Stephen Mitchell

The Administration of Roman Asia from 133 BC to AD 250

1. Republican Road Building

Roman Asia covered a vast land area. The impact and the impression which Roman government and administration made on its inhabitants and communities were constrained by geographical realities. Given the limited transport possibilities of a pre-mechanical age even energetic and active rulers and administrators would have found it difficult to make their presence felt except in its most accessible regions. In fact, the republican system of government by ex-consuls, who usually served for one year only, ruled out the theoretical possibility that a proconsul might visit the far-flung parts of the territory, except to deal with a crisis. Considerations of time and space determined the framework in which all administrative activity took place.

The construction of roads was crucially important, for these represented Rome's material attempt to master the geographical problem. During the Republic, as later under the Empire, Roman control of conquered or acquired territory was made visible in road building. Roads were the most significant means by which the Romans defined provincial space. The conceptual as well as the practical thinking which this entailed is illustrated throughout the Empire. In Italy we may trace it through the construction of the Appia (312), the Flaminia (220), the Aemilia (187) and the Postumia (178 BC), each road named after the magistrate or general responsible for the undertaking¹. The articulation of Roman control over its growing empire is equally clear outside Italy. In the West the via Domitia, named after the creator of Provincia Narbonensis Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, ran from the Italian Alps through Gaul to Spain². M. Agrippa confirmed Rome's grip on the Tres Galliae as far as the Rhine with the highway built from Massilia to

¹ *Peter Wiseman*, Roman Republican Road Building, in: *PBSR* 38 (1970) 122–52 = *Roman Papers* (1987) 126–56; *Nicholas Purcell*, The Creation of Provincial Landscape: the Roman Impact in Cisalpine Gaul, in: *Thomas Blagg, Martin Millett*, *The Early Roman Empire in the West* (Oxford 1990) 7–29 at 12–14. See also *Purcell's* review in: *JRS* 80 (1990) 178–82 of *Claude Nicolet's* important book, *L'Inventaire du monde. Géographie et politique aux origines de l'Empire romain* (Paris 1988), which pays little attention to roads.

² *P.-M. Duval*, *Gallia* 7 (1947) 207–31; *Polybius* 3.39.8; *Cicero*, *Font.* 18.

Moguntiacum in 38 BC³. Rome's earliest commitments in Macedonia were sealed by building the via Egnatia from Dyrrhachium to Perinthus, and later to Byzantium⁴. The conquest of the interior of Dalmatia and the suppression of the great Pannonian uprising was followed by the road built by Cornelius Dolabella to Salona in AD 10⁵, and the subjugation of Illyricum and the Alpine regions was finally consummated by the road, which Claudius built in AD 46 over 350 miles from the river Po to the river Danube⁶. The main via militaris through the Balkan provinces to Thrace and Byzantium was completed under Nero, thus enabling the western and eastern provinces to be joined by a major land route, and giving the Roman Empire the geopolitical shape which was to be preserved from the Flavian period to the later fourth century⁷. In Asia Minor itself, the Augustan via Sebaste, completed in 6 BC, linked the Pamphylian coast with the newly founded colony of Pisidian Antioch and the interior regions of central Anatolia⁸. A recently discovered inscription from Patara in Lycia, dated to the creation of the province in AD 43, lists the itineraries, measured in stades, which connected the provincial communities with one another⁹. The road building programme which began with the Flavian emperors and continued until the time of Hadrian enveloped the rest of Anatolia as far as the Euphrates and brought the whole of Asia Minor firmly under imperial control¹⁰.

The process can be traced in microcosm in the single province of Asia. Moreover, since Asia is one of the best documented provinces of the entire empire, road building can be related to other administrative procedures, and it thus becomes possible to gain a more detailed conception of how Roman rule was imposed on a large land area in practical terms. M'. Aquilius, the first governor of Roman Asia after the suppression of the revolt of Aristonicus, undertook to build the main roads, the unnamed equivalents of the strategic highways attested in other prov-

³ *Strabo* 4. 6. 11; *John F. Drinkwater*, *Roman Gaul* (London 1983) 124–6 and 238 map 7.

⁴ *Strabo* 7.5.9 (*Polybius* 34.12.2a–8). *P. Collart*, *BCH* 100 (1976) 177–200; *L. Gounaropoulou*, *Miltiades Hatzopoulos*, *Les Milliaires de la Voie Egnatienne entre Héraclée des Lyncestes et Thessalonique*. *Meletemata I* (Athens 1985); *Frank W. Walbank*, *Althistorische Studien Hermann Bengtson zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht* (*Historia Einzelschriften* 40, Wiesbaden 1983) 131–47; *The Via Egnatia: Some outstanding Problems*, in: *IV International Colloquium on Macedonia (Thessalonica 1983)*. Further bibliography in *SEG* 26, 771–3; 33, 494; 35, 701.

⁵ *CIL* III 10156 and 3200. Compare *Barbara Levick*, *The Government of the Roman Empire* (London 1985) 104.

⁶ *E. Mary Smallwood*, *Documents illustrating the Reigns of Caius, Claudius and Nero* (London 1966) no. 46.

⁷ *ILS* 231.

⁸ *Ronald Syme* (ed. *Anthony R. Birley*), *Anatolica*. *Studies in Strabo* (Oxford 1995) 227–8: „The Sebaste transcends local utility and acquires proper rank as a continental artery, binding together the southern regions of the Galatic province and linking western Asia Minor, Pamphylia, and the Cilician Gates“; *Stephen Mitchell*, *Anatolia. Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor I* (Oxford 1993) 71 n. 3, 77 and map 5 (= *Mitchell*, *Anatolia*).

⁹ *Sencer Şahin*, XVII. Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı, 1995 II (Ankara 1996) 163–4.

¹⁰ *David Magie*, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor II* (Princeton 1950) 1430 (= *Magie*, *Roman Rule*); *David French*, in: *ANRW* II 7.2, 698–729, esp. 707–11.

inces, between 129 and 126 BC. Deductions can be made from the findspots and the distance indications on the milestones set up by M'. Aquillius about the geo-political thinking which lay behind the creation of the new province.

Table 1: Milestones of M'. Aquillius 129–126 BC

No.	Findspot	Ref.	Distance	Caput Viae
1	Aydın (Tralles)	CIL III 14201 (<i>French</i> 198)	κθ'	Ephesus
2	Çamlık (nr Ephesus)	CIL III 7205 (<i>French</i> 742)	ε'	Ephesus
3	Dikili (w. of Pergamum)	CIL III 7184 (<i>French</i> 474)	ρλα' / CXXXI	Ephesus
4	Kazıkbağları (nr Elaea)	CIL III 7184 (<i>French</i> 485)	γ' / III	Pergamum
5	Sağlık (nr Metropolis)	Unpublished	–	–
6	Tire (nr Metropolis)	CIL III 14202 ⁴ (<i>French</i> 499)	κδ' / [XXI]III	Ephesus
7	Alan (SE of Laodicea)	(<i>French</i> 266)	σιδ' / CCXIV	Pergamum
8	Harmanlı (SE of Laodicea)	(<i>French</i> 279)	σκα'	Pergamum
9	Yaraşlı (Takina)	CIL III 14199 ⁸ (<i>French</i> 294)	σκαγ' / CCXXIII	Pergamum
10	Yaraşlı	(<i>French</i> 295)	σκζ' / CCXXVII	Pergamum
11	5 kms. w. of Side	<i>French</i> , in: EA 17 (1991) 53–4	τλα' / CCCXXXI	Pergamum

French = David French, *Roman Roads and Milestones of Asia Minor II. An Interim Catalogue of Milestones* (British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara Monograph 9, Oxford 1988).

The course of M'. Aquillius' road can be reconstructed with some confidence on the basis of the eleven milestones which have so far been discovered. Both Pergamum and Ephesus served as *capita viarum* and they themselves must have been directly linked by a coastal road, marked by milestones 4 and 5. Milestone 6 from Tire appears to come from the road which directly linked Ephesus with Sardis. From Ephesus the road turned inland and led to Tralles (milestones 1 and 2). It then followed the Maeander valley east as far as its tributary the Lycus, which took the road down to Laodicea. From here the route headed south east through the Milyas and Pisidia, across the southern range of the Taurus at the Döşemeboğazi, and into Pamphylia. Its final destination was the port of Side, which was accurately described by a provincial official in 43 BC as *extrema regio provinciae*¹¹. At the other end of the province the stone found at Dikili (3, surprisingly

¹¹ Lentulus Spinther, quaestor of Asia, in a letter to *Cicero*, fam. 12.15.4.

but unquestionably numbered from Ephesus) indicates that a branch of the road ran north from Pergamum to Adramyttium. The numbered miles on the stones can be reconciled with the actual distances measured either from Ephesus or from Pergamum. The figures recorded at Side (no. 11) and on the group south of Laodicea in and around Yaraşlı (ancient Tacina, nos. 7–10) correspond very closely with the direct overland distances between these places and Pergamum following a direct line through Laodicea, Philadelphia, Sardis and Thyateira. The 331 mp on the Side milestone may be reckoned as 496 kilometres; Pergamum is exactly 500 kilometres from Side by this route. The figures of 214, 221, 223 and 227 mp noted on the southern Phrygian group of stones correspond to a measured distance of 335 kilometres or 223 mp from Yaraşlı to Pergamum. The measurements on these southern and eastern milestones demonstrate that the Asian road should not be reconstructed as a simple linear connection between Adramyttium in the north west and Side in the south east, following the coast south to Ephesus before striking inland, but show that it consisted of a central triangle, with corners at Pergamum, Ephesus and Laodicea, and extensions from Pergamum to Adramyttium and from Laodicea to Side. This was the original form of the Asian province (See map).

The province was soon extended to include Phrygian territory formerly held by Mithridates V. Two fragmentary copies of a *Senatus Consultum* found at Arızlı imply that this region was added to the province in 119 or 116 BC¹². Arızlı is in southern Phrygia, on the northern slopes of the Sultandağları, north-east of Apamea and south of Synnada. The extension of Asia eastwards probably took place in two stages, the first incorporating what the sources call Greater Phrygia (Synnada and Apamea) in 119 or 116, the second extending as far as the region around Philomelium. The *lex de praetoriis provinciis* of 100 BC, shows that the writ of the governor of Asia at that time included an *eparcheia Lycaonia*, corresponding to the region around Philomelium¹³. In 51–50 BC the road followed by Cicero from Laodicea to the rest of his Cilician province, which had surely been constructed soon after the region had been annexed, traversed this territory, passing through Apamea, Synnada and Philomelium. The elder Pliny, who derived his information from official lists of the Augustan period, indicates that the city of Philomelium was the assize centre of the Lycaonian district of Asia. The Asian triangle thus acquired an eastern arm which embraced central and south-eastern Phrygia¹⁴.

¹² OGIS 436; IGR IV 752; Robert K. Sherke, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (= *Sherke*, RDGE) 13; English translation by Robert K. Sherke, *Rome and the Greek East to the Death of Augustus* (Cambridge 1984) no. 49. See the discussion of the texts and the date by Thomas Drew-Bear, in: *Historia* 21 (1972) 75–87, and *Nouvelles inscriptions de Phrygie* (Amsterdam 1978) 1–8. See also Bruce McGing, Appian, Manius Aquillius, and Phrygia, in: *GRBS* 21 (1980) 35–42.

