Pontic tradition. Mitchell sought to expand the geographical limit of this synthetic Ponticness to encompass all localities that identified themselves with some version of Pontic identity, a theory that would defy provincial boundaries and the juridical basis of the *lex Pompeia*. Vitale argues, however, that the term Pontus/Ponticus used in the Celsus clause is to be taken only in the restricted “eparchic” sense, and exclusively defined within the eparchia of Pontus within the double province, instead of being an overarching “ethnika” crossing several provinces. Vitale’s eparchic definition accurately reflects the difference between the double province of Pontus-Bithynia and the provinces that have proclaimed themselves (or perceived by others) as Pontic in the imperial period, including the eparchia of Pontus Polemonianus and Pontus Galaticus. The eparchic definition also reflects the clear distinction between the Bithynian and the Pontian inhabitants of the double province. Hence, compared to Mitchell’s ethnic interpretation, Vitale’s proposal of the “eparchic” identity is the more acceptable solution to the question of Ponticness in the Celsus clause.

---


120 Vitale 2012, 182 is included here in full for clarity: “Auch die von Mitchell herausgestellte Verwendung des Ethnikons ‘Ponticus’ ist als Symptom eines pontischen Provinzialbürgerrechts nicht verwertbar, denn gerade in Verbindung mit der *lex Pompeia* tauchen gleichermaßen Bithynici auf, die sicher nicht in einem einzigen Provinzialbürgerrecht zusammengefasst waren. In den Ethnika Bithynici und Pontici lässt sich lediglich eine die Bewohner der jeweiligen Provinzhälfte, also Eparchie, zusammenfassende Bezeichnung erkennen, weshalb man in diesem Falle nicht von Ethnika, sondern treffender von ‘Eparchika’ sprechen müsste.” [The use of the ethnic “Ponticus” that Mitchell used is not a symptom of Pontic provincial citizenship, because it appeared together with Bithynici in connection with the *lex Pompeia*, which surely was not bounded together into one united provincial citizenship. With regard to the ethnics Bithynicus and Ponticus, an inhabitant of the double province must belong to one of the half-province. The same is with Eparchia: recognising it as a collective term, one ought not speak of it in the “ethnic” sense, but rather “eparchic.” (Translation mine)]
As for the origin of the this eparchic Ponticness, Mitchell’s observation remains important, namely that Mithridatids did not promote any sense of Pontic identity, not even during the reign of Mithridates Eupator, for this dynasty placed their emphasis on their Iranian heritage. In this sense, Mitchell is right in the restricted sense, namely that the appearance of the eparchic Ponticness also highlights the beginning of new sense of belonging that was taking shape in coastal Paphlagonia, a movement that was closely tied to the legislative efforts of the holders of Roman imperium before the Augustan period. What Vitale and Mitchell help to shape is the perception that coastal Paphlagonia became “Pontic” in the perception of Roman administrators. The eparchic Ponticness may have ethnic overtones, but was really a top-down, juridically defined category of the individual. The logic behind the creation of such a category of the individual is not explained in the juridical sources, but Marshall’s assessment of the Celsus clause in the Digest offers some observations that are worthwhile to discuss, as they touch upon the pragmatic aspects of how to create a new sense of belonging in an annexed territory.

Marshall points out that the Celsus clause ought to be assessed alongside a separate clause of the lex Pompeia as preserved in Pliny’s report to Trajan, which limited a Bithynian city’s grant of citizenship to a citizen of another Bithynian city. Marshall’s theory is that this Bithynian clause of the lex Pompeia was designed to “curb the effects of ‘internationalism’ and to maintain municipal efficiency by ensuring the claims of each city on its élite class,” a matter that may have been particularly problematic during the

early stages of the Bithynian portion of the Pompeian province. Along similar lines, the Celsus clause would have targeted a particular problem concerning the “Pontic” or coastal Paphlagonian portion of the double province. In this instance the aim was probably to increase the number of people that could or must qualify as Pontic. For example, the marriage of an Asiatic individual to a Pontic woman would mean that their children would be Pontic rather than Asiatic. Marshall thinks that this *beneficium* would have prevented the loss of new inhabitants of rural communities that were *attributi* – “a peasant population of village-dwellers who lacked the full franchise of cities,” and hence a “concession to the cities . . . [a] right to claim citizens (within their territory) on the basis of the mother’s status.” The strength of Marshall’s view is that he placed the Celsus clause within the historical context of the double province. The double province was comprised of a pre-existing administrative system derived from a highly centralised Bithynian kingdom, and a sparsely urbanised rural landscape of coastal Paphlagonia that seemed to have remained autonomous even during the Mithridatic period. The Celsus clause then refers to a legally and spatially defined “ethnic group” populating the vast territories distributed among the coastal Paphlagonian cities.

Marshall’s discussion of the issues of urbanisation can be placed within Hanson’s study of the urbanised space of Anatolia in the imperial period. In the first diagram below, reproduced from Hanson’s work, we find a high proportion of the territories of the

---


124 Vitucci 1947, 436 Madsen 2009, 29-34 provides an updated synopsis and survey on the history and sources concerning the *lex Pompeia*, with relevant discussions on the impact of the *lex Pompeia* on the municipal level at 34-40. For a brief account of the history of coastal Paphlagonia under Heraclea Pontica and Amastris Erçiyas 2003, 1414; 1421-1422.
provinces of Asia and Lycia as having been reachable from the urban center. The 18.5 km radius represents Hanson’s estimate of the reachable distance for rugged terrain ubiquitous in coastal Paphlagonia.\textsuperscript{125} Clearly shown is the degree of “urban” territories in Bithynia and Asia, while Paphlagonia and Cappadocia represent the opposite.\textsuperscript{126} In Pontus-Bithynia, urban hinterlands are also heavily weighted towards the Bithynian cities to the west, while vast swathes of Paphlagonia were left without an immediate urban center. This diagram lends further significance to the urgencies that Marshall observed from the Celsus clause in the \textit{lex Pompeia} due to the lack of a centralising agency in vast mountainous territory that each of the cities of coastal Paphlagonia had to negotiate. Also included is a separate diagram that presents a closer look at the proportion of territory of coastal Paphlagonian cities that were considered reachable from the urban center in a day’s journey.

\textsuperscript{125} Bekker-Nielsen 1989 assumed a city’s theoretical hinterland as encompassing a radius of 37 km, for this is the maximum figure of a day’s travel in the 18th century CE on foot or pack animal; Hanson proposes 18.5 km radius to account for difficult terrain in Asia, and in Paphlagonia the figure is also ideal due to the difficult terrain of the Olgassys.

\textsuperscript{126} Hanson 2011, 236-244.
FIG. 4. TRAVEL RANGE AS INDICATOR OF APPROXIMATE DEGREE OF URBANISATION

18.5 km radius – 1/2 day foot-pack animal travel in 18th Century CE
Hanson 2011, p. 238 fig. 9.4

Red circle represents 18.5 km radius as approx. range of a day’s travel by foot or by pack animal over rugged terrain.

Yellow circle represents 37 radius as approx. range of a day’s travel by foot or by pack animal over normal terrain.
To conclude, Marek’s hypothesis that the Pontic koinon was formed together with the Bithynian koinon when Pompey organised the double province of Pontus-Bithynia seems unlikely due to both the lack of direct evidence that proves the Bithynian koinon existed at that time, and due to the fact that no evidence gives conclusive proof that a Pontic koinon existed at all. It is interesting that Marek himself pointed to a key difference between the two koina in the double province, but did not identify the problem. He writes: “the delegate assemblies were initially expressly Greek assemblies: the Koina of the Hellenes in Bithynia – perhaps modeled upon the older neighboring province of Asia – and its neighbor the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus.”\(^{127}\) The apparent issue not addressed by Marek is that the Hellenes are only mentioned in name for the Bithynian koinon but not for the coastal Paphlagonian. The difference in name is not a small matter in light of Marshall’s argument that the *lex Pompeia* was critical to urbanisation in coastal Paphlagonia. The coastal Paphlagonian koinon did no emphasise ethnic belonging, but rather cities. This emphasis on the urbanity of a region sets the coastal Paphlagonian koinon apart from its Bithynian counterpart. What may have been the case was perhaps a prolonged koinon formation process for both the Bithynian and the coastal Paphlagonian koinon, with the process of the latter particularly protracted due to the composite nature of the ethnic makeup of the eparchia of Pontus, as well as the low degree of urbanity in coastal Paphlagonia. We envision the *lex Pompeia* as the driver of both the process of urbanisation as well as koinon formation for coastal Paphlagonia, for

it provided inclusive mechanisms such as the determination of “eparchic" identity by both paternal and maternal lineage. This eparchic identity may have become in time a functioning common denominator across the cities of coastal Paphlagonia, and the basis for the formation of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon. In short, the Bithynian and the coastal Paphlagonian koina were founded as two separate entities, and had two separate histories, which may become intertwined in the second century CE, when elites from both Bithynia and costal Paphlagonia begin regularly to serve as both Pontarch and Bithyniarch.\(^{128}\)

1.1.5 Summary

A survey of literary, juridical and epigraphical sources indicates that contrasting titles “the Koinon of Hellenes in Bithynia” versus the “Koinon of the Cities in Pontus” represented distinct trajectories of the Bithynian and coastal Paphlagonian experience following the creation of the province of Pontus-Bithynia in 64/3 BCE. The Bithynian cities demonstrated considerable maturity in coordination and mobilisation that made them an important party with whom warring factions would seek to negotiate and secure support. Such ability may have been what Octavian wished to reform. By treating them as Hellenes instead of Bithynians or Asiatics, and by assigning them the privilege or burden of worshipping the emperor’s person, Octavian may have successfully diverted resources

\(^{128}\) IK Prusa ad Olympum 13 ll. 1-3 <Βεθυνι(?)>ἀρχης και Δις Ιερέα | τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ κτλ. IK Prusias ad Hyrium 29 ll.1-4 Αὐρήλιον Χρυσήνιον Δαμάστριον, ὑπαρξάμενον Βεθυνιαρχίας και Πονταρχίας και ἐπιστάτην τῆς πόλεως κτλ. IK Prusias ad Hyrium 17 ll.2-5 Τίτιον Οὔλπιον | Αἰλιανὸν | Παπιανὸν | Βεθυνιαρχίας και Ποντάρχης κτλ. IK Prusias ad Hyrium 53 ll.2-4 Καλλουρίνια Δομιτία Μαρκιανή, θυγάτηρ Μάρκου Δομίτιον | Τουλιανὸν | Βεθυνιαρχίας και Ποντάρχου κτλ. Marek, Kat. Amastris 95 ll. 10-11 Βεθυνιαρχίας και Ποντάρχης τειμηθείς ύπὸ θεοῦ Αντωνείνου κτλ.
and energy that made a difference for warring factions to the ceremonious demonstration of culture and loyalty.

The coastal Paphlagonian cities were absent from the correspondences between warring factions. This absence may be related to the degree of urbanisation, if not also the lack of a common framework of urban cities, making it more difficult for the warring factions to exploit resources. Marshall’s analysis of the *lex Pompeia* convincingly demonstrated that the Pompeian vision for coastal Paphlagonia concerned growth, particularly manpower, and the implication is that coastal Paphlagonia may have been truly lacking in any significant political or financial sway in the triumviral period for Octavian to direct his attention following the battle of Actium. The lack of political and economic significance of this region, and the lack of manpower, makes it less likely that any effort could have been devoted to the organisation of a koinon, be it a Roman project or local venture. It may have required several generations for the novel administrative landscape in coastal Paphlagonia to reach a degree of dynamic interaction. From what we have learned with the Brutus epistles and the Rufus monument, the formation of a koinon would have likely been preceded by some existing connection between cities. It is this developed framework of interconnection that can be taken as the precursor of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus. In section two, we look for further evidence regarding this formative stage.
1.2 Early Koinon Officeholders

We now shift focus to discuss evidence that may shed light on the early phases of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon. To begin, we offer a brief survey of the evidentiary limitations we face. There are thirteen inscriptions that relate to institutions and members partaking in the activities of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon in the imperial period, all of which are Trajanic or later. The best indicators of correlation between an inscription and the coastal Paphlagonian koinon in the imperial period are texts that include 1) the title of the koinon; 2) officers with clear designation as of the koinon, such as High Priest of Pontus or Pontarch. Two inscriptions that invoke the title Koinon of the Cities in Pontus, one from Amastris clearly dating from the Trajanic period,\textsuperscript{129} and the other from Heraclea, dating from the second half of the second century CE, based on the \textit{nomen gentilicum} of the honorand being Aurelius.\textsuperscript{130} There are two types of office that can be securely associated with this koinon, namely the High Priesthood of Pontus, the earliest being attested in the aforementioned Trajanic inscription, and the Pontarchate, the earliest attestation of which is from a funerary inscription of 184 CE,\textsuperscript{131} the latest being 209 CE.\textsuperscript{132}

Some activities of the koinon can be posited, though there is very little information to inform us of the specifics. At Amastris, Tiberius Claudius Lepidus was

\textsuperscript{129} Marek 1993, 160 Kat. Amastris no. 7.

\textsuperscript{130} Jonnes 1994, 6-7 no. 3. We note that Marcus Aurelius Cotta must have had a significant impact on the nomenclature of the double province due to the potential that his clients and freedmen would settle there.

\textsuperscript{131} Marek, Kat. Amastris no. 55.

\textsuperscript{132} Marek, Kat. Amastris no. 95.
High Priest of Pontus and may have led an embassy to Rome in this capacity.\textsuperscript{133} From Sinope, a Pontarch, whose name is now lost, paid for festivities including a bull-fight, a hunt, and a gladiatorial show,\textsuperscript{134} while a boxer who won at the Capitolia is known also to have competed and won at the agones of the Koinon of Pontus.\textsuperscript{135} The inscriptions listed here are all to be discussed in greater detail in the ensuing chapters.

In short, while there is at least some evidence for the koinon’s personnel and activities during the second century CE, no evidence can be securely dated to the first century CE or earlier.\textsuperscript{136} The absence of early evidence has led some scholars to argue that a coastal Paphlagonian koinon did not exist before the reign of Trajan, but it is just as conceivable that this class of second-century CE evidence represented the more active phase of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon.

One issue concerning this absence of pre-Trajanic evidence is that the identification of an officeholder of a koinon is dependent upon specific provincial or ethnic markers, without which there would be considerable ambiguity, given that


\textsuperscript{134} IK Sinope no. 103 ll. 3-8 [... ος γενομενον γυναικα Αρχιερεα του Ποντου] και δε τους Προσπαθειας] και κυνηγεσιον και [μονεμνατοι] κκτλ.

\textsuperscript{135} French 2004, 105-106 no. 105.

\textsuperscript{136} A full discussion on the evidence from Pompeiopolis mentioned in Fourcade 1811, 37-38 is in chapter three. A short excursus here is necessary. Fourcade reported that he saw an inscription concerning a Pontarch at Pompeiopolis. Since Pompeiopolis was part of Pontus-Bithynia before 6/5 BCE, it had been assumed by Marek 2015, 311-312 and Edelmann-Singer 2015, 71 fn. 243 among others that this report may be considered the earliest evidence for the existence of a coastal Paphlagonian koinon in the first century BCE. Yet, Fourcade did not mention this pontarch as having presented games; we merely know that he was honored by Pompeiopolis by setting up an inscription in the most conspicuous place in the gymnasium. The fact that we have individuals 1) from Prusias ad Hypium serving as Pontarch (IK Prusia ad Hypium nos. 13, 17, 29, 53) and 2) from Amastris serving as Bithyniarch (Kat. Amastris 95), as well as 3) a “son of Lesbos” and Lesbarch serving as Pontarch (Marek Kat. Amastris 19), suggests that the Pontarch from Pompeiopolis could have been not from Pontus-Bithynia.
provincial and municipal offices shared many terms. The municipal High Priests in the province of Asia represents one of the clearest examples of the problem of identification.\textsuperscript{137} For coastal Paphlagonia, the confusion is apparent in a list compiled by Christian Marek, which records seven “Oberpriester” of Pontus in inscriptions from Amastris, Heraclea, and Abonuteichos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oberpriester Bithynia</th>
<th>Oberpriester Pontus</th>
<th>Helladarchen, Hellenarchen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. Claudius Lepidus [29]</td>
<td>M. Aurelius Philippianus lason (Severus-Caracalla) [33]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gallus Avitus [30]</td>
<td>M. Domitius Paulianus Falco (Caracalla) [34]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Aurelius Alexandros [13]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aurelius Alexandros S.d. Timotheos (Antonine) [31]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


FIG. 5. MAREK’S LIST OF HIGH PRIESTS IN PONTUS-BITHYNIA

A closer look at the source texts that mention these individuals discloses that Marek’s list of the High Priests of Pontus is comprised of three priesthoods. The first priest listed is Daimenes from Amastris, who held a High Priesthood without specific designation, making it difficult to divine which imperial or local cult was the priesthood’s responsibility. Gallus Avitus from Abonuteichos also held such a title. The second on the list – Gaius Iulius Aquila dated in the reign of Claudius from references in the inscription that also gives his career – held the title ὁ τοῦ ἐπουρανίου Θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ἀρχιερεύς διὰ βίου, with the Latin equivalent Divi Aug. perpetuus sacerdos also inscribed. It is the rest that held the title ἀρχιερεύς τοῦ Ποντοῦ, and only these can be securely associated with

\textsuperscript{137} Frija 2012, 169-173, also the decisive differentiation discussed at 211-212, where Frija pointed out that municipal High Priests from Asiatic cities rarely advanced to the High Priesthood of Asia, because the latter position required much more wealth, as well as an extensive network beyond the city.
the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus. The following is an expanded version of Marek’s dossier for closer examination.

Table 1. Marek’s Dossier of High Priests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SOURCE FINDSPOT</th>
<th>TITLE IN SOURCE</th>
<th>DATE IN SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daimenes</td>
<td>Amasra. In the house of Mustapha in 1933. Fascimile by Kalinka.</td>
<td>Δαιμένου τοῦ τρίς ἀρχιερέως κατὰ τὸ ἔξης καὶ I ἄγωνοθέτου</td>
<td>ἐτους βλρʹ = in the year 132 (Lucullian era) = 62 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus Iulius Aquila</td>
<td>Fragment of a limestone block in a Wall at Amasra. Facimile by Kalinka.</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεά τοῦ I [Π]όντου</td>
<td>ἐτους α[λαβόντα] ἀναλαβόντας τοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος Νεροῦ Τέριον Κλαύδιον Λέπιδον Λεπίδου = 102-115 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus Claudius Lepidus</td>
<td>Limestone block near “Marineschule” in Amasra; facimile by Kalinka</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς τοῦ Πόντου</td>
<td>Τιβέριον Κλαύδιον Λέπιδον Λεπίδου οὗ τὸ ἐτοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος Νεροῦ = Lucian Alexander Lepidus of Amastris = c. 150 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Alexander son of Timotheus</td>
<td>Marble block seen by Kalinka at Eregli?</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεά τοῦ Πόντου</td>
<td>name of honorand assume to be late second century CE or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallus Avitus</td>
<td>Marble block in a corner of a bridge crossing the Awratschai west of Inebolu. Facimile by Kalinka.</td>
<td>δίς ἀρχιερέα</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ ἐτεὶ 274 (Lucullan era) = 204 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Aurelius Alexander</td>
<td>Block in an enclosure wall of a barn at Gökgöz, 70 km southeast of Amasra</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς τοῦ Πόντου</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ ἐτεὶ 279 (Lucullan era) = 209 CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Essentially Marek assumed that all High Priesthoods were provincial. A similar assumption is made by Fernoux with the Bithynian evidence. Fernoux proposes that any High Priesthood or archierosyne is an office of the Koinon,\(^\text{138}\) which stands in contrast to any hierosyne, which would be local priesthoods.\(^\text{139}\) Three examples from the province of Asia show that High Priesthoods could be municipal, indicated by their attributions τῆς πόλεως.\(^\text{140}\) Gabriella Frija further identified 140 municipal High Priests from 81 communities in Asia, whose title was ἀρχιερεύς, some with attributions that designate specific charge, but none specifically marked τῆς Ἀσίας.\(^\text{141}\) The distinction between provincial and municipal High Priesthoods clearly existed during the Augustan period. The koinon High Priesthood would tend to be marked with an attribute τῆς Ἀσίας, and possibly leaving the municipal High Priest without apparent designation, but just as


\(^{139}\) Fernoux 2004, 353-354.

\(^{140}\) Frija 2010 no. 104 = IPergamon 524; Frija 2010 no. 219 = SEG 46.1524; Frija 2010 no. 421 = Ramsay 1891, 643 no. 536.

\(^{141}\) The range of the 140 priests span from as early as 27 BCE to the third century CE, with 33 examples concentrated between 27 BCE to 14 CE.
recognisable for the local audience.\footnote{142} Similar trends can be found from Lycia and Galatia.\footnote{143}

Comparable evidence from Asia, Lycia and Galatia indicates that Marek’s assemblage of “Oberpriester” is suspect. Further differentiation of the different types and sub-types is necessary, less for the purpose of dispelling this generalising approach, than of more clearly identifying the relationship between some earlier High Priesthoods with that of Pontus attested in the second century CE. Controversial High Priesthoods, particularly nos. 1-2 from Amasoris in the first century CE, are discussed in the following sections.

\footnote{142} When supplemented with Friesen 1999, 283-284 on the evolutionary development of the High Priesthood of Asia, Frija’s identification becomes clearer. The term High Priesthood of Asia became a standard title only after Augustus’ death, either under Tiberius or can be as late as 40 CE during the reign of Gaius.

1.2.2 Archiereus from Amastris

The first High Priesthood to be discussed is the simple form, without additional epithet or designation. The single example from Amastris concerns one Daimenes and his sons Parmeniscus and Pharnaces, all of them High Priests of such sort.

The demos bears witness to Parmeniskos and Pharnakes, the sons of thrice chief priest and president of the games Daimenes, as chief priests, commissioners of the grain supply, overseers, and controllers of the market; and the demos pray to Zeus Strategos and Hera, the patron deities of the homeland and protector of the city, that all who become agoranomoi should be the sort of nurturing patrons Parmeniskos and Pharnakes have been. Year 132.

This inscription dates to the year 132 of the Lucullan era, or 62 CE. Marek only included Daimenes in his list of the High Priests of Pontus, but not his sons, perhaps due to his interpretation of the text. The plural dative ἀρχιερεῦσιν is a substantive noun, and not – as Marek may have believed – an adjective modifying υἱοῖς. The career of Daimenes – High Priest three times in succession and agonothete – is bracketed with τοῖς...υἱοῖς: this would already state clearly that the two honorands were sons of a High Priest, and there would be no need to re-emphasise “High Priest-sons of High Priest thrice in succession.” It seems that this reference is for the purpose of pointing to the highlight of the public career of Daimenes, since no municipal office was mentioned, even though one could reasonably assume that he must have served other liturgies of his municipality. Thus ἀρχιερεῦσιν is the first of a string of offices in the dative, agreeing
with Parmeniskos and Pharnakes, followed by the eutheniarchia, the epistateia, and the agoranomia, municipal-level offices concerning the procurement of supplies of food, overseeing construction and regulating trade. There is then the question of what High Priest here really stands for – an office of the municipality of Amastris, or of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus?

To equate the High Priesthood taken up by Daimenes, Parmeniskos and Pharnakes with the High Priesthood of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus would be to assume that the High Priesthood simple was abbreviated in an official document by the *demos*, which runs counter to the apparent effort of this inscribed text to document the exact nature of the offices held by Daimenes and his two sons. Admittedly, common practice indicates that abbreviation was, to a certain degree, allowed. According to Gabrielle Frija’s survey, about 280 titles of the *ἀρχιερεύς* or *ἀρχιερεύς τῶν Σεβαστῶν* types are without specific attribution to indicate whether they are municipal or provincial. Only 20 cases bear attributions such as *ἀρχιερεῖς τῆς πατρίδος* and *ἀρχιερεῖς τῆς πόλεως* that help pin down the municipal nature of a High Priesthood.\(^{144}\) The priesthood of Daimenes and his sons does not contain such clear attribution.

The of Titus Claudius Socrates Sacerdotianus from Thyatire offers a good example for determining the nature of such generic High Priesthood.\(^{145}\) He was advertised as simply High Priest in one short honorific decree issued by the boule and

\(^{144}\) Frija 2012, 71-72.

\(^{145}\) Frija 2012, 72.
demos of Thyateira honoring him,[146] and was again rendered as such in an elaborate honorific inscription generously honoring his son Tiberius Claudius Menogenes Caecilianus (who was High Priest of Asia), as well as his parents Claudius Socrates and Antonia Caecilia (both High Priest and High Priestess of Asia).[147] In a third honorific inscription (also honoring his son) he was styled High Priest of the emperors for life, with the attribution “of Asia” again noticeably missing.[148] The absence of the attribution τῆς Ἀσίᾶς was likely deliberate. We can claim that Sacerdotianus was the municipal High Priest at Thyateira, unlike his son, and unlike his parents.

A case to the contrary is that of Aulus Iulius Quadratus,[149] a prominent citizen of Bergam who was adlected into the senate by Vespasian and served as proconsul and legatus Augusti for several provinces in the Flavian period and during the reign of Trajan.[150] He was designated “High Priest of the temples in Bergamon” in a short text

---


issued by the boule and demos of Pergamum. Whether High Priesthood of the temples in Pergamon was municipal or provincial is difficult to distinguish. Pergamum became twice neokoros in the reign of Trajan, and the reference to Quadratus as High Priest of the temples in Pergamum may reflect the completion of the second temple. This interpretation assumes that the audience in Pergamum and the province of Asia in general would not need the attribution τῆς Ἀσίας to determine whether Quadratus held a provincial or municipal priesthood. Yet the inscription does not contain clear chronological information, and we have only a general sense that the second temple was founded between 114-116 CE. We can certainly assume that Quadratus was the provincial High Priest to the temples in Pergamum, but there are apparent risks.

To return to the case of Daimenes and his two sons: that evidence was an official document issued by the demos suggests that the terminology used would reflect diligence on the issuer’s part in communicating the nature of the office, and the likelihood is that the High Priest simple is municipal, as this office needed no additional clarification to indicate that it was otherwise. There is less risk in identifying Parmeniscus and Pharnaces as Amastrian municipal High Priests sometime before 62 CE, and we can even venture to attribute Daimenes’ High Priesthood to an earlier date, in the reign of Claudius.

It is unclear exactly what the duties of this municipal High Priesthood were, except that the officeholder would be responsible for a temple or altar, and perhaps be in

---

151 *IvP III* 20: [ἡ βουλὴ καὶ] | [ὁ δήμος τῆς μητροῦ] | [πόλεως τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ] | [δίς νε] | [κόκπρο ρ] | [όρος] | [Περγ] | [μν] | [πόλεως] | [έτη] | [Ἀ] | [Πρι] | [Κοναδρ] | [τον] | [ἀ] | [φιλότημ] | [καὶ ἀξίω] | [ναὶ τὸν ἐν Περγ] | 


charge of processions and games, if any, that would be associated with the honoring of emperors and their families. The case for the charge of the High Priesthood to be concerned with emperor worship requires support of specific objects of cult, such as temple or altar, dated to the reign of Nero. A rescue excavation in 1993 at Amastris uncovered four headless statues, among which one over-life-size female, with a preserved height of 180 cm and replicating the “Artemisia” statue type from the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, is of particular interest due to the datable style of her attire. The female figure was dressed in a himation and stola over a gap-sleeved chiton, though the trace of the stola disappears at breast level. Aydin et al. have dated this female statue to no later than the end of the first century CE, following Birgit Scholtz’s study on the stola’s history and its relations with Roman matrona. Scholtz found that the stola was primarily a first-century CE phenomenon closely connected with the conservative marriage laws and concepts of matrimonial fidelity promoted by Augustus and Vespasian (with very limited revival in the policy on marriage of Antonine Pius), but from the reign of Tiberius onwards the obvious limitations on the freedom of movement imposed by the dress have also limited such depictions on statues associated with imperial propaganda. Aydin et al. see the fine quality of the workmanship and the over-life-size scale of the statue as further indicators that this female statue depicted a member of the imperial family, though

154 Otherwise known as the “Orans” type, with which some statues of Livia and Crispina were modeled upon. Alexandridis 2004, no. 33 & 215.

155 Aydin et al. 2015, 226. Aydin et al. claims that there is a strap depicted on the right shoulder of the statue – unfortunately the photo provided in their article does not give a detailed view of it. An amateur photo by Dick Schmitt on the public domain captures the gap-sleeve tunic and the stola from an alternative angle.


they were rightly conservative in not suggesting that this statue might be part of a group associated with the imperial cult.\textsuperscript{157} The statue may be connected to the municipal High Priesthood, either as object or worship or honorific votive.

The three High Priests in the reign of Claudius and Nero are themselves an indication that the imperial cult was already part of the Amastrian municipal magistracy in the Julio-Claudian period. The High Priesthood without any attribution suggests that this office was not part of the koinon magistracy, according to comparable examples from Bithynia, Asia and elsewhere. The successive attainment of this office by Deimenes and his sons, hints at a degree of hereditary control of the imperial cult by powerful local dignitaries. It is unclear how long Daimenes’ successors were able to maintain control of the municipal imperial cult, and it is also uncertain whether this cult would continue to thrive in the second century CE, as this office disappears in the Amastrian epigraphic record. Nor do we know whether the High Priesthood simple would have continued at Amastris, or was superseded by a High Priesthood that focused on the worship of Divus Augustus. This latter cult, dedicated to Divus Augustus, will be introduced in the next section as possibly the precursor to the koinon High Priesthood in the Trajanic period and later, due to its regionalising tendencies.

1.2.3 \textit{Perpetuus Sacerdos Divi Augusti} and the Aquila Monuments

In this section we discuss the remains of a rupestral sculpture group associated with the cults of Theos Hypsistos Helios and Divus Augustus, and the High Priest that

\textsuperscript{157} Aydin et al. 2015, 228.
created it. The sculpture group is commonly referred to as “Kuş kayası Yol Anıtı” or Bird-rock roadside monument. For our purposes we call these the Aquila Monuments, since an inscription found among the sculptures inform us that it was Gaius Iulius Aquila, the permanent High Priest of Divus Augustus (*perpetuus Sacerdos Divi Augusti*), who cut through the mountains and paved the road that lies between modern Amasra and Bartin. The monument group that Aquila carved out seems to be a ceremonial space for an assimilated imperial cult that had a regional rather than an urban following. We begin with a brief overview of the various elements of the Aquila Monuments, followed by a closer look at the priesthood held by Aquila and the possibility of its being a position of regional significance.

1.2.3.1 The Passageway as Monument

Aquila’s dedication of his work in cutting through the mountain and paving the road to Claudius is advertised in a bilingual inscription located along the southwest section of the pass:

```
perpetuus sacer|dos C(aius) Iulius [Aquila pr]aef(ectus) fabr(um) bis in aerar(ium) 
delatus | a co(n)s(ulibus) A(ulo) Gabin[i]o [Secundo Ta]uro Statilio Corvino mon||
tem cecidit e[t viam – – – ]essionem d(e) s(uis) p(ecuniam) f(ecerit). | vacat | ύπέρ 
βίου? Γάιος] Ἀκυίλας ἔπαρχος || δίς εἰς τὸ αἱρ[έον ἀναφερόμενον]ος ὑπὸ ὑπάτων 
Τοῦ Γα[μένιον Σεκοῦνδου καὶ Ταύρου Στα]τειλίου Κορούνου τὸν λόφον | 
κόψας τὴν ὁδ[ὸν - - - - - - - - -]ον ἐκ τῶν ιδίων ὑπαρχόντων | ἐποίησεν.
```

On account of the Augustan peace, in honor of Tiberius Claudius Germanicus Caesar Augustus, the permanent (high)-priest of (Epouranios) Divus Augustus, Gaius Iulius Aquila, registered twice at the aerarium as praefectus fabrum by the
The inscription was more than to tout Aquila’s generous effort in creating a mountain pass. In dedicating his work to Claudius, Aquila was made public a privately funded venture. Aquila’s was not a consular or praetorian road. It is more appropriately described as a “local road” that linked village to village (\textit{uia uicinalis}),\textsuperscript{158} or a public road in the sense that it connected a consular road to a settlement.\textsuperscript{159} This passage was still in use in the 19th century by travellers, as the terrain along the shores west of Amasra made passage prohibitive.\textsuperscript{160}

\textsuperscript{158} \textit{Dig.} 43.8.20-23, es 43.8.22: uiarum quaedam publicae sunt, quaedam priuatae, quaedam uicinales. Publicae uias dicimus, quae Graeci βασιλικάς, nostri praetorias, alii consulares uias appellant. Priuatae sunt, quas agrarias quidam dicunt. Uicinales sunt uiae, quae in uiciis sunt uel quae in uicos ducunt: has quoque publicas esse quidam dicunt: quod ita uerum est, si non excollatione priuatarum hoc iter constitutum est. \[Some roads are public, some private, some local. We mean by public roads what the Greeks call royal, and our people, praetorian or consular roads. Private roads are what some call agrarian roads. Local roads are those that are in villages or lead to villages. These some call public, which is true, provided that they have not been established by the contribution of land by private persons. (Trans. Watson)\]

\textsuperscript{159} \textit{Dig.} 43.8.23 has ergo, quae post ocnusalarem exiciunt in uiillas uel in alias colonias ducentes, putem etiam ipsas publicas esse. \[these roads which are entered from the consular road and lead to farmhouses or other settlements I should think are public also. (Trans. Watson)\]

\textsuperscript{160} Eyice 1955, 109-110.
Aquila’s dedication of this road to the honor of Claudius was likely not simply words but deed: Eyice reports that the bilingual inscription is associated with a gabled aedicula flanked by two columns, though he did not interpret this as a shrine dedicated to the emperor.\textsuperscript{161} Aquila’s dedicatory act is the creation of a cultic space, in the form of a roadside imperial shrine. The dedication may have also been critical to the later evolution of the passage into a ceremonial space, where the accumulative advertisement of

\textsuperscript{161} Eyice 1955, 110.
benefactions to imperial and local cults multiplied its potential influence and possible functions.

Eyice observed the existence of a staircase leading down the slopes of the ceremonial passageway, and he pointed out that it remains uncertain whether this staircase was in fact the road leading to the small harbor town of Tarlaağzi.\textsuperscript{162} If we also consider Gömü, another community sitting between Amasra and Tarlaağzi, to have been connected by a direct route to this passageway, the ceremonial space would have served an important intersection and potential gathering space for several communities on the northern side of the Olgassys range.

1.2.3.2 The Sculptural Monuments

The Aquila Monuments consist of a togate figure within an arcuating niche (c. 1.85 m in height, 1.10 m in width and 0.5 m deep) that is situated atop a podium (c. 1.50 in height); the podium and niche are flanked by a column (1.87 m in height) on top of a pedestal (1.50 m in height), with a perched eagle grasping an ornate feather.\textsuperscript{163} All elements are carved out of the rockface along a paved mountain pass with a width between 2-5 meters, facing north, with a clear view of Amastris and the Black Sea. The watercolor was created by Jules Laurens in July of 1847 while he accompanied

\textsuperscript{162} Eyice 1955, 111.

\textsuperscript{163} Eyice 1955, 110-112.
Hommaire de Hell on his voyage through Anatolia, and the photos taken by Marek in 1993 provide additional visual reference.\(^{164}\)

\(^{164}\) Hommaire de Hell 1860, 46-47, comments on the geological aspect of the stone face in which the monument was carved, without commenting on the monument itself. Jules Laurens, “Tête de voie romaine en Bithynie, Amassarah (Turquie d’Asie),” https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Laurens_-_tête_de_voie_romaine.jpg, shows the monument relatively intact in 1847; later the stone facing with moulding below the niche was destroyed.
Laurens’ watercolor makes the togate figure’s “arm-sling” pose apparent, with the crooked right arm pulling up the cloth and holding it in place beneath the neck, and the detailed rendering of the garment that has now become too deteriorated would have been impressive to the viewer looking from below. Eyice notes that both later photos and Lauren’s watercolor confirm that the head of the togate figure was not sculpted from the rock face, but rather installed through a dowel hole to the neck. This feature suggests the portraiture was carefully designed for verisimilitude, or made in such a way that the

165 Stone 1994, 16
166 Eyice 1955, 112.
monument anticipated periodic changes to the portrait head but not the rest of the body. An inscribed tabula ansata above the niche offers some context for the niched togate, but considerable damage due to weathering has left only enough letters from the first four lines for the restoring of the preamble. The restoration by Kalinka was carried out using the inscribed tabula ansata to the right of the monument along the passageway to Bartin, mentioned earlier as the inscription that dedicated the road to Claudius. Kalinka identified a four-bar sigma in line 11, and line 13 may have a trace of a lambda, suggesting that the rest of the text may have been Greek.

FIG. 9. SKETCH AND LOCATION OF TABULA ANSATA ABOVE AQUILA MONUMENT NICHE

167 Kalinka 1993, 64-65 no. 13.

168 Kalinka 1933, 64. The facsimile is not reproduced by Marek in photo nor in transcription.
Implicit in the preamble, as expressed with the nominative and the accusative cases, is that a High Priest with the title ὁ τοῦ ἐπουρανίου θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ἄρχιερεύς was the dedicant, who performed an action – such as the commission of the niched togate figure – to honor Claudius. The straightforward interpretation of this dedicant-honorand relationship would be that the togate figure was Claudius himself. While sharing the preamble, the two *tabulae ansatae* may have been very different in content. The bilingual text dedicated the cutting and paving of the passageway to Claudius, and this could not have been the same text in the *tabula ansata* above the niche. Furthermore, Kalinka’s observation of the Greek letters in the second half of this heavily damaged inscription implies that the inscribed text must have been entirely Greek. It would be reasonable to assume that Gaius Iulius Aquila made the two dedications to Claudius.

The dedications to Claudius is somewhat peculiar, considering that Aquila’s cult was specifically dedicated to Divus Augustus. This cult was likely founded during the Augustan period or shortly afterwards, and it may be connected with the Augustan settlement of 27 BCE. The Augustan settlement of 27 BCE formally defined the double province of Pontus-Bithynia as a praetorial province held by the Roman Senate, and the contours given by Strabo include Bithynia, the Propontis, and “certain parts of Pontus” (Πόντου τινῶν μερῶν). Perhaps the cult to Augustus was responding to this event, and upon Augustus’ deification the cult became dedicated to Divus Augustus. The

---

169 In this case, the removable head is both an indication of carefully sculpted portraiture, as well as leaving open the monument’s potential for reuse. Reusing imperial statuary did carry some degree of risk based on anecdotes from Suetonius, Suet. *Tib.* 58; on the examples of imperial statuary reuse, Blanck 1969, 65-94 discusses several examples (p. 86 B 44; p. 88 B 54; p. 90, B 63). Marek 1993, 92, interpreted the togate figure as the High Priest and equestrian Gaius Iulius Aquila, though the inscription above the statuary specifically honoring Claudius makes this identification difficult.
dedications to Claudius may be understood as a new direction of emperor worship that Aquila initiated during his service as perpetuus sacerdos of the cult. The significance of perpetuus is debated. The epithet perpetuus and its equivalent διὰ βίου are attested widely in both the Latin West and the Greek East as bestowed upon magistrates of both municipal and provincial posts.\textsuperscript{170} The epithet perpetuus was likely an indication of exclusivity, since only a very small number of magistrates who can be referred to as perpetuus. In cases from the Iberian peninsula, Robert Étienne suggested that the ordo decurionum may have had the right to assign honorary status to a previous flamen upon the election of a new one.\textsuperscript{171} More generally, perpetuus could be an honorary title commending an office holder who has concluded his service, or a designation that makes an individual’s tenure of an office permanent.\textsuperscript{172} The permanent status seems the more appropriate interpretation for the dedicant of the Aquila monuments, as it seems counterintuitive for the same dedicant to make two epigraphic dedications to the same emperor for the same occasion, when one longer text would have sufficed. A prolonged

\textsuperscript{170} In Bithynia alone, there are nine types of municipal magistracies and priesthoods that were awarded with the epithet. \textit{IK Apameia (Bith.) u. Pylai} 114, ll. 4-5: . . . γυμνασιαρχον διὰ | βιου κτλ.; \textit{IK Iznik} 61, l. 13 . . . | [κ]διοδοῦντος διὰ βιου Αυρ. Στεφάνου; \textit{IK Iznik} no. 62, ll. 9-10: | ἐκδικοῦντος | διὰ βιου Μ. Αὐρ. | Ἐκκλησίου κτλ.; \textit{IK Prusa ad Olympium} no. 13, ll. 5-6: λογισθη|ν| | διὰ βιου κτλ.; \textit{IK Prusias ad Hypium} no. 49, l. 6: | καὶ γνώβουλον| διὰ| βιου|ν|; \textit{IK Prusias ad Hypium} no. 31, ll. 8-9: | ὑστερὸς τῆς κόμης διὰ βιου; \textit{IK Prusias ad Hypium} no. 10, ll. 3-4: | πολειτογραφον | διὰ| βιου; \textit{IK Prusias ad Hypium} no. 17, ll. 11-12: | ἱερεά | διὰ| βιου τοῦ Σωτῆρος Ἀσκληπιοῦ; \textit{IK Prusias ad Hypium} no. 11, ll. 2-3 ἄρχωντα| ἑν τῇ | πατρίδι τῶν | τῆς | πορφύρας σχήματι | καὶ | διὰ | | [β]ιου. \textit{IK Iznik} no. 61: [ἡ γερουσία — — —] | Ὀνησίμου | | Ὀνησίμου, τὸν ἀγαθὸν, ἀρχηγοὶ ἀντικειμένη καὶ γυμνασιαρχῆς, ἐνδέχεται ἐνδόξους καὶ ἐστιάζοντα τὸ συνέδριον μεγαλοπρεπὸς καὶ δόγματα διαδέχεται καθαρὸς γενσαραγγήτη ἀτέκλιτας τίμης καὶ ἀρξαντῆρα τὴν μεγίστην ἀρχήν ἐπὶ ἄρχοντα | | Ἀριστοτέλην | Ἀριστοτέλην | Ἀριστοτέλην | καὶ Παυλεινιανός Ἰακώβου, | | [γ]ραμματεύσιντος | Ἀυρ. | Συμφόρου, | | [κ]διοδοῦντος | διὰ | βιου Αυρ. Στεφάνου.

\textsuperscript{171} Étienne 1958, 237. This position has been cited by Fishwick 2002b, 30 fn. 49; Liertz 1998, 38 as the basis for their respective interpretations concerning the flamines perpetui.

\textsuperscript{172} Ameling 1984, 66. Fernoux stipulates that he was also awarded the epithet διὰ βιου to his magistracy and his membership in the Koinon assembly (κοινόβουλον διὰ βιου) by the authorities of Prusias ad Hypium for securing the emperor’s permission to establish a penteteric games in the emperor’s honor. Fernoux 2004, 357-358.
tenure for Aquila, during which time he made separate dedications along the passageway, could explain the repeated dedications to Claudius. We find, therefore, that Aquila’s High Priesthood was different from the High Priesthood held by Daimenes and his sons, which did not have a precisely defined deity of worship, and nor the permanent status that Aquila held.

Another aspect separating the priesthoods of Aquila and Daimenes and his sons lies in the Greek title of Aquila’s priesthood: *epouranios* lacks a corresponding word in the Latin title. The expression *epouranios* in combination with Augustus is rare, with only one other precedent at Erythrai, where “the *demos* (made a dedication) to Gaius Iulius Augustus Caesar *theos epouranios*.”¹⁷³ The connection between *epouranios* and Zeus Hypsistos, on the other hand, is common, and further associations can be made with Zeus Epouranios (*Δίος Ἐπουρανίος*) from Nicaea¹⁷⁴ and Egypt.¹⁷⁵ The column with the perched eagle flanking the niched togate figure becomes in this context relevant. Eagles are commonly found associated with dedications to Theos Hypsistos,¹⁷⁶ and it is therefore not surprising to find a dedication to this cult on the column pedestal. Laurens depicted several letters on the inscribed pedestal. Kalinka’s sketch and transcription offer a clear reading of the first two lines, indicating that it was a dedicatory inscription to Theos

---

¹⁷³ Erythrai 63: ὁ δῆμος Ἡσυχίου Σεθαστῶν Καίσαρι Ἀπολλόθιος Ἰσιδοροῦ.  
¹⁷⁴ IK Iznik 1115 Διὶ Ἐπουρανίῳ κατά ἐπιταγήν, 3rd century CE. IK Iznik 1114 Αριστοκράτης καὶ Ἀπολλόθιος Ἰσιδοροῦ.  
¹⁷⁵ SB 1.4166 Ζεύς Ἐπουράνιος. To be distinguished from Theos Hypsistos in an inscription concerning the construction of a prayer house found in Galatia. *RECAM* II 209Β ὁ μεγάλῳ Ἐπουρανίῳ καὶ Τοῖς ἀνέγειροι καὶ τῇ προσκυνητῇ αὐτοῦ προσευχῇ τῇ ὑδαίρᾳ γείνεται; late 2nd to 3rd century CE. Sheppard 1981, 96. Other less specific uses include IK Anazarbos 75 & 135 θεὸς Ἐπουράνιος; *IGR* III 1444 πάντας Ἐπουρανίους.  
Hypsistos Helios the listener.\textsuperscript{177} The cult of Theos Hypsistos Helios is attested at Pergamum and Alexandria and associated with open-air sanctuaries and the worship of the upper air of heaven and the sun,\textsuperscript{178} and here, in this ceremonial passageway, open-air dedications could also have taken place at an altar that is no longer present.

\textbf{FIG. 10. SKETCH OF THEOS HYPSISTOS EPEKOOS HELIOS INSCRIPTION}

The presence of dedicatory monuments to the cult of Theos Hypsistos Helios in a space primarily dedicated to Claudius suggests the possibility of an assimilated imperial cult, and Aquila’s priesthood may reflect this assimilation. It is unclear what relationship this cult has with Amastris but, as attested in the inscription honoring the sons of the High Priest Daimenes,\textsuperscript{179} the principal patron deities of Amastris were Zeus Strategos and Hera, suggesting that the cult here was perhaps local, or that Aquila deliberately introduced it to expand the audience and scope of his High Priesthood, if not to regionalise the imperial cult under his purview. Possibly, the syncretistic imperial cult

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{theos_hypsistos_epekoos_helios_inscription}
\caption{Sketch of Theos Hypsistos Epekoos Helios inscription.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{177} Kalinka 1993, 64-65 no. 13. Eyice noticed that a cross was carved onto the top of the column, and assumed that the dedicatory inscription may have been, like the cross, inscribed later, we could disassociate the cross and the inscription on good grounds.

\textsuperscript{178} Mitchell 1999, 91.

\textsuperscript{179} Kat. Amastris no. 3 ll. 10-12 ὁ δήμος . . . εὐχεται Δίῳ Στρατηγῷ | καὶ Ἡρᾳ τοῖς πατρίοις θεοῖς κτλ.
was established in the context of the administering of the imperial oath, such as the so-called Oath of Gangra from Vezirköprü, administered at the sebasteion in Gangra of the province of (Inner) Paphlagonia.180 This oath, dated to 3/2 BCE, includes clear instructions on where the oath-taking must be administered and to whom.181 There are specific locations such as the sebasteia at Gangra and Neapolis, but also the general reference to the chora in the province of Paphlagonia which is unique among the corpus of extant imperial period oaths, as they are mostly municipal instead of regional or provincial.182 The design of the oath is to have all parties taking it to feel compelled to be bound by the loyalty that they themselves speak of, by divine retribution over their person, their property, and their descendants. Hence the oath-taker swore to specific deities that were invoked in the oath – Zeus, Ge, Helios, and all male and female deities – that preceded Augustus.183 The three θεοὶ ὁρκοῦ184 expressly named may not have been “local” deities in particular, but a conventional sequence common in Asia Minor since the

180 Sørensen 2015, 16-20 gives a revised measurement, text and commentary based on his own autopsy as well as the drawing and transcription in Anderson et al., 1910, no. 67.

181 ll. 4-7 ὅπως ὁ τελεσθ[είς] ὑπὸ τῶν Παφλαγονίων καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ἑνών παῖς αὐτῶν ῥᾷ 

182 Herrmann 1968, 90-110 esp. 96-97 offers a close study of the oath in comparison with others in the Augustan period.


184 Herrmann 1968, 9 fn. 1.
Hellenistic period. It is not pure coincidence for Helios to have appeared in the proper expression of loyalty to emperors in the example of Gangra, and for the Theos Hypsistos Helios cult to have appeared in an inscription describing one dedication of the Aquila Monuments in honor of Claudius. Aquila may have intended to promote an oath-binding god of common currency with a ceremonial space strongly associated with the imperial cult under his purview, though the absence of an altar makes this connection difficult to establish.

Did Aquila inherit this cult, or did he create it? What did he intend to accomplish by creating a ceremonial space for this cult? It is necessary to place the Aquila Monuments in the context of Aquila’s career. We examine in the next section the literary and epigraphic sources that have been associated with Aquila in earlier scholarship.

1.2.3.3 Gaius Iulius Aquila

We learn from the bilingual text that Gaius Iulius Aquila was twice praefectus fabrum. This was an equestrian post that shifted away from “some sort of general aides-

---

185 Mitford 1960, 77. Cf. treaty between Iasos, mercenary commanders and Ptolemy I dated to 309-304 BCE, Iasos 83 ll. 35-36 ὁμνύω Δία Γῆν Ἡλιον Ποσειδῶ Ἀπόλλω Δήμητρα | [Γ]ρη Ἀθηναὶ Ἀρείαι θεοὺς πάντας καὶ πάσας καὶ τὴν Τωροπόλον. The same formula in lines 43-44, 48-49, 53-54, also in the oaths of Aristoboulos and Asklepiodotos to the boule and demos of Iasos between 304-282 BCE, Iasos 95 ll. 11-12, Iasos 96 ll. 22-23, as well as in the oaths sworn by Paramonos of the armed forces to Eumenes I in exchange for the king’s concessions, found at Pergamon (c. 261 BCE) OGIS 266 ll. 23-25; In treaty between Smyrna and Magnesia (245-243 BCE), the ὅρκοι θεοί expands to include the Sipylene Mother, and Apollo in Pandoi as well as the τύχη of Seleucus at lines 60-61 and 70-71: ὁμνύω Δία, Γῆν, Ἡλιον, Ἀρη, Ἀθηναὶ Ἀρείαι καὶ τὴν Τωροπόλον καὶ τῇ[μ] Μητέρα τῆς Σιπυλῆς καὶ Ἀπόλλω τὸν ἐμ Πάνδοις καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς πάντας καὶ πάσας καὶ τὴν τῶν βασιλέως Σελεύκου τύχην; Sarah Connolly argues that many oaths were designed to seek maximum inclusivity with phrases such as “and all the gods and goddesses” or “I swear by all the gods,” in hopes to “undermine any local distinctions expressed by the choice of particular gods.” Connolly 2007, 204-205. We see the same arrangement in the oaths of Palaipaphos and Assos, while at Aritium Iuppiter Optimus Maximus is named with Divus Augustus along with other unnamed gods. Herrmann 1968, 122-129. Assos ll. 19-20: ὁμνύμεν Δία Σωτῆρα καὶ θεον Κυίσαρον Σεβαστόν καὶ τη || πάτριοι ἀγαθὴν Παρθένον; Aritium ll. 5, 14-15: ex mei animi sententia . . . Iuppiter Optimus Maximus ac | Divus Augustus ceterique omnes di immortales etc.
de-camp” of military commanders in the late Republican period to become “a lower assignment for an equestrian cursus honorum” in the early principate, and was “attached to a consul or proconsul/propraetor whose confidence he obviously deserved and enjoyed.”

Dobson found a trend during the reign of Claudius in which equestrians were appointed praefectus fabrum before their military service, since the number of senior equestrians appointed to this post decreased in the available record. As for the procedure of registering at the aerarium (delatio ad aerarium), it is for a holder of imperium at Rome or in a province to register an equestrian for carrying out some duty of his designation in order to regularise the equestrian’s position and pay. The phrase praefectus fabrum bis in aerarium delatus a consulis etc. would then indicate that Aquila was first registered to the aerarium by Aulus Gabinius Secundus, who attained the suffect consulship in 44 CE, and was then again registered by the consul ordinarius Titus Statilius Taurus Corvinus in 45 CE.

Assessing these indications, Aquila may just have embarked upon an equestrian career and secured the confidence or at least support of Statilius Corvinus, and at a time when this distinguished senatorial family gained considerable favor from Claudius, with

---

187 Dobson 1966, 77-78.
188 Millar 2004, 83; Saddington 1985, 541.
190 Degrassi 1952, 12-13. On Aulus Gabinius Secundus, “‘shortly before 45 CE.” The rationale is that, since Gabinius Secundus is listed before Statilius Corvinus, and with the latter being consul designate for 45 CE, and the consul designates not being Gabinius Secundus, Gabinius Secundus must have been consul suffect sometime in the later months of 44 CE. So Saddington 1985, 537.
Covrinus’ brother already consul ordinarius the year before.\footnote{Degrassi 1952, 12.} We also know that Statilius Corvinus was implicated, along with Asinius Gallus, in the conspiracy of 46 CE to overthrow Claudius.\footnote{Suet. Claud. 13.2.} Asinius Gallus was banished,\footnote{Dio Cass. 60.27.5.} while the fate of Statilius Corvinus is unknown.\footnote{Barrett 1996, 118 assumes that Statilius Corvinus was executed.} If Aquila was praefectus fabrum under Statilius Corvinus, the downfall of this consul and his appearance near Amastris after 45 CE may indicate a derailed equestrian career followed by a return to Amastris, with perhaps an urgent need to demonstrate his loyalty to Claudius in a conspicuous fashion through the taking up of the High Priesthood of Divus Augustus, or potentially having created the position, considering his permanent tenure of it.

Aquila’s need to demonstrate his loyalty may be comparable with that of the Euryclids of Sparta.\footnote{Spawforth 2002, 100-103.} We learn from Strabo that Gaius Iulius Eurycles and Laco relied upon their close relationship with emperors in order to retain their “rule” and their position as hegemon over the Spartans.\footnote{Spawforth 2002, 100-103.} In an unflattering passage concerning Eurycles, Josephus accused him of maliciously stirring up factional strife in Herod’s court and profiting from the king’s generosity, before returning to Sparta and abusing the Peloponnese with the king’s gift as well as his friendship with Augustus, eventually...
ending in exile.197 Strabo informs us that his son Laco was much more careful with his own powers and ties to the imperial household,198 and an inscription found in Corinth reports that he took up the priestly office of *flamen Augusti*.199 Gaius Iulius Spartiaticus, entering into the equestrian order under Claudius and later became procurator to Nero and Agrippina, apparently continued this formal relationship by taking up the office of *archiereus domus Augustae in perpetuum*.200 Duncan Fishwick has proposed that Spartiaticus was in fact *archiereus domus Aug. [in]perpetuum primus Achaeon*: “the first to be chosen by the koinon of Achaeans as High Priest in perpetuum of the Imperial

197 J. BJ 1.26.4 Ἀλλὰ καίτοι τοὺς ἔλεγχους εὐρίσκον παρασκευάζει τοὺς ύπαι ἑκάστες τηρεῖν, ἐτι μέντοι λεγόμενοι, τὸν δὲ λοιμῶν τῆς οἰκίας καὶ δραματουργοῦν ὄλον τοῦ μύσας Ἑλευκλέα συστῆρα καὶ εὐφρεντὴν καλῶν πενηθέοντα δωρεῖται ταλάντος. ὅ δὲ τὸν ἁριβῆ φήμην φιάσας εἰς Καππαδοκίαν ἀργυρίζεται καὶ παρὰ Ἀρχελάος, τολμήσας εἰπεῖν ὅτι καὶ διαλαξάειν Ἡρόδην Ἀλεξάνδρον. διάρας δ᾽ εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα τοὺς ἐκ κακῶν κτήθεσιν εἰς ὑμεῖς κατηχησάτω: δὲ γοῦν ἐπὶ Καίσαρος κατηγορηθεὶς ἐπὶ τὸ στάσεως ἐμπλήσῃ τὴν Ἀχαίαν καὶ περὶ δεῦ εὐθαγεῖται. κάκεινον μὲν οὐκ ἡ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Αρετοβουλοῦ ποιής περιῆλθέν. [However, although Herod found the proofs too weak, he gave order to have his sons kept in custody; for till now they had been at liberty. He also called that pest of his family, and forger of all this vile accusation, Eurycles, his savior and benefactor, and gave him a reward of fifty talents. Upon which he prevented any accurate accounts that could come of what he had done, by going immediately into Cappadocia, and there he got money of Archelao, having the impudence to pretend that he had reconciled Herod to Alexander. He thence passed over into Greece, and used what he had thus wickedly gotten to the like wicked purposes. Accordingly, he was twice accused before Caesar, that he had filled Achaia with sedition, and had plundered its cities; and so he was sent into banishment. And thus was he punished for what wicked actions he had been guilty of about Aristobulus and Alexander. (Trans. Thackeray)]

198 Strab. 8.5.5 νεώστι δ᾽ Ἑλευκλῆς αὐτοῦ ἐπήραξε δόξας ἀποχρησάσθαι τῇ Καίσαρος φιλία πέρα τοῦ μετρίου πρὸς τὴν ἐπιστασίαν αὐτῶν, ἐπακούσα δ᾽ ἡ ἀριθή ταχέως, ἔκεινον μὲν παραχωρήσαντος εἰς τὸ χρεόν, τοῦ δ᾽ ύπο τῆς φιλίας ἀπετραμμένοι τῆν τοιαύτην πάσαν: συνέβη δὲ καὶ τοῖς Ἐλευθερολάκωνας λαβεῖν τινὰ τάξιν πολιτείας, ἐπειδὴ Ρομαιοὶ προσέθησαν πρῶτοι οἱ περίποιοι τυραννουμένης τῆς Σπάρτης, οἱ τὸ ἄλλοι καὶ οἱ Ἐλλοτες. [But recently Eurycles stirred up trouble among them, having apparently abused the friendship of Caesar unduly in order to maintain his authority over his subjects; but the trouble quickly came to an end, Eurycles retiring to his fate, and his son being averse to any friendship of this kind. And it also came to pass that the Eleuthero-Lacones got a kind of republican constitution, since the Perioeci and also the Helots, at the time when Sparta was under the rule of tyrants, were the first to attach themselves to the Romans. (Trans. Jones)]

199 Taylor & West 1926, 390-392 Ti. Claudi(i) Caesar(is) Aug(usti) Germanici procuratori C. Iulio, C. f(ilio), Fab(a) Tribu, Laconi, augur(i), agnothet(ae) Isthm/ion) et Caesareon, Ilvir(o) quinq(uennali), cur(ioni), fla(mini) Aug(usti) Cydichus Simonis Thisbeus b(ene) m(erenti).

200 Corinth 8.2 no. 68 ll. 1-2 & 8-9: C(aio) Iulio Laconis f(ilio) | Euryclus n(epoti) Fab(ia) Spartiat[ic]. . . archier Domus Aug(ustae) | [in] perpetuum, etc, an umbrella term for a variety of his titles in Greek attested in Corinth, Sparta, and Athens. Fishwick 1991, 425. From Corinth, ἀρχιερεύς τοῦ ὅπω τῶν Ἡλευκλίτων; IG III 1085; from Sparta, ἀρχιερεύς τῶν Σεβαστῶν, IG V.1 463. from Athens ἀρχιερεύς θεῶν Σεβαστῶν καὶ γένους Σεβαστῶν, IG II² 3538 II. 2-4.
What the three generations of Euryclids have demonstrated is that their social and political power rested with the demonstration of their loyalty to the emperor through taking up leadership positions in the imperial cults, and Spartiaticus may even have created a High Priesthood of regional significance that has previously been unattested in the Peloponnese or Mainland Greece. In this sense, Spartiaticus not only displayed his loyalty of acquiescence, but exerted his influence through the creation of an imperial cult that had a wider scope of worship than a *flamen* or *sacerdos Augusti*: now, his scope was to include members of the imperial household, and hence an even wider audience.

Returning to Aquila, it is possible that the assimilated cult of (epouranios) Divus Augustus demonstrated such ambition as well: it is not specifically an office of the koinon, but the assimilation suggests the desire to engage a wider audience, rather than only inhabitants of Amastris proper. Aquila’s actions likely led to a positive outcome on his later career. We learn from an inscription found in the territory of Nicaea that Gaius Iulius Aquila carried out road maintenance duties as Nero’s procurator in 58 CE. It is also likely that one of his descendants, Titus Iulius Aquila – whose philotimia was derived from his ancestors (ἐκ προγόνων) – attained the High Priesthood of Pontus during the reign of Trajan. This connection is to be further explored in the second chapter.

---


1.2.3.4 Contextualising the Aquila Monuments

It is tempting to consider the possibility that Aquila's permanent High Priesthood eventually evolved to become the High Priesthood held by his Trajanic descendant. No evidence supports this, but Gaius Iulius Aquila clearly left a mark with the ceremonial space connecting Amastris to the western cities of coastal Paphlagonia that was likely to have a prolonged impact on the prestige of the imperial cult under Aquila’s purview.

The assimilated cult of Divus Augustus and Theos Hypsistos Helios may be understood in the context of the preambles from the two tabulae ansatae: pro pace Augusti and ὑπὲρ τῆς Σεβαστῆς εἰρήνης. Such invocation of Augustan peace is relatively rare, and can be found in association with the Ara Pacis,203 as well as a general declaration of peace across the empire following an imperial victory.204 In Pontus, Tacitus reported an uprising led by a dethroned king Mithridates of the Bosporan kingdom that was suppressed in 49 CE, four years after Aquila attained the position of praefectus fabrum from Statilius Corvinus.205 Mithridates was originally conferred with the kingdom

---

203 In Kaikos from Aiolian Mysia, an inscription by the people of Kaisareia Myrina gave dedication to Augustus “on account of Augustan peace.” The dedication is to “divine” imperator Caesar Augustus “son of god” (Αὐτοκράτορι Καίσαρι θεῷ, ὑιῷ θεοῦ, Σεβαστῷ). The direct temporal reference is likely the Augustan peace of 9 BCE when the Ara Pacis was dedicated. *MousBiblSmur* II.1 1875-1876, 16 no. 13.

