

ANCYRA: FACTORS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY*

By

EDWARD DĄBROWA

The name Ancyra tends to evoke associations with the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, the best known ancient epigraphic monument found in that city and the most important source for research on the actions of Augustus. The inscription has attracted many scholars and remains worthy of study¹, but the place where it was found does not raise much scholarly interest. Few have noted the role the city played as the administrative centre of Galatia, as well as an important staging point on the road to the eastern border of the Empire, and even then only in the context of broader discussions of Roman provinces in Asia Minor. Usually authors also mention in passing something of its internal organisation as an urban centre². And there the range of their reasons for investigating Ancyra ends, although it was one of the greatest cities in this part of Anatolia during the Roman rule. Yet it is not totally irrelevant what factors decided on its importance, since the same factors had a similar influence on the lives of a number of population centres in the northern and eastern provinces of Asia Minor. Therefore investigating these factors ought to illuminate, if in a somewhat unaccustomed manner, the causes behind the phenomenon of urban revival observable in that part of the Empire between the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD.

There are few sources on which to base an inquiry into Ancyra's history. The preserved testimonies contain only a few mentions, but they are too short and incidental to allow a detailed picture of the city's past to be formed, so that only

* Originally published in Polish in "Eos" LXII 1974, fasc. 2, pp. 323–337.

¹ Almost every volume of "L'Année Philologique" contains several items related to the monument (for earlier literature, see *SEG* VI 50) or its copies found in Apollonia (*CIL* III, pp. 773 ff.; *Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua* IV 143) or Pisidian Antioch (W.M. RAMSAY, *JRS* VI 1916, pp. 108 ff.; W.M. RAMSAY, A. VON PREMERSTEIN, *Monumentum Antiochenum*, *Klio-Beiheft* XIX, Leipzig 1927).

² A.H.M. JONES, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford ²1971, pp. 408 f., n. 10; A. RANOVIĆ, *Vostočnye provincii Rimskoj Imperii v I–III vv.*, Moskva–Leningrad 1949, p. 111; also see n. 17 below.

a rough outline emerges. The major type of source at our disposal is inscriptions, and while these may appear to be quite numerous (several hundred have been discovered in Ancyra and its immediate region)³, only a small number of them pertain directly to the history of the city.

The earliest period for which mentions of Ancyra can be found is the end of the 4th century BC, during Alexander's campaign against the Persians⁴. The rest relate to the events of the 3rd and 2nd centuries: the war between Seleucus II Callinicus and Ptolemy III⁵, the Galatian conquest of Phrygia⁶, and the expedition of Gn. Manlius Vulso in 189 BC⁷. The most valuable information is to be found in the works of Strabo⁸ and Pliny the Elder⁹, who write about the Ancyra of their own times. Their testimonies show that even as late as the mid-1st century AD Ancyra was but a small defensive settlement¹⁰. Comparing their accounts to the epigraphic material, one can clearly see how fast Ancyra developed in a relatively short time, as witnessed by its urban character. That urban character was expressed through the titlature of Ancyra's official documents¹¹, as well as

³ Putting that source material to use is made considerably difficult by its scattered appearance in numerous publications, many of them hardly available today as they came out in the 19th century. See the full list in E. BOSCH, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ankara im Altertum*, Ankara 1967 (Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınlarından, VII Seri – No. 46), pp. XV–XVIII (hereafter BOSCH, *Quellen*). BOSCH's book aims to make them more accessible; it contains testimonies which refer to Ancyra's past or its people in any way, be they epigraphic texts, legends on coins, or literary references. Many of them are made available for the first time (see *AE* 1969/1970, nos. 601–605, and cf. J. and L. ROBERT, *Bulletin Épigraphique* (Paris) VI 1972, pp. 225 f., no. 566). In spite of its impressive size (it lists 372 numbered items), that collection is far from complete, omitting as it does many shorter Ancyran inscriptions, as well as all Christian ones; see e.g. J.G.C. ANDERSON, *Exploration in Galatia cis Halym*, JHS XIX 1899, pp. 97 f., nos. 79–84, or G. DE JERPHANION, *Mélanges d'archéologie anatolienne*, MUSJ XIII 1928, pp. 278 ff., nos. 54–67. That is not explained even by the editor's principle not to exceed the time of Constantine the Great's rule.

⁴ Arr. *Anab.* II 4, 1; Curt. III 1, 22.

⁵ Pomp. Trogus, prol. 27.

⁶ Memnon 11, 6 f. (= F. JACOBY, *FGrHist* III B, no. 434, pp. 346 f.).

⁷ Liv. XXXVIII 24, 1 f.; 25,1; Polyb. XXI 39, 1 f.

⁸ Strabo XII, p. 567.

⁹ Plin. *HN* V 146.

¹⁰ Strabo uses the word φρούριον; Pliny, *oppidum*.

¹¹ *CIG* 4010; BOSCH, *Quellen* (n. 3), p. 76, no. 72. One very characteristic feature of Ancyran inscriptions and coins has been long noted: F. IMHOOF-BLUMER, *Monnaies grecques*, Paris–Leipzig 1883, p. 415, no. 174; W. WROTH, *Catalogue of Coins of Galatia, Cappadocia and Syria. British Museum. Catalogue of Greek Coins*, London 1899, p. 8, nos. 1–2 (hereafter *BMC Galatia*); see also B.V. HEAD, *Historia Nummorum*, Oxford 1911, p. 747 (hereafter HEAD, *HN*), and BOSCH, *Quellen* (n. 3), p. 55, no. 58, and p. 58, no. 63. Namely, during the course of the 1st century AD one finds many ethnic terms, which disappear in the first half of the 2nd century only to return a little later, but then in combination with topographical names (*IGRR* III 180; BOSCH, *Quellen* [n. 3], p. 240, no. 181 = *AE* 1969/1970, no. 605); see D. MAGIE, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor: To the End of the Third Century after Christ*, Princeton 1950, p. 1319, n. 29.