¹³ The law is known from partial copies found at Delphi and at Cnidos. The text is most conveniently published by Wolfgang Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Knidos I* (IK 41, Bonn 1992) no. 31.

¹⁴ See Gertrud Laminger-Pascher, *Lykaonien und die Ostgrenze Phrygiens*, in: *EA* 16 (1990) 1–13 for a discussion of the ill-defined boundary between Phrygia and Lycaonia in the light

2. The Dioeceses of Asia

According to Strabo, M'. Aquillius organised the province into the scheme which it still retained in his own day: διέταξε τὴν ἐπαρχίαν ἐς τὸ νῦν ἔτι σύμμενον τῆς πολιτείας σχῆμα¹⁵. This cannot be a reference to the overall territorial extent of Asia, which had altered by the Augustan period, and is an unnatural way of describing his road building activities. It most likely refers to the setting up of the *conventus* or διοικήσεις (assize districts), into which Asia was divided and which remained a key element of the provincial organisation¹⁶. The detailed evidence for the assize districts of Asia has been much discussed in recent years, especially following the publication of the important but incomplete document from Ephesus, which provides a partial list not only of the *conventus* centres, but also of the smaller communities which were dependent on them. The main conclusions of this recent discussion can now be conveniently presented in the form of a table (page 23).

As would be expected there were alterations to the list at different periods, especially noticeable in the time of Augustus, and new dioeceses were added after the later 1st century AD, but continuity, not change, was the rule. Although the Ephesian inscription, which lists the *conventus* cities together with the communities that were dependent on them, might encourage one to think of the assizes as dividing Asia into spatially defined regions, this is a clear misconception. Both the etymology of the word *conventus*, derived from *convenire*, and the well documented parallel of Cicero's activities in the province of Cilicia in 51/50 BC prove, if proof is needed, that litigants and others came to do business with the governors and members of their staff primarily, if not exclusively, in the assize cities, and that a governor's duties were confined precisely to the assize circuit. Writing to his brother Quintus when the latter was about to begin his third term as proconsul of Asia in 59 BC, Cicero alluded explicitly to the governor's journeys, along the roads between the assize centres. He advised Quintus to keep an eye on the behaviour of his slaves, „so that they conduct themselves on your journeys in Asia

of pre-classical evidence. Most of the Greek and Roman sources imply that the inhabitants of Philomelium and even of the territory as far as Iconium, should be reckoned as Phrygians (Stephen Mitchell, in: ANRW II 7.2 [1980] 1060–2; Marc Waelkens, Die Kleinasiatischen Türsteine [Mainz 1986] 13–15, 254–68; W. Ruge, RE XX s.v. Phrygien) Philomelium was the assize centre of the ἐπαρχία Λυκαονία because it was the nearest point to Lycaonia on the governors' circuit, and cases from that region were heard there. Compare the function of Laodicea as assize centre for the Κυβεραιτική and, in Cicero's governorship, of Iconium for Isauria (Cicero, Att. 5,21,9).

¹⁵ Strabo 14,1,38; 646.

¹⁶ Eric Gray, M'. Aquillius and the Organisation of the Roman Province of Asia, in: Proceedings of the Xth International Congress of Classical Archaeology, Ankara-Izmir 1973 II (Ankara 1978) (= Gray, Tenth Congress) 965–7 at 969 ff.; Walter Ameling, in: EA 12 (1988) 15. For further discussion of the system see Rudolf Haensch, Capita Provinciarum. Statthaltersitze und Provinzialverwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit (Kölner Forschungen 7, Mainz 1997) 307–12, 748–51 (with emphatic methodological caution).

Table 2: The Assize Districts of Asia

Source and date	Cicero, Pro Flacco 28, 68 61 BC	RDGE 52 (+ Cicero) 56–50 BC	Pliny NH V. 95 ff Early Augustan	SEG 39 1180. 39 17 BC	I.Didyma 140 AD 40	SEG 37 884 Flavian	Later evidence
1				Cyzicus ¹⁷	Cyzicus		yes
2	Adra-myttium	Adra-myttium	Adra-myttium	Adra-myttium	Adra-myttium		
3	Pergamum	Pergamum	Pergamum	Pergamum	Pergamum	Pergamum	yes
4		Smyrna	Smyrna	Smyrna		Smyrna	yes
5			Sardis	Sardis	Sardis	Sardis	
6		Ephesus	Ephesus	Ephesus	Ephesus		yes
7		Miletus		Miletus	Miletus	Miletus	
8		Tralles					
9		Alabanda	Alabanda		Alabanda		
10		Mylasa					
11				Halicanassus	Halicanassus	Halicanassus	
12	Laodicea	(Laodicea ¹⁸)	Laodicea	Laodicea	Laodicea		
13	Apamea	(Apamea)	Apamea	Apamea	Apamea	Apamea	yes
14		(Synnada)	Synnada	Synnada	Synnada		
15		(Philomelium)	Philomelium ¹⁹	Philomelium	Philomelium		
16							Thyateira ²⁰
17							Philadelphia ²¹
18							Aezani ²²

¹⁷ Labelled διοίκησις Ἑλλησποντία. Cyzicus was a free city with an enormous territory extending across the Hellespontine plain and much of the Mysian hill country towards Pergamon. In the late second century BC it had close connections with Thrace and the province of Macedonia; compare the decree in honour of Machaon son of Asclepiades who undertook an embassy to M. Cosconius, propraetor of Macedonia, during the war which embroiled Asia at the death of Attalos III (IGR IV 134). See *Louis Robert*, *Hellenica* VII (Paris 1950) 231–2 on the absence of Cyzicus from earlier lists.

¹⁸ The following four cities were detached from Asia between 56 and 50 BC and came within the remit of the governor of Cilicia. Cicero's correspondence of 51 BC, however, confirms that they all continued to function as assize centres and were known as the *Asiaticae dioeceseis* (fam. 13,67,1).

¹⁹ Labelled eparchia Lycaonia in this and the next list. For Cicero's assizes at Philomelium, see fam 3,8 and Att. 5,20.

²⁰ For Thyateira as a conventus centre, see OGIS 517 = IGR IV 1287 = TAM V 2, 943: [...]ν[τ]α ἐνδόξως | [κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν | [Αὐτο]κράτορος Μάρκου Αὐρ. | [Ἀντωνίνου Σεβ. (Elagabalos) μετὰ τοῦ | Σεβαστοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ | Αὐτοκράτορος Ἀντωνίνου | ἐπιδημίαν (Caracalla, AD 215), ὁπότε ἐδωρήσατο τῇ πατρίδι ἡμῶν | τὴν ἀγορὰν δικῶν, | ἀνθυπατεύοντος Μαξίμου.

²¹ Aristides, or. 50. 96, 98 mentions an assize held at Philadelphia; confirmed by IGR IV 1620 and 1638; cf. *Robert*, *Hellenica* VII 229–31, *Habicht*, JRS 65 (1975) 71, 75; *Burton*, JRS 65 (1975) 93–4.

²² For Aezani as an assize centre, see *Friederike Naumann*, in: *Ist. Mitt.* 35 (1985) 217–26 (SEG 35, 1365), l. 15: ἀγοραῖαν ἀγοντος Κορηλίου Λατινιανοῦ. The date is probably around the end of Hadrian's reign, cf. *Werner Eck*, *Margaret Roxan*, in: *Römische Inschriften* –

exactly as if they were travelling by the Appian way; and let them not think that it is any different whether they are arriving at Tralles or Formiae²³. In fact the choice of cities as assize centres should be explained in connection with the provincial road system. M'. Aquillius' roads connected six of the nine assize cities which certainly operated in the province during the earlier part of the first century BC: Adramyttium, Pergamum, Sardis, Ephesus, Tralles, and Laodicea. We may be certain that assizes were also conducted at Side, as long as it remained part of the province of Asia, as they surely were in the later empire²⁴. Cicero held assizes at Apamea, Synnada and Philomelium in 51 BC, during the short period when the Phrygian cities of Asia were attached to Cilicia, and they had presumably served this function since they had been attached to the Asian province in the late second century BC²⁵. Only the Carian Cities of Miletus, Halicarnassus, Mylasa and Alabanda lay off the circuit of the main road. All were easily accessible from it by side routes or by sea, and it is reasonable to assume that they had been chosen as assize cities because of the substantial numbers of Roman citizens who operated in Caria after the creation of the Roman province²⁶.

Strabo thought that the assize centres were essentially a Roman innovation. In a famous passage he observed that the Romans did not divide the inhabitants of Asia by tribal or ethnic affinities, but used another principle to organise the *dioikeseis*, in which they conducted their assizes and court hearings²⁷. This was doubtless achieved by the promulgation of a *lex provinciae*, analogous to the „laws concerning general jurisdiction“, which had been devised for the newly annexed province of Achaëa in 146 BC²⁸. It is disputed how much the new Roman arrangements took over from the organisation of the Attalid kingdom. While the roads were notionally new, at least in the majority of cases they followed existing routes, dictated by the topography and well used in the Hellenistic period²⁹. We know nothing of Attalid forerunners of Roman assize procedures, but there is a

Neufunde, Neulesungen und Neuinterpretationen. Festschrift für Hans Lieb (Basel 1995) 74ff.

²³ Cicero, Q. fr. 1,1,17: ut ita se gerant in istis Asiaticis itineribus, ut si iter Appia via faceres; neve interesse quidquam putent, utrum Tralles an Formias venerint. Perhaps Tralles was chosen to illustrate the point as it was the first assize city a governor would reach as he set out east from Ephesus.

²⁴ Johannes Nollé, *Die Inschriften von Side* (IK 43, Bonn 1993) 80–95 has unearthed no direct evidence for this, but it is inconceivable that Side should have yielded in this respect to her deadly rival Perge. SEG 34, 1306, discussed by Peter Weiss, in: *Chiron* 21 (1991) 377–8, attests the conventus at Perge in the later third century.

²⁵ Cicero, fam. 3,8 and Att 5,20.

²⁶ See especially Cicero, fam. 13,56 relating both to Mylasa and to Alabanda.

²⁷ 13,4,12; 628: τὸ τοὺς Ῥωμαίους μὴ κατὰ φύλα διελεῖν αὐτοὺς, ἀλλὰ ἕτερον τρόπον διατάξας τὰς διοικήσεις ἐν αἷς τὰς ἀγοραίους ποιοῦνται καὶ τὰς δικαιοδοσίας.

²⁸ Polybius 39,5,5: τοὺς περὶ τῆς κοινῆς δικαιοδοσίας νόμους. An unpublished inscription from Pergamum refers to ἡ Ῥωμαϊκὴ νομοθεσία, see Michael Wörle, *Stadt und Fest in kaiserzeitlichem Kleinasien* (Vestigia 39, München 1988) 96 (= Wörle, *Stadt und Fest*).

²⁹ See, for the stretch between Laodicea and Pamphylia, Stephen Mitchell, *AS* 44 (1994) 132, 136.

striking correspondence between the main minting centres of the Asian cistophoric coinage – Pergamum itself, Ephesus, Sardis, Tralles, Laodicea on the Lycus, and Apamea³⁰ – and the Roman assize cities, which suggests that these had already established some official administrative status under the Pergamene kings. The question remains entirely open³¹.