204 Another case for comparison is a pair of inscriptions found in Gerasa of the Decapolis in the Transjordan. Gerasa 45 = OGIS 621 & Gerasa 46 = BASOR 45 (1932) 6.3 Gerasa 46: ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ ἔτους θκʹ ὑπὲρ | τῆς Σεβαστῆς Εἰρήνης ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀπολλωνίου Ηφαιστίου ἱερᾶς ἡμείσθαι τοῖς προέδρους | [καὶ . . . . . . οὐ] Δηµητρίου δεκαµαρίτου | [ . . . . . . Πολεµίων καὶ Αντιόχου Αριστονόσ] | [ἀρχαίων καὶ Ξέρξου Χαρέου γραμ]. The preamble of the inscriptions is the civic era plus ὑπὲρ | τῆς Σεβαστῆς Εἰρήνης, hence can be specifically dated to 66 CE, when Roman forces and allied principalties led by Corbuló forced the Armenian-Parthian alliance into an war of attrition, and finally led to the capitulation of the Armenian king Tiridates. Dio 63.1-6; Tac. *Ann.* 15.28-31; he closed the doors of the temple of Janus, as if no war was left: Suet. *Nero* 13, Ianum geminum clausit, tamquam nullo residuo bello.

in 38/39 CE,\(^{206}\) then removed in 44/45 CE by his brother Cotys with the help of Aulus Didius Gallus, legatus Augusti of Moesia at the time. Mithridates responded with an uprising following Didius Gallus’ departure.\(^{207}\) According to Tacitus, Gaius Iulius Aquila\(^{208}\) was left behind by Didius Gallus to accompany Cotys, and together they mobilised and deployed both the Aorsi cavalry and the Roman-style Bosporan troops with great success.\(^{209}\) Aquila was awarded praetorian decorations (praetoria insignia), while the “procurator of Pontus” Iunius Cilo, who was in charge of transferring Mithridates to Rome, was awarded consular decorations.\(^{210}\)

\(^{206}\) Dio Cass. 60.8.

\(^{207}\) Tac. Ann. 12.15 at Mithridates Bosporanorum amissis opibus uagus, postquam Didium ducem Romanum roburque exercitus abisse cognoverat, refectos in nouo regno Cotyn iuuenta rudem et paucas cohortium cum Iulio Aquila equite Romano, spretis utrisque concire nationes, inlicere perfugas; postremo exercitu coacto regem Dandaridarum exturbat imperioque eius potitur. [Meanwhile, Mithridates of Bosporus, a wanderer since the loss of his throne, learned that the Roman commander Didius had departed with the main body of his army, leaving the young and simple Cotys in his novel kingdom, with a few cohorts under the Roman knight, Julius Aquila. Scornful of both, he proceeded to raise the tribes and attract deserters: finally, mustering an army, he ejected the king of the Dandaridae, and seized his dominions. (Trans. Jackson)] Cf. BNP s.v. Mithridates [9].

\(^{208}\) Domaszewski 1907, 334. Pflaum 1960, 52-53.

\(^{209}\) Tac. Ann. 12.15-16 quae ubi cognita et iam iamque Bosporum inuasurus habebatur, diffisi propriis uiribus Aquila et Cotys, quia Zorsines Siracorum rex hostilia resumpserat, externas et ipsi gratias q quaesivere missis legatis ad Eunonen, qui Aorsorum genti rex potentia praecellebat. nec fuit in arduo societas potentiam Romanam aduersus rebellem Mithridatem ostentantibus. igitur pepigere, equestribus proeliis Eunones certaret, obsidia urbi Romani capesserent. tunc composito amine incidunt, cuius frontem et terga Aorsi, media cohortes et Bosporani tutabantur nostris in armis. [When this had become known and his invasion of Bosporus was expected from day to day, Aquila and Cotys – diffident of their own strength, as the Siracene prince Zorsines had resumed hostilities – followed his example, and sought outside support by sending envoys to the powerful Aorsian prince Eunones. An alliance presented little difficulty, when they could exhibit the power of Rome ranged against the rebel Mithridates. It was arranged, therefore, that Eunones should be responible for the cavalry fighting, the Romans undertaking the siege of all towns. They then advanced with combined forces, the front and rear held by the Aorsi, the center by the cohorts and by Bosporan troops armed on our model. (Trans. Jackson)]

With this career in mind, we return to the bilingual inscription, which does not mention the praetorian insignia that the Senate bestowed upon him. The absence of this honor likely suggests that the road construction took place before Aquila received the honors. Perhaps we can assign the niched togate figure to this particular period between 49-54 CE, though this would also hinge upon the heavily eroded text from above the niched togate figure as containing such references to Aquila’s performance in the Bosporan kingdom.

The continuous focus on the ceremonial space in the second half of Claudius’s reign also suggests that Aquila was consistently promoting the imperial cult of Divus Augustus with a regional audience in mind. It is also intriguing to compare the Aquila Monuments with the *Ara Romae et Augusti ad confluences Araris et Rhodani* – the Federal Altar at the confluence of the Rhône and the Sâone for the worship of the imperial cult of Tres Galliae, established by Drusus. In Livy’s *Epitome*, we learn that Drusus repelled an incursion by the Germanic tribes, and suppressed an uprising in Gaul opposing a census. For this suppression of the Gauls, an altar to Caesar was dedicated at the confluence of the Rhône and the Sâone, and Gaius Iulius Vercondaridubnus of the Aedui created a priesthood.211 A further tradition in Dio Cassius relates that Drusus

---

211 ex libro 139: Civitates Germaniae cis Rhenum et trans Rhenum positae oppugnantur a Druso, et tumultus, qui ob censum exortus in Gallia erat, componitur. Ara dei Caesaris ad confluentem Araris et Rhodani dedicata, sacerdote creato C. Iulio Vercondaridubno Aedu. [The Germanic cities on both sides of the Rhine were attacked by Drusus, and the tumult which took place in Gaul on account of the census was put down. An altar was dedicated to the god Caesar at the confluence of the Aare and the Rhodanus, with a priesthood created by Gaius Iulius Vercondaridubnu of the Aedui. (Translation mine)]
summoned leading men of the Sugambri to establish a festival. Considerable detail about the altar is known from a series of coins struck under successive emperors at the Lugdunum mint, including a rectangular block adorned with a civic crown in the center with flanking laurel trees, flanked by statues of Victory standing on columns holding crowns of victory, and overlooked by two *aediculae* in the background that likely hold representations of Roma and Augustus. These elements formed the cult center of the *concilium* of the *Tres Galliae*, and it is intriguing to compare some of these elements with features preserved in Laurens’ watercolor.

---

212 Dio Cass. 54.32.1 offers an explanation: τῶν τε γὰρ Συγάμβρων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων αὐτῶν διὰ τε τὴν τοῦ Αὐγούστου ἀπουσίαν καὶ διὰ τὸ τοὺς Γαλάτας μη ἐθελοδουλεῖν πολεμισθέντων σφίσι, τοῦτο ὑπήκοον προκατέλαβε, τοὺς πρώτους αὐτοῖς, προφάσις τῆς ἐορτῆς ἦν καὶ νῦν περὶ τοῦ τοῦ Αὐγούστου βωμὸν ἐν Λουγδούνῳ τελοῦσι, μεταπεμψάμενος, καὶ τοὺς Κελτοὺς τηρήσας τὸν Ῥήνον διαβαίνοντας ἀνέκοψε. [When the Sugambri and their allies, because of the absence of Augustus and that the Gauls did not wish to be enslaved, waged war against them, Drusus destroyed the subject; he then summoned for the leading men of the Sugambri, with the pretext of the festival which even now they perform around the altar of Augustus at Lugdunum, and, having waited for the Celts to cross the Rhine, repulsed them. (Trans. Cary)]

213 Fishwick 2002a, 10.
The single column with the perched eagle – itself anticipating a pairing column – has an *aedicula* carved into the rock face to the left. To the bottom-right corner of the water-color there is also a curious column fragment half-sunk into the soil. These elements have yet to be explained. Further investigation of the Aquila Monuments, with a focus on questions concerning topography and possible architectural features, would be required to understand on the one hand the curious aspects captured by Laurens in his
watercolor, and on the other whether the site planning had been on a more conspicuous and systematic style than currently known.

1.2.4 Summary

In part two, we have examined the list of High Priests collected by Marek, to determine whether any of the examples Marek cited could plausibly be related to the coastal Paphlagonian koinon, or at the very least demonstrate a degree of regionalistic outlook that might eventually have contributed to the creation of a koinon priesthood. We found that the High Priesthood held by Daimenes and his sons Parmeniscus and Pharnaces were likely municipal priesthoods, since the practice among Anatolian cities and provincial assemblies was to designate the provincial priesthood with specific epithets to that effect, and the majority of High Priesthoods without clear designation were likely municipal. In other words, Daimenes and his sons perhaps held the municipal High Priesthood. These are not koinon priesthoods, and it is likely that the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus did not exist at this time.

We also examined the priesthood held by Gaius Iulius Aquila. This is associated with the Aquila Monuments carved into the rockface along a passageway that were clearly monumentalised with the concentration of inscribed dedications, aediculae, a niched togate figure, as well as clear references to the cults of Divus Augustus and Theos Hypsistos Helios. The monuments along this ceremonial passage were likely dedicated by the equestrian High Priest Gaius Iulius Aquila, who dedicated his work of cutting through the mountains and paved the road to Claudius. Other dedications, such as the
niched togate figure, was likely Aquila’s dedication as well. The context of Aquila’s dedication may be understood in terms of a downturn in his career. He may have become embroiled in the conspiracy of Asinius Gallus and Statilus Corvinus in 46 CE and left Rome to return to his hometown of Amastris, where he held a permanent High Priesthood dedicated to Divus Augustus, and explored assimilation of this imperial cult with Theos Hypsistos Helios. This cult was of regional importance due to its function as an θεὸς ὅρκος, particularly during the swearing of loyalty at sebasteia in both urban and rural contexts. Aquila’s military accomplishments in the Bosporus kingdom was later accompanied by another dedication, likely the niched togate figure, which may have been Claudius. This recurring investment in the same ceremonial space may be due to the convenient location as well as Aquila’s intention to create a clear center for his assimilated imperial cult. It is perhaps through such a process during the reign of Claudius that the first High Priesthood of regional significance came into being. This is an important phase in the formation of a regionalised imperial cult and koinon formation.

1.3 Conclusion

This chapter discusses evidence concerning the early phases of the Bithynian and coastal Paphlagonian koina as indicators of a prolonged process of koinon formation, and not evidence for the koina themselves. The process of koinon formation in Bithynia and coastal Paphlagonia after the founding of the Pompeian double province likely bifurcated due to varying degrees of urban development as well as differing historical legacies in centralisation and autonomy. In Bithynia, the appearance of a common assembly of cities,
and perhaps even early variants of priests for Caesar and Augustus, predated the Augustan mandate, but it was not the moment when the Bithynian koinon came into being. Even the Augustan mandate itself may only have given a narrow definition to the Bithynian common assembly, but not the constitution of the Bithynian koinon, which may have been promulgated while Augustus administered affairs of Asia and Bithynia in 20 BCE.

The formation process of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon likely took a longer period of time than its Bithynian counterpart. The *lex Pompeia* provided the basic foundations for the forming of a sense of regionalistic identity in coastal Paphlagonia which, during much of the Hellenistic period were divided among the different kingdoms and city-states, and a broad interior populated with semi-autonomous tribes and clans that would have been integrated into the province in form only. The Pontic identity prescribed by the *lex Pompeia* must have had a significant impact on the ensuing urbanisation and creation of a common assembly, but several generations would have been necessary for coastal Paphlagonia to reach a degree of urbanisation and sophistication as demonstrated by the Bithynian koinon. The degree of urbanisation in Bithynia must have been a primary factor in the attestation of the Bithynian collective or koinon in the triumviral period, as common assemblies started to appear in Macedonia and Bithynia in particular, in order to take advantage of a centralised decision-making process when negotiating with warring factions.

Evidence of the developmental stages is hard to come by, and Marek’s identification of High Priesthoods in the reigns of Claudius and Nero represents the
casting of a wider net with ambivalent results. Comparisons with the examples from the province of Asia suggests that Marek’s association of the High Priesthood simple held by Daimenes and his sons with the High Priest of Pontus may require revision. Their priesthood was likely municipal. On the other hand, Marek’s association of the High Priesthood held by Gaius Iulius Aquila does bear some weight after considering the sculptures, inscriptions, Aquila’s career, and the historical context in the Pontic region during the reign of Claudius. Aquila’s career in the Pontic and Bithynian regions, with parallels to the Euryclids in Corinth, may have held considerable weight in the aggrandisation of his assimilated imperial cult. The deity Helios, which assimilated with Theos Sebastos in this case, had universal appeal in the Greek East, and was often invoked as among the oath gods when inhabitants of a province swore allegiance to the emperors. When further assimilated with Augustus, Aquila created a collage of local and imperial cults that seem to be tailored to attract a broader audience in coastal Paphlagonia. The Aquila monuments may have been the focal center of this assimilated cult that further expanded its influence during the years of significant turmoil in the Pontic region, and eventually became an important kernel of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus. 

In short, the chapter finds that the formation process of a coastal Paphlagonian koinon may have begun after the Octavianic mandate decisively excluded coastal Paphlagonian cities from the Bithynian framework, and reached a period of intensification during the Mithridatic uprising, when the imperial mandate for a regional imperial cult may have been put in place. A Neronian or even early Flavian date for the
formal constitution of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus is therefore perceivable. In this case, Loriot’s assumed Flavian date would not be too far off, though there is a basis for considering a late Julio-Claudian date for the foundation of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus as well.
2. THE KOINON OF THE CITIES IN PONTUS IN MUNICIPAL CONTEXT

Following the presentation of evidence regarding the pre-history of a regional framework in coastal Paphlagonia discussed in the first chapter, we move to examine evidence that can be securely associated with the so-called Koinon of the Cities in Pontus – henceforth “the Koinon” – in the second century CE. There are significant limitations. The number of sources is limited, and so too the information that can be elicited from them. The principal aim of this chapter is not to produce a holistic and structural description of the Koinon, but rather a series of analyses of what the Koinon did on specific occasions. The Koinon’s actions inform us of what problems the Koinon had, and what sort of people and institutions the Koinon were engaged with. Two decrees in particular illuminate what the Koinon’s immediate concerns were. The first decree concerned the proper recognition of a High Priest’s benefactions performed in the Amastrian *neoi*, and the second concerned the joint recognition of an individual by the koinon and municipal authorities of Heraclea, praising him for his willingness to serve as High Priest.

In the second part of this chapter, we focus further on the municipal perspective by examining a group of inscriptions from Amastris mentioning koinon officials. These inscriptions merely refer to an individual who once served as a koinon official honored for a reason unrelated to his koinon service, but also give other information, such as the time period, career, family, findsite, and other details. When grouped together, these inscriptions can help locate Koinon officials and their families within the temporal and
spatial dimensions of a city. We are able to see the Koinon as a focus of municipal life, gradually drawing families from different parts of the Amastrian territory into its liturgical system.

2.1 The Koinon Honoring its High Priests of Pontus in Municipal Contexts

The most important evidence for the title “Koinon of the Cities in Pontus” as the official designation of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon are two inscriptions from Amastris and Heraclea Pontica. The two koinon documents have not received extensive study, in part due to the stones’ being lost, and our having only facsimiles of them made by Kalinka. Also, the small number of documents concerning the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus, in comparison with other koina, makes the two documents more suitable to treatment as ancillary evidence that completes a fuller picture pertaining to generalising studies of the koina in the Greek East. The aim here is to reverse the process: by treating the inscribed and published decisions as solutions to specific problems to which the koinon must have been responding, it is possible to use such information to offer insight into the structure and operations of the koinon.

2.1.1 The Koinon honoring Titus Iulius Aquila as Leader of the Amastrian Neoi

The inscription to be discussed preserves a decree of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus to honor its High Priest Titus Iulius Aquila, decreeing that he must be addressed in a certain way, due to his contribution to the Amastrian neoi.

To good fortune. The Koinon of the Cities in Pontus honored Titus Iulius Aquila, loving of honor like his ancestors, a High Priest of Pontus, who received a stephanos of/from imperator Nerva Trajanus Caesar Augustus Germanicus Dacicus: he is to be called neos Aquila and incomparable, admirable neos, and first aristeus among the neoi, who from childhood did not slacken off to give benefaction to the patria, where his mame Lusia Aquilina erected his statue. (Translation mine.)

FIG. 12. SKETCH OF TITUS IULIUS AQUILA INSCRIPTION
Though without the expected ἔδοξε or δεδόχθαι, the infinitive “to be called” (καλεῖσθαι) marks the transition to the indirect statement containing the resolution of the Koinon. The titles mentioned include neos Aquila and incomparable, admirable neos, and first aristeus among the neoi. The resolution is accompanied by a rather ambiguous rationale, referring to Aquila’s history of benefaction.

The Koinon was clearly taking action to add prestige or status to Aquila by decreeing how he was to be addressed. The first neos may be understood as simply an adjective expressing the sense of “young Aquila,” even Titus Iulius Aquila the Younger. The second neos compares the honorand with others, associated with the group noun neoi, which was not a simple reference to heritage or age. Nigel Kennell identified the neoi in this inscription as the senior ephebic group, sometimes also called the neaniskoi, young men likely between twenty and thirty years of age. The neoi and neaniskoi appeared in a range of polis-based military roles, such as that of territorial guards in the Hellenistic period, and several Late Republican period examples show the neoi

---

214 Sacco 1979, 39-49.


associated in military contexts.\textsuperscript{217} In the imperial period, the *epheboi*, *neoi*, and *neaniskoi* were trained in physical and intellectual curricula in the *gymnasia*,\textsuperscript{218} with some groups even taking up a paramilitary role, such as the *neaniskoi* from Apollonia in Caria.\textsuperscript{219} The range of possibilities ought not to extend to military affairs, as no reference to such can be found in the inscribed text. Rather, the infinitive φιλοτειμήσθαι from subsequent lines (unfortunately damaged) suggests that Aquila made benefactions to his *patria*, an act that was already the grounds for a local recognition of setting up Aquila’s statue.\textsuperscript{220}

Benefaction is therefore the more likely context, though it remains difficult to assign a precise role to the Koinon with the information from the inscribed text.

\textsuperscript{217} Prag 2007, 91 fn. 128. The *neoi* of Ilium joining the *demos* honoring Pompey in 63/62 BCE for his efforts in defeating Mithridates and also the Cilician pirates. *SEG* 46.1565: vacat ὁ δῆμος καὶ οἱ νήπιοι vacat | [Π]γαλιον Πο]μη[ην, Γαλίου [υ]ζον, Μάργαν, τὸ τρίτον | [ἀυτοκράτειορα, τὸν πάτριον καὶ εὐφρενίτη τῆς πόλεως | [ἐπεστείλας ἐνεκεν τῆς πρὸς τὴν θέου τὴν οὕσαν αὐτῷ | [- -]ν καὶ εὐνοίας τῆς πρὸς τὸν δήμον, ἀπολογοστάντα | μὲν τοὺς ἄνθρωπους ἀπὸ τὸν ἡμερίαν, ἄφθονον δὲ | [τὴν εἰρήνην καὶ τὴν ἀσφάλειαν καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν. [The demos and the neoi honors Pompey Magnus, thrice imperator, the patron and euergetist of the city, on account of his piety to the god which . . . and goodwill to the people, having absolved those men from wars against barbarians (Mithridates) and of the dangerous pirates, having established peace and safety both on land and on sea. (Translation mine)] *IG* XII Su no. 116 was set up around 129 BCE by the *neoi* of Methymna donating funds for the purchasing of grain in support of the Roman effort during the Aristonicus revolt. Kennell 2012, 226.

\textsuperscript{218} Laes & Strubbe 2014, 73-74. Brelaz 2005, 190-191. Some of the *neoi* formed well-organised assemblies with official status, for instance the νεόν of Cyzicus, which sought ratification from the senate regarding their status as an association. At Smyrna, Nicaea and Pergamon, the νεόν formed synods, and also with those from Synnada, Laodicea and Hierapolis, where the νεόν even adopted the title συνόδρομον. Cyzicus *CIL* III 7060 = *FIRA* 4 I 47, 48. Millar 2002, 278. Forbes 1933, 38-39.

\textsuperscript{219} An inscription from Apollonia in Caria dated to the second to third century CE recorded a group of νεανίσκοι served as ὀροφυλακήσαντες under the leadership of led a νεανίσκαρχης Papias son of Eutychos, and were listed in a dedication to *Meter Theon Oriae* and the *patria* set up by one *paraphylax* Stephanion son of Stephanos. Robert & Robert 1954, 281-283 no. 162, II. 1-15: <Σ>τεφανίου Στεφανίου παραφύλαξ | Μητρί Θεόν Ὀρείᾳ ἐπηκόων θεᾶ | καί τῇ πατρίδι μετά τῶν νεανίσκων κατασκεύασεν τὸν θέα | παρθενον οἰκοδομήσαντες καί ἀφιλάσιον | καὶ κεφαλαίσαντες καὶ χρείσαντες | καὶ ἐνωριασαντες ἐνθήκαν | καὶ ὁ δὲ ὀροφυλακήσαντες ἦσαν Παπίας Εὐτύχου νεανισκάρχης, Μένανδρος Μοκολδεύ κατευθύνων | κτλ. ὀροφυλακήσαντες are variously translated as “frontier-guard” and “gardes des montagnes” depending on whether an editor assigns an aspirate to the initial omicron.

\textsuperscript{220} Kalinka’s restoration, ἐκ π[ου]δ[ί]οζ [μη] | [ἐξ]ιανέν[τα] φιλοτειμήσθαι τῇ πατρίδι, describes Aquila as one who “from childhood (did not) slacken off to give benefaction to the patria.” The subordinate clause modifying τῇ πατρίδι, “οὐ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ | | [Ἀ]υτοῦς Σακουλαζέαν τὸν ἄν[τα] | κατευθύνων,” suggests that the Koinon’s decision was based on a local honorific act that was already taking place, supervised by a dignitary who was likely Aquila’s “mother,” either by blood or adoption. Μήτηρ was not used seems to suggest a more complicated relationship between Aquila and Aquilina.
There is the possibility that Aquila may have played a role in organising an Amastrian contingent comprised of the *neoi* that would have been responsible for some aspect of the worship of the provincial imperial cult. The involvement of the *neoi* or other ephebic institutions in the affairs of a provincial koinon is rare, but not unprecedented. In the early Augustan period, the Pergamene *neoi* honored one Gaius Iulius Sacerdos for his provision of oil to the *neoi* and *epheboi* participating in the Sebasta Romaia, an annual or biannual gymnastic event associated with the provincial imperial cult.  

A second example is an inscribed proconsular decree addressing the role of the Ephesian ephebia in the provincial koinon. Responding to a proposal for financial reform of the Artemiseion at Ephesus, the governor Paulus Fabius Persicus allowed the Ephesian authorities to reduce expenditure by replacing paid professional singers with the Ephesian ephebes, who would sing without pay. Persicus was also keen to address the potential ramifications of his decision. Ephesus, like other cities of Asia, periodically dispatched

---

221 Laes & Strubner 2014, 31, discusses relevant scholarship discussed by Friesen 2001, 31. Sacerdos was the neokoros of Roma and Caesar and priest of Tiberius, and served as the gymnasiarch of the twelfth Sebasta Romaia, supplying oil for the *neoi* and *epheboi* for washing through the whole day at his own expense. οἱ νεοὶ ἐπιμενῶν | Ἡγίασ Τιτουλίου Σακέρδου τὸν | νεοκόρον θεὰς Ρώμης καὶ θεοῦ | Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος καὶ ιερέα | Τιτερίου Κλαυδίου Νέρωνος καὶ | γυμνασίαρχόν τοῦ δωδεκάτου | Σεβαστοῦ Ῥωμαίον τὸν πέντε | γυμνασίων ἁλείφοντα ἐξ λουτήρων | δὴ ὅλης ἡμέρας ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων, || προνοοῦσαν τῆς τε αὐτῶν καὶ τὸν | ἔξοδόντος ἄγογῆς νόμους τε πατρίοις | [καὶ] ἐκ ταῦτα τὸ κάλλιστον | ἀγανεωσάμενον. [The neoi honored Gaius Julius Sacerdos: the neokoros of goddess Rome and of god Augustus Caesar; priest of Tiberius Claudius Nero; and gymnasiarch of the 12th Sebasta Romaia for the five gymnasia, who supplied oil for the washings throughout the whole day at his own expense, who provided for their games [those of the neoi] and also for those of the ephebes, renewing the ancestral laws and customs according to what is most noble. Trans. Friesen.] The Sebasta Romaia is commonly associated the sacred games that Dio Cassius mentioned in passing at 51.20.9 καὶ ἔλαβον καὶ οἱ Περγαμηνοί τοῦ ἄγονα τὸν ἱερὸν ὅνομασάμενον 21ετί τῇ τοῦ νοοῦ αὐτῶν τιμῇ πουίν. [and the Pergamians also received authority to hold the sacred games, as they called them, in honor of Caesar’s temple. Trans. Cary]

222 Ephesos 227, ll. 53-56 ὁμοίως τῇ ὑμνῳδοῖς | ἀρέσκει, εἰς οὗ σύκο ὀλέγον μέρος τῆς πόλεως ἀναλίσκεται προσόδων, τῆς ὑπηρεσίας [ταυτὴς ἀπολογῆνα] τοῦ[ος] ὑπῆρησι[ος] δῖ[ε], || καὶ ἡ ἀξία καὶ ἡ ἀξία καὶ ἡ πρὸς τὸ μαθεῖν ἐπιτρεπότατης τοιαύτη μᾶλλον ἀρμοζεὶ λειτουργίᾳ, [ταυτὴν] τὰ[ο]ρι[ς] ἁγιαρίῳ | παρέφησα τὴν χρείαν. [Likewise regarding the hymnodes (sc. of Artemis) – to whom no small part of the municipal income is paid in order that this service be performed – it is resolved: the ephebes, whose age and worth and ability to learn are better attuned to such a liturgy, shall provide this need without payment. (Trans. Friesen)]
professional singers to Pergamum for the festivities of the provincial imperial cult, a
routine that was at first voluntary and unpaid for, but subsequently formalised by
Augustus, in requiring all of Asia to cover the expenses of this periodic event.\textsuperscript{223} Persicus
thus granted, on the one hand, an exemption to the singers who were set to perform at the
imperial festivities at Pergamum to continue to perform the service and receive pay. He
ordered, on the other, that Ephesus was to dispatch the ephebes, but they were to perform
to a standard that would befit the imperial household.\textsuperscript{224} The examples from the province
of Asia give some basis to the claim that the connection between Aquila’s role as High
Priest of Pontus and his leading status in the Amastrian \textit{neoi} was relevant to the
participation of the \textit{neoi} in koinon affairs.

The key issue, however, is why the koinon honored Aquila by defining how
Aquila was to be called among the Amastrian \textit{neoi}, for the inscription does not explicitly
give a clear action performed by Aquila or the \textit{neoi} that benefited the koinon. What we
can say for certain is that the koinon must have been the chief beneficiary of Aquila’s

Περγαμημόνας, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ τῆς Ασίας ὅλης ἐκέλευσεν, λογισάμε[νος] βαρεῖα[ν ἐπισθαί] μιᾶ πόλει τῆς τοιαύ·
tὴν εἰσφοράν. [Lest I seem to have judged the case for all hymnodes everywhere, I exempt those singing
hymns in Pergamon to the god Augustus himself in the temenos dedicated by Asia. There the first assembly
gathered, not as though hired but voluntarily and without payment. For this reason also the god Augustus
preserved the privileges decreed later regarding the succession of those who came after them, that their
expenses be defrayed not only by the Pergamenes, but wholly of the Asia, because such a contribution
would be a burden for a single city. Trans. Friesen]

\textsuperscript{224} Ephesos 227, ll. 61-63 ἡλευθερωμένη μέντοι τὴν Ἐφεσίων πάλιν τοῦ δαπανήματος [τοῦ]τοῦ καὶ
μετε[θε]κενεκμένης τῆς ὑπηρεσίας[1]|ς κατὰ τὴν αὐτὸν γνώμην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐφηβοὺς προνοεῖν δέσιμα, ὅπως
ἐπιμελῶς καὶ μετὰ τῆς καθηκονίας φροντίδος[ος] | οἱ ἐρημοὶ τελοῦσι τὴν ἱερ[α]ν, ὡς πρέπει τοῖς τῶν
θεοῦ οἶκον | ὑμ[ν]οῦντας. [Even though the city of the Ephesians is free from this expense and the service
is transferred to the ephebes according to their proposal, they must see to it that the ephebes complete the
duty carefully and with appropriate attention, singing hymns to the divine household in a fitting way.
(Trans. Friesen)]
action because it was the honoring agent. The critical issue is that the koinon wished to define how Aquila was to be called in the municipal organization, the Amastrian neoi. Upon publication, the inscription would require Amastrians to address Aquila in the way deemed appropriate by the koinon assembly, which, we emphasise, was a collective decision representing the cities in coastal Paphlagonia, and hence the honorific title would have carried some weight. Aquila’s contribution must have been affecting the neoi so that it acted in a way that was beneficial to the koinon. To approach a guess on what Aquila may have done, comparing the honorific “protos aristeus ton neon” with other similar titles is a starting point, though the exercise yield no exact results due to the lack of a direct match for the title. It is still useful, however, to review the range of possible contributions that Aquila might have made that led to the koinon’s honor.

Examples from Pisidia and Asia suggest that aristeus is related to the general category of services that benefit a city, including benefaction but also other actions. In the example from Pisidia the city of Adada publically proclaimed the honorand Aurelius Bianorianus Abisbianus Antiochus, the agonothete of the third themis at Oeonanda, as both philopater and aristeus, because he paid for his own statue that the city voted to set up with public funds.²²⁵ As for the example from Asia, the city of Cibyra honored Quintus Veranius Philagros for his embassies to Claudius that led to the removal of officials and dignitaries for embezzlement and extortion.²²⁶ Rendering aristeus would


depend upon context: Nollé rendered ἐφ᾽ οἷς ἡ πόλις ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τὰς ἀριστέως τειμὰς as “because of these the city awarded him (sc. Philargos) the title (or status) of honorary citizen,” which would not apply to Aquila’s νέων πρῶτος ἀριστεύς. Perhaps we could interpret the title given to Aquila along the lines of “the champion among the Amastrian neoi.” In sum, the comparisons indicate that the title aristeus was not merely to praise someone as being virtuous or generous, but to mark extraordinary contributions such as the alleviation of municipal financial burdens or the successful petitions and diplomatic missions that lead to the removal of corrupt officials. Perhaps we can translate the honorific as “the champion among the Amastrian neoi” to account for potential contributions beyond finances and petitions.

Aside from petitioning and financial contributions, we note the possible connection between the koinon’s honor with Aquila’s reception of a crown associated to Trajan. The crown concerned the reigning emperor, and it happens to be one of the two honors mentioned in the preamble of the inscription. For the koinon to have mentioned it, the crown was likely of considerable symbolic value to the circumstances dictating the koinon’s honoring of Aquila. In particular, Trajan’s full titulature, included as a genitive of description for the crown, is a curious rendering. One could take the reference to Trajan in the genitive construction of the participial clause as a genitive of separation, so that Trajan would be the giver of the crown (ἀ[ν]αλαβόντα[σ] | στέφα[ν]ο[ν] αὐτοκράτορος Νεροῦ κτλ.). The lack of a military reference in the inscription
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227 Nollé 1982, 267-273. By “Ehrenbürger,” honorary citizen, Nollé seems to mean that the individual who attained this title originally did not belong in the city or group, but rather is to elevate the individual’s status from ordinary to extraordinary.
downplays the possibility of the crown’s concern with valor, and hence the series of crowns associated with efforts in war are less likely.\textsuperscript{228} Alternatively, taking the genitive as descriptive, the crown may have borne the image of Trajan, and can be called a “bust-crown” commonly associated with priests of the imperial cult.\textsuperscript{229} That the \textit{stephanos} is mentioned immediately after Aquila’s title of the High Priesthood of Pontus may indicate some connection between this headwear and the priesthood, in which case we would have only one honor described in an elaborate fashion. However, recent examinations of the significance of the bust-crown require some consideration of this interpretation.

A large horizontal marble block found in the \textit{stadion} at Aizanoi that illustrated in relief the career of Marcus Ulpius Apuleius Eurykles shows that bust-crowns can be associated with three offices: the High Priesthood of Asia at the temple in Pergamon, the municipal \textit{stephanophoros}, and the \textit{Panhellenios}.\textsuperscript{230} The Aizanoi reliefs indicate that bust-crowns are not only the insignia of priesthoods of the imperial cult, as first suggested by George Hill.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Hill 1899, 245-249 highlighted historical connections with Hellenistic ruler-cult as well as Roman innovations that may have begun with Domitian’s \textit{Capitolia}. Suet. \textit{Dom.} 4. Rumscheid 2000, 7-8 on previous scholarship.
\item Riccardi 2007, 383-385, fig. 14b ivy wreath for the priesthood of Dionysos; figs. 14c-d 9-bust and 10-bust crowns as the High Priest of Asia of the temples in Pergamon; fig. 14f two-bust crown as a Panhellenios in Athens; fig. 14g a 9-bust crown as stephanophoros. \textit{SEG} 42.1188. Wörrle 1992.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
FIG. 13. BUST CROWNS FROM AIZANOI

- Nine-bust crown for the highpriesthood of Asia
- Ten-bust crown for the highpriesthood of Asia
- Two-bust crown for the *panhellene*
- Nine-bust crown for the *stephanophoros*

Riccardi 2007, p. 385
Furthermore, recent discussions concerning a detailed description of a bust-crown made for an agonothete in charge of the festivities of the *Demostheneia* at Oenoanda further indicate the need to re-evaluate the connection between priests of the imperial cult and the bust-crown.\(^\text{231}\) The crown prepared by Demosthenes, the founder of the festival in his name, is described as having “relief portraits of the emperor Nerva Trajan Hadrian Caesar Augustus and our “chief deity” the ancestral god Apollo” ([ἔχο])ντα ἐκτυπα πρόσωπα Αὐτοκράτορος Νέρουα Τραιανοῦ Ἀδρια[νοῦ] | Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ καὶ τοῦ προκαθη[γέτ]ου ἡ[μῶν]ν πατρώου θεοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος). Rumscheid proposed that, since multiple offices use this form of insignia, bust-crowns likely represent a specific function in agonistic affairs, for the offices associated with bust-crowns share this particular

\(^{231}\) Wörle 1988, 8-11 ll. 51-53 . . . καὶ ἦ . . . πενταετηρικῇ μοισικῇ πανηγύρει ἐπηγείλατο | κατασκευάσαι ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων καὶ στέφανον χρυσοῦν [ἔχο]ντα ἐκτυπα πρόσωπα Αὐτοκράτορος Νέρουα Τραιανοῦ Ἀδρια[νοῦ] | Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ καὶ τοῦ προκαθη[γέτ]ου ἡ[μῶν]ν πατρώου θεοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, ὃν φορήσει ὁ ἀγωνοθέτης . . . κτλ. [. . . and for the pentaeteric musical panegyris . . . he promised that he will furnish and dedicate to the city, at his own expense, a golden crown bearing relief portraits of the emperor Nerva Trajan Hadrian Caesar Augustus and our leader the ancestral god Apollo, which the agnothete will wear etc. (Translation mine, modified from Mitchell 1990, 185.).]
In other words, the custom in the eastern provinces was that the leading men in charge of festivities related to the imperial cult, whether priest or agonothete, would wear a crown adorned with the impressions of the deities and emperors that the festival was meant to celebrate.

The problem is, however, that the title of *Panhellenios* is also associated with a bust-crown, and it is not at all clear that Marcus Ulpius Apuleius Eurykles oversaw the *Panhellenia* during his involvement in the Panhellenion. Wörrle proposes that any delegate to the Panhellenion would be entitled to wear a bust-crown of the two emperors that the *Panhellenia* celebrated at the time. Lee-Ann Ricardi still finds it difficult to
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232 Jutta Rumscheid 2000, 7-51, es 14. Also, 49, Rumscheid also pointed out also that bust-crowns from archaeological context coincide with emperors such as Hadrian and the Severans, who were known to have supported Greek festivals. Also Ricardi 2007, 381-382, es 381 no. 24 for a survey of scholarship, overlapping with Michael Wörrle 1992, 349-368. For other discussions: George Hill, in particular, presented evidence of for example the so-called "Flavius Damianus" statue from Ephesus, among others. Inan & Rosenbaum 1966, 128 no. 151 pl 83.4, 87.2. Hill 1899, 245-249. Robert 1930, 265-267; 1930, 351. Loriot 2006, 531 fn. 59. We note also that standardised form of headwear for a provincial priest called the *corona aurea sacerdotum provincialium* described by Tertullian and Ammianus Marcellinus did not emphasise the presence of busts. Tert. *idol.* 18.1: *iam uero de solo suggestu et apparatu honoris retractandum. proprius habitus uniussuisque est tam ad usum quotidianum quam ad honorem et dignitatem. itigur purpura illa et aurum ceruicis ornamentum eodem more apud Aegyptios et Babylionios insignia erant dignitatis, quo more nunc praetextae uel trabeae uel palmatae et coronae aurea sacerdotum provincialium, sed non eadem condicione* [Now redirecting to only the attire and apparatus of honors only. There is appropriate attire for each and every one, as much as for daily usage as for honor and dignity. Therefore, purpose and gold as neck ornament were by custom among Aegyptians and Babylonians the insignia of dignity, which in present-day custom would be the toga praetexta, trabea, or palmata, and golden crowns of the provincial priests, but not the same conditions. (Translation mine)]; also in *Amm. Marc.* 29.5.16 bidoque post Icosium oppidum, cuius supra docuimus conditores, militia signa et coronam sacerdotalem cum ceteris, quae interceperat, nihil cunctatus restituit, ut praecipient est [Two days later, without hesitation, he restored, as had been ordered, the town of Icosium, of whose founders I spoke before, the military standards, and the priestly crown, as well as the rest of the booty which he had taken. (Trans. Rolfe)]; Boeft et al. 2011, 266; Boeft et al. 2013, 175. Cumont 1901, 138-141. *IScM* II 188 σπείρατο μὲν Συρίης μὲ Νεάπολις εὐρύάγυα | πλείονα δ᾽ αὐτῷ πάτρις | ἐστιν ἀγάπης τῷ Μοισίτῳ. || ἔμεθε γὰρ άλλων μερόποιον | πλέον εἰπόδες κοσμήθησα | χρυσείους στεφάνους | πορφυραίους πεπόλους | δίς γὰρ ἐπινύσασα | καὶ Άραιως θῆλα ἐπέλεξε, | τρίς τελέσας ὀργήν | καὶ πόλιν οὐχ ἤρισας κτλ. [Syrian Neapolis begot me with its wide streets, but Tomis crowned me more than my patria, which adorned me with golden crowns and the purple peplos more than other people, for I was twice Pontarch and gave the games of Ares, thrice served as magistrate, and did not commit outrage against the city etc. (Translation mine)]

233 Reynolds 1982, 186 proposed that Eurykles was “president” of the Panhellenion in the documents OGIS 504-507, but corrected by Wörrle 1992, 357, Rumscheid 2000, 13 fn. 85, and Ricardi 2007, 384 fn. 40.

234 Wörrle 1992, 357 fn. 93.
believe that membership alone would entitle one to a bust-crown, and hence proposed that Eurykles may have taken up the role of agonothete while serving at the Panhellenion between 154-157 CE.\footnote{Riccardi 2007, 383-386.} For our purposes the significance of the bust-crown of Trajan as associated with an agonistic event is helpful, in that we know Aquila was High Priest of Pontus, and his involvement or curation of a koinon festival would entitle him to wear such a diadem. Yet, the koinon placed the bust-crown in the context of this inscription, which indicates that the significance of this crown was associated not only with his High Priesthood, but the action that benefited the koinon. In other words, there was an agonistic event that Aquila was involved, and this involvement may have been relevant to the action that Aquila took to the benefit of the koinon.

Aquila’s involvement in an agonistic event concerning Trajan brings to mind Pliny’s letter to Trajan in the second year of his proconsulship in Pontus-Bithynia, reporting that a certain Iulius Largus wished to bequeath his property either for public building projects in Trajan’s name, or setting up a pentaeteric festival called the Traiania, which is to be discussed in more detail in chapter three.\footnote{Plin. \textit{Ep.} 10.75. Iulius, domine, Largus ex Ponto nondum mihi uisus ac ne auditus quidem - scilicet iudicio tuo credidit - dispensationem quandam mihi erga te pietatis suae ministeriumque mandavit. rogauit enim testamento, ut hereditatem suam adirem cerneremque, ac deinde praeceptis quinquaginta milibus nummum reliquum omne Heracleotarum et Tianorum ciuitatibus redderem, ita ut esset arbitrii mei utrum opera facienda, quae honoris tuo consecrarentur, putarem an instituendos quinquennales agonas, qui Traiani appellarentur. quod in notitiam tuam perferendum existimaui ob hoc maxime, ut dispicerem quid eligere debeam. [A Iulius Largus from Pontus, my lord, whom I have not yet seen, or even heard of previously, has entrusted to me (he was doubtless relying on your judgement of me), the handling and management of an act of devotion towards you. He requested, in his will, that I assume and enter upon his inheritance, and then, after taking first 50,000 sesterces, that I allocate all the rest to the cities of Heraclea and Tium, in such a way that it would be my decision whether a construction ought to be commenced which would be consecrated to your honor, or I think quinquennial games ought to be established, which would be called the Traiania. (Trans. Walsh, modified)].} There is no additional evidence regarding this festival from literary or epigraphic source; that Titus Iulius Aquila was not
referred to as an agonothete also leaves this line of interpretation in doubt. However, we
know that 1) the bequest of Iulius Largus was clearly earmarked either for a construction
project or a pentaeteric festival, and 2) the High Priest of Pontus received a crown likely
depicting the reigning emperor, which together suggest that Pliny, plausibly, chose the
pentaeteric festival. The implication of this hypothesis is that Aquila received a bust-
crown associated with the *Traiania*, perhaps in the capacity of the High Priest of Pontus.
Since the pentaeteric festival was supposed to celebrate Trajan to the benefit of two cities,
appropriate rituals and ceremonies were likely required above the municipal level, and
the High Priest of Pontus as well as the koinon that had a primary interest in the worship
of the imperial cult, are likely involved. Adopting this interpretation, we can even
propose a hypothetical time frame for the first *Traiania*. The broader timeframe can be
deducted from the titulature of Trajan associated with Aquila’s bust-crown, between 103
and 116 CE. The timeframe can be deduced from the date assigned to Pliny’s letter, in the
second year of his governorship in Pontus-Bithynia.\(^{237}\) The exact years are disputed, but
the choice is between 109-111 CE or 110-112 CE.\(^ {238} \) In short, the *Traiania* could have
been instituted between 109/110 to 116 CE. We also note that the short six-year
timeframe would also include the Koinon’s designation of Aquila as the leading member
in the Amastrian *neoi*.

In sum, we concede that the specific reason why the koinon sought to dictate
Aquila’s standing in the Amastrian *neoi* remains unknown, yet we note that the

\(^{237}\) Sherwin-White 1966, 532.

\(^{238}\) The exact years of Pliny’s governorship is disputed between Sherwin-White 1966, 82, proposing
overlapping symbolism and chronology of the evidence discussed above suggests that the Traiania was in fact the agonistic event that Aquila's crown symbolised, and the koinon may have been the direct beneficiary of some action that Aquila carried out in association with the Amastrian neoi. The earlier discussion on the relevance between ephebic groups and koinon festivities becomes even more pronounced. As we recall, the professional hymnodes performed a voluntary service in its first gathering at Pergamum on the occasion of the inauguration of the sanctuary dedicated to Augustus’ person, but Augustus later ordered that there must be a systematic collection of fees from provincial communities to ensure the payment of future performances. Eventually, this became a regular programme of the festivities of the Koinon of the Hellenes in Asia. Further developments in the performance of the hymnodes are also noteworthy. An inscription from Ephesus recorded a letter from the governor Paullus Fabius Persicus allowing the Ephesian authorities to replace paid professional singers with the Ephesian ephebes, who would sing without pay, as part of the city’s austerity measure. Since the neoi were, in essence, an ephebic institution, and hence a ready source of organized labor, municipal and koinon authorities may have been able to direct them to assist or participate in festivals or spectacles out of exigency. In short, the koinon may have benefited from Aquila’s organisational effort that “supplied” the Amastrian neoi to assist or participate in koinon affairs such as gladiatorial spectacles or agonistic festivals such as the Traiania, possibilities discussed in chapter three.

What remains to be discussed is the “µάμη” of Titus Iulius Aquila. This word, likely the variant spelling of µάμη, could mean mother or grandmother. Both would
make sense if following the restoration of the name [Λ]ουσία Ἀ[κυ]λεῖνα by Rudolph Egger for Kalinka’s edition of the text, but Louis Robert’s proposal of Iulia Aquilina, at the expense of emending the letter Σ, creates additional problems.

Firstly, the basis for Robert’s restoration of ΙΟΥΛΙΑ from ΛΟΥΣΙΑ is questionable. Robert’s basis for emending Lusia to Iulia was based on his claim that the sigma of [Λ]ΟΥΣΙΑ in Kalinka’s facsimile was in part uncertain. In the following illustration, it is clear that Kalinka only dotted the upper slanting stroke in the sigma of Lusia. This is a questionable interpretation of Kalinka’s sketch, and can hardly be a solid basis for altering the sigma into a lambda, particularly considering that the upper and lower horizontal strokes were clearly visible when Kalinka performed the autopsy.


FIG. 14. KALINKA’S SKETCH AND THE LOUSIA/IOULIA PROBLEM

Secondly, the reasoning presented to support the claim that there was an Iulia Aquilina is questionable. Robert proposed this emendation in order to identify Titus
Iulius Aquila’s *mame* as a dignitary supposedly attested on a separate inscription also found at Amastris (*CIG* 4150b). In *CIG* 4150b a female dignitary was honored by the “*damos*” of Heraclea as well as her *patria* Amastris with twin statues in the year 98 CE.²³⁹ The key is line two, where Sidoux’s facsimile records *ΟΥΔΙΑΝΑΙΥΙΔΕΙΝΑΝ*. The letters are indecipherable unless through emendation. Böckh’s proposal – *ΙΟΥΛΙΑΝ ΑΚΥΙΛΕΙΝΑΝ* – would seem plausible only if we assume that Sidoux misread some letters while producing the sketch. We are unable to confirm or deny Robert’s emendation, because the stone is now lost,²⁴⁰ perhaps due to its possible reuse, and other inscriptions found in the same location as building material.²⁴¹ Apparently, Robert’s claim for *CIG* 4150b to be the basis for reconstructing Iulia Aquilina in the inscription honoring Titus Iulius Aquila must rest upon Böckh’s emendation of Sidoux’s autopsy.

²³⁹ *CIG* 4150b = Marek 1993, 159 no. 4 [ὁ Ὅρασιον Ακυιλεινά] ταν ε[...] ἕνη καὶ φιλανδρὸν καὶ φιλότειμον ἀνθοτεράν τὸν πολι[...] πάσας ἀρετὰς καὶ ἄν προεδει[...] εἶπόνον ἔνθικα, ψαφισμένος τοῦ πατρίδος Αμάστριος ἐν τῷ προγονικῷ θεάτρῳ τεθήμεν αὐτῶς τὸν ἄνδριαντα, δι’ ἐπιμελείας τῷ Τιβερίῳ Κλαυδίῳ Μηνίου τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῶς. ἔτους Ἥξρʹ. [The people of Heraclea (dedicate this) to Iulia Aquilina, benefactress, devoted wife, and honor loving citizen of the two cities, on account of her every virtue and the prospects she brought, with her patria Amastris having voted to set her statue in (her) ancestor’s theater; administered by her husband Tiberius Claudius Menius. Year 168. (Translation mine)]

²⁴⁰ Marek 1993, 159.

²⁴¹ Notes of *CIG* vol. 3 1112 no. 4150b explains that the stone was built into the base of a masonry-built fence next to a building in modern Amasra, “Amastride in septo quadrato quod pertinent ad aedificium, cuius in muro est inscriptio n. 4150, in basi; transcriptis Sidoux, qui cum Choiseul-Gouffier in legatione erat; transmissum per Dionysium (Denis) nobiscum communicavit A. E. Eggerus.” [at Amastris, built into a stone fence that touches a building; the inscription is to the base of the fence. Sidoux transcribed it, who was with Choiseul-Gouffier in the embassy; transmitted by Denis, Auguste-Émile Egger communicated it with us. (Translation mine)] The same wall yielded three other inscriptions: no. 4150, no. 4150c, no. 4151, though the stones are now all lost. Denis was with the delegation of Auguste de Choiseul-Gouffier the French ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, and his report was passed on by Auguste-Émile Egger (then lecturer at the Ecole Normale Supérieure) to Böckh, later published for the supplement to volume 3 of the Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum in 1853, edited by Franz. *CIG* vol 3 1050: “nonnulla augustis inscriptionibus Paphlagoniae ex schedis Sidoux, qui cum Choiseul-Gouffier in legatione fuit, accepta a Dionysio (Denis) mihi transmisit vir amicissimus, A. E. Eggerus, Parisinus.” [Several among the additional inscriptions of Paphlagonia are from the letters of Sidoux, who was in the delegation with (the french ambassador to the Ottoman Empire) Auguste de Choiseul-Gouffier; the letters were received by Denis, and Egger the Parisian and an most amicable man transmitted them to me. (Translation mine)]
While Iulia Aquilina is an epigraphic persona created out of a series of conjectures made by the editor of the *CIG* and Robert himself, the initial *iota* could have suffered damage and been left out by Sidoux, or for the two *lambda* to be identified as *delta* and the *kappa* to be identified as an *iota* due to cracks, abrasions, or weathering. Assuming Sidoux misread the letters, the restoration of Iulia Aquilina may be correct. In turn she could be one of the family members of Gaius and Titus Iulius Aquila, with dual citizenship of Amastris and Heraclea. Yet this does not justify identifying Lusia Aquilina as Iulia Aquilina, because Robert’s emendation of the sigma was purely speculation, and the autopsy performed by Kalinka needs to be privileged. At this point we must accept Lusia Aquilina as the name of Titus Iulius Aquila’s “mame,” until further evidence surfaces.

We have determined that Egger’s restoration of [Λ]ουσία Α[κυ]λεῖνα preserves the clearly recognisable letters in Kalinka’s autopsy. Accordingly, Egger’s restoration leads to the attestation of a family heretofore rarely attested in Asia Minor. The rare attestation of members of this family, along with their supposed prominence on par with

---

242 IK Pessinous 84 Ἐπαφροδείτω ἀνέστησαν | Γάιος Ἰούστου καὶ Λουσία ἡ σύν|βίος μου κτλ.
the Iulii, whose ancestry likely included the equestrian Gaius Iulius Aquila, permanent High Priest of Divus Augustus and procurator of Nero, discussed in the first chapter. These factors lead us to posit that the Lusii were newcomers, and potentially associated with veteran or equestrian status. We do not seek to make a direct connection with other Lusii attested elsewhere in Anatolia, such as the praefectus fabrum Numerius Lusius Nomentanus from Cilicia, who was honored by the city of Hieropolis for his benefactions to Athena. Rather, there might have been several such families of equestrian status that could have established relations or even settled in Amastris before the end of Trajan’s reign. A veteran connection may also be likely, since there was a significant Roman veteran presence towards the northeast of the Amastrian territory. A notable example is a decorated military commander by the name of Sextus Vibius Gallus of the thirteenth

243 Hicks 1890, 245-246 no. 15 ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἱεροπολίτων | Νουμέριον Λούσιον Νουμερίου υἱόν Κορνηλία Νουμενταί·ν άραρχον τεχνειτῶν κτλ.

Legion,245 and a Lucius Sempronius of the Campanian auxiliary.246 Admittedly, not much more can be pressed upon the family of Lusia Aquilina, except that the existence of the Lusii at Amastris adds another data point when speaking of families of veteran or equestrian status in Amastrian society.

While the name of the prominent lady can be subject to further debate, the fact that she is featured in the inscription highlights an interesting dynamic. Did Lusia Aquilina arrange for Titus Iulius Aquila to serve in a certain capacity in the koinon and/or the neoi? What this question is really concerned with relates to whether Aquila had agency in deciding whether he wished to serve as High Priest of Pontus at all. A possible scenario would be that Aquila was still a young boy, since there is no reference to his municipal career, and it was his family that wished him to embark upon a public career, beginning with the High Priesthood of Pontus. However, as will be discussed in the next section, we also need to consider the fact that the High Priesthood of Pontus was a leading position among the elites of the member cities in the koinon. One could certainly assume that the elders among the Iulii held a dominant position in the region and had the ability to sway all delegates in the koinon to their favor, and manipulated Titus Iulius


246 Marek Kat. Marek Kat. Amastris 52. L. Senpronio militi et tu[bi(ici cohortis Camp(anorum), L. Allii]di Magna Titi Atti filia uxor | eius. Possible connections with family members or clients of Trajan’s leading military commander Lucius Quietus, who was highly successful in the Dacian, Armenian and Parthian campaigns, ought not to be ruled out. Dio Cass. 68.32.4-5 describes Lusius Quietus in the Dacian wars as a Moorish cavalry commander. Dio Cass. 68.29.4-30 describes Lusius as Trajan’s leading commander in quelling the rebellion after Trajan left Mesopotamia. PIR² L 439.
Aquila as a puppet, but it is more natural to assume that Titus Iulius Aquila had actual standing and recognised by his peers as a leading figure. Regardless, we acknowledge that the koinon’s reference to Titus Iulius Aquila’s name poses a peculiar challenge to interpreting this inscription, and to grasp the full dynamics between the koinon and the two prominent figures would require further evidence.

In summary, the importance of this inscription lies more than in its being only one of two koinon documents preserved on stone, since it situated the koinon authorities in a context that involved 1) a member of an elite family serving as the High Priest of the koinon; 2) a connection between this High Priest and a certain festival honoring Trajan, likely the Traiania mentioned by Pliny; 3) highlighting the maternal kin of this High Priest, who may have been from an equestrian or veteran family. If we compare the koinon’s honoring of Aquila with a vignette of a High Priest as represented by Barbara Burrell, some interesting similarities and discrepancies emerge.

The koina were generally headed by chief priests, who presided at the provincial imperial temples and their ceremonies. In their official functions, they may have come to be called ‘leader of the (individual koinon),’ so Asiarch, Lysiarch, Pamphyliarch, Pontarch, etc. . . . Chief priesthood of a koinon was considered the summit of a provincial career. Chief priests were generally not just Roman citizens but knights or sometimes even of senatorial family, and frequently they were friends of prominent Romans in power. The office was very costly, and could involve massive outlay not only to add special magnificence to koinon festivals (for which the cities also made contributions), but for such things as gladiatorial games and feasts, special building projects or even the payment of taxes for the entire province. For this outlay, and especially when presiding over the contests (s)he gave, the chief priest or chief priestess was often allowed the right to dress in purple, to wear a crown set with busts of the Augusti, and to walk at the head of the ritual procession of the koinon.

247 Burrell 2002, 346. Burrell’s account is comparable to a longer description by Kuhn 1864, 104-122, who surveys known sources in the literary and juridical tradition.
Several points make Titus Iulius Aquila stand out when compared with Burrell’s
description. Firstly, the *koinon* authorities made a relatively generic reference to Aquila’s
high social status, and exactly how high is left unsaid. While a likely descendant of the
equestrian procurator Gaius Iulius Aquila, whether Titus Iulius Aquila entered himself
into the equestrian order is not explicitly stated by the *koinon* authorities. That he lacks a
filiation in his nomenclature further adds to the ambiguity of his supposed prominence.
Nor may it be that all *koina* had within their territory abundant members of the equestrian
and senatorial order to choose from: from Bithynia, for instance, one notes that no known
officials of the *koinon* were advertised as of the equestrian or senatorial order.²⁴⁸ Burrell’s
impression was primarily derived from Quaß, whose selection of data from Devijver’s
*Prosopographia militarium equestrium* and Pflaum’s *Carrières procuratorientes*
équestres shows a concentration of examples in the provinces of Asia and Lycia.²⁴⁹ The
prominence of the officials of a relatively small and peripheral *koinon* such as the Koinon
of the Cities in Pontus may not be comparable with those of Asia and Lycia. This point is
to be pursued further in the ensuing section.

Secondly, the interest of the koinon authorities in recognising the leading status of
Aquila among the Amastrian *neoi* presents a degree of engagement with local institutions
by the koinon that is an aspect not emphasised in the vignette. The reason for the Koinon
to be involved in the hierarchy of the Amastrian *neoi* remains obscure, but one notable

²⁴⁸ Fernoux 2004, 349-360, es Tabl. 18 on known examples of individuals who served in the Bithynian
*koinon*.

²⁴⁹ Quaß 1993, 150, place the office of the provincial High Priesthood in the context of noblemen in the
equestrian and the senatorial orders demonstrating loyalty towards the emperors in order to become the
representatives of loyalty for their respective provinces and cities, and emphasised that their wealth was
instrumental in the display of loyalty. Also, Quaß 1982, 198.
common denominator of the two institutions is that both were concerned with agonistic competitions, which is discussed in chapter three. This overlap in their core interest may lead to a correlation between the Traiania mentioned in Pliny’s letter and Aquila’s leadership positions in the Koinon and in the Amastrian neoi, though the fact that the Koinon decree did not make this correlation explicit leads to further uncertainties. In any case, the appearance of a new pentaeteric agonistic event tied to the reigning emperor would have been a significant development, due to the range of resources that the festival would have required so that sacrifices, ceremonies, and preparation for competitions and prizes could be appropriately arranged. We know of such an impact that took place when a new festival for the living Augustus was established in Asia. The tradition of the professional hymnodes’ performing at Pergamum was at its initial gathering a voluntary service, and it was only until this voluntary service concluded that a province-wide collection of fees was approved by Augustus to make the hymnodes’ performance a regular paid service.250 Considering that the Koinon’s designation of Aquila was protos aristeus or champion of the neoi, we envision that the Amastrian ephebeia might have been drawn by municipal or koinon officials to participate in the newly found agonistic festival out of exigency to perform in ceremonies, or even participate in competitions.

250 Ephesus 227, ll. 56-61 ἵνα μὲν τοῖς δόξῳ πάσιν τοῖς πανταχοῦ ὑμνῳδοῖς τούτῳ πεπο[ηκέναι] τὸν πρόκριμα, ὡς εἰς τὰς Ξαροῦμας | τοὺς ἔν Περγάμῳ αὐτὸν τὸν θεὸν Σεβαστόν ὑμνοῦντας ἐν τῷ ὑπὸ τῆς Ἄσιας καὶ[θεριώ][μέν] τῷ ἐν[ε], ὅν ἦν πρώτῃ | σύνοδος τῶν ἑπετῶν οὐκ ἠμοίσθησαν καὶ χορὶς[ε] ἀργυρίου διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Σεβαστὸς μετὰ ταῦτα | ψηφισθέντα | φιλάνθρωπα ἃ[ν]τοι eis tìn diadokhìn tōn ἐκείνων γεννυμένων ἐπήρησεν, ἔξωθεν ἀνάλῳμαι ὅπο χρόνον ἔπος τῆς Ἀσίας ἀλλὰ ἑκέλευσεν, λογισάμε[νος] βαρεῖ[ν ἐπεσθαί] μιᾷ πόλει τὴν τοιαύτα τὴν εἰσφοράν. [Lest I seem to have judged the case for all hymnodes everywhere, I exempt those singing hymns in Pergamon to the god Augustus himself in the temenos dedicated by Asia. There the first assembly gathered, not as though hired but voluntarily and without payment. For this reason also the god Augustus preserved the privileges decreed later regarding the succession of those who came after them, that their expenses be defrayed not only by the Pergamenes, but by the whole of Asia, because such a contribution would be a burden for a single city. (Trans. Friesen)] The context likely refers to Dio Cass. 51.20.6-7; see chapter 1.1.
Thirdly, Burrell’s vignette portrays the High Priest as a leading figure during ritual processions, for which he would have worn “a crown set with busts of the Augusti” as part of his priestly regalia. The interpretations of Wörrle and Riccardi discussed earlier regarding the epigraphic and visual evidence of bust-crowns show, however, that the proper association of the bust-crown is with agonistic events, and a priest may have worn a bust-crown if he was agonothete. The distinction is significant, because the Koinon described Aquila’s reception of the stephanos as an event that was independent of Aquila’s holding of the High Priesthood. This hypothesis is supported by Rumscheid’s study of the archaeological and literary evidence concerning all known bust-crowns, as well as the similarities between Aquila’s crown in the description of the bust-crown created for the agonothete of the Demostheneia at Oenoanda. Burrell’s description is therefore correct only in the sense that High Priests were generally involved in agonistic festivals, but bust-crowns were not exclusively worn by High Priests. This identification is important in how we interpret Aquila’s service to the Koinon – he was both High Priest of Pontus, and he was also an important member of the first Traiania that likely took place at Heraclea or Tium. In turn, this interpretation situates Aquila within a regional agonistic network, in which dignitaries from cities in coastal Paphlagonia would become attracted to important imperial festivities. Whether the Koinon was the instigating party for Aquila to become involved is uncertain, but likely, particularly if the proper worship of the reigning emperor was also carefully observed by the provincial governor, as we see in the case of Paullus Fabius Persicus in his ruling on the Ephesian petition, mentioned earlier.
In summary, Aquila’s inscription is a starting point that helps establish the baseline of what to expect of a High Priest of Pontus in the specific context of coastal Paphlagonia. Aquila more or less follows common expectations of a local elite engaged in *philotimia* or the love of honor, such as performing the public service of the High Priesthood. Yet, the koinon decree offers more. The decree informs us of Aquila’s familial connection with a prominent lady who may have been a member of the Lusii that has not been attested in Amastrian inscriptions, though we note that the reading is of some controversy as discussed earlier. The decree also dictates how Aquila was to be addressed, which can be interpreted as an official appointment that gave Aquila a clear leading position in the Amastrian ephebeia. This is a rare example of a koinon in the Greek East to have been involved in the hierarchy at the local level, an aspect rarely discussed in scholarship, and implies that we ought to view the koinon as a regional institution that could influence or even direct local organisations through the mechanism of honorifics. In the next section, we move on to study the second inscription that was issued by the *Koinon* of the Cities in Pontus. This inscription found in Heraclea Pontica is short but important in its use of bureaucratic language that describes the practice of volunteering to perform benefaction at the *koinon* level. In turn, it is more than a unique piece of evidence for the *Koinon* of the Cities in Pontus, because it also adds to the small corpus of inscriptions that concern procedural matters during the election of a koinon High Priest.
2.1.2 The Koinon honors Aurelius Alexander as Voluntary High Priest

A second decree issued by the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus, found in Heraclea Pontica, was jointly issued with the boule and the damos of Heraclea to honor Aurelius Alexander, son of Timotheus, for his voluntary and generous service as High Priest of Pontus.\(^\text{251}\) The multiple agencies involved make this an intriguing document, as it touches upon the degree of interaction between local and koinon authorities comparable with that indicated by the previous document involving the koinon, the High Priest of Pontus Titus Iulius Aquila, and the Amastrian neoi. Pargoire first received the sketch and transcription of the text from a missionary based in Zonguldak and published them in 1898.\(^\text{252}\) The stone was later studied by Kalinka, who provided more accurate descriptions and measurements.\(^\text{253}\)

\[ \text{ἀγαθῆι τύχῃ | ἀβουλὰ καὶ ὁ δᾶμος καὶ τὸ κοινὸν | τῶν ἐν Πόντῳ πολίων} \\
\[ \text{ἐτείμασαν τὸν αὐθαίρετον καὶ μεγαλόψυχον ἀρχιερέα τοῦ Πόντου, Αὐρήλιον Ἀλέξανδρον Τειμοθέου.} \\
\]

To good fortune. The boule, the demos, and the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus honored the voluntary and magnanimous High Priest of Pontus, Aurelius

\(^{251}\) Jonnes 1984, 7 no. 3. The inscription is not seen by Lloyd Jonnes, and can be presumed lost.