Ancyra's own coins. It is also demonstrated by the attested presence of various offices typical of Greek cities. The offices are not merely empty formal dignities; rather, each is a function related to a definite section of urban affairs¹². Such offices are only found in large communities, where small councils of magistrates are not up to the task of managing their collective lives.

The sources, while meagre, do not speak of Ancyra simply as a lively centre of communal life, but also make it possible to point to the factors its greatness depended on. These factors appeared in various periods and there were a number of them, which is why one cannot agree with the view according to which *the* impulse that decided on the urban growth of Ancyra was that it became the provincial centre of the worship of the Roman emperor¹³.

Locating the provincial temple of Augustus in Ancyra was directly related to another event, momentous in its consequences for Ancyra; this event was transforming the domain of Amyntas, the last of the Galatian kings, into a Roman province. Coming under the Roman rule was accompanied by a number of changes related to introducing Roman provincial administration¹⁴. To soften the bad impression these changes may have given, the Romans needed to win the support of the Galatian higher classes. To that purpose an assembly of representatives of the population of the province (κοινόν) was called into being at the same time as Roman administration was introduced¹⁵, in order to represent the interests of all the inhabitants of the province, and it was formed of members of the Galatian tribal aristocracy¹⁶. The assembly had care of the provincial temple of Augustus and the cult there, and Ancyra was chosen as its seat and as the administrative centre of the province. This created the first premise for the city's development, for a Roman official attracted not just petitioners, but also men of

¹² Those include: ἀστυνόμος – CIG 4019, 4026, 4032 (= JHS XLIV 1924, pp. 43 f., no. 80), and 4069; ἀγορανόμος – IGRR III 173, and SEG VI 10; εἰρήναρχος – IGRR III 203 (cf. SEG VI 9), and 208, JÖAI XXX 1936/1937, Beibl., coll. 2 f., no. 2; ταμίαις – IGRR III 195; and ἐπιμελητής – CIG 4017, 4018, 4019 etc. For the extent and kind of duties assigned to these offices, see A.H.M. JONES, *Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*, Oxford 1940; W. LIEBENAM, *Städteverwaltung im Römischen Kaiserreiche*, Leipzig 1900; MAGIE, *op. cit.* (n. 11.); and the relevant entries in RE.

¹³ RANOVIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 2), p. 112.

¹⁴ The changes included requisitioning the lands of Galatian kings (RANOVIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 2), pp. 114 f.; M. ROSTOVITZEFF, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, Oxford²1963, p. 652, n. 1; see MAGIE, *op. cit.* (n. 2), pp. 1325 ff., n. 44; and cf. CIL III 256) and temple property (Strabo XII, p. 567; RAMSAY, JRS XII 1922, p. 149; and T.R.S. BROUGHTON, *Roman Asia*, in: *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, ed. T. FRANK, vol. IV, Baltimore 1938, pp. 642 f. and 650). The problems related the imperial lands in Galatia, while recently investigated again by B. LEVICK, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, Oxford 1967, pp. 216 ff. (Appendix VI), need more discussion.

¹⁵ W.M. RAMSAY, *Studies in the Roman Province Galatia*, JRS XII 1922, pp. 154 ff., 175 f., and see pp. 163 f. For the nature and organisational structure of such bodies, see RE Suppl. IV (1924) s.v. Κοινόν; and J.A.O. LARSEN, *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1955 (Sather Classical Lectures 28), pp. 106–125.

¹⁶ RAMSAY, JRS XII 1922, pp. 173 f.

business. The effects that factor had can only be seen after some time. In the case of Ancyra they are discernible, although obscured by the geographical factor.

Scholars writing on Ancyra emphasise its importance as a road junction¹⁷; many of the Roman roads crossing Bithynia and Galatia converged there, and roads leading to Roman territories further east fanned out from there. Ancyra already played a similar role much earlier during Persian times, when it lay on the Royal Road¹⁸. However, one should note one important political condition without which Ancyra could not have become a major road junction: *all* of Asia Minor needed to be part of one political organism; only then could Ancyra's central situation be put to its full advantage. Thus, while incorporating Galatia into the Empire did increase Ancyra's significance as the centre of political power in the province, the road junction aspect only came into play later, as Roman rule gradually extended to Cappadocia, Polemoniac Pontus and Lesser Armenia¹⁹.

The new territories needed to be tied as firmly as possible to the other Roman lands in Asia Minor, for administrative reasons, and even more so for military ones. A well developed road network was one of the factors guaranteeing the stability of the Roman rule, with local roads allowing access to the most remote parts of the province, while strategic roads enabled fast transportation, swift transfer of units to a threatened section of the border and supplying the garrisons, but also formed a connected organic system with other similar roads that already existed in other provinces. For the network to be fully functional it had to be maintained and extended.

In this discussion of the road system of Roman Asia Minor we do not mean all the roads that existed there, as we can no longer tell where and how they ran, but rather the routes built by emperors, their legates and procurators. Little can be said of local roads, since nothing remains of them, perhaps because of their poor construction; one must remember that the task of constructing and maintaining local roads was handed over to cities²⁰ and country settlements, which did not always cope well with it²¹.

¹⁷ BROUGHTON, *op. cit.* (n. 14), pp. 862 and 864; E. GREN, *Kleinasien und der Ostbalkan in der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Uppsala–Leipzig 1941 (Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift 9), pp. 44 f.; and I.W. MACPHERSON, *Roman Roads and Milestones of Galatia*, AS IV 1954, p. 111.

