

# Observations on the Historical Geography of Roman Lycaonia

*Sviatoslav Dmitriev*

CONCERNING LYCAONIA not much evidence has survived from pre-Roman times.<sup>1</sup> Neither Homer nor Herodotus refers to it. Xenophon seems to be the only Greek historian before the second century B.C. who mentions this territory, and solely when discussing non-Greek affairs far from Hellas. Lycaonia became noticeable with the coming of the Romans: it figured prominently in the accounts of the Apamean peace treaty (188 B.C.), which gave Lycaonia to the Attalids, who controlled it till the end of their dynasty. After the subsequent revolt of Aristonicus was suppressed in 129, Lycaonia was given to the kings of Cappadocia. Soon afterwards, however, Lycaonia is found as a district (*eparcheia*) under the control of the governor of the province of Asia. By the mid-first century B.C., the district of Lycaonia had been attached to the province of Cilicia, which was governed by Cicero in 51/0. It is from the first century B.C. that we start to have most of our evidence about Lycaonia.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>I cite the following by authors' names: S. MITCHELL, *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor* I–II (Oxford 1993); W. M. RAMSAY, "Lycaonia," *JÖAI* 7 (1904) Beibl. 57–132; B. RÉMY, *L'évolution administrative de l'Anatolie aux trois premiers siècles de notre ère* (Lyon 1986); R. SYME, *Anatolica. Studies in Strabo* (Oxford 1995), and *Roman Papers* I– (Oxford 1979–).

<sup>2</sup>Xen. *An.* 1.2.20–21, 7.8.25. The Apamean settlement: Polyb. 21.46.10, Liv. 38.39.15–16. The kings of Cappadocia: Just. *Epit.* 37.1.2; cf. Magie I 375 and K. Belke, "Lykaonien," *NPauIy* 7 (1999) 556. The governor of Asia: *I.Knidus* 31 (late II B.C.), dated to 100 B.C. by S. Mitchell, "The Administration of Roman Asia from 133 BC to AD 250," in W. Eck and E. Müller-Luckner, edd., *Lokale Autonomie und römische Ordnungsmacht in den kaiserzeitlichen Provinzen vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert* (Munich 1999) 20.

## I. The Isaurians and "Isauria"

Cicero administered several juridical districts, including those of Lycaonia and Isauria. Does this mean that they were two different territories? His letters reveal that Cicero could attach different meanings to the same geographical name. "Asia," for example, was both the Roman province and a much bigger territory, cis-Tauran Asia, that made up a part of his own *provincia*, thus highlighting a distinction between administrative and geographical divisions which carried the same name.<sup>3</sup> While in private correspondence Cicero spoke of himself as going through Lycaonia and Cappadocia to Cilicia, referring to them all as territorial units, in his letter to the magistrates, senate, and people of Rome he established his route as going through "Lycaonia, (the territory of) the Isaurians, and Cappadocia," reflecting both territorial and ethnic divisions.<sup>4</sup>

The most interesting implication of these discrepancies concerns the Isaurians: while they were quite well known in the mid-first century B.C., there was no Isauria as a territorial entity at that time: Cicero referred to the Isaurians only as a people or as a juridical district. This provides a different point of view from that of Roman historians, who usually employed only the names of territories, unless the matter concerned tribes and peoples allied with, or fighting against, Rome. In one such case, a fragment of Sallust's *Histories* speaks of Q. Marcius Rex, who

<sup>3</sup>The first: Cic. *Att.* (transl. Shackleton Bailey) 5.14.2, "Asia has given me a marvellous reception," written in Tralles, before he entered his *provincia* moving from Ephesus. The second: 5.21.7, "I myself left Tarsus for Asia on the Nones of January amid really indescribable enthusiasm among the Cilician communities, especially the people of Tarsus. After crossing the Taurus I found a marvellous eagerness for my arrival in the districts of Asia under me (*mirifica exspectatio Asiae nostrarum dioecesium*)," and 8, written in Laodicea, *i.e.* close to the border between his *provincia* and the province of Asia that lay further to the west, *cf.* 9 and 6.2.4, the division of his juridical districts into those of Asia and Cilicia.

<sup>4</sup>*E.g.* *Fam.* 15.1.2, 15.4.2, *Att.* 5.15.3, 5.20.2. *Cf.* *Fam.* 15.2.1, *iter mihi faciendum per Lycaoniam et per Isauros et per Cappadociam arbitratus sum.*

preceded Cicero as governor of the same *provincia* ca 67 B.C.,<sup>5</sup> as going to Cilicia through Lycaonia. The Roman Sallust, who in the first century B.C. knew about the Isaurians, did not refer to their region because it did not constitute a territorial unit.<sup>6</sup> Modern translators and commentators have followed in Roman footsteps.<sup>7</sup>

The Greek authors, whether historians or not, appear to have been more perceptive about ethnic boundaries. Strabo, whose *Geography* reflects the much better knowledge about these parts of Asia Minor after the campaigns of P. Servilius (Isauricus) in 78–75, writes of “the *Isaurike*,” implying that he was not referring simply to a territory as he did in the case of Lycaonia and Cappadocia.<sup>8</sup> He was merely following his own rule, according to which the geographer should reckon with natural and ethnic division. For the same reason, when in the first century B.C. Diodorus (18.22) described Perdiccas’ campaign of 322 B.C. and when in the second century A.D. Appian (*Mith.* 75) narrated exploits of one of Mithridates’ generals in 74–73, they referred to the Isaurians, not Isauria. In the first century A.D., Pliny the Elder, a Roman with a marked interest in geography, discovered that “all the authorities have made Pamphylia join onto Cilicia,

<sup>5</sup>For lists, and dates, of the governors of Cilicia from the late second century to the time of Cicero, see P. Freeman, “The Province of Cilicia and Its Origins,” in P. Freeman and D. Kennedy, ed., *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East* (BAR 297 [1986]) I 266–267.

<sup>6</sup>Sall. *H.* 5.14 Maur., cf. 2.87. One of the best examples of this difference in approach is offered in treatments of the Peace of Apamea: while Polybius (21.45.10) referred to “the Mysians who had been previously taken by Antiochus III from Eumenes,” Livy (38.39.15) spoke of Mysia as a territory. For the Roman attitude see also Strab. 628. A later summary of one of Livy’s books (*Per.* 93) mentions the Isaurians, but it is impossible to say if Livy himself made this reference.

<sup>7</sup>Syme, *RP* I 120–121, V 664–665, and various translations of Cic. *Fam.* 15.2.1. Lycaonia is thought to have stretched directly up to the Taurus range: G. Laminger-Pascher, *Lykaonien und die Phryger* (SBWien 532 [1989]) 5; A. H. M. Jones and S. Mitchell, “Lycaonia,” *OCD*<sup>3</sup> 894; Belke (*supra* n.2) 555. But see Magie I 289.

<sup>8</sup>Strab. 568, cf. 177. For this dating see Syme, *RP* VI 291; A. N. Sherwin-White, “Lucullus, Pompey and the East,” *CAH*<sup>2</sup> IX (1994) 249.

overlooking the people of Isauria (*gens Isaurica*).<sup>9</sup> He was referring to the general view of Cilicia and Pamphylia as contiguous territories, which hid the fact of the existence of the region of the Isaurians between them; likewise, Cicero can be said to have discovered the Isaurians between Lycaonia and Cappadocia.

Cicero, Strabo, and Pliny thus disclose that geographical and administrative divisions of Roman Asia Minor crossed over the borders of the territory occupied by the Isaurians in the first century B.C. and early in the first century A.D. The earliest evidence for Isauria as an administrative entity comes from two inscriptions referring to C. Iul. Quadratus Bassus and Caesennius Sospes as governors of a big composite province with Isauria as one of its parts. The former has universally been placed in the early second century, while the latter has been dated either to that time or to the late first century.<sup>10</sup> In the first century B.C. and before, our sources either do not mention Isauria at all or speak only of the territory of the Isaurians. Not surprisingly, when attempts are made to view it as a geographical or administrative unit in that period, "Isauria" appears to have had confusingly elusive borders.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup>Plin. *HN* 5.94: *Ciliciae Pamphyliam omnes iunxere neglecta gente Isaurica. oppida eius intus Isaura, Clibanus, Lalasis; decurrit autem ad mare Anemuri e regione supra dicti*. For the dating of Pliny's source and for what his "Cilicia" might have meant, see below.

<sup>10</sup>Bassus: Habicht, *I.Perg.* III 21 with pp.45–46 and *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 508. For the date, see Syme, *RP* VI 294 (ca A.D. 108/111?); Habicht 49 (ca 108/110); Mitchell II 151 n.7 (ca 109/112?). Sospes: *CIL* III 6818 [*ILS* 1017]. For the date, B. M. Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor* (Oxford 1967) 230 (ca A.D. 95); Syme 138 and *RP* III 1043–1061 (ca 94); R. K. Sherk, "Roman Galatia: The Governors from 25 B.C. to A.D. 114," *ANRW* II.7.2 (1980) 1029–1035, with bibliography (ca 112/3); Rémy 82 (111/114); Mitchell II 151 n.8 and 155 n.74 (ca 112/114?).

