



MERSİN ÜNİVERSİTESİ KILIKIA ARKEOLOJİSİNİ ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
MERSIN UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH CENTER OF CILICIAN ARCHAEOLOGY

KAAM
YAYINLARI

OLBA
XIX

(Ayrıbasım / Offprint)



MERSİN
2011

KAAM YAYINLARI
OLBA
XIX

© 2011 Mersin/Türkiye
ISSN 1301 7667

OLBA dergisi;
ARTS & HUMANITIES CITATION INDEX, EBSCO, PROQUEST
ve
TÜBİTAK-ULAKBİM Sosyal Bilimler Veri Tabanlarında taranmaktadır.

OLBA dergisi hakemlidir ve Mayıs ayında olmak üzere,
yılda bir kez basılmaktadır.
Published each year in May.

KAAM'ın izni olmadan OLBA'nın hiçbir bölümü kopya edilemez.
Alıntı yapılması durumunda dipnot ile referans gösterilmelidir.
It is not allowed to copy any section of OLBA without the permit of KAAM.

OLBA dergisinde makalesi yayımlanan her yazar, makalesinin baskı olarak ve elektronik ortamda yayımlanmasını kabul etmiş ve telif haklarını OLBA dergisine devretmiş sayılır.
Each author whose article is published in OLBA shall be considered to have accepted the article to be published in print version and electronically and thus have transferred the copyrights to the journal OLBA..

OLBA'ya gönderilen makaleler aşağıdaki web adresinde ve bu cildin giriş sayfalarında belirtilen formatlara uygun olduğu takdirde basılacaktır.
Articles should be written according to the formats mentioned in the following web address.

OLBA'nın yeni sayılarında yayınlanması istenen makaleler için yazışma adresi:
Correspondance addresses for sending articles to following volumes of OLBA:

Prof. Dr. Serra Durugönül
Mersin Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Arkeoloji Bölümü
Çiftlikköy Kampüsü, 33342-MERSİN
TURKEY

Diğer İletişim Adresleri
Other Correspondance Addresses
Tel: 00.90.324.361 00 01 (10 Lines) 4730 / 4734
Fax: 00.90.324.361 00 46
web mail: www.kaam.mersin.edu.tr
www.olba.mersin.edu.tr
e-mail: kaam@mersin.edu.tr

Baskı / Printed
BİLTUR Basım Yayın ve Hizmet A.Ş.
Tel: +90 216 444 44 03 www.bilnet.net.tr
Sertifika No: 15690

Dağıtım / Distribution
Zero Prod. Ltd.
Tel: 00.90.212.244 75 21 Fax: 00.90.244 32 09
info@zerobooksonline.com www.zerobooksonline.com/eng



MERSİN ÜNİVERSİTESİ
KILIKIA ARKEOLOJİSİNİ ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
(KAAM)
YAYINLARI-XIX

MERSIN UNIVERSITY
PUBLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH CENTER OF
CILICIAN ARCHAEOLOGY
(KAAM)-XIX

Editör

Serra DURUGÖNÜL
Murat DURUKAN
Gunnar BRANDS

Bilim Kurulu

Prof. Dr. Serra DURUGÖNÜL
Prof. Dr. Haluk ABBASOĞLU
Prof. Dr. Tomris BAKIR
Prof. Dr. Sencer ŞAHİN
Prof. Dr. Erendiz ÖZBAYOĞLU
Prof. Dr. Susan ROTROFF
Prof. Dr. Marion MEYER



MERSİN

2011

İçindekiler/Contents

Engin Akdeniz <i>Neolitik Çağ'da Manisa Yöresi</i> (<i>Manisa Region in the Neolithic Age</i>)	1
Hatice Kalkan <i>Doğu Anadolu'da Geç Demir Çağ: Sorunlar ve Gözlemler</i> (<i>Late Iron Age in Eastern Anatolia: Problems and Assessments</i>)	47
Gökhan Coşkun <i>Achaemenid Bowls From Seyitömer Höyük</i> (<i>Seyitömer Höyük'ten Akhaemenid Kaseler</i>)	57
Ertekin M. Doksanaltı <i>Karaman Müzesi'nden Bir Grup Siyah Figürlü Lekythos</i> (<i>A Group of Black Figure Lekythos from Karaman Museum</i>)	81
Murat Çekilmez <i>Geç Hellenistik Dönemden Bir Mezar Steli</i> (<i>A Funerary Stele From the Late Hellenistic Period</i>)	107
F. Eray Dökü <i>Eurymedon Vadisi Asarbaşı Yerleşimi Kaya Mezarları</i> (<i>Rock-cut Tombs at the Asarbaşı Settlement, Eurymedon Valley</i>)	127
Figen Çevirici-Coşkun <i>Maraş Müzesin'de Bulunan İki Heykel</i> (<i>Two Statues in the Maraş Museum</i>)	159
Celal Şimşek – M. Ayşem Sezgin <i>Laodikeia Kuzey Tiyatrosu</i> (<i>Laodicea's North Theater</i>)	173
Mustafa Şahin – Yasemin Polat – Thomas Zimmermann <i>Der Hafen von Kapanca: Ein Neuer Vorschlag Zur</i> <i>Lokalisation der Stadt Caesarea Germanica</i> (<i>Kapanca Limanı - Caesarea Germanica Kenti'nin</i> <i>Lokalizasyonu İçin Yeni Bir Öneri</i>)	203

Çiğdem Gençler Güray	
<i>Elaiussa Sebaste'nin Roma Dönemi Cam Buluntuları</i> (<i>The Roman Glass Finds from Elaiussa Sebaste</i>)	233
Mehmet Oktan	
<i>The Route Taken By Cilicia To Provincial Status: Why And When?</i> (<i>Kilikia'yı Eyaletleştirmeye Götüren Yol: Ne zaman ve Neden</i>)	267
Ebru Akdoğu Arca – Nuray Gökalp – Nihal Tüner Önen	
<i>Pamphylia Bölgesi'nin Mısır ve Kıbrıs İle Olan İlişkileri</i> (<i>Relations of Pamphylia with Egypt and Cyprus</i>)	287
Nurşah Çokbankir	
<i>Pamphylia, Lykia, Kilikia ve Pisidia'da Epigrafiik Verilerle</i> <i>Roma İmparatorluk Dönemi'nde Atletik Oyunların Finansı</i> (<i>Financing the Games in Pamphylia, Lycia, Cilicia and Pisidia in the</i> <i>Roman Imperial Period from the Epigraphic Evidences</i>)	313
Fatih Onur	
<i>New Inscriptions From Hadrianoi Pros Olympon (Mysia)</i> (<i>Hadrianoi Pros Olympon'dan (Mysia) Yeni Yazıtlar</i>)	331
N. Eda Akyürek Şahin	
<i>Nikomedeia'dan İki Entellektüel: Basilikos ve Kyrion'un Mezar Epigramları</i> (<i>Zwei gebildete Maenner aus Nikomedeia: Die Epigramme des</i> <i>Basilikos und des Kyrion</i>)	349
Ayşe Aydın	
<i>Antik Atlı Herosların Hristiyan Atlı Kahramanlara Dönüşümüne</i> <i>Bir Örnek: Tarsus Müzesi'ndeki Aziz Georgios Kabartması</i> (<i>Ein Beispiel für die reitende Heiligen von umgewandelte antike</i> <i>reitende Heros: Relief mit der Hl. Georg im Museum von Tarsos</i>)	371
Hatice Özyurt Özcan	
<i>Examples of Architectural Sculpture with Figurative and</i> <i>Floral Decoration of the Byzantine Period at Muğla, Bodrum and</i> <i>Milas Archaeological Museums</i> (<i>Muğla, Bodrum ve Milas Arkeoloji Müzeleri'ndeki Bizans</i> <i>Dönemine Ait Figürlü ve Bitkisel Bezemeli Mimari Plastik Eserler</i>)	389

THE ROUTE TAKEN BY CILICIA TO PROVINCIAL STATUS: WHEN AND WHY?