¹⁸ W.M. RAMSAY, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, Amsterdam 1962 (reprinted), pp. 35 ff. and *passim*; GREN, *op. cit.* (n. 17), pp. 42 f.; and see LEVICK, *op. cit.* (n. 14), pp. 10 ff.

¹⁹ On the circumstances of that extension, see F. CUMONT, *L'annexion du Pont Polémoniaque et de la Petite Arménie*, in: *Anatolian Studies Presented to W.M. Ramsay*, eds. W.H. BUCKLER, W.M. CALDER, Manchester 1923, p. 109 ff.

²⁰ There is a testimony from Ancyra according to which that city also bore the cost of repairing the nearby Roman roads: *CIL* III 6900 (= 6058).

²¹ LIEBENAM, *op. cit.* (n. 12), pp. 145 ff., and p. 146, n. 1.

When reconstructing the course of Roman strategic roads, it is possible to draw on several types of sources, which also make it possible to learn the role played by cities located on the roads.

The most important group is made up by epigraphic sources; the data they contain is vital and often very detailed. The group can be divided into two subgroups, *miliaria* and “other”. *Miliaria* inscriptions say when the road was built and by whom, as well as who oversaw the works or what exact kind of work was done. Among the sources in the “other” subgroup are honorific inscriptions²² and epitaphs²³. Of equal value are any preserved remains of road engineering, such as sections of the surface layer or parts of bridge structure²⁴.

The remaining sources are somewhat different in nature; they have nothing to say directly of the roads then in existence; instead they allow us to determine the routes most often taken by Roman legions. Thus, they often inform us of roads of which we otherwise have no knowledge, or else supplement the other data. That group includes references to Roman march routes in the literary and historical tradition²⁵, and a certain special sort of bronze city coins, the so-called *Signamünzen*²⁶. Those coins are significant in that they prove that there were Roman soldiers in the city that issued them, as cities minted them when Roman units on the march stopped there for a while so as to satisfy the rapidly increased demand of the local market for a small perfunctory coin²⁷. That type of coin was

²² See: *IGRR* III 173; BOSCH, *Quellen* (n. 3), pp. 123 f., no. 106; *SEG* VI 57 (Ancyra); F.K. DÖRNER, *Bericht über eine Reise in Bithynien*, Wien 1952 (Denkschriften der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, vol. LXXV, 1), p. 17, no. 10; *IGRR* III 60, 66, and 68, and cf. no. 62 (Prusias ad Hypium).

²³ See BOSCH, *Quellen* (n. 3), p. 277, no. 213; F.K. DÖRNER, *Inschriften und Denkmäler aus Bithynien*, Berlin 1941 (Istanbuler Forschungen 14), p. 105, no. 121; these sources are very rare in that they clearly indicate the dead man's part in the construction, complete with the name of the legion in which he served during the war against the Parthians or Persians. Attempts to discover which Roman units participated in the successive wars in the East usually run into considerable difficulty, and some need to be corrected again and again. See *AE* 1962, no. 311, an inscription which makes it possible to determine that Legio XXII Primigenia P.F. fought in Trajan's war against Armenia and the Parthians, while previously it was thought it only took part in L. Verus' campaign: *RE* XII 2 (1925), col. 1813; cf. *CIL* III 269 (= 6765), and 260 (= 6761).

²⁴ MACPHERSON, *op. cit.* (n. 17), p. 112; DÖRNER, *op. cit.* (n. 23), pp. 33 f.; RAMSAY, *Historical Geography...* (n. 18), p. 46; J.A.R. MUNRO, *Roads in Pontus, Royal and Roman*, *JHS* XXI 1901, p. 65; see K. BITTEL, *Kleinasiatische Studien*, Istanbul 1942 (Istanbuler Mitteilungen 5), pp. 9 ff.; cf. J. SÖLCH, *Bithynische Städte im Altertum*, *Klio* XIX 1925, pp. 173 f., n. 5.

²⁵ Cf. e.g. the itinerary of Julian the Apostate in *Amm.* XXII 9, 3–8 and XXV 10, 4–11.

²⁶ C. BOSCH, *Kleinasiatische Münzen der römischen Kaiserzeit*, *AA* 1931, coll. 426 f.; and C. BOSCH, *Die kleinasiatischen Münzen der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Part II, vol. I (*Bithynien*), Stuttgart 1935, pp. 94 ff. (hereafter BOSCH, *KM*); cf. GREN, *op. cit.* (n. 17), p. 150.

²⁷ GREN, *op. cit.* (n. 17), pp. 150 ff.; and J.P. CALLU, *La politique monétaire des empereurs romains de 238 à 311*, Paris 1969 (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 214), p. 28.

issued so often in a number of cities in Asia Minor during the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD²⁸ that it is possible to determine the most frequented routes. Three of them were used particularly often²⁹. All three had their beginning in Bithynian cities on the coast of the Propontis, and ran through Bithynia and Pontus to the eastern border of the Empire, converging or splitting in major centres of communal life in the region. There is much evidence from many periods that care was taken to maintain them in good repair, serving as proof of their great importance.

While referring to the great significance of the highways in northern and eastern Anatolia, both from west to east and from north to south, it is necessary to note why the Romans put so much effort into their construction and maintenance.

As the border of Roman Empire moved east, the need to secure it grew. The task was not easy. From Augustus to the waning years of the Empire, keeping the peace in the East forced successive emperors to undertake ever new diplomatic interventions and military actions alike. First the Parthians, then the Persians proved difficult neighbours who always kept the Romans on their toes. The main cause for conflict and tension between Parthia and Rome was Armenia³⁰, since for either side to hold it would mean a grave threat to the other's security. Parthian influence in Armenia was especially dangerous to the Romans, as for a time their position was not that strong either in the Syrian borderland or in north-eastern Anatolia³¹. The threat in these places only abated after Rome conquered Commagene, Polemoniac Pontus and Lesser Armenia.