<sup>11</sup>W. M. Ramsay, ed., *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces* (Aberdeen 1906) 51 (as far as Derbe: A. Margaret Ramsay), 165–166 (south and west of Iconium: T. Callander); W. Ruge, "Isauria," *RE* 18 (1916) 2056 ("ihre Ausdehnung lässt sich nicht genau bestimmen"); Magie I 289 (a part of Pisidia) and 443 (excluding Derbe and Laranda; so Syme, *RP* VI 292); Sherwin-White (*supra* n.8) 269 (including Derbe), cf. 232–233 (between the westernmost chain of the Taurus and Lycaonia); M. Sartre, *L'Asie Mineure et l'Anatolie d'Alexandre à Dioclétien* (Paris 1995) 166 (including Derbe and Laranda); K. Tomaschitz, "Isauria, Isauri," *NPauly* 5 (1998) 1117 ("das Bergland in

Syme, among others, argued that “Isauria in its earliest and restricted sense” was limited to the south-western border of Lycaonia, usually with reference to the cognomen Isauricus given to P. Servilius after his campaigns against the cities of Isaura Nova and Isaura Vetus and nearby fortresses.<sup>12</sup> But we know very little about his campaigns; we do not even know for certain from where, east or west, and by what way Servilius advanced to those cities.<sup>13</sup> Most importantly, the earliest evidence for the Isaurians that we have belongs to the first century B.C. and comes from Cicero and Strabo, who both speak of the territory of the Isaurians stretching far to the east of these two cities. Cicero regarded the territory inhabited by the Isaurians as a part of Lycaonia and placed it between that region and Cappadocia. He therefore identified its eastern border with that between Lycaonia and Cappadocia. According to Strabo, the territory of the Isaurians stretched to the east as far as Derbe which was the closest settlement to Cappadocia. Strabo not only put Derbe on the eastern border of the *Isaurike* but also directly identified the border between “the Lycaonians and the Cappadocians” as the one between Coropassus, a village of the Lycaonians, and Garsaüra, a town of the Cappadocians.<sup>14</sup>

---

Tauros”); and similarly H. Treidler, “Isauria,” *KlPauly* II (1979) 1458, and S. Mitchell, “Isauria,” *OCD*<sup>3</sup> (1996) 767 (“an ill-defined region of the Taurus mountains sandwiched between Pisidia to the west, Lycaonia to the north, and Rugged Cilicia”).

<sup>12</sup>For example, *RP* I 120–121, VI 287; *Anatolica* 217. See also W. M. Ramsay, *JRS* 7 (1917) 277; K. Belke, *Galatien und Lykaonien* (TIB IV = *DenkschrWien* 172 [1984]) 41; Sherwin-White (*supra* n.8) 232–233. Strabo’s *Isaurike* (569) could not designate this region (so Ramsay 278; Syme, *Anatolica* 217; cf. Ruge [*supra* n.11] 2056) because his *Isaurike* extended as far as Derbe in the east.

<sup>13</sup>For the evidence about Servilius’ campaigns against the Isaurians and various opinions of the way in which he could have reached their territory, see W. M. Ramsay, *JHS* 25 (1905) 165–166; Magie II 1170–1171 nn.22–23; Syme, *RP* VI 291–292 and *Anatolica* 210–213; Sherwin-White (*supra* n.8) 232–233. Cf. Mitchell II 152 n.32.

<sup>14</sup>Cic. *Att.* 5.18.1, *Fam.* 15.2.2; Strab. 568–569. Cf. Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Δέρβη·φορούριον Ἰσαυρίας καὶ λιμὴν. For the interpretation of *limen* as a “customs-station” and therefore as a mark of the border between the two territories, see Ramsay 75–76 and nn.21–22.

The border between Lycaonia and Cappadocia therefore remained approximately the same from the late fifth century—when Xenophon put it somewhere between Iconium and Tyana though closer to the latter—through the mid-first century B.C., when we know about this border from Cicero and Strabo, and into the imperial period.<sup>15</sup> The border of the territory of the Isaurians is unlikely to have changed significantly in two or three decades from Servilius' campaigns of 78–75 B.C. to the time of Cicero and Strabo. It is more probable that the eastern border of this territory extended beyond Derbe at the time of Servilius' campaigns which therefore established Roman control over a strategically important territory.<sup>16</sup>

The borders of the *Isaurike* in other directions can be determined as well. Servilius is also known to have conquered, or “penalized,” the tribe of the Oroandeis who lived to the west of the Isaurians.<sup>17</sup> Pliny in the first century A.D. put the Oroandeis in Pisidia, while Syme, who thought that they lived on the border of Lycaonia and Pisidia, suggested that the Oroandeis “might be taken for a Lycaonian people, or at least heterogeneous, mixed Lycaonian and Pisidian.”<sup>18</sup> They thus represented another case in which ethnic borders did not coincide with the administrative delimitation established or acknowledged by the Romans. The Oroandeis were clearly a separate ethnic group, and therefore their place of residence, however

<sup>15</sup>Xen. *An.* 1.2.20–21: after coming to the border of Lycaonia and Cappadocia, Cyrus “sent the Cilician queen back to Cilicia by the shortest route.” For the roads to the Cilician Gates, which went through Tyana, see M. H. Ballance, “Derbe and Faustinopolis,” *AnatSt* 14 (1964) 142–145; S. Panichi, “La Cappadocia,” in A. M. Biraschi and G. Salmeri, edd., *Strabone e l'Asia Minore* (Naples 2000) 524. For Derbe (Claudioderbe) as a Lycaonian city, see Acts 14:6 (late I A.D.); Hill, *BMC Lycaonia* xx; Head, *Hist.Num.* 713 (under Marcus Aurelius). For Cybistra as a Cappadocian city, Wroth, *BMC Galatia* 95 no. 1 = *SNG von Aulock* 6535, with *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 350 (P. Calvisius Ruso, legate of Galatia-Cappadocia sometime during A.D. 104–107).

<sup>16</sup>*Contra Magie* I 291, Sartre (*supra* n.11) 128.

<sup>17</sup>Cic. *Leg.Agr.* 2.50; Syme, *Anatolica* 180–183, 209.

<sup>18</sup>Plin. *HN* 5.94; Syme, *Anatolica* 181–183, 212 (between Antioch and Iconium).

vaguely it can be defined, marked the western limits of the territory of the Isaurians.

In the north-west lay Iconium which, in the time of Cicero, belonged to Lycaonia and served as the center of a juridical district.<sup>19</sup> According to some, Iconium was the main city of the Isaurian district.<sup>20</sup> However, neither Cicero nor any other author, whether Greek or Roman, saw Iconium as an Isaurian city. Cicero could have administered justice for the Isaurian district in Iconium, which might explain why he spent more days in that city than in other he visited on his way to Cilicia, but this did not make Iconium an Isaurian city.<sup>21</sup> Cicero also administered justice at Laodicea for the Isaurian, Pamphylian, and Lycaonian districts; but this certainly did not make Laodicea an Isaurian or Pamphylian or Lycaonian city.<sup>22</sup> The territory of the Isaurians lay further to the south of Iconium.

In the south, the Taurus was the natural border of the territory populated by the Isaurians. The name Isauria and its cognates are known to have been applied in later times to a much wider territory, and the later Roman province Isauria encompassed land both to the north and to the south of the Taurus range. However, the situation was different in the first century B.C. and would remain so for more than two centuries. Cicero, whose *provincia Cilicia* extended on the mainland from Laodicea in the west to Tarsus in the east, spoke of the territory of the Isaurians

<sup>19</sup>Iconium as a Lycaonian city: Cic. *Fam.* 15.4.2; Strab. 568; Plin. *HN* 5.95; as the main city of a juridical district: Cic. *Att.* 5.20.1, *Fam.* 3.5.4.

<sup>20</sup>W. M. Ramsay, *JRS* 12 (1922) 151; Syme, *RP* I 132 and n.8 and *Anatolica* 217. Both evidently argued on the basis of Cicero's letters, but the latter offer no evidence for Iconium as an Isaurian city or as the center of the Isaurian conventus. Cf. Magie I 376 (Iconium as the center of the Lycaonian district).

<sup>21</sup>Cic. *Att.* 5.20.1. He may have spent more than ten days in Iconium; L. W. Hunter, "Cicero's Journey to his Province of Cilicia in 51 B.C.," *JRS* 3 (1913) 80–81, 86–88.

<sup>22</sup>Cic. *Att.* 5.21.9. Cf. 5.15.3: Laodicea did not belong to Lycaonia. The name of the district was not always that of its main city; see R. Haensch, *Capita provinciarum. Statthaltersitze und Provinzialverwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Mainz 1997) 308.

only as lying between Lycaonia and Cappadocia, north of the Taurus. This territory took over the name “Cilicia” from pre-Roman times when Cilicia extended a long way north of the Taurus.<sup>23</sup> In the first century A.D., Pliny the Elder, probably relying on an ancient source, still put Iconium in Cilicia. But soon after Servilius’ campaigns, Cicero made a clear distinction between Cilicia in a general sense, *i.e.* as his *provincia* from Laodicea to Tarsus, and Cilicia as a designation for a particular territory to the south of the Taurus, which would soon become known as Cilicia Trachea and Cilicia Pedias.<sup>24</sup> Servilius—who, according to late Republican and early imperial writers, was sent to campaign in “Cilicia” and who has never been directly documented as crossing over the Taurus to the south—fought against the Isaurians in Cilicia north of the Taurus.<sup>25</sup>

In the first century B.C., Lycaonia as a geographical and administrative unit included the territory of the Isaurians which stretched from that of the Oroandeis in the west to Cappadocian Cybistra in the east, and from Iconium in the north to the spurs of the Taurus in the south. But this territory was treated separately as a juridical district or when ethnic boundaries were marked for some reason. In the 70’s A.D., Pliny referred to the territory of the Isaurians as extending to the south of the Taurus. Although Pliny was still speaking only of the Isaurians (*gens Isaurica*), his reference reflects what may have been the common opinion of his time, which extended the name of the Isaurians beyond the Taurus.<sup>26</sup> The situation changed further by the early second century A.D., or maybe even a bit

<sup>23</sup>Esp. Syme, *Anatolica* 156. In the first century B.C.: Dio 59.8.2 and Strab. 668.