Mehmet OKTAN*

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to show the several and necessary reasons for the formation of the Province of Cilicia. There are several dates provided in modern scholarly works concerning the foundation of the second province of Rome known as Cilicia in Anatolia. The dates which have been proposed for the foundation of this province are usually given as 102 B.C., 80 B.C. or as 64/63 B.C. However the most appropriate date for the foundation of the new province was when Sulla had complete authority. Since several dates have been advanced concerning the foundation of the province, there has been no real contextualization of the political conditions of how and why it was constituted. In the absence of an agreed date for the formation of the province, the campaigns and the appointments made against the pirates are given as the main reason for the foundation of the province. As shown by the appointments of M. Antonius and Sulla, piracy was a continuing feature of the area for centuries, and was of course a very important factor in the foundation of the province. However when we take into consideration the wider political-military situation up to 80 B. C., there is a variety of interconnected reasons for the foundation of this new province. Due to the large area within the borders of the province of Asia, the duties of the province's administrators were very onerous; while the piracy problem remained uncontrolled, together with the increasing threat against Rome caused through the banding together of the various powers in Anatolia against Roman power. Also the economic losses derived from the lack of authority in the area and, in consequence, the security necessary for the conduct of widespread trade could not be established; it is the combination of these different factors that can be understood as providing the background for this province's foundation.

Keywords: Sulla, Rome, Cilicia, Pamphylia, Piracy, Provincialism

* Arş. Gör., Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Eskiçağ Dilleri ve Kültürleri Bölümü, 07058 Kampus, Antalya-TR. E.mail: mehmetoktan@akdeniz.edu.tr

ÖZET

Kilikia'yı Eyaletleştirmeye Götüren Yol: Ne zaman ve Neden

Bu çalışmanın amacı Cilicia Eyaleti'nin kurulmasını gerekli kılan çeşitli nedenleri, buradan hareketle kuruluş yılını ve yeni eyaletin merkez üssünü genel hatlarıyla ortaya koymaktır. Roma'nın Anadolu'daki ikinci eyaleti olan Cilicia'nın oluşturulma yılı üzerine bilim insanları tarafından çeşitli tarihler öne sürülmüştür. Bunların odağında İÖ. 102, İÖ. 80 ve İÖ. 64/63 yılı vardır. Bununla birlikte Roma açısından Anadolu'da yaşanan gelişmeler göz önüne alındığında, eyaletin kuruluşu üzerine bu tarihler arasındaki en uygun zaman Sulla'nın Roma yönetiminde tüm yetkiye sahip olduğu yıllardır. Eyaletin kuruluşu üzerine fikir birliği bulunmaması nedeniyle, yeni eyaletin hangi siyasi koşullar altında nasıl ve neden oluşturulduğu şimdye kadar çok yönlü ele alınmamıştır. Bunun yerine öne sürülen tarihlerin ortak noktasının korsanlara karşı yapılan seferler veya atamalar olmasından dolayı eyaletleştirmeye yönelik gerekçe, bölgede her zaman var olan korsanlık gösterilmiştir. M. Antonius ile Sulla'nın atanmasından anlaşılacağı üzere bölgede sürekli kendini gösteren korsanlık eyaletin kurulmasındaki önemli etkenlerden biridir. Bununla birlikte İÖ. 80 yılına kadar geçen sürede Anadolu'da ve bölgede yaşanan askeri ve politik gelişmeler bir bütün olarak değerlendirildiğinde, korsanlık yanında bu eyaletin oluşturulmasını gerekli kılan birbiriyle bağlantılı önemli çeşitli etmenlerin olduğu anlaşılmaktadır. Asia Eyaleti'nin çok geniş bir alanı kapsamaması nedeniyle eyalet idarecilerinin iş yükünün önemli oranda artması, korsanlığın kontrol edilememesi, kendilerine yönelik tehditlerin çoğalması, güç durumda oldukları zaman Anadolu'daki farklı güçlerin Roma iktidarına karşı birlikte hareket etmesi, bölgede otorite boşluğundan kaynaklanan ekonomik kayıplar ve sağlıklı bir ticaret için vazgeçilmez unsur olan güvenlik ortamının sağlanamaması bunun genel nedenleri olarak sıralanabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sulla, Roma, Kilikia, Pamphylia, Korsanlık, Eyaletleşme

There are several dates provided in modern scholarly works concerning the foundation of the second province of Rome in Anatolia. At the nexus of these dates is the year 102 B.C. due to the Roman campaign led by M. Antonius against the pirates. In part due to use of the term *ἐπαρχεία*¹ in the *lex de provinciis praetoriis* promulgated by the Senate in 101/100 B.C. concerning the pirates in the area where M. Antonius conducted his activities,² it has been understood this was a new

¹ τὴν τε Κιλικίαν διὰ τοῦτο το πρᾶγμα κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν νόμον ἐπαρχείαν στρατηγικὴν πεποιηκέαι. Cnidus Copy, Column III line 35-38. For the inscription, see Hassal et al. 1974, 209 ff. See also SEG III no. 378; Sherk 1984 no. 55; Crawford 1996, 231 ff.

² Cic. de Or. 1. 18. 82; 2. 1. 2; ad Brut. 168; Liv. perioch. 68. 1; Tac. Ann. 12. 62; Obseq. Prodig. 44. See also ILLRP I no. 342; IGR IV no. 1116; AE 1928 no. 5; CIL I no. 2662.

province³. However, there are also many scholars who say there is no record of any new Roman province existing under the name Cilicia⁴ and according to these, the campaign of 102 B.C. was only of a military character against the pirates and did not result in the acquisition by Rome of any territory, as indicated from their reading of the *lex de provinciis praetoriis* after this campaign. With this difference of opinion between scholars, there is also no agreement concerning any other date. Other dates which have been proposed for the foundation of this province are in 80 B.C.⁵, and more commonly in 64/63 B.C. because of the conquests in Cilicia Pedias and Syria that were made by Pompey the Great⁶.

The Process of Foundation of the Province

The process of province formation in Anatolia began with the bequest from King Attalos III of Pergamon⁷ in 133 B.C., who gave the kingdom to Rome, not to his stepbrother Aristonikos⁸. Although Aristonikos's revolt postponed the foundation for 4 years, Rome maintained the balance in Anatolia without military conquest or annexation, formed this province from the land of the Pergamene kingdom. The foundation of this province in Anatolia brought new dimensions to the relationship between Rome and

³ Jones 1937, 132; Stevenson 1939, 26; Rostovtzeff 1941, 974; Badian 1956, 113; Hassall et al. 1974, 211 and 219; Bulin 1983, 18 f.; Lintott 1993, 10; Crawford 1996, 261 f.; de Souza 1997, 478; Glay et al. 1999, 105; Ferrary 2000, 167 ff.; 2008, 107 f.; Mitchell 2008, 190 f. See also Nollé 1993, 69 ff. Brennan (2000, 357 f.) says that it was soon after Antonius' military success.