What was the role of the assize centres in provincial administration? Cicero's letter to Quintus leaves no doubt that a governor's time at that period was almost entirely taken up by judicial activities. Asia was a peaceful province in 59 BC: „We need fear, I take it, no ambushes of enemies, no clash of swords in battle, no revolt of allies, no lack of tribute or corn-supply, no mutiny in the army ... What has been granted you is perfect peace, perfect tranquillity, with the reservation, however, that such a calm can overwhelm the helmsman if he sleeps, while it can give him positive pleasure if he keeps awake.³²“ Thus a governor's business was mainly confined to the courts: „Indeed it seems to me that there is no great variety of transactions in the government of Asia, but that the entire government mainly depends on the administration of justice; and being thus limited, the theory of government itself, especially in the provinces, presents no difficulty; you need only show such consistency and firmness as to withstand not only favouritism, but the very suspicion of it.“³³ Arbitration, in fact, was essentially a matter of

³⁰ Fred S. Kleiner, P. Noe, *The Early Cistophoric Coinage* (New York 1977). Gray, *Tenth Congress*, 975 indicates that only Pergamum, Ephesus, Tralles, Sardis, Apamea and Laodicea certainly issued cistophoric coinage before 133 BC. Synnada and Adramyttium minted in the period of the Roman province. Heavy minting of cistophoroi after 85 BC is probably to be explained by the pressing needs of the Asian cities to pay off Sulla's punitive levy after the defeat of Mithridates. In two recent articles Georges le Rider and Thomas Drew-Bear have drawn attention to the monograms of a much smaller group of cistophoroi, which they identify with a cluster of minor Phrygian communities, namely Dionysopolis, Blaundus, Lysias, Dioscome, the Praipennisaeis and the Corpeni, in: BCH 114 (1990) 683–701 and 115 (1991) 361–76. These issues are also perhaps to be explained in the same way, as evidence for the pressure which Sulla's levy placed even on the remoter parts of Phrygia.

³¹ Michael Crawford, *Coinage and Money under the Roman Republic* (London 1985) 160, takes it for granted that the Romans took over the Attalid system of taxation in Asia. Walter Ameling, in: EA 12 (1988) 15–17 argues for continuity between the Attalid and Roman schemes of administration; Erich Kornemann, RE V 716 emphatically stated the contrary view.

³² Cicero, Q. fr. 1,1,5: Nullas, ut opinor, insidias hostium, nullam proeli dimicationem, nullam defectionem sociorum, nullam inopiam stipendii aut rei frumentariae, nullam seditionem exercitus pertimescimus ... Tibi data est summa pax, summa tranquillitas; ita tamen, ut ea dormientem gubernatorem vel obruere, vigilantem etiam delectare possit (Loeb trans. by W. Glynn Williams). 1,1,25 does refer to various forms of violence within the province which Quintus had allegedly managed to abolish in the first years of his government. On this passage, and the letter as a whole, see the important article by E. Fallu, La première lettre de Cicéron à Quintus, in: R&L 48 (1970) 180–204 at 197. He argues that the letter acted, in effect, as a defence of Quintus' record in Asia, anticipating the danger that he would be prosecuted under the recently promulgated *Lex Iulia de repetundis*.

³³ Cicero, Q. fr. 1,1,20: Ac mihi quidem videtur non sane magna varietas esse negotiorum in administranda Asia, sed ea tota iurisdictione maxime sustineri. In qua scientiae praesertim

holding the balance between richer provincials, the *socii*, and the Roman or Italian *publicani* and *negotiatores*: „For your province consists, in the first place, of that type of ally which of all types of humanity is the most civilized; and secondly of that type of citizen who, either because they are *publicani*, are attached to us by the closest ties, or, because they are such successful traders that they have become rich, consider that they are safely in possession of their fortunes through the benefits of my consulship³⁴“. Cicero dwells at length and with considerable frankness on the bitterness that was engendered between the *socii* and the *publicani*, especially in the matter of tax collection (Q. fr. I.1, 32–6). This appraisal is broadly confirmed by all other evidence from Republican Asia³⁵. It is illustrated particularly vividly by the two lengthy inscriptions erected at the sanctuary of Clarus by the free city of Colophon in honour of their leading citizens, Polemaios and Menippos. Both men had undertaken embassies to Rome and to the provincial governors during the first generation of the new province, with a view to preserving their city's juridical independence, and the right of its courts to pass judgment even in capital cases where Roman citizens were involved³⁶. Mutatis mutandis, the bulk of a proconsul's duties under the empire were also in the assize courts. The evidence has been discussed elsewhere in detail³⁷. Particularly striking is the analysis of the martyr act of Pionius, put to death in the spring of AD 250 for failing to comply with the edict of Trajan Decius which required Christians to offer pagan sacrifice, for the narrative implies that, as in proconsular Africa, the annual dates of the governors' assize tours were well known and predictable³⁸.

However, the organisation of the assize centres provided a schema which was readily adaptable for uses other than jurisdiction. When the Roman senate resolved to safeguard Pergamene land from the intrusions of *publicani*, probably in 101 not in 129 BC, copies of its decision, which had an exemplary character applicable beyond the immediate matter at issue, were published in Adramyttium,

provincialis ratio expedita est; constantia est adhibenda et gravitas, quae resistat non solum gratiae, verum etiam suspicioni (Loeb trans.).

³⁴ Cicero, Q. fr. 1,1,6: Constat enim ea provincia primum ex eo genere sociorum, quod est ex hominum omni genere humanissimum; deinde ex eo genere civium, qui aut, quod *publicani* sunt, nos summa necessitudine attingunt, aut, quod ita negotiantur, ut locupletes sint, nostri consulatus beneficio se incolumes fortunas habere arbitrantur (Loeb trans. adapted).

³⁵ For disputes between the *publicani* and the free cities of Asia, see Sherk, RDGE 12 (*publicani* dispute over territory of Pergamon); Strabo 14,1,26 (Ephesus secures the tolls from traffic on the lake at the mouth of the Cayster back from the *publicani*); Die Inschriften von Priene no. 111; CIL I² 589 col. I, 12–20 (Rome recognises the rights of Termessus, *intra fines eorum*).

³⁶ Louis and Jeanne Robert, Claros I. Décrets hellénistiques (Paris 1989) (= Robert, Claros); the text can be consulted in SEG 39, 1243–4. Note especially the discussion of Jean-Louis Ferrary, Le statut des cités libres dans l'Empire Romain à la lumière des inscriptions de Claros, in: CRAI (1991) 558–77.

³⁷ Graham Burton, Proconsular assizes and the administration of justice in Roman Asia, in: JRS 65 (1975) 92 ff.

³⁸ Robin Lane Fox, Pagans and Christians (London 1986) 462–92.

Smyrna and Ephesus, all probably chosen because they were assize centres³⁹. Likewise the edict of Paullus Fabius Maximus, proconsul of Asia in 9 BC, included instructions that it was to be published ἐν ταῖς ἀφηγουμέναις τῶν διοικήσεων πόλεσιν⁴⁰. A section of Cicero's *Pro Flacco* shows that the contributions in gold, which the Jews of the province sent annually to Jerusalem, were collected in the assize centres. L. Valerius Flaccus had confiscated the small sums which he had found at Adramyttium and Pergamum, as well as the much larger totals (100 pounds in each case) which were temporarily banked at Laodicea and Apamea⁴¹. Later sources also indicate that Jewish gold was collected at two further assize centres, Ephesus and Sardis⁴². Evidently the Roman authorities sought to regulate and control the collection of this Jewish tax according to their own system of administration. Similarly in AD 40, when the Asian koinon contributed to the building costs of a new temple and founded a festival in honour of Gaius at Didyma, delegates to the ceremony came from each of the Asian assize districts, although in three cases the representative came not from the central assize city, but from one of the dependent towns⁴³. This suggests that the Roman authorities had earlier played a significant role in deciding how the koinon of the Greeks in Asia should be organised, as it had done with the organisation of the Jewish communities⁴⁴. The famous Flavian inscription from Ephesus provides unambiguous evidence that financial contributions might be made by individual communities arranged according to the dioeceses to which they belonged. In this case the nature of these contributions remains uncertain; the suggestion that it was a technical inventory compiled for the Asian treasury (*fiscus Asiaticus*) is fraught with problems of detail, but the balance of probability favours interpreting the document as being concerned in some way with the Roman taxation system, rather than with a non-Roman institution⁴⁵. Other contributions which the Roman authorities de-

³⁹ *Sherk*, RDGE no. 12 (Eng. trans. in *Sherk*, *Rome and the Greek East to the Death of Augustus* no. 45). For the fragmentary Ephesian copy, see *Georg Petzl*, in: EA 6 (1985) 70–71. See *Louis Robert*, *Opera Minora Selecta* I 612 n. 3 for the suggestion about publication in assize centres.

⁴⁰ *Sherk*, RDGE 65; *Umberto Laffi*, in: *Studi classici e orientali* 16 (1967) 66; *Robert*, *Hellenica* VII (1950) 233–4.

⁴¹ *Cicero*, *Flacc.* 68–69, with *Ameling*, in: EA 12 (1988) 11–14 and *Mitchell*, *Anatolia* II 33.

⁴² See *Ameling*, in: EA 12 (1988) 13, citing *Jos.*, AJ 16,163 f (Ephesus) and 171 (Sardis).

⁴³ That is from Iulia in Phrygia (representing Synnada), Antioch on the Maeander (Alabanda), Tralles (Ephesus). See *Robert*, *Hellenica* VII, 206–38 at 214–9. For the financing of constructions for the imperial cult in Asia, see *Peter Herrmann*, in: *Ist. Mitt.* 39 (1989) 191–6 and EA 20 (1992) 69–70.

⁴⁴ For the origins of the Asian koinon, see *Thomas Drew-Bear*, in: *BCH* 96 (1972) 444; *Joyce Reynolds*, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (JRS Monographs 1, London 1982) Doc. 5 (= *Reynolds*, *Aphrodisias and Rome*); Eng. trans. in *Sherk*, *Rome and the Greek East to the Death of Augustus* no. 65. It seems highly probable that one of the main functions of the Asian koinon, which is first attested by inscriptions of the first half of the first century BC, was precisely to look after the interests of the *socii* in the province against the *publicani*.

⁴⁵ *Dieter Knibbe*, in: *Tyche* 2 (1987) 75–93; but see the strong reservations indicated in SEG 37, 884. *Habicht*, JRS 65 (1975) 67 remained undecided. See further *F. Gschnitzer*, *Beurkun-*

manded from the provinces were also probably allotted according to the dioeceses. Road building was a burden that generally fell to provincial cities. Interpreting an inscription which refers to a section of road between Ephesus and Magnesia on the Maeander built by the people of the remote city of Amyzon, L. Robert suggested that the koinon of Asia had assigned responsibility for constructing sections of the roads to individual provincial communities according to the dioeceses to which they belonged⁴⁶. The assize districts were also probably used in the Republican period for organising levies of provincial troops. In another passage of the Pro Flacco it is made clear that Flaccus had been charged with the illegal extortion of money from the province to pay for a fleet. Part of Cicero's defence was that Flaccus had apportioned the money contributions according to the same system as Pompeius had used, and that this corresponded with the proportions defined by Sulla. Sulla had made a proportional assessment of all the cities of Asia by provinces, and Pompeius and Flaccus had followed the same system: „Discripsit autem pecuniam ad Pompei rationem, quae fuit accommodata L. Sullae discriptioni. Qui cum omnis Asiae civitates pro portione in provincias discripsisset, illam rationem in imperando sumptu et Pompeius et Flaccus secutus est.“ Editors, holding that the term *provincia* may only be understood in the singular as referring to the entire province of Asia, have sought to emend this passage in order to remove the expression ‘in provincias’. But in fact the plural term *provinciae*, or more often its Greek equivalent ἐπαρχαίαι, was frequently used to denote a subdivision of a large province, particularly in Asia Minor⁴⁷. Moreover, in Asia there is close to formal proof that these ἐπαρχαίαι should be identified with the dioeceses of the province. The Cnidus copy of the *lex de provinciis praetoriis* refers to an ἐπαρχία Λυκαονία (Die Inschriften von Knidos no. 31 col. III, 25). This is identical with the Lycaonian conventus whose assize centre was Philomelium, described by Pliny on the basis of provincial lists of the Augustan period⁴⁸. Imperial inscriptions show that the use of this sense of the term *provincia* or ἐπαρχεία continued, particularly in relation to financial administration. In the Trajanic period the equestrian C. Manlius Felix became procurator Augusti regionis Chersonesi, a district which apparently corresponded with the ἐπαρχία Χερσονήσου of the *lex de provinciis praetoriis*⁴⁹. P. Gavius Balbus, who succeeded to the position under

dungsgebühren im römischen Kaiserreich. Zu I. v. E. Ia 13, in: G. Thür (Hrsg.), Symposium 1985. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (1989) 389–403.