<sup>24</sup>Plin. *HN* 5.93, Cic. *Fam.* 15.2.2.

<sup>25</sup>Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.21; Liv. *Per.* 90, 93; Vell. 2.39.2. For this old meaning of Cilicia, see below. Cf. Syme, *Anatolica* 218: no source of “late Republican date” uses “Isaurian” of land south of the Taurus.

<sup>26</sup>Plin. *HN* 5.94 (*supra* n.9). See Ramsay (*supra* n.12) 278; Syme, *Anatolica* 217. Can Pliny’s reference to the *gens Isaurica* as occupying a part of Trachea be related to Vespasian’s foundation of *provincia Cilicia* in A.D. 74?



earlier, when the territory of the Isaurians became an administrative unit in its own right, Isauria. We do not have any direct evidence as to whether this Isauria corresponded to the territory of Pliny's *gens Isaurica*, in other words, whether it extended to both sides of the Taurus. If it did, administrative reorganization merely followed this development. But even in later times, when the name "Isauria" had already been carried over the Taurus and used for an administrative unit,<sup>27</sup> this name could be applied in retrospect to the old "territory of the Isaurians" when it still formed a part of Lycaonia, also contributing to modern confusions.<sup>28</sup> These have resulted largely from the fact that while the same name continued to be used, Roman administrative borders eventually came to cross ethnic boundaries of the Isaurians. The situation was similar in other parts of Lycaonia, as we will see in what follows.

## II. The "eleventh *strategia*" and the *strategia Antiochiana*

For about a hundred years after Pompey, the history of the territories on the eastern fringes of the Roman Empire consisted of numerous political and territorial rearrangements reflecting the relationships between local dynasts and their patrons in Rome. Strabo illuminates one such rearrangement concerning the kingdom of Cappadocia:

When, in the reign of Archelaus and the kings that preceded him, the country was divided into ten *strategiai*, those near the

<sup>27</sup>So Isauria with Lycaonia and Cilicia under Antoninus Pius and the Severi (see below on *Tres Eparchiae*), and with Lycia and Pamphylia under Commodus: *MAMA* VI 74–75 (n.86 *infra*).

<sup>28</sup>*E.g.* *AE* 1991, 1548 (ca. A.D. 313); *I.Kyzikos* 148 = *I.Prusa ad Olympon* pp. 186–187, Seleucea in Isauria (reign of Diocletian?). For the later province of Isauria see *The Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*, ed. R. J. A. Talbert (Princeton 2000) maps 101 and 102 (no. 45). *Cf.* Syme, *RP* VI 287: "With the efflux of time Cilicia Tracheia came to acquire the appellation of Isauria—and finally identity as a separate unit under the ordinances of Diocletian"; and his *Ammianus and Historia Augusta* (Oxford 1968) 43–52. *Cf.* Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Λυκαονία· χώρα Λυκίας τε καὶ Ἰσαυρίας, and *s.v.* Ἰσαυρία· μεταξὺ Λυκαονίας καὶ Κιλικίας πρὸς τῷ Ταύρῳ.

Taurus were counted as five: Melitene, Cataonia, Cilicia, Tyanitis, and Garsauritis. And the other five were Laviansene, Sargarausene, Saravene, Chamanene, and Morimene. The Romans later assigned to the predecessors of Archelaus an eleventh *strategia*, taken from Cilicia, that is the territory around Castabala and Cybistra up to Derbe held by the brigand Antipater (προσεγένετο δ' ὕστερον παρὰ Ῥωμαίων ἐκ τῆς Κιλικίας τοῖς πρὸ Ἀρχελάου καὶ ἑνδεκάτῃ στρατηγία, ἡ περὶ Καστάβαλά τε καὶ Κύβιστρα μέχρι τῆς Ἀντιπάτρου τοῦ ληστοῦ Δέρβης). And to Archelaus they further assigned the part of Cilicia Trachea round Elaeussa, and also all the country that had organized the business of piracy.<sup>29</sup>

The territory of the “eleventh *strategia*” has been identified either as a part of Lycaonia known as *Lycaonia Antiochiana*, with its capital in Cybistra, or as the similarly mysterious *strategia Antiochiana*.<sup>30</sup> The latter has been considered as occupying the same territory as the enigmatic “tetrarchy of Lycaonia.”<sup>31</sup> *Lycaonia Antiochiana* has been interpreted as approximately the same district as the *strategia Antiochiana*, or as the Lycaonian *koinon* that is known only from coins.<sup>32</sup> Each of these territorial units will be discussed here in turn.

<sup>29</sup>Strab. 534–535 (transl. after Jones). For his description of these *strategiai* see 537–538.

<sup>30</sup>*Lycaonia Antiochiana*: CIL V 8660 [ILS 1364] (see n.32 *infra*); cf. W. Ruge, “Lykaonia,” *RE* 26 (1927) 2255. The *strategia Antiochiana*: Ptol. 5.6.16 (n.63 *infra*); W. M. Ramsay, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (London 1890) 336, 372; Syme, *Anatolica* 155; A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1971) 412–413 n.21.

<sup>31</sup>“Tetrarchy of Lycaonia”: Plin. *HN* 5.95; Ramsay 73.

<sup>32</sup>*Strategia Antiochiana*: G. Laminger-Pascher, *Die kaiserzeitlichen Inschriften Lykaoniens* (*DenkschrWien* 232 [1992]) 29; see Magie II 1368 n.49. Lycaonian *koinon*: Jones (*supra* n.30) 412–413 n.21 with reference to CIL V 8660 [ILS 1364]: T. Desticio T. f. Cla. Severo p.p. leg. X Gem., *subpraef. vigil., proc. Aug. prov. Daciae superior., proc. provinc. Cappadoc. item Ponti mediterr. et Armeniae minor. et Lycaon. Antiochian.*, dated ca A.D. 166 by Ruge (*supra* n.30) 2255, and Jones. See also *I.Perg.* II 451 [IGR IV 390] (see n.71 *infra*) restored by Ramsay (70 n.8) as [Λυκαονίας Ἀντι]οχίας. For a brief summary of opinions see G. Laminger-Pascher, “Das Lykaonische Koinon und die Lage der Städte Barata, Dalisandos und Hyde,” *AnzWien* 123.7 (1986) 239.

### 1. The “eleventh *strategia*”

The Romans gave Lycaonia to the Cappadocian kings in 129 B.C. in return for their loyalty and military support at the time of Aristonicus’ uprising.<sup>33</sup> Soon afterwards, probably following the death of Ariarathes VI (*ca* 112 B.C.?), Rome took Lycaonia away and put it under the command of the governor of the province of Asia. Several years later, a new Cappadocian royal dynasty came to power with the election of Ariobarzanes (I) in mid-90s (the date is still debated). This dynasty never got control of Lycaonia; the western border of their kingdom lay somewhere between Derbe and Cybistra which, as we have seen, marked the ancient border between Lycaonia and Cappadocia. It is from Cybistra that Ariobarzanes III came to plead for protection and military support from Cicero once the latter had marched from Lycaonia into Cappadocia in the autumn of 51. The “eleventh *strategia*” therefore never encroached upon Lycaonia.<sup>34</sup>

Pompey the Great, as suggested by Syme, may have given the “eleventh *strategia*” to Ariobarzanes I and, as Syme and Magie have conjectured, also bestowed the principality that included Derbe and Laranda on Antipater. Strabo’s text makes it clear that when the “eleventh *strategia*” was founded, Derbe and Laranda were in the hands of Antipater.<sup>35</sup> Little evidence has survived about this powerful warlord who established control

<sup>33</sup>Ramsay (72) dated the foundation of the “eleventh *strategia*” to 129 B.C.

<sup>34</sup>Cic. *Fam.* 15.2 and 4; *pace* Jones (*supra* n.30) 177. M. Ballance, “The Site of Derbe: A New Inscription,” *AnatSt* 7 (1957) 150, correctly observed that there is no need to assume that either Derbe or Laranda (he, however, originally put Laranda to the east of Derbe, as did Syme, *Anatolica* 158) ever belonged to the “eleventh *strategia*.” For Laranda and Derbe (to the east of Laranda), see Ballance (*supra* n.15) 139 and n.1; *Barrington Atlas* 66.C2.

