

Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

² On Strabon cf DUECK 2000.

³ Eg App. *Mithr.* 97; Cass. Dio 37.12.1.

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

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

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

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

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

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