⁴ Ormerod 1922, 1, 50; Syme 1939, 299; Magie 1950, 284; Badian 1964, 161; Levick 1967, 21; Badian 1968, 52; Sherwin-White 1976, 5 ff.; 1977, 70; 1984, 97 ff.; 1994, 232; Freeman 1986, 255 f.; Broughton 1986, 19; Brandt 1992, 94; Pohl 1993, 227 f.; Sayar et al. 1994, 124 f.; Keyser 1997, 65; de Souza 1999, 109 f.; Sayar 1999, 201; Brandt - Kolb 2005, 20; Feld 2005, 62 f.; Kreiler 2007, 118 f.; Santangelo 2007, 26 f.

⁵ Ussher 1658, 4067; Mitford 1980, 1235; Sherwin - White 1984, 153; 1994, 232; Souza 1999, 124; Kreiler 2007, 124. For similar view, see Magie 1950, 285 fn. 15. Liebmann - Frankfort (1969, 453 f.) accepts that territorial province of Cilicia was created by P. Servilius Vatia during the years 78-75 B. C.

⁶ Broughton 1933, 143 f.; Badian 1964, 161; Levick 1967, 21; Pohl 1993, 239; Hild - Hellenkemper 2004, 31; Sayar et al. 1994, 129 f.; Sayar 1999, 204; Feld 2005, 73; Pilhofer 2006, 19; Grainger 2009, 152. Cf. also Liebmann - Frankfort 1969, 454. These arrangements were approved in 59 B.C. through the first triumvires constituted by Pompeius, Caesar and Crassus.

⁷ Liv. perioch. 58. 4; 59. 3; Strab. 13. 4. 2; Val. Max. 5. 2 ext. 3; Plin. nat. 33. 148; Plut. Tib. Gracch. 14. 1; App. Mithr. 62; civ. 5. 4; Flor. epit. 1. 35. 2; Eutr. 4. 18; Iust. 36. 4. 5; Oros. hist. 5. 8. 4.

⁸ Liv. perioch. 59. 3; Sall. hist. 4. 67. 8; Plut. Flam. 21. 6; Eutr. 4. 20; Oros. hist. 5. 10. 1; Iust. 36. 4. 6. See also Flor. epit. 1. 2. 20; Strab. 14. 1. 38. Aristonikos was not born to the purple, see Vell. 2. 4.

the other kingdoms in Anatolia, with Rome now physically neighbouring kingdoms that were antagonistic to each other. In consequence, Rome surrendered its previous role as manipulative referee and instead began working towards preserving the balances within the region. Rome gave part of the territory that had formerly belonged to the Pergamene kingdom, to other kingdoms that assisted Rome in defeating Aristonikos' rebellion as a reward⁹ and probably to prevent potential threats from these kingdoms to Attalos's territorial bequest to Rome. Through these actions the boundary of the province was shortened, which enabled the better administration of the Province of Asia. However, Phrygia Maior which had been given by Rome to Mithradates V was retaken around 116 B.C.¹⁰ in part due to security concerns, in part, because it was said by Rome that the king had obtained the territory through bribery, and also Lycaonia which was given to the Cappadocian Kingdom was retaken by Rome ca. 112/111 in the *senatus consultum*¹¹.

In this new process in Anatolia, both the Bithynian king Nikomedes III who had aimed to expand his territory at the expense of the Pergamene kingdom and Mithradates VI, now had to find new targets for their expansionist aims. From 108 B.C. onwards both kings initially tried to establish rule over Paphlagonia¹² and then Galatia¹³. Around 103 B.C. Cappadocia was added to the occupied lands of both kings¹⁴. In addition to this trouble from both kings for Rome, another danger in this period was caused to Rome through the pirates. They filled the vacuum of power which had arisen especially in Eastern Mediterranean due to the abolition of Seleucid Kingdom by the Romans and the decline of the power of Rhodos which controlled the sea routes. This situation endangered the corn supply of Rome and incited the slave trade in favor of pirates. While Rome sent no army against the kings, whom she was unable to control, she sent an army against the pirates in 102 B.C. probably due to the danger they presented to her territory and economy. From the following year, the pirates maintained

⁹ App. Mithr. 11; 12; 13; 57; Iust. 37. 1. 2; 38. 5. 3.

¹⁰ OGIS II no. 436; IGR IV no. 752 = Sherk 1984 no. 13; App. Mithr. 11; 12; 13; 20; 56; 57; Iust. 37. 1. 2; 38. 5. 3. See also Magie 1950, 168 f.; Drew - Bear 1972, 75 ff.

¹¹ For the date of this arrangement, see Dmitriev 2000, 359; Sherwin - White 1976, 7; Arslan 2007, 116 fn. 523.

¹² Strab. 12. 3. 41; App. Mithr. 112; Iust. 37. 4. 3; 38. 5. 4.

¹³ Iust. 37. 4. 6. See also, Strab. 12. 5. 2.

¹⁴ Iust. 38. 1. 1-10; 38. 2. 2-4.

their activities without a pause in many areas¹⁵. Consequently this campaign, of short duration in a limited area, had little salutary effect on the pirates activities and, in consequence, Rome published a very important decree called the *lex de provinciis praetoriis* ca. 101/100 with the intention of demanding co-operation from their allies.

These attempts made against the problem of piracy indicate that Rome gave considerable importance to maritime developments in the area. However due to the inability of the first campaign and then the ineffectiveness of the *lex* against the pirates in obtaining the desired suppression of piracy, Cilicia was placed in the hands of *pr. pro cos Sulla*¹⁶ in ca 94 B.C. Nevertheless Mithradates VI had for a long time obstructed Rome's policy from reaching a successful outcome because of his bitterness over Rome's actions regarding Phrygia Maior which Rome had taken back from his father's territory when he was child¹⁷. At the instigation of Mithradates VI, with the occupation of the kingdom of Cappadocia by the Armenian king Tigranes II, Ariobarzanes I abandoned his kingdom. Because Ariobarzanes then took refuge in Rome, Sulla was entrusted by the *senatus* with the restoration of Ariobarzanes to his throne¹⁸. For this reason progress in the matter of piracy could not be made, and then the civil war restarted in 91 B.C. which was then followed by the large war beginning in 89 B.C. And then the civil war began again in 83 B.C., developments which also prevented for a while any possible intervention being made against the pirates. However developments in this same period also contributed greatly to the rapid growth of piracy and for this reason Rome needed better protection against the risk which Mithradates VI posed and also made to obtain effective results against the increasing actions of the pirates which were causing very large damage to Rome's mercantile interests. For that reason the former understanding, that the responsibility in dealing with these problems belonged to the governor of the Province of Asia was abandoned, and Cilicia was then organized as a separate province.

The *lex de provinciis praetoriis* which was promulgated in 101/100 B.C. has been employed by some as proof of the foundation of the province

¹⁵ Strab. 14. 3. 2. See also Strab. 12. 7. 2.

¹⁶ App. Mithr. 57; civ. 1. 77; Auct. Liber de Vir. ill. 75. 4. See also, Magie 1950, 284 fn. 14; Badian 1964, 161 f.; Dmitriev 2006, 291 ff.

¹⁷ App. Mithr. 11; 12; 13; 15; Iust. 38. 5. 3.