<sup>35</sup>Syme, *Anatolica* 155 and *RP* I 130–131: 63 B.C.; see also R. Teja, “Die römische Provinz Kappadokien in der Prinzipatszeit,” *ANRW* II.7.2 (1980) 1103; Magie I 375, “the region of Cybistra in southeastern Lycaonia”; Mitchell I 32, “the eastern part of Lycaonia around Cybistra.” None of them directly referred to it as the “eleventh *strategia*.” For Laranda see Strab. 569.

over an extensive and strategically important principality.<sup>36</sup> Ariobarzanes I received “Castabala in Cilicia and other cities” as well as Cybistra from Pompey. However, he abdicated in favor of his son, Ariobarzanes II, in the presence of Pompey who thus installed his own man instead of the protégé of Sulla. Pompey, who obviously was tired of watching Ariobarzanes I being repeatedly expelled from his kingdom by Mithridates, wanted everything securely in place before leaving for Rome.<sup>37</sup>

As a part of this plan, and so probably simultaneously with the accession of Ariobarzanes II, Pompey established the rule of Tarcondimotus (I).<sup>38</sup> Cicero labeled Tarcondimotus the most trusted ally across the Taurus, and Dio called him a “dynast of some part of Cilicia,” when he enumerated the allies of Pompey against Caesar at the battle of Pharsalus.<sup>39</sup> Because Tarcondimotus thus remained a dynast until 48 B.C. and Caesar had no reason to make him a king, the kingship should have been bestowed by Antony. This is also how Magie interpreted the

<sup>36</sup>Syme, *RP* I 128–131. Once again we should regret that Syme did not fulfill his plan to write a separate article on Antipater.

<sup>37</sup>App. *Mith.* 105 and 114: dated to 65/4 by B. Niese, “Ariobarzanes (5),” *RE* 3 (1895) 834; M. Schottky, “Ariobarzanes [3] Philorhomaïos,” *NPauly* 1 (1996) 1083; to 62 by Magie II 1151 n.35 and W. Hoben, *Untersuchungen zur Stellung kleinasiatischer Dynasten in den Machtkämpfen der ausgehenden römischen Republik* (diss. Mainz 1969) 155. Castabala and Cybistra: Hoben 140, Niese 834, T. R. S. Broughton and A. J. S. Spawforth, “Ariobarzanes,” *OCD*<sup>3</sup> 158. The abdication of Ariobarzanes I and accession of his son: Val. Max. 5.7 ext. 2: dated to 64 by H. B. Mattingly, “L. Julius Caesar, Governor of Macedonia,” *Chiron* 9 (1979) 166, followed (64/3) by R. M. Kallet-Marx, *Hegemony to Empire* (Berkeley 1995) 215 and n.93; to 63/2 by Niese 834, Broughton/Spawforth 158, Schottky 1083; and to 62 by Magie I 390, II 1099 n.15. Cf. B. Simonetta, *The Coins of the Cappadocian Kings* (Fribourg 1977) 40–42: the known coins of Ariobarzanes I go to his thirty-second regnal year. Pompey’s command in the East lasted from 66 to 62: Sherwin-White (*supra* n.8) 250–270, Kallet-Marx 331.

<sup>38</sup>The beginning of his rule has been dated to ca 64 B.C.: R. Heberdey and A. Wilhelm, *Reisen in Kilikien* (*DenkschrWien* 14 [1896]) 29–30. Another famous tetrarch established by Pompey was Deiotarus: App. *Mith.* 114. Both would receive kingship from Antony.

<sup>39</sup>Cic. *Fam.* 15.1.2: the letter of Tarcondimotus reached Cicero on the border between Lycaonia and Cappadocia (51 B.C.); cf. Xen. *An.* 1.2.20–21 (*supra* n.15). For the territory of Tarcondimotus see Dio 41.63.1, Plut. *Ant.* 61.1.

words of Strabo. His view may be correct, for later coins of Tarcondimotus refer to him as king and as Philantonios.<sup>40</sup>

Tarcondimotus came to control Castabala while still a toparch<sup>41</sup> and obviously prior to the battle of Pharsalus because although Caesar did not take anything away from the supporters of defeated Pompey, he had no desire to increase their possessions either. Therefore, Tarcondimotus established his control over Castabala in the period from *ca* 64 to 48. Several attempts have been made at a more precise date, but none is convincingly supported by the evidence.<sup>42</sup> The most plausible date would be before Pompey's departure from Asia Minor, as it fits the general picture of his reorganization; he divided Asia between several rulers (including Ariobarzanes II, Tarcondimotus, Deiotarus, and Antipater) whom he personally installed and thus made them and their dynasties his clients, before leaving for Rome.<sup>43</sup>

The "eleventh *strategia*" was thus dissolved into two parts

<sup>40</sup>Strab. 676: καθ' ἡμᾶς δὲ κατέστη κύριος πάντων ἀνὴρ ἀξιόλογος καὶ βασιλεὺς ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ὀνομάσθη διὰ τὰς ἀνδραγαθίας Ταρκονδίμοτος, καὶ τὴν διαδοχὴν τοῖς μετ' αὐτὸν παρέδωκε; cf. Plut. *Ant.* 61.1, among the kings who supported Antony against Octavian was "Tarcondimotus of upper Cilicia." See Magie II 1240. Coins: *BMC Lycaonia* cxxx and 237; *SNG von Aulock* 5413; E. Levante, *SNG Switzerland I Cilicia* (Bern 1986) 1257–1258 (all dating to 39–31 B.C.).

<sup>41</sup>Heberdey/Wilhelm, *Reisen* 28–30 no. 63 [OGIS 752]: ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἱεροπολιτῶν τῶ[ν] πρὸς τῶι Πυράμοι τῆς ἱερᾶς κα[ὶ] ἀσύλου Ταρκονδίμοτον Στρατῶν[ος] υἱὸν τοπάρχην, τὸν εὐεργέτη[ν] καὶ κηδεμόνα τοῦ δήμου (Hierapolis-Castabala).

<sup>42</sup>H. Täuber, "Kastabala," *NPauily* 6 (1999) 322: *ca* 63 B.C., because it had to be sanctioned by Pompey. Syme, *Anatolica* 159: 52 B.C., *i.e.* after the death of Ariobarzanes II; see W. M. Calder, *JRS* 2 (1912) 105. Syme's remark that "Strabo is unaware of Tarcondimotus's connection with Castabala" offers no chronological indication: Strabo (676) clearly saw Tarcondimotus as the king, while Tarcondimotus controlled Castabala when he was still a toparch (*supra* n.41).

<sup>43</sup>Dio 37.20.4. Client-kings helping Pompey against Caesar: Magie I 402–404. *Pace* P. W. M. Freeman, "Pompey's Eastern Settlement: a Matter of Presentation," *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* VII (*Coll.Latomus* 227 [1994]) 143–179, who questioned the idea of Pompey's arrangements in the East as a "settlement," but without going into much detail about local dynasts of Asia Minor.

soon after its creation. Cybistra remained in the realm of the Ariobarzaneis: Ariobarzanes III used it as a retreat in his visits to Cicero in 51 B.C. Several years after the death of this ruler (42 B.C.) Antony established Archelaus as the king of Cappadocia and Amyntas as the king over Galatia and Lycaonia “with portions of Pamphylia,” all in 36 B.C. Both beneficiaries changed sides just in time to be pardoned by the victorious Octavian who allowed them to keep their kingdoms.<sup>44</sup> Archelaus therefore kept possession of Cybistra until the Romans reorganized his kingdom as the province of Cappadocia in A.D. 17.<sup>45</sup> The other part of the “eleventh *strategia*,” centered on Castabala, belonged to Tarcondimotus who died fighting for Antony in 31 B.C. After Actium, Octavian disinherited the family of Tarcondimotus, and we do not know who controlled his former realm at this time. Some suggest that at least a part of it, around Castabala, belonged to the Tarcondimoti all the way into the reign of Tiberius.<sup>46</sup>

But Augustus could have given this territory to Amyntas: Strabo says that after the death of Amyntas (25 B.C.), Archelaus received Elaeussa together with the whole of Cilicia Trachea, except Seleucea, “the same way it had been under Amyntas.” Dio remarks that in 20 B.C. Augustus gave “Tarcondimotus, son of Tarcondimotus,” the same old kingdom of his father only without some coastal territories which he presented to Archelaus.<sup>47</sup> If Dio erred on chronology, which would not be surprising, his words could mean that Augustus divided Amyntas’ possessions between Archelaus and the younger Tarcondimotus. If Dio’s dating is correct, the kingdom of Tarcondimotus I could have been in the hands of Amyntas

<sup>44</sup>Dio 49.32.3, 51.2.1–2; Plut. *Ant.* 61.1–2; Strab. 540; App. *BC* 5.7.

<sup>45</sup>Suet. *Tib.* 8, 37; Dio 57.17.3, 17; Tac. *Ann.* 2.42.

<sup>46</sup>Täuber (*supra* n.42) 322.

<sup>47</sup>Strab. 534–535, 671; for Archelaus’ coinage at Elaeussa, Head, *Hist.Num.* 734, 752, who dated it *ca* 18/7 B.C.–A.D. 5/6; Dio 54.9.2.

during 31–25 and of Archelaus during 25–20, before being restored in a reduced form to the younger Tarcondimotus.<sup>48</sup> At any rate, Strabo placed the creation of the “eleventh *strategia*” before Archelaus’ reign, *i.e.* before 36 B.C.; and even if Archelaus came to control Castabala as well, the *strategiai* of Cybistra and of Castabala were different territories at that time. As a result, the “eleventh *strategia*” can have existed as a single administrative unit only in the period from *ca* 64 to *ca* 48, and probably only to 52 or even 62.

