CLAUDIUS' GRANT OF CILICIA TO POLEMO

Late in 37 or in 36 B.C., Polemo I left his Cilician kingdom for Pontus, which he received from Antony who had taken it away from Darius, son of Pharnaces.[1] Before he died in 8 B.C., Polemo also gained control over neighbouring Bosporus when he married his first wife Dynamis, the widow of Asander, in 15 or 14 B.C.[2] Soon afterwards, Polemo, who had no children from Dynamis, married Pythodoris and had by her a daughter, Antonia Tryphaena, and two sons.[3] One of the two Polemo's sons from Pythodoris was Zeno, the king of Greater Armenia. The other, not named by Strabo (*idiotes* meant that he was not the king), has been identified as a dynast of Cilician Olba, M. Antonius Polemo, who struck his coins in Olba during the reign of Tiberius, about A.D. 27/29.[4] The Roman name came to him either from his father who, therefore, should have received it together with Roman citizenship from Antony, which is nowhere attested, or from his mother, Pythodoris, allegedly the daughter of Pythodoros of Tralles and Antonia.[5] His name has allowed some to identify him with M. Antonius Polemo, the king of Cilicia, whose coins from Olba are known in the reigns of Nero and Galba.[6]

This M. Ant. Polemo has been identified with another Polemo, the king of Pontus, after the words of Dio Cassius who described the grants of the emperor Claudius in the following way: 'to another Mithridates, a lineal descendant of Mithridates the Great, he granted Bosporus, giving Polemo some land in Cilicia in place of it'. How-

[1] D.C. 49.25.4; see 53.25.1 and 26.3, 54.24.5; App. *BCiv.* 5.75; Plut. *Ant.* 38, 61.2. For the origin of Polemo I, see G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford, 1965), 143–4.

[2] D.C. 54.24.6; Strab. 11.493, 495. For Polemo's coinage in Bosporus from 14/13 to 10/9 B.C., see V. A. Anokhin, *Monetnoe delo Bospora* [*The Coinage of Bosporus*] (Kiev, 1986), 81–2.

[3] M. I. Rostovtzeff, 'Queen Dynamis of Bosporus', *JHS* 39 (1919), 99 and 104–5; W. Hoben, *Untersuchungen zur Stellung Kleinasiatischer Dynasten in den Machtkämpfen der ausgehenden Römischen Republik*, Dissertation (Mainz, 1969), 52, n. 197.

[4] Strab. 12.556: *τῶν δὲ τῆς Πυθοδωρίδος υἱῶν ὁ μὲν ἰδιώτης συνδιώκει τῇ μητρὶ τὴν ἀρχήν, ὁ δὲ νεωστὶ καθέσταται τῆς μεγάλης Ἀρμενίας βασιλεύς*. G. F. Hill, 'Olba, Gennatis, Lalassis', *NC* 3rd ser., 19 (1899), 186–7; W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire* (London, 1903[7]), 427–8; W. W. Tarn and M. P. Charlesworth, *CAH* X (1934), 112–13; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton, 1950), 1407, n. 26; A. A. Barrett, 'Polemo II of Pontus and M. Antonius Polemo', *Historia* 27 (1978), 447; D. Braund, *Rome and the Friendly King. The Character of the Client Kingship* (New York, 1984), 41, 48, n. 15. For his coins, see *SNG. von Aulock* 5791–2; G. M. Staffieri, *La monetazione di Olba nella Cilicia Trachea* (Lugano, 1978), 20, nos. 29–31 (A.D. 27/28) and 21, nos. 32–4 (A.D. 28/29); R. Ziegler, *Münzen Kilikiens aus kleineren deutschen Sammlungen* (Munich, 1988), 56, no. 370.

[5] For his name as received from the father, see Braund (n. 4), 41–2; from the mother, see Hill (n. 4), 186–7; Ramsay (n. 4), 427–8; Th. Mommsen, *Gesammelte Schriften* VIII (Berlin, 1913), 270, 311; Tarn and Charlesworth (n. 4), 112, n. 5; R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1952), 262; Hoben (n. 3), 51. Cf. the scepticism of H. Dessau, 'De regina Pythodoride et de Pythodoride iuniore', *Ephemeris Epigraphica* 9 (1913), 691–3. But the grandsons of Pythodoris, that is, the three sons of Antonia Tryphaena and Cotys VIII Sapaean, were brought up together with Gaius (Caligula) who was the grandson of Younger Antonia (see below).