¹⁸ Liv. perioch. 70. 6; Plut. Sull. 5. 3-5; App. Mithr. 57; Vell. 2. 24. 3. See also Iust. 38. 2. 8.

by M. Antonius in 102 B.C. It is recorded however, according to this law promulgated by the *senatus*, that the proconsul or praetor who takes Asia/Macedonia as his *provincia*, when he has read the *lex* should swear within 10 days that he will do everything that the *lex* orders him to do and not to behave contrary to the orders of the *populus*. While the necessity for swearing the Asian and Macedonian governors to this *lex* is clearly indicated, for Cilicia which was the main shelter for the pirates and which formed a reason for the *lex* being promulgated, there is no mention of any such action¹⁹. This provides one of the important indications that Cilicia at this time was not in fact a province. Another indication that the province did not exist at this time is provided by the titles held by M. Antonius and Sulla as, M. Antonius held the title of *στρατηγὸς ἀνθύπατος* and then after him, the first administrator Sulla²⁰ held this same title and who was also *pr. pro cos.* were charged with the Cilician commandership (*Κιλικία στρατηγική*) as governor of Asia²¹. For this reason, the term *eparkheia Kilikia* in the *lex de provinciis praetoriis* in fact does not describe a geographical area, but instead indicates the scope of the task which M. Antonius and Sulla undertook and is formed by these conditions. The most important indication of the absence of a province of Asia is that from 102 B.C. until 80 B.C. there was no regular appointments made²² to the place called Cilicia. If there had been regular appointments to the area, these administrators, faced with the problem²³ of piracy which was very important to them, should have combated it and this activity would have been recorded in the ancient sources.

This situation changed after 80 B.C. and from this date onwards, with his officials, there is the regular appointment of governors to the Province of

¹⁹ See Delphi Copy, Block C line 8-10. See also Cnidos Copy, Column IV line 33-35 and 40-42; Delphi Copy, Block C line 4. Crawford (1996, 261 f.) not sworn by the governor of Cilician governor but accepted as a matter of course. See also Ferrary 2008, 106 and 109. Cf. Pohl 1993, 238; Kreiler 2007, 118.

²⁰ For M. Antonius see ILLRP I no. 342; IGR IV no. 1116; AE 1928 no. 5; CIL I no. 2662. For Sulla see Syll.3 no. 745; ILS no. 8771.

²¹ Sherwin - White 1984, 99; Kreiler 2007, 118 ff. Cf. Broughton 1986, 19. However de Souza (1999, 109) doesn't find it possible for the governorship of the Province of Asia to be held by M. Antonius.

²² Because of the *στρατηγὸς Παμφυλίας* expression in Poseidonios (fr. 78) it seems that in 89 B.C. Q. Oppius came to the area. However Oppius served against King Mithradates VI under the governor of Asia C. Cassius and after him in 88 B.C. became the governor of the province of Asia: Liv. perioch. 78. 1; App. Mithr. 17. For the activities of Oppius, see Kreiler 2007, 122 f.; Arslan 2007, 128 fn. 578.

²³ Piracy was generally a continuing feature of the area, see Cass. Dio 36. 20. 1.

Cilicia²⁴. So, in 80 B.C. the activities of the governor Cornelius Dolabella, his quaestor Malleolus and the pro quaestor Verres after Malleolus' death are explicitly watched in the area. Also, the territory where Verres operated and the area²⁵ where the next Cilician governor Servilius Vatia conducted his operations correspond. After Servilius Vatia, governor from 78-75/4 B.C, Lucius Octavius was appointed governor in 75/74 B.C. Due to his death during his voyage to the province, or as a consequence of his duties in the area, killed by pirates or by bandits, Lucullus was appointed to this position due to the vacancy caused by Octavius's death, and he joined the third Rome – Mithradates War in 74 B.C.²⁶ Lucullus carried out this duty until he was dismissed by the senatus in 68/67 who appointed in his place Q. Marcius Rex²⁷. For the date of the foundation of this province in 80 B.C. yet another indication is the auction of the praetor's number from 6 to 8 by Sulla during his dictatorship²⁸ as this situation can be explained as being due to the creation of a new province.

The Heartland of the Province

The territorial borders of the province of Cilicia cannot be precisely determined. However the places that were sacked by the pro quaestor Verres after the death of the first quaestor C. Puplicius Malleolus²⁹ enable us to begin to understand the borders of the new province. According to the information provided by Cicero the places which Verres harassed and sacked are given as: Phrygia, Pisidia, Milyas, Lykia, Pamphylia and the cities of Aspendos and Perge³⁰ indicating the borders of this new province. Although Attaleia and Side in the coastal area are not mentioned by Cicero,

²⁴ For the list of the administrators of Cilicia, see Magie 1950, 285 fn. 16; Freeman 1986, 266 f.; Ferrary 2000, 192 ff.; Mitchell 2008, 190.

²⁵ In this period for indications of the territorial extent of Cilicia, see Keyser 1997, 65 ff; Arslan 2007, 294 fn. 1321.

²⁶ Plut. Luc. 6. 1-4. For the governorship of Octavius in Cilicia, see Sall. hist. 2. 82. 10. However Velleius (2. 33. 1) and Memnon (27. 1) state that after holding the proconsulship Lucullus was sent to the province of Asia. See also Broughton 1952, 106 f.

²⁷ Cass. Dio 36. 15. 1. See also Sall. hist. 5. 14. For more information, see Arslan 2007, 428 f.

²⁸ Broughton 1952, 75.

²⁹ Cic. Verr. 2. 1. 36; 2. 1. 41; 2. 1. 90. See also Ussher 1658, 4067; Broughton 1952, 80.

³⁰ Cic. Verr. 1. 1; 1. 4. 11; 2. 1. 44; 2. 1. 53-54; 2. 1. 60; 2. 1. 91-93; 2. 1. 95; 2. 3. 6; 2. 4. 71. See also Magie 1950 285 fn. 15; Ferrary 1998, 168 ff.; Brandt - Kolb 2005, 20; Arslan 2007, 294 fn. 1321.

this may well be due to the presence in these cities of pirates³¹ and from Verres fear of the pirates, but it would seem that Side probably formed the eastern coastal border. Although the new province was called Cilicia, there are therefore no known places within its borders that geographically belong to Cilicia³² according to the information provided by Cicero. Apparently some places that belonged to the province of Asia (Pamphylia and adjacent territory) had been used as bases by the Romans from 102 B.C. to prosecute Rome's policy against the pirates. The above seems to have constituted the territorial limits of this new province.

While there was a loss of authority following the Peace of Apameia in 189/8 B.C., the annexation of Cilicia Tracheia to the new province wasn't possible because of the large numbers of pirates who lived there, as can be understood from the maritime warfare by Coracesion, with the pirates against Antiochus III and Pompey the Great's forces³³. When the information from the Pamphylian cities is investigated, it is understood that this border area formed a part of the province of Asia from its inception. As is shown by the customs law of Ephesus, concerning the foundation of the province of Asia in 129 B.C.³⁴, the cities of Pamphylia, Perge, Magydus, Phaselis and Side³⁵ are also listed in the custom collection district list. Further, the milestone found in the vicinity of Side³⁶ recording the name of the first governor of the province of Asia, M. Aquillius, shows the roads of the province were linked with the road network extending from Pergamon and that Pamphylia formed the southern border of the province of Asia during its formation, at least in respect to Side. In addition, the information given by Cicero concerning the Pamphylian cities sacked by Verres during

³¹ Cic. leg. agr. 1. 5. For the presence of the pirates in Pamphylia, see also Cic. Verr. 2. 4. 21; Strab. 12. 7. 2; 14. 5. 7; Oros. hist. 5. 23. 21.

³² Ormerod 1922, 51; Syme 1939 299 f.; Rostovtzeff 1941, 975; Magie 1950, 285 fn. 15, 22; de Souza 1999, 124 and 128. See also Broughton 1938, 520 fn. 101.

³³ Strab. 14. 5. 2; Plut. Pomp. 28.1; App. Mithr. 92; Vell. 2. 32. 4.

