

# GOODWILL, BENEVOLENCE AND HARMONY AROUND THE BLACK SEA\*

Ligia RUSCU\*\*

**Cuvinte-cheie:** *bunăvoință, armonie, poleis, Marea Neagră, cultură politică.*

**Keywords:** *goodwill, harmony, poleis, Black Sea, political culture.*

**Rezumat:** *Articolul discută conceptele de bunăvoință și armonie în orașele grecești de la Marea Neagră, așa cum sunt atestate de izvoarele epigrafice și literare pentru epoca elenistică și cea romană. Aceste noțiuni apar, cu diferite acoperiri și sensuri diferite, în contextele funcționării instituțiilor poliade, ale euergetismului, ale vieții religioase și ale celei private. Articolul urmărește să scoată în evidență utilizările acestor concepte și perspectivele pe care le oferă pentru cultura politică a epocii lor.*

**Abstract:** *The paper focuses on the concepts of goodwill, benevolence and harmony in the Greek cities around the Black Sea, as evidenced by epigraphical and (where available) literary sources of the Hellenistic and Roman periods. These notions occur, with different ranges and different significances, in the various contexts of the functioning of polis institutions, of euergetism, of religious life and of private concerns. The paper attempts to highlight the overlapping uses of these concepts and the insights they offer for the political culture of their time.*

Greek inscriptions destined for public viewing are on the whole dominated by serenity, kindness and positive formulations<sup>1</sup>. Even when relating distinctly unpleasant facts, bloody wars, piratical incursions, famine and disease, the inscriptions, focused as they are on the good deeds of the benefactor, the general or the king, offer but a skewed picture of the events and can be viewed as 'deliberate under-reporting'<sup>2</sup>. Against this background, I have attempted to

---

\* This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research, CNCS – UEFISCDI, project number PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0054, and by a scholarship at the UMR 8546 'Archéologie et philologie d'Orient et d'Occident' (CNRS-ENS-EPHE), funded by the Fondation Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

\*\* Ligia RUSCU: Universitatea Babeș-Bolyai Cluj-Napoca, Catedra de istorie antică și arheologie; e-mail: ligiaruscu@yahoo.com.

<sup>1</sup> HAENSCH 2014.

<sup>2</sup> WOOLF 2015, p. 736.

examine, in the inscriptions of the cities around the Black Sea, two of the most benign and propitious terms, *eunoia* and *homonoia*.

### 1. *Eunoia*

*Eunoia*, goodwill or benevolence, is a highly elastic and volatile term. It originated in personal morality and interpersonal relations<sup>3</sup> and ended up by becoming a highly charged political term, with various connotations, depending on context, ranging from benefaction to devotion to submission and even to extortion. The latter is illustrated by Demosthenes' reference to the fundraising policies of Athenian generals during Philip of Macedon's campaigns in Thrace and the Chersonese<sup>4</sup>.

By being taken over into the political sphere, the use of *eunoia* established a close relationship between ethics and politics, equating social privileges and personal virtues<sup>5</sup>. This has obvious political implications. On the one hand, the virtuous politician, according to Plutarch (*Praec.* 820b-e), should shrink from honours, except for those which represent an expression of gratitude and goodwill, and not just repayment for favours received. On the other, once a person is liked and trusted, their actions tend to be much easier accepted and valued as merits; Isocrates ascribes to *eunoia* an overwhelming strength that can even surpass truth<sup>6</sup>. This works on two levels, between those which are roughly equals in standing and power, as for instance two poleis, and between those who are not, as in the relation of cities to kings and rulers.

The term *eunoia* became a part of the language of public praise in democratic Athens in literary texts before it found entrance into epigraphic ones. While there was in itself nothing intrinsically civic or even democratic about this term, by the 4<sup>th</sup> century it had been firmly established as a cardinal virtue and had embarked upon a long career in decrees all over the Greek world<sup>7</sup>. Much hinges on the recipient of the praise: While for a foreigner benevolence towards a city is voluntary, for her own citizens duty is implied, so the meaning of *eunoia* shifted close to 'loyalty' or 'patriotism', underlining the increasing importance of civic reliability<sup>8</sup>. The terms of praise in Athenian decrees tended to multiply in the course of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC, from one to two, three or even more<sup>9</sup>, but among them *eunoia*, in this meaning of continued community service, active loyalty, tended to become one of the most highly valued civic virtues in the troubled political life of Athens<sup>10</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> See for instance Arist. *EN* 8.2.1155b27-1156a3, 9.5; cf. WHITING 2006, 281-284.

<sup>4</sup> Dem. *Chers.* 25: λαμβάνουσι δ' οἱ μὲν ἔχοντες μίαν ἢ δύο ναῦς ἐλάττονα, οἱ δὲ μείζω δύναμιν πλείονα. καὶ διδῶσιν οἱ διδόντες οὔτε τὰ μικρὰ οὔτε τὰ πολλὰ ἀντ' οὐδενός (οὐ γὰρ οὕτω μαίνονται, ἀλλ' ὀνούμενοι μὴ ἀδικεῖσθαι τοὺς παρ' αὐτῶν ἐκπλέοντας ἐμπόρους, μὴ συλᾶσθαι, παραπέμπεσθαι τὰ πλοῖα τὰ αὐτῶν, τὰ τοιαῦτα: φασὶ δ' εὐνοίας διδόναι, καὶ τοῦτο τοῦνομ' ἔχει τὰ λήμματα ταῦτα.

<sup>5</sup> WEST 2007.

<sup>6</sup> *Antid.* 280. Cf. ROMILLY 1958; ALEXIOU 2008, p. 365-366.

<sup>7</sup> WHITEHEAD 1993, p. 52-54.

<sup>8</sup> WHITEHEAD 1993, p. 53; COOK 2009, p. 37-40.

<sup>9</sup> VELIGIANNI-TERZI 1997, p. 177.

<sup>10</sup> COOK 2009.

On the other hand, the goodwill of a community or polis towards its benefactors became a stepping-stone on the way that led to the euergetical discourse. Already in Athenian decrees of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> centuries BC, the use of the concepts *eunous* and *eunoia* in the realm of external relations equates them to *euergesia*<sup>11</sup>. Diodorus claims that Alexander 'ordered the return of the exiles not only in order to gain fame (*doxa*), but also because he wished to have in each polis many people who would entertain good will (*eunoia*) toward him and so allow him to check revolutions and *staseis* among the Greeks'<sup>12</sup>. From here on, throughout the Hellenistic period and on under Roman rule, in the relations between rulers and cities the term became part of the process of rewriting power into benefaction, so that power could take on the trappings of good deeds<sup>13</sup>. No matter how conventional and stereotypical the euergetical language sounds like, the terms employed are not devoid of specific meaning, visible especially in the case of a flexible term like *eunoia*<sup>14</sup>.

In the inscriptions of Black Sea cities, the occurrences of *eunoia* fall roughly into two groups: *eunoia* concerning their own citizens or foreigners; and *eunoia* connected to kings and rulers.

#### *Eunoia in connection with private persons*

The most numerous occurrences are offered by the grants of *proxenia*<sup>15</sup>, particularly frequent in the Hellenistic period (45 in total). They come from Byzantion<sup>16</sup>, Dionysopolis<sup>17</sup>, Odessos<sup>18</sup>, Mesambria<sup>19</sup>, Callatis<sup>20</sup>, Tomis<sup>21</sup>, Istros<sup>22</sup>, Olbia<sup>23</sup> and Chersonesus<sup>24</sup>.

The inscriptions cover the period from the early 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century AD; however, the bulk of the evidence belongs to the Hellenistic period, since *proxenia* decrees disappeared with the onset of Roman rule. Notable exceptions to this are the cities north of the Black Sea, Olbia and Chersonesus, which remained until late outside formal Roman rule and where some features of

<sup>11</sup> VELIGIANNI-TERZI 1997, p. 260-262.

<sup>12</sup> 18, 8, 2: Ἀλέξανδρος γὰρ βραχεῖ χρόνῳ πρότερον τῆς τελευτῆς ἔκρινε κατάγειν ἅπαντας τοὺς ἐν ταῖς Ἑλληνίσιν πόλεσι φυγάδας, ἅμα μὲν δόξης ἕνεκεν, ἅμα δὲ βουλόμενος ἔχειν ἐν ἐκάστη πόλει πολλοὺς ἰδίους ταῖς εὐνοίαις πρὸς τοὺς νεωτερισμοὺς καὶ τὰς ἀποστάσεις τῶν Ἑλλήνων; CARNEY & OGDEN 2010, p. 136.