[6] Magie (n. 4), 1407, n. 26; R. D. Sullivan, 'Dynasts in Pontus', *ANRW* II.7 (1980), 926–7. *Contra* Barrett (n. 4), 446–7; Braund (n. 4), 48, n. 15; see also Hoben (n. 3), 52. Nero: Staffieri (n. 4), 22, nos. 35–6; H. Seyrig, 'Monnaies hellénistiques', *RevNum* 6th ser., 11 (1969), 45–7. Galba: ed. G. F. Hill, *BMC. Lycaonia, Isauria, and Cilicia* 21 (London, 1900), liv = B. V. Head, *Historia Numorum* (Oxford, 1911[2]), 727 = Staffieri (n. 4), 22, no. 37 (A.D. 68/69); see Magie (n. 4), 1407, n. 26.

© The Classical Association 2003, all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ever, a papyrus containing a rescript of Claudius, though almost a hundred and fifty years later than the original, refers to Polemo of Pontus as Iulius Polemo who held joint games together with Antiochus IV of Commagene.[7] Iulius Polemo of Pontus and M. Ant. Polemo of Cilicia were two different people.

Three solutions have been offered to reconcile the evidence that we have. First, some have still tried to see M. Antonius Polemo and Iulius Polemo as the same person who could for various reasons be referred to in different ways.[8] However, the *nomen* was different and the two men ruled different principalities at the same time since their coinages paralleled each other: the coins of M. Antonius Polemo of Cilicia refer to him as a dynast under Tiberius and as the king under Nero and Galba, while the known coins of Polemo from Pontus were issued from the reign of Claudius until the reorganization of Pontus as a province by Nero in A.D. 64.[9] The coinage of M. Antonius Polemo therefore was struck both before and after Pontus was reorganized as a province.

The second solution was offered by Magie who, referring to the papyrus discussed above, suggested that Dio confused two different people who bore the name Polemo and connected the grant of the Bosporan throne to Mithridates with the evidence for Polemo's presence in Cilicia. Magie's idea has great appeal because Dio clearly confused members of Polemo's dynasty in another place, where he described how the newly enthroned emperor Gaius (Caligula) 'granted to Sohaemis the land of the Ituraean Arabians, to Cotys Lesser Armenia and parts of Arabia at a later date, to Rhoemetalcus the possessions of Cotys, and to Polemo, the son of Polemo, his ancestral domain, all upon vote of the senate'.[10] These three men were sons of the above-mentioned daughter of Polemo I, Antonia Tryphaena (as the sister of M. Ant. Polemo of Cilicia, she had the same *nomen*), and Cotys VIII Sapaean, the king of Thrace. After Cotys VIII was slain in A.D. 19, his children came under the tutelage of Trebellienus Rufus and were brought up together with young Gaius.[11] The latter rewarded his boyhood friends, and probably cousins, by making them kings of 'ancestral kingdoms' soon after he became the emperor.[12] The eldest, Rhoemetalcus (III), named after his paternal grandfather, assumed the ancestral kingdom of Thrace. Cotys, named after his father, was appointed king of Lesser Armenia by Gaius. The third brother, Polemo, named after his maternal grandfather, was made the king of Pontus which he could claim as his ancestral kingdom through his connection to Polemo I.[13] Cotys VIII Sapaean, the father of the three kings, was the son of

[7] D.C. 60.8.2. *Greek Papyri in the British Museum* III (London, 1907), 214–9, no. 1178, with L. Mitteis and U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde* I.2 (Leipzig-Berlin, 1912), 185, no. 156 = E. M. Smallwood, *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero* (Cambridge, 1967), 104, no. 374, lines 21–3: ἐμ[α]ρ[τυ]ρεῖτε (or [πο]ιεῖτε) ἐπ' ἐμοῦ Γαΐῳ Ἰουλίῳ Ἀντιόχῳ τ[ῷ Κομμαγηνῆς] βασιλεῖ καὶ Ἰουλίῳ Πολέμωνι τῷ Πόντου, ἀνδράσι τειμίοις μο[υ καὶ] φίλοις κτλ. (A.D. 47; from A.D. 194).