\(^{252}\) Pargoire 1898, 492-493 1.50 m long, 0.40 m high; letters 0.025 high. Jonnes 1994, 6.

\(^{253}\) Kalinka 1933, 96 no. 67, 1.16 m in length, 0.47 m deep, 0.37 m in height, with letters measuring 0.03 m in height.
Alexander son of Timotheos.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{ΑΓΑΘΗ} & \quad \text{ΤΥΧΗ} \\
\text{ΑΒΟΥΛΑ} & \text{ΚΑΙΟΔΑΜΟΣ} \text{ΚΑΙ} \text{ΤΟ} \text{ΚΟΙΝΩΝ} \\
\text{ΤΩΝ} & \text{ΕΝΠΟΝΤΩΝ} \text{ΠΟΛΙΩΝ} \text{ΙΕΤΕΙΜΑΣΑΝΤΟΝΑΥΘΑΙ} \\
\text{ΡΕΤΟΝΚΑΙ} & \text{ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥΛΥΧΟΝΑΡΧΙΕΡΑΤΟΥΠΟΝ} \\
\text{ΤΟΥΑΥΡΗΙΟΝΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΝΤΕΙΜΟΘΕΟΝ} \\
\text{Sketch by Jules Pargoire (1898)} \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{ΑΓΑΕΙ} & \quad \text{ΤΥΧΗ} \\
\text{ΑΒΟΥΛΙΑ} & \text{ΚΑΙΟΔΑΜΟΣ} \text{ΚΑΙΤΟΚΟΙΝΩΝ} \\
\text{ΤΩΝ} & \text{ΕΝΠΟΝΤΩΝ} \text{ΠΟΛΙΩΝ} \text{ΙΕΤΕΙΜΑΣΑΝΤΟΝΑΥΘΑΙ} \\
\text{ΡΕΤΟΝΚΑΙ} & \text{ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥΛΥΧΟΝΑΡΧΙΕΡΑΤΟΥΠΟΝ} \\
\text{ΤΟΥΑΥΡΗΙΟΝΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΝΤΕΙΜΟΘΕΟΥ} \\
\text{Sketch by Ernst Kalinka (1933)} \\
\end{align*} \]

FIG. 16. SKETCH OF AURELIUS ALEXANDER SON OF TIMOTHEOS INSCRIPTION

The earlier transcription published by Pargoire received much attention for the

\textit{iota} after \textit{πολίων} in line three, which have been interpreted as the \textit{Koinon} of the Ten

Cities in Pontus. Strabo stated that there were eleven cities in Pontus in his time,\textsuperscript{254} with

one having been reallocated during territorial reforms in the Julio-Claudian period,\textsuperscript{255}

which made Pargoire’s report important evidence that would have supported Strabo’s

account. Yet Kalinka stated that he did not see the \textit{iota}.\textsuperscript{256} It is also notable that the first

line of the sketches made by Pargoire and Kalinka differ significantly in terms of spacing,

\textsuperscript{254} Strab. 12.3.1 τά μὲν πρὸς Ἀρμενίαν καὶ τά περὶ τὴν Κολχίδα τοῖς συναγωγοσεμένοις δυνάσταις
κατένειμε, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ εἰς ἔνδεικα πολιτείας διέτης καὶ τῇ Βιθυνίᾳ προσέθηκε, ὅστις ἐκ ἀμφότερον ἐπαρχόν
γενέσθαι μίαν.

\textsuperscript{255} Most important, Cumont 1901, Cumont 1903; See Sørensen 2016, 77-78 for survey of scholarship.

\textsuperscript{256} Perhaps also a more accurate transcription, Τειμοθέου instead of Τειμοθέον in line 4; Kalinka 1993, 95.
and the rest of the inscription differ in spacing as well as letter form, in particular the \textit{rho}, \textit{xi}, and \textit{psi}. The amount of details reported by Kalinka, both measurement and stylised letter forms, makes his autopsy more convincing. Pargoire’s \textit{iota} ought to be rejected.

One consistent detail reported by both Pargoire and Kalinka is the koiné \textit{ἀγαθῇ} \textit{τύχῃ} in line 1 and the Doric in the rest of the honorific inscription. What is interesting about this dialect inconsistency is that such phenomenon runs counter to traces of ethnic division in coastal Paphlagonia. A funerary epitaph from Kytoros in the Doric dialect commemorated a certain Aristander and his father’s benefactions in the \textit{ephebia} and \textit{gymnasia} of Heraclea Pontica, identifying his patria as the “Doric polis,”\footnote{SEG 30.1452; inscribed on a monument from Gideruz, now housed in Istanbul. [τ]όν πάρος ἀφνειόν με [καὶ ἐκ γενεῆς φιλοτ[ε]μον / οὕτος Αριστανδρο[ν] [ξέινε, τάφος κατέχει, / υἱὸ[ν] [Α]ἲστοτέξιον τοῦ πρὶν ποτ[ε] / [γ]υμνασίαρχου, / [α]ὐτὸν ἐφήβ[α]ρ | [χ]ον λαμπρότατον πατρι[δ][δ] | [μ]άρτυρ[α] δ’ Ηρακλέ[ν] | [λ]ιπαροῦ ἐν γυμνασίῳ[σ] | [χλ]άκεον ἄθρησες σύν | [κ]εραθεὶς άλφω. / τοῦ με χάριν | [Δ]ύοροι πόλις τεμαίσιν [α]π[α][σ]ας / ἰμμυγα Πασιθέη | [τ]εσσε φιλή άλφω. / ζήτας || [δ]’ εὐκταῖος και γηρ[ά]σι[ς] | [μ]α[κ]α[σ]τότων / [τ]ῶ[ν] θαν[ων] | [τ]ῆ[ν][β]εω σόμα καθωρμε[σ]α | [μ]ην. || [χ]αίρε. [Stranger, this tomb buries Aristandros, formerly with wealth and from a family eager to give benefactions, the son of Aristoxenos a former gymnasiarch; he himself was a famous ephebarch of his patria; consider the proof, a bronze Heracles with deer horns among splendid gymnasts. with grace the Doric city gives him all honors, along with his wife Peisithea; he lived devotedly and reached an old age. Upon his death I inter his body in this tomb. Farewell. (Translation mine)]} while another funerary epitaph from Amastris, dating from 155 CE, records in koiné one Aemilianus who died in Pergamum while competing there, and emphasises that it was on “Dorian
A survey of known inscriptions from Heraclea shows that, when measured along with koiné and other neo-Greek dialects, the proportion of inscriptions using Doric dialect was not particularly high. The sample is small, with only 22 out of 84 inscriptions from Jonnes’ collation being clearly Doric, but this preliminary assessment shows that the linguistic environment at Heraclea was diverse, and points further to the possibility that Heracleans held different sense of ethnic identity rooted in the use of different dialects.

The fact that the city of Heraclea issued this inscription along with the koinon in the Doric dialect suggests the possibility that Doric belonging may have been considered proper among prominent Heracleans who participated in municipal government. When coupled with the inscriptions in the Doric dialect that associated with the ephebia and gymnasia mentioned earlier, the linguistic and ethnic indicators seemed to point towards

---

258 Jones 1990, 54. ἔτος µὲν ἦν τριακοστὸν ἔδη µιὸς τόδε, | ἔθηκε δ' Αἰμιλιανὸν ὅνοµᾶ µιὸς πατήρ, | ὃν ἔθρεψε Γέµινος, ἕξ ἀνήρ τῶν εὐγενῶν; | παρ' ἐµπύρῳς δὲ κύων Εὐῖοθεο | τριετῆς τελετῆς ἀνήγαγον | ἀλὼτος, ἀπάντων εὐρυθμῶν σφαιρισμάτων | ὃν ἔθεσεν ἀνέπνευσεν τροφεὺς ἐµός, | σατύρῳ τε ἐνέικων Κύζικον καὶ Πέργαµον | καὶ Κυζίκου µὲν αὐτὸς ἠγέγκα ἑκτὸς, | τὸ Περγάµου δὲ µοίρα ἀπήγκεν πικρὰ | καὶ µου τὸ σῶµα Δωρίας ἐπὶ χθόνος | ἐµάρανε δαίµον, ὡστε δ' ἐν πάτρῃ λαβὼν | τροφεὺς Γέµινος λάρνακα ἐς λιθίνην θέτο | αἰωνίοις στεφάνοις ἐπικοσμοῦμενα. | ἐκσ’, πρὸ α’ καλ(ανδόν) Σεπτεµβρίων, | Λώου ζ’. This was now my thirtieth year, and my father gave me the name Aemilianus, and Geminus brought me up, a man of noble birth. Amid incense-vessels I led the revel for the biennial god Euhios, (and led) the rite in mystic fashion. I was also revered in the gymnasia, skilled in wrestling, the javelin, the pancration, the discus, the hoop, jumping, all rhythmical ball-games, in each of which my foster-father had trained. And with a satyr-play I won at Cyzicus and Pergamon; I myself took the crown at Cyzicus, but the Pergamene one cruel fate took away. Misfortune wasted my body on Dorian soil, but Geminus carrying my bones to my home city put them in a stone urn, adorned by eternal crowns. (Year) 225, 31 August, Loos 17th. (Trans. Christopher Jones)

259 From IK Heraclea, a collation of 84 inscriptions from Heraclea, at least 22 inscriptions include clear traits of Doric orthography, including examples datable to Vespasian, Hadrian, and the Antonine emperors, and from both private and public monuments. From IK Heraclea: Vespasian: no. 5; Hadrian: no. 58?; Antoninus Pius: no. 51; Antoinne: nos. 1, 3; Second/Third century CE: nos. 10, 11, 15; Uncertain imperial: nos. 16, 49, 55, 82; Uncertain: nos. 24, 26, 29, 47, 67, 71, 75, 78, 84. Jonnes noted some of the linguistic traits of Heraclean inscriptions in his commentary, but the fuller presentation of the complexity is given by Brixhe 1996, 639-641 no. 436, who pointed out notable examples of Doric and koiné dialects, and made comparisons between the koiné and the neo-Pontic dialect. The Doric acclamation τύχαι ἀγαθὰ was used, an Antonine example that is to be discussed in a a separate context in chapter two.
a socio-political context where groups that identified with the Doric sense of belonging were able to not only maintain political prominence, but can even curate their collective identity through ephebic institutions. This would also explain why the distinct ethnic division attested in the two inscriptions above came from individuals who have been trained in the *ephebia* and *gymnasia*. Likely, the honorands were trained to identify with the Doric sense of belonging through a curriculum overseen by prominent Heracleans during the imperial period. The inscription issued jointly by the city of Heraclea and the koinon is one indication that the koinon relied upon the predominant voice of a city to carry out the koinon’s agenda.

However, the puzzling feature of the inscription is that it was not entirely Doric. One would assume that the drafter[s] of the decree would have been aware of the cultural symbolism implied in dialect usage, as the ephebic inscriptions discussed earlier indicated that municipal elites who participated in the *ephebeia* would have been particularly indoctrinated by dialect distinction. Error is possible, but to the Ionic acclamation would have been so apparent that, should there have been real concerns about the symbolism of the Doric dialect, it would have been quickly erased and re-inscribed.

We note that we do not have a clear date for the joint decree: a date of the late second century CE or later may place this inscription in a time when ethnic division has become less pronounced. In such an environment, other extraordinary circumstances, such as intentional reuse, could be considered. One example can be found locally in a

honorific inscription dedicated to Valentinian, Theodosius and Arcadius. The inscription opens with ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ in the first line, followed by a Latin text.\textsuperscript{261} Jonnes observed that the stone was redressed, which in turn explains why there are significant differences in letter size, language and style between the acclamation and the dedicatory portion of the text.\textsuperscript{262} Yet the stone of the joint decree is now lost. Accordingly, we cannot determine whether reuse was behind the reason for the co-existence of two dialects. We can only tentatively conclude that the presence of the koiné acclamation suggests a degree of complacency on the part of all parties involved, which in turn was due to a dissipating interest in maintaining ethnic divisions based on linguistic performance.

While the juxtaposition of the Doric and Ionic dialects can be attributed to a gradual dissipation of anxiety among Heracleans to distinguish between Doric and Ionic dialects, it also points to unattentiveness towards detail on the part of curator that was in charge of setting up the monument honoring Aurelius Alexander. The absence of Alexander’s honors, benefactions and familial connection is in this respect relevant. There is no mention of past philotimia in the joint decree, either performed by Alexander or his family. There is no reference to the ties between Alexander and his patria, which could only be hypothetically assumed to be Heraclean, given that the Heraclean authorities were one of the issuing parties. As for ancestry, we have little to depend upon except Alexander's binominal nomenclature, though even this is inconclusive. The standard expectation for the binominal or trianominal formula of a Roman family is to

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item IK Heraclea no. 6, ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ | DDD NNN | Valentiniani | et Theodosi | et Arcadi Auggg | semper victoribus.

\item Jonnes 1986, 97 also pointed out that the stonemcutter mistakenly inscribed emperors in the genitive, which should have been in the dedicatory dative ending in -i.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
have the father's praenomen used as the filiation, and a name of non-Italian origin used as the cognomen, but in the imperial period the father's cognomen could also be used, which means that we have no clear indication on whether Alexander was of the first generation of enfranchised Roman citizens. To assume that Alexander's nomen gentilicum Aurelius is derived from the *Constitutio Antoniniana* is also suspect. Aurelius was an imperial gentilicum bestowed long before the *Constitutio*. We know that at least one dignitary from the southeastern territory of Amastris who have received citizenship from Marcus Aurelius. We also need to consider the influence of Marcus Aurelius Cotta, who was the first governor of Bithynia before the third Mithridatic War, and may have left his mark in the local nomenclature through the bestowal of his nomen gentilicum upon clients and slaves that would form families of their own following their rising fortunes.

What can be fairly certain is that Aurelius Alexander was a peer to Titus Iulius Aquila, due to the fact that the attainment of the High Priesthood of a koinon required more than simple wealth of an individual, but the result of a full review of the candidate’s person and his family by his peers within the city, followed by a collective consideration at the koinon assembly. We touch upon, therefore, the expectations of the High Priest of a koinon, and there are several literary sources that give us further insight on the general

---

263 McLean 2002, 114; an example in Amastris: Tiberius Claudius Lepidus son of Lepidus, discussed below.

264 Salway 1994, 136; Gilliam 1965, 83 surveys the number of persons with the nomen gentilicum Aurelius bestowed pre- and post-212 CE in the Dura military roster (Dura 100 & 101).

265 Marek 1993, Kat. Amastris 95. Also, Marcus Aurelius Cotta, the first Bithynian proconsul in 74 BCE, remained active in the Pontic region during the Third Mithridatic War, and could have had significant impact on nomenclature as well.
perception as well as the detailed criteria that would have been involved in the review processes at the municipal and the koinon levels.

Philostratus described the High Priesthood of a koinon as a prestigious position closely associated with prominent families. The High Priesthood of Lycia was “a liturgy highly regarded by the Romans, even though it concerned the small ethnos of the Lycians; the office was held by persons with distinguished ancestors,” and Heracleides of Lycia became High Priest of Lycia because of such lineage. Similarly, Scopelian of Clazomenae held the office of the High Priesthood of Asia because his family customarily inherited the office. The juridical tradition offers some explanation of why the High Priesthood is customarily associated with prominent families. In explaining the conditions of eligibility for honores and munera, Callistratus pointed to four criteria: 1) the individual's persona (with regard to social standing and age), 2) place of birth, 3) whether the individual's property would be sufficient, and 4) additional by-laws for the

---

266 Philostrat. VS 613 Ἀνήρ ἐλλογιώτατος καὶ Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Λύκιος καὶ τὰ οίκοι μὲν, ἐπειδή πατέρων τε ἀγαθῶν ἔρω καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς Λυκίων ἐγένετο. [Heracleides the Lycian was also a very notable person, in the first place as regards his family, since he was descended from distinguished ancestors and so became high-priest of Lycia. (Trans. Wright)]

267 Philostrat. VS 515 ἀρχιερεὺς μὲν γὰρ ἐγένετο τῆς Ἀσίας αὐτὸς τε καὶ οἱ πρόγονοι αὐτοῦ παῖς ἐκ πατρὸς πάντες, ὅ δὲ στέφανος αὐτοῦ πόλις καὶ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν χρημάτων. [For he [sic. Scopelian] was himself high-priest of Asia and so were his ancestors before him, all of them, from father to son. And this is a great crown of glory and more than great wealth. (Trans. Wright)]

268 The difference between honores and munera, as explained by Callistratus, is that the latter is expense without official status. Dig. 50.4.14.1 honor municipalis est administratio rei publicae cum dignitatis gradu, siue cum sumptu siue erogatione contingens. . . . publicum munus dicitur, quod in administranda re publica cum sumptu sine titulo dignitatis subimus. [Municipal office is the administration of the community with an official position, whether it involves expense or not. . . . something is called a public munus if we undertake it in the course of administering the community and are involved in expense but have no formal position. (Trans. Watson)]
service (*munus*) in question.\(^{269}\) These conditions concerning candidacy for *honores* and *munera* likely apply to the provincial priesthood, because Hermogenian’s statement – “none is debarred from holding again of his own free will the priesthood of a province” – is reported a few sections down,\(^{270}\) and in the same context.\(^{271}\)

Two epigraphic sources offer some further clarification of what considerations of one’s *persona* would entail. Firstly, in a long letter concerning appeals from Athens, Marcus Aurelius reaffirmed the disqualification of one Ladicus son of Polyaenus due to the fact that he was below the minimum age, had not served in public office before becoming Panhellenic in the synedrion of the Panhellenion,\(^{272}\) and granted an exception

\(^{269}\) Dig. 50.4.14.3 de honoribus siue munibus gerendis cum quaeritur, in primis consideranda persona est eius, cui deferatur honor siue muneri administratio: item origo natalium: facultates quoque an sufficere inuncto muneri possint: item lex, secundum quam muniburus quisque fungii debeat. [If one is concerned with the holding of office or the undertaking of munera, in the first place one must consider the character of the man on whom this office or administration of the munus is conferred; likewise, his place of birth; also his property, whether it is sufficient for the munus in question; likewise, the law under which everyone must perform munera. (Trans. Watson)]

\(^{270}\) Dig. 50.4.17.1 sponte prouinciae sacerdotium iterare nemo prohibetur.

\(^{271}\) Callistratus also described additional rules: Dig. 50.4.14.5, a viable candidate for holding office or serving *munera* could not hold the higher magistracy before the lesser, and may not hold offices in succession, erendorum honorum non promiscua facultas est, sed ordo certus est, rei adhibitus est. nam neque prius maiorum magistratum quisquam, nisi minorem susceperit, gerere potest, neque ab omni aetate, neque continuare quaisque honores potest.” [The opportunity to fill the honores is not indiscriminate, but a fixed arrangement is applied for this matter. For a man may not hold the more important magistracy before he has held the less important one, nor at any age, nor may anyone hold offices in succession. It is laid down in several constitutiones that if there is no one else to hold office, those who have held it are to be forced to do so again. Trans. Watson, modified.] Also, Dig. 50.4.14.6, exception can be made for holding offices in succession when there are no individuals viable for candidacy.

\(^{272}\) Oliver 1970, Plaque II = EM 13366 ll. 15-20. Λάδικος Πολυαίνου ὁ ἐκκελκλημένος πρὸς Σωφάνην Σω[φά]||[v]ο[π] ᾠ[λ] Ιουλ. Δαμοσθάτου τοῦ ἄρχοντος τῶν Πανελλήνων φαίνεται κατὰ τὸν ἀριστεύσαν χρόνον ἀπείρως δικαιοείθαι πρὸς τοὺς κεχειροτονημένους Πανελλήνας: κληθεὶς ἐπὶ τὴν κρίσην, ἀπειρο[κ]ε[π] τοῦ ἐν νομισμαίνῳ προβεβηκέν στὴν χειροτονίαν γεγενημένην, ὡς τὴν ἔννοιαν, ἠλπίζειν γεγονός οὕτως τότε, καὶ ὀνομάζειν ἄρχον προσέρχειν ἀρίστας ὡς ὁ θεὸς πάππος μου ἀρίστες, ὁδίκος [ἐρείπω]κέναι δικέσθαι. [Ladicus son of Polyaenus, he who has appealed a case against Sophanes son of Sophanes from the court of Julius Damosstratus the archon of the Panhellenes, seems [to have been away] at the appointed time [when] it is permissible for actions to be brought against the Panhellenes elect. Although the customary period after the election has taken place had expired, he was summoned to trial and was disqualified, according to the prescription of my deified grandfather, on the grounds that he had even then not attained the legal age and had held no previous office. He has, in our judgment, made an appeal without justification. (Trans. Oliver)]
for members of the Areopagites who did not meet the three-generation rule but became a
Panhellene.\textsuperscript{273} The \textit{persona} of Ladicus would concern first his local status, or whether he
was a member of the Areopagus.\textsuperscript{274} This local status was in turn based on his birth, or
whether he was born of three generations of free parents.\textsuperscript{275} Secondly, we learn that
Roman citizenship was assessed as a criterion of one’s \textit{persona} in certain jurisdictions.
The \textit{lex Narbonensis} provided that only Roman citizens were eligible to take up the
provincial priesthood in Gallia Narbonensis.\textsuperscript{276} It is possible that Roman citizenship was
highly preferred in northern Anatolia as well, since known High Priests of Pontus and
Pontarchs from northern Anatolian cities use the bi- or tria nomina.\textsuperscript{277}

\textsuperscript{273} Oliver 1970, Plaque II = EM 13366 frag. E II. 76-79: \textit{ὅταν τινες ἐξ Ἀρεοπαγειτῶν ἐν τοῖς [Πανέλ]λησιν ὄντες τὴν τριγονίαν καταληφθῶσιν τὴν τριγονίαν παρασχεῖν μὴ δύναμενοι, οὐ διὰ τοῦτο ἀπὸδοιο[[χήσονται τοῦ συνεδρίου, πρὸς δὲ τὸ μέλλον οὐδείς ἄλλος ἐξ Ἀρεοπαγειτῶν τοῖς Πανέλλησιν ἐνγραφή]σεται δόσι πρὸς τὰς χειροτονίας ἀφικνεῖσθαι δόναται τὴν τριγονίαν ἔχοντες. [If any Areopagites unable to meet the three-generation rule are found to be today among the Panhellenes, they shall not be expelled from the synedron (of the Panhellenes) on this account, but for the future no Areopagite other than those who can enter the elections with the three-generation quality shall be enrolled among the Panhellenes. (Trans. Oliver)]

\textsuperscript{274} Perhaps an example is Dig. 50.2.7.2 includes a section by jurist Paulus, stating that someone who is not a decurion cannot hold the duumvirate or other offices, because plebeians are debarred from holding the office of decurions.

\textsuperscript{275} Oliver 1970, 20-24, surveys multiple Athenian and Roman parallels regarding the various aspects for good birth as defined by free birth.

\textsuperscript{276} Fishwick 2002b, 296. Lines 17-21 is a section under the title si flamen in ciuitate esse desierit that outlines the procedures to replace a provincial flamen of the province of Gallia Narbonensis: si flamen in ciuitate esse desierit neque ei subrogatus erit, tum uti quis [flamen proxime fuerit . . . 19 . . . is] | in triduo quo certior factus erit et poterit Narboni sacra facito [. . . 35 . . . per reliquam] partem eius anni eo ordine hab(e)to quo anuorum flamin[um habentur . . . 16 . . . eique, si habuerit per dies non minus] | XXX, siremps lex ius causaque esto quae flamin Augus[tis ex hac lege erit. [If the flamen ceases to be a citizen, and a substitute has not been appointed for him, then [the man who was most recently flamen, . . .] within three days from the time he has been informed and is able, is to perform the sacred rituals in Narbo [and] hold [. . . for the remaining] portion of this year in that sequence in which [. . .] of the yearly flamines [are held. And if he performs for not less than] 30 [days] the statute and law and position is to be [for him] exactly as for the flamen of Augustus [in accordance with this statue, . . . (Trans. Williamson.)] For overview of lex Narbonensis and the possibility of, occasional exceptions shown in examples from Lusitania and Lower Moesia, Fishwick 2002b, 10-12, also 295-297; Williamson 1987, 181-189.

\textsuperscript{277} Loriot 2006, 537-538.
Returning to Aurelius Alexander, his nomen gentilicum implies that he received Roman citizenship. His patronymic does not inform us how many generations of free parents preceded him, but they might have been sufficient for his taking office. The lack of reference to serving in a local magistracy would not meet Athenian standards, but this does not seem to have affected Titus Iulius Aquila, leading to the conclusion that local service was not an important criterion for the Koinon. In short, Alexander was likely of free-born status, enfranchised with the Roman citizenship, with sufficient property to bear the financial burden, and fulfilled a certain age requirement, perhaps 25 to 55. These indicators likely also informed his Heraclean peers as they considered his candidacy, though the inscription suggests that his peers also had to take into account other outstanding factors that led to the final decision of producing a simple if not simplified honorific inscription that contained a text that did not pay due diligence to render the inscription in a uniform dialect.

To begin, the joint decree either had nothing to say about Aurelius Alexander’s philotimia or his personal contributions to either the koinon or the city in general. Instead, the focus of the Heraclean authorities and the koinon was on Aurelius Alexander’s voluntarity. The notion of voluntarity requires, therefore some consideration both in terms of the semantics of the term αὐθαίρετον itself, and the historical context of voluntary philotimia.

A. H. M. Jones envisioned that voluntary philotimia was a costly but necessary form of patriotic expression of one’s patria, because they were denied of other extreme

---

278 Likely above the age of 25. Dig. 50.4.2.11 reports the age of service for decurion between 25 and 55.
forms of expression such as to fight in wars and to die for one’s city, or to engage in diplomacy in a way that was comparable to the Classical or Hellenistic period. Jones held that the financial burden of taking up offices to perform liturgies was acceptable, because “the city aristocracies had plenty of money to burn. Many provincials enjoyed very large incomes, and, for lack of anything else to do with them, had to spend them.”

What is absent from the vision that Jones provided is the possibility that candidates who were described as willing to volunteer might in fact have been unwilling volunteers. One example is Aelius Aristides, who described how he defeated the provincial governors and the municipal authorities as they tried to force upon him municipal and koinon offices. We take particular interest in the process of his election to become a candidate for Smyrnaean office and the High Priest-elect of the Koinon of Asia. The comparison with Aelius Aristeides is useful, as it places Aurelius Alexander in an autobiographical account of a second century CE elite contending in the political arena of the municipal, regional, and provincial levels.

After two years of recovery in the Pergamene Asklepeion, Aristides stopped at Smyrna on the way to Lebedus in 147 CE, still weak from prolonged illness, only to become ensnared by members of the Smyrnaean demos to the ekklesia, summoning him

---

279 Jones 1940, 248-249. The reasoning is that, since local elites “could no longer add to [their native countries’] glory by war or diplomacy, they endeavoured to magnify them in the only ways still available, and a man with rhetorical skills could “cover himself with glory by persuading the emperor to make the city an assize town or a centre of the imperial cult,” while a man with wealth “could spend lavishly on the magistracies which he held and to give shows and feasts and distributions and buildings.”

280 Jones 1940, 250.

281 Ael. Arist. Or. 50 = Hieroi Logoi 4.

282 Behr 1968, 61-63.
under the pretence of a public sacrifice for his health.\textsuperscript{283} Aristides was led unawares into

the \textit{ekklesia} where a throng of people showered applause and clamored for him to be

Smyrna’s candidate for the High Priesthood of Asia, with magistrates from different

places standing about him and praising him along with the people.\textsuperscript{284}

\begin{quote}
When the year began and the first assembly was being held, men came from the \textit{demos} to summon me, since I had come after a long time; and at the same time they announced that they intended to sacrifice publicly on my behalf, which they had also done many times before. When I had entered the Assembly and the People shouted their customary approval, those, who had prepared themselves, went to work, applauding and offering me the common priesthood of Asia, and they won over the \textit{demos} without any difficulty. And at the same time, the officials stood about me, each from a different place praising me and shouting out and vying with the people in their request. (Trans. Behr)
\end{quote}

Though Aristides successfully dissuaded the \textit{ekklesia} from promoting this nomination, the Smyrnaean delegates of the \textit{koinon} entered Aristides’ name in the \textit{synedrion} of the \textit{koinon} regardless of the actual decision in the Smyrnaean \textit{ekklesia}, and Aristides was

\textsuperscript{283} Ael. Arist. \textit{Hieroi Logoi} 4.99-104.

\textsuperscript{284} Aristid. \textit{Hieroi Logoi} 4.100-101.
elected “third or fourth” in the vote. Aristides then reversed this decision by submitting an appeal to the governor Festus, and was eventually granted an exemption. The abuse of power by the municipal authorities demonstrated in the nomination process is striking. The Smyrnaean demos and the magistrates from the Smyrnaean territory had clearly reached a consensus that Aelius Aristides would be elected, and forced their nominee to take up the candidacy by leading him to the general assembly of Smyrna unaware that he was to be nominated, and surprised him with staged public approval. The scene as described by Aristides seems to have been so well-rehearsed as to suggest that it was Smyrnaean custom, if not also practised elsewhere in the Greek East. That Aristides was not impressed did not make any difference: his nomination in the synedrion of the koinon of Asia suggests that the Smyrnaean delegation had little regard for their nominee’s consent. Also notable in this context is Aristides’ remark that the summoners from the demos came oĩa δὴ δὴ χρόνου τε ἀφιγµένον – the reason being Aristides’ long absence.

The sense implied is that it was Aristides’ turn, and Aristides’ candidacy was less a matter of public approval than of fairness among the leading men of Smyrna and other communities within its territory. We can sense similar dynamics of fairness in a rescript from Hadrian to the authorities of Aphrodisias. A list of nominees to the High Priesthood

---

285 Aristid. Hieroi Logoi 4.103 καὶ συµβαίνει μετὰ τοῦτο συνέδριου μὲν ἐξέναι Σµυρναίων εἰς Φρυγίαν ἄνω καὶ µέλλειν φέρειν τούτων ὄνοµα ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ τῷ κοινῷ, προαισθέσθαι δὲ µὲ καὶ πέµψαι τὸν τροφέα τὸν Ζώσιµον: καὶ γίγνοµαι τρίτος ἢ τέταρτος τῇ χειροτονία. µετὰ ταῦτα ἔφεσις, κλῆσις τοῦ σωτῆρος εἰς Πέργαµον. And it happened after this, that the delegates of Smyrna went to Upper Phrygia and intended to nominate me in the Provincial Assembly, but that I got wind of it in advance and sent my foster father Zosimus. And I was elected in the third or fourth place. After this, there was an appeal, a summons of the governor, and a summons of the Savior to Pergamum. (Trans. Behr) The meaning of this result remains unclear, despite several speculations. Behr 1968, 64 fn. 15 proposes that “the three or four” could be correlated with the number of regular and irregular meetings for the koinon in a four year interval across a 29-year cycle, and would essentially mean that Smyrna nominated Aristides as the High Priest for the venue in Smyrna in the current four-year interval. Also see Magie 1950, 1295 no. 55.

seeking exemption was given to the magistrates, the boule, and the demos of Aphrodisias for investigation, and the authorities of Aphrodisias were to determine which of the candidates were better-off, for it was fair for these to serve first.287 That the municipal authorities held considerable power over its citizens with regard to municipal as well as koinon office further suggests that the expression of individual voluntarity in honorific inscriptions was nuanced.

The (potential) disregard of individual reluctance to serve, such as Aelius Aristides described, leads us to question the semantics of the word αὐθαίρετος and its cognate terms. As Kleijwegt pointed out, references for voluntary service may be a strategy to encourage potential benefactors to contribute amidst a general decline in willingness to take up liturgies.288 Upon surveying select inscriptions in such context, Kleiwegt proposed a list of words used to describe a candidate's voluntarity, such as ἐκούσιος, αὐθαίρετος, ἀπροφάσιτος, as being “more likely to have pointed to the announcement of willingness as the result of negotiations rather than to a completely spontaneous candidacy."289 Aurelius Alexander, described as αὐθαίρετος, may have belonged to this class of “negotiated” candidates, filling offices left vacant by dignitaries

287 Reynolds 2000, 16-17 ll. 32-35: ἐπεὶ δὲ ἦσαν τινες πολεῖται ὑμέτεροι λέγοντες εἰς ἄρχηροποσύνην ἀδύνατοι ὄντες προβεβλήσθησαν, ἀνέπεμψα αὐτοὺς ὥς ὑμᾶς ἔξενεσάντας προτερὸν δύνατοι ὄντες λειτουργεὶν διαβόουσαν, ἢ ἀληθὴ λέγουσιν. εἰ μὲντοι φαίνουσα τινες αὐτῶν εὐπορότεροι, προτέρους ἐκείνους ἄρχηροποσύνης δίκαιοι. συγχωρῶ ὑμένα παρὰ τὸν ἄρχηρείους ἀντὶ μονομαχᾶν ἀγγυρίαν ῥαμβάειν, καὶ οὐ υγχορό μόνον, ἃ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔπαινο τὴν γνώμην. [since there are certain citizens among you saying that they are unable to be nominated to the High Priesthood, I sent these to you to examine first of all whether they being able to serve evaded the liturgy, or they are telling the truth; if however, some of them were to appear to be better off, it is fair that they should hold the High Priesthood first. I concede that you should take money from the High Priests instead of gladiatorial shows (for the construction of the aqueduct); not only do I concede but I praise your proposal. (Trans. Reynolds)]


289 Kleijwegt 1994, 77.
who were able to use their connections and socio-political influence to claim an exemption.

In addition to assessing αὐθαίρετος semantically, we can also weigh the potential impact of Alexander’s service in accordance with the apparent burdens associated with the High Priesthood in general. A letter from Septimius Severus and Caracalla to the authorities of Smyrna concerning the rights of the sophist Claudius Rufinus is of particular relevance. The emperors noted that, despite having exempt status, "with you having summoned him with voluntary compulsion, he undertook the post of strategos due to his love for the patria" (ὑμῶν αὐτὸν ἐκουσίῳ ἀνάγκῃ προκαλουμένων ύφέστη τὴν στρατηγίαν κατὰ τὸ πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα φίλτρον), and would be fair to be left untroubled so to avoid his philotimia becoming “harmful” (ζηµία). This subtle warning issued to municipal authorities was aimed at prohibiting them from advancing too aggressively towards the elite to fill up municipal office, and a clear case of the vision that Jones had for philotimia does not apply. The nature of the harm – ζηµία – as a possible consequence to philotimia is not specified, but one assumes that financial burden is implied. Hadrian’s letter to the authorities at Aphrodisias, for example, mentioned that there were many dignitaries who attempted to secure exemption from service as High Priest of Aphrodisias

---

290 IGR IV 1402 οἱ θειότατοι Αὐτοκράτορες Σεουήρος καὶ Ἀντωνεῖνος Καίσαρες Σμυρναίοις· εἰ Κλαύδιος Τουφίνος ὁ πολεῖται ὑμῶν ὁ διὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν, ἔστεν ἐπὶ παιδεία, καὶ τὸν ἐν λόγῳ συνεχῆ βίον τὴν προκειμένην τοῖς σοφισταῖς κατὰ τὰς θείας τῶν προγόνων ἤµοιν διατάξεις ἀτέλειαν τῶν λειτουργιῶν καρπούμενος ὑμῶν αὐτὸν ἐκουσίῳ ἀνάγκῃ προκαλουμένων ύφέστη τὴν στρατηγίαν κατὰ τὸ πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα φίλτρον, τὴν γοῦν εἰς τὰ ἄλλα μείναι ἀπαγομενήν ἀκείνην ἀνακατατέθην ὑπὲρ συνεχῆς τοῖς σοφισταῖς τὰς θείας τῶν προγόνων διατάξεις, καὶ μάλιστα ταύτην ὑμῶν ἀρρενίμουν ύφέστη τὸν ἀνδρὸς τὴν χάριν. Puech 2002, 439 suggests that this letter may have been written by Antipatros of Hierapolis for its clever devices such as the oxymoron in question. Also Kokkinia’s 2007 review of Puech, online, at <http://www.sehepunkte.de/2007/03/6296.html>.
for financial reasons. Hadrian’s response to the authorities at Aphrodisias was less to punish than to maintain fairness: the authorities were ordered to conduct an investigation to make sure that the High Priesthood was taken up first by persons who appeared to be wealthier than others.

Presumably, a koinon High Priest would have been burdened with much more than the municipal High Priest. While we do not have precise numbers that describe the potential magnitude of the difference in financial burdens between the two levels of High Priesthood, we can find the burden of a provincial priesthood discussed in a way that was ruinous. One example is the alleviation of financial burdens of provincial priests by regulating the costs of gladiatorial games in the reign of Marcus Aurelius. This document, the so-called Aes Italicae, recorded a senator’s approval of measures that

---

291 Reynolds 2000, II. 32-36: ἐπεὶ δὲ ἦσαν τινες πολεῖται ύμέτεροι λέγοντες εἰς ἀρχιερωσύνην ἀδύνατοι ὀντες προβεβλῆσθαι, ἀνέπεμπα αὐτοὺς ὡρ᾽ ἵμας ἐξετάσαντας προτέρων δύνατον ὄντες λειτουργεῖν διὰ δύονται, ἢ ἄλληθρη λέγουσιν. εἰ μέντοι φαίνοντο τίνες αὐτὸν εὐπορώτεροι, προτέρους ἐκείνους ἀρχιεράσθησα δίκαιον. [Since there are certain of your citizens who say that they have been nominated for the High Priesthood when they are incapable of undertaking it, I have referred them to you to examine whether they are able to undertake the liturgy and are evading it, or are telling the truth; if, however, some of them were to appear to be better off, it is fair that they should hold the High Priesthood first. (Trans. Reynolds)]

292 Oliver 1955, 331 ll. 12-15: o magni impp(eratores), qui scitis altius fundari remedia quae etiam malis consulant qui se etiam necessarios fecerint! etiam fructus tantae vestrae providentiae emergit. legebatur etiam nunc apot nos oratio, sed ubi rumore delatu est quαι estus lanistarum recisos, fis cum omnem illam pecuniam quasi contaminatam reliquisse, statim sacerdotes fidelissimarum Galliarum vestrarum concursare, gaudere, inter se loqui erat aliquis qui deploraverat fortunas suas creatus sacerdos, qui auxilium sibi in provocatione ad principes facta constituerat. quid mihi iam cum appellatone? omne onus quod patrimonium meum opprimebat sanctissimi impp(eratores) remiserunt. iam sacerdos esse et cupio et opto et editionem munerationis, quam olim detestabamur, amplaelector. [o great emperors, who know that remedies which allow for the interests even of the wicked who have made themselves actually indispensable are set on deeper foundations, the harvest of your great foresight will indeed come forth. The official reading of the address in our assembly has barely finished, but when it was unofficially reported that the profits of the lanistae had been pruned back and that the fiscus had renounced all that money as contaminated, immediately the priests of your most loyal Gallic provinces rushed to see each other, were full of joy, and plied each other with questions and answers. There was one who upon being appointed priest had given up his fortune for lost, had named a council to help him an an appeal addressed to the emperors. But in that very gathering, he himself, before and after consulting his friends, exclaimed, “what do I want with an appeal now? Their most sacred majesties the emperors have released the whole burden which crushed my patrimony. Now I desire and look forward to being a priest, and as for the duty of putting on a spectacle, of which we once were solemnly asking to be relieved, I welcome it. (Trans. Oliver)]
would be promulgated upon the passage of the law. We note in particular the anecdote of a newly appointed provincial priest in the senator’s speech. This appointee claimed that he considered his fortune lost after his appointment, and had formed a “help-group” to aid him in making an appeal to the emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. When considered along with the discussion on the semantics of αὐθαίρετος discussed earlier, we find a potentially threatening if not also coercive nuance to the Aurelius Alexander inscription that would have otherwise been treated as simply a monument of gratitude honoring Alexander’s eagerness to spend.

In short, the Aurelius Alexander inscription points to a particular source of tension felt by leading dignitaries of cities caused by assuming Koinon office. Since cities were the source of viable candidates for these positions, the need to present viable candidates who could actually withstand the financial burden of liturgy and take leadership in tasks and events would have a considerable impact on all communities. Local dignitaries even formed teams, systematically to campaign to secure exemption from emperors. Municipal authorities developed strategies to generate candidates, and what Aelius Aristides described – leading a preferred individual into the ekklesia to force him to acquiesce to public opinion – may have been the customary strategy, elegantly termed “voluntary compulsion” in the letter from Septimius Severus and Caracalla. It is possible that Aurelius Alexander fell victim to a comparable scheme, and was given in return for his service a monument that contained very short biographical description that summed up his new achievement, and with little attention to the sort of dialect that could have reflected his personal sense of belonging.
2.1.3 Summary

The two inscriptions presented in part one comprise of two distinct advertising techniques deployed by the authorities of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus for the same office, leading to two perspectives. The first view concerns what activities the Koinon and its officials may have been engaged with, while the second concerns how officials of the Koinon were generated.

The inscription honoring Titus Iulius Aquila shows the Koinon taking interest in the personnel hierarchy of the Amastrian neoi. Aquila designated as protos aristeus of the neoi, a title that seems to have been based upon Aquila’s history of philotimia, and the Koinon’s decision may have some correlation with the newly established Traiania, the pentaeteric festival attested in one of Pliny’s letters, considering the chronological proximity of the two events, as well as the Koinon’s emphasis that Aquila received a bust-crown as an honor separate from the office of High Priesthood. We posit that Aquila was both High Priest of Pontus, as well as one who was involved with the first Traiania that likely took place at Heraclea or Tium. Somewhat curious are Aquila’s familial ties: the Koinon does not give his affiliation, despite mentioning the record of his family’s benefaction. He may be related to the equestrian Gaius Iulius Aquila, commander under Claudius and imperial procurator under Nero, but there is no direct reference. His mame Lusia Aquilina was mentioned by the Koinon, which is indicative of her eminent social standing. Yet the Lusii are rarely found in the Anatolian epigraphic record, leading to
more questions about the degree of prominence we ought to assign to her, and in turn to Aquila as well.

The problem of prominence is further pursued in the second section, where the joint decree honoring Aurelius Alexander is discussed. The koinon, the boule and damos of Heraclea issued a joint decree recognising its High Priest in summary fashion, absent of reference to his personal and familial record of *philotimia*. Inattention to the promiscuity of koiné and Doric dialects in the inscribed text suggests that the parties involved in setting up the decree were not attentive to the honor as would be expected, and may be an indication that Aurelius Alexander was not a candidate that the Koinon and the municipal authorities sought to impress. Yet the literary and juridical sources point to the likelihood that Aurelius Alexander met most conditions expected of any office holder, including his social standing, age, wealth and other details associated with the customs and by-laws that must have been in place for such a position, except for prior service or benefaction, an aspect that may have been the root cause of the lack of attention shown by the issuing authorities. Their joint decree did note of his voluntary undertaking, but there are cases in which individuals who took up office were likely compelled despite being described as volunteers. It is possible that Aurelius Alexander could be understood as such a “negotiated” candidate who was not able to obtain an exemption from service.

The two inscriptions point to a significant dependence of koinon authorities on its constituent cities to produce quality personnel upon whom the koinon would depend to influence local institutions. Conversely, the inability to produce such candidates might
have lead to the decline in ability to influence local institutions. Koinon positions such as
the High Priesthood could in theory be filled only by a selective group who could present
a consensus in a city as well as endure the financial burden, which means that the real
difference in social standing between Titus Iulius Aquila and Aurelius Alexander might
not be that significant. Yet the contrast in the relationships that Titus Iulius Aquila and
Aurelius Alexander had with their respective patriae makes the care or carelessness
exemplified in their honorific monuments even more telling. The High Priesthood was a
position filled by candidates from constituent cities of the Koinon, and the impact of the
Koinon is most apparent in the light of local dignitaries’ being compelled to take up such
office and bear the financial burden associated with it. The Koinon would have to be a
periodic source of socio-political pressure on candidates.

In the next section, we switch from the individual to the familial perspective,
focusing on a set of inscriptions from Amastris that mentions koinon officials in passing.
These inscriptions do not expressly honor officials for their contributions to the koinon,
or for taking action in the capacity of koinon officeholders. Yet these inscriptions provide
information on familial, territorial and chronological aspects of the most significant
families within the territory of Amastris. By examining these inscriptions from the
familial perspective, we are able to gain insight into some of the families’ sources of
social power that enabled them to advance to koinon positions and status of regional
importance.
2.2 Amastrian Sources of Koinon Officials

The Amastrian epigraphic record contains several examples of koinon officials who were only mentioned in passing in funerary or dedicatory records. The full name “Koinon of the Cities in Pontus” is also not found in these inscriptions to be discussed here, leading to a clear limitation in terms of the direct connection between the inscriptions and the coastal Paphlagonian koinon. However, the number of koinon officials attested in Amastrian territory is relatively more abundant than those of other cities in coastal Paphlagonia, and hence they serve as useful data for a case-study on what a coastal Paphlagonian city’s koinon officials and their families would have been like. While these instances do not contribute to the direct understanding of how the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus operated, they help provide nuanced information concerning koinon officials that are not attested in the two koinon documents discussed in part one of this chapter. Only a small number of Amastrians would have attained koinon office, and these must have come from restricted types of family and background in order to be considered eligible.

The following table and diagram present approximate chronological and familial connections of known koinon officials from Amastris, along with family members that might plausibly be identified. We note that the limitations of this survey are considerable due to the number of evidence that actually exist. However, at the very least, we see that the second century CE was a period when the koinon was particularly active, and must have had a considerable number elites that participated, contributed and potentially utilised the koinon in a way that could be described as reciprocal.
Table 2. Office holders of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus from Amastris

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Titus Iulius Aquila</td>
<td>ἀρχιερέα τοῦ Ποντού</td>
<td>102-115 CE</td>
<td>Marek, Kat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amastris 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tiberius Claudius Lepidus</td>
<td>τὸν ἀρχιερέα τοῦ Ποντού</td>
<td>c. 150 CE</td>
<td>Marek, Kat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amastris 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sextus Vibius Aquila</td>
<td>...τοῦ Ποντάρχου</td>
<td>184 CE</td>
<td>Marek, Kat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amastris 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius Alexander</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ Ποντού, Ποντάρχης</td>
<td>209 CE</td>
<td>Marek, Kat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amastris 95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIG. 17. STEMMATA OF KOINON OFFICIALS FROM AMASTRIS**
The chronological and geographical information preserved in these inscriptions allows us to shift perspective. We now turn our focus from a microscopic examination of individual High Priests or pontarchs to the broader scope of their social connections. We can also take up additional questions, such as approximate territorial regions of their socio-economic power, as well as relations with other sources of socio-political influence such as imperial establishment or local clans. In the following sections we first discuss the koinon officials from the families of the Iulii and the Vibii. These were likely descendants of equestrian and veteran families, which received plots of land and grants to exploit resources of the Amastrian territory based on privilege associated with the imperial and military establishment. We then examine koinon officials from the families of the Claudii and the Aurelii, whose families show local tendencies that are more closely related to the philosophical education and support of local clans rather than aristocratic or veteran immigrants.

2.2.1 Iulii and Vibii: Beneficiaries of Imperial and Military Establishments

The principle figures of the Iulii as constructed in the diagram above include the equestrian procurator Gaius Iulius Aquila active in the reigns of Claudius and Nero, and two Trajanic figures, including an Amastrian lady Iulia Aquilina who was citizen of both Amastris and Heraclea Pontica, and a High Priest of Pontus Titus Iulius Aquila. Marek proposed that the three Iulii might have been connected, forming one of the most prominent families at Amastris in the second century CE.293 Yet, apart from the identical

nomen gentilicum, Marek’s reconstructed stemma of the Iulii also proposed that Iulia Aquilina was the connection between Gaius and Titus Iulius Aquila, and it has been demonstrated in part one that this proposal is based on a bold conjecture made by Louis Robert, without good basis. However, Böckh’s emendation of line 2 of CIG III 4150b, discussed earlier, is a reasonable solution. Hence we assume that a separate persona called Iulia Aquilina did in fact exist and was honored by both Heraclea and Amastris in 98 CE. In other words, by amending Marek’s construction of the Iulii to reflect the connection between Lusia Aquilina and Titus Iulius Aquila, and to place Iulia Aquilina as their kin, we have a stronger presence of the Iulii in Amastris during the Trajanic period than Marek originally perceived.

We can further find extended importance of the Iulii in the Trajanic period by studying the inscription concerning Iulia Aquilina. The inscription was introduced earlier as CIG III 4150b, a dedication of the Heraclean damsos in Doric dialect, but was found in Amastris and concerned a vote by the Amastrian authorities.

[ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἡρακλεωτᾶν | Ἡρακλεωτᾶν Ἡρακλεωτᾶν
Ἰουλίαν Ἐκτιμήσων τὴν εὐγένη καὶ
φιλανδρὸν καὶ φιλότειμον ανθρώπιν τὴν πολιτωθεῖν, πάσας ἀρετὰς | καὶ

---

294 Marek 1993, 98-99. For clarity, Marek’s narrative on the relationship between the Iulii is included here in full: “C. Iulius Aquila, praefectus fabrum 45 n. Chr., der Erbauer der Straße oberhalb der Stadt, ist kein anderer als der von Tacitus erwähnte Offizier, der im Jahre 49 ein militärisches Kommando im Bosporanischen Königreich zum Erfolg führte und dafür die insignia praetoria erhielt. Er gehörte vermutlich dem Stab des Procurators (ducenarius) Iunius Cilo an. Es ist nicht unwahrscheinlich, daß er der πρόγονος der Iulia Aquilina war, welcher das Theater gestiftet hatte, in dem 98 n. Chr. der vornehmen Amastrianerin und zugleich Bürgerin von Herakleia ein Standbild gesetzt wurde. Unter Trajan zeichnete das pontische Koinon den Enkel dieser Frau aus, den Titus Iulius Aquila. Als Oberpriester des Provinziallandtages erwarb er seinerseits durch ungewöhnliche Munificenz eine Serie von Ehrentiteln.” [Gaius Iulius Aquila, the praefectus fabrum of 45 CE who built the roads in the elevated region of Amastris, is the military commander mentioned by Tacitus. In 49 CE, he commanded a military force in the Bosporan Kingdom and attained the praetorian insignia because of his success. He may have been a member of the staff of the ducenarius equestrian procurator Iunius Cilo. He may have been the πρόγονος of Iulia Aquilina and the benefactor of the theater, in which a statue was erected for this leading Amastrian lady in 98 CE, who was also a citizen of Heraclea. Under Trajan, the Pontic Koinon acknowledged the grandson of this lady, who as High Priest of the provincial koinon attained several honorary titles through extraordinary munificence. (Translation mine)]
The people of Heraclea (dedicate this) to Iulia Aquilina, well-born, husband-loving, and honor-loving citizen of both cities, on account of her every virtue and the prospects that she brought, with her patria Amastris having voted to set her statue in (her) ancestor’s theater; administered by her husband Tiberius Claudius Menius. Year 168. (Translation mine; modified from French 2004)

The vote by the city of Amastris to dedicate a statue of Aquilina in the “ancestral theater,” followed by an additional prepositional phrase noting that it was Tiberius Claudius Menius, her husband, who was charged with the task,295 has caused confusion as to the sequence of events. Did Heraclea’s honor precede or did it follow an Amastrian vote? While this ambiguity cannot be satisfactorily resolved due to limited detail and the lack of external evidence, it is apparent that the affairs of the cities of Heraclea and Amastris were closely intertwined during the Trajanic period. Amastris allowed the inscription of an Heraclean decision to be set up in Amastris in the Doric dialect, while Heraclea recognised the authority of the Amastrian demos in its vote to honor a dignitary, who was a citizen of both cities. We are again reminded of Titus Iulius Aquila’s likely involvement in the Traiana, which was in turn a bequest of one Iulius Largus that was aimed at benefiting Heraclea and Tium, all of which points to the likelihood that the Iulii attested at Amastris were key members of a regional family with interests and investments that spanned Heraclea and Amastris. We are also reminded of Gaius Iulius Aquila’s ceremonial passage connecting Amastris with Heraclea and Tium. It is possible, then, that the Iulii’s ties to multiple cities west of Amastris, in addition to those with the Koinon,

295 CIG 4150b = Marek Kat. Amastris no. 4.
form the general contours of their socio-political influence in the historical territories of
the city-state of Heraclea Pontica in the Hellenistic period. In turn we can envision that
the territory of the Iulii was coextensive with the core territory of the Koinon of the Cities
in Pontus during its early phases.

Concurrent with the Iulii in the Trajanic period was Sextus Vibius Gallus. His
dedication to Theos Monios found at Gideruz on the northeastern coast of modern
Amasra, dates from the year 179 (109 CE). The honorand is likely the same person on
several other inscriptions found in Amastris and its neighboring region, including two
inscriptions found in Cide, one Latin and one Greek, both dedicated to Zeus Sarsus
and perhaps associated with a sanctuary of the cult at Cide. There is also the monumental
dedication with high relief depicting a rider in battle against an adversary on foot using a

---

296 Marek 1993, 186 Kat. Amastris no. 113, for sketch, Mendel 1902, 287-288: ἀγαθῆ τύχῃ Ἡθῷ Μονίῳ εὔχῃ | Σέξτου Όυεΐβίου Γάλλου πρεμιῳ|πειλαρίου Εὐδέλπι|στοσ πραγματευτῆς | ἔτους θορ´ μηνὸς Δείου | νεομηνία.


faux, with bilingual cursus honorum of Sextus Vibius Gallus in Latin and Greek.\textsuperscript{299} This inscription, dedicated by Sextus Vibius Coccianus, the client of Sextus Vibius Gallus, further implies that we ought to envision the name Sextus Vibius as branching out through both blood and social construct. Whether Sextus Vibius Coccianus also attained significance is not known, as no further reference to him can be found in the epigraphic record, yet the apparent sprawling effect of clientela in addition to blood kinship further suggests that the Sexti Vibii became well established in the immediate generations after Sextus Vibius Gallus. Kalinka and Marek, for example, connected other individuals bearing the name Sextus Vibius in the vicinity of Amastris. In their reconstruction, Gallus was ancestor of the Pontarch Sextus Vibius Aquila, whose son Sextus Vibius Philon died in year 254 (184 CE).\textsuperscript{300} Marek also introduced Sextus Vibius Diogenes from Abonuteichos as of their family. Diogenes was chief magistrate when his colleagues (οἱ περὶ Σέξτον Οὐείβιον ν ἄρχοντα) dedicated a monument to Sextus Vibius Coccianus, the client of Sextus Vibius Gallus, in Latin and Greek.

\textsuperscript{299} CIL III 13648 = 6984. [S]ex. Vibio Gallo tri[ce]nario primipila[ri] praef. kastror. leg. | XIII Gem. donis dona[[t]o ab imperatoribus | causa torq. armi[lis] phaleris coronis | muralibus III vallaribus II, aurea I, hastis | p[juris V, vexillius II | Sex. Vibius Coccianus patrono | benemereni. | Σεξ. Οὐείβιῳ Γάλλῳ τρικαταριῳ πρειµατιλαρῳ | στρατος[ε] δάρχη λεγ. ιγ’, τεµαις τετεµηµήν καθαροίς [φαράγοις], | στεφάνοις πυργωτοίς γ’, τειχωτοίς β’, χρυσό α’, δόρασι | καθαροίς ε’, οὐθέξιλλοις β’, Σεξ. Οὐείβιος Κοκκειανὸς τοῦ πατρὸν]. The question of dating the monuments of Sextus Vibius Gallus has recently been revisited by Christian Maier, who pointed out that in the bilingual monument from Cide, the curious registry of Gallus’s unit as Legio XIII Gemina Getica (which has yet to have any comparandum), but rather Legio XIII Gemina Galleniana or Gemina Gallienarum, already with known examples. This would change Sextus Vibius Gallus’ war with barbarians from the two Trajanic campaigns with Dacia to the Gothic invasion in 268 CE during the reign of Gallienus. See Maier 2007, 255-257. Both Strasser and Pleket in SEG 57.1293 disagree with Meyer’s thesis, since the era dating ἔτους θρο´ in line 7 of Marek Kat. Amastris no. 113 places Sextus Vibius Gallus (a pronompuilius) in 109 CE. Both does not consider the possibility that there may have been more than one Sextus Vibius Gallus.

\textsuperscript{300} Marek 1993, 172 no. 55 Σεξ. Οὐείβιος Φίλον | Σεξ. Οὐείβιου Λκύλου | ύος τοῦ Ποντάρχου | ἐτῶν κθ´ | Αἰλία Πατερνιανῆ | γυνῆ Φίλονος ἐτῶν ἑ´ | ἐτους δντ´, μηνι | Περετίφω.
Antoninus Pius. This is a plausible scenario, considering that the locations of the inscriptions associated with the Sexti Vibii are found to the northeast border of the territory of Amastris, and adjacent to the territory of Abonuteichos. It is conceivable that Sextus Vibius Diogenes was a branch of the Sexti Vibii that became based in Abonuteichos, entering the city’s boule, while the branch of Sextus Vibius Aquila maintained a prominent presence in Amastris.

The funerary epitaph for Sextus Vibius Philon would have been an important document due to its value as an indication of where a member of the Vibii would be buried, but unfortunately the sarcophagus was removed to Istanbul with no clear information on where it was from, apart from the general description as from Amasra. While this intriguing evidence remains ambiguous, inscriptions attesting to the Vibii are found at locations northeast of Amastris at modern Gideruz and Cide, suggesting that this family’s socio-economic foundation was distributed along the Paphlagonian coast, perhaps best understood as on the borders of the territory of Amastris and Abonuteichos.

The region has recently been subject to a field survey project led by Bleda Düring, Claudia Glatz, and Tevfik Emre Şerifoğlu. Published results for the 2009-2011 seasons report “relatively few extant structures unambiguously Roman in date,” with a more

302 Koch and Sichtermann 1982, 554; SEG 43.907.
303 http://cidearchaeology.com/cap/
304 Düring & Glatz 2010, 209-211.
significant late-Roman/Byzantine activity in coastal Cide and its hinterland, but “several clusters of large and partly ornamented dress stones . . . probably derive[d] from large monumental structures” around the town of Cide, as well as “a series of construction pits in the Cide coastal plain” that yielded “substantial quantities of Roman period pottery, suggesting a rather sizable Roman town underneath modern Cide.”

Perhaps the coastline between Amastris and Abonuteichos only came to be developed under the leadership of veterans who settled there. Gideruz or ancient Kytoros was famous for its timber, and it may not be a coincidence that Roman veterans settled there to deal with labor-intensive production. If Marek is right in asserting that Sextus Vibius Gallus was a veteran of the Dacian Wars who settled in Amastris, he may have acquired estates and rights to this resource-rich region of the Amastrian territory as part of his missio agraria following his discharge from military service.

In closing this section, we first revisit the Iulii, who were a family that we can associate with a specific region in the Amastrian territory. The Iulii seemed to have strong ties with Heraclea Pontica, and may be related to the region west of Amastris that had thrived since the Hellenistic period. The early Hellenistic territory of Heraclea Pontica included Tium and reached as far as Amastris, with all three cities minting silver coins for

---

305 Glatz et al. 2011, 282-287.
307 12.3.10 πλείστη δὲ καὶ ἀρίστη πύξος φύεται κατὰ τὴν Ἀμαστριανὴν, καὶ μάλιστα περὶ τὸ Κύτωρον. [The most and the best box-wood grows in the territory of Amastris, and particularly round Cytorum. (Trans. Jones)]
much of the Hellenistic period. A road network leading from Heraclea Pontica to Amastris that passed through Tium existed as early as in the reign of Vespasian, according to surviving milestones. It is likely that the Iulii thrived upon this relatively well-connected coastal network between various corridors of habitation and cultivation separated by deep river valleys and mountainous terrain. We wonder whether Iulius Largus was a branch of the Amastrian Iulii seeking to benefit Heraclea and Tium as part of the disseminating influence, or was a separate family whose progenitor received enfranchisement concurrent with the Amastrian Iulii.

In comparison with the Iulii, who had ties with the equestrian procurator and hence a close relationship with the emperor, the Vibii were veterans that received land grants, and likely other concessions and rights that permitted them to become an established and wealthy family in Amastris within a short span of time. The findspots of inscriptions associated with the Vibii indicate that their socio-political base may have been centered on the northeast of Amastris and stretched to Abonuteichos. The Vibii had a significant presence in the timber-rich regions of Amastrian territory, and the connection with Sextus Vibius Diogenes the chief magistrate at Abonuteichos also indicates possible dissemination of familial influence to beyond municipal boundaries.

---


310 Öztürk 2016, 83-84; 2013 French 2013, 30-31 no. 04(A) = Mendel 1901, 39 no. 88 for the Vespasianic milestone dated to 78 CE found at Zonguldak west of modern Amsara, which could be paired with the milestone dated to 140/141 CE found also in Zonguldak, stating specifically ll. 11-13 that Antoninus Pius τὴν ὅδον ἀπεκατέστησεν Ἀπὸ Τείου ἡ’. French also provided a helpful presentation of the interior roads leading from Heraclea to Claudiopolis, Tieion to Flaviopolis, Amastris to Hadrianopolis, and Ionopolis (formerly Abonuteichos) towards Gangra respectively, but these are of late second to third century CE dates, and have limited significance here.
That members of both families eventually attained leadership positions in the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus suggests that the wealth and prominence of Gaius Iulius Aquila and Sextus Vibius Gallus were continuously inherited for at least half a century, with perhaps two to three generations of heirs or more. From the territorial distribution of the Iulii and the Vibii, we can also envision that the sources of economic and social power of the koinon became more diffuse from the Trajanic to the Antonine period.