<sup>13</sup> MA 2000, p. 199.

<sup>14</sup> MA 2000, p. 192-194.

<sup>15</sup> For *proxenia* around the Black Sea see now COJOCARU 2016.

<sup>16</sup> I.Byzantion 2 (mid-2<sup>nd</sup> c. BC); I.Byzantion 3 = IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 79 (mid-1<sup>st</sup> c. AD).

<sup>17</sup> IGBulg I<sup>2</sup> 13<sup>ter</sup> (3<sup>rd</sup>- 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BC); SEG 60, 761 (late 2<sup>nd</sup>- early 1<sup>st</sup> c. BC).

<sup>18</sup> IGBulg I<sup>2</sup> 38, 41, 43, 43<sup>bis</sup> (late 3<sup>rd</sup>- late 1<sup>st</sup> c. BC).

<sup>19</sup> IGBulg I<sup>2</sup> 308<sup>bis</sup>, 308<sup>novies</sup>, 312, 315, 316 (3<sup>rd</sup>- late 1<sup>st</sup> c. BC).

<sup>20</sup> ISM III 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 29 (early 3<sup>rd</sup>- late 1<sup>st</sup> c. BC).

<sup>21</sup> ISM II 5 (early 1<sup>st</sup> c. BC).

<sup>22</sup> ISM I 32, 47, 48 (2<sup>nd</sup>- 1<sup>st</sup> c. BC).

<sup>23</sup> IO 24 (= SEG 31, 710), 26, 28, 38, 39 (3<sup>rd</sup>- 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BC); IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 27, 30 (mid- 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC); SEG 28, 656 (including IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 48, late 1<sup>st</sup> c. BC – early 1<sup>st</sup> c. AD); SEG 34, 766 (IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 263 — IO 47+179+53, ca. AD 200). The inscription of Dragomirna ISM I 65 (first half 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC) in all likelihood also belongs here: cf. COJOCARU 2010.

<sup>24</sup> IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 345 (cf. SEG 42, 692; mid-3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC), 351, 364, 365 (SEG 5, .737), SEG 28, 632 (including IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 701), SEG 56, 875 (2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD).

polis life, elsewhere regarded as archaic, such as the granting of *proxenia* decrees, continued well into the Principate, sometimes into the 3<sup>rd</sup> century AD.

In these documents, *eunoia* is invariably referred to as the good will of the *proxenos* towards the city honouring him. In just one case is the *eunoia* of the honouring city towards the honorand invoked, but this is in the final provisions of the text concerning the publication of the decree in the *proxenos'* home city of Olbia<sup>25</sup>. This matches the situation in the Athenian decrees of the Classical period, where there is also just one single decree mentioning the *eunoia* of the Athenian demos towards someone.<sup>26</sup> The goodwill in this relationship is thus the goodwill of the *proxenos* towards the city honouring him, presented as the main incentive for his actions, and not a result of his actions. The same is the case in two decrees, both mentioning the collective *eunoia* of the Istrians: the decree of Apollonia honouring Hegesagoras son of Monimos in the first half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BC<sup>27</sup>, and a Milesian decree for Istros, perhaps as early as the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC.<sup>28</sup>

Remarkable in this context is a series of inscriptions from Chersonesus<sup>29</sup> honouring people from Heraclea Pontica, where the goodwill between Chersonesus and Heraclea is described in terms borrowed from family relations: either the Heracleans' *eunoia* towards Chersonesus is like the benevolence of good parents towards beloved sons<sup>30</sup>, or else the relation between the two is described as 'friendly and brother-like'<sup>31</sup>; elsewhere, the Heracleans are called εὐσεβέστατοι πατέρες<sup>32</sup>. This is justified by Chersonesus being a daughter-city of Heraclea, but never previously had the relations between the cities been thus described. Both inscriptions belong to the first half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD, a time when Roman rule or influence had moulded the relations between the cities in a shape convenient to its interests; here, Heracleian benevolence took the shape of intercession with Roman authorities on behalf of Chersonesus. Thus, the use of *eunoia* in these texts, although formally *proxenia* decrees, belongs altogether in the following category.

Almost as numerous as the *proxenia* decrees are the mentions of *eunoia* in inscriptions erected by cities (also tribes or associations within cities) for their own citizens and benefactors (41). Here too, it is invariably the *eunoia* of the honoured person towards those who granted him the honours that the inscriptions mention. However, since *eunoia* in these cases has primarily the

<sup>25</sup> I.Byzantion 3 = IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 79, *proxenia* for Orontes of Olbia, mid-1<sup>st</sup> c. AD, l. 35-37: ἵνα καὶ ἁ πατρὶς αὐτοῦ τὰς Βυζαντίων εὐνοίας πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τιμᾶς αἴσθηται. See for him COJOCARU 2009; AVRAM 2012b, p. 186.

<sup>26</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 264 (dated before 336-335 BC): VELIGIANNI-TERZI 1997, p. 80, A127.

<sup>27</sup> IGBulg I<sup>2</sup> 388bis = ISM I 64, l. 7-8: Ἰστριανοὶ συγγενεῖς καὶ φίλοι καὶ εὐνοοὶ ὑπάρχοντες τοῦ δήμου.

<sup>28</sup> ISM I 62, l. 5-7: ἔν τε] τοῖς πρότερο[ν χρόνοις] διετέλουν εὐ[νου]ς ὑ[πάρχοντες κοινῇ] τε τῷ δήμ[ω]ι τῶν Μιλησίων καὶ ἰδίαι ---.

<sup>29</sup> Three decrees granting *proxenia* and *politeia* to citizens of Heraclea: IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 357, 359 (SEG 48, 999a; 52, 737 (1)) and SUROV 1960; collective praise of the Heracleans: IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 362. Cf. DANA 2012, p. 253.

<sup>30</sup> IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 357 (late 1<sup>st</sup>- early 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD), l. 7: οἷα πατέρων ἀγαθῶν πρὸς υἱοὺς φιλοστόργους [εἶχ]εν <ε>ῶνοϊαν.

<sup>31</sup> IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 359; v. SEG 48, 999a; 52, 737 (1) (129-130 AD), l. 7: φιλ[ικαὶ κα<ι> ἰ>σαδέλφωι εὐνοῖαι.

<sup>32</sup> IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 362 (reign of Antoninus Pius).

meaning of loyalty (towards one's own city), it is worth noting that, while in most of the Black Sea cities that have yielded such documents in relevant numbers<sup>33</sup>, the mentions of *eunoia* in decrees for strangers and in decrees for citizens are roughly comparable in numbers (Odessos: four *proxeniai*, no honorary inscriptions; Mesambria: five *proxeniai*, one honorary inscription<sup>34</sup>; Callatis: ten *proxeniai*, four honorary inscriptions<sup>35</sup>; Olbia: ten *proxeniai*, 14 honorary inscriptions<sup>36</sup>; Chersonesus: nine *proxeniai*, three honorary inscriptions)<sup>37</sup>, there is a marked imbalance in the case of the city of Istros. There are fifteen mentions of *eunoia* in decrees for Istrians and just three in decrees for foreigners. Most of these texts<sup>38</sup> (barring two)<sup>39</sup> are dated to the Hellenistic period, and as there is no lack of *proxenia* decrees from Istros, this imbalance points to a distinct need of this city, greater than in the case of the others, to have her citizens value the virtues of loyalty and community service.

#### *Eunoia in connection with rulers*

Outside the inscriptions concerning individuals, the second category of texts mentioning *eunoia* includes inscriptions (mostly honorary) concerning kings, rulers and Rome. The rulers involved include Burebista king of the Getae<sup>40</sup>, several Bosporan rulers of the Roman period (Dynamis, Polemon I, Aspurgos, Sauromates II) and, most often, Mithradates Eupator. The texts related to the Bosporan kings come from their own subject cities and from Chersonesus and all of them name the *eunoia* of the persons honoured towards the king or queen of the Bosporus<sup>41</sup>, which in these cases signifies a statement of faith and allegiance. The same is the case of three inscriptions mentioning the goodwill of the cities Istros<sup>42</sup> and Odessos<sup>43</sup> and of a magistrate of Phanagoreia<sup>44</sup> towards the ruling emperor or emperors of Rome.