## 2. The “tetrarchy of Lycaonia”

This is referred to only once, by Pliny the Elder:

The Pisidians are in Lycaonia, which is included in the jurisdiction of the province of Asia, [which is also the center] for the people of Philomelium, Tymbrium, Leucolithium, Pelta, and Tyriaeum. To that jurisdiction is also assigned a tetrarchy from Lycaonia, where it adjoins Galatia, consisting of fourteen states, the most famous city being Iconium (*hos includit Lycaonia, in Asiaticam iurisdictionem versa, cum qua conveniunt Philomelienses, Tymbriani, Leucolithi, Pelteni, Tyrienses. datur et tetrarchia ex Lycaonia, qua parte Galatiae contermina est, civitatum XIII, urbe celeberrima Iconio*). Notable places belonging to Lycaonia itself (*ipsius Lycaoniae*) are Thebasa on Mount Taurus and Ida on the frontier between Galatia and Cappadocia (*HN* 5.95, transl. after Rackham).

The situation described by Pliny could not antedate 51–50 B.C. because, according to him, Lycaonia was in the Asian jurisdiction while Philomelium belonged to Lycaonia, quite contrary to what Cicero writes in his letters.<sup>49</sup> Jones attributed Pliny’s evidence to after the reign of Amyntas, namely 25 to 6 B.C. His *termini* were the foundation of Antioch-near-Pisidia (25 B.C.), *i.e.* the city mentioned by Pliny in 5.94, and the end of the Hom-

<sup>48</sup>Strab. 537, 671. See Syme, *Anatolica* 156–160.

<sup>49</sup>Cic. *Att.* 5.20.1, *Fam.* 15.4.2. Cf. Magie II 1307–1308 and Syme, *RP* I 147.

onadensian war, though its dating has been debated.<sup>50</sup> Syme, pointing out that Pliny's text consists of chronologically disparate evidence, which makes it possible that Pliny's information about the "tetrarchy of Lycaonia" and Antioch-near-Pisidia came from different sources, dated this tetrarchy to 39–37/6 B.C. His conclusion seems to rest on two observations: Pliny's reference to the *gens Isaurica* (5.94) and the absence in the text of Derbe and Laranda, which Syme explained by Antipater's control.<sup>51</sup> In other words, Syme dated the "tetrarchy of Lycaonia" to the reign of Polemo I, before Antony sent him to rule over Pontus. But Lycaonia together with Iconium was in the hands of Polemo.<sup>52</sup> Why then was the "tetrarchy of Lycaonia" set aside from the rest of his kingdom? A more general dating of Pliny's source about the "tetrarchy of Lycaonia" to the Augustan period spans several important changes that took place in the territorial organization of Asia Minor in that time.<sup>53</sup>

When Polemo left for Pontus in late 37 or 36, Iconium went over to Amyntas who controlled Galatia and Lycaonia up to the Taurus. After the death of Amyntas in 25, his whole kingdom, including Lycaonia, was transformed into the province of Galatia though some Pamphylian territories may have met a different fate.<sup>54</sup> From that time, northern Lycaonia together with Iconium is thought to have remained inside Galatia until the reign of Diocletian,<sup>55</sup> and so under Claudius and Nero as well

<sup>50</sup>Jones (*supra* n.30) 134. Plin. *HN* 5.94: *insident verticem Pisidiae, quondam appellati Solyimi, quorum colonia Caesarea, eadem Antiochia. oppida Oroanda, Sagalessos*. For the date of the foundation of this Antioch see Levick (*supra* n.10) 34–37.

<sup>51</sup>Syme, *RP* V 667.

<sup>52</sup>Strab. 568, *cf.* 578; Dio 49.32.3; Syme, *RP* I 142.

<sup>53</sup>S. Mitchell "Iconium and Ninica," *Historia* 28 (1979) 412, and (*supra* n.2) 20.

<sup>54</sup>Strab. 567, 569; Dio 49.32.3, 53.26.3. See Syme, *RP* I 146.

<sup>55</sup>The creation of *Tres Eparchiae* (Lycaonia, Isauria, and Cilicia) in the reign of Antoninus Pius (138–161) is thought to have affected only southern Lycaonia: see R. K. Sherk, *The Legates of Galatia from Augustus to Diocletian* (Baltimore 1951) 14–18, 39–42, 60–62, and (*supra* n.10) 997–998; H. von Aulock, *Münzen und Städte Lykaoniens* (*IstMitt* Beih. 16 [1976]) 53–59; Rémy 79.



(41–68).<sup>56</sup> Pliny’s mention of Antioch-near-Pisidia dates his evidence to after 25 B.C. and thus reflects the situation when Lycaonia, including Iconium, comprised a part of Galatia. Hence Pliny’s reference to “Lycaonia itself”: it was the Lycaonian territory that lay on the border between Galatia and Cappadocia.<sup>57</sup>

Because Lycaonia was a part of Roman Galatia from 25 B.C. into the third century A.D., Pliny’s reference to the “tetrarchy of Lycaonia” as a component of Galatia cannot be dated more precisely than to *ca* 25 B.C.–A.D. 79. His reference to the *gens Isaurica* may have reflected a new vision of the Isaurians as populating the territory south of the Taurus, which was probably connected with the foundation of *provincia Cilicia* by Vespasian in 74, but this has yet to be proved.<sup>58</sup> Further evidence includes the absence of Iconium among the assize cities of *provincia Asia* under Augustus and the Flavii,<sup>59</sup> as well as the creation of Galatia-Cappadocia, a huge composite province which was

<sup>56</sup>Belke (*supra* n.2) 930. M. Annius Afrinus, legate of Galatia in A.D. 49–54, is mentioned on the coins of Iconium: *SNG von Aulock* 8645; von Aulock (*supra* n.55) 253–257; G. R. Stumpf, *Numismatische Studien zur Chronologie der römischen Statthalter in Kleinasien* (Saarbrücken 1991) 166–170; see also *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 630; G. W. Houston, *Roman Imperial Administrative Personnel during the Principates of Vespasian and Titus* (diss. U. North Carolina 1971) 8–9 no. 5; Sherck (*supra* n.10) 976–977. L. Pupius, *epitropos* of the *Galatike eparcheia*, is praised in an inscription from Iconium in the reign of Nero: *IGR* III 263.

<sup>57</sup>In another passage (*HN* 5.147) Pliny refers to the border between Galatia and Lycaonia as follows: *attingit Galatia et ... Lycaoniae partem Obizenen*. Pliny’s “tetrarchy of Lycaonia” has been identified with the *Proseilemmene* (“the added land”) referred to in Ptolemy’s description of Galatia which speaks of the *Obizenoi* as well, by Ramsay (65–66) and Mitchell I 55, whose references should be to Plin. *HN* 5.95 and Ptol. *Geog.* 5.4.8: ὑπὸ δὲ τὰ εἰρημένα ἔθνη διήκουσι Προσειλημμενῖται μὲν συνημμένοι αὐτοῖς, ὑπὸ δὲ τούτους Ὀβιζηνοὶ καὶ μέρος τῆς Λυκαονίας, ἐν οἷς πόλεις (κτλ.). This tempting idea was rejected by Magie II 1308 n.8, because Ptolemy (5.6.15–16) mentions ten cities, not fourteen, that belonged to the *Obizenoi* and does not say anything about Iconium.

<sup>58</sup>The creation of the joint province of Galatia-Cappadocia *ca* 75–76 (see below) also hints that Pliny was referring to the situation as it was in the late 70s. But such evidence is hardly decisive by itself.

<sup>59</sup>C. Habicht, “New Evidence on the Province of Asia,” *JRS* 65 (1975) 69–70.

founded in Vespasian's reign and dissolved under Trajan.<sup>60</sup> Inscriptions from Antioch-near-Pisidia refer to C. Antius Aulus Iulius Quadratus and Calvisius Ruso Iulius Frontinus as legates of Galatia-Cappadocia in the first half of the 80s and in 104–107 respectively.<sup>61</sup> But the jurisdiction of Iconium did not necessarily indicate that Iconium was an assize city of Asia, and Galatia and Cappadocia had already been brought together for some time in the late 50s/early 60s, probably because of the Parthian campaigns of Cn. Domitius Corbulo.<sup>62</sup> Therefore this sort of evidence does not allow us to narrow the chronological limits of the "tetrarchy of Lycaonia" any further than *ca* 25 B.C.–A.D. 79.

### 3. The *strategia Antiochiana*

According to Ptolemy (*fl.* *ca* 146–170) the *strategia Antiochiana* included Derbe, Laranda, Olbasa, and Mousbanda. It was allegedly named for Antiochus IV Epiphanes Philokaisar of Commagene.<sup>63</sup> Antiochus IV is known to have ruled from 37 to 72 with a single break: Caligula gave him Commagene and

<sup>60</sup>The governors and legates of Galatia: Rémy 84–85: from 69/70 to 190/193. Galatia-Cappadocia: Magie II 1435–1438: from A.D. 72; Sherk (*supra* n.55) 39–40: *ca* 72–114; Rémy 65–70: dissolved sometime in 107/8–114; W. Eck, "Jahres- und Provinzialfasten der senatorischen Statthalter von 69/70 bis 138/139," *Chiron* 12 (1982) 281–362, dated the foundation of this conglomerate to 72/3 but suggested two governors, both with a question mark though, for 70/72. The earliest known governor of this province is, however, Cn. Pompeius Collega, whose governorship has been dated to 76 or *ca* 74/5–76: K. Strobel, "Cappadocia," *NPauily* 2 (1997) 974, and W. Eck, "Pompeius [II 6] Cn. P. Collega," *NPauily* 10 (2001) 111, and also *ILS* 998 and 8904 together with Dessau's comments which suggest 75/6. *Cf.* earlier Rémy 53: *ca* 75/6–77/8.