Amastris was itself a synoecised city in the Hellenistic period, and later considerably expanded under the Pompeian system to encompass even larger territories of the former Pontic Kingdom.\footnote{Erçiyas 2003, 1419-1422.} When one speaks of the “Amastrian territory” in the imperial period,
we mean not only the harbor town of Sesamos, but also large stretches of the habitable river valleys cutting across the Olgassys mountain range previously not under the authority of the Hellenistic city,\textsuperscript{312} as well as the stretches of the Paphlagonian coast that included towns such as Kytoros, which in one inscription proudly called itself a Doric polis even in the imperial period.\textsuperscript{313} Diversification of koinon officials also signals the increased integration of the Amastrian territory by its civic institutions, the boule and the demos. This increasing integration is clearly seen in the inscription dedicated to Theos Bonitenos Patroos by the local clan leader Marcus Aurelius Alexander, who also held the chief magistrate of Amastris, as well as koinon positions, including the High Priesthood of Pontus, and Bithyniarch and Pontarch. In short, we posit that the Iulii and Vibii had distinct territories of interest that can be deduced from literary and epigraphic sources, due to their relationship with the imperial center and the military establishment of the Roman empire.

\textsuperscript{312} Strab. 12.3.10 ἦν δ᾿ Ἡμαστρις γυνὴ μὲν Διονυσίου, τοῦ Ἡρακλείας τυράννου, θυγάτηρ δὲ Ὁξυάθρου, τοῦ Δαρείου ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ κατὰ Ἀλέξανδρον· ἔκεινε μὲν οὖν ἐκ τεττάρων κατοικίων συνόρκισε· ἐκ τῆς πόλιν, ἐκ της Σησαμίου καὶ Κυτώρου καὶ Κρῶμηνς (ὅν καὶ Ὁμήρος μέμνηται ἐν τῷ Παφλαγονικῷ διάκόσμῳ), τετάρτης δὲ τῆς Τιείου· ἀλλὰ αὕτη μὲν ταχὺ ἀπέστη τῆς κοινωνίας, αἱ δὲ άλλαι συνέμειναν, ὅν ἡ Σήσαμος ἀκρόπολις τῆς Ἡμαστρικῆς λέγεται. τὸ δὲ Κύτωρον ἐμπόριον ἦν ποτὲ Σινωπέων, ὑπό τοῦ Κυτώρου, τοῦ Φρίξου πατός, ὡς Ἐφορός φησι. [Amastris was the wife of Dionysius the tyrant of Heraclea and the daughter of Oxyathres, the brother of the Dareius whom Alexander fought. Now she formed the city out of four settlements, Sesamus and Cytorum and Cromna (which Homer mentions in his marshalling of the Paphlagonian ships) and, fourth, Tieium. This last, however, soon revolted from the united city, but the other three remained together; and, of these three, Sesamus is called the acropolis of Amastris. Cytorum was once the emporium of the Sinopeans; it was named after Cytorus, the son of Phryxus, as Ephorus says. (Trans. Jones)]

\textsuperscript{313} Marek 1993, 17-18. Kat. Amastris no. 44.
2.2.2 Claudii and Aurelii: Philosophers and Clan Chiefs

The second group comprises of the High Priest of Pontus Tiberius Claudius Lepidus and the High Priest of Pontus and Pontarch Marcus Aurelius Alexander. The two inscriptions are presented together since two office holders are advertised with traits that are distinctly different from those of the Iulii and Vibii, whose sources of economic and social power were closely tied to the imperial center and Roman military. Lepidus is advertised as a member of an embassy to Rome and perhaps implies that he was well trained in rhetoric, while Alexander’s self-advertisement emphasised his local roots deep in the Olgassys.

Our main source of information concerning Tiberius Claudius Lepidus is an inscription that had been reported by Mendel in 1902 through correspondence with an epigraphic enthusiast. The version published under CIG 4149 was later corrected by Kalinka based on autopsy. Kalinka’s main contribution is to provide good autopsy to support the CIG editor’s emendation of Τιβ[έ]ριον Κλαύ[δ]ιον Λέπ[ί]δον Λεπί[δ]ου ὑ[ί]ον.\textsuperscript{314}

\begin{verbatim}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{314} Kalinka 1933, 72, resolved much of the issues concerning the honorand of this inscription.
The people (honors) Tiberius Claudius Lepidus, son of Lepidus; High Priest of Pontus, *epistates* of the city, frequently led embassy to Rome at his own expense, and strived for the good of the city. Piously, with all eagerness, (the savior?). (Translation mine).

The exact motive for the honorific monument is unclear. Tiberius Claudius Lepidus is well-advertised. He held offices on the civic and koinon level, as well as having frequently led embassies to Rome, and with a notable record of *philotimia*. It is unclear whether the embassies to Rome were related to the city or the koinon, though the positioning of this particular contribution immediately after the reference to his role as
epistates seems to imply that Lepidus was the representative of the city and went on an embassy to Rome at his own expense. The ability to embark on embassies suggests that Lepidus was skilled in rhetoric, and we are reminded of Pliny’s rhetorical battles in the Senate against the Bithynian delegation during the repetundae trials of Iulius Bassus and Varenus Rufus. Notably, such skills in embarking on frequent embassies to Rome is not emphasised in the advertisements of Titus Iulius Aquila and Aurelius Alexander son of Timotheus. It seems, then, that Tiberius Claudius Lepidus was a welcome addition to the koinon leadership, similar to the philosophers whom Philostratus described as having held High Priesthoods of the Asian and Lysian koina. It would also seem reasonable to assume that Lepidus was a member of the literary or intellectual circle of Amastris, and even more tempting to assume that Lucian, whose writings indicate that he was at Amastris during the reigns of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, could have known him. Unfortunately, no information from the inscription could help date Tiberius Claudius Lepidus to a specific year or reign, and his acquaintance with Lucian remains conjectural.

The possibility that Lepidus and Lucian met at Amastris remains attractive to scholars, leading to various attempts to connect the two. Elimarus Klebs assumed that Tiberius Claudius Lepidus was associated arta propinquitate to an epicurean leader at Amastris called Lepidus in Lucian’s tale of a false prophet swindling people with a snake oracle cult based in Abonuteichos. Klebs’ suggestion remains plausible and an

317 Klebs, PIR 733: vel idem est vel certe cum hoc arta propinquitate conexus Lepidus ille, Amastrianus homo Epicuri sectae Alexandro Abonitichitae maxime adversarius Lucian Alex. 25, 43).
important reminder that Tiberius Claudius Lepidus had a father also named Lepidus, as apparent in the filiation. The cognomen is likely hereditary, producing several persons of the same name. Many scholars were unsatisfied with this conservative observation.\footnote{e.g. Harmon 1961, 210 no. 1; Anderson 1994, 147. Recently, Philip Harland again employed this identification as matter-of-fact, to support his analysis of an inscription from the Rhodiopolitans to Herakleitos the priest of Asklepios and Hygeia (\textit{TAM II} 910), that it is not uncommon for an Epicurean to take up priestly office and perform cultic functions, despite their criticism of practices such as divination. Harland 2014, §146 One example is Aurelius Belius Philippus, from Apamea in Syria, whose name and titles of the priest of Bel and diadoch of the Epicureans in Apamea were inscribed on a reused column east of the Great Colonnade, now lost ll. 5-6 ἐκ ἑλέος θεοῦ μεγίστου | Ἀγίου Βήλου, Αὐρ(ήλιος) Βήλιος | Φύλιππος ἱερεὺς | καὶ διάδοχος ἐν Ἄπαμεία τῶν Ἑπικουρείων. Also Smith 1996, 125-127.}

Stephen Mitchell, for instance, stated that “the credentials of Alexander had been vigorously contested in Amastris, especially by Lucian’s influential Epicurean friend Lepidus, who was High Priest of the imperial cult in Pontus and had championed the city by undertaking an embassy to the emperor.”\footnote{Mitchell 2010, 96.}

While Mitchell enlivened the readers’ imagination of Tiberus Claudius Lepidus as an Epicurean leader fighting against superstition, some of the details are not mentioned in Lucian. Firstly, Lucian must at least have been acquainted with the most distinguished Amastrian dignitaries after he moved his family there, but the friendship with the philosopher Lepidus, as stated by Mitchell, is assumed. Also assumed is Lepidus the Epicurean as High Priest. Secondly, Lucian did not write anything about Lepidus the Epicurean “vigorously contesting” Alexander the false prophet. Lucian wrote that there were followers of Lepidus and many like them, who considered Alexander’s oracular
Lepidus himself, who engaged in a testy dialogue with Alexander, the contents of which Lucian was privy to when he visited Sacerdos’ house in Tium. Any notion of a vigorous contest seemed to have been preserved for Lucian himself, who claimed to have “prepared battle” with Alexander, with a short catalogue of the prominent philosophers in coastal Paphlagonia: “so I undertook to prosecute him, and had many associates, particularly the followers of Timocrates, the philosopher from Heraclea.” In short, the offices of the High Priesthood of Pontus and epistates of the city of Amastris does not count as evidence for identifying Lucian’s Lepidus with Tiberius Claudius Lepidus. The recommendation given by Klebbs in the PIR remains the more viable option: the two Lepidi may have been members of an influential family that flourished in the mid-second century.

320 Luc. Alex. 25. τίνι γὰρ ἁν ἀλλο δικαίωτερον προσεπολέμει γόρης ἀνθρωπος καὶ τερατείας φίλος, ἀληθεία δὲ έξειςτος, ἦ Ἐπικούρων ἀνδρὶ τὴν φύσιν τῶν πραγμάτων καθεωρακότι καὶ μόνῳ τὴν ἐν αὐτῶς ἀληθειαν εἰδότι; οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀμη τὸν Πλάτωνα καὶ Χρύσιππου καὶ Πυθαγόραν φίλοι, καὶ εἰρήνη βαθεία πρὸς ἑκάενος ἦν· ὁ δὲ ἄθετος Ἐπίκουρος—οὐτοίς γὰρ αὐτῶν ὄνομαζέν—ἐξειςτος δικαίως, πάντα ταῦτα ἐν γέλω καὶ παιδιὰ τιθέμενος, διὸ καὶ τὴν Ἀμαστρινὴν ἔμεισε μάλιστα τῶν Ποντικῶν πόλεων, ὅτι ἡπίστατο τοὺς περὶ Λέπιδου καὶ ἄλλους ὀμοίους αὐτῶς πολλοὺς ἐνόντας ἐν τῇ πολεί· οὐδὲ ἔχρησιμόδεις πόστε Λεμπριανοῦ ἀνδρὶ. [Upon whom else would a quack who loved humbug and bitterly hated truth more fittingly make war than upon Epicurus, who discerned the nature of things and alone knew the truth in them? The followers of Plato and Chrysippus and Pythagoras were his friends, and there was profound peace with them; but “the impervious Epicurus”—for that is what he called him—was rightly his bitter enemy, since he considered all that sort of thing a laughing-matter and a joke. So Alexander hated Amastris most of all the cities in Pontus because he knew that the followers of Lepidus and others like them were numerous in the city; and he would never deliver an oracle to an Amastrian. (Trans. Harmon)]

321 Luc. Alex. 43 Τοιαῦτα μὲν ὁ Γλύκων τῷ Σακερδώτῳ διελέξη, ἐπὶ τέλει δὲ χρησμόν ἐμμετρὸν ἐφθέγξατο, εἰδὼς αὐτὸν Λεπίδου ἐταίρον ὄντα: Μὴ πείθους Λεπίδου, ἐπεὶ ἢ ληρὸς οἶτος ὄπισθει. [That was Glycon’s conversation with Sacerdos; and in conclusion he uttered an oracle in verse, knowing that Sacerdos was a follower of Lepidus: “Put not in Lepidus faith, for a pitiful doom is in waiting.” (Trans. Harmon)]

322 Luc. Alex. 43. Ἐθέλω δὲ σοι καὶ διάλογον διηγήσασθαι τῷ Γλύκωνας καὶ Σακερδώτος τινος, Τιανόν ἀνθρωπος ὄποιον τινὸς τὴν σύνεσιν, εἰσὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρωτησεον. ἀνέγγιξεν δὲ αὐτὸν χρυσοὺς γράμμασιν γεγραμμένον ἐν Τίο, ἐν τῇ τῶν Σακερδώτως οἰκία. [I want to include in my tale a dialogue between Glycon and one Sacerdos, a man of Tius, whose intelligence you will be able to appraise from his questions. I read the conversation in an inscription in letters of gold, at Tius, in the house of Sacerdos. (Trans. Harmon)]

323 Luc. Alex. 57 καὶ πρὸς τὴν κατηγοριάν χρήσιν πολλοὺς συναγωνιστάς ἐχον καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς ἀπὸ Τιαυκράτους τοῦ Ἡρακλείατου φιλοσόφου. [So I undertook to prosecute him, and had many associates, particularly the followers of Timocrates, the philosopher from Heraclea. (Trans. Harmon)]
century CE, but not the same person. While the severance deprives a literary (or epigraphic) persona of his shadow, it adds an additional member of extraordinary social if not cultic influence to the Amastrian Claudii, and further points to the family’s intellectual and social prowess not only in Amastris but also among coastal Paphlagonian communities.

The Amastrian Claudii also increased their influence through marital relations, as two inscriptions indicate. The first is dedicated by a Lucius Vedius Euphron to one Claudia Lepida. Her father was Claudius Lepidus and her mother Claudia Marciana, a union that may have been due to the bestowal of the imperial nomen gentilicum of Claudius upon two separate families during the reign of Claudius, marked by their respective cognomina. The second is the inscription honoring Iulia Aquilina, mentioned earlier, in which we also learn that she was married to Tiberius Claudius Menius. Due to the rarity of citizenship conferred in the early Julio-Claudian period, we may even envision an the Claudii at Amastris to have developed into several branches beginning in the middle of the first century CE, rivalling the Iulii in their direct connection with imperial favor that led to the enfranchisement and the bestowal of the imperial nomen gentilicum. If this were the case, then the continuation of the Claudii down to the Antonine period would make this family the most ancient of Amastrian lineage. The Claudii and the Iulii may have overlapped or even converged their economic and social power through marriage.

---

324 Kalinka 1933, 78 no. 33.

325 Marek 1993, 159 no. 4. Ed. pr. G. Hirschfeld 1888, 888-889 no. 61; Doublet 1889, 311-313 no. 20.
Marcus Aurelius Alexander, on the other hand, represents what may be called an “indigenous” elite with deep roots in interior Paphlagonia. This Alexander is son of Gaius, and hence not the same as Aurelius Alexander son of Timotheos from Heraclea Pontica, because of their filiation. The relevant inscription, dating to 209 CE and set up by Marcus Aurelius Alexander himself, was dedicated to the god Theos Bonitenos Patroos and found at Meyre, some 70 kilometers southeast of modern Amasra and on the border between Amastris and Pompeiopolis.326

To good fortune. Marcus Aurelius Alexander, son of Gaius, (grand)son of Areipios the prostates, the genearch (passed down) from his ancestors, the founder of the sacred sites, the incomparable trophæus, the chief magistrate, having laid the foundations of the temple, dedicates to Theos patroos Bonitenos. (Alexander was) genearch, prostates, founder, trophæus, High Priest of Pontus, having held the chief magistrate of the glorious city of the Amastrians, having been honored as Bithyniarch and Pontarch by the deified Antoninus, deemed suitable for all offices of government, consecrated the temple, having furnished it with everything of this world, in the year 279. (Translation mine)

326 Marek 1993, 180 Kat Amastris no. 95.
The inscription describes the family of Marcus Aurelius Alexander as being the leading figures of their tribe. The position of genearch is of particular significance, as this term implies a tribal system based on consanguine kinship, a social system different from the artificially constructed phyle attested at the urban center of Amastris. The curation of clanship may have been religiously based, since Areipios was also called the one who had set the foundation of the temple of Theos Patroos Bonitenos and founder of many sacred sites. While we know of no other sacred sites that could be connected to this clan, the remains of the temple of Theos Patroos Bonitenos give a sense of the possible scale of investment that was devoted to the maintenance of what seems to be the clan’s ancestral cult. The earliest report concerning what may have been the remains of the temple of

---

Theos Patroos Bonitenos appears in Felix Robiou’s *Histoire des gaulois d’Orient*, in which it is reported that a Mr. Boré, on his way back to Bartin passed through Kastamonu in central Paphlagonia, where he came upon a circular monument about 18 meters in diameter, with walls built of enormous blocks of rough granite preserved up to 6 feet in height, and an enormous fractured obelisk broken in two parts at the foot of the walls. Doublet revisited the site some twenty years later, also coming across many entablature blocks and column bases of what seems to be the same granite type, carved with riders galloping and with a radiant lance at the tip, along with the inscription dedicated to Theos Patroos Bonitenos by Marcus Aurelius Alexander. Lâtife Summerer reports that substantial remains are still visible: the temple measures about 20 by 15 meters, and could have been a *templum in antis* or *prostylos*. Excavation of the site is currently being planned.

The significant resources that were devoted to the maintenance of sacred sanctuaries and sites correspond to Strabo’s description of this region: “Mt. Olgassys is extremely high and hard to travel. And temples that have been established everywhere on this mountain are held by the Paphlagonians.” The geographer’s passage can be further

---

328 Robiou 1866, 128.
329 Doublet 1889, 311-312.
330 Summerer 2015, 199-200.
331 Strab. 12.3.40 λοιπὴ δ᾽ ἔστιν ἡ ἐκτὸς Ἀλυος χώρα τῆς Ποντικῆς ἐπαρχίας ἡ περὶ τὸν Ὄλγασσυν, συναφῆς τῇ Σινωπίδι, ἐστὶ δ᾽ ὁ Ὄλγασσυς ὄρος σφόδρα ύψηλον καὶ δύσβατον: καὶ ιερὰ τοῦ ὄρους τούτου παντοτάχοι καθιδρυμένα ἡγήσθιν τινα Παφλαγόνης περικέπτεται δ᾽ ἰκανῶς χώρα ἀγαθὴ καὶ τε Βλαηνὴ καὶ Ἰμανίτης, δι᾽ ἦς Αμνίας ὑπήκοος. [There remains that part of the Pontic province which lies outside the Halys River, I mean the country round Mt. Olgassys, contiguous to Sinopsis. Mt. Olgassys is extremely high and hard to travel. And temples that have been established everywhere on this mountain are held by the Paphlagonians. And round it lies fairly good territory, both Blaëne and Domonitis, through which latter flows the Amnias River. Trans. Jones]
visualised through the following diagram, demonstrating how the findsite of the dedicatory inscription to Theos patroos Bonitenos was located in an isolated habitation chamber.

![Diagram of the location of the temple of Theos Patroos Bonitenos.](image)

**FIG. 21. LOCATION OF TEMPLE OF THEOS PATROOS BONITENOS**

The devotion to investing in the sacred as described by Strabo seemed to have continued up to the days of Lucian, as we learn that Alexander the false prophet targeted “fat-heads and simpletons” such as the “Paphlagonians who lived up above Abonoteichus, who were for the most part superstitious and rich.” Yet the diagram also indicates that the temple of Theos Patroos Bonitenos is situated along the main passageway from Amastris to Pompeiopolis. In turn, we should recognise that Marcus Aurelius Alexander’s clan was deeply rooted in the Paphlagonian habitation chamber, and

---

332 Luc. Alex. 9 ἀνθρώπων...παχέων καὶ ἥλιθιων τῶν ὑποδεξομένων, οίους τοὺς Παφλαγόνας εἶναι ἐφασκεν ὑπεροικοῦντας τὸ τοῦ Ἀβώνου τεῖχος.
had a distinct sense of identity and belonging from coastal Paphlagonian communities, and acknowledge the potential transformation of this clan following the gradual development of the interior of the Olgassys range in the second and third centuries CE. The dedicatory inscription also informs us that, by the Antonine period, the clan of the Aurelii eventually had become subject to the integrative forces of the municipal liturgies and public service, with Areipios first taking up the chief magistracy of Amastris, followed by Alexander himself. Alexander’s continuous investment in the temple of Theos Patroos Bonitenos further suggests that the clanship continued to be an important source of social power for clansmen who had embarked upon a municipal as well as provincial career.

Alexander’s services as Bithyniarch and Pontarch seem to have been designated by Marcus Aurelius. Hirschfeld reasonably separated ὑπὸ Θεοῦ Αντωνείνου from πάσαις ταῖς τῆς πολειτείας διαπρέψας in lines 10-12, considering that διαπρέψας is active. The resulting interpretation is that Alexander appeared eminent or suited to all offices of government, as opposed to Alexander having received from Marcus Aurelius all honors of the Roman citizenship. The epigraphic record shows that the Bithyniarch is styled as the leading magistrate in the Bithynian koinon,333 and if we assume the same for the position of Pontarch, Alexander would have served as the de-facto leader of the communities of Pontus-Bithynia at the behest of the emperor. This appointment is extraordinary. As previously shown with the example from Aelius Aristides’ Sacred Tales,

333 δῆξῃ ἄρξαντα τὴν μεγίστην ἄρχην τοῦ κοινοβουλίου in the honorific inscription for Paulus Aelius Timotheus, TAM IV no. 33; ἄρξαντα τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἑλλήνων for Tib. Claudius Tertullianus Sanctus, Prusias ad Hypium no. 51. Fernoux 2004, 350-351.
the High Priesthood of the Koinon of Asia was an elected office, with the election process beginning at the municipal ekklesia. The municipal delegation would then attend the koinon’s synedrion and enter the name of the nominee for a general election. The koinon synedrion would then make the final decision on whether the candidate would take office.

A koinarch was likely also an elected office, as Strabo’s description of the Lycian political system implies. Strabo does not mention the nomination process, but we learn from him that the Lyciarch, as well as judges and other magistrates, were voted by a synedrion comprised of delegations from different communities with control over votes in proportion to the size of each. 334 It seems that Alexander was advertising himself as having received the positions of pontarch and High Priest of Pontus upon imperial favor. The Aurelii’s ties with the emperor Marcus Aurelius may have been even deeper.

Alexander’s nomenclature suggests the likelihood that his enfranchisement was recent, perhaps even in the time of Marcus Aurelius. In this case, the emperor’s favor made the difference in promoting his status among his peers, allowing him to become the

---

334 Strab. 14.3.4 Εἰσὶ δὲ τρεῖς καὶ εἴκοσι πόλεις αἱ τῆς ψήφου μετέχουσαι· συνέρχονται δὲ ἐξ ἑκάστης πόλεως εἰς κοινὸν συνέδριον, ἣν ἄν δοκιμάσωσι πόλιν ἐλομένων· τῶν δὲ πόλεων αἱ μέγισται μὲν τριῶν ψήφων ἐστίν ἐκάστη κυρία, αἱ δὲ μέσαι δυεῖν, αἱ δ’ ἄλλαι μιᾶς· ἀνὰ λόγον δὲ καὶ τὰς εἰσφορὰς εἰσφέρουσι καὶ τὰς ἄλλας λειτουργίας. ἐξ δὲ τὰς μεγίστας ἔρη ὁ Αρτεμιδώρος. Ξάνθον, Πάταρα, Πίναρα, Ὀλύμπον, Μύρα, Τλόν, κατὰ τὴν ὕπερθεσιν τὴν εἰς Κίβυραν κειμένην. ἐν δὲ τῷ συνεδρίῳ πρῶτον μὲν Λυκιάρχης αἰρεῖται, εἰς ἄλλα ἀρχαὶ αἱ τοῦ συστήματος· δικαστήρια τε ἀποδείκνυται κοινῇ· καὶ περὶ πολέμου δὲ καὶ εἰρήνης καὶ συμμαχίας ἐβουλεύοντο πρότερον, νῦν δ’ ὅσις εἰκός, ἄλλ’ ἐπὶ τοῖς Ρωμαίοις ταῦτ’ ἀνάγκη κεῖσθαι, πλὴν εἰ ἐκείνων ἐπεφεύγαντων, ἢ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν εἰπχρήσμων· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ δικασταὶ καὶ ἄρχοντες ἀνὰ λόγον ταῖς ψήφοις ἐξ ἑκάστης προχειρίζονται πόλεως. [There are twenty-three cities that share in the vote. They come together from each city to a general congress, after choosing whatever city they approve of. The largest of the cities control three votes each, the medium-sized two, and the rest one. In the same proportion, also, they make contributions and discharge other liturgies. Artemidorus said that the six largest were Xanthus, Patara, Pinara, Olympus, Myra, and Tlos, the last-named being situated near the pass that leads over into Cibyra. At the congress they first choose a “Lyciarch,” and then other officials of the League; and general courts of justice are designated. In earlier times they would deliberate about war and peace and alliances, but now they naturally do not do so, since these matters necessarily lie in the power of the Romans, except, perhaps when the Romans should give them permission or it should be for their benefit. Likewise, judges and magistrates are elected from the several cities in the same proportion. Trans. Jones.]
Amastrian nominee despite his family’s relatively distant position from the municipal center.335

Tiberius Claudius Lepidus and Marcus Aurelius Alexander represent a group of officeholders that can be set apart from those of Titus Iulius Aquila and Sextus Vibius Aquila, whose families were likely based upon Roman military influence. Tiberius Claudius Lepidus was styled a skilled ambassador who frequently led embassies to Rome, certainly for the purpose of representing local interests. Marcus Aurelius Alexander was styled the chief of a clan deep in the Olgassys, that may have had a lifestyle distinctly different from that of Amastris proper. In short, the inclusion of Lepidus and Alexander in the koinon establishment increased the diversity of skills and regions that could be actively represented. In particular, Alexander’s inclusion also implies that the koinon was able to attain what may have been previously untapped sources of economic and social power for the organisation and financing of koinon projects and activities. The families of the two koinon officials examined in this section demonstrate an attachment to Greek or even “local” aspects of provincial everyday life, and derived their social power from sources that appear to be different from those of the Iulii and Vibii discussed in the previous section.

335 To assume that Alexander may have not been viable or competitive due to his relatively newer if not lower social standing among the Amastrian elite to attain nomination and candidacy for koinon offices is also to say that there was considerable competition within the Amastrian citizenry that would lead to implicit hindrance of advancements of certain ambitious individuals. No evidence from Pontus sheds light on this factor, but Price 1984, 122-1233, identifies lawsuits in Pliny E 6.31 as a possible recourse to impede one’s career, and Plutarch’s Praecepts contain an example of Sardis being torn into strife by two of its leading citizens. Jones 1971, 117.
2.2.3 Summary

The second part of this chapter used epigraphic evidence to project the extent of familial connections of four families who had members serving as koinon officeholders. We have seen that the Iulii maintained the most intriguing ties among Amastrian families, with connection to the Claudii at Amastris who were also prominent during the High Priesthood of Tiberius Claudius Lepidus. Their socio-economic origins likely came from the historical territory of Heraclea Pontica, the stretch of the southern Black Sea coast from modern Eregli to Amasra. The Vibii, whose origins may have been a Trajanic veteran, likely settled to the northeast of Amastris, gradually attained local and regional importance by the late reign of Marcus Aurelius or early into the reign of Commodus. Their relationship with the imperial center and the military establishment of the Roman empire was pronounced. The Iulii were descendants of an equestrian ancestor, while the Vibii had ties with a veteran that likely received land grants and other concessions and rights. Both enjoyed a close relationship with the emperor and the Roman imperial establishment, which was likely the main source of social and economic power. The Aurelii of Bonita were different. Situated in the Olgassys, the Aurelii came from a long tradition of hereditary clan chiefs that perhaps only integrated with the city of Amastris during the reign of Marcus Aurelius. In particular, Alexander’s inclusion in the liturgical system of the province may indicate that traditional families had gradually begun to wane in terms of their wealth and influence, and previously untapped sources such as the clans in the interior became important.
2.3 Conclusion

Chapter two presents the known officeholders and their families by separating them into groups that represent different points of view. In part one, we examined the case of two officeholders of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus. In that of Titus Iulius Aquila, the honorific inscription written by the koinon authorities allows us to appreciate the honorand in positive portrayal. The latter is comparable with some of the more eloquent and generous advertisements municipal and koinon authorities attribute to their candidates and officeholders in other provinces, as the flourishing praises go beyond required decorum. In the case of Aurelius Alexander son of Timotheus, we see how an author of a koinon decree could do much worse, honoring the officeholder with only the bare bones of honorific decorum, and using vocabulary that leads one to wonder about the officeholder’s qualifications or his intent to serve.

In part two, examination of office holders from the familial perspective leads to a range of possible interpretations regarding how a koinon officeholder managed to attain such a prestigious position. The scarcity of data invites caution in our observations. Yet, the several points that we can deduce from the epigraphic sources indicate that koinon officeholders seemed to come from families that were rooted in different regions of the Amastrian territory. The Iulii were tied with an ancestor of the equestrian order, and hence likely benefited from ties with the imperial establishment. The Vibii were descendants of a veteran of the Dacian wars, who may have received plots of land and grants to exploit resources as part of the privileges that were derived from his military service. The Claudii were well known in philosophical circles, with one likely an
epicurean leader mentioned by Lucian, while another served as ambassador to Rome. The Aurelii were part of a clan close to the mountainous border between Amastris and Pompeiopolis. Their local presence seemed to have been relatively unremarkable. When presented together, the koinon officials represent the inclusion of different regions into the koinon establishment. From the data examined in this section, we find that Amastrian human, financial, and natural resources were becoming more orientated towards common goals, and here lies the key influence that the koinon had on its constituent cities.

The Koinon of the Cities in Pontus was an important source of social and financial pressure that factored prominently in the socio-political calculus of Amastrian dignitaries in the second century CE. The koinon nomination process that elevated important families to regional positions was deeply rooted in local perceptions of wealth, prestige, status, and leadership. The koinon positions could be jealously guarded by leading families when they were able to use the koinon to their advantage, but could also be awarded to rising families when such demand from leading families diminished. In this regard, we may posit that there is an acceleration effect with the koinon offices. Rising families may more surely augment their prestige by investing heavily and regularly in the koinon, but they may also thereby accelerate the depletion of their fortunes. The four families we see at Amastris may be the exemplary ones that had greater stability based upon privilege, grants, clanship and intellectual acumen.

Part two also finds that families of long lineage rooted in the Julio-Claudian period began to yield positions of prominent social standing to newcomers, the aristocratic Iulii to the privileged Vibii and the intellectually prominent Claudii, the
Aurelii – with its clan rooted deep in the interior to the south of the Olgassys – gradually taking hold of all prominent positions of Amastris as well as in the double province of Pontus-Bithynia. This shift may also have to do with the true financial influence that koinon offices may have had on leading families. Taking up expensive liturgies could in fact have devastating effects to a leading family. We may posit that koinon and municipal authorities needed periodically to locate the major sources of wealth and leadership in order to prevent the potentially adverse effects of failed festivities, financial crises and the collapse of leading families.
3. FESTIVITIES AND IMPACT OF THE KOINON

The competencies of various koina in the Greek East to elect leaders and magistrates and to honor outgoing koinon officials and other dignitaries with decrees and statues are well-attested. Less is known about a koinon’s activities beyond these powers. Deininger argued that very little evidence beyond organising festivities of the imperial cult and representing its constituent members in negotiations with Roman authorities points to the likelihood that the koina and concilia were restricted in its capabilities.\(^{336}\)

This assessment of the vitality of the koina in the Greek East remains sound, though there is evidence indicating that emperors or governors might divest officials of administrative powers as they saw fit, e.g., that of collecting customs tax or arbitrating in territorial disputes between cities, but such examples of divestiture are relatively rare in the epigraphic and literary records.\(^{337}\) The visible activities of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon conform to the general pattern of koinon activities elsewhere, but there are unique aspects in the epigraphic and literary record that permit us to consider a sort of vitality that is specific to coastal Paphlagonia.

In this chapter, we survey epigraphic evidence from the cities of coastal Paphlagonia.\(^{338}\) We also draw connections between a literary account from Lucian’s *Toxaris or On Friendship* and koinon festivities, in order to broaden the potential pool of sources that could help illuminate the mechanisms that the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus

\(^{336}\) Deininger 1965, 156-158.


\(^{338}\) Giraud 1887, 122, citing evidence from the Actia and other events, argue that koinon festivities include chariot racing, gladiatorial combats, athletic competitions, animal hunts, theatrical performances, musical contests, and poetry recitals, mentioned in many honorific monuments for athletic victors. Burrell 2004, 335-342.
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might have employed in order to maintain its vitality. These mechanisms, such as the use of ephebic institutions and payment to encourage participation in koinon activities, point to the existence of local strategies to promote the festivities and to maintain the vitality of the koinon during the second and third centuries CE.

3.1 Gladiatorial and Agonistic Events of the Koinon

Since the koinon in the eastern provinces are frequently associated with agonistic festivities and gladiatorial spectacles, to measure the vitality of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus with the festivities and spectacles associated to it would seem like a standard approach to understanding how prominent this coastal Paphlagonian koinon was. However, this approach cannot be fully adopted in our case, because the number of evidence for festivities and spectacles associated with the koinon is so small and difficult to use to the result that we have to consider the weight of the evidence we have first. Then we have to widen the net to capture more evidence that may be related to the festivities and spectacles of the koinon and subject these to interrogation as well. In the first part of this chapter, we use travel narratives by Fourcade, sketches produced by amateur epigraphists, as well as inscription facsimiles created by learned epigraphists to examine the range of possible venues and activities that took place with some frequency and regularity during the second to third centuries CE.
3.1.1 Fourcade’s Pontarchs and Gladiatorial Spectacles in Sinope

We begin with two inscriptions from Pompeiopolis and Sinope. That from Pompeiopolis in particular bears significance in modern scholarship well beyond the informational value of its content. It survives as Fourcade’s paraphrase. Fourcade writes:339

The city of Pompeiopolis has disappeared so completely that it was not possible for me to retrace the vestiges of a theater or a forum; however, the remains of one inscription prove to me the existence of a gymnasium. It concerns a certain Apollodorus, son of Ikesius, adorned with the dignity of Pontarch. The decree issued by the people and the senate of Pompeiopolis for the honoring of the memory of this magistrate was to be set according to the decision of the public authority in the most prominent place of the gymnasium. (Translation mine)

The stone has not been seen again, though the veracity of Fourcade’s summary of the contents has generally been accepted,340 and even used as evidence to debate questions such as when the Koinon existed, and to what geographical extent.341 The gist of the problem is rooted in chronology, and originates from the question of koinon membership. Pompeiopolis was likely given by Antony to the client king Deiotarus of Paphlagonia in the late 40s BCE, and it was later integrated into Galatia under Augustus in 6/5 BCE.342 Two strands of argumentation have taken shape. The so-called Analytical

339 Fourcade 1811, p.37-38. “La ville (sc. de Pompeiopolis) a tellement disparu, qu’il ne m’a pas été possible de retrouver des vestiges de théâtre, ou de forum; cependant les restes d’une inscription m’ont prouvé l’existence d’un gymnase. Il s’agit d’un certain Apollodore, fils d’Ikesius, revêtu de la dignité de Pontarque. Le décret rendu par le peuple et par le sénat de Pompeiopolis, pour honorer la mémoire de ce magistrat, devoit être posé, suivant la décision de l’autorité public, dans l’endroit le plus apparent du gymnase.”


341 Marek 2015, 311-315, rehearses the relevant arguments.

theorists argue that Pompeiopolis must have been either part of the province of Pontus-Bithynia during the second triumviral period in order to produce a Pontarch. The Unitarians, by contrast, argue that Apollodorus could have been Pontarch even in the imperial period, because the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus was not restricted by provincial boundaries. However, both camps assume that the Pontarch mentioned by Fourcade must have been honored for his actions in Pompeiopolis, that Pompeiopolis was the site of festivities hosted by the leader of a Pontic koinon.

What Fourcade wrote was different. His paraphrase is that the honorific monument to the Pontarch is to be set up in a conspicuous place in the gymnasium. The implication is best understood in Bosch’s observations made in 1935. Bosch noticed that there was a Pontarch from Amastris who was also Lesbarch. Since there is no possibility for Amastris to have been a member city of the Koinon of Lesbos, Bosch reasons that a koinarch should not be considered a definitive indication of the koinon membership of the city that produced it. There are at least two other examples of koinarchs who were chosen from provinces other than that in which the koinon was

---

343 Thesis promoted by proponents of the so-called analytical theory, Sørensen 2016, 76-78, most recently Marek 2015, 311-315 and Sørensen 2016, 84-85.

344 Thesis promoted by proponents of the so-called unitarian theory, Sørensen 2016, 75-76. The Unitarian theory, in its current version proposed by Loriot, also argued that the Koinon must have been a Trajanic creation, because available evidence do not date before this time relies upon the Pompeiopolitan Pontarch to date to the imperial period, it would have been part of a Pontic koinon. Loriot 2006, 527-532.

345 Marek, Kat. Amastris 19: ἀγαθῇ Τύχι | ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἐτέμησαν | Λ. Κακύλλων Γαίου | υἱὸν Κλοιστομείνα Πρόκλου | τὸν Ποντάρχην καὶ Λεσβάρχην καὶ ἱκὺν τῆς Ἀλεξίας, πρωτεύον τῶν ἐπαρχείων | πάσης ἀρετῆς χάριν ἀνέστησεν | Λ. Αἰλίως Λουκανὸς | ὑπὲρ φυλῆς | Diokouρίδος; Marek 1993, 70-71. Bekker-Nielsen 2016, 380 observes that, since Lucius Caecilius Procles was son of Lesbos, his origin must have been Lesbos, and hence his Pontarchate would have been “secondary.”

346 Bosch 1935, 74 fn. 33: “Dann müßte ebenso Amastris zum κοινὸν Λεσβίων gehört haben, weil dort ein Λεσβάρχης genannt wird; das ist natürlich absurd und diese Methode ganz unzulässig.”
based. At Meyre, in the southeastern *chora* of Amastris, one local clan leader (γενεάρχης) Marcus Aurelius Alexander was High Priest of Pontus, Bithyniarch, and Pontarch, discussed in the previous chapter. From Halicarnassus, two business representatives honored their client Marcus Aurelius Mindius Matidianus Pollio, who was, among other titles the imperial procurator, twice Bithyniarch, and Asiarch of the temples in Ephesus. These examples suggest that koinarchate could be taken up by individuals whose origins were not from the Koinon. Since Fourcade's paraphrastic description contains nothing about Apollodorus the Pontarch's having given games in Pompeiopolis per se, there is no ground to say for certain that Pompeiopolis was a member to the Koinon. In other words, this evidence is irrelevant both to the analyst and unitarian arguments, since it cannot prove the Koinon membership of Pompeiopolis.

Much of the basis of the argument for excluding the Pompeiopolis evidence from relevance relies on the accuracy of Fourcade's paraphrastic descriptions, and the lack of a sketch for the Pompeiopolis inscription makes this argument itself tenuous. However, subsequent treatment of the Sinopean inscription honoring a Pontarch, which immediately follows his report on Pompeiopolis, is a good indication of the general accuracy of Fourcade's paraphrastic description, since we have two sketches that

---

347 *OGIS* 531 ll. 1-10: ἀγαθῆ τύχη | ἤθος | Μάρκους Λύρηλλου Αλέξανδρος Γαίου τοῦ καὶ Λεπινίου . . . ἐ γενεάρχης καὶ προστάτης καὶ κτίστης καὶ τροφεὺς καὶ ἄρχερευς τοῦ Πόντου, ἄρξας τὴν μεγίστην ἄρχην τῆς λαμπρότατης Ἀμαστριανῶν | πόλεως Βεθυνιάρχης καὶ Ποντάρχης τειμηθέως κτλ.

348 *OGIS* 525: ἀγαθῆ τύχη· | Καλόκαιρος καὶ Εὐφρατης | πραγματευτέων | Μινδίου Ματίδιανοῦ Πώλλου, ἄρχων Μ. λειβάλικον Ασίας καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας κατεσκεύασαν καὶ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἔχρυσωσαν.
independently support his claims. We begin with Fourcade’s statement regarding his
finding in Sinope.349

I found the same title of Pontarch in the ruins of the amphitheater of Sinope. It
appears that before the new provincial division adopted by Hadrian, the federated
cities of Pontus celebrated public games in honor of Sarapis, Isis, Proserpina and
Mars, protective deities of the peoples of the Black Sea; all these cities, like the
province of Asia, of Cilicia, of Galatia, had undoubtedly obtained the favor of
electing an annual president of the games and spectacles which the inhabitants of
Pontus celebrated together. The Pontarch of Sinope had deserved the gratitude of
his compatriots by the gladiatorial duels and bull-fights, which he had given at his
expense and with the greatest magnificence.

In this description, Fourcade took note of two actions: “the federated cities of
Pontus celebrated public games in honor of Sarapis, Isis, Proserpina and Mars,” and “the
Pontarch of Sinope had deserved the gratitude of his compatriots by the gladiatorial duels
and bull-fights, which he had given at his expense and with the greatest magnificence.”

The second action honoring the Pontarch can be corroborated by two sketches, made
independently by amateur witnesses. The first witness is Captain J. G. Werninck, who
transcribed the fragmentary inscription during his trip in the late 1820s. Werninck’s
version was published as CIG III 4157. The second witness is the pharmacist Basile
Altinoglous, who created sketches for the stone (and two others) described as found in his

349 Fourcade 1811, 38 “J’ai trouvé le même titre de Pontarque dans les ruines de l’amphithéâtre de Sinope.
Il paraît qu’avant la nouvelle division provinciale adoptée par Hadrien, les villes fédérées du Pont
célébroyent des jeux publics en l’honneur de Sérapis, d’Isis, de Proserpine et de Mars, divinités protectrices
des peuples de la mer Noire; toutes ces villes, à l’exemple de la province asiatique, de al Cilicie, de la
Galatie, avoient obtenu sans doute la faveur d’élire un président annuel des jeux et des spectacles que les
habitans du Pont célébroyent en commun. Le Pontarque de Sinope avoit mérité la reconnaissance de ses
compatriotes par des combats de gladiateurs et de taureaux qu’il avoit donnés à ses frais et avec la plus
garden adjacent to an ancient temple. The Altinoglous version was published by Yerakis in 1901.

The Werninck and the Yerakis sketches differ slightly in content. The former preserved two lines at the top not seen in the Yerakis sketch, while the latter recorded one more line at the bottom of the text. Discrepancies in several letters and spacing can be observed in both sketches. The earlier sketch made by Werninck is commonly accepted as accurate, as it preserved more letters than the Yerakis sketch. For example, David Robinson apparently treated the CIG-Werninck version as more trustworthy, and this confidence seems to have derived from autopsy, given his comment on line 7 of the text,350 and Robinson was concerned with publishing newly discovered inscription in his 1905 collation, and texts that had already been edited were merely reproduced “with corrections, for the sake of completeness,”351 leading to uncertainty on the authority of his version of the text. The result of these different versions is a heavily negotiated text,352 though the general tenor of the content is for the most part similar to the second part of Fourcade’s account.

---

350 Robinson 1905, 312 “the reading in line 7, Κλάυδιον Ποτέλιον, is not given in the CIG, but is clear on the stone.”

351 Robinson 1905, 294.

352 For full apparatus criticus, see French 2004, 74 no. 103. Apparent questions include the accusative ending for Claudius Potelius in Robinson 1905, 311-312, which followed CIG III 4157 as well as the sketch provided by Yerakis 1901, 357, to restore ἔκγονον | Κλαυδίου Ποτελίου, while French followed Robert in restoring ἔκγονον | Κλαυδίον Ποτελίου, which certainly makes more sense, but defies the autopsy-based evidence. The published by Yerakis was produced by M. Basile Altinoglous, a pharmacist, who happened to have the stone (along with two others) in his garden, and subsequently removed them following the transcription. At Yerakis 1901, 356 line 9, Altinoglous records a ligature for (ΝΠ), which confirms the accusative form in the CIG, and Robinson clearly considered them genuine.
...former gymnasiarch, chief-magistrate for the senate-house, Pontarch, having put on a bull-fight and a show-hunt and a gladiatorial show with magnificence, descendant of Claudius Pote[lius], brother of the clarissima senatorial (lady), Claudia Paula, priestess of the goddess Isis, the joint presidents and the joint ephor (dedicated it) because of his goodwill towards them… (Trans. French)

FIG. 22. WERNINCK AND YERAKIS VERSIONS OF SINOPE PONTARCH INSCRIPTION

While some differences in the two sketches warrant a skeptical approach to reconstructing the original text, they justify good confidence in affirming the veracity of the second part of Fourcade’s account regarding the honoring of a Pontarch from Sinope. Yet, the sketches do not immediately contribute to verifying whether the first part of Fourcade’s account – the federated cities of Pontus celebrated public games in honor of Sarapis, Isis, Proserpina and Mars – was also from the same inscription. The apparent hurdle is space: we need to envision a longer text if Fourcade’s account is derived from the fragmentary inscription. Lengthening the reconstruction is possible, since both
sketches preserved bits of damaged lines at the top and bottom, but a clear indication remains lacking. A somewhat ambivalent basis is in lines 9-13, where the restored text identifies the Pontarch as “the brother of the most honorable lady Claudia Paula, of senatorial rank and priestess to Isis.” This proves very little, beyond the fact that the priestess to the Isis cult was an important position in Sinope that would befit a lady of senatorial rank. Given the internal evidence from Fourcade’s description and the two versions of the Pontarch inscription, we can only assume that there is the likelihood that the first part of Fourcade’s description regarding the koinon games, and the dedication of these games to the four deities, could have been derived from a missing section of the fragmentary Pontarch inscription.

Yet Fourcade’s list of deities is an interesting assemblage rarely found in extant Sinopean inscriptions, and the combination of Sarapis, Isis, and Proserpina is known to have been connected with an Egyptian priestly tradition that was associated with imperial propaganda in the Flavian period. According to this tradition, preserved by Tacitus,

We note that, even if Fourcade did see a longer text that included the full title of the koinon, the synprostatai and the synephor remain difficult to interpret, for they do not fit the titles of koinon offices expected of regional assemblies in Anatolia. Delegates of koinon assemblies in Anatolia were generally called koinoboules and attended by koinoboules, with the leader of the assembly a koinarch. For the synprostatai and the synephoros to fit in this mould, one would have to suppose that the coastal Paphlagonian koinon called their delegates synprostatai instead of koinoboules, and had a leading figure called synephoros instead of a koinarch. Since we know that the coastal Paphlagonian koinon did elect Pontarchs, attested in the same inscription, it becomes relatively more difficult to factor in the synephoros into the framework of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon. These titles present a challenge, but Fourcade’s rendering also reflects a clear separation between the titles and the Koinon. The titles were the “compatriots” who honored the Pontarch, while the Koinon presented public games honoring four deities.

For Classical period deities, we have Hestia Prytaneia in French 2004, 9-11 no. 7 and Poseidon Helikonios in French 2004, 11-13 no. 8. For Hellenistic period deities, there is Zeus Dikaiosynos in French 2004, 47 no. 75. For the Roman period, Sarapis was assimilated with Helios in one example, and in another it was assimilated with Zeus and Helios, in French 2004, no. 115 Διὶ Ἀθηναῖων Ἡλίῳ Σαράπιδι καὶ Εἰσίθων μυριονύμῳ. On coins, Sarapis and Isis appears together on Sinopean issues of the second century CE. Olshausen 1990, 1869-1870.

Ptolemy I dispatched an embassy to bring the image of Iuppiter Dis at Sinope – which was famous among the local inhabitants because of the deity Proserpina who was worshipped together – to a certain location in Alexandria, where an ancient shrine had previously been dedicated to Sarapis and Isis. Tacitus offers an interesting assessment, pointing out that the Ptolemaic tradition of the Iuppiter-Sarapis cult was juxtaposed with stories of Vespasian’s demonstrating miraculous healing powers to show that “many marvels occurred to mark the favor of heaven and a certain partiality of the gods toward [Vespasian].” Vespasian’s fortune and divine favor was a theme that influenced many other writers such as Suetonius and Dio Cassius, suggesting wide and effective circulation of the myth as propaganda. We do not know when the cults of Sarapis and Isis reached Sinope, but it was to the advantage of the Sinopeans to advertise themselves

356 Tac. Hist. 4.83 relates the account from Egyptian priests that described Ptolemy I’s vision of the god ordering him to send men to a city known as Sinope in Pontus, where near the city there was a temple of Jupiter Dis famous among the local inhabitants, and the reason for the fame, so Tacitus seems to imply, was because there was a female figure called Proserpina sitting beside the god. (cognoscit urbem illic Sinopen, nec procul templum uetere inter accolas fama Iouis Ditis; namque et muliebrem effigiem adsistere quam plerique Proserpinam uocent). It also happened that Ptolemy’s embassy to Sinope learned from stopping at Delphi that Jupiter Dis was the father of Apollo, and Proserpina was the sister (tum legatos et dona Scyrothemidi regi – is tunc Sinopensibus imeritabat – expediri iubet praecipitque nauigaturis ut Pythicum Apollinem adeant. illis mre secundum, sors oraculi haud ambigua: irent simulacrumque patris sui reueherent, sororis relinquerent.). The Egyptian priestly account continues in Tac. Hist. 4.84 about a prolonged process that finally led to the transferral of the god to Egypt, and specifically “on that spot” which was “an ancient shrine dedicated to Sarapis and Isis” (fuerat illic sacellum Serapidi atque Isidi antiquitus sacratum). Burstein pointed out the similarities of this narrative with others, such as the one from the Bentresh Stela, in which a deity’s image from a foreign place departed for Egypt after a prolonged delay due to the reluctance of the foreign ruler. Burstein 2012, 38.

357 Tac. Hist. 4.81 narrates that while Vespasian was waiting in Alexandria for favorable winds, “many marvels occured to mark the favor of heaven and a certain partiality of the gods toward him” (per eos mensis quibus Vespasianus Alexandriæ status aestiuis flatibus dies et certa maris opperiebatur, multa miracula euenere, quis caelestis fauor et quaedam in Vespasianum inclinatio numinum ostenderetur). The marvels include sick men approaching Vespasian asking for cure at the direction of Sarapis and were cured, as well as Vespasian seeing the vision of a man – whose name Basilides is suggestive of Vespasian’s future fortune – while in the temple of Sarapis (Tac. Hist. 4.82).

358 Scott 1936, 8-9 proposed that such miraculour tradition was aimed at “winning soliders to a belief in Vespasian’s destiny” and hence early propaganda to address the fact that Vespasian “had neither birth nor wealth to recommend him, but if a belief in his high destiny could become general, his path would be made much smoother.” Luke 2010, 86-89 argues that the promotion of the Alexandrian wonders was more emphatically carried out during the reign of Domitian. Also in Suet. Ves 7 and Dio Cass. 65.8.1-2.
as a key source of Vespasian’s fortune by worshipping Sarapis and Isis – if not also Proserpina – as their principal deities in the late first century CE.\textsuperscript{359} In turn, it is conceivable that the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus would have benefited from dedicating the koinon games to the honor of these deities.

In short, the fragmentary sketches as copied by Werninck and Altinoglous confirm a part of Fourcade’s report that Sinope was a venue for public games presented by the Koinon, as well as gladiatorial spectacles presented by the Pontarch. There is a good chance that additional information reported by Fourcade – that the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus dedicated public games to Sarapis, Isis, Proserpina, and Mars – is also from the same inscription, though this is not confirmed. The sketches therefore set Sinope and Pompeiopolis apart: there is no evidence that Pompeiopolis was the venue of koinon activities, despite having produced a Pontarch, while at Sinope we may posit that the koinon festivities were likely a regular affair overseen by the leading families of Sinope, who would take up both the koinon leadership and municipal priesthoods relevant to the imperial cult. The two sketches offer insight into this integrative aspect, informing us that the Pontarch’s sister of senatorial order was also the priestess of Isis. The cults of Isis and Sarapis were likely introduced during the Flavian period, when the colony was mentioned in propagandistic accounts that tied Vespasian’s fortune to the Sarapis cult at Alexandria. The two Sinopean sketches also indicate that the vitality of the Koinon was not restricted

\textsuperscript{359} Barat 2010, 134 suggested that the appearance of the Sarapis and Isis cults at Sinope may have been a deliberate move by the colonial authorities to take advantage of the city’s role in the priestly tradition of Vespasian’s fortune.
to the Heraclea-Tium-Amasstris region, where the three urban centers likely formed a more interconnected union than the Sinope-Amisus region.

3.1.2 A gladiatorial familia in Amisus

The free city of Amisus sat on the eastern extreme of the territories that contributed to the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus. Despite its peripheral location and free status – which would allow it to claim exemption from koinon liturgy, we have an inscription containing a reference to a Pontarch and a gladiatorial troupe that points to Amisus as also being a venue for koinon festivities.

ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ. | τῷ σμα' ἔτει, πονταρχούντων | Μ. Ἰουλίου Ἰουλίανον καὶ Σησστῦ| λίας Κυρίλλης, γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ, | φαμίλια μονομάχου τῶν | περὶ Καλυδόνα.

To good fortune. In the year 241, when (those) serving as Pontarchs (were) Marcus Iulius Iulianus and Sestullia Cyrilla his wife, the family of gladiators belonging to Calydon (dedicates this). (Translation mine)

Unlike the Sinopean inscription, which expressly mentions the Pontarch as having given a variety of gladiatorial spectacles and hence clearly sets Sinope as the venue of the Koinon, the Amisus inscription is less informative. We do not know whether the

---

360 Terpstra 2013, 186-187. Reynolds 1982 no. 14 a rescript from Trajan to Smyrna, ll. 2-4 oўδένα βούλομαι ἐκ τῶν ἐλευθέρων πόλεων ἀναγκάζεσθαι εἰς ὑµετέραν λειτουργίαν καὶ | μάλιστα ἐξ Ἀφροδεισίδος ἐξηρηµένης τῆς πόλεως καὶ τοῦ τόπου τῆς ἐπαρχείας ὅστε µήτε | εἰς τὰς κοινὰς τῆς Ἀσίας µήτε εἰς ἕτερας λειτουργίας ὑπάγεσθαι. [I wish no one from the free cities to be forced into (performing) your liturgy, and especially no one from Aphrodisias, since that city has been removed from the formula provinciae so that it is not liable either to the common liturgies of Asia or to others. (Trans. Reynolds)]

Reynolds 1982 no. 15 Hadrian to Aphrodisias, ll. 8-14 ἐντευχθεὶς δὲ διὰ πρεσβείας περὶ τῆς τοῦ σιδήρου χρήσεως καὶ τοῦ τέλους τῶν ἠλέων, καὶπερ | ἀναφοβηθησίµου τοῦ πράγµατος ὅντος διὰ τὸ | µὴ νῦν πρὸν τοὺς πελώνας ἐπικεφαληµένα | παρ' ὑµῶν ἐγκέλδαι ὡς εἰςδὸς τὴν πόλιν | τὰ τε ἄλλα τεµῆς οὕσαιν ἀξίαν καὶ ἐξηρηµένην | τοῦ τόπου τῆς ἐπαρχείας, κτλ.[I have been petitioned through an embassy about the use of iron and the tax on nails. Although the matter is controversial, since this is not the first time that the collectors have attempted to collect from you, nevertheless, knowing that the city is in other respects worthy of honor and is removed from the formula provinciae etc. (Trans. Reynolds)] Lintott 1993, 28-32 presents a historical account of the formulae and relationship with the leges provinciae.

361 Kalinka 1895, 230.
Pontarchs had a direct relationship with the gladiatorial familia, and who (or what) Kalydon was is also uncertain. In the interpretation of Cumont and Robert, the two Pontarchs were eponymous officials in a temporal genitive construct with the civic era τῷ σμα’ έτει, or the year 241 (209 CE), and the gladiatorial familia was owned by a certain Calydon. In the interpretation of Philip Harland, on the other hand, the owners of the gladiatorial familia were the Pontarchs, and by this rendering Harland faces some difficulty in rendering περὶ Καλυδῶνα: he translates “around Kalydon,” but this creates an ambiguous relationship between Kalydon and the gladiatorial familia. To approach this inscription, we focus on Harland’s translation, for a critique of it helps more vividly to illuminate the nature and significance of this inscription.

Harland’s first assertion is that this monument is funerary. Funerary references would have μνημῆς/μνήμας χάριν or other formulae that makes the funerary aspect explicit, which we do not find here. Placed in context, this inscription is similar to those from commemorative monuments set up by gladiatorial familiae elsewhere. The nature of such commemorative monuments remains uncertain, with some speculating that they

---


364 IG XII,2 447 (Mytilene) φαµιλία µονοµάχων [Μ]άρκου | Κλαυδίου | Τριφυονιανού νέου | καὶ ἀργερείας | Ὄρφης | Δαιλίας | Σωτίου γυναικός αὐτοῦ. Roueché, PPAphr 13 φαµιλίας | Κλαυδίου του Παυλείνου | ἀσιάρχου | νεωτέρου. Ephesos 1866 φαµιλίας | μονοµάχων | Τιβερίου | Κλαυδίου | Τατιανοῦ | Ἀττικοῦ | ἀσιάρχου.
are funerary markers for gladiators killed in action, and others proposing that they mark the location of gladiatorial barracks or the familial ludus. Harland’s interpretation is therefore taking one of the established assumptions, but we note that the lack of key references to remembrance customary for inscriptions of a funerary nature makes this interpretation risky.

Secondly, the noun and participial forms of ποντάρχω create ambiguities that are evident in Harland’s interpretation. Harland took πονταρχούντων as a genitive plural noun from ποντάρχης, and hence genitive of possession, rather than a genitive plural participle from ποντάρχω. There are several problems with Harland’s interpretation. One,

it is true that some provincial priests owned gladiatorial troupes, and the expression of such ownership would in the genitive, but the owners would appear after – not before – the gladiatorial familia in formulaic expressions, such as φαμιλίας | μονομάχου

Ti(βερίου) Κλ(αυδίου) Τατίανος Ἰουλίας|νοῦ ἀσιάρχου. Two, provincial priests also leased gladiators from lanistae, and Carter argued convincingly that leasing was the more practical (and potentially more popular) course of action for provincial priests to take in

---

366 The Antonine legislation discussed in the Senatus Consultum de Pretiis Gladiatorum Minuendis (CIL II 6278) was responding in part to this practice, as the price of gladiatorial troupes would become higher with each transaction. CIL II 6278 = ILS 5163 II. 59-61 sacerdotes quoque prouinciarum, quibus nullum cum lanistis nego[tium e[ri]t, gladiatores a prioribus s]lacerdotibus sue[ctos, uel si pl(ura]] et auctoratos, recipiunt, at post editio[em] pl[uere ex p]retiio in succedentes tran[s]fertunt. “there will be provinces too where the provincial priests have no dealings with the lanistae. They take over gladiators bought and trained by previous priests, or free fighters who had bound themselves with a contract, but after giving a spectacle they pass them on to successors at a higher price.” (Trans. Oliver) We learn from Galen that the province of Asia was engaged with such practice: the physician treated many gladiators under at least five High Priests of Asia. Com. med. 3.2 (XIII 599-600 Kühn), quoted by Carter 2003, 42-43 and Robert 1971, 285 fn. 1: κατὰ τὴν δὲ πολλῶν τεθνεότοιν ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν ἔτοι, ἐμοῦ δὲ οὕτω τῶν ὡς εἶρηθαι τετρομένων ἀποθανὸντος τινὸς οὗτ’ ἐ ἄλλου τραύματος, ὡς μετὰ τὸν ἐγχειρίσαντα μοι τότε τὴν θεραπείαν δεύτερος ἄρχερες ὡς, ὡς όμοιος καὶ αὐτὸς ἔπίστευσε τὴν ἐπέμελειαν τῶν μονομάχων μετὰ μήνας ἐπάνω μέσους, ό μὲν γὰρ πρῶτος περὶ τὴν φθονοποιημένην ἵστηριαν, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος ἁκμάζοντος τοῦ ἱροῦ ἐργαρίσατο. πάλιν δ’ ἐπὶ τούτῳ σωθέντων ἀπάντων ὁ τρίτος καὶ ὁ τέταρτος καὶ πέμπτῳ ὡςαύτῳ ἐνεχειρίσασιν μοι τὴν θεραπείαν τῶν μονομάχων, ὡστε πολλὴν βάσανον ἔχειν τῆς ἀγωγῆς. [Fortunately, while many (gladiators) died in the previous years, under me neither did any of the wounded die, as was said (above), nor (did any die) from any other wound, and the second archiereus – after the medical treatment had been entrusted to me (by the first) – did likewise and also entrusted the care of the gladiators to me seven and a half months later. For the first served as archiereus around the autumnal equinox, and the second in high spring. Again, with all saved, after him the third and the fourth and the fifth likewise entrusted the medical treatment of the gladiators to me, so that I had abundant testing of my training.] (Trans. Carter) The text does not explicitly comment on whether the gladiators Galen treated were owned by each of the succeeding High Priests of Asia, but Michael Carter assumed as much based on a reference from Epictetus that discussed the moral issues with owning a gladiatorial troupe. Epictet. 2.24.23 καὶ γείρων γήν κομψῆς ἄρχερες, δς τοὺς καλοὺς μονομάχους διὰ πάς τῆς ἐνεχειρίας ἔχει. “And do you sink below the level of an elegant High Priest who treats the noble gladiators with all respect?” (Trans. Oldfather) Carter then associated Galen’s passage with the section that concerned with provincial priests purchasing gladiatorial troupes from their predecessors in the Senatus Consultum. Carter 2003, 42-43. If Carter is correct, then the burden of the High Priests of Asia would – following the model described in the Senatus Consultum – increase in time, along with the risk of insolvency and even vacancy of the High Priesthood altogether.