³⁴ The paragraphs concerning the customs station and the slaves who work there belonging to the Attalids would continued to be used (Engelmann - Knibbe 1989, § 28, 90-91) and for the executions in places that formerly weren't within the sovereignty of Attalos (Engelmann - Knibbe 1989, § 29, 92) show the customs arrangement continued with the foundation of the province. Cf. Merola 2001, 212; Cottier et al. 2008, 110 f.; Mitchell 2008, 199.

³⁵ Engelmann - Knibbe 1989, § 9, 70-72.

³⁶ French 1991, 53 f. For the inscription also see SEG XLI no. 1336; AE 1991 no. 1529. See also Nollé 1993, 68 f.; Mitchell 2008, 188 f. For the presence of the Romans in the area see also Sherwin-White 1976, 3 ff.; Grainger 2009, 138 ff.

his period as Cilician pro quaestor between 80-78 B.C. also accords with this view³⁷.

Moreover, the decision for the expeditions to Cilicia in 102 and 94 B.C. show Rome had difficulty in ensuring the security of her provincial territory and these campaigns most probably derived from the desire to prevent the pillaging operations of the pirates in her territory. Therefore M. Antonius and Sulla had the opportunity to use Pamphylian territory as a governors of Asia without there arising any illegal situation or requiring any demarche against the pirates in their campaigns. Nevertheless the province wasn't named according to its actual geographical location, instead, the name reveals the aim of the province's foundation, in other words to supplant the epicentre of the pirates in geographical Cilicia, through its eventual inclusion in the Roman province of Cilicia.

The Reasons Leading to the Foundation of the Province

As shown by the appointments of M. Antonius and Sulla for Rome, piracy was a multifaceted problem for Rome and the key factor in respect to the founding of the province and most of the problems in the area revolved around this issue. Although Sulla first faced this problem ca. 94 B.C.³⁸ the damage which could be done to Rome by the pirates located on the Mediterranean coastline was clearly articulated through the dispatch of Lucullus for Sulla himself at the end of 87 B.C. to obtain naval forces and military support from Rome's ally to use in the Mithradatic war. Lucullus visited the Ptolemaic Kingdom, Cyrene, Rhodes, Cyprus, Pamphylia and many other places along the coast to obtain help from the allies. Lucullus was able to bring the help wanted by Sulla just ca. 5 months before the peace agreement of the start of 85 B.C., due to the attacks made by the pirates and he sometimes avoided the possibility of attacking them, and also because of the naval forces of Mithradates VI³⁹. The another danger

³⁷ See supra fn. 30.

³⁸ App. Mithr. 57; civ. 1. 77; Auct. Liber de Vir. ill. 75. 4. See also Magie 1950, 284 fn. 14; Badian 1964, 161 f.; Dmitriev 2006, 291 ff.

³⁹ Plut. Luc. 2. 2-6; 3. 1-3; 4. 1; App. Mithr. 33; 51; 56; Auct. Liber de Vir. ill. 74. 2. See also Keaveney 1992, 16 ff.; Pohl 1993, 215 f.; Sayar et al. 1994, 117 ff.; de Souza 1999, 118 f. Lucullus whilst himself having to find contributions for the war he didn't attempt against the pirates. However Sulla, it seems, noticed the difficulty of this task and didn't reprove Lucullus, who couldn't bring the necessary naval help in time in this most important war. Instead, he left Lucullus as quaestor of the province with the special aim of gaining it for himself after the war.

caused by the pirates which Sulla himself witnessed, occurred on the island of the Samothrake⁴⁰ which he came to on his way to Rome after the Dardanos Peace. Sulla did not take any action against them because he had to return Italy due to the situation there which was turning against him⁴¹. Thereafter, solving the problem of piracy devolved to Murena the governor of the province Asia. Murena gained some success against them with his limited naval forces at the start of his administration⁴² as the pirates generally become a threat at a time when there is a lack of authority and they generally abstained from war with a political power, such as a state. At the expense of ignoring his usual administrative duties Murena went to Cibyra without resolving the problem of piracy and annexed this city in 83 B.C. to the Province of Asia⁴³. Following this annexation, he preferred to war with Mithradates⁴⁴ instead of interesting himself in the internal problems of the province and once again attacking the pirates.

The dispatch of Sulla in 94 B.C. following M. Antonius' campaign shows also that it was very difficult for the Governor of Asia to exert control over the Pamphylian coastline as he had responsibility for a very large territory. In addition, throughout most of the First Mithridatic war, wars were also in progress in the Province of Asia and most of the cities in the province were exposed to sack or punishment either from the king or from the Roman administrators. This situation went on after the war and, according to the position they had taken during the war, most cities had lost their privileges due to their providing help to king Mithradates VI, or these cities were placed under heavy financial obligations to Rome⁴⁵.

⁴⁰ Taking advantage of the war between Rome and Mithradates, the number of pirates increased every day, due to the lack of security and state of ill repair of the cities and, spreading their activities over a wider area they sacked many places. The boldness of the pirates reached the point where they sacked the temple on the island, ignoring Sulla presence on the island at the start of 84 B.C. See, App. Mithr. 63; 92; 93. See also App. civ. 1. 102.

⁴¹ Plut. Sull. 22. 1-2; Memnon 25. 1-2; App. Mithr. 51. After his rapid departure the pirates continued their activity, capturing places such as: Iasos, Samos, Klazomenai and they looted famous temples including those at Klaros and Didyma See, Cic. leg. Man. 12. 33; Plut. Pomp. 24. 5; App. Mithr. 63.

⁴² Cic. Verr. 2. 1. 89; App. Mithr. 93; civ. 1. 79. See also Arslan 2007, 268 f.

⁴³ Strab. 13. 4. 17.

⁴⁴ App. Mithr. 64; 65; Memnon 26.

⁴⁵ Sall. Catil. 11. 4-7; Plut. Sull. 25. 2; Luc. 4. 1; 20. 4; App. Mithr. 62; 63. For the arrangements made by Sulla in the area, see Kallet Marx 1995, 265 ff. For the situation of the cities, see Rostovtzeff 1941, 945 f.; Magie 1950, 232 ff.; McGing 1986, 110 ff.; Hind 1994, 162 f.; Arslan 2007, 248 ff.; Santangelo 2007, 122 f.

Owing to these changes to most cities' status, the responsibilities of the governor of the province and of the quaestor together with the responsibilities of the Roman administrators who were in the province were substantially extended and differentiated. In this context the other important reason which required the establishment of the new province was that far too many responsibilities were carried by the governor and by the quaestor and other administrators' of the very large province of Asia. It is possible to understand this problem from the recorded activities of Murena, who finished his mission with campaigns against external military activities and Lucullus who collected all of the tax the cities were forced to disburse following the end of the war, on behalf of Sulla, over the previous 4 year.⁴⁶

From Rome's perspective another danger was the broadening of her enemies' sphere of activity and their collaboration with each other due to the disorder exhibited by Rome at this time. This process, generally the most important policy of the king in his conduct of his war with Rome, did great damage to Rome during the course of the war⁴⁷. Murena directing his attention to a different area and the civil war in Rome enabled Tigranes II to easily expand his border in a south-southwest direction. In this way, while Murena was sacking the territory of Mithradates in 83 B.C., Magadates, Tigranes II's general siezed control of Cilicia Pedias and Northern Syria⁴⁸. That this new military initiative of Tigranes II to the east took place at all, was at least in part, due to the pirates who repeatedly disrupted the maritime connection of Rome with the area. Thus, according to the information provided by Plutarch⁴⁹, although king Ptolemaios XI had furnished in a friendly fashion Lucullus with ships and accompanied him for part of his

⁴⁶ Plut. Luc. 20. 4. In this period revenues were very bad and the most important source for Sulla was the money collected from the province for his successful struggle during the civil war. In this context, this money which had to be collected, was very important for Sulla and in consequence, Lucullus could only be concerned with the fiscal situation. The senate charge against Sulla for the money which should be paid to the soldiers who had used the temple treasuries in 82 B.C. indicates the seriousness of these fiscal problems for Rome. See, Val. Max. 7. 6. 4. For the problem of the Roman economy in this period see Barlow 1980, 203 ff. The economic malignancy continued after the civil war and Sulla in contrast to the earlier period imposed tax burdens on the alliance's kings and upon the cities. App. civ. 1. 102. See also Rostovtzeff 1941, 947; Troxell 1982, 116; Arslan 2007, 284 fn. 1266.