<sup>61</sup>Quadratus: see n.71 *infra*. Frontinus: *MAMA* VII 193 (Philomelium in Asia), VIII 211.6–10 (Cana in Lycaonia); H. Dessau, *JRS* 3 (1913) 302 (Antioch-near-Pisidia); republished by Sherk (*supra* n.55) 55. His office was dated to 106/7 by W. M. Calder, *MAMA* VII p.38; E. Groag in *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 350; and Sherk 55–56. See also B. Rémy, *Les fastes sénatoriaux des provinces romaines d'Anatolie* (Paris 1988) 120, and Eck (*supra* n.60: 1982) under 104/5 and 106/7.

<sup>62</sup>Sherk (*supra* n.55) 32–35: *ca* 54/62; Rémy 39–40: *ca* 54/64.

<sup>63</sup>Ptol. 5.6.16: στρατηγίας Ἀντιοχιανῆς· Δέρβη, Λάρανδα, Ὀλβασα, Μουσβάνδα. On the name see Ruge (*supra* n.30) 2255; Magie II 1368 n.49; Ballance (*supra* n.34) 150; Syme, *Anatolica* 155; F. Hild, *Kilikien und Isaurien* (*TIB* V = *DenkschrWien* 215 [1990]) 32.

“coastal Cilicia,” which he soon took away. Claudius, while giving him back Commagene, added “parts of Cilicia,” probably a different territory, in 41.<sup>64</sup>

The direct link between the name of the *strategia Antiochiana* and that of Antiochus IV looks suspect for two reasons. First, if Ptolemy’s Olbasa is to be identified with Olba in Cilicia Trachea, as has usually been done,<sup>65</sup> it belonged to M. Ant. Polemo, presumably the same person who struck coins in Olba as dynast during the reign of Tiberius (during 27–29) and as king under Nero and Galba (54–69).<sup>66</sup> Even if Antiochus controlled this territory for twenty-five years between the known coins of M. Ant. Polemo and even if “parts of Cilicia” might have referred to a portion of old Greater Cilicia that included Derbe and Laranda, why should the name of the king of Commagene be associated with only one territory of his realm, which he controlled for only a part of his reign? Second, the names of the Cappadocian *strategiai* derived either from their main cities (Garsaūra, Tyana) or from geographical (or tribal) toponyms, as demonstrated by Ptolemy and Strabo alike.<sup>67</sup> There is no reason why the *strategia Antiochiana* should have been an exception.

<sup>64</sup>Dio 59.8.2, 60.8.1–2, with Magie II 1407 n.26; R. D. Sullivan, “The Dynasty of Commagene,” *ANRW* II.8 (1977) 785–794; A. Mehl, “Antiochos [18] IV,” *NPauly* 1 (1996) 772.

<sup>65</sup>Ramsay (*supra* n.30) 336; L. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen* (Heidelberg 1984) 435–436; Hild (*supra* n.63) 32 n.19; see *Barrington Atlas* 66.D3. For Mousbanda see Zgusta 403–404: unidentified, probably in the upper Calycadnus; Ramsay 336, 369 with reference to Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Βούσμαδις· Ἰσαυρική πόλις; see *Barrington Atlas* 66.B3.

<sup>66</sup>Dio 60.8.1–2 with Magie II 1407 n.26; Jos. *AJ* 20.145–146. Coins: G. M. Staffieri, *La monetazione di Olba nella Cilicia Trachea* (Lugano 1978) 20 nos. 29–30 and 22 nos. 35–36; Hill, *BMC Lycaonia* liv = Head, *Hist.Num.* 727 = Staffieri 22 no. 37. This identification: Magie; R. D. Sullivan, “Dynasts in Pontus,” *ANRW* II.7.2 (1980) 926–927. *Contra*: A. A. Barrett, “Polemo II of Pontus and M. Antonius Polemo,” *Historia* 27 (1978) 446–447; D. Braund, *Rome and the Friendly King* (New York 1984) 48 n.15; see also Hoben (*supra* n.37) 52. For the present discussion, it does not really matter if the dynast and the king were the same person.

<sup>67</sup>Jones (*supra* n.30) 177; Panichi (*supra* n.15) 526.

Müller therefore had some grounds for connecting the name of this *strategia* with that of a city which, in his opinion, should have been Antiochia Lamotis. His idea was rejected, however, because Antiochia Lamotis is mentioned only once and in a very late source.<sup>68</sup> A similar argument can be used against two other possible eponyms of the *strategia Antiochiana*, Antiochia ad Cragum which has recently been considered as founded by Antiochus IV, and Antiochia Castellum which could have had its name before Bassidius Lauricius, in 359, allegedly named it so though without any obvious reason.<sup>69</sup> The name of a territory did not have to be derived directly from that of its ruler. Pontus Polemoniacus was named for the city of Polemonium, which took this name from its founder, supposedly king Polemo I.<sup>70</sup> In short, it is far from certain whether the *strategia Antiochiana* existed in the time of Antiochus IV. An inscription for C. Antius Aulus Iulius Quadratus refers to him as an imperial legate, most probably of Domitian, in several territories, including Galatia, Cappadocia, and Phrygia, as well as [Anti]ochia. Ramsay restored [Λυκαονίας Ἀντι]οχίας, but it is difficult to support this restoration either historically or grammatically, and Cagnat may have been correct to take this [Anti]ochia as Colonia Caesarea Antiochia near Pisidia.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>68</sup>K. Müller's notes *ad loc.* in his edition of Ptolemy (Paris 1901). *Contra*: Ruge (*supra* n.30) 2255. See G. Hirschfeld, "Antiocheia (23)," *RE* 1 (1894) 2447, with reference to Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Ἀντιόχεια· Ἰσαυρίας, ἢ Λαμοτίς λεγομένη, who, however, did not connect it with the *strategia Antiochiana*; see Hirschfeld, "Antiocheiane," *RE* 2447.

<sup>69</sup>Antiochia ad Cragum: Hild (*supra* n.63) 191–192; H. Täuber, "Kilikies, Kilikia," *NPauIy* 6 (1999) 456. Its known coins date from the reign of Antoninus Pius (138–161) to that of Valerian (253–260): F. Imhoof-Blumer, *NC* III.15 (1895) 288–289; Head, *Hist.Num.* 717; see *Barrington Atlas* 66.A4. Antiochia Castellum: *ILS* 740, (Bassidius) *castellum diu ante a latronibus possessum ... occupavit ad[que] ad perpetuam [q]uietis firmitatem militum praesidio munitum Antiochiam nuncupavit*; see Néroutsos, *BCH* 2 (1878) 18–19; W. Ruge, *RE* Suppl. 1 (1903) 91 no. 19a; Hild 193; and *Barrington Atlas* 66.B3.

<sup>70</sup>E. Olshausen, "Polemonion," *RE* Suppl. 14 (1974) 427–428.

<sup>71</sup>*I.Perg.* II 451 [*IGR* IV 390], πρεσβευτὴν Σεβαστοῦ ἐπ[αρχ]ε[ί]ας Καππαδοκίας, Γαλατίας, Φρυγίας, [Πισιδίας, Ἀντι]οχίας, Ἀρμενίας μ[ικρᾶς (κτλ.)]. See *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 507; Ramsay 70 n.9; Cagnat *ad IGR*. His office was dated *ca* 84/5 by Sherk (*supra* n.55) 48–50 or *ca* 82/3 by Rémy 60.

Ptolemy, our only source about the *strategia Antiochiana*, distinguished between Galatia (including Paphlagonia, parts of Lycaonia and Pisidia, as well as Isauria), Pamphylia (including Phrygia, a part of Trachea, and the other part of Pisidia), Cappadocia (including Pontus Galaticus and Polemoniacus, the other part of Lycaonia, Armenia Minor, and Cappadocian territory itself), and Cilicia (including the other part of Trachea and Campestris). The Cappadocian territory was further divided into *strategiai*, some of which clearly remind us of, though they need not be identical with, the Cappadocian *strategiai* of Strabo.<sup>72</sup>

Inscriptions carrying the official titulature of Roman provincial officials establish the *terminus post quem* for the inclusion of Pontus Galaticus and Polemoniacus together with Armenia Minor in Cappadocia *ca* 112/3.<sup>73</sup> But this evidence does not wholly correspond to what Ptolemy says. His text also refers to the separation of Galatia and Phrygia. According to inscriptions

<sup>72</sup>Ptol. 5.6.11–25; Strab. 534–538. Both speak of eleven Cappadocian *strategiai*, though Ptolemy omits the reference to Melitene as a *strategia* (5.6.21) and spells differently the name of another (5.6.25 Ἀραωνή, Strab. 534 Σαραουονή). Ptolemy does not mention Azamora and Dastarcum with reference to either Cataonia or Melitene, but this omission can probably be explained by the fact that both places were only “strongholds” in the words of Strabo (537). These are minor discrepancies; the major difference between the two accounts concerns one of the *strategiai*: the “eleventh *strategia*” of Strabo (535) and the *strategia Antiochiana* of Ptolemy (5.6.16). While Ptolemy’s *strategia Antiochiana* encompassed Derbe, Laranda, Olbasa, and Mousbanda, the “eleventh *strategia*” did not include Derbe which was then in the hands of Antipater. More importantly, the “eleventh *strategia*” covered the country round Castabala and Cybistra (ἡ περὶ Καστάβαλά τε καὶ Κύβιστρα), while Ptolemy put Cybistra in the *strategia Cataonia* (5.6.22) and Castabala in Cilicia (5.7.7). It is unlikely, therefore, that Strabo and Ptolemy referred to the same territory, *pace* Panichi (*supra* n.15) 526.

