

CAPInv. 763: U-EAM-003

I. LOCATION

i. Geographical area	Eastern Asia Minor
ii. Region	Pontus
iii. Site	Amastris

II. NAME

i. Association with unknown name	U-EAM-003
----------------------------------	-----------

III. DATE

i. Date(s)	251 - 258 AD
------------	--------------

V. SOURCES

i. Source(s)	Marek, Stadt 56
Note	See also: Robert 1980: 151-9 SEG 30: 1449 Marek 1985: nr. 20
Online Resources	Marek, Stadt 56
i.a. Source type(s)	Epigraphic source(s)
i.b. Document(s) typology & language/script	Funerary inscription in Greek of Aurelios Tatianos and his wife Valeria Strategis by the <i>hieroneikon to amphodon</i> and the <i>Hieranphodeiton platearchai</i> .
i.c. Physical format(s)	Large limestone plaque with an inscribed panel and five wreaths, two at the left (both inscribed) and three at the right (two with inscriptions).

VII. ORGANIZATION

iii. Members	It is possible that the members of the group were collectively called Ἱεραμφοδεῖται <i>Hieramphodeitai</i> (Marek, Stadt 56, C I. 2).
--------------	---

iv. Officials

The Ἱεραμφοδειτῶν πλατεάρχαι (*Hieramphodeiton platearchai*, Marek, Stadt 56, C 1. 2) mentioned in this epitaph were in charge of the several πλατεῖαι (*plateiai*) of which the *amphodon* consisted (see Robert 1980: 154-5).

X. ACTIVITIES

iv. Honours/Other activities

The second wreath on the right side of the panel on this epitaph bears the inscription Ἱεραμφοδειτῶν, *hieramphodeiton* and the third one the inscription πλατεάρχαι, *platearchai*. This suggests the award of crowns by the *platearchai* of the *hieramphodeitai* either sometimes during the couple's life or *post mortem*, perhaps in response to benefactions.

XII. NOTES

i. Comments

As far as the date is concerned, Robert (1980: 152) proposes 258 AD, following the Pompeian era but Marek suggests 251 AD in his edition, according to the local era beginning in 70 BC ('liberation' of Amastris from the Pontic kingdom).

From the formula Ἱεραμφοδειτῶν πλατεάρχαι, Robert 1980: 156 suggested that the name of the group may have been *hieron amphodon*.

According to Pont (2013: 133-4) the term *amphodon* in Aurelios Tatianos' epitaph may refer to an avenue and not necessarily to a quarter, as Robert (1980: 152-4) and Marek considered. However, the fact that the group had several *platearchai*, i.e. leaders of avenues (*plateiai*), indicates that, as far as the terminology is concerned, *amphodon* should be here understood as city-quarter consisting of several streets. Cf. also [CAPInv 762](#).

The cost of the awarded crowns (see under X.iv: Honours/other activities) may be seen as an indirect indication for the existence of a common treasury. But there is no positive evidence for this. If the group had a common treasury, the members may have been obliged to offer contributions.

iii. Bibliography

Jones, N.F. (1987), *Public Organization in Ancient Greece: A Documentary Study*. Philadelphia.

Marek, C. (1985), 'Katalog der Inschriften im Museum von Amasra. Mit Anhang: Die Inschriften von Amastris und die angebliche Pompeianische Ära der Stadt', *EA* 6: 133-56

Pont, A.-V. (2013), 'Les groupes de voisinage dans les villes d'Asie Mineure occidentale à l'époque impériale' in P. Fröhlich and P. Hamon (eds.), *Groupes et associations dans les cités grecques (IIIe siècle av. J.-C. – IIe siècle apr. J.-C.)*, Genève: 129-56.

Robert, L. (1980), *A travers l'Asie mineure*. Paris

Van Nijf, O. (1997), *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*. Amsterdam.

XIII. EVALUATION

i. Private association

Possible

Note

Whether *amphoda* were official administrative subdivisions of the urban population or private associations of residents is not entirely clear. Jones (1987: 303, 336), based on evidence from Smyrna and Stratonikeia, supports the first view. Van Nijf (1997: 182) points out that a safe conclusion is not possible but admits that *amphoda* may have had an official status. As far as the Amastrian *amphoda* are concerned, Robert (1980: 159) viewed them as geographical subdivisions of the city comprising several streets (*plateiai*) but did not explicitly address the question of their official or private nature. Finally, Pont (2013: 132-8) considered that there is no evidence imposing the conclusion that the Amastrian *amphoda* were administrative sectors of the city and preferred to view such groups as voluntary private associations.