⁴⁶ Jeanne and Louis Robert, Fouilles d'Amyzon I (Paris 1983) 31–2 indicating that Magnesia and Amyzon both belonged to the conventus of Miletus; the inscription is IK 17. 1. 3157 (Naipili). A recently rediscovered bilingual milestone of AD 92 on the territory of Ionian Metropolis ends with the formula ἐργασαμένων Κολοφωνίων. The decree of Colophon for Menippos refers to a serious dispute concerning ἀνδρολήψιον between Colophon and Metropolis in the late 2nd/early 1st century BC. Robert, Claros 63 ff. (SEG 39, 1244 col. I, 50 ff.).

⁴⁷ Christian Marek, Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia, (Istanbuler Forschungen 39, Tübingen 1993) 73–82 (= Marek, Stadt, Ära und Territorium); Thomas Drew-Bear, Christian Naour, in: ANRW II 18.3, 1974–7.

⁴⁸ Pliny, n.h. 5, 95 ff.

⁴⁹ ILS 1419; Die Inschriften von Knidos no. 31 col. IV, 10–11 indicates that it was attached to

Hadrian, was ἐπίτροπος τοῦ Σεβ. ἐπαρχείας Χερσονήσου⁵⁰. Around AD 105 C. Minicius Italus held the office of *procurator provinciae Hellesponti*, and an imperial freedman of the second century, M. Aur. Marcio, was *procurator provinciae Phrygiae*⁵¹. Another freedman of the Flavian period held the otherwise unparalleled post of εἰρηνοφύλαξ τῆς ἐπαρχείας, doubtless also an official of the provincia Phrygiae⁵². One of two inscriptions for the legate of Asia, L. Ranius Optatus, shows that the term dioecesis was also retained to denote these important regional subdivisions⁵³. The volume of judicial business in Asia was such that the three *legati* of the *proconsul* certainly conducted assizes on their own behalf, and it may be that they took responsibility for certain dioeceses, like their counterparts in proconsular Africa⁵⁴.

3. Non-Civic Regional Organisation

Under the year 85/4 BC the Chronography of Cassiodorus, a very late source possibly deriving its information from Livy's History, records the information that Sulla divided Asia into forty four regions. *Magie* and later *Eric Gray* plausibly interpreted this as the division into four *regiones* of each of the eleven assize districts then in existence (Adramyttium, Pergamum, Sardis, Smyrna, Ephesus, Tralles, Alabanda, Miletus, Apamea, Synnada, and Philomelium). Each *regio* was to act as a collecting centre for the huge indemnity which Sulla levied from the Asian communities which had supported Mithridates⁵⁵. Gray conjectured that the system may have been revived in the late forties BC, when first Brutus and Cassius and then Antonius imposed huge levies on Asia, but it is not attested thereafter⁵⁶. This makes historical sense. Before the time of Augustus city organisation had

the province of Macedonia. For this passage, which also mentions a district called καίνεικῆ, see now *Michael Crawford* (ed.), *Roman Statutes I* (London 1996) 261–2.

⁵⁰ Die Inschriften von Ephesos VII 1, 3048.

⁵¹ ILS 1477; ILS 1374. Since epigraphic evidence from the earlier part of the first century AD is relatively sparse, it is unsafe to assume, as do *Drew-Bear*, *Naour*, in: ANRW II 18,3 1977, that regional subdivisions of the province had been introduced by Vespasian to aid financial administration. The existing *dioikeseis* had probably always been maintained for this purpose. Compare in general the terminology used for the administrative divisions of proconsular Africa, discussed by *Kornemann*, RE Suppl. IV (1924) 248, who regards the Asian districts as „wohl die die Regionen zusammenfassenden Oberbezirke, die in Afrika tractus oder dioeceseis, ja abusiv auch dort provinciae heissen“.

⁵² *Drew-Bear*, *Naour*, in: ANRW II 18.3, 1974.

⁵³ CIL VI 1507 legato provinciae Asiae; XII 3170 leg. dioeceseos.

⁵⁴ See RE Suppl. IV 248.

⁵⁵ *Magie*, Roman Rule II 1116–7; *Gray*, Tenth Congress 972–3.

⁵⁶ See *Appian* BC 4,74; 5,5–6. *Gray* also adduced *Strabo* 14.1.41, concerning the citharode Anaxenor of Magnesia ad Maeandrum, whom Antonius τεττάρων πόλεων ἀπέδειξε φορολόγον, στρατιώτας αὐτῷ συστήσας. For comparable appointments in the upheavals of the triumphal period in Asia, cf *Reynolds*, Aphrodisias and Rome 156–60 and *R. R. Smith*, The Monument of C. Iulius Zoilus (Aphrodisias I, Mainz 1993) 4–10.

made little impact on large parts of Asia; much of the interior was organised by δήμοι and ἔθνη, not by πόλεις. A temporary organisation of Asia into regions, to aid the rapid collection of financial levies, would have been highly appropriate⁵⁷. The term *regio*, however, does not completely disappear from provincial terminology. Imperial estates in the later Empire were sometimes described as *regiones*. At Phrygian Prymnessus there was a *tabularius regionis Ipsinae et Moeteanae* and a Lydian inscription refers to a βοηθὸς ἐπιτρόπων ρεγιῶνος Φιλαδελφηνῆς⁵⁸, both clearly estate officials⁵⁹. A third century inscription of Pisidian Antioch mentions a ἑκατοντάρχης ρεγωνάριος⁶⁰, and late Roman sources, such as the *Synecdemus* of Hierokles (AD 528) use the term *regio* to denote communities in rural parts of Anatolia⁶¹. In no case, however, can it be argued that these were survivals from Sulla's arrangements. Rather, the term *regio* was adopted as a non-specific designation of a substantial rural territory which was not dominated by a major urban centre.

4. Organisation by Cities

It goes without saying that the key elements in the organisation of most of the eastern Roman provinces were the individual city states. Cities, to a greater or lesser degree, took responsibility for collecting taxes and other dues owed to Rome, provided services in kind, policed their territories, and provided the infrastructure for local economic organisation⁶². When discussion or negotiation with the Roman authorities were necessary, the cities chose ambassadors to represent

⁵⁷ See *Peter Brunt*, Sulla and the Asian Publicans, in: *Roman Imperial Themes* (Oxford 1990) 1–8 and 481.

⁵⁸ *Michael Ballance*, in: *AS* 19 (1969) 143–6 (cf. *Bull. Ép.* 1972, 456); *OGIS* 526 = *IGR* IV 1651; cf. *Magie*, *Roman Rule* II 1426.

⁵⁹ Note also the expression ὁ τῆς τάξεως ἐπίτροπος apparently to translate *procurator regionis* on the inscription of Agabeyköy, which was probably part of the imperial estate at Philadelphia, *Joseph Keil, Anton von Premerstein*, *Dritter Bericht über eine Reise in Lydien* (*Denk. Ak. Wien* 57.1, Wien 1914) 37 no. 55, l.19 (= *Keil, Premerstein*, *Dritter Bericht*). A minor official on an imperial estate near Oenoanda is described as ἀπὸ καθολ(ικῶν) κυριακῶν ρεγεῶνος Οἶνο(ανδικῆς), *IGR* III 1502. It is interesting that there is no mention of any imperial property in the full list of Oenoanda villages listed on the Demostheneia inscription (see below n. 73).

⁶⁰ *J. R. S. Sterrett*, *The Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor* (Papers of the American School at Athens III, Boston, 1884–5 publ. 1888) no. 73; see *Charlotte Roueché*, *JRS* 71 (1981) 115–6 and *Manfred Clauss*, *Untersuchungen zu den principales des römischen Heeres* (1973) 100 with 186 n. 130.

⁶¹ *Arthur H. M. Jones*, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (Oxford 21970) 65, 144, 165–166, 168, 184–190.

⁶² *Arthur H. M. Jones*, *The Greek City* (Oxford 1940). See also the contributions of *W. Dahlheim, Hartmut Galsterer, Friedrich Vittinghoff* to: *Friedrich Vittinghoff* (ed.), *Stadt und Herrschaft. Römische Kaiserzeit und Hohes Mittelalter* (*Historische Zeitschrift Beiheft* 7, München 1982).

their interests to governors or emperors, and the decisions of the Roman authorities were generally conveyed in the form of letters addressed to the magistrates, council and people of the relevant civic community. Such a relationship between Roman authorities and the cities of the East would have been adopted as self-evident, as Roman interests and control spread over western Asia Minor. Pompeius' organisation of Pontus in Bithynia in 63 BC shows that the pattern was also adopted for unhellenised territory, and a similar strategy of urbanisation, consciously or unconsciously applied, led to the creation of new cities through most of central Anatolia by the Hadrianic period⁶³.

However, it is worth observing that while communities had their own motives to achieve city status, thus satisfying local aspirations, the technical status of a community was of less importance to Rome than its ability to provide dues and services for maintaining the empire. Thus the administration of Republican Asia functioned through the interrelationship of Roman governors and the *publicani* with the cities, peoples and tribes into which the province was divided, and there was no significant attempt to encourage new city foundations before the time of Augustus⁶⁴. An appropriate level of local organisation, rather than city organisation in the strict sense, was the essential requirement. Indeed city formation in Asia was still at an interim stage at the time of the Flavian inscription from Ephesus, listing the separate communities according to their dioeceses. The communities, as is usual in the epigraphic documentation from the Greek East, are almost always listed by their ethnics, not as geographical localities⁶⁵. Furthermore many of the ethnics refer to groups which had not yet, and in some cases never acquired independent city status, particularly in the assize districts of Sardis, an area where the distinction between civic and non-civic communities is notably difficult to draw, and of Apamea, that is to say in rural Lydia and Phrygia⁶⁶. From the point of view of the Roman administration it was a matter of indifference whether a community was labelled a city, a tribe or even a village⁶⁷, provided that it could meet its obligations to the Roman state.

⁶³ The case of Pontus and Bithynia has been repeatedly examined. See, most recently, *Marek*, *Stadt, Ära und Territorium* 26–46; *Syme*, *Anatolica* 111–24. For central Asia Minor see *Mitchell*, *Anatolia* I 80–99.