<sup>33</sup> Just isolated occurrences in: I.Sinope 103 (1<sup>st</sup>- 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD); I.Heraclea 2 (AD 130 or shortly after); CIRB 49 Pantikapaion (2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD); SEG 49, 1051 (ca. 300-275 BC).

<sup>34</sup> IGBulg V 5095 (late 4<sup>th</sup>- early 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC).

<sup>35</sup> ISM III 108 (late 2<sup>nd</sup>- early 1<sup>st</sup> c. BC); ISM III 28 (second half 1<sup>st</sup> c. BC); ISM III 41 (late 1<sup>st</sup> c. BC); ISM III 44 (AD 12-15).

<sup>36</sup> IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 32 (cf. SEG 29, 717), 38, 39, 40, 45b, 46, 51, 57, 64, 187; IO 28/29+123+IOSPE I<sup>2</sup>, 240 = SEG 39, 702; SEG 34, 758; IO 25, 42 (3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC – early 3<sup>rd</sup> c. AD).

<sup>37</sup> IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 371, 381, 425 (2<sup>nd</sup>- 3<sup>rd</sup> c. AD).

<sup>38</sup> ISM I 1, 3, 4+16, 8, 11, 12, 19, 21, 33, 55, 58, 59, 61; SEG 52, 724 (3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC – early 1<sup>st</sup> c. AD).

<sup>39</sup> ISM I 178-179, 193 (2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD)

<sup>40</sup> IGBulg I<sup>2</sup> 13 (honorary decree for Akornion) I. 27-28: τὴν εὐνοίαν τοῦ β[α][σιλέ]ως πρὸς τὴν τῆς πόλεως σωτηρίαν; I. 36-37: τοὺς ὑπὲρ τοῦ βα[σι]λέως χρηματισμοὺς διέθετο τὴν εὐνοίαν τὴν Ῥωμαίων πα[ρ]αγόμενος τῷ βασιλεῖ.

<sup>41</sup> Chersonesus: IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 354+SEG 42, 698 (heavily completed honorary inscription for an ambassador of queen Dynamis, 17/16 BC) I. 9: εὐνοῦν ἐ[αυτὸν παρῆσχετο κτλ. SEG 42, 697 (incl. IOSPE I<sup>2</sup>, 704) Chersonesus (letter of Polemon I, 14-9 BC?) I. 4-8: [οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ Βοσ]πόρου συνιόντες εἰς τὴν ὑμετέραν πόλιν πρέσβεις (?) ἐπαγγέλλονται τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὐνοίαν (*vel sim.*) — —. SEG 46, 940 Gorgippia (letter of Aspurgos for Pantaleon and Theangelos, AD 16) I. 5-6: ἔδο[ξ]αν ἐν πολ[ι]τοῖς μὲν πράγμασιν εὐνοηκέναι μοι. SEG 55, 862 Pantikapaion (funerary inscription for a general of king Sauromates II, late 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD) I. 43-44: τὴν δὲ παρὰ [βασι]λέως εὐνοίαν καταλογιζόμενος.

<sup>42</sup> ISM I 68 (*horothesia*) I. 55: τὴν εἰς τὸν Σεβασ[τ]ὸν ἡμῶν ἐπιδειξάμενοι εὐνοίαν.

<sup>43</sup> IGBulg I<sup>2</sup> 70 Odessos (reign of Antoninus Pius) (badly damaged): I. 7: τὴν εὐνοίαν.

The inscriptions of the time of Mithradates Eupator are all honorary decrees for representatives of the king of Pontus issued by cities which were, in one way or the other, part of Mithradates' Black Sea realm. They are: a decree of Phanagoreia granting privileges for the mercenaries of Mithradates stationed in the city<sup>45</sup>; a decree of Istros honouring Diogenes son of Diogenes, στρατηγὸν <καὶ ἐπὶ> [τῆς πόλ[ε]ως of Mithradates<sup>46</sup>; a decree of Olbia for a ship's captain from Amisos bearing royal assistance for the garrison of Armenians in the city<sup>47</sup>; a *proxenia* decree of Chersonesus for a *strategos* of the king<sup>48</sup>; finally the famous decree of Chersonesus for Diophantos of Sinope<sup>49</sup>. In all of these cases, the honours are couched in the usual formula of honorary decrees for foreigners and the *eunoia* is always the goodwill of the honorand, freely granted to the respective city, although it is, given the political circumstances, obvious that the cities regarded these people as protectors and treated them as such. The same goes for the decree of Chersonesus granting προξ[ε]νίας πολειτείαν to the Roman procurator T. Aurelius Calpurnianus Apollonides (AD 174), which also uses the term *eunoia* in the usual way, as the goodwill of the honorand towards the city<sup>50</sup>.

Most clearly establishing relations of protection and power is the use of the term in the decree of Dionysopolis for her citizen Akornion son of Dionysius, who was employed by Burebista king of the Getae as his ambassador to Pompey the Great<sup>51</sup>. The term *eunoia* is used twice: once to indicate the king's goodwill towards the salvation of the city, then again to show the goodwill of the Romans towards the king.

## 2. *Homonoia*

This term has a much more specific meaning and range than *eunoia*. *Homonoia* has long been a governing ideal of the Greek city, as much as, or perhaps more than, *eirene*, peace, and was, as so many ideals, hard to obtain in practice. *Homonoia* describes a community free from rebellion (*stasis*) and strife (*eris*), in harmony with itself.<sup>52</sup> But precisely because the normal, peaceful internal divisions in the political life of a Greek city so often tended to tip over into outright civil war, *homonoia* was conceived not just as the absence of dissent or

<sup>44</sup> CIRB 1000, AD 179, l. 6-8: διὰ τὴν ὑπερβ[ά]λουσιν εὐνοίαν πρὸς τοὺς κυρίου βασιλεῖς.

<sup>45</sup> SEG 41, 625, l. 5-6: ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσι φιλικῶς καὶ εὐνόως ἐσχηκέναι πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτῶν πόλιν.

<sup>46</sup> ISM I 45 + SEG 47, 1125, l. 43-44: [ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν καὶ] εὐνοί[ας τῆς εἰς τ]ὸν δῆμον.

<sup>47</sup> IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 35, l. 15: καὶ ἔσφωσεν τοὺς πλεόντας εὐνοί[ας] ὑπάρχων.

<sup>48</sup> IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 349 + SEG 52, 735; NEPKh II 110, l. 6: ἀποσταλε[ῖς] ὑπὸ βα[σιλέως] Μιθραδάτα Εὐ[πάτορος] εἰς [τὰν πόλιν] ἁμῶν ἐν πᾶσιν] εὐνοῦν ἐ[αυτὸν πα]ρέχεται; cf. AVRAM 2002; cf. SEG 52, 735; cf. also SAPRYKIN 1997, p. 269-270; BIFFI 2010, p. 59-60; MÜLLER 2010, p. 95.

<sup>49</sup> IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 352, l. 45-46: Χερσονασίταις εὐνοῦν ἑαυτὸν καὶ φιλότιμον παρέχεται, l. 50-51: ὁ δᾶμος στεφανοῖ Διόφαντον Ἀσκληπιοδώρου Σινωπέα ἀρετᾶς ἔνεκα καὶ εὐνοί[ας] τᾶς εἰς αὐτόν.

<sup>50</sup> SEG 45, 985 = AE 1996, 1359, l. 21-2: αἰώνι[α] καρύγματα ἐσσομένα τᾶς φ[ανερ]ᾶς ἐς ἀμὲ εὐνοίας; cf. HAENSCH 2005.

<sup>51</sup> IGBulg I<sup>2</sup> 13, l. 27-8: τὴν εὐνοίαν τοῦ β[α]σιλέως πρὸς τὴν τῆς πόλεως σωτηρίαν; l. 36-7: τοὺς ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλέως χρηματισμοὺς διέθετο τὴν εὐνοίαν τὴν Ῥωμαίων πα[ρ]αγόμενος τῷ βασιλεῖ.

<sup>52</sup> BIANCO 2013.

downright violence, but as perfect agreement, total unanimity, among decision-makers as well as throughout the citizenry<sup>53</sup>, and the aim of the statesman, according to Plutarch, was to produce such harmony within the body politic<sup>54</sup>.