367 Ephesos 1686. Other comparable examples include IMT Kyz Kapu Dağ 1498 ἀγαθῆι τύχηι· | φαμιλία μονομάχου [φιλοτεμίας Πλώτου] | Λύμ. Γράτου, ἀσύρματος, καὶ Ἰουλίας Ἀυρ. Ἀσκληπιοδόρας τῆς | γυναίκος αὐτοῦ || ἄρχερειας. BCH 17 (1893) 265,50 [φαμιλία] | μονομάχου Θ. Ἀρουντίου Νεκρομάχου | Τεθερευνανοῦ υἱῶν καὶ εὐγόνου, ἄρχερειας Ασίας ἀπογόνου, πρεμπτεύσαντος, ὑπατικοῦ | ἀνεγίγκατο | καὶ συνήγγονος, ἄρχερειας πρῶτον τῆς πατρίδος, καὶ Ἰουλίας | Ὑδαλαρίας, ἄρχερειας, γυναίκος αὐτοῦ.
fulfilling their obligations.\footnote{Discussed by the jurist Gaius, who discusses an example where leasing a gladiator would be two per cent of the purchasing price. Gai. \textit{Inst.} 3.146 \textit{item si gladiatores ea lege tibi tradiderim, ut in singulos, qui integri exierint, pro sudore denarii XX mihi darentur, in eo uero singulos, qui occisi aut debilitati fuerint, denarii mille, quaeritur, utrum emptio et uenditio an locutio et conductio contrahatur. et magis placuit eorum, qui integri exierint, locationem et conductionem contractam uideri, at eorum, qui occisi aut debilitati sunt, emptionem et uenditionem esse; idque ex accidentibus apparat, tamquam sub condicione facta cuitusque uenditione aut locatione. [again, suppose I deliver gladiators to you on the express terms that I will get 20 denarii for the efforts of each one who comes off unharmed, but 1,000 denarii for each one killed or maimed; is this sale or hire? The received opinion is that there is hire of the ones who come off unharmed but sale of those killed or maimed, and events determine the classification (whether sale or hire), as if there were a conditional sale or hire for each one. For there is no longer any doubt that goods can be sold or hired subject to conditions. Trans. Gordon \& Robinson] This practice is not specifically discussed in the surviving fragments of the \textit{SC}, but Carter presented a plausible connection by taking the \textit{SC}'s stipulation of a graded schedule of a gladiator's worth based on the palus-system as a mechanism of relative evaluation that would work for both leasing and purchasing a gladiator. A provincial priest would negotiate lease rates that were a percentage of a gladiator's overall value. See Carter 2003, 102-103.} Three, it is also possible to assign πονταρχούντων to the chronographical formula following τῷ σμα’ ἔτει, as the genitive participial clause denoting time when does not require an introductory preposition ἐπί. For example, in Lycia, a short koinon decree such as \textit{TAM II 497} could conclude with the eponymous official of the koinon in a genitive participial clause (λυκιαρχοῦντος τοῦ | ἄξιολογωτάτου Μάρ(κου) · Αὐρ(ηλίου) | Κυρείνα Λαίτου τοῦ καὶ | Παίτου).\footnote{\textit{TAM II 497} Λυκίων τὸ κοινὸν | Σ· ἐ<ζ>στὸν Κάλλαιδον | Κλημεντίνην Κητετλέα, καθός | ἐψηφίσατο τὸ ἐθνὸς, | λυκιαρχοῦντος τοῦ | ἄξιολογωτάτου Μάρ(κου) · Αὐρ(ηλίου) | Κυρείνα Λαίτου τοῦ καὶ | Παίτου.} The three points mentioned here point to the likelihood that Harland’s interpretation may not properly reflect the relationship between the Pontarchs and the gladiatorial familia. A more likely interpretation is to take the Pontarchs as eponymous officials, whom the gladiatorial familia held in deference for their financial and organisational leadership in the koinon spectacle wherein the gladiatorial familia concluded their performance.

Thirdly, Harland’s interpretation of φαµιλία µονοµάχων τῶν | περὶ Καλυδῶνα as a family of gladiators “around Kalydon” is ambiguous, and points to a key question: was Kalydon a person, or place? The expression περὶ followed by a person in the accusative is
commonly used to denote followers of a god or an official. In coastal Paphlagonia, for example, there are variants of the formula οἱ περὶ δεῖνον α´ ἀρχοντα ἀρχοντες, or “the magistrates under a certain chief magistrate,” while in Samos we find the formula οἱ περὶ τὸν ἀσιάρχην δεῖνον στρατηγοὶ δεῖνοι, “certain strategoi under a certain Asiarch.”

To interpret Kalydon as a person would entail that he was in a privileged position in relation to the gladiatorial familia, and it would be natural to assume that he was the owner. The difficulty is that, as mentioned earlier, owners take the genitive and is immediately preceded by the familia that they own. Carter proposes that the atypical rendering may indicate an atypical relationship between a gladiatorial familia and its owner: Kalydon may have been a retired gladiator, with a ludus organised not in “the typical master-slave relationship of most lanisticial families, but one of teacher-student, or of comrades.” Carter’s explanation is plausible but without precedent. A solution is that we take Carter’s interpretation in the abstract, and assume that φαμιλία μονομάχων τὸν περὶ Καλυδῶνα could be understood as “the gladiatorial familia with Kalydon as...
representative or leader,” with a range of possibilities regarding the precise nature of their relationship open to interpretation.

As for the interpretation that Kalydon may be a location, the basis is even weaker. The city of Calydon of the Aetolians was uprooted and left desolate by Augustus, its population moved to Nicopolis and its possessions to Patras. On a positive note, Calydon was still used as a reference point by Strabo for several features, including the temple of the Laphrian Apollo “near Calydon” (περὶ . . . τὴν Καλυδῶνα), as well as a lake “nearby Calydon” (πρὸς τῇ Καλυδῶνι) with an abundant supply of fish that was in the possession of the Romans in Patras. We also know that gladiators in the Greek East did travel. Examples include a secutor from Cyzicus who died in Larissa, having fought in Asia, Thrace, and Macedonia, and an unknown gladiator from Gortyn who fought in Crete and Asia. We also know, from an anecdote in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*, that municipal officials could venture far in search of famous gladiators in order to present an outstanding spectacle. Taking an extreme position, the Amisenian Pontarch inscription may have been one rare example of a gladiatorial troupe’s attempt to memorialise their

---

375 Strabo 10.16.3 Αἰτωλῶν δ’ εἰσὶ Καλυδῶν τε καὶ Πλευρῶν, νῦν μὲν τεταπεινωμέναι.

376 10.21 περὶ δὲ τὴν Καλυδῶνά ἐστι τὸ τοῦ Λαφρίου Ἀπόλλωνος ιερὸν . . . ἐστι δὲ τις καὶ πρὸς τῇ Καλυδῶνι λίμνη μεγάλη καὶ εὐόψης, ἣν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἐν Πάτραις Ρωμαῖοι. Pausanias, however, only mentions Calydon’s cult images removed to Patrae. Paus. 7.18.7-10 on the cult of Artemis Laphria, 7.21.1-2 on the cult of Dionysus Calydonios.

377 Carter 1999, 83. The third example is relatively uncertain: Carter 1999, 345 no. 236 is a monument from Smyrna, with relief depicting four shield-bearing gladiators holding placards with their names and origin, including Nicomedia, Smyrna, Pergamum, and Laodicea.


379 Carter 1999, 324 no 130 = ICret. 4.375 is a fragmentary list of victories of the unnamed boxer, including locations at Ephesus, Tralles, Laodicea, Aphrodisias, and Gortyn.

presence in a foreign land. Yet, the definite article accompanying both examples from Strabo is noticeably absent from the Amisenian Pontarch inscription, which makes the locative interpretation less plausible. Also, the dating of the Amisenian Pontarch inscription is also two centuries later than Strabo’s account. With Pausanias the periegete silent on the state of the land of Calydon in his time, the prospect that a group of third century CE gladiators would come from a land that had been left desolate by Augustus seems bleak.

In sum, the Amisenian Pontarch inscription ought to be considered along with a category of commemorative monuments with gladiatorial familiae as dedicating subjects, which are themselves of ambiguous significance. We can read the Amisenian Pontarch inscription as a commemorative monument set up by a gladiatorial troupe with a leader called Kalydon honored their owners or lessees during the year 241 when the Pontarchs were Marcus Iulius Iulianus and Sestullia Cyrilla. There is some chance that the Pontarchs may have owned or leased a gladiatorial troupe originating from Calydon, though this is predicated upon Strabo’s description dating to two centuries earlier. While some ambiguity exists, the baseline significance for the Amisenian Pontarch inscription is that it represented clear indications of vitality of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus outside of the Heraclea-Tium-Amastris region, though we do not have enough data to make sweeping generalisations regarding when Sinope and Amisus became fully involved in the core activities of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus.

In the next section, we examine an inscription from Sinope that suggests the involvement of Sinopean athletes in the agonistic festivities of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus.
Pontus may have begun in the early second century CE, which would be synchronous with the vitality observable in the Heraclea-Tium-Amastris region.

3.1.3 The Sinopean Boxer and the *Agones* of the Koinon of Pontus

The Amisenian and Sinopean Pontarch inscriptions discussed in the previous section gives us good confidence that koinon spectacles took place in the cities outside of the Heraclea-Tium-Amastris region as well. The logic behind this assertion that koinon spectacles must have taken place in Sinope and Amisus due to the attestation of Pontarchs in those cities is essentially a top-down point of view. The same assertion cannot be made for agonistic events of the koinon in Sinope and Amisus, due to the fact that High Priests of Pontus have not been attested here, but only in Heraclea and Amastris.

While we do not have evidence that offers a top-down perspective for koinon agonistic events in the Sinopean and Amisenian region, there is a Sinopean victory list that shows a Sinopean athlete having participated in an agonistic event held by the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus, and hence provides a bottom-up dimension of koinon
vitality in eastern coastal Paphlagonia. Inscribed and set up by the Sinopean boule, the victory list honored Marcus Iutius Marcianus Rufus, whose impressive boxing career extended beyond Anatolia, as he successfully competed in the four periodoi of mainland Greece, as well as the Capitoline and Neapolitan games in Italy.\textsuperscript{381}

Marcus Iutius Marcianus Rufus, distinguished Sinope boxer, victorious at sacred triumphal games: at Rome, the Capitoline, thrice in succession; at Neapolis, twice; the Actian, twice, first and only among Sinopeans; Nemea, twice; Isthmia, twice; the Pythian; the Olympic; the Panathenaic, first among Sinopeans; the Antiocaean, thrice, first and only among underage, youth, and adult age groups; the men’s Pythian in Antiochia; at Nicomedia thrice, first and only among the underage, youth, and adult groups; the Koinon of Asia games in Smyrna, Pergamum, and Ephesus; at the shield games at Argos, twice; the Koinon of Asia games at Sardis, twice; at Philadelphia, twice; at Tralleis, twice; at Hierapolis, twice; at Laodicea, twice; at Thyateira, twice; at Mytilene, twice; at the Koinon of Pontus games, twice; the Koinon of Galatia games, twice; the Koinon of Macedonia games; the Koinon of Bithynia games at Nicaea, twice; the Koinon of Cappadocia games; and other half-talent competitions, 110 times. 150 (victories total?). By decree of the boule. (Trans. French)

The first peculiarity to note about the inscription is the number of games that Rufus won. According to French’s translation, the Sinopean boule counts a total of 150 victories, with 110 unnamed victories in chrematitai; but the sacred victories total 48,

\textsuperscript{381} French 2004, 76-77 no. 105.
making the arithmetic difficult. The error may lie not in the arithmetic but the interpretation of the concluding notation $\nu\rho'$: it may instead be the era with an epoch of 45 BCE, which dates the inscription to 105 CE. Further assessment of the accuracy of this date is carried out in the fourth chapter. For now, we note that this date fits the key terminus post quem of 94 CE, based on the reference to Rufus’ three consecutive victories in the Capitoline games.

The second peculiarity concerns the organisation of the list. The chrematitai or money games were summarily lumped together and mentioned at the very end of the list, effectively separating them from the sacred games preceding them, and were registered individually with attention to the place and type of games. The geographical relationship between the sacred games is puzzling. Rufus’ victories at Nicomedia were placed between the Pythian games at Antiochia and the Koinon of Asia games in Smyrna, while the Koinon of Bithynia games at Nicaea were placed towards the end, between the

382 See chapter 4.

383 Domitian established the pentetaeric Capitolea in 86 CE Suet. Dom. 4.4; Griffin 2000, 69.

384 We note that even sacred games could have involved cash prizes, in addition to the symbolic honors, and hence this separation between the sacred and the money games demonstrate a clear difference in the prestige and status that the victor would care for, Klose 2005, 125-127. Regarding the award of cash prizes in the imperial period, an letter from Hadrian to the athletes and Dionysiac artists discuss the procedure that Hadrian wished to put in place, Petzl & Schwertheim 2006, 8 II. 19-23 τὰ περὶ τὰ ἄθλα καὶ τὰς συντάξεις δίκαιως αιτιᾶσθαι· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς οἶδα τοὺς ἐν ταῖς πόλεις διοικούμενος τὰ τουάτα, εἰ μὴ τι καὶ αὐτοὶ λάβουν, ἀποστεροῦντας τὰ διαδοχόμενα τοῖς ἁθληταῖς, τὰ μὲν δὴ τῶν άθλων οὕτω γεινέσθω· τοῖς ἀγόσι ὡς ἐπὶ πάν ἁρχὴ τις ἦμε τερα παρατυγχάνει· ὁ δ᾿ ἀγονοθέτης ἐκάστου ἀγώνος τῷ ἡγεμόνι τοῦ ἔθνους ἢ ἀνθυπάτου ἢ ταµία ἢ πρεσβευτῇ ἢ ὅστις ἢ αὐτὸς παρὼν ἢ, πρὸ μιὰς ἡμέρας ἐκάστου ἀγωνίσματος παραρίθμητοι τοῦ θέματος τὸ ἀργύριον· ὁ δὲ ἐνγιὼν εἰς φασκώλιον καὶ κατασημανόμενος τιθέτω παρὰ τὸν στέφανον, ἐὰν τε μοισικόν τὸ ἀγώνισμα ἢ γυμνικόν, καὶ ὁ νεικήσας εὐθὺς ἐπὶ ἡ γείκη σὺν καὶ τῷ στεφάνῳ πάντων ὀρόντων λαμβανέτοι. [You are making a just request in regard to the prizes and allowances; for in truth I am well aware that, if those who manage these matters in the cities do not themselves get something, they will deprive the athletes of what is owed to them. Now as for the businesses of the prizes, let it be thus. In competitions for the most part some official of ours is present. Let the agonothete of each contest count over to the head of the province or the Proconsul or the Quaestor or the Legate or whosoever is in attendance one day before each contest the money for the cash prize; he is to put it in a bag, seal it and put it beside the crown, whether the contest is musical or gymnic, and let the victor straight after the victory take it along with the crown, when everyone is looking on. (Translation mine, modified after Petzl & Schwertheim 2006, 9.)]
games of the Koinon of Bithynia and the Koinon of Macedonia. Also, the Koinon of Asia games in Smyrna, Pergamum and Ephesus are separated from the Koinon of Asia games at Sardis. Also separated are the koinon games held in Nicaea, the non-koinon competitions in Nicomedia, and the various cities that held the competitions of the Koinon of Asia. It seems that the authorities that listed the victories made a conscious choice that was not based on geographical location nor a particularly convenient travelling itinerary such as that planned by Hadrian.385

One possibility is that the victories might have been listed according to their prestige. The list begins with the Capitoline and the Panhellenic games, while the generic category of “other half-talent competitions” appears at the end.386 We know that the establishment of games in the Hellenistic period required formal announcement in order to secure recognition of their status, and during the imperial period similar practices continued at the municipal and provincial levels.387 Other victory lists suggest as much, such as one example from Aphrodisias, in which the Nicaean games were also placed in the middle tier and behind the Ankyra games of Galatia.388 In the Severan period, Nicaea

385 Hadrian in one of his letters to the athletes and Dionysiac artists set up in Alexandria Troas, dictated the exact days of the beginning and end of games in relation to the more important events within a game, and gave consideration on the required duration of travel for an athlete to depart from a game in order to arrive on time for another. Slater 2008, 619.

386 It is even more significant to place the Capitoline games as first, since counterexamples from Attica, Delphi, and Aphrodisias suggest that civic authorities viewed the Panhellenic games as more prestigious. IG II² 3163 (Hadrianic), IG II² 3169/70 (253-257 CE), IvO 243 (261 CE) from Attica, IG VII 49 (post-Hadrian) from Megara, FD III 1:550 (post-Hadrian) from Delphi, Roueché, PP4pfr 91 (161-169 CE) from Aphrodisias, Ephesos 1699, begin with the four Panhellenic games before Neopolitan and Capitoline games; A few, such as IvO 237, Magnesia 220, list Capitoline, Neapolis, Actium games first.

387 Price 1984, 127-128; In OGIS 456 = IGR IV 39, Mytilene publicised its new festival for Augustus, with copies of the decree set up at Pergamum, Actium, Brundisium, Tarraco, Massilia, Antiochia in Syria. Invitations sent by Termessus Minor in Lycia to other Lycian communities, in Paris & Holleaux 1886, 219 no. 3.

hosted the Severeia, resulting in some lists placing Nicaea above Ephesus (*Hadrianeia*), Smyrna (*Olympia*) and Pergamon (*Augusteia*).\(^\text{389}\) Emperors themselves intervened to adjust the hierarchy of the games in specific cities.\(^\text{390}\) In short, the victory list of the Sinope boxer games of the Koinon of Pontus was organised in a way that seems to make the games of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus ranking lower than the games of Bithynian Nicomedia, but higher than the games of the Koinon of Bithynia held at Nicaea.

We note that the games of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus did not seem to have a specific venue, unlike their Asiatic and Bithynian counterparts, and this treatment is identical with those of the Galatian, Cappadocian and Macedonian koina. That some koinon games are identified with specific cities while others were not points to deliberate distinctions regarding prestige. This can be further divided into several possibilities. A city might have an established tradition as host of koinon games, such as Nicomedia, Nicaea, Ephesus, and Pergamum, as we know that these cities were particularly named by Augustus to carry out the worship of Roma and Caesar as well as Augustus’ person. A city might have particular standing, such as neokoros or metropolis, that would require it to be the host of provincial games, such as Ankara in Galatia and Beroia in Macedonia, in which case there might be occasions on which the cities were not explicitly mentioned, since they themselves were not particularly recognised as of special importance beyond its region. Alternatively, a city might develop a well-known event that eventually made a

\(^{389}\) The Severeia in *IG II²* 3169/70 ll. 10-31 es ll. 22-23; Cf. *Tralles* 104 ll. 21-22 ranks Nicaean games as below the games of the Asian metropoleis, and only above other games of the koinon of Asia.

city more famous. For example, the Isactian games of the Koinon of Pontus
(Polemonianus) in Neocaesarea,\footnote{According to Strab. 12.3.31, Neocaesarea was previously known as Cabira in the Mithridatic period, Diospolis during Pompey's reorganisation of Pontus-Bithynia, and Sebaste by the dynast Pythodoris in honor of Augustus, the city's name Neocaesarea appears relatively late in the literary sources, first mentioned in the \textit{Natural Histories} of Pliny the Elder in \textit{HN} 6.8. Neocaesarea became the metropolis of the Koinon of Pontus in Cappadocia after the kingdom of Polemon had been annexed under Nero in 64 CE. Remy 1986, 43.} which were recognised as sacred, worldwide and iselastic (κοινὸν Πόντου ισάκτιον ἐν Νεοκαίσαρείᾳ, ἱεροὺς οἰκουμενικοὺς εἰσελαστικοὺς), was not attested in the victory list of Rufus the Sinopean boxer, but rather in the victory list of a comic actor Marcus Aurelius Philoxenos,\footnote{Bean 1965 51-53 no. 149. \textit{Ἀγαθῆι τύχηι καὶ Μαρκου Φιλόξενον.} \textit{Bean} 1965 51-53 no. 149.} likely of third century CE date.\footnote{Possibly, the \textit{iselastic} status elevated the Neocaesarean games to the level of the Panhellenic \textit{periodos}, and we know that an iselastic victor enjoy considerable privileges. Neocaesarea’s successful attainment of iselastic and Actian} Possibly, the \textit{iselastic} status elevated the Neocaesarean games to the level of the Panhellenic \textit{periodos}, and we know that an iselastic victor enjoy considerable privileges. Neocaesarea’s successful attainment of iselastic and Actian

\footnote{An agonistic competition styled the \textit{Actio} would, theoretically, include competitions in gymnastics, music, horse racing, gladiatorial spectacles, as well as with ritualistic celebrations and the dispensing of food. Paris & Holleaux \textit{BCH} 9 (1885) 70 no. 6; Eckhel \textit{DN} IV 424; cf. \textit{BCH} 5 (1881) 311.}
status certainly made the city more famous, eventually eclipsing the koinon and became
the symbol of the games itself. The absence of a specific venue associated with the
Koinon of (the Cities) in Pontus in the Sinopean victory becomes puzzling, and there are
several possibilities. It could be that the cities in coastal Paphlagonia might not have had
a fixed venue, and hence the koinon agonistic games were hosted cyclically at different
cities. It could also be that there was indeed a fixed venue, but for some reason the venue
was not worth advertising. Perhaps we can attribute this absence of a specific venue to
the fact that Sinope was part of the koinon that Rufus the boxer competed in and won,
and hence the audience would have been aware of the question concerning venues due to
local knowledge. Yet, for Galatia, Macedonia, and Cappadocia to have been treated in the
same way, such a non-specific approach to the venues of these games imply a systematic
rendering in accordance to accepted custom. We posit then that either the venues of
coastal Paphlagonia were unworthy of being cited as venues, or that coastal Paphlagonian
cities did not have a fixed venue, both of which following recognised decorum in
agonistic circles in the Greek East.

In summary, the Sinopean victory list points to the likelihood that the Koinon of
the Cities in Pontus attained considerable prestige in terms of rank, and its dating of 105
CE is further indication that the Trajan’s reign was a particularly vibrant period of the
Koinon. When viewed with other koinon games in the list, we can further contextualise
this vitality as of some attraction both to performers and athletes, though allure would
have been limited, considering its rare attestation. Such tempered expectation is
nevertheless fitting, since the size and prosperity of the territory that contributed to it
were not particularly urbanised nor great when compared with the western and south-western Anatolian koina. In the next section, we examine an attempt to bolster the prestige and visibility of coastal Paphlagonia by a private individual, who wished to bequeath his property for the founding of pentaeteric games in the name of Trajan.

3.1.4 A Pontic *Traiania*

In the second chapter, we have discussed Pliny the Younger’s letter to Trajan regarding the bequest of Iulius Largus. Trajan instructed Pliny to do what he thought more suitable to perpetuate the memory of Iulius Largus. Subsequent developments are absent from Pliny’s other letters, so whether Pliny chose to found a pentaeteric *Traiania* remains uncertain. The chronological sequence of the inscription and Pliny’s letter at least allow this possibility. The bequest of Iulius Largus, which falls in the second year of Pliny’s governorship, or in 110 or 112 CE, would soon have been met with Pliny’s abrupt death, presumably in office.

---

396 Plin. Ep.10.75.

397 Plin. Ep.10.76 Iulius Largus fidem tuam quasi te bene nosset elegit. quid ergo potissimum ad perpetuitatem memoriam eius faciat, secundum cuiusque loci conditionem ipse dispice et quod optimum existimaveris, id sequere. [Iulius Largus opted for your reliability as if he knew you well. So you yourself must consider what will best guarantee his enduring memory in accordance with the situation in each of the two places, and follow through the plan you think best. (Trans. Walsh)]

398 Sherwin-White 1966, 80-81 on dating the third year of Pliny’s governorship based the absence of a congratulation of Trajan’s assumption of the consulship in 112 CE in *Ep. 10.100 as indication of Pliny’s years between 109-11; assuming letters in book 10 are in sequence, *Ep. 10.75 would fall in the second year of Pliny’s governorship, hence 110 CE.*

399 Syme 1988, 184 argues for Pliny’s arrival in the summer of 110 CE based on the date of the death of Domitius Tullus (*Ep. 8.18*) and the dates of several letters in book 9 as in 109 CE, during which year Pliny learned about his appointment (*Ep. 9.28*), and hence Sherwin-White’s proposal of dating Pliny’s third year to 112 CE would be off the mark.
If instituted, the *Traiania* would likely have included competitions that resemble other festivities under the same name found elsewhere. Interestingly, epigraphic records indicate that there was only one other significant *Traiania*, namely the *Traiania Deiphileia* in Pergamum. This Pergamene festival included the typical competitions in boxing, the *pankration*, and the *pentathlon* of jumping, running, discus, javelin, and wrestling, as found in Philadelphia in Lydia. In addition to gymnastic competitions, musical and rhetorical contests are also attested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reference</th>
<th>competition type</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna 145</td>
<td>Τραιάνεια</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna 186</td>
<td>Τραιάνεια ἐν Περγάμῳ τὸ δ΄ ἀνδρῶν πανκράτιον</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesos 1129</td>
<td>Διφίλεια Τραϊάνεια [ῥήτ]υρ</td>
<td>Ephesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesos 1474</td>
<td>Τραιάνεια Δειφίλεια ἐν Περγάμῳ ἀνδρῶν πυγμήν</td>
<td>Ephesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesos 1701</td>
<td>Τραιάνεια ἐν Περγάμῳ ἄγ]ενεὶ]ον στάδιον</td>
<td>Ephesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM V,3 1506</td>
<td>Τραιάνεια ἐν Περγάμῳ πένταθλος . . . ἀγενείων</td>
<td>Philadelphia (Lydia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA 15 (1990) 34,1</td>
<td>Πέργαμον Τραϊάνεια παιδίων δόλιχον</td>
<td>Caesarea Germanica (Bithynia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.Napoli I 48</td>
<td>Πέργαμον Τραϊάνεια ἀγενείων . . . παλαιστής</td>
<td>Neapolis (Italia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.Napoli I 49</td>
<td>Τραιάνεια ἐν Περγάμῳ. παλαιστής</td>
<td>Neapolis (Italia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We note again that the Iulia Largus’ bequest explicitly mentions Heraclea and Tium as the beneficiaries of whatever project Pliny chose to pursue. In other words, the pentaeteric games that Iulia Largus envisioned were from the outset a multi-city affair. The question is whether the bequest to two cities would automatically mean that this was a project that involved the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus as well. The lack of additional
evidence forbids clear conclusion but, as previously discussed in chapter two, the
Trajanic High Priest of Pontus, Titus Iulius Aquila received a bust-crown that was likely
associated with agonistic festivities honoring Trajan. Also, we know that the Iulii of
Amastris were closely connected with Heraclea, as the lady Iulia Aquilina was honored in
98 CE as the citizen of both cities. These details are all circumstantial, and perhaps the
Traiania was only an event that was maintained without the koinon’s involvement, as
Iulius Largus seemed confident that his bequest would have been sufficient. In this case,
the Traiania and the agones that we inferred from the symbolism of Titus Iulius Aquila’s
bust-crown would have been two separate events. Such a scenario is certainly plausible,
and all the more interesting. If Iulius Largus’ bequest and Iulius Aquila’s bust-crown were
separate events, they point to an exceedingly vibrant coastal Paphlagonia during the reign
of Trajan. If the two Iulii happened to have been from the same Iulii, it would have been
an extraordinary record of a family whose wealth and influence stretched across three
cities in western coastal Paphlagonia, and would have been comparable with the
Euryclids in the Peloponnese, as mentioned in chapter two.

The Traiania were not attested in epigraphic evidence from coastal Paphlagonia,
nor mentioned in victory lists found elsewhere. There is, however, a reference to the
isactian, Hadrianic, and Heraclean competitions in Heraclea Pontica (ἐν Ἡρακλεῖα τῇ
The Hadrianeia would have been founded after the Traiania, and one would ask whether it is possible for the Traiania to have been founded in the late years of Trajan’s reign, and then changed to become the Hadrianeia as the new emperor ascended the throne. We note, however, that the Hadrianeia here were also assimilated with the Heracleia in honor of Heracles, the patron deity of Heraclea Pontica, which leads to the possibility that we do not have a koinon festival, nor a festival that included Tium, but rather a municipal festival that was restricted to Heraclea Pontica. It is therefore more likely that the two imperial festivals were separate events. The Traiania would also have been separate from the koinon festival at Sinope reported by Fourcade, because this festival dates to 105 CE.

\[\text{πρό[ς]} \mid \text{τῷ Πόντῳ Ἀδριάνειον Η[πάκλειοι ἱσάκτιον],}^{400} \text{and the absence of any reference to the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus makes it a comparable evidence for the Traiania.}

The Hadrianeia were also assimilated with the Heracleia in honor of Heracles, the patron deity of Heraclea Pontica, which leads to the possibility that we do not have a koinon festival, nor a festival that included Tium, but rather a municipal festival that was restricted to Heraclea Pontica. It is therefore more likely that the two imperial festivals were separate events. The Traiania would also have been separate from the koinon festival at Sinope reported by Fourcade, because this festival dates to 105 CE.

\[\text{[The boule and demos honored Marcus Aurelius [- - - Jos, son of Timokleos, grandson of Agathopous, great grandson of Artemidoros, councillor at Aphrodisias, Nicomedia, and Ankyra, sacred victor in the distance race, Pythian victor, exemplary Actian victor, having won in other contests he entered; in Ankyra of Galatia, at the iselastis Asclepiea, the boys distance race; in Hadrianeia of Bithynia, at the Hadrianeia Antinoeia, the boys’ distance race; in Heraclea Pontica at the sacred Hadrianeia Heracleia, the boys’ distance race; in Chalcedon, the boys’ distance race, followed by the mens’ distance race; at Nicomedia in the Augustea Severia, the mens’ distance race and the mens’ sprint in the same day; armed, at Nicaea in the Augustea, the mens’ distance race; at Heraclea Pontica in the sacred Hadrianeia Heracleia, the mens’ distance race and armed sprint, in the same day; at Nicaea in the Augustea, the mens’ long race and the armor sprint, in the same day; at Philadelphia in the koinon games of Asia, the mens’ distance race. By Antidoridos the priest of goddess Aphrodite, the curator for the erection of the statue, at his own expense. (Translation mine, modified from Joyce Reynolds, Charlotte Roueché, Gabriel Bodard, Inscriptions of Aphrodisias (2007). Available <http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/iaph2007/iAph120215.html> )]}

---

while the Traiania were most likely to have been after 109 CE, given what we know of Pliny’s letters to Trajan from the province of Pontus-Bithynia.

3.1.5 Summary

In part one, we traced the vitality of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus via travelogues, inscriptions and literary sources, and the result is striking when compared with the findings of the first and second chapters. We find that Sinope and Amisus were venues of koinon festivities where agonistic festivals, as well as gladiatorial spectacles, were held. The degree of vitality cannot accurately be measured but, considering the prestige that may be deduced from the Sinopean victory list, there is a basis for the claim that the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus held games that were attractive enough for international athletes and performers to attend from at least the Trajanic period to the third century CE. There were also other festivities associated with the imperial cult, such as the Traiania and the Hadrianeia Heraclea, that must have commanded the attention of the leading men of the Heraclea-Tium-Amastris region, but it is uncertain whether they were koinon games per se. Essentially, they were common games that would have required the participation of cities in the Koinon, and since these amount to common affairs, it would be sensible to assume that the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus played some role in their establishment and operation.
3.2 Lucian’s *monomachia* at Amastris

After concluding the survey of epigraphic evidence concerning the festivities of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus, we turn to a tale of a festival that took place in Amastris from Lucian’s *Toxaris or On Friendship*. The aim of part two is in part to interrogate Lucian’s tale to determine its value as the only description of how a gladiatorial spectacle was presented at Amastris. Treating this unique literary account as evidence has risks due to the lack of corroborating evidence, but there is the likelihood that Lucian drew from some elements of gladiatorial spectacles of the *Koinon* of Pontus to create his story. The martyrdom of Polycarp and the descriptions of Galen offer some information on the practical duties of the Asiarchate and the High Priesthood of Asia, which can serve as interesting comparisons, but they do not offer clear accounts of how spectacles were held in terms of logistics, participants and finances. A closer investigation of the details of Lucian’s tale would be helpful to clarify the constructive aspects that advance our project of articulating how gladiatorial spectacles could have been organised and performed, which are important aspects of *koinon* operations that are rarely found in epigraphic or literary sources.

---

401 Martyrdom of Polycarp 6-19 concerns the example of a Smyrnaean gladiatorial spectacle with the Asiarch Phillip in charge as a venue for execution. The Irenarch produced Polycarp to the stadium to prepare for trial with the proconsul presiding there. When Polycarp pronounced that he was a Christian, the proconsul proclaimed his confession to the audience in the stadium. The audience demanded that the Asiarch Philip send a lion upon him. The Asiarch claimed that it was unlawful for him to do so, because the shows of wild beasts were already finished. The audience then demanded Polycarp to be burnt alive. An Asiarch would therefore have been in charge of spectacles that could also serve as venues for ceremonial trials and executions, and the programmes of the spectacles an Asiarch presented had significant legal implications, in the sense that, once the method of execution demanded by the audience/jury/proconsul had already completed, his venue would no longer be tasked with carrying out an execution.

402 Nutton 2004, 223 & fns. 56-68 on Galen as source. Galen was employed by the High Priest of Asia to treat gladiators not only immediately after fighting, but also as dietician.
3.2.1 Lucian’s Tale

In Lucian’s *Toxaris or On Friendship*, Toxaris the Scythian and his interlocutor Mnesippus tell each other five stories as a contest to decide whether Greek or Scythian friendship is more exemplary. The fourth of Toxaris’s tales concern his own encounter with a demonstration of exemplary Scythian friendship while traveling with his Scythian friend Sisinnes to Athens. Toxaris and Sisinnes made a stop at Amastris and prepared to stay for the night at an inn by the harbor. While they were out, their belongings were stolen, the total loss being 400 *darics*, a great deal of clothing, some rugs, likely merchandise for sale. As Toxaris sulked, Sisinnes began to work, carrying lumber from the port to the agora for pay, and procured supplies with his wages.

The next day, Sisinnes came across a procession of young men marching through the agora, a *propompe* of well-born young men – γενναιοὶ καὶ καλοὶ νεανίσκοι. These young men, so Toxaris described, were “men enlisted to fight duels for pay” who “[would] conclude the fight in two days’ time” (μονομαχεῖν δὲ οὕτωι ἐπὶ μισθῷ ἀνδρολογηθέντες εἰς τρίτην ἡμέραν διαγωνιεῖσθαι ἐμελλον). Three days later, Sisinnes led Toxaris to the theater, on the pretext that they were going to see an enjoyable and an “unexpected” spectacle of the Hellenes (γὰρ μὲ ός ἐπὶ τερπνόν τι καὶ παράδοξον θέαμα

---

403 Lucian, *Toxaris or On Friendship*, 57. ὡφείλετο ἡμῶν τις δαρεικοὺς τετρακοσίους καὶ ἔσθήτα πολλῆν καὶ δάπιδας τινας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὁπόσα εἴχομεν . . .

404 Lucian, *Toxaris or On Friendship*, 58-59. ἐσθῆτα πολλὰ καὶ καλῶν νεανίσκων. μονομαχεῖν δὲ οὕτωι ἐπὶ μισθῷ ἀνδρολογηθέντες εἰς τρίτην ἡμέραν διαγωνιεῖσθαι ἐμελλον. καὶ δὲ τὸ πάν ὡς ἐχεῖν ἀμφότερον πιθομένος, ἐλθὼν ὡς ἔμε, μηκέτι, ὦ Τόξαρι, ἔφη, σαυτὸν πένητα λέγει, εἰς γὰρ τρίτην ἡμέραν πλούσιον σὲ ἀποφανοῦ. [The next morning he saw down at the agora a certain “propompe of well born and handsome young men,” as he claimed. These were enlisted to fight for hire and will fight three days later (the day after tomorrow). And when he learned all about them, Sisinnes came to me and said, “Toxaris, don’t say you are poor any more, for three days later I will make you rich.” (Trans. Harmon)]
τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ἄγει εἰς τὸ θέατρον). They saw first wild beasts being struck down by javelins, chased by dogs, but set upon men who seemed to be chained criminals (θηρία κατακοντιζόμενα καὶ ὑπὸ κυνῶν διωκόμενα καὶ ἔπ’ ἀνθρώπους δεδεμένους ἄφιέμενα, κακούργους τινάς).

405 The gladiatorial combat ensued after this series of spectacles:

έπει δὲ εἰσῆλθον οἱ μονομάχοι καὶ τίνα παραγαγὼν ὁ κῆρυξ εὑμεγέθη νεανίσκον εἶπεν, ὡς ἂν ἐθέλη τούτῳ μονομαχῆσαι, ἢκείν εἰς τὸ μέσον δραμᾶς ληψόμενον μυρίας μισθὸν τῆς μάχης, ἐνταῦθα ἐξανίσταται ὁ Σισίννης καὶ καταπηδήσας ὑπέστη κακούργους τινάς, ὡς εἰκάζομεν. . . .

When the gladiators entered, the herald introduced a young man of good size and said: whoever wants to fight with this man is to come to the middle for the purpose of taking away a prize of 10,000 drachmae, Sisinnes rose, leapt down, pledged to fight and asked for fighting gear; he took the prize, brought it to me and placed it in my hand . . .

Toxaris then described the action of the combat. Sisinnes was seriously wounded by his opponent’s curved sword. Sisinnes then managed to outmanoeuvre his opponent and stabbed him to death. Having barely survived the fight, Sisinnes was rescued by Toxaris and eventually returned to Scythia and married Toxaris’ sister, though now lame due to his injury. Lucian concludes the story by having Toxaris emphasise to Mnesippus that the fight “did not happen either in Machlyene or among the Alans, so as to be unattested and possible to disbelieve; there are many of the Amastrians here who remember the fight of Sisinnes.”

406 Toxaris supported his truth-claim with “Amastrians

405 Lucian, Toxaris or On Friendship, 58: ἑωρῶ ἐν τῷ πρῶτῳ θηρίᾳ κατακοντιζόμενα καὶ ὑπὸ κυνῶν διωκόμενα καὶ ἔπ’ ἀνθρώπους δεδεμένους ἄφιέμενα, κακούργους τινάς, ὡς εἰκάζομεν. [We saw first wild beast being struck down by javelins and chased by dogs, and set upon chained men, some criminals, so we thought. (Trans. Harmon)]

406 Luc. Tox. 60, τούτο ὁ Μνήσιππε, οὐκ ἐν Μάχλυσιν οὐδὲ ἐν Ἀλανίᾳ ἐγένετο, ὡς ἀμάρτωον εἶναι καὶ άπιστεύθαι δύνασθαι, ἀλλὰ πολλοὶ πάρεισιν Ἀμαστριανῶν μεμνημένοι τῇ μάχῃ τοῦ Σισίννου. Trans. Harmon.
present here,” which seems to suggest that the setting of the dialogue between Toxaris and Mnesippus was before an audience that must have been in part Amastrian in composition, and the site could even have been in Amastris. The Scythian reminded both his interlocutor and Lucian's readers that he was conveying knowledge common among Amastrians.

The tale has an alluring autobiographical tone even as it was told by a Scythian persona. Lucian claims in a separate work called *Alexander the False Prophet* to have moved his family to Amastris, and such an intertext led Franz Cumont to accept Lucian’s gladiatorial story as a reliable source. In his emphasis of the similarities between the *venationes* at Rome and Amastris, Sebastopolis, Sinope, and Amaseia, Cumont suggested that “Amastris was probably the metropolis of the Pontic decapolis, which was part of the province Bithynia-Pontus. It is in this city that the Pontarch must offer his munera, which could be confirmed by Lucian’s account” in the *Toxaris*. This proposal is certainly attractive, since it would make Lucian’s story important literary evidence with many details describing the process of how a koinon event was held in one of its cities. Yet we are not certain what details used by Lucian were factual. Also, gladiatorial events could be local. Cumont’s suggestion is therefore at best an educated guess. However, a full rejection of Lucian’s tale as fantastic is not necessary. Lucian’s clear fondness for

---

407 Luc. Alex. 56 τὸν πατέρα καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς εἰς Ἀμαστρίν προεκπέπωμφος.

408 Quotes in Cumont 1903, 274 fn. 5 quoted in full for clarity: “Amastris était probablement la métropole de la décapole pontique, faisant sa partie de la province Bithynia-Pontus. C’est donc dans cette ville que le pontarque devait offrir ses munera, ce qui confirme le récit de Lucien.” Similarly, Cumont 1903, 25-26. “Tout d’abord, les inscriptions prouvent qu’aux Ile et IIIe siècles Amisos et Sinope n’avaient pas cessé de faire partie du κοινὸν Πόντου, ou de dix villes dont la métropole paraît avoir été Amastris.”

Amastris as a subject of his writings, and his intent to create a verisimilitude of the city that his audience would have appreciated, suggest the need on the author’s part to employ facts to connect with his audience. Thus it is reasonable to assume that Lucian would consider a factually based Amastrian tale to be more effective than a fictional account. Lucian’s narrative would at least allow us to envision what Lucian and his knowledgeable Amastrian audience would have expected a gladiatorial spectacle to be like. This in turn would offer the baseline for envisioning the koinon spectacles that we only know summarily from the Sinope Pontarch inscription discussed in the first part of this chapter.

3.2.2 Possible Approaches to Lucian’s Spectacle in the Toxaris

Scholarship on Lucian’s account of “the fight of Sisinnes” has largely been carried out by critiquing the genre in which the story has been transmitted, and also through the lens of gladiatorial spectacles that were performed elsewhere in the empire. Awareness of Lucian’s ability to navigate notions of truth and falsehood to entice his audience has led to mostly negative interpretations from scholars working from a literary perspective. Thomas Wiedemann⁴¹⁰ and Konstantin Nossov⁴¹¹ treated Lucian’s story as a “romantic” account of a free man fighting for ransom money. Mheallaigh gives a more complex analysis of the artistic sophistication of Lucian’s account. Toxaris the Scythian portrayed himself as an “autodiegetic narrator,” or one who tells a story about himself, to achieve both vividness and an “ambivalent authenticating-strategy.” The veracity of

---


Toxaris’s story rests on his claim to truth, which Mheallaigh compares with Odysseus’s tales at the court of the Phaeacians in Odyssey books 9-12.\(^{412}\) The result is a highly romanticised and exaggerated narrative, one which Kathleen Coleman captures well.\(^{413}\)

Since this is the only story among those told by Mnesippus and Toxaris that were marked as real and personal experience, the truth-claim adds an interesting twist, further to mesmerise the audience into accepting this truth-claim as actually true. Christopher Jones has pointed out, however, that Lucian’s design seemed to have been to prepare his audience with stories of vague and fabulous worlds to preface this personal anecdote, and it could be a strategy to arrest the audience with “a fusion of the romantic and the realistic,” in which “fantasies of devoted friendship and of desperate combat” were juxtaposed with “the actual conduct of gladiatorial shows in the Greek east.”\(^{414}\)

Furthermore, Jones proposes that we could treat the story as “a compliment to a city which he had visited and where he had highly-placed friends,”\(^{415}\) and hence preserved some degree of verisimilitude to the Amastrian spectacles that he witnessed or learned while staying there. The proposal is a balanced rationale that guides us to view the various truth-claims in Lucian’s account in a moderate and constructive manner.

\(^{412}\) Mheallaigh 2014, 66-67.

\(^{413}\) Coleman 2000, 491 “[Sisinnes] chooses to fight bare-headed. . . . This detail has no consequences for the narrative. It appears to be inserted simply to add an extra frisson to a swashbuckling story of courage and loyalty that verges on parody; the air of burlesque exaggeration is sustained when the victorious Sisinnes sits down, half-fainting, on top of his opponent’s corpse. Lucian is emphasising that Sisinnes, a complete amateur, does not observe the conventions proper to gladiatorial combat; there is no suggestion that it was a rational option to dispense with one’s helmet.”


\(^{415}\) Jones 1990, 63.
Some scholars more concerned with the system of gladiation in the imperial period view Lucian’s tale more positively. They try to elicit usable information from Lucian's story by linking keywords and episodes with different segments of gladiatorial culture.416 An example important to our search for information, that could be used to envision a koinon event at Amastris is the condemnation of criminals to the beasts – condemnatio ad bestias. Louis Robert has cautioned that it would probably not be as straightforward as Cumont suggested to identify Lucian’s description of men chased by beasts as a koinon event, because such executions likely took place at both the municipal and koinon levels.417 At Aphrodisias, gladiatorial familiae owned by what seem to be municipal priests consisted of trained fighters, bull-catchers and convicts.418 From Eusebius we learned that the proconsul’s trial against the martyr Polycarp came to a dramatic moment when the proconsul declared formally in the arena that Polycarp was a Christian; many in the arena urged the Asiarch Philip to set a lion upon Polycarp, but Phillipus refused on grounds that the kynegesia had concluded.419

Robert’s cautious approach is in this case welcome, but the epigraphic sources that Robert cited may not be entirely interpreted as damnatio ad bestias. The καταδίκοι in

416 Robert 1971, 171 and Ville 1981, 365 discuss the identification of the propompe that Sisinnes saw as the exoplasiai or military review found on an inscription from Mylasa in the East, and Ville 1981, 399-400 connects the summoning forth of the gladiators into the theater with a second parade called the pompa mentioned from various literary sources. Ville 1981, 375 compares the κηρυξ with the praeco, the announcer for the munerator.


418 Roueché, PP Aphr 13 φαµιλίας µονοµάχων καὶ καταδίκων Τιβέρίου Κλαυδίου Παυλείνου || ἀρχιερέως ὑπὸ υἱὸς Τιβέρίου Κλεοδού | ἀρχιερέως ὑπὸ υἱὸς Τιβέρίου Κλεοδού; also Robert 1971, no. 157: φαµιλία Ζήνωνος[ος] | τοῦ Ἔµπειρου | τοῦ Ἐπέκτεις | τοῦ Ψυκλέους | τοῦ φύσει Ζήνωνος Ἐµπειροῦ | ἀρχιερέως, µονοµάχων καὶ καταδίκων καὶ ταυροκαθαρών.[θαυματουργία]

419 Euseb. Ecc. Hist. 4.15.27: ἐπεβόων καὶ ἠρώτων τὸν ἀσιάρχην Φίλιππον ἵνα ἐπαφῇ τῷ Πολυκάρπῳ λέοντα· ὁ δὲ ἐφη μὴ εἶναι ἐξὸν αὐτῷ ἐπειδὴ πεπληρώκει τὰ κινητές.
the gladiatorial familiae that included convicts from Aphrodisias may not all have been
thrown to beasts, as they could have been damnati ad ludos, or the punishment of
condemning the convict to a professional trainer at a gladiatorial school.\textsuperscript{420} Pliny reported
to Trajan that in Nicomedia and Nicaea there was such a surplus of such men that they
carried out assignments as public slaves.\textsuperscript{421} The execution ad bestias as described in
Lucian’s tale specifically referred to an official form of public execution comparable with
the circumstances of the martyrdom of Polycarp, and it would be properly placed in a
koinon event that supplemented the trial of the proconsul or imperial legate of the
province. In other words, if Lucian’s matter-of-fact narration of this particular part in the
gladiatorial repertoire at Amastris implies that public execution of such sort at Amastris
was common knowledge, there is a good case to assume that Amastris was the regular
venue for the carrying out of sentences passed by the proconsul and the Pontarch or High
Priest of Pontus in conjunction with koinon spectacles.

A focused analysis that studied “the locality in which the dramatic scene is set” –
such as the study performed by Kokolakis – would be welcome in light of the
aforementioned considerations.\textsuperscript{422} Kokolakis drew heavily from Robert’s resourceful
identifications of peculiar details in Lucian’s description concerning the animal hunt,
execution ad bestias, and gladiatorial combat. He pointed out that, of among the five

\textsuperscript{420} Wiedemann 1992, 105 criminals condemned ad ludos. Kyle 1998, 79 gives a survey of the sources,
including Suet. \textit{Nero} 12. damnati ad arenam.

\textsuperscript{421} Plin. Ep.10.31.2: in plerisque civitatibus, maxime Nicomediae et Nicaeae, quidam vel in opus damnati
vel in ludum similiaque his genera poenarum publicorum servorum officio ministerioque funguntur, atque
etiam ut publici servi annua accipiunt. [in many cities, particularly in Nicomedia and Nicaea, certain
convicts either condemned to force labor or to the gladiatorial school and similar types of punishments are
functioning in the offices and duties of public slaves, and even receiving emolument of a public slave.]

\textsuperscript{422} Kokolakis 1958, 335-343.
stories Toxaris told Mnessipus, it is that of Sisinnes’ duel that diverged from
topographical vagueness. Lucian had a vested interest in describing where the gladiatorial
duel took place, a position that was later taken up by Jones.\textsuperscript{423} The specificity goes
beyond Toxaris explaining where Amastris was – a port of call for those sailing from
Scythia, not far from Carambis.\textsuperscript{424} Toxaris points to the theater as the site where the two
Scythian friends went to observe the Hellenic spectacle, likely the “ancestral theater” in
which stood the statue of Iulia Aquilina so decreed in an inscription found at Amastris.\textsuperscript{425}
In turn, Kokolakis proposed that Lucian might have learned about the festivities
organised by imperial High Priests while living in Amastris.\textsuperscript{426} We are reminded of the
Sinopean Pontarch, who concluded his office after having magnanimously presented bull-
fights, hunts, and gladiatorial duels, as well as Cumont’s proposal that Lucian was
drawing on his knowledge of gladiatorial spectacles given by \textit{Pontarchs} in Amastris.
Together, the proposal by Cumont and Kokolakis, coupled with Lucian’s unique truth-
claim, encourage the exploration of Lucian’s account of the fight of Sisinnes as based on
a real \textit{koinon} event at Amastris.

3.2.3 Summary

In sum, there is a lot at stake if we take Lucian’s emphasis on the locality of his
tale “seriously” – i.e., treating Lucian’s tongue-in-cheek truth-claim that his tale was

\textsuperscript{423} Kokolakis 1958, 334.
\textsuperscript{424} Luc. \textit{Tox.} 57.
\textsuperscript{425} \textit{CIG} 4150b.
\textsuperscript{426} \textit{CIG} 4149.
well-known among Amastrians, who were “present” at the dialogue between Toxaris and
Mnesippus as a primary factor in our analysis of the tale’s usefulness. Lucian’s
description of Amastris was likely credible for his audience, and the gladiatorial spectacle
would have been familiar to his audience, though some would have spotted the romantic
exaggerations. One could point to the fight of Sisinnes as fictive, given the volunteer-
episode, but there are also creatively juxtaposed socio-cultural aspects that are plausibly
factual, though not necessarily facts. A series of spectacles first advertised in the agora
and then presented at the theater of Amastris, including a hunt, executions and a
gladiatorial duels between paid young men, echoes koinon events given by the Sinopean
Pontarch presented by the leadership of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus. Taking a step
further, we have reason to assume that public executions ad bestias would frequently
have concerned a trial involving the proconsul or imperial legate of the province. This
sort of involvement makes Lucian’s tale more likely to have been drawn from spectacles
held at the koinon level. Cumont may be right in his bold conjecture associating Lucian’s
depiction of gladiatorial spectacle at Amastris with a koinon event.

3.3 Paid fighters and 10,000 drachmae

The optimism derived from the survey of approaches in part two allows us to
explore specific details of Lucian’s tale on the assumption that they may derived from
koinon events. In part three, two extraordinary descriptions in Lucian’s tale are examined.
The first concerns the meaning of the description “those who were enlisted to fight for
pay” (μονομαχεῖν . . . οὗτοι ἐπὶ μισθῷ ἄνδρολογηθέντες). The second concerns the
herald’s claim that whoever comes forward to fight with one of the young men “would receive a payment of 10,000 drachmae” (δραχμὰς ληψόμενος μυρίας μισθόν τῆς μάχης).427

3.3.1 “μονομαχεῖν . . . οὗτοι ἐπὶ μισθῷ ἀνδρολογηθέντες”

Lucian described the gladiators that Sisinnes saw in the agora of Amastris as μονομαχεῖν . . . οὗτοι ἐπὶ μισθῷ ἀνδρολογηθέντες – those who were enlisted to fight for pay. Michael Carter thinks that Lucian “implies the contractual nature of the gladiators whom Sisinnes saw at Amastris” and these can in general be understood as the equivalent terms for the Latin auctorati, “a term which carried with it the sense that these men had hired or sold themselves to fight as gladiators, their remuneration termed the auctoramentum.”428 Yet the usual vocabulary associated with auctoratus is ἀπογραφομένος from ἀπογράφω.429 The word ἀνδρολογηθέντες from ἀνδρολογέω is itself rarely attested, and has the sense of military enlistment or levy.430 If Lucian’s intent is to describe the young men as auctorati, his choice of wording would either reflect

427 Luc. Tox. 59.
428 Carter 1999, 80-81.
429 Carter 2003, 99; Artem. 5.58; Mart. Pion. 20.6.
430 Lucian Tox. 58 μονομαχεῖν δὲ οὗτοι ἐπὶ μισθῷ ἀνδρολογηθέντες εἰς τρίτην ἥμεραν διαγωνιζόμεθα ἐμέλλον; Dion. Hali. 19.17.5 Το πλήθος ἀνδρολογήσαντες ἀπῆρεαν; Aleiphron 1.14.2 ἀνδρολογούσιν ἐκ Πειραιῶς καὶ Φαληρὸθεν καὶ ἐκ Σουνίου καὶ ἐκ τῶν αὐτῷ τῷ Γεραιστῷ προσοίκων χωρίων τοὺς τῆς θαλάττης ἐργάτας; Choniates Hist. Alex. οἱ δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως κατιγνητοὶ τρεῖς ὄντες καὶ τὰς κόρας πάντες ἐκκομμαμένοι παρ’ Ἀνδρονίκου, ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ ο ἐπὶ τῇ ἀδελφῇ τούτῳ Εἰρήνῃ γαμβρός ὁ Καντακουζήνος Ἰωάννης, ἐξ ὁμάτων καὶ αὐτὸς δεικνύει, παισὶ δέ γενετερόσερον τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀνδρολόγουν; Pachymeres Hist. 451-452 εἰς συχναὶ προστάξεις τοῦ ὑπερθέσθαι τὸν πρὸς τοὺς Μαγνησιώτας πόλεμον καὶ περάν συνάμα τῷ υπ’ αὐτῶν λαῷ κατὰ δόσιν πρὸς τὸν ἀνάκτορον Μιχαήλ (εἶναι γὰρ καὶ Μαγνησιώτας υπηρκόους τῇ βασιλείᾳ, εὑρίσκοντας ὀσφυμέρας τοὺς βασιλέας, καὶ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν παροινίας ἐφθάνεις εἰς καίρον ὑποσχεῖν δυναμένους) οὐδὲν ἦσαν, καὶ λόγοι τηνάλλους λεγόμενοι Ρωμαίους ἀνδρολογοῦντι, καὶ μάλιστα ἐπὶ Μαγνησιώτας, καὶ εἰ μὴ ἀναστατοῖ τούτους, οὐδὲ ζῆν θέλοντι.
unfamiliarity with the institution of the contract gladiator, or deliberately invoking the sense of non-contractual levy. This issue cannot be satisfactorily resolved without further evidence of ἀνδρολογηθέντες in a gladiatorial context.

Notably, Lucian also emphasised that the young men were γενναῖοι καὶ καλοί νεανίσκοι – “well-born and handsome.” A simple solution is not to read the description γενναῖοι καὶ καλοί νεανίσκοι as related to social status, but rather to understand it as an aesthetic expression. After all, Sisinnes was wounded by the young man with a curved sword, which could be the sica in the gladiatorial repertoire of a Thraex. Lucian would then be referring to good-looking auctorati, though the previous caveat regarding the sense of non-contractual undertaking continues to pose a problem. On the other hand, Lucian may also have been socially conscious when he employed the device of physical attraction of well-born and handsome young men to draw the attention of his audience. This alternative solution would take the description γενναῖοι καὶ καλοί νεανίσκοι as a literal indication of good birth, and there are some grounds to do so. As discussed previously, Titus Iulius Aquila was the High Priest of Pontus was honored by the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus as the first in aristeia among the neoi, which took place under an emperor who was praised by Pliny for promoting popular gladiation. This association between a leading koinon liturgist known for philotimia and his role as a leading member of the Amastrian neoi lends some credence to Lucian’s statement that well-born and handsome young men were involved in Amastrian spectacles, levied or no. Yet, in what

---

circumstances would young men of good birth fight – or be enlisted to fight – as gladiators?

While there is infamia associated with gladiators who were slaves, convicts and the financially distressed, the gradual spread of gladiatorial spectacle in both the Latin West and Greek East also generated active enthusiasm among respectable groups in cities that regularly held gladiatorial venues. Some citizens shifted from passively enduring the reality of periodic gladiatorial spectacle to active admiration and amateur practice of gladiation as part of everyday life. In the Greek East, the attraction of gladiation gave rise to “gladiatorial fan-clubs” called the philoploi attested at Termessus, Miletus and Ephesus. At Miletus, a “sacred plateia” of the philoploi (Ἱεροπλατίη τῶν φιλόπλων) was attested in the agora, suggesting that they had a formal establishment that was not stigmatised as a gladiatorial troupe, and Keil proposed a sport association of young men. At Ephesus, their activities included joint dedications of statues of Asiarchs to show gratitude for their presentation of gladiatorial spectacles, and they styled themselves also as Phil-Vedii, which to Robert is an indication that they were an association of supporters of the gladiatorial familia of the Vedii at the arena. In the Latin West, young men from some iuuentus organisations received training and participated in gladiatorial contests. These young men from above-average families were encouraged to train in

---

432 Carter 19999, 138-139.
434 Jones 2001, 45-47.
435 Wiedemann gives three examples from Carsulae, Paestum, and Aquae Sextiae, but with very little treatment. Wiedemann 1992, 125 no. 36: “ILS 6635 (Carsulae): pinn[irapus] iuvenum; AE 1935.27 (Paestum): summarudis iuvenum; CIL XII.533 (Aix-en-Provence): a youth who died aged 19 is said to have performed in the amphitheatre.”
combat sports, with opportunities to fight beasts and take part in hunts in the arena, but they were not encouraged to become professional gladiators.

What these examples from the Greek East and the Latin West show is a general differentiation between gladiation as an acceptable form of performative martial art, and gladiators as undesired performers out of their underprivileged and stigmatised social status. This differentiation was possible because societies in the Greek East also valued training in martial arts as part of their ephebic and gymnastic culture. For example, we know that young men from Amastris trained in martial arts in the gymnasia. One Aemilianus, who was buried in 155 CE at the age of 30, was well trained by Geminus, his foster-father “of noble birth,” so that he was “revered in the gymnasia, skilled in wrestling, the javelin, the pankration, the discus, the hoop, jumping, all rhythmical ball-games.”

We know that agonistic festivities did involve competitions in martial arts and military maneuvers. The category of “race in armor” in the Smyrnaean and Pergamene

---

437 Laes & Strubbe 2014, 128 no. 68.
439 Marek Kat. Amastris no. 44 ἕτος μὲν ἴν τριακοστὸν ἡδὴ μοι τόδε, ἀνθηκε δ’ Αἰμιλιανὸν ὅνομά μοι πατήρ, ὄν ἔθηκε Γέμινος, εἰς ἀνήρ τῶν εὐγενῶν· | παρ’ ἐμπύρος δὲ κόμιον Εὐήθιο θεῷ || τριετῆρι τελετῆ

μυστικῶς ἀνήγαγον | καὶ γυμνασίων δὲ σεμνῶς ἐγενόμην, ἤδης | πάλης, ἀκοντος, πανκρατίου, δίσκου, τρόχου, ἀλματος, ἀπάντων ἐυρυθμίων σφαιρισμάτων | ὄν εἰς ἐκαστὸν ἐπόνεσεν τροφεὺς ἐμός, || σατύρῳ τε ἐνείκων Κύζικον καὶ Πέργαμον | καὶ Κυζίκου μὲν αὐτός ἤνεγκα στέφος, | τὸ Περγάμου δὲ μιρὰ ἀπήνεγκεν πικρά | καὶ μου τὸ σῶμα Δωρίας ἐπὶ χθόνος | ἐμάρανε δαιμόν, ὥστα δὲ ἐν πάτηρ λαβὼν | τροφεὺς Γέμινος λάρνακα ἐξ λιθίνην θέτο | ἀιωνίοις στέφανοισιν ἐπικοσμοῦμενα. | εκσʹ, πρὸ ἀ’ καλ(ανδὸν) Σεπτεμβρίων, ἑκσʹ ζʹ. [This was now my thirtieth year, and my father gave me the name Aemilianus, and Geminus brought me up, a man of noble birth. Amid incense-vessels I led the revel for the biennial god Euhios, (and led) the rite in mystic fashion. I was also revered in the gymnasia, skilled in wrestling, the javelin, the pancration, the discus, the hoop, jumping, all rhythmical ball-games, in each of which my foster-father had trained. And with a satyr-play (?) I won at Cyzicus and Pergamon; I myself took the crown at Cyzicus, but the Pergamene one cruel fate took away. Misfortune wasted my body on Dorian soil, but Geminus carrying my bones to my home city put them in a stone urn (?), adorned by eternal crowns. (Year) 225, 31 August, (Trans. Christopher Jones)] Jones 1990, 94. Aemilianus was not trained in boxing, but his training in the pankration would already warrant attention, as Epictetus compared boxing and the pankration as foul sports similar to gladiation.
games was so important that Hadrian, in a letter dictating how the various games in the Greek East ought to be arranged, made it the time-regulating event that signaled when an athlete was to move on to the next competition. In Heraclea Pontica we have two fragmentary inscriptions belonging to a sizable list of victors at an agonistic event attended by younger and older ephebes as well as others. The reconstructed list is as follows:

Table 4. Agonistic Event in Heraclea Pontica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BOYS</th>
<th>YOUNGER EPHEBES</th>
<th>OLDER EPHEBES</th>
<th>unidentified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boxing πυγμή</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dash στάδιον</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle distance δίαυλος</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long distance δόλιχος</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrestling πάλη</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pankration παγκράτιον</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long distance with shield and sling ἀσπίς καὶ δολίχον σφενδόνη</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compulsory drills εὐταξία</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical conditioning εὐεξία</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lloyd Jonnes has pointed out that this list is representative of many other such agonistic events, which normally encompass track and field events, physical combat and military exercises. Furthermore, the occasional funerary epitaphs that memorialised

---

440 Petzl & Schwertheim 2006, 14 ll. 66-67 μετά δὲ Παναθήναια Ζμύρναϊοι ἀγέτωσαν, ἐς μὲν πλοῦν τῶν ἀγονιστῶν ἐχὼντων πεντεκαίδεκα ἡμέρας ἀπὸ τοῦ Παναθηναίων δῖπλου κτλ. Also ll. 68-69 ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἐν Ζμύρνη δῖπλου δύο ἡμέραις διαλιπὼν ὁ Περγαμηνεύν | ἀγὼν ἀρξάσθω τε εὔθυς καὶ ταῖς τετταράκοντα ἡμέραις συντελεῖσθω.