[8] R. D. Sullivan, 'King Marcus Antonius Polemo', *NC* 7th ser., 19 (1979), 11–3; id. (n. 6), 928–9; id., *Near Eastern Royalty and Rome, 100–30 B.C.* (Toronto, 1990), 163, 324 and stemma 2 (note 2); Barrett (n. 4), 445–7.

[9] For example, *SNG. von Aulock* 6690; Magie (n. 4), 1417, n. 62; Suet. *Ner.* 18; W. Kubitschek, 'Aera (xxxv)', *RE* 1 (1893), 643.

[10] Magie (n. 4), 1407, n. 26; D.C. 59.12.2.

[11] Vell. 2.129.1; Strab. 12.556; Tac. *Ann.* 3.38.

[12] *Syll.*[3] 798 = *IG Rom* IV.145 = Smallwood (n. 7), 121, no. 401, lines 6–7, 18–19 (Cyzicus, A.D. 37).

[13] Rhoemetalcus (III): *IG* III.1077, 1284 (archon in Athens in A.D. 37/38); *IG Rom.* IV.147

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rhoemetalcus I, whose full name was Ti. Iulius Rhoemetalcus. It is from him that Polemo of Pontus got his *nomen*.[14]

The third solution to the problem of how to reconcile the evidence about M. Ant. Polemo and Iulius Polemo with the information of Dio (60.8.2) arose with the discovery of an inscription from Laertes in Cilicia, which contains what might have been an imperial letter to that place and refers to someone whose name was plausibly restored as Iulius Polemo.[15] This letter, later attributed to the emperor Vespasian, has suggested to some that after retiring from Pontus, Iulius Polemo spent the rest of his days in Cilicia before it was reorganized as a province by Vespasian in A.D. 72. The new inscription has removed the problem of how to reconcile Claudius' grant of Cilicia to Iulius Polemo with the evidence about M. Antonius Polemo in Cilicia: the two men appear to have occupied different parts of Cilicia.[16] The same inscription also reinvigorated interest in the words of Dio (60.8.2) which have been interpreted as meaning that Claudius gave Polemo parts of Cilicia in return for Bosporus which this emperor assigned to Mithridates (VIII).[17]

This interpretation, however, raises two questions. First, Dio said that Gaius gave Polemo his 'ancestral kingdom', that is, Pontus and Bosporus, which had belonged to Polemo I, and he also made it clear that Polemo later received a compensation for Bosporus.[18] But on the one hand there are no other sources referring to the younger Polemo as the king of Bosporus, even before the accession of Claudius. An honorary inscription for Polemo's brother Cotys and Antonia Tryphaena from Cyzicus refers to Polemo only as the king of Pontus. And the coins of the Bosporan monarchs do not include any of the younger Polemo, which has allowed some to suggest that he never controlled that territory.[19] On the other, Mithridates has been acknowledged as controlling Bosporus already before the accession of Claudius: his coins are dated to the years 336/338 of the Bosporan era, or A.D. 39/40–41/42. Attempts that have been

(Cyzicus, after A.D. 37); Tac. *Ann*. 2.67; D.C. 59.12.2. Cotys: Tac. *Ann*. 11.9.2; D.C. 59.12.2. Polemo I, the maternal grandfather of this Cotys, received Lesser Armenia from Antony: D.C. 49.33.2, 44.3. Polemo the younger: ed. W. Wroth, *BMC. Pontus, Paphlagonia, Bithynia, and the Kingdom of Bosporus* 13 (London, 1889), 47, nos. 11 and 12 = *SNG. von Aulock* 6686–9.

[14] Cf. *PIR*^{2} I.516–17. See also 472: 'Iulius Polemo (II), rex Ponti', where, however, he is identified with M. Ant. Polemo of Cilicia.