How endemic internal strife<sup>55</sup> was in the Greek world is clearly illustrated by the numbers<sup>56</sup>. The *Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* counts 279 outbreaks of *stasis* in 122 poleis<sup>57</sup>. Nor did later times bring more internal peace. The Hellenistic period, with its new balance of forces, its change in the status of cities, brought rather more than less internal dissent with it, and, although Roman rule scotched armed conflicts between cities, the incidence of tensions between them remained as high as ever, taking on the more benign form of rivalry for titles, rank and prestige and for the more palpable advantages these brought with them<sup>58</sup>. Also, the correspondence between Pliny and Emperor Trajan alludes repeatedly to the possibility of riots and sedition in the cities of Pontus et Bithynia, nor is evidence for factionalism and strife elsewhere lacking<sup>59</sup>. Consequently, the issue of *homonoia*, within cities and among cities, remained a constant preoccupation and became a watchword of the second sophistic<sup>60</sup>: to name just two examples, Plutarch's ideal statesman, virtuous and well-educated, was supposed to put his accomplishments to the service of the common good, of which one of the highest aims is *homonoia*, and Dio Chrysostomos devoted the better part of three of his speeches (*or.* 38-41) to *homonoia* and its benefits<sup>61</sup>.

In the Black Sea area however, *staseis* are barely mentioned. There appears to be a great difference between cities like Heraclea Pontica and Byzantion on the one hand, the only ones of whose internal evolution we are at all well informed, and the rest of the Black Sea cities on the other, of which we know very little in this respect. At Heraclea, the survival of the local history of Memnon and the interest incited by the access to power and the tyranny of Klearchos have yielded information that shows the city changing, over a span of 300 years, from aristocracy to democracy to oligarchy (very restrictive in the beginning, then enlarged), to democracy, to oligarchy again, to tyranny and then back to democracy<sup>62</sup>. At Byzantion, changes from oligarchy to (moderate) democracy, then to an oligarchy sponsored by Sparta, then back to democracy are closely connected to the ups and downs of the general Greek history of the 5<sup>th</sup> and

<sup>53</sup> HANSEN 2004, p. 128; CARTLEDGE 2005, p. 19; CARTLEDGE 2009, p. 24.

<sup>54</sup> Plut. *Mor.* 824 bc; cf. CARTLEDGE 2009, p. 129.

<sup>55</sup> For various explanations of *stasis* in the Greek world see FUNKE 1980; STE CROIX 1981, p. 278-326; LINTOTT 1982; GEHRKE 1985, p. 309-353; FISHER 2000, p. 84-90; HANSEN 2004; AUSTIN 2008, p. 528-535. See also WEES 2007.

<sup>56</sup> GEHRKE 1985, p. 255-257; CARTLEDGE 2009, p. 22.

<sup>57</sup> HANSEN 2004, p. 142 and Index 19. GEHRKE's inventory (1985, 11-199) comprises 283 instances of *stasis* in seventy-eight different poleis, and BERGER 1992 adds seventy-two further examples in sixteen poleis of *Graecia Magna*.

<sup>58</sup> See for this HELLER 2006.

<sup>59</sup> BEKKER-NIELSEN 2008, p. 165-175.

<sup>60</sup> WEISS 2004.

<sup>61</sup> SHEPPARD 1984-1986, p. 241-251.

<sup>62</sup> BURSTEIN 1976; LINTOTT 1982, p. 267-268; GEHRKE 1985, p. 70-72; SAPRYKIN 1997, p. 21-56; BITTNER 1998, p. 19-55; GALLOTTA 2012.

4<sup>th</sup> century BC<sup>63</sup>. But apart from these two cities, there is hardly any information concerning the inner evolution of the Black Sea poleis; there is also no information on measures meant to prevent internal tensions, such as disarming the citizens, laws on regulating access to political power or legislation concerned with limiting economic exploitation or oppression of the poor<sup>64</sup>. One of the reasons for this dearth of information on the other Black sea cities is the scarcity of literary sources in general on this area: the works of local writers have rarely survived to any useful extent and authors from outside the Black Sea area had but scant interest in this peripheric region of the Greek world.

There is a handful of scattered incidents and notices relating to events in various Black Sea cities over a considerable period of time. It is likely that the arrival and integration of new waves of settlers (*epoikoi*)<sup>65</sup> in the Black Sea cities created tensions, but explicit knowledge of such there is only for Apollonia<sup>66</sup>, Byzantion<sup>67</sup> and Mesambria<sup>68</sup>. No doubt to be placed somewhere in the Archaic period are the brief references of Aristotle to the constitutional changes at Apollonia, Istros and Heraclea: at Apollonia, the oligarchs were ousted following a case of peculation<sup>69</sup>, at Istros, the oligarchy was replaced with a democratic regime, while at Heraclea the government passed from a smaller number to six hundred<sup>70</sup>. At Sinope, around 436 BC, the tyrant Timesileos was ousted by Athenian intervention and a Democratic regime instituted<sup>71</sup>. Among the provisions of the civic oath of Chersonesus, some refer to the pledged support for the citizens' consensus<sup>72</sup>, others to the defence of the city from external dangers, to the preservation of the extant democratic regime<sup>73</sup> and to the abstention from illegal regulation of conflicts. These have been seen as indications that an inner crisis, perhaps even involving the secession of parts of the territory of Chersonesus, was overcome and sealed by this oath<sup>74</sup>.

There are then a few vague references to *tarachai*, a term which occurs in Hellenistic texts with the meaning of political confusion, tumult, even civil war<sup>75</sup>. Two of them come from Istros: one is a very fragmentary honorary decree of the

<sup>63</sup> GEHRKE 1985, p. 34-37.

<sup>64</sup> WEES 2007, p. 35-39.

<sup>65</sup> AVRAM 2012a.

<sup>66</sup> Arist. *Pol.* 5.1303a: καὶ Ἀπολλωνιάται οἱ ἐν τῷ Εὐξείνῳ πόντῳ ἐποίκους ἐπαγαγόμενοι ἐστασίασαν.

<sup>67</sup> Arist. *Pol.* 5.1303a: καὶ Βυζαντίοις οἱ ἔποικοι ἐπιβουλεύοντες φωραθέντες ἐξέπεσον διὰ μάχης.

<sup>68</sup> Her. 4.93, 6.33; Ps.- Skymnos 741-742; cf. HIND 1998; ROBU 2014, p. 311-317.

<sup>69</sup> Arist. *Pol.* 5.1306a: ὅτε μὲν οὖν ἐπιχειροῦσί τι κινεῖν, ὅτε δὲ κλέπτουσι τὰ κοινά, ὅθεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς στασιάζουσιν ἢ οὗτοι ἢ οἱ πρὸς τούτους μαχόμενοι κλέπτοντας, ὅπερ ἐν Ἀπολλωνία συνέβη τῇ ἐν τῷ Πόντῳ.

<sup>70</sup> Arist. *Pol.* 5.1305b: ἐν Ἰστρῷ δ' εἰς δῆμον ἀπετελεύτησεν, ἐν Ἡρακλείᾳ δ' ἐξέλαττόνων εἰς ἐξακοσίους ἦλθεν.

<sup>71</sup> Plut. *Per.* 20.1; GEHRKE 1985, p. 150; SURIKOV 2001.

<sup>72</sup> IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 401 (late 4<sup>th</sup> – early 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC), I. 5-7: ὁμονοησῶ ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας καὶ ἐλευθερίας πόλεως καὶ πολιτῶν.

<sup>73</sup> IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 401, I. 13-4: οὐδὲ καταλυσῶ τὴν δαμοκρατίαν.

<sup>74</sup> STOLBA 2005; GALLO 2012. For a different opinion see MAKAROV 2014.

<sup>75</sup> See for this D. M. Pippidi, *ad* ISM I 18; BRUN 2009, p. 246 and n. 24.



3<sup>rd</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> century BC<sup>76</sup> the other the ample decree honouring Agathokles son of Antiphilos<sup>77</sup> (ca. 200 BC), the man who repeatedly helped to avert danger from the city, either by leading troops into battle against the Thracians of Zoltes and various other enemies, or else, more often, by diplomatic means and by buying the assailants off. The same word was used in a fragmentary honorary decree for the benefactor Satyros of the Roman period of Chersonesus<sup>78</sup>. Finally, much later under Roman rule, the only indications of civic tensions are episodic instances such as were brought to the attention of Roman authorities, or involved them: at Istros, the provincial governor Ovinus Tertullus had to intervene in a delimitation conflict between a certain Messia Pudentilla and the inhabitants of a village called Buteridava<sup>79</sup>; at Chersonesus, the affair of the prostitution tax created some tension between the city and the Roman garrison<sup>80</sup>.