The nature of their relations with Parthia led the Romans to undertake measures to guarantee the eastern provinces of the Empire their security³². That meant

²⁸ For a list of cities issuing *Signamünzen*, complete with an indication of the period their known series come from, see BOSCH, *KM* (n. 26), pp. 97 f.

²⁹ BOSCH, *KM* (n. 26), *loc. cit.*; his division refers to the major military roads of all of Roman Asia Minor, not merely those crossing Bithynia and Pontus; see BOSCH, *AA* 1931, coll. 426 f. Discussed in more detail in J. SÖLCH, *Klio* XIX 1925, pp. 170 ff.; and GREN, *op. cit.* (n. 17), pp. 511 ff. See also J.A.R. MUNRO, *Some Pontic Milestones*, *JHS* XX 1900, pp. 159–166; M.I. MAKSIMOVA, *Antičnye goroda jugo-vostočnogo Pričernomorija. Sinopa, Amis, Trapezunt*, Moskva–Leningrad 1956, pp. 311 f.; and MAGIE, *op. cit.* (n. 11), *passim*.

³⁰ Literature on Roman–Parthian relations is quite abundant; a concise presentation of the Parthian problem can be found in *CAH* X–XII (1934–1939), with bibliography.

³¹ O. V. KUDRIACEV, *Rim, Armenija i Parfija vo vtoroj polovinie pravljenija Nerona*, VDI 1949 fasc. 3, p. 61.

³² Despite many failures, Rome never gave up trying to influence Armenian affairs. The policy of the Flavians is characteristic in that respect: they gave up on direct attacks and instead tried to establish closer relations with the minor states surrounding Armenia yet hostile towards it. These closer relations encompassed not only diplomatic contact (F. GROSSO, *Aspetti della politica orientale di Domiziano*, *Epigraphica* XVI 1954, *passim*, and especially pp. 150 ff.), but also aiding their rulers (*SEG* XX 112). In developing those ties, the Flavian emperors intended even more to keep the borders safe from raids by nomadic peoples (GROSSO, *op. cit.*, pp. 117 ff.; see *CAH* XI, p. 95; and E. TÄUBLER, *Zur Geschichte der Alanen*, *Klio* XI 1909, pp. 18–21). It is probably to the same end that changes were made in the provincial administration of those regions (R.K. SHERK, *The Legates*

creating a permanent defence system which would also allow aggressive action to be taken.

The task was undertaken by the emperors of the Flavian dynasty. The Romans were fully aware that successfully defending the borders in eastern Anatolia could not rest on the units stationed along them alone³³; it also depended to a large extent on the ability to send in reinforcements from other provinces as they were needed. The extra legions used on the eastern front were usually those stationed on the Danube. This kind of troop movement could only be made possible by roads crossing Asia Minor from west to east. With this in mind it should be clearer why the three routes just mentioned were of such great importance.

Frequent marches of large armies, the presence in some cities of permanent Roman garrisons, the need to provide enough supplies, the cost of road repair and maintenance, and finally the large amount of money in circulation – all these elements impressed in various ways on the lives, not just of cities, but also of the province as a whole. Thus when reflecting on the factors in the development of Ancyra, but also of other Anatolian cities, one must not ignore economy³⁴. Its influence can be seen in the growth of many cities located near Roman roads or at junctions, such as Amasia, Caesarea-Mazaca, Tavium, or Ancyra. They all flourished during the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD, when traffic on the roads was very lively. Under the Late Empire, when many new factors caused a number of these routes to lose their old significance³⁵, the relationship between the rank of a road and the development of nearby urban centres was especially clear, since changes in the status of the roads were soon followed by the decline of their respective cities.

The purpose of the discussion in this paper so far has been to identify the factors which could have considerably influenced Ancyra's development and could have decided its importance as a result. Now let us find out whether those factors are reflected in the preserved testimonies.

of Galatia from Augustus to Diocletian, Baltimore 1951 [The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series LXIX, 2], p. 40).

³³ That mission was assigned to two legions (cf. Suet. *Vesp.* 8) and their auxiliaries (J. SZILÁGI, *Les variations des centres de prépondérance militaire dans les provinces frontières de l'Empire romain*, *Acta Antiqua* II 1953, pp. 161 f.) Initially, in Satala there was Legio XVI Flavia (*RE* XII 2, 1925, col. 1765), later replaced by Legio XV Apollinaris (*ibid.*, col. 1754; V.W. YORKE, *Inscriptions from Eastern Asia Minor*, *JHS* XVIII 1898, pp. 321 f., no. 35), whereas in Melitene it was the camp of Legio XII Fulm. (*RE* XII 2, 1925, col. 1707). Smaller units from those legions were placed along the border with Armenia and the coast (*CIL* III 6745, and cf. 6747; MAKSIMOVA, *op. cit.* [n. 29.], p. 312), guarded also by a squadron of warships (*RE* III 2, 1899, col. 2643), as well as in various cities of the province (including Ancyra: *CIL* III 252 (= 6754) and 266 (= 6758); also *SEG* VI 12).

³⁴ As regards some provinces of the Balkan region and Asia Minor, those issues are discussed extensively in GREN, *op. cit.* (n. 17), pp. 89–155.

³⁵ RAMSAY, *Historical Geography...* (n. 18), pp. 74 and 242.

It has already been emphasised that Ancyra was not just a staging point on the road to the eastern border of the Empire, but also an important road junction; it remained that during the Late Empire. The numerous milestones³⁶ found preserved in the region provide information on the directions of these roads.