[15] G. E. Bean and T. B. Mitford, *Journeys in Rough Cilicia 1964–1968*, *Denk.Ak.Wien* 102 (Vienna, 1970), 95, no. 71: [*Λαερτειτῶν* e.g. *τῷ δήμῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσι χαίρειν· τ*]*ῶν κατὰ Ἰούλιον Πολέ*[*μωνα - - - - - -] τὸ τέλος σχόντων*, tentatively attributed by the editors to the emperor Claudius, on the grounds that Polemo received Cilicia from that emperor (D.C. 60.8.2).

[16] E. W. Gray, *CR* 22 (1972), 400–1; R. Syme, *Roman Papers* V, ed. A. R. Birley (Oxford, 1988), 664.

[17] Hill (n. 4), 187; Ramsay (n. 4), 428; Mommsen (n. 5), 271; Rostovtzeff (n. 3), 105–8; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *The Emperor Gaius (Caligula)* (Oxford, 1934), 201: 'In A.D. 41 [Polemo] exchanged the Bosporus for part of Cilicia'; W. Hoffmann, 'Polemon (3)', *RE* 42 (1952), 1287; V. F. Gaidukevič, *Das Bosporanische Reich* (Berlin, 1971), 341; H. Volkmann, 'Mithradates (9)', *KlPauly* 3 (1979), 1358; Sullivan (n. 8), 12; Syme (n. 16), 664; J. J. Wilkes, *CAH*^{2} X (1996), 556; I. von Bredow, 'Polemon [5] Iulius', *NPauly* 10 (2001), 8: Mithridates 'wurde von Claudius im J. 41 als bosporan. König anerkannt, Polemon erhielt zu Pontos einen Teil von Kilikia'.

[18] D.C. 60.8.2, 69.12.2.

[19] *IG Rom.* IV.147 (after A.D. 37); Wroth (n. 13), xxxiv–xxxv; ed. G. MacDonald, *Catalogue of Greek Coins in the Hunterian Collection. University of Glasgow* II (Glasgow, 1901), 229–30: Rhescuporis I (14/42), Mithridates (42/46), and Cotys (46/78); Anokhin (n. 2), 81–101: Polemo I (14/13–10/9), Dynamis (9/8 B.C.-A.D. 7/8), KLE (8/9–9/10), Aspurgus (10/11–13/14), Dynamis (13/14), Aspurgus (14/13–37/38), Gepaepyris (37/38–38/39), Mithridates (39/40–41/42), Cotys (45/46–67/68?), Rhescuporis (68/69–91/92). See esp. A. A. Barrett, 'Gaius' policy in the Bosporus', *TAPA* 107 (1977), 1–9.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

made to explain this situation do not stand the test: there is no reason why Gaius' decision to give Bosporus to Polemo could not have been carried out, and it is out of question that Mithridates could have established his rule over territory designated by the emperor for another ruler.[20] There is no evidence that Polemo was promoted to the kingship of Pontus at the same time as Mithridates to that of Bosporus.[21] As we have seen, the earliest coins of Mithridates in Bosporus date to 39/40. If the 'ancestral kingdom' that Polemo received from Gaius did not include Bosporus,[22] why did Polemo have to be compensated? If he was compensated 'not for the loss of actual kingdom in Bosporus, but for the loss of expectations in the area',[23] what allowed him to have such expectations provided his 'ancestral kingdom' did not include Bosporus? Most importantly, why was Polemo compensated not by Gaius but only later, by Claudius?

Mithridates' control over Bosporus in 39 and Claudius' compensation to Polemo in 41 might be explained by the sad realities of the last two years of Gaius' reign. After the conspiracy, pretended or real, was revealed in Rome in autumn of 39,[24] Gaius deprived several rulers of their kingdoms, some of which he had only recently given to them, and sometimes of their lives as well. Antiochus IV, who received his ancestral kingdom of Commagene with 'coastal Cilicia' from Gaius in 37 or 38, soon saw his possessions being taken away by the same emperor.[25] Gaius also summoned and had Mithridates the Iberian put into chains.[26] Ptolemy of Mauretania, a cousin of Gaius, was summoned by him to be executed late in 39 or early in 40.[27] An accusation of conspiracy was the best way to do away with a political enemy, as demonstrated by Julius Agrippa who by accusing Herod Antipas of treachery before the emperor in late 39 caused Antipas' exile and acquired his principality.[28]