This is a meager reap out of the entirety of the Black Sea cities over eight or nine centuries. Mentions of *homonoia* are even scarcer. I have already mentioned the citizens' consensus in the civic oath of Chersonesus. Whether the temple of Homonoia mentioned by Apollonios of Rhodes (l. 717-719) as extant in the small island of Thynia in the territory of Heraclea actually attests the existence of the cult, is undetermined<sup>81</sup>. At Callatis there stood in the late Hellenistic period a sanctuary of Homonoia. It is attested only epigraphically: on two occasions it served as a place of exposure for public documents. The earliest of these is the *foedus* concluded between Rome and Callatis at a much discussed date, probably in the second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC<sup>82</sup>. The later one is an honorary decree granted by an association of *thoinatai* to the notable benefactor Ariston son of Ariston (the elder) towards the very end of the 1<sup>st</sup> century BC<sup>83</sup>, whose activities are known from a number of other inscriptions. The sanctuary seems to have replaced the Samothrakion as the place of exposure for official documents; the latter had served as such from the early 3<sup>rd</sup> to the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BC<sup>84</sup>. The cult of Homonoia<sup>85</sup> as a personification of harmony and agreement within a city, between rich and poor, democrats and oligarchs, between various subdivisions of the body politic or colleges of officeholders, is a typical political cult. The earliest unequivocal testimonies date to the last third of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC<sup>86</sup>, it reached its peak in the 3<sup>rd</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> century BC and attests to the repeated crises which shook the Greek poleis in the Classical as well as the Hellenistic period and also under

<sup>76</sup> ISM I 18, l. 12-13: συναγωγ[ιόντων δὲ τῶν πολιτῶν] τὰ μὲν διὰ τὰς παραχᾶ[ς] — — —.

<sup>77</sup> ISM I 15, l. 8-10: τῆς τε [πόλεως] οὔσης ἐν τα[ρ]αχῇ καὶ πειρατευ[όν]των Θραικῶν οὐκ [όλί]γων τήν τε [χ]ώραν καὶ τὴν [πόλ]ι[ν].

<sup>78</sup> IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 355, l. 19: τὰς ἐμφυλί[?]ου παραχᾶς.

<sup>79</sup> ISM I 359-360, AD 198-202.

<sup>80</sup> IOSPE I 404; cf. BE 2006, 302.

<sup>81</sup> See the discussion in THÉRIAULT 1996, p. 28-34.

<sup>82</sup> ISM III 1 = CIL I<sup>2</sup>, fasc. 3.2676; CIL I<sup>2</sup> 2, fasc. 4.2676; AVRAM 1999.

<sup>83</sup> ISM III 41.

<sup>84</sup> ISM III 4, 7, 19. See for places of exposure at Callatis A. Avram, ISM III, p. 146; in the Western Pontic cities, RUSCU 2015.

<sup>85</sup> For the particular nature, diffusion and iconography of the cult see: ÉTIENNE & PIÉRART 1975; WEST 1977; GIANGIULIO 1982; GRAF 1985, p. 164-165; THÉRIAULT 1996; MESSERSCHMIDT 2003, p. 53-60.

<sup>86</sup> See for this THÉRIAULT 1996.

Roman rule<sup>87</sup>. The presence of such a temple at Callatis indicates some civic convulsion for which we have otherwise no information, sometime prior to the late 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC at the latest, and which was healed by the consecration of this temple<sup>88</sup>.

At Olbia, a long and fragmentarily preserved decree honouring Kallinikos son of Euxenos<sup>89</sup> may include the only explicit reference to *stasis* anywhere around the Black Sea. Among the achievements of the honorand, l. 6-7 mentions that he brought to harmony those in the city who had been at variance with each other ([τοὺς διαφορομένους or τοὺς στασιάζοντας] ἐν τῇ πόλει εἰς ὁμό[νοιαν καταστήσαι). He accomplished this by abolishing certain taxes (*ta tele*) and by introducing the minting of small bronze coin denominations. The first editors<sup>90</sup> connected this with the campaign of Alexander's *strategos* of Thrace Zopyrion against Olbia, which would make the text, dated thus to the last quarter of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC, one of the earliest naming the concept of *homonoia* within the context of dissensions inside a civic community. However, neither the date nor the connection to Zopyrion are assured and a somewhat later date, in the first half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC, has been suggested<sup>91</sup>.

Again from Olbia comes the well-known decree in honour of Theokles son of Satyros (late 2<sup>nd</sup> – early 3<sup>rd</sup> century AD)<sup>92</sup>, notable office-holder and benefactor of the city, to whom no less than 19 cities in the area of the Black Sea and the Straits presented wreaths and honours for his good deeds and his help to strangers. Among many other things, he is described as having 'also held the highest office four times, as it was necessary for such men to hold office even more often', and then, in l. 27-8, as *πᾶσαν ὁμόνοιαν πολιτευόμενος*. The verb *politeuomai*, combined with *homonoia*, does not occur very often. I have found fourteen such instances<sup>93</sup>,

<sup>87</sup> MOULAKIS 1973, esp. p. 109; THÉRIAULT 1996.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. THÉRIAULT 1996, p. 52-54.

<sup>89</sup> IOSPE I<sup>2</sup> 25+31 = SEG 32, 794.

<sup>90</sup> VINOGRADOV & KARYŠKOVSKIJ 1997.

<sup>91</sup> MÜLLER 2010, p. 55 (cf. BÉ 1984, 276: 'tous ces événements sociaux peuvent se produire sans que l'occasion en ait été fournie par une guerre').

<sup>92</sup> IOSPE I<sup>2</sup>, 40. Cf. HEINEN 2009; DANA 2012, p. 263-265.

<sup>93</sup> SEG 60, 1075 Aphrodisias (ca. 188-167 BC): πάντες ... ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ πολιτεύονται; SEG 57, 1663 Melanippion (shortly after 188 BC) (cf. ADAM 2007): ... δι' ἃ καὶ συνβέ[βηκεν] ἐλευθέρους ἡμᾶς ὄντας ἐν εἰρήνῃ / μεθ' ὁμονοίας πολιτεύεσθαι κυριεύ[οντας] / τῶν ἰδίων; I.Smyrna 573 (shortly after 243 BC) l. 65: καὶ πολιτεύσομαι μεθ' ὁμονοίας ἀστασιάστως κατὰ τοὺς Συμυρναίων νόμους καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα τοῦ δή[μ]ου; I.Iasos 4 (honorary decree for Antiochos III and Laodike III, 195-190 BC) l. 56-58: ὃ τε θεὸς ὁ ἀρχηγέτης τοῦ γένους τῶν βασιλέων συνεγεμαρτύρηκεν τῷ βασιλεῖ παρακαλῶν μεθ' ὁμονοίας πολιτεύεσθαι; SEG 1952, no. 61 (ca. 230-220 BC) l. 11-13: οἱ πᾶ[σαν σπουδ]ὰν ἐποιήσαντο τοῦ διαλυθέντα[ς <τοὺς πολέτας>] [τὰ ποθ' αὐτο]ὺς μεθ' ὁμονοίας πολιτεύεσθαι; Syll<sup>3</sup>, 398 Cos (278 BC) l. 25-28: ἐπεύχεσθαι τῷ τε δάμοι τῷ Κώϊων γίνεσθαι τὰ ἀγαθὰ καὶ μεθ' ὁμονοίας πολιτεύειν ἐν δημοκρατίᾳ; I.Priene<sup>1</sup> 531 = I.Priene<sup>2</sup> 108 (honorary decree of Iasos for a judge of Priene, 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BC) l. 10-11: ἵνα συλλυθέντες οἱ ἀντίδικοι τὰ πρὸς αὐτοὺς μεθ' ὁμονοίας πολιτεύονται; I.Priene<sup>1</sup> 54 = I.Priene<sup>2</sup> 109 (honorary decree of Iasos for a judge of Priene, 2<sup>nd</sup> c. BC) l. 9-10: ἵνα συλλυθέντες οἱ ἀντίδικοι τὰ πρὸς αὐ[τ]οὺς[τοὺς μεθ' ὁμονοίας] [πολιτεύονται; IG XII.6.1 95 (honorary decree of Samos for judges of Myndos, ca. 280 BC) l. 15-18: τὰς δὲ διέλυσαν προαιρούμενοι τοὺς διαφορομένους τῶν πολιτῶν διαλυθέντας ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ πολιτεύεσθαι ἀπαλλαγέντας τῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐγκλημάτων; I.Iasos 67 (honorary decree of Calymna for

in which the most usual formula is μεθ' ὁμονοίας πολιτεύεσθαι or ἐν ὁμονοίαι πολιτεύεσθαι. These documents are *sympolitia* agreements, honorary decrees for Hellenistic kings or for foreign judges, and most often they refer to the *homonoia* established (or expected to be established) after some conflictual situation or external intervention. Theokles however is immediately afterwards in the decree described as „behaving like a brother towards the younger people, like a son towards the elder, like a father towards the children, adorned with every virtue ...”<sup>94</sup>. The reference to his taking part in government with all *homonoia* simply belongs in this context, where the civic community is presented like one large loving family<sup>95</sup>.