⁴⁷ Cic. leg. Man. 4. 10. See also Arslan 2003, 202 ff.

⁴⁸ Strab. 14. 5. 2; Plut. Luc. 14. 5; 26. 1; Pomp. 28. 4; App. Syr. 48, 69; Mithr. 105, 106. See also Cass. Dio 36. 2. 3-5; 36. 37. 6; Iust. 40. 1. 3-4.

⁴⁹ Plut. Luc. 3. 1.

journey, when Lucullus arrived in Egypt ca. 86 B.C., Ptolemaios abandoned his alliance with Rome, from fear of the outcome of the war.

With every passing day the situation was becoming worse and Rome needed to respond with more effective measures. If this did not happen then the stability of Anatolia would be lost and the arrangements made by Sulla would unravel. The piracy was becoming completely out of control and the occupation of Cilicia Pedias by Tigranes II are the first indications of this deteriorating situation⁵⁰. The new initiative of Tigranes II which indicated a more organized movement of pirate activity is an indication that, as in the first war, in the looming war the pirates would be able to prevent the Roman navy from providing the help requested from her allies in the region. Further, Rome could lose sovereignty over the coast of Pamphylia and the East Mediterranean and this would have emboldened her enemies. This situation would result in a massive loss of prestige, as also of sovereignty in Anatolia and at sea. In other words, Rome stood exposed to losses from which recovery would be very difficult indeed. Rome and its allies had seen the first war with Mithradates and knew the outcome of the second was not a forgone conclusion in favor of Rome. If the king did not follow an excessively expansionist policy, Roman rule in Anatolia could be erased⁵¹.

While there still remained no outright war in Anatolia, to some extent reducing the collaboration between the king and the pirates seems to have been the most sensible course of action that could be followed. This would have been facilitated by the foundation of a new province in the territory closest to the pirate centre. The province of Cilicia based in Pamphylia would ensure Roman domination in the area which had been weakened through piracy⁵². In this way, the workload of the governor of Asia and other administrators responsible for a most extensive area, would also be

⁵⁰ Even the appearance or suspicion of the threat on both land and sea caused great economic damage to Rome. Cic. leg. Man. 6. 15. As could be understood from the law that aimed for secure travel at sea ca. 100 B.C., this situation could also undermine or greatly reduce maritime trade and stop the grain supply from the east. See, Pohl 1993, 210 f.; Durukan 2009, 77.

⁵¹ At that time Rome attempted to remedy this situation through the success of Sulla and through the resistance of many cities to the kings, however, if they failed to implement the necessary measures, a new struggle in which King Mithradates, the pirates and King Tigranes were more closely co-ordinated and combined, would create an extremely dangerous situation for Rome.

⁵² Cic. leg. agr. 1. 5; 2. 50; Strab. 14. 5. 7; Eutr. 6. 3. See also Ormerod 1922, 36; Adak 2006, 118.

reduced⁵³ and they would be able to operate more effectively. Due to the governor's extensive military responsibilities following the outbreak of war in 89 B.C., he could not fulfill all his duties in respect to the province, nor could he exercise control over the maritime theater as required. Moreover, as can be understood from the siege of Mitylene by M. Minicius Thermus, the successor of Murena, and Lucullus⁵⁴ quiescence could not easily be obtained in the province. For Rome in this respect, the struggle with piracy in Pamphylia was of as much importance as the secure governance of the province of Asia together with its economic resources, both of these not just the matter of piracy were vital to Rome⁵⁵.

When these developments in Anatolia are taken together into consideration they gain in importance. Realizing the importance of the piracy menace, a start could not be made on any extensive campaign, together with Sulla's mistrust of the king⁵⁶ with whom he only made peace for pressing reasons. When Sulla became dictator he first tried to consolidate his power then began to deal with civic problems and the foreign policy of Rome. After he put into practise his desired form of management, he witnessed in person the improved developments since 93 B.C. during his visit to Anatolia, he saw the necessity for the creation of the new province. In this context, as result of both the information provided by Murena concerning the piracy problem and about Mithradates and also possible reports⁵⁷ submitted by Lucullus about the difficulties he had in performing his duties in the province, it seems most reasonable to suggest that it was at this time that it was decided to establish the new province. From experience, observation and report from Murena who returned to Rome in 81 B.C. and from Lucullus, the most appropriate time to execute the foundation of the

⁵³ It is also thought that the separation of the Galatian and Cappadocian provinces by Traianus was due to the difficulties in administering this very large area by just one governor. Magie *RRAM* I 1950, 605 f. fn. 25. Cappadocia came into prominence in this period because of the planned campaign by Traianus to the Arabia and Parthia in particular.

⁵⁴ Liv. perioch. 89; Plut. Luc. 4. 2-3; Suet. Iul. 2.

⁵⁵ The economic importance of the Province of Asia for Rome is one of the main themes of Cicero's orations with the aim of getting Pompeius command in the third war against Mithradates. Cic. leg. Man. 2. 5; 6. 14; 7. 17; 7. 19.

⁵⁶ Plut. Sull. 24. 2; App. Mithr. 58; Iust. 38. 3. 1-8. For Sulla's distrust of the king, see also Plut. Sull. 5. 3; Mar. 31. 2; App. Mithr. 10; 13; 112; Memnon 22.

⁵⁷ Because of the danger from Mithradates, epistles were written by Roman administrators to immediately inform Rome of the situation, see Cic. leg. Man. 2. 4.

new province in the light of the information obtained was when Sulla had complete authority⁵⁸.

When the general policy of Rome in Anatolia from 129 B.C. and the sphere of activity of the administrators in the area in 80 B.C. are taken into consideration, it can be understood that this province was created as a defensive measure, as a result of threats against their interests⁵⁹ rather than forming part of any aggressive policy of conquest. With the establishment of the Province of Cilicia better control could be exercised over the increasing danger along the Anatolian coastline⁶⁰. There is nothing known about the activities of Cn. Cornelius Dolabella, the first governor of the province except his probable struggle with the pirates⁶¹. As in the law published ca. 100 B.C., Sulla had already forbidden the administrators from fighting outside their province, without the permission of the *populus* and the *senatus* and the breaking of this prohibition was regarded as treason⁶². For this reason Dolabella was mainly on the defensive, and formed a part of the process of establishing the structure in province for the campaigns which would later be launched against the pirates. However due to the plundering carried out by himself, his quaestor Malleolus and Verres in the cities of the area there was more support and participation in pirate

⁵⁸ When Sulla had himself declared dictator for life in 82 B.C. he had the authority to make his arrangements concerning the area. Plut. Sull. 33. See also Keaveney 1983, 192 ff. However probably through the disposal of his enemies and forming the governance in Rome to his wishes with his consulship in 80 B.C. he ended his dictatorship. Plut. Sull. 34. 3; App. civ. 1. 103; Oros. hist. 5. 22. 1; Auct. Liber de Vir. ill. 75. 12.