[20] D. C. Braund, *OCD*[3], 254 and I. von Bredow, 'Mithridates VIII', *NPauly* 8 (2000), 281: from A.D. 38/39, without any explanation. The coins of Mithridates: Anokhin (n. 2), 96; N. A. Frolova, *Essays on the Northern Black Sea Region Numismatics* (Odessa, 1995), 116. Explanations: Gaidukevič (n. 17), 340; Anokhin (n. 2); J. G. Vinogradov in *SEG* 42.696; von Bredow (n. 17): 'Mithridates VIII. der legitime Erbe war und [das Regnum Bosporanum] auch praktisch antrat'.

[21] As implied by Barrett (n. 19), 1–9 and id., *Caligula. The Corruption of Power* (London, 1989), 222–3.

[22] Barrett (n. 19), 7–8; see also 6: 'during the reign of Gaius the rule of Gepaepyris and Mithridates [in Bosporus] remained undisturbed'.

[23] Barrett (n. 19), 8–9.

[24] See esp. C. J. Simpson, 'The "conspiracy" of A.D. 39', *Collection Latomus* 168 (1980), 347–66. For the date, see J.-Cl. Faur, 'La première conspiration contre Caligula', *RBPh* 51 (1973), 22: October and id., 'Caligula et la Maurétanie: la fin de Ptolémée', *Klio* 55 (1973), 267: around September.

[25] D.C. 59.8.2, dated to 38 by F. Hild, *TIB* V, *Denk.Ak.Wien* 215 (Vienna, 1990), 32 and B. Levick, *Claudius* (New Haven, 1990), 165. See also Suet. *Cal*. 16.3.

[26] Sen. *Tranq*. 11.12; Tac. *Ann*. 11.8; Magie (n. 4), 1410, n. 33.

[27] Sen. *Tranq*. 11.12; Suet. *Cal*. 26.1, 35.1; D.C. 59.25.1 with Faur, 'Caligula et la Maurétanie' (n. 24), 269: when Gaius was on campaign, that is, in late 39 or early 40. Some have put the execution of Ptolemy after Gaius' return, that is, in the autumn of 40; see D. Fishwick, 'The annexation of Mauretania', *Historia* 20 (1971), 467–8 (and n. 10) with a summary of opinions about the place and time of Ptolemy's death; Barrett (n. 21), 117; A. Ferrill, *Caligula. Emperor of Rome* (London, 1991), 150.

[28] Joseph. *AJ* 18.247–52; cf. 238: in the second year of Gaius' reign. And probably on the basis of this evidence, among other things, Faur, 'La première conspiration' (n. 24), 41, n. 84, placed the exile of Herod Antipas in mid-39, that is, earlier than the conspiracy of 39. But the return of Agrippa from Rome in the summer of 38 (18.238–9) and Herod's journey to Rome (18.245–6) did not necessarily follow immediately upon each other, and accusations against Antipas were

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The delinquencies of Gaius were mended only after the accession of Claudius, who restored kingdoms to their former rulers or set up new kings in the territories that required control. Establishing the status quo was not always attainable or desirable for Claudius. When he restored Commagene to Antiochus in 41,[29] Claudius gave him 'parts of Cilicia', probably a different territory from the 'coastal Cilicia' that Antiochus received from Gaius. Similar reversals of fortune happened to Iulius Polemo. He was enthroned in Pontus by Gaius in 37, that is, synchronously with the grants of kingship to two other sons of Cotys VIII Sapaean and to Julius Agrippa.[30] There could be a time gap between their enthronement and the official acknowledgement of their rule, and that of Antiochus IV, by the senate in 38.[31] Therefore, the enthronement of Antiochus IV could have happened in 37 as well. It is quite possible that Agrippa also received kingship from Gaius in 37 and was officially authorized by the senate in 38.[32] We know that Agrippa left Rome for Judaea only in the summer of 38.[33]