The last item concerning *homonoia* around the Black Sea are its representations on coins, which occur in several of the cities (in some of them, like Anchialos<sup>96</sup>, coins may also show a temple). However, these representations do not spring from anything specific to these cities. Most of the Black Sea shores lie outside the area of the *homonoia*-coins minted mainly in western Asia Minor and important harbours or road junctions of Bithynia, southern Asia Minor, inland Anatolia and Thrace, which documented relations between two or more cities and *koina*<sup>97</sup>. Just Byzantion and Perinthos, as well as the inland Trajanic foundation of Bizye<sup>98</sup>, offer such coins, connecting them either with each other or else with important centres of the province of Asia and Bithynia. The reasons for establishing *homonoia* between these cities may go back to some former conflict<sup>99</sup>, but in the main they pertain to the commercial links between various shores of the Propontis<sup>100</sup>, especially in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century AD, due to the increased importance of the military road connecting the Balkans with Asia Minor over the Hellespont area<sup>101</sup>. Apart from these however, the representations of *homonoia* on Black Sea

---

judges and the People of Iasos, ca. 270-260 BC): οἱ παραγενόμενοι [πᾶς]αν σπουδᾶν ἐποίησαντο {υ} τοῦ διαλυθέντ<α>ς τοὺς [πολ]ίτας τὰ πὸτ' αὐτοὺς πολιτεύεσθαι μετ' ὁμονοίας; PORCIANI 2001; SEG 30, 1119 (decree of Nacone concerning the reconciliation of rival factions, ca. 254-241 BC?) I. 5-6: συμφέρει δὲ καὶ ἐς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ὁμον[ο]οῦντας πολιτεύεσθαι; OGIS 222 Clazomenae (decree of the Ionian league, 282-268 BC) I. 16-18: ἐλεύθερα οὔσαι καὶ δημο[κρατούμεναι μεθ' ὁμονοίας πολι[τε]ύονται κατὰ τοὺς πατρί[ς]ους νόμους.

<sup>94</sup> L. 28-30: τοῖς δὲ παισὶν ὡς πατήρ, πάσῃ ἀρετῇ κεκοσμημένος.

<sup>95</sup> HEINEN 2009; NIJF 2014.

<sup>96</sup> Maximinus Thrax: STRACK 1912, p. 591; Gordian: STRACK 1912, p. 679 (pl. 8.28); cf. PRICE & TRELL 1977, p. 247 no. 71.

<sup>97</sup> PERA 1984; KLOSE 1987; THÉRIAULT 1996, p. 71-99; FRANKE & NOLLÉ 1997.

<sup>98</sup> Byzantion: with Bizye (under Philippus); with Nicaea (under Trebonianus Gallus / Macrianus): FRANKE & NOLLÉ 1997, p. 20-22 no. 125-139; Bizye: with Byzantion (under Philippus): FRANKE & NOLLÉ 1997, p. 19-20 no. 124; Perinthos: with Ephesus, Cyzicus, Nicomedia, Smyrna (under Gordian III): FRANKE & NOLLÉ 1997, p. 172-173 no. 1718-1725. Perinth also had a *homonoia*-link to Cyzicus under Severus Alexander: the governor M. Ulpius Senecio Saturninus acted as guarantor (*prostates*) of the *homonoia* of the two cities: IGRRP I 797 = I.Perinthos 21, also with Apamea I.Perinthos 55.

<sup>99</sup> See for this SHEPPARD 1984-1986, p. 230-237.

<sup>100</sup> See for this SCHÖNERT-GEISS 1965, I 22-23, 60-61; SCHÖNERT-GEISS 1972, 21-23; ROBERT 1989, p. 283-296; THÉRIAULT 1996, p. 92-93, 96-97; KIRBIHLER 2006.

<sup>101</sup> KLOSE 1987, p. 55-57.

coins<sup>102</sup> belong to a wide range of such monetary images which, under the Principate, illustrated concord in its various aspects concerning the entirety of the Roman empire: harmony within the Imperial house, the *concordia militum*, good understanding between the army and the cities (in the case of garrisons), between and within the cities<sup>103</sup>.

Thus, there are few mentions of strife or discord around the Black Sea, but even fewer of harmony or reconciliation. This is not far from the situation in the cities around the Aegean, who were nothing less than free of internal tensions, but where references to harmony and reconciliation are altogether rare, not least because often reconciliations were temporary, fickle, occasionally insincere<sup>104</sup>. In the Black Sea area, there are additional reasons for supposing that indeed *staseis* were less frequent than elsewhere. On the one hand, the position of these cities on the fringes of the Greek world and the proximity of Barbaric neighbours who were often hostile, especially during the later Hellenistic period, may have fostered a greater cohesion of the body politic, especially in the cities on the northern and western sea shore, which were more directly exposed. On the other, *stasis* was often fueled by external politics and spilled over into external politics<sup>105</sup>. The few cases known to us from the Black Sea area – Byzantion, Heraclea, Sinope – confirm this, as seen above. The Black Sea cities were isolated in this respect also. Prior to the coming of Rome, they were rarely part of any political construct larger than themselves. Alliances between cities, as far as they are documented, appear to have had little permanence, they were usually concluded in order to achieve a specific aim – to defend against a common enemy, to gang up against a neighbour – and were afterwards allowed to dissolve. Powers from outside the Black Sea area – Athens, the Hellenistic kingdoms – were rarely directly involved in Black Sea affairs and the only great power centered on the Black Sea, the realm of Mithradates Eupator, had its attention, over most of the duration of its existence, diverted away from the concerns of the Black Sea proper. Athens' presence in the Black Sea at the acme of its power may indeed have triggered changes of regime in several places – certainly at Sinope, perhaps the dynastic change in the Bosporan Kingdom, conceivably the advent of democratic regimes in other cities –, but this involvement remained episodic. As such, there was little opportunity for external entanglements enhancing the potential of internal dissent in these cities to the point of open revolt.

It appears, then, that *staseis* in the cities around the Black Sea were indeed a more seldom occurrence than in most parts of the Greek world. Otherwise, one would have to assume that these cities were no strangers to internal discord, just disinclined to pursue and document reconciliation and civic harmony.

---

<sup>102</sup> Perinthis: SCHÖNERT-GEISS 1965, I 58-59.

<sup>103</sup> WEISS 2004, p. 183.

<sup>104</sup> GEHRKE 1985, p. 261-266.

<sup>105</sup> GEHRKE 1985, p. 288: 'Vermengung von Außenpolitik und Stasis'; most emphatic RUSCHENBUSCH 1978 (for which see LINTOTT 1982, p. 272-273; FUNKE 1980).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Abbreviations

- AE *Année épigraphique*, Paris 1888.  
 BÉ *Bulletin épigraphique, Revue des études grecques*, Paris 1938.  
 I.Byzantion A. Łajtar, *Die Inschriften von Byzantion* (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 58), Bonn 2000.  
 I.Iasos W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Iasos I-II* (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 28.1-2), Bonn 1985.  
 I.Perinthos M. H. Sayar, *Perinthos-Herakleia (Marmara Ereğlisi) und Umgebung. Geschichte, Testimonien, griechische und lateinische Inschriften* (Veröffentlichungen der kleinasiatischen Kommission der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Nr. 9), Wien 1998.  
 I.Priene<sup>1</sup> F. H. von Gaertringen, *Inschriften von Priene*, Berlin 1906.  
 I.Priene<sup>2</sup> W. Blümel, R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Priene I* (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 69), Bonn 2014.  
 I.Smyrna G. Petzl, *Die Inschriften von Smyrna I-II* (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 23-24), Bonn 1982-90.  
 NEPKh E. I. Solomonik, *Novye epigraficheskie pamjatniki Chersonesa. Lapidarnye nadpisi*, Kiev 1964-1973.