441 Jonnes 1994, 35-38 no. 60.

442 Jonnes 1994, 37.
athletes slain in boxing matches suggest a gradual synthesis of martial arts as an overlapping category in the gymnastic and gladiatorial domains.443

Lucian may be drawing from the combative spirit that could be found in the training of the *ephebia* that Amastrian citizens must experience, and this combative spirit would also be part of the psyche of young men from good background in the Greek East, as many did train for and compete in municipal and *koinon* competitions that had categories concerning of martial arts and maneuver in arms. It would be impossible to divine whether the young men from the Amastrian *ephebeia* or the *neoi* could have been ordered to participate in gladiatorial performances. Yet the *ephebeia* seemed to have been a well organised and long-lasting institution overseen by influential Amastrian citizens, and issued inscriptions with some of the most verbose preambles that paid homage to the emperor and the imperial household, the senate at Rome, the provincial governor, and the

---

443 *SEG* 47.1742 involves a certain Athenian by the name of Asbolas, originally a citizen of Nicomedia, who fought in boxing eight times “against the fates” and “paid his due” (ὅ[ἤκ]τακι πυκτεύσας Μοίραις τὸ δάινειον ἔτεισα), perhaps in a competition Laodicea. *SEG* 49.1755 concerns a boxer by the name of Millarus who won many boxing competitions and finally met his end. Scholars have chose to interpret πυκτεύειν or fighting with fist as a figurative description for fighting as a gladiator, and that the two inscriptions are among the many that show gladiators in the Greek East borrowing the language from Greek gymnastics to represent themselves as athletes, which are certainly plausible. Yet, as Golden pointed out, elites in the Greek East who invested heavily in festivities that included agonistic and gladiatorial types had to face – however occasionally – a strand of hostility among the Roman elite that deplored gymnastic and athletic competitions for their associations with nudity and homosexuality, and could have added impetus to make a boxing match “a fight against the fates.” Golden 2008, 74-79, 84; Carter 2009, 306-313; Mann 2011, 156-163.
Amastrian civic authorities. The degree of fealty exemplified by these preambles would add to the possibility that the Amastrian ephebeia could have had a special relationship with the imperial establishment and the activities of the imperial cult held at Amastris.

In summary, evidence concerning ephebic and gymnastic martial arts training during the imperial period indicates that Lucian may have used some elements of what he saw. Amastrian gladiatorial combat may indeed have involved Amastrians of good birth, because it was part of their gymnastic and ephebic training to engage in duels and martial

---

444 Marko Kat Amastris 10: ἀγαθὴ τύχη. | ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἀὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρίου θεοῦ Τρα�ανοῦ Παρθικοῦ νικοῦ, | καὶ Νέρους υἱοῦ, Τραγουνοῦ | Ἀδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ημεροῦνιας τε καὶ αἰονίου διαμονῆς | και νεῖκης καὶ εἰρής συνελήφθε του και ὄλημου Ρωμαίων και | βουλῆς καὶ ὄλημου τοῦ Ἀμαστρίουν νν Γάιος Ἰο.subplots[0] | ἐφηβαρχήσας ἐν τοῦ ν αὐτὸν | ἐπὶ ἐπὶ τὸν περὶ Λ. Ἀλίου | ν Αλεξαννὸν ἄρχοντο τοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἱερᾶς συνή τοῦ βωμὸ καὶ τοῦ | ἱδίου κατασκευασμάτοις ἀνελθήσεν ἐγνώρισεν καὶ τοῦς ὅποιον εἰσήβουσ. | To good fortune. In the name of emperor Hadrian, the sacred senate and people of Rome, and the boule and demos of the Amastrians, Gaius Heliophron, ephebeach in the year 201 during the archontship of Lucius Aelius Aelianus, furnished and dedicated the satyr with the altar from his own expense, and inscribed the ephebes under him.] SEG 41.1106 ἀγαθὴ τύχη. | Αὐτοκράτορα τοῦ β’ Καίσαρα | Ι. Άλιου Ἀδριανοῦ Ἀντωνίου[Π] | [Ἀ]υτές Ἐνετ.pdf βιοῦ καὶ ι ὄλημος ἐκ τῶν καταβρεμμένον χρημάτων ὑπὸ Γαῖος Ἰο.subplots[0] Ἰο.subplots[0] λας τοῦ Λ. Ἀντωνίου | διαίρθησε, ὡστε παρὰ ἔτος εἰ | τής προσόδος αὐτὸν ἀνίστασα | ι οἱ άνθρώπον τοῦ Αὐτέον Παρθηνοῦ καὶ | ἠκολουθησεὶς τῆς πολείς ὑπὸ τῆς γυναίκος αὐτοῦ καὶ κληρονόμον τοῦ | Μαρκίανῆς Μάρκαλλου αὐτό | στην ἑκ τοῦ ἰτ υδέπ ἐπὶ τοῦ περὶ | Καλλικινόν θεόν ἄρχοντον. | To good fortune. The boule and demos dedicate (this statue) to the emperor Antoninus Pius from the estate left behind by Gaius Heliophron in accordance to his will, so that a statue of the emperor would be set up and maintained every other year from this estate by the city under the direction of his wife and heir Marciana Marcellus. (The inscription) is set up in the year 217 when the magistrates served under Caelicianus Theon. (Translation mine) Marko Kat Amastris 11 [ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἀὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρίου Τίτου Άλιου Ἀδριανοῦ Ἀντωνίου Σεβαστοῦ Εὐσέβους πατρός] [πατρίδος καὶ Αὐτοκράτορος, τοῦ εἰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ Φαυστεινῆς Σεβαστῆς, καὶ τῶν τέκ] καὶ οὐκ ἄριστον καὶ τὸ σύμπαντον ὁλο [τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ σισαράς καὶ εἰρής συνελήφθη καὶ ὄλημος Ρωμαίων] [εἰν καὶ Βουλῆς καὶ ὄλημος τοῦ Ἀμαστρίουνοι ν... ἐπὶ Α.] [Ἀ]υτές Ἐνετ Ἐπετεῖον τοῦ προσήλυτου καὶ ἀντὶςτρατηγῆς Σεβαστοῦ... ἐρήμωρ] [χήσει ἐν τοῦ θυσιδεύτου] ἐπὶ τοῦ περὶ Π... πρῶτον] ἀργοῦν ἄρχοντον ανέστησον [ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων κατασκευασμάτων τῶν βασιλέως καὶ τοῦ Ἰερᾶ]; καὶ τῆς κατασκευασμένης λεοντην τοῦ τοῦ] [δυνατας ἀποκατέστησαν [...]] [...] ἄρχοντον προ Η... [In the name of Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, and Faustina Sebasto and the imperial family, and the sacred senate and people of Rome, and the boule and demos of the Amastrians... when Lucius Lollianus Avitus was imperial legate... (ignotus) served as ephebeach in the year 229 when P... was chief magistrate, the altar was dedicated... and the Heracles, and the claws of the reclining lion were restored... (Translation mine) Kat. Amastris 18 [ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἀὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρίου Λ. Σεβαστῆς Σεβήνου [Περπάννου] Σεβαστοῦ Αραβικῆς Λαυδαβίκου Παρθικοῦ μεγίστου καὶ Ἀὐτοκράτορος] [Μάρκου Αὐτοκράτορος Άντωνίου Αὔγουστου Σεβαστοῦ καὶ Π. Σεβαστῆς Πιτυά] [Καίσαρά και Ἰο...] [Σεβαστῆς μητρὸς καστόμου καὶ τῶν σύμπαντον ὁλο[ν] [αὐτῶν σισαρά] καὶ νεῖκης καὶ αἰονίου διαμονῆς καὶ ἑρής συνελήφθε καὶ ὄλημος Ρωμαίων] [μαίων καὶ τοῦ ἐκ τῶν Αὐτοκράτορος Λαυδαβίκος Ρωμαίων ἐρήμωρσας τοῦ Ζηστοῦ ἐπετεί] [... ἔκ τοῦ Θυσιδεύτου] [πατρίδοι τῶν ἱερῶν κατασκευασμάτων συ] [ν τοῦ βωμοῦ τ...]. [In the name of Septimius Severus, Geta, and Julia Domna and their household, the sacred senate and people of Rome, and the demos of the Amastrians, Longidianus Rufus ephebeach in the year 277 furnished the people with... (?)] (Translation mine).
combat. Furthermore, the fealty expressed by the Amastrian *ephebeia* to the emperors and imperial household suggests that young men of good birth may have been systematically introduced to festivities of the municipal or koinon imperial cult as performers in a low-risk gladiatorial spectacle. In a sense, we may be able to compare the young men performing in gladiatorial spectacle with the ephebes of Ephesus who trained as *hymnodes* to perform at the festivities of Artemis as well as the koinon festivities in Pergamum. At the very least, Lucian’s account of the Amastrian gladiatorial scene must be considered an important source of information regarding who fought and under what circumstances, particularly because of his eagerness to demonstrate his knowledge of Amastris through the meticulous reporting of detail. One such detail is to be assessed in the next section, namely Lucian’s claim that Sisinnes could receive 10,000 drachmae for merely participating in a gladiatorial duel.

3.3.2 “δραχμὰς ληψόμενον μυρίας μισθὸν τῆς μάχης”

The 10,000 drachmae paid to Sisinnes even before the beginning of the duel is a surprising detail in Lucian’s tale, because no other example of such significant payment to a volunteer before a duel has been mentioned in primary sources. We could still weigh the plausibility of this account, not in terms of whether such form of payment was actually made at Amastris, but rather whether such a figure would have been plausible to

---

445 Ephesos 227, l.l. 53- 56 ὁ ἡμοίος τῇ[τί]ς ὑπερηφάνει | ἀρέσκει, εἰς οὖς οὐκ ἐλάχιστον μέρος τῶν τῆς πόλεως ἀναλίσκεται προσόδων, τῆς ὑπηρεσίας [παῦτης ἀπολυτ[θήν] ν[α][τ], το[ν] ἐρήμο[ν] δ[έ][ξ] | εἰς καὶ ἡ ἠλίκια καὶ ἡ ἀζέια καὶ ἡ πρὸς τὸ μαθήματι ἐπιπατοποιήθη τοιαύτη μάλλον ἀρμόζει λειτουργία, [παῦτην] γ[ο][ρίς] ἄγιορῳ | παρέχεσθαι τὴν χρείαν. [Likewise regarding the hymnones (sc. of Artemis) – to whom no small part of the municipal income is paid in order that this service be performed – it is resolved: the ephebes, whose age and worth and ability to learn are better attuned to such a liturgy, shall provide this need without payment. (Trans. Friesen)]
Lucian’s Antonine audience. There are two questions to address: would this sum be impossible when placed in the context of known total costs of gladiatorial spectacle? Would this sum be impossible when placed in the context of known payments made to gladiators? Figures of revenue and prices from the document known as the Aes Italicae or the so-called SC de pretiis gladiatorum minuendis of 177 CE will be used as the basis for answering these questions, as this document is of the Antonine period and could more plausibly be seen as reflecting the expectations both of Lucian and the Antonine audience.

The SC de pretiis gladiatorum minuendis of 177 CE gives two types of data: first, five ranges of the upper and lower limits of gladiatorial expenses, along with the different price schemes for different tiers of gladiators, as included in the following. The figures are listed here in denarii, assuming the tariff rate to be 4 sestertii per denarius, for the purpose of comparing with the drachma standard that Lucian uses in the Toxaris.

Table 5. Munus cost/gladiator price, reconstructed from Carter 2003, 97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Munus Cost in denarii</th>
<th>&lt;7.5K</th>
<th>7.5K-15K</th>
<th>15K-25K</th>
<th>25K-37.5K</th>
<th>37.5-50K+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primus palus</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secundus palus</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertius palus</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartus palus</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiro</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, the SC gives the estimated revenue of 20 to 30 million sestertii (500k - 750k denarii) that would have been derived from the total cost of gladiatorial expenses based on a 25% to 33% tax rate, which would yield a maximum and minimum range of
total gladiatorial expenses between 60 to 120 million sestertii (15-30 million denarii), with an average figure of 90 million sestertii (22.5 million denarii). Combining the two data sets, Duncan-Jones proposed a scheme where an average revenue expense of 90 million sestertii divided by the upper limit of 200,000 sestertii (50,000 denarii) per munus would yield about 450 munera per year. Duncan-Jones proposed that we should consider the 100,000 sestertii (25,000 denarii) figure the more reasonable, given known costs of ludi and munera in Italy and Africa, some of which are clearly dated to the years before the publication of this senatus consultum that was aimed at controlling extraordinary expense. Comparing the maximum and average limits to the cost of gladiatorial spectacle using an exchange rate of a tetradrachm to four denarii after the Hadrianic period, the payment made to Sisinnes would comprise 40% of the total cost of gladiatorial spectacles with an average cost of 100,000 sestertii or 25,000 denarii, and 20% of the total cost of those with an average cost of 200,000 sestertii or 50,000 denarii.

How plausible is a payment to a volunteer gladiator of an estimated 20% to 40% of the total cost of a gladiatorial spectacle? There are two perspectives from which to weigh this question: from what the munerarius would be risking to pay, and what the gladiator would generally receive. If projecting Lucian’s tale onto normal circumstances, the munerarius would have to risk both paying the volunteer 20% to 40% of estimated

---

446 Duncan-Jones 1974, 245-246.

447 Games from Africa include the following cost: no. 281 – 200,000 HS, no. 282a – 16,000 HS, no. 283 6,000 HS for single day, no. 286 6,000 HS for 3 days; from Italy, 1074a is a foundation of 600,000 HS that would have 5% revenue or 150,000 HS used annually for gladiatorial expense; no. 1075 has half of an estate of 200,000 HS diverted to gladiatorial games; no. 1076-1077 gives expense of 50,000 HS for games; no. 1078 has 8,000 HS for 5 days, totalling 40,000 HS; no. 1079 has 7,750 HS for games.

448 Howgego 1985, 52-53.
cost, and losing a trained gladiator, valued at between 5,000 and 15,000 sestertii (1250 to 3750 denarii), or a range between 2% to 15% of estimated cost.\footnote{Carter proposed that the prices concerning gladiators recorded in the \textit{Aes Italicae} reflected the full price instead of the leasing price. This assumption is primarily based on a legal opinion written by the jurist Gaius.} This estimate is based on the price (\textit{pretium}) of individual gladiators regulated in the \textit{Aes Italicae}, which formed a classification system that hierarchically arranged gladiators into price-groups.\footnote{Oliver & Palmer 1955, ll. 30-35.}

Carter has proposed that the hierarchical system mentioned by the unnamed senator could be projected to the palus-system that is often found in funerary epitaphs.\footnote{Carter 2003, 89-93.} Carter further argues that the price-group system reflected not the actual sum a gladiator would receive, but rather the “purchase price” that a \textit{munerarius} would pay a \textit{lanista} when a gladiator was maimed or killed.\footnote{Carter 2003, 105.} This argument is based on a well-known clause recorded by Gaius, who contemplated a problem on the distinction between sale and hire if a \textit{lanista} were to lease a gladiator at 20 denarii, and expect a payment of 1,000 denarii to cover the loss of a slain gladiator.\footnote{Gai. \textit{Inst.} 3.146 item si gladiatores ea lege tibi tradiderim, ut in singulos, qui integri exierint, pro sudore denarii XX mihi darentur, in eos uero singulos, qui occisi aut debilitati fuerint, denarii mille, quasertur, utrum emptio et uenditio an locutio et conductio contrabatur. [Again, suppose I deliver gladiators to you on the express terms that I will get 20 denarii for the efforts of each one who comes off unharmed, but 1,000 denarii for each one killed or maimed, is this sale or hire? Trans. Gordon & Robinson, qtd. in Carter 2003, 102.]} This arrangement would not make sense financially, and would only be plausible if the munerarius was seeking to bolster the show’s prestige through bloodshed and death, and to reduce the risk to one of his own gladiator’s life by seeking amateur fighters.
The plausibility of the 10,000 drachmae that Sisinnes received also needs to be weighed against what gladiators would receive, in addition to what they cost. What concerned the gladiators was a separate source of money, which the senator, perhaps citing verbatim, called *praecipuum mercedis*.454

item censeo de exceptis ita opseruandum ut praecipuum mercedis gladiator sibi quisque paciscatur eiusmod pecuniae quae ob hanc causam excipiēbatur quartam portionem liber, seruus autem quintam accipiat.

Likewise I support the opinion “that in the matter of prize money care must be taken that as his own share of the reward each free gladiator contract to receive a quarter of that money, whatever used to be set aside for this purpose in the past, but each slave gladiator receive a fifth. (Trans. Oliver & Palmer)

The unnamed senator agreed to a proposal that a free gladiator was to receive a quarter of the *merces*, with the rest being used to settle debts or whatever had led to the free man to risk gladiatorial combat, while a slave gladiator was to receive a fifth of the prize money. There are two interpretations of the *praecipuum mercedis* circulating in scholarship: the first is that the *lanista* was to reserve a percentage of the *pretium* that would be paid to the gladiator, while the second is that the gladiator himself was to receive, upon his successful return, a percentage of the leasing fee that was set aside.455

Both interpretations point to the fact that gladiators received far less than the total cost of a *munus*, which runs counter to what Lucian’s tale suggests. In turn, this unusually large sum makes Lucian’s account of the gladiatorial combat less plausible.

If we set aside the gladiatorial perspective, and take up an agonistic perspective, the 10,000 drachmae would measure differently. Marcus Iutius Marcianus Rufus, the

454 Oliver & Palmer 1955, ll. 45-46.

455 Ambrosino 2016, 97-98.
Sinopean boxer mentioned previously, won at “half-talent” games 110 times, and Marcus Aurelius Philoxenos from Side won 15 “talent” competitions, and 85 victories in half-talent and thousand-drachmae games. It is unclear whether references to such talent, half-talent, and thousand-drachmae awards for the top prize, or the total cost of the games. If it was the total cost, then these games were relatively inexpensive: a talent was 6000 drachmae or 6000 denarii at a fixed tariff for the Attic drachma and the denarius, or 24,000 sestertii. Alternatively, if we suppose that the talent/half-talent/thousand drachmae refer to the amount awarded to the victor, it would be a different matter. An incomplete logismos of an agonothete of the Ourania (or Eurycleia) at Sparta dated between 143-148 CE includes expenditure of at least 80,000 sestertii for prizes, with the largest amounting to 7,190 denarii or close to 30,000 sestertii. This amount is apparently much more than the expected reward for a gladiator after the SC of 177 CE, and would at least lend some credence if we also suppose that Lucian was dealing with an audience that might have been more familiar with the finances of agonistic competitions than those of gladiatorial spectacle. Dio Chrysostom’s tongue-in-cheek remark, that crowd-pleasers would even be willing to pay starting fees to the number of 5 talents (or

456 Carter 1999, 224. Howgego 1985, p.52. Rhodian tetradrachms and cistophoric tetradrachms used in Bithynia and Asia were tariffed at 3 denarii, so the equivalent would be 4,500 denarii or 18,000 sestertii.

457 It should be noted that this logismos included rhetoricians, trumpeters, painters, as well as athletes and actors from Thyateira, Sidon, Sardis, and possibly Tarsus and Nicomedia, suggesting that a prize of a talent or more for an individual category would have been more than enough to make the event an attractive international competition. SEG 11.838 I. 5 Σωκράτει Μίγωνος Θυατειρηνῷ, I. 6 Θεοδότος (Θεοδότου) τραγῳδῷ Σιδωνίῳ, I. 8 Ταμτρισί ζωγράφῳ, II. 8-9 Απολλωνίῳ Δηµητρίῳ Νε[κκοµηδεί (?)] -", I. 9 Τ(ίτο) Κορνηλίῳ Διονυσίῳ Σαρδιανῷ.

458 Camia 2011; SEG 11.838 (143-148 CE); Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 188.

459 SEG 11.838 I. 3.
30,000 *drachmae*) in order to secure famous athletes for their agonistic events, further makes Lucian’s sum of 10,000 drachmae as a possible liturgical reference.\textsuperscript{460}

Associated with the question of the payment received by Sissines is that Lucian envisioned the payment to be in drachmae. Lucian occasionally mentions payment in *drachma* in his work. For example, each of Alexander’s oracles cost a drachma and two obols,\textsuperscript{461} and Lucian even paid him “eight drachmae and what it comes to besides” (sic. 2 drachmae and 4 obols).\textsuperscript{462} The false prophet can amass seventy or eighty thousand per year through swindling aristocrats and common people alike.\textsuperscript{463} In Lucian’s literary world the *drachma* standard seems to be considered as the staple method of account in everyday life that would have been widely acknowledged by his audience.

The impression that the *drachmae* featured so significantly that it could also be used to pay for large events would run counter to the predominance of the denarial

\textsuperscript{460} Remijen 2015, 295. Dio Or. 66.11 ὥστε τούς γε φιλόπαιδας καὶ σφόδρα, οἴμαι, μικαρίζειν αὐτοὺς τοῖς φιλοδόξοις παραβάλλοντας, ὅταν αὐτοὶ μὲν ὄρτυγας ἤτοσιν ἢ ἀλεκτρυόνα ἢ ἀηδόνιον, τοῖς δὲ ὄρδεσιν ἀνάγκην οὕτων Ἀμοβέα ἢ Πόλουν ἤτοσιν ἢ τῶν Ὀλυμπίασις νεικικότον τινά πέντε μισθοῦσθαι ταλάντων. [so that the boy-lovers, I think, consider themselves fortunate comparing themselves with popularity seekers, since they themselves seek only quails or cock or a tiny nightingale, while those others, they observe, must needs seek some Amoebus or Polus, or some among the Olympic victors for a fee of five talents. (Trans. Crosby)]

\textsuperscript{461} Lucian, *Alexander*, 21: ἐτέτακτο δὲ ὁ μισθὸς ὧν ἐκάστῳ χρησμῷ δραχμῇ καὶ δύο ὀβολῶ. [a price for each oracle had been fixed at one drachma and two obols. (translation mine)]

\textsuperscript{462} Luc. *Alex*. 54: μίαν ἔρωτισιν ἐρωτήσας ἐπέγραψα τῷ βιβλίῳ κατὰ τὸ ἔθος “τοῦ δεῖνος χρησμοὶ ὀκτῶ,” ψευσάμενος τι ὅνομα, καὶ τὰς ὀκτὼ δραχμὰς καὶ τὸ γιγνόμενον ἐτὶ πρὸς ταῦτας πέμψας κτλ.

\textsuperscript{463} Lucian, *Alexander*, 21: μὴ μικρὸν οἰηθῆς, ὦ ἑταῖρε, μηδὲ ὀλίγον γεγονήσθαι τοῦ πόρου τοῦτον, ἀλλ᾽ εἰς ἐπτά ᾧ ὀκτὼ μυριάδας ἐκάστου ἐτοὺς ἥθοιζεν [Do not think it little, my friend, nor think that little is to come of this revenue; rather, he collects seventy to eighty thousand each year. (trans. Harmon)]
standard associated with benefaction in literary and epigraphic evidence.\textsuperscript{464} Inscriptions concerning customs tax found in Myra and Kaunos make it clear that the Lycian Koinon regularly received a sum of 6000 and 7000 denarii from the two cities,\textsuperscript{465} and the lex portorii provinciae Lyciae made it clear that such sums were associated with the rights that cities of the Lycian Koinon purchased for the collection of customs tax to be submitted to the Roman fiscus at the lump sum of 100,000 denarii per year.\textsuperscript{466} The implication of this system of tax collection was that a significant portion of the cash reserve of the Lycian Koinon was in denarii, because it was a stable and abundant source of revenue, based on the collection of customs duty, are different sources of gifts and bequests, the most representative being a sum recorded on a limestone statue base dedicated to Opramoas of Rhodiapolis.\textsuperscript{467} Opramoas granted an estate that would give a yearly revenue of totally 20,000 denarii to the Lycian koinon, so that the two thousand

\textsuperscript{464} Zuiderhoek 2009, 167-169 tabulated 85 foundations in the Greek East that had specific capital sums in denarii, with none in drachmae, but a survey of David Magie’s account 1950 535, 586, 615-631 yield some examples – At Pergamon there was a bequest of 100,000 drachmae to the city, by one Caius Julius Maximus, who held various magistracies and priesthoods after retiring as a legionary tribune. There were endowments from the Lycian community of Telmessus where 560,058 “light drachmae” were used for the gymnasion there, when other Lycian communities stated construction projects and endowments in denarii. Tiberius Claudius Atticus Herodes spent 7,000,000 drachmae building a bath at Alexandria Troas. Imperial benefactions in drachma can match and at times exceed private benefactors in scale. Antoninus Pius gave 250,000 drachmae as for the rebuilding of the city of Stratonicea after a severe earthquake struck soon after the emperor’s accession. Hadrian gave 10,000,000 drachmae for a building program in Pergamon that included a grain-market, a gymnasion, and the temple of Zeus at the request of the sophist Antonius Polemo; on another occasion, the same Polemo secured from Hadrian a sum of 500,000 drachmae for acquiring columns of marble and porphyry for the anointing-room of the gymnasion.

\textsuperscript{465} Marek 208-209; 212-23.

\textsuperscript{466} Takmer 2007, 174-175.

\textsuperscript{467} SEG 30.1534. Λυκίω[ν] | τὸ κοινὸν Ὀσραμώα[ν] | Ἀπόλλωνίου ὁ δῖς τοῦ Καλλιάδου Ῥοδιαπολείτην || καὶ Μυρέα καὶ Παταρέα | καὶ Τελευταὶ καὶ Ἐάνθουν καὶ | Τελμεσσάκια καὶ Λυμναία, πολέπειομένου δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς | κατὰ Λυκίων πόλεσιν πάσαις, || τὸν γεγονότα ἄρχερεα τῶν | Σεβαστῶν, τὸν δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ | γραμματέα Λυκίων, χαρισάμενον ταῖς μὲν πόλεσιν | ἱδία ἐκάστη πλαίστα, τῷ δὲ | ἐθνεὶ ἑρωίς φέροντας προσόδου | κατ’ ἔτος (δηνάρια) ἕξ, ὃ[ν] [κε] | λαμβάνοντα Λυκίων ἱκα[σ]τος τῶν κοινοῦλων | ἀνὰ (δηνάρια) δέκα. Pleket and Stroud comments that the estate’s worth was likely 250,000 denarii stated in SEG 30.1535 ll. 2-3, which would make the revenue stand at 8%, higher than the 5%-6% revenue in western provinces.
members of the *koinoboulion* would receive 10 denarii each. A separate inscription on a white marble stele with pediment recorded a list of “δωρεὰ,” including a 250,000 bequest without clear denarius or drachma notation to the Lycian koinon.\(^{468}\) The predominance of other such benefactions to *koина* in the Greek East makes it difficult to envision a scenario where a *koinon* would have given a large sum in provincial denomination as payment for services rendered.

A simple explanation is that Lucian was not consciously distinguishing between the denarial and the drachma standard when he wrote that Sisinnes would receive 10,000 drachmae (δραχμὰς ληψόμενον μυρίας μισθὸν τῆς μάχης,) since from the Hadrianic period onwards, all drachma standards except the Egyptian were tariffed at a one-to-one rate.\(^{469}\) The corollary is that Lucian’s reference to the drachma in his accounts concerning the people and the transactions taking place in the cities of the coastal Paphlagonian *koinon* was no literary conceit, but a straightforward narration that would be acknowledged by his audience as the normal experience of everyday life. In turn, it would not be inconceivable that a certain portion of a *koinon*’s cash funds was in provincial coinage, though we do not know whether a *koinon* would accept provincial coinage in satisfaction of the financial obligations of individual cities. The “metropolis” coins issued by Heraclea Pontica and Amastris during the Hadrianic period suggest that we should not reject the idea wholesale. For cities like Amastris and Heraclea that were not known to have issued silver coinage in the imperial period, the issuance of the bronze

\(^{468}\) SEG 30.1535 ll. 22-23 πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς ἐν Λυκίαι κατὰ πόλιν βουλευταῖς ἀνα (δραχμὰς) I; ll. 39-40 τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς πολείται[ς κ]αὶ | μετοίκοις ἀνὰ (δραχμὰς) I.

\(^{469}\) Howgego 1985, 53.
“metropolis” coins might have provided much needed financial tools for small transactions during festivities, when increased transactions would lead to more demand for the full range of small denominations.

Also, the composition of coins issued in the second-century CE from the Amasra Museum and the Amaseia Museum indicates that the ratio of provincial versus imperial standard coinage stood roughly at between 2:1 (n=17) and 3:1 (n=277) respectively. Among the 200 provincial coins from the Amaseia Museum there are also 89 silver coins of various denomination in the drachma standard issued by the mint in Caesarea. This number is interesting because it exceeded the number of second-century CE silver denarii in the Amaseia Museum. It has been assumed that mints of provincial coinage issued only a limited quantity of coins and only supplemented imperial coinage, but the ratio from Amasra and Amaseia, along with Lucian’s descriptions of the use of the drachma in coastal Paphlagonian cities, suggests that provincial coinage could also have been more prevalent than what we can now observe in the numismatic records.

In short, if the koinon required regular contributions from its member cities in addition to being presented with gifts by wealthy dignitaries to maintain its operations, it would likely need to account for the availability of monetary instruments that were at the disposal of its constituent cities. There might be a role for the argentarii in the equation, should the koinon have required all contributions in provincial coinage to be exchanged into coins of the denarial standard. Yet if the main expenditure concerned provincial

---

470 If we expand the chronological scope to examine the Caesarean coins for the first two centuries, we would have 101 specimens across 22 types of Caesarean coinage minted between the reign of Nero down to the reign of Commodus, with a concentration of 51 specimens of various drachm denominations issued during the reign of Hadrian. All are silver Caesarean drachms save for 5 bronze specimens issued in the Antonine Period.
establishments, agencies and service providers, there is little reason for the koinon to reject a variety of silver and bronze provincial coinage collected from different sources and by a variety of methods in order to make payments for the preparation of festivities and to better facilitate transactions when festivities actually take place. Lucian’s exclamatory sum of 10,000 drachmae may not be entirely fictitious when viewed from the perspective of the availability of cash to make the payment. Yet even the largest prize for agonistic festivals rarely exceeded one talent or 6,000 drachmae. There is good basis to consider the 10,000 drachmae overblown, even though Lucian may have chosen such an incredible sum in light of his knowledge of the prize money for major agonistic victories.

3.3.3 Summary

Our assessment of whether the payment of 10,000 drachmae to Toxaris makes sense to Lucian’s audience comes down to one of context. Perhaps Lucian expected his audience to consider the amount sensible, given their familiarity with prize money awarded in the gymnastic context, such as that which a top athlete at the worldwide games of the Ourania (or Eurycleia) at Sparta would receive. The gymnastic context is not entirely absent from Lucian’s tale. Toxaris says that Sisinnes brought him “on the pretext of going to see a τερµήνων τι καὶ παράδοξον θέαµα τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν,” which emphasised the novel, unorthodox, but Hellenic nature of the show. The problem is that Sisinnes received the payment not as “ἀθλά” – the reward of victory in agonistic context, but rather as a sort of participation fee. In other words, there would be a disjunction if we
assume that Lucian intended to fulfil the expectations of some spectacle of the Hellenes that was novel and unorthodox by grafting an agonistic concept of a reward for victory to the gladiatorial spectacle. We are left with two options: that the payment was pure fiction, or that it was based on an actual practice that had hitherto been unattested beyond Lucian’s tale, but was part of the repertoire in cities less renowned, such as Amastris.

We agree with Cumont’s brief but critical assessment of Lucian’s account: that it described the essence of such a koinon spectacle, and how the status of Amastris was closely tied to its ability there to present such an impressive koinon spectacle.\textsuperscript{471} We further posit that Lucian’s tale may have preserved the details of a critical mechanism that allowed the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus to maintain its vitality, by using payment set to the scale of the agonistic athla to encourage the citizenry to participate in gladiatorial spectacles that were directly associated with the imperial cult.

3.4 Conclusion

The result of examining the epigraphic and literary record concerning the vitality of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus confirms that there were games and spectacles held at Sinope, Amisus, and Amastris, and Heraclea, with the single attestation of a High Priest of Pontus, was likely a venue for the activities of the koinon as well. The games and spectacles of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus are indications of the prosperity of the koinon cities involved. We need not optimistically assume that the gladiatorial spectacles presented by the Pontarchs at Sinope and at Amisus were on par with those

\textsuperscript{471} Cumont 1903, 274 fn. 5. See page 168 fn. 407.
presented at Ephesus and Smyrna, but the spectacular display would have been impressive to the audience, and it is in this respect that Lucian’s account of the gladiatorial spectacle at Amastris makes sense. We should also consider the single attestation of the games of the Koinon of Pontus in the victory list of Rufus the Sinopean boxer. The ranking of these games in relation to other events from the same victory list suggests that the games of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus were on par with koinon and municipal events from Bithynia, Macedonia, Galatia and Cappadocia, though it belonged a tier lower than the various games of the Koinon of Asia.

We are able further to examine how the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus managed to maintain its vitality within its member cities. Our analysis of Lucian’s account suggests that there is a good basis for interpreting the gladiatorial spectacle attended by Toxaris and his friend Sisinnes as derived from Lucian’s knowledge of Amastrian koinon spectacle. Young men might take an interest in koinon spectacle, enticed by the prospect of monetary reward for their participation. The need for financial instruments increased as a result, and this led to the demand for collecting a wide range of provincial coinage from neighboring cities and regions in order to facilitate payment for services, as well as to make small transactions more convenient.

In sum, the general pattern of the relationship between koina and cities in the Greek East is that the vitality of the koinon depended upon its constituent cities and the leading elites that funded them. The coastal Paphlagonian koinon was particularly restricted by the lack of urbanisation during the first century CE, but gradually the vitality of the koinon increased along with the growth of urbanisation in coastal Paphlagonia. The
festivities hosted by the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus, in particular the agonistic games, may further have created an accelerating effect that was conducive to regionalisation, as leading elites were obligated to invest in common projects that did not immediately contribute to their performance of *philotimia* that would have made their own *patriae* better. Alternatively, the elites from cities that declared themselves as metropoleis – such as Amastris and Heraclea – may have contributed to the koinon events in order to make their own city better. In this case, the investments made to the koinon by Amastrian elites who served as koinon officials would have an accelerating effect on both regionalisation and urbanisation. Since Amastrians maintained a constant stream of investments that increased both the local prosperity as well as the regional standing of the city in the second century CE, we posit that Amastris attained considerable prominence during this same period of time. In the next chapter, we examine the dissemination of a chronographic practice used at Amastris to Abonuteichos and Sinope in the late second and early third centuries CE, and the potential connection between such a spread of chronographic practice and rising Amastrian influence among coastal Paphlagonian cities.
### Appendix 1: Inscriptions on the Origins of Gladiators

#### Table 6. Findsite and Origin of Gladiators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carter no.</th>
<th>Findsite</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tomis</td>
<td>Dacia</td>
<td>Σκίρτος Δακήσις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Philippopolis</td>
<td>Thessalonike</td>
<td>πατρίς δέ μου Θεσσαλονέικη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Philippopolis</td>
<td>Pergamon</td>
<td>Φλαμεάτη ρηταρίῳ πρώτῳ πάλω Περγαμηνψ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Plotinopolis</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>[δείνος] μυρμόλλων Ζμύρνης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Beroia</td>
<td>Ephesus</td>
<td>Ζμαράγδος Νυμφέρατι Εφεσίω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Beroia</td>
<td>Pautalia (Thr)</td>
<td>πατρίς δέ μοι Παυταλία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Beroia</td>
<td>Arpeinos (Arpi, Apulia?)</td>
<td>Πόπλις ὃ καὶ Μαρίσκος Αρπείνος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Thessaloniki</td>
<td>Lacedaemon</td>
<td>Τίτος Φλαουίος Σάτυρος Νεκτηρόροι Συνέτου Λακεδαιμονίῳ τὸ καὶ Ναρκίσσῳ σεκούτορι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Thessaloniki</td>
<td>Thessaloniki</td>
<td>πάτρας ἀπὸ Θεσσαλονεὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>Μαριανῷ τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀνδρὶ τῷ καὶ Κωνωπᾷ Σµυρνέῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Larissa</td>
<td>Cyzikos</td>
<td>οὔνοµα πρὶν Λαγένης, ἥµην δὲ γένει ΚΥ’ζκηνός, ὅστις πυκτεύσας Ασίαν, Θράκην, Μακεδονίαν, ἀθλὸν ὃ ἐν Λαρείσῃ τὸ πεπροµένον µοίρης ἀπέδωκα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Gortyn</td>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>ἡ δὲ πατρίς Τροιάς µοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Nicomedia</td>
<td>Apamea</td>
<td>οὔνοµα µοι παγανῶν Απολλώνις ἐκλήθην οὐ πατρίς Απάµεια, νῦν ὃ Νικοµήδειας μὲ γα´ ἵππος ἄνεθρεψεν κατέχει µε µίτος καὶ νήµατα Μοιρῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Claudiopolis</td>
<td>Macedon</td>
<td>Φιλοκινητος ἐγὼ Μακεδών ρήταρος ἄλειπτος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Pergamon</td>
<td>Nicomedia</td>
<td>οὔνοµα µοι Χρηστείνος τὸ πρὶν ἀνέθρεψεν ἄλαὶ Βειθυνῶν πρώτῃ Νικοµήδεια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Cyzicus</td>
<td>Nicopolis</td>
<td>ὑπόµνηµα Νυµφέροτος ὁ καὶ Νεκκάνωρ Νεκκόπολείτης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Cyzicus</td>
<td>Apros</td>
<td>οὔνοµα δ´ ἤν µοι τὸ πρὶν Διονύσιος, Ἀπρηνῶν δ´ ἀνεθρέψατο γαῖα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter no.</td>
<td>Findsite</td>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>Nikomedia, Smyrna, Pergamon, Laodikea</td>
<td>Σελείνης Νεικομήδεας, Κέστιλλος Συμφωναίος, Λυκοφόντης Περγαμήνος, Κάστορ Λαδεικεους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Ephesus</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Νίλου ἐπί προχοαῖς γενόμην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Perge</td>
<td>Πέργη δὲ μοι πάτρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>εἴ δὲ νόσῳ προδοθεῖς ὑπὸ Μύρης ὁδὸ εἰρονεύθην, ὃγδον πυκτεύσας ἐσχα τέλος θανάτου, τοῦτ᾽ ἔφερεν Στεφάνῳ πρὸς Φιλαδελφέων ἄστυ κατελθεῖν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Synnada</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>ἔπαγάθῳ σεκοινδαροῦδῃ Συμφωναίῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>Laodiceia ep Lykos</td>
<td>Smyrna?</td>
<td>Λημμία τῷ ἄνδρι Σωζομένῳ Συμφωναίῳ μνείας χάριν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>Laodiceia ep Lykos</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>Καλλιμόρφῳ τῷ ἱδίῳ ἄνδρι Θυατειρῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>Xanthus</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>οὐ πατρίς ἤν Λιβύη, νῦν δὲ Σάνθιοι με γαία αὐξανίων δάπεδον κατέχει σὺν δόγματι Μοιρων.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>Ancyra</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Καλλεύρδομος Ἀσειανὸς ὁ θρᾶσις ἐν σταδίοις πρῶτος πάλος ῥητιαρίων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>Ancyra</td>
<td>Anazarbus (Cilicia)</td>
<td>Δαναὸς θρᾶτις πάλος πρῶτος Κῖλις Ἀναζαρβεύς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>Asia Minor?</td>
<td>Asia?</td>
<td>Ἡλειοδορίς Απλέρωτι γυνὴ εἰδείᾳ μνήμης χάριν Ἀσειανῷ προβοκάτορι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Amasra Museum Coins issued in the Second Century CE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Emperor/Symbol</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Coin Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Trajan/Abundantia</td>
<td>98-100 CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>AE dupondius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Trajan/Pallas</td>
<td>98-117 CE</td>
<td>Bithynia/Heracleia Pontica</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Trajan/Trajan’s column</td>
<td>113 CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>AR denarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hadrian/Octastyle temple</td>
<td>117-138 CE</td>
<td>Bithynia/Koinon Beithynias</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Hadrian/Mount Argaeus</td>
<td>117-138 CE</td>
<td>Cappadocia/Caesarea</td>
<td>AR drachm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Hadrian/Crescent moon with seven stars</td>
<td>125-128 CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>AR denarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Hadrian/figure with patera and sceptre</td>
<td>134-138 CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>AE dupondius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Antoninus Pius/Hestia</td>
<td>138-161 CE</td>
<td>Bithynia/Tion</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lucius Verus/Ares</td>
<td>161-169 CE</td>
<td>Paphlagonia/Amastris</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lucius Verus/Nemesis</td>
<td>161-169 CE</td>
<td>Paphlagonia/Amastris</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lucius Verus/Galley</td>
<td>161-169 CE</td>
<td>Paphlagonia/Amastris</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lucius Verus/ΘΕAC CYΠΙΑC ΙΕΡΟΠΙ in wreath</td>
<td>161-169 CE</td>
<td>Syria/Hierapolis</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Faustina II/Hygeia</td>
<td>161-175 CE</td>
<td>Paphlagonia/Amastris</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Faustina II/female standing</td>
<td>161-175 CE</td>
<td>uncertain mint</td>
<td>AE as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius/Ram</td>
<td>161-180 CE</td>
<td>Paphlagonia/Amastris</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius/Asklepios</td>
<td>161-180 CE</td>
<td>Bithynia/Tion</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius/Victory</td>
<td>166 CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>AR denarius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8. Howgego Countermarks p. 76

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Howgego Cmk no.</th>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Diameter (n)</th>
<th>Weight (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cmk 826</td>
<td>Amastris</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cmk 771</td>
<td>Balbinus</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cmk 789</td>
<td>Hostilian</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cmk 809</td>
<td>Philip I</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cmk 825</td>
<td>Vlerian-Gallienus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28 (34)</td>
<td>12.5 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cmk 827</td>
<td>Gallus</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cmk 808</td>
<td>Tranquillina</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cmk 824</td>
<td>Valerian</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPC no.</td>
<td>Diameter</td>
<td>Average Weight</td>
<td>RPC no.</td>
<td>Diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1161 Heraclea Pontica (Rec 93)</td>
<td>33 mm</td>
<td>20.23 g</td>
<td>3.1205 Amastris (Rec 50)</td>
<td>32 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1163 Heraclea Pontica (Rec 98)</td>
<td>32 mm</td>
<td>17.25 g</td>
<td>(17.25-17.32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1172 Heraclea Pontica (Rec 97)</td>
<td>30 mm</td>
<td>17.59 g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1164 Heraclea Pontica (Rec 91-2)</td>
<td>28 mm</td>
<td>17.42 g</td>
<td>(15.06-19.37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1162 Heraclea Pontica (Rec 100) 98/102 CE</td>
<td>27 mm</td>
<td>10.94 g</td>
<td>3.1208 Amastris (Rec 51a) 116/117 CE</td>
<td>27 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1165 Heraclea Pontica (Rec 99)</td>
<td>24 mm</td>
<td>8.25 g</td>
<td>(7.59-8.92 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1166 Heraclea Pontica (Rec 94)</td>
<td>24 mm</td>
<td>8.74 g</td>
<td>(8.65-8.83 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1168 Heraclea Pontica (Rec 101)</td>
<td>24 mm</td>
<td>5.40 g</td>
<td>(3.80-6.73 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1175 Heraclea Pontica (Rec 96)</td>
<td>24 mm</td>
<td>7.63 g</td>
<td>(7.17-8.09 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1167 Heraclea Pontica (Rec 89) 102/14 CE</td>
<td>21 mm</td>
<td>4.84 g</td>
<td>(5.30-4.21 g)</td>
<td>3.1204a Amastris (Forum coins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1170 Heraclea Pontica (O Milne 1926)</td>
<td>21 mm</td>
<td>4.88 g</td>
<td>(5.39-4.36 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1176 Heraclea Pontica (Rec 90)</td>
<td>21 mm</td>
<td>4.60 g</td>
<td>(3.82-5.87 g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1169 Heraclea Pontica (Rec 95)</td>
<td>20 mm</td>
<td>3.72 g</td>
<td>(3.26-4.17 g)</td>
<td>3.1207 Amastris (vA 6808)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1209 Amastris (Rec 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1210 Amastris (Rec 29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. APPROACHING COMMON TIME

In this chapter, we focus on time reckoning, a method of expression of time that many cities in the Greek East used to cultivate their unique sense of communal history. While time reckoning in the Greek East was predominantly used by communities to express individual time, there are several systems of time reckoning that were shared. The question to examine in this chapter is whether studying shared expressions of time can clarify how a shared identity was formed. One example is the province of Asia, which had a uniform calendar standardised by the joint efforts of the Roman governor and the Koinon of Asia. The standardisation led to a shared cyclical rhythm that had wide-reaching effects on how the cities of Asia and their common assembly operated. The cyclical rhythm of the Koinon is observable in the periodic nature of elections and festivities, described in the earlier chapters. One example of such rhythm at the koinon level is touched upon in Aelius Aristides’ *Sacred Tales*. The nomination of the High Priesthood of Asia would first take place at the local level at the beginning of the Asiatic year in mid-Summer, followed by the koinon assembly that elects the common High Priest from among the candidates.472 The Koinon of Asia was structured carefully around local time, so that its constituent cities could produce coherent positions and nominations to bring to the koinon assembly. Yet, the shared beginning of the year marked an important acknowledgement by the communities regulated by the calendar: they shared a

---

472 Aristid. *Hieroi Logoi* 4.100 ἰσταμένον δὲ τοῦ ἔτους καὶ γιγνομένης ἐκκλησίας τῆς πρώτης ἦκον ἕκ δήμου καλοῦντες μὲ . . . αἱ συμβάνται μετὰ τοῦτο συνέδρους μὲν ἐξέδεισι Σμύρναίων εἰς Φρυγίαν ἀνοί καὶ μέλλειν φέρειν τοῦμα ὄνομα ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ τῷ κοινῷ . . . [When the year began and the first assembly was being held, men came from the *demos* to summon me . . . and it happened after this, that the delegates of Smyrna went to Upper Phrygia and intended to nominate me in the Provincial Assembly . . . after this, there was an appeal, a summons of the governor, and a summons of the Savior to Pergamum]
common sense of time that in turn defined the shared rhythms of their everyday lives. We envision that similar designs – koinon time constructed upon civic time – would make sense in coastal Paphlagonia as well.

The Amastrian calendar is an important example of civic time, and serves as the point of departure for our discussion in the first part of this chapter. The Amastrian calendar has no apparent relation to the Julian calendar, and has a considerable longevity that continues until the mid-third century CE. The combination of the stable presence of the Amastrian calendar and the many Amastrians who were eventually elected as koinon leaders leads to the thesis that Amastrian civic time was critical to Koinon time. In the second part of this chapter, we move to consider the reckoning of the year in coastal Paphlagonia, of which we are better informed than in the reckoning of the month. From Heraclea to Amisus, each municipal center had its own reckoning of the year. The case of Sinope is unique. This Roman colony changed its colonial era (with an epoch or starting date of 45 BCE) to the Lucullan era (with an epoch of 70 BCE) in the Severan period, after two centuries of continuous use. This adoption is a curious change that has not been satisfactorily explained. In the third part of this chapter we move towards an explanation of why the Lucullan era was more than the time-reckoning system used by one city in coastal Paphlagonia. From epigraphic and numismatic evidence available, the longevity and visibility of the Lucullan era at Amastris are much more significant when compared with those in Abonuteichos and Sinope. When also considering Sinope’s adoption of the Lucullan era at the turn of the third century CE, we posit that Sinope’s adoption of the Lucullan era was a step towards closer integration with Amastris.
4.1 The Amastrian Calendar

The Amastrian calendar has been described as Macedonian because the names of its months were identical with those that were described as Macedonian in ancient sources. Yet, the Macedonian calendar is a nomenclature used to describe the systems of time-reckoning that were based upon the calendar originating in Macedonia, but these were themselves assimilated calendars and far removed from the original state of computation. In this sense, the Amastrian calendar ought to be understood as a local calendar that may or may not share the traits of the more dominant types of assimilated Macedonian calendars, like the Seleucid or the Ptolemaic variants. We examine evidence of Amastrian months from 15 Amastrian inscriptions dated between 109 CE to 251 CE, listed below, in Table 10. Here, the chronographic formula consists of three entries, the year, the month and the day. The context of the inscriptions is predominantly funerary, with only one dedicatory inscription. While we have no indication that the chronographic formula was used in official context, its seemingly ubiquitous presence in the funerary context suggests that the inhabitants of the Amastrian territory considered the chronographic formula to have been an important aspect of their everyday lives. In this

---

473 Mendel 1902, 288 identified the calendar as Bithynian based on the name Deios in no. 15 of the Amastrian chronography above, but Marek 1985, 151 and Leschhorn 1993, 165 demonstrated that the month names are Macedonian. Samuel 1972, 139.

474 The terms Macedo-Hellenic, Macedo-Syrian, and Macedo-Egyptian were employed by Greswell 1862, 26-28, to describe the different systems of calendars with Macedonian months. Samuel 1972, 140-145, the Syro-Macedonian or Seleucid calendar adapted of the Babylonian lunar calendar 19 year cycle, with the insertion of seven lunar months over a period 19 years to resolve the intercalation, 140. Samuel 1972, 145-149, the Macedo-Egyptian or Ptolemaic calendar was an adaptation of the Egyptian solar calendar with each month 30 days and 5 epagomenal days to form 365 days, with the quarter day anomaly dictating the beginning of the year, and would fall on 31 August, upon the arrival of Octavian in Egypt, 145.
respect, the study of the symbolism and significance of the chronographic formula is an important approach to understanding the habitual tendencies in Amastris and potentially other cities in coastal Paphlagonia as well.

Table 10. Amastrian Chronography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronographic Formula</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Marek</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ακτ´ μηνός</td>
<td>Απελλαίου β´</td>
<td>321=251 CE</td>
<td>Apellaios 2nd</td>
<td>n.56 funerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 έτους δνσ´, μηνί</td>
<td>Περειτίω</td>
<td>254=184 CE</td>
<td>Per(i)ti(os)</td>
<td>n.55 funerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 μηνός Υπερβερεταίου η´</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Hyperberetaios 8th</td>
<td>n.102</td>
<td>funerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 έτους βζ´ μηνός Δύστρου.</td>
<td>222=152 CE</td>
<td>Dystros</td>
<td>n.74</td>
<td>funerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 έτους βζ´, μηνός</td>
<td>Δύστρου κε´.</td>
<td>202=132 CE</td>
<td>Dystros 25th</td>
<td>n.90 funerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 έτος απρ´, μηνός Ξανδικο[ῦ]</td>
<td>181=111 CE</td>
<td>Xandikos</td>
<td>n.62</td>
<td>funerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 μηνός Αρτεμισίου κ´</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Artem(i)sios 20th</td>
<td>n.36</td>
<td>funerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 έτους δνσ´ μηνός Δαεσίου δ´</td>
<td>254=184 CE</td>
<td>D(a)esios 4th</td>
<td>n.48</td>
<td>funerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 εκάρ´ πρό α´ καλ. Σεπτεμβρίων Λώου ζα´</td>
<td>225=155 CE</td>
<td>August 31st/Loos 17th</td>
<td>n.44</td>
<td>funerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 έν τῷ γοσ´ έτι Λώου ακ´</td>
<td>273=203 CE</td>
<td>Loos 21st</td>
<td>n.45</td>
<td>funerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 έτους δεσ´, Γορπιαίου α´</td>
<td>214=144 CE</td>
<td>Gorpiaios 1st</td>
<td>n.97</td>
<td>funerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 έτους απρ´, μηνός Δίου</td>
<td>181=111 CE</td>
<td>Dios</td>
<td>n.50</td>
<td>funerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 έτους ζις[σ´]</td>
<td>μηνός Δείου</td>
<td>(2)87=117 CE</td>
<td>D(i)os</td>
<td>n.59 funerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 έτους γορ´, μηνός Δε![ου]</td>
<td>193=123 CE</td>
<td>D(i)os</td>
<td>n.62</td>
<td>funerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 έτους θορ´ μηνός Δείου</td>
<td>νεοµηνία</td>
<td>179=109 CE</td>
<td>D(i)os (1st?)</td>
<td>n.113 dedi catory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The list shows three distinct traits. The first is the use of Macedonian nomenclature, which places the Amastrian calendar within a family of calendars in the Greek East that shows such continuation of Hellenistic influence in their local time
reckoning. The second is the single reference to the Julian calendar in no. 9 of the catalogue, which is an indication that the imperial calendrical system was rarely used at Amastris for everyday purposes. The third is no. 15 in the catalogue, which contains a reference to the new moon for the month of Dios. This observation of the new moon is characteristic of a lunar or lunisolar calendar, because it would determine the beginning of a month by observing the appearance of the new moon. The three traits are important to our understanding of the Amastrian calendar, as they allow us to envision the correlation of the Amastrian with the Julian calendar and other Macedonian calendars that were of provincial rather than municipal importance. These aspects are explored in the following sections.

4.1.1 The Macedonian Connection

The Macedonian connection of the Amastrian calendar is, in bare essence, a matter of nomenclature, as we learn from the Hemerologia about the considerable variations that exist among calendars with names of Macedonian months. The reason is that, while many calendars in the Greek East continued to show Macedonian influence,

---

475 Evidence for the influence of Egyptian and Babylonian calendrical systems on the Seleucid calendar include occasional references in literary sources, such as Ptolemy’s Almagest. Samuel 1972, 140 discusses three cases of concordance between Egyptian and Seleucid Macedonian months that could be used to deduce the first day of the Macedonian month, as well as the first visibility of the moon at Babylon. Also, Samuel 1972, 141 discusses concordance between Babylonian and Macedonian months: Plut. Alex. 75-76 on the different dates of Alexander’s death identifies Daisios 30 and Daisios 28, which can be aligned with the Babylonian month of Airau 29 in an entry in the astronomical diary. Sachs 1955 no. 209 qtd. in Stern 2012, 155.

476 Kubitscheck 1915. While the source of the Hemerologia remains unknown, Kubitscheck proposes Ptolemy as a possible source of the original compilation, and was later reworked. Kubitscheck 1915, 79-81, points to several indications: the name Byzantion is still used, as opposed to Constantinople; the existence of the Arabic calendar, which would be after 106 CE; the use of the chronological tables, which could be the so-called προγείρων κατ’ όνον διάταξις καὶ ψηφοφορία, or “scheme and manipulation of the ready tables.” Samuel 1972, 173-174, for brief introduction.
they were not coterminous with each other. As city-states and kingdoms in Anatolia broke away from the Seleucids, they also lapsed from strict observance of the Babylonian 19-year cycle, the defining feature of the Seleucid calendar.477

Following the annexations of various parts of the Greek East to the Roman imperium, there were further deviations from their Macedonian legacy. We know, for example, that the provincial governor Paullus Fabius Maximus of 9/8 BCE ordered the calendar of Asia, which used Macedonian nomenclature, to begin its year with Augustus’ birthday. In addition, the calendar of the province of Lycia, also nominally Macedonian, became coterminous with the Julian calendar. We note that the Tyrian calendar and a few others show no apparent relationship with the Julian calendar, and hence creates another category as we attempt to locate the Amastrian calendar within the Macedonian calendrical matrix.

The variations of the Macedonian calendar discussed above are presented in the following table, along with the Bithynian calendar – which does not use Macedonian nomenclature – for purposes of comparison. The Julian calendar is used to serve as the chronological anchor, in order to give a general reference to what time of the year a month of the Macedonian and the Bithynian calendars would correspond to. We note that a precise correspondence between the Julian months and the individual Macedonian and Bithynian calendars would require a much more detailed layout to account for the different beginnings of the year, as will be demonstrated in a later example.

477 Stern 2012, 248.
It is apparent that, apart from the months of Audynaios and Panemos, all of the names attested in the relevant lines of the Amastrian inscriptions selected earlier can be found among the calendars tabulated above. The concordance of the August 31st-Loos 17th of 155 CE further suggests that we ought to envision the Amastrian calendrical sequence as falling within the general contours of the Hellenic and Tyrian calendars. For precision, we tabulate the transitions between August and September to arrive at a comprehensive view of the Amastrian calendar within the selection of calendrical systems. To prepare for the tabulation, we need to consider the issue of the length of Loos. If we assume the Amastrian calendar to be identical with the overall structure of these calendars, which all have 365 days, it could have been structurally designed like the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELLENIC*</th>
<th>LYCIA</th>
<th>ASIA**</th>
<th>BITHYNIA</th>
<th>TYRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAN</td>
<td>Audynaios</td>
<td>Dios</td>
<td>Peritios</td>
<td>Herakleios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB</td>
<td>Peritios</td>
<td>Apellaios</td>
<td>Dystros</td>
<td>Dios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>Dystros</td>
<td>Audynaios</td>
<td>Xanthikos</td>
<td>Bendidios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>Xanthikos</td>
<td>Peritios</td>
<td>Artemisios</td>
<td>Stratios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>Artemisios</td>
<td>Dystros</td>
<td>Daisios</td>
<td>Periepios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>Daisios</td>
<td>Xanthikos</td>
<td>Panemos</td>
<td>Areios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUL</td>
<td>Panemos</td>
<td>Artemisios</td>
<td>Loos</td>
<td>Aphrodisios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>Loos</td>
<td>Daisios</td>
<td>Gorpiaios</td>
<td>Demetrios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP</td>
<td>Gorpiaios</td>
<td>Panemos</td>
<td>Hyperberetaios</td>
<td>Heraios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT</td>
<td>Hyperberetaios</td>
<td>Loos</td>
<td>Dios</td>
<td>Hermairoplos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV</td>
<td>Dios</td>
<td>Gorpiaios</td>
<td>Apellaios</td>
<td>Metroos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>Apellaios</td>
<td>Hyperberetaios</td>
<td>Audynaios</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Manuscripts describe as the common Hellenic calendar (Ἑλλήνων) in Kubitchek 1915, 2-12 (Florence MS); 16-25 (Leiden MS); 27-38 (Vatican MS).

** Manuscripts describe variously as the Asian and the Ephesian in the Florence and Leiden MS, and in the Vatican MS, variously as the Asian or the Asian-Pamphylian.
Tyrian calendar with 30- and 31-day months without epagomenal days, or it could be structured with 30-day months with epagomenal days, and the assignment of these epagomenal days could be arbitrary, as the purpose is only to reconcile the expected number of days in a year. A survey of the length of days of each month in the calendars, shown below, indicates that Loos is either 30 or 31 days in length. Group 1, being coterminal with the Julian calendar, assigns Loos 31 days, and the calendar of Asia in Group 2 also assigns it this length, despite being of a different configuration. The difference is the Tyrian calendar, with Loos being 30 days.

Table 12. Calendars Compared: Greswell 1862; Kubitschek 1915; Samuel 1972.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hellenic 365</th>
<th>Lycia 365</th>
<th>Asia 365</th>
<th>Bithynia 365</th>
<th>Tyre 365</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1st</td>
<td>Per(itios)</td>
<td>Ape.</td>
<td>Feb 21</td>
<td>Xan. 31d.</td>
<td>Dios 30d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1st</td>
<td>Xan(thikos)</td>
<td>Per.</td>
<td>Apr 23</td>
<td>Dai. 31d.</td>
<td>Stratios 31d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1st</td>
<td>Art(emisios)</td>
<td>Dys.</td>
<td>May 24</td>
<td>Pan. 30d.</td>
<td>Periepios 30d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 1st</td>
<td>Gor(piaios)</td>
<td>Pan.</td>
<td>Sep 23</td>
<td>Di. 31d.</td>
<td>Heraios 31d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1st</td>
<td>Di(os)</td>
<td>Gor.</td>
<td>Nov 23</td>
<td>Aud. 31d.</td>
<td>Metroos 31d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1st</td>
<td>Ape(llaios)</td>
<td>Hyp.</td>
<td>Dec 24</td>
<td>Per. 30 d.</td>
<td>Dionysios 31 d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The count for the days from the 21st day of Dystros begins at ἐξιόντος 8 instead of ἐξιόντος 10.

We tentatively assign 30 days to the month of Loos in the Amastrian calendar, since the single concurrence with the Julian calendar suggests a more distant relationship.

---

478 Samuel 1972, 173;
from Groups 1 and 2, which have 31 days for the month. With potential complications regarding the length of Loos in mind, we proceed to the tabulation as follows.

Table 13. August to September Concordance, Kubitschek 1915, pp. 49-50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Julian</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hellenic</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Bithynia</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Loos</td>
<td>Daisios</td>
<td>Gorpiaios</td>
<td>Aphrodisios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 or Sebastos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Gorpiaios</td>
<td>Panemos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ἐξίοντος 10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>ἐξίοντος 9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>ἐξίοντος 5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>ἐξίοντος 4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1/Seb.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tabulation makes two aspects of the Amastrian calendar apparent. Firstly, the Amastrian calendar could not have coincided with Augustus’ birthday on September
23rd, a point observed by Marek. This means that the Amastrian calendar was not pegged with the Bithynian calendar, which began its New Year on Augustus’ birthday.

Secondly, the beginning of the month of Loos for the Amastrian calendar would have been on August 15th of the Julian calendar, the time when the astronomical new moon appeared for the year 155 CE. This coincidence is intriguing, as it suggests that the Amastrians observed astronomical phenomena to decide the beginning and the length of its months. Leschhorn takes this position, and he pointed to a dedicatory inscription from Kytoros that contains a reference to the observation of the first visibility of the crescent moon for the month of Dios. A certain Euelpistos, a business representative of Sextus Vibius Gallus, made a dedication to the god Theos Monios upon the appearance of the new moon in the month of Dios in 109 CE. Leschhorn argues that this observance of the lunar phase indicates that the Amastrian calendar preserved many of the traits of its Hellenistic calendar, including the alignment of its New Year with the autumnal equinox. We note, however, that the tabulation shows little connection between the beginning of the month of Gorpiaios, Hyperberetaios, and Dios with the autumnal equinox.

---

480 Marek 1985, 151.


482 Samuel 1972, 14.

483 Marek Kat. Amastris 113. ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ· ἐν θεῷ Μωνίῳ εὐχῇ | Σέξτου Ὀὐείβίου Γάλλου πρειστὸς εὐλαρίου Εὐέλπιστος πραγματευτής | ἔτους θορ’, μηνὸς Δείου | νεομήνια. [To good fortune. With prayers of Sextus Vibius Gallus to Zeus Monios, his business representative Euelpistos (dedicate this) in the year 179 of the month of Dios, new moon. (Trans. mine) ] Mendel, who published this inscription, proposed that the month of Dios referred here is actually the Bithynian month, and hence attests to the influence of the Bithynian calendar on coastal Paphlagonian cities. Mendel 1902, 288. However, as Marek pointed out, Dios is also the name of a Macedonian month, and since the names of the months at Amastris are identical to the Macedonian calendars in the Greek East, the month of Dios ought to be understood as the name of a Macedonian instead of a Bithynian month. Marek 1985, 151.