⁶⁴ Documents from the first half of the first century BC refer to the organisation which was to become the *koinon* of Asia as „the peoples and tribes“: *Sherk*, RDGE no. 47, letter of Q. Mucius Scaevola to the Ephesians; OGIS 438 (Poemanenum); OGIS 439 (Olympia); *Reynolds*, *Aphrodisias and Rome* Doc. 5, l. 24; all translated by *Sherk*, *Rome and the Greek East to the Death of Augustus* nos. 57, 58, 65. The best discussion is by *Thomas Drew-Bear*, in: *BCH* 96 (1972) 443–71, esp. 448–9 and 460–1.

⁶⁵ See *Fergus Millar*, *The Greek City in the Roman Period*, in: *Mogens Hansen* (ed.), *The Ancient Greek City State* (Copenhagen 1993) 232–60; *Mitchell*, *Anatolia* I 199–206, emphasises the notion of community in civic identity.

⁶⁶ SEG 37, 884: Makedoneis, Mokadenois, Lakimenois, Moureniois, Outhimenois, Kabaleneis (in Sardis), Pantheotai (in Pergamum), Kainai Komai, Ammoniatai, Tiprizenois, Assaiorenois (in Apamea). See *Habicht*, *JRS* 65 (1975), 67.

⁶⁷ One of the communities in the district of Apamea was called *Καὶνὰὶ Κῶμαι*, SEG 37, 884 col II, l. 22.

The broad assumption that a province such as Asia was simply divided up into coterminous city territories, all with comparable responsibilities as far as the Roman authorities were concerned, may also tend to simplify the real situation. There are some indications of the hierarchical subordination of smaller cities to larger ones, within the provincial arrangement. In regions such as Caria and Pisidia, where political conditions of the Hellenistic period had favoured the development of many small cities, there was a tendency under Roman rule for these to be reorganised as subordinate communities under the control of larger, favoured cities or colonies. The *SC de Stratonicensibus* of 82 BC, promulgated by Sulla in favour of the Carian city of Stratonicea, which had remained loyal during the war with Mithridates, assigned the city control over certain Carian communities, namely Pedasus, Themessus and Ceramus⁶⁸. The edict of the Galatian governor Sex. Sotidius Strabo Libuscidianus which regulated the transport liturgy in the territory of Sagalassus, stated that the people of Sagalassus had to provide transport for official use within the boundaries of their territory, 'as far as Cormasa and Conana' or subcontract the service to people of another town or village to undertake the duty⁶⁹. At least for the purposes of the transport liturgy, the territory of Sagalassus, which was very extensive, may have incorporated smaller cities, which nevertheless enjoyed a degree of self-governing status under the Empire, including the privilege of issuing their own coins⁷⁰. An analogous situation may have existed in the territories of certain of the Augustan colonies (for instance Alexandria Troas, Cremna and Comama) founded in Asia Minor, which incorporated important earlier settlements, some of city status. In the province of Asia some of the smaller communities of the Cayster valley and the Hellespontine plain, although they retained independent civic status, may have been subordinated for some administrative purposes to the dominant cities of Ephesus and Cyzicus. The matter would bear further investigation.

The evidence from Asia, therefore, indicates that individual cities were by far the most widespread 'administrative unit', on which the Roman provincial system

⁶⁸ *Sherk*, RDGE 18, l. 54 (trans. *Sherk*, Rome and the Greek East to the Death of Augustus no. 63).

⁶⁹ *Stephen Mitchell*, JRS 66 (1976) 107, l. 12: *iis qui alterius civitatis aut vici munere fungentur* = τοῖς ὑπηρετοῦσιν ἐξ ἄλλων τόπων.

⁷⁰ See JRS 66 (1976) 118–9, suggesting that Baris, Seleuceia and Bindaios might fall into this category. At least two other small Hellenistic cities can be identified near Sagalassus, at Kepez Kalesi and at Güneyce, for which see *Marc Waelkens*, *Sagalassos* 4 (Leuven 1997) 218–9, 71–2. Their status under the empire is unclear. *Marcel Christol*, *Thomas Drew-Bear*, in: *Bull. de la société nationale des antiquaires de France* (1992) 345–6 discuss a milestone erected on a stretch of the via Sebaste at İlek (İleğidağı), west of Apollonia, in AD 198 by the governor of Galatia T. Atticius Strabo Norbanus, which concludes with the letters CAIT inscribed on a separate line. They take this (perhaps unnecessarily) to be a later addition to the text and expand the abbreviation to Σαγαλασσεών, implying that the Sagalassans were responsible for building or repairing this part of the route. It is unlikely that the territory of Sagalassus in fact extended this far (10 kms. north even of Conana), but they may have been required to undertake road construction duties beyond the boundaries of their territory, the phenomenon attested at Amyzon and Colophon in Asia; see above n. 46.

depended, but that they did not play an exclusive role. Other forms of social organization, such as tribal groupings, were perfectly acceptable in principle, and there might be practical or other reasons for larger cities taking responsibility for the obligations of smaller cities within their spheres of influence. The technical status of these smaller communities may be hard to define. The ambiguity is particularly clear in a famous instance, that of Orcistus in Phrygia, which successfully petitioned Constantine for its civic status to be recognised and for it to be freed from dependence on its neighbour Nacolea. In fact, Orcistus had displayed many of the characteristics of a city, claiming indeed that „it flourished with the splendour of a town“, since the second century: it had a large agora decorated with imperial statues, resolved public business in a *πάνδημος ἐκκλησία*, and in 237 used the bequest of one of its leading inhabitants to organise a substantial public festival⁷¹.

5. Villages

The most widespread and numerous type of settlement in Roman Asia Minor was the village, and most of these fell far short of Orcistus in size and aspirations. From a modern view-point a village may be defined as a relatively small, nucleated rural settlement most of whose inhabitants are directly involved in agriculture. The size of Asia Minor villages was largely dictated by the economics of dry farming in the climatic conditions of the Anatolian uplands. Cereal agriculture was heavily predominant. This requires the organised labour of man and animals, to plough, to harvest and to process the grain. A family in isolation cannot sustain the effort required, so the settlement must be of a certain critical mass, with enough men and oxen to work the soil and produce the grain. On the other hand pre-industrial transport technologies make it impossible to till land which is a long distance from people's homes, for to travel more than about five kilometres from the settlement to tend the fields would consume more energy than the crops grown there could supply. In practice this meant that most villages would have a population of between 200 and 1000 inhabitants. No ancient writers attempted to define villages in this way, however obvious such facts may have been to them. Rather, in the context of a world of Graeco-Roman city states, the defining characteristic of a village, and the condition from which Orcistus sought to free itself, was its dependence on another, civic community⁷².

The status of dependent villages vis-a-vis an Asia Minor city is illustrated with exemplary clarity by the Demostheneia inscription from Oenoanda, whose authorities required the thirty five named village communities in the city's territory

⁷¹ MAMA VII 305; cf. MAMA I 416 (imperial statue of Commodus); *William Hepburn Buckler*, in: JHS 57 (1937) 1–10 (festival foundation). *André Chastagnol*, L'Inscription constantinienne d'Orcistus, in: MEFRA 93 (1981) 381–416.

⁷² See *Mitchell*, *Anatolia* I 176–81.

to contribute sacrificial animals for the newly founded festival⁷³. But villages in favoured areas were capable of prospering and laying claims to some economic independence, and this is clear from the epigraphy of western Asia Minor. While no doubt all villages had headmen, some imposed on them by the city authorities⁷⁴, the larger ones could have their own assemblies and magistrates resembling those of the cities⁷⁵. More importantly some acquired revenues through fines (usually for disturbing tombs), bequests, or the leasing of land, and undertook expenditure on public buildings or festivals⁷⁶. The evidence for these activities is almost exclusively derived from settlements in the most developed regions of western Asia – especially from Lydia, and it illustrates the way in which village communities in an economically developed region behaved in many respects like small cities, the status to which they doubtless aspired⁷⁷.

However, except in well defined and exceptional circumstances, it is striking that precisely in these areas, which are well documented epigraphically, there is no evidence that villages as such dealt directly with Roman authorities. One category of exceptions, to be dealt with in the next section, were villages (and small towns) which suffered from the depredations of undisciplined soldiers and officials in the increasingly turbulent times of the late second and third centuries. The other exceptions are villages which sought permission to hold rural markets, either in connection with local festivals or as staging points in the circuit of travelling traders, whose effects could have important economic repercussions on their neighbours⁷⁸. The importance of these rural markets is discussed in detail by *Johannes Nollé* in this volume, but a brief sketch is also appropriate here.

The villages where these markets were authorised were substantial settlements. The village of the Mandragoreis, a day's journey ESE of Magnesia, was still an active harbour on the north bank of the Maeander river in the thirteenth century, and the site contains the remains of a large scale building of the imperial period. Its magistrates included a board of three *grammateis*⁷⁹. Tetrapyrgia was an outlying settlement to the north of Lydian Philadelphia, an area which contained several large villages. Its name suggests that it was already a rural fortified refuge in the Hellenistic period, perhaps enjoying a status comparable to its southern neighbour Castolus⁸⁰. The village of the Arhilleni, which was in another part of

⁷³ Wörle, Stadt und Fest 135–50.

⁷⁴ See the Demostheneia inscription, l. 81–3.

⁷⁵ Mitchell, *Anatolia I* 182.

⁷⁶ See *Magie*, Roman Rule II 1027 for a full collection of evidence; Mitchell, *Anatolia I* 183.

⁷⁷ See further *Johannes Nollé* in this volume, S. 93–113.

⁷⁸ *Johannes Nollé*, *Nundinas instituere et habere* (Hildesheim 1982) (= *Nollé*, *Nundinas*); *Hasan Malay*, Greek and Latin Inscriptions of Manisa Museum (Denk. Ak. Wien 237, Wien 1994) no. 523 (= I. Manisa); *L. de Ligt*, *Fairs and Markets in the Roman Empire* (Amsterdam 1993), and *Ius nundinarum* and *immunitas* in I. Manisa 523, in: *EA* 24 (1995) 37–54.

⁷⁹ *Nollé*, *Nundinas* 18–27.

⁸⁰ *Nollé*, *Nundinas* 76–8; *Louis Robert*, *Études anatoliennes* (Paris 1937) 159–60 argued that

Table 3. Rural Markets in Asia

Village and date	Reference	Mode of petition	Mode of response	Other documentation
Arhilleni, village on estate of Asinius Rufus. 134/5 or 135/6	I. Manisa 523; <i>Nollé, Eck, Chiron</i> 26 (1996) 267 ff.	Petition of Metras (priest in a nearby demos), <i>nomine vicanorum Arhillon</i> to procos. Asiae	Edict of procos. Asiae, authorising annual market <i>Proponi volo</i>	Supporting letter of Asinius Rufus to magistrates at Sardis.
Mandragoreis, 209	SEG 32, 1149; <i>Nollé, Nundinas</i> 1	Petition of κηδέμων (? Dionysios of Magnesia ad Maeandrum)	Edict of procos. Asiae, authorising 10 day market <i>proponi volo</i>	
Tetrapyrgia, 253/4	TAM V 1, 230; <i>Nollé, Nundinas</i> 2; SEG 32, 1220	Petition of Domitius Rufus, asiarch,	Letter of procos. Asiae to Domitius Rufus, authorising monthly market	
Pylitai, nr Tralles, 3rd century. Subject matter uncertain.	<i>Hasan Malay, EA</i> 11 (1988) 53–8; <i>Nollé, EA</i> 15 (1990) 121–5; SEG 38, 1172.	Favourable decision of city (?Magnesia) forwarded as a petition by Eumelos, <i>archiereus</i> , on behalf of Pylitai	Letter of procos. to authorities of Magnesia ad Maeandrum.	Acclamation of decision and resolutions of Magnesian boule

Lydia, the northern part of Sardian territory north of the Gygaean lake, possessed at least one monumental structure with a propylon leading to a sacred grove⁸¹. The find-spot of the inscription of the Pylitai is unknown, but it evidently lay on the territory of Tralles or of Magnesia, and enthusiastic acclamations of the councillors of one of these cities shows that it was a place which they held in some esteem⁸².