## Authors

- ADAK 2007 – M. Adak, *Die rhodische Herrschaft in Lykien und die rechtliche Stellung der Städte Xanthos, Phaselis und Melanippion*, *Historia* 56 (2007), 3, p. 251-279.  
 ALEXIOU 2008 – E. Alexiou, *Eunoia bei Plutarch: von den Praecepta Gerendae Reipublicae zu den Viten*, in: A. G. Nikolaidis (ed.), *The unity of Plutarch's work. 'Moralia' themes in the 'Lives', features of the 'Lives' in the 'Moralia'*, Berlin – New York, 2008, p. 365-386.  
 AUSTIN 2008 – M. M. Austin, *Society and Economy*, in: D. M. Lewis, J. Boardman, S. Hornblower, M. Ostwald (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History<sup>2</sup> VI. The Fourth Century BC*, Cambridge, 2008, p. 527-564.  
 AVRAM 1999 – A. Avram, *Der Vertrag zwischen Rom und Kallatis. Ein Beitrag zum römischen Volksrecht*, Amsterdam, 1999.  
 AVRAM 2002 – A. Avram, *Ein neuer Strategie des Königs Mithridates VI Eupator im Taurischen Chersonesus*, *Izvestija na narodnija muzej Burgas* 4. *Studia in honorem Ivani Karayotov*, Burgas, 2002, p. 69-73.  
 AVRAM 2012a – A. Avram, *Le rôle des époikoi dans la colonisation grecque en mer Noire: quelques études de cas*, *Pallas* 89 (2012), p. 197-215.  
 AVRAM 2012b – A. Avram, *Les étrangers dans la diplomatie des cités grecques de la mer Noire (époques hellénistique et impériale)*, *Cahiers du centre Gustave Glotz* 23 (2012), p. 181-194.  
 BEKKER-NIELSEN 2008 – T. Bekker-Nielsen, *Urban Life and Local Politics in Roman Bithynia. The Small World of Dion Chrysostomos*, Aarhus, 2008.  
 BERGER 1992 – S. Berger, *Revolution and Society in Greek Sicily and Southern Italy*, Stuttgart, 1992.  
 BIANCO 2013 – E. Bianco, *Concordia senza homonoia*, *Historika* 3 (2013), p. 287-322.  
 BIFFI 2010 – N. Biffi, *Scampoli di Mithridatika nella Geografia di Strabone*, Bari, 2010.  
 BITTNER 1998 – A. Bittner, *Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft in Herakleia Pontike. Eine Polis zwischen Tyrannis und Selbstverwaltung* (Asia Minor Studien 30), Bonn, 1998.  
 BRUN 2009 – P. Brun, *Pourquoi les Grecs avaient-ils horreur des révolutions?*, in: G. Urso (ed.), *Ordine e sovversione nel mondo greco e romano. Atti del convegno internazionale Cividale dei Friuli, 25-27 settembre 2008*, Pisa, 2009, p. 241-257.

BURSTEIN 1976 – S. M. Burstein, *Outpost of Hellenism. The Emergence of Heraclea on the Black Sea*, Berkeley, 1976.

CARNEY & OGDEN 2010 – E. D. Carney & D. Ogden, *Philip II and Alexander the Great: Father and Son, Lives and Afterlives*, Oxford, 2010.

CARTLEDGE 2005 – P. Cartledge, *Greek Political Thought: The Historical Context*, in: Chr. Rowe, M. Schofield (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*, Cambridge, 2005.

CARTLEDGE 2009 – P. Cartledge, *Ancient Greek Political Thought in Practice*, Cambridge, 2009.

COJOCARU 2009 – V. Cojocaru, *Von Byzantion nach Olbia: Zur Proxenie und zu den Außenbeziehungen auf der Grundlage einer Ehreninschrift*, *ArhMold* 32 (2009), p. 41-56.

COJOCARU 2010 – V. Cojocaru, *Inscripția greacă de la Dragomirna*, *Pontica* 43 (2010), p. 323-345.

COJOCARU 2016 – V. Cojocaru, *Instituția proxeniei în spațiul pontic / Die Proxenie im Schwarzmeerraum (Pontica et mediterranea 5)*, Cluj –Napoca, 2016.

COOK 2009 – B. L. Cook, *Athenian Terms of Civic Praise in the 330s: Aeschines vs. Demosthenes*, *GRBS* 49 (2009), p. 31-52.

DANA 2012 – M. Dana, *Pontiques et étrangers dans les cités de la mer Noire: le rôle des citoyennetés multiples dans l'essor d'une culture régionale*, in: A. Heller, A.- V. Pont (eds.), *Patrie d'origine et patries électives: les citoyennetés multiples dans le monde grec d'époque romaine. Actes du colloque international de Tours, 6-7 novembre 2009 (Scripta Antiqua 40)*, Bordeaux, 2012, p. 249-266.

ÉTIENNE & PIÉRART 1975 – R. Étienne & M. Piérart, *Un décret du koinon des Hellènes à Platées en l'honneur de Glaucon, fils d'Étéoclés, d'Athènes*, *BCH* 99 (1975), p. 51-75.

FISHER 2000 – N. Fisher, *Hybris, Revenge and Stasis in the Greek City-States*, in: H. v. Wees (ed.), *War and Violence in Ancient Greece*, London, 2000, p. 83-123.

FRANKE & NOLLÉ 1997 – P. R. Franke & M. K. Nollé, *Die Homonoia-Münzen Kleasiens und der thrakischen Randgebiete*, Saarbrücken, 1997.

FUNKE 1980 – P. Funke, *Stasis und politischer Umsturz in Rhodos zu Beginn des IV. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, in: W. Eck, H. Galsterer, H. Wolff (eds.), *Studien zur antiken Sozialgeschichte. Festschrift Friedrich Vittinghoff*, Köln, 1980, p. 59-70.

GALLO 2012 – L. Gallo, *Le poleis del Mar Nero tra stasis e homonoia: il caso di Chersoneso Taurica*, in: S. Cataldi, E. Bianco, G. Cuniberti (eds.), *Salvare le poleis, costruire la concordia, progettare la pace*, Torino, 2010, p. 431-437.

GALLOTTA 2012 – S. Gallotta, *Le città del Mar Nero tra stasis e homonoia: Eraclea Pontica*, in: S. Cataldi, E. Bianco, G. Cuniberti (eds.), *Salvare le poleis, costruire la concordia, progettare la pace*, Torino, 2012, p. 439-445.

GEHRKE 1985 – H.-J. Gehrke, *Stasis. Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. (Vestigia 35)*, München, 1985.

GIANGIULIO 1982 – M. Giangiulio, *Edifici pubblici e culti nelle nuove iscrizioni da Entella*, *Annali della scuola normale superiore di Pisa* 12 (1982), 3, p. 981-992.

GRAF 1985 – F. Graf, *Nordionische Kulte. Religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulturen von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia (Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana 21)*, Rome, 1985.

HAENSCH 2005 – R. Haensch, *Rom und Chersonesus Taurica. Die Beziehungen beider Staaten im Lichte der Ehrung des T. Aurelius Calpurnianus Apollonides*, in: V. Cojocaru (ed.), *Ethnic Contacts and Cultural Exchanges North and West of the Black Sea from the Greek Colonization to the Ottoman Conquest*, Iași, 2005, p. 255-268.

HAENSCH 2014 – R. Haensch, *Un discours épigraphique sur les faiblesses de l'Imperium Romanum? Le regard des princes et de leurs sujets*, *Cahiers du centre Gustave Glotz* 25 (2014), p. 297-306.

HANSEN 2004 – M. H. Hansen, *Stasis as an Essential Aspect of the Polis*, in: M. H. Hansen, T. H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford, 2004, p. 124-129.