484 Leschhorn 1993, 165-166.
equinox, which would have taken place in late September of the Julian calendar.\textsuperscript{485} Intercalation would have to be assumed to have taken place. It is in this context interesting to consider that the beginning of the Amastrian month of Dystros would likely have fallen around the vernal equinox on March 25th of the Julian calendar,\textsuperscript{486} assuming that the calendar was structured as a 365-day year with 30-day months and five epagomenal days. This points to further likelihood that the Amastrian calendrical system looked for fixed astronomical phenomena to structure its year.

Furthermore, the Amastrian calendar can be placed within the context of the “post-Seleucid” Macedonian calendars used by Antioch, Tyre, Ascalon and Gaza, which all had the month of Dios coincide with the Julian months of November and December.\textsuperscript{487} Stern regarded this range for the month of Dios as indicative of one or several excessive intercalations imposed by the Levantine cities, as they deviated from the strict observance of the Babylonian 19-year cycle and conducted their own calendrical computations.\textsuperscript{488} We may accordingly have to account for the possibility that the Amastrian calendar in the imperial period was also the accumulative result of a lengthy process of deviation from a major calendrical system in the Pontic region. Amastris was originally founded by Amastris, the daughter of Darius III’s brother Oxathres, and then wife to Lysimachus after the death of her first husband Dionysus of Heraclea Pontica.\textsuperscript{489} Yet the Amastrian

\textsuperscript{485} Hannah 2005, 119-120 accounts for errors that could have taken place with the observation of the autumnal equinox, and a range between September 21 to 24.

\textsuperscript{486} The precise date of the vernal equinox in relation to the Julian calendar is written by Calumella 9.14.1 and Pliny the Elder \textit{NH} 18.246-248, cited by Hannah 2005, 114-115.

\textsuperscript{487} Stern 2012, 250-252.

\textsuperscript{488} Stern 2012, 247.

\textsuperscript{489} Memnon \textit{BNJ} 434 5.4-9.
calendrical system shows no trace of this Heraclean connection. Instead, it has closer relationship to a later development, when Amastris was given to king Ariobarzanes (c. 265-255 CE) of the Mithridatic kingdom,\textsuperscript{490} and remained subject to the Mithridatids until the Roman annexation in 70 BCE.\textsuperscript{491} In other words, the Amastrian calendar as preserved in the imperial period would most likely have been influenced by the Mithridatid calendar, a point to be pursued in the next section.

We may conclude that the Amastrian calendar was likely correlated with lunar phases and astronomical phenomena, the hallmarks of a lunar calendar. This makes the Amastrian calendar similar to the lunar calendars such as the Tyrian discussed earlier, because its months are not pegged to the Julian calendar in an apparent fashion. While we can accommodate the Amastrian calendar within the group of calendars in the Greek East that seem uninflected by the Julian calendar, we note that the calendars that did enter into a fixed relationship with the Julian calendar are the Bithynian, Asiatic and Lycian, and these encompass the most urbanised areas of Anatolia. In other words, there may be a correlation between the low degree of urbanisation and the Amastrian calendar’s unpegged relationship with the Julian calendar. The second point to make is the Macedonian legacy of the Amastrian calendar, which seemed to have derived from the Mithridatic Kingdom from the mid-third century BCE. Since coastal Paphlagonian cities shared similar historical trajectories with regard to the Mithridatic and later the Roman domination in 70 BCE, there is basis to consider the possibility that the Amastrian

\textsuperscript{490} Memnon \textit{BNJ} 434 9.4.

\textsuperscript{491} Memnon \textit{BNJ} 434 35.7.
calendar is representative of other calendrical systems in coastal Paphlagonia. They can at the very least form a group comparable with the Levantine cities that were, as Stern puts it, drifting away from a centralised Babylonian calendrical system as they attained independence. The Amastrian calendrical system, as well as those of other coastal Paphlagonian cities, could have been drifting away from the Mithridatid standard in the years following Roman annexation, and the low degree of urbanisation of coastal Paphlagonia further prevented the forceful subjection of the drifting calendars under the Julian system. In turn, the shared historical experience under the Mithridatid kingdom may have led coastal Paphlagonian cities to agree to the Mithridatid calendar as the possible source of common time in the imperial period, a point to be discussed in the next section.

4.1.2 The Mithridatid Connection

In the following, we show that the Seleucid calendrical system was a likely source of influence for the Mithridatid calendar due to its relative stability after having adopted the Babylonian 19-year cycle. Yet, to speak of a Mithridatid calendar, we assume that the Pontic kingdom maintained a calendrical system that set itself apart from that of the Seleucid. This is difficult to prove, but the numismatic examples highlighted by de Callataï give a good indication that the Mithridatid calendar operated with its own computations at least by the beginning of the first century BCE. It is this Mithridatid calendrical system that may be the basis for common time in coastal Paphlagonian cities.

492 Stern 2012, 250-251.
Indications of the similarity between the Mithridatid and the Seleucid calendar come from two inscriptions, found in the Crimea and Abonuteichos respectively. The two months attested in the two inscriptions are Daisios and Dios, indicating that the Mithridatid calendar went by Macedonian names, and therefore likely shared a close relationship with the Seleucid calendar. This close relationship concerns two assumptions. The first is the strong link between the Mithridatids and the Seleucids in the form of royal marriages during the second century BCE. Burstein and McGing proposed that the close relationship may have led the Mithridatids to use the Seleucid era until Mithridates Eupator’s adoption of the royal Bithynian era. The second is that adoption of the Seleucid era would require a calendar that readily reflected the beginning of a Seleucid year. We could then envision that the Macedonian months attested in Mithridatid contexts were based upon the Seleucid calendrical system.

As for the deviation from the Seleucid calendrical system, we rely on some examples of tetradrachm issues from the reign of Mithridates Eupator with Greek

493 Iospe Π 402 ll. 29-32 ο δὲ ὁρκος οὕτος συνετελέσθη ἐν | τῷ ἑβδόμῳ καὶ πεντηκοστῷ καὶ ἑκατοστῷ | ἔτει, μηνὸς Δαισίου, καθὼς βασιλεύεις Φαρνάκ[ῆς] | ἁγεῖ. This inscription, concerning an oath establishing friendship between Pharnaces of the Mithridatid Kingdom and Chersonesos, is subject of controversy. The problem can be simplified to the question of whether the Seleucid era that was used in the concluding lines of the oath, which states that the oath was taken in the month of Daisios of the 157th year, with Pharnakes leading the taking of the oath. Burstein 1980, 1-12. SEG 30.962. McGing 1986, 251-254.

494 Reinach 1905, 117-119. The preamble includes an invocation of Mithridates V Euergetes, a dynastic era of the 297th year that translates to 137/6 BCE, and finally the month Dios, βασιλεύοντος Μιθραδάτου, ἑυρηγέτου έτος αξρ´ | μηνὸς Δίου· ἠδύνη φατόρος· Δάιπος Κρίτωνος ἱερατεύων εἶπεν κτλ. Only Aitolia among Greek mainland and Ionian months, reported by McLean 2002, 160-163, have the month name of Δίος; the Hemerologia reports calendars from Sidon, Lykia, Ephesos, Pamphylia, Bithynia, Askalon, Tyros, Arab and Gaza as using the month Διος, in Kubitschek 1915, 116.

495 The marriage between Mithridates II (r. 250-210 BCE) and the sister of Seleucus II Callinicus (r. 246-225 BCE) is found in Euseb. Chron. 1 118; the marriage between Antiochus III (222-187 BCE) and Laodice the daughter of Mithridates II is in Polyb. 5.43.1-4. Achaeus (d. 213 BCE), the vice-regent of Antiochus III, also married a daughter of Mithridates II, attested in Polyb. 5.74.5, 8.19.7, 8.20.11. The marriage between Pharnaces I (c. 185-155 BCE) with Nysa is in OGIS 771.

496 McGing 1986, 253.
numerals denoting the month and regnal year when a coin type was issued. The Greek numerals interpreted as months were so taken due to the range of numbers they implicate, which are typically between A and IB.\textsuperscript{497} Yet, there are also three examples dated to the years 90, 88, and 74 BCE with the Greek numeral ΙΓ.\textsuperscript{498} The occurrence of a thirteenth month in the three examples can be explained as the intercalary mechanism at work, where an embolismic month of a lunar calendar was introduced to reconcile discrepancies in computation. Notably, the three intercalations cannot be found in the Babylonian calendar, which only intercalated in 87 BCE.\textsuperscript{499} It must be, then, that the Mithridatid calendar had already drifted away from the Seleucid calendrical system before the beginning of the first century BCE.\textsuperscript{500}

There are also some grounds to consider that there was a variety of Macedonian calendars in coastal Paphlagonia that took some time to become assimilated with the Mithridatid calendar. An inscription at Sinope used the Macedonian month of Panemos for a dedication by a group of prytaneis to Hestia prytaneia without any reference to Mithridatic agency.\textsuperscript{501} Uniquely the inscription used no era of any sort, and instead resorted to eponymous offices for chronographic purposes, including the nomophlax, the \textit{epistates} of the \textit{boule}, as well as the \textit{grammateus}.\textsuperscript{502} Since Sinope was only annexed by

\textsuperscript{497} de Callataÿ 1997, 29.

\textsuperscript{498} de Callataÿ 1997, 8 (D 38), 10 (D 52), and 18 (D 56-7).

\textsuperscript{499} de Callataÿ 1997, 29-30.

\textsuperscript{500} Stern 2012, 248.


\textsuperscript{502} French 2004, 10 no. 7.
the Mithridatids in 183 BCE, we could perhaps assume that the absence of Mithridatid kings in this inscription was not a matter of noncompliance, but a dedication made before Sinope was annexed by the Mithridatids. We may, in light of two sources, venture to date this inscription to as early as the beginning of the Hellenistic period. The first is a Sinopean sacred law concerning the conditions for appointing the priest of Poseidon Helikonios.\textsuperscript{503} The priest mentions specifically the months of Taureon and Posideon – Milesian months that were still in use before Sinope’s transition to the first Macedonian calendar.\textsuperscript{504} The second is a literary source from Arrian’s \textit{Anabasis of Alexander}, in which we learn that the Sinopeans had sent an embassy to meet “their king” Darius III, but met Alexander.\textsuperscript{505} We can assume that Sinope was for some period of time under the influence of the Achaemenids, and came under that of Alexander by 330 BCE, the possible turning point when Sinope adopted a Macedonian calendar.\textsuperscript{506}

What we have now are some indications that the Mithridatid annexation in 183 BCE would have led to the introduction of a calendrical system in Sinope that was Seleucid, but with Mithridatic characteristics. The question is whether we could expect

\textsuperscript{503} French 2004, 10 no. 7 ll. 1-4 ἐπὶ τοῖσδε συνιστάναι τὸν ἱερέα | Ποσειδώνος Ἑλικωνίου· συν[σταθεῖς ἱεράσται] | μέχρι βίου λαμβάνοι . . . | μεμεριομένοι. On these conditions to appoint the priest of Poseidon Helikonios: the appointee will exercise his priesthood for life, taking . . . as allotted.


\textsuperscript{505} Robinson 1905, 247. \textit{Arr. Ana.} 3.24.4 τοὺς Σινωπέων δὲ ἀφῆκεν, ὅτι Σινωπεῖς οὔτε τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἑλλήνων μετέχον, ὑπὸ Πέρσαις τε τεταγμένοι οὐκ ἀπεικότα ποιοῦν ἐδόκουν παρὰ τὸν βασιλέα σφῶν πρεσβεύοντες. [But he released envoys from Sinope, since the Sinopeans were not part of the Greek league but subject to Persia, and he did not think they were acting unreasonably in sending an embassy to their own king. Trans. Brunt]

\textsuperscript{506} Robinson 1905, 248. Tacitus \textit{Hist.} 4.83 mentioned a certain king called Scyderothemis, who received embassy from Ptolemy I. Robinson points out that upon knowing Ptolemy’s request, the king called an assembly of the people, which eventually opposed the king’s plans. As such, it is possible that Scyderothemis was a tyrant and was subject to the decision of an \textit{ekklesia}.
the Mithridatid calendrical system to continue down into the imperial period to coincide with the Amastrian calendar. It is here, with the few references to earlier use of the Macedonian months in Sinope and Abonuteichos, that our trail of evidence ends, but the regionalising force of a standard calendrical system has already been put in place by the Mithridatids from the third to the second century BCE. Following the annexation of Amastris during the reign of Ariobarzanes between 265-255 BCE and the annexation of Sinope in 183 BCE, we expect that the majority of coastal Paphlagonia came under the influence of the Mithridatid calendar. The dominance of the Mithridatid calendar would remain unchanged until the Roman annexation of these territories in 70 BCE. The existence of provincial calendars in Bithynia, Asia and Lycia further suggests that the Romans sought to modify and not to repeal existing regional calendars based on the Julian calendar. In this regard, variants of the Mithridatid calendar used by the cities of coastal Paphlagonia could have continued, with possible modifications after the promulgation of the Julian calendar, such as a fixed 365-day structure for a year.

4.1.3 Regional Implications

The question is whether we expect the existence of a central agency making modifications that were regionally applicable. Again we note that the beginning of a calendar year was an important event, for it was the time when, as Aelius Aristides specified, the nomination for koinon offices would have taken place at the municipal level. The province of Asia is a key example in this regard. We know of Paullus Fabius Maximus’ order that the calendar of Asia begin on September 23rd, so that the universal
admiration of the emperor would be expressed more conveniently by those who honor
him, as custom in Asia already established that the beginning of the year was when
officials take office.507 The order was given directly to the Koinon of Asia, which
promulgated a clearly defined set of changes not only to the calendar of Asia, but also to
Asiatic chronographic practice. In the lengthy and prosaic text that lauded the virtues of
Maximus as well as Augustus, the official order of the Koinon appears midway:508

δι᾽ ὃ τύχη άγαθή καὶ ἐπὶ σωτηρίας δεδόχθαι τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς Άσίας Ἐλλησιν· ἀρχεῖν
τὴν νέαν νομίμαν πάσας[...] | ταῖς πόλεσιν τῇ πρὸ ἐννέα καλανδῶν Ὄκτωβρίουν,
ητίς ἐστίν γενέθλιος ήμέρα τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ· ὅπως δὲ ἄει ἄτροφον ἡμέρα στοιχή καθ’
ἐκάκιστην πόλιν, συνχρηματιζεὶν τῇ ῥωμαϊκῇ καὶ τὴν ἐλληνικὴν ήμέραν· ἀγαθόσσα δὲ
tὸν πρῶτον μὴν Καίσαρα καθα καὶ προεψήφισται ἀρχόμενον ἀπὸ πρὸ ἐννέα μὲν
καλανδῶν Ὄκτωβριων, γενεθλίου δὲ ἡμέρας | Καίσαρος...

Therefore, with the blessings of Good Fortune and for their own welfare, the
Greeks in Asia decreed that the New Year begin for all the cities on September 23,
which is the birthday of Augustus; and, to ensure that the dates coincide in every
city, all documents are to carry both the Roman and the Greek date, and the first
month shall, in accordance with the decree, be observed as the Month of Caesar,
beginning with 23 September, the birthday of Caesar…

This order is followed by very clear directions on the length of days each month
ought to have, followed by what month would have an extra day in leap years, and the

507 Laffi 1967, 20 ll. 19-26 ἡδεῖον δ´ ἀν ἀνθρώποι τὴν κοινὴν πᾶσιν ἡμέραν γενέθλιον ἀγάγοι[...] | ἐὰν
προσγένηται αὐτοῖς καὶ ἱδίᾳ τις τῇ τὴν ἀρχήν ἡδύνη, δοκεῖ μοι | πασῶν τὸν πολειτηῶν εἶναι μίαν καὶ τὴν
αὐτήν νέαν νομίμην | τὴν τοῦ θρονότου Καίσαρος γενέθλιον, ἐκείνη τε πάντας εἰς τὴν ἀρχήν ἐνβαίνειν,
ητίς ἐστίν πρὸ ἐνεία καλανδῶν Ὄκτωβριων, ὅπως καὶ περισσότερον τιμηθή προσλαβομένη ἐξεδοθὼν τινα
θρησκήν καὶ μᾶλλον πάσι γείνηται γνώριμος, ἢν οἴομαι καὶ πλείστην εὐχρηστίαν τῇ ἐπαρχῇ
παρέξεσθαι· ψήφισμα δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῆς Άσ(ίας) δεθησεὶ γραφήναι πᾶσας ἐπὶ[...]εὶλθης τὰς ἀρετὰς
ἀυτοῦ κτλ. | Whereas on the other hand it may be presumed that people will more readily celebrate as a
birthday a day that is already observed in common by all, especially if it offers them a measure of leisure
because it coincides with the local inaugural observance, it is my judgement that the one and the same
day observed by all the citizens as New Year’s Day be celebrated a the birthday of Most Divine Caesar, and on
that day, September 23, all elected officials shall assume office, with the prospect that through association
with observances connected with the existing celebration, the birthday observance might attract all the
more esteem and prove to be even more widely known and thereby confer no small benefit on the province.
Therefore it would behoove the Asian League to pass a resolution that puts into writing all his aretai etc.

fixed relationship between each new month (or new moon) and the calends of the Julian calendar. Stern has pointed out that the calendrical changes promulgated by the Koinon of Asia were actually different from what Paullus Fabius Maximus originally proposed. A fragmentary section of the Latin version of this edict also made clear that the proconsul wished the sequence of the last four months to follow that of 30-31-30-31 days, but in the Koinon version the last four months were 30-31-31-30 days. Clearly, the Koinon of Asia had some control over its own calendrical system, and was able to balance the political directives of the proconsul and the practicalities of its calendar. It is difficult to ascertain whether the Bithynian and Lycian assemblies had a similar degree of control over their own calendars. The Bithynian calendar closely followed the Asian model, while the Lycian calendar became coterminous with the Julian calendar. One could envision that the Bithynian and Lycian coherence to the Julian calendar was the result of forceful implementation of calendrical reforms at the behest of imperial authorities, or that the trend to adopt some form of the Julian calendar among communities in Asia Minor was so strong that the authorities of the two koina adopted the popular measure and reformed their calendars in accordance to the needs or desires of their constituents.

---

509 Il. 67-77 ἀρχήσονται οἱ μῆνες κατὰ τάδε· Καῖσαρ ἡμερῶν λα’, Ἀπελλαῖος ἡμερῶν λ’, | Αὐδναῖος ἡμερῶν λα’, Περίτιος ἡμερῶν λα’, Δύστρος η’, Ξανδικός λα’, || Άρτεσίος ἡμερῶν λ’, Δαίσιος λα’, Πάνημος λ’, Ἀθός λα’, Γορπιαῖος λα’, | Υπερβερεταῖος λ’· ὁμοί ἡμέραι τεξε’. ἔρ’ ἐτος δ’ ἐν τήν ἱντερκαλάριον | ὁ Ξανδικός ἀρχήσεται ἡμερῶν λβ’. ένα δ’ ἐπο τὸν στειρόταιραν οἱ | μῆνες καὶ αἱ | ἡμέραι, ὁ μὲν νῦν ἐν οἰκείος Περίτιος μὴν ἀρχήσεται μέχρι τῆς | ἱ’, τῇ δ’ πρὸ ἐννέα καλανδῶν Φεβρουαρίων | ἀξόμενον νομιμιάν μηνός || Δύστρος, καὶ καθ’ ἐκατόν μῆνα ἀρχή {i} ἔσται τής νομιμίας ἢ πρὸ ἐννέα | καλανδῶν. ἢ δ’ ἐνβόλιος ἡμέρα ἐσται πάντοτε τῶν ἱντερκαλαρίων καλανδῶν τοῦ Ξανδικοῦ μηνός, δύο | ἕτος μέσων γεινομένων. [The months shall be observed as follows. Caesar 31 days, Apellaios 30 days, Audnaiaoi 31 days, Perittios 31 days, Dystros 28 days, Xandikos 31 days, Artemios 30 days, Daisios 31 days, Panemos 30 days, Loos 31 days, Gorpiaios 31 days, Hyperberetaios 30 days, a total of 365 days; but in leap years Xandikos shall be observed as 32 days. And in oider that the months be observed through the fourteenth and we shall observe January 24 as the first day of Dystros, and each month thereafter the beginning of the new moon will fall on the ninth day before the kalends, and the intercalation shall always take place when Xandikos falls in a leap year, with two years always intervening. Trans. Danker]

510 Stern 2012, 276.
In this light we wonder why the Amastrian calendar seemed to show no indication of the impact of calendar reforms that had taken place during the early principate. One possibility is that the calendar of Bithynia was the standard for the double province of Pontus-Bithynia, assuming that the Bithynian koinon was the principal assembly of the double province in the first three centuries CE. Such a leading status implied in the titulatures of Nicaea and Nicomedia shows that the cities styled themselves “first in Bithynia and Pontus.”511 In addition to the leading role advertised by Nicaea and Nicomedia in their titulature during the second and third centuries CE, Vitale has pointed out that all the literary evidence involving repetundae cases were all concerning Bithynian delegations.512 In this case, either the coastal Paphlagonian cities were not represented at all, or the Bithynian delegation did represent coastal Paphlagonian cities, with the implication being that there was a cooperative or even hierarchical mechanism that allowed the Bithynian koinon to represent coastal Paphlagonian cities. Following this line of argument, the interpretation of the continuation of the local calendars in coastal Paphlagonia could be exempt from sweeping changes during the early Augustan period by simply pegging their calendars to the Bithynian, creating a rigid hierarchy of time on the local, provincial, and imperial levels. Yet, the complete disjunct between the Bithynian and the Amastrian calendars leaves any direct correlation between the two

511 The titulature of Nicomedia after the reign of Hadrian, TAM IV.1 34 ll. 1-3 ἡ μητρόπολις καὶ πρώτη Βειθυνίας Πόντου Ἀδριανή | νεοκόρος Νεικομήδεια, ἱερὰ καὶ ἁγιά, φίλη καὶ σύμμαχος | <Ἀνώ>θεν τὸ δήμω τῷ Ῥωμαίων; in 214 CE, TAM IV.1 25 ll. 3-10 ἡ μητρόπολις καὶ πρώτη | Βειθυνίας τε καὶ Πόντου | Ἀδριανὴ Σεουηριανὴ δίς | νεοκόρος Ν<ε<υ>κομήδεια | ἱερὰ καὶ ἁγιά, φίλη, ποιητὴς καὶ σύμμαχος ἄνωθεν τ<ω<ς> δήμω | τῷ Ῥωμαίων κτλ. The titulature of Nicaea, dated to 123 CE, IK Iznik 29 ll. 1-2 ἡ ἑυσεβεστάτη | [νεωκόρος τῶν Ἕλληνων] , αὖ ἐν Ὠρώνειον [καὶ Ἱππακληίου], [πρ]ο[τ]η[ς] Βιθυνίας καὶ Πόντου, ἡ μητρόπολις δὲ καὶ ταύτα τὰ κρίματα τῷ Αὔτο[κρ]α[τ]ῷ ἀριστοκράτους καὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς συνήγορος.

512 Vitale 2012, 196-197.
calendars speculative. The observable difference between the Bithynian calendar and the Amastrian calendar indicates that there was a range of time-reckoning practices in the double province.

To assert that the cities in coastal Paphlagonia were unfettered by the Bithynian calendrical system is not to say that they would have shared a “regional” calendar among themselves, as the little indication we have of any use of a calendar beyond evidence from Amastris offers little ground for such a claim. The diverse use of the local era at Amisus, Sinope and Amastris indicate that time reckoning in coastal Paphlagonia was far from homogenous. Nevertheless, it is a fact that from the Severan period onwards Abonuteichos and Sinope adopted the Lucullan era, which was long used at Amastris. It is not a coincidence that the Lucullan era became regional during a time when the epigraphic sources show Amastrians active in koinon affairs, and when the literary sources indicate that Amastris was both a hub for maritime travel and an immigration destination, as discussed in earlier chapters.

In closing this section, we again emphasise that the profuse application of “Macedonian” months in funerary and dedicatory inscriptions from Amastris can represent how the year was perceived among inhabitants in Amastrian territory. This local view of time appears to be unfettered by the Julian or the Bithynian calendrical systems, and implies a prominent presence of a central authority at Amastris that systematically broadcasted the days of the year. Such ability to inform its citizens of the authoritative definition of days in a year stands in contrast to Heraclea, Tium, Abonuteichos, Sinope and Amisus. The epigraphic record from these cities does not show habitual use of their
own local calendars. The absence of evidence could be interpreted as a mere matter of epigraphic custom, with some cities desirous to denote the time of commemoration or dedication, others less so. While attempts by different communities to maintain a time-reckoning system independent of others were likely the norm in northern and western Asia Minor, there were apparent difficulties: only the Amastrians were capable of maintaining a time-reckoning tradition of its own, and potentially influencing others. At the very least, the Amastrian calendar would have been consulted when the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus considered the scheduling of their agenda. It is even possible that the Amastrian calendar was itself the calendar of the Koinon. This suggestion is to be further examined in the second and third parts of this chapter, where the use of the Lucullan era in coastal Paphlagonia is discussed.

4.1.4 Summary

In the first part of this chapter, we examined the Macedonian and Mithridatid connections of the Amastrian calendar, as well as the regional implications that may have been attached to this enduring and stable calendrical system. The Macedonian connection of the Amastrian calendar is, as mentioned before, formal. Many calendars in the Greek East show this connection as part of the Hellenistic historical legacy, as the Macedonian month names continued to be in use in the imperial period. However, the calendars in the Greek East that used Macedonian month names had already gone through several phases of transformation, assimilating dominant calendrical systems such as the Babylonian and the Egyptian, and deviating from these following the disintegration of the Seleucid and
Ptolemaic empires. This variegated spectrum of “Macedonian” calendars then assimilated the Julian calendar, some becoming coterminous to this imperial calendrical system, while others established a fixed relationship with it. The Amastrian calendar seemed to have maintained only a loose relationship with the Julian calendar, if any. Its historical legacy comes from the Mithridatid calendar that may first have been based on the Seleucid model, but then deviated from it, with the most apparent deviation attested in the early first century BCE during the reign of Mithridates Eupator.

It so happens that Sinope and Abonuteichos were also influenced by the Mithridatid calendar upon their annexation, which means that, by the time the Romans annexed coastal Paphlagonia, we can envision a chronographical landscape that was likely Mithridatic. How enduring this Mithridatic chronographical landscape was during the early principate remains speculative. Yet, from the strong presence of the Amastrian calendar in Amastrian territory, we can posit that the coastal Paphlagonian cities were able to maintain a degree of autonomy over how their year was structured. Since they shared a common sense of the rhythm of a year, it is likely that the Amastrian calendar represents a concrete format that would have been consulted in matters such as when the member cities of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus ought to meet. There is even the possibility that the Amastrian calendar was the Koinon calendar, and this is a point to be discussed in the following parts of this chapter.
4.2 The Local and the Regional Eras of Coastal Paphlagonia

In the previous sections, we focused on how a year was structured at Amastris and coastal Paphlagonia. We discussed the possibility that a common structure for the year may have existed in coastal Paphlagonian cities, due to the Mithridatid legacies they all share. We now discuss how the years were counted among the cities in coastal Paphlagonia, from Heraclea to Amisus. From the outset, each coastal Paphlagonian city seemed to have used a distinct set of methods to count the years, such as eponymous offices or counting the years sequentially with the starting year fixed to specific historical events. We begin with Heraclea and Amisus, followed by Abonuteichos and Sinope. The time-reckoning used at Sinope is significant in particular, because the numismatic evidence indicates that this city changed the beginning of its era from 44 BCE to 70 BCE under the reign of Septimius Severus. The reason that scholars have given for this change at the beginning of the Sinopean era was that Septimius Severus had an anti-Caesarean position, known from literary sources, and Sinope chose to move away from its legacy as a colony founded by Caesar in order to adapt to the new regime. Yet the choice of 70 BCE is itself puzzling: why did Sinope choose to adopt this particular year? This question is to be discussed following a survey of the reckoning of the year in coastal Paphlagonian cities.

4.2.1 Heraclea Pontica

At Heraclea Pontica, private and public inscriptions do not systematically register the month and year, with only two chronographic examples in the present record. The
first is an inscription with imperial titulature, which does not concern us here.  

The second is a letter from the Hadrianic hymnodes based in Rome, sent to Heraclea to commend one of its citizens. On the reverse side of the stele there are inscribed seven lines of text, its letters about twice the size of the lengthy inscription on the front of the stele. The contents are essentially a notice that the statue was erected at a specified time.

This was erected during the consulship of Qu(intus) Fabius Catullinus and M(arcus) Fabius Aper, and when the basileion was Heracleides son of Heracleitus.

513] - - - - [ | δη]μαρκηνης ἐξουσίας τὸ κα’, ἵππατός τὸ γ’. | ] | Λ Οινήδιον Λεσπίον τὸν ἑξάδραν σὺν πα[ντὶ τῷ κοινῷ. According to Dörner, there are two candidates: Hadrian in 137 CE, Marcus Aurelius in 165 CE; Jonnes adds a third, Tiberius 18 to 20 CE. The link with another dedicatory inscription to Hadrian from Sebastapol ILS 2 8801 seems to support the identification as Hadrian.

514 Hirschfeld 1888, 881-883; Jonnes 1994, 6. The text of the inscription is preserved by Hirschfeld, the transcription itself was produced a Greek teacher at Heraclea Pontica in hast just before the inscribed stone along with others were smashed and walled in under the orders of the kaimakam. πᾶσαν ἐπίστασθαι χάριν ὁμολογούμενον Μαρκίω (ΣΣ)μενοράτῳ τῷ ὑπέρτῳ πολει[τι] καὶ διὰ τὴν τῶν ἦδου σημνότητα καὶ διὰ τὴν τοῦ βυζίου κοινώμοντα αὐξάνει μὲν καὶ γεραιρέ τὸ τῆς υμετέρας πόλεως ἀξίωμα, κομοεὶ δὲ τὸ ἱερὸν ἕμουν συνεδρίων όμοιόν τῇ κατὰ τὸ ἐγεχεν ἄρτη ἕς ἔστιν περιβόητο όλλα καὶ ἐπὶ τα κατὰ τὴν εὐωνιαν σκοιδῆ φιλοτείμοναι τοὺς ἐπάρμον ὦς καὶ τοὺς καθ’ ἑνα τὸν ή(μ)ετέρο Σονδίδο τὴν εὐεργετεῖν καὶ ἐν τοῖς τῷ κοινῷ ἀνήκουσι προθύμῳ ἀπαντα πράττειν ὦς καὶ ἢδι διὰ τῆς ἐκατοντο προνοίας οὗ κοινὰ αὐδέ τὰ τυχόντα κατορθοῦσαι ἦμεν ὐδὲν εὐεργετούμενοι τοσάττα μόνον οὐ||τος ἔλογσά(μ)θα δύνασθαι τὴν καταξίαν δὲν οὑς τῆς ἩΩΤΡΙΑΝ. Ο ὑ(μ)ειν οὐς | φιλοτέοις κέκρικεν αὐτὸ ὁμολογοῦντες (εἰ)δόνει μὲν χάριν αὐτοῖς, συνηδό(μενο) δὲ ἄρτη ὑπάτων πολεείτην, ἀνθ’ ὑπ᾽ ἡ | καὶ ἐδηον τῇ ἐρὴ ἤμον Ἁδριανη ΑΝΤ’ΕΙΠΕΡΙ | . . . ΣΤΙΚΗΟΥΕΙΚΗ μεγάλη νεοκόρο ἐπὶ Ραήμη (?) συνὸδον ψήφισμα ΣΤ. . . αὐτοῦ[ν] [αγα]λμα[tον] [ΠΑ εἰκόν[αν] . . . καὶ ΛΔΙΑΝΤ. . . . ἀναστάσες[. . . ?] . . . . we acknowledge that we are conscious of all gratitude to Marcius Xenocrates, your fellow citizen, both because of the dignity of his character and the decorum of his life. He increases and honors the reputation of your city; he embellishes our sacred association not only by the excellence in work that is well known but also by the earnestness of his thought, being enthusiastic so that he benefits our fellow travellers individually and does eagerly everything that relates to the common good. Through his foresight he has already been able to accomplish uncommon and extraordinary things for us. Wherefore, having received many benefits, only thus do we reckon it possible to render appropriate acknowledgement of this grace to you whom he has judged most dear to himself, sharing the pleasure that there has been a benefit to yourselves from such a citizen. Therefore, it pleased our sacred Hadrianic synod . . . responsible for the temple in Rome(?) to set up statue(s) and icon(s) of this man . . . (Trans. Jonnes, modified).]

515 Hirschfeld gave measurements for the letters of the obverse inscription as being 0.03 m, while reverse inscription measures 0.07 m.
What is unique is that there are two ways of reckoning the year in this notice. The first is the eponymous basileus at Heraclea, which was likely a continuation or revival of an archaic Megarian tradition.\textsuperscript{516} The second is the consular year, which yields the date 130 CE.\textsuperscript{517} We can be fairly certain that the short text here is not part of the main text.

The ending of the main text has ἀναστάσει: the stem ἀναστάσις- is more likely the future

\textsuperscript{516} Hanell 1934, 152-160. Megarian colonies include Chersonesos in the Crimea and Kallatis in West Pontus.

\textsuperscript{517} The consuls Quintus Fabius Catullinus and Marcus Flavius Aper were of the year 130 CE, and would agree with the main text that made reference to the sacred Hadrianic synod. Mordtmann made a suggestion based on CIG 349: Mordtmann 1889, 316. CIG 349 = BMI 49. Αγαθῆ Τύχη | ψηφίσμα τῆς ἁδριανῆς Ἀντωνεί[ν]ις | θυμελικῆς περιπολιστικῆς μεγάλης συνόδου | τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ὁμοιομενῆς περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον και | Λιοντκράτηρα Καίσαρα Τίτου Αλλίου Ἀδριανοῦ Ἀντ[ο[νεύν]ον Σ]ησιστὸν Εὐσεβῆ νέον Διόνυσον τεχνιῶν. The restored lines would be ἐκδόθη τῇ ἁδριανῇ Ἀντωνεί[ν]ις | περὶ[πολιστικῆς] [θυμελικῆς] μεγάλης νεοκόρου ἐπὶ Ρώμης συνὸδου ψηφίσμα[τι], namely “it was resolved by our sacred, traveling, Hadrianic, Antonine theatrical synod responsible for the temple in Rome,” though we note the missing reference to Dionysus in the reconstruction. Jonnes 1994, 6. There are, however, several problems with this restoration. The first is spacing. According to Hirschfeld’s preserved transcription, ΑΝΤ’EIIEPI is at the end of line 20, with no other space left for the restoration of Ἀντωνεί[ν]ις | περὶ[πολιστικῆς]. The many ligatures employed in this inscription suggests that the inscriber was consciously employing a wealth of knowledge on how to save space, and the wedge-like symbol or ligature could be the abbreviation mark, though it is more common for a wedge to be pointing towards the left (<). Yet, the more common method of space-saving – the horizontal stroke – does not appear to have been recorded in the facsimile produced by the Greek teacher Kartalidis, whose preservation of the text just before the stone was smashed and used as construction material was carried out in haste, and it is not out of the question that some of the abbreviating symbols were not included in the process. Hence Hirschfeld 1888, 881 Nr. 44 (this inscription) und 45 sind von Hrn. Basil. Kartalidis, Lehrer an der griechischen Schule in Herakleia abgeschrieben. Sie befanden sich auf Seiten eines Steines, welcher von einiger Zeit beim Bau des neuen Konaks ausgegraben und auf Befehl des Kaimakams von Eregli zerschlagen und eingemauert wurde mit mehreren anderen. Die Abschriften wurden in grosser Eile genommen. [No. 44 and 45 are recorded by Mr. Basil. Kartalidis, a teacher at the Greek school in Heraklea. They were on the underside of the stones that were dug up during the construction of the new Konak, and smashed and walled in with several others, ordered by the kayakam of Eregli. The transcriptions were made in great haste.] That said, it is somewhat out of the ordinary for the synod to abbreviate the emperor’s name in its official title. Secondly, if it was indeed an abbreviation for Antonine that was meant by ΑΝΤ’EI, it would create a chronological inconsistency with the inscription on the reverse, since the ascension of Antoninus Pius in 138 CE would be eight years later than the year of the two consuls referenced here, namely 130 CE. If arguing that the consular dating of 130 CE on the reverse side of the stone preceded the text on the front of the stone, one would have to ask what was set up that warranted the careful demarcation of both imperial and local time in the first place, and why such a monument in the Hadrianic period would be immediately recycled for a long document that exactly fit the size of the stone. The simple solution is then to reject the restoration of Antoninus after Hadrian. ΑΝΤ’EI would require further interpretation, but that is of no concern here. Cf. Burrell 2004, 258, McLean 2002, 56.
of ἀνίστημι than the aorist subjunctive.\textsuperscript{518} On the reverse of the stone, the first word is ἀνέστη: the temporal augment è makes it clear that the stem is aorist, and different from the future stem in the main text. We ought then to expect that the Heraclean authorities did not copy a date from the main text, but rather knew the alignment between the Heraclean eponymous office and the Roman consular year. This relationship marks how the reckoning the year differs distinctly from Bithynian and coastal Paphlagonian practices.

In Bithynia, for example, cities used the regnal year of an emperor, for example in IK Kios 16 ll. 1-4, we have an inscription beginning with a formula έτους αὐ’ ἐπὶ Αὐτοκράτορος Νέρου Τραϊανοῦ Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ | Δακικοῦ, or the 11th year of Trajan.\textsuperscript{519} Epigraphic record shows that the Bithynian cities had adopted such chronographic formulae consistently since as early as the reign of Nero.\textsuperscript{520} Some of the chronographic formulae even give precise Bithynian months and days, suggesting that there was indeed a uniform way of measuring and recording time, one which Heraclea

\textsuperscript{518} As in the example of an inscription from Ancyra, where the statue of Ulpius Aelius Pompeianus “will be set up in a conspicuous place of the metropolis,” [δεδόχθαι οὖν] ἡ̣μ-είν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ τετηρῆσαι μὲν | [τὰς τειμὰς τῷ τῷ] Αὐτοκράτορι καὶ τῷ Διονύσῳ διασε ἐν Αὐτοκράτορι καὶ τῷ Διονύσῳ διασε | τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῷ τῷ Αὐτοκράτορι καὶ τῷ Διονύσῳ διασε | τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῷ τῷ Αὐτοκράτορι καὶ τῷ Διονύσῳ διασε | τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῷ τῷ Αὐτοκράτορι καὶ τῷ Διονύσῳ διασε | τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῷ τῷ Αὐτοκράτορι καὶ τῷ Διονύσῳ διασε | τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῷ τῷ Αὐτοκράτορι καὶ τῷ Διονύσῳ διασε. (Translation mine)

\textsuperscript{519} IK Kios 16 ll. 1-4 ἔτους αὐ’ ἐπὶ Αὐτοκράτορος Νέρου Τραϊανοῦ Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ | Δακικοῦ, στρατηγοῦντον τῆς πόλεως | Σωσικλέους Δαψιλέως, Γ. Ἰουλίου Κιανοῦ.

\textsuperscript{520} IK Iznik 1161 ἔτους ἐνάτου | ἐπὶ Νέρωνος Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος | Σεβαστοῦ κτλ.
apparently did not share. Heraclea’s use of the consular year is therefore striking, for such a choice shows deference to the symbolic authority of the Roman Senate, while the Bithynian formula obscures it. The concordance between the Amastrian calendar and the Julian calendar mentioned earlier is another example. The chronographic formula includes the month and a local era that begins with 70 BCE, but with no reference to the consular year. That said, Amastris did invoke the Roman Senate in several inscriptions that have elaborate preambles, but these typically follow a reference to the Roman emperor, as well as the boule and demos of Amastris, and hence a balanced if not neutral exclamation of imperial, senatorial and local authorities that conformed to the expectations of all parties.

Given the symbolic nature of the Heraclean authorities’ choice, the use of the consular year may not have been part of customary Heraclean epigraphic practice, but rather a gesture to the reigning emperor. Hadrian’s deference to the Roman Senate was part of a series of maneuvers that he conducted to curate the symbolic eminence of the

---

521 IK Iznik 1202 ll. 1-5 ἔτους [. . .] Αὐτοκράτορος Νέρου Τραιανοῦ | Καίσαρος [Σ]εβα[στ]ιοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Δακικοῦ [μή]νας Ηρακλή | TAM IV 159 ll. 5-6 ἔτους γ’ Αὐτοκρατορὸς Καίσαρος Πρεσβῇ δ’. Klaudius polis 62 ll. 6-7 ἔτους Αὐτοκράτορος, ἔτους η’ Αὐτοκράτορος.

522 Marek Kat. Amastris 44 ll. 17-18.

523 Marek Kat. Amastris 10 ll. 2-10 ὑπὲρ τῆς Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Βασιλείας Τραιανοῦ Καίσαρος Πατρικοῦ [υἱοῦ], | Άντωνος Ιερομάνυ τῆς Τασίκιας Ῥουμίκης τῆς Καίσαρος Πατρικοῦ [υἱοῦ], Καίσαρος. This formula can also be found elsewhere in the Greek East, some examples including IK Iznik 12 and 31 in Nicaea, SEG 33:166 in Attica, EKM 68 in Macedonia, Taşlıkkoğlu II:67,1 in Thrace, among others.
Senate and senatorial members. Perhaps Heraclean authorities demonstrated such
deverence to the Roman Senate in this context. Hadrian's personal connection with
Heraclea may further have led Heraclean authorities to take up Hadrianic policies.
Hadrian may have visited Heraclea in 124 CE, and we know that the city’s civic
festival, the *Heracleia*, became *Heracleia Hadrianeia* at some time during Hadrian's
reign. When seen together, it is possible to regard Heraclea’s choice of the consular
year as an indication that Hadrian and his policies had a direct impact on Heraclea, which
on the one hand blessed the city with honors and attention, but on the other led to some
modifications to local practices, the most apparent being the choice to defer to the
symbolic authority of the Senate.

We proceed to another Heraclean chronographic practice. In chapter two we
discussed the significance of the inscription issued by the people of Heraclea to honor

524 The *Scriptores Historia Augustae* spent a section in Hadrian’s biography to describe Hadrian’s
choreographed participation and curation of the senatoral members as aimed to increase the dignity of the
Senate’s symbolic eminence, and he even denounced past emperors who did not show the same deference.
SHA Hadrian 12.6-10. senatui legitimo, cum in urbe uel iuxta urbem esset, semper interfuit. senatus
fastigium in tantum extulit, difficile faciens senatores ut, cum Attianum ex praefecto praetorii ornamentis
consularibus praedictum faceret senatorem, nihil se amplius habere quod in eum conferri posset ostenderit.
equites Romanos nec sine se de senatoribus nec secum iudicare permisit. erat enim tunc mos ut, cum
princeps causas agnosceret, et senatores et equites Romanos in consilium uocaret et sententiam ex omnium
deliberatione proferret. exsecratus est denique principes qui minus senatoribus detulissent. [He always
attended regular meetings of the senate if he was present in Rome or even in the neighborhood. In the
appointment of senators he showed the utmost caution and thereby greatly increased the dignity of the
senate, and when he removed Attianus from the post of prefect of the guard and created him a senator with
consular honors, he made it clear that he had no greater honor which he could bestow upon him. Nor did he
allow knights to try cases involving senators whether he was present at the trial or not. For at that time it
was customary for the emperor, when he tried cases, to call to his council both senators and knights and
give a verdict based on their joint decision. Finally, he denounced those emperors who had not shown this
deference to senators. Trans. Magie.] One aspect not mentioned in the *SHA* is that Hadrian’s appointment of
the *consulares ordinarii*, pointed out by Syme 1984, 44, maximises the numbers of *ordinarii* by only
serving as eponymate consul three times, and not allowing many iterations.


ἐν Ἡρακλείᾳ τῇ πρὸς[[z]] τῷ Πόντῳ Ἀδριάνειον Ἡ||ράκλειον ἱσάκτιον ἀνεύρων δύλιχον τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμ[έ][ρ]α
ὁπλον.
Iulia Aquilina of Amastris, a dual citizen of both cities (ἀνφοτερᾶν τῶν πολίων πολεῖτιν).

The prior focus had been on the extensive connections and influence that members of the Iulii had, extending from Amastris to Heraclea Pontica.527 We note here that the inscription ends with ἔτους ηξρ´, the 168th year, which has been taken as an Amastrian rather than an Heraclean era, and with good reason, since no inscription from Heraclea has been attested with an era. However, there is a problem concerning agency. The inscription in question begins with δάμος ὁ Ἡερακλεωτάν, a clear indication that this document is drafted in Doric and issued by Heraclean authorities. The inscription mentions a decision by Amastrian authorities as if they were a third party (ψαφισαμένας τᾶς πατρίδος Ἀμάστριος), further suggesting continuation of the Heraclean authorities as the same epigraphic persona. The problem becomes apparent at the end of the inscription: did the Heraclean authorities use a foreign era, or did someone insert an Amastrian era in an Heraclean document?

The problem is certainly one that requires more comparable inscriptions from both cities for any meaningful conclusion to be made, but at the present, it is perhaps helpful to look at the drawing of the inscription issued by the Heraclean damos and compare it with an Amastrian inscription that has the same level of issuing authority. The chronographic formula for the Heraclean damos inscription appears distinct in style, as

527 CIG III 1050 no. 4150b [ὁ] δάμος ὁ Ἡερακλεωτάν | ονόματι Αὐτοῖον <Θουλίαν Ακυλιναν> τῶν ἔτι[γγ]| ενή καὶ φίλον καὶ φιλότειμον ἀνφοτερὰν τῶν πολι||ων πολεῖτιν, πάσας ἀρετὰς | καὶ ὄν προδέει[ξ]ίον ἐλπίδών | ἔνεκα, ψαφισαμένας τᾶς πατρίδος Ἀμάστριος ἐν τῷ προγονικῷ ἑθάρῳ τεθήμεν αὐτάς | τῶν ἀνδριάντα, δὶ ἐπιμελείας | Τιβερίου Κλαύδιου Μηνίου | τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτᾶς, ἔτους | ἔτους μετὰ ἐνεξρ´. [The people of Heraclea (dedicate this) to Iulia Aquilina, benefactress, devoted wife, and honor loving citizen of the two cities, on account of her every virtue and the prospects she brought, with her patria Amastris having voted to set her statue in (her) ancestor’s theater; administered by her husband Tiberius Claudius Menius. Year 168. (Translation mine, modified from Jonnes 1984)]
ἐτους was inscribed as attached with the main text, while the Greek numerals ηξρ´ for the era 168 had two parallel lines bracketing it. This is not the case with the Amastrian demos inscription. The entirety of ἐτους βλρ´ was inscribed outside of the field prepared for the main text, as if added separately. There is no commentary that explains the use of the double strokes, and no other comparable use of the double stroke can be found from Heraclea or Amastris.

FIG. 24. ERA FORMATTING ON HERACLEAN VERSUS AMASTRIAN INSCRIPTIONS

There is a risk in identifying the double horizontal stroke as a feature of Heraclean chronography when this is the only example we have. Yet, the layout and usage of ligature in an official inscription ought to have been important indicators of the issuing authority’s aesthetic character. It is possible that the era from the Heraclean demos inscription was one that has yet been taken into account by Leschhorn, who included a brief discussion on one coin issued by Heraclea with the Greek numeral ΟΓ (73) on the
reverse field, along with the name of the proconsul Pasidienus Firmus.\footnote{Leschhorn 1993, 198-199.} Pasidienus Firmus is known from other coins in Nicaea and Nicomedia, and was certainly a governor under Claudius.\footnote{Leschhorn 1993, 198 fn. 6 for coins of this proconsul.} It has been assumed that the era in question was Actian, with the starting year or epoch being 30 BCE, which would derive a 42/3 CE date for the 73th year of the era, but the exact years of governorship for Pasidienus Firmus have led Leschhorn to consider other possible epochs, such as the freedom era used by Amisus with the epoch being 32/1 BCE.\footnote{Leschhorn 1993, 199-200.}

For our purposes, dating the Heraclean damos inscription in accordance with either the Actian or freedom eras would result in a significant downdating of the inscription from a Trajanic to an Antonine date, which is possible, as nothing within the text would make such downdating contradictory. Alternatively one could also continue to read the era of 168 as dated to 98 CE, but would then face a choice. Either the Amastrian authorities forced its era upon a Heraclean decree, because this inscription was to be published at Amastris; or the damos of Heraclea used the Amastrian era, which leads to further complications to be discussed in the following sections.

4.2.2 Amisus

Leschhorn provided a seriation of a corpus of Amisenian coins bearing 36 imperial portraiture associated with 49 era dates ranging from year 28 to year 594, and

\footnote{Leschhorn 1993, 199-200.}
found that the likely epoch was between Autumn of 32 to Autumn of 31 BCE.\footnote{Leschhorn 1993, 106-108. The coins issued during the short reign of Decius and his son Herennius Etruscus, named Caesar in 250 CE, provided the key range for the year 281 of Rec. Gen. 145b SNG Co 198, yielding a terminus post quem of 32 BCE for the epoch. The corpus of 36 portrait of emperors and their families seriation of coins account for similar information concerning the accession of emperors For the corpus, see Leschhorn 1993, 463-465. Leschhorn gave considerable thought to the accession dates of emperors to derive an exact date due to the potential overlap with the Actian era, with a start date at 31/30 BCE. Leschhorn 1993, 109-111 does point out some problems with third to sixth century CE evidence, but there is no such concern for inscriptions between first and third centuries CE.} This seriation helps to provide a fixed historical point for an inscription from Claros, set up by an Amisenian delegation, which is of particular significance for our discussion of the local reckoning of the year at Amisus. The inscription commemorated three \textit{theopropoi} – ambassadors sent officially to inquire of an oracle\footnote{OGIS 530 ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ. Ἀµισὸς ἔλευθερας καὶ αὐτοῦ/νοµὸς καὶ ὀµοσπόνδου Ἦρωµατος· ἐπὶ πρωτάνευς Ἀπὸλ./λονος τὸ ἕγ', ἱερατεύοντος Μ(άρκου) Ο(ὐ)λ(πίου) | Ἀρτεµιδόρου, θεσσ(ο)δούντος[] | Ἀσκληπιίδου τοῦ Δηµοφιλίου[] | τὸν ἀπ' Ἀρδοῦς Ἡρακλείδου | Πατροκλοῦς, προφητεύοντος] τοὺς Ἐρµίου Ἀττάλου, γραµµατέων Ἀττάλου β', Ἐρµογένους | Δαδέου, θεσπρόσο ἧλθον | Κρίσπος Τρύφωνος καὶ | Π(όπλιος) Πούπιος Καλλικλῆς. | οἵτινες μυηθέντες ἐνεβάτευσαν. | ἔτους ρέγ' τῆς ἕλευθερίας. [from autonomous Amisus civitas libera et foederata. During the 63rd prytany of Apollo, in the time of the priesthood of Marcus Ulpius Artemidorus, in the time of the divine singer Asklepiades son of Demophilus of the Heraclidae from Ardis Patrogenis, in the time of the prophet Hermes Attalus, when the clerks were Attalus II and Hermogenes Dadeus, Crispus Tryphonus and Poplius Pupius Callistus the \textit{theopropoi} were initiated and entered the abaton. In the 163th year of freedom. (Trans. Arnold, modified).} – for their initiation and the entry into the abaton at the sanctuary of Apollo at Claros, and concluded with a time stamp ἔτους ρέγ' τῆς ἔλευθερίας, “in the 163th year of freedom.”\footnote{Strab. 12.3.14 Λεύκολλος δὲ καὶ ταύτην ἐπολιόρκησεν, εἰθ᾿ ὄστερον Φαρνάκης, ἐκ Βουσπόρου διαβάς· ἔλευθεροθέσαν δ᾿ ὑπὸ Καίσαρος τοῦ Θεοῦ παρέδωκεν Ἀντώνιος βασιλεύσας· εἰθ᾿ ὁ τύραννος Στράτων, κακῶς αὐτὴν διέθηκεν· εἰθ᾿ ἠλευθερώθη πάλιν μετὰ τὰ Ακτιακὰ ὑπὸ Καίσαρος τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ, καὶ νῦν εὖ συνέστηκεν. Lucullus besieged it also, then Pharnakes, during his crossing from the Bosporus. Having been set free again by the deified Caesar, Antonius gave it to the client kings. Then the tyrant Strato done it harm. It was then again set free by Caesar Augustus after Actium, and now it is well managed.} The straightforward interpretation is that the era used here at Claros was the Amisenian “freedom era.” Strabo informs us that Amisus was given to the client kings after being set free by Caesar, then again was “set free” (ἡλευθερώθη) by Augustus from the tyrant Straton “following the battle of Actium.”\footnote{Wörrle 1990, 32.} This liberation may be connected
to an inscription from Pergamum, in which the demos of Amisus declared Augustus as *soter* and *ktistes*. The literary and epigraphic sources indicate that Amisus was likely refounded by Augustus as a *civitas libera et foederata*. The time when Amisus received such status can only be deduced from the era used at Amisus, and Leschhorn’s seriation produced an interesting epoch of 32/31 BCE. This epoch is different from the epoch of the Actian era, or 31/30 BCE, and also creates a sequence that is at odds with Strabo’s account. The discrepancy leads to different interpretations, which we do not venture into. We only note that the Amisenian freedom era was indeed separate from the Actium era used by many cities in the province of Asia, and the Amisenian delegation also made sure that the visitors at the famous sanctuary of Apollo at Claros would know of the political meaning behind the way Amisenians count their years.

---
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While the Claros inscription gives a clear example of the Amisenian freedom era by explicitly stating this political connotation, the reference to freedom is not found among inscriptions from Amisus. Inscriptions found at Amisus use a simple chronographic formula, with ἔτους or ἔτει followed by Greek numerals. It is logical to argue that all evidence found on an Amisenian inscription would have likely been the Amisenian freedom era, but this argument is only certain for coins with imperial portraiture. For the epigraphic record, inscriptions bearing the era do not contain specific reference to historical personage and events, and hence less secure than the numismatic evidence. Again, to assume that the era from Amisenian inscriptions would be the Amisenian freedom era would be logical. Yet, one inscription, mentioned in chapter three, has “in the year 241 when those serving as Pontarchs were the Marcus Iulius Iulianus and Sestullia Kyrilla his wife.” This correlation between the year and the Pontarchate as an eponymous official leads to an interesting question: could it be that the year 241 was a koinon era instead? The problem is we do not find the Pontarchate used as an eponymous official in coastal Paphlagonia. In fact, the two koinon documents discussed in chapter two did not use any chronographic formula at all. What we have then are a small scatter of evidence that does not overlap on the issue of chronographic practice. It would be convenient at the present to simply assume that all

---


541 SEG 37.1089 Πομπωνίων Θέρμης | Κορηνηλία | Ποστομήλη | ή γυνη| μνήμης χάριν | ἔτους ρέξ’; SEG 37.1090 Φίλωνης | Σερεβίλλανοι | ἀνδρὶ μνήμης χάριν ἐποιήσα ἔτους ἐποίησα | εκδ’; SEG 37.1091 Κασπεριανὸς | και | Ιουλία | Ζώη τῇ θυγατρὶ μνῆμης χάριν | ἔτους ρέβ’.

542 St. Pont. III 2 άγαθη τύχη, | τῷ σμα’ ἐπεὶ, πονταρχοῦντον | Μ. Ιουλίου Ιουλιανοῦ | και | Σερβιλίας | Κυρίλλης, | γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ, | φασιμὶ μονομάχον τὸν | περὶ Καλυδῶνα.

543 There is, however, one case in Dionysiopolis in IGBulg F 14 ll. 2-3 ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως καὶ πονταρχοῦ τῆς ἱδίας πατρίδος | Μ(άρκου) Λύρ(ηλίου) Ἀντιπάτρου Παπα κτλ.
eras from Amisus would be the Amisenian freedom era unless specifically noted otherwise, but simplifying the identification of all eras from Amisus would carry some risk.

To conclude, we know from numismatic seriation that the Amisenians used an era fixed to the epoch of 32/31 BCE, and we know from an Amisenian dedication at Claros that the political symbolism of this date was likely associated with the refounding of the city of Amisus as *civitas libera et foederata* by Augustus, and can be conveniently called the freedom era.\(^{544}\) The numismatic evidence indicates that the freedom era was used consistently for at least two centuries and more, and such enduring usage allows us to simply assume that all eras found in Amisenian sources would have been the freedom era. The enduring use of the freedom era is an important indication of the Amisenian sense of historical belonging and self-perception, placing Amisus on par with Sinope and Amastris, two other cities that boast the continuous use of an era to commemorate a historical event that defined their place after their annexation into the Roman imperium. Despite the apparent strength of the Amisenian freedom era in Amisus, there is one inscription found in Amisus that aligned the era with the Pontarchs of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus. This association of the era and eponymous koinon officials is interesting, since we do not know whether the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus used its own era or not. This gives us reason to take a more reserved stance towards the interpretation of all eras found at Amisus as being the freedom era. In the next section, we introduce a set of examples from Sinope that show this Roman colony adopted a separate

---

\(^{544}\) Leschhorn 1993, 429.
era commonly used by other cities in coastal Paphlagonia in the late second century CE, to demonstrate how a city could indeed have two eras.

4.2.3 Sinope

Sinope was a colony and it is expected that its citizens measured time in a fashion that reflected their colonial status. Two epigraphic examples demonstrate this Roman perception of time. Both inscriptions were dedicated by the authorities of the colony to emperors – the first to Antoninus Pius in 146/147 CE, the second to Marcus Aurelius and Commodus in 175/176 CE and 180/181 CE respectively. Both inscriptions use the imperial titulature meticulously, no doubt also aware of the chronographical value in doing so, in addition to demonstrating their Romanity. Interestingly, only two examples among the 92 imperial period inscriptions collated by David French show this practice. We can assume that imperial titulatory features were used in inscriptions dedicated by the authorities of the colony, but perhaps not with regularity.

Apart from imperial titulature, Sinope also used era to express time. Clear indication that Sinope used the era to reckon the year comes from numismatic evidence. Seriation of Sinopean coins made three centuries ago by Jean Foy-Vaillant already established that Sinope used two eras, the first to commemorate the Lucullan conquest

---

545 The colonial authorities honoring Antoninus Pius in *IK* Sinope 87: Imp · Caesari | divi Hadriani fil | divi Traiani Parthici | nep · divi Nervae pro | nep · T · Aelio Hadriano | Antonino Aug · pio | pontif · max · trib · potest · VIII | imp · II · cos · III · p(atri) · p(atriae) | C(olonia) · I(ulia) · F(elix Sinopensium); the same authorities honoring Marcus Aurelius [Imperator · Caesari · Divi · Pii · L · Aureli] | Veri · Parthici · maximi · fratri · Divi · Hadriani · nep · Divi · Tr(aiani · Parthici · p)]ron · Divi · Nervae · [abn[e]pp · m · trib · pot · XXX · imp · VIII · cos · [III · p] · p · || procos · [fet · L · Aurelio · Commodo · ]] Caesari German[i]c[O · Sarmatico · Colonia · Iulia · Felix · Sinopensium].
and subsequent liberation of the city, and the second to advertise the colonial status it received under Iulius Caesar. Recently, Leschhorn’s study with an expanded corpus of the data from the *Recueil général des monnaies grecques d’Asie mineure* provided new observations. Leschhorn confirms that Sinope did indeed issue coins with the colonial era that has the epoch beginning from 45 BCE, the time when the city received a colony under the arrangements of Caesar, as well as the Lucullan era with an epoch beginning from 70 BCE. The Lucullan era first appeared on coins issued during the reign of Septimius Severus between 194 CE to 198 CE (era years 264-268), followed by a brief revival of the colonial era from 209 CE to 219 CE (era years 252-262) during the reigns of Caracalla, Marcinus and Diadumenianus. From Severus Alexander onwards the Lucullan era returned, and would endure for another half-century, from 223 CE to 265 CE (era years 293-335), before the numismatic record discontinued.

Whether the Lucullan era was used at all during this time on other media is unknown, but the epigraphic record from Sinope does not show habitual chronography on

---


547 Strab. 12.3.11; Magie 1950, 414 no. 33 for survey of sources, including earliest use of C(olonia) I(ulia) F(elix) on coins in Rec. gén. 1 201f from Mark Antony onwards. The observation was first raised in Vaillant’s study of the Sinopean coins in the Pellerin collection, and subsequent numismatic studies provide further corroboration. Vaillant 1695, vol. 1 193 points to coin of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus as Caesar with era 204, and vol. 2 42 coin of Caracalla with era 252 for evidence of Colonial era 45/44 BCE; Vaillant vol. 2 149 coin of Gordianus III with era 308 for evidence of Lucullan era 71/70 BCE; Belley 1759, 458-460; Eckhel 1828, 391-394; Cavedoni 1847, 151; Rec. gén. vol 1 196-210. Marek 1985, 146.


549 Leschhorn 1993, 157-158. The key evidence is again a coin of Traianus Decius (249-251 CE), with the era year 319, yielding the possible range of 70-68 BCE for the epoch. There is a possible third era that Leschhorn’s study identified. The second series comprise of 10 coins that may or may not have the same epoch as the colonia era, since the evidence based on the coins of Macrinus (217-218 CE) and Diadumenianus (218 CE) is aligned with the year 261, yielding a 44/43 BCE range. Rec. gén. 144 for the year 261 during the very brief “reign” of Diadumenianus as Augustus from May to June of 218 CE, along with Rec. gén. 144b for the year 262 associated with Iulia Maesa (165-224 CE); new data includes SNG Aulock 6876 for the year 262 associated with Iulia Paula (219-220 CE).
both public and private inscriptions. Only two inscriptions may potentially have used a
certain unidentifiable era. The first inscription is a dedication by the \textit{demos} and \textit{boule} of
Sinope to the gymnasiarch, xystarch, and agonothete Caius Sestullius Maximus.\footnote{IK Sinope 101.} The
text, inscribed on a statue base shaped in the form of a round \textit{cippus} with mouldings at
top and bottom, contains a line on the upper moulding that may be a time-reckoning
formula, followed by the main text on the shaft. Though the line of text is obliterated due
to reworking of the upper moulding, French, relying on the reading from his squeeze,
compared the inscribed line with Bithynian inscriptions that opened with the regnal year
of Roman emperors, proposing that the remaining letters may be [ἐ]τοῦς ι´ or τ [.´].\footnote{Reinach 1916, 338 does not include the heading in his text. French 2004, 71-72 follows Hind 1964, 180
n. 40 no. 17; Lifshitz 1974, 100 no. 17.} Yet
the standard Bithynian formula is with ἔτους x ἐπὶ Αὐτοκράτορος γ.\footnote{See Appendix 3.} What French did
not point to is a group of funerary inscriptions from Nicomedia that open with the era, but
it is uncertain what era was meant.\footnote{See Appendix 4.}

The second case of a Sinopean inscription that may have used a certain era is the
victory list of the Sinopean boxer Marcus Iutius Marcianus Rufus discussed in the
previous chapter. The victory list has the numerical notation ρν´ or 150 immediately

\footnote{IK Sinope 101.}

\footnote{Reinach 1916, 338 does not include the heading in his text. French 2004, 71-72 follows Hind 1964, 180
n. 40 no. 17; Lifshitz 1974, 100 no. 17.}

\footnote{See Appendix 3.}

\footnote{See Appendix 4.}
following the list of victories that Rufus won,\textsuperscript{554} and it has been interpreted as the number of victories in total by Reinach.\textsuperscript{555} French produced a new reading based on autopsy, and made significant corrections to Reinach's text, resulting in a different tabulation, shown as follows.