The most important was the road from Nicaea via Juliopolis to Ancyra, as it connected Ancyra to the Bithynian cities on the coast of the Propontis. It was a section of one of several main and most used military routes, as proven by the large number of series of *Signamünzen* issued in those cities towards the end of the 2nd and at the beginning of the 3rd century AD³⁷. Another important road, and one which allowed access to the cities of the province of Asia, was the route from Dorylaeum via Germa to Ancyra³⁸. Based on our source for it, we can suppose that it was one of the earliest great Roman roads in that part of Galatia³⁹.

Ancyra's advantageous situation caused all the roads which started there and gave access to cities in the north, east or south to assume the status of major transportation highways, maintained in good condition with much effort.

Connection to other military routes crossing Bithynia-Pontus, and even more importantly to the cities on the coast of Propontis and the Black Sea, was provided by the road from Ancyra to Gangra⁴⁰. Two other arteries of note were the

³⁶ At present we have around 50 milestones from the region of Ancyra. Many of the inscriptions found on them were published in *CIL* III, as well as by DE JERPHANION, *op. cit.* (n. 3), p. 277, no. 53; K. BITTEL, *AA* 1932, col. 260; H. MILTNER, *Epigraphische Nachlese in Ankara*, *JÖAI* XXX 1936/1937, Beibl., col. 19, no. 16; col. 27, no. 28; and *AE* 1946, no. 178. All of these are collected in BOSCH, *Quellen* (n. 3). Many completely new ones, as well as some whose existence was known of but which were unavailable, were published by MACPHERSON, *op. cit.* (n. 17), pp. 113 ff.

³⁷ From the section between Juliopolis and Ancyra we have: *CIL* III 14184⁶¹⁻⁶⁴; MACPHERSON, *op. cit.* (n. 17), p. 113, no. 1, and p. 114, no. 3. The earliest of these dates back to the times of Hadrian. See ANDERSON, *op. cit.* (n. 3), pp. 58 ff., for an attempt at locating and identifying the places known from the tradition, a description of the remains and the inscriptions found along that section. For a list of the known series of *Signamünzen* from Nicaea, Juliopolis and Ancyra, see BOSCH, *KM* (n. 26), p. 97. For coins issued by each of those cities in general: W.H. WADDINGTON, E. BABELON, T. REINACH, *Recueil général des monnaies grecques d'Asie Mineure*, Paris 1910, vol. I, 3: *Nicée et Nicomédie*, p. 423, no. 195; p. 436, nos. 297 and 298; and p. 442, no. 349; *BMC Pontus, Paphlagonia*, p. 159, no. 49; p. 161, nos. 61 and 62; p. 65, nos. 82 and 83; p. 166, no. 86; etc.; *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum (The Royal Collection of Coins and Medals: Danish National Museum), Bosphorus-Bithynia*, Copenhagen 1944, nos. 512, 513, 514, 519, 520, and 526 (Nicaea); *BMC Pontus, Paphlagonia*, p. 150, no. 9; *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, op. cit.*, nos. 463 and 464 (Juliopolis).

³⁸ *CIL* III 317, 318, and 14184^{59, 60}; ANDERSON, *op. cit.* (n. 3), pp. 84 ff.; and RAMSAY, *Historical Geography...* (n. 18), pp. 237 f.; see also CUMONT, *L'annexion...* (n. 19), p. 114.

³⁹ *CIL* III 318. The road was built during the reign of Titus, in 80 AD.

⁴⁰ *CIL* III 309 (= 6898), 310, 314, 317, 13645 (= AS IV 1954, pp. 118–119, no. 17) and 14184^{55, 56, 57}; *AE* 1946, no. 178; and AS IV 1954, p. 119, no. 19; see RAMSAY, *Historical Geography...* (n. 18), pp. 258 f.; and MACPHERSON, *op. cit.* (n. 17), pp. 112 f. The road was not all that useful for military purposes. Totally different considerations occasioned its construction; it made it easier to supply the troops from the Pontic ports on the Black Sea (MAKSIMOVA, *op. cit.* [n. 29], p. 314). Besides the garrison stationed in Ancyra, other units needed to be provisioned, namely those headed east or returning

roads leading east from Ancyra, to Tavium⁴¹, and south, allowing access to such important Anatolian centres as Archelais and Caesarea-Mazaca⁴². Based on some discovered *miliaria* we can date their construction precisely to 80–82 AD⁴³. They were built as part of the Flavian plan for a road network in the border regions of Pontus and Galatia, which was to form the foundation for their defence system. The guess that these roads were part of a broader plan is justified not only by the coincidence of their construction with roadworks in Pontus and Lesser Armenia⁴⁴, but also by their direction. According to that design, they were supposed to be great arteries allowing for fast reinforcements, while also connecting the major cities of the province to its administrative centre.

Ancyra's role as a road junction was not limited to the 2nd and 3rd centuries, but continued later on, as can be concluded from various itineraries, the major source for our knowledge of the road system of the Late Empire⁴⁵. Undoubtedly the most important road to cross Ancyra then was the so called "pilgrim road", leading from Constantinople through Chalcedon, Nicomedia, Nicaea, Ancyra and Tarsus to Jerusalem⁴⁶. Its importance as one of the most vital routes of Anatolia

from there. This was not always possible, and then the duty to provide supplies fell to the people of the city (*IGRR* III 173; BOSCH, *Quellen* [n. 3], pp. 123 f., no. 106; and *SEG* VI 57) and province (J. GUEY, *Inscription du second siècle relative à l'annone militaire*, *MEFR* LV 1938, pp. 61 ff., 69 ff., and esp. 71–77). Many other Pontic roads of similar direction served the same purpose, the most crucial one being the route from Amisus to Amasia (*CIL* III 6895, 12158–12161, and 14184^{22, 24, 25}), the only one that allowed access from the shores of the Black Sea to the interior of Anatolia (see MUNRO, *op. cit.* [n. 24], pp. 52 ff.). It was used to convey military supplies from the Bosphorus (ROSTOVITZEFF, *op. cit.* [n. 14], pp. 154 and 259; cf. IDEM, *Pontus, Bithynia and the Bosphorus*, *BSA* XXII 1916–1918, p. 13).