⁵⁹ While there was still no war, the basic aim was to render more effective the administrative-military structure for the struggle with the pirates, and it must also have been to consolidate Rome's rule in Anatolia and to strengthen the lines of defence as Rome during the first Mithradates War, begun in 89 B.C., had entirely lost control in Anatolia within a short period of time, possibly a year, both because there were few troops stationed in the province of Asia and because of the negative attitude taken by the Romans towards the inhabitants of the province. See, Cic. Verr. 2. 1. 44; 2. 1. 73. See also Sherwin-White 1976, 11; 1984, 153 f.; Pohl 1993, 260 fn. 214.

⁶⁰ While there was no attempt made by Tigranes II to establish control over Cilicia Pedias and Syria ca. 83 B.C., the regularly sending by Rome of administrators to the area from 80 B.C. onwards seems to reflect the anxiety felt towards the pirates.

⁶¹ Cic. Verr. 2. 1. 44; 2. 1. 73. See also Sherwin-White 1976, 11; 1984, 153 f.; Pohl 1993, 260 fn. 214.

⁶² Cic. Pis. 21. 50. See also Keaveney 1983, 199 ff. As could be seen with the recall of Murena in 81 B.C. and not sending an army against Sertorius, essentially Sulla refrained from any campaign during this period.

activities⁶³. With P. Servilius Vatia⁶⁴ the second governor of the province began the hardening attitude of Rome on land and sea, as Vatia performed a large scale campaign against piracy. During his office 78-75 B.C. Vatia gained important successes against the pirates and their strongholds in Isauria briefly came under Roman control⁶⁵. Henceforth, with the creation of the Cilician Province, the struggle of governor of the province Asia came to end, as the problems with the pirates and the peoples living around Pisidia and Isauria then became the problems of the governor of Cilicia. In this way, Rome in her struggle both with the tribes around Pisidia, Isauria and against piracy would gain a very important advantage as the forces at the governor of Cilicia's disposal would be adjacent to the area of operations, and thus be able to intervene more quickly against either the king, the pirates or the restive peoples of Isauria and any possible linkage between the king and the pirates could be more swiftly interdicted.

In conclusion, the titles of M. Antonius and Sulla indicate that they were the governors of Asia and there is no information in the *lex de provinciis praetoriis* to indicate that the position of governor of Cilicia existed at that time, given the remarks made above concerning the fact that only two governors, those of Macedonia and Asia, are recorded as having to take the oath. The person who was responsible for fundamental changes to policy concerning Cilicia in the period under investigation was Sulla, and it seems the establishment of the province of Cilicia in Pamphylia was due to the military requirements that he faced at that time, not only from piracy but also from Mithradates and from Tigranes. In support for the establishment of the province of Cilicia in 80 B.C. is the fact that records show the governor and his officials were regularly appointed from this year onwards and therefore that the province was established at this time. Only after the passage of years would the geographical and the territorial coincide in *Provincia Cilicia*.

⁶³ Ormerod 1922, 37.

⁶⁴ Broughton 1952, 87 ff.

⁶⁵ Liv. perioch. 93. 1; Strab. 12. 6. 2; Flor. epit. 1. 41. 6; Eutr. 6. 3; Amm. Marc. 14. 8. 4; Vell. 2. 39; Oros. hist. 5. 23. 21-23; Fest. Brev. 12. 3. See also Keyser 1997, 66 ff.; Uğurlu 2007, 82 ff.

Bibliography and Abbreviations

- Adak 2006 Adak, M., “Batı Toroslar’da Yerel Ayaklanmalar ve Eşkıyalık”, Olba XIV, 113-126.
- AE L’ Année Épigraphique.
- AJPh American Journal of Philology.
- ANRW Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt.
- Arslan 2003 Arslan, M., “Piracy on the Southern Coast of Asia Minor and Mithridates Eupator”, Olba 8, 195-211.
- Arslan 2007 Arslan, M., Mithradates VI Eupator: Roma’nın Büyük Düşmanı, İstanbul.
- Badian 1956 Badian, E., “Q. Mucius Scaevola and the Province of Asia”, Athenaeum 34, 104-123.
- Badian 1964 Badian, E., Studies in Greek and Roman History, Oxford.
- Badian 1968 Badian, E., Roman Imperialism in the Late Republic, Oxford.
- Barlow 1980 Barlow, C. T., “The Roman Government and the Roman Economy, 92-80 B.C.”, AJPh 101/2, 202-219.
- Bechert 2001 Bechert, T., Die Provinzen des Römischen Reiches: Einführung und Überblick, Mainz.
- Brandt 1992 Brandt, H., Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft Pamphyliens und Pisidiens im Altertum, Bonn.
- Brandt – Kolb 2005 Brandt, H. – Kolb, F., Lycia et Pamphylia: Eine Römische Provinz im Südwesten Kleinasiens, Mainz.
- Brennan 2000 Brennan, T. C., The Praetorship in the Roman Republic II, Oxford.
- Broughton 1933 Broughton, T. R. S., “Some Notes on the War with the Homanadeis”, AJPh 54/2, 133-144.
- Broughton 1938 Broughton, T. R. S., Roman Asia Minor, Baltimore.
- Broughton 1952 Broughton, T. R. S., The Magistrates of the Roman Republic II, 99 B.C – 31 B.C., New York.
- Broughton 1986 Broughton, T. R. S., The Magistrates of the Roman Republic III: Supplement, Atlanta.
- Bulin 1983 Bulin, R. K., Untersuchungen zur Politik und Kriegführung Roms im Osten von 100 – 68 v. Chr., Frankfurt/Main.
- CAH Cambridge Ancient History.
- Cottier et al. 2008 Cottier, M. – Crawford, M. H. – Crowther, C. V. – Ferrary, J. L. – Levick, B. M. – Salomes, O. – Wörrle, M., “Geography, Politics, and Imperialism in the Asian Customs Law”, see: The Customs Law of Asia, Cottier, M. – Crawford, M. H. – Crowther, C. V. – Ferrary, J. L. – Levick, B. M. – Salomes, O. – Wörrle, M., (ed.), 165-202, Oxford.