Nevertheless the social and administrative distance between the village and the proconsul, who was ultimately responsible for issuing the right to hold a market,

Castolus was a small Hellenistic city, but against this see *Pierre Debord*, in: *REA* 87 (1985) 349 (cf. *Mitchell*, *Anatolia* I 182 n. 161).

⁸¹ IGR IV 1347 explained by *Malay*, I. Manisa, p. 154.

⁸² See especially the discussion of *Johannes Nollé*, in: *EA* 15 (1990) 121–5 with comments on the close similarities between the procedure implied by this inscription and that attested for the Mandragoreis. He concludes: „Damit soll allerdings nicht gesagt sein, daß es sich bei den Privilegien für die Pyliten ebenfalls um Marktrechte handelt. Das ist zwar möglich, doch kommen auch viele andere Rechtsübertragungen in Frage.“ Perhaps, and for the purpose of showing the relation of proconsular administration to villages, the matter is not important. However, in fact no other forms of transaction involving this combination of agents is epigraphically or otherwise attested in Asia. *Nollé* now conjectures that the last words of the Pylitai text, μετὰ ἐπιστάτου, „with his trainer“, hint that the matter at issue may have been an agon.

was too great to be spanned without important intermediaries. The villages were not represented by officials or magistrates acting *ex officio* but relied on the intercession of patrons. Metras, hereditary priest of Zeus Drikteos and the Thamyrilai acted for the Arhilleni, while Eumelos, high priest, perhaps of Dionysus, represented the interests (as their *μεγὰς κηδέμων*) of the Pylitai. It is likely that the markets in these cases were held in connection with local religious festivals⁸³. This would also explain why at Tetrapyrgia the proconsul commended the high-ranking petitioner, Domitius Rufus, an asiarch, for his religious devotion, in that he had founded or promoted a cult in the village, which was evidently not unconnected with the market. In the case of the Mandragoreis, who were granted the rights to a market which recurred every ten days and was evidently not restricted to an intermittent monthly or yearly festival, the petition, as with the Pylitai, was presented by *κηδόμενοι τῆς κατοικίας*, one of whom may be the named individual, Dionysius of Magnesia.

The distance between the village communities and proconsul is marked in another way by the form of communication used to record the decisions. In the cases of the Arhilleni and the Mandragoreis the villagers themselves received edicts, public notices with no specific addressees. In the case of the Pylitai the proconsul communicated in more personal form, by letter, but this was addressed to the city to which they were subordinate, which had received and approved the original request from its villagers. Likewise at Tetrapyrgia the proconsul used the form of a letter, but addressed it to Domitius Rufus, the villagers' champion and possibly also the owner of an estate on which the village lay⁸⁴.

The pattern to be observed in these instances may be summarised in the general rule that proconsuls did not address or deal directly with villages, but only through intermediaries such as local religious leaders, powerful private estate owners, or representatives of the cities to which the villages belonged. Conversely individual villagers or village headmen did not approach proconsuls but relied on higher-status individuals to act on their behalf. This by no means implies that such contacts were legally or procedurally out of order, but may simply illustrate the wide gulf in status that separated the rural and urban inhabitants of Asia. The picture in any case is broadly confirmed by a larger category of evidence, the petitions from rural communities in Lydia and Phrygia, many originating from the inhabitants of imperial estates, which reveal the abusive behaviour of soldiers and officials at the end of the second and during the third century⁸⁵.

⁸³ The combination was, of course, normal in the case of civic religious festivals; see Wörle, *Stadt und Fest* 14, I. 87–9, 209–15; *L. de Lig.*, P. W. Neeve, *Ancient Periodic Markets; Festivals and Fairs*, in: *Athenaeum* 66 (1988) 391–416.

⁸⁴ This was the view of *Michael Rostovtzeff*, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1957) 657 n. 7; *Nollé*, *Nundinas* 77 regards it as a decisive argument against this that the actual rights to hold the market were given not to Domitius Rufus but to the village itself. However, the Arhilleni inscription now offers a precise parallel, in that the rights to the market there were given to the villagers, not to Asinius Rufus, the village's ancestral owner (I. Manisa 523, 48), who supported their petition.

⁸⁵ The pattern also goes far to explaining the importance of city-dwellers or large land-

6. Imperial Estates as Administrative Units

Although there were more cities in Asia than in any other province of the empire, large parts of Anatolia were hardly touched by urbanisation in the Hellenistic period, and the spread of new cities across the interior was a gradual process even under the empire⁸⁶. This was especially true of the inland parts of Asia and of areas which had not been reached by the Republican road system: for instance the region east of Cibyra as far as the Milyas and the Augustan via Sebaste⁸⁷, much of central and eastern Phrygia between Philomelium in the south and Dorylaeum in the north, extending to the provincial boundary with Galatia⁸⁸, and tracts of northern Lydia, especially to the east of the road which ran between Sardis and Thyateira. In the central and eastern Anatolian provinces of Galatia and Cappadocia there were even more extensive areas virtually without cities, especially in the central part of Galatia and in Cappadocia⁸⁹. In these regions the organisation of large rural properties, above all imperial estates, played a key role in provincial and regional administration.

There are, as yet, no inscriptions from Asia, comparable to the great dossiers of administrative texts from the North African imperial estates, to throw light on estate organisation⁹⁰. However, the epigraphic evidence, mainly in the form of inscriptions which mention freedmen or slave officials, suggests very similar patterns in the larger areas of imperial estate holding. This pattern can be observed even where small cities emerged with their own councils or from time to time

owners as village patrons in Asia Minor (and elsewhere), see *Mitchell*, *Anatolia* I 184–5. See now Andrew Gregory, *JRA* 10 (1997) 547–9.

⁸⁶ For the province of Galatia and eastern Anatolia, see *Mitchell*, *Anatolia* I 80–98.

⁸⁷ For recent discussion of the provincial boundaries of Asia, Galatia and Lycia-Pamphylia, west of lake Burdur, see *Marcel Christol*, *Thomas Drew-Bear*, D. Fronteius Fronto, Proconsul de Lycie-Pamphylie, in: *GRBS* 32 (1991) 397–413; Bornes routieres et géographie administrative en Asie Mineure sous les Antonins et les Sévères, in: *Bulletin de la société nationale des antiquaires de France* (1992) 338–48.

⁸⁸ *Johann Strubbe*, A group of imperial estates in central Phrygia, in: *Ancient Society* 6 (1975) 229–50.

⁸⁹ See the maps in *Mitchell*, *Anatolia* I 99 map 6 and (facing) 164 map 10, with discussion on 149–58 (revising *ANRW* II 7.2, 1070–80), for Galatia; and *Anatolia* I, 97–8 and *Ramon Teja*, Die römische Provinz Kappadokien in der Prinzipätszeit, in: *ANRW* II 7.2 (1980) 1083–1124 esp. 1091–2 and 1109–18 for Cappadocia.

⁹⁰ *Dieter Flach*, *Chiron* 8 (1978) 441–92. Note, however, that the petition of the inhabitants of the imperial estate at Ağabeyköy in Lydia, refers to a law which governed the terms of their tenure on the estate, τῷ τῆς γεωργί[ας] δικαίῳ (l. 39–40) and τὰς πίστεις τηροῦμεν τῷ δεσποτικῷ λόγῳ (l. 53–4). *Keil*, *Premierstein*, *Dritter Bericht* 37–47 no. 55; see *Peter Herrmann*, Hilferufe aus römischen Provinzen. Ein Aspekt der Krise des römischen Reichs im 3. Jahrhundert n.Chr. (Hamburg 1990) 34–37 (= *Herrmann*, Hilferufe), and especially *Tor Hauken*, Petition and Response. An Epigraphic Study of Petitions to Roman Emperors 181–249 (Diss. Stavanger 1994) 64 (= *Hauken*, Petition). Compare also the reference to τοὺς ὑμετέρους νόμους in the petition from Mendechora, *Keil*, *Premierstein*, *Dritter Bericht* 26–9 no. 28, l. 10–11, the whole of which is based on arguments about the explicit lawlessness of the behaviour from which the local inhabitants had suffered.

issued their own coinage. These settlements are probably better characterised as 'agri-towns', to use modern terminology, than as autonomous Graeco-Roman cities⁹¹. There is hardly any trace of a significant local aristocracy, the *sine qua non* of developed urban life in other parts of Asia Minor or the eastern Roman Empire. Rather, the leading figures in society seem either to have been absentee land-owners, including especially the emperors, and their slave or freedmen agents⁹². There is little evidence for developed urban organisation, that is to say for major public building, organised public festivals, or urban office holding.

There is no up-to-date systematic investigation of the administrative hierarchy of imperial estates in Asia. The most important domainal official appears to have been an Imperial freedman procurator, based in the long established Phrygian as-size centre of Synnada⁹³. On him depended a staff of *tabularii* and their *adiutores*, attested in Synnada itself, at Prymnessos, Euladra, and elsewhere in eastern Phrygia⁹⁴. It is evident that this personnel was responsible for rendering the accounts of the estates to the procurator.

The most important evidence illustrating the way in which the imperial procurators in charge of these estates wielded their powers is contained in the inscribed dossier from Sülmenli in eastern Phrygia of the long running dispute over the transport liturgy between the villages of the Anoseni and the Antimacheni⁹⁵. This claimed the attention of three domainal procurators of Phrygia between about 200 and 237. The record of the dispute itself is recorded in Greek, evidently the language of the hearing, while the rubrics indicating the speakers are in Latin. At the first hearing, held at the village of Anosa itself, Panas of Anosa and Alexander of Antimacheia presented petitions (cf. the technical term ἐνετύχετε, l. 20) to the imperial procurator Aurelius Threptus, who judged that the communities in dispute should continue to provide transport services in the same ratio as their tax rating, [κατὰ τὴν ἀνὴ]λογίαν τῆς ἀποφορᾶς καὶ τὴν ὑπηρεσίαν παρέχειν. On a further point the duties of the Anoseni and Antimacheni were split evenly, and a junior officer, an *optio* named Aurelius Symphorus, instructed to supervise the practical outcome. The dossier continues with a letter sent by Symphorus to the villagers and elders of the two villages, and another to the Antimacheni alone, which was attached to the verbatim extracts of the transcript of the hearing, and identified

⁹¹ Compare *Mitchell*, *Anatolia I* 180–1 on the problems of distinguishing 'cities' from villages in Lydia and Phrygia, and 225–6 on the absence of evidence for developed urban life from central Anatolia.

⁹² See *Magie*, *Roman Rule II* 1325–7, 1426–7, and 1548–9 for much of the evidence.