HEINEN 2009 – H. Heinen, *Theokles von Olbia: ein idealer Polisbürger und Freund der Fremden*, in: A. Çoşkun, H. Heinen, S. Pfeiffer (eds.), *Identität und Zugehörigkeit im Osten der griechisch-römischen Welt. Aspekte ihrer Repräsentation in Städten, Provinzen und Reichen*, Frankfurt/Main, 2009, p. 21-33.

HELLER 2006 – A. Heller, *“Les bêtises des Grecs”. Conflits et rivalités entre cités d’Asie et de Bithynie à l’époque romaine (129 a. C.- 235 p. C.)*, Bordeaux, 2006.

HIND 1998 – J. Hind, *Megarian Colonization in the Western Half of the Black Sea (Sister- and Daughter-Cities of Herakleia)*, in: G. Tsetskhladze (ed.), *The Greek Colonization of the Black Sea Area* (Historia Einzelschriften 121), Stuttgart, 1998, p. 131-152.

KIRBIHLER 2006 – F. Kirbihler, *Les émissions de monnaies d’Homonoia et les crises alimentaires en Asie sous Marc-Aurèle*, *REA* 108 (2006), p. 613-640.

KLOSE 1987 – D. O. A. Klose, *Die Münzprägung von Smyrna in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Berlin, 1987.

LINTOTT 1982 – A. Lintott, *Violence, Civil Strife and Revolution in the Classical City*, London, 1982.

MA 2000 – J. Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford 2000.

MAKAROV 2014 – I. A. Makarov, *Towards an Interpretation of the Civic Oath of the Chersonesites (IOSPE I<sup>2</sup>, 401)*, *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 20 (2014), p. 1-38.

MESSERSCHMIDT 2003 – W. Messerschmidt, *Prosopopoia. Personifikationen politischen Charakters in spätklassischer und hellenistischer Kunst*, Köln – Weimar – Wien, 2003.

MOULAKIS 1973 – A. Moulakis, *Homonoia. Eintracht und Entwicklung eines politischen Bewußtseins*, München, 1973.

MÜLLER 2010 – Ch. Müller, *D’Olbia à Tanais. Territoires et réseaux d’échanges dans la mer Noire septentrionale aus époques classique et hellénistique (Scripta antiqua 28)*, Bordeaux, 2010.

NIJF 2014 – O. M. van Nijf, *Affective Politics. The Emotional Regime in the Imperial Greek City*, in: A. Chaniotis, P. Ducrey (eds.), *Unveiling Emotions II. Emotions in Greece and Rome: Texts, Images, Material Culture* (Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien 55), Stuttgart, 2014, p. 351-368.

PERA 1984 – R. Pera, *Homonoia sulle monete da Augusto agli Antonini. Studio storico-tipologico*, Genova, 1984.

PORCIANI 2001 – L. Porciani, *I decreti. Testo e traduzione*, in: C. Ampolo (ed.), *Da un’ antica città di Sicilia. I decreti di Entella e Nakone*, Pisa, 2001, p. 11-31.

PRICE & TRELL 1977 – M. J. Price, B. L. Trell, *Coins and Their Cities. Architecture on the Ancient Coins of Greece, Rome and Palestine*, London, 1977.

ROBERT 1989 – L. Robert, *Opera minora selecta VI*, Paris, 1989.

ROBU 2014 – A. Robu, *Mégare et les établissements mégariens de Sicile, de la Propontide et du Pont-Euxin. Histoire et institutions*, Bern 2014.

ROMILLY 1958 – J. de Romilly, *Eunoia in Isocrates or the Political Importance of Creating Good Will*, *JHS* 78 (1958), p. 92-101.

RUSCHENBUSCH 1978 – E. Ruschenbusch, *Untersuchungen zu Staat und Politik in Griechenland vom 7.- 4. Jh. v. Chr.*, Bamberg, 1978.

RUSCU 2015 – L. Ruscu, *The Places of Display of Public Documents in the Western Pontic Cities*, in: A. Dobos, D. Petruț, S. Berecki, L. Vass, Sz. P. Pánczél, Zs. Molnár-Kovács, P. Forisek (eds.), *Archaeologia Transylvanica. Studia in honorem Stephani Bajusz*, Cluj-Napoca, 2015, p. 75-83.

STE. CROIX 1981 – G. E. M. de STE. CROIX, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World, from the Archaic Age to the Arab Conquests*, Ithaca, 1981.

SAPRYKIN 1997 – S. J. Saprykin, *Heracleia Pontica and Tauric Chersonesus before Roman Domination (VI.- I. centuries B. C.)*, Amsterdam, 1997.

SCHÖNERT-GEISS 1965 – E. Schönert-Geiß, *Die Münzprägung von Perinthos*, Berlin, 1965.

SCHÖNERT-GEISS 1972 – E. Schönert-Geiß, *Die Münzprägung von Byzantion Teil II: Kaiserzeit*, Berlin – Amsterdam, 1972.

SEGRE 1952 – M. Segre, *Tituli Calymnii*, *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente* 22-3 N.S. 6-7 (1944-5 [1952]), 1-248.

SHEPPARD 1984-1986 – A. R. R. Sheppard, *Homonoia in the Greek cities of the Roman Empire*, *AncSoc* 15-17 (1984-1986), p. 229-252.

STOLBA 2005 – V. F. Stolba, *The Oath of Chersonesus and the Chersonesean Economy in the Early Hellenistic Period*, in: Z. H. Archibald, J. K. Davies, V. Gabrielsen (eds.), *Making, Moving and Managing. The New World of Ancient Economies, 323-31 BC*, Oxford, 2005, p. 298-321.

STRACK 1912 – M. L. Strack, *Die antiken Münzen Nordgriechenlands II 1/1: Thrakien*, Berlin, 1912.

SURIKOV 2001 – I. E. Surikov, *Historico-Geographical Questions Connected with Pericles' Pontic Expedition*, *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 7 (2001), 3-4, p. 341-366.

SUROV 1960 – E. G. Surov, *Novaja khersonesskaja nadpis*, *VDI* 3 (1960), p. 154-158.

THÉRIAULT 1996 – G. Thériault, *Le culte d'Homonoia dans les cités grecques*, Lyon – Québec, 1996.

VELIGIANNI-TERZI 1997 – Ch. Veligianni-Terzi, *Wertbegriffe in den attischen Ehrendekreten der klassischen Zeit*, Stuttgart, 1997.

VINOGRADOV & KARYŠKOVSKIJ 1997 – Ju. G. Vinogradov & P. O. Karyškovskij, *Kallinikos, Sohn des Euxenos: Probleme der politischen sowie der Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte Olbias in der zweiten Hälfte des IV. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, in: Ju. G. Vinogradov, *Pontische Studien. Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte und Epigraphik des Schwarzmeerraumes*, Mainz, 1997, p. 276-322.

WEES 2007 – H. v. Wees, *"Stasis, Destroyer of Men". Mass, Elite, Political Violence and Security in Archaic Greece*, in: C. Brélaz, P. Ducrey (éds.), *Sécurité collective et ordre public dans les sociétés anciennes*, Genève, 2007, p. 1-39.

WEISS 2004 – P. Weiß, *Städtische Münzprägung und zweite Sophistik*, in: B. E. Borg (ed.), *Paideia: the World of the Second Sophistic*, Berlin, 2004, p. 179-202.

WEST 1977 – W. C. West, *Hellenic Homonoia and the New Decree from Plataea*, *GRBS* 18 (1977), 4, p. 307-319.

WEST 2007 – W. C. West, *"Good Will for the City": Development of a Formula in Inscriptions and Literature*, in: M. Mayer y Olivé, G. Baratta, A. Guzmán Almagro (eds.), *XII Congressus Internationalis Epigraphiae Graecae et Latinae (Barcelona, 3-8 septembris 2002) II*, Barcelona, 2007, p. 1493-1496.

WHITEHEAD 1993 – D. Whitehead, *Cardinal Virtues. The Language of Public Approbation in Democratic Athens*, *Classica et mediaevalia* 44 (1993), p. 37-75.

WHITING 2006 – J. Whiting, *The Nicomachean Account of Philia*, in: R. Kraut (ed.), *The Blackwell Guide to Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*, Oxford, 2006, p. 276-304.

WOOLF 2015 – G. Woolf, *Rome and Imperialism*, in: I. Ness, Z. Cope (eds.), *Palgrave Encyclopedia of Imperialism and Anti-Imperialism*, London, 2015, p. 725-739.