⁴¹ *CIL* III 311 (= 6901), and 6899; *AS* IV 1954, pp. 115 ff., nos. 8–16, and cf. p. 115, no. 6. Only the publication of those latter testimonies explained many doubts as to the course of that road: MACPHERSON, *op. cit.* (n. 17), p. 112; RAMSAY, *Historical Geography...* (n. 18), pp. 258 f.; ANDERSON, *op. cit.* (n. 3), pp. 98 ff.; and BITTEL, *op. cit.* (n. 24), pp. 16 ff. They also supplied us with another vital piece of information, that is the date when it was constructed. The earliest of its milestones known by then came from Nerva's times (*CIL* III 6899), but now it is possible to establish the date as 80–82 AD (*AS* IV 1954, p. 115, no. 8). That would make it another road built in that part of Anatolia under the Flavians alongside those from Ancyra to Germa and from Ancyra to Caesarea (*CIL* III 14184⁴⁸; the origin of another Flavian *miliarium*, *CIL* III 312, is not known).

⁴² *CIL* III 316, 14184^{47–52}; *AS* IV 1954, p. 114, nos. 4 f.; p. 115, nos. 6 f.; and p. 120, nos. 7A and 7B; cf. *CIL* III 14184⁴⁵ (= (?) *AS* IV 1954, p. 114, no. 4). ANDERSON, *op. cit.* (n. 3), pp. 100 ff.; RAMSAY, *Historical Geography...* (n. 18), pp. 254 ff.

⁴³ The legate then was A. Caesennius Gallus (SHERK, *op. cit.* [n. 32]; *PIR*² C 170; see also *RE* III 1, 1899, coll. 1306 f.; and *RE* Suppl. I, 1903, col. 269).

⁴⁴ See *CIL* III 306 and 14188³. Also MAKSIMOVA, *op. cit.* (n. 29), p. 313; and CUMONT, *op. cit.* (n. 19), pp. 113 f.

⁴⁵ *RE* IX 2 (1916), coll. 2308 ff.; K. MILLER, *Itineraria Romana*, Stuttgart 1916, passim; and see GREN, *op. cit.* (n. 17.), pp. 142 f.

⁴⁶ RAMSAY, *Historical Geography...* (n. 18), pp. 197, 242 and *passim*; ANDERSON, *op. cit.* (n. 3), pp. 53 f.; see pp. 100 ff.; and GREN, *op. cit.* (n. 17), pp. 54 f.

is related to Diocletian choosing Nicomedia for the centre of power in the eastern part of the Roman Empire; then increased even more as Constantinople was made the capital of the East. However, Diocletian did not build it, although we have testimonies from the time of his rule for work conducted on that road⁴⁷. Comparing the information from the itineraries with data from epigraphic and numismatic sources, one can easily see that the pilgrim road followed several important roads constructed in the 1st and 2nd centuries.

It has been noted above that the Roman conquest of areas to the north and east of Ancyra was a prerequisite for its central location coming fully into play, and the sources confirm this conclusion in full. None of the roads leading from Ancyra towards Polemoniac Pontus or Lesser Armenia was built before the year when those territories were annexed. The same testimonies reveal a close correlation between Ancyra's growing role as a junction where several roads met, vital first to Roman political designs, and later to consolidating the Roman rule in north-eastern Asia Minor on the one hand, and its development as an urban centre on the other.

Two other factors can clearly be seen at work: that of the large cult centre that was the temple of Augustus, and that of the administrative centre, that is, the seat of the imperial legate. Their presence makes itself known in a large proportion of the Ancyran inscriptions⁴⁸. Based on the preserved sources, it may be difficult to determine the extent of direct influence each of them had on Ancyra's growth, but neither is this necessary. After all, a similar process can be observed in many other cities of Asia Minor with famous sanctuaries or the seat of a provincial governor, where the precise degree of influence of one factor or the other is more tangible.

⁴⁷ *CIL* III 14184^{51, 61, 62, 63, 64}; see also the previous note. Apart from those, a number of other milestones from Bithynia-Pontus and Lesser Armenia from the time of Diocletian and his co-rulers are known: *CIL* III 307, 6895, 12157 etc.; DÖRNER, *op. cit.* (n. 22), p. 42, no. 86.

⁴⁸ Expressed, among others, through the many inscriptions honouring the priests of the provincial temple (*IGRR* III 158, 173, 194 etc.), and official documents of the Galatian *koinon* (BOSCH, *Quellen* (n. 3), pp. 35 ff., no. 51 = L. ROBERT, *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec*, Amsterdam 1971 (reprinted); pp. 35 ff., no. 86 (= *OGIS* 533); pp. 94 ff., no. 98 (= *SEG* VI 52); and see pp. 225 ff., no. 174). Cult celebrations in the temple were accompanied by athletic games organised by the provincial assembly; see e.g. L. MORETTI, *Iscrizione agonistiche greche*, Roma 1953 (Studi pubblicati dall'Istituto italiano per la storia antica 12), p. 174, no. 65; or p. 191, no. 69 (= *SEG* XIII 540), as well as gladiatorial games (*OGIS* 533; *SEG* VI 10; ROBERT, *Les gladiateurs...*, pp. 135 ff., nos. 86–90; L. ROBERT, *Hellenica VIII*, pp. 40 ff., nos. 328–329; p. 64; BOSCH, *Quellen* (n. 3), p. 193, no. 152 (= *AE* 1969/1970, no. 604), financed by the priests of the imperial cult (ROBERT, *Les gladiateurs...*, pp. 270 ff.). A provincial administrative centre involves the presence not just of an imperial legate (*CIL* III 248, 249 (= 6753), and 252 (= 6754); *IGRR* III 171, 176–178, 184 and 186), but also of his team of specialised officers (*procurator*: *CIL* III 251; *SEG* VI 11 and 12; *IGRR* III 168–170 and 181; *JÖAI* XXX 1936/1937, Beibl., coll. 14 f., no. 7; *tabularius*: *CIL* III 251; *IGRR* 168) and a military unit at his disposal (*beneficiarii*: *CIL* III 252 (= 6754), 266, 6758; *SEG* VI 12; see the commentary in BOSCH, *Quellen* (n. 3), p. 245, n. 10).