Table 14. Sinopean Victory List count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Reinach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ῥώµην Καπιτώλεια γ’ κατά τὸ ἑξῆς</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νέαν πόλιν β’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ακτία β’ πρότος καὶ μόνος Σινωπέων</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νέμεια β’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ισθμία β’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πόλιμπα</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ολόμπια</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παναθήνεα πρότος Σινωπέων</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{554} French 2004, 76-77, no. 105 M. Εἰούτιος Μαρκιανός Ροῦφος παράδοξος | Σινωπεὺς πύκτης νεικήσας ἱεροὺς εἰσελαστικοὺς | ἀγῶνας Ῥώµην Καπιτώλεια γ’ κατά τὸ ἑξῆς Νέαν πόλιν β’ Ἀκτία β’ πρότος καὶ μόνος Σινωπέων Νέμεια β’ Ἰσθμία β’ | Πόλιμπα Ολόμπια Παναθήνεα πρότος Σινωπέων Αντιόχειαν γ’ πρότος καὶ μόνος τῶν ἀπὸ αἰῶνος αγενείων καὶ ἀνδρῶν ἡμέρα μᾶ ἀνδρῶν Πόλιμπα ἐν Ἀντιόχειᾳ Νεκρομυθόδειαν γ’ πρότος καὶ μόνος τῶν ἀπ’ αἰῶνος παίδων αγενείων ἀνδρῶν Κοινὰ Ασίας Σιμώναν Πέργαμον Ἐφέσον τῆς Ἑδεῖας Κοινὰ Ασίας | Σάρδις Φιλαδέλφειαν β’ Τράλλεις β’ Ιεράν | πόλιν β’ Λαδίκεαν β’ Θυάτειρα β’ Μυτλήνη β’ | Κοινὸν Πόντου β’ Κοινὸν Γαλατίας β’ Κοινὸν Εἰούτιος Μαρκιανὸς Ροῦφος, outstanding boxer of Sinope, who won victories in the sacred triumphal competitions: at Rome in the Capitoline, 3 times in succession – at Neapolis twice – at the Actian, twice, the first and only Sinopean (to do so) – at the Nemean, twice – at the Isthmian, twice – at the Pythian – at the Olympic – at the Panathenaic, the first and only Sinopean (to do so) – at Antiocheia (in Syria), 3 times, the first and only ever of the youth and men’s classes in one day, in the men’s class – in the Pythian Games at Antiocheia – at Nicomedia, 3 times, the first and only ever in the under-age, youth and men’s classes – at the Community of Asia Games at Smyrna, Pergamum and Ephesus – at the Aspis at Argos, twice – at the community of Asia Games at Sardis, twice, at Philadelphia, twice, at Tralles, twice, at Hierapolis, twice, at Laodiceia, twice, at Thyateira, twice, at Mytilene, twice – at the Community of Pontus Games, twice – at the Community of Galatia Games, twice – at the Community of Macedonia Games – at the Community of Bithynia Games at Nicaea, twice – at the Community of Cappadocia Games – and at other competitions in the half-talent class, 110 times. (In all) 150 victories. By decision of the Senate. (Trans. French)]

\textsuperscript{555} Reinach 1916, 358 si l’on conserve ensuit la leçon PN on pourrait y voir le nombre des victoires remportées par notre athlète dans ces jeux mineurs, 150 contre 50 victoires isélastiques (Rome 3, Naples 5, Actia 2, Némées? 2, Isthmiques 2, Pythiques 1, Olympiques 1, Panathénées 1, Antioche 4, Nicomédie 3, Commune Asie 15, Argos 2, autres Κοινὰ 7, Nicée 2 = total 50).
The tabulation shows that French and Reinach’s readings vary, leading to a difference in count of iselastic victories, as well as the total count of victories. For our current discussion, we focus on the differences in their interpretation of ΡΝ. Reinach sidestepped the issue of the Greek numerals ΡΝ by taking it to be “jeux mineurs,” but French confidently produced καὶ ἄλλους ἡ µιταλαντιαίους ρι´ for minor games, leaving...
PN open to interpretation. French translated the Greek numerals PN to be “(in all) 150 victories,”\footnote{French 2004, 77.} but this number does not reconcile with the 158 victories based on his reading. In light of the current discussion on the use of the era, we propose that it is possible for the number 150 to be the year of an era. We have a terminus post quem in lines 3-4, where we learn that Rufus won the *Capitolia* three times in succession. The *Capitolia* began in 86 CE, and as a quinquennial event, the third would be 94 CE. For a *terminus ante quem* we have no indication other than the fact that the *Panhellenia*, first held in 137 CE, is absent from the victory list of such an accomplished boxer. If adopting the colonial era for the year 150, the inscription could be dated to 105 CE, within the proposed chronological range for the victory list. Conversely, assuming an epoch of 70 BCE, the 150th year would be 80 CE, which falls outside of the acceptable chronological range. In short, we have a good basis to interpret the Greek numerals PN as the 15th year of the colonial era.

The dating of the Sinopean victory list – a tally of agones that were “Hellenic” events – adds to the impression that the colonial era was the only official reckoning of the year used at Sinope before the Severan period, because if the Lucullan era was really in use, a victory list documenting agones would have been the context in which to use it. This makes Sinope’s switch to the Lucullan era in the Severan period all the more curious. One possibility to be explored further in the third part of the chapter is that the Lucullan era had significance beyond the symbolism of freedom that a Roman colony was once awarded. The Lucullan era was recognised also by Abonuteichos and Amastris,
with the Amastrian tradition the most impressive of all. For Sinope to adopt an era that was already accepted by its peers in the same province suggests a powerful regionalising trend taking hold of coastal Paphlagonian cities. We may be looking at a process in which the Lucullan era becomes a regional era, similar to those found in provinces such as Macedonia and Asia.\footnote{Leschhorn 1993, 214-215. In Macedonia, we have the Actian era with its epoch beginning in 31/0 BCE and another era beginning in 148 BCE. Tod’s discussions of the Macedonian era in Tod 1915, 206-217, and Tod 1919, 54-67; Tod 1953, 382-397, remain seminal works. In particular, Tod point to two examples in 1915 209 as critical to come a precise determination of when the Macedonian era began. One inscription (Tod 1919 207 no. 2 has the formula \( \text{ἐτους } \) \( \text{ρο’} \) (76) \( \text{Σεβαστοῦ } \) \( τοῦ } \) \( \text{και } \) \( \text{βϙrq’} \) (192) is followed by the imperial titulature of Claudius, identifying the year as when the emperor received his fourth tribunicia potestas, and hence between 25th of January of 44 CE and 24th of January of 45 CE. This provides an important correlation: the epoch could not be 146 BCE, which was when the Macedonian province was established, for it would make the 192th Macedonian year 46 CE. One could further narrow down the precise year and month of the Macedonian era with an inscription of 141/2 CE (Tod 1919, 209 fn. 3) that equates the ides of March with the second of Xandikos, and sequencing would find that the beginning of the Macedonian year is October 15th. In Asia, an decree issued by katoikia Akokome is dated to the 21st year of the victory of the deified older Caesar imperator, and the fourth year of victory of the younger Caesar imperator. Leschhorn 1993, 425-426. At Apollonis, \( \text{TIM} \text{ V.2 1229 ll. 1-7 } \text{ἐτους } \) \( \text{εἰκοστοῦ } \) \( \text{καὶ } \) \( \text{πρώτου } \) \( τῆς } \) \( \text{Καίσα } \text{ρος } \text{τοῦ } \text{πρεσβυτέρου } \text{Αὐτοκράτορος } \text{θεοῦ } \text{νεικ } \text{ς, } \text{τετάρτου } \text{δὲ } \text{τῆς } | } \text{Καίσα } \text{ρος } \text{τοῦ } \text{πρεσβυτέρου } \text{Αὐτοκράτορος } \text{θεοῦ } \text{νεικ } \text{ς, } \text{τετάρτου } \text{δὲ } \text{τῆς } \text{Καίσα } \text{ρος } \text{τ[ού] } \text{νεωτέρου } \text{Αὐτοκράτορος[ς], } | | } \text{θεοῦ } \text{υἱοῦ, } \text{στεφανηφόρου } \text{δὲ } \text{kαι } \text{iερε } \text{υς } \text{τῆς } | \text{Ῥω } \text{µ } | \text{ης } \text{Ἀπολλωνίδου } \text{τοῦ } \text{Αἰσχρίωνος, } | \text{μηνὸς } | \text{Δωδεκά } | \text{τῃ. } \text{At Sardis, the 6th year of an unspecified era is associated with the High Priesthood of an unspecified imperial cult, ll. 1-2 } \text{ἐτους } \text{ζ’, } \text{ἐπ’ } \text{ἀρχιερέως } \text{Ἐρμογένους. } \text{Robert 1982, 366-367 provided three scenarios, including the Sullan era which would yield a date of 43/42 BCE, the Pharsalian era of 48/47 BCE, and the Actian era 31/30 BCE. Robert points out that the reference to the High Priesthood makes the Actian era more likely, as this office of the imperial cult appeared earliest in the aftermath of Actium. It is possible that the era in the province of Asia was the product of the establishment of the provincial imperial cult in Asia, and Leschhorn proposes that the \text{Koinon} \text{ of Asia may have been involved in the dissemination of the era. Leschhorn, 426.}}

We conclude our discussion of Sinope with brief mention on the use of the era for reckoning of the year in Abonuteichos, with a fuller discussion in part three. There are only two inscriptions from Abonuteichos that show the use of the era. The first is an inscription honoring Septimius Severus dedicated by the local magistrates serving under a certain Gallus son of Avitus, twice High Priest and twice chief magistrate, in the era...
year 274. The second, dedicated to Caracalla, is damaged, and has limited value.

The years of the era in the two inscriptions are aligned with specific emperors, but not to specific years during their reign. We are left with guesswork, and for the era year 274 to be associated with Septimius Severus, who reigned between 193-211 CE, the range of possible epochs falls between 81 BCE to 63 BCE. This range excludes the Actian era, the Amisenian freedom era of 32/1 BCE and the Sinopean colonial era of 45/4 BCE. We are left with the Lucullan era of 70 BCE, used primarily in Amastris but later in Sinope during the Severan period. It seems, then, possible that by the Severan period, the Lucullan era had become the common era recognised by most if not all cities in coastal Paphlagonia.

4.2.5 Summary

Our survey of coastal Paphlagonian time reckoning shows that cities reckoned their year individually. The individuality invested in the reckoning of the year was important, because the beginning of a year is the optimal time for commemorating a specific event that was communally significant. Heraclea’s use of the reckoning of its year was likely different from those of other coastal Paphlagonian cities, which used the eponymous basileus of the Milesian colonial tradition. Its reference to the Roman

558 Marek Kat. Abonuteichos 3 = Hirschfeld 1888 no. 39 [τὸν μέγιστον καὶ] | [θείατατον Αὐτοκράτορα] | Καίσαρα Λούκιον Σεπτίμιον | Σουηρῆνον Περτίνακα | Σεβαστὸν Εὐσεβῆ, Εὐτυχῆ | οἱ περὶ Γάλλον Ἀουείτου | δεὶς ἄρχιπερα καὶ τὸ β´ | πρῶτον ἄρχοντα ἄρχοντες ἀνέστησαν | ἐκ τῶν τῆς πόλεως | [χρημάτων ἐν τῷ | δοσ´ ἀ][τεί.

consular years in the reign of Hadrian also indicates that Heraclea was perhaps eager to portray itself as complying with Hadrian’s policies. These traits are not found in Amisus, Sinope, Abonuteichos or Amastris, which again marks the unique position of Heraclea among peer cities in coastal Paphlagonia. Among the other three cities surveyed, the era at Amisus is the most clearly defined, both due to the seriation as well as the specific reference to what the era signified in an inscription from Claros. At Sinope the seriation of coins offers similar clarity, except that the results of seriation indicate that the city used two eras, the first with an epoch beginning in 45 BCE, the second with an epoch beginning in 70 BCE. The seriation also shows that the second epoch began only from the Severan period onwards, and the rationale for switching from one era to another remains in dispute. As for Abonuteichos, only one inscription offers some indication of the epoch of the era, which is likely 70 BCE, likely associated with the annexation of coastal Paphlagonia under Lucullus.

This survey of evidence indicates that the Lucullan era was of considerable importance to coastal Paphlagonian cities only much later in the second century CE. It may be that this epoch garnered additional symbolism or significance in the first two centuries CE due to various factors, including its continuous use by a prominent city such as Amastris, or even the adoption of this era by the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus, elevating it to the status of standard time reckoning in coastal Paphlagonia. In part three, we examine the Amastrian evidence for the Lucullan era and its use of it as a regional time reckoning standard.
4.3 The Lucullan Era

We began by training our focus on the Lucullan era, and in part two we demonstrated that it eventually became the era for Sinope, Abonuteichos, and Amastris. The appearance of the Lucullan era in Sinope and Abonuteichos is two centuries later than the first attestation of this era at Amastris, and forms an intriguing sequence of development that calls for explanation. While Amastris may not have been directly responsible for the wider adoption of the Lucullan era in the second century CE, Amastris was a key contributor to the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus, and its continuous as well as the ubiquitous use of the Lucullan era. These two circumstances lead to the likelihood that there were strong correlations between Amastris and the dissemination of the Lucullan era. Before we take a closer look at the Lucullan era from Amastrian sources to assess these correlations, it is necessary to first discuss an earlier assumption made by scholars that Amastris used the Pompeian era that commemorated the epoch when Pompey reorganised the double province of Pontus-Bithynia. first by looking at the role the Amastrian era played in earlier interpretations of eras from other cities in coastal Paphlagonia. We then examine the full range of the Amastrian era attested in epigraphic and numismatic sources to demonstrate its longevity. We conclude by exploring the likelihood that the Lucullan era evolved to become a regional era in coastal Paphlagonia due to the role that Amastris may have played as a leading contributor in the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus.
4.3.1 The Pompeian Era

Here we take up some of the issues of scholarly interpretation of the Pompeian era to clear the way for discussion of the Amastrian era and its regionalising trajectory in the second century CE. We revisit the inscription from Abonuteichos, mentioned in part two.560

[τὸν μέγιστον καὶ] [θειότατον Αὐτοκράτορα] | Καίσαρα Λούκιον Σεπτίμιον | Σεουῆρον Περτίνακα | Σεβαστὸν Εὐσεβῆ, Εὐτυχῆ | οἱ περὶ Γάλλον Αουείτου | δίς ἄρχερεα καὶ τὸ βʹ | πρῶτον ἄρχοντα ἄρχοντες ἀνέστησαν | ἐκ τῶν τῆς πόλεως | χρημάτων ἐν τῷ | δοσʹ ἐτεὶ.

The magistrates attending to Gallus Avitus twice High Priest and twice chief archon set up (the statue in honoring) the greatest and most divine emperor Caesar Lucius Septimius Severus Pertinax Augustus Pius Felix, from the city’s funds, in the year 274.

The year of the era in the inscription was 274 (δοσʹ), and the reigning emperor was Septimius Severus. Hence, the epoch of the era in question, given the regnal years of Septimius Severus (193 to 211 CE), has a probable chronological range between 81 to 63 BCE. In the prior discussion, the era used in this inscription has been identified as the Lucullan era with an epoch of 70 BCE, and the year 274 would then be equivalent to 204 CE and within the reign of Septimius Severus. Yet the earliest interpretation of the era advanced by Mordtmann was not Lucullan, but rather Pompeian, beginning with 63 BCE.561 The basis for the existence of the Pompeian era is not discussed by Mordtmann, nor did he explain why this era from Abonuteichos must be Pompeian. Possibly,

560 Marek Kat. Abonuteichos 3 = Hirschfeld 1888 no. 39
Mordtmann assumed that the Pompeian era would have been a provincial era, adopted by communities that were included in the Pompeian reorganisation of the Mithridatic territories annexed in the late 70s and early 60s BCE. Yet, as the survey in part two shows, Sinope and Amisus never seemed to have adopted such an era. Furthermore, Mordtmann did not discuss the positions of Cavedoni and Franz, who posited that the Lucullan era was shared between Sinope and Amastris, “since both cities came under the control of Lucullus at the same time.”

The Abonuteichos inscription is produced in the reign of Septimius Severus, and hence would fall within the period of time when the Lucullan era was indeed shared between Amastris and Sinope. Abonuteichos, which lies between Amastris and Sinope, was a likely subject to the influences of both cities. It would be plausible to attribute the era used in this third century CE inscription as potentially affected by the Lucullan era as well.

While there is no evidence that supports the existence of the Pompeian era in coastal Paphlagonia, Mordtmann’s proposal gained further traction and influenced Gustav Hirschfeld, who attempted to argue that the Amastrian era was Pompeian. Hirschfeld’s argument focused on CIG 4152d from Amastris that contains a reference to the governorship of Lucius Lollianus Avitus and the era year of 229. Hirschfeld believed in Franz’ restoration of the preamble for CIG 4152d, as well as his own reading of the era.

---

562 In the entry of the CIG Franz expressed uncertainty as to what era was used for an Amastrian inscription (CIG III 4151), and Cavedoni 1847, 151, thinks the epoch in Amastris ought to be the based on the epoch of 70 BCE found at Sinope, bringing the dating of the Amastrian inscription to 190 CE. (parmi che l’era di Amastrì debba essere la stessa che quella di Sinope, ossia la Lucullea, che ha il suo principio nel 684 di Roma, poiché ambedue quelle città vennero in poter di Lucullo quasi ad un tempo.) This suggestion was rather quickly adopted by Franz in "CIG III Addenda et Corrigenda "CIG III 4151 116” 1113, where he presents new facsimile produced by Sidoux with a new era dating and attempted to use Cavedoni’s suggestion of the Lucullan era to assign a new date for the inscription.

563 Hirschfeld 1888, 875-876 no. 26.
Franz working with a very difficult facsimile produced by Sidoux, restored line 4 “... ἩΣΑΣ . ΝΤΩΙ . . ΣΕΤΕΙΕΠΙΟΝΠΕΡΗΤ . . .” restored as οἶκοι[δομήσος [ἐ]ν τῷ - - σ ἔτει ἐπὶ [τῷ]ν περὶ. In his attempt to make sense of what seems to be the Greek numerals of an era ([(ἐ]ν τῷ - - σ ἔτει), Franz made a bold assumption, reading the iota in ΝΤΩΙ as the vertical stroke of an eta, instead of the iota subscript for the dative τῷ, and restored lambda to form the Greek numeral ΗΛΣ (238). This reading produces a date of 169 CE following the Lucullan era, and further allows the restoration of τέκνων to become a reference to the co-emperorship of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus.\

Hirschfeld was intrigued by Franz’s solution to τέκνων, but he was able to perform an autopsy, and saw the Greek numerals of the era as ΘΚΣ or 229, making it impossible for the year to fall within the co-emperorship of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus with an epoch of 70 BCE. Hirschfeld proposed that a Pompeian era with an epoch of 64 BCE would reconcile both Franz’s restoration and his reading, and dated the inscription 165 CE.

The problem with Hirschfeld’s choice of a Pompeian as opposed to the Lucullan era is his assumption that Franz’s solution to τέκνων was correct. Christian

---

564 CIG 4152d: “Dixeris vs. 4. quum Iota quod vocatur mutum exulet vs. 6, ductu I post TΩ pro altero crure litterae H accepto, designatum fuisset annum ΗΔΣ, 238, qui annus respondet anno u.c. 922. Chr. 169. siquidem verisimile est Imperatores, quorum nomina in lacuna interierunt, esse M. Aurelium et L. Verum.”


566 Hirschfeld further cited Lucian’s Alexander 56f where Avitus was mentioned as the governor of the double province of Pontus Bithynia during the reign of Marcus Aurelius as further support. See fn. 564.
Marek pointed out that τεκνῶν αὐτῶν should not be interpreted as the “children of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus,” because Lucius Verus was not known to have any children, and the plural would have been carefully avoided.\(^{567}\) Also, the Pompeian era would not be applicable to all era-dated Amastrian inscriptions. One example, first published by Kalinka, has the year 277 aligned with Septimius Severus, Iulia Domna, and Caracalla as Augustus and Geta as Caesar.\(^{568}\) The year 277 of the Pompeian era would be 213 CE, an unlikely date, because it would take place after Septimius Severus’s death 212 CE,\(^ {569}\) and Geta would already have been elevated to Augustus, which took place in 209 CE.\(^ {570}\) The year 277 would have to take place before Geta’s elevation to Augustus in 209 CE. The year 277 in the Lucullan era would be 207 CE, within the chronological limits observable in the inscription.

Marek’s proposal for a Lucullan era is further supported by Leschhorn’s seriation of datable numismatic and epigraphic evidence, which runs from the first year of the era down to 321.\(^ {571}\) Marek therefore argued that, unlike the proposal first advanced by Franz and later Hirschfeld, the province of Pontus-Bithynia was made into an imperial province as early as 159 CE under the reign of Antoninus Pius. The governor Lollianus Avitus

\(^{567}\) Marek 1985, 147.


\(^{570}\) Geta’s elevation is in 209 CE. PIR S 325. SHA Sept. Sev. 16.3.4. Cf. Levick 2007, 48 no. 87.

\(^{571}\) Leschhorn 1993, 479-481.
would have a tenure that extended from the reign of Antoninus Pius to the early years of Marcus Aurelius, given the reference in Lucian. Leschhorn further pointed out that, as a matter of fact, no evidence from Bithynia and Pontus indicates that the Pompeian era actually existed, for the studies that cite the Pompeian era for Pontus-Bithynia are all derived from Hirschfeld’s interpretation. Accordingly, the year 274 on the Abonuteichos inscription dedicated to Septimius Severus is more likely Lucullan than Pompeian, and hence ought to be dated to 204 CE instead of 211 CE.

In short, this section reiterates Leschhorn’s observation that the Pompeian era was not part of the chronographic tradition among communities in Pontus-Bithynia. This section also identified the problems with the positions taken by Mordtmann and Hirschheld with regard to their interpretations of the eras from Abonuteichos and Amastris. As we have established a firm basis for interpreting the Lucullan era as the standard of time reckoning in Sinope, Abonuteichos and Amastris, we move to examine the tradition of the Lucullan era at Amastris in the following section.

4.3.2 The Lucullan Era at Amastris

The use of the Lucullan era at Amastris is best viewed via Leschhorn’s seriation, which can be summarised into two phases. The first consists of only numismatic examples, with the Lucullan era of years ranging from 1 (A or 71/0 BCE) to 43 (ΓΜ or

---

572 Luc. Alex. 56.
573 Leschhorn 1993, 418-419.
29/8 BCE) found on legends of Amastrian coin issues.\textsuperscript{575} The use of the era falls off from the numismatic record altogether from the Augustan period onwards. It is intriguing to consider that the latest numismatic issue dated to the year 43 or 29/28 BCE coincides with the year when the Hellenes in Bithynia and Asia petitioned for permission to establish precincts for the imperial cult in their respective provinces,\textsuperscript{576} and precedes 27 BCE when the Augustan reform settled the status of Pontus-Bithynia as a praetorian province.\textsuperscript{577} We note that subsequent Amastrian bronze issues no longer bear the era, and the imperial portraiture becomes the only chronological markers identifiable on Amastrian coins.

The second phase consists only of epigraphic examples, with the first attested year of the era being the 121st year or 51 CE, from a monument dedicated both to the emperor Claudius and an unspecified \textit{demos} by an \textit{agoranomos} called Dionysios son of Dionysios.\textsuperscript{578} The era is here used in conjunction with the eponymous office of grammateus, which is not attested in other Amastrian inscriptions. Another epomynous

\textsuperscript{575} Leschhorn 1993, 479. All of the coins have Tyche with a mural crown on the obverse, and \textit{ΑΜΑΣΤΡΕΩΣ} on the reverse, with various designs. These coins with era dates never have the legend of the propraetor Gaius Papirius Carbo on the reverse, which itself formed a separate series that could be dated by the Carbo’s successful legal assault on Marcus Aurelius Cotta and subsequent control of Pontus-Bithynia between 61 and 59 BCE, as well as by the Nicomedian coins that have both Carbo’s name as well as the Bithynian regnal years from 222 to 224 or the so-called “proconsular era,” which epoch was 282/281 BCE. Leschhorn 1993, 191-197 for the survey of sources, including coin series of Papirius Carbo between 62-59 BCE and Vibius Pansa of 47/6 BCE. Güney 2015, 34-35, introducing recent discussions on the precise epoch of the Bithynian regnal year as well as the governorship of Papirius Carbo.


\textsuperscript{577} Strab. 17.25. ἀλλ᾽ ἐν ἀρχαῖς γε διεθήκε ποιήσας υπατικάς μὲν δίοι ... δέκα δὲ στρατηγικάς ... δεκάτην δὲ Βιθυνίαν μετὰ τῆς προποντίδος καὶ τοῦ Πόντου τινὸν μερών.

\textsuperscript{578} Κατ Αμαστρις 2 αὐτοκράτορι Τιβερίῳ | Κλαυδίῳ Καίσαρι Σεβαστῷ | Γερμανικῷ καὶ τοῦ | δήμωι Διονύσιῳ | Διονύσιῳ, φύσει δὲ Ἀπφοῦ, ἀγορανόμος ἐν τού ἀκρ᾽ ἐτεὶ, γραμματεύοντος Θεοφίλου τοῦ Θεοφίλου. [To the emperor Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus and to the demos, Dionysius son of Dionysius and adopted son of Apphus, the agoranomos in the year 121, when the grammateus was Theophilus son of Theophilus.]
office associated with the era is what may have been the chief magistrate πρῶτος ἄρχων.

In CIG 4152d mentioned in the previous section, we have a certain individual who

“served as ephebarch in the year 229 (159 CE) when the magistrates were led by P[...]

as chief magistrate” (ἐφηβαρ] [χ]ήσας ἐν τῶι θυσί έτει ἐπὶ τῶν περὶ Π[— — — — — πρῶτον] | ἄρχωντα ἄρχωντον). The eponymous chief magistracy appears also in similar honorific context on inscriptions set up during the reigns of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius,

in the formula ἐν τῷ X ἐτεί ἐπὶ τῶν περὶ Y ἄρχωντον, with two inscriptions. The first is a dedication made in the year 201 (131 CE) when the emperor was Hadrian, and when the magistrates were led by Lucius Aelius Aelianus (ἐν τῷ άστερ | ἐτεί ἐπὶ τῶν περὶ Λ. Αἰλιον | Αἰλιανὸν ἄρχωντον). The second inscription is a dedication made in the year 217 (147 CE) when the emperor was Antoninus Pius, and when the magistrates were led by Caelicianus Theon (ἐν τῷ ζιστε | ἐτεί τῶν περὶ Καιλικιανὸν Θέωνα ἄρχωντον). The reference to the chief magistrate seems to continue in the third century CE, when the ephebarch Longidianus Rufus furnished a monument in the year 277 (207 CE) while Geta was not yet Augustus, and one would expect a reference to the person who was in a leading position, though we note that the formulaic ἐπὶ τῶν περὶ ἄρχωντον is now

579 Marek, Kat. Amastris 11 ll. 5-7.

580 Marek 1993, 161 no. 10 ἁγαθῆ τύχη, | ὑπὲρ τῆς Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρίως θεοῦ Τριανού Παρθικοῦ νιωθ. | θεοῦ Νέρου ιωθ. Τριανοῦ | Αἰλιανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ἡγεμονιας τε καὶ αἰωνίου διαμονῆς | καὶ νεικίς καὶ τεράς συνκλή | του καὶ δήμου Ρωμαίον καὶ | θιλιστήν καὶ δήμου του Λαμπρικανόν Γαίως ἡλιοφόντος | ἐφηβαρχήσας ἐπὶ τό άστερ | ἐτεί τῶν περὶ Λ. Αἰλιον | Αἰλιανὸν ἄρχωντον τόν σάρτουν σῶν τῷ βιομό ἐκ τῶν | ἱδίων κατασκευάσας ἀνέθηκεν ἐνγράψας καὶ τοὺς | ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐφήβους.


changed. \((\tau\bar{o} \varsigma \acute{o} \tilde{\varepsilon} \tau[\varepsilon]) | [\ldots]\)\(\nu\nu\) Βίον Διονυσίου\).

All of the inscriptions cited here have a clear reference to the reigning emperors and principal figures in the imperial family, which are important in terms of contextualising the era. Yet, the most important information is \(CIG\) 4152d, for it can be precisely dated to 159 CE based on multiple reference points, and its use of the same chronographic formula found in the other inscriptions cited here help define the Amastrian era used in the epigraphic context as Lucullan.

It is in this respect that we can fully accept Leschhorn’s seriation, which includes a total of 33 examples spanning from year 1 to year 321 or 70 BCE to 251 CE, and across two different media, the numismatic and the epigraphic. In comparison, the Lucullan era in Sinope is attested only in a series of coins spanning from the year 264 to the year 335, or 194 to 265 CE. The Lucullan era is therefore comparatively better established at Amastris than at Sinope, and it is possible to assume that Sinope’s adoption of the Lucullan era was the result of Amastrian influence. This assumption is weak, because we do not know of any direct influence that Amastris had on Sinope, but the coincidence is nevertheless impossible to ignore.

We can approach a thesis on the regional influence of Amastris from the contours generated by numismatic, epigraphic, and literary sources. In terms of numismatic evidence, there is a series of metropolitan coins issued by Amastris during the reign of

583 Marek 1993, 163 no. 18 [ὑπὲρ τῆς Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Λ. Σεπτίμιου Σεβάστου [Περτίνακος] | [Σεβαστού Αραβικού] Αδιαβρικού Παρθικού μεγίστου και Αὐτοκράτορος | [Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου Αντωνίου Αὐτοκράτορος Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος καὶ Ιουλίας Δομινίας Σεβαστῆς μητρὸς κάστρον καὶ τοῦ σύμπαντος οίκον | [αὐτῶν σωτηρίας καὶ αἰωνίου διακήρυξε | [αὐτῶν Σεβαστοῦ Παρθικοῦ επηρεασμένων τῷ ζωσ’ ἐτεί][[— — — — — —]νον Διονυσίου τῇ πατρίδι τόν δήμον κατασκεύασας σὺ[ν τῷ βομφῷ(?) — — —].
Trajan that point to both the city’s advertisement of its leading status, as well as the actual ability of the city to issue coins. In terms of epigraphic evidence, there are several High Priesthoods of Pontus and Pontarchs who originate from Amastris and its territory. The two types of evidence have been discussed in previous chapters, and we would refrain from elaborating further. There is also archaeological evidence yet to be mentioned, which requires a brief discussion here.

Amastris is the site of an impressive building in opus latericium, now called the Bedesten, which is located in the sacred district of Roman Amastris. A 19th-century travelogue mentioned the remains of a marble temple to the in the proximity of the Bedesten, and recently an intriguing discovery of a group of statues in 1993 near the Bedesten during construction work further highlighted the potential that this sacred region also was the site of a temple for the imperial cult. The findsite of the statues is

Hoffmann 1989, 206-207. The remains of this opus latericium building reveal a 120 m by 40 m floor plan, with the wide East-West façade facing northwards preserving the walls that articulate a grand central hall of 22.6 m wide and 17 deep, with 6 rooms of various size symmetrically flanking it. The exterior façade is decorated by triads of pierced indentures that have a rectangular space flanked by half-round niches, and the interior of the façade is also ornately decorated with opus reticulatum. Hoffmann, who was the first to publish measurements and a floor plan for the Bedesten, suggested that it may have been inspired by the Italian portico designs, though there may have been other architectural inspirations. Aydin et al. 2015 230-231 suggests that it was likely “a horreum on the arterial road leading south,” though this analysis seem to stand at odds with the more elaborate decorations such as opus reticulata still visible today, and Hoffmann’s suggestion of a market building or basilica remains the better assessment due to full consideration of the decorative aspect of the building.

Robert 1980, 151-163 discusses an inscription found in 1963 that makes reference to the plétharchi of the holy quarters, associated with the Bedesten area. SEG 30.1449 “left of the panel three wreaths, within these the inscription ἱεροςκειμον; τὸ ἀµφοδον. At the right three wreaths; in the first no text; in the first no text; in the other two the following inscriptions: ἱεραµφοθεία | τῶν; πλατε/άρχαι.” ἀµφοδον denotes a quarter of a city, ἰσραµοοδεῖγαι the dwellers of the quarter of the sacred, denoting a quarter dedicated to the main deity or deities of Amastris.

Boré 1840, 235: “À l’entrée du vallon, deux monuments frappèrent nos regards. Le premier était un temple en marbre blanc, dont le temps et la main des hommes n’ont point effacé les derniers festons, qu’y avait prodigués la sculpture. L’autre, beaucoup plus vaste, étendait sur deux lignes parallèles ses murs de briques, que le ciment romain a rendus indestructibles.”

Ateşoğlu & Şimşek 1995; Aydin et al. 2015.
approximately 50 meters east of the Bedesten, and this findsite is also the location where a bath house may have been situated.\footnote{Ateşoğlu & Şimşek 1995, 101 plan 1; Aydin et al. 2015, 230. Aydin et al. noted that the statues were found adjacent to a wall of what may have been a bath house, though the wall was not preserved, nor were its contours further explored, and the relationship between the statues and the wall was not clearly described nor defined. Aydin et al. 2015, 231-232.} The statues include an over-life-size cuirassed emperor of the Hierapytna type sculpted in the half-round,\footnote{Aydin et al. 2015, 224-225. The cuirass decoration of the Amastrian example is studied by Karanastasi 2012-2013, 333-334 who observed that the style and iconographic features are “provincial and simplified” if not also poorly composed and asymmetrical, and ought to be understood as a “local” product. Aydin et al. 2015, 226 notes that there is also the possibility that the statue depicted other emperors as well.} and an over-life-size statue in the round of a woman wearing a chiton, himation and stola, likely of early imperial date.\footnote{Aydin et al. 2015, 223-233. The statues were found “densely packed in a small trench,” arranged next to each other “in careful placement,” and all of them headless. Aydin et al. 2015, 233. Aydin et al. 2015, 233-234 notes that, apart from possible decapitation, there are no additional signs of reuse or mutilation on the statues, which makes it possible that their abandonment was due to disuse of the building that housed them.} Aydin et al. identified the statue as potentially depicting Hadrian, and made an intriguing connection between the statue with Amastrian inscriptions and literary accounts that could have been related to a concerted effort by Amastrians to honor Hadrian with statues, altars, and agonistic games.\footnote{Marek 1993, 95-96 invokes Lucian On the Dance 79 to argue that there was a form of social competition involving a Bacchian dance that elites from the cities in Pontus including Amastris participated in regularly. Marek further associates two inscriptions to this Bacchian dance, both concerning a performance called the satyron, the first is Kat. Amastris no. 44, involving a trained athlete competing in the satyron and died in Pergamon, while another, Marek Kat. Amastris no. 10, is an ephebic dedication of an altar with satyr statue in the reign of Hadrian.} Hopefully, the speculative nature of the archaeological evidence mentioned here would be soon clarified with planned excavations of Amasra announced in 2017. At present, we take a more conservative approach, and assume that the over-life-size cuirassed statue of an emperor was likely associated with a building of the imperial cult in the sacred quarter of Amastris, potentially part of a Kaisersaal of the imperial cult situated within a large public building...
complex that may have also included the Bedesten. The scale of public infrastructure at Amastris was therefore significant, and would have the potential to serve as the venue for the gathering of the delegates of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus in the second and third centuries CE.

Lucian’s description of the accessibility of Amastris is also necessary to take into account. To Lucian, a well-travelled second-century sophist, Amastris was a port-of-call to where he moved his family, and where Scythians would naturally stop on their way to

---

592 Aydn et al. 2015, 231-233 discusses the presence of a wall and terracotta pipes found with the statuary, though these features have not been preserved by the excavators due to their focus on the statues instead of the archaeological context. The association of the statues with the wall and the terracotta pipes would in turn suggest that the statues were housed within a kaisarsaal or imperial hall filled with imperial emblems and statuary – which is a common feature at gymnasium-bath complexes. See also Yegül 1982, 11-31 on the connection between halls filled with imperial imagery and the imperial cult, with particular focus on the Middle Gymnasium at Pergamum (12) for the dedication to Augustus and Livia as theoi sebastoi and new gods alongside Hermes and Herakles (IGR IV 1908). This is a clear indication for the kaisersaal as “a religious place,” in which contains “permanent provisions for the observance of altar ceremony and related cult ritual to be conducted predominantly at a popular and private level” (30-31).
Athens. This matter-of-fact description seems to imply that Amastris was a transportation hub in the second century CE. Further support of the significance of Amastris in the transition from the second to the third century CE is found in milestone records. We learn that in 198 CE, Quintus Tinius Sacerdos the legatus Augusti pro praetore restored public roads from Tium and from Amastris respectively.\textsuperscript{593} The restoration of the Tium-Amastris road coincided with the efforts by Lucius Petronius Verus in restoring the public roads in the vicinity of Pompeiopolis, attested in a milestone set up in the same year.\textsuperscript{594} We posit that there was a conscious effort led by the Severan governors and procurators to re-establish and to improve the connections between coastal and interior territories of coastal Paphlagonian cities. The completion of these would result in the improvement of land accessibility for imperial and senatorial agents, as well as military activities between coastal and inner Paphlagonia at the beginning of the third century CE. The maintenance work on the public roads may simply be a matter of necessity, considering that the previous maintenance was carried out under Antoninus Pius in the Tium region,\textsuperscript{595} but the attention of the Severan period governors in this region suggests that Amastris and Tium had become important nodes in the north Anatolian road network by the late second century CE. Such focus on the accessibility of Amastris with its neighboring cities further suggest that Amastris held a privileged position from the point of view of the imperial administrators of the second and third century CE. Possibly, Amastris’ role in the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus was a major factor that transformed it from a city isolated from its

\textsuperscript{593} French 2013, 32-34.

\textsuperscript{594} French 2013, 81-82.

\textsuperscript{595} French 2013, 31-32.
own interior territory by mountainous terrain into a regional hub that connected coastal and inner Paphlagonia with the Pontic region.

\[\text{FIG. 25 ROAD NETWORK IN PONTUS-BITHYNIA}\]

\[\text{French 2013, p. 19-20}\]

4.3.3 Summary

In sum, we find a range of sources, numismatic, epigraphic, and literary, that overlap in the second and third centuries CE and point to Amastris as an increasingly popular destination and venue for the celebration of the imperial cult. Perhaps the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus offered Amastris a key platform to accelerate and amplify its influence over other cities in coastal Paphlagonia, with the result that Sinope and Abonuteichos adopted the Lucullan era by the Severan period.
4.4 Conclusion

This chapter has examined the reckoning of the month and the reckoning of the year in coastal Paphlagonia, and identified the Amastrian system of time reckoning as having the greatest potential to bear regional significance. The Amastrian reckoning of the month is likely a continuation of the Mithridatic calendrical system, which in turn was a branch of the Seleucid calendar assimilated with the Babylonian 19-year intercalary cycle. Various indications suggest that the Amastrian calendrical system continued to be lunar, with reference points such as the beginning of the year fixed to the autumnal or spring equinoctial points, and the beginning of each month based on the observance of lunar phases. However, there may have been some influence from the Julian calendar, such as the adoption of the 365 day year, in accordance with the normal practice across Anatolia. This would have allowed the Amastrian calendar greater predictability than its lunar precedent. Coastal Paphlagonian cities likely all used some variation of the Mithridatid calendrical system, which leads to the possibility that the Amastrian calendar, with its enduring tradition and frequent use in everyday life, may have become an important standard for the coastal Paphlagonian cities to take into account, and it must have had significant impact on the operational schedules of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus due to the city’s significant contributions in filling the offices of the Koinon.

This chapter has also examined the possibility that the Lucullan era became a regional standard for the reckoning of the year in the second century CE. Coastal
Paphlagonian cities indeed used various ways of reckoning the year. Some commemorated particular historical events that gave the city a special status, such as the “freedom” era of Amisus, and Sinope’s colonial era. Heraclea, on the other hand, seemed to have maintained a Miletian tradition of reckoning the year by the eponymous basileus. Heraclea also stands out as having used the consular year, a practice not attested in coastal Paphlagonian cities, and this suggests that it nurtured its relationship with the Roman imperial center with particular care. The most striking aspect of the coastal Paphlagonian practice of reckoning the year comes from Sinope. This city used the colonial era for two centuries, but switched to a reckoning system in the Severan period that had the same epoch as Amastris. This phenomenon may not have been peculiar only to Sinope, as Abonuteichos seems to have used the Lucullan era in the reign of Septimius Severus, leading to the possibility that the two cities adopted an era always used by Amastris, because they were influenced by it.

There are reasons to believe that Amastris did play an important part in disseminating its system of reckoning. Amastris was prosperous in the second century CE, with archaeological, epigraphical and literary sources pointing to its significant contributions to the imperial cult, to the liturgies of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus, and to its importance as a port-of-call that served as an interface between the Pontic region and the Mediterranean. Its ardent participation in the Koinon assembly would have offered them an important platform for setting standards and orientating schedules to their benefit. With this in mind, we ought to view time reckoning as both an indication of
Amastris’ influence over its peers, as well as furnishing the tools of power for them to take further advantage of the Koinon’s venue.
Appendix 3: Formulaic Patterns of Regnal Years

1. Era as header:

Kios:
IK Kios 16 έτους αι’ ἐπὶ Αὐτοκράτορος Νέρουα Τραϊάνου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ | Δακικοῦ κτλ.
IK Kios 1035 έτους γ’ | Αντωνείνου | Καίσαρος κτλ.

Nicaea:
IK Iznik 1161 έτους ἐνάτου | ἐπὶ Νέρωνος Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος | Σεβαστοῦ κτλ.
IK Iznik 1206 έτους εἰ’ ἐπὶ | Αὐτοκράτορος | Τραϊανοῦ Αὐριανοῦ | Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ κτλ.

Nicomedia:
TAM IV,1 15 έτους δι’ [Δ]α[m][ε]τιανοῦ | Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμα]νικοῦ κτλ.
TAM IV,1 16 [ἀγαθή] τύχη. έτους ζ’ | [Αὐτοκράτορος Τ]ραϊανοῦ Αὐριανοῦ Καίσαρος | [Σεβαστοῦ κτλ.
TAM IV,1 17 II. 7, 12, 17-19 έτους δι’ Αὐριανοῦ Καίσαρος . . . έτους ζ’ Τραϊανοῦ Αὐριανοῦ Καίσαρος . . . έτους | [Α]ὐτοκράτορος ε’ Καίσαρος Μ. Αὐρηλίου Κομμάδου Αντω[νείνου] [ν]ου κτλ.
TAM IV,1 18 έτους η’ Αὐτοκράτορος Τραϊανοῦ | Αὐριανοῦ Καίσαρος ο[ς] [Σεβαστοῦ] κτλ.
TAM IV,1 49 έτους β’ Τ(ι)ου Αίλιου | Αντωνεινοῦ Καίσαρος.
TAM IV,1 50 έτους β’ Τ(ι)ου Αίλιου | Αὐριανοῦ Αντωνεινοῦ Καίσαρος.
TAM IV,1 63 έτους η’ [Ἀν]τωνεινοῦ [ν] Καίσαρος | κτλ.
TAM IV,1 87 έτους . . Καίσαρος Αὐριανοῦ κτλ.
TAM IV,1 98 [έτους . . Τραϊανοῦ Αὐριανοῦ] [Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ] ημήνος Πρε[ιετείου — —] κτλ.

2. Era preceded by ἀγαθὴ τύχη:


Nicaea:
IK Iznik 1207 ἀγαθὴ τύχη | έτους γι’ ἐπὶ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος | Αντωνεινοῦ κτλ.
IK Iznik 1209 ἀγαθὴ τύχη | έτους η’ τῶν Αὐτοκράτορος | Σεβαστοῦ | | [Α]ὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος κτλ.
IK Iznik 1129 ἀγαθὴ τύχη | έτους εἰ’ | Τραϊανοῦ Αὐριανοῦ Καίσαρος | Σεβαστοῦ κτλ. ἀγαθὴ τύχη.

Nicomedia:
TAM IV,1 23 ἀγαθὴ τύχη | έτους ἐνάτου | Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Παρθικοῦ [νι]οῦ, | Θεοῦ Νέρουα Παρθικοῦ [νι]οῦ, | [Γεν.] Παρθικοῦ Παρθικοῦ Καίσαρος κτλ.
TAM IV,1 67 ἀγαθὴ τύχη | έτους η’ | Αὐτοκράτορος | Καίσαρος κτλ.
TAM IV,1 78 ἀγαθὴ τύχη | έτους η’ | Αὐτοκράτορος | Καίσαρος κτλ.
TAM IV,1 82 ἀγαθὴ τύχη | έτους θ’ | Αὐτοκράτορος | Καίσαρος κτλ.
3. Era placed at the end of dedicatory text:

Nicæa:
IK Iznik 1130 Τίτος Φλάβιος Κασιανὸς | Διὶ συνγενικῷ εὐχήν | ἔτους ηὐ.

Nicomedia:
TAM IV,1 26 ll. 6-7 [ἐτ]οὺς θ’ Σεούηρου καὶ | Ἀντωνείνου Σεβαστόν κτλ.
TAM IV,1 35 [ἐτοὺς ἑ.] Ἀντωνείνου Καίσαρος | [μηνὸς] Πρειετ[είου — — —]
TAM IV,1 59 ἐτοὺς γ’ Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος Πρειετῆν δ’.
TAM IV,1 60 ἐτοὺς δευτέρου | Νέρουα Τραϊανοῦ Κέσαρος κτλ.
TAM IV,1 79 ll. 6-7 ἐτοὺς θ’ Σεούηρου καὶ | Ἀντωνίνου Σεβαστόν.

Kalchedon:
IK Kalchedon 103 ll. 6-7 ἐτοὺς θ’ Σεούηρου καὶ | Ἀντωνίνου Σεβαστ[ῶ]ν.

Claudiopolis:
IK Klaudiopolis 62 ll. 6-7 ζ’ Δύ(στρου), ἐτοὺς η’ Ἀ[ντο]νων Καίσαρος.
SEG 36:1155 ll. 10-12 ἐτοὺς i’ Ἀντωνείνου Καίσαρος.

4. Era in-text:

IK Iznik 1127 Διὶ Σαουαζίῳ | καὶ δῆμῳ Συλλαντηνῶν | ἐτοὺς γ’ Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ.
Appendix 4: Unknown Era from Nicaea

IK Iznik 1306 ἔτους γι’· Χρήστη | Ἰπποκράτου Μάρκικο τῷ ἐαυτῆς | συμβίοι κὲ Ἡπιό|τη τῷ νιὸς ζήσαντί ἐτη κα’ κὲ Μαρκία [θν]’ γατρὶ ἡμοσιμένη [ξε] | ἐτὸν ι’ κὲ ἐαυτῇ | μνήμης χάριν.

IK Iznik 1354 ἔτους γι’· Φλαουιάνὸς Διοφάνους ζήσας ἔτη κα’· χαῖρε. || Διοφάνης Ἀρ|χελάου ζῆ|σας ἐτη οα’ | ἐτους ζ’· Τίτ θα, Παπίου γν||[νὴ ζήσαση ἐτη — — —].

IK Iznik 1440 ἔτους η’· | K<λ>ῳδίος Μάξιμο[ξ] | φύτευσαν ζήσας | ἔτη οε’ | χαῖρε.

IK Iznik 1441 ἔτους β’ | Μ. Κ(λαύδιος) Ἀγρίπ|[πα]ζ καὶ Δι(λιοζ) | [Ἀσ][χελισμὸδοτ][ος] || [Ἀρ]’στειδιανὸ | [Νικο]μιδεῖ τῷ ἐαυτ[ῶν] | [πατρὶ μν]’μης ἔνεκεν.

IK Iznik 1465 ἔτους η’· | Π. Δι(λιοζ) | Ἐρμίας Ἐρμιόνη τῇ ἐαυτοῦ | γλυκυτάτη γυναικι ζήσαση | ἐτη κε’, | καὶ Καλλιόπη | θυγατρὶ ζησάση | ἐτη θ’, | καὶ Ἐρμαδίω νέῳ ζήσαντι | ἐτη θ’ | ἀνέστησεν | καὶ ἐαυτῷ ζόν | καὶ φρονόν | χαῖρε.

IK Iznik 1470 ἔτους κυ’· | Μάρκος Γα’ον | ζήσας ἐτη μζ’.
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5. CONCLUSION

As we conclude our discussion of the sources that we have assembled for the purpose of clarifying several aspects of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon and its relationship with constituent cities and elites, we acknowledge that the scarcity of information necessarily leaves many questions unanswered. There are also multiple gaps that remain with regard to the organisation, administration, and the full spectrum of activities and functions that the koinon would have been able to perform. Yet, the results that surface from the analyses conducted in the four chapters of this dissertation provide a view that exceeds the existing knowledge of both the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus as well as coastal Paphlagonian regionalism from Lucullus’ annexation to the third century CE.

Unlike what Christian Marek had proposed, the double province of Pontus et Bithynia likely were not the earliest commonalties that go back to the Republican period. Instead, the Bithynian and the coastal Paphlagonian cities likely underwent a prolonged process of koinon formation due to varying degrees of urban development as well as differing historical legacies in centralisation and autonomy. The most critical aspect of koinon formation for the coastal Paphlagonian cities was the *lex Pompeia*. This “provincial law” promulgated by Pompey provided the basic foundations for the forming of a sense of the “eparchic” identity in coastal Paphlagonia that bridged the different kingdoms and city-states. The promulgation of this law was likely aimed at integrating the broad interior of the Olgassys Mountains populated with semi-autonomous tribes and
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clans, but we know from Strabo’s account of Paphlagonia that the integration was still in its early stages when the geographer was writing in the early Julio-Claudian period. The sense of “eparchic” belonging may have been ritualistically rehearsed through the demands of the worship and celebration of the imperial cult. The High Priesthood of Divus Augustus may have managed or controlled the cult of Divus Augustus, and by the time of Claudius the imperial cult expanded under the tenure of the equestrian procurator Gaius Iulius Aquila of Amastris. We find it plausible that Aquila might have been highly influential in the Pontic region, with his successful suppression of the Mithridatic uprising of 47 CE the defining contribution of his imperial career. Locally, Aquila might have been instrumental in creating or aggrandising a syncretistic imperial cult of Augustus that is apparent in the investment of a monumental sculptural programme on the outskirts of Amastris. The assimilation of Augustus, Helios and Theos Hypsistos coincided with the deities that would have appeared in the oaths of loyalty regularly recited by the communities of coastal Paphlagonia. We attribute the formation of this syncretistic imperial cult to the first basic framework of an eparchic system of imperial cult worship that formed the kernel of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon later known as the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus.

The epigraphic evidence of the name and offices of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus offers us a limited but incisive view of this koinon regarding two aspects: the koinon’s interest in its leadership’s standing in a local ephebic institution, and the koinon’s concerns regarding the election of its leading officials. Our assessment of these two points leads to several observations regarding the source of the koinon’s
effectiveness. First of all, while the effectiveness of the koinon was dependent upon the participation of the elites of coastal Paphlagonia in both financing worship and festivities of the imperial cult and in managing the honoring and election of their peers for the continuation of the koinon’s capacity to carry out these tasks, these aspects only form part of the dynamics in koinon-city and koinon-elite relations. A koinon whose organisational legitimacy was commonly recognised and legally sanctioned would become a necessary institution for the expression of loyalty. It would also become the authoritative elite assembly that ensures their expressions of loyalty were properly executed. The koinon leadership must be filled as a matter of necessity, because failure to do so would lead to financial and organisational crisis, and in turn create uncertainty in their expression of loyalty and communication with the imperial establishment. The authority of the koinon and its impact on local communities must be measured accordingly.

In this regard the koinon’s attentiveness to the standing of Titus Iulius Aquila as protos aristeus among the Amastrian neoi ought not simply to be understood as a matter of honor but of power. The koinon could have only honored Aquila for his contributions to the koinon in general, without referencing the Amastrian neoi. The koinon went further, however, and defined how Aquila must be perceived among the Amastrian neoi. One may interpret the koinon’s ability to honor as a mechanism of control that was different from administrative control.

Administrative control implies a clear chain of command and execution that would yield at the minimum a set of expected results. There is no clear indication that the Roman imperial authorities delegated or divested such powers to the coastal
Paphlagonian koinon to control local institutions. However, the koinon may have been able to use the mechanism of honor to achieve comparable results to a direct command and control structure. This mechanism would presumably rely upon other factors, for example, Aquila’s individual and familial prestige and influence on the Amastrian elite to generate expected returns. With the various factors taken under consideration, the elites of coastal Paphlagonia publically recognised the High Priest of Pontus as the leading figure in the Amastrian neoi, for which role he would likely have received public deference, and might have also held actual influence over the Amastrian neoi. Similarly, it was decided by the elites of coastal Paphlagonia that Aurelius Alexander, son of Timotheus, was to volunteer as High Priest of Pontus. As a High Priest Aurelius Alexander would likely attain the same deference and influence over his peers and koinon affairs like Titus Iulius Aquila, but his potential unwillingness may have been a matter of considerable tension between him and the koinon assembly. The friction may have been the reason for the honorific inscription that was carelessly produced with juxtaposed dialects and a peculiar reference to his voluntarity, or lack thereof. Unlike Aelius Aristides, who successfully warded off all attempts to make him perform public service, Aurelius Alexander may have been unsuccessful in his maneuvers, and his peers in the koinon assembly scored a victory in forcing him to comply and contribute in accordance to his social standing and wealth. This ability of the koinon to draw from the ranks of leading citizens to serve despite their willingness to do so is a significant mark of political power that need to be factored in the dynamics between the koinon and its member cities. Aurelius Alexander’s example also indicates that any suggestion that
Heraclea Pontica was “Italic” because it received a colony, and therefore “not subject to the same provision as the provincials,”\textsuperscript{597} would have to be confined by the fact that the coastal Paphlagonian koinon was influential enough to subject one of the leading members of Heraclea to its system of public service.

As for the concentration of epigraphic evidence concerning koinon officeholders from Amastris, this group of inscriptions provides a lateral view of the spatial and social distribution of participating elites in the territory of a city. Simply put, the koinon’s accepted authority prompted wide participation and contribution to koinon affairs, and was an important source of integrative pressure that prompted Amastrian elites based in different parts of the municipal territory to interact and select their peers. Longstanding families with imperial and military ties based along the coast were found to have recognised clans in the interior and families who were more intellectually orientated. Therefore, the impact of the koinon on the elite dynamics of the individual cities must have been wide-ranging, because the koinon was not any organisation: being exclusive and competitive, it was the assembly which only the most prominent members of a city could attend and have a say.

In terms of the impact of the koinon’s vitality, the attestation of koinon officials in most cities of the eparchia of Pontus indicates that spectacles were widely held among constituent cities in the second and third centuries CE, and not concentrated only in the metropolis. Of agonistic festivals there is close to no precise information at all, but Fourcade’s report of an agonistic festival in Sinope, along with the overlap of Pliny’s

\textsuperscript{597} Marek 2016, 415.
mention of the bequest of Iulius Largus and the inscription of Titus Iulius Aquila seem to point to an itinerant rotation rather than a fixed location for agonistic festivities of the koinon. The Koinon of the Cities in Pontus might have had an egalitarian structure with each of its urban areas enjoying close to equal shares of responsibilities and privileges. Conversely, the cities of coastal Paphlagonia were competitively striving to become the metropolis due to the advantages that come with this status, such as being the center of the koinon imperial cult and the primary venue for all festivities and spectacles, which would entail a right to command the resources of coastal Paphlagonia. We await for excavations and new epigraphic discoveries to clarify these points. Yet, given the fact that gladiatorial spectacles of the koinon were held in a variety of places, it is likely that Marek is right to propose that the coastal Paphlagonian koinon’s assembly and festivities took place at different sites in the province, even if there were claims from cities for the status of capital.  

We notice also that the methods which the koinon used to present festivities and spectacles might have been a combination of monetary inducement and ephebic support. Young men from Amastris and Heraclea Pontica, skilled in martial arts as part of their ephebic training, might take an interest in participating in martial combat that can generally be described as gladiation, which differs somewhat from competitive martial arts combat, though we also discussed indications that the dividing line had blurred by the second century CE. In this regard the festivities hosted by the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus were important outlets and venues for young citizens trained in their municipal  
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ephelia to exert themselves in events that might not be found among the programmes of the prestigious periodoi of mainland Greece and Italy. We do not know whether the aggregate effects of such a system of martial combat training might have affected the quality or quantity of the auxiliary forces of the Roman army, but the combination of ephebia, koinon and martial arts categories in agonistic events of at least Heraclea Pontica, Amastris and perhaps Sinope seem more than physical exercise for recreational purposes. At least, it is necessary to consider the koinon as an organisation that promoted competitive programmes that were tailored to the ephebic curriculum, and not simply providing a venue for regional competition in the Olympic categories.

Finally we considered the koinon’s role in the definition of the sense of time in coastal Paphlagonia. Coastal Paphlagonian cities used various ways of reckoning the year for commemorative purposes, and while we know less about how each of the cities reckoned the months of a year, the natural assumption would be that there was as much difference as the reckoning of the year. However, from the examples of Bithynia and Asia, which both had provincial calendars, it is counterintuitive to assume that a koinon could function with little or no standard system of time reckoning for synchronising purposes. Our discussion finds that Amastrian time reckoning of both the month and the year represent the primary candidate for such a standard system of time reckoning. There are two main indications. The first is Sinope’s shift away from its own colonial era and in preference for the Lucullan era. The second is the longstanding and common usage of the Amastrian reckoning of the year and the month. The hypothesis is that the Macedonian-Mithridatic calendar was widely adopted by coastal Paphlagonian cities in the Hellenistic
period and continued down to the Roman period, and this system of the reckoning of the month was the basis for the different reckonings of the year in the individual cities. However, the maintenance and curation of the lunar-based Macedonian-Mithridatic calendar required specialised knowledge, and the longstanding and common usage of the Macedonian-Mithridatic calendar in the territory of Amastris might have been a more stable and therefore reliable system, to the effect that other cities relied on it. Reliance on the Amastrian time reckoning system may ultimately have led to Sinope’s decision to switch entirely to the Amastrian reckoning system, and other coastal Paphlagonian cities might have been affected as well. To be precise, it may not have been that Sinope and other cities adopted an “Amastrian” reckoning system, but rather a commonly recognised system of account. Considering the stable participation of Amastrian elites in the coastal Paphlagonian koinon, it may be that the assembly of elites became satisfied with the stability and utility of the Lucullan era and the Amastrian variant of the Macedonian-Mithridatic calendar, to the point that this combination of time reckoning became the established norm by the late second and early third centuries CE.

In conclusion, the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus in coastal Paphlagonia can be understood as a dynamic architecture defined within the “eparchic” parameters of the Augustan settlement in administrative and juridical terms. The mandatory process that forced the periodic selection of municipal peers to attain koinon leadership status not only created a socially distinct category of “koinon” elite, but also elevated the koinon to extraordinary status based on consensus in the eparchia. The koinon in turn became a respected and even potentially useful political instrument for dictating honors and social
standing, which could both prolong or accelerate individual and familial prominence at the eparchic or provincial level. Such mechanism of status generation was in essence a feedback loop: elites would have had the tendency to contribute more to the koinon to sustain the value of the honor that they attained from it, while the koinon became further aggrandised through continuous or even enhanced elite participation in koinon activities. The result was the continuous increase of the koinon’s importance among the elites of coastal Paphlagonia as they accessed the koinon’s architecture through political participation and financial investment. In extension, the social customs and norms of certain cities would more naturally become accepted by others due to the prominent representation of their elites as well as the stability of the customs and norms themselves. We posit that, as the koinon became inextricably embedded in the socio-political calculus of the elites in coastal Paphlagonia, the koinon organisation became more influential in its ability to affect or even dictate the social and political standing of constituent cities and elites. The local impact of the coastal Paphlagonian koinon was then the normalisation and standardisation of municipal and elite interaction across the mountainous terrain that separated pockets and valleys of semi-isolated communities.

In closing, we return to the introduction,\textsuperscript{599} where we mentioned that there had been continuous debate regarding how influential the koina of the eastern provinces were and to whom. Various points that have been cited as an indication of the koinon’s specific functional importance include border dispute arbitration, assisting the Roman governor in establishing a common calendar, and collection of customs tax. Deininger and Edelmann-

\textsuperscript{599} See Introduction, section B.
Singer further proposed that the koina had broader impact through the representation of its constituency’s juridical interests and its informational value as an exchange network. Only a few aspects of the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus directly overlapped with those already known in koinon scholarship. Yet, the peculiar reach of the koinon into the Amastrian neoi, the admission of the volunteer High Priest in Heraclea Pontica, the potential connection between koinon festivities and ephebic training, and the shift of Sinope’s epoch to adhere to the Lucullan era of Amastris point to the likelihood that many aspects of everyday life in the cities of coastal Paphlagonia were influenced by the assembly of elites that participated the Koinon of the Cities in Pontus. The coastal Paphlagonian koinon was then a vital political instrument that had socio-political significance beyond the expression of loyalty to the imperial idea, but a form of elite commission that can determine local hierarchies and local standards based on collective consensus. The legitimacy of this elite commission was derived from the need to worship the emperor, but its power to influence or even control the behavior of individuals and cities was based upon the socio-economic standing of the participating elites.
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