If Iulius Polemo ever came to rule Bosporus, this could have happened in the year following the establishment of his reign over Pontus.[34] Very soon Polemo lost Bosporus, which was assigned by Gaius to Mithridates in 39, and probably the Pontic kingdom as well: the coins of Iulius Polemo from Pontus are known only starting with the reign of Claudius. But Claudius could not, or did not wish to, give Bosporus back to Iulius Polemo because it was then securely under Mithridates' control, and he compensated this loss by giving Polemo a part of Cilicia.[35] The new arrangement should have followed immediately upon the accession of Claudius in 41, that is, as in the case of Antiochus IV. After Mithridates' revolt, which probably took place in 42 as the dating of his coins indicates, Claudius would have had no reason to deny Bosporus to Polemo.

In sum, Claudius' grant of Cilicia to Polemo came as a compensation for the loss

brought when Gaius was at Baiae (248–9), that is, before he set off on his campaign to the north in the autumn of 39. Cf. 19.351: Agrippa ruled Herod's principality during the last year of Gaius' reign.

[29] For this date, see A. Mehl, 'Antiochos [18] IV', *NPauly* 1 (1996), 772.

[30] All three brothers are referred to as 'kings' in *Syll.*[3] 798 = *IG Rom.* IV.145 = Smallwood (n. 7), 121, no. 401.18–19 (A.D. 37). Julius Agrippa: A. H. M. Jones, *The Herods of Judaea*, rev. edn (Oxford, 1967), 191–2; E. M. Smallwood, *The Jews under the Roman Rule* (Leiden, 1976), 190.

[31] D.C. 59.12.2 with Balsdon (n. 17).

[32] Although Agrippa grew up together with Claudius and Drusus the Younger, Agrippa's mother, Berenice, was close to Antonia: B. M. Levick, *Tiberius the Politician* (London, 1976), 141; D. R. Schwartz, *Agrippa I. The Last King of Judaea* (Tübingen, 1990), 41–2 with notes. It was Antonia who patronized the three sons of the late Cotys VIII Sapaean, and the close friendship of Agrippa and Gaius is well documented: e.g. D.C. 59.24.1.

[33] Schwartz (n. 32), 55.

[34] The beginning of Polemo's rule over Bosporus has been connected with the death of the Bosporan king Aspurgos, and therefore, dated to 38: P. von Rohden, 'Aspurgos', *RE* 1 (1896), 1739; von Bredow (n. 17). Interpretations of numismatic evidence, however, leave no place for Polemo (II) in Bosporus: the rule of Aspurgos is thought to have been followed by those of Gepaepyris and Mithridates, though the datings suggested for their reigns differ; see Gaidukevič (n. 17), 340 (and n. 16), 573; Anokhin (n. 2), 81–101 (see note 19); Frolova (n. 20), 114–24, who, nevertheless, found it possible to speak (pp. 116, 183) of Polemo (II) as one of the kings of Bosporus, thus creating a confusion. D. MacDonald, 'The Cimmerian Bosporus in the year of revolutions', *AHB* 13 (1999), 141, who followed Frolova and had no place for Polemo (II) among the rulers of Bosporus, left unexamined the date and circumstances of Mithridates' coming to the Bosporan throne.

[35] D.C. 60.8.1. The words of Dio (60.8.2: Claudius *Μιθριδάτῃ τὸν Βόσπορον ἐχαρίσατο*) here meant 'allowed to keep' rather than 'gave'.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that Polemo had suffered from Gaius. This was not an exchange but an act of Claudius' benevolence. For this reason, Polemo became a devoted 'friend' of Claudius and went out of his way to venerate that emperor.[36]

Michigan State University SVIATOSLAV DMITRIEV
dmitriev@msu.edu

[36] Dio (60.8.1–4) mentioned Claudius' grant to Polemo among other favours by that emperor to local dynasts who had been wronged by Gaius; *Greek Papyri in the British Museum* (n. 7), no. 1178 with Mitteis and Wilcken (n. 7), 185, no. 156, lines 21–3.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.286 Published online by Cambridge University Press