<sup>73</sup>*I.Perg.* III 21, *leg. Aug. pro pr. Cappadociae Galatiae Armeniae Minoris Ponti Paphlagoniae Isauriae Phrygiae* (C. Iulius Quadratus Bassus, *ca* 109/112?); *ILS* 1017, *leg. Aug. pro pr. provinc. Gal. Pisid. Phryg. Luc. Isaur. Paphlag. Ponti Gala. Ponti Polemoniani Arm.* (L. Caesennius Sospes, *ca* 112/114?). See Mitchell II 155 (112/3?) and “Galatia,” *OCD*<sup>3</sup> 621 (“After 112 the Pontic regions and Cappadocia were given their own consular legate”); K. Strobel, “Galatia, Galaten,” *NPauIy* 4 (1998) 745 (“Cappadocia, Pontus Polemoniacus und Pontus Galaticus wurden 113 abgetrennt”). But inscriptional evidence suggests that these territories could have been separated from Galatia at different times; see *ILS* 1038 and 1039 (next note).

that we have, imperial legates over Galatia ceased to control Phrygia *ca* 116/7.<sup>74</sup> Also, in 114/*ca* 117, *i.e.* in the time of the Parthian war, Cappadocia and Armenia Minor were united with Armenia Major under the command of L. Catilius Severus.<sup>75</sup> The creation, early in the reign of Antoninus Pius (138–161), of the conglomerate of Isauria, Lycaonia, and Cilicia, that came to be known as the “three provinces” (*Tres Eparchiae*: see below) establishes the *terminus ante quem*. The *strategia Antiochiana* of Ptolemy thus falls within the period from *ca* 116/7 to *ca* 138, *i.e.* the reign of Hadrian.<sup>76</sup>

#### 4. The Lycaonian *koinon*

The history of the “Lycaonian *koinon*” goes back to the late Republican period. In 39 B.C. Antony made Polemo king by giving him a “part of Cilicia.” Strabo says that this Polemo I was in control of Iconium at that time. For this reason, Polemo’s “Cilicia” is thought to have carried the old meaning of the word, *i.e.* Cilicia to the north of the Taurus.<sup>77</sup> Further evidence about the kingdom of Polemo can be easily added. When in late 37 or 36 Polemo left for Pontus which he received from Antony who had taken it away from Darius, son of Pharnaces, Polemo’s Trachea went over to Cleopatra.<sup>78</sup> What Polemo received in 39 as a “part of Cilicia” in the version of Appian went over to

<sup>74</sup>ILS 1039, *leg. Aug. pro pr. provinc. Galat. Phryg. Pisid. Lycaon. Paphlag.* (anonymous, 116/7); 1038, *leg. Aug. pro pr. provinciar. Galatiae Pisid. Paphlagoniae* (L. Cossonius Gallus?, *ca* 117/119?).

<sup>75</sup>ILS 1041; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 558. See Rémy 70–71.

<sup>76</sup>*Cf.* M. Christol and Th. Drew-Bear, “D. Fonteius Fronto, Proconsul de Lycie-Pamphylie,” *GRBS* 32 (1991) 412–413, who dated Ptolemy’s description of the borders of Asia, Galatia, and Pisidia to the reign of Hadrian.

<sup>77</sup>*App. BC* 5.75; *Strab.* 568. For this Cilicia, see P. Desideri, “Strabo’s Cilicians,” in *De Anatolia Antiqua* I (Paris 1991) 299–301; Syme, *Anatolica* 155–156, 218–219, and *RP* I 143–144. On the house of Polemo see G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford 1965) 143–144.

<sup>78</sup>Cleopatra’s Trachea: *Strab.* 669; *Plut. Ant.* 36. Octavian gave it after 31 to Amyntas and, after Amyntas’ death in 25, to Archelaus (see above).

Amyntas in 36 as “Lycaonia and parts of Pamphylia” in the words of Dio.<sup>79</sup>

Polemo’s Cilicia, therefore, stretched from Iconium to Trachea, quite like Cicero’s *provincia Cilicia*. But Polemo’s Cilicia did not include the districts of Phrygia (Laodicea, Apamea, and Synnada) which were finally attached to *provincia Asia* under the proconsul C. Fannius, in 49 B.C., *i.e.* soon after Cicero’s governorship.<sup>80</sup> Nor did it include the principality of Antipater who was defeated and killed by Amyntas only several years after Polemo had left for Pontus.<sup>81</sup> Nor did it include the kingdom of Tarcodimotus. In other words, Polemo did not control all the territories of the old Greater Cilicia. Hence Appian’s reference to Polemo’s kingdom as comprising only a “part of Cilicia.” After the last Ariobarzanes passed away in 42 and his brother Ariarathes X proved to be of no use and Polemo was needed in the north, Antony realized that even this reduced Cilicia would be too much for one ruler and that several rulers would provide a more effective way of governing this territory. He finally divided what remained of the old Greater Cilicia among Amyntas, Archelaus, and Cleopatra in 36.<sup>82</sup>

Two attempts would be made to resurrect it in approximately the same form, by putting together Lycaonia, Isauria, and Cilicia.<sup>83</sup> The first was undertaken in the reign of Antoninus Pius (138–161), probably in anticipation of a war against

<sup>79</sup>49.32.3. For Amyntas’ coins in Pamphylia see *BMC Galatia* 2 nos. 1–7 (note †); for his coins in Lycaonia see De Luynes, “Médailles inédites d’Amyntas, roi de Galatie,” *RevNum* (1845) 261: probably in Hermopolis. For the kingdom of Polemo I as including Lycaonia, see also Strab. 568, *cf.* 578; Syme, *RP* I 142.

<sup>80</sup>Sherk, *Roman Documents* no. 52; Stumpf (*supra* n.56) 49: coins from Apamea and Laodicea carried the name of C. Fabius, proconsul of Asia in 57 B.C. These districts therefore were attached to Asia before the governorship of Cicero; Magie (I 383–384) put the transfer of the three Phrygian districts (Cibyra-Laodicea, Apamea, Synnada) to Cilicia *ca* 57/6.

<sup>81</sup>L. Robert, *A travers l’Asie Mineure* (Paris 1980) 243 (around 36 B.C.), and Mitchell I 38 (late 30s or early 20s; *cf.* however his Map 3 *s.v.* “Antipater”: 63–35?).

<sup>82</sup>The gradual abolition of the Greater Cilicia by 36 B.C.: Syme, *RP* I 141–144.

<sup>83</sup>Syme, *RP* I 144–148, thought that under Amyntas and later the functions of the former Cilicia were performed by Galatia.

Parthia.<sup>84</sup> This conglomerate is likely to have been discontinued already at the end of his reign<sup>85</sup> and was clearly absent under Marcus Aurelius and Commodus as well as in the early reign of Septimius Severus (161–211), when Lycaonia, Isauria, and Cilicia made up parts of different composite administrative units.<sup>86</sup> But the Severi (193–235) made the second attempt by bringing together Lycaonia, Isauria, and Cilicia under the name *Tres Eparchiae* that has been commonly applied in retrospect to the first version of this conglomerate as well.<sup>87</sup>

It is during the first of these periods that Lycaonia is thought to have been divided between Galatia and Cappadocia, with

<sup>84</sup>E.g. C. Habicht, "Zwei neue Inschriften aus Pergamon," *IstMitt* 9–10 (1959–60) 110 no. 1.4–5: A. Cl. Charax ἡγεμὼν Κιλικίας Λυκαονίας Ἰσαυρίας (ca A.D. 144/146); cf. *AE* 1961, 320; *ILS* 8827.6–8 (= *OGIS* 576), [ἀν]τιστράτηγον ἐπαρχειῶν Κιλικίας Ἰσαυρί[ας] Λυκ[α]ονίας (Isaura Vetus?, ca 147/149?). It is thought to have been created between 138 and 144 (Sartre [*supra* n.11] 175) or 138 and 146 (Habicht 116–117 and Mitchell II 155). The anticipated war against Parthia: *Magie* I 660, II 1529 n.3; Habicht; Rémy 79.

<sup>85</sup>See Rémy 81, though arguing only *ex silentio*.