⁹³ See *Louis Robert*, in: *Journal des Savants* (1962) 25 (OMS VII 9); For the freedman procurators see *G. Boulvert*, *Esclaves et affranchis impériaux sous le haut Empire romain* (Naples 1970) 294 n. 207; *Marcel Christol*, *Thomas Drew-Bear*, in: *Tyche* 1 (1988) 43.

⁹⁴ *Drew-Bear*, *Nouvelles Inscriptions de Phrygie* 10–11, lists examples. Compare the estate officials attested in the Galatian estates dependent on Laodicea Catacecaumene, *Mitchell*, *Anatolia I* 184.

⁹⁵ *William Frend*, *JRS* 46 (1956) 46–56; *SEG* 16, 754; *T. Zawadzki*, *REA* 62 (1960) 80 ff.; *Thomas Pekary*, *Untersuchungen zu den römischen Reichsstraßen* (1968) 135–8, 145–55; *Levick*, *The Government of the Roman Empire* 57–60.

him as responsible for its enforcement. On 11 October 213 the dispute was considered again by another procurator, Philocyrius, who may be identified with the freedman procurator M. Aur. Philocyrius who played a part in handling the roughly contemporary complaints of the imperial estate at Tacina⁹⁶. A speaker at the hearing, Valens, probably a soldier or official rather than one of the villagers, reported that the Anoseni had requested the presence of a military policeman, a *stationarius*, and the request was granted by the procurator. In a final hearing held at Synnada on 10 October 237 another procurator, Novellius, confirmed the original decisions of Threptus and threatened transgressors with further penalties. The protocol of the hearings is clear: the villagers were able to present petitions directly to the imperial freedman procurator, who had full authority to resolve the issue, and could give orders to soldiers to enforce his decisions. The hearings themselves took place at three separate locations: at one of the villages concerned, at Prymnessus which was the nearest town to the area of the dispute, and at Synnada, the procurator's headquarters. There are significant differences between the procurator's role and that of the proconsul of Asia in analogous situations. There is no evidence for villagers directly approaching the proconsul of Asia. Rather, they always used a spokesman of higher status to present their petitions; nor did proconsuls travel to the scene of the dispute to conduct a hearing (see above p. 36). The procurators in contrast adopted a more active role and were accessible to humbler clients than were the proconsuls, as befitted their freedman status and the relatively limited geographical scope of their commands. Their actual powers of decision, however, were no less absolute than the proconsuls'. The administrative arrangements which were adopted in rural areas on imperial or large private estates were accordingly significantly different from those that prevailed in well defined city territories⁹⁷. The powers of proconsuls and procurators in such cases, however, are shown to be essentially similar⁹⁸.

The epigraphic evidence for the handling of complaints against abuse and exploitation by soldiers and officials in late second and third century Lydia and Phrygia confirms this picture and also shows that the spheres of proconsular and procuratorial authority sometimes overlapped. The inhabitants of imperial estates were apparently not classified or described as citizens of any of the provincial cities. In the second and third century inscriptions from imperial estates, it is made clear that the inhabitants regarded the estate itself, and not any of the cities in the neighbourhood, as their *patria*. So, the spokesman for the peasants on the estate at Ağabeyköy near Philadelphia described his fellows as οἱ ὑμέτεροι γεωργοὶ and indicated that if they were not protected they would leave their ἐστίας πατρώας καὶ τάφους προγονικούς, fleeing the δεσποτικῶν χωρίων ἐν οἷς καὶ ἐγεννήθημεν καὶ ἐτρέφημεν καὶ ἐκ προγόνων διαμένοντες γεωργοὶ τὰς πίστεϊς τηροῦμεν δεσ-

⁹⁶ SEG 37, 1186, l. 15, 30.

⁹⁷ Mitchell, JRS 66 (1976) 120–1.

⁹⁸ The classic study of Peter Brunt, *Procuratorial jurisdiction*, in: *Latomus* 25 (1966) 461–87 (revised version in *Roman Imperial Themes* (Oxford 1990) 163–87) shows from the legal sources that procurators usually lacked the power to inflict capital penalties.

ποτικῶ λόγῳ⁹⁹. Elsewhere documents of the same category as the Ağabeyköy inscription refer to the petitioners as *dominici coloni*¹⁰⁰, or *πάροιχοι καὶ γεωργοὶ οἱ ὑμέτεροι*¹⁰¹, and although in both cases they lived close to small towns, respectively Tacina on the Asian/Pisidian border and Appia in the upper Tembris valley in Phrygia, they are not identified as citizens of these places.

The common patterns of these petitions from rural communities for help to stop the abuses of unlicensed soldiers and officials have long been recognised, and they have been emphasised in two recent studies by *Peter Herrmann* and *Tor Hauken*¹⁰². The main epigraphic evidence can again be presented in a table (table 4)¹⁰³.

There is a broad similarity among all the affected communities. They were not remote or economically disadvantaged. It was significant that all lay on or close to the main roads across Asia, and a leitmotif of their complaints was that they were being exploited by soldiers who had left the *λεωφόροι ὁδοί*, thus presumably defying explicit orders and escaping the discipline of their officers or of military policemen¹⁰⁴. Like the villages which had received market privileges, most of these communities were successful agricultural centres. Tabala and Euhippe had broken through the status barrier and become ‘cities’ which minted their own coinage¹⁰⁵. The people of Tacina, although they probably still lacked city status in 213, had profited from a local benefactor, who had petitioned the emperor Commodus in person and whose will provided them with a bath-house¹⁰⁶. The other sites are named as *κῶμαι*¹⁰⁷ or as *χωρία*¹⁰⁸, but the settlement at Mendechora, for one, had honoured two of its elders as early as 12/11 BC for the construction of an aqueduct, and a komarch, M. Caecilius Lucinus, for building a double stoa and an archway¹⁰⁹. The peasants on the imperial property of Ağabeyköy had the

⁹⁹ *Keil, Premierstein*, Dritter Bericht 37 no. 55, l. 47–54.

¹⁰⁰ Tacina, SEG 38, 1186, l. 16.

¹⁰¹ Aragua, MAMA X 114, l. 7.

¹⁰² *Herrmann*, Hilferufe; *Hauken*, Petition.

¹⁰³ The table omits a few fragmentary inscriptions of a similar nature, from Kassari in Lydia (TAM V.1. 611) and from the territory of Eumeneia in Phrygia (*Drew-Bear*, *Nouvelles Inscriptions de Phrygie* 16 no. 8; SEG 28, 1120).

¹⁰⁴ MAMA X 114, l. 20; SEG 38, 1244, l. 4; CRAI (1952) l. 7–8; cf. the Scaptopara petition, IGBulg. IV 2236, l. 45–6. For the term in a 5th or 6th century inscription, see *Marek*, *Stadt, Ära und Territorium* 182 no. 100, 7, discussed in: XI. *Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı* 1993 (Ankara 1994) 106–9.

¹⁰⁵ For Tabala, see *Herrmann*, TAM V 1, 63–5; Euhippe: *Robert*, CRAI (1952) 589–99 ff.

¹⁰⁶ IGR IV 881. The Tacina dossier of 213 shows that the people and their magistrates could move psephismata, but there is no sign of a council. In SEG 37, 1186, l. 20, restore [ἀρχοντο] δῆμο with Hauken. Lines 34 and 46 identify the magistrates as δημάρχου.

¹⁰⁷ TAM V 1 611, l. 15, 18 (Kassar, Lydia); TAM V 1 419, l. 24 (Kavacık, Lydia); SEG 19, 718, l. 2, 4 (restored; Güllüköy, Lydia); *Keil, Premierstein*, Dritter Bericht, 26–9 no. 28, l. 5–6 (Mendechora).

¹⁰⁸ *Hauken*, Petition 188, l. 13 (Kilter, Phrygian Pentapolis); MAMA X 114, l. 13 (Aragua).

¹⁰⁹ *Jeanne and Louis Robert*, *Hellenica* VI 28–34.

Table 4. Petitions from Rural Communities in 2nd and 3rd Centuries

Place and date	Ref.	Type of Community	Source of trouble	Local authority	Action taken	Imperial role
<i>Kilter</i> (Phrygia), 187–91	<i>Hauken</i> , Petition, 187–200	2 villages on private estate	Abusive soldiers	Letter of procos. Asiae	Supervision by primipilaris and mil. trib.	
Tabala, 189	SEG 38, 1244	City	Abusive soldiers off main roads	Letter of procos. Asiae	Procos. to punish soldiers	Letter of Pertinax replying to petition
Euhippe, 212/3	<i>Robert</i> , CRAI 1952, 589–99	City	Abusive soldiers off main roads	Letter of procos. Asiae	Soldiers sent to governor	Caracalla received petition
Tacina, 212/3	SEG 37, 1186	Imperial estate/town	Abusive soldiers off main roads	Letters of proconsul (?Asiae/ ? Lyciae-Pamphyliae) and proc. Phrygiae	Freedman proc. to ensure no future transgressions	Rescript of Caracalla to petition
Aragua, 244–7	MAMA X 114	Imperial estate	Abusive soldiers off main roads and imperial officials	Proconsul	Procos. Asiae responsible for future conduct	Rescript of 2 Philips to petition, presented by soldier
<i>Ağabeyköy</i> , Lydia	<i>Herrmann</i> , Hilferufe 34 no. 8	Imperial estate	Abuse by various officials, with collusive procurators	Proconsul Asiae, regional and provincial procurators	Request emperor to demand action from procos, and procurators	Petition to unnamed emperor
<i>Kavacık</i> , Lydia, 247/8	TAM V.i 419	Village	Abuse by various officials	?	?	Imperial rescript
<i>Güllüköy</i> , Lydia, 2nd/3rd cent	SEG 19, 718	Village	Abuse by passing soldiers/officials	Procos. Asiae, city officials	Request procos. to ask help from eiren-archs etc	Petition to procos. Asiae
<i>Mendechora</i> , Lydia, Severan?	<i>Keil and Premierstein</i> , Dritter Bericht, no. 28	Village	Abuse by officials		Proconsul asked to take action	Petition to emperor

resources to pay a ransom of 1000 Attic drachmas to secure the release of one of their fellows who had been kidnapped¹¹⁰.

The documentation nevertheless shows that the status of the petitioners' communities varied. There were small cities such as Tabala and Euhippe; Tacina, almost a city, which seems to have been co-terminous with an imperial estate; villages on imperial estates at Aragua and at Ağabeyköy; two villages on a large private estate at Kilter; a village which was perhaps attached to the territory of Philadelphia at Güllüköy; and villages whose attachment to larger units cannot be definitely determined at Mendechora and Kavacık. The passage from the Ağabeyköy petition quoted earlier implies that the inhabitants of imperial estates were particularly vulnerable to abuse. Perhaps soldiers and officials assumed a right to take what they needed directly from imperial properties, or the freedman and slaves who managed the estates naturally colluded in their abusive behaviour with the emperors' soldiers and officials¹¹¹. However, clearly the imperial *coloni* were not the only victims of such behaviour.

Formal status does appear to have had significant consequences for the way in which the petitions and complaints were handled. In the two clear cases where the complaint came from a village not belonging to an imperial estate, matters were dealt with by proconsuls, although not necessarily directly. The villages near Kilter in Phrygia were on a private estate, which lay close to Roman military garrisons at Eumeneia and Apamea. The manner in which the problem had reached the proconsul's attention is not clear from the surviving fragment of text, but probably the landowner himself had presented the petition. The proconsul's action had been to instruct the commanders of two military units to prevent repetitions of the incidents, and these orders were quoted inside another letter addressed to the affected villagers, whose author might be the proconsul of the following year, or perhaps one of the proconsul's legates¹¹². At Güllüköy, the petition to the proconsul was presented by a single individual who speaks in the first person, apparently a patron of the village who also owned property there¹¹³. He requested the proconsul to ask certain magistrates and eirenarchs (perhaps from the nearest city, Philadelphia) to intervene, a good example of the active relationship which proconsuls were expected to develop with city eirenarchs¹¹⁴.