- Crawford 1996 Crawford, M. H., *Roman Statutes I*, London.
- Drew-Bear 1972 Drew-Bear, Th., “Three Senatus Consulta Concerning The Province of Asia”, *Historia* 21/1, 75-87.
- Dmitriev 2000 Dmitriev, S., “Observations on the Historical Geography of Roman Lycaonia”, *GRBS* 41/4, 349-374.
- Dmitriev 2006 Dmitriev, S., “Cappadocian Dynastic Rearrangements on the eve of the First Mithridatic War”, *Historia* 55, 285-297.
- Durukan 2009 Durukan, M., “The Connection of Eastern and Central Cilicia with Piracy”, *Adalya XII*, 77-102.
- EA Epigraphica Anatolica
- Engelmann – Knibbe 1989 Engelmann, H. – Knibbe, D., “Das Zollgesetz der Provinz Asia: Ein Neue Inschrift aus Ephesos”, *EA* 14, 1-195.
- Feld 2005 Feld, K., *Die Isaurier und das Römische Reich*, Berlin.
- Ferrary 1998 Ferrary, J. L., *Philhellenisme et impérialisme: aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la seconde guerre de la Macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate*, Rome.
- Ferrary 2000 Ferrary, J. L., “Les gouverneurs des provinces romaines d’Asie Mineure (Asie et Cilicie) depuis l’organisation de la province d’Asie jusqu’à la première guerre de Mithridate (126-88 av. J. C)”, *Chiron* 30, 161-193.
- Ferrary 2008 Ferrary, J. L., “Retour sur la loi des inscriptions de Delphes et de Cnide (Roman Statutes, n° 12)”, see: *Epigrafia 2006: Atti della XIV^e rencontre sur l’épigraphie in onore di Silvio Panciera con altri contributi di colleghi, allievi e collaboratori (Tituli 9)*, Caldelli, M. L. – Gregori, G. L. – Orlandi, S., (ed.), 101-114, Roma.
- Freeman 1986 Freeman, P., “The Province of Cilicia and Its Origins”, see: *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East*, Freeman, P. – Kennedy, D., (ed.), 253-275, Berkeley.
- French 1991 French, D., “Sites and Inscriptions from Phrygia, Pisidia and Pamphylia”, *EA* 17, 51-63.
- Glaz et al. 1999 Glaz, M. L. – Jean-Louis Voisin – Bohec, Y. L., *Histoire de Rome*, Paris.
- Grainger 2009 Grainger, J. D., *The Cities of Pamphylia*, Oxford/Oakville.
- GRBS Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies.
- Hassall et al. 1974 Hassall, M. – Crawford, M. H. – Reynolds, J., “Rome and the Eastern Provinces at the End of the Second Century B.C.: The so-called ‘Piracy Law’ and a new inscription from Cnidos”, *JRS* 64, 194-221.

- Hild – Hellenkemper 2004
Hild, F. – Hellenkemper, H., *Kilikien und Isaurien*, TIB 5/1, Wien.
- Hind 1994
Hind, J. G. F., “Mithridates”, *CAH IX*², 129-165.
- IGR
Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes.
- ILLRP
Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae.
- ILS
Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae.
- IK
Inchriften griechischer Staedte aus Kleinasien.
- JNES
Journal of Near Eastern Studies.
- Jones 1937
Jones, A. H. M., *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford.
- JRS
Journal of Roman Studies
- Kallet-Marx 1995
Kallet-Marx, R. M., *Hegemony to Empire: The Development of the Roman Imperium in the East from 148 to 62 B.C.*, Berkeley.
- Keaveney 1983
Keaveney, A., “Studies in the Dominatio Sullae”, *Klio* 65, 185-208.
- Keaveney 1992
Keaveney, A., *Lucullus: A Life*, London.
- Keyser 1997
Keyser, P. T., “Sallust’s *Historiae*, Dioskorides and the Sites of the Korykos Captured by P. Servilius Vatia”, *Historia XLVI*, 64-77.
- Kreiler 2007
Kreiler, B., “Zur Verwaltung Kilikiens von 102 bis 78 v. Chr.”, *Gephyra* 4, 117-126.
- Levick 1967
Levick, B., *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, Oxford.
- Liebmann-Frankfort 1969
Liebmann-Frankfort, Th., “La Prouincia Cilicia et son intégration dans l’empire romain” see: *Hommages à Marcel Renard, II* (Collection Latomus 102), Bibauw, J., (ed.), 447-457, Brussels.
- Lintott 1993
Lintott, A., *Imperium Romanum: Politics and Administration*, London.
- Magie 1950
Magie, D., *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century After Christ I-II*, Princeton.
- McGing 1986
McGing, B. C., *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator King of Pontus*, Leiden.
- Merola 2001
Merola, G. D., *Autonomia Locale Governo Imperiale: Fiscalità e amministrazione nelle province asiatiche*, Bari.
- Mitford 1980
Mitford, T. B., “Roman Rough Cilicia,” *ANRW II* 7. 2, 1230-61.
- Mitchell 2008
Mitchell, S., “Geography, Politics, and Imperialism in the Asian Customs Law”, see: *The Customs Law of Asia*, Cottier, M. – Crawford, M. H. – Crowther, C. V. – Ferrary, J. L. – Levick, B. M. – Salomes, O. – Wörrle, M., (ed.) 165-202, Oxford.
- Nollé 1993
Nollé, J., *Side im Altertum: Geschichte und Zeugnisse*, IK 43, Bonn.
- OGIS
Orientis Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae.

- Ormerod 1922 Ormerod, H. A., "The Campaigns of Servilius Isauricus against the Pirates", *JRS* 12, 35-56.
- Pilhofer 2006 Pilhofer, S., *Romanisierung in Kilikien? Das Zeugnis der Inschriften (Quellen und Forschungen zur Antiken Welt 46)*, München.
- Pohl 1993 Pohl, H., *Die römische Politik und die Piraterie im östlichen Mittelmeer vom 3. bis zum 1. Jh. v. chr.*, Berlin.
- Rostovtzeff 1941 Rostovtzeff, M., *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World II*, Oxford.
- Sanford 1950 Sanford, E. M., "Roman Avarice in Asia", *JNES* 9/1, 28-36.
- Santangelo 2007 Santangelo, F., *Sulla, The Elites and the Empire: A Study of Roman Policies in Italy and the Greek East*, Leiden.
- Sayar et al. 1994 Sayar M. H. – Siewert, P. – Taeuber, H., "Asylie-Erklärungen des Sulla und Lucullus für das Isis- und Serapisheiligtum von Mopsuestia (Ostkilikien)", *Tyche* 9, 113-130.
- Sayar 1999 Sayar, M. H., "Antik Kilikya'da Şehirleşme", see: XII. Türk Tarih Kongresi Ankara 12-16 Eylül 1994, Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler Cilt I, 193-216, Ankara.
- SEG Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum.
- Sherk 1984 Sherk, R. K., *Rome and Greek East to the death of Augustus (Translated Documents of Greece and Rome 4)*, Cambridge.
- Sherwin-White 1976 Sherwin-White, A. N., "Rome, Pamphylia and Cilicia, 133-70", *JRS* 66, 1-14.
- Sherwin-White 1977 Sherwin-White, A. N., "Roman Involvement in Anatolia, 167-88 B.C.", *JRS* 67, 62-75.
- Sherwin-White 1984 Sherwin-White, A. N., *Roman Foreign Policy in the East 168. B.C.-A.D. 1*, London.
- Sherwin-White 1994 Sherwin-White, A. N., "Lucullus, Pompey and the East", *CAH IX*², 1994, 229-265.
- de Souza 1997 de Souza, P., "Romans and Pirates in a Late Hellenistic Oracle from Pamphylia", *The Classical Quarterly* 47/2, 477-481.
- de Souza 1999 de Souza, P., *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World*, Cambridge.
- Syll. Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum.
- Stevenson 1939 Stevenson, G. H., *Roman Provincial Administration: Till the Age of the Antonines*, Oxford.
- Syme 1939 Syme, R., "Observations on the Province of Cilicia", see: *Anatolian Studies Presented to William Hepburn Buckler*, Calder, W. M., - Keil, J., (ed.), 299-333, Manchester.
- Uğurlu 2007 Uğurlu, E., "Olympos ve Zeniketes'in Kalesinin Lokalizasyonu", *Adalya X*, 81-103.
- Ussher 1658 Ussher, J., *The Annals of the World*, London.

- Troxell 1982 Troxell, H. A., *The Coinage of the Lycian League* (Numismatic Notes and Monographs 162), New York.
- TIB *Tabula Imperii Byzantini*
- Wesch-Klein 2008 Wesch-Klein, G., *Provincia: Okkupation und Verwaltung der Provinzen des Imperium Romanum von der Inbesitznahme Siziliens bis auf Diokletian*. Ein Abriss, Berlin.