Many criteria are customarily used to judge the importance of ancient cities, including their area; the size of the remains of public and private buildings, whether preserved or excavated; and preserved artifacts serving as evidence of living conditions or of the range, type and intensity of contact with other population centres. But there are other determining factors too. Under the Empire they include issuing money, and the titlature used in official documents, as well as on coins.

In soliciting various privileges and titles granted by emperors, Greek cities were not merely chasing after honours of little intrinsic value; the phenomenon had its justification, and was related to the still living and nurtured traditions of their old independence and splendour. After all, in the Hellenistic era many of them were important economic and political centres, often with their own policies towards not only neighbouring cities, but even kings. As soon as Roman presence in Asia Minor became permanent, the freedom of the Greek cities there began to be increasingly limited, and there was no room in the new order for any independence. Dreams of independence, however, lived on, fed by some emperors' policies towards the eastern provinces. Still, it was impossible to achieve them in their old shape, and so they took on new forms.

Titlature was one of those new forms of expression. In the epigraphic and numismatic sources from the cities of Asia Minor titles are often made of many words⁴⁹ which are to inform of the city's status, privileges and honours, its special relationship with Rome, and its place among the cities of the province. However, the titlature of Ancyra is quite modest and offers little in the way of new information. Of the many titles in use elsewhere, only two are attested for Ancyra: *neokoros* (νεωκόρος) and *metropolis* (μητρόπολις). The first epithet indicates that the city in question has a provincial temple of a Roman emperor⁵⁰; the meaning of the second remains somewhat unclear, despite attempts to elucidate it⁵¹.

⁴⁹ See e.g.: *IGRR* IV 154 (Cyzicus): ...ἐφηβαρχοῦντος τῆς λαμπροτάτης μητροπόλεως τῆς Ἀσίας Ἀδριανῆς νεωκόρου φιλοσεβαστοῦ Κυζικηνῶν πόλεως...; *IGRR* IV 451 (Pergamum): Ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος τῆς πρώτης μητροπόλεως τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ τρις νεωκόρου τῶν Σεβαστῶν Περγαμηνῶν πόλεως... (cf. the inscription on a coin from Caracalla's time, *HEAD, HN* (n. 11), pp. 536 f.: Ἡ ΠΡΩΤΗ ΤΗΣ ΑΣΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙΣ ΠΡΩΤΗ ΚΑΙ ΤΡΙΣ ΝΕΩΚΟΡΟΣ ΠΡΩΤΗ ΤΩΝ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩΝ ΠΕΡΓΑΜΗΝΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΣ); see also: *Sardis. Publications of the American Society for the Excavation of Sardis*, vol. VII 1: *Greek and Latin Inscriptions*, Leyden 1932, pp. 74 f., no. 63 (= *IGRR* IV 1528); pp. 77 f., nos. 67–70; p. 82, no. 77. For a list of all those terms as used on coins, see *HEAD, HN* (n. 11), pp. LXXIX ff.; *BROUGHTON, op. cit.* (n. 14), pp. 706 ff. and 740 ff.; and *MAGIE, op. cit.* (n. 11), pp. 635 ff. and 1497 f., with nn. 20–22.

⁵⁰ *RE* XVI 2 (1935), coll. 2424 ff.; *B. PICK, Die tempeltragenden Gottheiten und die Darstellung der Neokorie auf den Münzen*, *JÖAI* VII 1904, pp. 1 ff.; and *BOSCH, KM* (n. 26), pp. 226 ff. Ancyra gained another imperial cult temple during the reign of Valerian and Gallienus: *BMC Galatia* (n. 11), p. 15, no. 39; *BOSCH, Quellen* (n. 3), p. 346, nos. 283–286; and *PICK, op. cit.*, pp. 34 ff.

⁵¹ *HEAD, HN* (n. 11), p. LXXX; *BOSCH, KM* (n. 26), pp. 221 ff.; *MAGIE, op. cit.* (n. 11), pp. 636 f.; and *BROUGHTON, op. cit.* (n. 14), pp. 741 ff.; see *P.R. FRANKE, Kleinasien zur Römerzeit. Griechisches Leben im Spiegel der Münzen*, München 1968, p. 21.

The right to issue its own coinage was an important privilege for a Greek city, because it was granted either by the emperor himself⁵² or, with his consent, by his representative in the province⁵³. At the same time, consent to minting one's own money was an official acknowledgement of the great political and economic importance⁵⁴, and of the urban character of a city, as well as granting it a certain degree of independence, since it meant the emperor relinquished some of his privileges in that regard⁵⁵. When consenting to minting, Rome mostly had the economic aspect in mind. After all, urban coinage played an important role in the monetary circulation of the eastern part of the Empire as a perfunctory coin, since the imperial mints were unable to supply enough of it⁵⁶. But for the Greek cities it was the political aspect of the decision that mattered the most, giving as it did the impression of some autonomy⁵⁷.