In all the other cases, affecting small cities and villages on imperial estates, the emperors had a part in resolving the issue. The magistrates at Tabala received an extract from a letter of Pertinax, forwarded to them in a letter addressed to the

¹¹⁰ *Keil, Premierstein*, Dritter Bericht 37 no. 55, l. 8–11.

¹¹¹ Note in particular the passages in the Aragua inscription, which mention abuses by estate officials, MAMA X 114, l. 19, 31.

¹¹² *Hauken*, Petition 187–200. For a proconsular legate pursuing a matter which had previously been handled by a proconsul, compare the inscription from Metropolis in Phrygia published by *Drew-Bear*, *Nouvelles Inscriptions de Phrygie* 20, revised by *David French*, EA 17 (1991) 51–2 (SEG 28, 1169 and 41, 1236). For the involvement of proconsul's legates in administrative matters, see also *Rudolph Haensch* in this volume 115 ff.

¹¹³ SEG 19, 718, l. 2; now I. Manisa 21 (without text).

¹¹⁴ See *Magie*, Roman Rule II 1491, 1514–15.

magistrates, council and people of the city by the proconsul of Asia, to whom the problem had been referred¹¹⁵. The situation at Euhippe was precisely analogous, differing only in the identity of the emperor who was Caracalla not Pertinax. The exactly contemporary dossier from Tacina is extremely obscure, due to the fragmentary nature of an inscription which records as many as six administrative documents. Caracalla replied in this case not with a letter but with a rescript to the petition which had been presented to him by two named individuals, the Aurelii Andronicus and Hilarianus, whose names suggest they are imperial freedmen. Since he devolved the responsibility for preventing further abuses not on a proconsul but on his freedman procurator, we must surely assume that the complaints had come from the *dominici coloni* who are mentioned in two of the following documents, and the official who was immediately concerned was M. Aur. Philocyrius, procurator of Phrygia, who had also acted in the dispute between the Anoseni and Antimachen¹¹⁶. The estate at Tacina was probably the same imperial property attested in AD 54 by the boundary stones between the imperial property at Tymbrinassus and Sagalassus, erected by the procurator of Galatia in collaboration with an imperial legate, probably not of Galatia but of Lycia-Pamphylia¹¹⁷. The ambiguities of the rest of the Tacina dossier discourage one from drawing further conclusions from the involvement of the proconsul in the affair, not least because it is not clear whether the governor in question held office in Asia or in Lycia-Pamphylia¹¹⁸. At all events the situation of the *coloni dominici* at Tacina closely resembles the much better known case of Aragua in the 240s. Here too the *coloni* (πάροικοι) presented their petition to the emperor through representatives who were better placed to speak for them: M. Aur. Eclectus and a soldier Didymus (perhaps his son-in-law or a *centurio frumentarius*)¹¹⁹. The emperors replied not with a letter but in a subscript, which commended the matter to the attention of the proconsul. It emerges from the petition that the people of Aragua had submitted an earlier petition to Philip before his accession, when he was praetorian prefect of Gordian III after the death of Timesitheus in early summer 243¹²⁰. It is unusual that the subscript did not refer in any way to the imperial procurator of

¹¹⁵ SEG 38, 1244. Pertinax's decision follows the rubric ἐξ ἐπιστολῆς θεοῦ Περτίνακος. It seems surprising that a letter addressed directly to Tabala was not inscribed in full. It was not, however, addressed to the proconsul (as were Trajan's replies to Pliny; cf. the subject matter of Pliny, ep. 10, 77–78).

¹¹⁶ SEG 37, 1186, ll. 4, 14–15, 30, 35, 39.

¹¹⁷ George Bean, in: AS 9 (1959) 85–8 no. 30; several other copies of the inscription have been recorded. For the problem of the command of the imperial legate, M. Petronius Umbrius, see Mitchell, *Anatolia II* 154, and Syme, *Anatolica* 190–1.

¹¹⁸ Observe the doubts of Christol, *Drew-Bear*, in: GRBS 32 (1991) 406 n. 35.

¹¹⁹ MAMA X 114, 2–3 – The reading is controversial but for the military status of Didymus, compare the soldier Aur. Pyrrhus, the praetorian soldier who acted as petitioner to Gordian on behalf of the people of Skaptopara (IGBulg IV 2236, 6). For the latter see further Klaus Halloff, *Die Inschrift von Skaptopara. Neue Dokumente und neue Lesungen*, in: Chiron 24 (1994) 405–29 and Evgeni I. Paunov, Dimitar J. Dimitrov, *Der Siegelring des Aurelius Pyrrus aus Skaptopara*, in: Chiron 26 (1996) 186–93.

¹²⁰ MAMA X 114, 24–7.

Phrygia, who in all other cases took at least partial responsibility for law and order on the imperial estates, but the explanation may lie with the war-footing which prevailed in Asia in 243–4, a period when the governor of Asia for a three year spell was L. Egnatius Victor Lollianus, whose role evidently differed significantly from that of routine proconsuls¹²¹. There are also close formal similarities between the Aragua inscription and the fragmentary text dated to AD 247/8 from Kavacik in Lydia. This too contains a petition and ends with an imperial subscript, but we cannot be certain whether the community was on city territory or belonged to an imperial estate¹²².

That point is left unambiguous by the much better preserved petition from the people of Ağabeyköy, who pleaded that everything that they and their ancestors possessed was προυπεύθυνα τῷ ἱερωτάτῳ ταμείῳ τῷ τῆς γεωργίας δικαίῳ, doubtless a reference to the law governing tenure on such properties. They also protested that by being prevented from working their land they were unable to meet the demands for imperial levies and services, καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι ἐκ τοῦ κωλύεσθαι τὴν γῆν ἐργάζεσθαι μηδὲ ταῖς δεσποτικαῖς ἐπακούειν ἀποφοραῖς καὶ ψήφοις πρὸς τὰ ἐξῆς¹²³. The tenants on the estate rendered their dues (in taxes, rents and services) directly to the emperor, rather than as part of a civic unit. The detailed matter of the petition identified their main complaint as the illegal seizure of nine individuals, who were said to have been despatched, dead or alive, to the procurators then under the command of Aelius Aglaus, a procurator acting vice praesidis. Although the inscription is commonly dated to the Severan period, *Tor Hauken* has advanced good arguments for placing it too in the time of the two Philips, presumably immediately after the proconsulate of L. Egnatius Victor Lollianus, when the governor's role could have been taken by Aelius Aglaus¹²⁴. From the surviving text we do not know what action was taken, but it is clear that the problem had previously been brought to the attention of a domainal procurator, Aurelius Marcianus, and to the procurators of Asia, and the petitioners hoped that their present grievances would be settled by the hegoumenos of the province and the imperial procurators (lines 31–3). The high profile of the latter throughout the whole affair confirms what we would expect, that they were the main source of

¹²¹ *Karl-Heinz Dietz*, *Senatus contra principem*. Untersuchungen zur senatorischen Opposition gegen Kaiser Maximinus Thrax (Vestigia 9, München 1980) 149–54 argues that his three year tenure began between 242/3 and 244/5 and ended between 244/5 and 246/7. Inscriptions found at Miletus, Tralles, Smyrna, Ephesus, and recently Aphrodisias (*Joyce Reynolds*, L. Egnatius Victor Lollianus and Carian Aphrodisias, in: *L'Afrique, la Gaule, la Religion à l'époque romaine. Mélanges à la mémoire de Marcel Le Glay* [Collection Latomus 226, Brussels 1994] 675–80), show him to have been „energetic and successful in Asia“. *Reynolds* conjectures that he may have supervised the creation of the new province of Phrygia and Caria (see now SEG 44 [1994] 863).

¹²² TAM V 1 419. Line 1 may refer to the city of Maionia, but does not show that Kavacik belonged to it.

¹²³ *Keil*, *Premesterstein*, *Dritter Bericht* 37 no. 55, ll. 27–30, 38–40; see above p. 38–39.

¹²⁴ διέποντος Αἰλίου Ἀγλάου τοῦ κρατίστου καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀνθυπατείας μέρη (l. 7–8). For the dating, see *Hauken*, *Petition* 52–3, 54–6.

authority over the inhabitants of imperial estates. The Mendechora petition has also generally been placed in the Severan period, although it too could comfortably be assigned to the reign of the two Philips. The petition was presented by an individual who, to judge by the arguments mounted, had had some legal training. He seems to appeal to the emperor to refer the matter to the proconsular assizes, rather than allow officials of lower ranks (the notorious *frumentarii*, *colleiones*, and their fellows, who appear in several of these documents), to take the law into their own hands¹²⁵.

This collection of petitions and responses from the late second to the mid-third century constitutes by far the most explicit body of information from Roman Asia about the relationship between non-civic bodies and the central administration. It is easier to gain a general impression than to elucidate every procedural detail from the complexities of these documents. Firstly, these texts confirm the pattern observed in the dossier of inscriptions on market rights, that only cities seem to have had direct access to the emperor, and enjoyed the privilege of an imperial letter in response. Villages on private estates appealed to the proconsul of Asia, but only with the support of the land-owner, and in the two clear cases where this occurred the emperor had no part to play in resolving the issue. The inhabitants of imperial estates clearly looked to the emperor directly as their patron, without using cities or even powerful private individuals as intermediaries. However, they too needed champions to plead their cause, a role which was played by non-ranking soldiers and perhaps by imperial freedmen attached to their communities.

In all cases without exception the provincial proconsuls had some part to play in settling the grievances or in preventing trouble from recurring, or they were expected to do so. Except at Aragua, in the cases which involved imperial estates the proconsul operated in concert with the freedman procurator of Phrygia, the most senior domainal official of the province. Moreover the Tacina dossier and the Ağabeyköy inscription suggest that in general the latter was the highest authority with whom the inhabitants of the imperial estates would ever deal, a conclusion supported by the documentation of the dispute between the Anoseni and Antimacheni.

The geographical distribution of the documentation, generally close to the main roads but in the central and eastern parts of the province of Asia, reveal that there were large parts of the province where the classic formula for Roman provincial administration, namely for the Roman authorities to devolve as much responsibility as possible on cities and local magistrates, simply could not be applied. City institutions were inadequately developed for the purpose, and the prevalence of domainal land-holding, especially by the emperor, entailed different administrative procedures. The inscriptions also illustrate the limits of Roman rule. The depredations of marauding soldiers and the heavy hand of Roman government were only felt directly by communities close to the main roads. Soldiers strayed briefly

¹²⁵ Keil, *Premierstein*, Dritter Bericht 26–9 no. 28, ll. 19, 21.

from the main routes across the province to secure supplies or to line their pockets. Even this was an abnormal state of affairs, due to the constant troop movements and warfare which affected Asia between the death of Commodus and the mid third century. In more peaceful times troops and officials, like the proconsul of Asia and his staff in Republican times, stuck to the main routes and carried out their business in the major cities. Geography imposed a rule that could not be broken. The active role of officials and military personnel in the administration of Roman Asia never extended far beyond the main roads.