<sup>86</sup>Antoninus Pius: *ILS* 1050, P. Cassius Dexter *legatus Aug. pr. pr. provinciae Ciliciae* (Castabala, A.D. 149/151) with *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 490; *SEG* XXXV 1835, Cornelius Dexter governor of Cilicia (Nephelion, 156/160); Ballance (*supra* n.34) 149.10–12 [*AE* 1960, 34; *SEG* XVI 758) invoked *CIL* VIII 8934 mentioning Cornelius Dexter as the legate and propraetor of what Ballance thought was the same composite province in A.D. 157; cf. the skepticism of Rémy 81. *SEG* XXXIII 777, ἐπαρχείας Καπ[πα]δοκίας καὶ Πόν[του] καὶ Λυκαονί[ας], dated to the late reign of Antoninus Pius or the early reign of Marcus Aurelius. Commodus: *MAMA* VI 74.9–12 (cf. *AE* 1938, 4) and 75.6–9, Καρμυνίου Ἀθηναγόρου ἀνθυπάτου Λυκίας καὶ Πανφυλίας καὶ Ἰσαυρίας, dated by M. Clerc, *BCH* 11 (1887) 348–351; see also *Magie* II 1529 n.3; Rémy 81, 85, 96–97. Septimius Severus: honors to C. Atticius Norbanus Strabo, governor of Galatia in 198, in *AE* 1906, 21 (Iconium) and 1907, 58 (Lycaonia); see B. Rémy *Les carrières sénatoriales dans les provinces romaines d'Anatolie au Haut-Empire* (Paris 1989) 138 no. 123.

<sup>87</sup>Rémy (96–97) dated the resurrection of *Tres Eparchiae* to 202, but *AE* 1926, 75, which he invoked, does not seem to allow us to draw such a conclusion. See Levante, *SNG Switzerland* I 1407ff, Anazarbus as *metropolis* of the *Tres Eparchiae* from A.D. 204/5. Caracalla (198–217): *BMC Lycaonia* 200 no. 206, κοινὸς τῶν τριῶν ἐπαρχειῶν (Tarsus); *I.Anazarbos* 4.13–15 (A.D. 207). Elagabal (218–222): *I.Anazarbos* 12. Severus Alexander (222–235): *IGR* III 879–880, μητρόπολις τῶν γ' ἐπ[αρχειῶν] Κιλικίας Ἰσαυρίας Λυκα[ονίας] (Tarsus), with G. Laminger-Pascher, *ZPE* 15 (1974) 32; *SEG* XXVII 1335 (Tarsus); *I.Anazarbos* 6 and 13; *AE* 1990, 989 and 994: μητρόπολις τῶν τριῶν ἐπαρχειῶν Κιλικίας Ἰσαυρίας Λυκαονίας (from Tarsus and Anazarbus)—a good example of civic rivalry in this part of the Roman east; cf. their titles in Levante and *I.Anazarbos* 16, 17, 18, 25 (III A.D.). For *Tres Eparchiae* under Macrinus (217–218) see *I.Anazarbos* 11.



the latter part forming the Lycaonian *koinon*.<sup>88</sup> The coins of this *koinon* are known from 161–169 (Derbe, Hyde, Barata, Ilistra, Dalisandos, Laranda) and 244–249 (the last four).<sup>89</sup> The fact that the two periods were represented by different cities may mean that the *koinon* did not remain the same or was resurrected after a lapse of time.<sup>90</sup>

Why should Lycaonia be divided in arrangements that recreated almost all of the old Greater Cilicia? The dating of the first period of the *koinon*'s coinage shows that it came about not because of the creation of *Tres Eparchiae* but because of its dissolution, thus implying that *Tres Eparchiae* survived till the end of Antoninus Pius' reign. Therefore, the second period of the *koinon*'s coinage may have followed upon the dissolution of the second edition of *Tres Eparchiae* in the reign of Philip the Arab (244–249). Philip is known to have concluded peace with the Sasanids immediately after obtaining the imperial power and before going to Rome.<sup>91</sup> As the treaty was concluded in the spring, there was enough time for Philip to implement territorial rearrangements during his journey to Rome in 244.<sup>92</sup> After 244, there was no engagement with the Sasanids for some time. Philip is referred to as *consul ordinarius* in Rome in spring or early summer 245.<sup>93</sup> And later in 245 he was already fighting against the Carpi who were pressing over the Danube.<sup>94</sup> Therefore, the conglomerate which was caused most probably by the

<sup>88</sup>Ramsay 71; Ruge (*supra* n.30) 2253; Syme, *RP* VI 296; Jones (*supra* n.30) 413 n.21; Belke (*supra* n.2) 556; Mitchell II 155. For Lycaonia as divided between Cappadocia and Galatia, see Rémy 91 map 14 and (*supra* n.86) 158 no. 123.

<sup>89</sup>Von Aulock (*supra* n.55) 25–32.

<sup>90</sup>Von Aulock (*supra* n.55) 35. Cf. Ruge (*supra* n.30) 2253, who thought that the *koinon* continued uninterrupted from Antoninus Pius to Philip the Arab.

<sup>91</sup>Zonar. 12.19; Zosim. 1.19.1; E. Stein, "Iulius (Philippus) [386]," *RE* 20 (1917) 759–760; M. Peachin, "Philip's Progress," *Historia* 40 (1991) 331–342.

<sup>92</sup>Peachin (*supra* n.91), esp. 332–333.

<sup>93</sup>*FIRA* II p.657; *CIL* VI 793; *AE* 1954, 110; T. Franke, "Philippus [2] Ph. Arabs," *NPauly* 9 (2000) 812.

<sup>94</sup>K. Patsch, "Carpi," *RE* 3 (1899) 1609; A. Alföldi, *Studien zur Geschichte der Weltkrise des 3. Jahrhunderts nach Christus* (Darmstadt 1967) 314, 317.

war that Septimius Severus started against the Parthians became unnecessary in 244. Lycaonia may have been divided between Galatia and Cappadocia in 244 as well. In both cases, when Lycaonian cities found themselves in different administrative units, they tried to reinforce their ethnic cohesiveness by presenting themselves as members of the Lycaonian *koinon* on their civic coinage.

To summarize: The evidence that we have about the “eleventh *strategia*,” the *strategia Antiochiana*, the “tetrarchy of Lycaonia,” and the Lycaonian *koinon* presents them as different units geographically and historically. To judge by the location of their identifiable cities, the “eleventh *strategia*” and the *strategia Antiochiana* lay next to each other, with Cybistra again marking the western border of Cappadocia.<sup>95</sup> The “eleventh *strategia*,” which included Cybistra and Castabala, was to the east. In the list of Ptolemy, Cybistra was in the Cataonian *strategia* of Cappadocia and Castabala in a different region, Cilicia Campestris (5.6.22, 5.7.7). The “tetrarchy of Lycaonia,” which was then attached to Galatia, included Iconium, while the Lycaonian *koinon* did not include Iconium, Laodicea Cecaumene, and Savatra.<sup>96</sup> Nor did the *strategia Antiochiana* include Iconium. Ptolemy put Iconium together with a part of Lycaonia in Cappadocia, next to the *strategia Antiochiana*, which, among other things, makes it impossible to identify the latter as the same territory as the “tetrarchy of Lycaonia.”

Chronologically, the evidence that we have about these territories belongs to different periods. The “eleventh *strategia*”

<sup>95</sup>Strabo (537, Caesarea [Mazaka] as a city in Cilicia) late in the first century B.C., and Ptolemy (5.6.14: Mazaka in Cilicia) in the second century A.D. extend Cilicia as far as Cappadocian Caesarea; see also Const. *Them.* 1. It is true that here both Strabo and Ptolemy are using archaic terminology, but since it is Strabo who speaks of the “eleventh *strategia*” as comprising “Cilicia” (see *supra* 359), “Cilicia” has the same meaning in each of these two passages. The “eleventh *strategia*,” therefore, could be a part of Cilicia, without occupying any part of Lycaonia.

<sup>96</sup>Von Aulock (*supra* n.55) 50, 72–90; Mitchell II 155. See *Barrington Atlas* 63.A4 Laodicea Cecaumene (Claudiolaodicea), 64.B1 Iconium and C1 Savatra (Soatra).

lasted at most from *ca* 64 to 48 B.C., though probably its existence was even shorter, *ca* 64 to 62. Pliny's evidence about the "tetrarchy of Lycaonia" is dated broadly from *ca* 25 B.C. to A.D. 79. Ptolemy's evidence about the *strategia Antiochiana* most probably reflects the period *ca* 116/7 to 138. The coins of the Lycaonian *koinon* date to 161–169 and 244–249.

Ethnically, Iconium and the "tetrarchy of Lycaonia" belonged to Lycaonia; administratively, they formed a part of Galatia;<sup>97</sup> and, if we believe Pliny, they were under the jurisdiction of the proconsul of *provincia Asia*. The coins of the Lycaonian *koinon* likewise reflected the overlapping of ethnic and administrative boundaries. As has already been seen by Ruge, the *koinon* allows us to establish the borders of Lycaonia as an ethnic unit ("in ethnographischer Beziehungen"),<sup>98</sup> while the politico-administrative borders of Lycaonia are on the whole difficult to determine because they changed profoundly and often.<sup>99</sup>

January, 2002

Department of History  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
dmitriev@msu.edu

<sup>97</sup>Magie (II 1307–1308 n.8) has countered the opinion of his predecessors, including Mommsen, that the tetrarchy was a Galatian institution, referring to it as a Macedonian invention that was inherited by the Romans, as, for example, in Syria. But a part of Lycaonia added by the Romans to Galatia could be organized by them as a tetrarchy, in line with the system that existed in Galatia prior to the Romans.

<sup>98</sup>Ruge (*supra* n.30) 2253. See also Magie II 1312 n.15.

<sup>99</sup>This paper has benefited from the comments of the anonymous reader.