This autonomy was in fact quite illusory; minting the city coin cannot have expressed any real independence if the decision to do so was taken by the Roman authorities, and the coins were issued bearing the emperor's image or symbols⁵⁸. The series of actual quasi-autonomous coins were too few to carry any real meaning beyond being a sign of prestige⁵⁹.

The first urban coin of Ancyra was issued under Vespasian. This is a fact of importance in the light of the above comments, as it is evidence that Ancyra was quite urban in character even in the 70's of the 1st century AD, a guess apparently borne out by Ancyran inscriptions too. That evidence becomes even more

⁵² BOSCH, *KM* (n. 26), pp. 5 f., and see p. 21; H. MATTINGLY, *Roman Coins from the Earliest Times to the Fall of the Western Empire*, London 1967, pp. 191 f., and p. 191, n. 1; CALLU, *op. cit.* (n. 27), pp. 25 f.; E. SCHÖNERT, *Griechisches Münzwerk. Die Münzprägung von Perinthos*, Berlin 1965 (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft 45), pp. 15 f.; EADEM, *Das Ende der Provinzialprägung in Thrakien und Mösien*, *Klio* L 1968, p. 251; also see A.R. BELLINGER, *Greek Mints under the Roman Empire*, in: *Essays in Roman Coinage Presented to Harold Mattingly*, eds. R.A.G. CARSON, C.H.V. SUTHERLAND, Oxford 1956, p. 148.

⁵³ BOSCH, *KM* (n. 26), pp. 9 and 172.

⁵⁴ SCHÖNERT, *Die Münzprägung...* (n. 52), pp. 15 and 28; EADEM, *Das Ende...* (n. 52), pp. 251 f.; see BROUGHTON, *op. cit.* (n. 14), pp. 886 f.; cf. BOSCH, *AA* 1931, coll. 430 f.

⁵⁵ BOSCH, *KM* (n. 26), p. 3, and p. 3, n. 5.

⁵⁶ SCHÖNERT, *Die Münzprägung...* (n. 52), p. 28; EADEM, *Das Ende...* (n. 52), p. 251; BOSCH, *KM* (n. 26), pp. 7 f.; BROUGHTON, *op. cit.* (n. 14), pp. 886 f.; and A. KUNISZ, *Obieg monetarny w Cesarstwie Rzymskim w latach 214/215–238 n.e.*, Katowice 1971, pp. 65 f.; see BELLINGER, *op. cit.* (n. 52), pp. 147 f.; cf. BOSCH, *AA* 1931, coll. 437 f.

⁵⁷ BOSCH, *KM* (n. 26), pp. 3 ff.; see p. 296: "Vom Jahre 256 an gibt es also keine nikomedischen Stadtmünzen mehr. Damit war der Stadt auch dieser letzte Schein von Souveränität, die letzte Möglichkeit, eine eigene Meinung öffentlich auszusprechen, genommen. Die allgemeine Ende der Stadtprägungen ist der symbolische Ausdruck für das Ende der antiken Polis und ihrer Kultur".

⁵⁸ BOSCH, *KM* (n. 26), pp. 8–9; MATTINGLY, *op. cit.* (n. 52), p. 196; and A.N. ZOGRAF, *Antičnye monety*, Moskva–Leningrad 1951 (Materialy i issledovanija po archeologii SSSR 16), p. 72.

⁵⁹ ZOGRAF, *loc. cit.* (n. 58).

expressive when we recall that almost simultaneously, construction of strategic roads started in Galatia, and those roads crossed Ancyra. It appears, then, that the beginnings of Ancyra's development as a city and a major road junction date to the period of the Flavian dynasty, and are related to those emperors' eastern policy, also continued by their successors⁶⁰.

Under the later emperors, many Greek cities of Asia Minor flourished again, but many others only had their chance to develop then. In general, there were a number of causes behind this phenomenon, such as emperors' policies towards the provinces, or favourable conditions for economic growth. However, such generalisations ignore the specificity of the several regions of Asia Minor. While it is easy to list the factors which influenced the growth of cities on the Aegean, in the Troad, Lydia, Caria, or Lycia, difficulties are encountered in explaining the revival of the cities of central and eastern Anatolia. Ancyra's example provides an explanation: the decisive factor was Roman eastern policy. While it remained almost purely aggressive, little attention was paid to developing infrastructure⁶¹. When the failures of that policy forced the Flavians to partly give it up in favour of creating a system that would grant the Romans ultimate success, the problem of infrastructure gained enormous importance, and the existing urban centres needed to become important links in that new system⁶².

⁶⁰ Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian continued to develop the road network in Anatolia (see *CIL* III, p. 2316¹⁰, as well as: MILTNER, *JÖAI* XXX 1936/1937, Beibl., col. 21, no. 21; *AE* 1946, no. 178; MACPHERSON, *op. cit.* (n. 17), p. 114, no. 3; p. 115, nos. 6 and 8; p. 116 f., nos. 9–12; and pp. 118 ff., nos. 14–16, 17 (= *CIL* III 3645), 18 and 19).

⁶¹ See CUMONT, *op. cit.* (n. 19), pp. 109 f.

⁶² Numismatic evidence provides vital information here. When looking into urban minting in Bithynia-Pontus, it is possible to notice the moment after which it developed with particular intensity. In many cases the mints in question only started operating under the Flavians and Trajan (BOSCH, *KM* [n. 26], p. 92; HEAD, *HN* [n. 11], listed under the respective cities; cf. also BOSCH, *AA* 1931, col. 434). There is also a close correlation between the number of minting centres, their time of operation, and the nearby presence of a military route (cf. SCHÖNERT, *Das Ende...* [n. 52], p. 253).